had in His divine arrangements brought  
about, by the angel sent to Cornelius,  
their coming.

**23. lodged them**] This  
was his first consorting with men uncircumcised and eating with them (ch. xi. 3):  
though perhaps this latter is not necessarily  
implied.

**certain brethren from Joppa**]  
*Six*, ch. xi. 12; in expectation of some  
weighty event to which hereafter their testimony might be required, as indeed it was,  
as there appears.

**24.**] These **near  
friends** of Cornelius, like himself, must have  
been fearers of the true God, or at all events  
must have been influenced by his vision to  
wait for the teaching of Peter.

**25.  
worshipped**] St. Luke, observes Bengel,  
has not added “*him*;” doubtless from an  
euphemistic motive. It was natural for  
Cornelius to think that one so pointed out  
by an angel must be deserving of the  
highest respect; and this respect he shewed  
in a way which proves him not to have  
altogether lost the heathen training of his  
childhood. He must have witnessed the  
rise of the custom of paying divine honours  
first to those who were clothed with the  
delegated power of the senate, and then,  
even more conspicuously, to him in whom  
the imperial majesty centered.

**26. I myself also am a man**] This was the lesson which Peter’s vision had taught him,  
and he now begins to practise it:—the  
*common honour and equality of all mankind in God’s sight*.—Those who claim to  
have succeeded Peter, have not imitated

this part of his conduct. See Rev. xix. 10;  
xxii. 8.

**27.**] This second *going in*(compare ver. 25) betokens the *completion*  
of his entering in; or the former, his entering the *house*,—this latter, the *chamber*.

**28.**] **Ye** (emphatic) **know**: i.e.  
**you, of all men, [best] know**: being those  
immediately concerned in the obstruction  
to intercourse which the rule occasioned.

**how that it is an unlawful thing,**  
... or **‘how unlawful a thing it is:’**  
better the former. There is some difficulty  
about this unlawfulness of consorting with  
those foreigners who, like Cornelius, worshipped the true God. It rests upon no  
legal prohibition, and seems, at first sight,  
hardly consistent with the zeal to gain  
predicated of the Pharisees,  
Matt. xxiii. 15, and with other, Jewish and  
Rabbinical, notices cited in my Greek Test.  
But, whatever *exceptions* there may have  
been, it was unquestionably the *general  
practice* of the Jews, to separate themselves in common life from uncircumcised  
persons. We have Juvenal testifying to  
this at Rome in his Satires,—that the Jews  
“would not shew the way except to their  
fellow-religionists, nor guide any but a  
circumcised person to a fountain of which  
he was in search.” And Tacitus says that  
“they cherished against all mankind the  
hatred of enemies, they were separate in  
hoard and bed,” &c.

**and**] (not, *‘but*  
God hath shewed me,’ as A. V.) ‘*Ye*,  
though ye see me here, know, how strong