

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

4-15-1928

Speeches in the Book of Acts

C C. Nieman

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_arndte@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>

Digital Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)
Commons

Network

Recommended Citation

Nieman, C C., "Speeches in the Book of Acts" (1928). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 744.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/744>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

SPEECHES IN THE BOOK OF ACTS

A thesis
presented to the faculty of
Concordia Seminary,
St. Louis, Mo.

by
G.C. Nieman

in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree
of
Bachelor of Divinity.

1928

"And daily in the temple,
and in every house, they
ceased not to teach and
preach Jesus Christ."
Acts 5,42.

Table of Contents.

Page.

1. Introduction into the Book of Acts.
Author of the Book of Acts.
Date of the Writing of the Acts.
2. General Outline of the Book of Acts.
3. Sources which were used by the author.

6. The Speeches in Acts. (General)
7. Peter the Apostle.
8. Speech before the One hundred and Twenty. Acts 1,15-22.
9. Peter's Sermon on Pentecost Day. Acts 2,14-39.
13. Peter's Sermon in the Porch of Solomon. Acts 3,12-26.
16. Peter's Speech before the Council. Acts 4,8-12.
17. The Prayer of the Disciples. Acts 4,24-30.
19. Peter before the Council. Acts 5,29-32.
20. The Speech of Gamaliel. Acts 5,35-39.
21. Peter's Speech to Cornelius. Acts 10,34-43.
23. Peter's Speech at Jerusalem. Acts 11,4-17.
24. Peter's Speech at Jerusalem. Acts 15,7-11.
25. Conclusions to be drawn from Peter's Speeches.

26. The Speech of Stephen. Acts 7,2-53.

Speeches of Paul.
30. Paul, the Apostle.
31. Paul's Speech at Antioch. Acts 13, 16-41.
33. Paul's Speech at Lystra. Acts 14, 15-17.
35. Paul's Speech at Athens. Acts 17, 22-31.
38. Paul's Speech at Ephesus. Acts 20, 18-35.
39. Paul's Speech on the Stairs at Jerusalem. Acts 22, 1-21.
40. Paul's Speech before Felix at Caesarea. Acts 24, 10-21.
41. Paul's Speech before King Agrippa. Acts 26, 2-29.

43. Speech of James at Jerusalem. Acts 15, 13-21.
43. Remaining minor Speeches of the Acts.
45. Conclusion to the Speeches of Paul

46. General Conclusion.

47. Bibliography.

SPEECHES IN ACTS.

Introduction into the Book of Acts:

While a discussion of the isagogical questions of Acts does not belong into the sphere of this treatise properly, we will find that a consideration of the most pertinent questions in the field will be helpful and explanatory of various phrases which will be used. We will, however, limit ourselves to only a few of the most important and evident questions, lest we stray to far afield. Again, let me add, that no arguments pro and con will be advanced, but only the results and conclusions of the most eminent scholars in the field will be presented, in order to give us a working basis. This because of the above stated reason, for brevity and because the field has so thoroughly be examined. We will consider, briefly, first:

The Author of the Book of Acts: The author of this book was Luke.

While the proof is not absolute, there can be very little doubt of this fact in the mind of any one who has examined the facts. The arguments which are stated as proof are: 1) The author of Acts and the Gospel of Luke are identical(cf. Acts 1,1 and Luke 1,4); 2) the similarity of language and other peculiarities, especially the medical terms used; 3) the author of Acts was a companion of Paul("we" sections 16:10-40;20:6-28:31); 4) this companion of Paul is a Physician(shown by Hobart in: The Medical Language of St. Luke,1882); 5) Luke was with Paul in Rome,2Tim. 4:11. The conclusion which Robertson, Luke the Historian, reaches he states in the words which he quotes from: Jones, New Testament in the Twentieth Century: "This author of Acts and the third gospel is to be identified with St. Luke the companion, friend and physician of St. Paul."

Date of the Acts: Robertson places the date at 63 A.D. Neither is

this absolute, but the arguments advanced seem conclusive. They are:

1) Luke does not mention the burning of Rome in 64 A.D. and the persecutions of the Christians along with it; 2) Does not mention the destruction of the Temple and Jerusalem in 70 A.D.; 3) he makes no mention of the supposed martyrdom of Paul, and the close of the book seems to exclude all such thought as the impending doom of Paul; 4) the trial of Paul had probably not yet ended, and the close of the books was the record of events that had transpired up until that time.

The arguments seem most conclusive and if we accept them, then we must set the place of writing at Rome, which also fits very well.

General Outline of the Book of Acts: The book of Acts is a history, and as every history is and should be, is divided into certain periods^{-iods} and stresses certain facts in each particular period. Torrey: The Composition and Date of Acts, divides the book in two parts, ch.1-15 and 16-28. He does this on the basis of his theory, which makes the first part a translation from an Aramaic document, and the second part a composition of the author. Better is the division, ch.1-12 as the work of the apostles in Palestine; and ch.13-28, as the work of the apostles in heathen lands.(Gentiles).

In the first part, we find: ch.1-5: the work of Peter and the apostles near and in Jerusalem, following the day of Pentecost. ch. 7 and 8, the work, arrest, defense, and stoning of Stephen, and as a result of the following dispersion, the work of Philip and others. Ch. 9, the conversion of Paul; ch.10 and 11, the first work and call of Peter to the Gentiles; ch.12, the death of James, imprisonment of Peter, the dealings with and death of Herod. The first part is essentially the Peter-part of the Acts. What the relation of Stephen is, if any, we shall see later.

The second part, ch.13-28 is the Paul-part of Acts. It is more or less the continued and successive events of Paul's ministry recorded

as they actually occurred, namely, the beginning of his Gentile ministry, the first, second and third missionary journeys, and the journey to Rome for his trial before Caesar. The fact that the first part is called the Peter-part, and the second part, the Paul-part, together with the views that the Acts is a conciliatory writing, or on the other hand, that its purpose is to show the parallels in the lives of Peter and Paul, as much as they come into contact with our subject at hand, will be treated in their respective places.

Sources which were used by the author: We must treat this matter a little more at length, because of its direct bearing upon the point at issue. If we can establish, or least come to a logical and plausible conclusion as to where Luke got the material which he incorporated in his work, then we have much of our work done. In this connection, it may be added, that had he not had access to all the material which he records, that he could have been inspired by the Holy Ghost with such information as He wished to have recorded. Such a statement would not, naturally receive the least credibleness from the great majority of modern writers, but that cannot alter the facts or destroy the clear teachings of Scripture. But in this case, I think it will be possible to show that Luke possessed all the information which he has set down in his book.

W.H.Ramsay, in St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen, calls Luke a "historian of the first rank" and describes his method of writing as follows: (p.2) "There is, finally, the historical work of the highest order, in which a writer commands excellent means of knowledge either through personal acquaintance or through access to original authorities, and brings to the treatment of his subject genius, literary skill, and sympathetic historical insight into human character and the movement of events. Such an author seizes the critical events

concentrates the reader's attention on them by giving them fuller treatment, touches more lightly and briefly on the less important events, omits entirely a mass of unimportant details, and makes his work an artistic and idealised picture of the progressive tendency of the period." This statement characterizes the work of Luke exactly.

Most critics think that Luke had some written and some oral sources. Harnack thinks that for the first twelve chapters of Acts Luke has no written documents, while C.C.Torrey holds that Luke translated an Aramaic document for ch.1-15. Neither of these can be proven conclusively. Robertson says: Luke, the Historian: "But some broad facts are clear. One is the use of both oral and written sources. Another is that Luke himself is a participant in a large part of the story. Another is the facts of Paul's presence and Epistles. Another is the stay of Luke in Caesarea and Palestine, when he had opportunity to learn much about the earlier stages of the history before he became a Christian. It is plain, therefore, that Luke had exceptionally good opportunities for obtaining historical data for the Acts." (p.77). We see then, that Luke was an eyewitness (Luke 1,2) of much that he records ("we" sections). Then as a companion of Paul he had ample opportunity to learn from him, all his experiences, his teachings, his preachings and intentions. Being with Paul five or six years, on his various journeys, on his last ship voyage, and with him in Rome gave him ample time to get all his needed information. Taking the place of writing as Rome, while yet residing with Paul, Luke being fully aware and conscious of the task he was undertaking, namely of putting down in writing the history of the spread of Christianity in its first years, and being, as we see from his writings, a man of learning and a careful historian, it is only reasonable that he should go to the sources where he could get reliable information, and that quite naturally, would be to the apostles and laborers themselves.

Again, the acquaintance of Luke extended to many others, who could give him reliable information as to the early events and proceedings of the Christian church. Among these we have recorded, Aristarchus, Silas, Erastus, Timothy, Titus, Gaius, Sopater, Tychicus, Trophimus, Mark, Demas, Epaphras, Mnason, Barnabas, and probably many others. He very likely knew Peter, he met James at Jerusalem, he probably knew Philip and perhaps all of the disciples. From these facts we find no difficulty in seeing how Luke had many sources of information. The main difficulty consists only in the sources for the first five chapters of the book. Men of that period he knew, but as to the more detailed reports, such as the speeches of the apostles, we are confronted with a greater difficulty. Weizsaecher, *The Apostolic Age*, has a grain of truth in his statement, but he goes too far when he says, p.24: "We do not know with any certainty from what source the author of the Acts--who himself lived long after the events he describes-- has taken his materials. If he used a source, it cannot be indicated in his text. The narrative is too much of a piece and too smooth for that." Weizsaecher says that the writer of Acts lived in the second century, and that his details, the numbers, the events, the speeches are merely fabrications, which the author invented to give his writing the appearance of truth and historicity.

Sources which were used by Luke in recording the Speeches in Acts would necessarily be the same as for the entire book. In some respects these offer the most difficulty, since the events which he records could more easily be gotten and remembered by eyewitness, while the verbatim recollection of a speech would in many instances be impossible. However, the earlier or first part of the book has the fewer details, which would point to its source as an oral one, or at least only fragmentary. Sources of the Speeches will be taken up more in detail in considering each one.

The Speeches in Acts.

It is the purpose of this paper to show not only that the speeches in the Book of Acts are authentic, but also to show how they form an intrinsic part of the whole book. We will see how, without these speeches, the Acts remains only a bare outline of facts, without that personal element that must surely be given to show the inner and personal connection of the apostles to the church at large and the unity of spirit and mind in their relation of one to another. We will consider the speeches of the various apostles separately and during the course of the development endeavor to show their inner unity as well as their outward conformity.

There is here neither space nor occasion to enter into the exegetical material that the Speeches offer. Furthermore, works of this nature have been produced which are far beyond anything, both in scope and intensity, which this paper is capable of extenuating. We are limited therefore, to such points of the speeches themselves, which are not so evident to the average reader. The many critical questions, some of which arise, and some of which critics have unnecessarily foisted upon the book, will be considered only in instances when their importance is such to warrant it. This work is not one of intensive criticism, but rather one of constructive investigation. The field has by far not been exhausted, and it is to be regretted that much of the work done by critics in this field has either been superficial or of the higher critical type.

For us, to whom the speeches in Acts are the truly inspired word of God, the purpose of investigation is an apologetical and salutary one. We look, not for something to destruct, but for something to construct, for something that will be of material assistance in the building of God's kingdom on earth. This should be the end and aim of all true Christian investigation, and is so in this case.

SPEECHES OF PETER.

Peter the Apostle: As to the person of Peter we have neither the space nor the occasion to say much. We note just a few facts. His name, Peter, Πέτρος Cephias, Κηφᾶς also called Simon, gives us the characteristic which is usually associated with him, the Rock-man. The son of a Galilean named Jonas, from the town of Bethsaida, he was called by Christ from his work as a fisherman to be a disciple. With all his natural zeal and impetuosity, he is at one time the daring confessor of Christ, at another the cringing denier. His easily aroused enthusiasm and ready tongue made him the (self-styled) leader of the disciples, the first to boast, the first to repent. The picture which is left in our minds at the end of the gospel narratives is not one that could be especially commended, even with the sincere repentance of Peter. But in the first chapters of Acts, we are surprised at the apparently old, yet new Peter. Here we find the same zeal, the same Rock-man, but with it is a power of conviction, the daring to face slaves and rulers, the thoughtfulness of a meditative mind, one unwavering purpose. We have two events recorded in Scripture which tell us how it is "possible for us to understand how the Peter of the denials became in the short space of fifty days the Peter of the Pentecost." These two events are: the three questions and commands of Christ recorded in John 21, and the miracle of the Pentecost day, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Peter had been humbled. To the answer of the questions of Christ: Lovest thou me, he gives the humblest answer and himself he draws into the background. This rebuke he would not soon forget. The risen Savior was a constant reminder of his weakness. But the promise of Christ. To feed the church of Christ, to keep it, to make it grow was the one purpose of Peter. And when on the day of Pentecost, they were filled with the Power from on high, Peter was the true Rock-man indeed. The time of denial was at ^{Pass} ~~hand~~, now was the time of work.

Speech before the One hundred and Twenty. Acts 1,15-22.

Occasion: 'In those days': the time was after the ascension of Christ. Christ had ascended, the disciples were apparently left alone on earth. We can well imagine they were at a loss what to do. They had the ^{promise} promise of Power from the Holy Ghost (1,8; John 14) but when we remember the helplessness of the disciples when Christ was absent, often evidencedⁱⁿ in the three years of their discipleship, we picture them to ourselves as a forlorn, half-fearful band of believers. They numbered only one hundred and twenty, an insignificant number compared to the thousands of hostile Jews. Yet the three years of training and the promise of Christ was not entirely in vain and forgotten. They knew they were to carry out the mission of spreading the kingdom of Christ. What they were to do, they knew, how they were to do it, was probably not so ^{clear} clear to them. Yet this was clear to them: Judas having fallen away and hanged himself left a gap in the ranks that must be filled. And Peter, taking upon himself, as he so often did, the duty of spokesman, stood up and put the facts and the proposition before them.

Analysis of the Speech:

vv.16-18: The prophecy of Judas and his horrible end.

vv.19-20: The fate of Judas ~~was~~ known in all Jerusalem.

vv.21-22: The gap in the rank of the disciples must be filled, since Judas was gone, to be witness of Christ in obedience to His command given them in V.8.

Observations: (General)

- 1) Peter's advice was well taken. Matthias was chosen, v.26.
- 2) The Disciples see need of complete and compact organization.
- 3) v.16: 'Men and brethren': Peter claims no superiority.
- 4) Peter accepts literal prophecy and fulfillment, vv.16.20.
- 5) Call of Judas into the ministry was effective, v.17.
- 6) Peter recognizes the reward of unrighteousness and despair, v.18.

Observations: (Critical).

- 1) Establishes Ps. 41 as Davidic.
- 2) Source: One hundred and twenty people heard this speech. Some of these surely remembered it. The meeting was in the form of an informal conference. Perhaps notations of the reports were kept, as in our present conferences or meetings.
- 3) Integrity: We have all the speech recorded. This was not an entirely new matter to those present. Naturally it had been discussed by them many time before this. In this more orderly and formal assembly, Peter merely states what they all know, and simply puts the proposition before them. What he states here was sufficient simply to state the case in hand. Therefore we accept the speech as complete at this occasion.
- 4) Some take v.19 and also v.20 as not belonging to the speech, but as an insertion of Luke, an explanatory note. Others point to the translation of Aceldama as proof of an Aramaic source. (Torrey). As to the first point, we may let that stand, it may be an insertion by Luke, it may belong to the speech of Peter, we cannot prove either. As to the second point: Why? Luke knew Aramaic; those from whom he received the report of the speech knew Aramaic. Luke merely explains the term for his Gentile reader, Theophilus. We cannot therefore advance that as an argument that ch.1-15 are a translation from an Aramaic source.

Peter's Sermon on Pentecost Day. Acts 2,14-39.

Occasion: The day of Pentecost. The disciples were in a house, οἶκος (Schaff: Apostolic Christianity: House, οἶκος 2,2 some take as the upper room. Some take it as one of the 30 side buildings of the temple, as Josephus uses οἶκος in describing the temple. This agrees with the custom of the disciples, Lk. 24,53; Acts 2,46; 5,12;42. The time of the miracle was the morning hour of prayer; large assembly would point to place in temple; would add to the solemnity of the occasion to

have it in the temple as the ancient sanctuary of God. Yet all these reasons are invalidated by the hostility of the Jews. [†]The place of this miracle was evidently at the house of assemblage of the disciples). The sound of the rushing might wind was heard throughout all the city of Jerusalem. (Alford, N.T. on v.6) Being fifty days after the first day of the Passover, being the Feast of the Harvest, Jews from all over the world were present. They assembled at the house of the disciples, some probably saw the strange tongues of fires, others heard the disciples speak in their own tongues. Not as some take it that the one language of the disciples sounded as the native language of each in his own ears, but that the ability to speak in each different language was given to the disciples. The hearers, however, not understanding more than one or two tongues, were naturally confused by the various strange languages which must have been so much jargon in their ears. Being accused of drunkenness, Peter speaks. Schaff remarks: "The speaking with tongues was followed by the sermon of Peter; the act of devotion, by an act of teaching; the rapturous language of the soul in converse with God, by the sober words of ordinary self-possession for the benefit of the people." (p.233) Again he remarks, (p.233). Peter spoke "probably in his own vernacular Aramaic which would be most familiar to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, possibly in Greek, which would be better understood by the foreign, Acts 22,2."

Analysis of the Speech:

vv.14-15: Refutation of the charge of drunkenness.

vv.16-21: Shows that the Pentecost miracle is the fulfillment of the prophecy in Joel 2,28-31.

vv.22-25: The earthly work, the crucifixion, and the resurrection of Christ, for the people and by the people.

vv.26-35: Proofs from the O.T. of the absolute Life of the Son of Man, His prophetic office, his Resurrection, His exaltation, and His sitting ^{with}

at the right hand of God.

v.36: Conclusion that Jesus is the Lord and Christ, God and Redeemer.

vv.38-39: The gospel promise: Appropriated by repentance, faith, baptism into the name of Christ. Universal call of all nations.

Observations: (General)

McGiffert, The Apostolic Age:(p.53)! The pentecostal address of Peter is peculiarly interesting because it constitutes the earliest extant Christian apology. It is, moreover, a thoroughly representative discourse. It reproduces not the thought of Peter alone, but the thought of his fellow-Christians as well. The spirit of primitive Jewish Christianity in general speaks in it." This is ^{precisely} little beside the point. While it may be representative discourse, and may reflect the spirit of Christianity, its main purpose is not that. As a speech of Peter, who was assuredly a Christian, and spoken under the influence of the Holy Spirit, what else would we expect to find? We note: The progress of Peter in Christian knowledge in the space of fifty days. This we can attribute to 1) the instruction of the Lord during the forty days on earth, 2) reflection and thought of the words and teachings of Christ, 3) mainly, the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit. He saw here the fulfillment of the promise of the Comforter, John 14,26;15,26; 16,13,14. We note also the use of the O.T. Every thing is based on the O.T. prophecies. Peter sees more in them than he formerly did, sees them in a new light.

It is the first Christian sermon. It is based throughout on the word of God, the O.T. But the center of his preaching is Christ. His procedure is: Conditions, the pointing out of sin, the holding up of the gospel promise. He is not ambiguous in his accusations, or wavering in his promises. Language is direct and to the point. Very like Peter. The results of preaching was three thousand converts. Shows great power of Holy Spirit. Weizsaecker says the number, 3000, is artificial.

Observations: (Critical)

Weizsaecker says, p.40: "Although the first glance this preliminary ^{essay} seems appropriate to the conditions, yet we cannot escape the feeling that the justification from the prophets of the miracle of the spirit is much more intelligible when we see in it the result of after observation and reflection, while, not to speak of its complication with the unhistorical miracle, it is only with difficulty that we can conceive of such a speech as having been already prepared and forthcoming at the moment of an overwhelming experience." We must bear in mind that Weizsaecker does not accept the first part of Acts as truly historical and that ~~the~~ book was written in the second century. Just why he should think it impossible that Peter could deliver such an address on this occasion is difficult to ascertain. The disciples and Christ were in possession of the entire revealed truth, and any truth that was uttered at a later date by any of the disciples, does not mean that they could not have known it before. And least of all, does second or any following ^{ing} century theology show any revelation that is beyond that of the disciples ^{-als.}. Stanley Leathes, in *The Witness of St. Paul to Christ*, quotes from Davidson, *Introduction to the Study of the N.T.* (1868) regarding the last verse of Peter's speech: 'The promise is to you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, as many as the Lord our God shall call'. "But we learn from the *Epistle to the Galatians* that Peter had not such ideas about the admission of the Gentiles to the privileges of Christianity until long after; not till Paul had privately explained the success of his work among them." Here we need ^{only} to remember the final message of Christ to His disciples, ch.1,8. Then the teachings of Christ plainly foreshadowed the ingathering of the Gentiles. The First Epistle of Peter leaves no doubt as to the matter. On the other hand it tells us clearly that Peter then already, knew full well of the work among, and the call of the Gentiles by the Gospel.

Source: Many people heard this speech, but the most probable source was Peter. Though it was years later, how could Peter remember the words of his address? This speech, can it not be taken as a fulfillment of the words of Christ, Matt. 10,19: "For it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak." Peter spoke under the influence and guidance of the Holy Spirit. Could he not, therefore, under ^{the} the same influence, speak the same words, especially since we know that they were intended by the Holy Ghost to be recorded as His revelation? We take these then, as the exact words of Peter, from whom Luke also obtained them.

Integrity: We do not have all the speech. This we are told in v.40. This probably only a small section of what Peter actually spoke. As to the entire sermon, we can say nothing. But as far as we have it, we have the true and exact words of Peter.

Peter's Sermon in the Porch of Solomon. Acts 3,12-26.

Occasion: The disciples were Jews, and observed the rites of the law. Accordingly they went to the temple to worship with the other Jews. On such a certain occasion, Peter and John going up to pray, about the middle of the afternoon, encountered at the east gate of the temple, called Beautiful, a beggar; a man lame from birth, who asked alms of them and of all who came that way every day. He asked also of Peter and John. Instead of giving him alms, Peter, in the name of Christ, healed the lame man, so that he was perfectly whole. At the result of this miracle on him, the man created a great excitement, first by his ability to walk, and secondly by his words of praise to God. As Peter and John entered the temple, the lame man seized both, and the trio stopped in the porch called Solomon's, which was located on the temple court, along the inner side of the outer wall. Around the three standing in the ~~glorified~~ porch, a great crowd of admirers and

and curiosity seekers collected. Seeing the lame man, a familiar figure, healed and walking about, the next question naturally was: How did it happen? This is the crowd that Peter addressed. People of all classes, temple officers and priests, Sadduces and Pharisees were there.

Analysis of the Speech:

vv.12-13: This is no work of ours, but of God, for the glory of Jesus,

vv.13-15: whom ye killed and denied but God has raised up again.

v.16: Faith in the name of this Jesus has healed this man.

vv.17-18: Their actions may have been the result of ignorance, but it was done to fulfill the prophecy of God.

vv.19-21: By repentance they may be saved from their sins, and by the coming of Christ they will be saved unto life.

vv.22-24: All this was told and repeated by the prophets in the O.T.

vv. 25-26: Application of this truth and promise to the hearers, to the Jews especially, as the children and heirs of Abraham.

Observations:

Weizsaecker says, p.40: "The objection is weighty enough that at such a time the apostle could not possibly have used the language attributed to him. Beside, an accurate report of the speeches, such as is only possible by means of notes taken at the time, is out of the question. In the first place, a later speech of Peter, Acts 10,34 ff shows very clearly the traces of free invention and warrants therefore similar conclusions in reference also to the earlier." McGiffert does not go quite so far in his statement of this speech, p.82: "The utterances of Peter and others recorded in Acts 3,ff are not to be regarded as formal discourses delivered on particular occasions, but rather as mere ^{mere} examples of the kind of testimony born by him and by his followers on all occasions. That they represent so accurately the views of the early disciples is due, not to the fact that they are a stenographic report of the particular speeches, but that they are taken from

primitive Jewish Christian documents dating, doubtless, from a very early period." Plainly these two statements militate against the plain words of Luke: v.12: "And when Peter saw it, he answered unto the ^{people.} people." Again, if they are similar to the other speeches of Peter, when the circumstances under which they were spoken are the same, and the class of people to whom they addressed is the same, and because the truths of God are always the same, we would expect them speeches to be similar. The idea that Peter had not yet such a highly developed theology as he here teaches, can be held only on the basis of progressive or evolutionistic religion, which has no place whatsoever in Christianity. On the other hand, we note that Peter seizes the opportunity to present the great truths of God. The astonishment and curiosity of the people gave him a lead over into the power and works of Christ, from ^{that} that thence to the person of Christ, His prophecy, the fulfillment of the prophecy, the results of the coming of Christ, and the final word to believethis. Peter shows no little knowledge of the human psychology. He is ready to grasp the opportunity. His words must have seemingly made an impression on his hearers. If not, the temple officers and Sadducees would not have interfered. Apparently he was gaining the approval of the people, or the objection to them would not have been so great.

Source: Peter again is undoubtedly the source of Luke's report. The whole incident must have made a deep impression on him.

Integrity: We can safely say that we have the entire speech of Peter on this occasion. The detail of the material given speaks against the idea of a resume or synopsis. Though not a long speech as we have it, the manner in which it was interrupted by the temple priests, not a great opportunity would be given Peter for speaking. As soon as ^{they} they noticed that Peter was teaching and heard what he was teaching, they would not dearly in stopping him. We can, therefore, accept the speech

as it stands as complete.

Peter's Speech before the Council. Acts 4,8-12.

Occasion: The events leading up to this speech of Peter's follow immediately upon the address in the porch of Solomon. As Peter was speaking he was rudely interrupted by the temple guard and by the Sadducees. The fact that they were teaching in the temple was resented by the priests and captain of the Levitical guard(Alford). The Sadducees resented the teaching of the resurrection(Matt. 22,23; Acts 23,8). They were 'put in hold', either in prison or under guard over night. Next morning the council convened. There were present the rulers, the elders, the scribes, the priests and all the kindred of the high priest. Annas was present. Probably assembly of the Sanhedrin. They were in Jerusalem, perhaps in the temple, perhaps in some other hall(Alford). The objection of the priests shows that the whole system was under the control of the Sadducees and Pharisees. Brought before this assembly Peter and John were questioned by what power and name they had done this. Question does show whether they referred to the healing of the lame man or the teaching in the temple. Perhaps both. But it shows ^{that} that they recognized some higher power or name back of the works and words of the disciples. Peter was Especially filled with the Holy Ghost and answered them in the following speech.

Analysis of the Speech:

v.8: Salutation, customary usage, one of respect.

v.9: Peter is not quite clear why they are called to account.

v.10: But it is by the power of the crucified and risen Christ that the lame man was made whole.

v.11: This same man was rejected and scorned by you(Jews and rulers).

v.12: But in this same man lies the only hope of every man's salvation.

In the name of Christ there is salvation, the only salvation.

Observations:

These few words of Peter are remarkable in their clarity, their directness and their content. Peter gives a straight unambiguous answer to their question. There is no doubt of his meaning. And the great truths that are contained in these few words astonish us. They are a proof of supernatural inspiration.

We have in this connection a strong proof against the modern idea of the impossibility of miracles. We have the healed man, the words of Peter, a disciple of Christ. We have then the Sanhedrin, who could do nothing but admit it. Solely on the basis of the historical record, ^{if} this record is accepted at all, the miracle must be admitted. The enemies of Christ here admitted it. Cf. v.13-14.

- But we note also the boldness of the disciples. Compare this ^{Peter} Peter with the Peter in the Palace of the high priest. There is no denial, no quibbling in the answer of Peter. We note also the O.T. reference of Peter. The Jews believed the O.T., claimed to adhere to it. Peter shows that Christ is the stone of the corner, Is.28,16. In this short speech he drives this point home. The object of his speech, the answer to the question, is extenuated by the teaching of the person of Christ. The object is accomplished, the Jews have no comeback.

Integrity: The speech is complete. This is clear from its construction. ^{- time -} Its point is clear. Nothing more is needed. Besides Peter was fully aware that no great opportunity for many words would be given him. ^{Per-} Perhaps other conversation was exchanged between them, but in this instance ^{-ance} we have all that Peter spoke. The source of Luke was probably Peter, or some of the other disciples to whom Peter repeated his remarks. Perhaps even Paul was present at the assembly, though this cannot be shown.

The Prayer of the Disciples. Acts 4,24-30.

Occasion: The Sanhedrin had released Peter and John with the command ^{- stand} that they should no more preach in the name of Jesus. The answer of ^{Peter} Peter,

"Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you mor than unto God, judge ye, for we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." Acts 4,19.20. But because they could prove nothing against them, and because they feared the people, they were forced to let them go. As in the days of Christ, the worker of miracles was saved by popular approval. But without this aid, the courage and boldness of the disciples was in no way daunted. The Holy Spirit was working in them and through them. This they confessed in prayer. They returned to their own company, either the twelve disciples, or to a larger group of Christians. When they had reported their experience, they joined in a prayer of thanksgiving and suplication.

Analysis of the Prayer:

- v. 24: Recognition of the power, creatorship and rulership of God.
- v.25: Human wisdom and efforts are vain and foolish.
- v. 26: The greatest earthly powers rail against Christ.
- v. 27: It is always and only against Christ that opposition centers.
- v. 28: But even the enemies of Christ work out the will and plans of God.
- v.29-30: Petition for continued help and strength in preaching His word.

Observations:

Were are shown here: When we should pray; to Whom we should pray; for what we should; the thankfulness for blessings.

The prayer is probably spoken by one in the name of all. If we take the usual course of events, Peter would assume the role of spokesman.

We note also the use of Scripture in Prayer. Especially the use of Psalms. We have very likely the entire prayer recorded. The Lord's Prayer is short. Christ had told them that vain repetitions were the heathen prayers. When we note the beginning of the prayer, the connected thought in the prayer, and the conclusion in the name of Christ, then we can conclude that we have the entire prayer. The source is probably the same as for the speech of Peter.

Peter before the Council. Acts 5,29-32.

Occasion: This occurred after the death of Ananias and Sapphira. The apostles continued performing teaching and performing many signs and miracles. There were many believers, both men and women are mentioned. v. 28 gives us the extent of the effect of their preaching. It was becoming known over all Jerusalem, and were preaching that the Jews ^{were} were guilty of the death of Christ. The priests, the Pharisees, and Sadducees ^{- all} every class of opponents were greatly incensed against them, and had all the disciples put in prison. But now they were miraculously freed by the angel of the Lord, and were told to go, and preach in the temple./ Very early next morning they were in the temple. The council and senate of the Jews assembled, not in the temple for they did not yet know of the release of the apostles. They sent to the prison, found the apostles ^{- his} gone, no one knew how. Then report came that they were in the temple teaching. The captain of the guard came to the temple and took them before the council. The high priest put the question to them: "Did we not straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name? and, behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine, and intend to ^{bring} bring this man's blood upon us?" Peter's short speech was the answer.

Analysis of the Speech:

v.29: General statement, we ought to obey God rather than man.

v.30: God has raised the slain Christ.

v. 31: He is the prince and Savior of Israel.

v.32: We are simply carrying out the commands to be His witnesses.

Observations:

Alford, N.T.: "The whole is a perfect model of concise and ready eloquence and of unanswerable logical coherence, and a notable fulfillment of the promise, Matt. 10,19." We note the logic of Peter. We ought to obey God rather than man, this is just what we are doing, he says.

Again, the God our of our Fathers, the God whom they worshipped, He is

One, who has raised Christ, the teaching to which they make such objection. This is the fourth time that Peter connects church on earth with the ascended Lord. We note also the direct accusation against the Jews. Again the fearless Peter. There is no quailing before them. Peter's words struck home. But the effect of his words on some we find in the speech of Gamaliel, who draws a comparison between things that are of God and of man.

Integrity: While during the course of their dealings with the council there must have been several questions and answers, also by the other apostles, we can safely say that what Peter answered here is complete and exactly as it was spoken. He has simply made an answer to a question. It is notable that we have always the words of Peter, but not of the other disciples. This tells us the source which Luke had was one who if not Peter, was one who knew of his dealings and words, as for instance, Mark. That Peter's words are so faithfully given throughout the entire first part, are an added proof of their reliability.

The Speech of Gamaliel. Acts 5,35-39.

It is listed by some as one of the speeches of Acts (Madden: Problems of the N.T.). But we do best merely to regard it as an opinion expressed^{-ed.}. It is of note inasmuch as it shows the effect of Peter's speech on Gamaliel. It saved the apostles from any rash treatment at the hands of the Jews. Gamaliel's opinion that the works of men always come to nought cannot be held absolutely. In the final sense regarding salvation^{-tion} this is true, but in the sense that Gamaliel spoke it is not the case, if we compare Mohammedanism, Buddhism, and the other false religions which have stood for centuries. His reference to the rebel, Theudas, mentioned also by Josephus, and the contradiction between the two^{accounts} may be satisfactorily explained in the manner found in Alford N.T.

Peter's Speech to Cornelius. Acts 10, 34-43.

Occasion: Peter, after many labors, was residing at the house of a ^{tanner} tanner in Joppa. There appeared to him the vision from heaven in the form of a sheet filled with all manner of unclean animals. As he pondered on vision, there called for him the men sent by Cornelius, the centurion of the Italian, living in Caesarea. This man had also had a vision in the form of an angel, who commanded him that he should send for Peter and from him receive instruction. Obeying the request, Peter the next day departed with them for Caesarea and entered the house of Cornelius. Cornelius had called his friends and relatives together for the event. At the entrance of Peter, Cornelius fell down and worshipped him. At this Peter forbade him to do it, and the conversation began as to how it came about that Cornelius had sent for Peter. The two visions explained each other. Cornelius, knowing that Peter was a disciple of Christ, asked that Peter teach them the things of God. Peter complied. The crowd before him were Gentiles. He was a Jew. Ordinarily there was no contact between the two. No Jew entered the house of a Gentile. But Peter unhesitatingly enters and preaches to the assembled Gentiles.

Analysis of the Speech:

v.34-35: God has his believers in every nation of the earth.

v.36-37: The word of God was to be preached first in all Judea.

v. 38: What that word concerned, namely Christ, the Anointed.

v. 39-43: Disciples are the witnesses of this man after His work of Redemption was done, as the prophets were before He came.

Observations:

The outstanding characteristic of this speech is the open statement of Peter, that not only the Jews, but also the Gentiles were included in the new covenant of God. This was not a completely new revelation to Peter, as we see from his statement on Pentecost day. But never before had the fact appeared to him with such striking force as now.

We see this from his opening words. It is the first thing he says. The matter, which appears to have been somewhat doubtful to him before this time is no longer in doubt. From this statement then he turns his words to the same old message, that of Christ and His work. We note that he particularly emphasized his apostleship. As the Jews had little communication with the Gentiles, so the Gentiles had little use for the Jews. To establish his apostleship then, was first of all necessary. But there is no doubt in Peter's mind. The Gentiles called. He answered.^{-ed} He preaches them the words of Christ. It is the Gentiles' Pentecost. We see this, that while he was speaking, the Holy Spirit fell on all ^{that} heard him speak. Peter perceived this, that is, he saw and heard their confessions of faith, and they were baptized.

Integrity: Not all the speech of Peter is recorded. The speech is too short to meet the demands of the occasion. In such a time Peter would not be content with only these words. Besides, the statements are too general. The truths as he would preach them to the Gentiles would be more detailed. The words which Luke records are the words either of Peter^{-er} or someone else giving a resume of what Peter said, or only a part of Peter's address. It may be that these words represent the truths that Peter then expounded, but we are told that while speaking these words the Holy Ghost descended, implying that at this point in the speech Luke brings in this fact. Also the fact of baptism shows further instruction^{-tion} by Peter. Also Cornelius had requested to hear all the things that God had commanded to speak. These were not all the truths of God. The source for this speech could be found in any number of Christians. "The preaching of Peter to the Gentiles created a sensation. What he preached as well as the fact of his preaching was sure to be remembered. It is entirely probably that Cornelius, devout as he was would write down the words of Peter, that he might have them continually. Thus we take them not as Luke's idea of the opening for the Gentiles, but as the ^{the} true words of Peter.

Peter's Speech at Jerusalem. Acts 11,4-17.

Occasion: The apostles and other Christians heard of the experience ^{and} and the works of Peter among the Gentiles. When Peter, therefore in the course of his labors came to Jerusalem, the Jews questioned him concerning this, and seemed to be of the opinion that he should not have mingled with the Gentiles. In order to explain the situation, Peter tells them the whole story from beginning to end. (note: Ramsay takes this incident at Jerusalem as that time to which Paul refers in Gal.2. He says that Gal.2 does not mention the later occurrence recorded in Acts 15. Most of the investigators do not agree with him).

Analysis of the Speech:

V.4-15: Recounting the order of events with Cornelius.

v.16: Promise of Christ to send the Holy Ghost.

v. 17: Since it was then the work of God, it was proper to do it.

Observations:

We note in the last part of the speech of Peter that he again asserts that it was the working of God, and proves it by the fact that God ^{sent} sent the Holy Spirit. Peter is convinced against his will. Again, were ^{all} all the Christians and apostles of the opinion that Peter had done wrong? We say no; for we read in v. 3: 'they that were of the circumcision contended with him'. This could mean all Jews, but more probably to the more zealous and fanatical Jews, who particularly stressed the ^{ob-}ob-
^{-inc-}servance of the law in spite of their faith. Peter's speech is convinc-
ing. After he had recounted his experience, they held their peace.

Integrity: No doubt Peter was forced more than once to answer this objection. But here we have what is the complete explanation of Peter before a more or less formal assemblage or conference. Paul probably was, and even Luke, may have been present. Many Christians were there, perhaps even an account of Peter's remarks were kept, for they were important in the growth and expansion of the Christian church.

Peter's Speech in Jerusalem. Acts 15,7-11.

Occasion: The question of the Gentiles' admission into the Christian church was being discussed. Paul and Barnabas, teaching in the churches of country around and in Antioch, were accosted by various Judaistic Christians on the question of circumcision. These Jews still always insisted that the Gentiles must be circumcised. After much dispute it was decided that the apostles and others should go to Jerusalem to discuss the matter in general assembly. Thus we find the apostles and elders of the whole church assembled in conference. The question was brought up. There was much discussion. Finally Peter arose and Spoke.

Analysis of the Speech:

v.7: Salutation. God chose the Gentiles to receive His word also.

v.8: In proof of which He sent His Holy Spirit into their hearts.

v.9: And put them on the same level with the other Christians (Jews).

v.10: Therefore they should not tempt God by placing unnecessary burdens on those whom he has made his Christians.

v.11: But everyone shall be saved only by the grace of Jesus Christ.

Observations:

Peter, being yet the acknowledged leader of the church gives his opinion as a summary of what he thinks is correct in regard to this question.

This is the complete speech of Peter in this instance. There had been much discussion. In these few words Peter summarizes. Each verse

gives a statement or a truth of God. He states his view of the matter.

In every verse we note a characteristic phrase of Peter, such as he had used in his previous speeches. There is no doubt about the genuineness of the report. Paul was present. Luke may have been present.

Very likely reports of the conference were kept. The most noteworthy thing about Peter's speech is the strong leaning toward the Gentile viewpoint. It seems that he leans more toward the Gentiles than toward the Jews, if one must make a decision.

** with him was no respect of persons.*

Conclusions to be drawn from Peter's Speeches:

Addressees: Peter's words reached every class of people. He limited himself to no particular ^{class}, but the higher and lowly, the rulers and masses, men and women, Jews and Gentiles alike were the receivers of his words. This was a novel attempt in the history of the Jewish church, except ^{for} for the examples of Christ. Christ's kingdom was not all-inclusive.

Content of his preaching: The one word which of course would characterize his preaching is the "gospel". But particularly do we find Peter preaching those things of Christ which he himself had seen Christ do. On almost every occasion he mentions the many works of healing and wonders that Christ had performed. Then also the great events of his crucifixion and death, and his resurrection and ascension, events to which Peter was an eye-witness, and which therefore made a lasting impression on him, these also are constantly proclaimed by Peter. The claim that the Christology and theology of Peter is primitive and not within the experience of the writer of Acts (Hoffatt, Overback, Robertson) cannot be held. It is contrary to the statements of Christ that the "Holy Ghost should lead them in all truth." While in Peter's speeches we do not have the details and the extenuation of the great truths of Scripture recorded, we have enough to show that the Holy Spirit was not restricted in him, and that in Peter was the consciousness of complete Christianity.

Form of speaking: While we have only a very small number of the many discourses that Peter must have delivered, we find by their similarity and their unity of thought, that he spoke as one convinced of what he was speaking, that he spoke directly with the boldness of one who had the courage of his convictions. Directness, plainness, straightforwardness, no covering of facts, this characterizes his speech. A comparison with the Epistles of Peter show the same characteristics. But above all, we note that though primarily his work was among the Jews,

*
with respect of persons.

The Speech of Stephen. Acts 7,2-53.

Occasion: Stephen was one of the seven men, chosen by the congregation to take care of the duties of the office of the deacons of the church at Jerusalem. Stephen, it seems, did not limit his work to the care of the poor, but went about, doing great wonders and miracles, Acts 6,8. In the course of his labors, he came into contact and argument with those of his own nationality, the Greeks, and the Jews. Quite naturally, his labors, as that of the apostles incurred the hostility of the Jews, especially the rulers, priests, Pharisees, ^{etc.} By false witnesses they brought him before the council, charging him with blasphemy against Moses, against the temple, the law and God. He was reported to have said (6,14) "Jesus of Nazareth shall ^{destroy} destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered." Therefore he was arraigned before the council, the Sanhedrin, and the apology which we have recorded in the seventh chapter of Acts was delivered.

Analysis of the Speech:

- v.2-36: The continuous history of the Patriarchs, beginning with Abraham, his promise; Isaac, Joseph, his twelve sons, and the trips to Egypt, the oppression in Egypt; Moses, his youth, the killing of the Egyptian, the appearance of God to him, and the deliverance out of the land of oppression.
- v.37-50: The prophecy of Moses of the prophet like him, and the succeeding promises of God, but the Jews were idolatrous and turned ^{away} away from God, the worship of the true God to their idols, and the desecration of the tabernacle and the temple. Particular emphasis is laid on the holiness of the temple. The various temples are mentioned ^{-ed} but it is shown from 1 Kgs.8,27; 2Chr.2,6; Is.66,1,2, that not the outward building of the temple, but the temple of the living God in the heart of men is regarded by God himself.

v.51-53: An imprecation against the evil and rebellious Jews who ^{have} changed since the days of their fathers, the greatest evil which culminated in the slaying of the Just One, Jesus of Nazareth.

Observations: We note first how admirably the speech of Stephen fits into the occasion. He spoke to the Jews. They knew the Old Testament. ^{-ment} He shows to them that he knows it also. They accuse of blaspheming Moses. He gives them the plain statement what he thinks of Moses. They accuse him of blaspheming God. He calls Him the "God of glory who appeared unto our father Abraham". They accuse him of blaspheming the temple, and he lays particular emphasis upon the holiness ^{-ness} of that place, showing how it is held in esteem by all the true believers, and showing at the same time from their own Scriptures that the outward form is mere hypocrisy if the heart is not right. They accuse him of speaking against the law, and he says it was ^{-en} given by the dispensation of the angels. From their own Scriptures, he shows that everything he says and which Jesus said is true. They ^{are} forced to admit the truth on the basis of their own claim of authority. These points are just as we would expect. We are told that Stephen was learned and full of wisdom of the Holy Ghost. A refutation of the accusations against him is what we would expect. That they are reproduced so exactly shows not only the accuracy of Luke's report, but shows that his source for the speech is reliable.

The alleged mistakes in the report of Stephen concerning the events ^{of} of the Jewish history, we ^{are} never fully enumerated and carried out by the critics. The incident in 7,16, concerning the burial ground of Joseph, which apparently is not the one referred to in Gen.23,16, offers no difficulty. The mention of the angel, which spoke to Moses ^{-ed} on Mt. Sinaï, and who gave the law, merely serves to show that the knowledge of Stephen of the Angel of the Lord, was the Logos, the Revelation of God in the thru His Word.

Of importance in the speech of Stephen is the reference to the Gentiles in v.45. Critics say that here Stephen supersedes his time. This should be a proof of the composition of Luke, namely, that Luke put this thought in the speech, because this was too early a date ^{for} for such ideas to be incorporated in the Jewish Christianity. But we note against this, the earlier references in the speeches of Peter. But above all, any reader of the O.T. will find not only one but ^{many} many references that the Gentiles shall inherit ~~was~~ Israel shall reject. The apostles, Jesus, and the O.T. give to the learned and spiritual Stephen an insight that is unusual, far beyond that of the blinded council, and of the modern critics. Maurice Jones, Writing in the Expositor, vol.13, says that the real motive for introducing this ^{for introducing} speech of Stephen is the opportunity ^{and} the personalities of Stephen and Philip. This is weak. While Luke undoubtedly chose only portions of the history of the early church, the reason for choosing this particular portion is to show 1) a true occurrence of the early church; 2) the spirit of the defense of the first Christian martyr; 3) the spread of Christianity and its influence among Gentile nations; 4) the record of the heroic conviction of the early Christians. Some critics take the speech to be a bridge from Peter to Paul (^{Rack-}ham, Robertson). While this in a certain sense may be true, it can't hardly have been intentional on the part of Luke, who also would not find it necessary, since his purpose was to write a history. ^{time.} Source: Harnack thinks that Luke is dependent on Silas for this section. He thinks that Luke had a written document, as does Robertson, and others. Ramsay, Expositor, vol.8, says that Philip is the eye witness. We know that Paul heard the speech. Robertson says that the speech was a formal apology and was therefore written out. Against this speaks the length of the speech, the great jumps in some sections ^{-time} of the history, and the abrupt and scathing ending from the mouth of

Stephen. It may be that Stephen wrote the apology and that Luke had the written document, but if such is the case, not all of it was delivered. The last verses, 51-53 seem to be an outburst of feeling on the part of Stephen, as he saw the hardness of his listeners, and his own accusations against them aroused ~~him~~ to greater wrath and indignation. The closing incidents and words Luke could have gotten from Paul. This speech must have made an impression on Paul. Some of the thoughts, especially those concerning the temple, we find reproduced again in the speeches of Paul himself. The fact that similar phrases and thoughts occur in the speeches of Peter and Paul as are found ^{here} in the apology, is no ground for assuming that all these speeches are the composition of Luke, wherein he puts his own thoughts and the prevalent doctrines of the age in the mouth of the contemporaneous apostle. When we consider that these men lived among the same class of people, had the same opposition, spoke under very similar circumstances, and above all that human nature is always the same and the truth of God is always the same, and that they taught all and only the truth of God, what else should we expect but that similar thoughts and phrases occur? To the contrary, this is a proof that these speeches are genuine, and are not a mechanical reproduction of Luke, but the words of different men under similar circumstances. Later in the speeches of Paul we shall note similar conditions.

Robertson says: (p.224) Luke has given the trial and defense of ^{Stephen} Stephan a dramatic setting and has shown the historians insight in the way ^{that} that he has presented the whole story. The speech bears the mark of a ^{real} real report. It is full of life and power. It left its mark on Paul. It blazed the way for future expansion of Christianity. It broke the shackles of Judaism. It defied Pharisaism. It flashed before the ^{Jew} Jewish world the heart of Christ's message and mission to the whole ^{wide} wide world.

SPEECHES OF PAUL.

Paul, The Apostle. Again, as in the case of Peter, we cannot give a detailed account of the great apostle to the Gentiles, but are permitted to say only a few words which have a more direct bearing upon the point at issue. From the account of Luke and from his own mouth, we learn how this once zealous Jew, learned in the Jewish law and customs, the most straitest of the Pharisees, was turned by the power of God to the apostle of that teaching which he had purposed to destroy. As he had been vigorous in his persecution of the Christian religion, just so strong was he, just such courage of conviction was his in his defense of the Christian religion. No man was too lowly, no land was too far, no danger too threatening, no despair too black to keep him from beginning anew the battle for the Lord against the forces of evil. His call, an apostle to the Gentiles was his one purpose in life, it was his being, his existence, his goal.

In our work we consider him mainly as Paul the Preacher. In Acts 9,29 Luke gives us an interesting point as to the manner of Paul's preaching, to whom, how and what he preached, and also the difficulties he encountered, where it reads: "And he spake boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus, and disputed with the Grecians: but they went about to slay him." We see him as one who was ready to meet others in discussion, as one who had the courage of his religious convictions, as one who held the Crucified Christ before his hearers continually. Due to the fact that all his preaching centered about the Christ, it was at Antioch that Paul and his followers were first called Christians, Acts 11,26.

Luke presents him to us in his speeches as the versatile orator, the solicitous pastor, the able apologist, the determined Christian. What more is to be said of him will be brought out in the various speeches as the facts exhibit his characteristics.

Paul's Speech at Antioch. Acts 13, 16-41.

Occasion: Paul and Barnabas were on what we call Paul's first missionary journey. Being separated by the Holy Ghost (Acts 13,4) they departed to the island of Cyprus, then went to Perga and from thence their journey took them to Antioch in Pisidia. John and others (13,13) were with them. On the Sabbath day they went into the synagogue and sat down for the reading of the Scripture. At the close of this, the rulers of the synagogue approached them and asked if they wished to say anything to the people. Paul and his company must have been in ^{the} city several days, and rumor of their work and mission must have been spread. Otherwise we cannot understand this strange question, whether or not they wished to speak to the people. The people were not the usual strict Jews. The city was Hellenized. Ramsays The Cities of St. Paul, p.261: "The evidence, scanty as it is, points to the ^{-con} conclusion that the Hellenistic Antioch was rather a Greek colony than a ^{-ian} Phrygian city Hellenized. The Greek colonists predominated, and, although a Phrygian element in the city must be supposed, yet either it was not so numerous as to affect the character of the city, or it was so ^{-ously} thoroughly Hellenized as to acquiesce in the Hellenic spirit." Thus to a mixed audience of Jews and proselytes, men who had learned and knew the Jewish law, Paul addressed this speech.

Analysis of the Speech:

v.16-26: The prior history of the Jewish nation and the events ^{-ing} leading up to the great event--what God has done for his people--in the gift of the Savior.

v.27-37: Messiahship of Jesus and proof of it from the O.T.

v.38-41: Application of this truth to themselves.

Observations: Most critics assume that Paul's theme was taken from the previously read Scripture readings, which for this Sunday to be Is. and Deut.I. The Greek words in Paul's speech agree in several ^{the} instances.

This is customary of Paul. Taylor, Paul the Missionary, points out that the speech contains a historical, an apologetical, doctrinal, and a practical section. "The historical section bears a considerable resemblance to the address of Stephen before the council at Jerusalem, and it is not improbable that the words of the protomartyr were fresh in the memory of the apostle while he spoke." "In the second part we are reminded of words of Peter on Pentecost. It was natural that, in seeking to establish the same conclusion, they should use similar arguments, especially when they were reasoning with the same class of hearers." (Taylor. p.115).

The effect of his speech was unusual. Many were interested in what he said to them, v.41-43. We attribute this to 1) his manner of approach, from the known to the unknown, from impersonal to the personal, making them feel that what he said was for the utmost importance for them, 38-42; 2) by forestalling rejection and counter-speech on the part of the Jews, v. 40,41; 3) mainly, as is always, to the power of the Holy Spirit. Ramsay: Cities of St. Paul, p.298: "Such a reception--that a pagan city should welcome a Jewish stranger as an angel of God--was marvelous, impossible, incredible, but Luke describes how it occurred."

This speech marks the elevation of the Gentiles to the same level with the Jews. Ramsay: "It is absurd and unfair to doubt that Luke was fully conscious of this. The aim of the sermon was to drive into the minds of the audience one of two fundamental principles, and to suggest the universality of the gospel; and the subsequent events showed that this part of the message was caught with avidity by the hitherto unprivileged Gentiles in the audience. The oration was only the introduction, not the completion of a course of instruction." McGiffert, p.186: There is a resemblance in the early portion to the speech of Stephen, and in other parts to the discourses of Peter, while the style is in the main undeniably Luke's. Moreover, it is difficult to believe that Paul

can have uttered vs. 38 and 39, at least in the form in which we have them. Both of them are sufficiently unPauline to excite surprise, occurring as they do at the climax of his utterance to the very essence of the gospel as he understood it. V. 38 contains an idea of which there is little trace in his teaching, while the phrase itself, *ἕως ἄρτι*, which is employed by Peter with the same significance and practically in the same connection in both his Pentecostal and Caesarean discourses, is found in none of Paul's epistles, except once in Eph. 1,7 and again the parallel passage in Col. 1,14. On the other hand, in v. 39, where it is said that "every one that believeth is justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses," a conception of justification is expressed, which, if not distinctly un-Pauline, nevertheless falls far below Paul's characteristic and controlling idea of justification as the state of the saved man who is completely reconciled to God and enjoys peace with him."

Weizsäcker: Paul in Antioch repeats argument from the 16th Psalm. There remains therefore hardly a doubt that it is not at one time Peter at the other Paul, who speaks, but that the historian has assigned the same ideas to both."

McGiffert's assertion is destroyed by his own statement that Paul did repeat this teaching in two other occasions. Again, he seems wholly to neglect what is one of the great threads of Paul's argument in the whole Letter to the Romans. In 2 Cor. 3, we find a similar idea. Weizsäcker's statement has been answered before.

We do not have all the speech that Paul made recorded here. Luke evidently has it as he got it from Paul, who clearly was the source. The occasion, however, demands, and the results show that more was spoken than these few words. From this very first recorded speech of Paul we note the complete absence of a counter doctrine to that of Peter, any disagreement with the earlier apostles or a 'tendency' doctrine, but rather the great, simple, sublime gospel truths.

Paul's Speech at Lystra. Acts 14,15-17.

Paul and Barnabas were still on their first missionary journey. They had been forced to flee from Iconium and came to Lystra. There they continued preaching the gospel, and they found there a lame man, who hearing the preaching of Paul and believing him, Paul healed him. This was a heathen city, full of idols, superstitious. Anyone who performed something unusual or supernatural was to their minds a god. This healing of the cripple was an astounding miracle to their minds. Only a god

could have done it. Immediately the rumor spread. A crowd collected. They saw and called out: The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men. They thought Barnabas to be Jupiter and Paul Mercurius. From this we see that their idea of a god was vague, having no clear conception of what they were like or what they could or would do. They were clearly gross heathen. Seeing Paul's miracle their heathen priest made ready to sacrifice to them. When the apostles learned this, they naturally were shocked and immediately raised their protests against the action. Paul words are as follows:

v.15: They were merely men created by the living Creator of the world.

v.16: Who has permitted many people to live in their idolatry.

v.17: But has been witness to himself thru His providence.

Observations: On the spur of the moment, Paul appeals to the natural knowledge of the people. They knew nothing of Christ. He had no approach thru the gospel. Their common ground was the natural knowledge in the heart of man. To this Paul directs his remarks. Shows Paul resourcefulness and knowledge of the natural heart of man.

Taylor, p.143: says in reference to v. 16: "Paul knew nothing of that modern idea which would make all things evolve themselves from a primordial germ, and simply by the force of an inherent energy, into the cause of which it is no part of philosophy to investigate."

Integrity: The speech here is reproduced as Luke got it from Paul. No doubt that much more was said and explained, vv. 14,18. But these words reproduce exactly the thoughts which Paul uttered on that occasion. That just these thoughts are recorded, which even to our minds today seem to be the correct and psychologically correct thoughts to speak to such an audience on such an occasion, speaks not only for the truth and reliability of Luke as a historian, but shows that he had in mind not the idea of giving us, as is said by some, merely an example of the type of apostolic preaching among the heathen.

Paul at Athens. Acts 17, 22-31.

Occasion: Luke describes the city of Athens at the time of Paul, as a 'city wholly given to idolatry'. Paul was on his second missionary journey, had gone to Berea, was forced to leave because of the disturbances caused by the Jews, and had gone to Athens to await the arrival of Silas and Timothy. While there he naturally explored the city. As an educated man, learned also in all the philosophy of his day, not insensible to the arts and sciences of the Athenians, still susceptible to the influences of intellectual minds from his training at Tarsus, the air and atmosphere of Athens was to Paul no unfamiliar thing: Eadie: Paul the Preacher, p. 189, describes the scene well:

"As he waited, he wandered through its streets with inquisitive and sorrowing gaze--it was so unlike Jerusalem, the city of God. His spirit was stirred within him, roused and excited to profound grief and indignation, as he surveyed it glories, not with the eye of an artist but that of a Christian. The statues and temples not looked upon him as the creation of genius, but the means and results of debasing superstitions. Intellect, taste and beauty were alike profaned, for the one God was dethroned. Wherever the solitary stranger gazed, he saw manifestations of polytheism, nature deified, humanity depicted as superhuman, and virtues, nay even vices, exalted into divinities. It was an unwonted sight which greeted him, The city was wholly given to idolatry--idol full, crammed, as one might say, with idols,--one idolatrous mass." In the city which contained many Jews also, he

entered into the synagogue and taught, and in the market place, or forum. Here he encountered the many different classes of men from all parts of the world, also the philosophers, who spent their time in conversation, in gossip, in any new idea or rumor that arose. ^{The} The Epicureans and Stoics are mentioned, as prominent ones of the time, very likely. This new philosophy of Paul--for Christianity is a form of philosophy, rightly considered---attracted the attention of the inquisitive Athenians, and especially it was concerning some God of whom they had not heard, they inquired of him. From their questions we gather that they thought not very highly of him, yet their curiosity was too strong for them. They summoned him to the Areopagus,

or Mars Hill. Where this was is a disputed question with the critics. Some say it was the forum, others the open meeting place^s of the ^{court}, some say it was a judicial assembly of the highest court of Athens. In either case, at the request of the ^{assembly}, he prepares to ^{explain} to them the teachings of which they had heard.

Analysis of the Speech:

- v.22. Salutation. Mentions the religious fervor of the Athenians.
- v.23: From this point proceeds to the 'unknown god' of the Athenians.
- v.24: This God is the creator of the world and is not 'hand-made'.
- v.25: God is not dependent but all things are dependent on Him.
- v.26: God has established the human race and their habitation.
- v.27.28: God is near and sustains all His creations.
- v.29.30: Idolatry God has in past times overlooked and not always chastened and corrected those who did not worship him.
- v.31: But now is an appointed day of judgment by the resurrected ^{Christ} Christ.

Observations: Most critics are loud in their praise of this speech.

Steir, calls it a "marvelous example of logical coherence and ^{- uses "}eloquence".

We note first of all, the logic which Paul uses. Every verse is in logical connection. Each verse and the truth it depicts flows as a logical conclusion from the preceding one. Meeting the Athenians ^{on} their own ground, Paul is their equal. Next we note his text: To ^{the} the unknown God. Eadie, p.198, says: " In the synagogue he had selected ^{his} his theme from Moses, but on the Areopagus he takes his text from a ^{heathen} heathen altar. To the children of Abraham he proclaimed Christ, but to the citizens of Athens he 'preached Jesus'." Their own unknown God was the one he revealed to them. He made known the unknown, by going ^{from} from the unknown to the known. He uses this basic principle of teaching. He chooses from those things which are before them, he is aware of the situation. Next we note the subject matter. We find not the deepest ^{- set} dogmatical teachings of ^{the} the person of the Trinity and Christ. He ^{starts} starts

with the natural knowledge of God, as he did before at Lystra. He is aware of the fact that he is speaking to heathen. Only at the end of his speech does he mention something of the person of Christ. But all the way through the appeal to the things of God that can be seen or felt. He appeals to their reason. And his arguments are irrefutable. They know within them that his words are true, whether they ^{admit} admit it or not. Next we note how he refutes the logic of the day. The Stoics are called the Pharisees of Athens, the Epicureans, the Sadducees. The Epicureans denied the truth of a Deity, the certainty of immortality, the existence of the soul, and the gods, if any, are entirely aloof from the doings and actions of man. We see at a glance how Paul draws a sword through these. The rejection of Stoicism is not so apparent except in v. 27.28. The Stoic ideas that ^{- side} suicide is justified, that there is no higher goal than this life to seek, that there is no consumation of glory, are here refuted. An outright declaration against the prevalent philosophy would have been foolhardy and without result. Paul was not insensible to the fact. His teaching of the true God is couched in terms that the philosophers could devour. They listened, until he spoke of the resurrection of Christ--the stumbling block of all unbelievers--and they would have nothing more to do with him.

Luke got this speech from Paul. It is the record of a true occurrence. Weizsaecker's statement that it has only 'proverbial value', and that this discourse at Athens is interpolated between the visits to Macedonia and Corinth, as a type of Paul's preaching to the ^{Gentiles,} Gentiles, is without grounds. Not all the speech of Paul is recorded. It is ^{not} not reasonable to suppose that he spoke only these few words. They had summoned him to hear his teachings. What Luke gives us here is the report which Paul gave him of his speech in a somewhat resume form. Its brevity, however, does not destroy its verity and authenticity.

Paul's Speech at Ephesus. Acts 20, 18-35.

Paul was returning home on his third missionary journey. He was heading back for Syria, and was going from Troas to Rhodes. They came to the city of Miletus, and in order to save time, he called the elders of Ephesus to come to see him, that he might go on as soon as possible. Luke and others of his company were with him. He was taking his final leave of them, and the words of his speech were here recorded by the historian.

Analysis of the Speech:

v.18-21: He reminds the elders of his conduct among them.

v.22-25: He announces to them his final separation from them.

v.26-35: He earnestly commends to their care the flock for which he has labored, not for his own interests, but solely for theirs.

Observations: Taylor, p.355, says: "For depth of pathos and fervor of appeal it seems to me to be well nigh unrivalled even in Holy Writ. It quivers all through with emotion. There is love in every sentence and a tear in every tone." This we note, that his words here are conspicuous for their tenderness. This, of course, is what we would expect at such an occasion, and the words are correctly reproduced by Luke. Luke himself was present. It is first hand reporting. We can note this in the detail of the words and thoughts that are given us here. The complete speech is not given. It sounds very much as the final words which Paul might have used on this occasion. They are very likely the verbatim conclusion of the remarks which Paul made to them.

Critics accept this speech as the most authentic of all that are recorded in Acts, because the author (we) was present himself and had first hand sources. The last words of Paul throw an interesting slant on the integrity in reproducing the speeches in that it shows a similar principle in the recording of the speeches of Christ.

The last words of the speech: "It is more blessed to give than to receive." Paul says these are the words of Christ. But they are not found in the gospels. This shows that not all the words of Christ which he spoke officially or in the capacity as a teacher are recorded for us. We can safely assume that this method was also followed by Luke in reporting the speeches which he records for us.

Paul's Speech on the Stairs at Jerusalem. Acts 22, 1-21.

Occasion: Paul was in Jerusalem. He was, it seems by now almost a nationally known. ^{Wherever} he went, he attracted great crowds and continual followings, if for nothings else than curiosity. While in Jerusalem he went to the temple with the other Jews. There Jews of Asia, where he had labored, recognized him, and immediately set the crowd afire. They accused him of defiling the temple by bringing ^{Greeks} Greeks into it. The mob grew furious. They beat and buffeted. They took him from the temple and set about to kill him. The confusion attracted the attention of the Roman soldiers, who came and quieted the mob. ^{But} But the leader was forced to take Paul to a castle to protect him from the infuriated mob. As they were entering the building, Paul asked ^{the} the captain if he might speak to the people. The building was one with an outer stairs leading to the second story. On this stairs, perhaps on a little platform in the midst of it, at least on an elevated position, standing with a soldier on each side guarding him, Paul beckoned to the people to come closer beneath him, and he spoke to them the followings words of defense of his position and actions.

Analysis of the Speech:

v.1-3: Paul declares himself to be Jew and zealous in the law.

v.4-5: He formerly persecuted Christianity at the instigation of the high priest, and was its bitterest enemy.

v.6-16: The account of his conversion, the trip to Damascus, the ^{house} house and events of Ananias, and the command to be an apostle to the ^{nations.} nations.

v.17-21: The command that he should leave Jerusalem, necessitated by his conversion, his part in the trial of Stephen and the command of God to ^a witness to the Gentiles.

Observations: Paul spoke in Hebrew, the language of the people. (Not ^{the} the Hebrew of the O.T., but the Chaldee, which at the time of the apostles ^{-be} had long superseded it in Palestine.-Thayer, p/164). Not only the psychology of Paul, but the accurateness of Luke is shown here.

We not ^{also} how Paul stresses his former learning and actions as a Jew, showing that at the time he was ^a Jew. Then also, how all the work which he did was at the command of God alone. Also, first he is to be witness--this was accepted by the Jews-- and then to be a witness ^{-ness} to the Gentiles. Here the Jews interrupted his words.

Integrity: We probably have the complete speech of Paul. Conditions were not favorable for many words, a mob does not ^{take} take to many details and explanations. The facts Paul stresses. Luke was probably present, ^{-ent,} Acts 21,17ff., so that the report is from ^a eyewitness. The details of the events following the interruption of the speech, the throwing of dust in the air by the mob, the fury at the mention of the name of Stephen and the Gentiles, speak for an eyewitness. But Paul had over-estimated the indulgence of the Jews, when he brought in these things.

Paul's Speech before Felix at Caesarea. Acts 24,10-21.

Occasion: Paul was in prison in Caesarea. After the trouble in Jerusalem, a number of Jews had conspired to kill ^{him}. Learning of this from Paul's nephew, by night the chief captain, Claudias Lysias, sent Paul to Caesarea to be tried in the court of Felix, the governor. Arriving ^{ing} there, and learning the charge that was against Paul, Felix ordered him placed in the judgment hall of Herod until the accusers of Paul should come down. Five days later they appeared, armed with a certain ^{-ain} orator named Tertullus. Called before the governor, Tertullus first pleaded the case of the Jews, accusing Paul and Paul was then requested ^{-ed} to answer to the charge. The following speech was his answer.

v.10-13: Respects to governor. The folly of the accusation, and the refutation of it, the false testimony of the Jews against him.

v.14-17: He worships the same God which his accuser claim to worship and preaches the resurrection of the dead.

v.18-21: The Jews should therefore have no fault to find with his teachings and if they do they are finding fault with their own doctrine. ^{-nine.}

Observations: We note first Paul's clear refutation of the accusation of the Jews. The Jews had no real case against him. The circumstances showed it. Felix knew it (v.22). We also gather from this that the gist of Paul's teaching was concerning the resurrection. Again we note how important a part this plays in the teachings of the early apostles. The source of Luke here was probably himself. He very likely was present when Paul spoke these words. The answer of Paul is complete. It is the short simple direct statement of the fearless ^{-and} unwavering apostle to his civil superior. Other than this, little need be said.

Paul's Speech to King Agrippa. Acts 26,2-29.

Occasion: After Felix, Festus became governor, and three days after his induction into office he went up to Jerusalem. At once the high priest sought him out to persuade him against Paul. In trying to lure him to Jerusalem, they wanted to kill him on the way. But Festus ^{-us} was not so easy. He kept Paul in Caesarea, and informed the Jews that they must bring their accusation against Paul there. This they did about ten days later. On this occasion Festus inquired of Paul he would be willing to go to Jerusalem. Paul answered by a counter ^{stat-} statement and made his appeal to Caesar. This ended the proceedings. Some time later king Agrippa and his wife Bernice came to visit Festus. Festus put the case of Paul before Agrippa. Agrippa was interested and on the following day, before the royal assembly, Paul was brought ^{-gt} out to be given a hearing before the king. Festus stated the facts ^{and} and ^{Paul} answered before Agrippa the following speech.

Analysis of the Speech:

v.2-3: Salutation. Respects to Agrippa. Agrippa's wisdom in judgment.

v.4-7: Paul himself was formerly on of the strictest of the Pharisees, and taught and did as they still did, having the hope of life to come.

v.8-11: Driven by his former unbelief he had persecuted many Christians^{-ians}.

v.12-18: The story of the conversion on the way to Damascus.

v.19-23: Obedient to the command of Christ, he preached Christ and his fruits to the Jews and the Gentiles, great and small, to all.

v.24-26: He answers Festus that he is not mad but speaks only the truth^{truth} of God, which also Agrippa knows to be the truth.

Observations: The tone of the Speech reflects the situation. The whole manner of speaking, the precision, the eloquence, the careful construction of thoughts bespeaks an unusual audience. The whole speech is a nicely rounded unit, showing the fact the he is blameless and that his commission is from God. Paul uses the argument ad humanum. Even kings are not immune to it. We not also the short description of the facts of his conversion. The details were not so important as in the case with the Jews in Jerusalem. Mainly the fact that it was a divine command is stressed here. Agrippa would be interested in the facts at hand, not the many preceding details. The diplomacy of Paul is carefully recorded by Luke. The fact that the details of the conversion of Paul differs here from the one in ch.22, shows not only Paul's knowledge but the care with which Luke has put down the records for us. It shows the speeches are genuine. If they were mere compositions by Luke, we would expect more correspondence of detail. We not also how Luke reflects Paul composure and assurance^{-ance} in his answer to Festus that he was mad. The outbursts of Peter on similar occasions, so ably put down by Luke correspond to what we otherwise know of Peter. So here of Paul. These points are important^{-ant} in showing the reliability of Luke. Luke was undoubtedly an eyewitness^{-ness}. Considering the conditions, we probably have all the speech recorded.

In addition to the speeches of Peter, Stephen and Paul, we find in the book of Acts a number of smaller speeches. In most cases these speeches are^{not} of relatively great importance, but for the sake of completeness, we shall briefly consider them. The first of these we find: The Speech of James at Jerusalem, Acts 15, 13-21.

The conference was in session in Jerusalem. The questions of the Gentile circumcision was at hand. Peter, Paul and Barnabas had voiced their opinion, giving the facts of the happenings among the Gentiles. Then James, in the ordinary manner of a conference gives his opinion. He simply states that his opinion agrees with that of Peter, that the Gentiles should be admitted into the church of God and adds an additional proof from the O.T. Luke probably records all the words of ^{James} James here. The similarity of language between this speech and James' Epistle is striking (Robertson, Mayor). Luke inserts this very ordinary and natural opinion of James, perhaps to show that the others were in ^{agreement} agreement with the opinions of Peter and Paul. Paul was present and very likely Luke was also present. (Cf, p.24, Speech of Peter].

The circular letter, Acts 15, 23-29, written as a result of the decision of the conference contains the resolution of conference in regard to the matter of circumcision and Gentile admittance into the church. Just when this conference took place and this letter was sent has been the source of much discussion and divided opinions among critics, of which it is not in line to discuss. The statements of the letter ~~are~~ are clear. They were sent to all the churches. Luke could easily obtain a copy, and we have it here verbatim. It was probably composed by James, following his suggestion and bearing a close resemblance to his Epistle. (?)

A somewhat unusual and novel speech is found in Acts 19, 35-40, ^{the} the speech of the town-clerk of Ephesus at the occasion of a mob riot in which Gaius and Aristiarchus, companions of Paul were being mobbed by

the friends of the silversmiths whose business the apostles destroyed by preaching against idols. The address of the town-clerk was adroit. It shows that he knew how to deal with a mob. First he compliments their image, then having gotten their confidence, he bade them beware against making rash accusations. The accused had really not spoken against their Gods and the courts were a better place to settle all grievances. The testimony of the clerk shows wisdom in Paul's preaching, which was not a brusque attack on their great idolatry. He introduced truth without controversy. Just as at Athens, the tact of Paul is shown. He proceeds from the known to the unknown, from the visible, to the invisible, from the temporal to the eternal. This speech is recorded in its entirety. Paul and his companions heard it. The ^{speech} speech must have made an impression on them, since he could so quickly dispel such a mob. From them Luke could get the speech.

The remaining speeches we will more briefly consider. The letter (Acts 23, 27-30) of Claudias Lysias to the governor Felix was a public document. Luke could have gotten hold of it. Especially when it was learned that Paul was a Roman citizen, greater privileges were accorded him. Also the short speech of Tertullus, Acts 24, 2-8, was made in public. Luke probably heard it. It embodies the accusations against Paul, framed in the words of a hired lawyer, who was the plaintiff in the case of Paul vs. Jews. Likewise the speech of Festus to Agrippa was in open court. The public heard it. Luke could have heard it. The last short address of Paul, Acts 28, 17-20, is merely a short recounting of how he was made prisoner, and how he came to be in Rome. Luke was present with Paul at the occasion. This speech offers no difficulty at all.

In all these last short speeches, which are more statements than speeches, we find the personal element; they are given as a part of a conversation. Their formality is gone. Luke gives us what he saw and heard. Their historicity and correctness cannot be doubted.

Conclusion to the Speeches of Paul.

We not in the speeches of Paul the ability to fit himself to the occasion. He was able to strike a connection in whatever position he found himself. The great truths of Scripture he could fit into a form which was understodd by any class. In Athens he was an Athenian. In Ephesus he was as an elder^s to the elders. Before Agrippa he was the cool, logical defender of his position. And in reproducing this effect, to really give us the situation, Luke is scrupulously careful.

From the speeches of Paul we see that all and every one of the great truths of God were proclaimed. While in his speeches we do not find every detailed doctrine set forth, in the few that we have we find so much of the complete Biblical truth, that we can be sure that Paul neglected no part. Especially the teaching of Christ crucified for all the world, and the doctrine of the resurrection are emphasized by him, as ought to be done by every preacher of the gospel. From such speeches as those in Athens, and before Agrippa we learn that true Christianity does not militate against either learning, logic, eloquence, or philosophy. We find therein the educated scholar, the Christian orator, the sincere apologist.

The part that Luke plays is best given by a statement of Ramsay: St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen, p.14: If Luke wrote Acts, his narrative must agree in a striking and convincing way with Paul's: they must confirm, explain and complete one another. This is not a case of two commonplace, imperfectly educated, and not ver observant witnesses who give divergent accounts of certain incidents which they say without paying much attention to them. We have here two men of high education, one writing a formal history, the other speaking under every obligation of honor and conscience to be careful his words; the subjects they speak of were of the most overpowering interest to both; their points of view must be very similar, for they were personal friends and the one was the teacher of the other; and anturally had moulded to some extent his mind during long companionship. If ever there was a case in which striking agreement was demanded by historical criticism between two classes of documents, it is between the writings of Paul and Luke." Suffice it to say here that the speeches of Paul in Acts shows us that Luke meets every requirement, that as a historian he is not to be placed into question.

Conclusion: Little need be added to what has been said in the conclusions to the speeches of Peter and Paul. But one point let me emphasize, that the full revealed truth of God was complete and conscious in the apostles. By this I mean that Christianity is not a progressive religion, that the theories advanced by the so-called 'Religionsgeschichte' ^{Religionsgeschichte} are untenable. The fact that the speeches in the Acts contain the great depth of doctrine speak against the idea that Luke has given us a second century idea of advanced Judaism, which was then called Christianity. In this connection we read in Fisher: Beginnings of Christianity: "All these developments, whether of thought and belief, of worship and devotion, of Christian politics or morals, as far as they are sound or wholesome, are due to the ^{-ius} genius of Christianity. Here is at once their source, and the touchstone of their character....we must hold that the whole deposit of revealed truth was with Christ and the apostles, and is contained in their teachings. So far as the development is normal, it springs out of the primitive seed. What we behold results from a clearer understanding, a more vivid appreciation of the truth forth in the N.T. To the sum and substance of this truth nothing has been added."

The ~~S~~peeches in Acts are the heart of which the rest of the book is the body. It is the speeches which are the main factor in changing the historical narrative into a religious-historical narrative. They bring the personal element into the book. They are the expression of Christian minds and hearts under the guidance and influence of the Holy Spirit, and they help to give us an insight in to the lives, the workings and the ambitions of the apostles as nothing else could. We are sincerely grateful that they have been preserved for us.

Bibliography:

- Eadie: Paul the Preacher.**
Fisher: Beginnings of Christianity.
Jones, Maurice: The Expositor, vol. 13.
Leathes: Witness of St. Paul to Christ. (Boyle Lectures, 1869)
Madden: Problems of the New Testament.
McGiffert: The Apostolic Age.
Moffatt: Introduction to the New Testament.
Ramsay: St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen.
Ramsay: Cities of St. Paul.
Ramsay: The Expositor, vol. 7.
Schaff, Philip: Apostolic Christianity.
Robertson: Luke the Historian in the Light of Recent Research.
Torrey: Composition and Date of Acts. (1916).
Taylor: Peter the Apostle.
Taylor: Paul the Missionary.
Weber: History of Philosophy.
Weizsaecker: The Apostolic Age.

Text books:

- English Bible.**
Greek N.T. (Nestle).
Expositor Greek Testament.
Alford Greek New Testament.
Thayer: Lexicon of N.T. Greek.