that no probable reason for their omission can be suggested. Onthe other hand,  
as De Wette observes, it is hardly imaginable  
that so little should have been assigned to  
the speaker, as would be if these words were  
omitted. Besides this, the words **whom  
we took** seem to require some sequel, some  
reason, after his seizure, why he was there  
present and freed from Jewish durance.  
The phenomena are common enough in  
the Acts, of unaccountable *insertions*; but  
in this place it is the *omission* which is  
unaccountable, for no similarity of ending,  
no doctrinal consideration can have led to  
it.

**8.**] **by examining of whom**, if  
the disputed words be *inserted*, refers naturally enough to *Lysias*; but if they be  
omitted, to *Paul*, which would be very unlikely,—that the judge should be referred  
to the prisoner (for examination by torture  
on one who had already claimed his rights  
as a Roman citizen, can hardly be intended)  
for the particulars laid to his charge. Certainly it might, on the other hand, be said  
that Tertullus would hardly refer the governor to Lysias, whose interference he  
had just characterized in such terms of  
blame; but (which is a strong argument  
for the genuineness of the doubtful words)  
remarkably enough, we find Felix, ver. 22,  
putting off the trial *till the arrival of  
Lysias.* The English reader should be cautioned against one mistake which the form  
of the words in the A. V. rather encourages: the referring **whom** to the *accusers*.  
This cannot be, as the relative “*whom*” is,  
in the original, in the *singular*.

**9.  
assented**] **joined in setting upon him**, bore  
out Tertullus in his charges.

**10. of  
many years**] Felix was now in the seventh  
year of his procuratorship, which began in  
the twelfth year of Claudius, D.D. 52.—‘The contrast between Tertullus’s and Paul’s  
winning favour with the judge is remarkable. The former I have characterized  
above. But the Apostle, using no flattery,  
yet alleges the one point which could really  
win attention to him from Felix, viz. his  
confidence arising from speaking before one  
*well skilled by experience in the manners  
and customs of the Jews*.

**ll. twelve  
days**] The point of this seems to be, that  
Felix having been so long time a judge  
among the Jews, must be well able to  
search into and adjudicate on an offence  
whose whole course was comprised within  
so short a period.—The twelve days may  
be thus made out: 1. his arrival in Jerusalem, ch. xxi. 15–17; 2. his interview  
with James, ib. 18 ff; 3. his taking on  
him the vow, ib. 26; 3–7. the time of  
the vow, interrupted by—7. his apprehension, ch. xxi. 27; 8. his appearance before  
the Sanhedrim, ch. xxii. 30 ff; 9. his departure from Jerusalem (at night); and so  
to the 13th, the day now current, which  
was the 5th inclusive from his leaving Jerusalem. This is far more natural than to  
suppose that the days which he had already  
spent at Cæsarea are *not to be counted*, because