very birth (see especially Acts xiii. 2), and  
effected by a special calling: viz., that on  
the road to Damascus, carried out by the  
instrumentality of Ananias. To understand this “*call*” of an act in the divine  
Mind, is contrary to our Apostle’s usage of  
the word, see ver. 6; Rom. viii. 30 al.  
This calling first took place, then the revelation, as here.

**16.]** **to reveal his Son**  
(viz. by that subsequent revelation, of  
which before, ver. 12: not by his *conversion*,  
which, as above, answers to the “*call*”) **in  
me** (strictly: ‘*within me,*’ “the revelation  
shining through his soul,” Chrysostom:  
the context here requires that his own  
personal illumination should be the point  
brought out).

**among the Gentiles]** the  
main object of his Apostleship: see ch.ii. 7, 9.

**with flesh and blood]** i.e. with  
mankind: these words are used generally  
with the idea of weakness and frailty.

**17.]** **went away both times** refers to  
his departure from Damascus: “when I  
left Damascus, I did not go....but when  
I left Damascus, I went.”

**into Arabia]**  
On the place which this journey holds in  
the narrative of Acts ix., see notes on  
verses 19, 22 there. Its object does not  
seem to have been the preaching of the  
Gospel,—but preparation for the apostolic  
work; though of course we cannot say,  
that he did not preach during the time, as  
before and after it (Acts ix. 20, 22), in the  
synagogues at Damascus. Into *what part*  
of Arabia he went, we have no means of  
determining. The name was a very vague  
one, sometimes including Damascus,—sometimes extending even to Lebanon and the  
borders of Cilicia. It was however more  
usually restricted to that Peninsula now  
thus called, between the Red Sea and the  
Persian Gulf. Here we must apparently  
take it in the wider sense, and understand  
that part of the Arabian desert which  
nearly bordered on Damascus. *How long*he remained there we are equally at a loss  
to say. Hardly for any considerable portion of the three years: Acts ix. 23 will  
scarcely admit of this: for those “*many  
days*” were manifestly passed at Damascus.  
—The journey is mentioned here, to account,  
for the time, and to shew that he did  
not spend it in conferring with *men*, or  
with the other Apostles.

**and returned ....]** compare Acts ix. 22, 25.

**18—24.]** *But after a very short visit  
to Peter at Jerusalem, he retired to Syria  
and Cilicia.*

**18.]** At first sight, it  
would appear as if the three years were to  
be reckoned from his *return to Damascus:*  
but on closer examination we see that **after  
three years** stands in opposition to ‘“*immediately*” above, and the “*not going  
away to Jerusalem*” here answers to  
“*going up to Jerusalem*” there. So that  
we must reckon them from his *conversion*:  
the period specified in ver. 15 ruling the  
whole narrative. See also on ch. ii. 1.—This  
is the journey of Acts ix. 26,—where see  
note. There is no real discrepancy between  
that account and this. The incident which  
led to his leaving Damascus (Acts ix.  
25; 2 Cor. xi. 32, 33) has not necessarily  
any connexion with his purpose in *going  
to Jerusalem:* a purpose which may have  
been entertained before, or determined on  
after, that incident. To this visit must be  
referred the vision of Acts xxii. 17, 18.

**to visit** (i.e. **to make the acquaintance of) Cephas**—not to get information  
or instruction from him. Peter was at  
this early period the prominent person  
among the Apostles: see note on Matt.  
xvi. 18.

**fifteen days]** mentioned to  
shew how little of his institution as an  
Apostle he could have owed to Peter.