

SPEECHES IN THE ACTS – JOHN CARTER

STUDY 2 – PETER AT PENTECOST

We were speaking yesterday about the importance that we should attach to the portions of Luke's narrative, by reference to the place he gives to them in space and repetition. And since he gives so much space to the various speeches, it is quite evident that Luke would have us understand something concerning the thinking of the early Christians, something concerning the message that was given to them, something concerning God's message which was communicated through them as witnesses.

We are back at the very beginning of Christian teaching. We are going to consider the first address that was given. It was an address however with a background, for there had been some preparation of the men who were to give it. We all know how dismayed they were when Jesus was crucified and how it seemed as though all their expectations had failed. We all know how changed this was, when after the first day Jesus had appeared unto them. We are told that Jesus met them and expounded to them from the scriptures. And I think we are quite right in attaching some words that Jesus spake which are in the first book of Luke, in the Gospel, concerning what Jesus told them after he was raised from the dead.

He met two on the way to Emmaus. They thought he was a stranger and he said, 'What is this that you're discussing among yourselves?'

And as we read it we can catch first one speaking and then the other, as they answer him, as their words fall over each other as they talk to him. If we go back just to catch that up in the 21st verse,

"But we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel: and beside all this, to day is the third day since these things were done."

And you catch the voice of the other interposing

"Yea, and certain women also of our company made us astonished, which were early at the sepulchre; And when they found not his body, they came, saying, that they had also seen a vision of angels, which said that he was alive." Luke 24:21-23.

And thus they tossed their words, as the words used by Luke indicate, they tossed their words one to the other, they fall over each other almost, in their eagerness to communicate to this stranger.

And then Christ said unto them,

"O foolish ones and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." Luke 24:25-27.

And then when he was revealed to them at the breaking of bread, they thought nothing of the journey back to Jerusalem to say that the Lord was risen, but they said one to another, "Did

not our heart burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened up to us the scriptures?" (v32).

Now there is the Divine example, "he opened up the scriptures" and the opening up of the scriptures by this master-teacher had the effect of making their hearts glow and burn within them. Now that is what we will try to do as far as arousing the power in all of us, as we study together these words of inspiration through the apostles.

But Jesus had to complete the preparation, and he met the apostles as Luke tells us in a later verse,

"And he said unto them," we're quoting verse 44, "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms concerning me. Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures." Vv 44-45.

So that insight which was his, concerning the meaning of scripture, was given to them. He opened up their understanding and expounded to them what had been written.

"Thus it is written and thus it behoved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses." Vv. 46-48.

And I think we will be right in saying that that Divine pattern in the words of Jesus as he expounded to them the scriptures concerning himself, was that which gave shape to their own addresses. It was that mould in which their thought was cast as they went out to witness to this truth.

They had to testify to Jews that Jesus whom they had crucified was really the Messiah. And not only had they to witness to the fact of the matter of experience in their own lives, that Jesus had risen from the dead, but they had to put that fact of the resurrection of Jesus into the framework of the Old Testament revelation. Therefore it was necessary that they should understand and be empowered to open up the significance of the Old Testament scriptures in order that it might be shown that what had happened in Jerusalem in connection with Jesus, was according to the Divine plan that had been revealed in the Old Testament writings.

And as we study these features in Acts we shall find the resemblance between them. And, again I think it would be right to say, that before many days had passed in connection with the work of preaching the gospel, they had a group of texts under different headings which was common property of all the teachers. And all turned to it for guidance and used it as the pattern upon which could be presented this doctrine. We have a declaration. All of you will be familiar with it. It consists of a number of propositions and a display of proof texts in support of the propositions, and that, that was something like what the early believers had, probably before ever a gospel was written. They were bodies of testimony, the corpus of quotations, testifying to certain particular doctrines, and therefore it is that we find a similar grouping of passages in one and another address and in the epistles.

These various passages came to be grouped together as witnessing to certain facts in connection with Jesus. And the Lord himself had set them the example in his own exposition

of the scripture during his ministry, in how he had gathered together various scriptures to build up his testimony and give the message that was entrusted to him by the Father.

Ruskin has said in one of his books, that we should go to a book, not to find there what we think, but so to read and so to re-read and study the author, that we come to know what he intended to say, and that is good counsel.

We are going to look at these speeches and see what Luke intended that we should know from them, or what God intended in the writing through Luke. And if we speak of Luke you will remember that we will always have, in reserve that point of view that it was God through Luke. Just as we saw before how wonderfully accurate Luke was in his writing of history, so we are going to observe today, how wonderfully he gives us a summary of the address.

We have in these addresses what cannot be anything more than a *précis* of what was said. But just as a long article might be summarized, and indeed it is a test in literature exams (or used to be), that an article of some length should be summarized, that there must be a bringing out of the essential features and a reduction in words but still a preservation of the essential content of what the longer article contains. So, if in these speeches recorded in Acts, we have the same skill, in summarizing, in writing the *précis*, that Luke has manifested in writing the history, we shall be able to **expand** the speech and observing Luke's method, acquire a fuller view of what was said than the summary would give us if we just read it quickly.

I was going to notice how many minutes it took the reading of this speech. I don't suppose it took more than three or four minutes, but you don't think for a minute that Peter stood up in Jerusalem and spake for five minutes. How long would Peter be addressing this multitude of people who were there on the Day of Pentecost from the different parts of scattered Jewry? Would it be anything less than an hour? Might we not presume that with the giving of such a message it might be of two hours duration? Yet Luke has compressed, shall we say, an hour and a half's address, in the compass of what it takes us four minutes to read. Now can we ascertain with what skill an address of such length has been summarized?

I think we can, and we want to trace out Luke's method and, catching hold of his method, do a little expansion. The expansion that is intended we should make for ourselves so that we get a larger view of the address that Peter gave.

We said yesterday that one church historian has said, that one of the reasons why Christianity spread so remarkably during the first century was that the Christians out-thought the Pagans and as we follow the argument of Peter, and the other arguments in the other addresses, we shall find that they're all marked by a close knit reasoning. You won't have to nod, if you do you'll miss something of his address. It's closely woven together, and there's a close-knit texture about it. There is power and cogency in the presentation of the argument and we shall try to see that, as we go through it.

Now there isn't time for any more words by way of a preamble. Let us turn to our Bibles and follow through this address. You've read it as a whole, now we are going to look at it piece by piece.

The miracle of the bestowal of the Spirit and the speaking with tongues had been performed, and a crowd was gathered together probably in one of the temple courts. It was not unusual for a sect, one of the many sects of Israel, to use the temple courts and give their addresses

and speeches there. So it was in keeping with such a practice that the Christians for a considerable time in Jerusalem met in one of the cloisters and gave their addresses there. And so there was therefore a large company of Jews closely packed together, standing in the court, when Peter stood up and spoke.

It has been estimated upon good grounds, that there would be two million Jews assembled in Jerusalem for every Passover. Not so many attended the feast of Pentecost, but if we just remember that two million could assemble for the feast of Passover and we were to cut that in half, as an estimate of the attendance at Pentecost, we can understand what a vast company of Jews were there, making a potential audience under circumstances like this.

The news fled like wildfire throughout the city. Something has happened! Something has happened, and these men are speaking in the temple courts and it wouldn't be very long before, along all the narrow alleyways of the old city, men were hurrying to the temple court to see what had happened. And they noticed the unusualness of this phenomenon and, as men are always ready to do, some mocked. They said, 'they're only drunk!' to which Peter rejoined firstly 'it's only nine o'clock in the morning, and it is forbidden for Jews to partake of intoxicants before that time, so therefore as good Jews it can't be a right explanation that we are drunk. But there's another explanation', says Peter, 'you remember the prophecy of Joel', and he cites the prophecy of Joel of God pouring out of His Spirit upon old and young of God's servants and hand-maidens who should prophesy.

Now there are two ways of looking at this citation. It is possible to regard it as a fulfillment of the words of Joel, but as we look at the context, we must conclude that it cannot be a full fulfillment, it can only be a partial fulfillment of the prophecy of Joel. But there is another way of interpreting the words. "This" and "that" have to be determined concerning their relatives. Peter says, "**This is that** which was spoken by Joel". But what does he mean by "this" and what does he mean by "that". '**This** statement is **that** which is spoken by Joel' or 'this which is happening is **that** which was foretold by Joel'.

Now if we take the first - 'These words that I am speaking unto you, this citation, is that which was spoken by Joel' - then Peter is giving them a testimony upon which he is going to argue by analogy that when this which you believe will come to pass, as you believe the Old Testament scriptures, will you then say that these men are drunk? Or will you see that there has been a Divine intervention among you by the outpouring of His Spirit upon some of His servants. If when **this** then, does come to pass you will say that this word has been fulfilled (and you must admit its possibility in the light of the Divine testimony), then why not now examine the matter and see whether there hasn't been something happening now before your eyes which corresponds to it. But he said something more. He says, 'Observe what God has said in connection with an outpouring of His spirit'.

And we want you to look at verse 20 of Acts 2,

"The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before that great and notable day of the Lord come: and it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved." Acts 2:20-21.

Now keep your finger in that place in Acts and turn back to Joel. As we carefully read the prophecy of Joel, we notice that Peter stops short at the quotation:- verse 31,

“The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and notable day of the Lord come: and it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord, shall be delivered.” Joel 2:31-32.

However, the rest of Joel’s statement which reads,

“... for in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as the LORD hath said, and in the remnant whom the LORD shall call.” Joel 2:32.

he has not quoted in Acts. Now that should make us pause. It wasn’t that Luke was so short of space, with regard to this quotation that he must cut those words in view of the fact that he’s quoted at such length the previous verses. But now notice this, that the very last words, “... and the remnant whom the LORD shall call”, are in fact quoted later in the speech.

Now I want you to notice this, v39 of Acts 2. “For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off” and now comes the quotation from Joel, “even as many as the Lord our God shall call”. Now we suggest from this method of Luke’s of thus breaking off that quotation and then introducing it afterwards, that this in fact is what happened, and it has happened many a time on a Christadelphian platform. A brother quotes so far and he says, ‘now we’ll stop there and talk about that and come back to the rest afterwards’. Now Luke doesn’t tell us he’s doing that, but by his very summary he shows that it was done, and Peter quoted so far in the statement of Joel, and he says, ‘now I’m going to stop there and we’ll talk about this and I’ll come back to the rest of the quotation later’.

Now that which we observe in connection with Joel’s prophecy, may be noticed in other quotations that Luke gives, which Luke reports in this speech. And the fact that Luke does it more than once in his reporting is surely clear evidence that we are expected to see that Peter stopped at that point and took up the thought of that point and carried it on and then came back later to take up the remainder of the verse and explain it. Now you’ll see how that actually happened as we continue the thought through this address.

So we come back again to verse 21.

“And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved.”

This passage is used by Paul in the letter to the Romans and he takes up each word in turn in the 10th chapter of the letter. We’re not going to follow it out but we want you to notice that this verse was a verse that was used in the setting forth of the gospel in the first century, not by one but by others, that it was part of the common stock of quotations that was given. Just as we have a stock of quotations common to all of us as speakers in presenting the first principles of the truth. If any of us wanted to refer to the teachings of Jesus on the Kingdom of God, the vast majority would include in a lecture the fact that Jesus said, “in the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit upon the throne of his glory, ye twelve shall sit upon twelve thrones.” If a lecture were being given on the nature of man, there would be a certain reference to Genesis which says, “dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return.” And so in setting forth the Divine purpose, this passage in Joel similarly, was used by them, and Paul in his arguments stresses first of all “whosoever”, he stresses “call” and he stresses “name” in turn, but Peter uses it as the starting point of an exposition of how there has been exhibited in the midst of them, a means for their salvation by a Divine intervention in their

midst. God would reveal Himself by this out-pouring of the Spirit and there would be exhibited a way of salvation upon which men might call in order that they might be saved. It was a salvation manifested, bound up with a name of the Lord upon which men shall call.

Now tomorrow we shall follow out what is involved in that name of the Lord because it is the subject of particular reference in Peter's speech, the second speech recorded in Acts, but the word 'salvation' is the connecting thought between the speech of Joel and what Peter has next to say. He says to them, what is this salvation? What has been done to make effective a salvation? What is it that God has provided as the way of salvation? Now he says, we'll tell you. You know about Jesus of Nazareth, he says, 'listen to this' you men of Israel:

v22, "*Jesus of Nazareth*" and then he affirms three things of him:

1. he was a man approved among you by miracles and wonders and signs which God did by him;
2. him being delivered by the determinate council and foreknowledge of God, you have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain; and
3. whom God hath raised up having loosed the pains of death because it was not possible that he should be holden of it.

And you'll notice that the common feature to those three verses is that there was Divine action in their midst. First, Jesus was raised up and was approved, attested of God among them. Secondly, that even their delivering up of Jesus fulfilled a Divine purpose. They did it ignorantly in unbelief but nevertheless they were fulfilling a Divine purpose which had been revealed before - it was according to the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God. And then thirdly, God had raised up Jesus. So the events connected with Jesus were all part of a Divine activity for men's salvation.

But you don't think brethren and sisters for a minute that Peter just said that Jesus of Nazareth was approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs which God did by him, without passing in review some of the miracles that Jesus had done. He classified them as miracles, wonders and signs. Doesn't that suggest to us that Peter surveyed the varied range of miracles that Jesus did. He would say to them, "Now this man has done miracles among you. You all know that he's healed the sick, don't you remember such a case, and he has given sight to the blind." And there would be amongst those that were there, some who had themselves either been the subject of the healing power of Jesus, or had friends or relatives who had. And so it was an appeal to a body of common knowledge in their midst, but it couldn't be made without a certain recapitulation of certain miracles.

And so when he said that he was delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, such a bold statement would never for a minute be itself convincing. He'd have to show that it was the determinate counsel of God, that Jesus should be crucified and slain. And we shall observe as we go through these speeches that an emphasis is given to the fact that Jesus was crucified. He would have therefore, to gather up from the Old Testament those passages which showed that God had decreed that this should be necessary for men's salvation. There would be an opening up, say, of those servant passages in Isaiah which begin at the 42nd chapter and go on to the end of the 53rd in which God speaks of His servant whom He would uphold; of that servant of the LORD who would be despised and rejected; who would prolong his days; by whose stripes men would be healed; who would bear their iniquities; who would see his seed and in whose hands the pleasure of the LORD would yet prosper.

It would only be by a survey of passages like that, that Peter would be able to say that it was according to the determinate council and foreknowledge of God. But when he comes to the third point, 'that whom God hath raised up', **that** was something outside the common experience of all of them. The witnesses had seen Jesus but they all had the scriptures and now Peter in particular elaborates the prophetic testimony concerning the resurrection of Jesus.

Now, that was fitting, was it not? In the first point he can appeal to their common experience and their knowledge of the wonders and signs that Jesus had done. With regard to the second, it being the determinate council, he will pass in review scriptures. But, the essential point of the testimony, and the one which would 'clinch' the whole argument, consisted of the evidence of the resurrection of Jesus. For if God had raised him up from death when they had slain him and crucified him, then it proved beyond all peradventure, that Jesus must be the one about whom those testimonies, that had been cited, was concerned. So he discusses a passage of scripture concerning the resurrection of Jesus. he boldly affirms two things firstly. First, that it was by David and that he was speaking concerning Jesus - v25 - "For David speaketh concerning him", and they might have said, "well, how do you know David was speaking'. And the answer is firstly that modern higher criticism hadn't cast a doubt upon the authorship of the 16th Psalm, and all Orthodox Jews accepted the literary heading of the Psalm, that it was by David. But speaking concerning HIM must needs be the subject of some testimony, some reasoning and so Peter must quote at some length from the 16th Psalm. But the very fact that it is quoted by Luke at some length shows that it was the subject of considerable elaboration by Peter and Luke tells us in what way it was elaborated. First, the affirmation that David was speaking concerning Jesus then the citation of the passage. "I foresaw the Lord always before my face, he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved: therefore did my heart rejoice and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope: Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption. Thou hast made known to me the ways of life; thou shalt make me full of joy with thy countenance."

We go back to the 16th Psalm and we observe that here again Luke has only given us part of the quotation:

v10-11 "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. Thou wilt shew me the path of life: in thy presence is fulness of joy."

He leaves unquoted for the moment "at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore." But he does, come back to it later in the address, which again teaches us and shows us that we are rightly interpreting Luke's method of summarizing when we suggest that Peter said at this point, 'I'm only going to quote so far at the moment. We'll come back to the implication of that phrase, "at thy right hand are pleasures for evermore" in a moment or two.' "But let us talk about this fact," says Peter, 'that here David is testifying concerning somebody whose ways were pleasing to God, who always walked in the light of God's countenance, whose flesh would rest in hope because his body wouldn't be left there. Nay, not only would it not be left in the grave but the resurrection would come so soon after his death that it was before corruption had set in.' An important point. "Thou wilt not suffer thine holy one to see corruption", therefore resurrection must follow so soon after the burial that corruption of the body had not taken place. But what Peter has to say has the slight appearance of a little

disparagement of David. He says, ‘now David isn’t speaking about himself.’ You will catch that apologetic tone in the 29th verse when he said;

“Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David.”

We all honour him and respect him and it isn’t any disparagement when we say that the Psalm doesn’t apply to him. Nay, in fact he says it **cannot** apply to him, “he is both dead and buried and his sepulchre is with us unto this day.”

And as he stood in the temple court he could have said:

“You know where his sepulchre is, It isn’t far from the temple walls, just over there in the city of David. If I were to ask any one of you where David’s sepulchre is you would say ‘why! don’t you know Peter? Come along and we’ll show you’.”

And so we all agree that that is David’s sepulchre. It is his sepulchre because his body was buried there and it has remained there. So David wasn’t raised up but the Psalm speaks of a man whom God raised up and therefore it couldn’t apply to David, but, to whom it did apply?

Follow on then his argument.

“Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day.”

Therefore, since it couldn’t apply to him, it must apply to someone else ... could it? Yes it could, because David was a prophet and David had promises given unto him and therefore his prophecy concerns ‘the one’ promised to him. “Therefore, being a prophet and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne.” And could Peter say that without quoting them the 7th chapter of the second book of Samuel and elaborating a little, the covenant made with David? Of course he would do that. Now he would say ‘David had these promises made to him that one of his descendants should sit upon his throne. The horizon of his salvation was bound up with that man whom God was going to raise up in his line and his prophecy concerned him. So Peter concludes, v31, “He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of the Christ” (the revised version rightly includes the definite article) and when Peter says ‘the Christ’, he doesn’t say Jesus. Perhaps if we translated ‘Christ’ into ‘Messiah’ we would see that he was not thinking then of the person Jesus, but was arguing purely from the text that, whoever the Messiah is, the Messiah must be a resurrected man. That’s Peter’s argument.

The prophecy, he says here is, “and David speaking by prophecy tells of one who would be raised from the dead.” He was speaking of ‘the one’ promised to him, says Peter, in the covenant made with him. That being so, the Messiah of necessity, for the scripture requires it, must be a man RAISED FROM THE DEAD. “He spake of the resurrection of the Messiah, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption.”

I think we’d all admit the force of the argument, but just think, brethren and sisters, of the circumstances under which that argument was put forward. Peter said, with a gesture of his hand probably, “You know where David’s sepulchre is, and it’s his sepulchre because his dust is there, but God has raised up Jesus, and that has fulfilled this prophecy. And the place where Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus put the body of Jesus isn’t his sepulchre, because

he's been raised from the dead". It was only less than a mile across the city and wasn't there anybody there with sufficient wit to say 'Yes Peter, but the tomb of Joseph is the sepulchre of Jesus'?

It was only seven weeks after Jesus was crucified, And yet Peter is standing in the temple court, in the very **citadel of Israel's** rulers, and quoting this scripture that the Messiah must be a resurrected man and saying the passage can't apply to David because his sepulchre is there, it does apply to Jesus because that isn't his sepulchre. They didn't take Peter around to show him that it was, because they knew that the place where Jesus had lain was not his sepulchre. They knew that their seals had been broken. They knew the guard had come around with a lame tale. They knew that there was some mystery about it beyond their explanation but in which there had been revealed Divine power. The one thing that would have completely squashed right at the beginning, the setting forth of this basic Christian doctrine that Jesus was raised from the dead, the one thing that would have squashed it wasn't done because it **couldn't** be done. But the challenge was made **at once, right there** and the first address that was made in the very citadel, the very stronghold of Israel's rulers. It gives us a picture, doesn't it brethren and sisters, of the vigour and the forcefulness, the logicalness, the effective, cogent way in which they put forward their case.

So, he sums it up in v32, "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses" and since Jesus is raised up, and it isn't a matter you can dispute, he must be the Messiah, for he was the only one that God ever did raise up. Others were raised as attesting the truth of the messages which God's messenger's gave, but Jesus alone was the one whom God raised up having loosed the pains of death.

So he passes on to the next aspect of the Divine work. If Jesus is raised, where is he? And so he says that now Jesus is ascended to God. Therefore he says, 'now I want you to remember the rest of the Psalm -"at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore". And the resurrected man has gone to the right hand of God'. And by the allusion to it, Luke would have us know that Peter is taking up this second part and telling them, emphasizing to them, that just as the man must not see corruption, so he must ascend to God's right hand. But he is going to bring together a catena of quotations to show that the Messiah, whoever he may be, must not only be a resurrected man, but a man who has a session at God's right hand before he assumes the office of Messiahship. Therefore being by the right hand of God, exalted. And that word exalted is a word that sends us off at once to the 68th Psalm. The very use of a word which in modern printing method would be put in quotation marks to show that it is a quotation, is by that very use of it, Luke's method of telling us that Peter cited the passage. Psalm 68:18,

"thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the LORD God might dwell among us."

"Thou hast ascended on high" and if "thou" hast ascended (and the background of course is the Divine descent at the Exodus for the deliverance of His people, and its typical bearing concerning another deliverance; if it could be said that God came down at the Exodus, it could also be said that, the deliverance effected, God ascended, He went back), and when Peter ventures to apply this "thou has ascended on high", he means, not that Jesus personally had descended but he does mean that, in Jesus there had been a Divine manifestation and, catching up the idiom of the Old Testament, there had been a visitation of God. Joseph said, "God will surely visit you". How did God visit them? By the angel of His presence, as the

vehicle of Divine manifestation appearing in their midst to lead them out. But how has God visited and redeemed His people as we read in Luke's gospel in those songs connected with the birth of Jesus? Why, "by the dayspring from on high hath visited us" (Luke 1:78). So if in the birth of Jesus, there was in this sense of the Bible idiom, God coming in the midst of His people, then, that one through whom God had manifested Himself, ascended on high.

But God never comes into human life without accomplishing His purpose. God came down at the Exodus, not to leave the work unfinished and He wouldn't ascend until the work was accomplished. So here, the fact of the ascension of Jesus is a witness to the accomplishment of the means of salvation.

Now we are quite safe in seeing that Peter brought that out, because Paul brings it out in his letter to the Ephesians at some length. So we are therefore quite sure that the allusion by Luke would have us turn back and see that Peter laid hold of that passage and brought out its implication. So you see, by the very use of a word, Luke is wanting us to call to mind the passage indicated and understand that he's giving us this wonderful summary. He wants us to open it out for ourselves and see the range of thought and the wealth of meaning and the beauty of the elaboration of the exposition of the scriptures.

"Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit (and the reference in Psalm 68 is to 'gifts to men' which Paul explains of these gifted men by the Spirit of God), so here, "He hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear" (Acts 2:33), and you will observe the perfect parallel between Peter's citation and its implications and what Paul brings out in the letter to the Hebrews. But, just as he must show that the passage in the Psalm couldn't have reference to David, because David's sepulchre was there, so the passage of the ascent couldn't refer to David because for the same reason, his sepulchre was there.

"For David is not ascended into the heavens". Did David know then, that this word had reference to someone else? He did know, says Peter, "but he saith himself", you notice how the very structure of a sentence requires you to expand it like that. Did David know, that this passage of the 'the ascent' in the Psalm didn't refer to himself? He did know, for David himself saith, "The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make they foes thy footstool". And so he cites the 110th Psalm which begins,

"The LORD said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The LORD shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies." Psalm 110:1-2.

In other words it's clearly a Messianic Psalm, therefore the Messiah, whoever he may be, must ascend to God's right hand to remain there until the time when God will establish His power.

And so, Peter can now lead on to his conclusion ... v36,

"Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made, (and now we can make the application) that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ."

And you'll mark that he takes the word 'Christ' from the 16th Psalm which speaks of him as the Messiah and he takes the word 'Lord' up from the 110th Psalm. He's made him both Lord and Christ. And it wasn't just done as an assertion there was an elaboration of the meaning of the words and what was signified thereby. But Peter has already moved them to such length that they said, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?"

He said, 'You must be baptised everyone of you in the name of Jesus Christ'. But the passage in Joel said "Whosoever shall call on **the name of the LORD** shall be saved". Now, just as Peter has given the exposition from the 68th Psalm that there must be an ascent after God had manifested and visited His people, so here also 'the name of the LORD' has been embodied in the manifestation of God in His Son, the Lord Jesus Christ. "Repent and be baptised everyone of you **in the name of Jesus Christ** for the remission of sins". For he says 'this promise of salvation which we are setting before you ... go back to what Joel says and just think of the blessed privilege that is yours. For Joel said "as many of you shall call upon the name of the LORD shall be saved" and you're calling on Him now. But he says, let the other part of the passage come through also "even as many as the Lord our God shall call". This is a Divine ministry, he says, this is the testimony of God, and God by this message is calling you. Unite your call with God's call and lay hold of this salvation. "With many other words did he testify and exhort saying 'Save yourselves from this untoward generation... for he said, 'it is a remnant whom the Lord shall call', as Joel testifies. And so Luke adds it up by saying "And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved: for it was a selective process, and again Peter goes back to the Joel passage 'Even the remnant' and he says, 'make sure you're in the remnant'.

Well it calls for application brethren and sisters, as we follow it through but if we will only gird up the loins of our minds I think we will perceive the strength of our position as we follow apostolic thought and see how well founded our faith is.

Question: (Summary only) Did Peter or the others speak in different tongues or did Peter speak in Hebrew and by a miracle did each hear in his own language?

Answer: I don't know, I don't know that there is an answer. I've asked the question to myself that you've put, and I can't give an answer that has any definiteness about it. Was the miracle performed on the hearers or the speakers? I think it was on the speakers, I think. I don't think that this gift of tongues is the glossalalia of the Corinthian epistles when they spoke with tongues, which was a kind of ecstasy. I think the two things were distinct. Here was a remarkable miracle which offset what happened in Genesis 11 when God confounded the speech of men, and by this record of all these men hearing it, there is the indication that this which God is now setting forth to all men is going to gather them back, to oneness again. I think we are right in going back to Genesis 11 again, and putting this as a counterpart. I'm sorry I can't answer more emphatically brother, but I've never read an answer which is complete and satisfactory. Can you give us one?

Comment: Don't you think a partial answer is given in v4? "And **they** were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and (**they**) began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." And people heard them speaking in their own language. Could they have been in groups, were they in groups?

Answer: That is possible, that is possible of course.

Question: In Psalm 16:10 “Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell”. Could you explain that – David’s words?

Answer: It was the Spirit of Christ in them that did testify, and there was an impersonation of the Messiah in the testimony given. That is, the words of David, being uttered by the Spirit of Christ in them, the prophets searched what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ that was in them did testify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow.

And you will observe, seeing you are taking me back to this Psalm, that this psalmist like the one in Psalm 110 is a priest.

Psalm 16:4: *“Their sorrows shall be multiplied that hasten after another god: their drink offerings of blood will I not offer, nor take up their names into my lips.”*

The writer, the real writer of the 16th Psalm is not only a king, but a priest, just as the 110th Psalm which speaks of the man that will reign out of Zion.

Psalm 110:4: *“The LORD hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.”*

I believe it is a beautiful fitting together, that the two passages that were the real basis of Peter’s argument, the 16th Psalm and 110th Psalm both refer to Jesus as king and priest. The speaker as it were, was for the moment was impersonating Jesus, and he was speaking as though he were Jesus, and therefore we can read these Messianic Psalms as though Jesus himself were speaking, for they are his utterances.

“My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?”

When did that 22nd Psalm ever fit, but in a very casual way in David’s life, and yet he could pour them out, even to the breaking of a sentence in the middle that intervenes between the resurrection in that 22nd Psalm. Astonishing grammatical structure, and yet David couldn’t have envisaged that of himself, but he speaks as though he were the Messiah, and it had to be read as though the Messiah were in a kind of preview uttering it. Am I making my meaning clear?

Concluding Comment: Well, will you please remember will you, the points that we have established concerning Luke’s method. Because I shall show that method of referring to a passage, where our method would put in quotation marks, our method of printing, where he just gives the broader allusion, where he expects us to recognize as a quotation. That we shall find in fact, that a recognition of that, not only opens up the later addresses, but in fact removes the difficulties that have been created and the criticisms that have been put forward concerning the accuracy of the speeches which Luke records.

That is, we said yesterday something of the vindication of Luke in matters of history. The principle we have tried to show which permeated Luke’s method of reporting applied to the 7th chapter of Acts, not only removes every difficulty, but turns the criticism back upon the critics and shows how marvelously correct and what a marvelous way Luke had as a historian of presenting a summary of what was said.