

1 Peter 1:8 - and though you have never seen Him, you continue loving Him, with reference to Whom at the present time you continue not seeing Him, yet you keep on believing with sublime unalloyed happiness [ἀγαλλιάω (*agallíāō*); “rejoice”] that is joy [χαρά (*chará*): “joy”] inexpressible [ἀνεκλάλητος (*aneklálētos*)] and full of resplendent glory. (EXT)

53. Therefore, we may conclude that Peter acquired from the example of David the rarified atmosphere of the copacetic spiritual life.
54. What Peter came to understand is what he knows the Jews assembled before him should also know at least academically, that David had advanced to the copacetic spiritual life.
55. This takes us back to Acts 2 and resumption of the opening verses of Peter’s argument:

Acts 2:25 - “For David spoke concerning Jesus in Psalm 16:8, ‘I kept on foreseeing the Lord always before me prophetically, for He is always on my right hand through the recall of divine revelation, so that I should remain inwardly undisturbed.’ (EXT)

Principles:

1. This is the first verse of eleven in Peter’s Argument (vv. 25–35). The structure of rhetoric is designed to persuade an audience.
2. The Argument Peter delivers will consist of three sections: (1) **ἔθος (*éthos*)**: the character of the individual speaking or of the one referenced (vv. 25–28), (2) **λόγος (*lógos*)**: rationale of the Argument based on evidence presented (vv. 29–35), and (3) **πάθος (*páthos*)**: the passion elicited from the souls of the audience (vv. 34–35 cf. v. 37).
3. These three elements of a rhetorical presentation are designed to present truth supported by the speaker’s integrity or those he quotes, the validity of the rationales presented and known to the audience, and soliciting a positive response.

4. Here is a synopsis of the elements of rhetorical persuasion:

Classical rhetoric is about persuading people. In his book *Rhetoric*, Aristotle devised a whole lexicon of persuasive principles. He spoke of the three modes of persuasion: *ethos*, *logos*, and *pathos*. These are the three ways in which we are persuaded.

The first way we are persuaded by the speaker is by his character, his *ethos*. We believe him because he convinces us that he is good, trustworthy, or credible in some way. This appeals to our wills. We believe in the *man*.

5. In the context of Peter's Argument, it is his quotation from Psalm 16 of David who possesses the summum bonum of personal character in the pantheon of Jewish luminaries.

The second way we are persuaded is when we accept the rational appeal of the speaker, his *logos*. His arguments are rationale and his evidence convincing. This is an appeal to our intellects. We believe his logic.

6. Peter's *logos* section presents an analysis of David's personal life and death in light of prophecies that speak of the Messiah's death, burial, and resurrection followed by his session at the right hand of God.

The third way we are persuaded is when we desire to believe the speaker. We are drawn by his *pathos*. He excites our passions. We believe in him because we want to believe in him. This is an appeal to our hearts, to our emotions.²

7. Peter concludes his Argument by quoting Psalm 110:1, also authored by David, which certifies the session of Jesus which guaranteed His victory over Lucifer in the Angelic Conflict.
8. The audience, in Acts 2:14, is made up of Jews both local and transient. As members of the Roman Empire, those being addressed are multilingual, some assisted further by the gift of languages.
9. The language Peter uses is understood by those present, indicated by the aorist middle indicative of the verb ἀποφθέγγομαι (*apophthéngomai*): "declared."

² Martin Cothran, "The 3 Modes of Persuasion," *The Classical Teacher* (Spring 2016): 26.

10. The aorist tense is ingressive indicating the beginning of an action. It occurs with verbs that denote activities, especially in contexts where the action is introduced as a new item in the discourse.³
11. This word is used in Acts 2:14 to gain the attention of the crowd that is making the erroneous assumption that those speaking in foreign languages are drunk:

Peter's sermon ... was probably delivered in the outer court of the temple. And while the verb *apophthéngomai* ["declared"] in verse 14 is the same as in verse 4 ["utterance"], we should understand that Peter undoubtedly spoke in the local vernacular (whether some form of Aramaic or koine Greek) and not in a foreign language, for *apophthéngomai* relates more to the inspired nature of the message than its mode.⁴

12. Peter resumes his sermon in Acts 2:22 with the all-inclusive vocative, "Men of Israel," after which he continues with his opening Exordium followed by his Statement in verses 23–24.
13. He began his Argument in verse 25 which is a quote from David's second messianic Psalm at Psalm 16:8. We now resume with Peter's Argument at:

Acts 2:26 - 'Therefore my heart was glad and my tongue exulted; moreover my flesh also will live in hope'; (NASB)

1. We have noted the word "heart" is the noun *kardía* referring to the inventory of ideas in the soul of David with emphasis on the problem-solving devices of personal love for God, unconditional love for man, and the copacetic spiritual life.
2. This is confirmed by two words: (1) "glad," the aorist passive indicative of the verb **εὐφραίνω** (*euphrainō*) and (2) "exulted," the aorist middle indicative of **ἀγαλλιάω** (*agalliaō*).

³ Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar: Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 558.

⁴ Richard N. Longenecker, "The Acts of the Apostles," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, gen ed. Frank E. Gaebelien (Grand Rapids: Regency Reference Library, 1981), 9:274.