ground and standing-point of these two  
orations of Peter are peculiar, and the  
very mention of the ‘times of refresh-  
ment’ *proceeding forth from the presence  
of the Father* would naturally lead to the  
position here assigned to the Son, as one  
*sent* by the Father. See below, on ver.  
26.

**who was before appointed]**  
**before appointed**, as apparently in ch. xxii.  
14 (marginal reading).

**unto you**,—as  
your Messiah.

**21. whom the heaven  
must receive]** The words thus translated  
admit of a double rendering: (1) ‘*Whom  
the heaven must receive.*’ (2) ‘*Who must  
possess the heaven*” Of these the former  
is in my view *decidedly preferable*, both as  
best suiting the sense, and as being the  
natural rendering, whereas the other is  
forced. The reason given by Bengel for  
rejecting the right rendering, “To be   
*received*, i.e. *contained, shut into*, the  
heaven, is a violent interpretation, and  
seems to imply, that the heaven is *greater  
than* Christ, and to detract from His  
exaltation above all heavens,” is best  
answered by himself, “ Yet there is a sense,  
in which it may be said that the heaven  
*receives* Christ, viz. that it admits Him, as  
a throne its proper King;” only I would  
rather understand it *locally*, and   
recognize a parallel expression with that in  
ch. i., also *local*, “a cloud *received Him*  
out of their sight.” And so far from  
seeing in it any derogation from the  
Majesty of Christ, it seems to me   
admirably to set it forth: it behoves the  
*heaven* (which is *his*, obeying his will) to  
*receive Him* till the time appointed.

**until]** Not *during*, as the advocates of the  
*present spiritual sense* of the passage wish  
to render it, but **until**; see below. The  
key both to the construction and   
meaning here, is our Lord’s saying, Matt.  
xvii. 11, “*Elias truly first cometh, and  
shall* **restore all things**.” From this we see  
that **the restoration of all things** stands  
alone: and that **which** *does not belong* to  
“*all things*.” Next, what is this **restoration**?   
According to the usage of the  
word, it cannot be applied to the works of  
the Spirit in the hearts of men, but must  
be understood of the *glorious restoration  
of all things, the* **regeneration** (Matt. xix.  
28), which, as Peter here says, is the  
theme of all the prophets from the   
beginning.—No objection can be raised to this  
from the meaning of the word **times**: see  
ch, vii. 17, and St. Peter’s own language,  
1 Pet. i. 20, “*in the last times*.” —On the  
testimony of the prophets, see ver. 18 note.

**22.]** This citation is a free but   
faithful paraphrase of the text in Deuteronomy.  
—That the words, as spoken by Moses,  
seem to point to the whole line of   
prophets sent by God, is not any objection  
to their being applied to Christ, but rather  
necessitates, and entirely harmonizes with,  
that application. See the parable Matt.  
xxi. 33–41, And *none* of the whole   
prophetic body entirely answered to the words  
**like unto me**, *but Christ*. The Jews   
therefore rightly understood it (though not  
always consistent in this, comp. John i. 21  
with vi. 14) of the Messiah.

**24.]** See  
ver. 18, note.—St. Peter’s aim is to shew  
the unanimity of *all the prophets in   
speaking of these times*.—Samuel is named, more  
as being the *first great prophet after  
Moses*, than as bearing any part in this  
testimony. The prophetic period of which