

on the mind, but nothing beyond that of a permanently and really religious character.

The use of ἐκπλήττομαι elsewhere by Luke—three times in the Gospel, here alone in Acts—does not suggest that astonishment was a sure prelude to conversion. The use of the almost synonymous ἐξίσταμαι by Luke is equally unfavourable to that view. Mere astonishment is not the state of mind which favours real conversion; it produced the unreal and evanescent conversion of Simon Magus.

Meyer-Wendt and others consider that the Proconsul was converted; and Blass even connects ἐπίστευσεν ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ κυρίου—"he believed in the teaching of the Lord, being astonished (at the miracle)"—regardless of the Greek order and of the analogies which he quotes (Luke iv. 32; Mark i. 22); but he has not persuaded Wendt to accept this translation, and is not likely to find others ready to follow him. Mr. Rackham, on the contrary, has a judicious and convincing note, in his edition of the *Acts*, to which I may refer the reader; and he concludes that a real conversion of the Proconsul would have had more serious consequences, whereas Paullus "had no more dealings with the Apostles, who leave Cyprus".

Luke lays full emphasis on the highly favourable impression which Paul made on the first Roman official with whom his mission work brought him in contact. This is in accordance with his general plan, and illuminative of his purpose in this history (as is pointed out in *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 304-309). It is unjustifiable to go farther, and to think that the Governor was converted.

Some will be disposed to set no value on Mr. Rackham's first argument: "it seems incredible that at this date a Roman Proconsul could have been converted:—it would have made a great stir in the Church and in the world, of