especially committed to him) the keys of  
the kingdom of heaven,—who opened the  
door to the 3000 on the day of Pentecost,  
—now (as a formal and ratifying act) to  
the Samaritans,—and in ch. x. to the Gentiles. So far, is plain truth of Scripture  
history. The monstrous fiction begins,  
when to Peter is attributed a fixed diocese  
and successors, and to those successors a  
delegated power more like that ascribed to  
Simon Magus than that promised to Peter.  
——This is the last time that JOHN appears  
in the Acts. He is only once more mentioned in the New Testament (except in  
the Revelation), viz. as having been present in Jerusalem at Paul’s visit, Gal. ii. 9.

**15. prayed for them**] So laying on  
of hands is preceded by prayer, ch. vi. 6;  
xiii, 3.

**18. when Simon saw**] Its  
effects were therefore *visible* (see above),  
and consequently the effect of the laying  
on of the Apostles’ hands was not the *inward* but the *outward miraculous* gifts of  
the Spirit.

**he offered them money**] De  
Wette excellently remarks, ‘He regarded  
the capability of imparting the Holy Spirit,  
—*rightly, as something conferred*, as a *derived power* (see Matt. x. 1), but *wrongly*,  
as one to be obtained by an *external  
method*, without an *inward disposition:*  
and, since in external commerce every  
thing may be had for gold, *he wanted to  
buy it*. This is the essence of the sin of  
*Simony*, which is intimately connected with  
unbelief in the power and signification of  
the Spirit, and with materialism.’—Clearly,  
from the narrative, Simon himself *did not  
receive the Spirit by the laying on of  
hands*. His nefarious attempt to treat  
with the Apostles was *before he himself  
had been presented to them for this purpose*.

**20.**] The solemn denunciation  
of Peter, like the declaration of Paul, 1 Cor.  
vi. 13, has reference to the perishableness  
of all worldly good, and of those with it,  
whose chief end is the use of it (see Col.  
ii. 22). ‘Thy gold and thou are equally  
on the way to corruption:’ *thy gold*, as its  
nature is: *thou with it*, as having no higher  
life than thy natural corrupt one: as being  
bound in the *bond of iniquity*. The *expression of the same Peter*, 1 Pet. i. 7, *“gold that  
perisheth,”* is remarkably parallel with this  
(see too 1 Pet. i. 18).

**thou thoughtest**] not *‘thou hast thought’*, as A. V.  
The historic force of the tense is to be  
kept here: the Apostle uses it as looking  
forward to the day of his destruction, ‘Let  
thy lot be destruction, and that because  
thou thoughtest,’ &c.

**to acquire**, not  
passive, as A. V., ungrammatically.

**21. neither part nor lot**] The two words  
are apparently synonymous: the first being  
literal, the second figurative, but not without reference perhaps to the *inheritance* of  
the kingdom of God, the *incorruptible inheritance*, 1 Pet. i. 4.

**this matter**] i.e. **the matter now spoken of**,—‘to which  
I now allude.’

**thy heart is not right**,  
—sincere, single-meaning,—**in God's presence**, ‘as God sees it:’ i.e. ‘seen as it  
really is, by God, is not in earnest in its