the famous Stoa or porch, where the Stoics  
held their disputations.

**18. Epicurean**] The Epicurean philosophy was antagonistic to the gospel, as holding the  
atomic theory in opposition to the creation of matter,—the disconnexion of the  
Divinity from the world and its affairs,  
in opposition to the idea of a ruling Providence,—and the indissoluble union, and  
annihilation together, of soul and body, as  
opposed to the hope of eternal life, and  
indeed to all spiritual religion whatever.  
The Epicureans were the materialists of  
the ancient world.—The common idea  
attached to Epicureanism must be discarded in our estimate of the persons mentioned in our text. The “**chief good**” of  
the real Epicureans, far from being a degraded and sensual pleasure, was *imperturbability* of mind, based upon *wisdom*—perhaps the best estimate of the highest  
good formed in the heathen world;—and  
their ethics were exceedingly strict. But  
the abuse to which such a doctrine was  
evidently liable, gave rise to a pseudo-Epicureanism, which has generally passed current for the real, and which amply illustrated the truth, that corruption of that  
which is best, is itself worst. For their  
chimerical *imperturbability*, Paul offered  
them *the peace which passeth all understanding*, Phil. iv. 7.

**Stoick**] So  
named from the *Stoa*, or porch (see  
above),—founded by Zeno of Cittium in  
the fourth century B.C., but perhaps more  
properly by Cleanthes and Chrysippus in  
the third century B.C. Their philosophy,  
while it approached the truth in holding  
one supreme Governor of all, compromised it, in allowing of any and all ways  
of conceiving and worshipping Him (see  
below, vv. 24, 25),—and contravened it, in  
its pantheistic belief that all souls were  
emanations of Him. In *spirit* it was directly opposed to the gospel,—holding the  
independence of man on any being but himself, together with the subjection of God  
and man alike to the stern laws of an inevitable fate. On the existence of the soul  
after death their ideas were various: some  
holding that all souls endure to the conflagration of all things,—others confining  
this to the souls of good men,—and others  
believing all souls to be reabsorbed into the  
Divinity. By these tenets they would obviously be placed in antagonism to the doctrines of a Saviour of the world and the resurrection,—and to placing the summum bonum of man in abundance of that grace  
which *is made perfect in weakness*, 2 Cor.  
xii. 9.

**some said... other some**]  
These are not to be taken as belonging the  
one to the Epicureans, the other to the  
Stoics,—but rather as describing two  
classes, common perhaps to both schools,—the one of which despised him and his  
sayings, and the other were disposed to  
take a more serious view of the matter,  
and charge him with bringing in new  
deities.

**this babbler**] The word in  
the original signifies a kind of bird which  
picks up and devours seeds: whence the  
Athenians called by this name those who  
went about picking up trifles in converse  
and making it their business to retail  
them: in fact, the name imports *one who  
talks fluently to no purpose*, and hints  
also that his talk is *not his own*.

**a setter forth of strange gods**] “*Socrates  
is guilty of bringing in new gods*,” was  
one of the charges on which Athens put  
to death her wisest son. The *strange  
gods* which they charged Paul with setting  
forth were, *the true God*, the God of  
the Jews, and *Jesus Christ* His Son: the  
Creator of the world (ver. 24), and the Man  
whom He hath appointed to judge it, ver.  
31. Compare ver. 23, end: which is an express answer to this charge.

**19. they  
took him**] No violence is implied.

**to the hill of Mars**] There is no allusion  
here to the *court* of Areopagus, nor should