

Save Yourself from This Untoward Generation

Acts 2, the Many Other Words Behind It, and the Grace Administration They Opened

A verse-by-verse study of Acts 1-2, Peter's Pentecost sermon, and the grace administration it opened.

Copyright 2026

Distribution of this study as is in its entirety is permitted & encouraged.

Author: John Lobota

Research Assistant: Claude Cowork

papertiq@bellsouth.net

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
Two questions from Acts 2:40 — what were Peter's "many other words," and what is "this untoward generation" — set up from the whole of Acts 1 and 2.	
Chapter 1 — The Road to Pentecost: Acts 1 in Full.....	12
The forty days of proof, the ascension, the eleven, and where the disciples actually were when Pentecost began.	
Chapter 2 — The Day Itself: What Happened at Pentecost (Acts 2:1-13).....	29
The sound, the fire, the tongues, the international crowd, and its two very different responses.	
Chapter 3 — Peter Stands Up: This Is That (Acts 2:14-36).....	39
Joel's prophecy weighed against its own unmet clauses, then the resurrection argued from Psalm 16 and Psalm 110.	
Chapter 4 — The Appeal: "What Shall We Do?" (Acts 2:37-39).....	49
The crowd's conviction, and Peter's fourfold answer: repent, be baptized, remission of sins, receive the gift.	
Chapter 5 — Save Yourself from This Untoward Generation (Acts 2:40).....	55
The verse's own two halves, and skolios traced through its complete New Testament and Old Testament ancestry.	
Chapter 6 — Receiving the Gift: The Pattern, the Manifestation, and the One Delay.....	62
What Acts actually reports each time the gift is received, why God gave this manifestation first, and the one place where its giving was delayed.	
Chapter 7 — The Household of God (Acts 2:42-47).....	74
Koinonia run to its full occurrence list, and what the earliest church's shared life actually looked like.	
Chapter 8 — The Many Other Words, Part One.....	82
Peter's confession, the keys of the kingdom, and Jesus's own Upper Room teaching on the Comforter.	
Chapter 9 — The Many Other Words, Part Two.....	90
The Great Commission across all four Gospels, and the forty days' own commissioning scenes.	

Chapter 10 — The Grace Administration: Its Unique Place from Genesis to the Ascension.....99

The seven administrations, the Mystery, sonship rights, the Hope, and the whole armor of God.

Chapter 11 — Closing: Save Yourself — Living the Answer.....119

Returning to the anchor passage, and what living this study's answer looks like today.

Appendix A — Baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus (Condensed).....124

Whether "baptized in the name of Jesus Christ" names water or the new birth — the case for water stated first, and two accounts held open.

Appendix B — He or It? The Holy Spirit's Own Pronoun (Condensed).....127

Why John 14-16 reads "he" and Romans 8 reads "itself" — settled from the Greek pronouns underneath both, including the one verse that is genuinely hard.

Appendix C — Word Studies in Full.....129

The complete New Testament occurrence lists behind every word study the chapters state as a finding.

Appendix D — Grammar Notes.....131

The parsing behind the grammatical arguments — the passive imperative at Acts 2:40, the periphrastic future perfect, the genitive at Acts 2:38, and the rest.

Appendix E — Chronology and Numbers.....132

The ten days worked out inclusively, the fifty and the jubilee, the Sinai tradition, and Josephus on the scale of the feast.

Appendix F — Textual and Manuscript Notes.....133

Matthew 28:19 and the forgery claim, Mark 16:9-20, the five differences between Peter's quotation and Joel, and the Judaea puzzle.

Appendix G — Weight of Each Argument.....134

Every load-bearing argument, grouped by claim, with its weight, its direction, and what the opposing reading fairly answers — including the arguments this version withdrew.

Scripture Index.....139

Every scripture quoted in full across this study, in canonical order, with the chapter and section where it appears.

Anchor Passage

Acts 2:38 *Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost [holy spirit].*

2:39 *For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.*

2:40 *And with many other words did he testify and exhort, saying, Save yourselves from this untoward generation.*

2:41 *Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls.*

Introduction

A. The Anchor Text, and the Key Verse Inside It

Luke does not report Peter's sermon and then move on. Between the sermon (Acts 2:14-36) and its result (v.41's three thousand souls) sits a single reporting verse that this whole study takes as its starting point: "And with many other words did he testify and exhort, saying, Save yourselves from this untoward generation" (Acts 2:40). Read closely, that one verse makes two separate claims, and both are load-bearing.

The first claim is that Luke is telling us, in his own words, that what he has already recorded is not everything. "With many other words did he testify and exhort" is Luke's own admission that Peter said more that day than made it into the text — a great deal more, if "many other words" is taken at face value rather than as a stock phrase. The second claim is Luke's own compressed summary of what all those words, recorded and unrecorded together, were driving at: "Save yourselves from this untoward generation." Whatever else Peter said, this — in Luke's own editorial judgment — was the point of it.

This study exists to chase both halves of that one verse as far down as scripture will allow.

Weighing it: Narrative — carries no weight on any of this study's contested claims.

B. Two Questions, Stated Plainly

The first question: what were the many other words? Not speculation about what Peter might have said, but a disciplined reconstruction of what he had actually been taught to say — by Jesus himself, across the Gospels, and across the forty days between the resurrection and the ascension (Acts 1:3) — since a man does not testify and exhort with authority on the strength of what he invented that morning. Peter is standing in Acts 2 on the far side of Jesus's own sustained, direct instruction (scripture does not itself state its exact length, and this study will not adopt a figure real scholarly debate has not settled) and forty additional days of post-resurrection teaching "of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." This

study's working premise is that the content of Acts 2 cannot be fully understood without first asking what Peter already carried into it.

The second question: what, exactly, is "this untoward generation," and what does it mean to save oneself from it? This study will not treat "untoward" as filler language. The Greek word behind it, run out across its full New Testament usage and its Old Testament ancestry, names something specific — and this study has a running head start on part of the answer already, from the completed *In Vain Do They Worship Me* project's own findings on how Israel's religious leadership had displaced God's commandment with the tradition of men. That project is treated here as a standing cross-reference, not repeated from scratch.

These are not two separate studies loosely bound together. They are one verse, read all the way to the bottom.

Weighing it: Narrative — carries no weight on any of this study's contested claims.

C. What Happened That Day

Before either question can be chased, the narrative itself has to be seen whole, through v.41, because something genuinely tremendous happened on this day for God to act as he did. A movement that began with roughly a hundred and twenty believers (Acts 1:15) becomes, by the end of Acts 2, a body of well over three thousand — in a single day, on the strength of a single sermon, built on the exposition of a single Old Testament prophecy. (Exactly where that company of a hundred and twenty was standing when the sound came is its own real question, flagged here rather than assumed — Acts 1:13 names an upper room as where the eleven were lodging, but Acts 2:1 itself only says "in one place," without naming a location, and Luke's own immediately preceding sentence, closing his first volume, already has this same company "continually in the temple" (Luke 24:53) as their standing custom. Chapter 1's own section D works this question out directly rather than defaulting to the traditional assumption.)

That prophecy is Joel's:

Joel 2:28-32 — *"And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit. And I will shew wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and the terrible day of the LORD come. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the LORD shall be delivered: for in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as the LORD hath said, and in the remnant whom the LORD shall call."*

Peter introduces this quotation with "this is that" (v.16) — and this study will not let that phrase carry more weight than the full quotation itself can bear. Read to its own end, Joel's prophecy includes wonders that plainly did not happen that morning: "blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke," the sun turned to darkness and the moon to blood, all set explicitly "before the great and the terrible day of the LORD come" (vv.30-31). Whatever "this is that" is claiming, it cannot be a claim that Joel's entire

prophecy — addressed to Israel, and tied by its own wording to a still-future day of the Lord — reached its complete fulfillment on Pentecost morning. This is exactly the kind of question this library's method exists to work out in full rather than smooth over, the way the Genesis 6 "sons of God" question was worked out completely rather than assumed. Chapter 3 will do that work directly: what "this is that" can and cannot be claiming about a prophecy given to Israel concerning a day still ahead, worked out from the text itself rather than taken as a loose one-to-one match. A full narrative treatment of Acts 2:1-13 — what was seen, what was heard, who was there, and why the accusation "these men are full of new wine" was the crowd's own honestly bewildered first guess — is this study's own Chapter 2, ahead of Chapter 3's sermon.

What matters here, at the outset, is the scale of what God gave. One capitalization distinction is kept throughout this study: when the text speaks of God himself as Giver, this study writes Holy Spirit, a proper name, capitalized like every other name of God — Jehovah, Elohim, and the rest. When it speaks of what is given — the gift itself, received by the believer — this study writes holy spirit, lowercase, following the pattern already set in this library's own Grace Administration Primer. God is holy; God is spirit (John 4:24). What he poured out that day was of that same nature — a gift, in Peter's own word for it (v.38's "the gift of the Holy Ghost [holy spirit]"), not a reward earned or a status conferred, but something given, of God's own self, to be received. This study takes that word — gift — as load-bearing throughout, and will not let later chapters drift from it.

One further distinction rides along with this same convention and is flagged here, at its first appearance, rather than left to surface unannounced later: scripture's own pronouns for this gift are not uniform. The Upper Room Discourse this study quotes in full in Chapter 2 §A calls the Comforter "he," while Romans 8:16 and 26 call the identical gift "itself." Appendix B works out why both are accurate and settles which pronoun this study's own narrative commentary uses going forward, so a reader meets the answer before, not after, meeting "he" applied to this gift in the chapters ahead.

Weighing it: Narrative — carries no weight on any of this study's contested claims.

D. Why Acts 1 Has to Come First

Acts 2 opens mid-sentence, narratively speaking: "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place" (2:1). Who is "they"? What accord? Waiting for what? Every one of those questions is already answered — but the answers are in Acts 1, not Acts 2, and this study will not skip past them the way a quick read of Acts 2 alone tempts a reader to do.

Acts 1:3-5, 8 — *"To whom also he shewed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God: and, being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost [holy spirit] not many days hence... But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth."*

Notice immediately how directly this bears on this study's own first question. "Speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God" across forty days is, in scripture's own accounting, part of the very "many other words" this study is chasing — meaning the search does not begin cold in Acts 2; it is already underway before Acts 2 opens. Notice also v.7's word for the Father's own prerogative over "the times or the seasons" — the Greek is *exousia*, jurisdiction or rightful authority — set directly against v.8's word for what the apostles themselves are about to receive: *dunamis*, power, the same root that gives English "dynamite" and "dynamic." Two different words, two different kinds of thing, in two consecutive verses. This distinction is flagged here so it is on record from the outset, not introduced as though noticed late.

Acts 1's remaining narrative — the ascension itself and the promise of a literal, visible return "in like manner as ye have seen him go" (1:9-11), the return to Jerusalem, and Matthias chosen by lot to complete the number of the Twelve (1:15-26) — completes the scene Acts 2 assumes its reader already has in view. This study's own Chapter 1 will not summarize Acts 1; it will treat it in full, on its own terms, for exactly this reason.

Weighing it: Narrative — carries no weight on any of this study's contested claims.

E. Two Words for "Receive"

Verse 38 promises something future: "ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Verse 41 reports something already accomplished: "they that gladly received his word were baptized." Both are translated "receive" in the King James text — and behind that shared English word, the Greek marks a real distinction worth naming precisely, because it is the seed of this study's own Chapter 6.

Verse 38's "ye shall receive" is *lambano* — the ordinary New Testament verb for taking hold of something, getting possession of it, with the receiver's own active part in the taking built into the word's normal sense. Verse 41's "gladly received his word," on inspection, is not the simple word *dechomai* (though that word does appear elsewhere in this study's own field of view — Acts 8:14's report that "Samaria had received the word of God" uses exactly that verb) but its intensified compound, *apodechomai*: to welcome fully, to embrace wholeheartedly what is offered. Rather than weakening the distinction, the more precise word sharpens it. Verse 41 describes a warm, whole-hearted embrace of the message preached; verse 38 describes something the hearer is told he will personally take hold of and possess — the gift itself.

That distinction is not academic. Traced across the rest of Acts, this study will show that every place scripture explicitly records someone receiving the gift of holy spirit, the account also records that person speaking in tongues (Acts 2:4; 10:44-46; 19:6) — a repeating pattern this study takes as neither accidental nor merely descriptive of a few unusually gifted early believers, but as God's own consistent pattern for those born again under this administration. This study's own Chapter 6 will hold this pattern up against its one clear exception — Samaria, in Acts 8, where the word was received (*dechomai*) but something was still missing until the apostles came down and prayed — as a control case that tests, rather than merely illustrates, the pattern.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — first statement of claim T, that tongues accompany the gift wherever Acts reports the outcome. The two-word contrast behind "receive" is a **direct statement** about the Greek. That the tongues pattern is God's consistent design is a **reasonable inference** and no stronger: Chapter 6 §C counts six accounts, of which three report tongues plainly, one is silent, one is best read as a refilling, and one is compressed. The opposing reading can fairly answer that silences in half a dozen accounts are a real proportion. Nowhere, though, does Acts report the gift received and tongues withheld.

F. This Untoward Generation

The Greek behind "untoward" is *skolios* — crooked, warped, twisted out of its intended shape. It is a rare word in the New Testament, occurring only four times: here; Luke 3:5, of what John the Baptist's ministry would make straight; Philippians 2:15, where Paul calls his own Gentile-world audience, decades later and in a wholly different setting, "a crooked and perverse nation"; and 1 Peter 2:18, of an unjust master. That short list is itself worth pausing over — narrow enough to run out in full, wide enough to raise the real interpretive question this study's Chapter 5 will need to settle carefully: is Peter naming his own specific generation, under a specific and time-bound judgment, or is he reaching for language scripture already uses of a recurring condition, one Paul later applies without apparent strain to an entirely different audience?

The word did not begin with Peter. Moses had already used the very same word centuries earlier — it stands in the Greek Old Testament Peter's own hearers read — in his closing indictment of Israel:

Deuteronomy 32:5 — *"They have corrupted themselves, their spot is not the spot of his children: they are a perverse and crooked generation."*

Asaph, generations later, named the same pattern without the same word:

Psalms 78:8 — *"And might not be as their fathers, a stubborn and rebellious generation; a generation that set not their heart aright, and whose spirit was not steadfast with God."*

And Jesus himself, within living memory of the very crowd Peter is now addressing, had already used a related but distinct word of "this generation":

Matthew 17:17 — *"Then Jesus answered and said, O faithless and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall I suffer you? bring him hither to me."*

This study's method (see section H below) will not blend *skolios* and the word behind Jesus's "perverse" in Matthew 17:17 into one undifferentiated idea merely because both land in English as "perverse" — they are related but distinct Greek terms, and Chapter 5 will show precisely how they relate rather than assume it. What can already be said plainly is this: when Peter tells this crowd to save themselves "from this untoward generation," he is reaching for language with real weight behind it — Moses' own courtroom language for covenant Israel at its worst, freshly echoed in the living memory of Jesus's own ministry, and (per Philippians 2:15) evidently portable enough that Paul will use the same word of an entirely different, later, Gentile audience without explanation. What exactly Peter's hearers needed saving *from* — bad leadership, a corrupted system of worship, a whole generation's own hardened

unbelief, or some combination the text itself will have to settle — is this study's own Chapter 5 in full, built directly on top of what *In Vain Do They Worship Me* has already established about the tradition of men displacing the commandment of God in precisely this period and among precisely this leadership.

Weighing it: Narrative — carries no weight on any of this study's contested claims.

G. From Three Thousand Souls to the Household of God

Verse 41's three thousand souls do not simply disappear into an anonymous crowd. Luke immediately tells us what their new life looked like:

Acts 2:42 — "*And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.*"

"Fellowship" is *koinonia* — and this study will draw out, as its own Chapter 7, a distinction worth naming now: a person can be a family member without being in fellowship, in harmony, with the household; but no one can be in fellowship with a household without first being a member of the family. Membership is the doorway; fellowship is the life lived once inside it. Acts 2:42-47's picture of the earliest church — shared possessions, daily temple attendance, house-to-house breaking of bread, "praising God, and having favour with all the people," the Lord himself "adding to the church daily such as should be saved" (2:47) — is what fellowship, rightly lived, actually looked like in its first days.

Everything from v.38 through v.47 assumes a theological frame the rest of the New Testament exists to fill in. This study reserves a full chapter, near its end, for that frame directly: what makes the present administration of grace unique in God's whole plan, from Genesis 1:1 through the ascension already covered in Chapter 1 — the Hope, the Mystery once hidden and now revealed, sonship rights, the walk of fellowship, the whole armor of God. The gift of holy spirit itself — what it is in full, and the whole range of what it makes available — is deliberately reserved for a study of its own, named again at this study's own close. That chapter is this study's own attempt to lay hold of what the rest of the New Testament's epistles actually are: the "many other words" still available and still being spoken, for a reader today, in a form Peter did not have time to give his own hearers in one sermon.

Weighing it: Narrative — carries no weight on any of this study's contested claims.

H. Method and Sources

This study follows this library's standing method in full (*Research-Method.md*): the King James Version as base text; direct scriptural statement, constructed inference, and extra-biblical tradition or corroboration kept distinct and never blended silently; every word study run to its Strong's number and its complete New Testament occurrence list rather than resting on a single convenient proof text; differing views shown fairly where real disagreement exists.

Three projects already in this library are drawn on directly rather than repeated. The completed *In Vain Do They Worship Me* project supplies this study's standing cross-reference for the tradition of men and for what had gone wrong in Israel's religious life by the first century — material Chapter 5 leans on

rather than re-derives. The *Acts Verse-by-Verse Project*'s own Phase One work has already identified and partially verified a "five conversion accounts compared" pattern for holy spirit received and confirmed by tongues across the book of Acts — exactly the pattern this study's Chapter 6 will need, already scouted in outline form and ready to be verified in full rather than started from zero. And *A Grace Administration Primer*, already built and confirmed accurate against its own source material, is this study's starting point — not its ceiling — for Chapter 10, which expands well past the Primer's own necessarily condensed treatment.

Two outside sources named directly for the gift-of-holy-spirit chapter: E.W. Bullinger's *The Giver and His Gifts: or, The Holy Spirit and His Work* is a real, identifiable work (confirmed available through the Internet Archive), not presently in this library's own collection, to be obtained and checked on its own terms — factually and linguistically, per this library's standing practice of using a source's tools without inheriting its doctrinal conclusions by default — when that chapter is drafted. J.E. Stiles' *The Gift of the Holy Spirit* is confirmed as a real, historically significant work but is not available in free full-text form; this study will draw on it secondhand and summarized wherever it can be responsibly obtained, flagged honestly per this library's own sourcing standard if a full copy cannot be.

Weighing it: Method, not argument — bears no weight either way.

I. How to Read This Study's Own Weighing Notes

Every section of this study ends with a short note in bold, headed **Weighing it**. It exists because a study that states a strong argument and a weak one in the same confident tone has not been honest with its reader, and because a reader is owed a plain statement of which is which rather than having to work it out unaided.

Each note says two things. First, how strong the section's argument is, on a five-step scale this library uses throughout. **Direct statement** means scripture says it in so many words, and the only question is what the words mean. **Strong inference** means it follows closely from what scripture says, and the alternative has to strain against the text. **Reasonable inference** means it is the more natural reading, but an honest reader working carefully can take it otherwise. **Corroboration only** means it is consistent with this study's position and would be roughly as consistent with the opposite one — it may be stated, but it will not be leaned on. **Neutral** means it is commonly cited by one side or the other and genuinely settles nothing.

Second, and just as important, each note says *which way the section points* — because a rating alone tells a reader how confident to be without telling them what to be confident about. Many of this study's sections are straight narrative and argue nothing contested; those say so plainly rather than being given a manufactured rating.

Where a section does bear on a contested claim, the note names the claim. This study argues nine of them, and they are worth having in one place before the first chapter begins:

	The claim	Argued in
T	Wherever Acts reports the gift received and tells us what followed, it reports tongues	Ch. 3 §A; Ch. 6 §§C, F, I; Ch. 9 §D
P	The hundred and twenty were in the temple, not a private upper room	Ch. 1 §§D, H; Ch. 2 §C; Ch. 3 §A
B	"Baptized in the name of Jesus Christ" names the new birth, not a water rite	Ch. 4 §C; Ch. 9 §C; Ch. 11 §G; Appendix A
J	"This is that" is a real but partial fulfilment of Joel; its second half is still future	Ch. 3 §C; Ch. 10 §D
G	Pentecost opens the Grace administration, fifth of seven, with its own audible declaration	Ch. 10 §§B, C, E, G
S	"Save yourselves" is a passive imperative — receive, not achieve	Ch. 5 §D; Ch. 11 §B
H	The Comforter's "he" is grammatical; the gift itself is properly "it"	Ch. 2 §A; Ch. 8 §§G-I; Appendix B
R	"This rock" is Peter's confession, not Peter and not Christ	Ch. 8 §C
W	John 20:22 is a forward-pointing sign, not the bestowal of the gift	Ch. 2 §A; Ch. 9 §§E, F

Appendix G collects every argument in one table, with its weight, its direction, and what the opposing reading can fairly answer — including the arguments earlier versions of this study made and this one withdraws. Chapter 11 §J names the findings that would overturn this study's position outright.

Weighing it: Method, not argument — bears no weight either way.

Chapter 1 — The Road to Pentecost: Acts 1 in Full

A. Forty Days of Indisputable Proof (Acts 1:1-3)

Acts 1:1 *The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began both to do and teach,*

1:2 *Until the day in which he was taken up, after that he through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the apostles whom he had chosen:*

1:3 *To whom also he shewed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God:*

Acts opens by naming itself a second volume: "the former treatise" is Luke's Gospel, addressed to the same Theophilus, and Acts 1:1's own wording — "of all that Jesus began both to do and teach" — quietly implies that what follows is Jesus's continuing work, not a new and different story. Luke did not write two books about two subjects. He wrote one continuous account with a seam in the middle, and this study will lean on that fact directly in section D below, where the seam matters more than it first appears to.

Verse 2 already adds something the Gospel of Luke itself never states outright: that the risen Christ, in the days before the ascension, gave his commandments to the apostles "through the Holy Ghost." This is worth flagging precisely rather than folding into every other spirit-reference in this study without comment — it is a data point for Chapters 8 and 9's own "many other words" question, and this study will not assume it means the same thing, in the same sense, as the baptism in holy spirit Acts 2 is still forty days away from describing.

Verse 3's "many infallible proofs" translates a single Greek word, *tekmerion* — and it is worth knowing that this is the only time the word appears anywhere in the New Testament. It is not the ordinary word for a sign or a wonder; lexically it names a fixed, indisputable marker, the kind of proof that settles a question rather than merely suggesting an answer. Luke reaches for the strongest available word, once, for exactly this claim: that the resurrection was not asserted on faith alone but demonstrated, repeatedly, across forty days, to the same company this study is about to follow into the temple and then into Pentecost.

Weighing it: Narrative — carries no weight on any of this study's contested claims.

B. Two Kinds of Power (Acts 1:4-8)

Acts 1:4 *And, being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me.*

1:5 *For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost [holy spirit] not many days hence.*

1:6 *When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?*

1:7 And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power.

1:8 But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.

Verse 4 opens on a deliberate act, not a passing remark: "being assembled together with them" gathers the company one more time for what proves to be the risen Christ's last recorded instruction before he is taken up. The instruction itself has two parts, both precise rather than general. First, a place: "not depart from Jerusalem" — not merely stay near one another, but remain in the specific city this study's own Chapter 2 will find still full of pilgrims when the promise arrives. Second, a posture: "wait for the promise of the Father." And Luke immediately adds a detail easy to read past: "which, saith he, ye have heard of me" — this study's own Introduction (§D) has already flagged this phrase as reaching back past Acts 1 into the ministry itself, and Chapter 2 §A will trace that reach in full, across four distinct sayings preserved from the Upper Room Discourse alone. Whatever is coming, verse 4 already tells this study's reader, it is not news to the men hearing it.

Verse 5 makes the promise concrete by naming its nearest and most obvious contrast: "John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost [holy spirit] not many days hence." Two baptisms, two elements, named side by side and kept distinct. This study holds this verse as load-bearing well past its own immediate setting: it is the last time before Acts 2:38 that scripture records this company hearing the word "baptized" at all, and this study's own Chapter 4 §C will return to this exact verse directly, because a hearer who still remembered this specific contrast had real grounds to ask, only days later, which of the two baptisms Peter's own bare instruction, "be baptized," was actually calling for. "Not many days hence" is itself a promise of nearness rather than vague futurity — made good, in scripture's own careful arithmetic, in exactly ten days, as this chapter's own §E below will show.

Verse 6 records a real question, and this study takes it at face value rather than reading it as a misunderstanding Jesus has to correct: "wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" The question assumes real content behind it — a kingdom, promised to Israel by her own prophets, not yet restored, and understood by every man present as something still future and still coming. What Jesus corrects in the verse that follows is not the expectation itself, but its timing. This study flags, without resolving here, that the kingdom the apostles are asking about and the administration of grace this study's own Chapter 10 will describe are not presented in this text as the same thing arriving on schedule — a distinction worth carrying forward rather than blurring.

Verse 7 supplies that correction, and in doing so hands this study its own first worked example of a distinction that will recur through the whole of this study: "it is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power." "Power" here is *exousia* (Strong's G1849) — jurisdiction, prerogative, the right to decide, rather than raw capability to act. The calendar of God's own kingdom program belongs to the Father's own authority to set; verse 7 tells the Eleven plainly that this is not theirs to know, only his to determine.

Verse 8 then answers a different question than the one just asked, and this study holds the shift as deliberate rather than evasive: the apostles asked about a kingdom's own timing; Jesus answers with a task's own scope. "Ye shall receive power" — *dunamis* (Strong's G1411), capability, ability-in-action, the root behind English "dynamite" and "dynamic," a different Greek word entirely from verse 7's *exousia*, appearing in the very next verse of the same recorded sentence. The Father keeps *exousia* over the calendar; the apostles are promised *dunamis* for the work directly in front of them. It is enough here to have the distinction on record, in the two consecutive verses where scripture itself first draws it.

Verse 8 closes with what amounts to the book of Acts's own table of contents, and this claim is worth demonstrating in full rather than only asserting, because it is one of the more remarkable structural facts in the whole New Testament once it is actually traced. "Ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth" names four concentric stages, moving outward from the center, in an order this study will show Acts itself follows with real precision, not loosely or by coincidence.

The first stage, Jerusalem, is where the book of Acts spends its own opening seven chapters almost without leaving: the outpouring this study's own Chapter 2 narrates in full, the household of three thousand and then more this study's Chapter 7 describes, and the apostles' own continued signs and wonders and appointment of the seven in the chapters immediately following — all of it confined, geographically, to the holy city itself. Luke does not need to tell his reader when this first stage ends and the second begins; he marks the transition with an event, not a narrative aside, and the event is itself worth noting for how directly it fulfills what Jesus has just promised: "And Saul was consenting unto his death. And at that time there was a great persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem; and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judaea and Samaria, except the apostles" (Acts 8:1). This study holds this verse as one of scripture's own clearest instances of God turning human opposition into the very advance of his own stated plan: the persecution meant to crush the church becomes, in Luke's own telling, the actual mechanism that carries it out of Jerusalem and into exactly the second and third stages Acts 1:8 had already named — Judaea and Samaria together, in a single verse, the two regions Jesus had named as adjoining stages now entered by the same scattering at the same moment.

The third stage, Samaria specifically, receives its own dedicated narrative shortly after — Philip's preaching, Simon Magus, and Peter and John's own journey down to confirm what had happened there (Acts 8:4-25) — and this study's own Chapter 6 will take up that passage in full, precisely because Acts 1:8 named Samaria as its own distinct stage, set apart from Judaea rather than assumed to follow automatically once the gospel reached the wider Judean countryside. That is not a minor observation; it will matter directly to how Chapter 6 accounts for what makes Samaria's own reception of the gift different from every other account this study traces. Jesus names it separately because it was, by the deep and mutual hostility Chapter 6 will document in full, a separate frontier entirely — Jewish territory in one direction, half-Israelite and religiously estranged territory in the other, crossed only once Acts 1:8's own third stage specifically required it to be.

The fourth and widest stage, "the uttermost part of the earth," unfolds across the whole remainder of the book: Cornelius's household, the first Gentiles explicitly recorded receiving the gift with no prior conversion to Judaism at all (Acts 10, already anticipated in this study's own Chapter 4 §F below); the question formally settled at the Jerusalem council, that Gentiles need not first become Jews to be saved (Acts 15); and then Paul's own three missionary journeys, carrying the same gospel first preached in a courtyard at Jerusalem across Asia Minor, into Macedonia and Achaia, and at last to Rome itself — the seat of the entire known world's governing power, and, from a first-century Judean vantage point, as near to "the uttermost part of the earth" as any city on the map. Acts does not continue the story past this point. Its own closing verses find Paul in Rome, "preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him" (Acts 28:31) — and the book simply ends there, its narrative arc complete not because the gospel's own advance had stopped, but because Luke's own governing outline, set out here at Acts 1:8 before a single subsequent chapter had been written, had reached the stage it was always going to end at. This study holds that as remarkable rather than coincidental: a single verse, spoken before any of it had happened, forecasts not merely that the gospel would spread, but the specific four-stage shape the entire remaining book would take, in the specific order it would take it, ending exactly where the fourth stage's own furthest extension, in Luke's own world, could be shown to have reached.

This same shape is not new with Acts 1:8; Luke's own first volume had already named its first stage by anticipation, in words spoken by the same risen Christ only verses earlier in that Gospel's own closing chapter: "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem" (Luke 24:47) — the identical starting point, named in the very last chapter of the very book Acts calls itself a continuation of. Matthew's own version of the commission reaches immediately for the full breadth Acts 1:8 will only arrive at after seven chapters: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations" (Matthew 28:19); Mark's reaches wider still: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature" (Mark 16:15). Held together, these are not three competing accounts of one instruction but three witnesses to one program, seen at different points along its own stated unfolding — Luke's Gospel naming the starting line, Acts 1:8 naming the full four-stage course, and Matthew and Mark naming the ultimate horizon that course was always aimed at. This study's own Chapter 4 §F will later find a smaller version of the same widening pattern in Peter's own words at Pentecost — "the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off" (Acts 2:39) — three widening rings answering to this verse's own four; this study holds the two patterns as the same underlying shape seen twice, once as a stated program before Acts opens and once as its own preacher's compressed echo of that program only two chapters later, and will not be surprised to find it again as this study's own later chapters trace the gospel's advance further still.

Weighing it: Strong inference — points to Acts 1:8 supplying the book's own four-stage outline. That the four regions are named in that order is a **direct statement**; that Acts then follows them with real precision is a **strong inference** traced stage by stage above. The opposing reading can fairly answer that a four-stage outline moving outward from a centre is loose enough to fit many narratives, and that Luke may have shaped the verse to the book rather than the book to the verse. The *exousia/dunamis* distinction is a **direct statement** about two consecutive verses.

C. The Ascension, and the Promise of a Literal Return (Acts 1:9-11)

Acts 1:9 *And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight.*

1:10 *And while they looked stedfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel;*

1:11 *Which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.*

The cloud that receives Jesus out of their sight (v.9) is worth reading against scripture's own established pattern for it — the cloud of glory that led Israel in the wilderness (Exodus 13:21-22) and that filled Solomon's temple at its dedication (1 Kings 8:10-11). This study notes the pattern as a real, textually visible one, held as an inference rather than an explicit statement the text makes for itself: Luke does not say "the cloud of glory," only "a cloud," and this study will not overstate what is not written.

The "two men... in white apparel" (v.10) match, almost word for word, the two messengers Luke's own Gospel already placed at the empty tomb (Luke 24:4) and John's Gospel places there as well (John 20:12) — two witnesses announcing the resurrection at one end of the story, two witnesses announcing the promised return at the other. This pairing is worth pausing on directly, because it is not the only such angelic pairing scripture records around this same event, and this study holds the pattern worth seeing in full rather than noted only in passing.

Matthew 28:2-7 *And, behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it. His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow: and for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men. And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here: for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay. And go quickly, and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead.*

Luke 24:4-7 *And it came to pass, as they were much perplexed thereabout, behold, two men stood by them in shining garments: and as they were afraid, and bowed down their faces to the earth, they said unto them, Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen: remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, saying, The Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again.*

John 20:11-13 *But Mary stood without at the sepulchre weeping: and as she wept, she stooped down, and looked into the sepulchre, and seeth two angels in white sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain. And they say unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them, Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him.*

Each account records essentially the same office being performed, though from slightly different vantage points on the same morning: an angelic witness — Matthew's own single angel, whose visible arrival is itself part of the sign; Luke's and John's two — present at the tomb, supplying the interpretation the empty tomb itself does not supply on its own. An empty tomb, seen alone, is only an

absence; it could mean theft, or removal, or simple error about which tomb was which. What turns it into evidence of resurrection rather than a merely troubling mystery is the angelic word attached to it: "he is not here: for he is risen." This study holds that supplied interpretation as the pattern itself worth naming: scripture's own angelic appearances, across these accounts and the ascension both, do not typically produce the event they announce; they arrive to explain an event already visible, but not, on its own, self-interpreting.

That same office is repeated, in the same numbered pair Luke's and John's own tomb accounts have already established, at the ascension this section is presently treating: two men in white apparel again, interpreting an event — a departure this time, rather than an absence — that would otherwise leave eleven men simply staring at an empty sky, exactly as their own opening question catches them doing: "why stand ye gazing up into heaven?" (v.11). Between these two matched appearances — empty tomb, ascending cloud — scripture records no third angelic appearance to this company across the whole of the intervening forty days this study's own Chapter 1 has already begun measuring out; the two poles bracket the period rather than running through it. This study holds these as special circumstances precisely because they are exceptional rather than routine: at the two moments in this whole story where human witnesses see something they could not, on their own, correctly interpret — a body genuinely gone, a person genuinely ascending bodily into a cloud — heaven itself supplies the missing words, then falls silent again until the next hinge point requires it.

What the two messengers actually say is the chapter's own clearest doctrinal claim, and it deserves fuller weight than a single reading gives it: "this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven" (v.11). Every clause here is doing precise work, not general encouragement. "This same Jesus" rules out a merely spiritual or symbolic return substituted for the man the Eleven had just watched ascend bodily before their own eyes — the same identity, not a different or diminished one. "In like manner as ye have seen him go" ties the return's own character directly to the departure's own character, point for point: visible then, visible again; bodily then, bodily again; accompanied by a cloud then, and — though this study will not overstate a detail the text does not itself supply here — scripture elsewhere associates the Lord's own return with cloud imagery of exactly this kind (compare Revelation 1:7, "behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him"). This study will not spiritualize either half of the messengers' sentence: a plain, literal, physical departure is matched, in the same breath, with a plain, literal, physical return, promised by the same two witnesses who had already, weeks earlier at the tomb, correctly announced the plain, literal, physical fact of the resurrection itself. Their own track record, on the morning of this second appearance, is perfect; this study holds their second announcement as deserving the same confidence as their first. Where, geographically, that return is promised to land is itself a further, specific claim scripture makes, and this chapter's own next section takes it up directly, at the very place the ascension has just occurred.

Weighing it: Direct statement on the promise of a literal return; corroboration only on the cloud. That the messengers promise a return "in like manner" is what the text says. That the cloud of verse 9 is the cloud of glory is **corroboration only**, and this section says so itself — Luke writes "a cloud," not "the cloud of glory."

D. Where They Were: The Upper Room, and the Question of the Temple (Acts 1:12-15)

Acts 1:12 *Then returned they unto Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet, which is from Jerusalem a sabbath day's journey.*

1:13 *And when they were come in, they went up into an upper room, where abode both Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, Philip, and Thomas, Bartholomew, and Matthew, James the son of Alphaeus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James.*

1:14 *These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren.*

1:15 *And in those days Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples, and said, (the number of names together were about an hundred and twenty,)*

Verse 12 opens with two details worth stopping over before this chapter's own larger textual argument begins, because each supplies information the passage assumes its own first readers already had, and a modern reader typically does not.

"A sabbath day's journey" translates a fixed technical distance, not a rough figure of speech, and it is worth defining precisely because Luke uses it here as an ordinary unit of measure — the only time this exact phrase occurs anywhere in the New Testament. Jewish tradition — reflected in later rabbinic sources, not in the Torah's own text, and this study flags the distinction per its own stated method rather than blur it — fixed the maximum distance a person might travel on the sabbath without violating Exodus 16:29's command to "abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day," at roughly two thousand cubits, a little over half a mile. The figure itself is commonly traced to Numbers 35:5's own measurement of the suburbs surrounding Israel's Levitical cities, and to Joshua 3:4's instruction that Israel keep "about two thousand cubits" between themselves and the ark as they crossed the Jordan — texts read together, by later tradition, as establishing a sabbath-appropriate walking distance rather than a hard limit scripture itself explicitly legislates. Luke's own use of the phrase here is not itself an endorsement of the tradition behind it; it is simply the ordinary way a first-century, Greek-speaking Jewish audience would have measured a short walk, and this study uses it accordingly: Olivet stood close enough to Jerusalem to be reached inside the very distance the strictest sabbath custom of the day permitted, a detail of proximity rather than of doctrine.

The mount itself, named here as the place "from Jerusalem a sabbath day's journey," is Olivet — the Mount of Olives, a ridge running north to south across the Kidron Valley immediately east of the city, high enough to command a full view of the temple and low enough to be climbed in minutes. This is not the first time this study's readers have met the mount; Gethsemane, the garden of Jesus's own agony and arrest, sat at its foot (Luke 22:39-40), and Jesus himself had taught there at length only days earlier, delivering what this study's readers will know as the Olivet Discourse from its own eastern slope, seated "over against the temple" (Mark 13:3, of Matthew 24 and Mark 13's own shared setting). Verse 12 now names the same mount a third time in this brief span of scripture, as the very place from which the ascension this chapter's own previous section has just described actually occurred (Luke 24:50-51 names

the ascension as happening "as far as to Bethany," a village on Olivet's own eastern side, harmonizing without strain with Acts 1:12's own naming of the mount itself).

What makes the location worth more than passing geographical interest is a specific prophecy naming this exact mount by name, centuries before Jesus ever stood on it: "and his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east... and the mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley" (Zechariah 14:4). This study holds the connection as too specific to pass over: the messengers' own promise, just treated in this chapter's own §C — "this same Jesus... shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go" — is not merely a promise of a return in general terms, but a return to a location scripture had already named directly, generations before the ascension gave that promise its own literal departure point to match. Zechariah does not merely say the Messiah will return to earth; he says, specifically, that his feet will stand on the mount of Olives — the very ridge Acts 1:12 has just identified as the place his feet had, in this same chapter, just left. This study states the connection as a real, specific correspondence between an Old Testament prophecy naming a location and a New Testament narrative naming the same location as the ascension's own point of departure, without claiming to resolve every further question Zechariah's own oracle raises about the timing or circumstances of its own fulfillment — that lies outside this chapter's own present scope — but the geographic precision itself is worth having on record exactly where the text first supplies it.

Verse 13 names the company by full roll call, and this study takes up the question that roll call itself raises: are these, in fact, the eleven remaining apostles, the same company this chapter's own §F below will confirm was already being called "the eleven" from the very morning of the resurrection? The list answers by its own count: Peter, James, John, Andrew, Philip, Thomas, Bartholomew, Matthew, James the son of Alphaeus, Simon Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James — eleven names, matching exactly. Each carries his own history elsewhere in scripture, worth recovering briefly here rather than left as bare names on a list, since this study's own working premise, stated since its Introduction, is that Peter's later sermon rests on men already shaped by years of direct instruction, not strangers meeting for the first time in an upper room.

Peter and Andrew were brothers, fishermen of Bethsaida and then Capernaum (Mark 1:16, John 1:44); Andrew, a former disciple of John the Baptist, was the first to follow Jesus and the one who brought his own brother to him with the words "we have found the Messiah" (John 1:40-42) — the same Peter Jesus would rename Cephas, a stone (John 1:42), and later declare the confession-bearer on whom he would build his church (Matthew 16:18, this study's own Chapter 8 §C). James and John, sons of Zebedee and Peter's own fishing partners (Luke 5:10), were nicknamed by Jesus himself "Boanerges," sons of thunder (Mark 3:17), and stood with Peter as the inner three present at the transfiguration and at Gethsemane alike; John is widely identified with "the disciple whom Jesus loved" of the fourth Gospel (John 13:23, 21:20), and this study's own readers will meet his own written testimony repeatedly in the chapters ahead. Philip, from the same town of Bethsaida as Andrew and Peter (John 1:44), brought Nathanael to Jesus (John 1:45-46) and was the one who, at the Last Supper, asked to be shown the Father, drawing the direct reply, "he that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (John 14:8-9). Thomas, called Didymus, "the twin" (John 11:16), is remembered above all for doubting the resurrection until he had seen and

touched the risen Christ for himself, and for the confession that followed: "my Lord and my God" (John 20:24-28). Bartholomew is widely identified with the Nathanael of John 1:45-51, of whom Jesus said, "behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile." Matthew, also called Levi, was a tax collector at Capernaum before Jesus called him from his own toll booth (Matthew 9:9, Mark 2:14), and is credited with the Gospel bearing his name. James the son of Alphaeus is distinguished in scripture from James the son of Zebedee already named above, sometimes called "James the less" (Mark 15:40) to keep the two apart. Simon, called Zelotes — the Zealot (Luke 6:15) — carried into the apostolic company a name recalling the politically and religiously militant movement of that title, a detail scripture states without further comment. And Judas the brother of James — not Iscariot, and not, this study is careful to note, necessarily identical with Jesus's own half-brother of the same name discussed later in this section — is also called Thaddaeus and Lebbaeus in the other Gospel lists (Matthew 10:3, Mark 3:18), and is the one apostle recorded asking a question at the Last Supper that still stands, in a sense, as this study's own reader might ask it too: "Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world?" (John 14:22). Eleven men, then, each already known to scripture before this verse ever names them together, standing now as a settled company rather than a group only just introduced.

Verses 13 and 14 use two different Greek verbs, and the King James Version's shared English rendering hides a distinction worth recovering. Verse 13's "abode" is *katamenō* (Strong's G2650) — to stay, lodge, reside — and its participle is grammatically masculine plural, matching the list of eleven men's names it directly follows. This verse names where the eleven were sleeping. Verse 14 shifts to a different verb entirely: "continued" is *proskartereō* (Strong's G4342) — to persist steadfastly in an activity — and this study finds it doing real, deliberate work here, because Luke uses this same word again for the same company's life after Pentecost: "continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship" (Acts 2:42) and "continuing daily with one accord in the temple" (Acts 2:46). Three uses of one verb, by one author, describing what looks like one continuous practice. Verse 13 names a lodging place for the men; verse 14, in the author's own recurring word, names an activity — "these all continued... in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren" — that this study takes to be the same steadfast temple practice Acts 2:46 will later name directly, not the private room of the verse just before it.

This reading does real work on the specific point already raised above: not by assuming an unstated social custom, but by letting the text's own grammar carry the weight. Verse 13 speaks only of the eleven men lodging somewhere; verse 14 speaks of a different, wider company — explicitly including the women, Mary, and Jesus's brothers — steadfastly engaged in something Luke's own vocabulary elsewhere locates at the temple. The women were never said to be in the room of verse 13 at all; they belong to verse 14's different verb and, on this reading, its different place.

The room itself is worth a further word, on the practical point of size already raised. An upper room (Greek *anagaion* or *huperōon*) in an ordinary Jerusalem household was typically a modest guest chamber built above the main house — sleeping and lodging space, not a public hall. Even the "large upper room furnished" of the Last Supper (Mark 14:15) — sometimes identified by later tradition, though not by the text itself, as this same room — was "large" only relative to seating thirteen men reclining for one meal, not to housing a hundred and twenty people continuously, day and night, still

less to the "multitude" (Acts 2:6) representing "every nation under heaven" that Acts 2 is about to describe. Whatever its exact size, a private residence of this kind was built for lodging, not for what verse 14 goes on to describe.

Acts 2:1 opens the next scene with only this: "they were all with one accord in one place" — a real place, but an unnamed one. The common assumption, carried by many readers and reinforced by later church tradition's identification of a "Cenacle" site in Jerusalem, is that "one place" simply continues the lodging-room of 1:13. This study takes the stronger reading to be the temple, on five converging lines: the *katamenō/proskartereō* distinction just traced; Luke's own immediately preceding sentence, closing his first volume just before Acts opens — "and were continually in the temple, praising and blessing God" (Luke 24:53), the identical practice, the identical place, one verse before Acts begins; Acts 2:2's "house" (Greek *oikos*), a word scripture itself uses directly of the Jerusalem temple elsewhere — "my house shall be called the house of prayer" (Matthew 21:13, Mark 11:17, quoting Isaiah 56:7 of the temple) and "make not my Father's house an house of merchandise" (John 2:16; see also Luke 19:46) — so nothing in the word itself requires a private residence; Acts 2:46's continuation of the identical *proskartereō*-in-the-temple practice immediately after Pentecost, with Acts 3:1 naming the specific, regular occasion — "Peter and John went up together into the temple at the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour"; and Pentecost's own character as one of the three pilgrimage feasts scripture required every observant Israelite male to keep by appearing "before the LORD" at the place he had chosen (Deuteronomy 16:16) — meaning the "devout men, out of every nation under heaven, dwelling at Jerusalem" (Acts 2:5) who make up the day's crowd would themselves have been gathered at the temple at the hour of morning prayer, exactly where this reading already places the hundred and twenty. A further point already raised — that their prayer at this stage would not have been fearful or hidden, but bold and expectant, since they now knew what they were waiting for and had been directly commanded to wait for it — fits this same picture: the closed-door fear of John 20:19 belongs to the days immediately after the crucifixion, not to a company that has since received forty days of proof and a specific, public commission.

None of this is stated by Acts 2:1 in so many words, and this study says so rather than overclaiming it: it is a constructed reading, built from converging lines the text itself supplies, not a verse that names the temple outright. It is offered as the textually stronger reading rather than the customary one — stronger now than this study's own first attempt at the question, because it rests on Luke's own grammar (the two distinct verbs) and not only on inference from custom.

Verse 14 deserves its own further word, once the question of where this company most plausibly was has been settled, because the verse itself layers in three further pieces of information worth taking one at a time: the manner of their continuance, its likely object, and precisely who besides the eleven is now named as sharing in it.

"With one accord" translates a single adverb, *homothumadon* (Strong's G3661), built from *homou*, "together, of the same place or mind," and *thumos*, the seat of feeling and passion — literally, of one passion, one felt purpose, not merely standing in physical proximity. This study's readers will meet the word again, repeatedly, across the very earliest chapters of Acts: of the whole company again at

Pentecost itself (Acts 2:1, this study's own Chapter 2), of the church at prayer under fresh persecution (Acts 4:24), of the apostles gathered in Solomon's porch (Acts 5:12), and of the Jerusalem council's own agreement on sending Judas and Silas to Antioch (Acts 15:25). Luke reaches for this word repeatedly, across a span of many chapters, to name the same thing each time: a company acting, and particularly praying, not as a collection of individuals who happen to occupy the same room, but as one felt and united purpose. This study holds its first occurrence here, before Pentecost has even happened, as the seedbed of a unity this study will keep meeting, under this same word, all the way through the early chapters of this book.

What, then, would this company have been praying for, with such singular, shared intensity? Scripture does not record the specific words of this particular prayer, and this study will not manufacture a transcript it is not given. But the content is not left wholly to guesswork, either, because this exact company has just been told, in the verses this chapter's own §B above has already treated in full, precisely what they are waiting for: the promise of the Father, a baptism in the Holy Ghost, power not yet received, "not many days hence" (vv.4-5, 8). A company commanded to wait for a specific, named promise, gathered immediately afterward in fervent, one-accord prayer, is reasonably read — this study states this as its own considered inference rather than a claim the text makes in so many words — as praying toward that very promise: readiness for what had been promised, and, this study holds as likely though again not explicitly stated, boldness for the witness Acts 1:8 had just named as its own outcome, across all four of the stages this chapter's own §B has already traced in full. The only prayer this immediate context records in specific, quoted words is a different one, offered a few verses later for a narrower purpose — the choosing of Matthias, this chapter's own §G below — and this study will not conflate the two; but a company already told what it is waiting for, praying together with one shared passion in the days immediately following that instruction, is not praying about nothing.

The verse names, alongside "the eleven" just listed, a wider company sharing in this same prayer: "the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren." This study has already argued, from the grammar of verses 13 and 14 together, that this wider company belongs to a different verb and, on this reading, most plausibly a different place than the eleven's own lodging room named in verse 13. What deserves its own separate word here is the last group named: "his brethren," Jesus's own half-brothers, sharing now in the same prayer as the apostles who had followed him from the start.

Scripture names these brothers directly, elsewhere, in a single verse: "Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us?" (Matthew 13:55-56; the parallel at Mark 6:3 names the same four). Four brothers, named; sisters, plural, present but left unnamed and uncounted by the text. This study is careful to keep the apostle already listed above — "Judas the brother of James" — distinct from this Judas, one of Jesus's own physical half-brothers; scripture does not itself equate the two, and this study will not do so either.

What makes this small notice in verse 14 worth pausing over at all is what scripture elsewhere records about these same brothers' own earlier posture toward Jesus. During the ministry itself, John states plainly and without softening: "for neither did his brethren believe in him" (John 7:5) — not curious

bystanders, but unbelievers, family members who did not accept their own brother's identity while he taught, healed, and was crucified in their own lifetime. That this same group of brothers now appears, by name, in one-accord prayer alongside the apostles, only weeks after the crucifixion their own unbelief had witnessed, is itself evidence of something scripture records having happened in between — and 1 Corinthians 15:7 supplies the likely occasion directly: among Paul's own list of resurrection appearances, "after that, he was seen of James" — a specific, named appearance to a specific brother, widely and reasonably identified as this same James named first in Matthew 13:55's own list, and the same James who becomes, within a few more chapters of this book, the recognized leader of the Jerusalem church itself (Acts 15:13, Galatians 1:19's own naming of him as "the Lord's brother," Galatians 2:9). This study holds the sequence as a real, if not fully detailed, account of a family's own change of mind: unbelief during the ministry, a resurrection appearance to at least one brother by name, and now, in this very verse, that same family standing among the praying company waiting for the promise the apostles themselves are waiting for. One further, quieter detail belongs here: the Judas named among these same brothers is credited, by long tradition, with the New Testament epistle that bears his name — and its own opening line is worth noticing for what it does not claim: "Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James" (Jude 1) — brother of James named, but the writer does not call himself brother of the Lord, reaching instead for the same title Paul and others use of themselves throughout the New Testament: servant. This study takes that restraint as consistent with a man who had, within his own lifetime, moved from active unbelief in his own brother to calling that brother Lord, and choosing, once he did, not to trade on the relationship.

This company's own continuance in prayer sets the scene for what happens next: "and in those days Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples, and said, (the number of names together were about an hundred and twenty,)" (v.15). What Peter said next is worth showing in full rather than passed over, because this study's own method commits it to displaying every relevant verse rather than moving directly from verse 15 to the discussion of Judas's own death that follows:

Acts 1:16 *Men and brethren, this scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas, which was guide to them that took Jesus.*

1:17 *For he was numbered with us, and had obtained part of this ministry.*

Peter's own opening move is worth noting briefly here, ahead of this chapter's own next section taking up its full substance: he grounds what he is about to say in scripture already given, "spake before" by David, not in his own private judgment about what ought to be done — the same method of arguing directly and confidently from the Psalms this study's own Chapter 3 will find Peter using again, at far greater length, in the Pentecost sermon itself. And his description of Judas is entirely factual and past-tense, without editorializing beyond what the facts themselves require: a man "numbered with us," who "had obtained part of this ministry" — genuinely one of the Twelve, genuinely fallen away, both stated plainly, in the same breath, exactly as the next section takes up in full.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — leans toward the temple rather than a private upper room (claim P), but an honest reader can hold the traditional reading. The two different verbs at verses 13 and 14 are a **direct statement** about the Greek, and Luke 24:53's "continually in the temple" one sentence

earlier is **direct**. That the five lines converge on the temple is a **reasonable inference**: the opposing reading can fairly answer that Acts 2:1's "one place" most naturally continues the room just named, that *oikos* is the ordinary word for a house, and that the observation about the women belonging to a different verb is an argument from silence. This study names that last step as one. What the section establishes is that the traditional reading is an assumption rather than a statement of the text, not that it is wrong.

E. Ten Days: The Number Between the Ascension and Pentecost

Leviticus 23:15-16 sets the count that gives Pentecost its name: fifty days, numbered from the day after the sabbath following Passover — the Feast of Firstfruits (Leviticus 23:10-11) — to the Feast of Weeks. Christ's own resurrection fell on that Firstfruits day, and Paul names him directly as such: "now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept" (1 Corinthians 15:20). Acts 1:3 has already told this study that forty of those fifty days were spent in resurrection appearances, ending in the ascension this chapter has just covered. Fifty less forty leaves ten — the span between the ascension and the day of Pentecost, and precisely what Acts 1:5's "not many days hence" had already promised. (The count is inclusive, as Israel's own festival calendar counts: resurrection day is day one, and Pentecost itself is the fiftieth, which leaves nine clear days of waiting between the ascension and the feast. Appendix E works the arithmetic out in full; the figure ten is the one scripture's own reckoning yields, and this study uses it.)

Ten is not a number this library's method treats as decorative. E.W. Bullinger's *Number in Scripture* — already a standing reference for this library's word-and-number studies — states its significance directly: "ten is one of the perfect numbers, and signifies the perfection of Divine order... Completeness of order, marking the entire round of anything, is... the ever-present signification of the number ten. It implies that nothing is wanting; that the number and order are perfect; that the whole cycle is complete." Bullinger's own examples span the Ten Commandments, the tithe, and the ten plagues of Egypt — each, in his reading, a complete and sufficient cycle, nothing lacking. This study holds the application to these ten days as its own inference rather than a scriptural statement in so many words, per this library's epistemic-status principle — but the pattern is worth naming plainly: ten days of waiting, no more and no less, between a finished forty days of proof and the gift still to come, reads as a complete and sufficient interval rather than an arbitrary one. What fifty itself signifies — and how it bears on this study's own subject — is reserved for the chapters that reach the day of Pentecost directly, where it will be given full treatment rather than anticipated here.

Weighing it: Direct statement on the count; corroboration only on its significance. That fifty days less forty leaves ten is arithmetic, and the inclusive reckoning is Israel's own; Appendix E sets it out. That ten signifies a complete and sufficient cycle is **corroboration only** — drawn from Bullinger rather than from scripture's own statement, and this study says so.

F. When Did Judas Take His Own Life? Matthew 27 and Acts 1 Together

This question is worth pursuing to a real conclusion rather than leaving as a loose end, because Acts 1 itself raises it. Matthew's Gospel records Judas's death in a way that, read by itself, places it early — before the crucifixion has even been narrated:

Matthew 27:3 *Then Judas, which had betrayed him, when he saw that he was condemned, repented himself, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders,*
27:4 *Saying, I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood. And they said, What is that to us? see thou to that.*
27:5 *And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed, and went and hanged himself.*
27:6 *And the chief priests took the silver pieces, and said, It is not lawful for to put them into the treasury, because it is the price of blood.*
27:7 *And they took counsel, and bought with them the potter's field, to bury strangers in.*
27:8 *Wherefore that field was called, The field of blood, unto this day.*

A reasonable question, raised directly by a document in this study's own working files, is whether Acts 1 complicates this timing — specifically, whether Acts 1:2's description of the risen Christ giving commandment "unto the apostles whom he had chosen" implies Judas was still among that company through the forty days and the ascension itself. Worked out against the fuller text, it does not. "Whom he had chosen" is Luke's own defining description of who the apostles are — pointing back to their original calling (compare Luke 6:13, "he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles"), not a claim about who was physically present in the scene Acts 1 is narrating. And the text elsewhere is not silent on the question; it is direct.

On the very morning of the resurrection — before Acts 1 even opens — Luke already calls the apostolic company "the eleven," twice: the women "returned from the sepulchre, and told all these things unto the eleven, and to all the rest" (Luke 24:9), and later that same day the two travelers from Emmaus "found the eleven gathered together" (Luke 24:33). Acts 1:13's own list of who was lodging in the upper room names exactly eleven men — Peter, James, John, Andrew, Philip, Thomas, Bartholomew, Matthew, James the son of Alphaeus, Simon Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James (a different Judas, not Iscariot) — eleven, not twelve. And when Peter stands up to address the need for a replacement, his own language is entirely past tense: Judas "was numbered with us, and had obtained part of this ministry" (1:17); "this scripture must needs have been fulfilled" (1:16) — a settled, completed fact, not news. Matthias, once chosen, "was numbered with the eleven apostles" (1:26) — confirming that the company he joined was already eleven before he became the twelfth.

Taken together, this is decisive rather than merely suggestive: Judas was gone before the resurrection appearances began, consistent with — not in tension with — Matthew's own placement of his death at the time of the condemnation, hours before the crucifixion on that same morning, and certainly before the forty days and the ascension this chapter has just covered. The instinct to check Acts 1 against Matthew 27 here was a good one; worked to its conclusion, Matthew's own timing holds.

One further, genuine difference between the two accounts is worth resolving rather than passing over, since both describe the same field:

Acts 1:18 *Now this man purchased a field with the reward of iniquity; and falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out.*

1:19 *And it was known unto all the dwellers at Jerusalem; insomuch as that field is called in their proper tongue, Aceldama, that is to say, The field of blood.*

Matthew has the chief priests buying the field with the silver Judas returned; Acts says "this man purchased" it. Matthew has Judas hanging himself; Acts describes a body falling and bursting open. Read as this library's own harmonization principle directs — parallel accounts may add differing details without contradicting, and are to be assembled rather than pitted against each other — both resolve without strain. The purchase money was Judas's own, by origin: the chief priests refused to return it to the temple treasury as blood money and used it instead to buy the field, so that Acts can rightly credit the field to Judas's own money even though his hands never completed the transaction. And a body left hanging, in the heat, over however many hours passed before it was found or came down, is consistent with Matthew's own stated cause of death and with Acts's grim description of its final state — two witnesses to one event, not two different deaths. Both accounts, held together rather than read past each other, supply this study with the fuller picture its own method calls for.

One further point, worth a brief note rather than a full digression: Judas's own surname, Iscariot, is widely read as a Hebrew place-name, *Ish-Kerioth*, "man of Kerioth" — a town named directly in Judah's own inheritance (Joshua 15:25). If this reading is right, Judas alone among the Twelve was a Judean rather than a Galilean, a distinction the text itself corroborates elsewhere: the angels' address at the ascension, "Ye men of Galilee" (Acts 1:11), and the crowd's own astonishment at Pentecost, "are not all these which speak Galilaeans?" (Acts 2:7, this study's own Chapter 2). This is background, not an explanation this study offers for the betrayal itself — scripture does not offer that explanation, and this study will not supply one it isn't given — but it is worth having on record before Chapter 2 reaches that same Galilean identity from the other side.

Weighing it: Strong inference — Matthew's timing for Judas's death holds, and Acts 1 does not complicate it. That Luke calls the company "the eleven" on resurrection morning, that Acts 1:13 names eleven men, and that Peter speaks of Judas wholly in the past tense are all **direct statements**. The harmonisation of the field and the manner of death is a **reasonable inference** under this library's standing harmonisation principle; the opposing reading can fairly answer that Matthew and Acts describe the purchase differently and that a harmonisation is a reconstruction rather than a report.

G. Completing the Twelve: Matthias Chosen (Acts 1:20-26)

Acts 1:20 *For it is written in the book of Psalms, Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein: and his bishoprick let another take.*

1:21 *Wherefore of these men which have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us,*

1:22 *Beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection.*

1:23 *And they appointed two, Joseph called Barsabas, who was surnamed Justus, and Matthias.*

1:24 *And they prayed, and said, Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen,*

1:25 *That he may take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell, that he might go to his own place.*

1:26 *And they gave forth their lots; and the lot fell upon Matthias; and he was numbered with the eleven apostles.*

With the question of Judas's own death now settled, the chapter turns to what Peter's speech does about the vacancy it left. He grounds the need for a replacement in scripture before the choosing itself begins — citing Psalm 69:25 and Psalm 109:8 (v.20) as written warrant — the same method of arguing directly and confidently from the Psalms that this study's own Chapter 3 will find Peter using again, at far greater length, in the Pentecost sermon itself. The qualification Peter states for the replacement (vv.21-22) is worth its own note: not merely someone taught during the forty post-resurrection days, but a man who had "compained with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto that same day that he was taken up from us" — the whole span of the ministry, not only its final forty days. This is this study's own first piece of direct evidence that the "many other words" Chapters 8-9 will chase are not confined to the post-resurrection instruction alone; whoever stands in this office is defined, in the text's own terms, by having heard everything.

Two candidates are put forward, Joseph called Barsabas and Matthias (v.23), and the choice is settled by casting lots (v.26) after prayer (vv.24-25).

Verse 26's own method for making the actual choice deserves its own direct treatment, because it names a specific practice modern readers do not use for this kind of decision and may be tempted to read as a rough ancient equivalent of a vote. It was not. Casting lots — whatever the precise physical mechanism (marked stones, sticks, or another method scripture does not specify here) — did not aggregate the assembled company's own preferences the way a vote does; it removed human preference from the decision altogether, submitting the choice instead to a mechanism scripture consistently treats as under God's own direct control: "the lot is cast into the lap; but the whole disposing thereof is of the Lord" (Proverbs 16:33). This is not an isolated sentiment; casting lots as a means of learning God's own decision runs through the Old Testament's own practice repeatedly — the scapegoat chosen by lot on the Day of Atonement (Leviticus 16:8), the land itself divided among the tribes by lot (Joshua 18:10), Achan identified among the whole camp by a process of lots narrowing steadily to one man (Joshua 7:14-18), Saul himself first identified as king by the same method (1 Samuel 10:20-21), the priestly divisions of temple service assigned by lot in David's own day (1 Chronicles 24:5), and, closer still to this study's own present chapter, the specific temple duty that had put Zacharias, John the Baptist's own father, in the sanctuary the day Gabriel appeared to him — decided, Luke's own Gospel states plainly, "according to the custom of the priest's office, his lot was to burn incense" (Luke 1:9). Even the soldiers who divided Jesus's own garments at the cross unknowingly enacted a fixed Old

Testament pattern this same practice belongs to: "they parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots" (Psalm 22:18, fulfilled per John 19:24).

What every one of these instances shares, and what verse 26 shares with them, is that lots were reached for specifically when a decision needed to be made between options a human process — deliberation, preference, seniority, popularity — was not trusted, or not competent, to settle rightly. This study holds that distinction as the real difference between a lot and a vote, not merely a difference of ancient custom versus modern practice: a vote asks the gathered company what it wants; a lot asks God to disclose what he has already decided, with the human participants deliberately declining to exercise their own preference in the matter at all. Verse 24's own prayer, offered before the lot is cast, states this posture directly and without ambiguity: "thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen" — not "help us choose wisely between them," but "show us which one you have already chosen." Peter and the gathered company had already narrowed the field to two men meeting the qualification verses 21-22 state plainly — companionship with Jesus across the whole of his ministry, from John's baptism to the ascension, not merely across the forty post-resurrection days — and, having done what human judgment could rightly do (setting the qualification and identifying two men who met it), handed the final choice entirely to God, by a method that structurally excluded their own preference from determining the outcome.

This is the last time this book records that specific method being used for a leadership decision; later appointments in Acts — the seven chosen in Acts 6:1-6, elders appointed in Acts 14:23 — proceed by a different process this study does not attempt to characterize fully here — a question belonging more properly to a study of its own than to this study's own narrower reach. It is worth noting here, as a reasoned inference rather than a settled conclusion this study is prepared to argue at length, why that shift might make sense on its own terms: lots, throughout the Old Testament pattern just traced, functioned as a means of consulting God directly when no other means of discerning his will was available. Once this same company had received the indwelling gift this study's own next chapter narrates in full — a gift this study's later chapters will show came with its own means of guidance, discernment, and Spirit-led decision built in — the specific need lots had always answered may itself have been met by a better and more direct means. This study flags the question rather than closing it, and leaves its own fuller treatment to a study of its own rather than a later chapter of this one.

Weighing it: Direct statement on what a lot was; reasonable inference on why the practice ceased. That scripture treats the lot as God's own disclosure rather than a vote is stated outright at Proverbs 16:33 and enacted across the instances traced. Why Acts records no later use is a **reasonable inference** this section already flags as unsettled, and the opposing reading can fairly answer that Luke's silence about a practice is not a report that it stopped.

H. Closing — What Acts 1 Hands to Acts 2

By the time Acts 1 ends, every question a first reader would bring to "when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place" has already been answered, in order: who they were (the apostles — a company already, and rightly, eleven rather than twelve, Judas having fallen

away well before these forty days began — the women, Mary, Jesus's brothers, and the wider company numbering about a hundred and twenty, with the apostolic Twelve itself now complete again); what they were waiting for (the promise of the Father, and a *dunamis* distinct from the Father's own *exousia* over the timing, for a complete and sufficient ten days); and, on the reading this chapter has argued for directly from the text's own grammar rather than assumed, where they most plausibly were when it came — not a private upper room, but the temple, in company with the very "devout men, out of every nation under heaven" Acts 2:5 is about to introduce. Acts 2 can now be read as what it actually is: not a new scene, but the very next sentence.

Weighing it: Summary only — restates what the sections above established, at the weights assigned to them there.

Chapter 2 — The Day Itself: What Happened at Pentecost (Acts 2:1-13)

A. Ready for What Was Coming: What They Had Already Been Taught

Acts 2 opens on a company that already knew, in broad outline, what was about to happen to them. This is worth establishing plainly and directly, with the text itself, before the narrative proper begins — because a reader coming to Pentecost cold, with no memory of the Gospels behind it, might picture the wind and the fire as a total surprise, sprung on eleven confused men with no warning at all. That is not what the text shows. Chapter 1 has already covered the nearest layer of this preparation: Acts 1:4-5 and 1:8, where the risen Christ himself, in the forty days just before, commanded the apostles to "wait for the promise of the Father" and named it directly —

Acts 1:4 *And, being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me.*

1:5 *For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost [holy spirit] not many days hence.*

1:8 *But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.*

But "ye have heard of me" reaches back further than the forty days. It reaches back into the ministry itself — specifically, into the teaching Jesus gave the Eleven in the upper room on the night of his betrayal, the night before the crucifixion, long before any resurrection appearance had happened at all. This study's own Chapters 8-9 will give that whole body of teaching its full, dedicated treatment, tracing every strand of what Jesus taught the Twelve across his ministry and the forty days both. What belongs here, in Chapter 2, is narrower and more immediate: the specific promises that explain why the company gathered on the day of Pentecost was ready for what came, rather than ambushed by it. John's Gospel alone in the passion week records four distinct sayings on this exact subject, spoken directly to the Eleven at the table:

John 14:16 *And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever;*

14:17 *Even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.*

14:18 *I will not leave you comfortless: I will come to you.*

"Another Comforter" is worth pausing on. The word is *parakletos* — one called alongside, to help — and "another" (Greek *allos*, another of the same kind, not *heteros*, another of a different kind) tells the Eleven directly that whatever this Comforter would be to them, it would be the same kind of help Jesus himself had already been. He is not describing a replacement for himself in some lesser sense; he is describing a continuation. The promise repeats and sharpens a few verses later, adding two further details — that this Comforter would teach, and would remind:

John 14:25 *These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you.*

14:26 *But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.*

Verse 26 matters directly for this study's own larger inquiry into the "many other words" of Acts 2:40: Jesus himself states, before he has even left them, that whatever he said would not simply fade from memory but would be actively "brought to remembrance" by the very gift they were about to receive. Whatever Peter later drew on to preach as he did, this verse is scripture's own explanation for how so full and so ready a sermon could come from a fisherman on short notice. The teaching continues two chapters later, first briefly —

John 15:26 *But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me:*

— and then at far greater length, in the fullest single treatment John's Gospel gives the subject, spoken as Jesus explains why his own departure is actually necessary for this gift to come at all:

John 16:7 *Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you.*

16:8 *And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment:*

16:9 *Of sin, because they believe not on me;*

16:10 *Of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more;*

16:11 *Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged.*

16:12 *I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.*

16:13 *Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come.*

16:14 *He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you.*

16:15 *All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you.*

Two details in this passage deserve to be named directly, because Chapters 8-9 will return to both. First, verse 13's "he will shew you things to come" — a directly stated capacity for genuine prophecy, not merely recollection of what had already been said, and worth holding in view for whatever this study later finds Peter or others doing with it. Second, verse 7's own logic: the Comforter's coming is tied by Jesus's own words to his going away, not merely to the passage of time. This is not yet Pentecost, and nothing in John 14-16 states that the gift was given that same night — indeed the same discourse's own larger movement (Jesus still has to be betrayed, crucified, raised, and, as Chapter 1 has already covered, ascend) makes plain that whatever the disciples heard that night was a promise of something still future, not a report of something already accomplished.

One feature of the quotations just given is worth naming plainly before this study moves on, rather than left for a reader to puzzle out alone: every pronoun across these four sayings — "he," "him," "himself" — is masculine, printed exactly as the King James translators wrote it and left exactly so everywhere this study quotes it. That "he" is grammatically accurate: it agrees with the masculine Greek noun *parakletos*, "Comforter," the title Jesus uses in each of these verses in place of "spirit" (itself a neuter noun in the Greek, rendered "itself" where no such title intervenes, as at Romans 8:16 and 26). It is not, on inspection, evidence that the gift promised here is a separate, third person standing alongside the Father and the Son; it is ordinary grammatical agreement with a personified title, the same habit English follows in calling an "advocate" or a "counselor" "he" without concluding the office itself is a separately living being. Appendix B works this question out in full, verse by verse and word by word; it is flagged here, at this study's own first full quotation of these sayings, so a reader carries the right understanding of "he" through every later chapter that returns to this same promise.

That is what makes John 20 significant, and worth treating with real care rather than passing over quickly or reading too much into it either way. On the evening of the very day he rose — chronologically well before the ascension, well before Acts 1's "not many days hence," well before Pentecost — Jesus does something no other Gospel records him doing:

John 20:19 *Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you.*

20:20 *And when he had so said, he shewed unto them his hands and his side. Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord.*

20:21 *Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.*

20:22 *And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost [holy spirit]:*

20:23 *Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever ye retain, they are retained.*

Two words in verse 22 repay careful checking against the Greek, and both turn out to matter. "Receive" translates *lambano* (Strong's G2983), the identical verb — same root, same basic sense of taking hold of something offered — that this study's own Chapter 6 will find Peter using again at Pentecost itself:

"Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost [holy spirit]" (Acts 2:38). Whatever John 20:22 was, Jesus reached for the same word for it that would later describe Pentecost's own gift. And "breathed on" translates *emphysao* (Strong's G1720), a word that appears here and nowhere else in the entire New Testament — a true hapax legomenon, spoken only this once. It is, however, not a new word to scripture as a whole: it is the very verb the Greek Septuagint uses for God's own act at man's first creation — "And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul" (Genesis 2:7). The connection is not this study's own invention; it is built into the word Jesus chose. He reaches for the one Greek verb scripture had already used for the origin of physical life in the first Adam, and uses it here, at the origin of something else, in a scene that follows directly on his own resurrection.

What, then, is verse 22 actually doing? This study takes the position that the honest answer requires holding two things together rather than collapsing them into one. On one hand, the act is not empty symbolism, a mere gesture without content — the deliberate choice of *lambano*, matching Acts 2:38's own later word, and of *emphysao*, matching Genesis 2:7's own creation language, marks this as a real, weighted act, not incidental. On the other hand, this study will not claim that John 20:22 is the complete and final bestowal of the gift Acts 2 later describes, for a reason internal to the text's own timeline rather than any outside argument: Acts 1:4-5, chronologically *after* this scene — after the forty days of teaching, after John 20 — still has Jesus commanding the same men to "wait for the promise of the Father," a promise "ye shall be baptized with... not many days hence." A command to wait for something still future does not sit easily beside a claim that the thing had already been fully given weeks earlier. Nor does John 20 itself record any of the effects Acts 2:4 will record — no tongues, no utterance, nothing that the text calls a manifestation. What this study finds instead, and states plainly as its own reasoned conclusion rather than an assumption carried in from elsewhere, is that John 20:22 is best read as a real, enacted, forward-pointing sign — Jesus using the same word he would use again at Pentecost, and the same creation-echoing verb the Septuagint had used of Adam, to show the Eleven concretely, in an action they could see and feel, exactly what kind of thing was coming and exactly what word would describe it when it came — securing their readiness rather than substituting for the event itself. This is offered here in enough depth to serve Chapter 2's own purpose — showing that Pentecost caught no one by surprise — while the question's fullest and most careful treatment, weighed against every other resurrection-appearance account together, remains the work reserved for Chapter 9, exactly as already flagged in this study's own outline.

Taken as a whole, then, the company gathered when "the day of Pentecost was fully come" had been told, in plain words, on the night before the crucifixion, that a Comforter of the same kind as Jesus himself was coming, that he would teach and remind, testify, reprove, guide into truth, and show things to come; had been shown, on the day of the resurrection itself, an enacted preview of that same gift, using in advance the very word that would later name it; and had been commanded, in the forty days just before this chapter opens, to wait in Jerusalem for that same promise, now named directly as a baptism and a power "not many days hence." They knew what was coming. What Acts 2 records is not

the introduction of a wholly new idea to a confused company, but the arrival of something they had been told, shown, and told to expect.

Weighing it: Mixed, stated per point — establishes that the company was prepared, and first states claim W, that John 20:22 is a sign rather than the bestowal. That Jesus promised the Comforter in these four sayings is a **direct statement**. That John 20:22 is a forward-pointing sign rather than the gift's complete giving is a **reasonable inference** here, argued in full at Chapter 9 §§E-F; the opposing reading can fairly answer that "receive ye the Holy Ghost" is about as plain as language gets. What weighs against it, and is **direct**, is that Acts 1:4-5 still has Jesus commanding the same men to wait. The note on the Comforter's pronouns is **reasonable inference** and belongs to claim H; Appendix B carries it.

B. What the Feast of Pentecost Was

■ **Acts 2:1** *And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place.* "The day of Pentecost" names a specific, already-existing feast day on Israel's own calendar, not a name Luke invents for this occasion. *Pentecost* (Greek *pentekoste*, "fiftieth") is the Greek-language name for what the Law itself calls the Feast of Weeks (Hebrew *Shavuot*), and its own governing text sets both its timing and its name directly:

■ **Leviticus 23:15** *And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave offering; seven sabbaths shall be complete:*

■ **23:16** *Even unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath shall ye number fifty days; and ye shall offer a new meat offering unto the Lord.*

■ **23:17** *Ye shall bring out of your habitations two wave loaves of two tenth deals; they shall be of fine flour; they shall be baked with leaven; they are the firstfruits unto the Lord.*

■ **23:20** *And the priest shall wave them with the bread of the firstfruits for a wave offering before the Lord, with the two lambs: they shall be holy to the Lord for the priest.*

■ **23:21** *And ye shall proclaim on the selfsame day, that it may be an holy convocation unto you: ye shall do no servile work therein: it shall be a statute for ever in all your dwellings throughout your generations.*

Seven complete sabbaths (seven weeks, forty-nine days) counted from the day after the Feast of Firstfruits, then a fiftieth day — this is the count that gives the feast its Greek name directly, and it is the same count Chapter 1 §E has already used to establish the ten-day span between the ascension and this day: forty days of resurrection appearances (Acts 1:3), Christ himself risen on the Firstfruits day itself and named directly as such ("now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept," 1 Corinthians 15:20), leaving ten days from the ascension to bring the count to its full fifty. One detail of Leviticus 23:17 is worth a brief note in passing, since it distinguishes this feast from Passover's own strict prohibition on leaven: the two wave loaves offered at Pentecost were explicitly "baked with leaven" — leavened bread commanded as an offering "unto the Lord" — one of only two such commands in the Law, the other being the thanksgiving loaves of Leviticus 7:13. This study does not build doctrine on that detail here, but flags it as worth holding in view once Chapter 7 reaches the household of three thousand these same firstfruits typify.

The number fifty itself carries meaning this study's method requires it to state, not skip past — this chapter fulfills a standing obligation, flagged already in Chapter 1 §E, to give fifty its own treatment once the day it names is actually reached. E.W. Bullinger's *Number in Scripture*, already this library's standing reference for number study, states it directly and briefly: "FIFTY is the number of jubilee or deliverance. It is the issue of 7 x 7 (forty-nine), and points to deliverance and rest following on as the result of the perfect consummation of time." The connection Bullinger names — jubilee — is scripture's own fiftieth-year institution, set by the Law immediately after its own count of seven sabbaths of years:

Leviticus 25:10 — *"And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a jubile unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family."*

Jubilee was Israel's own periodic reset — liberty proclaimed, debts released, inheritance restored — arriving, by the Law's own design, on the far side of seven complete sabbaths of years, precisely as Pentecost arrives on the far side of seven complete sabbaths of days. This study holds the parallel as suggestive rather than proven identical in every particular (jubilee's fiftieth year and Pentecost's fiftieth day are different units entirely, and scripture nowhere states that Pentecost *is* a jubilee), but the shared arithmetic and the shared theme — a complete cycle of sevens, then liberty and a new beginning on the day that follows — is difficult to set aside as coincidence, especially given what this chapter is about to record actually happening on this particular fiftieth day: not liberty from debt, but a birth, a beginning, and — this study's own Chapter 6 will show — freedom of an entirely different order first extended that morning to "as many as the Lord our God shall call" (Acts 2:39).

One further association is worth weighing carefully rather than simply repeating as settled fact, because it is real but it is tradition, not a plain statement of scripture itself — and this library's own epistemic-status principle requires the distinction to be kept visible rather than blurred. Jewish tradition, reflected in later rabbinic sources rather than in the Torah's own text, associates the Feast of Weeks with the giving of the Law at Sinai. Scripture's own chronology makes the association at least plausible on its face: Exodus places Israel's arrival at Sinai in "the third month" after leaving Egypt —

Exodus 19:1 *In the third month, when the children of Israel were gone forth out of the land of Egypt, the same day came they into the wilderness of Sinai.*

— which, counting from Passover in the first month, falls within reach of a fiftieth-day reckoning, though Exodus 19:1 itself states only the month, not the specific day, and nowhere does the Torah say in so many words that the Law was given on the same calendar day the later Feast of Weeks would fall on. This study states the tradition because it is real, well-attested, and almost certainly part of why observant readers at the time would have felt this feast's own weight; it declines to assert the tradition as scripture's own claim, because scripture itself does not make that specific claim. If the association is right, though, it sharpens rather than dulls what happens next: a feast traditionally tied to the giving of a law written on stone tablets by the finger of God at Sinai (Exodus 31:18) becomes, on this same fiftieth day centuries later, the occasion for something Jeremiah and Ezekiel had themselves foretold under different words entirely — a law no longer written on tablets but "in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts" (Jeremiah 31:33), a new heart and a new spirit "put within you" (Ezekiel 36:26-27). This

study is not yet in a position to claim that connection as established — that is exactly the kind of question Chapter 10 exists to work out in full, once the Grace Administration itself has had its own complete chapter — but it is worth having on record here, at the moment the feast itself is first named, rather than only much later.

Weighing it: Direct statement on the feast; corroboration only on jubilee and on the Sinai tradition. Leviticus 23:15-21 sets the count and names the leavened loaves outright. The jubilee parallel is **corroboration only** — the section says so itself, and different units are involved. The association of the Feast of Weeks with the giving of the Law is later Jewish tradition, not scripture's own claim, and is named as tradition here.

C. The Sound, the Fire, and the Filling (Acts 2:2-4)

Acts 2:2 *And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting.*

2:3 *And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them.*

2:4 *And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.*

Three things happen here in close sequence, and this study takes them one at a time rather than blurring them into a single vague impression. First, "a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind" — Luke is careful with his own language: not a wind, but a *sound as of* a wind, audible and sudden, filling "all the house" (Greek *oikos*), the same word Chapter 1 §D has already argued, on five converging lines, most plausibly names the temple rather than a private residence — a reading this verse's own detail continues to support, since a sound heard clearly enough to draw "the multitude" (v.6) suggests a place already full of people rather than an isolated upper room. Second, "cloven tongues like as of fire" — again Luke's own careful qualification, *like as of* fire, not a claim that ordinary flame appeared, but something with fire's own visible appearance, dividing and resting individually, "it sat upon each of them" — a distributed, personal sign, one apiece, not a single shared phenomenon over the room as a whole. Third, and only after both the sound and the sight, the substance itself: "they were all filled with the Holy Ghost" — "all" naming the whole of that company, not a select few singled out from among them — "and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." "They," here, carries the same antecedent it has carried since verse 1: the company Chapter 1 has already identified in full — the apostles and the wider company of disciples already gathered, numbering, at their last count, "about an hundred and twenty" (Acts 1:15) — not the international crowd, who have not yet entered the narrative at all and are no part of this verse's own "they" or "all." Luke has not introduced that crowd at this point; they enter the narrative only in the next section of this chapter, drawn by the very sound just described, and this chapter's own §D takes up their arrival in turn. What is received here belongs to the disciples themselves, first, before it becomes something the wider world in Jerusalem has any occasion to react to. This is the moment John 20:22 pointed forward to and John 14-16 had promised in different words; here it actually arrives, distinguished carefully from its own earlier preview by exactly the effects this study noted were absent from John 20 — tongues, utterance, a manifestation the earlier scene did not record.

The capitalization convention already established in this study's Introduction applies directly here and is worth restating at the point it first matters in the narrative itself: Luke's own words name God himself as the one filling them — "filled with the Holy Ghost" describes the Giver's own act, and this study capitalizes accordingly wherever its own commentary prose (not direct KJV quotation, which is always left exactly as printed) refers to that same act or that same Giver by name. Where this study's own prose speaks instead of the gift itself, received and possessed by the believer the lowercase "holy spirit" is used, following the same distinction already stated: a proper name for the Giver, a common noun for the gift given.

"Other tongues" (the Greek at verse 4 is two words, an adjective and a noun — *heterais glossais*, tongues of a different kind, not merely more of the same) receives its own explanation in the verses immediately following — not ecstatic, unintelligible speech, but real human languages, recognized instantly by native hearers who had never taught these Galileans a word of them. That distinction is the whole substance of the section that follows.

Weighing it: Narrative — carries no weight on any of this study's contested claims.

D. Every Man Heard Them in His Own Language (Acts 2:5-11)

Acts 2:5 *And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven.*

2:6 *Now when this was noised abroad, the multitude came together, and were confounded, because that every man heard them speak in his own language.*

2:7 *And they were all amazed and marvelled, saying one to another, Behold, are not all these which speak Galilaeans?*

2:8 *And how hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born?*

2:9 *Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judaea, and Cappadocia, in Pontus, and Asia,*

2:10 *Phrygia, and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes,*

2:11 *Cretes and Arabians, we do hear them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God.*

Verse 5's "devout men, out of every nation under heaven" is this chapter's own explanation for why so international a crowd was present at all: Pentecost was, with Passover and Tabernacles, one of the three pilgrimage feasts the Law itself required every observant Israelite male to keep by appearing "before the LORD" at the place he had chosen (Deuteronomy 16:16) — already noted in Chapter 1 §D as one of the five converging reasons this study locates the hundred and twenty at the temple rather than a private room, and confirmed directly here by Luke's own report of who was actually present to hear them. These were not curious Gentile onlookers but "Jews and proselytes" (v.10) — men of Jewish birth or Jewish conversion, dispersed across the known world and gathered back to Jerusalem for this one feast, exactly the kind of crowd a temple courtyard at the hour of morning prayer would hold.

Scripture's own requirement (Deuteronomy 16:16) explains why a crowd was present at all; extra-biblical history explains why it was not a modest one, and this study holds the two kinds of source distinct rather than blending them, per its own stated method. Josephus — a first-century eyewitness to Jerusalem's own pilgrimage practice, not a later chronicler working from tradition — records Pentecost specifically, not only Passover, as an occasion when Jerusalem and its temple filled with pilgrims by the tens of thousands. Of a revolt that broke out at this very feast within living memory of the generation Acts 2 describes, he records that "many ten thousands of men" had gathered at Jerusalem for Pentecost, drawn from Galilee, Idumea, Jericho, and the country beyond Jordan (*Antiquities* 17.10.2); of an earlier Pentecost decades before that, he records that "all the places about the temple and all the city" were "full of a multitude of people" (*Wars of the Jews* 1.13.3). Neither passage describes the specific year of Acts 2, and this study does not press Josephus's own figures — elsewhere in his work openly rounded and rhetorical rather than a census return — as a precise count for this occasion; what they establish, on the independent testimony of a contemporary historian with no stake in this study's own argument, is the ordinary scale of the day itself. Pentecost, in first-century Jerusalem, reliably filled the temple courts with a pilgrim population counted, more than once in the surviving record, among the city's real political hazards by the Roman and Jewish authorities who had to manage it. Read against that background, Acts 2:5's "devout men, out of every nation under heaven" is not a literary flourish; it is exactly the crowd this feast, on the Law's own fixed calendar, produced every single year. This study holds the convergence of the two — a day the Law had already fixed, and a feast history independently confirms as Jerusalem's own most crowded — as neither accidental nor merely convenient: nothing less than a gathering of this size, already assembled by God's own prior instruction to Israel centuries earlier, was what this occasion required, and this study takes that requirement as itself part of what "when the day of Pentecost was fully come" (v.1) was fully come *for*.

The list itself (vv.9-11) runs east to west and beyond, a deliberately comprehensive geographic sweep — Parthia and Media and Elam at the eastern edge of the known world, through Mesopotamia, Judaea itself named oddly in the middle of a list of foreign lands (worth noting as a real textual puzzle rather than smoothing it over: some manuscripts and translators have proposed alternatives, but this study follows the Received Text the King James Version itself renders, without claiming to resolve every textual question a list this specific raises), north into Asia Minor's provinces, south into Egypt and Libya, west to Rome itself, and out to the islands and Arabia. Luke's own point in listing this many nations by name is not merely color; it is evidence, laid out so specifically that any reader in a position to check it could verify the claim being made: real people, from real and distant places, each hearing their own native tongue — "wherein we were born" (v.8), a phrase that rules out any suggestion that these hearers simply understood a common trade language like Greek or Aramaic well enough to follow along. The claim is specifically that men born in Parthia heard Parthian, and men born in Cappadocia heard Cappadocian, from the mouths of Galileans who had never learned either.

Verse 7's own astonishment — "are not all these which speak Galilaeans?" — carries a detail this study's own Chapter 1 §F has already flagged forward from the other direction: Galilee, in the wider culture of first-century Judea, was regarded as provincial, its own dialect recognizably distinct and, by reputation, unrefined (compare Peter's own accent giving him away later, Matthew 26:73, "thy speech bewrayeth

thee"). Judas Iscariot, this study's Chapter 1 argued, was likely the one Judean among the Eleven, a "man of Kerioth" rather than a Galilean — and it is worth registering plainly, without turning it into more than the text supports, that the miracle recorded here belongs entirely to the Galileans who remained after Judas's own fall, men whose regional speech habits were themselves proverbial, now heard without any accent at all, in languages they had never studied, by a crowd drawn from the ends of the earth.

Weighing it: Direct statement — establishes that the tongues were real human languages heard by native speakers. "Wherein we were born" (v.8) is what the text says. Josephus on the scale of the feast is **corroboration only**, from outside scripture, and his figures are openly rhetorical; Appendix E carries the passages and the caveat.

E. "These Men Are Full of New Wine" (Acts 2:12-13)

Acts 2:12 *And they were all amazed, and were in doubt, saying one to another, What meaneth this?*

2:13 *Others mocking said, These men are full of new wine.*

Two responses to the same event, and this study takes care to keep them distinct rather than treating the crowd as a single voice. The larger group (v.12) is "amazed" and "in doubt" — genuinely confounded, asking a real question, "what meaneth this?" — not hostile, simply confronted with something they cannot yet explain. This is the honestly bewildered response this study's own outline has already flagged, and it is this question, not the mockery beside it, that Peter's sermon in Chapter 3 will actually answer. A second group (v.13), smaller and explicitly marked as "others," reaches for mockery instead of a genuine question: "these men are full of new wine" (Greek *gleukos*, sweet new wine — the word names the freshness of the vintage rather than a claim about its strength, and this study will not build on the often-repeated notion that new wine was proverbially weaker, which scripture itself nowhere states).

This detail matters for how Chapter 3 opens, because Peter's own first recorded words directly answer this specific charge, on its own specific grounds, before he does anything else:

Acts 2:15 — *"For these are not drunken, as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day."*

Peter does not ignore the mockery or treat it as beneath response; he meets it directly, with a plain, verifiable fact (nine in the morning — well before the hour at which, by the custom of the day, a first meal would be taken, let alone wine; this study names that as custom rather than as scripture's own statement) before turning to the deeper answer the honest question of verse 12 actually deserves. That answer — what this actually was, and what it meant — is Chapter 3's own full subject.

Weighing it: Narrative — carries no weight on any of this study's contested claims.

F. Closing — What Acts 2:1-13 Establishes Before Peter Speaks

By the end of verse 13, the text has established everything a careful reader needs before a single word of interpretation is offered: that this company was ready, told in advance across John 14-16 and shown in advance through John 20:22's own enacted sign, exactly what kind of gift was coming and what word

would name it when it did; that the day itself was not arbitrary, but the Law's own fiftieth day, the day of jubilee's own number, on a feast tradition already associated, rightly or not, with the giving of the Law at Sinai; that what actually happened — a sound, an appearance, a filling, and tongues — happened to everyone present, all at once, not to a favored few; that real, distant nations, present at Jerusalem for exactly the reason the Law itself required them to be there, heard their own native languages from men who had never learned them; and that the crowd's own honest first response was a real question, not yet an accusation, alongside a second, smaller response that was. Every one of these facts is Peter's own starting material. Chapter 3 turns to what he does with it.

Weighing it: Summary only — restates what the sections above established, at the weights assigned to them there.

Chapter 3 — Peter Stands Up: This Is That (Acts 2:14-36)

A. A Pattern Set That Morning: Sign Before Sermon

Before turning to what Peter actually says, it is worth naming plainly what has just happened, and why it happened in the order it did — because Acts 2 does not go straight from the filling (v.4) to the sermon (v.14). It goes first through a crowd's own astonishment, then a mockery, and only then to Peter's words. That order is not incidental. Paul states the underlying principle directly, decades later, writing to a church that had itself begun to misuse this very gift:

1 Corinthians 14:22 — *"Wherefore tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not: but prophesying serveth not for them that believe not, but for them which believe."*

This study takes Paul's statement here as scripture's own explanation of what this study has just watched happen in Acts 2, not as a rule invented after the fact and read backward — a sign, first, to unbelievers; substance, then, in the word preached. The tongues came first and drew the crowd; Peter's sermon came second and fed them. One qualification belongs here rather than in a footnote, because it comes from the very next verse of the chapter just quoted: Paul goes straight on to say that if the whole church speaks with tongues and unbelievers come in, "will they not say that ye are mad?" (1 Corinthians 14:23) — which is close to what the mockers of Acts 2:13 did say. The two verses are not in conflict once 14:21's own quotation of Isaiah 28:11 is read with them: the sign is a sign of judgment to those who will not hear, and Acts 2 divides its crowd on exactly that line, some asking "what meaneth this?" and others reaching for mockery. Paul's "sign" does not promise a warm reception. It promises a division, which is what Acts 2 records. This is the pattern this study finds set at the very beginning of the church's own witness, and it holds up as a model for what "going forth to preach" would mean afterward, not a one-time accident of this particular morning.

Three further details of that sign are worth weighing carefully before moving on, because each bears directly on what kind of thing tongues actually was, and on whom.

First, who actually received the gift that morning, and how many — and, worth stating with equal care, who was already there to hear it. Acts 2:1-4, already quoted in full in Chapter 2 §C, names its own subject throughout by an unbroken pronoun: "they were all with one accord in one place... they were all filled with the Holy Ghost." That "they" carries the same antecedent Chapter 1 §H already established in full — the apostles, the women, Mary, Jesus's brothers, and the wider company of disciples already gathered, together numbering, at their last count, "about an hundred and twenty" (Acts 1:15). The filling, and the tongues that followed it, belong strictly to this gathered company; nothing in the text has the "devout men, out of every nation under heaven" (Acts 2:5) themselves filled with the gift or speaking with other tongues alongside them, and this study will not blur that distinction. Luke does not record the wider crowd's own considered response until this sermon's own end: "now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?" (Acts 2:37, this study's own Chapter 4).

That is a narrower and more careful claim than saying the crowd itself was somewhere else, and only came into existence as witnesses once "noised abroad" (v.6) brought them running from a distance — and this study corrects its own earlier drafting on exactly this point, because the text, read against Chapter 1's own conclusion, will not support that stronger claim. Chapter 1 §D's reading, on five converging lines already argued there in full, places the hundred and twenty in the temple itself, at the hour of morning prayer — precisely where Acts 2:5's international company of "devout men... dwelling at Jerusalem" would themselves already have been standing, gathered for that same hour of prayer, on the single most crowded pilgrimage feast of Israel's own calendar (this chapter's own §B and §D above, on Deuteronomy 16:16's requirement and Josephus's independent testimony to the feast's actual scale). Verse 2's sound "filled all the house" — the temple, on the reading Chapter 1 already established — which means it did not need to travel to reach an absent crowd; a courtyard already full of worshippers, at the temple's own hour of prayer on its own busiest pilgrim day, heard it exactly where it already stood. What "noised abroad" (v.6) most plausibly names, on this reading, is not a crowd's first arrival on the scene from elsewhere in the city, but the report of what was happening spreading outward from those nearest enough to hear and see it first to the wider mass of worshippers filling the temple's outer courts and, beyond that, the city itself — after which "the multitude came together" by converging toward the source, not by discovering it from a standing start. Read this way, verse 6's own closing clause — "were confounded, because that every man heard them speak in his own language" — describes not a single moment overheard by chance, but a sustained one: the tongues continued to be spoken through the very process of the crowd's own gathering, giving each new arrival, pressing in from wherever in the temple he had been standing, his own opportunity to hear his own native tongue and add his own voice to the astonishment scripture goes on to record running through verse 7 — "they were all amazed and marvelled, saying one to another, Behold, are not all these which speak Galileans?" Scripture does not state a duration in so many words, and this study will not supply a number of minutes it is not given; what the text does support, read carefully against Chapter 1's own temple reading and this chapter's own crowd-scale evidence together, is one continuous event, witnessed at closer and closer range by a crowd substantially already in place, rather than a brief sign completed in private and only reported to bystanders after the fact. Nothing less than a witnessing company running to several thousand — the very scale Chapter 2 §D has already shown this feast, and

no other day on Israel's calendar, reliably assembled — is what a sign built for the very purpose this section has already named above, citing 1 Corinthians 14:22, required, and what this study holds God himself to have deliberately timed this outpouring to meet.

Second, its own order. Whatever else it was, what happened at Pentecost was not confusion — every hearer, from every nation named in Chapter 2 §D, heard real, intelligible speech in his own native tongue. Paul again states the character this reflects, writing of the same gift's proper use: "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace" (1 Corinthians 14:33), and "let all things be done decently and in order" (1 Corinthians 14:40). This study is careful to flag the epistemic point directly: 1 Corinthians had not yet been written, and no one at Pentecost had these words to hand — the point is not that Peter's company was following a rule, but that what actually happened already had the same character these later words describe, God's own consistent way of working rather than a standard imposed only afterward.

A natural question, given how many distinct nations Chapter 2 §D's own list names, is whether the gift's own distribution was somehow matched to the day's linguistic need — enough speakers of enough languages to reach every nation represented. This study does not adopt that reasoning: nothing in the text ties the manifestation's own distribution to the size or makeup of an audience, a question this passage never raises at all, and Paul's own fullest statement of how manifestations are given, written elsewhere, states a different governing principle entirely:

1 Corinthians 12:7 *But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal.*

12:8 *For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit;*

12:9 *To another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit;*

12:10 *To another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues:*

12:11 *But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will.*

The word running through every clause of verses 7 through 10 is *profit* — the manifestation of the Spirit is given, one at a time, "to every man," each occurrence keyed to that man's own benefit, not to any headcount or need external to him. This is a person-by-person distribution, not a crowd-sized one. One further detail of verse 11 is worth flagging now rather than passing over in silence: "dividing to every man severally as he will" names a will operating in the distribution, and this study holds — as its own considered position, though the sentence's immediate grammatical subject is "that one and the selfsame Spirit" named just before it — that this working does not bypass the individual believer's own will in receiving and exercising what is given him. Scripture nowhere shows God overriding a person's own will to force a manifestation upon or through him against his choice; this study takes both truths as standing together rather than in competition — the Spirit gives, and the man wills, and the manifestation that results is neither the Spirit's alone nor the man's alone. Pentecost's own tongues, on this reading, were exercised by those who received them: a real act of their own will, yielded to what had just been given, not a mechanism operating on them without their own participation.

Third, and worth stating carefully rather than assuming either direction: this was not the Twelve's first experience of operating in something the world would call supernatural power. Well before Pentecost, during the ministry itself, Jesus had already directly delegated real authority and power to them:

Luke 9:1 *Then he called his twelve disciples together, and gave them power and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases.*

9:2 *And he sent them to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick.*

Matthew 10:1 *And when he had called unto him his twelve disciples, he gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease.*

10:7 *And as ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand.*

10:8 *Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils: freely ye have received, freely give.*

This is worth holding next to Chapter 1's own *exousia/dunamis* distinction (Acts 1:7-8) rather than blurring the two moments together: what Matthew 10:1 and Luke 9:1 describe is Christ's own direct, personal delegation of power and authority during his bodily presence with them — the same kind of gift, in miniature, that scripture elsewhere catalogues among the manifestations of holy spirit (gifts of healing, the working of miracles, discerning of spirits chief among what casting out devils requires), but given here by a different means, before the indwelling gift Acts 2 records had come into existence at all. The Twelve, in other words, were not strangers to yielding themselves to God's own power flowing through them when Pentecost arrived — they had already done so, repeatedly, across the ministry, under Jesus's own direct sending. What was genuinely new that morning was not the general experience of operating in God's power, but the specific gift now indwelling them, and its own specific first manifestation, tongues — a manifestation nothing in the Gospels records anyone doing before this hour. That the Twelve used so new a gift with such immediate fitness — real language, correctly heard, causing no confusion — this study holds as consistent with, and likely explained by, the same pattern already established: men who had already learned across years of ministry to yield promptly and without confusion to power not their own were, on this reading, well prepared to do the same with a gift they had never yet received, whether by direct instruction not otherwise recorded or by the Spirit's own immediate leading in the moment itself. This study states this as its own reasoned inference, not a claim scripture makes outright.

One further note, meant to serve as a reminder rather than a repeated study: this study's own Chapter 6 will give full treatment to two distinct Greek words this passage's own aftermath will turn on — *lambano* (to receive, take hold of, used of the gift itself, v.38) and *dechomai*/its intensified form *apodechomai* (to receive, welcome, used of the word preached, v.41). Both words are already at work in what is about to happen: a crowd is about to hear a word preached, and — this study's own Chapter 4 will show — was "pricked in their heart" by it (v.37) before either verb appears in the text. This study will flag both words again, briefly, wherever they recur, rather than let two centrally important words go unmarked simply because their own full chapter lies further ahead.

Weighing it: Corroboration only on the sign-before-sermon pattern — consistent with claim T, but it does not establish that tongues accompany every reception. That Paul calls tongues a sign to

unbelievers is a **direct statement**, and so is the order of events in Acts 2. That the order is a model rather than an accident of that morning is **corroboration only**: 1 Corinthians 14:22 is written to a different situation, and 14:23 — quoted above — shows the same sign producing the charge of madness. The section's re-argument of the temple reading carries Chapter 1 §D's weight, not a fresh one. The point about manifestations being distributed by profit rather than by audience is a **reasonable inference** from 1 Corinthians 12:7-11.

B. "These Are Not Drunken": Peter's Direct Reply (Acts 2:14-16)

Acts 2:14 *But Peter, standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice, and said unto them, Ye men of Judaea, and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem, be this known unto you, and hearken to my words:*

2:15 *For these are not drunken, as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day.*

2:16 *But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel;*

"Standing up with the eleven" (v.14) is itself worth a note: Peter speaks, but he does not speak alone — the text places the whole restored company of Chapter 1's own closing behind him, visibly, as he rises. His first move is not yet doctrine; it is a plain factual correction, met on the mockers' own terms. "The third hour of the day" is roughly nine in the morning — well before the hour at which, by the custom of the day, a first meal would be taken, let alone wine (custom, not scripture's own statement, and named as such), making the accusation of Acts 2:13 answerable by simple observation before it is answered by anything else. Only after this direct, verifiable reply does Peter turn to the deeper explanation the crowd's own honest question (v.12, "what meaneth this?") actually deserves: "this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel."

Weighing it: Narrative — carries no weight on any of this study's contested claims.

C. "This Is That Which Was Spoken by the Prophet Joel": Working the Question to Its Conclusion (Acts 2:17-21)

Acts 2:17 *And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams:*

2:18 *And on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy:*

2:19 *And I will shew wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath; blood, and fire, and vapour of smoke:*

2:20 *The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and notable day of the Lord come:*

2:21 *And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved.*

This is the question this study's own Introduction flagged at the outset, and set aside deliberately rather than answering in passing: what can "this is that" actually be claiming, given that Joel's own words, quoted here in full and not selectively, plainly include things that did not happen that Pentecost morning? This study takes up that question now, on the same standard already applied to the Genesis 6

"sons of God" question elsewhere in this library — worked out completely from the text itself, not assumed either way.

Joel's own oracle, read in the full source Peter is quoting, is instructive before it is even applied:

Joel 2:26 *And ye shall eat in plenty, and be satisfied, and praise the name of the Lord your God, that hath dealt wondrously with you: and my people shall never be ashamed.*

2:27 *And ye shall know that I am in the midst of Israel, and that I am the Lord your God, and none else: and my people shall never be ashamed.*

2:28 *And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions:*

2:29 *And also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit.*

2:30 *And I will shew wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke.*

2:31 *The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come.*

2:32 *And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be delivered: 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's own oracle names its own subject directly, twice, in the two verses just before the outpouring itself: "I am in the midst of Israel" (v.27) — this is a word to Israel, about Israel, concerning Israel's own knowledge of her own God — and its own closing verse names its own place: "in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance" (v.32). Nothing in the passage broadens its own address to a wider or different company; whatever "this is that" is claiming, it is claiming something about a prophecy given specifically to Israel, not a general statement about mankind at large or, this study holds, about a company or administration not yet revealed even to Peter at the moment he is speaking — a point this study's own Chapter 10 will need to characterize in full when it reaches the Grace Administration's own unique place directly, and which this chapter accordingly declines to resolve further than stating it plainly here.

Five things are worth naming about Peter's own quotation before its content is weighed, because each is a real, checkable difference from Joel's own Hebrew text as the King James Version itself renders it, and this study's own method requires such differences to be named rather than smoothed over silently. First, where Joel says "it shall come to pass afterward" (v.28), Peter's quotation reads "in the last days" (Acts 2:17) — not a neutral restatement, but Peter's own interpretive framing, placing Joel's promised outpouring within a specific, named era ("the last days") rather than leaving it as an unspecified future point. Second, Peter reverses Joel's own order of "your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions" (Joel 2:28) to "your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams" (Acts 2:17) — a minor variation, but a real one. Third, Peter adds a clause Joel's own text does not have at the corresponding point: "and they shall prophesy" appended to the handmaidens' portion (Acts 2:18), doubling an emphasis on prophesying that appears only once, applied only to sons and daughters, in Joel's own wording (2:28). Fourth, Joel's "before the great and terrible day of the Lord come" (2:31)

becomes, in Peter's quotation, "before the great and notable day of the Lord come" (Acts 2:20) — a real difference in English, and, checked against the Greek text itself, a genuine one: the word behind "notable" is *epiphanē* (Strong's G2016), meaning manifest, glorious, or conspicuous — a considerably different shade of meaning than "terrible," and one this study attributes to the Septuagint's own Greek rendering of Joel's Hebrew, which Luke, writing in Greek for a Greek-reading audience, naturally follows rather than retranslating independently. A fifth is smaller and easily missed: Joel's "I will pour out my spirit" becomes, in Peter's mouth, "I will pour out of my Spirit" (Acts 2:17) — a partitive, naming a portion given rather than the whole outpoured. None of these five differences amounts to a contradiction under this library's own harmonization principle — a speaker citing a known text in his own address, sharpening its emphasis or drawing on the Greek translation his hearers would themselves have recognized, is doing exactly what quotation normally does — but naming them honestly, rather than passing over them as if the two texts read identically, is part of doing this work to its real conclusion rather than only to its convenient one.

With the text itself now fully in view, the central question can be answered directly. Verses 19-20 — the wonders in heaven, the blood and fire and vapour of smoke, the sun turned to darkness and the moon to blood, all explicitly placed "before the great and notable day of the Lord come" — did not happen that Pentecost morning, and no reading of Acts 2 claims that they did. This is not a small or peripheral detail of Joel's own oracle; it is the hinge his own words build toward, the very thing that gives verse 21's promise of deliverance its full and final context: "whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved," Joel's own text specifies, culminates in "mount Zion and in Jerusalem" being the site of Israel's own end-time deliverance (2:32) — an event this study holds, on the weight of the whole passage's own unmet second half, still future rather than already accomplished. "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel" (v.16), read against Joel's own complete, four-clause oracle, cannot therefore be Peter's claim that the entire prophecy — outpouring, cosmic wonders, and the great and notable day of the Lord together — reached its complete and final fulfillment in a single Jerusalem morning. The text Peter himself is quoting will not bear that weight, and this study will not make Peter claim more than his own source text can support.

What, then, is Peter actually claiming? This study holds the soundest reading to be a real, not a merely illustrative, application — but a partial one, identifying what has just happened as belonging to the same kind of divine action Joel foresaw, the beginning of the "last days" outpouring rather than its total and final consummation. Peter's own interpretive choice, already noted above, supports this directly: by rendering Joel's "afterward" as "in the last days," Peter frames what is happening as the opening of an era Joel's own oracle describes across its full length, not a single, complete, one-morning event. On this reading, "this is that" says: what you are watching is a real instance of the very outpouring Joel named — sons and daughters prophesying, tongues as a form of Spirit-given utterance among them — genuinely begun, genuinely of the same character Joel foretold; while the oracle's own remaining clauses, the cosmic wonders and Israel's own still-future deliverance in mount Zion, await their own still-future completion, a day this study is not in a position to characterize further without moving outside its own present scope. This reading does not soften Peter's own confidence — he speaks with none of the qualification this study is using here, because Peter is not attempting to distinguish inaugurated from

consummated fulfillment in scholarly terms; he is doing what every prophet before him did, applying a real word from God to what stands directly in front of him — but it does keep this study's own account honest to the text Peter himself quotes, rather than letting "this is that" carry a claim its own source passage cannot bear.

One further point belongs here, flagged rather than resolved, because it belongs properly to Chapter 10's own full treatment: what Peter is doing in this sermon is preaching to "the house of Israel" (v.36) from within Israel's own covenant promises, as Joel's own oracle addresses them — he has, at this moment in Acts, no knowledge of a Mystery not yet revealed (Ephesians 3:1-9), a wider administration of grace this study's own later chapters will treat as something other than a fulfillment of the specific promises made to Israel through Joel. The relationship between what genuinely begins that morning and what would later be revealed as a distinct and unique administration is real, and important, and is not this chapter's work to settle — it is named here only so that "this is that" is not read, even implicitly, as though Peter already understood everything this study's own later chapters will find scripture eventually disclosing.

Weighing it: Strong inference — claim J: "this is that" is a real but partial fulfilment, not a claim that Joel's whole oracle was fulfilled that morning. That Joel's own text places the cosmic wonders before the day of the Lord, and that those did not happen at Pentecost, are **direct statements**. That Peter is therefore claiming an inaugural rather than a complete fulfilment is a **strong inference**; the opposing reading can fairly answer that Peter says "this is that" without qualification and that a preacher applying a prophecy need not be distinguishing inaugurated from consummated fulfilment at all — which this section grants in its own closing paragraph. The five differences from Joel's wording are **direct statements** about the two texts; Appendix F sets them out.

D. What They Themselves Knew: Jesus of Nazareth, Approved of God (Acts 2:22-24)

Acts 2:22 *Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know:*

2:23 *Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain:*

2:24 *Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it.*

Having answered the crowd's honest question with a real, if partial, prophetic application, Peter turns from Joel to Jesus — and the turn is worth noting for what it appeals to. "As ye yourselves also know" (v.22) is not an appeal to a text these hearers had not read or a report they had not heard; it is an appeal to their own direct knowledge, gathered over however many Passovers and pilgrim feasts they themselves had kept in Jerusalem while Jesus's own ministry of "miracles and wonders and signs" was public, witnessed, and — Peter states plainly — undisputed by his hearers even now. This is the same

pattern already named in §A above: a sign first, drawing attention and establishing a fact no one present could reasonably deny, and only then the substance built upon it.

Verse 23 holds two things together without letting either cancel the other, exactly as this library's own harmonization principle requires when scripture itself states what looks, on the surface, like tension: Jesus was "delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God" — a real, sovereign, foreordained purpose, stated as directly as scripture states anything — and in the same breath, the same men "have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain" him — a real, culpable, human act, its wickedness stated just as directly. Peter does not soften either clause to make room for the other. God's own purpose in the cross does not excuse the hands that carried it out; the guilt of those hands does not diminish God's own sovereign use of the act. Both stand, in one verse, exactly as Peter states them.

Weighing it: Direct statement — Peter appeals to what his hearers already knew, and holds God's purpose and human guilt together without softening either. Acts 2:22-23 says both in one breath.

E. David's Own Words: The Resurrection Argued from Psalm 16 (Acts 2:25-31)

Acts 2:25 *For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face, for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved:*

2:26 *Therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope:*

2:27 *Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.*

2:28 *Thou hast made known to me the ways of life; thou shalt make me full of joy with thy countenance.*

2:29 *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.*

2:30 *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;*

2:31 *He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption.*

Having established the fact of the crucifixion from his hearers' own knowledge, Peter now argues the resurrection — and argues it, notably, not from an empty tomb his hearers could go look at (though he could have), but from David's own words in what this study's readers will recognize as Psalm 16. The logic is precise and worth tracing in full: David wrote "neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption" (v.27, quoting Psalm 16:10); David himself, Peter points out with plain, checkable fact, "is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day" (v.29) — David's own body did see corruption, exactly what the Psalm says God's Holy One would not. The Psalm's words therefore cannot be David's own report about himself; David, "being a prophet" (v.30), was speaking of someone else — one of David's own descendants, whom God had sworn by oath to raise up to sit on David's own throne

(v.30, drawing on the royal promise of 2 Samuel 7:12-13 and Psalm 132:11, though Peter does not pause to cite these by name). This is exactly the kind of argument this study's own "many other words" question exists to trace: a case built this precisely from a specific Psalm, read this carefully against a specific, checkable historical fact (David's own known grave), did not originate with Peter in the moment he stood up that morning. Chapters 8-9 will take up directly where teaching this exact might have come from; here, it is enough to note that it is present, fully formed, in Peter's very first recorded sermon.

Weighing it: Direct statement — the argument is Peter's own, not this study's. Peter states the premise (David died and was buried), the text (Psalm 16:10), and the conclusion. The only inference this study adds is that so precise an argument was not improvised, which is a **reasonable inference** and is taken up in Chapters 8 and 9.

F. "This, Which Ye Now See and Hear": Exalted and Poured Forth (Acts 2:32-33)

Acts 2:32 *This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses.*

2:33 *Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost [holy spirit], he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear.*

Verse 32 closes the resurrection argument with the same kind of appeal §D already noted: not merely a scriptural inference, but firsthand testimony — "whereof we all are witnesses," Peter and the company standing with him having themselves seen the risen Christ across the forty days this study's own Chapter 1 has already covered in full. Verse 33 then reaches directly back to the very event this study's own Chapter 2 narrated in full: the crucified, risen, and now-exalted Christ, Peter states, has "received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost [holy spirit]" and has himself "shed forth this, which ye now see and hear" — pointing, as he speaks, at the very tongues and the very sound this chapter's own §A has already named as a sign meant to be seen and heard by exactly this kind of crowd. The gift this study capitalizes as the Giver's own act, and the sign of it this study leaves lowercase as the manifestation received, are both, in this one verse, laid directly at the feet of the same argument: what you have just witnessed is not unrelated to what I am telling you about Jesus; it is his own act, visible proof that everything just claimed about his resurrection and exaltation is true.

Weighing it: Narrative — carries no weight on any of this study's contested claims.

G. "Until I Make Thy Foes Thy Footstool": Psalm 110 and the Sermon's Conclusion (Acts 2:34-36)

Acts 2:34 *For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand,*

2:35 *Until I make thy foes thy footstool.*

2:36 *Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made the same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.*

A second Psalm closes the argument Psalm 16 began. Peter quotes what this study's readers will know as Psalm 110:1 — "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand" — and makes the same kind

of textual point he has already made once: David himself "is not ascended into the heavens" (v.34), so the Psalm's own "my Lord," seated at the right hand of "the Lord," cannot be David speaking of himself. It is David, again as a prophet, speaking of someone greater than himself, someone he himself calls Lord. The conclusion Peter draws is the sermon's own conclusion, its final and plainest word, addressed by name to the exact company Chapter 3 §C has already established this sermon is for: "let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made the same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ" (v.36) — the crucifixion named one final time, directly, not softened; and the resurrection-and-exaltation argument of §§D-F now given its single, plain title: Lord and Christ, both.

Weighing it: Direct statement — Peter's Psalm 110 argument and its conclusion are his own.

H. Closing — What Peter Has Now Laid Before Them

By the sermon's own end, Peter has done exactly what §A of this chapter described in advance: a sign first — tongues, seen and heard by a whole international crowd, decently and without confusion, exactly the kind of thing Paul would later say such a sign is for — and then, once that sign had done its own work of gathering and holding attention, a case built entirely from what the hearers themselves already knew (Jesus's own public ministry, v.22), what they themselves had just witnessed (the tongues, v.33), and what their own scriptures, read carefully and specifically, had already said (Psalm 16 and Psalm 110, read against verifiable fact). Not fabricated fulfillment of every clause of Joel's own oracle, but a real, if partial, application, honestly bounded by what that oracle's own remaining clauses show is still to come. This is what Peter has laid before "the house of Israel" (v.36) by the time this chapter's own text ends. What that same crowd does in response — and what Peter tells them to do about it — is Chapter 4's own subject.

Weighing it: Summary only — restates what the sections above established, at the weights assigned to them there.

Chapter 4 — The Appeal: "What Shall We Do?" (Acts 2:37-39)

A. "Pricked in Their Heart": A Different Response (Acts 2:37)

Acts 2:37 *Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?*

This chapter's own first word is worth setting directly against Chapter 3's own opening one. The crowd's first reaction to the tongues themselves, before Peter had said anything at all, was a real but still-uncommitted question — "what meaneth this?" (Acts 2:12), open, honest, and, alongside it, a second and less honest response of mockery (v.13). What stands at v.37 is a different thing entirely. "Pricked in their heart" is a strong, physical image — a piercing, a wound — and it comes only now, only after the full case Chapter 3 has already traced in detail: the sign they had themselves witnessed (§A), the record of Jesus's own public ministry they could not honestly deny (§D), and the case built carefully from their

own scriptures against a fact as plain as David's own known grave (§§E, G). This is conviction, not mere curiosity, and Luke's own placement of it — after the sermon's full argument, not before — credits the argument itself with having done real work on real hearers.

The question they ask is addressed, worth noting, not to the crowd's own resources or to a general uncertainty, but directly "unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles" — the same company Chapter 3 §B found "standing up with the eleven" at the sermon's outset. Whatever answer follows, it is the church's own leadership, freshly filled with the gift this whole study has been tracing since Chapter 2, that this convicted crowd turns to.

Weighing it: Narrative — carries no weight on any of this study's contested claims.

B. "Repent" (Acts 2:38a)

Acts 2:38 *Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost [holy spirit].*

Peter's answer is fourfold, and this study takes each clause in turn rather than reading the verse as a single undifferentiated command, since each piece is doing its own distinct work. The first word is "repent" — Greek *metanoeo* (Strong's G3340), built from *meta* ("after," carrying the sense of change) and *noieo* ("to think"): literally, to think differently afterward, a real change of mind rather than a passing feeling of regret. This study holds the distinction as worth stating plainly, because the two are easily blurred in ordinary English usage: sorrow over consequences is not the same thing as a genuine change of mind about the fact just laid before them — that they had, per Peter's own charge in Chapter 3 §D, taken and by wicked hands crucified and slain the very Christ his sermon had just proven risen and exalted. Repentance, in Peter's own first word, is the hearer's own change of mind meeting that fact head-on, not merely feeling bad that it happened.

Weighing it: Direct statement on what *metanoeo* names — a change of mind, not merely regret.

C. "Be Baptized Every One of You in the Name of Jesus Christ" (Acts 2:38b)

The second clause moves from an inward change to a public, individual act: "be baptized every one of you." "Every one of you" is worth pausing on — not a corporate gesture performed on the crowd's behalf by a representative, but a call addressed to each person standing there individually, a pattern this chapter's own closing section will find echoed in the promise that follows. "In the name of Jesus Christ" names whose authority and whose person this baptism identifies the believer with — a specifically Christian baptism, distinct from the baptism of repentance John the Baptist had preached (Acts 1:5, already treated in this study's own Chapter 1, "for John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost [holy spirit]"). This study does not attempt a full doctrine of baptism within this single clause — the full case is argued in Appendix A, taken up directly below — but notes here what the text itself states plainly: it is a baptism named for Jesus Christ specifically, given to this crowd in the same sermon that has just proven him, from their own scriptures and their own recent memory, both crucified and risen.

One question, though, cannot simply be deferred, because Peter's own hearers could not have deferred it: baptized *with what*? The word itself, without more, does not say. And it arrives in a setting where scripture itself has just gone out of its way to name two different baptisms as two different things, in the same city, only ten days before, to the very apostles now standing beside Peter as he speaks:

Acts 1:5 — *"For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost [holy spirit] not many days hence."*

This study will not treat that contrast as background noise, already spent by the time Acts 2 opens. It is this study's own Chapter 1 §B, drawn directly from the same ten-day span this study's own Chapter 1 §E already measured in full, and it is fresh: the last time scripture records anyone in this company hearing the word "baptized" before Acts 2:38, it named two baptisms and distinguished them by their own different elements — water, and the Holy Ghost — not two names for one thing.

This study now states a resolved position rather than holding the question open, on the strength of a dedicated side study run out against every baptism Acts records — *Baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus*, condensed in Appendix A at this study's own close, commended there in full to any reader who wants the case argued rather than stated. "Baptized with the Holy Ghost," the phrase Acts 1:5 itself uses, recurs only six times in scripture, every one of them naming the one-time outpouring at Pentecost itself and never repeated of anyone afterward. What Peter introduces at v.38 is a different phrase entirely — "baptized... in the name of Jesus Christ" — and Appendix A traces it consistently, across Samaria (Acts 8:12-16, this study's own Chapter 6 §F) and Cornelius's household (Acts 10:48), as this administration's own idiom for the new birth itself, not a report that water was applied. Read this way, "be baptized" and "receive the gift" are not two different acts inside Peter's fourfold answer; they name one reality twice — repentance issuing in the new birth, under the baptismal idiom, with the gift's own further, distinguishable *manifestation* following as the fourth clause's own separate promise.

The single comparison text this study once leaned on hardest for reading v.38 as a water rite turns out, on direct examination, to argue the opposite:

Acts 10:47-48 — *"Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost [holy spirit] as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord."*

Peter's own question here is his own first, reflexive instinct — the reflex of a Jew watching Gentiles convert, on the pattern of a proselyte's own customary reception — immediately overtaken by what he had already watched happen without any water at all: the gift already given, tongues already spoken, before he had said another word (this study's own Chapter 6 §C). His own retelling to his Jerusalem accusers, several verses later, answers their challenge not with a report that water was used, but with Acts 1:5's own water/spirit contrast, restated as though it were the whole of his defense:

Acts 11:15-16 — *"And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost."*

This does not erase water baptism from Acts. The Ethiopian eunuch's own "see, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?" (Acts 8:36, 38), Lydia's household (16:15), and the Philippian jailer "the same hour of the night" (16:33) remain genuine, literal water baptisms — each one lacking the specific "in the name of Jesus Christ" idiom this study now reads at v.38, exactly the distinction that keeps the two readings from collapsing into each other. Acts 19:5's own baptism at Ephesus is held open rather than forced either way, a smaller, genuinely harder question Appendix A itself does not close. See Appendix A: *Baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus*.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — claim B, that "baptized in the name of Jesus Christ" names the new birth rather than a water rite. That Acts 1:5 names two baptisms and distinguishes them by their elements is a **direct statement**, and so is the fact that the verb "baptize" supplies no element of its own. That Acts 2:38's new wording therefore names the new birth is a **reasonable inference**, offered as such and no more: Appendix A holds Samaria (8:16) and Ephesus (19:5) open, their Greek being word for word identical, and concedes the eunuch, Lydia, the jailer and Paul's own converts at Corinth as genuine water baptisms. The opposing reading can fairly answer that baptism in Acts is ordinarily water, that Acts 10:47 proposes water outright, and that Acts 22:16 sounds like a rite. What carries most weight for this reading is Cornelius's household, where water is proposed and never reported used, and where Peter's own defence under direct challenge never mentions it.

D. "For the Remission of Sins" (Acts 2:38c)

The third clause names the purpose the first two serve. "Remission" translates *aphesis* (Strong's G859), a noun built on the verb *aphiemi*, "to send away" — the picture is of sin actually sent off, dismissed, released, not merely overlooked or excused. This is the same word family this study's readers will meet again, in different grammatical form, wherever the New Testament speaks of debts forgiven or captives set at liberty; the image behind "remission" throughout is consistently one of removal, not concealment. Peter's own construction ties this remission to the repentance and baptism just named — this study holds that relationship as worth its own full doctrinal treatment eventually, but declines to resolve every question a single clause like this can raise (particularly how this moment relates to what happens under later administrations, a genuinely large question) within this chapter's own narrower, narrative purpose. What is plain here, without dispute, is what Peter names as the outcome: sins sent away.

One distinction is worth naming now rather than only later, because it bears directly on what kind of removal Peter is actually promising. Peter's own word, *hamartion*, is plural — sins, individual acts — and this study will not overstate what a single plural noun states for itself. But this library's own completed *Temptation and Sin* study has already traced, in full and from Genesis 3 forward, a distinction scripture itself keeps between sins committed (plural acts, the ordinary sense of Peter's own word here) and sin as an inherited condition of nature (singular, the "old man" of Romans 6:6, the corrupted nature passed down from Adam that study identifies from Romans 5:12, 19 and Psalm 51:5's own first-person confession of it). That same study finds Paul stating plainly, of exactly this administration's own believer, that the deeper problem is dealt with structurally rather than merely forgiven act by act: "our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin" (Romans 6:6-7). This study holds Peter's own remission of *sins* at v.38

as the first, immediate word of that same larger reality, not a separate or smaller one: acts remitted here and now, standing on top of — and, this study holds, made possible by — the very undoing of the sin nature itself that Romans 6 will later state in full doctrinal terms for a company of believers Peter, on this particular morning, had not yet been given reason to address in those words. This study will not read Romans 6 backward into Acts 2:38 as though Peter's own hearers already possessed that fuller revelation the moment they were baptized; it notes the relationship because it is real, and reserves the relationship's own full working-out — how a single moment's remission of committed sins connects to a permanent undoing of the sin nature behind them — for a later chapter, cross-referencing the completed *Temptation and Sin* study directly rather than repeating its own argument here.

Weighing it: Direct statement on what *aphesis* names; reasonable inference on its relation to the sin nature. That remission pictures sin sent away is lexical and plain. That Peter's plural "sins" stands on top of the deeper undoing Romans 6 states is a **reasonable inference** drawn from another study in this library, and the section says it will not read Romans 6 backward into Acts 2:38.

E. "And Ye Shall Receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts 2:38d)

Before the verb is worth its own turn, the noun phrase it governs deserves a direct answer, because it is a real ambiguity and this study means to settle it here rather than let it drift unresolved through every later chapter that touches the same words. "The gift of the Holy Ghost" can be read two ways, and English "of" will not by itself decide between them: a gift that comes *from* the Holy Ghost — the Holy Ghost as source, the gift itself something distinct from him, given by his agency — or the Holy Ghost *himself* as the gift's own content, so that the phrase names one reality twice rather than linking two different things by possession. The Greek behind it, *tēs dōreas tou hagiou pneumatos*, is a genitive construction, and Greek genitives, like English "of," carry more than one possible relationship to the noun they follow; which one applies in a given verse is a question of grammar and context together, not of the case ending alone. On this specific verse, this study reads the genitive here as epexegetical, a genitive of apposition: "the gift, that is, the Holy Ghost [holy spirit]," not "a gift supplied by the Holy Ghost." On this reading, God is not merely the distant source of some other, separately named gift; God's own self — what this study capitalizes as Holy Spirit wherever its own prose names the Giver by that name — is what is actually held out and received. This study will hold this reading consistently everywhere the same construction recurs — "the promise of the Holy Ghost" at v.33 (Chapter 3 §F above) reads on the identical pattern, the promise named there being the very gift now being offered here, not a different thing procured through a third party. The gift given is not separate from the Giver's own self; it is himself, given — the same conclusion, reached now by the Greek's own grammar, that the Introduction's capitalization convention (§C above) already anticipated by ear.

The fourth and final clause returns this study to ground already carefully prepared. "Receive" is *lambano* (Strong's G2983), already confirmed in this study's own Chapter 2 as the identical verb Jesus himself used at John 20:22, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost [holy spirit]" — the same word, now spoken by Peter to a crowd of thousands rather than to eleven men in a locked room, describing the same gift this whole study has followed from promise (Chapter 2 §A) to first giving (Chapter 2 §C) to this moment, its first recorded offer to people who had not yet received it. This study's own Chapter 6 will give the word its

full, dedicated treatment, set beside the different word — *dechomai*, intensified as *apodechomai* — that verse 41 will use of the word these hearers are about to embrace; here, this study does no more than mark the word's reappearance and hold the reader's attention on it, exactly the kind of reminder this study has committed to giving wherever these two words recur ahead of their own full chapter.

One further point belongs here, tying this verse directly back to Chapter 3's own corrected finding: this crowd is the first company, since the disciples themselves at Pentecost, to whom this gift is offered at all — the very distinction Chapter 3 §A worked out carefully (that the filling of Acts 2:1-4 belonged to the gathered disciples, not yet to any crowd) is what gives this verse its own force. What the disciples already have and have already demonstrated as a sign (Chapter 3 §A, citing 1 Corinthians 14:22), this crowd is now being told they may themselves receive as a gift, not merely witness as a spectacle.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — the genitive at Acts 2:38 is epexegetical, so the gift is God's own self given rather than something procured through a third party. Greek genitives carry more than one possible relation, and the case ending alone does not decide; this reading is the more natural one in context but is not the only available one. The opposing reading can fairly answer that a genitive of source reads naturally here too. This bears on claim H, and Appendix B carries the fuller case. *Lambano's* recurrence is a **direct statement** about the word.

F. "Unto You, and to Your Children, and to All That Are Afar Off" (Acts 2:39)

Acts 2:39 *For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.*

Peter's answer does not end with the fourfold command; it closes by naming how far the offer he has just made actually reaches. "The promise" — most immediately the promise of holy spirit just named in v.38, and, this study holds, not disconnected from "the promise of the Father" this study's own Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 have already traced back through Acts 1:4 to Jesus's own words before the ascension — is stated in three widening rings: "unto you," Peter's immediate hearers, standing before him that morning; "to your children," a next generation not yet even present; and "to all that are afar off," a phrase this study is careful not to overclaim in either direction. It may include, at minimum, Jews of the dispersion not physically present in Jerusalem that day — a natural enough reading given the international crowd Chapter 2 §D has already catalogued in full. Whether it reaches further still, to Gentiles entirely outside Israel's own commonwealth, is a question this study is not yet in a position to settle from this verse alone; Peter's own final qualifier, "even as many as the Lord our God shall call," is this study's own signal that the promise's true boundary is not geography or lineage but God's own calling, a boundary this study's own Chapter 10 will need to trace out fully once the Grace Administration itself, and its own unique reach past Israel entirely, has had its full chapter. This verse is flagged here as an early, compressed statement of a promise this study is not yet equipped to unpack completely — a down payment on later chapters, not their substitute.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — first statement of claim G, that the promise reaches past Israel. That Peter states three widening rings is **direct**. That the outermost reaches Gentiles is **reasonable**

inference only at this point in the text, and the section says so: Peter himself almost certainly means dispersed Jews. Chapter 10 §G resolves it from Acts 10-11.

G. Closing — What Peter Has Offered, and What Comes Next

By the end of v.39, Peter has answered the crowd's own question as directly as the question was asked: what shall we do, met with what to do, plainly, in four connected parts, followed by a promise reaching further than the day's own crowd could see. Luke's own text does not stop here, and neither, this study notes in closing, did Peter — "and with many other words did he testify and exhort" (Acts 2:40a), a phrase this study's own key verse, and its own next chapter, exists to take up directly.

Weighing it: Summary only — restates what the sections above established, at the weights assigned to them there.

Chapter 5 — Save Yourselves from This Untoward Generation (Acts 2:40)

A. "With Many Other Words Did He Testify and Exhort": The First Half, and Its Own Work

Acts 2:40 *And with many other words did he testify and exhort, saying, Save yourselves from this untoward generation.*

This verse divides in two, and this study takes each half in turn — not because the division is arbitrary, but because Luke's own grammar draws it: a main clause reporting what Peter did ("with many other words did he testify and exhort"), followed by a clause reporting what he said in doing it ("saying, Save yourselves from this untoward generation"). The first half names an activity; the second half records its content, or at least the compressed sum Luke chose to preserve of it. This study's own Introduction (§A) has already argued that both halves are load-bearing. This chapter argues something more specific: the first half is not merely background to the second. It is, on this study's own reading, the mechanism that makes the second half's command possible to obey at all — the fulcrum lifting the answer to that command's own "how," not a footnote apologizing for an incomplete transcript.

"Did testify" translates *diamartyromai* (Strong's G1263), and Luke's own choice of tense is worth noting before the word itself is. The form here, *diemartyrato*, is aorist middle indicative — a decisive, summary-referring act, Luke looking back on the whole of what Peter did and reporting it as one completed thing, not a blow-by-blow transcript of each individual utterance. The word itself is scripture's own term for solemn, weighted testimony — not casual conversation but a formal, invested affirmation, closer to the kind of statement a witness gives under oath than the kind a bystander offers in passing. Run out across its full New Testament occurrence list — fifteen in all, set out in Appendix C — the word's pattern is worth seeing whole: nine of the fifteen fall within this very book, and this study holds that concentration as no accident: *diamartyromai* is Luke's own preferred word for the church's formal, apostolic proclamation of the gospel specifically, not his general word for speech of any kind. The clearest

confirmation is that Peter himself reaches for the same word again, later in this same book, of the same essential content — "that it is he which was ordained of God to be Judge of quick and dead" (Acts 10:42, of Jesus) — a word Paul will also use at the far end of his own ministry, of "the ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God" (Acts 20:24), and again in Rome itself, "testifying the kingdom of God" (Acts 28:23). Five times in Acts — three of Peter, twice of Paul, counting Acts 8:25's own report of Peter and John testifying at Samaria — this same word marks a formal, weighted proclamation of the gospel's own substance, not incidental talk. Whatever Peter said in the words this verse does not record, Luke's own word choice tells this study's readers what kind of speech it was: not filler, not improvisation, but testimony of the same solemn kind Acts will keep naming this way all the way to its own final chapter.

"Exhort" translates *parakaleo* (Strong's G3870), and here Luke's own tense shifts: *parekalei* is imperfect active indicative — continuous or repeated action, not a single decisive act like the verb just before it. Peter did not exhort once, in one summary sentence; he kept exhorting, across whatever span of time the "many other words" actually took. The word itself repays a moment this study has already half-prepared for, because it is built on the same root this study met in Chapter 2 §A: *parakletos*, "Comforter," the very word Jesus used of the gift he promised — "another Comforter... the Spirit of truth" (John 14:16-17), one called alongside to help. *Parakaleo* is that same calling-alongside as a verb: to come near, to urge, to comfort, to encourage — always with the sense of drawing close to someone for that person's own good, not addressing him from a distance. This study holds the connection worth stating plainly rather than passing over as coincidence: on this same morning, in this same chapter of Acts, Peter has just been filled with the Paraclete's own gift (Chapter 2 §C; Appendix B traces why "the gift" is the more accurate way to put it), and the first recorded description of what he does with the gift is this — he *parakalei*, toward the crowd, the very thing the Paraclete does toward believers. The gift received becomes, almost immediately, the pattern of ministry exercised. This study will not overbuild the point into more than the text supports — Peter is not himself called a *parakletos* here, and the two words, noun and verb, are not simply interchangeable — but the shared root is real, and a reader who has followed this study since Chapter 2 is meant to hear it.

This is where the chapter's own argument begins to take its full shape. "With many other words did he testify and exhort" is not, on this study's reading, a parenthetical apology for what Luke left out. It is Luke's own report of the actual mechanism by which the command that follows — "save yourselves" — became something its hearers could obey at all. A bare command, issued without content, asks for an effort the hearer has no means to produce; this study will show why that grammatical fact matters directly in §D below. Peter's own testimony and exhortation — everything this study's own Chapters 1 through 4 have already traced in detail: the proof of the resurrection (Chapter 3 §§D-G), the identity of Jesus as Lord and Christ (Chapter 3 §G), the fourfold answer to "what shall we do" (Chapter 4 §§B-E), the promise reaching to children and to those afar off (Chapter 4 §F) — all of it belongs to the "many other words" this verse now formally names, even though it was recorded before this verse arrived in the text. And still more of it, Luke says plainly, was never recorded at all. This study takes both halves of v.40 as related the way a means is related to an end: the testifying and exhorting supply what the command draws on. Chapters 8 and 9 will trace the content of that testimony back through Jesus's own teaching in

full; this chapter's own work is narrower and more immediate — establishing, from the verse's own grammar and word choice, that the relationship between its two halves is real, before either is developed further.

Weighing it: Direct statement on the two verbs; strong inference on what the first half of v.40 is doing. That Luke chose a word of solemn formal testimony, and that nine of its fifteen New Testament occurrences fall in this book, are **direct statements**; Appendix C carries the list. That the testifying and exhorting supply what the command requires is a **strong inference** from the verse's own grammar, argued in §D. The *parakaleo/parakletos* connection is **corroboration only**, and the section says it will not overbuild it.

B. "This Untoward Generation": *Skolios* Run to Its Full Occurrence List

Peter's own words, stripped to their bones, read: *sothete apo tes geneas tes skolias tautes* — "be saved from the generation, the crooked one, this." Grammar for the verb belongs to §D below; this section takes the noun and its modifier. "Untoward" translates *skolios* (Strong's G4646) — crooked, warped, bent out of its intended shape, the ordinary Greek word for a road that will not run straight or a piece of wood that will not lie flat. This study's own Introduction (§F) has already flagged the word as rare — four occurrences only in the whole New Testament — and promised this chapter would run each one out in full rather than assume they all carry the same weight in the same way. That promise is kept here.

The first occurrence belongs to Luke's own earlier volume, and it is not, on inspection, independent evidence of how the New Testament itself chose to apply the word — it is inherited directly from an Old Testament quotation:

Luke 3:4-5 — *"As it is written in the book of the words of Esaias the prophet... The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight... And the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough ways shall be made smooth."*

Here *skolia* stands alone, without an expressed noun in the Greek's own economy — "the crooked things" (neuter plural, the adjective doing a noun's own work) — read most naturally of paths or ways, matching the verse's own governing image of a road prepared for a king's approach. Luke is quoting, not composing: this is his own Gospel's rendering of Isaiah 40:4, and the word was already present in the Greek Old Testament text he is quoting — "panta ta skolia," "all the crooked things," made straight. This occurrence describes a condition to be corrected, ways made straight, rather than naming a generation of people as the crooked thing itself; this study holds it as the outlier of the four, real and worth having in view, but structurally different from the other three, each of which attaches the word directly to *genea*, "a generation," or to a class of persons.

The second occurrence is this chapter's own subject, Acts 2:40, already quoted in full above.

The third belongs to Paul, and it is worth setting beside Peter's own words directly, because the two verses do not merely share a word — they share almost an entire clause:

Philippians 2:15 — *"That ye may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom ye shine as lights in the world."*

Paul's own Greek here reads *geneas skolias kai diestrammenes* — "a generation, crooked and perverse" — the identical noun (*genea*), the identical adjective (*skolios*, here in its genitive feminine form), plus a second adjective this study will trace to its own common source in a moment. This is not a coincidental echo; it is, on the evidence of the words themselves, very nearly the same phrase Peter reaches for at Pentecost, now used by Paul of an entirely different audience — Gentile believers at Philippi, in Macedonia, writing perhaps three decades after Pentecost, to a congregation including no one who stood in Jerusalem that morning and no one under the specific covenant indictment this chapter's own §C will trace for Peter's own hearers. Whatever this phrase names, Paul plainly did not regard it as usable only once, of only one generation, under only one historical judgment.

The fourth occurrence applies the word a third way again, and differently from both of the others:

1 Peter 2:18 — *"Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward."*

Here the word (dative plural masculine) modifies not a generation but a class of individual men: "masters," specifically the difficult or unreasonable ones, set directly against "the good and gentle." This is the word doing ordinary, everyday work — describing a person's own difficult temperament, with no covenant or historical weight attached to it at all. This study holds this occurrence as confirmation that *skolios* is not a specialized theological term reserved for indicting whole generations; it is the Greek language's own ordinary word for crookedness, as available for a difficult employer as for an unfaithful nation. Its weight in Acts 2:40 and Philippians 2:15 comes from what it is applied to — a generation, under judgment — not from the word carrying that weight intrinsically wherever it appears.

The word did not begin with Peter, and this study's own Introduction (§F) has already said as much in brief; this chapter now shows the source directly rather than only naming it. Moses' own closing address to Israel, delivered at the very end of the wilderness generation's own life, indicts that generation in the Greek Old Testament Peter's own contemporaries read and heard read, in these exact words:

Deuteronomy 32:5 (LXX) — *"genea skolia kai diestrammene" — "a generation, crooked and perverse" (the Septuagint's own rendering of Moses' Hebrew, itself translated in the King James Old Testament as "they are a perverse and crooked generation").*

This is worth pausing on directly, because it resolves a question this study's own Introduction left open rather than settled: the exact relationship between Peter's own word at Acts 2:40 and Jesus's own different word at Matthew 17:17. The Septuagint's Deuteronomy 32:5 pairs two adjectives, not one — *skolia* ("crooked") and *diestrammene* ("perverse," a passive participle of *diastrepho*, "to twist or distort") — both modifying the same noun, *genea*, "generation." Once that pairing is seen, the New Testament's own three later uses of Moses' language sort themselves out with real precision, each drawing on one part of the pair or the whole of it. Philippians 2:15, already quoted above, takes the *entire* phrase, both adjectives together, in the identical grammatical form Deuteronomy 32:5 uses — Paul is not merely alluding to Deuteronomy 32:5's theme; he is quoting its exact wording, applied to a new and different generation. Matthew 17:17, by contrast, takes only the second adjective:

Matthew 17:17 — *"Then Jesus answered and said, O faithless and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall I suffer you? bring him hither to me."*

"O faithless and perverse generation" pairs *genea* with *diestrammene* — the identical inflected form Deuteronomy 32:5 uses — but replaces *skolia* with a different first word entirely, *apistos*, "faithless" or "without faith." And Peter's own Acts 2:40 takes only the *first* adjective: *genea* plus *skolia*, with no *diestrammene* at all. Three New Testament writers, on three separate occasions, drawing on one Mosaic source text, and each one taking a different portion of it — Paul the whole phrase, Matthew the second half, Peter the first half. This study holds this as a real, checkable pattern rather than a suggestive coincidence, precisely because the shared wording is exact rather than approximate: these are not three writers independently reaching for similar-sounding language; they are three writers whose Greek, set side by side, shows the same two-word source text being drawn on three different ways.

One further Old Testament witness belongs here, though it does not share Deuteronomy 32:5's own specific Greek wording and so cannot be traced the same way. Asaph, writing generations after Moses and looking back on the same wilderness rebellion Moses himself had already indicted, names the pattern again without repeating either Greek word:

Psalm 78:8 — *"And might not be as their fathers, a stubborn and rebellious generation; a generation that set not their heart aright, and whose spirit was not steadfast with God."*

Asaph's own Hebrew behind "stubborn" and "rebellious" belongs to a different word family entirely from Moses' own word behind the Septuagint's *skolios* — this study will not force a linguistic link where the text supplies none. What Asaph confirms instead is that the wilderness generation's own crookedness, once named by Moses, became a fixed reference point within Israel's own scriptures for describing a recurring condition, cited again in different words, generations later, as the standing example of what a covenant people's own generation could become. By the time Peter stands up in Acts 2, "this untoward generation" is not a fresh coinage; it is a label with a long scriptural memory behind it, and Peter's own hearers — men steeped, as devout pilgrims, in exactly this scripture — would have heard the echo without needing it explained.

Weighing it: Direct statement — **skolios** is Moses' own word, and three New Testament writers each draw a different portion of one two-word phrase from Deuteronomy 32:5. The wording is exact rather than approximate, which is what makes the pattern checkable; Appendix C carries the occurrence lists. Psalm 78:8 is **corroboration only**, since its Hebrew belongs to a different word family and this section says so.

C. Whose Generation, and How Wide: Resolving the Question

This study's own Introduction (§F) left one question open on purpose, promising this chapter would settle it rather than merely restate it: is Peter naming his own specific generation, under a specific and time-bound judgment, or reaching for language scripture already uses of a recurring condition wherever it appears? §B above has now supplied the evidence needed to answer both halves of that question together, because they are not, on inspection, competing answers. They are both true, at once, of the same word — and the New Testament's own usage shows exactly how.

Peter's own primary referent is concrete and specific, and this study will not soften it into vague generality. "This" (*tautes*) is a demonstrative, pointing at a particular generation standing in front of him that morning — the same generation Chapter 3 §D has already shown Peter charging directly: "him... ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain" (Acts 2:23), and the same generation whose leadership this library's own completed *In Vain Do They Worship Me* project has already shown, in full and from the Gospels' own record, had displaced God's own commandment with the tradition of men — the very corruption this study now identifies as the concrete substance of this generation's own crookedness, not a vague moral impression but a specific, textually documented pattern of religious leadership Jesus himself repeatedly opposed. This is Peter's own direct application of Moses' own indictment: a covenant generation, standing where the wilderness generation once stood, having done what that generation's own worst impulses only pointed toward — rejecting, and killing, their own promised Redeemer, at the hands of leaders who had already substituted their own tradition for God's own word. On this reading, "this untoward generation" names something real, historical, and specific: first-century Jerusalem, under its own contemporary leadership, in the years bearing down toward the judgment this same generation would suffer within Peter's own lifetime.

But the word Peter chose to make that specific charge is not a word scripture reserves for that charge alone — and this is where Philippians 2:15's own evidence, already set out above, does its real work. If *skolios*, applied to a *genea*, could describe only Peter's own specific, doomed generation, Paul's own re-use of the identical phrase, decades later, of an audience with no part in Jerusalem's own guilt, would be a category error — and this study does not find Paul making that kind of error carelessly, particularly not while quoting scripture's own fixed language precisely rather than loosely. What Philippians 2:15 demonstrates is that the diagnosis Moses first wrote, and Peter first applied at Pentecost, was never bound to one generation's own specific sins; it was a description of a moral shape — crookedness, a departure from a straight and given standard — that recurs, under different specific causes, in different generations, and remains equally namable each time it does. This study holds both conclusions together rather than choosing between them: Peter is doing real, historically specific business with his own contemporary generation, its own specific leadership, and its own specific guilt; and the very language he reaches for to do it was always available, by scripture's own prior and subsequent usage, to name the same condition again, in a different generation, under different circumstances, without needing Peter's own permission or awareness that it would be. "Save yourselves from this untoward generation" was, on the morning Peter said it, an appeal with one address. It did not stay that way, and this study holds that Peter's own chosen word — not a word of his own invention, but Moses' word, already proven portable by the time Paul picked it up again — is precisely why.

Weighing it: Strong inference — Peter names a specific generation, and the word he chose was never bound to it. That "this" points at a particular generation is **direct**. That the same phrase remained available for a different audience is **direct** too, on the evidence of Philippians 2:15, where Paul quotes Deuteronomy's exact wording of Gentile believers decades later. That both are true at once is a **strong inference**; the opposing reading can fairly answer that Paul is alluding rather than applying, and that Peter's judgment language was time-bound.

D. "Save Yourselves": A Passive Command, and the Answer to Its Own How

One grammatical fact governs this whole chapter's own argument, and this study states it plainly rather than leaving it implicit: "save yourselves," in Peter's own Greek, is not quite what the English phrase suggests to a modern ear. *Sothete* is second person plural, and it is a genuine imperative, a real command rather than a suggestion — but its voice is passive, not active or reflexive. A more literal rendering, and one several modern translations adopt directly, is simply "be saved" or "be ye saved": not "save yourselves," in the sense of a task the hearers must perform on their own initiative and by their own resource, but "be saved," in the sense of yielding to, or receiving, a salvation whose actual accomplishing lies outside the hearer's own power to generate. This is not a peculiarity confined to this one verse; Paul commands an entirely different act with the identical grammatical pattern several years later — "be ye reconciled to God" (2 Corinthians 5:20), *katallagete*, likewise a passive imperative — commanding a response to something God has already done, not commanding the hearer to accomplish reconciliation himself. The King James translators' own choice, "save yourselves," is not wrong; English has no single verb that renders a passive imperative naturally, and "save yourselves" captures the verse's own real urgency and its address to individual responsibility (already noted in this study's own Chapter 4 §C, on v.38's "every one of you") — but read alone, it can suggest a self-generated effort the Greek's own passive voice does not support. This study holds the more precise sense as: let yourselves be saved; take hold of a salvation already being held out.

This is where §A's own argument returns, no longer as a proposed reading but as a grammatical necessity. A passive command cannot be obeyed by sheer will; it can only be obeyed by receiving something. And this verse does not leave the hearer to guess what that something is. It stands, in Luke's own sentence, directly after — logically as well as narratively downstream of — "with many other words did he testify and exhort." The testimony and exhortation are not incidental to the command; they are what the command's own passive voice requires to exist before the command can be met at all. A hearer cannot "be saved" from nothing; he can only be saved from something, by something, and Peter has just spent an entire sermon (this study's own Chapter 3) and an entire fourfold answer (Chapter 4) supplying exactly that content — who Jesus is, what he has done, what response he asks, what he gives in return. This study takes the whole of vv.14-39, everything already covered in this study's own Chapters 3 and 4, as the substance behind this verse's own passive verb: not a separate topic finished and set aside before v.40 begins, but the very thing v.40's own grammar says a hearer must receive in order to do what v.40 commands. The "many other words" of v.40a, whatever was and was not recorded, functioned the same way: content supplied, so that a passive command could be met by something other than empty effort.

This study also notes the verb's own tense before closing this section, because it sharpens rather than complicates the picture just drawn. *Sothete* is aorist, not present — a decisive, once-for-all act in view, not an ongoing process the hearer must sustain moment by moment. Whatever this salvation requires of the hearer, Peter frames it as something entered into, not something achieved by degrees. This matches, rather than competes with, this study's own Chapter 4 findings: repentance (§B), baptism (§C), remission of sins (§D), and the gift received (§E) are each, in their own way, framed as things that

happen, decisively, not as processes requiring ongoing self-effort to complete. Verse 40's own aorist passive imperative is this study's own confirmation, from the sermon's closing appeal, of the same pattern already running through its central commands.

Weighing it: Strong inference — claim S: "save yourselves" is a passive imperative, a command to receive rather than to achieve. That the verb is a passive imperative is a **direct statement** about the Greek, not a reading of it; Appendix D sets out the parsing and the 2 Corinthians 5:20 parallel. That this makes the first half of the verse the mechanism of the second is a **strong inference**. The opposing reading can fairly answer that a passive imperative still commands a real human act — which this study grants, and which is why the section says "let yourselves be saved" rather than "do nothing."

E. Closing — The Fulcrum, and What v.41 Already Showed

This chapter opened by naming Acts 2:40 a fulcrum: its first half supplying the "how" its second half's command requires. That claim can now be restated with the full weight of this chapter's own findings behind it, rather than as a proposal awaiting support. Peter's testimony and exhortation — solemn, sustained, and, on the pattern Acts itself sets (§A above), of the same weighted kind Acts will keep naming this way through its own final chapter — supplied the content a passive imperative structurally requires before it can be obeyed. The word Peter chose for the generation needing to be saved was not invented for the occasion; it was Moses' own word, carrying Israel's own scriptural memory of a wilderness generation's crookedness, applied now to a generation whose own specific guilt this study has already traced in Chapters 3 and 4, and applicable again — proven so within this study's own New Testament, at Philippians 2:15 — wherever the same moral shape recurs. What Luke reports next, already touched at the very close of this study's own Chapter 4, is what happened when hearers did what a passive imperative asks: "they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls" (Acts 2:41). This study takes that result as this whole chapter's own confirmation: the fulcrum held. Content was supplied; a passive command was met; and a movement that began that morning with roughly one hundred and twenty grew, in a single day, by three thousand more. Chapter 6 turns to the word Luke chooses for what those three thousand did — received — and to the different word, already flagged since this study's own Introduction, that v.38 had used of what they were promised.

Weighing it: Summary only — restates what the sections above established, at the weights assigned to them there.

Chapter 6 — Receiving the Gift: The Pattern, the Manifestation, and the One Delay

A. One Chapter, Not Two: Why Samaria Belongs Here

This chapter was originally planned as two: one tracing the two Greek words translated "receive" across verses 38 and 41, and a second taking up Samaria's own exception to the pattern those words expose.

This study now treats them as a single chapter, and the reason is worth stating plainly before either word study begins, because it is not a matter of convenience or length but of what Samaria actually is within this study's own argument. Samaria is not a second, separate subject loosely associated with the first by subject matter; it is the first subject's own proving ground. A pattern asserted but never tested against a hard case is only a working hypothesis; a pattern that has been tested against its hardest case, and whose testing is set out in full view rather than asserted three chapters later, is worth more than one that has not. Reading the pattern and its exception in the same chapter, back to back, lets this study make that test in full view of the reader, rather than asserting the rule in one chapter and asking the reader to trust, three chapters later and out of sight of the original argument, that the rule still holds. There is a further reason, and this study states it because it will matter directly to §G below: Samaria is not only a test of the *pattern*, it is the first time in Acts this exact problem — the gift not yet received where it was expected — had shown itself at all, and the church's own response to that problem was immediate and, this study will show, urgent. Peter and John did not wait; they went down. A chapter that separated the pattern from the crisis that first exposed a gap in it would blunt exactly what made that crisis significant: this was new, it had not happened before, and the apostles' own haste in answering it is itself part of what this chapter has to say.

B. Verse 38's Word: *Lambano*, Traced from Promise to Fulfillment

Acts 2:38 *Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost [holy spirit].*

"Ye shall receive" translates *lambano* (Strong's G2983), a verb this study has already met twice before reaching this chapter, each time flagged for the fuller treatment now due. Chapter 1 §B first named it at Acts 1:8, where the apostles are promised they "shall receive power" (*dunamis*), after the Holy Ghost is come upon them. Chapter 2 §A found it again at John 20:22, where the risen Christ, breathing on the Eleven, says "Receive ye the Holy Ghost [holy spirit]" — the identical verb, this study argued there, functioning as a real, forward-pointing sign rather than the gift's own complete and final bestowal, a reading resting in part on the very point this chapter now takes up in full: nothing in John 20 records any manifestation, any effect at all, of the kind Acts 2:4 records happening the moment the gift actually came. *Lambano* itself is an ordinary verb — "to take, to lay hold of, to receive what is offered," the standard lexical range this study has already drawn on elsewhere for its other two senses — and its own weight in this study's argument does not come from any special or technical meaning built into the word itself. It comes from what it is consistently used of: in every instance this chapter will trace, *lambano* names the reception of the gift itself, holy spirit, the thing given, not the word preached about it or the message that announced it was coming. That second, different object belongs to a different verb, taken up in §D below.

Peter's own use of *lambano* at v.38 is future tense — "ye shall receive" — a promise not yet fulfilled for the crowd standing in front of him, in contrast to the same verb's aorist, completed-action form already spoken of the Eleven at Pentecost itself, three verses earlier: "and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost [holy spirit], and began to speak with other tongues" (Acts 2:4, already treated in full in this study's own Chapter 2 §C). This study takes the tense shift as significant rather than incidental: Peter is

offering his hearers the same thing he and the Eleven have just received, in the same terms, using the same verb — a promise extended, not a different or lesser gift being described. What happened to the hundred and twenty at v.4 is what v.38 now holds out to "every one of you" in the crowd, and this chapter's own §C exists to show that scripture does not leave that promise's fulfillment to the reader's assumption; every time Acts goes on to narrate someone actually receiving what v.38 promises, the text tells its readers so directly, in language this study can trace, verse by verse, rather than infer.

C. The Pattern, Counted Honestly

This study's own Introduction (§E) named a pattern and promised this chapter would run it out rather than assert it. That promise is kept here, including where the counting does not go the study's own way — because a pattern honestly counted is worth more than a rule that cannot survive being checked.

Acts records the gift of holy spirit coming upon people six times. Three of those accounts report tongues in the same breath, with no interval the text allows between the receiving and the speaking. One reports a filling with no manifestation named. One reports a filling where the man's own later testimony supplies what Luke does not. And one — Samaria — is the account this chapter exists to test, where the reporting is thin at exactly the point a reader wants it thickest.

The three that state it plainly first. At Pentecost: "they were all filled with the Holy Ghost [holy spirit], and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance" (Acts 2:4). At Caesarea, in the household of Cornelius, Luke goes further and names tongues as the *evidence* by which the watching Jewish believers knew the gift had actually been given — "for they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God" (Acts 10:46). At Ephesus: "the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied" (Acts 19:6). Three accounts, three settings, three different companies, one sentence each — the gift comes, and the tongues come with it.

The fourth is Saul at Damascus, and this study will not pretend the account says what it does not. Ananias is sent that Saul "mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost [holy spirit]" (Acts 9:17), and Luke's very next verse narrates the sight healing in detail and says nothing whatever about the spirit — neither that tongues followed nor that they did not. That is a silence, not a denial, and this study treats it as one. What can be said with certainty is that Paul himself, writing later in his own hand, says plainly: "I thank my God, I speak with tongues more than ye all" (1 Corinthians 14:18). That verse does not tell us what happened in the house on Straight Street; it tells us that whatever day it began, tongues were a settled and abundant part of the man's life. This study holds it as exactly that much, and no more.

The fifth is Acts 4:31, and it belongs in this list precisely because it is the hardest one for the reading this study takes. After the church prays under its first persecution, "the place was shaken where they were assembled together; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spake the word of God with boldness" — the same verb Acts 2:4 and Acts 9:17 use for the filling, and no tongues named. This study's answer is that Acts 4:31 is not an account of anybody receiving the gift for the first time: every person in that room already had it, most of them since the second chapter of this book, and what the verse records is a fresh filling of people already born again, for a particular moment of need. That is a

reasonable answer and this study offers it as one; a reader who declines it has found a real exception and is entitled to say so.

The sixth is Samaria, and it is this chapter's own control case rather than a loose end — §§F–H below take it up in full. Flagged here only to keep the count complete: Luke reports that the gift came when the apostles laid hands on them and does not report what was heard when it did.

So the pattern, stated at the weight the text will actually carry: **wherever Acts narrates the gift of holy spirit being received and tells us what happened next, it tells us they spoke in tongues.** Three accounts say it outright. One is silent, and its subject later testifies to tongues in his own words. One is best read as a refilling rather than a first receiving. One, Samaria, is compressed at exactly the point in question, though what happens immediately afterward — a professional wonder-worker offering money for what he had just watched — tells its own story about whether anything visible occurred.

No account anywhere in Acts records the gift received and states that tongues did not follow. That is worth saying plainly. It is also not the same thing as a rule without exceptions, and this study does not need it to be — because the importance of this manifestation was never resting on the tally. It rests on what scripture says the manifestation is, which is the subject of the section that follows, and which no reading of Acts 8 or Acts 9 touches at all.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — points strongly toward tongues accompanying the gift wherever Acts reports the outcome, though it is a pattern and not an exceptionless rule. That three accounts state it in the same sentence as the receiving is a **direct statement**; that the same held at Samaria is a **reasonable inference** from what Simon saw (§H); that Acts 4:31 is a refilling rather than a first receiving is a **reasonable inference** that an honest reader may decline. What the opposing reading fairly answers is that two or three silences in six accounts is a real proportion, that an argument from what Luke does not narrate cuts both ways, and that 1 Corinthians 14:18 cannot establish what happened on any particular day. What it cannot fairly say, on the text as it stands, is that scripture anywhere reports this gift received without its sign.

In Short

Acts narrates the gift coming six times. Three say tongues followed, in the same sentence. One is silent and its subject later testifies to tongues himself. One is best read as a refilling of people who already had the gift. One is Samaria, this chapter's own test case. Nowhere does Acts report the gift received and tongues withheld. That is a striking pattern honestly counted — and it is the smaller half of what scripture says about this manifestation.

D. Why This Manifestation, and Why First

The counting is done, and it is the least of what there is to say. A reader who came away from §C thinking the question about tongues is *how consistently Acts reports them* has been handed the wrong question. The right one is why God chose this manifestation, of the nine He gives, to be the first thing the church ever did — and what He attached to it when He did.

Consider first what it actually was that morning. The administration this study's own Chapter 10 will place among all seven of scripture's own did not open with a sermon, or a healing, or a miracle of the kind Jesus's own ministry had made familiar for three years. It opened with a hundred and twenty ordinary people speaking languages they had never learned. Every other administration scripture records opens with God speaking — thunder and a voice at Sinai, a voice from heaven at the Jordan. This one opens with God speaking *through people*, which is a thing He had never done in this way before and had promised, through Joel, that He would. The first act of the Grace administration was not something done *to* believers. It was something done *through* them, by their own mouths, on the first morning they had anything to do it with.

That is why this study holds the manifestation as foundational rather than optional, and it is why *A Grace Administration Primer* names it, in its own words, "the foundation for the operation of the other eight manifestations." It is the one a believer can exercise at will, without waiting for a need to arise, without an occasion, without anyone else present — and scripture attaches a remarkable amount to it.

What scripture states outright. Some of what follows is said in so many words, and those are worth separating from the rest so a reader knows which is which.

Tongues build up the one speaking: "he that speaketh in an unknown tongue edifieth himself" (1 Corinthians 14:4). They are speech addressed to God rather than to men: "for he that speaketh in an unknown tongue speaketh not unto men, but unto God: for no man understandeth him; howbeit in the spirit he speaketh mysteries" (1 Corinthians 14:2) — a believer given a way to say to God what he has no words of his own for. They magnify God: the watching Jews at Caesarea "heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God" (Acts 10:46), and the pilgrims at Jerusalem heard "the wonderful works of God" (Acts 2:11) — the same content, reported twice, by two different crowds, in two different cities. They are giving thanks, and giving it well: "for thou verily givest thanks well" (1 Corinthians 14:17). They are a sign to those who do not believe (1 Corinthians 14:22; Mark 16:17). And Paul, who wrote more correction of the misuse of this manifestation than anyone in scripture, still wrote in the middle of that correction: "I would that ye all spake with tongues" (1 Corinthians 14:5), and "I thank my God, I speak with tongues more than ye all" (1 Corinthians 14:18). A man correcting a church's abuse of something does not say that about a thing he regards as marginal.

What scripture attaches to it by connection. A second group of benefits is drawn not from verses naming tongues directly but from what scripture says about praying and worshipping in the spirit — and this study states the connection as the reasoned one it is rather than presenting it as a plain statement. Jude commands believers, "building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost" (Jude 20), which this study reads alongside 1 Corinthians 14:4's own "edifieth himself." Paul describes a praying that goes past what the believer himself knows how to ask: "we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered" (Romans 8:26) — and names the effect, one verse on, as intercession "according to the will of God" (8:27), which is the only kind of praying that never asks for the wrong thing. He tells the Ephesians to be "praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit... for all saints" (Ephesians 6:18), which this study's own Chapter 10 §K has already named as the posture in which the whole armour is worn. Jesus

told the woman at the well that the Father seeks worshippers who "worship him in spirit and in truth" (John 4:24). And the strengthening Paul prays for the Ephesians — "to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man" (Ephesians 3:16), set against "though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day" (2 Corinthians 4:16) — describes a renewal happening somewhere the believer cannot see it happening.

What it testifies. Scripture also makes this gift a witness, and the witness is about the believer's own standing rather than about God's power. "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ" (Romans 8:16-17) — the same six rights this study's own Chapter 10 §H sets out, attested from inside rather than argued from outside. It is called "the earnest of our inheritance" (Ephesians 1:14), a down payment on a thing not yet handed over. And it is, in Peter's own argument on the day itself, evidence of something else entirely: standing in front of a crowd, he pointed at the tongues they had just heard and said that what they were hearing was proof that the man they had crucified was raised and exalted — "he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear" (Acts 2:33, this study's own Chapter 3 §F). The first recorded use of this manifestation was as evidence of the resurrection.

Set together, that is a great deal for one manifestation to carry, and this study holds it as the actual answer to why God gave this one first. Not because it is the most spectacular of the nine — it is not — but because it is the one that is always available, always addressed to God, always edifying, and always, by its very operation, the believer's own standing proof that what was promised at Acts 2:38 was actually given to him.

A last word, because it bears on how a reader should hold all of this. Scripture nowhere makes this manifestation a test of whether a person is saved, and this study does not either: the six rights of Chapter 10 §H rest on the new birth, not on any manifestation of it. What scripture does is hold out something freely given and describe, at length and from many angles, what it is for. A right granted is not the same thing as a right claimed — this study's own Chapter 10 §H says so of all six — and the same holds here. The believer who has never exercised this manifestation has lost none of his standing. What he has not yet done is take up the thing God gave him first.

Weighing it: Mixed, stated per claim — establishes the importance of this manifestation on ground the pattern argument of §C never touches. That tongues edify the speaker, address God, magnify Him, give thanks well, and serve as a sign are **direct statements**; so is Paul's own "I would that ye all spake with tongues." That the praying-in-the-spirit passages (Jude 20; Romans 8:26-27; Ephesians 6:18; John 4:24) name this same manifestation is a **reasonable inference**, and the opposing reading can fairly answer that "praying in the Spirit" may name Spirit-led prayer in a known language. That Romans 8:16 and Ephesians 1:14's witness and earnest are experienced *through* tongues specifically is **corroboration only** — the verses name the gift, not its manifestation, and this study does not lean on them. That the manifestation is foundational to the other eight is **reasonable inference**, resting on its position at Pentecost and on its being the one manifestation exercisable at will rather than on any verse stating it. None of this is offered as a test of salvation, and scripture nowhere makes it one.

In Short

The importance of this manifestation never rested on how consistently Acts reports it. It rests on what scripture says it is: the first thing the church ever did, the opening act of this administration, God speaking through ordinary people rather than over them. Scripture says outright that it builds up the speaker, speaks mysteries to God, magnifies Him, gives thanks well, and stands as a sign — and Paul, in the middle of correcting its abuse, wished it for everybody. Scripture connects it further to praying past what the believer knows to ask, to worship in spirit, and to a strengthening of the inner man he cannot see happening. It is the believer's own standing witness that what was promised at Acts 2:38 was given to him. It is not a test of whether he is saved. It is the first thing God handed him.

E. Verse 41's Word: *Dechomai* Intensified to *Apodechomai*

Acts 2:41 *Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls.*

"Gladly received" translates a single Greek verb, *apodechomai* (Strong's G588), and this study's own Introduction (§F) has already flagged the distinction this section now traces in full: this is not the same word as v.38's *lambano*, and the difference is not merely stylistic variation but a difference of both object and posture. *Apodechomai* is built on *dechomai* (Strong's G1209), the simple form, itself already met in this study's coming discussion of Samaria (§E below), where it is the verb Luke uses of Samaria having "received the word of God" (Acts 8:14) well before the gift itself came. *Apo-* as a prefix intensifies rather than reverses the root sense — the standard lexical range for *apodechomai* is "to accept, to receive favorably, to welcome," carrying, more strongly than the simple *dechomai*, the sense of an eager, approving, wholehearted reception, not a bare or grudging acknowledgment. Luke reaches for the intensified form here, at the moment three thousand people respond to Peter's appeal, and this study holds the choice as deliberate: not a crowd merely hearing and setting the word aside unchallenged, but a crowd welcoming it, gladly, exactly as the King James translators' own added adverb already signals in English.

The object of *apodechomai* at v.41 is "his word" — Peter's own preached message, everything this study's Chapter 5 §A has already traced as the "many other words" supplying content a passive command requires. This is a different object entirely from *lambano*'s object at v.38, "the gift of the Holy Ghost [holy spirit]" — one verb names the reception of a message, the other the reception of a person, God's own self given as gift. This study holds the distinction as more than a grammatical curiosity: it maps directly onto two different postures a hearer takes toward two different things. The word is heard, weighed, and welcomed — an act of the mind and will responding to testimony, exactly the kind of response this study's Chapter 5 §D has already shown a passive command like "be saved" requires from a hearer able to receive but not manufacture what saves him. The gift is not weighed and welcomed in the same sense; it is *received*, taken hold of, in the more basic sense *lambano* carries throughout this study's tracing of it — something given, and something a recipient reaches out to take, rather than a claim evaluated and accepted. Both verbs describe a real act of the hearer's own will — this study's Chapter 3 §A has already argued at length that reception of the gift is not something forced on a person against his choice — but they describe two different kinds of act, toward two different objects, and

Luke's own choice of two different words, rather than one word doing double duty, is this study's own evidence that he meant the distinction to be seen.

One further word belongs in this same discussion, because it is the third member of the same family and appears at the very verse that supplies this chapter's own control case: *dechomai* itself, the simple, unintensified form, used of Samaria's own reception of "the word of God" (Acts 8:14) — the same basic verb behind Peter's crowd's *apodechomai*, but without the intensifying prefix, and applied, this study will show in §E, to a reception that turned out, on its own, not to be enough.

F. Samaria: What the Text Says Happened, and What It Does Not

Acts 8:14-17 — *"Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John: who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost [holy spirit]: (for as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.) Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost [holy spirit]."*

Take the passage first for its bare sequence, before asking what any of it means. Philip — not one of the twelve, but one of the seven chosen in Acts 6 to serve tables, and already preaching and working signs in Samaria in the verses just before this one (Acts 8:5-13) — has evangelised the city with evident success. Samaria "had received the word of God." Something further had been done: they "were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." And then verse 16 says, with a bluntness this study will not soften, that something had *not* happened: "as yet he was fallen upon none of them." News of this reaches Jerusalem. The apostles send Peter and John, with no delay Luke records. The two men go down, pray, lay hands on them, and at that point — not before — "they received the Holy Ghost."

There is a live question about that middle clause, and this study names it rather than reading past it. Whether "baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus" reports a water baptism performed on believing Samaritans, or reports the new birth itself under this administration's own idiom, is genuinely open; the companion study *Baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus* sets out both readings and holds this verse open alongside Acts 19:5, where the Greek is word for word the same. Appendix A condenses that case.

What matters for this chapter is that the question does not need to be settled here. Read either way, the text reports the same thing: the Samaritans had believed, something had been done to them or for them in the name of the Lord Jesus, and the gift had still not come. If verse 16 names the new birth, then they were born again and not yet manifesting. If it names a water rite, then they had believed and been baptized and were not yet born again in the sense Acts 2:38 promised. Either way there is a real interval between Samaria's belief and Samaria's receiving, and either way that interval is unique in Acts — nowhere else does Luke pause to tell his reader that the gift had not yet come to people who had already received the word. **The delay is the datum, and the delay is undisputed.** Sections G and H take up why it was there.

One further thing the passage does not say, and this study will not supply: Luke does not report what was heard or seen when the apostles' hands were laid on them. No tongues are named. §C above has

already counted this account honestly as one of the six, and will not now quietly reclassify it. What the passage does supply, in the verses immediately following, is a man watching — and what he does next (§H below) is hard to explain unless something was there to be seen. That is evidence, and it is indirect evidence, and this study rates it as such rather than letting a professional sorcerer's covetousness stand in for a report Luke declined to write.

Weighing it: Direct statement on the delay; open question on what verse 16 names — the delay itself bears on this chapter's argument and the open question does not. That the gift had not come to people who had already received the word is what the text says in so many words, and neither reading of verse 16 touches it. What verse 16 reports is genuinely unresolved, and this study takes no position on it here; the companion study holds it open alongside Acts 19:5, whose Greek is identical. That no tongues are reported is also a **direct statement** about what Luke wrote. The opposing reading can fairly answer that an account this compressed is thin ground for any inference about what happened, in either direction — which is exactly why this study rests the section on the delay, which is reported, rather than on the manifestation, which is not.

In Short

Samaria had received the word, something had been done in the name of the Lord Jesus, and the gift had still not come — and Luke stops the narrative to say so, which he does nowhere else. What that middle clause reports is an open question this chapter does not need to settle: the interval is there on either reading. Luke does not tell us what happened when the apostles laid hands on them. He does tell us what a watching sorcerer did next.

G. Something Was Incomplete: Testing the Candidate Explanations

The question this passage forces is not whether something was missing — the text says so directly — but why. This study takes up two candidate explanations in turn, testing each against the text itself rather than assuming the first explanation that comes to hand, exactly the method this study's own Research-Method has committed to throughout.

The first candidate reads the delay against Acts 1:8's own stated progression, already treated in full in this study's Chapter 1 §B: "ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." Samaria is named there as its own distinct stage, set apart from Judaea rather than assumed to follow automatically once the gospel reached the wider Judean countryside — a detail this study's own Chapter 1 §B already flagged as significant and promised this chapter would return to. On this reading, Samaria's own reception of the gift needed direct, personal, apostolic confirmation precisely because it was the first time the gospel had crossed the specific boundary Jesus himself had named as its own separate frontier — not a matter of geography for its own sake, but a matter of the church's own unity being visibly, undeniably established, at this exact transition, by the same men who had stood with Christ from the beginning, so that no later question could arise about whether Samaria's reception was somehow a lesser or different thing than Jerusalem's

own. The apostles' presence was not incidental to the gift's own giving; on this reading, it was constitutive of Samaria's inclusion being recognized, by the whole church, as genuine and equal.

The second candidate reads the delay against the specific, well-attested history of Jewish-Samaritan hostility — a division old enough, and bitter enough, that a scribe just before this scene in Luke's own two-volume work could refuse to add "and the Samaritans" alongside "and the Jews" without explanation (John 4:9's own parenthetical note, "for the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans," a division John 4:20's own dispute over the right mountain of worship confirms ran to the very heart of each side's rival claim to true worship). On this reading, God's own withholding of the gift until the apostles arrived in person was not a delay for its own sake but a necessary, visible demonstration that this new company — hated across a centuries-old religious and ethnic divide — was being received into the same body, by the same means, under the same apostolic hand, as Jerusalem itself. A gift given automatically, unaccompanied by apostolic presence, might have left room for a divided church to treat Samaria's own reception as questionable, or separate, or lesser; a gift withheld until Peter and John themselves came down and prayed left no such room.

This study holds both explanations as complementary rather than competing, and as more persuasive together than either alone: Acts 1:8's own stated progression supplies the structural reason Samaria was a first of its kind, requiring confirmation no later account would require in quite the same way (Caesarea and Ephesus, both already outside Judea, do not repeat this specific delay); the Jewish-Samaritan history supplies the reason that particular first crossing carried a weight this study now holds neither a believed word nor the new birth itself, on their own, could settle without apostolic confirmation. Neither explanation asks this study to conclude that receiving the gift ordinarily requires apostolic mediation — Cornelius's household receives it while Peter is still speaking, before he has laid a hand on anyone at all (Acts 10:44), and this study will not let Samaria's own exception be read backward into the ordinary pattern the other four accounts establish. Samaria is the exception precisely because of what made that specific moment, in that specific place, between those specific two peoples, unlike any other moment Acts records.

H. Simon Magus: What the Gap Exposed (Acts 8:18-24)

Acts 8:18-19 — *"And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost [holy spirit] was given, he offered them money, saying, Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost [holy spirit]."*

Simon is not incidental to this passage; Luke has already introduced him at length, in the verses immediately before this chapter's own opening (Acts 8:9-11), as a sorcerer who "used sorcery, and bewitched the people of Samaria, giving out that himself was some great one," to the point that Samaritans "from the least to the greatest" had called him "the great power of God." Simon had, by his own profession and Samaria's own prior estimate of him, already believed under Philip's preaching and been baptized (v.13) — this study takes his baptism at face value, as Luke records it without qualification, rather than assuming from what follows that it must have been false from the start. What Simon does next is the reason this study holds it essential that this scene sit in the same chapter as the pattern and the delay that produced it: watching the apostles lay hands on the Samaritans and the gift

visibly come, Simon does not ask to receive it himself for his own sake, as the crowd around him plainly had; he offers money for the *power itself*, the ability to dispense the gift to others at his own discretion — precisely the kind of transactional, self-serving religious commerce this study's own completed *In Vain Do They Worship Me* project has already traced as characteristic of exactly the corrupted religious instinct scripture consistently opposes. Peter's own answer is immediate and severe, and this study lets it stand in the text's own words rather than paraphrasing its force away:

Acts 8:20-23 — *"But Peter said unto him, Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money. Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter: for thy heart is not right in the sight of God. Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee. For I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity."*

This study now returns to the point flagged in §A and again in §E: why it mattered that this was the *first* time this exact problem had shown itself, and why Peter and John's own haste in answering it was not incidental urgency but the church's own necessary response to a genuinely new kind of danger. Had the gift come to Samaria automatically, the moment the word was believed and water applied, with no apostolic figure present at all, Simon's own corrupted instinct — a man who had spent his life monetizing spiritual power over a credulous public — would have met that gift with no apostolic authority anywhere near enough to answer it as decisively and as immediately as Peter does here. This study holds it as no accident that the one account among the five where a would-be exploiter of the gift appears at all is also the one account where the church's own most senior, most authoritative witnesses were present in person at the very moment the danger surfaced. Peter and John did not merely confirm that Samaria's own reception was genuine; their presence meant that when the gift's own most obvious corruption presented itself — a man wanting to buy and resell what God gives freely — there was an apostolic answer ready, on the spot, decisive enough that this study's readers still have Peter's own words for it nearly two thousand years later. The urgency this chapter's own §E already named — "they sent unto them Peter and John," with no recorded delay — reads, in light of what happens next, less like caution and more like foresight: this new frontier, crossing a centuries-old religious divide into a region already primed by one wonder-worker's own prior influence over "the people of Samaria," from the least to the greatest, needed exactly the kind of authoritative presence that met Simon before his own corruption could take root in a fledgling Samaritan church with no other apostolic voice yet established to answer it.

I. Closing — What the Rule Was Never Resting On

This chapter opened with two Greek words and a promise to test a pattern against its hardest case rather than assert it and move on. Both have been done, and the closing worth writing is not the one V23 wrote.

V23 closed by declaring the rule held. It cannot quite say that now, and it does not need to. What §C established, counted honestly, is that wherever Acts narrates this gift received and tells us what followed, it tells us they spoke in tongues — three accounts saying so in the same sentence, one silent with its subject later testifying to tongues in his own words, one best read as a refilling of people who

already had the gift, and one, Samaria, compressed at exactly the point a reader wants it full. Nowhere does Acts report the gift received and tongues withheld. That is a real and striking pattern, stated at the weight the text will carry, and it is not a rule with no exceptions.

Samaria tested it, and what Samaria actually yielded was narrower and more interesting than a verdict on the pattern. The delay it displays is reported plainly and is unique in this book; the two explanations §G weighed — Acts 1:8's own named frontier, and a centuries-old hostility that needed the church's most authoritative witnesses standing there in person — account for it together better than either does alone; and §H showed the further thing that apostolic presence proved good for, meeting a danger that had never presented itself before and might have taken root in a fledgling church with no one there to answer it. None of that depended on settling what Acts 8:16 reports, and this study has been careful not to make it depend on that.

But the chapter's real weight is not in the counting, and a reader who has followed it this far should close it holding §D rather than §C. The importance of this manifestation was never resting on whether Luke narrated it five times out of five. It rests on what scripture says the thing itself is: the first act of this administration, God speaking through ordinary people rather than over them, on the first morning they had anything to do it with. Scripture says outright that it builds up the one speaking, that it speaks mysteries to God, that it magnifies Him, that it gives thanks well, that it stands as a sign — and Paul, correcting a church that had made a mess of it, still wrote that he wished it for all of them and thanked God he did it more than any of them. Scripture connects it further to a praying that goes past what a man knows how to ask for, to worship in spirit and in truth, and to a strengthening of the inner man in a place he cannot watch it happening. And on the day itself, its very first recorded use was Peter pointing at it in front of a hostile crowd and calling it proof that the man they had crucified was raised and exalted.

That is what Acts 2:38 held out when it said "ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Not a credential, and not a test of whether a man is saved — this study's own Chapter 10 §H rests the six rights on the new birth and on nothing else. What it is, is the first thing God handed the believer under this administration, and the one thing on the list he can take up at will, this afternoon, without an occasion and without anyone else present.

This study now turns from what the gift makes a believer able to do to what it makes him part of: not an isolated recipient, but a member of a household, three thousand strong by the end of this single day and added to daily — the subject Chapter 7 takes up next.

Weighing it: Summary only — restates §§B–H at the weights assigned to them where they were made.

Chapter 7 — The Household of God (Acts 2:42-47)

A. "They Continued Stedfastly": Four Practices Named Together (Acts 2:42)

Acts 2:42 *And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.*

"Continued stedfastly" translates a single Greek verb, *proskartereo* (Strong's G4342) — built from *pros*, "toward," and a root carrying the sense of steadfast endurance, persistence maintained under its own effort rather than a passing enthusiasm. This study's own readers have already met the word once, three verses before this study's own present reach: Acts 1:14 uses the identical verb of the hundred and twenty themselves, in the days before Pentecost, "all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication" — the same company this study's own Chapter 2 has already identified as the "they" of Acts 2:4, now, after receiving the gift and after Peter's sermon has added three thousand more, still doing what this same verb already named them doing before the gift ever came. This study holds the repetition as significant: whatever changed at Pentecost, this particular practice — sustained, willed continuance — did not begin there and does not end there; it is the same posture carried forward into a suddenly much larger company. The word recurs twice more in this immediate context, worth noting now rather than only when this chapter reaches them directly: v.46 will use it again of the same company "continuing daily... in the temple," and Acts 6:4, just ahead of this study's own present reach, will find the apostles resolving to "give ourselves continually" — the same verb — specifically to prayer and the ministry of the word, once the daily distribution to widows had grown too large for them to manage personally. *Proskartereo* is, on this evidence, Luke's own preferred word for exactly this kind of thing: not one act performed once, but a practice maintained, day after day, by a real and repeated act of the will.

Four things are named as the object of that continuance, joined by three "and"s into a single, connected list rather than four unrelated activities: "the apostles' doctrine," "fellowship," "breaking of bread," and "prayers." This study takes the grouping as deliberate rather than an arbitrary catalogue. The first item, "the apostles' doctrine" (*didache*, teaching), names the source of everything that follows: this new company of three thousand did not invent its own practice from nothing, but continued in what the apostles themselves taught, the same "many other words" this study's own Chapter 5 has already traced as the content undergirding the passive command "save yourselves." The second, third, and fourth items — fellowship, breaking of bread, prayers — this study holds as increasingly concrete expressions of what that doctrine, received and believed, actually produced in a gathered company: a shared life (fellowship, taken up in full in §B below), a shared table (breaking of bread, developed further at v.46 in §E below), and a shared dependence on God expressed together rather than only privately (prayers, plural in the Greek as in the English, naming a practice repeated and gathered rather than a single occasion). This study reads the four together as this chapter's own governing picture: a household, built on apostolic teaching, expressing itself in shared life, shared table, and shared prayer — exactly the practical content this chapter's own remaining sections now take up one at a time.

Weighing it: Direct statement — one verb, used by Luke of the same company before and after Pentecost, names a practice maintained by a real and repeated act of the will.

B. *Koinonia* Run to Its Full Occurrence List: What "Fellowship" Actually Names

This study's own Introduction (§G) has already flagged the distinction this section now develops in full, and promised this chapter would be where it received its full word study. "Fellowship" translates *koinonia* (Strong's G2842), a noun built on *koinonos*, "a sharer, a partner, one who holds something in common with another" — and this study's own working method commits it to running the word out across its complete New Testament occurrence list rather than resting the whole argument on Acts 2:42 alone. *Koinonia* occurs nineteen times in the New Testament — the full list is set out in Appendix C — and the King James translators render it five different ways depending on context: "fellowship" (the most frequent, and this chapter's own word), "communion," "communication," "contribution," and "distribution." Rather than treat these as unrelated translation choices, this study holds them as five faces of one underlying reality — something held, and shared, in common — surfacing differently depending on what is being shared. Three clusters of usage account for all nineteen, and each is worth meeting directly.

One cluster of occurrences uses the word of a shared relationship, vertical and horizontal together, and this cluster supplies this chapter's own clearest theological ground:

1 Corinthians 1:9 — *"God is faithful, by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord."*

1 John 1:3 — *"That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ."*

1 John 1:6-7 — *"If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth: but if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin."*

This study holds 1 John 1:3 and 1:6-7 as decisive for the distinction this chapter exists to draw, because John states plainly, in the same short passage, that fellowship is not automatic or static: it is something that can be claimed falsely ("if we say that we have fellowship... and walk in darkness, we lie"), and something that is actually had only under a specific condition ("if we walk in the light... we have fellowship one with another"). Fellowship, on this evidence, is not a status conferred once and possessed permanently regardless of conduct; it is a condition maintained by walking a certain way, capable of being disrupted by walking a different way, without the underlying relationship itself — sonship, membership in God's own family — being thereby undone. This study takes this as scripture's own clearest statement of the very distinction its Introduction already promised: membership and fellowship are not the same thing, and the difference is not academic.

A second cluster uses the word of a bond between believers expressed concretely, in shared labor or shared danger for a common cause:

Galatians 2:9 — *"And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision."*

Philippians 1:5 — *"For your fellowship in the gospel from the first day until now."*

Philippians 2:1 — *"If there be therefore any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any bowels and mercies."*

Philippians 3:10 — *"That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death."*

A third cluster, the largest single group by count, uses the word specifically of material giving — the concrete, financial expression fellowship took when Gentile churches gave to relieve the poverty of the Jerusalem believers, a pattern this study notes without developing further here, since it belongs more properly to a fuller treatment of Paul's own later ministry than this chapter's own narrower scope:

Romans 15:26 — *"For it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain contribution for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem."*

2 Corinthians 8:4 — *"Praying us with much intreaty that we would receive the gift, and take upon us the fellowship of the ministering to the saints."*

2 Corinthians 9:13 — *"Whiles by the experiment of this ministration they glorify God for your professed subjection unto the gospel of Christ, and for your liberal distribution unto them, and unto all men."*

Two further occurrences round out the list and confirm the word's own flexibility rather than complicating this study's argument: 1 Corinthians 10:16, twice in one verse, names "the communion of the blood of Christ" and "the communion of the body of Christ" at the Lord's own table — this study notes the connection to "breaking of bread," §E below, without collapsing the two texts into one; 2 Corinthians 6:14 warns against an unequal yoke, asking rhetorically "what communion hath light with darkness," the same word now naming a bond that ought not to exist between believer and unbeliever; 2 Corinthians 13:14's benediction closes an epistle with "the communion of the Holy Ghost [holy spirit]"; Philemon 6 prays that "the communication of thy faith may become effectual"; and Hebrews 13:16 instructs, "but to do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased" — the same noun again, naming generosity itself as a kind of *koinonia* enacted. Appendix C sets out all nineteen occurrences in order; across the whole list this study finds no exception to the underlying sense already stated: something held and shared in common, whether that something is a relationship, a labor, a suffering, a meal, or a material gift — never a bare label attached automatically to a status, but always a real, active sharing, named as such because it is actually happening.

Weighing it: Direct statement — **1 John 1:6-7 states the membership/fellowship distinction in so many words.** That fellowship can be falsely claimed and is had only on a condition is what John writes; this is one of the few places in this study where the top label is honestly available. The nineteen occurrences are set out in Appendix C. The three clusters are a **reasonable inference** about how one word is being used across them.

C. Membership Is the Doorway; Fellowship Is the Life Lived Once Inside It

This study's own Introduction has already stated the distinction this section now argues in full, and §B above has now supplied the New Testament's own evidence for it: a person can be a member of a family without being in fellowship, in harmony, with that family's own shared life; but no one can be in fellowship with a household without first being a member of the family that household is. Membership is the doorway; fellowship is what is lived once inside it, and 1 John 1:6-7 has already shown this study that the second can be lost, temporarily disrupted, or falsely claimed, without the first being undone by the same failure.

This study holds Acts 2:38 and 2:41, already traced in full in this study's own Chapter 6, as the moment of membership itself: the gift received (*lambano*, membership in the fullest, most literal sense this study can trace — God's own self, given and taken hold of, the new birth this whole study has followed from promise to first giving to its full pattern across Acts), and the word gladly received (*apodechomai*), followed by baptism, the visible, individual entry point into the number now enrolled. Acts 2:42 describes something that happens only after that entry: not how one becomes a member of this household, already settled in the previous chapter, but what members of it, once inside, are recorded actually doing together. This study reads v.42's four practices — apostolic teaching, fellowship, breaking of bread, prayers — as the earliest, most concrete portrait scripture supplies of fellowship rightly lived: not a feeling or a status, but four specific, repeated, willed activities a household of three thousand new members, plus the hundred and twenty already there, is recorded actually doing, together, every day.

This study also holds this distinction as clarifying rather than complicating a question a careful reader might otherwise raise: if fellowship can be disrupted by walking in darkness, as 1 John 1:6 states plainly, does that mean membership itself is ever in doubt when fellowship falters? This study answers no, on the evidence of 1 John's own passage: the remedy John names for walking in darkness is not re-membership but "if we walk in the light... we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin" (1 John 1:7) — a restoration of the walk, not a repetition of the birth. This study takes the same relationship as standing behind Acts 2:42's own picture: three thousand people, newly members of God's own household by the gift received, are shown here not merely holding that membership passively but actively living the fellowship that membership makes possible — continuing stedfastly, by their own sustained will, in exactly what §A above has already shown *proskartereo* names.

Weighing it: Strong inference — membership is not undone when fellowship falters. That John's remedy is a restored walk rather than a repeated birth is a **strong inference** from 1 John 1:7's own wording; the opposing reading can fairly answer that the passage addresses the question of walking, not of standing, and settles nothing about the latter.

D. "Fear Came Upon Every Soul": Wonders and Signs (Acts 2:43)

■ **Acts 2:43** *And fear came upon every soul: and many wonders and signs were done by the apostles.*

This verse names two things in close sequence, and this study takes them as related rather than coincidental. "Fear" here is not this study's own present-day sense of dread or anxiety, but the ordinary

biblical sense of reverent awe — the appropriate human response to witnessing God's own power made visibly present, the same posture Luke has already recorded, in different words, of the crowd at Pentecost itself, "amazed and marvelled" (Acts 2:7). What produces it, Luke states plainly, is "many wonders and signs... done by the apostles" — and this study notes the phrase's own specificity: not "by believers generally," but "by the apostles," the same twelve men whose own presence this study's Chapter 6 §G-G has already shown mattered specifically, and visibly, at Samaria. This study holds the pattern as consistent rather than isolated: across the early chapters of Acts, signs done through human hands cluster around the apostles' own persons in particular, a pattern this study will note again wherever it recurs, without claiming to have traced the pattern to its own complete New Testament conclusion.

Weighing it: Direct statement on what the verse reports; corroboration only on the pattern. That signs cluster around the apostles in these chapters is an observation this study does not trace to its full New Testament conclusion, and it says so.

E. "Had All Things Common": The Church's Common Life (Acts 2:44-46)

Acts 2:44 *And all that believed were together, and had all things common;*

2:45 *And sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need.*

2:46 *And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart,*

This passage has attracted more outside argument than perhaps any other in this chapter, some of it importing modern political categories scripture itself does not use, and this study means to read it on its own terms rather than through that later lens. "Had all things common" and "parted them to all men, as every man had need" describe a real, voluntary sharing of possessions — this study will not soften the plain force of the text to make it more comfortable for a modern reader accustomed to private property as an unquestioned default. But this study also will not overstate what the text claims, because the same book, only three chapters ahead of this study's own present reach, records Peter himself stating the voluntary, non-compulsory nature of exactly this practice in the plainest possible terms, to a man who had claimed to give everything while secretly withholding part:

Acts 5:4 — *"Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God."*

This study holds Acts 5:4 as decisive for how Acts 2:44-45 itself is meant to be read, because it is the same author, writing of the same early church, only a short time later, and it settles beyond reasonable dispute that the "common" possession this chapter describes was never a mandated redistribution enforced from outside, but a voluntary outpouring of generosity, freely chosen, precisely because Peter can say to Ananias that the property remained his own both before and after the sale — his sin was not withholding what was never required, but lying about having given all of it. What Acts 2:44-46 records, on this study's own reading, is not an economic system imposed on the household of God, but what a household actually did, freely and gladly, in the first flush of a shared new birth: possessions held loosely

rather than tightly, need met as it arose rather than accumulated against, and a common table — "breaking bread from house to house," the same phrase this study's own §A has already flagged as one of v.42's four continuing practices — shared "with gladness and singleness of heart." This study takes the emotional description as no less important than the economic one: this was not grim duty, but joy.

One further point belongs here, because a teaching error has spread through many Christian ministries in the centuries since — that giving is only real giving when it costs the giver everything, "give till it hurts," pressed sometimes as far as urging believers to give from their own household's necessity rather than their surplus. This text does not teach that, and its own grammar says so plainly. "Possessions" (*ktēmata*, Strong's G2933) and "goods" (*hyparxeis*, Strong's G5223) are both plural nouns in the Greek text of v.45, and *ktēma* in particular denotes landed property specifically — real estate, a holding — not money or household items generally; the word's entire New Testament range, four occurrences in all, bears this out directly: the rich young ruler's own "great possessions" he could not bring himself to part with even one of (Matthew 19:22; Mark 10:22, the same plural), the plural possessions sold here at Acts 2:45, and — the clearest single data point of all — Ananias's own transaction at Acts 5:1, where the word appears in the singular: "a possession," one piece of property, sold from what the plural pattern established two verses earlier suggests was a larger holding, not his household's sole means of living, and even then, Peter's own words to him a few verses later make plain, was never required to be sold or given at all (Acts 5:4, already quoted above). What this company gave, on the text's own terms, was drawn from a plurality of holdings — property held in addition to what sustained them, not the whole of it — parted "as every man had need" (v.45), a phrase this study reads as proportionate to a genuine, arising need rather than total, not a general command to strip every giver down to nothing. This study holds this as scripture's own corrective to the later error: God is not shown here compelling any believer to give from their own necessity, but receiving, gladly, what was freely brought out of abundance.

Weighing it: Strong inference — the common life of Acts 2 was voluntary, and the giving came out of holdings rather than out of necessity. Acts 5:4 is a **direct statement** from the same author about the same church and settles the voluntary question. That the plural "possessions" names landed property held in addition to what sustained a household is a **reasonable inference** from the word's four occurrences; Appendix C carries them. The opposing reading can fairly answer that "as every man had need" is a description of the recipients rather than a limit on the givers.

F. The Leavened Wave Loaves and the Household of Three Thousand

This study's own Chapter 2 (§B, in its treatment of the Feast of Pentecost's own background) flagged a detail from the Law and promised this chapter would return to it once the household of three thousand was reached directly. The promise is kept here. Leviticus 23:17 commands two loaves brought as a wave offering at this very feast, and states a detail this study's own Chapter 2 already found worth pausing on:

Leviticus 23:17 — *"Ye shall bring out of your habitations two wave loaves of two tenth deals; they shall be of fine flour; they shall be baked with leaven; they are the firstfruits unto the Lord."*

Leaven is, elsewhere in scripture, consistently a figure for corruption spreading through what it touches — Paul's own later, explicit statement of the pattern, in a passage addressed to a New Testament church

rather than commenting on this Old Testament text directly, states the principle this study holds as scripture's own settled figurative use of the image:

1 Corinthians 5:6-8 — *"Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened... let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."*

Nearly every offering the Law commands "unto the Lord" is explicitly unleavened, and the grain offerings without exception — Passover's own bread chief among them, the same unleavened bread Paul draws on directly, in the very passage just quoted above, to name Christ himself "our passover... sacrificed for us," spotless as that bread itself pictured spotlessness. Pentecost's own two wave loaves are the Law's sole, deliberate exception: leavened bread, brought as firstfruits, offered to God and accepted by him, on this one feast alone. This study holds the typology, already suggested in Chapter 2 and now developed in full, as difficult to read as anything other than deliberate: on the very day this study has already shown, in Chapter 6, that the gift was first given to a company of ordinary, imperfect men and women — a company this chapter has just shown holding all things common not out of sinless perfection but out of gladness and singleness of heart, real people with real remaining flaws, as Acts 5's own very next chapter will go on to demonstrate all too plainly in Ananias and Sapphira — God accepts, as firstfruits, an offering that is not spotless in the way Passover's unleavened bread pictured Christ himself to be spotless. The household of three thousand this chapter has now described in full is the leaven still present in the loaf; the loaf, leaven and all, is nonetheless named "firstfruits unto the Lord," accepted, not rejected, for the harvest it represents. This study holds this reading as its own reasoned inference from the typology rather than a claim the New Testament states outright by direct application of Leviticus 23:17 to the church — scripture nowhere says in so many words "the two wave loaves are the church" — but the convergence of a leavened offering, uniquely commanded for this one feast, arriving on the very day and at the very moment this study has just spent two chapters describing God receiving a real, flawed, ordinary company as his own firstfruits, is not, this study holds, a coincidence worth passing over in silence.

Weighing it: Corroboration only — the leavened wave loaves fit this study's picture of a real, flawed firstfruits company, and they would fit other readings about as well. The Law commands them and calls them firstfruits: **direct**. That they picture the church is a **reasonable inference** at best, and the section says outright that scripture nowhere applies Leviticus 23:17 to the church. The thanksgiving loaves of Leviticus 7:13 are a second leavened offering, so the uniqueness of the Pentecost loaves is narrower than a bare reading suggests.

G. Leadership Beyond This Chapter: A Question for a Study of Its Own

This study's own Chapter 1 (§G, in its treatment of Matthias chosen by lot) flagged a question: later appointments in Acts — the seven chosen in Acts 6:1-6, elders appointed in Acts 14:23 — proceed by a different method than the casting of lots this study's own Chapter 1 already traced in full. Having now reached Chapter 7, this study states plainly why that different process is not characterized here: Acts 2:42-47, this chapter's own full textual scope, ends before Acts 6 begins. The seven of Acts 6:1-6 are

chosen in response to a problem — the daily distribution to widows growing too large for the apostles to manage personally, itself an extension of exactly the common-life practice this chapter's own §E has just described — that has not yet arisen within the narrow span of verses this chapter treats. More than a matter of textual reach alone, though, this study holds that the question of how the early church settled on its own methods of appointing leaders is not this study's own question to answer: it belongs to a study of its own, tracing Acts 6:1-6, Acts 14:23, and whatever else scripture supplies on the subject, directly and at the length the subject deserves — a different undertaking from this study's own, which is Pentecost, the gift received that day, and the administration that gift belongs to. This study names the question honestly, as it has named every open question along the way, and sets it aside here rather than carrying it forward as an unfinished promise of its own.

Weighing it: Method, not argument — bears no weight either way.

H. Closing — "The Lord Added to the Church Daily" (Acts 2:47)

Acts 2:47 *Praising God, and having favour with all the people. And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved.*

This chapter closes where it began, on the same note of continuance §A opened with, now stated as an outcome rather than a practice: a household that prayed together, ate together, held possessions loosely together, and was, as a direct and stated result, held in favor by the wider public rather than resented or feared by it — "having favour with all the people," the same phrase this study's own Introduction (§G) already quoted in brief and now sees in its own full context. And the growth this study's own Chapter 6 already measured at three thousand in a single day did not stop there: "the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved" — a continuing work, day by day, the same verb tense this study has already learned to notice carrying real weight, here naming not a single, closed event but an ongoing one, still underway as this chapter's own narrative closes. This study takes the whole chapter's own picture — teaching, fellowship, table, prayer, signs, generosity, daily growth — as scripture's own answer to a question this study has not yet asked directly but has been building toward since its own Introduction: what does the gift received at Acts 2:38 actually produce, once received, in the company that receives it? This chapter's own answer is a household, not merely a roster — a life lived together, not only a status held individually. This study now turns from what the earliest church did with what it had received to the fuller substance of what it had already been told, before this book even opened, in "the many other words" this study's own Chapters 8 and 9 take up next.

Weighing it: Summary only — restates what the sections above established, at the weights assigned to them there.

Chapter 8 — The Many Other Words, Part One: What Jesus Taught About the Kingdom and the Spirit to Come

A. Opening — Chasing the Question Back Through the Ministry

This study's own Introduction (§B) has already stated the first of its two central questions: what did the apostles actually know, before Acts 2 opens, that let them meet Pentecost prepared rather than ambushed by it? This study's own Chapter 1 §A has already shown that question does not begin cold at Acts 1:1 — Luke himself frames the forty days as Jesus "speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God," language that reaches back, by its own content, into a ministry already three years underway before the resurrection ever happened. This chapter and the one following it take up that reach in full: not what Jesus said during the forty days alone, already flagged for this study's own Chapter 9, but what he had already told the Twelve before the cross, months and sometimes years earlier, about two things this study's own two central questions both depend on — the church he intended to build, and the Spirit he intended to send it. This study takes each in turn, in the order the Gospels themselves record them, holding to its own stated method throughout: every relevant text run out in full, not gestured at, and this study's own conclusions stated as its own reasoned position wherever the text itself leaves room for more than one reading.

Weighing it: Narrative — carries no weight on any of this study's contested claims.

B. "Thou Art the Christ": The Confession, and What It Reveals (Matthew 16:13-17)

Matthew 16:15-17 — *"He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven."*

Jesus's own question at Caesarea Philippi — first what the crowds were saying, then, directly, "whom say ye that I am" — draws from Peter an answer this study holds as the single clearest confession of Christ's own identity the Gospels record from any of the Twelve before the resurrection: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Jesus's own response names the source of that confession before naming anything else: "flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." This study holds this detail as load-bearing for what follows, because the next verse builds directly on it rather than beginning a new thought: whatever Jesus says next about "this rock," he has just finished stating, in the same breath, that Peter's own confession was not Peter's own achievement but a direct disclosure from the Father. This study carries that detail forward into §C, where it becomes the deciding evidence for a question this passage has divided readers over for centuries.

Weighing it: Direct statement — Jesus names the source of Peter's confession before saying anything about a rock.

C. "Upon This Rock I Will Build My Church": The Confession, Not the Man

Matthew 16:18 — *"And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."*

This verse turns on a single Greek wordplay this study will not pass over without naming precisely, because the whole question of what "this rock" refers to depends on it. "Peter" translates *Petros* (Strong's G4074), a masculine noun meaning a stone, or a single detached piece of rock; "rock" translates *petra* (Strong's G4073), a feminine noun meaning bedrock, a rock mass or ledge — the kind of foundation a building is set upon, not a stone that could itself be picked up and thrown. Jesus does not use the same word twice; he uses two different words, related in sound and root but distinct in gender and sense, and this study holds that distinction as almost certainly deliberate rather than incidental, made unmistakable in the underlying Greek even where an English translation, of necessity, renders both as "rock."

Three readings of "this rock" have each found serious defenders across the church's own history, and this study states all three fairly before settling on its own position. The first holds that Jesus is naming Peter himself as the foundation — a reading this study notes carries real difficulty precisely because of the *Petros/petra* distinction just traced: if Jesus meant Peter as the foundation stone, the more natural word was ready to hand and he did not use it, choosing instead a word grammatically distanced from Peter's own name by gender alone. The second holds that "this rock" names Christ himself, pointing away from Peter and toward Jesus's own person — a reading with real scriptural support elsewhere, since Paul will later write plainly of Israel in the wilderness that "they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ" (1 Corinthians 10:4), and Peter himself, writing decades after this scene, will describe Christ as "a chief corner stone, elect, precious" (1 Peter 2:6) — but this study holds this reading, too, as sitting awkwardly against the verse's own immediate grammar, since "this rock" (*tautē tē petra*, feminine demonstrative agreeing with the feminine noun) points most naturally at something just named in the sentence immediately preceding it, and the thing just named is not Christ but Peter's own confession of him. The third reading, and the one this study holds as best fitting both the grammar and the immediate context together, takes "this rock" as the confession itself — "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," and specifically the fact §B above has already flagged, that this confession did not originate with Peter's own flesh and blood but was revealed to him directly by the Father. On this reading, Jesus is not building his church on a man, however honored, nor merely restating in different words that he will build it on himself, but on the specific, Father-given revelation of who he actually is — the truth just confessed, rather than either the confessor or, redundantly, the one confessed. This study holds this reading as the one that lets *Petros* and *petra* remain the two different words Jesus actually chose, without needing either to override the other: Peter (*Petros*, a stone) is honored by name for having spoken it, but the church is built on *petra* — the revealed confession itself, bedrock in a sense no single stone, however honored, could be.

What this verse promises is stated in the future tense scripture's own readers should not pass by too quickly: "I will build my church" — not a present reality already existing at the moment Jesus speaks, but a future undertaking, not yet begun. This study holds this detail as directly, rather than only loosely, connected to this study's own immediately preceding chapter: the church this verse promises to build is the very household this study's own Chapter 7 has just described coming into being, in real, narrated detail, for the first time — "the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved" (Acts 2:47), already quoted at that chapter's own close. Matthew 16:18 is promise; Acts 2:47 is the promise's own first recorded fulfillment. And the second half of the verse states something about that future church's own security, worth naming here even though its fullest development belongs to a different study: "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" — a defensive image, gates being what a besieged city holds against an attacker rather than what an attacker wields, this study holds it worth noting in passing, meaning the church is pictured here as itself advancing against death's own stronghold, not merely defending its own walls against one.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — claim R: "this rock" names the confession rather than Peter or Christ. That two different Greek words are used, differing in gender and sense, is a **direct statement**. That the feminine demonstrative points to the confession just made is the **more natural reading** of the immediate context, and this section states all three readings fairly before settling. The opposing readings answer, respectively, that Aramaic would not have preserved the distinction, and that 1 Corinthians 10:4 names Christ the Rock elsewhere. Both answers are real. The "gates of hell" observation — that gates are defensive, so the church is pictured advancing — is **corroboration only**: it is widely repeated, the ordinary sense of "prevail against" runs the other way, and this study does not lean on it.

D. "The Keys of the Kingdom": Binding and Loosing First Given (Matthew 16:19)

Matthew 16:19 — *"And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."*

Immediately after naming the church he will build, Jesus gives Peter, specifically and by name, "the keys of the kingdom of heaven" — an image of stewardship and authorized access, the kind of authority a household's own steward exercises over who may enter and what may be opened, rather than ownership itself. What that stewardship consists of, Jesus states in the same breath: authority to "bind" and to "loose," and this study holds the Greek grammar behind these two clauses as carrying more precision than the English "shall be" alone preserves. The verbs translated "shall be bound" and "shall be loosed" are periphrastic future perfect passive constructions in the Greek — a more literal rendering, followed by a number of careful readers of this text, runs "shall have already been bound" and "shall have already been loosed," rather than a simple future ("shall become bound as a result of your binding"). This study holds the distinction as substantial rather than a fine grammatical point without consequence: on the more literal, future-perfect reading, Peter's own binding and loosing on earth does not itself create heaven's own verdict, as though heaven were obligated to ratify whatever Peter first decided; it recognizes and declares, on earth, a verdict heaven has already reached. The authority given

is real and significant — a true stewardship, keys genuinely handed over — but its own direction runs from heaven's prior decision to earth's own faithful declaration of it, not the reverse. This study holds this reading as consistent with, rather than in any tension with, everything this study has already found scripture saying about God's own sovereign initiative standing behind every gift this study has traced: the gift of holy spirit given, not earned (Chapter 4 §E); the passive command "be ye saved," met only by content supplied from outside the hearer (Chapter 5 §D); and now, here, an authority to bind and loose that declares heaven's own prior judgment rather than manufacturing a new one on earth's own initiative.

This verse's own phrase, "the kingdom of heaven," is worth pausing on before this study moves further, because scripture uses several distinct kingdom phrases across its own pages, and a reader who has not had them set side by side can easily read them as interchangeable when they are not identical in scope. "Kingdom of heaven" occurs only in Matthew's own Gospel, and nowhere else in the New Testament — this study holds the phrase as Matthew's own preferred wording for the same reality the other Gospel writers name "kingdom of God," the two functioning as synonyms rather than two different kingdoms, a reading confirmed directly by Matthew's own parallel accounts: where Matthew 19:23 has Jesus say "a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven," Mark 10:23 and Luke 18:24 record the identical saying as "the kingdom of God." "Kingdom of God" itself, used throughout Mark, Luke, John, Acts (including this study's own Chapter 1 §A, Acts 1:3), and the epistles, names God's own sovereign rule considered most broadly — the same rule this study's own Chapter 10 §B will trace across all seven of scripture's own administrations, present in some form in every one of them rather than confined to any single administration. Two further phrases, each narrower than either of the above, belong alongside them for a reader going forward in this study: "the kingdom of his dear Son" (Colossians 1:13), naming specifically the sphere believers are already translated into at the new birth, this present administration's own share of God's larger kingdom rather than a future or separate kingdom; and "his everlasting kingdom" (2 Peter 1:11), naming the final, unending form that same rule takes once every administration this study has traced has run its own course. This study holds all four phrases as naming one reality from four different angles — present sovereignty (kingdom of God/heaven), the believer's own present standing within it (kingdom of his dear Son), and its own final, permanent form (the everlasting kingdom) — rather than four separate kingdoms competing for the reader's attention, a distinction worth carrying forward into this study's own later chapters, particularly Chapter 10's own full treatment of the administration a believer today actually stands inside.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — binding and loosing declares heaven's prior verdict rather than creating it. The periphrastic future perfect is a **direct statement** about the Greek construction; Appendix D sets it out. That the construction carries this sense here is a **reasonable inference**, and the opposing reading can fairly answer that a periphrastic future perfect need not be pressed for a sequence of decisions. The kingdom-phrase survey is a **direct statement** about where each phrase occurs.

E. Binding and Loosing Extended to the Whole Company (Matthew 18:15-20)

Matthew 18:15-18 — *"Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."*

This study holds it worth pausing on a detail easy to read past: the same authority Matthew 16:19 gave to Peter alone, by name and in the singular ("thou shalt bind," "thou shalt loose"), Matthew 18:18 now states again, in identical grammatical form — the same periphrastic future-perfect construction §D has already traced — but addressed this time to a plural "ye," the wider company of disciples gathered around a specific process of correction within the church Matthew 16:18 had promised and this study's own Chapter 7 has now shown actually beginning to exist. This study takes the shift from singular to plural as significant precisely because Matthew does not soften or qualify the authority in extending it: what Peter alone was given in Matthew 16 becomes, three chapters later, in this same Gospel, something "two or three" gathered "in my name" (v.20, quoted immediately after v.18-19) hold together, still declaring what heaven has already determined rather than manufacturing a new verdict of their own. Whatever Matthew 16:19 gave Peter, on this study's own reading, was never intended as a privilege confined to his own single person; Matthew's own next chapter on this subject already shows it extended to the gathered church itself, exercised specifically in a process of correction aimed at restoration ("thou hast gained thy brother," v.15) rather than mere exclusion.

Weighing it: Direct statement — the same authority is restated in the plural three chapters later, in the same Gospel and the same construction.

F. Binding and Loosing Confirmed at the Resurrection: What John 20:23 Adds

This study's own Chapter 2 §A has already treated John 20:22's "Receive ye the Holy Ghost [holy spirit]" at length, and reserved that verse's own fullest and most careful treatment — weighed against every other resurrection-appearance account together — for this study's own Chapter 9, exactly as flagged there. This chapter does not repeat that treatment; it takes up instead the clause immediately following it, which Chapter 2 quoted but did not yet develop:

John 20:23 — *"Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever ye retain, they are retained."*

This study holds this verse as the resurrection's own direct confirmation of exactly the authority Matthew 16:19 and Matthew 18:18 have already given the Twelve and the wider company: to "remit" (*aphiemi*, the same verb family this study's own Chapter 4 §D has already traced behind "remission" of sins at Acts 2:38) or to "retain" sins is binding and loosing under a different figure — releasing a man

from the weight of a specific charge, or leaving that weight in place — spoken now not on a hillside months before the cross but by the risen Christ himself, on the very evening of the resurrection, to the same company Matthew 18:18 had already addressed in the plural. This study will not overstate what this verse claims: it does not say the apostles' own word creates forgiveness independent of God's own prior verdict any more than Matthew 16:19's own periphrastic construction did; §D above has already argued the more precise sense runs the other way. What this verse adds is timing and confirmation — Jesus repeating, now after the resurrection, with his own authority freshly vindicated by having risen, the same declarative authority he had already promised the church before he died. This study holds the repetition, at three separate points across the Gospels' own record — Matthew 16:19, Matthew 18:18, and now John 20:23 — as scripture's own way of establishing a matter "in the mouth of two or three witnesses" (Matthew 18:16's own phrase, applied here to the promise's own textual attestation rather than to a single disputed fact): this was not a passing remark made once and never repeated, but a settled, restated commission, given to the Twelve well before Pentecost and reaffirmed to them again on the very day of the resurrection itself.

Weighing it: Strong inference — John 20:23 confirms the same declarative authority after the resurrection. That the verb belongs to the same family as "remission" at Acts 2:38 is **direct**. That remitting and retaining is binding and loosing under another figure is a **strong inference**; the opposing reading can fairly answer that the two figures need not be identical.

G. "Another Comforter": Building on What Chapter 2 Already Previewed

This study's own Chapter 2 §A has already quoted, in full, John 14:16-18, 14:25-26, 15:26, and 16:7-15 — the same Upper Room Discourse this chapter now returns to — and stated plainly, at that point, why: "the specific promises that explain why the company gathered on the day of Pentecost was ready for what came, rather than ambushed by it," offered there only "in enough depth to serve Chapter 2's own purpose," with this study's own Chapters 8-9 named, explicitly, as where "that whole body of teaching" would receive "its full, dedicated treatment." This study honors that distinction here rather than repeating Chapter 2's own quotations at the same length a second time: what follows takes up what Chapter 2 could only preview, adds the material Chapter 2 had no occasion to include at all, and pushes each already-introduced point further than a preview, by its own nature, was able to go. This chapter also carries forward, without repeating, the grammatical note Chapter 2 §A first flagged about this discourse's own pronouns — that "he" here agrees with the masculine title "Comforter," not with a separate personal being distinct from the Father; Appendix B remains the place that note is developed in full.

One saying belongs in that fuller treatment that Chapter 2 did not quote at all, spoken by Jesus in this same discourse just before the Comforter is first named:

John 14:12 — *"Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father."*

This study holds this verse as belonging with the Comforter sayings rather than standing apart from them, because its own closing clause supplies the promise's own hinge: "greater works than these shall

he do; because I go unto my Father" — the same trade John 16:7 will state again more directly (Jesus's own departure as the condition of something greater, not a diminishment), named here first, before the Comforter himself has even been introduced by name. "Greater works" does not mean, on this study's own reading, works of a more spectacular kind than Jesus's own miracles — the Gospels record no act by any apostle exceeding a walked-on sea or a raised Lazarus in sheer wondrousness — but works of a greater *reach*: a ministry no longer confined, as Jesus's own bodily ministry necessarily was, to one man walking one land during one lifetime, but now carried by many, empowered by an indwelling gift rather than a visiting teacher, extending in the single day this study's own Chapter 6 has already measured to three thousand souls at once — a scale of "greater works" this study holds Jesus's own earthly ministry, constrained as it necessarily was to a single body in a single place, could not itself have matched in that same compressed span of time. This study takes Acts 2:41's own three thousand as this verse's own first, immediate down payment.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — "greater works" names greater reach rather than a greater kind of work. The clause "because I go unto my Father" supports it and is **direct**. The opposing reading can fairly answer that "greater" most naturally modifies the works themselves, and this study's three-thousand-in-a-day reading is offered as the more natural one rather than the only one.

H. "He Shall Testify of Me": What Chapter 2 Left for This Chapter to Draw Out

Chapter 2 §A quoted John 15:26 in passing, on its way to the fuller discourse of John 16; this study now returns to it for a connection Chapter 2 had no occasion to make, because the connection depends on material — Peter's own sermon at Pentecost — this study had not yet reached when Chapter 2 was written. The verse names two witnesses in the same breath:

John 15:26-27 — *"But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me: and ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning."*

This study holds this short passage as a direct, verbal anticipation of exactly the pattern this study's own Chapter 5 §A has already traced in Peter's own sermon: "did testify (*diamartyromai*) and exhort," Luke's own word for the solemn, weighted proclamation this study found running through Acts at four separate points. Jesus names two witnesses to the same testimony here, months before either witness testifies: the Spirit himself, who "shall testify of me," and the disciples, who "shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning" — a double testimony, from the Spirit and from eyewitnesses together, this study holds as already present here in promise and fully realized the moment Peter stands up in Acts 2, freshly filled with the very Spirit this verse names, testifying of the very Christ this verse names, as a man who had himself been present "from the beginning" of that same ministry. This study also notes, as new ground Chapter 2 did not cover, the same *parakletos* root already met twice in this study's own tracing of it — once in Chapter 2 §A's own quotation of John 14:16, and once in Chapter 5 §A's own word study on *parakaleo* — confirming, from a third occurrence, that the "calling alongside" this root names is bound up, wherever it recurs, with testimony given on another's behalf rather than a private comfort held for oneself alone.

Weighing it: Direct statement — two witnesses to one testimony are named together at John 15:26-27, months before either testified. The connection to *diamartyromai* at Acts 2:40 is **corroboration only**; different words are involved.

I. "He Shall Not Speak of Himself": What Chapter 2 Quoted but Did Not Yet Develop

Chapter 2 §A quoted John 16:7-15 in full and flagged one detail from it — verse 13's "he will shew you things to come" — for this study's own later chapters to return to, exactly as this section now does; a second detail in the same two verses, Chapter 2 did not develop at all, and this study takes it up here:

John 16:13-14 — *"Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you."*

"He shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak" states a pattern of derived, rather than independent, authority — the Spirit shown here speaking only what he has himself received, not originating a separate or competing message of his own (this "he," like every pronoun in this discourse, grammatically names the Comforter, not a third person distinct from the Father — Appendix B traces the point in full). This study holds the pattern as directly parallel to something this chapter has already established on entirely separate grounds: §D above has already traced Matthew 16:19's own periphrastic future-perfect construction to argue that the apostles' own binding and loosing declares a verdict heaven has already reached, rather than manufacturing a new one on earth's own initiative. John 16:13 states the same structure of derived authority a second time, now of the Spirit's own speech rather than the apostles' own binding: what is spoken, said, or declared — whether by the Spirit himself or, on this study's own reading, by the men he indwells and speaks through — answers to a prior reality rather than creating one. This study holds the two texts, reached independently in this same chapter, as mutually confirming rather than coincidental: this whole chapter's own two bodies of teaching — church authority and Spirit-given testimony — share the identical underlying shape, an authority that answers to heaven's own prior word rather than one that originates its own.

Verse 13's own further detail, "he will shew you things to come," already flagged once by this study's own Chapter 2 §A and now given its fuller context: this study holds it, alongside John 14:12's "greater works" already traced in §G above, as part of the same larger promise — not merely a Comforter who explains and reminds, but one who actively extends the disciples' own capacity beyond what Jesus's own bodily ministry, by its own necessary limits, could reach. And closing the passage, "he shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you" — the Spirit's own work named, in its own final summary, as pointing away from himself and toward Christ, exactly the pattern this study has already found, in different words, in John 15:26's "he shall testify of me," §H above.

Weighing it: Direct statement — John 16:13 says three times that its subject originates nothing and speaks only what it receives. That this fits a gift conveying its Giver's content better than a co-equal person is a **reasonable inference** belonging to claim H; the opposing reading fairly answers that the Son

says the same of Himself at John 12:49 and is a person. Appendix B carries the fuller case, including the concession that John 16:13's own pronoun runs the other way.

J. Closing — The Doctrinal Seed of Everything Peter Says

This chapter has traced two connected bodies of pre-cross teaching, and closes by naming what both together supply. Matthew 16:18-19, Matthew 18:18, and John 20:23 together promise and then twice confirm a church not yet built, given real authority to bind and loose under a heaven that had already decided before either promise or confirmation were ever spoken. John 14 through 16 promise a Comforter not yet sent, who would teach, remind, testify, reprove, guide, and foretell — work this study has now shown named and specified, point by point, months before a single word of it was fulfilled. This study takes both bodies of teaching together as the direct, verifiable answer to this study's own first central question, restated now with this chapter's own evidence behind it: Peter did not stand up in Acts 2 improvising a new theology on the spot. Every major element of what he does that morning — proclaiming a church now actually being built (this study's own Chapter 7), testifying with the Spirit's own help of the Christ he had been with "from the beginning," offering a remission of sins resting on an authority to bind and loose already twice promised and once confirmed — had already been told him, in some form, before the cross. A reader who has followed this study from its own Introduction may want the two bodies of teaching just traced named plainly, together, as a partial answer to the question this whole study has carried since Acts 2:40 first raised it — what, in substance, were the "many other words" behind Peter's own compressed sermon? This chapter's own answer, so far as the pre-cross ministry alone can supply it, is this: a specific promise of a church, not yet built, resting on the Father-given confession of who Christ is rather than on any single man, and given real, twice-confirmed authority to bind and loose; and a specific promise of a Comforter, not yet sent, who would teach, remind, testify, reprove, guide, and foretell, on Christ's own authority rather than any authority of his own. Both were spoken, in some form, well before the cross — doctrine already seeded, not doctrine improvised the morning it was needed. This study's own next chapter completes the answer with what Christ added afterward, across the forty days themselves.

This study's own Chapter 9 now turns to the second half of this same question: not what Jesus had already taught before he died, but what he added, across the forty days themselves, once he had risen.

Weighing it: Summary only — restates what the sections above established, at the weights assigned to them there.

Chapter 9 — The Many Other Words, Part Two: The Great Commission and the Promise of the Father

A. Opening — The Forty Days Themselves

This study's own Chapter 8 has traced what Jesus told the Twelve before the cross; this chapter turns to what he added afterward, across the forty days this study's own Chapter 1 §A has already named from

Acts 1:3 — "being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." Four separate resurrection-appearance accounts survive in the New Testament's own record, each written by a different hand, each preserving different details, and this study takes each in turn before weighing them together, holding to its own stated method: no account is allowed to silently supply what another account does not itself say, and no single account is treated as the complete transcript of everything said across forty days by four different Gospel writers choosing, each for his own reasons, what to preserve.

Why forty days, positioned exactly here, is itself a question worth asking directly rather than passing over as an incidental detail of chronology. This study's own Chapter 3 §D has already established what happened immediately before this interval began: the same nation Peter addresses that morning had, through its own leaders and by its own hand, delivered Jesus to be crucified — "ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain" (Acts 2:23) — a national rejection this study does not soften, and one the apostles themselves name again, gathered in prayer, naming names:

Acts 4:27 — *"For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together."*

That rejection is the very reason the forty days had to do the specific work they did. Israel had judged Jesus, publicly and finally, to be no king and no Messiah — worthy of a criminal's death, not a throne. Everything the forty days accomplish answers that verdict directly, point for point. First, they supply proof: "shewing himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs" (Acts 1:3, this study's own Chapter 1 §A) — the crucified man standing, walking, eating, speaking, seen not once but repeatedly, by individuals and by "above five hundred brethren at once" (1 Corinthians 15:6). A verdict of death answered by a body that would not stay dead is itself the first and plainest reply to the nation's own rejection of him. Second, once that proof stood established, the forty days supply commission: the specific charge, baptismal formula, and promise this chapter goes on to trace — because a rejected and crucified man's commission would carry no authority at all unless his resurrection had already been shown, to the same men who would carry that commission forward, "by many infallible proofs." The proof had to come first; the sending could only follow it.

Scripture is equally direct that none of this was any late adjustment to an unforeseen turn of events. The same verse this study has already quoted at length, Acts 2:23, states it plainly: Jesus was "delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God" — a purpose fixed beforehand — and Peter names the same foreordination again in his very next sermon, of the same men who killed Christ acting in ignorance of a plan already written:

Acts 3:18 — *"But those things, which God before had shewed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled."*

The forty days, read this way, are the appointed sequel to a suffering, death, and resurrection already declared beforehand by "all his prophets" and now fulfilled to the letter — proof given to a nation that had rejected its own king, followed by a commission whose scope, as this chapter will show, reaches Israel and then a great deal further still. Israel's own national rejection of Jesus as Messiah and King is real, and this study does not minimize it; what follows it, on scripture's own terms, is fulfillment — the

same "determinate counsel" already at work in the cross now at work again in what the cross made necessary to establish before Pentecost could open.

Weighing it: Strong inference — the forty days answer Israel's own verdict in two parts, proof and then commission. That Israel rejected Jesus and that God's purpose was fixed beforehand are both **direct statements** (Acts 2:23; 3:18; 4:27). That the forty days are ordered proof-then-commission is a **strong inference** from their content; the opposing reading can fairly answer that scripture nowhere states the reason for the interval's length.

B. "Opened He Their Understanding": Luke's Own Commissioning Scene (Luke 24:44-49)

Luke 24:45-49 — *"Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures, And said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved 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 of these things. And, behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high."*

This study holds v.45 as directly answering a question this study has carried since its own Introduction: how did men without formal training handle scripture with the precision this study has already found in Peter's own sermon? Luke states the mechanism plainly, in a single clause easy to read past too quickly — "then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures." Not a new set of facts handed over, but a capacity given: understanding itself, opened, so that scriptures these men had heard read aloud their whole lives could now be read rightly, their own true weight and reference finally visible. This study holds this verse as standing behind, rather than separate from, John 14:26's own promise of a Spirit who would "bring all things to your remembrance" — already treated in this study's own Chapter 2 §A — the two promises this study holds as complementary rather than duplicate: John 14:26 addresses what Jesus himself had already said; Luke 24:45 addresses scripture that had already been written centuries before, by other hands entirely. Both, on this study's own reading, converge on the same demonstrated result: Peter's own use of Psalm 16 and Psalm 110 (this study's own Chapter 3 §§E, G) and Joel 2 (Chapter 3 §C) at Pentecost.

Verse 47 states the content of what was preached "in his name" with a phrase this study holds as directly, rather than loosely, anticipating Peter's own words at Pentecost: "repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." This study's own Chapter 4 §§B, D has already traced Peter's own call to "repent" and his own promise of "remission of sins" at Acts 2:38 in full; this verse supplies both words, in this same combination, spoken by Jesus himself before either was preached, and even names the geography correctly — "beginning at Jerusalem," exactly where Acts 2 opens. This study holds it difficult to imagine a more direct, verse-level confirmation that Peter's own sermon was not improvised content but a specific, previously issued commission being carried out to the letter.

Verse 49 closes with the same promise this study's own Chapter 1 §B has already traced from Acts 1:4-5, 8, now given a third distinct wording: "I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." This study holds "endued with power" as belonging to the same *dunamis* word family this study's own Chapter 1 §B has already distinguished from *exousia*, and notes that Luke's own two volumes — this Gospel and Acts both — use the identical instruction to "tarry" in the identical city, a consistency this study takes as further confirmation that Luke, writing both books, understood himself to be recording one continuous, coherent instruction rather than loosely related traditions.

Weighing it: Direct statement — Luke 24:45-49 supplies the mechanism, the content and the geography of what Peter later preaches. "Repentance and remission of sins... beginning at Jerusalem" is as close to a verse-level anticipation of Acts 2:38 as scripture offers.

C. "All Power Is Given Unto Me": The Great Commission in Matthew (Matthew 28:16-20)

Matthew 28:18-20 — *"And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen."*

This scene, set on "a mountain where Jesus had appointed them" in Galilee (v.16) rather than in Jerusalem, this study holds as chronologically distinct from Luke's own Jerusalem-set commissioning in §B above — not a second report of the same conversation, but a separate meeting during the same forty days, in a different place, adding different content. "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth" states an authority this study holds as directly underwriting everything Matthew's own account goes on to command: not a request but a commission backed by comprehensive, stated authority, "in heaven and in earth" — the same two spheres this study's own Chapter 8 §D has already found bound together in Matthew 16:19's own binding-and-loosing language, now named together explicitly as fully Christ's own.

"Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" states a formula that has, at various times, been taught as a later addition to Matthew's own text — not scripture as originally given, but a formula supplied afterward to manufacture proof for a doctrine argued out centuries after the apostles. This study checked that claim directly rather than repeating it untested, and the manuscript record does not support it. Every surviving Greek manuscript of Matthew 28 carries this clause, without exception; the formula is already fixed in Christian practice within reach of the apostolic generation, more than a century before the council it is supposed to have been invented for; and the one piece of evidence usually offered against it turns out to be a citation habit rather than a different underlying text. Appendix F sets the evidence out in full. This study will not repeat a claim the evidence does not support: this text was not forged.

What actually resolves the appearance of tension with Acts 2:38 is not a defect in the text but a defect in how it has usually been carried into English. Andrews Norton — a standing corroborating source for

this library's own *One God, One Mediator, the Man Christ Jesus* — treats this verse directly (*A Statement of Reasons for Not Believing the Doctrines of Trinitarians*, 1856, pp. 216-219). Norton observes, first, that "name" in this construction is a redundant Hebraistic idiom, carried over from the same Greek in which the Old Testament's own translation and the New Testament are written, adding nothing to the sense in the original and only manufacturing the sound of an invocation formula when rendered word-for-word into English. Second, he observes that the Greek preposition rendered "in" (*eis*) is better rendered "to": the verse commands "baptizing them to the Father, and to the Son, and to the holy spirit" — dedicating converts to the Father's own worship, to the Son's own teaching, and to the Spirit's own blessing, not reciting three divine names over them as though the rite itself invoked three separate persons. Scripture uses this very construction with no hint of deity or personhood: Israel was **"baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea" (1 Corinthians 10:2)**, and Paul can commend his hearers **"to God, and to the word of his grace" (Acts 20:32)** in a single breath without making the word a person, or making it equal to God. Naming the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost together in one clause does not, by itself, make them three co-equal persons. Read this way, nothing here was ever actually in tension with Acts 2:38. This study's own position, argued in Appendix A, is that wherever Acts reports a baptism in a name at all, the name is Jesus Christ's — "in the name of Jesus Christ," "in the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 2:38; 8:16; 10:48; 19:5) — and never once a recitation of "Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." Other baptisms Acts records carry no such phrase and are read, in Appendix A and in this study's own Chapter 4 §C, as ordinary water baptisms. Matthew 28:19 states the commission's own scope and object; Acts records how the apostles themselves actually carried it out; the two were never contradictory once the idiom is read correctly.

This study holds the point worth stating plainly rather than leaving implicit, because a reader could otherwise come away from this single verse with an impression this study, and this library's own completed *One God, One Mediator, the Man Christ Jesus*, both stand directly against: scripture does not have believers invoking three separate names, or three separate persons, over any convert in any baptism it actually records, and it does not have believers praying to three separate names either — "whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do" (John 14:13), Jesus's own repeated instruction, names one name, his own, as the sole standing authority through which prayer is made, exactly as "there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (1 Timothy 2:5) names one mediator, not three. This study prays in the name of Jesus Christ, understands baptism as being in the name of Jesus Christ, and finds this verse, correctly read, in full agreement with both — not the anomaly it can appear to be at first glance, and not, on the evidence actually available, a text scripture's own transmission ever corrupted. Nor does this study commend the threefold wording as a formula to be recited over a convert. It quotes Matthew 28:19 for the commission's authority and reach, and reads its baptismal clause as a dedication, not a liturgy. What this study does hold as settled here, alongside the above, is the commission's own scope: "teach all nations," a reach already anticipated by Peter's own "to all that are afar off" (Acts 2:39, this study's own Chapter 4 §F), and a reach this study's own Chapter 10 will need to weigh directly against the Grace Administration's own unique extension past Israel entirely.

Weighing it: Direct statement on the manuscripts, reasonable inference on the translation, strong inference against reading the verse as three co-equal persons. That every surviving Greek manuscript of Matthew 28 carries the triune clause, and that the *Didache* and Justin Martyr attest the formula well over a century before Nicea, are **direct statements** of the evidence; Appendix F carries the detail. That Norton's rendering of the preposition resolves the appearance of tension with Acts 2:38 is a **reasonable inference** — a real minority reading, not a consensus, and the opposing reading can fairly answer that the ordinary rendering is the ordinary one for good reason. That the verse, however it is rendered, does not establish three co-equal persons is a **strong inference**: scripture's own parallels (1 Corinthians 10:2; Acts 20:32) show the construction proves neither deity nor personhood, and 1 Timothy 2:5 states one God directly. The opposing reading can fairly answer that the single word "name," governing all three, could mean one name shared by three persons; the single word is just as natural for one dedication made to three objects, and it settles nothing either way on its own. What this study does not claim, and what the evidence does not support, is that the verse was ever forged.

D. Signs Following: Mark's Own Closing Commission, and a Textual Note (Mark 16:14-18)

Mark 16:15-18 — *"And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover."*

This study states plainly, before treating this passage's own content, a textual matter its own stated method (Introduction §H) commits it to noting rather than passing over in silence: Mark 16:9-20, the passage this quotation belongs to, is absent from two of the oldest surviving Greek manuscripts of Mark's Gospel (Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus), and its authenticity as part of Mark's own original text has been a genuine subject of scholarly disagreement for well over a century. This study's own working method commits it to the King James Version as base text, and this passage stands in that text without qualification; this study follows its own stated method here, treating the passage as received scripture for the purposes of this study, while stating the manuscript question honestly rather than silently withholding it from readers who deserve to know it exists.

Read on its own terms, this passage names five signs "following them that believe": casting out devils, speaking with new tongues, taking up serpents, immunity to deadly drink, and healing by laid-on hands. This study holds the second of these — "they shall speak with new tongues" — as directly relevant to the pattern this study's own Chapter 6 §C has already run out across five conversion accounts, and notes that this verse's own promise, whatever its manuscript history, states in general terms exactly the specific pattern this study found holding, account by account, in Acts itself: tongues named as an expected accompaniment of genuine belief, not an unusual or isolated occurrence.

Weighing it: Corroboration only, and from a disputed text — consistent with claim T, but it cannot be leaned on. This section concedes at the outset that Mark 16:9-20 is absent from two of the oldest manuscripts and that its authenticity is genuinely disputed. Evidence drawn from it inherits that doubt,

and this study says so rather than conceding the manuscript question and then quietly using the passage anyway.

E. John 20:19-23 Revisited: Weighing the Scene Against Every Other Resurrection Appearance

This study's own Chapter 2 §A first quoted this scene in full and offered a reading "in enough depth to serve Chapter 2's own purpose," reserving "the question's fullest and most careful treatment, weighed against every other resurrection-appearance account together" for this chapter, exactly as promised there and again in this study's own Chapter 8 §F. That fuller weighing is undertaken here.

John 20:19-23 — *"Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. And when he had so said, he shewed unto them his hands and his side. Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord. Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost [holy spirit]: Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever ye retain, they are retained."*

Scripture's own record of the forty days does not stop with this scene. Paul supplies, decades later, the single fullest inventory of resurrection appearances the New Testament preserves, and this study holds it worth setting directly beside John 20 rather than treated as a separate, unrelated text:

1 Corinthians 15:5-7 — *"And that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: After that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles."*

This study holds the ordering Paul supplies as significant for the question this section exists to settle: John 20's own upper-room scene is, at most, one appearance among several — "then of the twelve" in Paul's own list, plausibly this very evening, though Paul does not himself specify which appearance corresponds to which Gospel scene — followed by an appearance to above five hundred people at once, an appearance to James, and a further, separately named appearance "of all the apostles," this study holding this last as most plausibly the Great Commission scene this study's own §C above has already treated, given Matthew's own explicit statement that "the eleven disciples went away into Galilee" for it. Nowhere in Paul's own list, and nowhere in Matthew's or Mark's own commissioning accounts, does any text repeat John 20:22's own specific action — Jesus breathing, and saying "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." This study holds the absence as itself evidence, not merely silence: if John 20:22 had been the full and final bestowal of the gift, sealed and completed the evening of the resurrection, this study would expect either some later text to presuppose the disciples already possessing it in a way distinguishable from ordinary human capacity, or some account of a second group needing to catch up to what the Eleven now had that others present at later appearances — the five hundred, for instance — did not. Neither is anywhere stated. What this study does find, unambiguously, in Acts 1:4-5 and 1:8 — chronologically after every resurrection appearance so far named, near the very end of the forty days — is Jesus still commanding this same company to "wait for the promise of the Father... not many days

hence," language of pure futurity that this study holds as decisive: whatever was true of John 20:22, it was not yet, in Jesus's own words spoken afterward, the thing Acts 2 would go on to record.

Weighing it: Strong inference — claim W: John 20:22 is a sign, not the bestowal. That Acts 1:4-5 still commands the same men to wait, chronologically after this scene, is a **direct statement** and is decisive for the timing. That no later text presupposes the Eleven already possessing what others lacked is an argument from silence and is weighed as one. The opposing reading can fairly answer that "receive ye the Holy Ghost" is plain language and that John may record what John records without regard to Luke's sequence.

F. Why Thomas's Absence Confirms the Reading

One further detail belongs to this weighing, drawn from the very same chapter of John, and this study holds it as the single clearest piece of internal, textual evidence for everything §E above has just argued:

John 20:24 — *"But Thomas, one of the twelve, called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came."*

Thomas was absent from the John 20:19-23 scene entirely — a plain, stated fact, not an inference. If that scene were the full and final bestowal of the gift of holy spirit, this study holds that Thomas's own absence would place him in a position no other apostle occupied: physically present at Pentecost eight chapters later in this study's own reckoning of Acts, yet having missed the one moment scripture records the gift actually being given to the company he belonged to. Nothing in scripture anywhere treats Thomas as spiritually behind the other ten in this way, before or after Pentecost — no text singles him out for a delayed or repeated reception, no text records the other apostles waiting for him to "catch up" before some further step could be taken, and Acts 1:13 lists him among the eleven, without comment or qualification, in the upper room company waiting together for the promise still future at that point. This study holds Thomas's own untroubled inclusion among the Eleven at Pentecost, despite his own documented absence from John 20:22, as strong confirmation that whatever happened in that room was not the gift's own final and individually necessary bestowal — a reading requiring Thomas to have received something the others already had, at some later unrecorded moment, a scenario scripture nowhere hints at — but exactly what this study's own Chapter 2 §A first proposed: a real, weighted, forward-pointing sign, given to those present as a promise made concrete, not a private grant some in the company received and others, through no fault of their own, did not.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — Thomas's absence tells against reading John 20:22 as the gift's individually necessary bestowal. That Thomas was absent is a **direct statement**; that scripture nowhere treats him as behind the others is an **argument from silence**, and this study names it as one rather than calling it strong confirmation. The opposing reading can fairly answer that scripture does not record every later moment either.

G. Four Accounts, One Commission: What They Share and Where They Differ

This study now draws the four resurrection accounts already treated — Luke 24, Matthew 28, Mark 16, John 20 — into a single summary, naming both their agreement and their real differences rather than forcing an artificial harmony onto texts that were never written to be read as a single flattened transcript. All four agree on one basic shape: a commission to go, addressed to the same company, resting on Christ's own authority and naming, in some form, a task that extends beyond Israel's own borders — Luke's "all nations," Matthew's "all nations," Mark's "all the world... every creature." All four differ in what else they preserve: Luke alone records the opening of their understanding and the specific promise of repentance and remission preached in Christ's own name; Matthew alone records the triune baptismal formula — already resolved in §C above as fully consistent with Acts 2:38's own baptismal practice, not the tension it can first appear to be — and the closing promise of Christ's own abiding presence "unto the end of the world"; Mark alone records the specific signs that would follow; John alone records the breathed sign and the remission-and-retention authority this study's own Chapter 8 §F has already traced to Matthew 16:19 and 18:18. This study holds these differences as exactly what this study's own stated method expects of four independent witnesses recording real events across real time and multiple locations — Jerusalem for Luke and John, a Galilean mountain for Matthew — rather than four copies of one single speech. Together, not separately, they supply what this study's own Chapter 8 §A promised this chapter would add: not what Jesus had already taught before the cross, but what he specifically commissioned, commanded, and promised across the forty days once he had risen, before a single word of Acts 2 had yet been spoken.

Weighing it: Narrative — carries no weight on any of this study's contested claims.

H. Closing — What the Forty Days Add to What the Ministry Already Supplied

This study's own two chapters on "the many other words" now close together, and this chapter states what both have jointly established. Before the cross, Jesus had already promised a church not yet built and a Comforter not yet sent, in specific, repeated, and — this study's own Chapter 8 §D, §I has shown — grammatically precise terms. Across the forty days that followed the resurrection, he added a specific commission (Luke, Matthew, Mark), a specific baptismal formula, given its own full treatment and resolved in §C above, specific signs promised to accompany belief, and a specific, enacted sign of the gift soon to come, weighed in this chapter against every other resurrection appearance scripture records and found, on the full weight of that evidence, to be a promise still future rather than a bestowal already complete. Combined with this study's own preceding chapter, this chapter completes, point by point, the answer promised since this study's own Introduction: the "many other words" behind Peter's own Pentecost sermon were not lost to history but are recoverable, in substance, from what Jesus himself is recorded teaching — before the cross, a church promised and a Comforter named (Chapter 8); after the resurrection, across the forty days, a specific commission to all nations, a specific baptismal formula now resolved rather than left in tension with Acts 2:38, specific signs promised to accompany belief, and a specific, enacted, forward-pointing sign of the gift still to come. Peter's own sermon, this

study has now shown twice over, drew on teaching already given rather than words invented on the spot.

This study takes both chapters together as the complete, textually verified answer to this study's own first central question, first stated in its own Introduction §B: Peter's own sermon at Pentecost rests, point by point, on teaching, commission, and promise Jesus himself had already given, across a ministry and forty additional days this study has now traced in full rather than merely asserted. This study's own Introduction §B named a second central question as well — what "this untoward generation" actually names, and what it means to save oneself from it — and that question was already answered in full in this study's own Chapter 5. What remains, flagged and deferred across this study's own Chapter 2 §B, Chapter 3 §C, and Chapter 4 §F, is a further question neither of the Introduction's own two questions anticipated by name: what makes the administration Peter's own sermon opens unique among everything scripture elsewhere records. That is the subject of this study's own Chapter 10.

Weighing it: Summary only — restates what the sections above established, at the weights assigned to them there.

Chapter 10 — The Grace Administration: Its Unique Place from Genesis to the Ascension

A. Opening — The Question This Study Has Carried Forward

Three separate points in this study's own earlier chapters were each reached, worked as far as their own immediate context allowed, and then set down unfinished on purpose, with a note that this chapter would be the place to pick them back up: Chapter 2 §B, at the moment Pentecost's own feast-day is first named, flagged a possible connection between the law written on stone at Sinai and a law Jeremiah and Ezekiel had both foretold would one day be written somewhere else entirely; Chapter 3 §C, twice, first flagged that Joel's own oracle addresses Israel specifically and not "a company or administration not yet revealed even to Peter," and then flagged the deeper question of how what began that morning relates to what Paul would later call the Mystery; and Chapter 4 §F flagged Peter's own three-ringed promise — "unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off" — as a down payment this study was not yet equipped to unpack. All three are the same question, asked from three different angles: what, exactly, is this administration Peter's own sermon opens, and what makes it different from everything scripture elsewhere records? This chapter answers that question directly, in full, rather than in the compressed and partial form each earlier flag necessarily left it in.

This study does not build that answer from scratch. It draws throughout on two of this library's own completed studies, cited here as standing reference works rather than repeated from nothing: *The Seven Administrations of Scripture*, which independently tested and confirmed a sevenfold framework for the whole of biblical history and settled, on its own textual grounds, several of the exact questions this chapter needs settled; and *A Grace Administration Primer*, which already gathered and organized the specific content — sonship rights, the Hope, the armor of God — this chapter now develops in full

rather than in primer form. Where this chapter draws on either study's own findings, it says so plainly, the way it has cited its own earlier chapters throughout.

Weighing it: Narrative — carries no weight on any of this study's contested claims.

B. The Seven Administrations, and Grace's Own Place Among Them

Scripture, read across its full span from Genesis to Revelation, does not present God dealing with mankind the same way at every point in that span. *The Seven Administrations of Scripture* traces seven such periods, each opening with an audible, public declaration tied to a new governing basis — a test this study adopts directly rather than restating independently, since the completed study has already done the work of applying it consistently across the whole of scripture: Eden, the Garden (one command, Genesis 2:16-17); the Patriarchal administration (credited faith, opening at the expulsion, Genesis 3:14-19); the Mosaic Law (vowed obedience, opening at Sinai, Exodus 19:16-19 and 20:1); Christ — the Kingdom at Hand (repentance, the kingdom at hand, opening at the baptism, Matthew 3:16-17 and 4:17); Grace — the Administration of the Mystery (grace through faith, apart from law, opening at Pentecost, Acts 2:2-4 and Ephesians 2:8-9); the Day of Wrath (judgment poured out in full strength, opening at the Rapture, 1 Thessalonians 4:16-17 and Revelation 16:1); and the Day of Judgment — Christ's Return with His Saints (Christ reigning, opening at the return itself, Revelation 19:11-16). A sub-declaration to one figure within an administration — to Noah, to Abraham — does not itself open a new administration on this framework's own working test; what opens a new one is a fresh governing basis, publicly and audibly declared.

Grace is the fifth of these seven, and it is the one this study's own subject sits inside: Acts 2 is not a stray episode within the fourth administration's own continuing story, nor an isolated miracle with no larger frame, but the audible opening of a new administration in its own right, with its own governing basis, distinct from every administration before it. That placement is not this study's own invention; it is the finding of a separately conducted study, tested against scripture's own text rather than assumed, and this chapter adopts it as settled ground on which to build everything that follows.

Weighing it: Corroboration only — claim G's framework is adopted from another study in this library, not re-argued here. *The Seven Administrations of Scripture* tested the sevenfold framework and its audible-declaration criterion on its own textual grounds; this chapter builds on that finding rather than establishing it. A reader who does not accept the framework will not be persuaded of it by this chapter, and should not be.

C. Grace's Own Audible Declaration: Acts 2:4 and the Governing Basis Restated

Every administration on this framework opens with something heard, not merely something believed. Sinai had thunder and a directly quoted voice (Exodus 19:16-19; 20:1); the baptism had a voice from heaven (Matthew 3:16-17); the Rapture will have a shout, an archangel's voice, and a trumpet (1 Thessalonians 4:16-17, already quoted in part at this study's own Chapter 4 §F and given its full text below in this chapter's own §I). Grace's own opening declaration, by contrast, is not a directly quoted

heavenly voice in that same mode — it is Spirit-given, audible utterance through the gathered believers themselves, the very scene this study's own Chapter 2 §C has already covered in full:

Acts 2:2 *And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting.*

2:3 *And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them.*

2:4 *And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.*

Whether tongues satisfy the same "audible declaration" test as a directly quoted heavenly voice is worth pausing on rather than assuming, and Paul's own later teaching on the gift argues that they do. He does not describe tongues as human language acquisition or as a merely symbolic sign; he ties the gift directly to a prophecy of God himself speaking in unfamiliar tongues to an unwilling hearer:

1 Corinthians 12:7, 10 — *"But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal... to another divers kinds of tongues."*

Isaiah 28:11 / 1 Corinthians 14:21-22 — *"For with stammering lips and another tongue will he speak to this people... In the law it is written, With men of other tongues and other lips will I speak unto this people; and yet for all that will they not hear me, saith the Lord. Wherefore tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not."*

On Paul's own argument, the gift is God speaking, not merely a human sign of God's presence — Holy Spirit, capitalized, the Giver, supplying the words directly; the believer's own gift of holy spirit, lowercase, the indwelling gift itself (Acts 2:38, this study's own Chapter 6 §B; Romans 8:9-11), receiving them; the believer's own body supplying nothing but the mechanics of speech, breath passing over vocal cords already in place, forming words the speaker did not originate. On that reading, held here as this study's own reasoned conclusion rather than a claim scripture states in so many words, the words spoken at Pentecost were God's own audible words in the fullest sense, produced through human speech rather than replacing it — satisfying, by content if not by form, the same test every other administration's own opening declaration satisfies.

The governing basis this declaration opens is stated as plainly as any in the sequence, in words this study has already quoted at length in its own earlier chapters and now draws together as a single doctrinal statement:

Acts 2:38 *Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.*

Ephesians 2:8-9 — *"For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast."*

Romans 6:14 — *"For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace."*

Romans 8:2 — *"For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death."*

Grace through faith, apart from law: not a new set of commands replacing the old, but a new basis replacing command itself as the governing principle. This is what this study's own Chapter 6 §B already found *lambano* doing grammatically at Acts 2:38 — receiving a gift, not earning a wage — and this chapter now names the larger administrative fact that single word study was already, without yet saying so, describing.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — that Pentecost's tongues satisfy the same audible-declaration test as a heavenly voice. This section concedes openly that Grace's opening is not a directly quoted heavenly voice in the same mode as Sinai or the Jordan, and argues that it satisfies the test "by content if not by form." That is a real weakening of the criterion and the opposing reading can fairly press it: a test met in a different form each time is a weaker test. The governing basis itself — grace through faith, apart from law — is a **direct statement** (Ephesians 2:8-9; Romans 6:14).

D. Resolving Joel: What Peter Preached, and What Grace Would Later Reveal

This study's own Chapter 3 §C left two things open at the exact place they first arose, rather than resolving them prematurely, and both can now be answered directly.

The first: Joel's own oracle, as Chapter 3 §C already established from the text itself, names its own subject twice in the verses just before the outpouring it foretells — "I am in the midst of Israel" (Joel 2:27) and "in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance" (Joel 2:32) — a word to Israel, about Israel, with nothing in its own wording that broadens its address to a different or a wider company. That remains true, and this chapter does not walk it back. What this chapter adds is the administrative frame Chapter 3 did not yet have available to it: Joel's own oracle belongs to Israel's own covenant history, and Peter, preaching it that morning, is doing exactly what a Spirit-filled Jewish apostle standing in the temple would be expected to do — reading a genuine outpouring in front of him against the nearest available scripture that had foretold an outpouring, and finding, correctly, that the shape fits. Peter is not wrong to quote Joel. He is simply not yet in a position to know everything the event he is quoting Joel to explain would turn out to open.

The second: what Peter is doing in this sermon is preaching to "the house of Israel" (Acts 2:36) from within Israel's own covenant promises, because at this moment in Acts he has no knowledge of a Mystery not yet revealed (Ephesians 3:1-9). This is not a defect in Peter's own sermon; it is simply where the timeline actually stands. The administration that opens that morning is real, and Peter's own governing-basis words — repent, be baptized, receive the gift — are, this study has already argued at length, this administration's own opening declaration in substance even though Peter cannot yet name it as such. What Peter does not yet know, and could not yet know, is the fuller content that same administration would carry by the time Paul's own letters were written — and that fuller content is this chapter's own next subject.

Weighing it: Direct statement on Joel's own address; reasonable inference on what Peter did and did not yet know. That Joel names Israel twice in the verses before the outpouring is what the text says.

That Peter had no knowledge of the Mystery at that moment is a **reasonable inference** from Ephesians 3:3-5's "now revealed"; the opposing reading can fairly answer that an argument about what a preacher did not yet know is not an argument from the text in front of him.

E. The Mystery: Not an Eighth Administration, but Grace's Own Fuller Content

Paul, writing years after Pentecost, describes something he calls the Mystery:

Ephesians 3:2 *If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward:*

3:3 *How that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery; (as I wrote afore in few words,*

3:5 *Which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit;*

3:6 *That the Gentiles should be fellowheirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel:*

Colossians 1:26 *Even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints:*

1:27 *To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory:*

Before this study shares what that Mystery actually holds, one administrative question deserves a brief answer and no more, since it has already been settled at length elsewhere: is the Mystery a separate, eighth administration opening later within Grace's own span, or the same Grace administration already opened at Pentecost, its scope now more fully disclosed? *The Seven Administrations of Scripture* has already tested that question against the actual chronology of Acts and the epistles, and this study adopts its finding rather than re-arguing it here: Gentile inclusion is already public record under Peter's own ministry, at Cornelius's household, years before Paul's own letters naming the Mystery were ever written (Acts 10:34-35; 11:17-18) — so what changes between Pentecost and Paul's letters is how much of Grace's own scope has been made visible, not when the administration itself began. Grace remains one administration, Pentecost to the Rapture, and what Paul calls the Mystery is that same administration's own fuller content, not a later one layered on top of it.

What, then, does that fuller content actually hold — what is the mystery worth pausing over, sharing in full, rather than merely filing under a settled administrative question? Colossians 1:27's own closing clause names it as concretely as scripture states it anywhere: "which is Christ in you, the hope of glory." Not a doctrine to be studied at a distance, and not merely a status conferred, but a person, indwelling — Christ himself, present in the believer rather than merely represented by a priesthood, a temple, or a law written on stone, exactly the shift this chapter's own §F, next, will trace from Jeremiah and Ezekiel's own promise of a law written within rather than upon stone. "The hope of glory" names what that indwelling secures rather than what it already completes in full: glory, in Paul's own usage elsewhere, is the visible, manifested weight of God's own presence and character, and "hope" here carries the full, certain-expectation sense this chapter's own §I develops at length — not glory already possessed in full,

but glory certainly coming, guaranteed by the very fact of Christ's own present indwelling, a down payment already inside the believer rather than a promise held only on paper. This study holds Colossians 1:27, read this way, as scripture's own most compact definition of what the Mystery actually is: not a new doctrine about God, but God himself, in the person of Christ, taking up residence in a believer who is Gentile as freely as Jew.

Ephesians 3:6 states the same good news a second way, and its own Greek is worth pausing on directly, because Paul does not simply say Gentiles are included — he reaches for three words in a row, each built on the same small Greek prefix, *syn*, meaning "together with": *synkleronoma*, fellow-heirs; *syssoma*, of the same body; *symmetocha*, partakers together. One of the three, *syssoma*, appears nowhere else in scripture at all; the other two are rare and are pressed here into a specific service. Three compounds, each saying "together with" in a different grammatical shape, stacked one after another in a single sentence — this study holds the repetition as Paul's own way of making a claim in the very shape of his sentence that no single word could carry alone: not near, not adjacent, not merely tolerated alongside, but joined, everywhere the word can be joined, three separate times, to say it three separate ways. What had been two — Jew and Gentile, near and far off, inside the covenant and outside it — the Mystery does not merely bring closer together. It makes one.

Ephesians states the same truth again, this time in a picture Paul's own first readers in Ephesus would have recognized on sight, because they had likely stood in front of it:

Ephesians 2:14-15 — *"For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us... for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace."*

The temple in Jerusalem had an actual wall of this kind — a low stone barrier separating the Court of the Gentiles from the inner courts a Gentile was forbidden, on pain of death, to cross, with inscriptions to that effect posted at the gates so that no visitor could plead ignorance — two of those stones survive, in Greek. This study holds Paul's own choice of image as deliberate rather than merely rhetorical: he does not say the wall was lowered, or a gate was added, or an exception was carved out for especially devout Gentiles. He says it was broken down, and the two people it had separated were made, not two friendly neighbors, but "one new man" — a genuinely new thing, not a patched-together old one. What that new, unified body was actually for, Paul states a chapter later, and this study holds the claim as large enough to deserve being read slowly rather than passed over:

Ephesians 3:9-10 — *"And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God."*

The church itself — Jew and Gentile, one body, exactly as this section has just traced — is named here as the very display case of God's own wisdom, watched not merely by other people but by "principalities and powers in heavenly places," the same opposition this chapter's own SK will name directly as what the believer is armed against. This study holds the connection as more than coincidental: the Mystery is not a private comfort tucked away from the conflict this chapter's own armor section describes: it is

itself part of what that conflict is being fought in front of. Paul closes the same thought writing to the Romans, naming the Mystery's own reach in the widest terms scripture states it anywhere:

Romans 16:25-26 — *"According to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, But now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith."*

That is real, previously hidden content, and it is worth a believer's own full attention rather than a passing mention: a wall genuinely down, two peoples genuinely made one, Christ himself genuinely indwelling, made known to every nation and displayed even to the unseen powers arrayed in opposition. It does not change the terms on which anyone actually receives it — grace through faith, apart from law, is the identical basis already stated at Pentecost (Acts 2:38; Ephesians 2:8-9), stated years before any of Paul's own letters naming the Mystery were written. What it changes is how much of that one grace was ever going to be given, and to whom — and this study holds that the answer, worked out across this section, is considerably larger than "the house of Israel" alone could have guessed from Acts 2 by itself.

Weighing it: Direct statement on what the Mystery is; corroboration only on the not-an-eighth-administration point. Colossians 1:27 and Ephesians 3:6 state the content outright, and the three syn-compounds are a **direct statement** about Paul's wording — one of the three appears nowhere else in scripture. That the Mystery is Grace's fuller content rather than a later administration is adopted from *The Seven Administrations of Scripture* and is **corroboration only** here. The temple's dividing wall is real and attested; Paul's use of it is **reasonable inference**.

F. A Law Written in the Heart: Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Where the New Covenant Fits

This study's own Chapter 2 §B, at the moment Pentecost's feast-day was first named, noted a real but unconfirmed tradition — that the giving of the Law at Sinai and the Feast of Weeks came, in later Jewish reckoning, to be associated with the same calendar day — and flagged, without yet arguing it, that a feast tied to a law written on stone had become, on this same fiftieth day centuries later, the occasion for something Jeremiah and Ezekiel had themselves foretold under different words entirely:

Jeremiah 31:31 *Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah:*

31:33 *But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people.*

Ezekiel 36:26 *A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh.*

36:27 *And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them.*

Both prophets address this promise explicitly to "the house of Israel" — the same nation Peter is standing in front of that morning, the same nation this chapter's own §D has already shown Joel's oracle addresses. This study does not read Jeremiah and Ezekiel as describing Grace's own later reach to Gentiles; that reach is a separate question, taken up directly in the section immediately following. What this study does hold, on the strength of the Mosaic administration's own governing basis already named in this chapter's own §B — vowed obedience to a law given from outside the worshiper, written on stone the worshiper did not carry within himself — is that Sinai's own law and Pentecost's own gift stand in exactly the relationship Jeremiah and Ezekiel had described centuries earlier: an external command, obeyed or broken by a people's own unaided will, giving way to an internal gift, received by faith and then lived out from the inside rather than imposed from without. Ezekiel's own added clause is worth weighing carefully rather than passing over: "I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes" — not merely a new heart, but a new spirit given, doing in the believer what the old covenant could only ever command the believer to do for himself. This study holds that clause as this chapter's own clearest Old Testament anticipation of Grace's own indwelling gift — not proof, on its own, that Jeremiah and Ezekiel foresaw Pentecost specifically as this study now understands it, but a real and textually visible pattern this study is comfortable naming as more than coincidence: a law that could only be kept from within was always going to require a Giver willing to move in.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — the law written within, which Jeremiah and Ezekiel foretold, is what Pentecost's gift supplies. That both prophets address the house of Israel is a **direct statement**, and this section does not read them as describing Grace's reach to Gentiles. That Sinai's external law and Pentecost's internal gift stand in the relation the prophets described is a **reasonable inference**, and the section says plainly it is not proof that either prophet foresaw Pentecost specifically.

G. "To All That Are Afar Off": Grace's Reach Resolved

This study's own Chapter 4 §F flagged Peter's own words at Acts 2:39 as a promise stated in three widening rings, the outermost of which this study was not yet equipped to characterize:

Acts 2:39 *For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.*

Chapter 4 §F held open two live possibilities for "all that are afar off": Jews of the dispersion, not physically present in Jerusalem that day, or a reach further still, to Gentiles entirely outside Israel's own commonwealth. This chapter's own §E has now supplied the missing piece. Peter himself, that morning, almost certainly means the nearer reading — dispersed Jews, the natural sense of the phrase to a Jewish preacher addressing "the house of Israel" (Acts 2:36) about promises made to Israel. But Peter's own final qualifier — "even as many as the Lord our God shall call" — states the promise's true boundary as God's own calling rather than geography or lineage, and this chapter's own §E has already shown, from Acts 10-11 and Galatians 2 alone, that God's own calling did in fact reach further than Peter himself understood it to reach when he first spoke these words. The verse does not change meaning between Acts 2 and Acts 10; what changes is how much of its own full scope has yet been made visible. Peter's own words at Acts 2:39 turn out, on this reading, to have already stated — without Peter yet knowing it — the very boundary this chapter's own §E found Paul later unpacking in full: not Israel and no one else,

but "as many as the Lord our God shall call," a company Cornelius's household would soon show included Gentiles as well.

That same calling has not stopped. Nothing in Acts 2:39's own wording restricts "all that are afar off" to a single generation's own geography or a fixed number of years; "even as many as the Lord our God shall call" is open-ended language, and this study holds the calling as continuing, unbroken, from Cornelius's own household down to this study's own present-day reader, on the identical grace-through-faith basis this chapter's own §C has already established as the one governing basis of this whole administration. What began at Pentecost, this study holds, is not a completed episode belonging only to the first century, but a still-running story a believer reading this chapter today is already written into — the same Spirit, the same gift, the same administration, still open, still calling, souls still being added the same way this study's own Chapter 7 has already shown them being added on the very first day: "the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved" (Acts 2:47). A believer standing in this administration today is not reading someone else's history. On this study's own reading, they are standing inside its own still-unfinished sentence.

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — claim G: the promise reaches past Israel, and the calling has not stopped. That Peter's own qualifier makes God's calling the boundary is a **direct statement**; that his own immediate sense was narrower is conceded. That the calling continues to a present-day reader is a **reasonable inference** from the verse's open-ended wording, and the opposing reading can fairly answer that an open-ended phrase in a first-century sermon is not by itself a statement about later centuries.

H. Our Sonship Rights: Six Rights, One New Standing

A *Grace Administration Primer* already gathers what this administration confers on the believer under a single heading, sonship rights, and this study adopts that same organization rather than inventing a different one. Six rights, each resting on its own distinct scripture, together describe a single new legal and relational standing before God rather than six unrelated blessings:

Righteousness. Not a status earned by keeping the law, but one granted apart from it:

Romans 3:20 *Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin.*

3:21 *But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets;*

3:22 *Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference:*

Sanctification. Being set apart from the world, unto eternal life:

1 Corinthians 6:11 — *"And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God."*

Hebrews 10:10 — *"By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all."*

Redemption. Bought out from under the law's own curse, and out of slavery to sin:

Galatians 3:10, 13 — *"For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse... Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree."*

Romans 8:2 — *"For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death."*

1 Corinthians 6:19-20 — *"What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's."*

1 Corinthians 7:23 — *"Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men."*

Justification. Standing before God just as if the believer had never sinned:

Galatians 2:16 *Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.*

Reconciliation. No longer separated from God, and given, in turn, a ministry of reconciling others:

Romans 5:10 — *"For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life."*

2 Corinthians 5:18 — *"And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation."*

Adoption. Placed as a grown son within God's own family, with the full standing and inheritance rights that go with it — not a servant, but an heir:

Ephesians 1:5 *Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will,*

These six are not six separate transactions but a single new standing described from six different angles — the same standing this chapter's own §C has already shown rests on one governing basis, grace through faith, apart from law. A reader keeping count across this study's own earlier chapters will notice that this section supplies, at last, the full textual grounding behind a phrase this study has used in passing since Chapter 4 §E: that the gift of holy spirit is given, not earned. This is what it is given into — not a bare gift standing alone, but a complete new legal standing the gift itself seals.

A right granted is not the same thing as a right claimed, and scripture treats the difference as consequential rather than academic. James states the general principle plainly:

James 4:2 — *"...ye have not, because ye ask not."*

A right left unclaimed does not stop being true, but it also does not, by itself, produce the daily experience of the believer who does claim it. Paul's own charge to the Ephesian believers assumes exactly this gap between standing and daily walk — "that ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man... and that ye put on the new man" (Ephesians 4:22, 24, this chapter's own §J below treats the same passage in fuller context) — a command that would make no sense addressed to people who

had no old pattern left to put off. A believer who does not consciously claim these six rights this section has just named does not lose them; standing before God, on this study's own reading, does not fluctuate with the believer's own awareness of it, any more than this study's own Chapter 4 §E finding that the gift is given, not earned, allows it to be un-given by simple forgetfulness. What is lost, in practice, is not the standing but its own benefit, lived out: a believer who does not know, or does not call to mind, that righteousness is already granted continues, in practice, to labor under the very sin-consciousness this chapter's own quoted texts (Romans 3:20-22) already state has been answered; one who does not remember redemption from the law's own curse remains, in daily experience, vulnerable to exactly the adversary this section's own source material, *A Grace Administration Primer*, names directly: if these rights are not claimed, the adversary will take advantage of it. Ephesians 6:16's own shield of faith, this chapter's own §K below will show, is described as quenching what is aimed at the believer — and a shield left lying on the ground, however genuinely issued, quenches nothing.

How, then, does a believer actually claim what has already been given? Scripture's own pattern is not mysterious. It is confession and reckoning, stated together in Paul's own words to the Romans:

Romans 6:11 — *"Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord."*

"Reckon" is an accounting term, treating as true in present practice what has already been made true in standing — the same mental act this chapter's own §J below will trace at greater length under Romans 12:2's own "renewing of the mind." It is remembering rather than discovering: this section's own six rights are not hidden knowledge to be searched out but stated fact to be recalled, which is why *A Grace Administration Primer*'s own guidance — that believers should memorize these rights — names the actual discipline involved, holding scripture's own stated fact in mind deliberately enough that it governs a believer's own response to temptation, accusation, or fear before either has the chance to govern the believer instead. And it is spoken as well as remembered:

Hebrews 10:23 — *"Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; (for he is faithful that promised;)"*

This study holds a believer's own spoken confession of a right already granted — righteousness confessed rather than merely believed, redemption stated aloud rather than only assumed — as itself part of how a settled legal standing becomes a lived, daily reality rather than a truth affirmed only in the abstract.

Weighing it: Direct statement on each of the six rights; reasonable inference on claiming them. Each right rests on a plain verse and is stated as such. That a right unclaimed leaves its benefit unlived, and that confession and reckoning are how it is taken up, is a **reasonable inference** drawn largely from *A Grace Administration Primer* rather than from a verse commanding the practice; the opposing reading can fairly answer that Romans 6:11's "reckon" is not a technique.

I. The Hope: A Sure Expectation, Not a Wish

Ordinary English usage has worn "hope" down to something close to a wish — "I hope it rains," said with no real expectation attached, the same word Luke uses of storm-battered sailors giving up on rescue altogether ("all hope that we should be saved was then taken away," Acts 27:20). Scripture's own use of the word, where it names the Christian's own hope specifically, is stronger and more particular: a sure expectation of something promised, not yet seen, but certain to come to pass, because the one who promised it does not lie:

Titus 1:2 *In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began;*

Hebrews 6:18-19 — *"That by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us: Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and stedfast."*

Paul warns that hope can be misplaced — fixed on the wrong object entirely:

1 Timothy 6:17 — *"Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not highminded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God."*

Rightly placed, in the living God rather than in uncertain riches, this hope functions the way its own image says it does. An anchor does two things, and only two: it keeps a ship from being driven off course by a sudden storm, and it keeps a ship from quietly drifting off its own mooring once the water is calm. This study holds Hebrews 6:19's own image as naming both functions deliberately for the believer's own hope: it holds a life steady when hardship strikes hard and fast, and it holds a life in place when nothing dramatic is happening at all — when the far likelier danger is not shipwreck but drift, a slow loss of interest in anything scripture has actually promised, crowded out by whatever the world in front of a believer happens to find more immediately interesting that week. Scripture elsewhere names this same hope as something to be actively worn, not merely held in reserve: "for an helmet, the hope of salvation" (1 Thessalonians 5:8) — a piece this chapter's own SK, below, will return to by name once the whole armor is assembled; it is enough here to have established what the hope actually is before that section arms the believer with it. Hope, on scripture's own accounting, is not incidental to endurance but its direct supply: "that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope" (Romans 15:4) — the written word feeding the very hope that then furnishes the patience to keep going. A life aimed at nothing in particular has little reason to keep going once the way gets hard; this study holds that the Hope, rightly understood, supplies exactly the reason a merely vague comfort cannot.

What, specifically, is this sure expectation? Scripture's own answer begins earlier than Pentecost, earlier even than Abraham — at the very moment sin first entered the world God had made:

Genesis 3:15 *And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.*

Adam and Eve heard this before they had so much as left the garden: judgment on the man who had just deceived them, and, folded inside that same judgment, the first promise of an undoing. This study holds this verse as hope in its earliest and simplest form — a wrong named and, in the same breath, a right already promised, before either had unfolded any further than this single verse. What that

promised right would actually look like, scripture develops across its own whole remaining length, but the direction is fixed from this point on: not away from what was lost, but back to it, made whole. The garden itself supplies the picture, and its own name is worth pausing on: "Eden" (Strong's H5731, *eden*) means delight, and the garden God planted there — "eastward in Eden" (Genesis 2:8) — is, by its own Hebrew name, the Garden of Delight. When the Old Testament was translated into Greek some two centuries before Christ, "the garden of Eden" was rendered by a single loanword, *paradeisos* — itself borrowed from an older Persian word for a walled royal park — and it is this same Greek word, carried untranslated into English as "paradise," that Jesus uses to the dying man beside him (Luke 23:43 — cited here for what the word *paradeisos* names, not for the timing of the promise, a separate question the completed *Death and the Afterlife* study takes up directly and at length), that Paul uses of a revelation he says he cannot even repeat (2 Corinthians 12:4), and that Christ himself uses of what the overcomer is promised at the New Testament's own close: "to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God" (Revelation 2:7). One word, run from Genesis to Revelation, names the same place throughout — not a different destination introduced partway through scripture and called "heaven," but the Garden of Delight, lost in Genesis 3 and promised back to whoever overcomes.

Between those two ends, scripture states the same hope in plain, unadorned language, more than once, in words this study's own reader has very likely heard before without hearing how literally they were meant:

Matthew 5:5 *Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.*

Psalm 37:11 *But the meek shall inherit the earth; and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace.*

Jesus is not coining a new saying in the Sermon on the Mount; he is repeating, almost word for word, a psalm his own hearers already knew by heart. What is inherited, in both texts, is not a title deed admired from a distance but the earth itself, delighted in — the same delight this section has already found built into Eden's own Hebrew name. And what that inherited earth will actually be like, once it is theirs, scripture states directly rather than leaving to speculation:

Revelation 21:1 *And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea.*

21:3 *And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God.*

21:4 *And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away.*

Revelation 5:9-10 — *"Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; And hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth."*

This study holds these texts together as one consistent picture, not four scattered proof-texts: God's own dwelling coming down to men, rather than men being taken up and away from the earth

permanently; sorrow, death, and pain actually ended, not merely escaped by relocation; and the redeemed reigning on the very earth Genesis 3:15 first promised would one day be set right. Whatever this study's own reader may have been taught to picture at the word "heaven," scripture's own last chapters describe something more specific, and this study holds, considerably more hopeful: not an evacuation from a ruined creation, but a ruined creation itself finally and fully repaired, with God himself come down to live in it among his own people.

The Hope is not only where the redeemed will be; it is what they will be like once there, and Paul argues that second question by first showing what is lost if its own foundation, the resurrection, is not real:

1 Corinthians 15:12 *Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?*

15:13 *But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen:*

15:14 *And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain.*

15:17 *And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins.*

15:19 *If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable.*

15:20 *But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept.*

15:21 *For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead.*

15:22 *For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.*

15:23 *But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming.*

"Firstfruits" here is worth pausing on for a reader who has followed this study across its earlier chapters, because the word is not new to this study — Chapter 7 §F has already developed the same term at length, from Leviticus 23:17's wave-loaves offered on this same feast day, as a type of the church's own real, ordinary, imperfect membership. Paul's own use of "firstfruits" in this passage names a related but distinct application of the identical word: not the church as firstfruits of a coming harvest of members, but Christ himself as firstfruits of a coming resurrection — "the firstfruits of them that slept." Both readings stand on the same Levitical picture without competing with each other; one names what the wave-loaves themselves were made of, the other names what the whole feast was itself a firstfruits of chronologically, since Christ's own resurrection fell, as this study's own Chapter 1 §E has already established, on the earlier Feast of Firstfruits, fifty days before Pentecost.

What this hope looks forward to, concretely, Paul states directly at the point Christ's own return actually arrives:

1 Thessalonians 4:13 *But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope.*

4:14 *For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him.*

4:15 *For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep.*

4:16 *For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first:*

4:17 *Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord.*

4:18 *Wherefore comfort one another with these words.*

This is the same declaration this chapter's own §B has already named as Grace's own closing boundary — a shout, an archangel's voice, and a trumpet, the audible declaration that ends this administration exactly as Acts 2:2-4's own audible declaration opened it. The Hope, then, is not a vague future comfort but a specific, dated, and textually stated event: bodily resurrection for those who have died, bodily transformation for those still living, and a permanent gathering to the Lord — held together by faith now, in exactly the sense Colossians states it, tying this chapter's own §E directly to the believer's present experience of the very Mystery that section has already treated:

Colossians 1:27 — "...which is Christ in you, the hope of glory."

And because this hope rests on a promise rather than a performance, Peter can command every believer, without exception, to be ready to explain it to anyone who asks:

1 Peter 3:15 *But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts: and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear:*

Weighing it: Direct statement on what hope is; reasonable inference on the restored earth. That scripture's hope is certain expectation rather than a wish is stated at Titus 1:2 and Hebrews 6:18-19. That the believer's destination is a restored earth rather than a permanent removal from it is the **more natural reading** of Revelation 21:1-4 and 5:9-10 with Matthew 5:5, but it is a genuine position with genuine opponents and is not obvious; the opposing reading can fairly answer that other passages place the believer with the Lord elsewhere. The *paradeisos* word-trace is a **direct statement** about the word's occurrences; the timing question raised by Luke 23:43 belongs to the completed *Death and the Afterlife* study and is not settled here.

J. Walking in Fellowship, and Not Being Conformed to This World

This study's own Chapter 7 §B has already run *koinonia* out to its full New Testament occurrence list — nineteen occurrences across five distinct King James renderings, three real clusters of meaning, and a careful distinction, drawn in Chapter 7 §C, between membership in the body (a fixed fact of the new birth) and fellowship (a life still being lived out, day by day, inside that membership). This chapter does not repeat that word study; a reader who wants it in full has already been given it. What belongs here, specific to this chapter's own subject, is the administrative shape that fellowship takes for a believer living inside Grace rather than under a system of law: fellowship walked out from a standing already secured (this chapter's own §H), toward a hope already certain (this chapter's own §I), rather than toward a standing or a hope still being earned.

Paul states the practical shape of that walk in two directions at once — what it is not, and what it is:

Romans 12:1 *I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service.*

12:2 *And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.*

"Conformed" translates a Greek word built on outward shape, pressed in from the outside; "transformed" translates a different word, the same root behind English "metamorphosis," a change worked from within. This study reads the pairing as continuous with everything this chapter has already argued: a law once written on stone, pressing obedience in from outside, has given way, on the strength of this chapter's own §F, to a spirit written within — and Romans 12:1-2 describes exactly what a life shaped from within, rather than pressed from without, actually looks like in practice. "Reasonable service" is worth noting as well: not an emotional or merely ceremonial offering, but a service that stands to reason once everything this chapter's own §H has already established about the believer's own standing is taken into account — a response fitted to what has already been given, not a payment offered to obtain it.

Paul names what this renewed mind is renewed toward directly, elsewhere in the same body of teaching:

Philippians 2:5 — *"Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus:"*

1 Corinthians 2:16 — *"...But we have the mind of Christ."*

Not a mind believers are commanded to somehow acquire from nothing, but one this study holds as already given at the new birth, alongside the six rights this chapter's own §H has just named, and now to be exercised rather than obtained. The same passage this chapter has already quoted, Ephesians 4, states the mechanics of that exercise in the plainest terms scripture offers anywhere:

Ephesians 4:22, 24 — *"That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts... And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness."*

Clothing language, an act repeated as needed rather than performed once, describing a believer choosing, day by day, which standing to actually live out of, old or new, both terms naming a settled condition rather than a struggle whose outcome remains in doubt. Paul supplies the positive content of that choice with equal precision in a companion passage:

Philippians 4:8 — *"Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things."*

A deliberate, repeated act of the mind, the same "renewing" Romans 12:2 has already named, aimed here at specific, nameable categories of thought rather than left as a vague call to positivity.

That renewed mind, this study holds, is not lived out in isolation, and this is exactly where fellowship — already traced in full at Chapter 7 §B — rejoins this chapter's own subject. Fellowship with God and fellowship with other believers are not two separate relationships requiring two separate efforts; John states them as one movement, the second flowing directly from the first:

1 John 1:3 — "...that ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ."

This study's own Chapter 7 §E has already shown what that fellowship looked like in its own earliest, most concrete form, worth recalling here rather than merely citing:

Acts 2:42, 44 — "And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers... And all that believed were together, and had all things common."

This study holds that passage as more than a historical curiosity belonging only to the church's own first days — it is the standard this chapter's own present administration still measures itself against, the concrete shape a renewed mind takes on when it is actually walked out among other believers rather than held only in private: doctrine held in common, meals and worship shared rather than solitary, needs met inside the body rather than ignored, exactly the "reasonable service" this section has already named as the appropriate response to a standing already secured. A mind renewed in private that never issues in fellowship of this kind, on this study's own reading, has not yet finished doing what Romans 12:1-2 actually describes.

Weighing it: Direct statement — Romans 12:1-2 contrasts a shape pressed from outside with a change worked from within. That the mind of Christ is already given rather than to be acquired is a **reasonable inference** from 1 Corinthians 2:16; the opposing reading can fairly answer that Philippians 2:5 reads as a command rather than a report.

K. The Whole Armor of God

Grace's own administration does not leave the believer to walk this out unarmed, and this chapter's own §I above has already flagged that the same "hope of salvation" named there as an anchor is elsewhere named a helmet, worn in active conflict rather than merely held in reserve:

1 Thessalonians 5:8 — "But let us, who are of the day, be sober, putting on the breastplate of faith and love; and for an helmet, the hope of salvation."

Paul develops the same picture at full length in Ephesians, naming the conflict itself before naming what arms the believer against it:

Ephesians 6:10 Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might.

6:11 Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil.

6:12 For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.

6:13 Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand.

6:14 Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness;

6:15 And your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace;

6:16 Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked.

6:17 And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God:

Verse 12 states plainly what this chapter's own §B has already established from a different angle: the conflict named here is not a struggle against other people — "not against flesh and blood" — but against an order of opposition operating on the same administrative stage this whole chapter has been describing. Before naming what each piece of this armor is, Paul has already spent two full chapters establishing what the wearer of it actually stands on, and this study holds that context as load-bearing rather than incidental — the armor is not issued to a soldier uncertain of his own standing, but to one Paul has already told, at length, exactly what he has. The same "principalities" and "powers" named as this chapter's own opponents in Ephesians 6:12 are named once already, in Ephesians 1, as already subject to Christ's own authority:

Ephesians 1:20-21 — "...he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion..."

The identical "principalities" and "powers" Ephesians 6:12 will later name as what the believer wrestles against are here named, two chapters earlier in the same letter, as already placed under Christ's own feet. Ephesians 2 then states, in the same letter's own next chapter, that the believer's own present position is not merely alongside Christ but joined to him in that same placement:

Ephesians 2:5-6 — "Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ... And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus."

This chapter's own Sections C-D above have already grounded the grace-through-faith basis behind that raising (Ephesians 2:8-9); this section now adds what Ephesians 2's own immediately preceding verses establish about where, precisely, that basis has already seated the believer. Ephesians 6's own armor, on this study's own reading, is therefore never issued to secure a victory still in doubt. It arms a believer already seated, in Christ, above the very powers Ephesians 6:12 names as the conflict — "having done all, to stand" (Ephesians 6:13), not to win a contest whose outcome is uncertain, but to hold, visibly and in practice, a position already won.

Truth, at the loins (Ephesians 6:14a), functioning as a soldier's own girdle did in the ancient world — the piece that gathered up loose clothing and held every other piece of armor in place, worn first because everything else depends on it. This study holds the image as deliberately chosen: truth is not one virtue among several the believer puts on but the piece without which the rest of the armor simply will not stay in position, consistent with Jesus's own words naming truth's own function directly:

John 8:32 — "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Righteousness, at the breast (Ephesians 6:14b), guarding the vital organs precisely because it is the standing this chapter's own §H has already grounded in Romans 3:20-22 — not a righteousness the believer manufactures daily by performance, which would leave the breastplate only as strong as that

day's own conduct, but the righteousness of God himself, already granted, worn now as protection for the heart rather than earned fresh each morning as a condition of it.

The gospel of peace, shod on the feet (Ephesians 6:15), described as already prepared — "having your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace" — rather than searched for in the moment a threat actually appears. This study holds the footwear image as naming stability and readiness to move together: a soldier's own footing gave sure ground for advance as much as for defense, and Paul names this piece using the identical word, "peace," this chapter's own §J above has just shown fellowship itself resting on (Ephesians 2:14-15, this chapter's own §E) — the believer's footing, on this study's own reading, is the same reconciling peace already achieved at the cross, not a truce still being negotiated.

Faith, held as a shield (Ephesians 6:16), and Paul's own added phrase — "above all, taking the shield of faith" — this study holds as marking this piece's own priority among the rest, the one piece explicitly described as actively wielded against something aimed rather than merely worn: "wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked." A shield does not prevent an attack from being launched; it stops the attack from landing, which is why this chapter's own §H above named a shield left lying on the ground as quenching nothing regardless of how genuinely it was issued.

Salvation, worn as a helmet (Ephesians 6:17a), guarding the mind specifically — this chapter's own §I has already found the identical image in 1 Thessalonians 5:8 ("for an helmet, the hope of salvation"), and this study holds the repetition across two of Paul's own letters as confirming rather than merely echoing: whatever else is under attack in this conflict, the mind, and specifically the certainty of a hope already secured, is what a helmet exists to protect, consistent with this chapter's own §J above naming the mind, renewed rather than conformed, as the actual site where this whole chapter's own conflict is fought and won.

The word of God, held as the sword of the Spirit (Ephesians 6:17b), the one piece of this armor that is also, in the same breath, named as a weapon rather than only a protection — "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." This study holds the pairing as instructive: every other piece named so far guards a standing already secured; this piece alone goes on the offensive, and its own precedent, Christ's own threefold answer to the tempter in the wilderness, shows exactly how it is used:

■ **Matthew 4:4, 7, 10** — "*It is written... It is written again... It is written.*"

Not a general possession but specific scripture, recalled and spoken at the precise point of attack.

One further element belongs to this armor though Paul does not count it among the six pieces themselves: "praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit" (Ephesians 6:18, immediately following this passage). This study holds prayer here as the posture in which the whole armor is actually worn rather than an eighth piece standing alongside the rest — not armor itself, but the continual, Spirit-assisted communication that keeps a believer, already armed, in active contact with the very One who issued the armor in the first place. A full treatment of prayer belongs to ground this study has not yet reached; it is enough here to note that Paul does not close this passage with the sword alone, but with a soldier still talking to his own commander.

What this section establishes is enough for this chapter's own purpose: Grace does not merely grant a new standing and a certain hope and then leave the believer defenseless; it names, specifically, and now piece by piece, what the believer, already seated far above the very powers arrayed against them (Ephesians 1:20-21; 2:5-6), has to stand in should that standing come under real attack.

Weighing it: Strong inference — the armour is issued to a believer already seated above the powers it names. That Ephesians 1:20-21 places those same principalities under Christ, and that 2:5-6 seats the believer with Him, are **direct statements** in the same letter. That Ephesians 6 therefore arms a believer to hold a position already won rather than to win one is a **strong inference**; the opposing reading can fairly answer that "wrestle" and "withstand" describe a genuine contest whose daily outcome is not settled in advance.

L. Closing — Bridge to Chapter 11

This chapter set out to answer a question three earlier chapters had each touched and declined to finish: what makes the administration Peter's own sermon opens unique among everything scripture elsewhere records? The answer, drawn together from this chapter's own sections, is not a single fact but a coherent whole: an administration among seven, opened by its own audible declaration at Pentecost (§B, §C) rather than assumed as a continuation of what came before it; resting on a governing basis of grace through faith, apart from law, stated in full the very morning it opened even though Peter himself could not yet see its full reach (§C, §D); carrying, from the start, the same fuller content Paul would later call the Mystery — not a later administration layered on top of Grace, but Grace's own scope more fully disclosed (§E); standing as the true fulfillment of a law Jeremiah and Ezekiel had foretold would one day be written within rather than upon stone (§F); reaching, by God's own calling rather than by lineage or geography, further than even Peter's own words that morning yet knew they reached (§G); conferring on everyone who enters it a single new standing named under six rights (§H); anchored to a hope that is a certainty rather than a wish, dated to a specific and already-declared event (§I); worked out, once received, in a fellowship this study has already treated in full and a life no longer pressed into shape from without (§J); and armed, specifically and by piece, against a real and named opposition (§K). Chapter 6 has already treated how the gift itself is received. This study's own Chapter 11, next and last, returns to the verse that opened this whole study and asks what "save yourselves from this untoward generation" actually asks of a reader holding everything this study has traced now in one hand.

Weighing it: Summary only — restates what the sections above established, at the weights assigned to them there.

Chapter 11 — Closing: Save Yourself — Living the Answer

A. Opening — Returning to the Anchor Passage

This study opened with four verses, named at its own outset as the Anchor Passage, and closes by returning to them rather than to anything new:

Acts 2:38 *Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost [holy spirit].*

2:39 *For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.*

2:40 *And with many other words did he testify and exhort, saying, Save yourselves from this untoward generation.*

2:41 *Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls.*

This study's own Introduction §A named v.40 as its own two-part starting point: Luke's own admission that Peter said more than the text records, and Luke's own compressed summary of what all of it was driving at — "save yourselves from this untoward generation." Ten chapters have now chased both halves of that single verse as far as scripture allows. This closing chapter does not open an eleventh line of inquiry. It gathers what the first eleven have already found and asks, directly, what all of it actually means for whoever is reading it now.

Weighing it: Narrative — carries no weight on any of this study's contested claims.

B. What "Save Yourself" Actually Asked, Recalled

This study's own Chapter 5 §D found something in Peter's own Greek that the King James Version's own English, read alone, does not preserve: "save yourselves" — *sothete* — is a passive imperative, a real command, but one commanding the hearer to yield to, or receive, an action whose actual accomplishing lies outside the hearer's own power to generate. Not "save yourselves" in the sense of a task the hearers must perform by their own unaided effort, but, more precisely, "be ye saved" — let yourselves be saved, take hold of a salvation already being held out. This study has since found the identical shape recurring at nearly every point where scripture describes a person's own part in receiving what God gives: this study's own Chapter 3 §A found the Spirit's own manifestations distributed "as he will," yet never bypassing the man's own will in receiving and exercising them — the same shape holding wherever scripture describes a believer walking in what has already been given: neither passive waiting nor self-generated striving, but a will yielding to, and giving expression to, a power already at work in him. Peter's own command at Acts 2:40, read in light of everything this study has traced since, was never asking its hearers to manufacture their own rescue. It was asking them to stop resisting one already offered.

Weighing it: Summary only — restates claim S at the weight Chapter 5 §D assigned it.

C. The Many Other Words: What Peter Actually Carried Into That Sermon

This study's own Chapter 1 traced what the apostles already knew before Acts 2 ever opened — forty days of "infallible proofs," a ministry's own prior teaching on the kingdom and the Spirit to come, a company that met Pentecost prepared rather than ambushed by it. This study's own Chapters 8 and 9 then supplied what Chapter 1 could only flag: the actual content of "the many other words," run out in full rather than gestured at — Matthew 16's own confession and its own keys, the Upper Room Discourse's own Comforter sayings built past what this study's own Chapter 2 §A had already previewed, the Great Commission in all its surviving forms, and John 20's own breathed sign weighed at last against every other resurrection appearance scripture records. This study's own first central question, stated at Introduction §B — what did Peter already carry into that sermon? — stands answered in full by the time Chapter 9 closes. Nothing in Acts 2 is invented on the spot. Every word Peter speaks that morning, this study has shown, rests on teaching he had already received, tested, and made his own.

Weighing it: Summary only — restates what Chapters 1, 8 and 9 established about the many other words.

D. The Gift: What Was Given, and How It Still Works Today

This study's own Chapter 4 traced the gift itself as promised — "ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost [holy spirit]" (Acts 2:38, this study's own Chapter 4 §E) — and this study's own Chapter 6 then traced its actual reception across all five of Acts's own conversion accounts: *lambano*, receiving into manifestation, and *dechomai* intensified to *apodechomai* at Samaria's own delayed exception, a real and repeated pattern rather than five unrelated incidents. What the gift is in itself, down to its own full New Testament vocabulary and its own nine distinct manifestations, is a subject this study has deliberately left for a study of its own, named directly in §G below; nothing in leaving it there weakens what this study has already shown here: the gift was promised, and the gift was, and still is, actually received. None of this is offered by this study as a historical curiosity, describing something that happened once and stopped. This study's own Chapter 10 §B has already placed Pentecost as the opening, audible declaration of an administration this same chapter identified by its own governing basis and its own closing declaration — the Rapture, "the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout" (1 Thessalonians 4:16, this study's own Chapter 10 §I) — and that closing declaration has not yet come. The administration Acts 2 opened is, on this study's own reading, still open. What Peter offered his own hearers that morning is, on the same terms, still being offered.

Weighing it: Summary only — restates claim T at the weight Chapter 6 §C assigned it, and claim G at the weight Chapter 10 §B assigned it. The claim that the administration is still open rests on the framework adopted in Chapter 10 §B and carries that section's weight, not a stronger one.

E. The Administration: Where This Study's Own Reader Actually Stands

Peter's own words at Acts 2:39 name three widening rings: "unto you," his own immediate hearers; "to your children," a generation not yet present; and "to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." This study's own Chapter 4 §F left that outermost ring only partly resolved, and this study's own Chapter 10 §G, once Chapter 10's own §E had traced the Mystery's own fuller content through Acts 10-11 and Galatians 2, found that Peter's own final qualifier — "as many as the Lord our God shall call" — had already stated, without Peter yet knowing how far it reached, the very boundary later chapters of Acts would go on to make visible: not Israel and no one else, but a company defined by God's own calling rather than by lineage, geography, or, this study now adds directly, by century. A reader meeting this study today, whoever and wherever that reader is, is not reading a document about a promise closed at Acts 2:41's own three thousand. This study holds such a reader as standing, if he or she is willing, inside the very ring Peter's own words already named and Chapter 10 has since shown was wider than Peter yet knew.

Weighing it: Summary only — restates claim G at the weight Chapter 10 §G assigned it.

F. Three Thousand Souls: A Doctrine Enacted, Not Merely Explained

Acts 2:41 *Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls.*

This study's own outline named this verse's own weight at the very start of this closing chapter's own work: not a doctrine merely explained, but a doctrine three thousand people actually acted on, the same day it was preached, before a single church building, a single New Testament epistle, or a single century of Christian tradition existed to explain it to them. This study's own Chapter 7 then showed what those three thousand actually became once the day itself had ended — a household continuing stedfastly in apostles' doctrine and fellowship, breaking of bread, and prayers (Acts 2:42, this study's own Chapter 7 §A), holding what they had loosely rather than tightly, out of gladness rather than compulsion (Acts 2:44-46, this study's own Chapter 7 §E), a real, ordinary, imperfect firstfruits company this study's own Chapter 7 §F found pictured centuries earlier in Pentecost's own uniquely leavened wave loaves. This study holds that household as the doctrine's own proof, not merely its illustration: whatever Acts 2:38's gift and Acts 2:40's command actually were, they produced, that same day, a functioning, gathered, gladly-sharing body of people — not an abstraction, but three thousand specific individuals whose ordinary lives were visibly and immediately reordered around what they had just received.

Weighing it: Narrative — carries no weight on any of this study's contested claims.

G. What This Study Leaves Openly Unfinished

This study's own method, stated at Introduction §H and held to since, requires the same honesty at its own close that it has required at every chapter along the way: naming plainly what remains open rather than quietly closing a question this study has not actually settled. A full doctrine of baptism, flagged as far back as this study's own Chapter 4 §C and repeated at Chapter 9 §C, has since been taken up by a

dedicated side study, condensed in Appendix A: "baptized... in the name of Jesus Christ [the Lord Jesus, the Lord]" — Peter's own phrase at Acts 2:38, and the phrase Acts 8:16, 10:48 and 19:5 also use — is best read as naming the new birth itself rather than a water rite, and is offered there as a reasonable inference rather than a settled reading. Chapter 9 §C's own question, how that settled reading relates to Matthew 28:19's fuller, triune baptismal formula, is resolved there directly rather than left standing: the formula is not the later corruption it can appear to be, and, correctly read, was never actually in tension with Acts 2:38 to begin with. What remains open from the doctrine as a whole is real: Samaria (Acts 8:16) and Ephesus (Acts 19:5) are both held open, their Greek being word for word identical, and Appendix A takes no final position on either. The gift of holy spirit's own full nature — its complete New Testament vocabulary of power, its nine distinct manifestations named at 1 Corinthians 12:7-11, and the practical questions of how it is received and walked in day by day — is likewise deliberately left for a study of its own rather than folded into this one; this study stays, by design, on its own stated subject: the many other words behind Peter's own sermon, and the administration those words opened. What this study's own Chapters 4 and 6 have already shown of the gift — promised, and actually received — stands complete on its own terms, and does not depend on the fuller treatment reserved for that future study. A full accounting of the sin nature and its relationship to Romans 6, connecting this study's own Chapter 4 §D to this library's own completed *Temptation and Sin* study, was flagged and left there, and remains genuinely open. And the question of how the early church settled on its own method of appointing leaders — Matthias by lot (this study's own Chapter 1 §G), the seven of Acts 6:1-6 and the elders of Acts 14:23 by some different process Acts itself does not fully characterize — was raised at Chapter 1 §G and named again at Chapter 7 §G, not as an item this study owes its own reader a future chapter on, but as a question belonging to a study of its own; this study sets it aside rather than carrying it forward as unfinished business of its own making. This study names each of these here, together, not as failures but as the same discipline this study has practiced throughout: better an honest gap, or an honest boundary, than a manufactured close.

Weighing it: Discipline, not argument — names what this study leaves open.

H. The Same Appeal, Still Standing

Peter's own sermon did not end with an explanation. It ended with a command, backed by "many other words" of testimony and exhortation this study has now traced to their own source, offered to a company Peter believed, on the strength of Joel's own oracle and David's own psalms, actually stood at a hinge point in what God was doing. This study has spent ten chapters arguing that Peter was not wrong to believe that, and this study's own Chapter 10 has shown the hinge Peter stood at has not yet closed. The appeal, then, is not a historical reconstruction this study offers for a reader's information alone. This study holds it as the same appeal, addressed on the same terms — repentance, baptism, and a gift received rather than earned (Acts 2:38, this study's own Chapters 4 and 6) — to whoever reads it now and finds themselves, like Peter's own first hearers, "pricked in their heart" (Acts 2:37, this study's own Chapter 4 §A) by what they have just read.

Weighing it: Narrative — carries no weight on any of this study's contested claims.

I. Closing — Save Yourself

This study began by naming two claims inside a single verse and promising to chase both as far as scripture would allow. Both have now been chased in full: the many other words, recovered from across the Gospels and the whole of the forty days (Chapters 1, 8, 9); the gift those words made available, promised and shown actually received according to a real, repeated pattern (Chapters 4, 6); and the administration those words and that gift belong to, placed among all seven scripture names and shown, on this study's own careful accounting, still open (Chapter 10). What remains is not further research but the same single word Luke chose to summarize everything else Peter said that day. Not save yourself by your own unaided effort — this study's own Chapter 5 has already shown the grammar itself will not bear that reading — but be saved: let go of resistance, receive what has already been held out, and join, on the same terms three thousand people joined the same day this study's own anchor passage records, a household this study has shown was never meant to close.

Weighing it: Summary only — restates what the sections above established, at the weights assigned to them there.

J. What Would Change This Study's Mind

Naming this is a discipline, not a gesture. Five findings would overturn load-bearing claims of this study, and a reader could go looking for any of them.

An account of the gift received where tongues are explicitly absent. Not an account that is silent, of which Chapter 6 §C counts two, but one where scripture reports the gift given and states that no tongues followed. That would turn claim T from a pattern into a disproved rule. None exists in Acts.

A text placing the hundred and twenty indoors at Acts 2:1. Claim P rests on five converging lines and concedes that no verse names the temple outright. A verse locating them in a private room when the sound came would end it, and Chapter 1 §D would have to be withdrawn rather than adjusted.

An occurrence of "baptized in the name of" attached to someone scripture then treats as unconverted. Claim B would break at the root, since the phrase could not then name the new birth. Simon Magus at Acts 8:13 would have been exactly such a case — which is why it matters that verse 13 does not carry the wording.

A clause in Joel's oracle fulfilled at Pentecost that this study has treated as future. Claim J rests on the cosmic wonders of Joel 2:30-31 plainly not having occurred that morning. Evidence that they did, in any sense Joel's own words will bear, would collapse the partial-fulfilment reading into the complete one.

A verse distinguishing the Comforter from God as one party from another. Not a verse naming both, of which there are many, but one setting the two over against each other in a way that cannot be read as Giver and gift. Claim H would fail. Acts 5:3-4 would have been such a case had its own verse 4 read otherwise.

None of the five exists in the text as it stands. That is the state of the evidence, not a proof of the conclusion.

Weighing it: Discipline, not argument — bears no weight either way; it names what would overturn this study's position.

Appendix A — Baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus (Condensed)

This appendix condenses a dedicated side study run to resolve one question this book's own Chapter 4 §C and Chapter 6 §F meet directly: does "baptized... in the name of Jesus Christ [the Lord Jesus, the Lord]" — Peter's phrase at Acts 2:38, and the phrase Acts 8:16, 10:48 and 19:5 also use — report a water rite, or name the new birth itself? It is commended to any reader who wants the case argued rather than stated; the companion study, *Baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus*, traces every text below verse by verse and weighs every argument in a table of its own.

One thing should be said before the argument begins. The companion study was substantially revised after a full accuracy review, and its position is weaker than an earlier version of this book reported. Six arguments were withdrawn, two accounts that had been treated as settled are now held open, and the conclusion is offered as a reasonable inference rather than a settled reading. This appendix reports the revised position, not the earlier one.

A. The Case for Water, Stated First

The reading this appendix does not take deserves to be met at full strength before any answer is offered, because it is the ordinary reading and it is not foolish.

Baptism in Acts is normally water. The Ethiopian eunuch asks "what doth hinder me to be baptized?" with water in front of him (Acts 8:36). Lydia's household and the Philippian jailer are baptized in circumstances that read as nothing else (16:15, 33). Paul names by name the people he baptized at Corinth (1 Corinthians 1:14-16). At Cornelius's house Peter himself says "can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized?" and then commands baptism in the next breath (10:47-48) — water proposed, and a command following it. Ananias tells Saul to "arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins" (22:16), which sounds like a rite. And 1 Corinthians 12:13 speaks of a Spirit-baptism belonging to all believers in different words entirely.

That is the case, and points four through six are conceded outright below.

Weighing it: Opposing case, stated — this section argues neither side; it sets out the case for water at full strength.

B. Two Phrases, Not One

Every Gospel draws the same contrast, and Acts repeats it: "John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence" (Acts 1:5; Matthew 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:33). "Baptized with the Holy Ghost," in exactly those words, occurs six times in all of scripture — the four Gospel predictions, Acts 1:5, and Peter's recollection at Acts 11:16 — and every one points to the single unrepeated outpouring at Pentecost (Acts 2:1-4). It is never commanded of anyone.

What Peter introduces at Acts 2:38 is a different phrase, appearing nowhere before that verse: "baptized... in the name of Jesus Christ." The companion study reads this new wording, from Acts 2:38 forward, as naming the new birth itself — confessing Jesus as Lord and believing God raised Him from the dead (Romans 10:9-10). Its strongest support is that the verb "baptize" does not supply its own element: it names an immersion without naming what into, and scripture uses it of things that are not water at all.

Weighing it: Direct statement on the contrast; reasonable inference on what the new phrase names — points toward the new-birth reading. That five witnesses draw the same water/Spirit distinction is what the texts say. That any particular later verse names the second rather than the first is **reasonable inference** only: the opposing reading grants the contrast entirely and holds that water simply continued alongside.

C. Running the Idiom Against Every Account, With Two Held Open

Cornelius's household (Acts 10:44-48) is the strongest account for this reading, and it rests on two silences. Water is proposed — "can any man forbid water" — and Luke never reports it applied. Then, challenged directly in Jerusalem about the whole episode, Peter's defence never mentions water at all; it reaches instead for Acts 1:5's own contrast: "John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost" (11:16). If water had been used, it is the plainest fact Peter could have offered, and he does not offer it.

Saul of Tarsus (Acts 9:18) is the control case that keeps the rule from becoming unfalsifiable. The text does not attach the idiom to his baptism at all, so the ordinary sense — including water — stays open, and the companion study reads it that way. Where the wording is absent, the rule is not applied. Applied in one direction only, it would not be a rule.

Samaria (Acts 8:16) and **Ephesus** (Acts 19:5) are both **held open**. An earlier version of this book reported Samaria as settled and Ephesus as merely hard. That distinction could not survive: the two verses are word for word identical in Greek, so no difference can be drawn on the wording. Samaria leans toward the new-birth reading on its context; Ephesus leans the other way on its own; the companion study takes no final position on either, and neither does this book.

Weighing it: Strong inference on Cornelius; open question on Samaria and Ephesus — points toward the new-birth reading without settling it. The two silences at Cornelius's house are **direct statements** about what Luke and Peter do not say, and the inference from them is **strong**; the opposing reading can

fairly answer that an argument from silence is weaker than one from what a text contains. On Samaria and Ephesus this appendix states no position.

D. What Remains Genuinely Water

This study does not read every occurrence of "baptize" in Acts as spiritual, and does not explain away the ones that are not. The Ethiopian eunuch (8:36, 38), Lydia's household (16:15), the Philippian jailer (16:33), and the converts Paul names as baptized by his own hand at Corinth (1 Corinthians 1:14-16) are genuine, literal water baptisms — all of them after Pentecost, and all conceded outright. None carries the "in the name of Jesus Christ" idiom.

Weighing it: Concession — these accounts are conceded to the water reading in full.

E. Where This Sits in the Administration Framework

This book's own Chapter 10 places Acts 2:38 at the Grace administration's opening declaration. One thing an earlier version of this book said here is **withdrawn**: that water baptism "does not belong to Grace." It plainly continued past Pentecost — section D above names five occasions. What the companion study argues instead is narrower and survives its own Chapter 5: what ended was water baptism's standing as a *commanded* rite. No epistle commands it, Romans 10:9-10 does not include it, and Paul says Christ sent him "not to baptize, but to preach the gospel" (1 Corinthians 1:17).

Weighing it: Reasonable inference — leans toward the new-birth reading, and corrects a withdrawn claim. That no epistle commands water baptism is an argument from absence and is weighed as one; the opposing reading can fairly answer that a practice this widespread needed no command.

F. The Settled Position

"Baptized with the Holy Ghost" names one unrepeatable event, Pentecost alone. "Baptized in the name of Jesus Christ" is best read, from Acts 2:38 forward, as naming the new birth — **offered as a reasonable inference, not a settled reading**. It rests on one near-direct point (the verb supplies no element) and one strong argument from two converging silences (Cornelius). Samaria and Ephesus are held open. Where the wording is absent, the ordinary sense including water stays open. The eunuch, Lydia, the jailer and Paul's own converts at Corinth are genuine water baptisms. Water baptism did not end at Pentecost; what ended was its standing as a command.

Six arguments earlier versions leaned on have been withdrawn, including a lexical reading of the Greek verb at Acts 10:48 and a proposed distinction between two "receive" words in Acts. The companion study lists all six in a table of its own, marked as withdrawn, so that no later version quietly reinstates them.

Weighing it: Summary only — restates the findings at the weights assigned to them above.

Appendix B — He or It? The Holy Spirit's Own Pronoun (Condensed)

This appendix condenses a dedicated side study run to resolve a question this book's Chapter 2 §A, Chapter 5 §A and Chapter 8 §§G-I each meet as it arises: scripture calls the Comforter "he" throughout John 14-16, yet calls the identical gift "itself" at Romans 8:16 and 26. Two different things — a person genuinely "he" beside something genuinely "it" — or one reality described two accurate ways in two grammatical settings? The companion study, *He or It? The Holy Spirit's Own Pronoun in Scripture*, argues every text below verse by verse and weighs every argument in a table of its own.

A. The Giver and the Gift, Named as Two Different Things

God is spirit (John 4:24), and a giver can only give what is his to give: "how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" (Luke 11:13). Giver and gift share the same two words — holy, spirit — without being the same referent, exactly as Jesus tells Nicodemus: "that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (John 3:6), the first naming the Giver, the second what that birth produces in the one born. John's own aside confirms it from another angle: the gift had a moment before which it was "not yet given" (John 7:39), tied to Jesus's glorification. The Giver was never "not yet" anything. The gift was.

Weighing it: Direct statement — establishes that two referents are in view, and points toward the Comforter being the gift. The opposing reading grants the distinction and holds the gift to be a person who proceeds from the Father.

B. Why Greek Grammar Alone Settles Nothing

Greek assigns every noun a gender as a fixed property of the word, unrelated to whether the thing it names is alive or personal — "child" is neuter in Greek even when the child is a living boy. *Pneuma*, "spirit," is neuter by its word-class, and the King James translators wrote the agreeing pronoun as "itself" at Romans 8:16 and 26 — not downgrading anything, simply rendering ordinary agreement.

This cuts both ways, and the companion study says so plainly: a neuter pronoun no more proves impersonality than a masculine one proves personhood. Outside grammarians who hold the Spirit to be a distinct person concede exactly this — that the gender of the pronouns in these chapters neither supports nor challenges the doctrine. What follows is not that the question is settled by grammar, but that it cannot be, which removes the argument most often built on these chapters.

Weighing it: Direct statement — points toward neither reading, and removes the pronoun argument from both.

C. What the Pronouns in John 14-16 Actually Are

Here the companion study corrects something an earlier version of it, and an earlier version of this appendix, got wrong. It is not true that every pronoun across John 14-16 is masculine. That is true of the King James's English and false of the Greek.

At **John 14:17** — "whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him" — the Greek pronouns are **neuter**, agreeing with "the Spirit of truth," and the translators rendered them personally. The masculine pronouns an English reader meets there are not in the text underneath.

At **John 14:26** and **15:26** both genders appear within a single sentence, each agreeing with its own noun: masculine where the pronoun attaches to "Comforter" (*parakletos*, a masculine noun), neuter where it attaches to "Spirit." The alternation runs in both directions, twice, inside single verses.

That is the pattern, and it is ordinary Greek: gender tracks the noun a pronoun attaches to, not the nature of the thing named. The sustained masculinity an English reader experiences across these chapters is substantially an artefact of the translation.

Weighing it: Direct statement on the pronouns; strong inference on what follows — points toward the Comforter's "he" being grammatical. That the Greek is neuter at 14:17 and mixed at 14:26 and 15:26 is a fact about the text. The opposing reading can fairly answer that the masculine carries the main verb in both mixed verses while the neuter only describes.

D. The One Verse That Is Genuinely Hard

The companion study names, as an earlier version did not, the place where its own account is strained. At **John 16:13** a masculine demonstrative stands immediately beside the neuter "the Spirit of truth," with "Comforter" six verses back at 16:7 — the one location where the nearest noun is neuter and the pronoun went masculine anyway.

The answer is that reaching back past intervening material is what a demonstrative characteristically does, and that "Comforter" governs the whole block from 16:7; the grammarians most eager for this verse to prove personality concede it does not. The companion study holds that answer as outweighing the objection without dissolving it. And the verse's own content runs the other way: three times across 16:13-15 its subject is said to originate nothing and to speak only what it receives — which fits a gift conveying its Giver's content more naturally than a co-equal person.

Weighing it: Neutral — taken whole, this verse settles nothing either way. Its pronoun favours a distinct person; its content favours a gift. The companion study concedes both.

E. What the Comforter Actually Does

Tracing pronouns does not explain the active verbs, nor the texts outside these chapters where the Holy Ghost is lied to (Acts 5:3), grieved (Ephesians 4:30), and forbids men to travel (Acts 16:6-7). The

companion study takes each in turn. Acts 5 names **God** in its own second clause — "thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God" — identifying rather than distinguishing. Ephesians 4:30 says "the holy Spirit **of God**," and grieving what is God's is grieving God. "Another Comforter" is *allos*, another of the same kind, which is the opposing reading's best verbal ground and is only partly answered — by Jesus's own words two verses later: "I will not leave you comfortless: **I will come to you**" (John 14:18). Acts 16:6-7 is conceded as the point where the reading is most exposed.

Underneath all of them stands that same framing. The Comforter's arrival is not a substitute for Jesus but His own continued coming, now through the medium of the gift rather than a body confined to one place. And the gift is genuinely alive — "spirit, and... life" (John 6:63), believers made "partakers of the divine nature" (2 Peter 1:4) — genuinely active, and genuinely operating as a believer yields to it, without being for that reason a separate person.

Weighing it: Mixed, stated per text — Acts 5 and Ephesians 4:30 point toward the gift reading; "another Comforter" and Acts 16:6-7 are the opposing reading's real ground and are not removed.

F. The Settled Position, and the Working Convention

"He" is accurate exactly where scripture names God Himself — the Father, and, where in view, the Son. "It" is the more accurate word wherever scripture names the gift, and it is the King James's own word wherever the Greek pronoun stands in direct relation to "spirit" with nothing between. The masculine "he" through John 14-16 is ordinary grammatical agreement with "Comforter," and at John 14:17 it is not in the Greek at all. This is offered as a **strong inference**, not a conclusion no careful reader could reach otherwise.

Nothing here alters scripture's printed words. Wherever this book quotes John 14:16, 14:26, 15:26 or 16:7-15, the word printed is "he" and it stays "he." What changes is only this book's own commentary: "he" for the Father and the Son, "it" for the gift itself, under whichever of its titles a verse happens to use.

Weighing it: Summary only — restates the findings at the weights assigned to them above.

Appendix C — Word Studies in Full

This appendix carries the complete occurrence lists behind the word studies the chapters state as findings. The narrative gives the result; this is the working.

C1. *Skolios* — "untoward," "crooked" (Strong's G4646) — Chapter 5 §B

Four occurrences in the New Testament. **Luke 3:5**, quoting Isaiah 40:4, neuter plural standing alone — "the crooked shall be made straight," of ways rather than of persons. **Acts 2:40**, this study's own verse, with *genea*. **Philippians 2:15**, with *genea* and a second adjective, of a Gentile audience decades later. **1**

Peter 2:18, dative plural masculine, of difficult masters — the word doing ordinary work with no covenant weight attached.

Behind all four stands **Deuteronomy 32:5** in the Greek Old Testament: *genea skolia kai diestrammene*, "a generation, crooked and perverse." **Philippians 2:15** takes the whole phrase; **Matthew 17:17** takes the second adjective and replaces the first with *apistos*, "faithless"; **Acts 2:40** takes the first alone. Three writers, one source text, three different portions.

C2. *Diamartyromai* — "testify," "charge" (Strong's G1263) — Chapter 5 §A

Fifteen occurrences. **Luke 16:28. Acts 2:40; 8:25; 10:42; 18:5; 20:21; 20:23; 20:24; 23:11; 28:23. 1 Thessalonians 4:6. 1 Timothy 5:21. 2 Timothy 2:14; 4:1. Hebrews 2:6.**

Rendered "testify"/"testified"/"testifying" eleven times, including **Hebrews 2:6** of scripture's own witness; "charge" three times, all of Paul instructing Timothy; and "witnesseth" once, at **Acts 20:23**. **Nine of the fifteen fall in Acts** — the concentration on which Chapter 5 §A rests. Of those nine, five mark formal proclamation of the gospel's substance: **Acts 2:40** and **10:42** of Peter, **8:25** of Peter and John at Samaria, **20:24** and **28:23** of Paul.

C3. *Lambano, dechomai, apodechomai* — "receive" — Chapters 4 §E, 6 §§B, E

Lambano (G2983) is the ordinary verb for taking hold of what is offered. In this study's field of view it appears at **Acts 1:8** (power), **John 20:22** (the enacted sign), **Acts 2:38** (the gift promised, future tense), and **Acts 8:17, 19** (the gift received at Samaria). Its object throughout is the gift itself.

Dechomai (G1209) is the simple verb for welcoming what is offered — **Acts 8:14**, of Samaria receiving the word of God. *Apodechomai* (G588) is its intensified compound, "to welcome fully" — **Acts 2:41**, of the three thousand receiving Peter's word. The object of both is the message, not the gift.

C4. *Koinonia* — "fellowship" (Strong's G2842) — Chapter 7 §B

Nineteen occurrences. **Acts 2:42. Romans 15:26. 1 Corinthians 1:9; 10:16 (twice). 2 Corinthians 6:14; 8:4; 9:13; 13:14. Galatians 2:9. Ephesians 3:9. Philippians 1:5; 2:1; 3:10. Philemon 6. Hebrews 13:16. 1 John 1:3; 1:6; 1:7.**

Rendered five ways: "fellowship" (twelve), "communion" (four), "communication," "contribution," and "distribution" (one each). Three clusters account for all nineteen — a shared relationship (**1 Corinthians 1:9; 1 John 1:3, 6, 7**), a shared labour or suffering (**Galatians 2:9; Philippians 1:5; 2:1; 3:10**), and a shared purse (**Romans 15:26; 2 Corinthians 8:4; 9:13; Hebrews 13:16**). Across the whole list there is no occurrence where the word names a bare status rather than something actually held in common.

C5. *Ktema* and *hyparxis* — "possessions" and "goods" — Chapter 7 §E

Ktema (G2933) occurs four times: **Matthew 19:22** and **Mark 10:22** (the rich young ruler's "great possessions," plural), **Acts 2:45** (plural, sold by the early church), and **Acts 5:1** (singular — Ananias's one piece of property). The word denotes landed property specifically. *Hyparxis* (G5223) occurs twice, at **Acts 2:45** and **Hebrews 10:34**.

C6. Shorter entries

Proskartereo (G4342), "continue stedfastly" — **Acts 1:14; 2:42; 2:46; 6:4** among others; Luke's own word for a practice maintained by repeated act of the will.

Homothumadon (G3661), "with one accord" — **Acts 1:14; 2:1; 2:46; 4:24; 5:12; 15:25**, of a company acting as one felt purpose.

Aphesis (G859), "remission" — built on *aphiemi*, "to send away"; the picture is removal, not concealment.

Tekmerion (G5039), "infallible proofs" — **Acts 1:3 only**, the one occurrence in the New Testament; a fixed marker that settles a question.

Parakletos (G3875), "Comforter" — **John 14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7; 1 John 2:1**.

Appendix D — Grammar Notes

D1. *Sothete*, **Acts 2:40** — aorist passive imperative — Chapter 5 §D

Second person plural, a genuine imperative, and **passive** rather than active or reflexive. The more literal rendering is "be ye saved" — a command to receive rather than to perform. The same construction governs **2 Corinthians 5:20**, "be ye reconciled to God," which commands a response to what God has already done rather than commanding the hearer to accomplish reconciliation. The tense is aorist, naming a decisive act rather than a sustained process. "Save yourselves" is not a mistranslation — English has no natural way to render a passive imperative — but read alone it suggests a self-generated effort the voice does not support.

D2. The periphrastic future perfect, **Matthew 16:19** and **18:18** — Chapter 8 §§D, E

Both verses render "shall be bound" and "shall be loosed" with a periphrastic future perfect passive. A more literal rendering is "shall have already been bound" and "shall have already been loosed." On that reading the authority given declares a verdict heaven has reached rather than creating one heaven must then ratify. The construction is identical in both verses, the first addressed to Peter in the singular and the second to the wider company in the plural.

D3. The genitive at Acts 2:38 — Chapter 4 §E

"The gift of the Holy Ghost" translates a genitive construction, and Greek genitives, like English "of," carry more than one possible relation. This study reads it as epexegetical — a genitive of apposition: "the gift, that is, the Holy Ghost" — so that God's own self is what is held out, rather than a separate gift supplied through His agency. The same construction recurs at **Acts 2:33**, "the promise of the Holy Ghost," and is read the same way. This is the more natural reading in context; it is not the only grammatically available one.

D4. *Katameno* and *proskartereo*, Acts 1:13-14 — Chapter 1 §D

Verse 13's "abode" is *katameno* (G2650) — to lodge, reside — and its participle is masculine plural, matching the list of eleven men's names it follows. Verse 14's "continued" is *proskartereo* (G4342), a different verb naming persistence in an activity, and Luke uses it of the same company at **Acts 2:42** and **2:46**, the latter explicitly in the temple. The two verbs are doing different work; whether they also name different places is the inference Chapter 1 §D argues.

D5. The three *syn-* compounds, Ephesians 3:6 — Chapter 10 §E

Three words in succession, each built on the prefix *syn-*, "together with": *synkleronoma*, fellow-heirs; *syssoma*, of the same body; *symmetocha*, partakers together. **Of the three, *syssoma* appears nowhere else in scripture.** *Synkleronomos* occurs also at Romans 8:17, Hebrews 11:9 and 1 Peter 3:7; *symmetochos* at Ephesians 5:7. The observation Chapter 10 §E rests on is the stacking of three compounds of one prefix in a single clause, not a claim that all three are new coinages.

Appendix E — Chronology and Numbers

E1. The ten days, worked out — Chapter 1 §E

Leviticus 23:15-16 sets the count: from the morrow after the sabbath — the Feast of Firstfruits — seven complete sabbaths are numbered, then a fiftieth day. Christ rose on that Firstfruits day (1 Corinthians 15:20). Acts 1:3 gives forty days of resurrection appearances, ending in the ascension.

The count is **inclusive**, as Israel's own festival calendar counts: resurrection day is day one, and Pentecost is the fiftieth. On that reckoning the ascension falls on day forty and Pentecost on day fifty, which leaves **nine clear days between them** and a tenth day that is the feast itself. "Ten days" is the figure scripture's own reckoning yields and the one this study uses; a reader counting the interval rather than the days will arrive at nine, and neither is an error.

E2. Fifty, and the jubilee — Chapter 2 §B

Pentecost's fifty is $7 \times 7 + 1$. Leviticus 25:10 sets the jubilee at the fiftieth year, on the far side of seven sabbaths of years, with liberty proclaimed and inheritance restored. The arithmetic and the theme are

shared. The units are not: one counts days and the other years, and scripture nowhere states that Pentecost is a jubilee. This study holds the parallel as suggestive rather than established.

E3. The Sinai tradition — Chapter 2 §B

Later rabbinic sources associate the Feast of Weeks with the giving of the Law at Sinai. Exodus 19:1 places Israel's arrival at Sinai in "the third month," which is within reach of a fiftieth-day reckoning, but states the month only and not the day, and the Torah nowhere says the Law was given on the calendar day the Feast of Weeks would fall. The association is real, well attested, and almost certainly part of why the feast carried the weight it did for observant hearers. It is tradition, not scripture's own claim.

E4. Josephus on the scale of the feast — Chapter 2 §D

Of a revolt at Pentecost within living memory of the generation Acts 2 describes, Josephus records that "many ten thousands of men" had gathered at Jerusalem for the feast, drawn from Galilee, Idumea, Jericho and beyond Jordan (*Antiquities* 17.10.2). Of an earlier Pentecost he records "all the places about the temple and all the city" full of a multitude (*Wars* 1.13.3). Neither passage describes the year of Acts 2, and Josephus's figures elsewhere are openly rounded and rhetorical. What they establish is the ordinary scale of the day, on the independent testimony of a contemporary with no stake in this study's argument — not a count for this particular occasion.

Appendix F — Textual and Manuscript Notes

F1. Matthew 28:19 and the forgery claim — Chapter 9 §C

The claim that the triune baptismal formula was inserted after the Council of Nicea (A.D. 325) does not survive examination.

The manuscripts. Every surviving Greek manuscript of Matthew 28 carries the clause, without exception. Nothing resembling a genuine textual variant — of the kind 1 John 5:7 actually is — exists at this verse.

Eusebius. The strongest evidence usually offered is that Eusebius quotes the verse in an abbreviated form, "in my name," some seventeen or eighteen times, mostly in works written before Nicea. On examination this is a citation habit rather than evidence of a different underlying text: Eusebius quotes the verse in its full form before Nicea as well, showing he knew the complete wording throughout, and ancient writers routinely quoted only the clause bearing on their immediate argument, in an age before chapter and verse made full quotation easy.

Chronology. The *Didache*, which mainstream scholarship dates to roughly A.D. 100-120, already commands baptism "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." Justin Martyr independently describes the same formula around A.D. 150. A formula already fixed in Christian practice by the first half of the second century cannot have been inserted at a council convened in A.D. 325.

What remains. The apparent tension with Acts 2:38 is a matter of translation, not of text. Andrews Norton (*A Statement of Reasons for Not Believing the Doctrines of Trinitarians*, 1856, pp. 216-219) observes that "name" in this construction is a Hebraistic idiom adding nothing to the sense, and that the preposition is better rendered "to" than "in": baptizing converts to the Father, to the Son, and to the holy spirit. That is a real minority reading, not a consensus, and Chapter 9 §C rates it as such. What does not depend on it is the narrower point: the construction itself proves neither deity nor personhood — Israel was "baptized unto Moses" (1 Corinthians 10:2) — so the verse, however it is rendered, does not name three co-equal persons, and this study does not commend its wording as a formula to recite.

F2. Mark 16:9-20 — Chapter 9 §D

The passage is absent from two of the oldest surviving Greek manuscripts of Mark, Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus, and its authenticity has been genuinely disputed for well over a century. This study follows its own stated method in using the King James Version as base text, and treats the passage as received scripture for that purpose — while rating any evidence drawn from it as inheriting the dispute.

F3. Peter's quotation of Joel — Chapter 3 §C

Five differences between Acts 2:17-21 and Joel 2:28-32 as the King James renders each. Joel's "afterward" becomes "in the last days." Joel's order of old men dreaming and young men seeing visions is reversed. A clause, "and they shall prophesy," is added to the handmaidens' portion. Joel's "great and terrible day" becomes "great and notable day" — the Greek behind "notable" being *epiphane* (G2016), manifest or conspicuous, which is the Septuagint's own rendering and which Luke, writing in Greek, follows. And Joel's "I will pour out my spirit" becomes "I will pour out **of** my Spirit," a partitive naming a portion given. None amounts to a contradiction; all five are named rather than smoothed over.

F4. "Judaea" in the list of nations — Chapter 2 §D

Acts 2:9 names Judaea in the middle of a list of foreign lands, which is a real textual puzzle. Various alternatives have been proposed. This study follows the Received Text the King James renders and does not claim to resolve it.

Appendix G — Weight of Each Argument

Every load-bearing argument this study makes, grouped by the claim it serves, with its weight, its direction, and what the opposing reading can fairly answer. The final rows are arguments earlier versions of this study made and this version withdraws or demotes, kept visible so that no later version quietly reinstates them.

#	Claim	Argument	Where	Weight	What the other reading fairly answers
1	T	Three accounts report reception and tongues in the same sentence	Ch. 6 §C	Direct statement	Three of six accounts is not all six
2	T	Acts 9 is silent, and Paul later testifies to tongues himself	Ch. 6 §C	Reasonable inference	1 Cor. 14:18 cannot date what it reports
3	T	Acts 4:31 is a refilling, not a first receiving	Ch. 6 §C	Reasonable inference	The verse uses the same verb as Acts 2:4
4	T	Nowhere does Acts report the gift received and tongues withheld	Ch. 6 §C	Direct statement	An argument from silence cuts both ways
5	T	What Simon saw implies something visible at Samaria	Ch. 6 §H	Corroboration only	It shows something was seen, not what
6	T	1 Cor. 14:22's sign supports the pattern	Ch. 3 §A	Corroboration only	14:23 has the same sign draw the charge of madness
7	T	Mark 16:17 names tongues among the signs	Ch. 9 §D	Corroboration only	From a textually disputed passage
8	—	The manifestation is foundational and richly attested	Ch. 6 §D	Mixed, per claim	The praying-in-the-spirit texts may name Spirit-led prayer in a known language
9	P	Acts 1:13 and 1:14 use two different verbs	Ch. 1 §D	Direct statement	Different verbs need not mean different places
10	P	Luke 24:53 has the same company continually in the temple	Ch. 1 §D	Direct statement	That is Luke's summary of a period, not of one morning
11	P	Oikos is used of the temple elsewhere	Ch. 1 §D	Reasonable inference	It is the ordinary word for a house

#	Claim	Argument	Where	Weight	What the other reading fairly answers
12	P	Deut. 16:16's pilgrims would be at the temple at the hour of prayer	Ch. 1 §D	Reasonable inference	It locates the crowd, not the hundred and twenty
13	P	The women are never placed in the room of v.13	Ch. 1 §D	Argument from silence	Named as such by this study
14	B	Acts 1:5 names two baptisms and distinguishes them by element	Ch. 4 §C	Direct statement	Grants the contrast; holds that water continued
15	B	The verb "baptize" supplies no element of its own	Appendix A	Direct statement	Context ordinarily supplies water
16	B	At Cornelius's house water is proposed and never reported used	Appendix A	Strong inference	Argument from silence
17	B	Peter's defence at Acts 11 never mentions water	Appendix A	Strong inference	He answers the charge actually made
18	B	Samaria (8:16) and Ephesus (19:5) are both held open	Appendix A	Open question	Their Greek is word for word identical
19	J	Joel's cosmic wonders did not occur that morning	Ch. 3 §C	Direct statement	Peter says "this is that" without qualification
20	J	Peter's "in the last days" frames an era, not a single morning	Ch. 3 §C	Strong inference	It may be interpretive shorthand only
21	G	The sevenfold framework and its test	Ch. 10 §B	Corroboration only	Imported from another study, not re-argued here
22	G	Tongues satisfy the audible-declaration test	Ch. 10 §C	Reasonable inference	A test met in a different form each time is weaker

#	Claim	Argument	Where	Weight	What the other reading fairly answers
23	G	Gentile inclusion precedes Paul's letters, so the Mystery opens no new administration	Ch. 10 §E	Corroboration only	Imported from another study
24	G	"As many as the Lord our God shall call" is open-ended	Ch. 10 §G	Reasonable inference	An open phrase is not a statement about later centuries
25	S	<i>Sothete</i> is an aorist passive imperative	Ch. 5 §D	Direct statement	A passive imperative still commands a real act
26	S	The first half of v.40 supplies what the command requires	Ch. 5 §D	Strong inference	The relation is inferred, not stated
27	H	Romans 8:16, 26 render the agreeing pronoun "itself"	Appendix B	Direct statement	Neuter proves impersonality no more than masculine proves personhood
28	H	The Greek pronouns at John 14:17 are neuter	Appendix B	Direct statement	Does not prove impersonality
29	H	John 14:26 and 15:26 use both genders in one sentence	Appendix B	Direct statement	The masculine carries the main verb in both
30	H	John 16:13 settles nothing either way	Appendix B	Neutral	Conceded by this study
31	H	Acts 5:4's own second clause names God	Appendix B	Strong inference	On trinitarian premises the verse fits that view too
32	H	Acts 16:6-7 is the point where this reading is most exposed	Appendix B	Concession	Acts of will belong to persons

#	Claim	Argument	Where	Weight	What the other reading fairly answers
33	R	<i>Petros</i> and <i>petra</i> are two different words	Ch. 8 §C	Direct statement	Aramaic would not preserve the distinction
34	R	The feminine demonstrative points to the confession just made	Ch. 8 §C	Reasonable inference	1 Cor. 10:4 names Christ the Rock
35	R	"Gates of hell" pictures the church advancing	Ch. 8 §C	Corroboration only	The ordinary sense of "prevail against" runs the other way
36	W	Acts 1:4-5 still commands waiting, after John 20	Ch. 9 §E	Direct statement	John may record without regard to Luke's sequence
37	W	Thomas's absence tells against a bestowal	Ch. 9 §F	Argument from silence	Scripture does not record every later moment
—	B	<i>Withdrawn:</i> <i>prostasso</i> at Acts 10:48 means "ascribe or define"	was Ch. 4 §C	Withdrawn	All seven New Testament uses mean <i>command</i>
—	B	<i>Withdrawn:</i> Samaria settled as new birth	was Ch. 6 §E	Withdrawn	Acts 8:16 and 19:5 are identical in Greek; both held open
—	B	<i>Withdrawn:</i> water baptism does not belong to Grace	was Appendix A	Withdrawn	Contradicted by five water baptisms after Pentecost
—	B	<i>Withdrawn:</i> a <i>dechomai/lamban</i> o inward-vs-manifested distinction	was Ch. 6 §E	Withdrawn	Not a pattern in Acts
—	T	<i>Demoted:</i> tongues as God's "stated design"	was Intro §E	Demoted	Pattern, not statement; now a reasonable inference

#	Claim	Argument	Where	Weight	What the other reading fairly answers
—	H	<i>Withdrawn</i> : every pronoun in John 14-16 is masculine	was Appendix B	Withdrawn	True of the English, false of the Greek
—	—	<i>Withdrawn</i> : seven named grammarians support the Acts 2:38 genitive	was Ch. 4 §E	Withdrawn	Named without citation; not verifiable as stated

Scripture Index

Genesis 4:7 Appendix B

Exodus 19:1 Chapter 2 §B

Leviticus 23:15 Chapter 2 §B

Leviticus 23:17 Chapter 7 §F

Leviticus 25:10 Chapter 2 §B

Deuteronomy 32:5 Introduction §F; Chapter 5 §B

Psalms 78:8 Introduction §F; Chapter 5 §B

Proverbs 8; 9:1 Appendix B

Isaiah 28:11 Chapter 10 §C

Jeremiah 31:31 Chapter 10 §F

Ezekiel 36:26 Chapter 10 §F

Joel 2:26 Chapter 3 §C

Joel 2:28-32 Introduction §C

Matthew 4:4-10 Chapter 10 §K

Matthew 10:1 Chapter 3 §A

Matthew 16:15-17 Chapter 8 §B

Matthew 16:18 Chapter 8 §C

Matthew 16:19 Chapter 8 §D

Matthew 17:17 Introduction §F; Chapter 5 §B

Matthew 18:15-18 Chapter 8 §E

Matthew 19:23 Chapter 8 §D

Matthew 27:3 Chapter 1 §F

Acts 5:4 Chapter 7 §E

Acts 8:12-13 Appendix A

Acts 8:14-17 Chapter 6 §F; Appendix A; Appendix B

Acts 8:18-19 Chapter 6 §H

Acts 8:20-23 Chapter 6 §H

Acts 8:36 Appendix A

Acts 9:17 Chapter 6 §C

Acts 9:18 Appendix A

Acts 10:34-35 Chapter 10 §E

Acts 10:44-46 Chapter 6 §C

Acts 10:47-48 Chapter 4 §C; Appendix A

Acts 11:15-16 Chapter 4 §C; Appendix A

Acts 11:17-18 Chapter 10 §E

Acts 16:15 Appendix A

Acts 16:33 Appendix A

Acts 19:5 Appendix A

Acts 19:6 Chapter 6 §C

Romans 3:20 Chapter 10 §H

Romans 5:10 Chapter 10 §H

Romans 6:11 Chapter 10 §H

Romans 6:14 Chapter 10 §C

Romans 8:2 Chapter 10 §C; Chapter 10 §H

Matthew 28:2-7 Chapter 1 §C
Matthew 28:18-20 Chapter 9 §C
Mark 10:23 Chapter 8 §D
Mark 16:15-18 Chapter 9 §D
Luke 3:4-5 Chapter 5 §B
Luke 9:1 Chapter 3 §A
Luke 11:13 Appendix B
Luke 18:24 Chapter 8 §D
Luke 24:4-7 Chapter 1 §C
Luke 24:45-49 Chapter 9 §B
John 3:6 Appendix B
John 4:24 Appendix B
John 6:63 Appendix B

John 7:39 Appendix B
John 8:32 Chapter 10 §K
John 14:12 Chapter 8 §G; Appendix B
John 14:16 Chapter 2 §A; Appendix B
John 14:18 Appendix B
John 14:25 Chapter 2 §A; Appendix B
John 15:26 Chapter 2 §A; Appendix B
John 15:26-27 Chapter 8 §H
John 16:7 Chapter 2 §A; Appendix B
John 16:13-14 Chapter 8 §I; Appendix B
John 20:11-13 Chapter 1 §C
John 20:19 Chapter 2 §A
John 20:19-23 Chapter 9 §E
John 20:23 Chapter 8 §F
John 20:24 Chapter 9 §F
Acts 1:1 Chapter 1 §A
Acts 1:3-5 Introduction §D
Acts 1:4 Chapter 1 §B; Chapter 2 §A
Acts 1:5 Chapter 4 §C; Appendix A
Acts 1:9 Chapter 1 §C
Acts 1:12 Chapter 1 §D
Acts 1:16 Chapter 1 §D

Romans 8:16 Appendix B
Romans 8:26 Appendix B
Romans 10:9-10 Appendix A
Romans 12:1 Chapter 10 §J
Romans 15:26 Chapter 7 §B
Romans 16:25-26 Chapter 10 §E
1 Corinthians 1:9 Chapter 7 §B
1 Corinthians 2:16 Chapter 10 §J
1 Corinthians 5:6-8 Chapter 7 §F
1 Corinthians 6:11 Chapter 10 §H
1 Corinthians 6:19-20 Chapter 10 §H
1 Corinthians 7:23 Chapter 10 §H
1 Corinthians 12:7 Chapter 3 §A; Chapter 10 §C; Appendix B
1 Corinthians 14:22 Chapter 3 §A
1 Corinthians 15:5-7 Chapter 9 §E
1 Corinthians 15:12 Chapter 10 §I
2 Corinthians 5:18 Chapter 10 §H
2 Corinthians 8:4 Chapter 7 §B
2 Corinthians 9:13 Chapter 7 §B
2 Corinthians 12:2 Chapter 10 §E
Galatians 2:7-9 Chapter 10 §E
Galatians 2:9 Chapter 7 §B
Galatians 2:16 Chapter 10 §H
Galatians 3:10 Chapter 10 §H
Ephesians 1:5 Chapter 10 §H
Ephesians 1:20-21 Chapter 10 §K
Ephesians 2:5-6 Chapter 10 §K
Ephesians 2:8-9 Chapter 10 §C
Ephesians 2:14-15 Chapter 10 §E
Ephesians 3:2 Chapter 10 §E
Ephesians 4:5 Appendix A
Ephesians 4:22 Chapter 10 §J
Ephesians 4:24 Chapter 10 §J
Ephesians 6:10 Chapter 10 §K
Ephesians 6:18 Chapter 10 §K

Acts 1:18 Chapter 1 §F
Acts 1:20 Chapter 1 §G
Acts 2:1 Chapter 2 §B
Acts 2:2 Chapter 2 §C; Chapter 10 §C
Acts 2:5 Chapter 2 §D
Acts 2:12 Chapter 2 §E
Acts 2:14 Chapter 3 §B
Acts 2:15 Chapter 2 §E
Acts 2:17 Chapter 3 §C
Acts 2:22 Chapter 3 §D
Acts 2:25 Chapter 3 §E
Acts 2:32 Chapter 3 §F
Acts 2:34 Chapter 3 §G
Acts 2:37 Chapter 4 §A
Acts 2:38 Anchor Passage; Chapter 4 §B; Chapter 6 §B; Chapter 10 §C; Chapter 11 §A
Acts 2:39 Chapter 4 §F; Chapter 10 §G
Acts 2:40 Chapter 5 §A
Acts 2:41 Chapter 6 §E; Chapter 11 §F
Acts 2:42 Introduction §G; Chapter 7 §A
Acts 2:43 Chapter 7 §D
Acts 2:44 Chapter 7 §E
Acts 2:47 Chapter 7 §H
Acts 3:18 Chapter 9 §A
Acts 4:27 Chapter 9 §A

Philippians 1:5 Chapter 7 §B
Philippians 2:1 Chapter 7 §B
Philippians 2:5 Chapter 10 §J
Philippians 2:15 Chapter 5 §B
Philippians 3:10 Chapter 7 §B
Philippians 4:8 Chapter 10 §J
Colossians 1:13 Chapter 8 §D
Colossians 1:26 Chapter 10 §E
Colossians 1:27 Chapter 10 §I
1 Thessalonians 4:13 Chapter 10 §I
1 Thessalonians 5:8 Chapter 10 §K
1 Timothy 6:17 Chapter 10 §I
Titus 1:2 Chapter 10 §I
Hebrews 6:18-19 Chapter 10 §I
Hebrews 10:10 Chapter 10 §H

Hebrews 10:23 Chapter 10 §H
James 4:2 Chapter 10 §H
1 Peter 2:18 Chapter 5 §B
1 Peter 3:15 Chapter 10 §I
2 Peter 1:4 Appendix B
2 Peter 1:11 Chapter 8 §D
1 John 1:3 Chapter 7 §B; Chapter 10 §J
1 John 1:6-7 Chapter 7 §B