his army into their winter quarters, himself returning to Antioch. This change  
of the supreme power brought about a  
great change in the situation of Antipas  
and his enemy. Antipas was soon (A.D.  
39) banished to Lyons, and his kingdom  
given to Agrippa, his foe (Antt. xviii. 7. 2),  
who had been living in habits of intimacy  
with the new emperor. It would be natural that Aretas, who had been grossly  
injured by Antipas, should by this change  
of affairs, be received into favour; and the  
more so, as there was an old grudge between Vitellius and Antipas, of which Josephus says, he concealed his anger until  
the reign of Caligula, when he followed it  
up. Now in the year 38 Caligula made  
several changes in the East, granting  
Ituræa to Soæmus, Lesser Armenia and  
parts of Arabia to Cotys, the territory of  
Cotys to Rhæmetalces,—and to Polemon,  
the son of Polemon, his father’s government. These facts, coupled with that of  
no Damascene coins of Caligula and Claudius existing (which might he fortuitous,  
but acquires force when thus combined),  
make it probable that about this time  
Damascus, which belonged to the predecessors of Aretas, was granted to Aretas by  
Caligula. This would at once solve the  
difficulty. The other suppositions,—that  
the Ethnarch was only visiting the city  
(as if he could then have guarded the city  
to prevent Paul’s escape),—or that Aretas  
had seized Damascus on Vitellius giving  
up the expedition against him (as if a  
Roman governor of a province would, while  
waiting for orders from a new emperor,  
quietly allow one of its chief cities to be  
taken from him),—are in the highest degree

improbable.

**25.**] Further particularized  
by the addition of “*through a window,*”  
2 Cor. xi, 33. Such windows in the walls  
of cities are common in the East: see Josh.  
ii. 15: and an engraving of part of the  
present wall of Damascus in Conybeare and  
Howson’s Life of St. Paul, i. p. 124.

**in a basket**] The word here is the same as  
in Matt. xv. 37, where see note.

**26.**]  
He went to Jerusalem *immediately*: the  
purpose of this journey was to become  
acquainted with Peter, Gal. i. 18: a resolution probably taken during the conspiracy of the Jews against him at Damascus, and in furtherance of his announced  
mission to the Gentiles: that, by conference  
with the Apostles, his sphere of work might  
be agreed on. And this purpose his escape  
enabled him to effect.

**27.**] It is very  
probable that Barnabas and Saul may have  
been personally known to each other in  
youth. “Cyprus is only a few hours’ sail  
from Cilicia. The schools of Tarsus may  
naturally have attracted one who, though  
a Levite, was a Hellenist: and there the  
friendship may have begun, which lasted  
through many vicissitudes, till it was rudely  
interrupted in the dispute at Antioch (ch.  
xv. 39).” Conybeare and Howson, edn. 2,  
i. p. 127.

**brought him to the apostles**] Only to Peter and James the Lord’s  
brother, Gal. i. 18, 19. Probably there  
were no other Apostles there at the time:  
if there were, it is hardly conceivable that  
Saul should not have seen them. On his  
second visit, he saw John also (Gal. ii. 9).  
Perhaps he never saw in the flesh any other  
of the Apostles after his conversion.

**29. the Grecian Jews**] See ch. vi. 1 and  
note. This he did, partly, we may infer,