VII. 1, 2. THE ACTS, 689   
   
 VII.1™ Then said the high priest, Are these things so?   
 2And he said, 72 Men, brethren, and fathers, hearken ; acn.xxii1.   
 The God of glory appeared unto our father Abraham,   
   
   
 m render, But the high priest said.   
 1 yender, Brethren : see ch. i. 16.   
   
 Stephen wonld lead us to infer, that there respecting it; and he is procceding,—when.   
 was something remarkably striking in his (interrupted by their murmurs—or i   
 appearance and demeanour, which over- tion ? but see note, ver.51) he bursts   
 awed his adversaries. But both from the into a holy vehemence of invective against   
 plain langnage of our text, well understood their rejection of God, which provokes his   
 among the Jews to signify supernatural tumultuary expulsion from the council, and   
 brightness, and from the fact that in St. execution. (2) But simultaneously and   
 Luke’s own narrative we have supernatural parallel with this apologetic procedure, he   
 brightness associated with angelic appear- also proceeds didactieally, shewing them   
 ances more than once (see Luke ii. 95 ch. that a future Prophet was pointed out by   
 xii. 7), should be inclined to think that Moses as the final Lawgiver of God’s   
 the face of the martyr was lighted up with people,—that the Most High had revealed   
 @ divine radiance. That the eflect on His spiritual and heavenly nature by the   
 those present was not such as to prevent prophets, and .did not dwell in temples   
 the examination proceeding, is no argu- made with hands. And (3) even more re-   
 ment against this view: in the very mild- markably still does the element run.   
 ness of the question of the High Priest throngh the speech. “Jt is not I, you,   
 which follows, I see the trace of some un- who from the first times till now have re~   
 usual incident exercising an influence over jected and spoken against God.” And this   
 him. Chrysostom explains well the eflect element, just appearing ver. 9, and again   
 on the council: “God seems to me to have more plainly vv. 25—28, and again more   
 made him beautiful to look at, perhaps to pointedly still in ver. becomes dominant.   
 prepare the way for his speech, and that in vv. 39—44, and finally prevails, to the   
 he might immediately strike them with exclusion of the apologetic and didactic, in   
 his look. For there is, yea there is, in vy. 51—53.—That other connected pur-   
 faces full of spiritual grace that which is poses have been discovered in the speech,   
 lovely to those that love them, and strikes as, for example, that so ably followed out   
 awe and fear into those that hate them. by Chrysostom, of shewing that the cove-   
 Or perhaps the Evangelist mentions it to nant and promises were before the law,   
 account for their tolerating his speech. and sacrifice the law before the temple,   
 For what answer does the High Priest —is to be attributed to the wonderful depth   
 make? Do you see, how mildly and un- of words uttered like these nnder the im-   
 reproachfully he puts his question ?” mediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit,   
 Cnap. VII. 1.) On the High Priest’s ques- presenting to us, from whichever side they   
 tion, see’ Chrysostom just quoted.—It is are viewed, new and inimitable hues of   
 parallel with Matt. xxvi. 62, but singularly heavenly wisdom. Many of these will be   
 distinguished from that question by its brought out as we advance.—The question,   
 mildness: see above. 2—53.] STEPHEN’s JSrom what probable source St. Luke de-   
 DEFENCE. In order to understand this rived his report of this speech, so pecu-   
 wonderful and somewhat difficult speech, liar in its character and citations as to   
 it will be well to bear in mind, (1) that bear, even to the most prejudiced, decisive   
 the general character of it is apologetic, evidence of authenticity, cam be only con-   
 referring to the charge made against him: jecturally answered: but in this case the   
 bnt (2) that in this apology, forgetting conjecture can hardly be wrong. I have   
 himself in the vast subject which he is diseussed the point in the Introductior to   
 vindicating, he every where mixes in the the Acts, ch. i. § ii. (a). 2. Bre-   
 polemic and didactic element. A general thren (men who are brethren), and fathers]   
 synopsis of it may be thns given: (1) He So Paul, ch. xxii. 1, before mixed assem-   
 shews (apologetically) that, so far from bly of Jews. The brethren would embrace   
 (dlishonouring Moses or God, he believes, all: the fathers would be a title of respect   
 and holds in mind, God’s dealings with to the members of the Sanhedrim, in ¢his   
 Abraham and Moses, and grounds npon ease, but hardly in ch. xxii. 1. The   
 them his preaching; that, so far from God of glory] Not eqnivalent to the glorious   
 dishonouring the temple, he bears in mind God, but the Gad of (i.e. who possesses