

## Episode #1107 – Acts 1 Part 2-Wait In Jerusalem!

I. Acts is unique in the New Testament. Rather than the ministry of Jesus Christ on earth, it focuses on what came after, when the Lord had ascended back into heaven. The Lord left His disciples with many commands to carry out, and Acts tells us how they did them.

II. The Lord commands His apostles. Acts 1:2-5.

- A. Luke 24:44-45. He opened their understanding, so that they might comprehend the Scriptures. These men, once this teaching was done, must have had great knowledge of the truth. Many seem to view the twelve as generally clueless men who never seemed to really “get” or understand the truths the Lord was trying to teach them. Those who look at it this way always seem to view themselves as being more intelligent, and thus believe that they understand the truths that these men missed. But in the light of Luke 24:44-45, it is absolutely wrong to think of the disciples, from this point on, as being clueless. They understood better than we do!
- B. What the Lord taught His disciples was the kingdom of God. He was not teaching them about a new religion called Christianity or some organization He wanted them to form called “the church.” Nor was He focusing on what He was going to do in heaven, or proclaiming it as their future home. He was telling them about God’s government of the world, the very government that John the Baptist and the Lord Himself had proclaimed throughout their earthly ministries. He had not left the “physical kingdom” behind for some “spiritual kingdom” in their hearts. From this point on, these men who had their understandings opened understood the kingdom and what it was that the Lord wanted them to do regarding it. It is only a mark of pure, personal ignorance for men to claim from this point on that the disciples did not understand what the Lord had been teaching when He told them about the kingdom of God. It is the scholars and preachers of today, not the disciples, who do not understand.
- C. Verse 4. He told them not to depart from Jerusalem. Luke 24:13. Some were starting to scatter from Jerusalem after the Lord had died. The command given to them by the angels was to meet Him in Galilee. (Matthew 28:10 and Mark 16:7.) They certainly did go there and meet Him, Matthew 28:16 and John 21:1. At this point in the forty days they are back in Jerusalem, and their command is to remain there and to wait for the Promise of the Father. What was this? The same promise which they had already heard about from Him. Luke 24:49. “Power from on high,” the same as the “spirit holy” we talked about earlier: the power and gift of the Holy Spirit.
- D. Verse 5. Now the Lord turns their minds back to the baptism of John. We come upon this important word “baptism.”

III. The meaning of “baptism” in Greek.

- A. Many believe that baptism means a water ritual. Yet the Lord here contrasts a baptism which is a water ritual with another baptism which is not.
- B. The word “baptism” is not a translation of a Greek word at all. Instead, it is a transliteration of a Greek word, *baptismos*. The translators have just changed the ending to turn this into an English word. So what would a translation of this word be? Some have suggested “dip” or “immerse” as translations of the Greek word *baptismos*. But how could the Lord Jesus “immerse” His people with fire, Matthew 3:11 and Luke 3:16?

- C. It is true that the original, and we might say the basic, meaning of the Greek word baptism was “to dip.” John 13:26. Yet this word developed over time, and was used in new situations and given new meanings and connotations. This is something that often happens to words. The English word “broadcast,” originally meant to scatter seeds, as a farmer would do when planting a field. Today when we hear this word we think of the transmission of information over great distances. The same is true of the word *baptismos*. It developed a deeper meaning, more than likely through its use by the dyeing industry. Revelation 19:13.
- D. When you dye a piece of cloth, you will start off with a white or off-white cloth and a dye of blue, red, purple, or some other color. You “dip” the cloth in the dye, and when it comes out, it is a blue or a red or a purple cloth. The dye and the cloth are now identified or merged together. Thus, the word *baptismos* came to take on the meaning of an identification: one that is meant to be permanent and results in a merger.
- E. The best illustration of this idea may be a marriage. Two individuals who were completely independent of each other are merged together into one family. We could call marriage a baptism of two people with each other.
- F. What was it that John was identifying or merging people with? He was using a water ceremony, but this was just a symbol and a ritual that went along with the true baptism. Mark 1:4. John’s baptism was a baptism of repentance.

#### IV. The meaning of “repentance” in Greek.

- A. The Greek word is *metanoia*, *meta* means after and *noia* means mind. The idea is to make up your mind now, so that no matter what comes after, you will not change it.
- B. The idea of *metanoia* is clear in the wedding vows. A man and a woman pledge that “for better or for worse, for richer or for poorer, in sickness and in health,” that they will remain married to each other. They don’t know if things in their lives will go better or worse. Yet this wedding vow promises that, no matter what comes after, these two people will stay married to each other. If they mean that vow, then what they have is truly an “aftermind.”
- C. A better translation of *metanoia* than repentance would be submission. John was identifying people as submissive to God. John’s baptism was a promise, just like the marriage vows. When the situations that came later actually happened, it would be made clear whether they actually did have an aftermind or not.

#### V. The Kingdom Now? Acts 1:5-8.

- A. Acts 1:5. What of this new baptism with the Holy Spirit that Christ tells His disciples about here in Acts 1:5? Remember there are four phrases for “the Holy Spirit.” In this case, the definite articles are not there. They were to be identified, not with the Person of the Holy Spirit, but instead with His work, His gifts, and His power. This is important, because if they were to be baptized with the Person of the Holy Spirit, then this could be done internally and invisibly in a person’s heart when he is saved. Yet identification with the power of the Holy Spirit could not be this way. No one can rightfully claim to be baptized with the spirit holy of God without being able to demonstrate that holy power in his life and actions. The power of the Spirit is a clear demonstration. It is not something that can be faked, or something that can be claimed and yet not deliver when it is called upon to do so. We have every right to ask those who claim to be identified with God’s power to demonstrate that power. If they

cannot do so, then they are not speaking the truth. These men, however, had every right to expect that great power would be granted to them, and they did indeed receive that power, as the Lord said, not many days from when He made this statement to them, as we will learn about in Acts 2.

VI. Conclusion: The Lord during the forty days between His resurrection and ascension taught His disciples about the kingdom of God, demonstrating that they knew about these things much better than theologians today. They were not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the power of the Holy Spirit to be identified with them. It was an open, obvious identification, and no one today has the right to claim to be baptized with the Holy Spirit today who cannot show forth the power. The Acts period was a time of power, whereas today we live in the time of God's silence. We must rightly divide between the Acts period and today.