Antioch in Pisidia

Last session we left off with Paul's first recorded message in the book of Acts. We saw some of the great things as far how God structured the message. What he said was not something he wrote out ahead of time; something that he worked up by his five senses. Like Peter on the day of Pentecost; he said what God wanted him to say. That's why what is recorded that Peter said on the day of Pentecost is so accurate. Structure wise, numerically and in every other way, what Peter said was just as perfect as the rest of God's Word. What Paul said when he gave this message on that day was that perfect because it was God's Word that he was speaking. That's why you see such a beautiful pattern in here.

We went over what all was covered in here. We saw how he started in his first verses with his introduction to the people.

> **Acts 13:16:**
> Then Paul stood up, and beckoning with *his* hand said, Men of Israel, and ye that fear God, give audience.

Were there others there besides the men of Israel? Were there on the day of Pentecost? There were proselytes there. Peter conducted his introduction accordingly. Here, it wasn't just to Israel but to everybody who feared or had a respect for God.

He didn't start with Jesus Christ. He started with the Old Testament; what they knew. Then he went into Jesus Christ's life. Then he got into the resurrection. That's what he had to teach in order for them to believe to get saved. Because you have to believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead if you're going to get saved. All these things in here were vital and it's structure-wise perfect because it's God's Word.

Here's the summation of this structure:

A) Introduction – Acts 13:16
  B) Old Testament (what they knew) - Acts 13:17-22
    C) The life of Christ - Acts 13:23-29
    C) The Resurrection of Christ - Acts 13:30-31
  B) Old Testament examples (what they knew) - Acts 13:32-37
A) Promises and summation - Acts 13:38-41

Now you have a general structure of what was covered in this thing. The first one, the introduction, sort of goes along with the last one. Both of the 'B's sort of go together. The two in the middle go together; the life of Christ and the resurrection of Christ. That was his main point, what he was after; the resurrection. The promises and summation compliment the introduction. That's the basic structure of it.

Now I want to look at some of the Old Testament that he quoted when he was teaching here at Antioch in Pisidia.

> **Acts 13:22:**
> And when he had removed him [Saul], he raised up unto them David to be their king; to whom also he gave their testimony, and said, I have found David the *son* of Jesse, a man after mine own heart, which shall fulfil all my will.

Where do you find that in the Old Testament? You don't, not really, just bits and pieces. It says, "...gave testimony and said." It doesn't say, "It is written." It says he said it. The spoken Word is just as much the Word as the written Word. I couldn't find anything that had basically what you find in verse 22. You find a fragment of it but you can't go on fragments. Either he quoted the Word or he didn't.

> **Acts 13:33:**
> God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.

It says, "...it is also written." Then you're going to find that it's written. It says it's written in the second Psalm.

> **Psalm 2:7:**
> I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou *art* my Son; this day have I begotten thee.

There it is quoted from the second Psalm. Did He know the Old Testament? He sure did.

> **Acts 13:34:**
> And as concerning that he raised him up from the dead, *now* no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David.

If it said he said it, then you know that he said it. Could it also have been written? Or could it have been written in a similar form? But he also said it. This essentially is found in Isaiah 55.

> **Isaiah 55:3:**
> Incline your ear, and come unto me: hear, and your soul shall live; and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, *even* the sure mercies of David.

Essentially he says the same thing in Acts 13:34. In Acts it says he said it. It doesn't say it was written.

> **Acts 13:35:**
> Wherefore he saith also in another *psalm*, Thou shalt not suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.

The word *psalm* is in italics meaning that it was not in the text. It was added. So, he said also in another place, which happens to be a Psalm.

> **Psalm 16:10:**
> For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.

The later part of the verse is what you find in Acts. There, even though he "saith" it, he also wrote it. Just because it says he said it doesn't mean it wasn't written. All that means is that he did say it and if it was written then you know that it was also written. If it's only similar then what he said was said and wasn't written. When it says in Acts that "he said" then that wasn't necessarily written in the Old Testament. If, in Acts, it says he "said" it, does it mean it wasn't written in the Old Testament? No, it could be or it could not be. If it says in Acts that he said it and I go to the Old Testament and find something that's similar but not the same then did he also write it? No, it's only similar.

> **Acts 13:41:**
> Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish: for I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you.

"work a work" – figure of speech – same word used different inflection. He could have said, "I work." For emphasis he said, "I work a work."

> **Acts 13:40:**
> Beware therefore, lest that come upon you, which is spoken of in the prophets;
>
> "spoken of" – does that mean it was written? No, it was only spoken of in the prophets. That means it could be similar but not necessarily the same.
>
> **Habakkuk 1:5:**
> Behold ye among the heathen, and regard, and wonder marvellously: for *I* will work a work in your days, *which* ye will not believe, though it be told *you*.

It is very close but it doesn't say, "It is written." It's not absolutely what was written in the Old Testament.

Those are all the Old Testament that he utilised, here. In order to utilise them, he had to know them. He must have memorized a few scriptures. Paul knew a little of the Old Testament to begin with, being a Pharisee. Those are all that he quotes or makes reference to of things that are in the Old Testament or spoken that are similar to what is in the Old Testament.

One other thing I want to look at in here. Do you know what homiletics is? It is the branch of theology that deals with the composition and the preaching of sermons; the branch of theology that deals with how to make up a sermon and then how to preach it. In homiletics you analyze sermons to see how they're constructed and what makes the best means.

You don't analyze spiritual things. Spiritual things are ascertained. Sense knowledge facts may be analyzed. When you teach God's Word, you don't sit down and analyze and write out your whole sermon ahead of time. You may get a few of the things that you want to cover. On the other hand, could you walk into a meeting and teach extemporaneously? Yes, because you've studied the Word enough ahead, you know it. On the other hand, there are times God shows you ahead of time what you're going to cover. But it should never be a cop out where you say, "Well, I'm not prepared to teach." You're ready all the time to give an answer; ready to teach the Word.

What I want to do is look at what Paul taught here and what Peter taught in his first recorded message to show you again the beauty of God's Word and how perfect it is. And what it was that he covered and how he covered it that anybody that really wanted to believe couldn't get missed. That's the way it will always be when you teach the Word if you walking. When you teach the Word and you get done, if you're walking by the spirit, anybody there that's hungry for truth has got to be filled. If somebody's there that's not hungry, they're not going to get filled. When you walk into a meeting, come expecting and you get ten times as much out of it. When you go into teach, and you've got people that are expecting something, they'll draw it out of you. If they're not expecting something, it'll be like hitting rocks; like pounding on rock. Sometimes you have to pound on rock.

Peter, on the day of Pentecost, walked by the spirit. Paul walked by the spirit, in Pisidia. He knew the Word. He had studied it ahead of time. He was ready to go. He didn't need his notes all written out. In Acts 13:16 Paul has his introduction.

> **Acts 13:16:**
> Then Paul stood up, and beckoning with *his* hand said, Men of Israel, and ye that fear God, give audience.

He's addressing not only men of Israel, but proselytes; people of Gentile background. So he has to include all that fear God. If he went to an unbeliever's meeting to teach the Word, then could he say, "All ye that fear God?" Perhaps not, unless he wanted to divide his audience. He might have to say, "It's available to anybody that really wants to receive."

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

"all *ye* that dwell at Jerusalem" – there were others besides men of Judaea at Jerusalem at the time. There were proselytes. There were Hellenists and others who had come in for the feast of Pentecost. So he includes them in this, "all *ye* that dwell at Jerusalem."

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

That's his introduction. This parallels with chapter 13. In Acts 2:16-21, he quotes Old Testament. Here he quotes it, whereas Paul talked more about it in chapter 13:17-22.

A) Introduction – Acts 13:16 – Acts 2:14-15
B) Old Testament – Acts 13:17-22 – Acts 2:16-21

On the day of Pentecost when Peter spoke, he didn't start way back in the Old Testament drawing from the examples of how God moved the children of Israel and so-on and so-on. He started with Joel because that was the thing that was hot on the minds of the people right then and there. They were concerned about all this tongues that they were hearing; the languages; speaking the wonderful works of God. He doesn't go to Psalms or Genesis. He doesn't go to the scriptures about Abraham and his seed right away.

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

Here he brings in Jesus. He didn't start talking about him right away but brought him in at the right moment.

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

There's a condensed version of the life of Christ as to what had happened.

C) The life of Christ – Acts 13:23-29 – Acts 2:22-23
C) The Resurrection of Christ – Acts 13:30-31 – Acts 2:24

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

B) Old Testament examples (David) – Acts 13:32-37 – Acts 2:25-32

He especially used David in Acts 13. Peter, on Pentecost, does the same thing.

Acts 2:25-28 is quoted from **Psalm 16:8-11**

Paul in Acts 13 quoted from Psalm 16:10; in this same general area. It's sort of significant isn't it?

A) Promises and summation – Acts 13:38-41 - Acts 2:33-39

Sometime you should read through these and see the beauty of it; how God's Word when Paul spoke it and God's Word when Peter spoke it, they were both after winning people for Jesus Christ. They were showing them from the Old Testament and the spoken Word as they spoke it, the witnesses they had, how Jesus Christ had accomplished and fulfilled the Old Testament promises of the messiah. So, today we've got something that's a work of all works and yet some people won't even believe it, just like it said in the Old Testament.

> **Acts 13:42:**
> And when the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them the next sabbath.
>
> Now when the congregation was broken up, many of the Jews and religious proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas: who, speaking to them, persuaded them to continue in the grace of God.

In verse 42 the Jews went out of the synagogue and then they went back into the synagogue and in verse 43 the congregation broke up. Do you see the problem? In verse 42 they went out and in verse 43 they went out again. That doesn't make a whole lot of sense. It says here in the King James the same thing you find in a lot of the late manuscripts and only a couple of the uncials and they weren't even that old. In the Revised Standard Version and in The Phillip's as well as the New English Bible, The Weymouth, The New American Standard Bible and Lamsa's translation and the critical Greek texts as well as the old manuscripts, read:

> And as they went out, they asked them that these words might be preached to them the next sabbath.

The words; Jews, synagogue and Gentiles are not in most of the critical Greek texts nor in most of the manuscripts. The Revised Standard Version and The Phillip's Version change that second "they," where it says "Gentiles" in the King James, to "the people."

> When they were gone out of the synagogue the people besought them that these words might be preached to them the next sabbath.

In The Weymouth, New American Standard Bible and The Lamsa change the first "they" to Paul and Barnabas. There are no manuscripts that have "Paul and Barnabas" in them and there are no manuscripts that have "the people" in it. What they're doing is interpreting what it is and I believe rightfully so. Because:

> When they [They who? Paul and Barnabas] were gone out then they [the people] besought them [or asked them] that these words might be preached to them the next sabbath.

They were so excited about what they had heard Paul and Barnabas say, that when Paul said, "Amen" and he started to walk down the aisle and go out, they said, "Well, how about coming back next sabbath and teach us again. Then verse 43:

> **Acts 13:43:**
> Now when the congregation was broken up, many of the Jews and religious proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas: who, speaking to them, persuaded them to continue in the grace of God.

Now, time-wise it flows.

"congregation" – synagogue

"religious" – this may indicate that these weren't just "proselytes of the gate" but they were "proselytes of righteousness." That's what they called them. They may have been proselytes who had believed to the point that they were circumcised; religious proselytes, not just ordinary proselytes.

"continue in the grace of God" – not the law; the grace of God. Remember in verse 39 he had really hit on that; that when you believe you're justified, something that the law of Moses couldn't do. When you believe, it's by grace and they persuaded them to continue in the grace of God.

> **Acts 13:44:**
> And the next sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God.

"the whole city together" - word got around

"the word of God" – how many times have we seen that? – a lot – 5 times? In one chapter.

> **Acts 13:45:**
> But when the Jews saw the multitudes, they were filled with envy, and spake against those things which were spoken by Paul, contradicting and blaspheming.

Envy will do it every time. The Jews saw that the whole city came together to hear the Word. They didn't come to hear the Rabbi teach the Old Testament scrolls or to go through his liturgy. They came to hear Paul teach the word of God. They said, "Look at the big crowd of people he's got; the whole city. We've never had that. We shouldn't let anybody like that in here or we'll be out of Rabbi business pretty soon. They were envious of what the apostles were doing because they were winning people.

It's the same trick of the adversary today. Whenever the Word starts to move, instead of people seeing how great it is and how wonderful, they get full of envy.

> **Acts 13:46:**
> Then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold, and said, It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles.

"waxed bold and" – speaking boldly

"the word of God" – there it is again

"ye put it from you" – they put the Word away from themselves

He just laid it on them. You go into a community and somebody doesn't want to believe the Word. Just look them straight in the eye and say, "Well, don't you think you're worth everlasting life? Don't you really want it?"

> **Acts 13:47-49:**
> For so hath the Lord commanded us, *saying*, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the ends of the earth.
> And when the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord: and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed.
>
> And the word of the Lord was published throughout all the region.

Bullinger's major problem was rightly dividing administrations. He sets the beginning of the church administration at the end of the book of Acts. That's how he gets rid of speaking in tongues. The reason he wanted to get rid of that is he saw it was indecent and out of order in practice. He bases this on what Paul says to the Jews in Acts 28.

> **Acts 28:28-29:**
> Be it known therefore unto you, that the salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles, and *that* they will hear it.
>
> And when he had said these words, the Jews departed, and had great reasoning among themselves.

Verse 29 is not in the old manuscripts. That's where Bullinger sets the church. Paul said this same thing back in Acts 13 on his first itinerary. Then why can't the church start in Acts 13, if that's the criteria for the start of the church?

> **Acts 13:46b-48a:**
> ... lo, we turn to the Gentiles.
>
> For so hath the Lord commanded us, *saying*, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the ends of the earth.
>
> And when the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord...

Do you see a difference? No, same thing; Paul went into a community, he taught the Word. First he'd go to the Jews. The Jews wouldn't believe, so he'd go to the Gentiles. It's the same story in every community he went in to; some of the Jews believed, some of the Gentiles believed. It wasn't a matter of how many; it was a matter of who wanted to believe. We'll go anyplace where there are people hungry for the Word. They went for hungry people and that's why the Word was published throughout all the region. Not just in Antioch of Pisidia but throughout the whole region of Pisidia. Just like at Ephesus. It wasn't just at Ephesus but it spread throughout all of Asia minor.

> **Acts 13:50:**
> But the Jews stirred up the devout and honourable women, and the chief men of the city, and raised persecution against Paul and Barnabas, and expelled them out of their coasts.

Because of that envy in verse 45, they couldn't stand the Word moving among the Jews and Gentiles so they pushed them out.

> **Acts 13:51-52:**
> But they shook off the dust of their feet against them, and came unto Iconium.
>
> And the disciples were filled with joy, and with the Holy Ghost.

That's where they go to the next city; the city of Iconium.