1. **Jesus’ Commission and Ascension (1:6-11)**

* On Jesus’ last days on earth, it seems that the priority of his time with the disciples was to teach and prepared them of what was to come. Verses 6-8 we can observe Jesus answering their burning question regarding the coming of the Holy Spirit and commands them to be “witnesses”; clearly we will see this again in the book of Acts. In the following 3 verses (9-11), Jesus ascends to heaven and two angels appear to deliver the message of Jesus’ future return.
  1. **Jesus’ Commission (6-8)**

**Acts 1:6**   So when they had come together, they were asking Him, saying, “Lord, is it at this time You are restoring the kingdom to Israel?” **7** He said to them, “It is not for you to know times or epochs which the Father has fixed by His own authority; **8** but you will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you shall be My witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and even to the remotest part of the earth.”

* Luke now records a conversation between the disciples and the risen Lord. The transitional phrase, “So when they had come together,” perhaps speaking of the last time they met with him before his ascension. If this is so, their last meeting together was going to be a memorable one! Notice that Luke uses the imperfect to create a sense of tension regarding the question… “the imperfect is used for a question because the action of questioning is incomplete until an answer is given.[[1]](#footnote-1)”
* The question is an astute one: ““Lord, is it at this time You are restoring the kingdom to Israel?””—This question has given lots to talk and write about:
  + Most of the time we have heard those who, mistakenly, would say that the explanation to this question is that the disciples are still thinking in terms of a political kingdom, a kingdom where Jesus would be their earthly king and provide for their needs, not to mention liberate them from the foreign oppression of the Roman Empire.
  + However, as one reads on, we know that this is not what the disciples are asking at all. Jesus in Luke 24:45 had opened their minds to understand the Scripture; meaning that they understood what they were asking, they had spent 40 days “speaking of the things concerning the kingdom of God.” (Luke 1:3)
  + In the disciples’ minds the outpouring of the Holy Spirit and the coming of the promised kingdom were closely associated. And well they should be, because the Old Testament frequently joined the two (Isa. 32:15–20; 44:3–5; Ezek. 39:28–29; Joel 2:28–3:1; Zech. 12:8–10). When Christ told the disciples of the soon-coming Spirit baptism, they immediately concluded that the restoration of Israel’s kingdom was near in time.[[2]](#footnote-2)
  + Restoration hopes were deeply rooted in the prophecies of Israel’s future and closely tied to the sacred space of Jerusalem/Zion.’ The apostles were expecting Jesus, as God’s anointed king, to usher in the restoration to which many Jews looked forward, and of which Jesus himself had spoken. Since the Spirit was connected with the end events in Jewish expectation (e.g., Joel. 2:28–32), they took it for granted that sovereignty was soon to be restored to Israel, so that God’s ultimate purpose for the world might be fulfilled. The question was, would he act decisively *at this time.* [[3]](#footnote-3)
* V.7- “**7** He said to them, “It is not for you to know times or epochs which the Father has fixed by His own authority;”
  + It is key to understand that Jesus does not correct the disciples as he had in the past. Jesus does not tell them that their question was misguided. Rather, he answers by changing the focus to chronology, the time of the kingdom.
  + It is most likely that the Greek terms for “times” and “seasons” are synonymous, and they appear to reflect a traditional phrase. It is possible, however, that the first refers to a specific time period and the second to a broader time frame, given the use of “times” of the Gentiles in Luke 21:24 and the specific question about the “time” of the end in verse 6. The point is clear: the timing of the promise’s completion, however it is conceived, is set by God and will not be revealed (Mark 13:32 and parallels make a similar point). The Father has “set” the timing in his own sovereign authority.[[4]](#footnote-4)
  + That Jesus does not deny their expectation of a literal, earthly kingdom involving Israel is highly significant. It shows that their understanding of the promised kingdom was correct, except for the time of its coming. If they were mistaken about such a crucial point in His kingdom teaching, His failure to correct them is mystifying and deceptive. A far more likely explanation is that the apostles’ expectation of a literal, earthly kingdom mirrored the Lord’s own teaching and the plan of God clearly revealed in the Old Testament.[[5]](#footnote-5)
* V.8- “…**8** but you will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you shall be My witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and even to the remotest part of the earth.””
* Verse 8 starts with a word of contrast “**but**”, the contrast is with verse 7. Instead of knowing the times or epochs, these disciples were going to receive power and be witnesses. There are two promises from the risen Christ to his beloved disciples.
  + **The first element of the risen Lord’s promise** is ‘*you will receive power*’, and the qualifying clause explains that this will happen ‘*when the Holy Spirit has come upon you*’ see the reference of Luke 24:49). [More on this on week 3][[6]](#footnote-6)
  + The term “power” appears ten times in Acts, sometimes referring to miracles or other effects of power (2:22; 3:12; 4:7; 8:13; 10:38; 19:11) and other times to enablement (4:33; 6:8). The enablement is in word and act[[7]](#footnote-7)
  + Jesus himself was anointed with the Spirit as God’s chosen Servant (Lk. 3:21–22; cf. Is. 42:1; Lk. 4:18–21, cf. Is. 61:1–2), and now he promises that his apostles will shortly be empowered by the same Spirit to share the Servant’s ministry. The promise of the Spirit here specifically recalls Isaiah 32:15, which speaks of the desolation of Israel that continues until ‘the Spirit is poured on us from on high’. [[8]](#footnote-8)
  + T**he second element of the promise has to do with being a witness**. The endowment with the Spirit is the prelude to, the equipping for, mission. The role of the apostles is that of “witness” (*martys--* The Greek word μαρτυς (“witness”) came to have in later Christian literature the sense of “martyr,” one who bore testimony even to death. The only place it could possibly have such a meaning in Acts is 22:20 in connection with Stephen.). In Acts the apostles’ main role is depicted as witnessing to the earthly ministry of Jesus, above all to his resurrection (cf. 1:22; 2:32; 3:15; 5:32; 10:39, 41). As eyewitnesses only they were in the position to be guarantors of the resurrection. But with its root meaning of *testimony*, “witness” comes to have an almost legal sense of bearing one’s testimony to Christ. In this way it is applied to Stephen (22:20) and to Paul (22:15; 23:11; 26:16).[[9]](#footnote-9)
  + The geographical scope of Acts 1:8 provides a rough outline of the entire book: Jerusalem (1–7), Judea and Samaria (8–12), the ends of the earth (13–28).
  + As such it can well be considered the “theme” verse of Acts. It is not by accident that Jerusalem came first. In Luke’s Gospel, Jerusalem was central, from the temple scenes of the infancy narrative to the long central journey to Jerusalem (9:51–19:28), to Jesus’ passion in the city that killed its prophets (13:34). The story of Jesus led *to* Jerusalem; the story of the church led *from* Jerusalem.
  + Judea and Samaria are probably to be taken together; Judea was understood in the sense of the Davidic kingdom, which would include the coastal territories and Galilee as well. Samaria would be included within Judea in this broader sense, but it is mentioned separately because of its non-Jewish constituency.
  + The “ends of the earth” are often taken as referring to Rome, since the story of Acts ends in that city. The phrase is often found in the prophets, however, as an expression for distant lands; and such is the meaning in Isa 49:6, which may well lie behind Acts 1:8. In fact, the final verse in Acts (28:31), with Paul preaching “without hindrance” in Rome, suggests that the story has not reached its final destination—the witness continues[[10]](#footnote-10)

# Day One- Questions

## What is meant by ‘restoring’ the kingdom to Israel? Why did they ask if this restoration would be ‘at this time?’

## What is the difference between ‘times’ and ‘epochs’? Why is this important?

## What is meant by the disciples ‘receiving power’?

## Where were the apostles to be witnesses for Jesus? Why not just say everywhere?

* 1. **Jesus’ Ascension (9-11)**
* In these verses we see Jesus ascends into heaven, thus ending his earthly ministry. Jesus is then taken up in the clouds; two angels declare he will return in the same manner as he departed. Luke alone narrates this ascension and its picture of being the reverse of the return.[[11]](#footnote-11)

**9** And after He had said these things, He was lifted up while they were looking on, and a cloud received Him out of their sight. **10** And as they were gazing intently into the sky while He was going, behold, two men in white clothing stood beside them. **11** They also said, “Men of Galilee, why do you stand looking into the sky? This Jesus, who has been taken up from you into heaven, will come in just the same way as you have watched Him go into heaven.”

* V.9 - Luke records the event of Jesus’ ascension in remarkably few words. At the conclusion of his Gospel account, he reports that Jesus led the disciples to the vicinity of Bethany, less than two miles from Jerusalem (Luke 24:50; John 11:18). In Acts, he reveals that the exact place of departure was the Mount of Olives (1:12). In the Gospel, he relates that “having lifted up his hands, Jesus blessed [the disciples]. As he was blessing them, he left them and was taken up to heaven” (Luke 24:50–51). But Luke’s narrative in Acts merely has the words, “After [Jesus] said these things, he was lifted up while they were looking.”[[12]](#footnote-12)
* The passive voice expression “he was lifted up” (ἐπήρθη) describes God’s action of taking Jesus back into heaven to the right hand of God (2:33)[[13]](#footnote-13)
* The *cloud* which *hid him from their sight* indicated to them his total envelopment in God’s presence and glory. Perhaps they recalled the cloud as the visible token of God’s glory associated with the tabernacle in the wilderness (e.g., Ex. 40:34–35). Certainly they must have remembered the cloud covering Jesus on the Mount of Transfiguration, when three of their number were given a revelation of the glory that was to be his after his suffering (cf. Lk. 9:31 [‘his departure’], 34).[[14]](#footnote-14)
* V.10- **10** And as they were gazing intently into the sky while He was going, behold, two men in white clothing stood beside them.
* The phrase, “they were gazing intently into the sky” is important because this conveys the idea that they were straining their eyes to see, they eyes were fixed on one thing, or better yet, a person, Jesus, their risen Savior as he was departing. -- Luke likes this verb. Twelve of the fourteen NT occurrences are in Luke-Acts, with ten of them in this book alone (Acts 3:4, 12; 6:15; 7:55; 10:4; 11:6; 13:9; 14:9; 23:1). It refers to a fixed gaze and means giving something significant attention. As they are looking, something else takes place.[[15]](#footnote-15)
* The word “Behold” is a participle which it is usually utilized to call attention to what is going to follow; perhaps something surprising. In this context, the best translation would be with the word, ‘suddenly’. **Suddenly**, “two men in white clothing stood beside them.” One can imagine the surprise factor as they were gazing up to the sky and could hardly see their master and savior. Suddenly two men appear.
* Their appearance and their function resembled that of the two men who met the women at the tomb of Jesus (Lk. 24:4–7). Supernatural beings attend both the resurrection and the ascension events [the whiteness of the clothes helps to identify the “men” as angels’].Here, as at the empty tomb, a challenge (‘*why do you stand here looking into the sky?*’) is followed by a correction (‘*This same Jesus, who has been taken from you into heaven, will come back in the same way you have seen him go into heaven*’).[[16]](#footnote-16)
* V. 11- “**11** They also said, “Men of Galilee, why do you stand looking into the sky? This Jesus, who has been taken up from you into heaven, will come in just the same way as you have watched Him go into heaven.””
* The angels addressed the apostles as “Men of Galilee” (literally, “Men, Galileans”). That their Galilean origin was highlighted may not be incidental. A strong Galilean witness motif is in Luke-Acts. The women of Galilee witnessed the crucifixion (Luke 23:49, 55); at this point the men of Galilee became the apostolic witnesses to the ascension.[[17]](#footnote-17)
* Again, just as the disciples’ question to Jesus in 1:6 seemed reasonable, so also their actions seem most natural. What else should one do when Jesus ascends except stand and look into heaven after him? But idly gazing into heaven is an inappropriate response to Jesus’ ascension. The messengers assure the disciples (and audience) that Jesus will return in just the same way he left.[[18]](#footnote-18)
* The Ascension of Christ marked the conclusion of His ministry on earth in His bodily presence. It also exalted Him to the right hand of the Father (Acts 2:33–36; 5:30–31; Heb. 1:3; 8:1; 12:2). At the same time the Ascension meant that the continuing work of Christ on earth was now placed in the hands of His disciples (Acts 1:1–2, 8).
* It was imperative that the Ascension occur so that the promised Comforter could come (cf. John 14:16, 26; 15:26; 16:7; Acts 2:33–36). The Holy Spirit would empower the disciples as they ministered the gospel and waited for the kingdom.[[19]](#footnote-19)

# Day Two- Questions

## What happened when Jesus finished speaking to the disciples? Why is this significant?

## Why were the disciples ‘gazing intently into the sky’? What does that communicate?

## Who were these two men in white clothing? Why is this important?

## What did they say? And why is this important to the disciples? And to us?

1. **The Immediate obedience of Jesus’ disciples (1:12-14)**

The story of the ascension is completed with the account of how the disciples obeyed Jesus and returned to Jerusalem to await the promised Spirit in an attitude of prayer.[[20]](#footnote-20)

**Acts 1:12**   Then they returned to Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet, which is near Jerusalem, a Sabbath day’s journey away. **13** When they had entered *the city,* they went up to the upper room where they were staying; that is, Peter and John and James and Andrew, Philip and Thomas, Bartholomew and Matthew, James *the son* of Alphaeus, and Simon the Zealot, and Judas *the son* of James. **14** These all with one mind were continually devoting themselves to prayer, along with *the* women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with His brothers.

* V.12-- The first response of the Eleven was to return to *Jerusalem*, to await ‘the promise of the Father’ (vv. 4–5). Mention of *the* mount called Olivet as the place of the ascension should not be taken to contradict Luke 24:50, which speaks more generally of Jesus leading them out ‘to the vicinity of Bethany. Bethany was on the eastern slope of the mountain, and according to John 11:18 was about fifteen stadia from Jerusalem (about two miles or three kilometers). It is likely that Jesus would have led them into open country, rather than close to the village of Bethany, to witness his ascension. In Zechariah 14:1–5, the Mount of Olives is associated with the Lord’s coming in judgment against the nations that fight against his people.[[21]](#footnote-21)
* “a Sabbath day’s journey away” Writing to Theophilus, who was a Gentile, Luke assumes that he is acquainted with Jewish law and custom even though Theophilus may have been unfamiliar with Palestinian topography. Luke employs the popular expression *a Sabbath day’s walk* to indicate distance and not time, for a Jew was permitted to walk from Jerusalem a distance of three-quarters of a mile on the Sabbath.[[22]](#footnote-22)
* V. 13— **13** When they had entered *the city,* they went up to the upper room where they were staying; that is, Peter and John and James and Andrew, Philip and Thomas, Bartholomew and Matthew, James *the son* of Alphaeus, and Simon the Zealot, and Judas *the son* of James.
* “When they had entered *the city*”- After descending the western slopes of the Mount of Olives, the disciples passed south of Gethsemane across the Kidron Valley, entering the city through the gate in the northwestern section of the City of David (about 200 meters north of the Pool of Siloam),or further south through the gate at the foot of Mount Zion near the issue of the Tyropoeon Valley, or further west, in the Valley of Hinnom, through the gate and tower complex that gave access to a road that ran between the Upper City and the Lower City, often identified as the “Gate of the Essenes.” [[23]](#footnote-23)
* “upper room”-- Upper rooms in Palestinian cities were usually the choicest rooms because they were above the tumult of the crowded streets and beyond the prying eyes of passersby. For the wealthy, the upper room was the living room. Sometimes upper rooms were rented out. Often they served as places of assembly, study, and prayer. The upper room mentioned here may or may not be the same upstairs room where Jesus and his disciples had celebrated the Passover (Luke 22:12) and where Jesus appeared to some of them on Easter Day (Luke 24:33; John 20:19, 26).The various meetings recorded in Acts 1:13; 2:1–4; 4:23–31; 12:12–17 could all have been in different locations. There is not enough evidence to be certain.[[24]](#footnote-24)
* “they went up to the upper room where they were staying;” Most likely there were not lodging there, but the force that the phrase “were staying” carries is that this was a common meeting place where they would usually have frequent meetings.
* “that is, Peter and John and James and Andrew, Philip and Thomas, Bartholomew and Matthew, James *the son* of Alphaeus, and Simon the Zealot, and Judas *the son* of James.” Who are the apostles? The writers of the synoptic Gospels have given a list of names (Matt. 10:2–4; Mark 3:16–19; Luke 6:14–16), yet Luke deems it necessary to present another list without the name of Judas Iscariot. He implies that the apostles must appoint a person in the place of Judas to fill up the number twelve. He lists the names in a sequence that varies from earlier lists: Peter, John, James, and Andrew. Notice that although Peter and Andrew are brothers, their names are separated by the names of the brothers John and James. Then follow Philip and Thomas, Bartholomew and Matthew. The last three have additional descriptions: James son of Alphaeus, Simon the Zealot, and Judas son of James. The last person also is known as Thaddaeus (Matt. 10:3; Mark 3:18).[[25]](#footnote-25)
  + The reordering of the names is possibly deliberate. Andrew was moved from second place in the Gospel to fourth place in Acts, and John was moved to second place. This gives prominence to Peter, John and James, the only apostles who have any individual role in the narrative of Acts[[26]](#footnote-26)

V. 14—“ These all with one mind were continually devoting themselves to prayer, along with *the* women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with His brothers.”

* Verse 14 mentions others who were present in the upper room—“the women,” Mary, and Jesus’ brothers. The women may have included the wives of the apostles and certainly the women who accompanied Jesus from Galilee and witnessed his crucifixion (Luke 8:2; 23:55; 24:10). Mary may have accompanied the beloved disciple (John 19:26), but it is likely she was a member of the believing community in her own right. Like Jesus’ brothers, she was confused by Jesus’ ministry (Mark 3:11; John 7:5). Like them she may have experienced an appearance from the risen Jesus. Paul mentioned such an appearance to James, the oldest of the brothers (1 Cor 15:7). According to Mark 6:3, Jesus had four brothers—James, Judas, Joseph, and Simon. There is no reason to take Mark’s words in any other sense than that they were Jesus’ half-brothers, the natural offspring of Mary and Joseph after the birth of Jesus. James assumed the leadership of the Jerusalem church in the latter portion of Acts (12:17; 15:13; 21:18), and according to tradition Judas later assumed the same position and authored the Epistle of Jude.[[27]](#footnote-27)
* Luke’s first summary of the life and the activities of the followers of Jesus in Jerusalem focuses on prayer, highlighting the fact that the apostles were not focused on themselves, nor on their task, but on God whose power sustains their life and assists them in their mission. The meaning of the verb (devoted) which denotes “to be busily engaged in, be devoted to,” and the imperfect tense, both underscore the persistent and continuous nature of their prayers. In 6:4 the apostles reassert the priority of prayer for the leadership of the Jerusalem church. Before followers of Jesus do anything else, they call on God, whether with praise or petition, thanksgiving or intercession, as they utterly depend on God in whose sovereignty they trust.
* They were of “one mind, unanimously,” The context indicates that, here, more than physical co-location (mentioned already in v. 13) is meant. Luke describes a shared attitude of heart and mind. The reference to the harmony and unanimity of the disciples is repeatedly stressed in Acts (cf. 2:46; 4:24; 5:12).[[28]](#footnote-28)

# Day Three- Questions

## Why did they return to Jerusalem? Why not go in hiding?

## Why would Luke give all these topographical information? Why is it important to say that it was “a sabbath day journey?”

## Is there any significance in the listing of the apostles’ names? Why change the order in one of the names?

## What did they do in the upper room? What does that tell us about the apostles?

The material in 1:15–26 has no parallels in Luke 24, which makes this section the first full narrative section of Acts (acknowledging that 1:1–14 includes narrative). After squarely focusing on Jesus, who grants to his disciples the presence and power of the Holy Spirit, and has initiated the restoration of the kingdom to Israel, and who is sending his disciples to be his witnesses in Jerusalem and to the end of the earth, Luke now turns his focus on the apostles.[[29]](#footnote-29)

1. **Judas’ substitute (1:15-26)**

Luke relates one incident which in effect fills up the time gap between the ascension and Pentecost. It may, therefore, be regarded as of particular importance in his eyes. The story is concerned with the choice of a successor to Judas to become a witness to the resurrection and take his place among the twelve apostles; woven in with this is an account of how Judas died and lost his place. There can be no doubt that the choice of Matthias instead of the alternative candidate is historical.[[30]](#footnote-30)

* 1. **Judas’ defection (1:15-20a)**

**Acts 1:15**   At this time Peter stood up in the midst of the brethren (a gathering of about one hundred and twenty persons was there together), and said, **16** “Brethren, the Scripture had to be fulfilled, which the Holy Spirit foretold by the mouth of David concerning Judas, who became a guide to those who arrested Jesus. **17** “For he was counted among us and received his share in this ministry.” **18** (Now this man acquired a field with the price of his wickedness, and falling headlong, he burst open in the middle and all his intestines gushed out. **19** And it became known to all who were living in Jerusalem; so that in their own language that field was called Hakeldama, that is, Field of Blood.) **20** “For it is written in the book of Psalms,

‘LET HIS HOMESTEAD BE MADE DESOLATE,

AND LET NO ONE DWELL IN IT’;

* V. 15—“At this time Peter stood up in the midst of the brethren (a gathering of about one hundred and twenty persons was there together), and said,”
* “At this time” could also be translated as, “in those days”—this marks a new transition. It seems like during this period of meetings in the upper room, where prayer was a big part of the time, the next story takes place.
* It is, “at this time”, that Peter takes centerstage.
  + Although Peter denied Jesus three times (Lk. 22:54–62), Jesus had prayed that after his time of testing Peter would be used to strengthen his ‘brothers’ (Lk. 22:31–32). Peter now does that by becoming ‘an interpreter of Scripture and of God’s purpose for the church’, having learned how to do this from Jesus himself (cf. Lk. 24:44–49). Luke then records that a group of *about a hundred and twenty* was present, thus preparing for 2:41; 4:4, where we are shown how quickly the number of disciples grew after Pentecost.[[31]](#footnote-31)
  + In the first twelve chapters of Acts, Peter is the unquestioned leader in the Jerusalem church. Here is the beginning of his apostolic ministry. Speaking decisively, he addresses the crowd and directs attention to the fulfillment of Scripture. He says, “Men and brethren,” which is a familiar address.[[32]](#footnote-32)
  + Peter assumed leadership among the apostles and convened the assembly. Throughout Acts, Peter played this role. He was the spokesman, the representative apostle. The other apostles were present and active, but Peter was their mouthpiece (This role is perhaps anticipated in Luke 22:32.). [[33]](#footnote-33)
* “a gathering of about one hundred and twenty persons was there together”
  + Luke makes a statement that has confused some commentators. Why mention this group of 120?
  + “Significantly, Luke made the parenthetical remark that the group numbered about 120 “believers.” “Believers” is a correct rendering of the Greek (“brothers”), since the term was not gender specific and would include female as well as male members of the community. The number is also significant. In rabbinic tradition 120 was the minimum requirement for constituting a local Sanhedrin.[[34]](#footnote-34)” ~ John B. Pollhill
  + Also, it is important to note that there were other follower elsewhere. (1 Corinthians 15:6 tells us that Jesus appeared to 500 believers total).

Peter stands up ….

* v. 16 – “and said, **16** “Brethren, the Scripture had to be fulfilled, which the Holy Spirit foretold by the mouth of David concerning Judas, who became a guide to those who arrested Jesus.”
* Peter’s words in v. 16, and again later in v. 21, speak of the “necessity” (*dei*) of Scripture being fulfilled in relation to Judas’s defection and the choice of another to replace him. In Luke’s writings *dei* stresses the compulsion inherent in the divine plan—a stress usually accompanied by an emphasis on man’s inability to comprehend God’s workings. At times that divine necessity is explained in terms of the fulfillment of Scripture (e.g., Luke 22:37; 24:26, 44). But more often that is not the case (e.g., Luke 2:49; 4:43; 9:22; 13:16, 33; 17:25; 19:5; 24:7). This suggests that the concept of “divine necessity” is broader than just “the fulfillment of Scripture” with its usual introductory formula “it is written,” though it may contain the latter.[[35]](#footnote-35)
* As Peter speaks, he points out that the Scriptures *had* to be fulfilled. Peter bases his remarks on God’s Word and intimates that Scripture is authentic and inexorably must be fulfilled. He links the written Word to the Holy Spirit, who “foretold by the mouth of David concerning Judas”. Scripture, then, is the product of the Spirit, as Peter eloquently states in one of his epistles (2 Peter 1:20–21). He asserts that the Holy Spirit speaks by using the mouth of man. That is, the Spirit communicates to us through the mouth of David, the composer of many psalms.[[36]](#footnote-36)
* “concerning Judas, who became a guide to those who arrested Jesus.” Luke can assume that his readers are familiar with his own or, less probably, some other account of Judas and his treachery.[[37]](#footnote-37)
* V.17-- **17** “For he was counted among us and received his share in this ministry”
* Almost as an afterthought Peter notes that Judas belonged to the circle of the twelve disciples during Jesus’ earthly ministry. Throughout this period, Judas was one of the twelve whom Jesus appointed after he spent a night in prayer (Luke 6:12–16). In addition, “Peter refers to Judas having obtained through Christ’s choice a share in the apostolic ministry.”Judas, then, was divinely appointed to take his place among the apostles and serve Christ in the ministry.[[38]](#footnote-38)

“Judas was obviously never saved. Jesus expressed that fact in John 6, when He told the apostles, ‘There are some of you who do not believe.’ For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were who did not believe, and who it was that would betray Him. Jesus answered them, ‘Did I Myself not choose you, the twelve, and yet one of you is a devil?’ Now He meant Judas the son of Simon Iscariot, for he, one of the twelve, was going to betray Him” (John 6:64, 70–71; cf. 17:12). Judas was placed among the apostles because it was essential for him to betray Jesus. God did not force Judas into that betrayal against the man’s will. Jesus even said of Judas that it would have been better for him if he had never been born, because of the choice he made (Matt. 26:24; cf. Luke 22:22). Instead He used Judas’s evil intent to accomplish His own predetermined purposes (cf. Acts 2:23).

Judas represents the greatest example of wasted opportunity in all of history. He had the rare privilege, given to only twelve men, of living and ministering with Jesus Christ, God incarnate, for more than three years. He had the same convincing, overwhelming opportunity to come to faith in Him as the eleven did. Yet his motives for following Jesus were never anything but selfish. He no doubt shared the common Jewish hope that Messiah would deliver the nation from the yoke of the hated Romans. When it became obvious that was not Jesus’ plan, and he would not get the wealth and power he wanted, Judas decided to cut his losses and get out with whatever he could salvage. Betraying the incarnate Son of God to the authorities for a paltry sum seemed a way to gain some compensation. The greed he evidenced by that act was another indicator of his wicked heart. There had been a preview of this avarice when, after Jesus’ anointing with costly perfume by Mary, Judas indignantly exclaimed, “Why was this perfume not sold for three hundred denarii, and given to poor people?” (John 12:5). His real concern was evident from John’s cutting editorial comment in verse 6: “Now he said this, not because he was concerned about the poor, but because he was a thief, and as he had the money box, he used to pilfer what was put into it.” Driven by disappointment and greed, this most tragic of all men squandered inestimable privilege, betrayed the Lord for thirty pieces of silver, and damned his soul to hell.

Judas’s tragic life reached a damning climax in his suicide.[[39]](#footnote-39)” ~ John MacArthur

Verses 18–19 are not a part of Peter’s speech but constitute an “aside” that Luke provided for his readers, as indicated by the parentheses in our Bibles. Peter’s train of thought was thus: Judas was a member of the Twelve (v. 17); his place was now vacant (v. 20*a*) and needed to be filled (v. 20b).[[40]](#footnote-40)

* **18** (Now this man acquired a field with the price of his wickedness, and falling headlong, he burst open in the middle and all his intestines gushed out. **19** And it became known to all who were living in Jerusalem; so that in their own language that field was called Hakeldama, that is, Field of Blood.) **20** “For it is written in the book of Psalms,

‘LET HIS HOMESTEAD BE MADE DESOLATE,

AND LET NO ONE DWELL IN IT’; ”

* Before continuing on, there is an explanatory note on Judas’ demise.
  + Luke tells us that Judas bought a field with the money he received from betraying the Lord, and he fell headlong, burst open in the middle and his insides gushed out.
  + This is different than what Matthew 27 records. Matthew writes that Judas feeling remorse after seeing that Jesus had been condemned, he attempted to return the thirty pieces of silver. He even said, “I have sinned by betraying innocent blood.” However the chief priests did not listen to him and he threw the pieces of silver into the temple sanctuary and departed, and he went away and hanged himself.
  + The chief priest in turn took the money and bought a field to bury strangers, and this is the reason why that field is now called “Field of Blood.”
* Though the accounts seem at first to be at odds, Simon Kistemaker, noted commentator offers a good harmony between to the two accounts:
  + “He provides information that is supplementary and not contradictory to what Matthew writes about Judas’s demise (Matt. 27:3–10). Matthew records that Judas, after he returned the thirty silver coins to the chief priests and the elders, hanged himself. The chief priests decided to use the money to buy the potter’s field for the burial of foreigners.
  + In an abbreviated account, Luke portrays Judas as the buyer of this field. Because the high priests considered the reward Judas had received to be blood money, they refused to accept the thirty silver coins. These belonged to Judas. Indirectly, then, Judas purchased the potter’s field. This is what Luke has in mind when he writes, “This man bought a field with the reward money he got for his wickedness.”
  + “Falling headlong, he burst open in the middle and all his intestines spilled out.” Even though Luke omits the information that Judas hanged himself (Matt. 27:5), we infer that Judas’s falling down headlong resulted from being suspended. The rope either broke due to the sudden stress caused by a falling body or eventually was cut by someone. The possibility is not remote that, while falling, Judas’s body struck a sharp object that caused it to burst open. We also infer that Judas died on the field which the chief priests bought. Luke indicates that the residents of Jerusalem heard about Judas’s gruesome death and named the field “in their own language Akeldama,” which means “field of blood.” From Matthew’s point of view, the blood that was spilled belonged to Jesus. For that reason, the high priests called the thirty silver coins “blood money” (Matt. 27:6). But notice that whereas Matthew writes for a Jewish audience, Luke addresses Gentile Christians. Hence, the accounts of Matthew and Luke are not at variance.Matthew and Luke are like two news reporters describing an event from different perspectives for different audiences.[[41]](#footnote-41)” ~ Simon Kistemaker
* “**20** “For it is written in the book of Psalms,

‘LET HIS HOMESTEAD BE MADE DESOLATE,

AND LET NO ONE DWELL IN IT’; ”

* When Peter was speaking about David “prophesying” regarding this event he was speaking of this quotation of verse 20. Actually there are two quotations from the Psalms:
  + The first quotation is from Ps 69:25.
  + Psalm 69 is “a psalm of protest and plea” closing with a declaration of trust in Yahweh. The psalmist pleads with God not as a private individual but as representing a community under attack by people with a different spiritual commitment. He prays that God may bring his wrath against these enemies and remove them from the community. John and Paul used the psalm as a typological prediction of Jesus’ suffering (John 2:17; 15:25; Rom 15:3), and Paul applies it to the Jews who rejected Jesus (Rom 11:9–10).
  + As Judas had joined Jesus’ enemies, the Psalm could be applied to him as well. The term translated “homestead” (“farm, homestead, residence”) can be understood as a loose reference to the plot of land purchased by Judas. Peter uses the psalm as a scriptural prophecy of what has happened when Judas betrayed Jesus and then fell to his death—what he had and what he owned has become desolate. The quotation expresses a curse. In the context of Matt 27:7, it can literally refer to the burial place which the field became that was bought with Judas’s money. Peter asserts with this quotation that Judas experienced the judgment that falls on the enemies of the righteous sufferer.[[42]](#footnote-42)

# Day Four- Questions

## Why did Luke make a point to tell us how many people were in the upper room? (v15)

## What does the phrase “Scripture had to be fulfilled” imply? (v.16).

## What does the phrase “the Holy Spirit foretold by the mouth of David” imply? How should we think about Scripture? (v.16)

## Why are verses 18-19 a parenthesis?

## How can we reconcile Matthew’s account of Judas’ death (Matt. 27:5ff) with the one in Acts 1:1-19?

* 1. **Judas’ replacement (1:20b-26)**

and,

‘LET ANOTHER MAN TAKE HIS OFFICE.’

**21** “Therefore it is necessary that of the men who have accompanied us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us — **22** beginning with the baptism of John until the day that He was taken up from us — one of these *must* become a witness with us of His resurrection.” **23** So they put forward two men, Joseph called Barsabbas (who was also called Justus), and Matthias. **24** And they prayed and said, “You, Lord, who know the hearts of all men, show which one of these two You have chosen **25** to occupy this ministry and apostleship from which Judas turned aside to go to his own place.” **26** And they drew lots for them, and the lot fell to Matthias; and he was added to the eleven apostles.

V.20b. “and,

‘LET ANOTHER MAN TAKE HIS OFFICE.’”

* The second quotation is from Ps 109:8. Psalm 109 is a prayer for vindication and vengeance. The psalmist describes one of his enemies, a wicked and deceitful man, and formulates a series of curses against him. The term translated “OFFICE” (ἐπισκοπή) denotes a “position of responsibility.” The psalmist prays that the wicked man’s days may be few (109:8a), i.e., that his life might be cut short, and that his position of leadership in the community may be given to somebody else (109:8b). [[43]](#footnote-43)
* The quotation expresses Peter’s conviction that Judas, who “belonged to our number and received a share in our ministry” (v. 17), whose life was cut short as he experienced God’s judgment, needed to be replaced by another person who would take his place of leadership. In the context of Luke 22:30, Peter (Luke) may think specifically of the role of the Twelve as judges in the community of Israel.

**IS PETER PRACTICING EISEGESIS?[[44]](#footnote-44)**

* Is Peter just injecting into the text what he wants to say? Is he using the text as a pretext? No, not at all.
* Now this does not mean that Peter is exegeting the text the way we would taking into account the original context and meaning of the passages he quoted. However as Bock says, “the passage is in the Psalter so that God’s people will reflect upon the way God acts and cares for the righteous who cry out to God. Peter takes the principle expressed in the psalm as a summary of how God acts and applies it to an event where God has judged. In this sense, Peter is certainly within the psalm’s meaning and spirit.[[45]](#footnote-45)”

Verse 21-22, “**21** “Therefore it is necessary that of the men who have accompanied us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us — **22** beginning with the baptism of John until the day that He was taken up from us — one of these *must* become a witness with us of His resurrection.””

Quoting the words of the psalmist, “Let someone else take his office,” Peter utters the wish that God indeed will appoint a successor.[[46]](#footnote-46)

* V.21- Once again (v. 16) Luke used the verb *dei*, translated **it is necessary**, to show logical or divine necessity. Interestingly the apostolate saw fit to replace the vacancy left by Judas, but later when the Apostle James died (12:2) no record was given of a successor being appointed. Evidently it was necessary to replace Judas’ position because he had vacated his place of promise, referred to in Matthew 19:28. There **the Lord** promised the apostles they would sit on 12 thrones reigning over Christ’s kingdom of Israel when He returns to reign on Planet Earth (cf. Rev. 21:14).[[47]](#footnote-47)
* Peter lays out the qualifications for a man that would take Judas’ place in the group of the disciples:
  + “that of the men who have accompanied us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us —”This statement formulates the first two criteria for membership in the group of the Twelve:
    - (1) Judas’s replacement must be a man (ἀνήρ).
    - (2) He must have been among Jesus’ disciples along with the Twelve. According to Luke 6:13, Jesus was surrounded by a larger group of disciples from which he chose the Twelve (“When morning came, he called his disciples to him and chose twelve of them, whom he also designated apostles”).
  + Peter clarifies the second criterion: the new member of the Twelve must have been an eyewitness of Jesus’ ministry[[48]](#footnote-48)
  + “beginning with the baptism of John until the day that He was taken up from us.” Here is a clear reference to the beginning of the apostolic gospel (Matt. 3:1; Mark 1:1; Luke 3:1). For instance, in the house of Cornelius, Peter also begins his gospel presentation with Jesus’ baptism (Acts 10:37). The apostolic gospel sketches the baptism by John as the beginning of Jesus’ ministry. And that ministry lasted until the day of his ascension.[[49]](#footnote-49)
  + one of these *must* become a witness with us of His resurrection.” - The second qualification was that of having been a witness to Christ’s resurrection. So the candidate must be both a guarantor of the gospel tradition because he had been a companion of the earthly Jesus and a witness to Christ’s resurrection because he had been personally met by the risen Lord. It is from vv. 21–22 that we may derive a strict definition of the term “apostle” and one that determines much of what Luke presents in the remainder of Acts (though, of course, Luke also uses the word “apostle” more broadly). “An apostle, then, was not an ecclesiastical functionary, nor just any recipient of the apostolic faith, nor even a bearer of the apostolic message; he was a guarantor of the gospel tradition because he had been a companion of the earthly Jesus and a witness to the reality of his resurrection because the risen Lord had encountered him.”[[50]](#footnote-50)

V.23 – “**23** So they put forward two men, Joseph called Barsabbas (who was also called Justus), and Matthias.”

* As they looked at the men around them, the disciple’s decision was that there were two men that had the necessary qualifications to be named as Judas’ successor:
  + Joseph and Matthias. Joseph is also known by his Latin name *Justus* (compare 18:7; Col. 4:11) and as the Son of Sabbas (the elder) or Son of the Sabbath. Either his father’s name was Sabbas or Joseph was born on a Sabbath. Probably Judas Barsabbas (15:22) was his brother. The second candidate is Matthias. His name is a shortened form of Mattathias (gift of Yahweh).[[51]](#footnote-51)
  + However, it seems like these two men had impeccable qualification and testimony that they are not able to make a decision.
  + And because apostleship is divinely ordained…

Vs. 24-25. “**24** And they prayed and said, “You, Lord, who know the hearts of all men, show which one of these two You have chosen **25** to occupy this ministry and apostleship from which Judas turned aside to go to his own place.””

* They prayed. It is interesting that in their prayer, the apostles acknowledge God’s omniscience. He knows the hearts of all men. (Psalm 7:9; 26:2; 38:9; 44:21; 139; Proverbs 21:2; Jeremiah 11:20; 20:12.) This is one of the reasons as to why they are recognizing God’s omniscience. God knows the motivations and the hearts of men.
* And in this way, they beseech God to reveal his choice to occupy Judas’ empty “ministry seat”.
* There is a play on words here, even in their prayer—the idea here is the Judas had abandoned his place among the apostles to go to “his own place”.
  + The last expression is a euphemism for his final destiny, most likely death and the judgment of God beyond that.[[52]](#footnote-52)
  + “The last phrase is a shocking and sobering statement. Judas, and all others who go to hell, belong there; it is the **place** of their **own** choosing. It belongs to them, and they to it![[53]](#footnote-53)” ~ John MacArthur

V.26- “**26** And they drew lots for them, and the lot fell to Matthias; and he was added to the eleven apostles.”

* Immediately after the prayer concluded, they drew lots. It seems like something completely out of character- after all they had prayed to the omniscient Lord of the universe.
* The method was likely the one depicted in the Old Testament. Marked stones were placed in a jar and shaken out. The one whose stone fell out first was chosen (cf. 1 Chr 26:13f.).[[54]](#footnote-54)
  + This was a traditional way of determining God’s will in Judaism (cf. Lv. 16:8; Nu. 26:55; Jon. 1:7–8). Here, specifically, it was a way of deciding between two equally qualified candidates, given the belief that ‘the lot is cast into the lap, but its every decision is from the Lord’ (Pr. 16:33). Even the fall of the dice is in the hands of the sovereign Lord.[[55]](#footnote-55)
* In this case, the lot fell on Matthias… and he was added to the eleven apostles. And so the eleven are restored to twelve.

**Were Peter and the other apostles hasty in choosing a replacement for Judas and not waiting for Paul?**

* The fact that they prayed for the Lord to choose Judas’s replacement offers further proof that the choice of Matthias was no mistake. The Lord could have answered their prayers by telling them to wait, then added Paul to the ranks of the twelve, if that had been His plan.[[56]](#footnote-56)
* It has sometimes been suggested that the apostles were wrong in co-opting Matthias to complete their number, that they should have waited until, in God’s good time, Paul was ready to fill the vacancy. This is a complete mistake, and betrays a failure to appreciate the special character of Paul’s apostleship. Paul did not possess the qualifications set out in verses 21 and 22. He himself would certainly have dismissed as preposterous the idea that he was rightfully the twelfth apostle, on the same footing as Peter and the rest of the eleven.[[57]](#footnote-57)
* “Finally, and contrary to an oft-heard claim that the apostles were wrong in selecting Matthias and should have awaited God’s choice of Paul to fill the vacancy, it should be pointed out (1) that Paul had not been with Jesus during his earthly ministry—in fact, he acknowledges his dependence upon others with respect to the gospel tradition (e.g., 1 Cor 15:3–5); (2) that the necessity of having exactly twelve apostles in the early church sprang largely from the need for Jewish Christians ministering within the Jewish nation to maintain this symbolic number, and, while Paul could appreciate this, he did not feel its necessity for his primarily Gentile ministry; and (3) that Paul himself recognized the special nature of his apostleship—. it was in line with that of the Twelve, but it also rested on a somewhat different base (cf. his reference to himself as an apostle “abnormally born” in 1 Cor 15:7–8). Paul’s background, ministry, and call were in many ways different from those of the Twelve. Yet he insisted on the equality of his apostleship with that of the other apostles—an equality he never interpreted in terms of either opposition or identity.[[58]](#footnote-58)” ~ Richard Longenecker

**Casting Lots in the OT? But How about in the NT?**

* The casting of lots to decide between several options in v. 26 is often contrasted with the immediately following account of the coming of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles and believers, who thus no longer needed this “mechanistic” manner of determining the will of God since they now have the aid of God’s Spirit. Four factors should be considered, however. (1) The casting of lots was an established and divinely sanctioned manner of determining the will of God. (2) The casting of lots had been a traditional practice in Israel for centuries. (3) Luke could have omitted the detail of the manner of Matthias’ selection if he had regarded the casting of lots as an inappropriate method for the church. (4) The presence of the Holy Spirit does not necessarily make decisions easier, unless there is a direct prophecy about the course of action to be taken. This leads us to the conclusion that the action of the Jerusalem believers was not an act of unbelief, but an entirely proper procedure of the Jerusalem believers to ask the Lord to make his choice among the two candidates.[[59]](#footnote-59)

# Day Five- Questions

## Why do we say that Peter is using the right exegesis? Defend your answer.

## Why did Peter have these qualifications for the new apostle? What were those qualifications? Can we make sense of these?

## Why are they mentioning God’s omniscience in the prayer? What can we learn from this prayer?

## Why did they draw lots? Can we use that method today to make decisions? What if we prayed about it?
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