The expression, **the senate of the children  
of Israel**, common in the LXX, is perhaps  
translated from the form of words in which  
they were summoned.

**24.] the priest,**  
if genuine (and the varieties of reading  
seem to have arisen from the difficulty it  
has occasioned), must designate the *High*  
Priest; not that the word itself can bear  
the meaning (compare 1 Macc. xv. 1 and  
2), but that the *context* points out *the  
priest* thus designated *to be the Iigh  
Priest*. On *the captain of the temple*,  
see note ch, iv.1. He appears to have  
been summoned to meet the Sanhedrim,  
perhaps as the offence had taken place  
within his jurisdiction. But he was   
probably one of the *chief priests*. ‘These  
latter were the *titular High Priests*, partly  
those who had served the office, partly the  
presidents of the twenty-four courses, partly  
the kindred of the High Priest (see Matt.  
ii. 4).

**concerning them]** i.e. ‘*concerning the Apostles’*,   
the persons mentioned   
in ver. 22; not ‘*these words*,’ as  
would appear at first sight.

**whereunto this would grow**, i.e. **to what this  
would come**, is the correct translation  
of the original: not, as some have   
maintained, ‘*how this had come about:*’ nor,  
‘*what was the meaning of this.*’

**26.]**  
The clause, **lest they should have besn  
stoned**, depends upon “*brought them   
without violence*,” not upon “*for they feared the  
people.*”

**23.]** “They ought to have  
enquired first, How did ye escape? But  
as if nothing had happened, they ask them,  
saying &c.” Chrysostom. “The same   
shyness of open allusion to the names or facts  
connected with Jesus and the spread of  
his doctrine may be traced in the words  
“*this name*,” and “*this man’s blood*,” and  
is a strong mark of truth and   
circumstantiality— “The High Priest will not name  
Jesus: Peter names and celebrates Him.”  
Bengel.

**to bring this man’s blood  
upon us]** Not meaning that *divine   
vengeance* would come on them for the murder  
of Jesus; but with a stress on **us**—that  
the *people* would be incited to   
take vengeance on *them*, the Sanhedrim, for that  
murder, The preceding clause, “*ye have  
filled Jerusalem with your doctrine*,” shews  
this to be their thought. Compare the  
pointed address of Peter to the Sanhedrim,  
ch. iv. 8–12, and the distinction between  
them and the people in iv. 21.—This being  
so, the resemblance between this expression  
and the imprecation of the people in Matt.  
xxvii. 25 must not be too closely pressed,  
though the coincidence is too striking to  
escape notice.

**29.] Peter**, by word of  
mouth; **the Apostles**, as a body, by *assent*,  
implied in *his own utterance* and *their  
silence*. There is no occasion to insert  
“*other*,” as done in the A.V.—This   
defence of Peter divides itself into the   
propositions of an ordinary syllogism—(1) *The  
statement of the general truth that we  
must obey God rather than men:* (2) *The  
reduction of the present circumstances  
under that general truth*, as being the  
work of the God of their Fathers—shewn  
in his having raised and glorified Jesus,  
for a definite purpose, to give, &c.—(3) *The*