*by their conversion:* better than,—by the  
signs and wonders which he wrought among  
them. Their conversion was the great  
proof.

**in the Lord** belongs to the  
whole sentence, see above, on ver. 1.

3.] This belongs to the *preceding*,  
not, as in A. V., to the *following verses*:

**This**, viz. the fact of your conversion: this word is the *predicate, not  
the subject*—as in John i. 19; xvii. 3,  
and stands here in the emphatic place  
before the verb; referring to what went  
betore. With ver. 4 a new course of questions  
begins, which furnish no *defence*.  
**me** is emphatic.

4.] He resumes the  
questions which had been interrupted  
by giving the proof of his Apostleship.  
‘The plural, we, seems to apply to Paul  
alone: for though Barnabas is introduced  
momentarily in ver. 6, there can be no  
reference to him in ver. 11. It may perhaps be used as pointing out a matter of  
*right*, which any would have had on the  
same conditions (see ver. 11), and as thus  
not belonging’ personally to Paul, as do  
the things spoken of in verses 1, 2, 15.  
This however will not apply to ver. 12,  
where the emphatic me *is* personal.

**to eat and to drink**, *i.e. at the cost of the  
churches.*

**5.] Have we not the  
power to take about with us** (also to  
be maintained at the cost of the churches,  
for this, and not the power to marry, is  
here the matter in question) **as a wife, a  
(believing) sister** (*or, ‘to bring with us  
a believing wife*;’ these are the only renderings of which the words are legitimately  
capable. From a misunderstanding of this  
passage grew up a great abuse, that of missionaries  
taking about with them women  
of wealth, who ministered to them of their  
substance. Such women are mentioned  
with reprobation by Epiphanins, aud were  
forbidden by the Council of Nicaea), **as  
well as the other Apostles** (in the wider  
sense, not only the Twelve; for, ver. 6,  
Barnabas is mentioned. It does not follow  
hence that all the other Apostles *were  
married ; but that all had the power, and  
some had used it*), **and the brethren of  
the Lord** (mentioned not *because distinct*  
from the Apostles, though they were absolutely  
distinct from the *Twelve*, see  
Acts i, 14,—but as a further specification of  
the *most renowned persons*, who travelled  
as missionaries, and took their wives with  
them. On the *brethren of the Lord,* see  
note, Matt. xiii. 55. They were in all probability  
the actual brethren of our Lord by  
the same mother, the sons of Joseph and  
Mary. The most noted of these was   
James, the Lord’s brother [Gal. i. 19; ii. 9, 12, compare Acts xii.17; xv. 13; xxi. 18], the resident bishop of the Church at Jerusalem; the others known to us by  
name were Joses [or Joseph], Simon, and  
Judas, see note on Matt. ib.), and Cephas  
(Peter was married, see Matt. viii. 14. A  
beautiful tradition exists of his encouraging  
his wife who was led to death, by saying,  
“O thou, remember the Lord.” Clement  
‘of Alexandria relates that he had children  
On a mistake which has been made  
respecting St. Paul’s (supposed) wife, see  
note on ch. vii. 8)?

**6.] Or** (implying  
what the consequence would then be, see  
ch. vi. 2, 9: does not introduce a new  
“*liberty*,” but a consequence of the denial  
of the last two) **have I only and Barnabas**(why Barnabas? Perhaps on account of  
his former connexion with St. Paul, Acts  
xi. 30; xii. 25; xiii. 1-xv. 39; but this  
seems hardly enough reason for his being  
here introduced. It is not improbable that,  
having been at first associated with Paul,  
who appears *from the first* to have abstained from receiving sustenance from  
those among whom he was preaching,  
Barnabas, after his separation from our  
Apostle, may have retained the same self-