number at the time, is not said. Clearly  
the 120 names of ch. i. 15 cannot be meant.

**It is not our pleasure]** Not, *it is  
not reasonable*, as Beza, Calvin, and the  
A.V. The meaning of the original word  
is always as above.

**leave the word  
of God]** For to this it would come, if the  
Apostles were to enquire into, and do   
justice in, every case of asserted neglect.

**serve tables]** It is a question, whether  
this expression import the service of   
distributing money—or that of apportioning  
the daily public meals. The latter seems  
to me most probable, both on account of.  
the word “*daily*” above, aud of the usage  
of the word *ministration*. That both kinds  
of tables may be meant, is possible: but  
hardly probable.

**3. look ye out]** The  
similarity to Gen. xli. 33 may be noticed,  
and seems to shew that the **look ye out** of  
the A.V. is the right rendering.

**seven men]** Some have supposed a   
reference to the number of nations of  
which the Hellenistic Jews would per-  
haps be composed: some, to 7000, to  
which number the believers would by  
this time amount: some, to the mystic  
number seven, so common in Jewish  
writings:—but the best remark is   
Lightfoot’s:—‘why seven were to be chosen, let  
him say, who has boldness to make the  
guess.’—Some present consideration of  
convenience probably regulated the number.

**over this business (or duty)]** The  
*duty* (see above) was, not that of ministering  
to the Hellenistic Jews only, but that of  
superintending the whole distribution.

**4.] the ministry of the word**, in opposition  
to the ministry, or serving, of tables. “This  
is the noblest portion of the work, which  
no bishop can delegate to another, as   
being himself occupied in more important  
matters.” Calvin.

**5.] full of faith**, —  
not in the lower sense of ‘truthfulness,’  
but in the higher of **faith**, the root  
of all Christian virtues: see ch. xi. 24.—  
Of these seven, Stephen and Philip (ch.  
viii. 5, 26, 40; xxi. 8) only are elsewhere  
mentioned. On the idea of Nicolas having  
founded the heretical sect of the   
Nicolaitans, Rev. ii. 6, 15, see note there. From  
his being called **a proselyte of Antioch**,  
some have argued that *he only* was a   
proselyte, and none of the rest: some that *all*  
were proselytes,—but the rest, of   
Jerusalem. But neither inference seems justified:  
rather I should say that the addition simply  
imports that he became better known than  
the rest, from the very circumstance   
perhaps of Antioch having been afterwards  
so important a spot in the Christian  
history (ch. xi, 19, note).—These names  
are all Greek: but we cannot thence infer  
that the seven were all Hellenistic Jews:  
the Apostles Philip and Andrew bore Greek  
names, but were certainly not Hellenists.  
There does appear however, in the ease of  
these two Apostles, to have been a   
connexion with Greeks of some sort, see John  
xii, 20–22. Possibly, though *Hebrews*,  
they may not have been *descended from  
Hebrews* (see above on ver. 1), but sprung  
from intermarriage with Hellenists. And  
so these seven may have been partly   
Hebrews, though their names seem to indicate,  
and their office would appear to require,  
that they were connected with Hellenists,  
and not likely to overlook or disparage  
them. The title of ‘*deacons*’ is nowhere  
applied to these seven in Scripture, nor  
does the occur in the Acts at all.  
In 1 Tim. iii. 8 ff. there is no absolute  
identification of the duties of deacons with  
those allotted to these seven, but at the  
same time nothing to imply that they were  
different. The universal consent of all  
Christian writers in regarding this as the  
institution of the office of deacons should