*that Christ is the Son of God*—instead of  
that which it now bears,—that *Jesus is  
the Son of God*, i.e. that Jesus of Nazareth, *as a matter of fact*, is the Son of  
God, i. e. the Messiah expected under that  
appellation.

**21.**] **had come hither**, implying the abandonment of the purpose.

**22.**] I regard the expression **Saul  
increased the more in strength**, as the  
*only words beneath which can lie concealed the journey to Arabia*. Paul mentions this journey (Gal. i. 17) with no obscure hint that to it was to be assigned the  
reception by him, in full measure, of the  
Gospel which he preached. And such a  
reception would certainly give rise to the  
great accession of power here recorded. I  
am the more disposed to allot that journey  
this place, from the following considerations. The omission of any mention of it  
here can arise only from one of two causes:  
(1) whether Paul himself were the source  
of the narrative, or some other narrator,—  
*the intentional passing over of it, as belonging more to his personal history* (which  
it was his express purpose to relate in Gal. i.)  
*than to that of his ministry:* (2) on the  
supposition of Paul not having been the  
source of the narrative,—*the narrator  
having not been aware of it*. In either  
case, this expression seems to me one very  
likely to have been used:—(1) if the omis-  
sion was *intentional*,—to record a remarkable accession of power to Saul’s ministry,  
without particularizing whence or how it  
came: (2) if it was *unintentional*,—as a  
simple record of that which was observed  
in him, but of which the course was to the  
narrator unknown.

**confounded the  
Jews which dwelt at Damascus**] Chrysostom strikingly says, “Being learned in their  
law, he stopped their mouths and suffered  
them not to speak: they thought that they  
had got rid of such arguments in getting  
rid of Stephen, and behold they found another arguer more powerful than Stephen.”

**23. many days**] *In* Damascus, see  
above on ver. 19. The whole time, from  
his conversion to his journey to Jerusalem,  
was three years, Gal. i. 18.

**took  
counsel to kill him**] “The Jews again have  
recourse to the logic of force. They no  
longer seek for suborned men, and false  
accusers and false witnesses.” Chrysostom.

**24.**] In 2 Cor. xi. 32, St. Paul  
writes, “*In Damascus the governor under  
Arĕtas the king kept the city of the Damascenes with a garrison, desirous to apprehend me.*” A somewhat difficult chronological question arises respecting the  
subordination of Damascus to this Arĕtas.  
The city, under Augustus and Tiberius,  
was attached to the province of Syria:  
and we have coins of Damascus of both  
these emperors, and again of Nero and his  
successors. But we have none of Caligula  
and Claudius; and the following circumstances seem to point to a change in the  
rulership of Damascus at the death of  
Tiberius. There had been for some time  
war between Aretas, king of Arabia Nabatæa (whose capital was Petra), and Herod  
Antipas, on account of the divorce by  
Herod of Aretas’ daughter at the instance  
of Herodias, and on account of some  
disputes about their frontiers. A battle  
was fought, and Herod’s army entirely destroyed. On this Antipas, who was a  
favourite with Tiberius, sent to Rome for  
help: and Vitellius, the governor of Syria,  
was commissioned to march against Aretas,  
and take him, dead or alive. While on his  
march, he heard at Jerusalem of the death  
of Tiberius (March 16, A.D. 37), and no  
longer being able to carry out his intended war, on account of the change  
of the supreme power from Tiberius to  
Caligula, abandoned his march, and sent