

Peter's Use of Psalm 16:8-11 in Acts 2:25-32

Gregory V. Trull
Western Baptist College
5000 Deer Park Drive SE
Salem, OR 97301
gtrull@wbc.edu

INTRODUCTION

Psalm 16 shines as a wonderful and unique psalm. A man after God's own heart revels in his unequalled relationship with Yahweh. This man reflects on a determined promise from God of rescue from the grave's power. Psalm 16 voices a clarion testimony of David's hope in the secure promises of Yahweh. For the apostles, this psalm also occupied a special place. In the two pivotal and programmatic sermons of Peter and Paul, Acts 2 and 13 respectively, Psalm 16 provides a centerpiece of the argument that Jesus' resurrection fulfilled the resurrection expected in David's words. The purpose of this paper will be to explore the meaning of Psalm 16 and its interpretation and usage by the apostles in Acts.

BASIC OUTLINE

- I. Introduction
- II. Review of Interpretive Approaches
- III. Exegesis of Psalm 16
- IV. Analysis of Psalm 16 in Intertestamental Interpretation
- V. Interpretation of Psalm 16 in Acts 2
- VI. Conclusions

REVIEW OF INTERPRETIVE APPROACHES

Apostolic Hermeneutical Error. Some scholars hold that the usage of Psalm 16 as a messianic text represents a mistake in interpretation. S. H. Hooke sees Peter's understanding of Psalm 16 as speaking of the Messiah's resurrection as stemming from the "mistranslation" by the LXX. The apostles only found resurrection in Psalm 16 because the LXX changed the meaning from deliverance from threat of death to a deliverance after death.¹

Jewish Hermeneutics. This category views Peter's interpretation of Psalm 16 as the result of practicing the Jewish hermeneutics common to his day. For example, Ellis and Longenecker hold that a midrashic connection is made between Psalm 110 and Psalm 16 and then a peshet understanding by Peter produces the introduction, "David says concerning Him."² Juel holds that a messianic interpretation of Psalm 16 results from a complex midrashic-type process that links the psalm to Messiah through Psalms 86 and 89.³

¹ S.H. Hooke, "Israel and the Afterlife," *Expository Times* 76 (May 1965): 238. See also S.R. Driver, "The Method of Studying the Psalter: Psalm XVI," *Expositor* 7, no. 10 (1910).

² Richard Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 1975), 100 and Earle E. Ellis, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 1978), 199-202.

³ Donald Juel, "Social Dimensions of Exegesis: The Use of Psalm 16 in Acts 2," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 43 (1981).

Typology. This view held by scholars such as Bock⁴ and Lampe,⁵ states that the life and words of David prefigured the experience of Christ. David's words of hope of deliverance from threatening death look ahead and find ultimate fulfillment in Jesus' deliverance after death. The meaning of the psalm expands to describe fully the experience of Jesus' resurrection.

Sensus Plenior. This position understands that David wrote of deliverance from a premature death, but that the deeper meaning is found in the New Testament. This deeper and preferred meaning was only revealed through Peter. Proponents include S. Lewis Johnson⁶ and Donald Hagner.⁷

References Plenior. Elliott E. Johnson sees that the message is singular ("hope for resurrection"), but that the references are plural (David and Jesus).⁸ He states that the psalm is "unlimited in reference to Christ and limited in reference to David."⁹ Later, "In a limited reference, David would not be abandoned to the grave; to limited

⁴ Darrell L. Bock, "Use of the Old Testament in the New," in *Foundations for Biblical Interpretation: A Complete Library of Tools and Resources*, ed. David S. Dockery, Kenneth A. Mathews and Robert B. Sloan (Nashville, TN: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 1994).

⁵ G. W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woolcombe, *Essays in Typology* (London: SCM Press, 1957).

⁶ S. Lewis Johnson, *The Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980).

⁷ Donald A. Hagner, "The Old Testament in the New," in *Interpreting the Word of God*, ed. Samuel J. Schultz and Morris Inch, A. (Chicago: Moody Press, 1976).

⁸ Elliott E. Johnson, *Expository Hermeneutics: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990), 180-185.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 182.

extent, he would not see decay. David would not remain in the grave eternally; he would not see decay eternally.”¹⁰

Generic Promise. Kaiser holds that Psalm 16:8-11 applied both to David and to Christ. They are linked together because they are both part of the multifaceted single promise that develops through the OT. The promise to the “Favored One” applied historically to David and ultimately to Christ. David’s original intention was to speak of his hope of victory and of the ultimate victory of Christ as one single hope.¹¹

Directly Prophetic. This view, defended in this paper, sees that David spoke prophetically of the Messiah’s resurrection. Speaking from a international culture fertile in afterlife belief and following the precedent of belief in God’s ability to raise the dead in order to accomplish His purpose, David prophesied of the resurrection of Messiah as implied in the Davidic Covenant. The Apostle Peter then used David’s intended meaning to demonstrate that Jesus’ resurrection fulfilled the messianic prophecy.

EXEGESIS OF PSALM 16

The following discussion overviews the main supporting evidence for a directly prophetic view.

Davidic Authorship. Several lines of data support David’s writing of the psalm. First, David was a recognized psalmist and certainly qualified as a likely source. Second, the location of the psalm favors Davidic authorship. Book One of Psalms, which

¹⁰ Ibid., 183.

¹¹ Walter C. Jr. Kaiser, "The Promise to David in Psalm 16 and Its Application in Acts 2:25-33 and 13:32-37," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 23 (September 1980)

houses Psalm 16, predominately contains Davidic psalms. Further, Psalm 16 is one of six *miktams* Psalms 16, 56-60). The *miktams* all have Davidic connections, four of them containing specific historical superscriptions from events in David's life. Third, the *lamed auctoris* clearly designates David as the author. This finds support both in Hebrew grammar¹² and in biblical usage (Isa 38:9 and Hab 3:1). Finally, both Peter and Paul affirm Davidic authorship (Acts 2:31, 13:35-37).

Covenantal Setting. Peter states that David spoke Psalm 16 from the perspective of the Davidic Covenant (Acts 2:30). David's rejoicing over his unusual blessing from Yahweh (Ps 16:5-6) compares favorably with David's response to the covenant (2 Sam 7). Also, the passive use of the term דָּבַר in Ps 16:10 provides a link to the covenant. The term designates one who has received the loyal love of Yahweh. 2 Chr 6:41-42, Ps 89:19-20 and Isa 55:3 connect דָּבַר with the Davidic Covenant.

Literary Structure. The literary structure seems to support a heightening through movement. The psalm as a whole moves from present blessing (vv. 1-6) to a hinge confession of praise (v. 7) and then to a focus on future blessing (8-11). The portion quoted in Acts 2 also shows heightening within it. A broad confidence statement (8) gives way to physical security (9) leading to a prediction of resurrection (10) and exaltation (11). Some have opined that the psalm progresses from Abrahamic Covenant imagery (note usage of land terms) to Davidic Covenant reflection. Widely varying views

¹² See Francis A. Brown, S. R. Driver and Charles Briggs, *The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1979), 5 and L. Kautzsch, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, 2nd ed., trans. A.E. Cowley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), 419.

of the structure of the psalm exist. Certainty may be elusive. The idea of heightening movement though would at least be compatible with the proposed prophetic view.

Verse 10 Meaning. This verse is the crux of the issue. Both Paul and Peter focus their argument upon it. Interpreters also center their interest on the meaning of these words and how the New Testament understands them.

“Because,” כִּי, links verse 10 as a further cause for the joy expressed in verse 9. “You will not abandon,” לֹא־תַעֲזֹב, is an imperfect denying a future possibility.¹³ The verb means “to give over to, to give up to the power or disposal of another.”¹⁴ Here it refers to being given over to the dominion of death. The speaker does not deny the possibility of his death,¹⁵ but expresses trust that Yahweh will not relinquish him to the power of the grave. Here, אֲנִי, is a poetic equivalent to the first person singular pronoun.¹⁶ “Sheol,” concludes Harris, is a term used almost exclusively in poetic texts to denote the grave.¹⁷

¹³ R.J. Williams, *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*, 2nd ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976), § 395

¹⁴ M. Stuart, "Interpretation of Psalm XVI," *The Biblical Repository* 1 (January 1831): 107. See also *BDB*, 737; and Mitchell Dahood, "The Root *Azb* II in Job," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (Quarter? 1959).

¹⁵ In fact, the Davidic Covenant which is the backdrop of this psalm clearly states David will die (II Samuel 7:12).

¹⁶ W.A. VanGemeren, "Psalms", ed. Gaebelien, F.E. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing, 1991), 5:98. See also Bruce K. Waltke, "נָפֵשׁ", in *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, ed. Harris, R. Laird, Archer, Gleason L. Jr., Waltke, Bruce K. (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), vol. 2.

¹⁷ R. Laird Harris, "The Meaning of the Term *Sheol* As Shown by Parallels in Poetic Texts," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 4 (December 1961). He notes that of the 65 uses, all but 8 are in poetic texts and that the normal term for grave in prose is *qeber*.

It is often paralleled with terms like “death,” or “sepulcher.” It has no clear punishment connotations, but is the “common end” of all mankind.¹⁸

In the synthetic parallel second line, the understanding of two key words (קִדְדָה and שָׁחַת) is critical. קִדְדָה is used 11 times in the singular (plus 4 variant readings) and the singular form occurs only in poetic texts.¹⁹ Many render the term actively as “pious one” or “holy one,”²⁰ emphasizing faithfulness to Yahweh. “Pious” would be preferred over “holy” since קִדְדָה never means “holy.”²¹ Others render it passively as “favored one,”²² emphasizing the one as the recipient of Yahweh’s blessing. Grammatically, the term can be either active or passive. The term קִדְדָה in the psalms denotes almost without exception God’s lovingkindness to man.²³ The substantive use of קִדְדָה is often employed in the Psalms to denote those who have received Yahweh’s קִדְדָה (See Psalm 31:24 where the plural adjectival form is used substantively of those blessed by Yahweh [31:8,17,23]²⁴). This passive sense is common enough that Stoebe says, “one may well maintain the term intends no specifically ethical description” but rather emphasizes living

¹⁸ Ibid., 134.

¹⁹ Total usage is 25 times (plural and singular) mostly in poetic texts.

²⁰ Stuart, "Psalm XVI", 102.

²¹ J. J. Stewart Perowne, *The Book of Psalms* (1878; reprint, Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing, 1966), 95.

²² Kaiser, "Psalm 16", 224-5.

²³ A.F. Kirkpatrick, *The Book of Psalms* (1902; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1982), 835.

²⁴ For other example texts where קִדְדָה represents recipients of Yahweh’s קִדְדָה, see Psalms 32:6&10; 52:8&9; 86:2&5.

“in the sphere of God’s devoted grace.”²⁵ Kirkpatrick agrees, “it must certainly mean ‘one who is the object of Yahweh’s lovingkindness.’”²⁶ Outside the psalms, *חֶסֶד* is related specifically to David in two key passages (II Chronicles 6:14-18,42; Isaiah 55:3). Both the prophetic passage of Isaiah and Solomon’s dedication prayer for the Temple connect *חֶסֶד* with the Davidic Covenant of II Samuel 7.²⁷ Also, Psalm 89 links God’s *חֶסֶד* to the eternal nature of His covenant with David (89:20-24, 32-37). In the Psalm 16 context, the psalm has emphasized not so much personal piety, but rather the faithfulness of Yahweh. The brief petition of 1a is based on the refuge found in faithful Yahweh. The ongoing loyalty of 4b is a result of Yahweh as the singular source of blessing. The entire tenor of the psalm has directed its attention to who Yahweh is and what He does. Therefore, the best solution seems to be to understand *חֶסֶד* passively as Yahweh’s “favored one,” the recipient of His faithful covenant love, especially as it is expressed in the Davidic Covenant.

The other key term, *שִׁחַת*, has been translated either “pit” or “decay.” The Hebrew form can be derived either from *חָתַת* meaning “to dig” or from *שִׁחַת*, meaning “to corrupt.” Scholars are divided on the proper translation. Some scholars, the LXX and most versions choose “corruption,” while Delitzsch, Driver and other Old Testament scholars prefer “pit.” Either rendering fits the parallelism with Sheol. Several points however, can be made in support of “corruption” over “pit.” First, *שִׁחַת* often has the meaning of

²⁵ H. J. Stoebe, "חֶסֶד", in *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, ed. Jenni, Ernst Westermann, Claus, trans. Biddle, Mark E. (Peabody: MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997), 2:463.

²⁶ Kirkpatrick, *Psalms*, 835.

decay or corruption in the cognate languages²⁸ and in later Hebrew usage in Qumran texts.²⁹ Second, the meaning of corruption for שחת could fit all other occurrences of the term without violating context or parallelism,³⁰ and is clearly the better translation in passages such as Psalm 30:9 and Job 17:14.³¹ Third, the more common Hebrew terms for “pit” are בַּאֵר, בּוֹר, שׁוּקָה, פְּחַת, שִׁיקָה.³² Fourth, Bierberg observes that “according to Hebrew usage, this verb (רָאָה), when employed to express the ideas of “experiencing,” “enduring,” “proving,” and the like, takes for its object a noun indicative of *state* of soul or body.... On the contrary, when indicating the idea of *place* (e.g. pit, grave, sheol, gates of death, etc.), the Hebrew authors invariably use a verb of motion: for example, “to go,” “to descend,” etc.³³ This verse uses a verb of experiencing (רָאָה) so a more natural noun would be one of condition, such as “corruption,” rather than place (“pit”). Thus the translation “corruption” seems justified in the Hebrew text.

²⁷ In fact, Paul uses Isaiah 55:3 in connection with Psalm 16:10 in Acts 13:34-35.

²⁸ R.P. Bierberg, "Conserva Me Domine Psalm 16 (15)" (Ph.D. dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1945), 75.

²⁹ Roland E. Murphy, "שחת in the Qumran Literature," *Biblica* 39 (1958). More research needs to go to evaluating in detail Murphy's arguments.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Harris, "Sheol", 132

³² Gleason L. Archer and G. Chirichigno, *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1983), 63.

³³ Bierberg, "Conserva", 82. Note: For brevity, I have omitted the many examples cited within his sentences. He does not provide a full usage study of the various terms. If a comprehensive study validates his assertion, it would offer significant support for the idea of corruption.

In summary, the terminology of Psalm 16:10 communicates the promise of deliverance from the corruption of the grave, i.e. resurrection before decay. This promise extends to the דָּוִד , the referent in the Davidic Covenant. The focal issues are the meanings of the key terms and the covenantal setting of the psalm. Closely related to these issues and significant for the interpretation of Psalm 16:8-11 are David's messianic consciousness and his likely view of resurrection.

David's Messianic Consciousness. David spoke prophetically of a Messiah, a Messiah of whom he had awareness. That awareness of a coming Messiah seems tied to two key passages. First, the Davidic Covenant and his responses to it may hint at an expectation of a greater Son. Second, Ps 110 speaks of One who is David's lord and yet is distinct from Yahweh. Substantial evidence exists that proves that neither David nor any of his sons before Christ could be the referent of the "Lord" in Ps 110:1. Though David and Solomon were involved in worship ritual, it is debatable whether either actually performed sacrifices as a priest would. Further, Heb 7:12-13 makes clear that no one from the tribe of Judah ever served at the altar as a priest. That the "Lord" of Ps 110:1 is Jesus finds substantial support in the New Testament.³⁴

David's Understanding of Resurrection. That David spoke of Messiah's resurrection finds further support in the probability of David holding a developed resurrection view. Afterlife hopes filled the world of the Ancient Near East. Immortality beliefs consistently rise from Egyptian writings such as the Osiris myth. Further examples include segments of the Gilgamesh Epic, Descent of Ishtar and Tale of Aqhat. A developed afterlife belief would be expected in David's world. The Bible also leads to

³⁴ See especially Matt 22:41-45 and parallel accounts.

an expectation of a resurrection belief. Enoch's escape of death posits the foundational truth that God can overcome death. Hannah's prayer also confirms Yahweh's ability to overturn death (1 Sam 2:6). Many scholars see a resurrection expectation in Job as well. Though the Job passages are debated, respected authorities such as Kaiser and Smick support a resurrection stance.³⁵ The clearest support for an early resurrection belief comes from Hebrews 11:19. Abraham recognized that God could and would raise Isaac from the dead in order to fulfill His promise. This passage is key because it reveals the recipient (Abraham) of God's promise understanding Yahweh's ability to raise the recipient's promised offspring (Isaac) from the dead to keep His covenant (Abraham Covenant). Similarly, Psalm 16 records the recipient (David) of God's promise understanding Yahweh's power to raise the recipient's promised offspring (Messiah) from the dead to keep His covenant (Davidic Covenant). Within the psalms themselves a theological framework existed that is completely compatible with a resurrection belief. For the psalmists, life centered in Yahweh (31:14-15, 37:23). He alone was in control of life because He alone was everlasting and perfectly free. (90:2, 102:23-27). He also was the source of life (36:7-9, 21:4) and held death in his power (104:29). These foundations allowed David to contrast those whose portion is in this life with himself who will wake³⁶ in God's presence (Ps 17:13-15). Though a very strong case for a belief in general resurrection exists, the argument needs only prove that David could have expected God to

³⁵ Walter C. Jr. Kaiser, *Hard Sayings of the Old Testament* (Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1988), 149-51 and Elmer B. Smick, "Job", ed. Gaebelien, F.E. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing, 1991), 4:943.

³⁶ Note that the imagery of death as sleep is clearly used by David in Ps 13:3.

raise Messiah from the dead in order to keep His promise, thus an exceptional resurrection. This fits well with Peter's commentary in Acts 2:31.

Summary. David wrote Psalm 16 with a Davidic Covenant backdrop. His words moved from Yahweh's present blessings to the expected blessing of the future. The expected blessing is the resurrection of David's promised offspring, Messiah. Messiah's resurrection would ensure the ultimate fulfillment of God's covenant with David. David describes a special resurrection in Psalm 16, a resurrection occurring before any bodily decay. This fits both with the Old Testament evidence and with Peter's interpretation in Acts 2.

PSALM 16 IN INTERTESTAMENTAL INTERPRETATION

Intertestamental interpretation did not greatly affect the apostolic understanding of Psalm 16. First, the rabbinic interpreters held a variety of messianic views. These views did not produce a consensus understanding that would have shaped the apostles' thinking. Rather their divergent and often conflicting messianic conceptions reflected and perhaps helped produce a generation of Jews who did not recognize the true Messiah when He was in their midst. Second, though resurrection belief flourished in rabbinic literature, the literature does not portray the resurrection of Messiah. The writings at times speak of Messiah's work producing a resurrection, but not of the resurrection of the Messiah Himself. Third, the only relevant known rabbinic connections in Psalm 16 either link David to Messiah from the use of "glory" in 16:9 or suggest that Psalm 16:10 guaranteed that David's body would never decay in the grave.

Rabbinic literature does not then provide an interpretive stream between David and Peter. Rather the writings reveal a mosaic of messianic and resurrection views, none

of which can be understood as informing Peter's interpretation. The more likely source of Peter's interpretive practice is found in Jesus' personal instruction.

INTERPRETATION OF PSALM 16 IN ACTS 2

Text of Psalm 16 Quote. The Acts 2 quotation of Psalm 16 follows the LXX exactly.³⁷ The LXX differs from the MT in several areas. First, the LXX reads “sees” in Psalm 16:8 where the MT reads שׁוֹרֵי (“set”). The difference is minor and does not affect the NT usage of the quote. Second, the LXX reads “my tongue” in 16:9 where the MT reads כְּבוֹדִי (“my glory”). The reason for this change is debated but does not alter the NT use.³⁸ Third, the LXX reads “in hope” in 16:9 where the MT reads לְבִטָּח (“in security”). Steyn sees that this change helps allow a resurrection reading of the psalm and that the change resulted from the thriving resurrection belief in the era the LXX was translated.³⁹ Bock, citing Rese, however recognizes that the change is not crucial to a resurrection meaning, but rather the context is determinative.⁴⁰ Since it has been earlier proved that the original context was indeed a resurrection context, this translation is a fit rendering of the MT. Fourth, some say that a change of meaning occurred when the LXX translated MT 16:10 to say “corruption” rather than “pit.” Above it has been

³⁷ Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 12, 1987), 172.

³⁸ Bock (172) sees the change as coming from the language of rejoicing. Schmitt also holds this view (Cited in Gert Jacobus Steyn, *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the Acts Apostolorum* (Pharos, 1995), 106).

³⁹ Steyn, *Quotations*, 106.

⁴⁰ Bock, *Proclamation*, 175.

demonstrated that “corruption” is the proper rendering of רָשָׁע . Fifth, some claim that the LXX shifts the meaning of 16:10 from a life pleasing to God (supposed MT reading) to an eternal life with God. Like the third change noted above, the issue hinges on context. It has been shown that the original context was indeed a life enduring after death so the LXX is appropriately translating the meaning of the MT.

In conclusion, the LXX translation of Psalm 16:8-11 represents a fair rendering of the MT. It accurately communicates the meanings of the Hebrew terms in the context of the resurrection spoken of by David.

Peter’s Interpretation in Acts 2:25-31. The introduction of 2:22-24 leads to the Psalm 16 quotation in 2:25-28 followed by commentary on the quote in 2:29-31. Peter alludes to Psalm 18 (2:24) when he says it was impossible for Jesus to be held in death’s power. The reason it was impossible was that David prophesied long ago that the Messiah would be resurrected.⁴¹ The psalm quoted is attributed to David, but Peter says David does not speak of himself, but of Jesus (2:25).⁴²

Significant for this study is the inspired commentary Peter gives on David and his psalm. Unlike most Old Testament citations, Psalm 16 here is interpreted in detail by the apostle. Peter makes several critical points concerning David in 2:29-31. First, Peter says that David died and his tomb was there to this day.⁴³ If any hearer clung to the rabbinic tradition that decay would not touch David’s body, the tomb was near. Second,

⁴¹ The explanatory connective links the Psalm 18 allusion to the Psalm 16 quotation.

⁴² That this phrase should be seen as an exclusive reference will be affirmed by Peter in 2:29-31.

⁴³ Josephus supports this statement (*Antiquities* 13.249 and *War* 1.61).

David spoke prophetically.⁴⁴ Third, Peter says that David spoke of the Messiah (2:31). David's speaking of the Messiah is modified by three causal participles⁴⁵ explaining his prophetic speech.⁴⁶ The first causal participle established David as a prophet, a claim recognized as true by his audience.⁴⁷ The second participle links the prophecy to David's knowing that God had promised him a descendant to sit on his throne.⁴⁸ Here the passage connects ultimately back to the Davidic Covenant of 2 Samuel 7. Peter is linking the resurrection of Christ to the promise of an eternal throne in the Davidic Covenant. Paul makes the same basic argument with Psalm 16 in Acts 13 where he also ties the eternal promises to David to the resurrection of Christ. The third states that David foresaw the resurrection of Messiah and spoke of it.⁴⁹

A major issue to explore is similar passages where the apostles interpret Old Testament passages. Understanding that there exists a wide variety of ways that the New Testament employs the Old, not all uses of the Old Testament in the New can be surveyed.

⁴⁴ The term is here used to draw an inference or conclusion based on the reality of David's death and decay.

⁴⁵ Einwechter, "Peter's Use of Psalm 16," 67-68.

⁴⁶ The term is used to denote prophetic utterances. See R.C.H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles* (Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1944), 94.

⁴⁷ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "David 'Being Therefore a Prophet . . .,'" *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 34:3 (July 1972), 332-339. See also I. Howard Marshall, *The Acts of the Apostles*, The Tyndale New Testament Commentary Series, R.V.G. Tasker, editor (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1980), 76.

⁴⁸ Here Peter alludes to Psalm 132:11.

⁴⁹ Here Peter quotes again Psalm 16:10 changing the verbs to aorist tense to clarify his application of the verse to Jesus.

CONCLUSION

David directly prophesied of Messiah's resurrection. Peter then employed David's original meaning to demonstrate that Jesus' resurrection fulfilled David's messianic prophecy and thus proved that Jesus was the Messiah. This position seems to be the view that most accurately understands the original meaning of Psalm 16 and respects the meaning of Peter's interpretation of the psalm.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Archer, Gleason L. and G. Chirichigno. *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1983.
- Bierberg, R.P. "Conserva Me Domine Psalm 16 (15)." Ph.D. dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1945.
- Bock, Darrell L. "Use of the Old Testament in the New." In *Foundations for Biblical Interpretation: A Complete Library of Tools and Resources*, eds. David S. Dockery, Kenneth A. Mathews and Robert B. Sloan, 97-114. Nashville, TN: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 1994.
- Brown, Francis A., S. R. Driver and Charles Briggs. *The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1979.
- Dahood, Mitchell. "The Root *Azb* II in Job." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (Quarter? 1959): 303-9.
- Driver, S.R. "The Method of Studying the Psalter: Psalm XVI." *Expositor* 7, no. 10 (1910): 26-37.
- Hagner, Donald A. "The Old Testament in the New." In *Interpreting the Word of God*, eds. Samuel J. Schultz and Morris Inch, A., . Chicago: Moody Press, 1976.
- Harris, R. Laird. "The Meaning of the Term *Sheol* As Shown by Parallels in Poetic Texts." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 4 (December 1961): 129-35.
- Hooke, S.H. "Israel and the Afterlife." *Expository Times* 76 (May 1965): 236-9.

- Johnson, S. Lewis. *The Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980.
- Kaiser, Walter C. Jr. *Hard Sayings of the Old Testament*. Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1988.
- _____. "The Promise to David in Psalm 16 and Its Application in Acts 2:25-33 and 13:32-37." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 23 (September 1980): 219-29.
- Kautzsch, L. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. 2nd ed. Translated by A.E. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.
- Kirkpatrick, A.F. *The Book of Psalms*. 1902; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1982.
- Lampe, G. W. H. and K. J. Woolcombe. *Essays in Typology*. London: SCM Press, 1957.
- Murphy, Roland E. "שָׁחַת" in the Qumran Literature." *Biblica* 39 (1958): 61-6.
- Perowne, J. J. Stewart. *The Book of Psalms*. 1878; reprint, Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing, 1966.
- Smick, Elmer B. "Job." In 4:, ed. F.E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing, 1991.
- Stoebe, H. J. "חָסַד." In *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 2:462-4, eds. Ernst Jenni, Claus Westermann, trans. Mark E. Biddle. Peabody: MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997.
- Stuart, M. "Interpretation of Psalm XVI." *The Biblical Repository* 1 (January 1831): 51-110.
- VanGemeren, W.A. "Psalms." Vol. 5, ed. F.E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing, 1991.
- Waltke, Bruce K. "נָפֵשׁ." In *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, 2:587-91, eds. R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Jr. Archer, Bruce K. Waltke. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980.
- Williams, R.J. *Hebrew Syntax: An Outline*. 2nd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.