in some of even our earliest MSS., few  
of which, however, have found their way  
into the revised text. This insertion is found  
as early as Irenæus (Century II.), who  
quotes it. It appears to have been made  
to suit the formularies of the baptismal  
liturgies, it being considered strange that  
the eunuch should have been baptized without some such confession.

**38.** **he** (viz.  
the eunuch) **commanded**] Some of our  
MSS., whose text apparently Jerome followed, read here, ‘*the Spirit fell on the  
eunuch, and an angel of the Lord caught  
away Philip*.” This is curious, and has  
probably arisen from a desire to conform  
the results of the eunuch’s baptism to the  
usual method of the divine procedure, and  
the snatching away of Philip to his commission, ver. 26. But the Spirit did not  
fall on the Samaritans after baptism by  
Philip.—The text clearly relates a supernatural disappearance of Philip: compare  
2 Kings ii. 16; no interpretation of his  
being suddenly hurried away by the  
prompting of the Spirit, will satisfy the  
analogy of the above-cited passage, and of  
(see below) a parallel one in St. Luke’s own  
Gospel.

**39. saw him no more**] Not  
‘never saw him from that day,’ though (see  
below) that meaning may be indirectly  
included :—but as in Luke xxiv. 31, “*He  
vanished from their sight,*” and as in the  
strictly parallel words of 2 Kings ii. 12,  
“*he saw him no more*,”—after the going  
up of Elijah. These last words in my view  
decide the question, that the departure of  
Philip was miraculous.

**for he went on  
his way**] This refers to *what follows:*—  
Philip was found at Azotus: if the eunuch  
had gone *that way*, he might have met  
with him again: but he did not, for he  
went from the fountain *on his own way*,  
which did not lead through Azotus. There

has been some strange inadvertence in this  
verse on the part of the translators of the  
A. V. The Greek has plainly, **and the  
eunuch saw him no more, for he went  
on his way rejoicing:** and there is no  
variety of reading.

**40.**] The term  
“*was found*” again appears to refer to  
4 Kings ii. ver. 17.—AZOTUS or ASHDOD  
(Josh. xiii. 3; 1 Sam. v. 5 al.) was one of  
the five principal cities of the Philistines,  
never, though nominally in Judah, thoroughly subjugated by the Jews: it was  
taken by Tartan the Assyrian general (Isa.  
xx. 1),—again by Psammetichus, Jer. xxv.  
20,—again by Judas Maccabæus (1 Macc.  
v. 68) and Jonathan (1 Macc. x. 84), and  
the latter destroyed;—rebuilt by Gabinius, and belonged to the kingdom of  
Herod, who left it in his will to his sister  
Salome. At present it is a small village,  
retaining the name Esdud, but there are  
no remains.

**all the cities**] viz. Ekron,  
Jamnia, Joppa, Apollonia, on the direct  
road: or, if he deviated somewhat for the  
purpose, Lydda also (which seems implied  
ch. ix. 32).

**Cæsarea**] See note, ch.  
x. 1.

**CHAP. IX. 1—30.**] CONVERSION OF  
SAUL.

**1.**] The narrative is taken up  
from ch. viii. 3, but probably with some  
interval, sufficient perhaps to cover the  
events of ch. viii.

We should perhaps hardly render the original word here,  
as the A. V., “breathing *out*,’ — but  
**breathing**; his ‘spirit,’ inhaled or exhaled,  
being **threatenings and slaughter**.

**the high priest**] See table in Introduction  
to Acts;—it would be Theophilus,—brother  
and successor to Jonathan, who succeeded  
Caiaphas.

**2. letters**] of authorization: written by the high priest (in this  
case, but not always, president of the Sanhedrim) in the name of *the whole estate of*