

## Naked Bible Podcast Transcript

Episode 337

Q&A 40

August 15, 2020

**Teacher: Dr. Michael S. Heiser (MH)**

**Host: Trey Stricklin (TS)**

### Episode Summary

Dr. Heiser answers your questions:

- How did the Samaritans in Acts 8 know that they had not received the Spirit when they believed? [Time stamp 4:30]
- What do you think John meant in 1 John 1:5 when he said that Jesus came by water and by blood? [20:30]
- Can you comment on Peter's interesting use of the Septuagint in Acts 1, as well as the implications this has about applications from interpretations that may be in conflict with the intended meaning of the Old Testament authors? [24:20]

### Transcript

**TS:** Welcome to the Naked Bible Podcast, Episode 337: Our 40<sup>th</sup> Q&A. I'm the layman, Trey Stricklin, and he's the scholar, Dr. Michael Heiser. Hey, Mike! How are you?

**MH:** Pretty good. Can't complain. Sort of back to normal, even though it's a new normal.

**TS:** Are you going to be grumpy? Because we had some technical difficulties before the start of this, and those things tend to make you grumpy. [MH laughs] So I'm nervous.

**MH:** Yeah, no. I have a lot of love/hate relationship with technology.

**TS:** I'm nervous.

**MH:** I'll get over it. I think I'm already over it, unless you keep reminding me of it. [laughs]

**TS:** Well, thankfully we had Calvin there to help you out. Without his help, I don't know if this episode would be happening right now. So shout out to Calvin.

**MH:** There's a good chance that it wouldn't. So yeah, shout out to Calvin.

**TS:** Yeah. Well, now that we're back to normal, you got a new office? Is that correct?

**MH:** Yeah, I'm all moved in. I'm out of boxes again. Right when I had to leave to be my mom's caregiver is, of course, the very week that we moved from one building to the next. So I had my office torn down in preparation for that a week before. So it's been about five weeks that I've been in boxes or away. But everything's out now and put away. So we're getting back to normal.

**TS:** Alright. Well, good. And everything, I assume, went well?

**MH:** Yeah. Funeral went really well. I was able to do a short presentation (the gospel). It was about ten minutes or so. There were some people there who I had never met before (relatives) and some of them are believers, and they really appreciated it. So I'd say 40 or 50 people, most of whom I had met at least once before, but a few that I hadn't. So everybody really was appreciative. And it went well. My brother really organized most of the logistics of it. But as far as what actually happened at the funeral, that was mostly me. So, you know, everything got taken care of. And we should be back to the new status quo. We had to move my mom's stuff out, too, and all her property, and basically gut the apartment and all that. So I feel like I've moved three times now since January. It's just kind of weird. I'm hoping... We're done now, hopefully, and can just get into routine. I like routine.

**TS:** Well, I've noticed that your family has made it to the beach, so hopefully part of your routine will be you going in your flip-flops down to the beach and relaxing.

**MH:** [laughs] Yeah. Well... Oh boy. I'm sure I'll get dragged down there at some point. I would never use the word "relaxing" of the beach. For me, anyway.

**TS:** Yeah.

**MH:** Sand in my shorts really isn't relaxing to me. Between my toes... It's just the sand. I hate the sand. [laughter] Sand belongs on the beach, not in the crevices of my body, okay? That's pretty much what it comes down to.

**TS:** Alright, well, with that image, Mike...

**MH:** [laughs] Right!

**TS:** Why don't we... [laughs]

**MH:** Yeah.

**TS:** Why don't we just transition to our questions here. Because I don't know how to recover from that image. [MH laughs]

**MH:** Do your best. Everybody is going to have to...

**TS:** Alright. Let's see if we can take a crack (no pun intended) at these questions, minus the sand.

**MH:** Thanks for that.

**TS:** Alright, here's... Our first question is Charles from Oregon. And he just left a church after about a decade. And he's struggling here. And in this church, they believe [in his words]: "if you truly receive the Spirit you will manifest a sign (primarily they say tongues, but I think they would probably accept prophecy as well)." His question is:

4:30

**One of the texts they use that I'm having trouble discounting is in Acts 8 when the Samaritans don't receive the Spirit even though they believed and were baptized. The problem to me isn't that they didn't receive the Spirit upon believing the gospel, but how did they know they hadn't received the Spirit if they weren't expecting some kind of manifestation? This is just one of many of their doctrines that I'm struggling to deprogram from my mind.**

**MH:** Well, yeah, I would say the wording of the question suggests to me that either you (Charles) or the people you're referencing (or maybe both) are reading something unnecessarily into Acts 8. Nobody ever asks the Samaritans about receiving the Spirit (or anything else). So the premise is a little bit misguided. Let me read it in Acts 8:14-17, just to refresh everybody's mind as to what is actually said here.

**<sup>14</sup> Now when the apostles at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent to them Peter and John, <sup>15</sup> who came down and prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit, <sup>16</sup> for he had not yet fallen on any of them, but they had only been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.**

**<sup>17</sup> Then they laid their hands on them and they received the Holy Spirit.**

So you'll notice in those verses that Peter and John (who get sent) never ask a question: "Hey, do you have this, or did you not have that? Was this manifestation present?" They never ask them any of that. They just hear that the Samaritans had received the word of God. Peter and John get sent there, they come down and they pray for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit. So the Samaritans themselves, perhaps initially, don't really know what they're missing, or... The issue sort of arises from what the apostles hear. And so the apostles get curious about, "Okay, we've heard that the Samaritans are believing the message of the gospel, but we need to go down there and make sure of

something.” (And I’m going to get to the something a little bit later.) They send Peter and John. And there’s no interrogation. Peter and John just go down and pray for them, and they receive the Holy Spirit. So on and so forth.

So the Samaritans would have come to know that something was lacking because when Peter and John show up, we have to imagine that that became evident at some point. So since the writer (Luke, in this case—this is Acts) records that this happened to them, there must have been some manifestation of a change. We just have to assume that, even though it’s not specifically described. Else how would Luke know to even write about it? And how would those at the scene know? So there had to be something that happened, but it’s not actually mentioned in the text. It just says they laid their hands on them and they received the Holy Spirit. If you keep reading in Acts 8:18-19, we read this:

**<sup>18</sup> Now when Simon [MH: this is Simon the Samaritan, who was present there; not Simon Peter] saw that the Spirit was given through the laying on of the apostles’ hands, he offered them money, <sup>19</sup> saying, “Give me this power also...**

So we have to assume, again, that something visible or discernable had happened. What else would prompt Simon’s question and his bribe (essentially)? Acts 8:13’s reference to such (this, if we go back up prior to Acts 8:14, where we started this, we have a line about “seeing signs and great miracles performed, he [Simon the Samaritan] was amazed,” that can only be a reference to something Philip was doing. Philip was the guy who was evangelizing the Samaritans in Acts 8. And Philip, of course, was an apostle. So Simon had apparently spent some time with Philip. The text actually says he “continued with Philip.” And he knows there was something going on here, in Philip’s life. Philip is able to do certain things because he’s an apostle. He was there at Pentecost. So on and so forth. But the Samaritan believers themselves haven’t had this bestowal yet.

Now this delay between them hearing the gospel from Philip’s preaching and what happens here in Acts 8... There’s obviously a delay between them believing and then receiving the Spirit. The delay involved these new believers doing such things (or having such manifestations, receiving the Spirit). And we have to assume that this was intended by God providentially. And the question, of course, is, “Why?” Well, I would say that it was intended to demonstrate to both the Samaritans and the Jerusalem apostles that the messiah of the Jews (the messiah of Israel) had indeed come, and that Samaritans needed to embrace him, and the Samaritans were included in the people of God. I think we need to unpack even that that a little bit.

10:00

So the point of this whole episode, in my judgment, is that a visible, experiential demonstration was needed to link the Samaritans with the Jewish believers at Pentecost. There has to be something that happens that goes on so that both groups know they are one family and the source of what’s going on is the same.

And for the Samaritans, that the messiah of the Jews is The Messiah. And for that, the apostles were necessary. This is why they get sent down. They're necessary, both to explain to the Samaritans that the coming of the Spirit (which was a New Covenant prophecy)... And remember, the Samaritans only accept the first five books of the Old Testament. So this notion isn't going to be immediately apparent to them. But it is to the Jews, and it's connected to messiah. So they're going to have to learn that "It's really not the messiah as we've been articulating the idea that is changing things—changing lives. That is true, according to demonstrations of power." They have to learn that. They have to embrace it, because there are theological differences between these two parties.

So they have to believe that the coming of the Spirit had been fulfilled at Pentecost (something the Samaritans lacked in terms of where they were at theologically). Imagine if the gospel message had been heard by the Samaritans... The gospel message that was heard by the Samaritans through a witness of the events in Jerusalem at Pentecost. So they... Somebody that was there at Pentecost comes into Samaritan territory and starts talking about it. And the Samaritans believe the story and the message, and then all of a sudden, the Spirit comes upon them. Like, if it would have happened that way, they don't know what in the world's going on. They can't connect what they heard from some guy who happened to be in Jerusalem at Pentecost and then they hear it and believe it and then all of a sudden they have all this crazy stuff happening. They're not going to have any framework in which to put that. So this visit by the apostles is going to be necessary for them. They're just not going to not know what it means without the apostles explaining it to them. And the apostles are the only ones who knew the answer, because they're the only people to whom the answer had been given by Jesus. Jesus had told them before he ascended what was going to happen. He hadn't told the Samaritans. He told *them*.

So some explanation is essential. The Samaritans are now part of the people of God. The messiah of Israel was their messiah. That was a disconnect between the two parties. And so they just have to learn this.

So that's their side, which brings us to the Jewish side. The Jews have to learn this, too. They're going to have to learn it with the Gentiles later on. It's not just about *them*. It's not just about the "pure Jews," with Samaritans and Gentiles excluded. So this whole set of events has to be what it is. You can't just have somebody hearing what happens at Pentecost, runs over to a Samaritan neighbor a week later, tells him a story, the guy believes, and then if all this freaky Spirit stuff starts happening, they're not going to know what to do with it. So providentially, there's a delay between the message and the coming of the Spirit for the Samaritans. And frankly, for the Gentiles, it's going to work this way, too. And the delay is essential to both sides—the apostles (the Jews) and these other groups—to know that these things are connected and to believe that this is right. It comes from the same source.

Now if you go to a different passage (Acts 19), you actually get some of this questioning. There we have people (likely Jews) in Ephesus who had been following John (John the Baptist) and they had not yet heard of Jesus. Acts 19 makes this clear. They had not received the Spirit. Paul actually asks them in the passage. There you do have the question asked, which is a natural question once Paul heard that “disciples” had believed. Paul is assuming that the word disciples (or this account he’s heard) means they were following Jesus, but they weren’t. They’d never heard of him. They were just disciples of John. So when Paul meets these people, he asks, “Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?” And they answer (this is Acts 19, the first few verses):

**And they said, “No, we have not even heard that there is a Holy Spirit.”<sup>3</sup> And he said, “Into what then were you baptized?” They said, “Into John’s baptism.”<sup>4</sup> And Paul said, “John baptized with the baptism of repentance, telling the people to believe in the one who was to come after him, that is, Jesus.”<sup>5</sup> On hearing this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. [MH: So they accept Paul’s explanation.]<sup>6</sup> And when Paul had laid his hands on them, the Holy Spirit came on them, and they began speaking in tongues and prophesying.<sup>7</sup> There were about twelve men in all.**

15:00

So you have this delay. In this case, it’s because they really need clarification about Jesus and that Jesus was the one that John was preaching about. They have to hear that and believe it. And then they’re baptized and then they receive the Spirit. So it’s a little bit different, but somewhat related. But the pattern here is still consistent. These other groups hear the gospel. They believe. Eventually they’re going to receive the Spirit. There’s this what I would call “providential delay” between events. And then there’s a sign to that effect that links the episodes back to Pentecost. You get these similar manifestations.

Now let’s go back (before we wrap this question up) to whatever church group this is—this notion that if you really have the Holy Spirit, you’re going to manifest a sign. Well, sure, except when the New Testament doesn’t say that. [laughs] Which there are more instances where it doesn’t happen than you might think.

So let’s just go through a few. How about the Ethiopian eunuch? You read through Acts 8 (it’s the same chapter, just further along), and there’s no sign. It’s the same guy. Philip is the same guy preaching here. He was in Samaritan territory; then he links up with the Ethiopian eunuch. He explains to him Isaiah. He’s reading Isaiah 53. The guy believes. He’s baptized. So on and so forth. But there’s no sign. We aren’t given any other details about the Ethiopian eunuch, other than Philip explains what he’s reading to him. The assumption is that Isaiah 53 is about Jesus. And then the Ethiopian eunuch says when they spot some

water, “Well, is there anything preventing me from being baptized?” And Philip says, “Nope. Let’s go do that.” That’s all we get.

Now earlier in the passage about the eunuch, it says that he “had come to Jerusalem to worship.” So he’s apparently Jewish. He’s an Ethiopian eunuch. He’s from Ethiopia. He’s linked to Candace, the queen, it says in the passage. But he’s apparently Jewish, but he doesn’t understand the gospel yet. He’s confused about Isaiah 53. So my guess is... There’s no verse that explicitly says this, but if you look at the calendar, after Pentecost, it’s months before there’s anything on the festal calendar. And if you read through the book of Acts, at least the first seven or eight chapters, there isn’t a whole lot of time that elapses between Acts 2 and Acts 8. We know this from phrases in Acts 6:1 that associate the events there with “these things” (these things that have been happening— basically the expansion of the early Church). So on and so forth. It’s a fairly tight timeline. So this guy could have been present at Pentecost and didn’t really understand what was going on. Not everybody believes. There were 3,000, but it’s not everybody. And Philip hooks up with him later and explains to him what he’s reading in Isaiah 53 and then he understands. Then he is baptized. But we don’t get any reference to “then the Spirit of God fell upon him.” So on and so forth. My guess is he didn’t need that, because if he had seen the events at Pentecost, he already knows. Once he understands the gospel, it’s like, “Okay. I get it now. I understand what they were preaching. The messiah has come, and it was evidenced by the coming of the Spirit.” And he, as a Jew, is going to know that that links back to the new covenant promises in passages like Ezekiel 36. He’s going to know these things.

So that’s how I would parse what goes on with the eunuch. But in any event, you don’t always have signs when people believe. Let’s go through a few other examples. How about Paul himself? Read through Paul’s conversion. Where’s the sign gift? You just don’t have it. You don’t have this language about “the Spirit of God fell upon him and he spoke in tongues.” Paul... This is *Paul* we’re talking about. You don’t get this language. So to me, I don’t know why you’re making this a requirement to validate salvation when you can’t even demonstrate it with Paul. There’s no account of this in his conversion. How about the Philippian jailor (Acts 16)? There’s no sign there. How about believers in Berea (Acts 17:12)? They believe, but there’s no reference to the coming of the Spirit and the signs and all that stuff. How about believers at Mars Hill, later on in Acts 17? Same thing. You don’t have a sign. How about Crispus in Acts 18:8? No sign. I hope you see the point. It’s very easy for church groups to teach that, “Oh, if you’re really a believer—if you really have the Holy Spirit—you’re going to do this, that, or the other thing,” (speak in tongues, whatever it is) and then they’ll point to you in the New Testament where that sort of thing happens. But they conveniently leave out the places where it *doesn’t*. And that’s really inconsistent, and frankly, unfortunate, because it creates this culture of haves and have-nots. And it can be used by leadership (and I don’t know the specific situation here) to manipulate people. And that’s just really unfortunate.

20:00

**TS:** Oliver has a question.

20:30

**In 1 John 5 what do you think John means by Jesus coming by water and by blood?**

**MH:** I think the blood part is clear. That's a reference to his atoning death. So it's the water that presents the interpretive challenge, if you will. My view is that this refers to Jesus' baptism. So as messiah, he represents Israel. It's hard for us to wrap our heads around how one person represents a group. But I talk about this in *Unseen Realm* in one particular chapter—how the messiah represents Israel. Adam represented Israel. And you have the second Adam. And you have this single-to-corporate solidarity thing going on.

So if we think about it in those terms, if we look at Jesus' baptism... As messiah, he represents Israel. The act of him being baptized represented... It was a new Exodus. It's a new beginning. We traversed over that territory before in several episodes. But it also represents (since it is a new beginning) the acceptance of God's cleansing and forgiveness offered to the nation.

The nation is still in exile in the New Testament. I hope we realize that. Old Testament prophecies about the exile (the return from exile specifically) involve all twelve tribes. That is *not* what happens in the Persian period. You have Judah come back. You don't have all twelve tribes return from exile. The first ten are thrown to the wind by the Assyrians. You don't have a return from exile. You don't have an end of the exile in the events of the Persian period. The nation is still conscious of this, because they know their Old Testament. So when you get Jesus show up and you have this new Exodus imagery, it's a signal that not only a new Exodus is happening, but what is the Exodus? It's the deliverance of God's people from captivity. So this is what's happening. It's Round 2. And this is going to become important. Because when you get to Pentecost, that's when the exile is ended. Because you have people (Jews, specifically) from all over the known world come to Jerusalem, they believe, and they become the reconstituted people of God. This is the real healing of the exile.

So Jesus starts this off with his baptism. It's New Exodus imagery. The use of water represents cleansing and the forgiveness offered to the nation. It's also part of the New Covenant language. If you look at Ezekiel 36, there's New Covenant passages, there's the sprinkling of water (that sort of thing) to denote cleansing. The baptized Jesus, therefore, is the sinless Son of God. And he represents the corporate Son of God, which is a phrase used of Israel corporately back in the Exodus. It highlights that God wants the corporate Son (Israel) to follow suit, to link themselves to Jesus, to this one. So baptism is a declaration of embracing the messiah. It's a declaration of loyalty to the true God having been forgiven by identifying with the messiah. And this is going to be certified later via the atoning death of Jesus and his resurrection. This is very



early in Jesus' ministry. But I think that's what's meant by "water and the blood." The blood's the easy part, and the water I think is this New Exodus (New Covenant) imagery that is really parse-able by Jesus representing the nation.

**TS:** Mordecai wants to know:

24:20

**In the selection of Matthias in Acts 1:12-26, Peter quotes from Psalms 69 and 109 regarding Judas, and in particular uses Psalm 109:8 to say, "May another take his place of leadership." However, in Psalm 109:8, BDB suggests that the Hebrew there is intended to mean possessions. It seems to me that Peter is basing his interpretation/use of this verse on the Septuagint translation. Can you comment on this interesting use of imprecatory psalms and the interpretation used by Peter? What implications does this have about using applications from interpretations that may be in conflict with intended meaning of the original authors?**

**MH:** Yeah, I don't think it... This is going to be pretty involved here. I don't see anything about possessions. If the term that the question is referring to with respect to BDB is *pequddah* in Psalm 109, that just means "appointment." So I don't really know if that's the particular term involved. (I would almost think it has to be.) And yeah, that's the quick answer. So I don't think for the second part of the question there that there's a problem. I don't think there's a problem for the first part of the question.

But let me try to... I'll try to get into this, because this is awfully complicated. I'm going to just open up my go-to source for this sort of thing. This is Beale and Carson's *Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament*. And they have different people contributing to that. But before I take a look at that, I just want to throw out a few things, just generally, in regard to this. And I'm not saying that there's anything lurking behind the question in a negative way. I don't think there is. But often, when I get questions like this, I think there is a problem with the way we're taught to think about prophecy and fulfillment. So let me try to unpack this a little bit.

So typically, when we get to the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament, especially when it relates to Jesus, we tend to have a popular (and I will say flawed) view of how the New Testament writers looked at Old Testament passage when they were thinking about Jesus. We tend to think that if there is any relationship between those two things (Old Testament and Jesus), it's a fulfilled prophecy, as though something was predicted on one end (whatever the Old Testament passage happens to be) and then that thing comes to pass on the other end (in Jesus). But a truly predictive prophecy is quite different than a statement in the Old Testament that just serves as an analogy to something that happens later. New Testament writers saw both things: a specific predictive statement and then just something in the Old Testament that reminded them of

Jesus or was analogous to something that happened. They saw both of those kinds of things as speaking to the messiahship of Jesus and events surrounding what he did. But we, on the other hand... What I'm trying to say is, because we're thinking cause-and-effect (prediction and fulfillment), because this is the way we're taught to think about the relationship of the Old Testament to Jesus in church (so to speak)... We're taught this simplistic way to approach these things. Because we think this way for most everything said in the New Testament about Jesus that connects to the Old Testament, we sort of manufacture a problem for the original meaning of the Old Testament passage. We create the disconnect. If the original passage wasn't predicting anything, though, but it only served as a point of analogous reference, we're really talking about the *application* of the Old Testament passage, not that it predicted anything and then was fulfilled.

So when we're talking about application, we really aren't talking about its original meaning, and we aren't talking about having that original meaning changed in any way. It's just an application. It's an analogy.

The same thing goes for literary allusions. So this is a little bit different, when instead of the New Testament writer is citing something in the Old Testament specifically... Sometimes you just have an allusion to something. And it's the same sort of deal. A New Testament writer (or maybe two Old Testament writers) may want readers to mentally connect passages, so they will allude to this or that. They'll drop a little bit of one passage into another one to connect dots for their readers. But that doesn't mean one of those things is a prophecy of the other. And, conversely, it doesn't mean that one is the fulfillment of the other. It just means that the writer just wants their readers to connect two things.

30:00

So meaning and application are different things, but they're connected. They relate to each other. An application is only as sound as its derived coherence in relation to the meaning of the earlier passage. That's true. But they aren't identical. Our problem is that we don't think clearly about any of these nuances because we've been taught in churches to think only in one mode: prediction and outcome. And that's really simplistic and flawed. And it creates tension where tension doesn't need to be.

Let me use an example, before I get to the actual passage here. Let's talk about Jonah. Jonah and the... It wasn't a whale, but that's how everybody thinks about it. But Jonah and the big fish, okay? Was Jonah's stay in the fish for three days a prophecy or an analogy? If you think simplistically and you know those two things are related, then you're going to, "Oh, it's a prophecy. Because one thing's related to the other!" And Jesus even alludes... He even mentions Jonah in the whale's belly for three days being like him in the grave for three days. "Must be a prophecy." If you go back and read Jonah, there's nothing like that. It's not worded as a prophecy. It doesn't predict anything. But if you think of that as a prophecy, then somehow you have to turn Jonah on its head as really being about the specific death of Jesus. And I would say good luck with that. If Jesus'

own citation of Jonah's situation was meant to be analogous to what was going to happen to him eventually, then it's easy to see and think about. The writer of Jonah wasn't thinking about Jesus or even the messiah. There's no indication in Jonah that he was.

But you might ask, "Wasn't... Maybe *God* was thinking about Jesus when his author-servant (whoever wrote Jonah) was writing. Maybe God was thinking about Jesus." If that's what's going through your head right now, think about the question. It sort of suggests that God was planting the words in the writer's head. And that is *not* how inspiration works. I've gone off on this trajectory multitudes of times.

But anyway, let's try to steer back on the path here. The answer is pretty easy when it comes to Jonah. "Was God thinking about Jesus when Jonah was getting written by this author?" The answer is no. We'll eventually be doing an episode on Jonah and the fish at some point. And the reason I say "no" will become pretty clear. For now, I'm going to say this: I'll simply say that the fish in the story has clear connections to Leviathan, and so does Jonah himself in the story. Some of the language in the Old Testament about the way God treats and subdues and even chastises Leviathan is actually used of Jonah in the story (not the fish). But there are other things that are very clearly about the fish that connect to Leviathan. So both things are operating. Well, God would have known that, so if God was thinking about Jesus in the book of Jonah, then Jesus would be the character Jonah (in the fish), and that wouldn't be good, because God has to knock him on the head to straighten him out. [laughs] So that would really break down pretty quickly into some bad theology. But let's just go to the actual passage here. So we have Acts 1. I'm going to read 18-20, because Luke cites two psalms here (18-20 will give us a bit more of the context).

**<sup>18</sup> (Now this man [MH: talking about Judas] acquired a field with the reward of his wickedness, and falling headlong he burst open in the middle and all his bowels gushed out. <sup>19</sup> And it became known to all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, so that the field was called in their own language Akeldama, that is, Field of Blood.) <sup>20</sup> "For it is written in the Book of Psalms [MH: here's the first quote],**

**" 'May his camp become desolate,  
and let there be no one to dwell in it';  
and**

**" 'Let another take his office.'**

Now the first of those two citations in Acts 1:20 is Psalm 69:25 (or 68:26 in the Septuagint). Psalm 69 is a psalm of David. And I'm just going to read Psalm

69:20-25 so that listeners can get an idea of what it says there. It's a psalm of David and he's complaining about his enemies.

- 20 Reproaches have broken my heart,  
so that I am in despair.  
I looked for pity, but there was none,  
and for comforters, but I found none.**
- 21 They gave me poison for food,  
and for my thirst they gave me sour wine to drink.**
- 22 Let their own table before them become a snare;  
and when they are at peace, let it become a trap.<sup>[a]</sup>**
- 23 Let their eyes be darkened, so that they cannot see,  
and make their loins tremble continually.**
- 24 Pour out your indignation upon them,  
and let your burning anger overtake them.**
- 25 May their camp be a desolation;  
let no one dwell in their tents.**

35:00

So this is David's complaint. And that's the original psalm. I'm going to read a little bit from I. Howard Marshall here that I alluded to earlier, that I was going to check on this. Marshall is the guy who wrote this portion of Beale and Carson's commentary on the use of the Old Testament in the New. He writes this:

Psalm 69 is an "individual lament" in which the psalmist describes his plight of deep suffering, prays to God for deliverance, and calls upon God to exercise his wrath against the sufferer's foes. It was interpreted by early Christians as typifying Jesus in his suffering and death (John 2:17; 15:25; Rom. 15:3) and also as applying to those who rejected him [MH: Jesus] (Rom. 11:9–10)."

Now that's just the first part of Marshall's quote. He's saying, "Hey, Christians saw something here." The line in verse 21 that we just read about "they gave me sour (bitter) wine to drink" was a touchpoint for Luke and early Christians, obviously, because of what happens on the cross. There was an analogy there with respect to Jesus being given the gall (as one of the Gospels has) And that encouraged people to look at the psalm and connect Jesus to it by analogy. Because what's happening to David's enemies with the things that David wants to happen to his enemies... Some of those things are analogous to what happens at the cross. But there's no prediction in Psalm 69. They're just points of analogy. So this encouraged them looking at one passage in a particular way. And that led to verse 25, which is what's specifically cited. If you'll notice, in Psalm 69... I'll read it again.

**25 May their camp be a desolation [MH: the camp of his enemies be desolate];  
let no one dwell in their tents.**

So the psalmist is praying about his enemies generally and says, “Boy, may their homes get destroyed,” or something like that—something broad. In the citation in Acts, it changes to a singular. It’s not plural anymore. It’s singular. Because it’s about Judas (one person). So Marshall writes this:

The citation [MH: in Acts] follows the LXX with minor changes, the most important being the change from plural to singular so that the curse is directed against one individual, and the omission of “tents.” The psalm can thus be regarded as a loose reference to the “field” purchased by Judas [MH: just a place that his enemies called home, essentially, or belonged to his enemies]; the LXX’s [MH: terminology] *epaulis* can refer to a dwelling, a fold, or a village (LEH 166). The whole statement is a poetic way of expressing a curse against a person, but it could be intended more literally: Matthew comments that the place bought with Judas’s money was turned into a burial place (Matt. 27:7).

So it actually *was* more than one person in Matthew 27:7. In other words, the original meaning of the psalm is that the psalmist is lamenting how he suffers from a range of enemies (just his enemies in general). He prays in verse 25 that the camp of his enemies be wiped out, that his enemies be eliminated (“let no one dwell in their tents”). In other words, no one is home because they’re dead and gone. This is what the psalmist wants.

Now that whole wish gets applied singularly to Judas. He’s no longer at home either. Okay? He’s dead. And the field that he bought... Why does he buy it? We don’t know. But the field that he bought actually gets turned into a burial place (a graveyard). So what the psalmist wanted to happen to his enemies broadly actually happens to Judas.

40:00

The New Testament thus applies the psalm. Its application is completely consistent with the original meaning of the psalm. It is application by analogy. The point of Peter’s citation isn’t that what happened to Judas fulfilled Psalm 69 (there’s no predictive prophecy in Psalm 69). Rather, the point is that the apostles are justified in replacing Judas because he was an enemy to the son of David (Jesus). He got what he deserved. God punished him. He wound up meeting the end that David prayed his enemies would meet. It’s a good application of the prayer of the original David, that God would judge his enemies. God, of course, frequently did judge David’s enemies, and he certainly judged Judas, the enemy of the ultimate David, who is the messiah.

Now the second citation in Acts 1:20 (“Let another take his office”) is taken from Psalm 109:8 (Septuagint is 108:8). And the interesting thing here is that the noun in the Septuagint is *episkopēn*. It sounds like a church office (like *episkopos* or Episcopal). And that may have influenced how the ESV translators take it. But anyway, the Septuagint regularly uses this noun to translate the Hebrew in the traditional Hebrew text (this *pequddah*), which means “appointment” or “appointed office.” I have no idea what “possessions”... What’s going on there with BDB or anybody else. This is a standard term. It gets translated with *episkopēn* regularly. So there’s no disconnection there. The issue (if you can call it that), is that the Psalm passage is used to validate the filling of Judas’ vacancy in the apostolate. Here’s Marshall again:

The interesting feature here is the term *episkopē*, translated as “place of leadership” and used in 1 Tim. 3:1 for the function exercised by an *episkopos* [MH: church officer]. The reference in the psalm is probably a general one to a role of leadership in the community. Peter himself refers to the role of Judas and his colleagues as one of service (*diakonia*) [MH: in Acts1:17] and apostleship. (The term *klēros*, used here for Judas’s share in the service, is also used in Num. 18:21–26 [MH: where you have different kinds of serving]... The task of church leaders was understood as one of oversight and pastoral care (in the manner of a shepherd) over the other members of the congregation (1 Pet. 5:2). This element in the work of the Twelve, who are otherwise seen preeminently as witnesses to Jesus, is significant. Since the appointment is to a place among the Twelve, the question arises whether the need to maintain twelve apostles to judge the tribes of Israel (cf. Luke 22:30) is in mind (see Evans 1993b: 185), but the stress seems to be principally, if not exclusively, on the tasks of service and witness.

So to sum this one up, there was no apostolate in the Old Testament (we get that), so that quite obviously isn’t the original meaning of Psalm 109. And I’d say, “No kidding.” The point, though, is just merely appointment for service more broadly. And that *is* consistent with Psalm 109. So both the Hebrew and the Greek term are used generally broadly. So we should not presume that the use in Acts was done so that we would imagine Luke was thinking there was an apostolate in the Old Testament and therefore distorting the meaning of Psalm 109. That is not the case. Luke is not guilty of messing up the passage. The terms can be understood quite broadly. And if you’re just talking about some sort of leadership, there really is no problem here. So that’s how I would approach both of those.

**TS:** Okay, Mike. That’s all the questions we have for this week. So we appreciate everybody that sent in their questions, and for you answering them. Any last thoughts there, Mike?

**MH:** No. Those were longer. Sometimes we look at Q&A and we think, “Ah, this will be a shorter episode.” But nope. Several of those were pretty involved

questions. They were good ones. Detail. That's the kind of things we would expect from this audience.

**TS:** Alright. Again, you can send me questions at [TreyStricklin@gmail.com](mailto:TreyStricklin@gmail.com). And next week, Mike, I think we're going to wrap up our Conversation Series with the pastors and everybody out there repurposing your material. And I think people are enjoying that series. So the last one will be next week. And with that, Mike, I want to thank everybody for listening to the Naked Bible Podcast! God Bless.