probably ch. xiii. 2, but certainly ch. x.  
19; xvi. 6, 7. Chrysostom understands  
the words of *the appearance of an angel*,  
but the text hardly allows it.

**30.**) Yea, but....: i.e. “It is well, thou art  
well employed: but....?” The form of  
the question assumes, modestly, that he  
did not understand what he was reading.

**31.**] **For** (see margin) gives the  
reason of the negative which is understood.  
The answer expresses at once humility and  
docility.

**32.**] Perhaps it is best to  
render, **The contents of the** (passage of)  
**Scripture which he was reading were as  
follows.**

**33.**] This stands in the Hebrew ‘He was taken away by distress and  
judgment’ (so in the margin of the A.V.):  
i.e. as Lowth, ‘by an oppressive judgment.’

**his generation**] i.e. **the age in  
which he shall live**—‘the wickedness of his  
contemporaries.’ The fathers, and Bede  
and some modern Commentators, explain  
‘*His generation*’ of His eternal Sonship  
and His miraculous Incarnation. But the  
Hebrew does not seem to bear this out.

**34. answered**] *to the passage of  
Scripture*, considered as the question proposed: not, to the question in ver. 30.  
We can hardly suppose any immediate reference in the words **some other man**, to Christ.

**86. a certain water**] Traditions  
about the situation of this spring are found  
in some ancient notes to Jerome. It is  
said to be near a place named Bethsur.  
Eusebius states it to be twenty miles south  
of Jerusalem in the direction of Hebron:  
and so it is set down in the ancient itineraries. Pocock found there a fountain  
built over, and a village called Betur on  
the left. Fabri describes the fountain as the  
head of a considerable brook, and found near  
it the ruins of a Christian church. There  
is no improbability in the tradition, except  
that, even supposing a way going across  
from Hebron straight to Gaza to be called  
*desert*, this would not be on that portion  
of it, but on the high road.

**what doth hinder me to be baptized?**] There is  
no reason for supposing Philip to have  
preached to him the necessity of baptism:  
his own acquaintance with Jewish practices,  
and perhaps his knowledge of the progress of the new faith in Jerusalem, would  
account for the proposition.

**37.**) The authorities against this verse are too  
strong to permit its insertion. It appears  
to have been one of those remarkable additions to the text of the Acts, common