

III. The Choice of Matthias (1:12-26)

A. The Prayer (1:12-14)

1:12 Then they returned to Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet, which is near Jerusalem, a Sabbath day's journey away.

1:13 When they had entered the city, they went up to the upper room where they were staying; that is, Peter and John and James and Andrew, Philip and Thomas, Bartholomew and Matthew, James the son of Alphaeus, and Simon the Zealot, and Judas the son of James.

1:14 These all with one mind were continually devoting themselves to prayer, along with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with His brothers.

The disciples obeyed Christ (Acts 1:4), left the Mount of Olives from which Jesus had ascended (Acts 1:9-10), and arrived in Jerusalem to wait for the promised Holy Spirit (Acts 1:4-5). Zechariah 14:4 mentions that Messiah will return to the Mount of Olives, so the place of their gathering has eschatological overtones.

It was **a Sabbath-day's journey** (about ¾ of a mile) from the Mount of Olives to where they stayed in Jerusalem. This does not mean that the ascension was on the Sabbath; rather, by mentioning a Sabbath day's journey, Luke is giving a point of reference as to the apostles' travels.

Once they arrived in Jerusalem, they went to **an upper room** which was a room that was built on the roof of a house and often served as a guest room.

The eleven disciples (Judas had killed himself) were there, but Acts 1:14 makes it clear that others were also present. The "women" were probably those who were witnesses of Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection since they are not described in further detail (Lk. 23:49; 24:1, 9, 22). Jesus' mother and His brothers were also present. Later Jesus' brother, James, will be identified as the leader of the church in Jerusalem (Acts. 12:17; 15:13; 21:18).

Already, the infant church is showing the character of the church; they are of one mind, gathered, devoted to prayer, seeking God's will (Acts 2:42, 46; 6:4), and ready to carry out His mission. They did not sit around passively assuming that because Christ had said the Spirit would come they could relax and wait. Rather, the promise of the Spirit made their prayers all the more urgent. They saw God's sovereign promises as the warrant to pray; it was because Christ had made a promise that they could pray according to His will, in faith, believing that what He had promised He would also do. The sovereignty of God does not make prayers redundant; rather, it is through the prayers of His people that God is pleased to act. Prayer is the God-ordained means which pleases God to enact His will. But Luke wants to emphasize that they didn't just pray – they prayed *corporately*! They prayed together, unified as a group.

B. The Problem (1:15-22)

1:15 *At this time Peter stood up in the midst of the brethren (a gathering of about one hundred and twenty persons was there together), and said,*

1:16 *"Brethren, the Scripture had to be fulfilled, which the Holy Spirit foretold by the mouth of David concerning Judas, who became a guide to those who arrested Jesus.*

1:17 *"For he was counted among us and received his share in this ministry."*

1:18 *(Now this man acquired a field with the price of his wickedness, and falling headlong, he burst open in the middle and all his intestines gushed out.*

1:19 *And it became known to all who were living in Jerusalem; so that in their own language that field was called Hakeldama, that is, Field of Blood.)*

1:20 *"For it is written in the book of Psalms, 'LET HIS HOMESTEAD BE MADE DESOLATE, AND LET NO ONE DWELL IN IT'; and, 'LET ANOTHER MAN TAKE HIS OFFICE.'*

(a gathering of about one hundred and twenty persons was there together): The group mentioned in 1:15 grew to about 120 people and Peter begins to take leadership. He stands up and points out that a replacement of Judas is needed to share a portion of the apostles' work. What stands out is Peter's new-born understanding of the significance and meaning of the OT Scriptures. Here is a man in whom the OT is beginning to leap out with Christological significance; he was reading the Word of God with new eyes.

the Scripture had to be fulfilled, which the Holy Spirit foretold by the mouth of David concerning Judas: Judas' betrayal is referred to as a fulfilment of Scripture (Psa. 41:9; Jn. 13:18; also by way of interest Jn. 6:70; 13:21); through it God's divine plan is fulfilled.

"Brethren, the Scripture had to be fulfilled, which the Holy Spirit foretold by the mouth of David . . . For it is written in the book of Psalms, 'LET HIS HOMESTEAD BE MADE DESOLATE, AND LET NO ONE DWELL IN IT' (Psalm 69:25); and, 'LET ANOTHER MAN TAKE HIS OFFICE' (Psalm 109:8); (1:20).

There are different ways that the NT writers view things as being fulfilled. Most are familiar with direct fulfilment where the prophecy matches the fulfilment word for word. However, the type of fulfilment in Acts 1:20 is referred to as a typological-prophetic fulfilment; this understands a *generic* OT reference as applicable to a *specific* situation. In the OT passage that Peter is quoting from, the psalmist is asking God to pour out His wrath on his enemies. When the psalmist prayed, **'LET HIS HOMESTEAD BE MADE DESOLATE, AND LET NO ONE DWELL IN IT'** he was asking that the home of his enemies be left uninhabited (i.e. that God would wipe them out completely). Peter saw in Judas' death a fulfilment of the fate of an enemy of God. What happens to the enemies of God in a general way, happened to Judas, an enemy of God, in a specific way. Judas experienced judgment as the enemies of God do. Peter uses the second passage (**'LET ANOTHER MAN TAKE HIS OFFICE'**) in a similar way to justify finding a replacement for Judas. It also comes from a psalm of judgment where the psalmist asks God to bring an untimely death to his enemies so another can seize their position. That is, he wants his enemy to be dispossessed of the place and office which he holds along with all its honors and privileges. Removal and replacement shows that the removal is permanent. From these Psalms we can conclude that the move to replace Judas is not just a need to bring the number of apostles back to twelve, but it is part of the judgment Judas experiences. So "Peter takes the principal expressed in the psalm as a summary of how

God acts and applies it to an event where God has judged. In this sense, Peter is certainly within the psalm's meaning and spirit" (Bock, 87).

"Williams (1990:109) makes the point that it is Judas's *apostasy, not his death*, that requires his replacement because, after the death of James son of Zebedee in Acts 12:2, no replacement is made or noted. Once a faithful member becomes the replacement, the effort to have twelve is not to be continued perpetually. Wilkenhauser (1961:33) recalls Jesus's promise to the twelve that they would inherit twelve thrones on his return. This promise might well have motivated Peter here (Matt. 19:28; Lk. 22:28-30). So the slot must be filled, and when Matthias is elected, he will fill the twelfth slot of this special class of apostles once and for all" (Bock, 82).

"For he was counted among us and received his share in this ministry." This is the solemn note that is made about Judas. For three years Judas had masked his unregenerate heart with a veneer of piety. He acted like a believer; he may have even thought he was a believer in Christ. He lived such a convincing lifestyle that even his fellow apostles didn't see through it (and they were with him day and night under every circumstance imaginable). But God's word had prophesied about Judas' defection so it had to come to pass. "Judas may not be excused on the ground that what befell him was prophesied, since he fell away not through the compulsion of prophesy but through the wickedness of his own heart" (Calvin). Judas' presence among the apostles is a reminder that the church at its very best is a mixed multitude.

(Now this man acquired a field with the price of his wickedness, and falling headlong, he burst open in the middle and all his intestines gushed out. And it became known to all who were living in Jerusalem; so that in their own language that field was called Hakeldama, that is, Field of Blood.) In verses 18 and 19 Luke takes a brief explanatory sidetrack to explain what happened to Judas. This further underscores the horrific judgment he faced. "The detail differs from Matthew 27:3-10, leading to much discussion about what is said here and its relationship to what Matthew says. Matthew has Judas repent and try to return the money. When it is refused, Judas tosses the money in the temple, and the priests use the proceeds to purchase the Field of Blood (see Acts 1:19). He then hangs himself (Matt. 27:5). Matthew sees in this a fulfillment of Zech. 11:13. There is no mention of Judas's hanging or his repentance in Acts. . . It is evident that Matthew tells his account not only to discuss Judas but also to focus on the Jewish leadership and critique them for their involvement in what the evangelist sees as an unrighteous act. Judas fits Matthew's polemic against the leadership. Acts is interested only in Judas's eventual fate, not in any intervening activity, including any regret Judas may have felt" (Bock, 83).

When it states that Judas **acquired a field with the price of his wickedness** it simply means that the field was acquired with Judas's money; that is, a field to bury him was the reward he received for his wickedness; all that his betrayal-money got him was death. Hakeldama is Aramaic meaning Field of Blood.

In short, if we try to put Matthew's account and Acts together, what probably happened was that Judas hung himself, the rope evidently broke and when it did he fell tearing open his side (possibly after decomposition had already begun to set in). The detail adds to the ugly fate of the wicked.

1:21 "Therefore it is necessary that of the men who have accompanied us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us--

1:22 beginning with the baptism of John until the day that He was taken up from us-- one of these must become a witness with us of His resurrection."

The person to replace Judas must meet certain qualifications. He must be one who had been with them from the time of John the Baptist's ministry until the day Jesus ascended. The **baptism of John** could be either the time when Jesus was baptized by John or from the beginning of John's ministry. The person must also be a witness of the resurrection. These requirements show that the role of the apostle could not continue beyond those of the first century, for eyewitnesses would eventually die out. It also points to the apostles' foundational role in the church's early years.

C. The Solution (1:23-26)

1:23 So they put forward two men, Joseph called Barsabbas (who was also called Justus), and Matthias.

1:24 And they prayed and said, "You, Lord, who know the hearts of all men, show which one of these two You have chosen

1:25 to occupy this ministry and apostleship from which Judas turned aside to go to his own place."

1:26 And they drew lots for them, and the lot fell to Matthias; and he was added to the eleven apostles.

The choice is made between two men through prayer and belief in God's sovereign election – for God knew who should fill the position. Surrounded with unity, piety, and prayer, they cast lots. The lots were probably stones with each individual's name written on them that were placed in a bag or vessel; the stone that was drawn would determine the decision. One can see the use of lots in [Leviticus 16:8](#); [Joshua 18:6](#); [19:51](#); [23:4](#); [I Samuel 14:42](#); [I Chronicles 6:65](#); [24-26](#); [Nehemiah 10:34](#); [11:1](#); [Isaiah 34:17](#); and [Jonah 1:7](#). In [Proverbs 16:33](#) it says, "The lot is cast into the lap, But its every decision is from the LORD." Casting lots was the way that the human factor could be removed from choosing of the twelfth apostle. Although making decisions by casting lots is not mentioned later in the decision-making process in the Book of Acts, in principle, the casting of the lot is an expression in the belief in the sovereignty of God. After this there is no mention of casting lots to make decisions, rather, decisions were made after careful thought and prayer, based on what seemed good to the people and was believed to be the will of the Holy Spirit; but the position of an apostle was a position that came by direct appointment by Christ. Human error needed to be removed from the equation; casting lots seemed to be the only reasonable way of doing that.

"In sum, Acts 1:12–26 covers the obedience of the church as its members wait in Jerusalem for the Spirit. There, Peter moves to replace Judas and bring the number of apostles to twelve. The community is unified, praying and seeing what to do through Scripture. Here's a picture of active community life, one of several such snapshots in 1:12–6:7. Peter is leading the congregation, and the choice is left to prayer and the Lord. Everything about the community's actions suggests that this is a community walking with God. The community understands Judas's death to be a judgment from God and part of the divine plan. Peter leads by pointing the community to Scripture, and the community shares in the

deliberations, appealing to God to select one who has the heart for the ministry. With the Twelve restored, the table is set for the coming of the Spirit. Readers of Acts are to understand the unity not only as an explanation of how Judas was replaced but also as a precedent of how to seek God as a community in decisions, looking to God to show the way” (Bock, 90).

IV. The Coming of the Spirit (2:1-13)

A. The Arrival (2:1-3)

2:1 *When the day of Pentecost had come, they were all together in one place.*

2:2 *And suddenly there came from heaven a noise like a violent rushing wind, and it filled the whole house where they were sitting.*

2:3 *And there appeared to them tongues as of fire distributing themselves, and they rested on each one of them.*

Acts 2:1-41 is the turning point of the account of Luke and Acts.

When the day of Pentecost had come: Pentecost was one of the three Jewish feasts that called for a pilgrimage to the Holy City. It means “fiftieth” for it occurred on the fiftieth day after the first Sabbath after Passover (Lev. 23:15-16; Exo. 23:15-17; 34:22; Num. 28:26; Deut. 16:9-12). It was known among the Jews as the “Feast of Weeks” (Exo. 34:22) or the “Day of Firstfruits” because it was the day when the first fruits of the wheat harvest were offered to God.

they were all together in one place: The disciples were staying together in the upper room when the baptism in the Spirit occurred as Jesus had promised (see notes on Acts 1:4-5).

And suddenly there came from heaven a noise like a violent rushing wind, . . . And there appeared to them tongues as of fire distributing themselves, and they rested on each one of them. Two physical evidences occurred with the coming of the Spirit: (1) a sound like a mighty wind filled the room, and (2) the appearance of fire like tongues distributed themselves over each person present.

Both the Hebrew and Greek word for spirit (or Spirit) can also be translated as wind or breath. Wind is used to describe the Holy Spirit elsewhere in the Bible. When Ezekiel prophesied to the wind and called upon it to blow upon the dead bodies in his vision, it was the Spirit of God that filled them with new life (Ezek. 37:9-14). In Genesis 1:2 it was the Spirit who hovered over the waters during creation. Jesus, when He spoke to Nicodemus, likened the Holy Spirit to the wind (Jn. 3:8). So wind becomes an appropriate symbol of the Holy Spirit’s coming. It is also very possible that the imagery of the Spirit coming *like a wind* evoked the thought of the dawning of a new creation as it did in Ezekiel, Genesis, and John.

How we are to envision “tongues of fire” resting above each person’s head is difficult to know, but the experience provided visible evidence that each was a participant of the baptism of the Spirit.

Further evidence that this was the fulfillment of Jesus’ statement in Acts 1:4-5 is in Acts 11:15-17.

B. The Results (2:4-6)

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

2:5 *Now there were Jews living in Jerusalem, devout men from every nation under heaven.*

2:6 *And when this sound occurred, the crowd came together, and were bewildered because each one of them was hearing them speak in his own language.*

they were all filled with the Holy Spirit: All who were in the upper room, not just the apostles, were filled and began to speak in tongues. In Acts 2:17 and 18 it says, "I will pour forth of My Spirit on all mankind; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy . . . even on My bondslaves, both men and women, I will in those days pour forth of My Spirit" (compare Numbers 11:25-29).

Following the baptism in the Spirit, the believers were all filled with the Spirit. To be filled with the Spirit means to be controlled by the Spirit. The baptism in the Spirit happens once in a person's life; it is a part of entering the New Covenant; filling is repeated as the person submits to the Spirit's leading (Acts 2:4; 4:8, 31; Eph. 5:18).

began to speak with other tongues: The Holy Spirit as an inward, invisible reality demonstrated His presence with the outward signs of the wind and the "tongues like fire" over the disciples' heads, but also by the speaking of tongues through the disciples.

C. The Reaction (2:7-13)

2:7 *They were amazed and astonished, saying, "Why, are not all these who are speaking Galileans?"*

Galileans had a distinctive pronunciation which caused others in Jerusalem to view them as provincial (cf. Mk. 14:70), so when they were heard fluently speaking other languages, the people around them were amazed.

2:8 *"And how is it that we each hear them in our own language to which we were born?"*

2:9 *"Parthians and Medes and Elamites, and residents of Mesopotamia, Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia,*

2:10 *Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and the districts of Libya around Cyrene, and visitors from Rome, both Jews and proselytes,*

2:11 *Cretans and Arabs-- we hear them in our own tongues speaking of the mighty deeds of God."*

The Jews had been scattered everywhere through the diaspora and many decided to make their residences in other countries. However, Pentecost was a major event in the Jewish calendar which drew people from all over the known world. Each of the countries listed had large populations of Jews living in them, though we need not assume the list is exhaustive. What is being expressed through the many languages being spoken is the universal nature of the gospel. God is declaring that He so loved the world that he gave His only-begotten Son. He is establishing that the disciples really will be witnesses "in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and even to the remotest part of the earth" (Acts 1:8).

Speaking in tongues is a controversial subject; the following may help clarify the nature of the gift.

1) “The Bible is a work of literature. Literature comes in different genres, or categories based on style, and each is read and appreciated differently from another. For example, to confuse a work of science fiction with a medical textbook would cause many problems—they must be understood differently. And both science fiction and a medical text must be understood differently from poetry. Therefore, accurate exegesis and interpretation takes into consideration the purpose and style of a given book or passage of Scripture” (<http://www.gotquestions.org/Bible-genres.html>).

In this case, the genre is narrative. It is a record of history; the story of how the early church developed. The events recorded in Acts are therefore unique to that time in history. Never before had Christ come, died, and sent the Spirit. This means that the manifestations in Acts 2 are not necessarily repeated; Acts only tells what happened. Even in Acts 4 when the Spirit fell on the church again, the house was shaken, the fullness came, there was passion and boldness, but there were no new tongues (Acts 4:31), nor was there wind and fire. In other words, God did not repeat what He had done earlier. Unless there is teaching on the subject elsewhere in Scripture, there is no reason to assume that the events are intended to be normative.

Just as the Spirit does not always descend upon every believer with the sound of a mighty wind and flames of fire above their head, neither should we assume that all who are filled with the Spirit will speak in tongues. In fact, Paul clearly says that all do not speak in tongues (I Cor. 12:29), but that the Spirit distributes gifts as He wills (I Cor. 12:11). In this case, the need for the gift of tongues was obvious since there was a need to reach the many Jews of different linguistic backgrounds who had come to celebrate Pentecost.

2) Second, Acts 2 is the only place in the NT where the nature of the tongues is given. The Greek word for “tongues” primarily means human languages when used in the Bible (e.g., Ro. 14:11; Phil 2:11; Rev. 10:11, 17:15, etc.). The present context bears overwhelming evidence that it means human language, as well. We might define the gift of tongues given by the Holy Spirit to the disciples in Acts 2 as *the supernatural ability to speak foreign languages that were previously unknown and unlearned by the speaker*.

3) Third, in Acts 2 the purpose of the tongues was to testify of the mighty deeds of God to the unbelieving. God was empowering the believers to be His witnesses as He commanded them to be (Acts 1:8).

As Piper says, “The speaking in tongues in Acts has a very definite role to play. It's directly connected to the presence of people from all the nations who need to understand the great things the disciples were saying. In other words, the miracle of tongues was a demonstration of God's sovereign power, and it showed that this power promised in Acts 1:8 really was intended to advance the spread of the gospel to the ends of the earth. It was a token that God means for all peoples to understand His greatness and that He is willing to do miracles to make His glory known among the nations.”

4) Some feel that the miracle was in the hearing. That is, they say, disciples spoke in their native language but the words were transformed into the language of the listener when it reached their ears. But if everyone heard the disciples speaking of the mighty deeds of God in their own language, why would anyone accuse them of being drunk (2:13)? It's more conceivable that some thought they were drunk because the languages they heard were incomprehensible to them. In addition, if the unbelieving were hearing their own language then *they* would be the ones who received the miracle not the ones

who were baptized in the Spirit; the relationship between the disciples being filled and their speaking in tongues would be obscured; it wouldn't be evidence that the Holy Spirit had come upon the believers at all.

5) There is also a question as to what the sound in 2:6 is. Some believe that it was the sound of the Spirit coming like a mighty wind (2:2) that drew people out to see what had happened. When they arrived they then heard the disciples speaking in languages they knew. Others believe that it was the sound of the disciples speaking that drew them. In either case the result is the same. They were amazed to hear Galileans speaking fluently in their mother tongue.

Some argue that tongues in I Corinthians is different than tongues in Acts; in I Corinthians they say that tongues are non-human, heavenly, or "angelic" languages or even babbling. The following argues against this:

- "Tongues" and "languages" are used interchangeably in Acts 2 and many of the languages listed were languages current to their time.
- The exact same wording appears in both Acts and I Corinthians. Unless there is additional evidence or an explanation showing that there are two different gifts that have the same name there is no valid reason to draw that conclusion.
- In I Corinthians 13:1 "tongues of men" can only be interpreted as languages of men.
- In I Corinthians 14 the word "tongues" appears both in the singular ("a tongue" 14:2, 4, 9, 13, 14, 19, 26, 27) and plural ("tongues" – 14:5, 6, 18, 22, 23, 39). The use of both the singular and plural only makes sense if languages are in view. Babbling cannot be divided into different kinds, so there is no need for a plural. Language can be spoken of in both a generic sense, or divided into kinds of languages, such as Chinese, Japanese, French, etc.
- Words form the content of the tongues in both Acts 2 and I Corinthians 14 (14:19). Words are associated with language as we know it.
- In I Corinthians 14:11 Paul explains the frustration of someone who hears a foreign language but does not understand it. The frustration comes from the fact that the language is foreign, not because it is unintelligible. Foreigners speak foreign languages; they don't babble.
- Tongues are likened to the Assyrian language in I Corinthians 14:21.

The Most Common Objections and Responses to This View:

1. OBJECTION: I Corinthians 13:1 speaks of the tongues of angels. Doesn't this indicate that tongues are a heavenly language?

REPLY: In I Corinthians 13:1-3 Paul is demonstrating the futility of using spiritual gifts without love. He is speaking in hypothetical terminology, taking each gift mentioned to the limits of the imagination. In 13:2 he imagines possessing the gift of prophecy to the extent that he knows all mysteries and has all knowledge; he imagines possessing all faith to the degree that he can move mountains; in 13:3 he pictures himself as being able to give all he owns, even giving his own life for the benefit of others. In actuality, none of the gifts were experienced to these degrees. No one knows all mysteries or has all knowledge except for God. No one can actually move mountains. Paul is using extreme examples to say, "Suppose I had the gift of prophecy to the extent that I possessed the totality of divine revelation, or I had the gift of faith to the extent that I could trust God for anything imaginable, or the gift of service to the extent that I gave all I

had (even my own life) to others, but did not have love, what would my contribution to the body of Christ be?" His answer is, "I would be nothing."

Speaking in the tongues of men and angels is simply one more example of taking a gift to the limits of the imagination. He is imagining someone who has the ultimate linguistic ability which has never been realized before. Even he, if he did not have love, would contribute no more to the body of Christ than that which the noise of a gong or a symbol would.

This verse is not teaching that tongues is a heavenly language, rather, it demonstrates it is not. Tongues of angels expresses the limits of the imagination never realized, not the reality of the gift.

2. OBJECTION: I Corinthians 14:2 states, "For he who speaks in a tongue does not speak to men but to God, for no one understands him; however, in the spirit he speaks mysteries." If no one understands, how can tongues be a known language?

REPLY: There is no need to conclude that this verse teaches that tongues is unintelligible. All this demonstrates is that the situation in the church of Corinth was different than that in the book of Acts. In Acts 2 people were present from many different countries who understood what was being said. Evidently, no one in the church of Corinth knew the language being expressed by the tongues speaker. As 14:10-12 demonstrates, the problem with the understanding is in the foreignness in the language, not the unintelligibility of it. The issue to Paul in 14:2 is if only God understands what is being said there is no benefit to the church at all (cf. 14:6-9).

3. OBJECTION: Romans 8:26 says, "the Spirit Himself makes intercession for us with groanings too deep for words." Doesn't this show that tongues are inarticulate sounds, not languages?

REPLY: This is a not tongues for the following reasons: (1) what is spoken of here is a promise for all believers, the gift of tongues is not (I Cor. 12:30) (2) the gift of tongues has a different purpose (I Cor. 14:22), (3) it has not been proven that "tongues" are "groanings," and (4) there is no mention of spiritual gifts in this context at all. This is not speaking of tongues but is a reference to the fact that when we don't know how to express our prayers or thoughts adequately, the Holy Spirit intercedes for us. He fills the gap between the desires of our heart and our inability to express it.

2:12 And they all continued in amazement and great perplexity, saying to one another, "What does this mean?"

2:13 But others were mocking and saying, "They are full of sweet wine."

The demonstration of God's power in the miracle of tongues caused amazement and perplexity among everyone. This gave way to two very different responses. Some asked, "What does this mean?" Others (in verse 13) mocked and concluded, "They are filled with new wine." The accusation that they were drunk comes from the fact that those listening could not understand the language they heard and assumed that the disciples were intoxicated, babbling nonsense.

This is one of many examples that show that miraculous events are not self-authenticating. The Pharisees claimed that Jesus' works came from Satan (Matt. 12:22 ff.). Some thought that God's voice was just thunder (Jn. 12:28-29). In the end times, many who reject the works of the Spirit will be willing

to believe the miraculous signs that Satan produces (Matt. 24:24). The heart must first be prepared by the Spirit of God for His works to be accepted.