

Henry Alford “Alford’s Greek Testament”
An exegetical and critical commentary. 1877
Acts 13:

16. *κατασεύσας τ. χειρῖ*] As was his practice; see ch. [Act 21:40](#). See also *ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα*, ch. [Act 26:1](#).

On the character, &c. of Paul’s speeches reported in the Acts, see Prolegg. § i. 13; ii. 17.

The contents of this speech ([Act 13:16-41](#)) may be thus arranged: I. *Recapitulation of God’s ancient deliverances of His people and mercies towards them, ending with His crowning mercy, the sending of the Deliverer and promised Son of David (Act 13:16-25)*. II. *The history of the rejection of Jesus by the Jews, and of God’s fulfilment of His promise by raising Him from the dead (Act 13:26-37)*. III. *The personal application of this to all present,—the announcement to them of justification by faith in Jesus, and solemn warning against the rejection of Him (Act 13:38-41)*. It is in the last degree unsafe to argue, as Wordsworth has done, that, because Strabo asserts the language of the Pisidians to have been neither Greek nor Lydian, St. Paul must have spoken to them by virtue of his miraculous gift of tongues. To the question put by Wordsw., “In what language did St. Paul preach in Pisidia?” we may reply, seeing that he preached in the synagogue after the reading of the law and prophets, “In the same language as that in which the law and prophets had just been read.”

οἱ φοβ. τ. θ.] The (uncircumcised) proselytes of the gate; not excluding even such pious Gentiles, not proselytes in any sense, who might be present. The speech, from the beginning and throughout, is *universal* in its application, embracing Jews and Gentiles.

17. *το? λαο? τούτου*] ‘Hoc dicit Pisidis, Judæos digito monstrans’ (Grot.). Or rather, perhaps by the *τούτου* indicating, *without gesture*, the people in whose synagogue they were assembled.

τ. πατ. ἡμ?ν] It is evident that the doctrine so much insisted on afterwards by Paul, that all believers in Christ were the true children of Abraham, was fully matured already: by the *το? λαο? τούτου* he alludes to the time when God was the God of the Jews only: by this *ἡμ?ν* he unites all present in the now extended inheritance of the promises made to the fathers.

ὑψωσεν] Evidently an allusion to [Isa 1:2](#), where the word is also used in the sense of ‘bringing up,’ nourishing to manhood. This was done by increasing them in Egypt so that they became a great nation: see ref. Gen. There is no reference to any *exaltation* of the people during their stay in Egypt: whether by their deliverance (Calv., Heinr., Elsner), or by the miracles of Moses (Meyer), or by Joseph’s preferment to honour (Beza, Grot.).

18. *ἐτροφοφόρησεν*] That this is the right reading, is rendered highly probable by manuscript authority here and still more in the LXX of ref. Deut., and, I conceive, *decided* by the Heb. of that passage, and by the expansion of the same image in [Num 11:12](#). The compound verb (from *ὄ*, not *ἦ*, *τροφός*, as the similitude is that of a *man* (*ψῆν*) bearing his son) implies carrying and caring for, as a nurse: see ref. Macc.

19. ἐπτά] See [Deu 7:1](#); [Jos 3:10](#); [Jos 24:11](#).

The unusual transitive sense of [κατεκληρονόμησεν](#), justified by reff. LXX, has not been understood by the copyists, and has led to the rec. reading.

From the occurrence of manifest references, in these opening verses of the speech, to Deuteronomy 1 and Isaiah 1, combined with the fact that these two chapters form the present lessons in the synagogues on one and the same sabbath, Bengel and Stier conclude that they had been then read. It may have been so: but see on [Act 13:15](#).

20.] Treating the reading of ABCN^{[64] [65] [66] [67]} (see var. readd.) as an attempt at correcting the difficult chronology of our verse, and taking the words as they stand, *no other sense can be given to them, than that the time of the judges lasted 450 years. The dative ἔτεσιν* (see ch. [Act 8:11](#)) *implies the duration of the period between ταῦτα* (the division of the land), and Samuel the prophet, inclusive. And *we have exactly the same chronological arrangement in Josephus*; who reckons (Antt. viii. 3. 1) 592 years from the Exodus to the building of Solomon's temple,—arranging the period thus: (1) forty years in the wilderness: (2) twenty-five years under Joshua ([στρατηγὸς δὲ μετὰ τὴν Μουσεῶς τελευτὴν πέντε κ. εἴκοσι](#), Antt. v. 1. 29): (3) Judges (below): (4) forty years under Saul, see on [Act 13:21](#); (5) forty years under David, [1Ki 2:11](#); (6) four years of Solomon's own reign. This gives 592–149 = 443 years (about, ὥς, 450) for the Judges, including Samuel. That this chronology differs widely from [1Ki 6:1](#), is most evident,—where we read that Solomon began his temple in the four hundred and eightieth (LXX, four hundred and fortieth) year after the Exodus. All attempts to reconcile the two are arbitrary and forced. I subjoin the principal. (1) Perizonius and others assume that the years during which the Israelites were subject to foreign tyrants in the time of the Judges are *not reckoned in 1Ki 6:1*, and attempt, by adding them, to make out the period—in direct contradiction to the account there, which is, not that the *Judges lasted* a certain number of years, but that Solomon began to build his temple in the *four hundred and eightieth year after* the Exodus. (2) Calovius, Mill, &c. supply [γενόμενα](#) after [πεντήκοντα](#), and construe, these things 'which happened in the space of 450 years,' viz. from the *birth of Isaac* to the division of the land. But why the *birth of Isaac*? The words too will not bear this construction. (3) Olshausen conceives the 450 years may include all from the Exodus, as far as the building of the temple. But to this the objection which he himself mentions is fatal, viz. that [μετὰ ταῦτα](#) and [ἔνεθεν](#) must beyond dispute give the termini *a quo* and *ad quem* of the period. (4) Others suppose various corruptions, here or at [1Ki 6:1](#), and by arbitrary conjecture emend so as to produce accordance.

It seems then that Paul followed a chronology current among the Jews, and agreeing with the book of Judges itself (the spaces of time in which, added together = exactly 450), and that adopted by Josephus, but *not with that of our present Hebrew text of 1Ki 6:1*. The objection to this view, that Josephus is not consistent with himself (Olsh.),—but in Antt. xx. 10. 1, contra Apion. ii. 2 gives *another* chronology, has arisen from not observing that in the latter places, where he states 612 years to have elapsed from the Exodus to Solomon's temple, he reckons *in* the twenty years occupied in building the temple and the king's house, [1Ki 6:38](#); [1Ki 7:1](#). His words are, Antt. xx. 10. 1, ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐξέλιπον Αἴγυπτον Μουσεῶς ἄγοντος, μέχρι τῆς τοῦ ναοῦ κατασκευῆς, ὃν Σολομὸν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν ἑρροσολύμοις ἀνήγειρεν, ἔτη δισκαίδεκα πρὸς τοῦς ἑξακοσίους. To reckon in the thirteen years during which he was building his own house may be an *inaccuracy*, but there is no *inconsistency*.

Wordsworth, contrary to his usual practice, takes refuge in the amended text of **ABC**, and then characterizes in the severest language those who have had the moral courage to abide by the more difficult reading, charging them with “arbitrary caprice,” “gratifying a sceptical appetite,” &c. I cite this as an example of that elastic criticism, which by any means within reach, and at any price, smooths away every difficulty from the sacred text.

Σαμουήλ] mentioned as the terminus of the period of the Judges, also as having been so nearly concerned in the setting up over them of Saul and David.

21. Σαοὺλ ... ἄνδρα ἐκ φ. Β.] It may be not altogether irrelevant to notice that a *Saul, a man of the tribe of Benjamin*, was speaking; and to trace in this minute specification something characteristic and natural.

ἔτη τεσσαεράκοντα] So also Josephus: ἐβασίλευσε Σαοὺλ Σαμουήλου ζ᾽ντος ἔτη ὀκτὼ πρὸς τοῦς δέκα· τελευτήσαντος δὲ δύο καὶ εἴκοσι, Antt. vi. 14. 9. In the O. T. the length of Saul’s reign is not specified; **1Sa 7:2** gives no reason, as Bengel thinks, why Saul’s reign should have been *less than twenty years*, as the twenty years there mentioned do not extend to the bringing up of the ark by David, but only to the circumstances mentioned in the following verses. Biscoe has well shewn (p. 399), that as Saul was a young man when anointed king, and Ishbosheth his *youngest* son (**1Ch 8:33**) was forty years old at his death (**2Sa 2:10**), his reign cannot have been much short of that period. **It is clearly against the construction to suppose Samuel’s time as well as Saul’s included in the forty years, following as they do upon the ἔδωκεν. Yet this has been done by the majority of Commentators.**

[64] The MS. referred to by this symbol is that commonly called the Alexandrine, or CODEX ALEXANDRINUS. It once belonged to Cyrillus Lucaris, patriarch of Alexandria and then of Constantinople, who in the year 1628 presented it to our King Charles I. It is now in the British Museum. It is on parchment in four volumes, of which three contain the Old, and one the New Testament, with the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. This fourth volume is exhibited open in a glass case. It will be seen by the letters in the inner margin of this edition, that the first 24 chapters of Matthew are wanting in it, its first leaf commencing ὁ νυμφίος, ch. **Mat 25:6** :—as also the leaves containing ἴνα, **Joh 6:50**,—to καὶ σὺ, **Joh 8:52**. It is generally agreed that it was written at Alexandria;—it does not, however, *in the Gospels*, represent that commonly known as the Alexandrine text, but approaches much more nearly to the Constantinopolitan, or generally received text. The New Testament, according to its text, was edited, in uncial types cast to imitate those of the MS., by Woide, London, 1786, the Old Testament by Baber, London, 1819: and its N.T. text has now been edited in common type by Mr. B. H. Cowper, London, 1861. The date of this MS. has been variously assigned, but it is now pretty generally agreed to be the *fifth century*.

[65] The CODEX VATICANUS, No. 1209 in the Vatican Library at Rome; and proved, by the old catalogues, to have been there from the foundation of the library in the 16th century. It was apparently, from internal evidence, copied in Egypt. It is on vellum, and contains the Old and New Testaments. In the latter, it is deficient from **Heb 9:14** to the end of the Epistle;—it does not contain the Epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon;—nor the Apocalypse. An edition of this celebrated codex, undertaken as long ago as 1828 by Cardinal Angelo Mai, has since his death been published at Rome. The defects of this edition are such, that it can hardly be ranked higher in usefulness than a tolerably complete collation, entirely untrustworthy in those places where it differs from former collations in representing the MS. as *agreeing with* the received text. An 8vo edition of the N.T. portion, newly revised by Vercellone, was published at Rome in 1859 (referred to as ‘Verc’): and of course superseded the English reprint of the 1st edition. Even in this 2nd edition there were imperfections which rendered it necessary to have recourse to the MS. itself, and to the partial collations made in former times. These are—(1) that of

Bartolucci (under the name of Giulio de St. Anastasia), once librarian at the Vatican, made in 1669, and preserved in manuscript in the Imperial Library (MSS. Gr. Suppl. 53) at Paris (referred to as 'Blc'); (2) that of Birch ('Bch'), published in various readings to the Acts and Epistles, Copenhagen, 1798,—Apocalypse, 1800,—Gospels, 1801; (3) that made for the great Bentley ('Btly'), by the Abbate Mico,—published in Ford's Appendix to Woide's edition of the Codex Alexandrinus, 1799 (it was made on the margin of a copy of Cephalaëus' Greek Testament, Argentorati, 1524, still amongst Bentley's books in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge); (4) notes of alterations by the original scribe and other correctors. These notes were procured for Bentley by the Abbé de Stosch, and were till lately supposed to be lost. They were made by the Abbate Rulotta ('Rl'), and are preserved amongst Bentley's papers in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge (B. 17. 20)¹. The Codex has been occasionally consulted for the verification of certain readings by Tregelles, Tischendorf, and others. A list of readings examined at Rome by the present editor (Feb. 1861), and by the Rev. E. C. Cure, Fellow of Merton College, Oxford (April 1862), will be found at the end of these prolegomena. A description, with an engraving from a photograph of a portion of a page, is given in Burgon's "Letters from Rome," London 1861. This most important MS. was probably written in the *fourth century* (Hug, Tischendorf, al.).

[66] The CODEX EPHRAEMI, preserved in the Imperial Library at Paris, MS. Gr. No. 9. It is a Codex rescriptus or palimpsest, consisting of the works of Ephraem the Syrian written over the MS. of extensive fragments of the Old and New Testaments². It seems to have come to France with Catherine de' Medici, and to her from Cardinal Nicolas Ridolfi. Tischendorf thinks it probable that he got it from Andrew John Lascaris, who at the fall of the Eastern Empire was sent to the East by Lorenzo de' Medici to preserve such MSS. as had escaped the ravages of the Turks. This is confirmed by the later corrections (C³) in the MS., which were evidently made at Constantinople³. But from the form of the letters, and other peculiarities, it is believed to have been written at Alexandria, or at all events, where the Alexandrine dialect and method of writing prevailed. Its text is perhaps the *purest* example of the Alexandrine text,—holding a place about midway between the Constantinopolitan MSS. and most of those of the Alexandrine recension. It was edited very handsomely in uncial type, with copious dissertations, &c., by Tischendorf, in 1843. He assigns to it an age at least equal to A, and places it also in the *fifth century*. Corrections were written in, apparently in the sixth and ninth centuries: these are respectively cited as C², C³.

[67] The CODEX SINAITICUS. Procured by Tischendorf, in 1859, from the Monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai. The Codex Frederico-Augustanus (now at Leipsic), obtained in 1844 from the same monastery, is a portion of the same copy of the Greek Bible, the 148 leaves of which, containing the entire New Testament, the Ep. of Barnabas, parts of Hermas, and 199 more leaves of the Septuagint, have now been edited by the discoverer. A magnificent edition prepared at the expense of the Emperor of Russia appeared in January, 1863, and a smaller edition containing the N.T. &c., has been published by Dr. Tischendorf. The MS. has four columns on a page, and has been altered by several different correctors, one or more of whom Tischendorf considers to have lived in the sixth century. The work of the original scribe has been examined, not only by Tischendorf, but by Tregelles and other competent judges, and is by them assigned to the *fourth century*. The internal character of the text agrees with the external, as the student may judge for himself from the readings given in the digest. The principal correctors as distinguished by Tischendorf are:—A, of the same age with the MS. itself, probably the corrector who revised the book, before it left the hands of the scribe, denoted therefore by us **Ⲙ**-corr¹; B (cited as **Ⲙ**²), who in the first page of Matt. began inserting breathings, accents, &c., but did not carry out his design, and touched only a few later passages; C^a (cited as **Ⲙ**^{3a}) has corrected very largely throughout the book. Wherever in our digest a reading is cited as found in **Ⲙ**¹, it is to be understood, if no further statement is given, that C^a altered it to that which is found in our text; C^b (cited as **Ⲙ**^{3b}) lived about the same time as C^a, i.e. some centuries later than the original scribe. These are all that we need notice here⁶.