to me, as this man is to all.” “Gallio, my  
brother, whom there is none that does not  
love a little, even those who have not the  
power of loving more.” He is called “*the  
pleasant Gallio*” by Statius. He appears  
to have given up the province of Achaia  
from ill health. He was spared after the  
execution of his brother: but Dio Cassius  
adds, that Seneca’s brothers were put to  
death afterwards, and Eusebius in his  
Chronicle, on A.D. 66, says that he put an  
end to himself after his brother’s death.

**the deputy**] See note on ch. xiii. 7.  
Achaia was originally a senatorial province,  
but was temporarily made an imperial one  
by Tiberius.

**of Achaia**] The Roman  
province of Achaia contained Hellas and  
the Peloponnesus, and, with Macedonia,  
embraced all their Grecian dominions.—“The **judgment seat** is mentioned three  
times in the course of this narrative (see  
vv. 16, 17). It was of two kinds: (1) fixed in some public and open place: (2) moveable, and taken by the Roman magistrates to be placed wherever they might  
sit in a judicial character. Probably here  
and in the case of Pilate (John xix. 13),  
the former kind of seat is intended. See  
Smith’s Dict. of Antiquities, under ‘Sella.’  
See also some remarks on ‘the tribunal,—the indispensable symbol of the Roman  
judgment seat,’ in the Edinburgh Review  
for Jan. 1847, p. 151.” Conybeare and  
Howson, vol. i. 494.

**13. contrary to  
the law**] Against the Mosaic law:—the  
exercise of which, as a ‘*lawful religion*,’  
was allowed to the Jews.

**15. questions**] The plural expresses contempt: **If  
it is questions, &c.**: as we should say, ‘a  
parcel of questions.’ See ch. xxiii. 29.

**names**] Paul asserted Jesus to be the

Christ, which the Jews denied. This, to a  
Roman, would be a question of *names*.

So Lysias (ch. xxiii. 29) declined to  
decide Paul’s case, and Festus (ch. xxv. 20)  
though he did not altogether put the  
enquiry by, wished to judge it *at Jerusalem*, where he might have the counsel of  
those learned in the Jewish law.

**17.  
all (the people)**] Apparently, all the *mob*,  
i.e. the Gentile population present. Sosthenes, as the ruler of the synagogue  
(either *the* ruler, or *one* of the rulers;  
perhaps he had succeeded Crispus), had  
been the chief of the complainant Jews,  
and therefore, on their cause being rejected,  
and themselves ignominiously dismissed,  
was roughly treated by the mob. From  
this, certainly the right explanation, has  
arisen the explanatory gloss, “*the Greeks*.”  
Another explanatory gloss, “*the Jews*,” is  
given: and has sprung from the notion  
that this Sosthenes was the same person  
with the Sosthenes of 1 Cor. i. 1, a Christian  
and a companion of Paul. But, not to  
insist on the improbability of the party  
driven from the tribunal having beaten  
one of their antagonists in front of the  
tribunal,—*why did they not beat Paul himself?*—there is no ground for supposing  
the two persons to be the same, Sosthenes  
being no uncommon name. If they were,  
this man must have been converted afterwards; but he is not among those who accompanied Paul into Asia, either in ver. 18,  
or ch. xx. 4.—The carelessness of Gallio  
about the matter clearly seems to be a  
further instance of his contempt for the  
Jews, and indisposition to favour them or  
their persecution of Paul. Had this been  
otherwise meant, certainly **and** would not  
have been the copula. ‘So little did the