of the practice, which seems to  
have begun immediately after the Resurrection (see John xx. 26), of assembling on the  
first day of the week for religious purposes.  
Perhaps the greatest proof of all, that this  
day was thus observed, may be found in  
the early (see 1 Cor. xvi. 2) and at length  
general prevalence, in *the Gentile world*,  
of the *Jewish seven-day period* as a *division  
of time*,—which was entirely foreign to  
Gentile habits. It can only have been  
introduced as following on the practice of  
especial honour paid to this day. But we  
find in the Christian Scriptures no trace of  
any *sabbatical* observance of this or any  
day: nay, in Rom. xiv. 5 (where see note),  
St Paul shews the untenableness of any  
such view under the Christian dispensation.  
The idea of the *transference of the Jewish  
sabbath from the seventh day to the first*  
was an invention of later times.

**to  
break bread**] See note on ch. ii. 42. The  
breaking of bread in the Holy Communion  
was at this time inseparable from the  
*agapæ* or *love-feasts*. It took place apparently in the evening (after the day’s work  
was ended), and at the end of the assembly, after the preaching of the word (ver.  
11).

**unto them**, in the third person,  
the discourse being addressed to the  
disciples at Troas: but the first person is  
used before and after, because all were  
assembled, and partook of the breaking  
of bread together. Not observing this,  
the copyists have altered **we** above into  
“*the disciples*,” and again into **they** below  
to suit this **to them**.

**8. there were  
many lights**] This may be noticed, as  
Meyer observes, to shew that the fall of the  
young man could be well observed: or, perhaps, because many lights are apt to increase drowsiness at such times. Calvin  
and Bengel suppose it to have been done,—in order that all suspicion might be removed from the assembly, others that the  
lights were used for solemnity’s sake,—for  
that both Jews and Gentiles celebrated  
their festal days by abundance of lights.  
But surely the adoption of either Jewish  
or Gentile practices of this kind in the  
Christian assemblies was very improbable.

**9.**] Who Eutychus was is quite uncertain. The occurrence of the name as  
belonging to slaves and freedmen (as it appears from inscriptions) determines nothing.

**on the window-seat**] The windows  
in the East were (and are) without glass,  
and with or without shutters.

**being  
fallen into a deep sleep**] Literally, **borne  
down by a deep sleep**. I believe the word  
is used here and below *in the same sense*,  
not, as usually interpreted, here of the  
effect of sleep, and below of *the fall* caused  
by the sleep. It implies that relaxation of  
the system, and collapse of the muscular  
power, which is more or less indicated by  
our expressions ‘*falling asleep*,’ ‘*dropping  
asleep.*’ This effect is *being produced*, in  
this clause, but as Paul was going on long  
discoursing, took *complete possession of  
him*, and having been **overpowered**,—**entirely relaxed in consequence of the  
sleep**, he *fell*. In the words, **was  
taken up dead**, here there is a *direct  
assertion*, which can hardly be evaded by  
explaining it, ‘*was taken up for dead*,’  
or by saying that it expresses the *judgment  
of those who took him up*, as Meyer. It  
seems to me, that the supposition of a  
mere suspended animation is as absurd  
here as in the miracle of Jairus’s daughter,  
Luke viii, 41—56. Let us take the narrative as it stands. The youth falls, and  
is taken up dead: so much is plainly  
asserted. Paul, not a physician, but an  
Apostle,—gifted, not with medical discernment, but with miraculous power, goes  
down to him, falls on him and embraces  
him,—a strange proceeding for one bent on  
discovering suspended animation, but not  
so for one who bore in mind the action of  
Elijah (1 Kings xvii. 21) and Elisha (2 Kings