lack of emphasis, assuming the awful fact,  
gives more solemnity to the question.

**5.**] That Saul *saw*, as well as heard, Him  
who spoke with him, is certain from Ananias’s speech, ver. 17, and ch. xxii. 14,—  
that of Barnabas, ver. 27,—from ch. xxvi.  
16 (“*I* [have] *appeared unto thee*’), and  
from the references by Paul himself to his  
having seen the Lord, 1 Cor. ix. 1; xv. 8.  
These last I unhesitatingly refer to this  
occasion, and not to any subsequent one,  
when he saw the Lord *in a trance*, ch. xxii.  
17. Such appearances could hardly form  
the subject of the testimony of an eyewitness which should rank with that of  
the other apostles: this, on the contrary,  
was no *trance*, but the *real bodily appearance of the risen Jesus;* so that it might  
be adduced as the ground of testimony to  
His Resurrection.—On the words excluded  
from our text, as having been interpolated  
from ch. xxvi. 14, and xxii. 10, see note at  
xxvi. 14. It is natural that the account of  
the *historian* should be less precise than  
that of the *person concerned, relating his  
own history.* In ch. xxvi. 15–18, very  
much more is related to have been said by  
the Lord: but perhaps he there, as he  
omits the subsequent particulars, includes  
the revelations made to him during the  
three days, and in the message of Ananias.

**7.**] In ch. xxii. 9, we read, “*They  
that were with me saw indeed the light,  
and were afraid: but they heard not the  
voice of him that spake to me.*” Two accounts seemingly (and certainly, in the *letter*) discrepant; but exceedingly instructive when their *spirit* is compared,—the  
fact being this: that the companions of  
Saul saw and were struck to the ground by  
the light, but saw *no person*:—that they  
stood (I should acknowledge the discrepancy here, and recognize the more accurate detail of ch. xxvi. 14, that they *fell* *to  
the ground*) mute, hearing the sound of  
the voice, but not the words spoken and  
their meaning. Compare John xii. 29,  
note. Two classes of readers only will  
stumble at this difference of the forms of  
narration; those who from enmity to the  
faith are striving to create or magnify discrepancies,—and those who, by the suicidal  
theory of verbal inspiration, are effectually  
doing the work of the former. The devout  
and intelligent student of Scripture will  
see in such examples a convincing proof of  
the simple truth of the narrative,—the  
absence of all endeavour to pare aware apparent inconsistencies or revise them into  
conformity,—the *bonâ fide* work of holy  
truthful men, bearing each his testimony  
to things seen and heard under the guidance, not of the spirit of bondage, but of  
that Spirit of whom it is said, “*where the  
Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty*.’—  
I should not too hastily determine that  
this account *has not come from Saul himself*, on account of the above differences:  
they are no more than might arise in narrations at different times by the same person.

**8.**] **When his eyes were opened**(it would seem that he had closed them on  
the first disappearance of the vision)**, he  
saw no one.** He explains it, ch. xxii. 11,  
“*when I could not see for the glory of that  
light.*” He had seen, what those with him  
had not seen, the glorious Person of the  
Lord Jesus. See below on ver. 18.

**9. he neither did eat nor drink**] There is  
no occasion to soften these words; the