

Acts 24:19

Authorized King James Version (KJV)

Who ought to have been here before thee, and object, if they had ought against me.

Analysis

Paul's devastating point - his real accusers aren't present - exposes the prosecution's weakness. Under Roman law, accusers must face the accused and prove charges. The Asian Jews who actually started the riot were absent, suggesting they couldn't substantiate their accusations. This procedural failure should have resulted in case dismissal under proper Roman jurisprudence.

Historical Context

Roman law required accusers' presence to face cross-examination. Their absence violated proper procedure and suggested the charges couldn't withstand scrutiny. Felix's failure to dismiss the case revealed corruption over justice.

Related Passages

Hebrews 11:1 — Definition of faith

Romans 1:17 — The righteous shall live by faith

Study Questions

1. How do you wisely point out procedural failures when they reveal accusers' inability to prove their case?

2. What does this teach about standing on proper legal procedures when they protect truth and justice?

Interlinear Text

οὐς	δεῖ	ἐπὶ	σοῦ	παρεῖναι	καὶ	κατηγορεῖν	εἴ	τι
Who	ought	before	thee	to have been here	and	object	G1487	G5100
G3739	G1163	G1909	G4675	G3918	G2532	G2723		

ἔχουσιν	πρὸς	μέ
they had	against	me
G2192	G4314	G3165

Additional Cross-References

Acts 23:30 (Parallel theme): And when it was told me how that the Jews laid wait for the man, I sent straightway to thee, and gave commandment to his accusers also to say before thee what they had against him. Farewell.