mentioned by Josephus have failed to   
convince any one except their propounders.  
See them quoted in my Greek Test. The  
assumption of Josephus having *misplaced  
his Theudas* is perhaps improbable; but  
*by no means impossible*, in an historian  
*teeming with inaccuracies*. All we can  
say is, that such impostors were too   
frequent, for any one to be able to say that  
there was not one of this name, which was  
by no means uncommon, at the time   
specified. It is exceedingly improbable,   
considering the time and circumstances of the  
writing of the Acts, and the evident   
supervision of them by St. Paul, the pupil of  
Gamaliel, that a gross historical mistake  
should have been here put into his mouth.

**about four hundred** hardly agrees  
with Josephus’s words above, “*a very  
great multitude*,” which may mean even  
more, *the greatest part of the multitude:*  
and this confirms the idea that different  
events are pointed at in the two accounts.  
But the Jewish historian speaks very  
widely about such matters: see note on ch.  
xxi. 38.

**37.]** The decided words,  
**after this man**, fix beyond doubt the place  
here assigned to Theudas. ‘The revolt  
of Judas, and the occasion of his revolt  
are related by Josephus. It arose on the  
mission of Quirinus to enroll the inhabitants  
of Judea. They took it quietly at first,  
but afterwards rose in revolt under Judas  
as their leader. Ife says he was a   
Gaulonite, from a city named Gamala, and in  
returning to the mention of him as the  
founder of the fourth sect among the Jews,  
he calls him “*Judas of Galilee*”? From  
the above citation it is plain that this  
**enrolment** was that so called beyond all  
others, under Quirinus: see Luke ii. 2 and  
note. His revolt took a theocratic character,  
his followers maintaining, as Josephus tells  
us, *that God was the only ruler and master*.  
His end is not related by Josephus.

**were dispersed]** Strictly accurate—for  
they still existed, and at last became active  
and notorious again, under Menahem, son  
of Judas the Galilean, as Josephus also   
relates.   
  
**38.] if it be of men...if it is of  
God**: implying by the first, perhaps, the  
manifold devices of human imposture and  
wickedness, any of which it might be, and all  
of which would equally come to nought,—  
and, on the other hand, the solemnity and  
fixedness of the divine purpose by the   
*indicative* mood, which are also intimated by the  
*present* tense, **ye cannot**.—Or perhaps the  
indicative mood is used in the second place,  
because that is the *case assumed*, and on  
which the advice is founded. At all events,  
the distinction ought to be prescribed, which  
it is not in our A.V.

**this counsel]** The  
whole plan—**the scheme**, of which this **work**,  
the fact under your present cognizance, forms  
a part.

**39.]** He warns them, lest they  
be found opponents not only to *them*, but  
*also* to God:—‘*even’ in* A.V., does not  
give the sense.—As regards Gamaliel’s   
advice we may remark that it was founded  
on a view of the issues of events, agreeing  
with the fatalism of the Pharisees: that  
it betokens *no leaning towards Christianity*,  
nor indeed very much even of worldly  
wisdom;—but serves to shew how low  
the supreme council of the Jews had sunk  
both in their theology and their political  
sagacity, if such a fallacious *laissez-aller*  
view of matters was the counsel of the  
wisest among them. It seems certainly,  
on a closer view, as if they accepted, from  
fear of the people (see ver. 26), this