

Message# 192 - 6-05-2022 - Christians Believe that Jesus Fulfilled the Prophets - H2O Water Baptism Ended with the Old Covenant

Preached first on 6/05/2022 on www.molibertyradio.us

Good morning everyone. Thank you for tuning into the message. I want to let you know that each week we continue to get positive emails coming in regarding this series of messages:

Christians Believe that Jesus Fulfilled the Prophets - H2O Water Baptism Ended with the Old Covenant

When I began this series, I did receive a few objections and basically all I felt like I could do - at that time - was simply to ask the listener to continue listening to the rest of the series - then make up their mind after they heard more of where we were going in the series. Maybe they chose to just tune out - having heard what they thought was enough - I don't know - but with the exception of just a few listeners - all the emails that have come since then - have all been very positive responses. That is encouraging.

It's encouraging because - *as I have warned many times before* - if what you believe about the Bible has been shaped or molded in any form - by something that calls itself "church" - I'm telling you - you better go back and reevaluate every single thing you think you know - because this thing called "church" - has gotten pretty much every single thing there is to know from the Bible - they have gotten it wrong.

I'm sure many people who have heard me say that have scoffed and sadly - as soon as they heard it - they probably tuned me out and maybe never listened again. I can't help that. The times we are in do not allow for sugar-coating or coddling or guiding unwilling people to truth. You have to speak the truth, even when the truth is offensive, or hurts.

First of all, and again, said it a thousand times - the English word "church" should not even be in our Bibles - maybe - maybe - with the one time where the temple of the false goddess Diana was called a "church" - but other than that - the Greek word for "church" which is kurias or kuriakon - has been wrongly - and I absolutely believe intentionally - it's been twisted - in order to dupe people into the place where they are today - that "church" is one and the same with the Greek word that's actually found in the Greek text - which is ekklesia. The Greek word ekklesia is what is found in the text - it's not kurikos or kuriakon of the English Bible - where the translators despicably put the word "church." "Church" comes from kuriakos or kuriakon in the Greek. It does not

come from the Greek ekklesia.

Ekklesia in the Greek - is the same word the Greeks used to describe government. It is not a building or place designated for people to come together to sing songs, collect money, and be preached to.

Jesus Christ was setting up a One World Government where His Father would once again rule Israel and the world - just like it was intended from before the day of Creation.

No "church" anywhere teaches this. No "church" anywhere teaches that the Kingdom of God is the Only Legitimate Government found in the world and all men everywhere are to come out from the idols of manmade government that they have created for themselves out of rebellion to the King of kings and Lord of lords - and live exclusively as Citizens of the Kingdom God - also known as the Commonwealth of Israel.

"Churches" are not just in name - *but in action* - are the religious arm of the state - not just in the U.S. - but in every nation that covers this earth.

If you are listening to someone preach or teach the Bible, and they have not even reached the understanding that the word "church" should not be in our English Bibles - and - in fact - in the very first completed English Bible - the Coverdale Bible - the word "church" is not found. The only time even a form of the word is found is in Acts 19:37 where Paul said he was not a "churchrobber" - one word - and he was speaking of the temple of the false goddess Diana.

William Tyndale was burned at the stake as a Bible translator - and one of the main reasons was because he would not use the word "church" in his translation. Coverdale, who finished the work of Tyndale - stayed true to Tyndale's conviction and a great debt of gratitude should be paid to those men who gave their lives for truth - but instead - as it regrettably seems to be when it comes to truth - a lot of the time - evil seems to prop its ugly head back up and once again capture the thoughts of most people.

This is why the Christian faith uses terms such as vigilance, fighting the good fight of faith, subduing thoughts, capturing minds, etc. It is a constant fight against evil for the minds of men.

So that no one can misunderstand what I am saying - if a Bible teacher uses the word

“church” in a positive way - or even thinks they are using it when they think they are referring to Ekklesia - then friends - I'd be as watchful as I could be when letting any they say enter my ears. And I'd be extra careful when my children are in the room. If someone does not even know the English word “church” should not be in our Bibles - they have much to learn and should not be a teacher of the Word.

Look around you today. In the u.s., you can't travel more than a mile - unless you are out on the interstate highway - you cannot travel more than a mile without seeing a “church” building. Teresa and I live in the country - very rural. Just to get from our house to an interstate is about 12 miles. In that area - we'll pass one “church” that's still going - another one - that thankfully went out of business - and then two more - just in that 12 mile area of rural pastureland. “Churches” are everywhere - yet the u.s. is quite possibly the most God forsaken place in all the earth right now. Evil is totally out of control. It's just crazy what is going on in the u.s. right now. And, getting worse and worse each day.

Do you think there's any chance that the fact that there are more “churches” than just about any other institution in the u.s. - do you think there is any correlation there? “Of course, there isn't, how ridiculous?”

If you listened to the “churches” - this is all supposed to be happening. Because out of control evil, the loss of the family, turning against the Bible, turning against Christ, lawlessness turning against God the Father - well - that's all the plan of God. That's fulfilling Bible prophecy. That's what God wants. Thanks to the “church” that's what most people - inside the “church” and outside the “church” believe. Everything that is going on in the world today - all the evil - that's God's plan. It's Bible prophecy - so - not only is there nothing you can do about it - there's nothing you should do about it - because to resist the fulfillment of Bible prophecy is to resist God Himself. That - is the message of the “church.”

The “government” created this ridiculous corona-virus madness - and the “government” had the solution - lockdowns and vaccines - and by far - by far - the overwhelming number of “churches” in the u.s. were totally onboard with the most obvious plans for destruction that I have ever seen in my lifetime. This whole hoax was crystal clear from day one. Yes, there were some “churches” and “churchmen” that offered a little bit of resistance - but in the end - that was simply “controlled opposition.” It was used by the “government” to actually strengthen the “church” because the “church” has been losing credibility for quite a while and a little perceived

“persecution” can go a long way towards re-strengthening the ranks.

“Churches” are 501(c)(3) government corporations. For anyone who would think for two minutes - what this means in light of the teachings of Christ - anyone should be able to see that someone who claims to be the “body of Christ” should not be incorporated by men's governments.

But they don't see it - they can't see it. Why? Because “churches” and the people who go to them - are filled with people who have mistaken “churchianity” for Christianity.

Churches teach churchianity - they do not teach Christianity.

I'm telling you - if there is one single thing that you believe about the Bible - that has been shaped, formed or molded by this thing called “church” - you better go back and reevaluate it - reevaluate it from the perspective that Christ set up His Government in the first century and commands every man, woman, boy and girl to come out from men's little g governments and into His One True Kingdom - reevaluate it from the understanding that ALL - A-L-L Bible prophecy was fulfilled by Jesus the Christ - in the first century - because if you do not do this - there is no possible way you can understand the Bible.

When we were studying a couple weeks ago - we were in Luke 24 - turn there quickly so we can see this again - we were studying Luke 24 and we came across verses 44-45. Look at it again - I thought this was so important - I put it on the Home page of the website and it's at the top of the Audio page now:

And He said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me.

Then opened He their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures,

I sure hope you see this. Once He told them that all things must be fulfilled - the things written in the Law, the things written in the prophets and in the psalms - after this - then the text says -

Then opened He their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures.

More proof. More Biblical evidence that if someone does not understand and believe

that Jesus fulfilled All Bible prophecy, He fulfilled the Law God gave Moses, He fulfilled the Psalms - if we don't believe those things - we cannot understand the Scriptures.

It just amazes me how much people today think that things in the Bible don't really apply to them. We have all been raised up in an atmosphere - a spiritual - actually it's a non-spiritual atmosphere - but we've all been raised - because it has been from "church" - that for the most part - we are allowed to basically make up our own religion - our own belief system - and as long as we say the word "Jesus" over it - then that somehow makes it blessed by God - and we are now free to basically do whatever we want to do. It's really strange. Or even, believe anything we want to believe.

I know the origin of it. And, it all has to do with the false doctrine of the requirement for H2O water baptism being carried over from the Old Covenant world into the New.

As long as someone has been "baptized" in some form of physical H2O water - then basically they are as some say "covered by the blood" - which is a silver bullet for living anyway you want to - or - according to the Catholics for instance - quote:

Incorporated into Christ by Baptism, the person baptized is configured to Christ. Baptism seals the Christian with the indelible spiritual mark (character) of his belonging to Christ. No sin can erase this mark, even if sin prevents Baptism from bearing the fruits of salvation.

I was talking with Teresa this week and I said to her, "If we were to go to those who command H2O water baptism and say, 'Alright, we are ready to be H2O water baptized, but first, I would like for you to take your Bible and show me exactly what will take place, because, I need to know that what I am doing is what the Bible teaches, if you will take your Bible and show me exactly what it is we are about to do, then, I'll do it.'"

And, I've asked this same question many times in this series, what does H2O physical water baptism look like in the Bible - brethren - I've been studying this book for over 50 years. The ONLY details as to what physical H2O water baptism looks like is what we find in the Law God gave Moses. And even with those details - it's not enough there to base your "salvation" on if H2O physical water baptism is a requirement in the New Covenant today.

There is, of course, the story of Naaman. Naaman, the Syrian leper, was told by Elisha to go to the river Jordan and baptize himself - dip himself in the water - seven times - to

cure his leprosy. Then, listen now, also in the Old Covenant World, there is the story of Phillip and the Ethiopian eunuch - in which some more details are offered as to what Old Covenant baptism looked like - but even in that story - there's not enough there to say - "This is what physical H2O water baptism is supposed to look like."

For those who command physical H2O water baptism - the only thing they have is "church" tradition.

Several months ago, I linked for you the Catholic Catechism on baptism. It is probably - of all the religions commanding physical H2O water for "salvation" - it offers probably the most details of any of them. And there is absolutely no Biblical citations showing what this thing called "baptism" is supposed to look like.

"Well, you need to get baptized." "Ok. What does that mean? What does that look like? Please show me from the Bible what this process looks like. Is there a ceremony? If so, what words are to be said. Does it require a specific type of water? Should it be done in the river Jordan? Can it be done in a swimming pool? How about a stock tank? How about a pond? Can we use tap water? Can we use water that has fluoride in it?"

All I'm asking - it's a simple request - if I am commanded to be physically baptized in H2O today - in the New Covenant World - exactly what am I supposed to do?

"Well, you get baptized."

It is an endless circle. It's the cat chasing its tail. There is not one single person alive today that can tell you with all honesty - what physical H2O water baptism looks like in the Bible. And, if they say they can, they are lying - unless - they go back to the Law God gave Moses - which offers at best - limited details - as to what the requirements were for the use of physical H2O water - for the remission of illnesses - and for the remission of sins in certain cases - prior to offering the sacrifice of an animal - under the Law God gave Moses.

Every single time we see what appears to be the application of physical H2O water in our Bibles - without question - every single time - it is Old Covenant baptism.

"I indeed baptize you with water" - said John the Baptist - who was clearly baptizing in the Old Covenant world - "but the One coming after me, Whose shoe latchet I am not worthy to unloose, He is going to baptize you with something totally different."

The word John uses there is baptize with fire and with the Holy Ghost. When speaking of the baptism of Christ - John clearly uses the word baptism in referring to what he was doing and referring to what Christ would do. BOTH - both of them were called baptism - but only one of them referred to physical H2O water.

Why is it then - when today - every time we hear the word baptism - we are immediately drawn to physical H2O water in our minds? John clearly referred to Jesus' baptism - fire and the Holy Ghost - has nothing whatsoever to do with water. Why then are we still preferring in our minds - John's baptism - as opposed to the baptism of Christ - which clearly has nothing to do with physical H2O water?

I've asked you before, do you want John's physical H2O water baptism? Or do you want Christ's fire and Holy Ghost baptism? The argument I'm making right now - when I talk about Christ's fire and Holy Ghost baptism - is not concerning fire and the Holy Ghost - as far as knowing exactly what those two phrases meant - so much as - there were clearly TWO baptisms spoken of by John - and only one of them had anything to do with physical H2O water. One was physical water - John said, "I **indeed** baptize you with water. BUT - BUT - the One coming after me is going to baptize you with something other than water."

They are both baptisms. One is clearly water - the other is not. Why then, are we always assuming baptism means water?

As I was once again looking at the Catholic Catechism on baptism, the opening two paragraphs say this, quote:

1213 Holy Baptism is the basis of the whole Christian life, the gateway to life in the Spirit (vitae spiritualis ianua),

Sorry, but I don't speak Latin. Continuing:

and the door which gives access to the other sacraments. Through Baptism we are freed from sin and reborn as sons of God; we become members of Christ, are incorporated into the Church and made sharers in her mission: "Baptism is the sacrament of regeneration through water in the word."

I. WHAT IS THIS SACRAMENT CALLED?

1214 This sacrament is called Baptism , after the central rite by which it is carried out: to baptize (Greek baptizein) means to "plunge" or "immerse"; the "plunge" into the water symbolizes the catechumen's burial into Christ's death, from which he rises up by resurrection with him, as "a new creature."

This is the opening paragraph? They are basing their entire opening paragraph on a lie.

As I have shown before, the root bapto, does not mean water. In fact, it rarely means water. It does mean "to dip, to immerse, to stain."

Water does not stain.

In a study called The Meaning of Baptizein in Greek, Jewish, and Patristic Literature, by Eckhard Schnabel - who I have no idea who he is - I'll just tell you that right now - but what he wrote concerning the meaning of the word baptism is really really good, quote:

<https://www.bsw.org/filologia-neotestamentaria/vol-24-2011/the-meaning-of-baptizein-in-greek-jewish-and-patristic-literature/635/article-p5.html>

"The English term 'baptize' is not a translation of the Greek term Baptizein, but a transliteration. Translators of the New Testament who translate Baptizein with 'baptize' have to assume that the readers of their translation are familiar with the meaning of the English term - a technical religious term that is not used in contemporary English in non-Christian or non-religious contexts. The meaning of the English verb 'to baptize' can be defined, with the standard Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, as "to use water in a rite for purpose of renewing or establishing a relationship with God" in most cases denoting "the Christian sacrament of initiation after Jesus' death."

Let me stop for just a second, he said this was from the Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament - and I don't doubt this at all - this guy is very scholarly from what I've been reading - but what I want to mention is that that statement is also word for word what is found in the Catholic Catechism on Baptism. Continuing with Schnabel - this is very good.

"Merriam-Webster's New Encyclopedic Dictionary captures the popular understanding of "baptize" in the definition" to administer baptism to" (while defining 'baptism' as "a Christian sacrament signifying spiritual rebirth and admitting the recipient to the

Christian community through the ritual use of water.”) The College Dictionary Edition of Merriam-Webster attempts to integrate etymological [the origin of words] into its definition: “to immerse (an individual) in water, to pour or sprinkle water over (the individual), as a symbol of admission into Christianity or a specific Christian church.” The Oxford English Dictionary seeks to include in its definition the meaning of the Greek term more consistently, while reflecting the sense of the word in ecclesial practice in the Christian traditions that practice infant baptism by sprinkling water on the newborn child: “to immerse in water, or pour or sprinkle water upon, as a means of ceremonial purification, or in token of initiation into a religious society, especially into the Christian Church.”

What these definitions do not show is the particular understanding of the term 'to baptize' that modern readers of the New Testament assume who belong to the Roman Catholic church or to Lutheran, Reformed, Baptist, Pentecostal (or I add churches of Christ churches). The problems inherent with translating baptizein with 'to baptize' can be seen in the discussion of the use of baptizein in Acts 1:5 in a handbook for Bible translators: “The verb baptize may require a direct object, that is, “John baptized people with water.... Some translators have objected to using the same term for 'baptism of the Holy Spirit' and 'baptism with water.' For 'baptism water' they may have some expression as “to enter the water' or 'to receive water on the head'; while for 'baptism of the Holy Spirit' they have 'for the Holy Spirit to enter people.' Not to employ parallelism in these two expressions is, however, unfortunate. One can usually employ some sort of related structure, for example, 'to cause water to come upon' and 'to cause the Holy Spirit to come upon.’”

While the authors recognize the problem of translating baptizein in contexts that mention a physical substance such as water, and in other contexts where a physical substance is not present, they do not address the meaning of the Greek term. The suggestion that the verb could be translated with “to receive water on the head” is not informed by the use of the Greek term in Greek and Jewish texts but by baptismal practices - [traditions] - in Christian churches.”

Listen to this.

“Another example for the lack of interest in the meaning of the Greek term and the (implicit) assumption that baptizein is a technical term can be found in comments on Matthew 3:1 in another handbook for translators: “Some translators have treated Baptist as a proper name, and simply written it as it would be pronounced in their

language. Others have tried to translate it as 'the one who baptizes' or the 'the one they called the Baptizer.' Such translations depend on how 'baptize' itself is translated, and this can be a major problem. In many cultures where baptism is completely unknown. Where it has been introduced by the churches, different denominations have often disagreed on method and theological implications, and have even introduced the terms they have used to translate; for example, 'sprinkling', or 'immersing'. To avoid these problems, translators have either borrowed the Greek word 'baptize' or used expressions like 'putting on of water', 'putting on God's water', 'washing', or 'God's washing'. Translators should always consider this problem carefully, keeping in mind the terms used by the churches in their area and the practice of the ritual itself.'

The “theological implications” of Christian water baptism should surely not control how the Greek term baptizein is translated, particularly in a passage which describes an action involving water in a purely Jewish context. Christian baptism as “introduced by the churches” was unknown in Second Temple Judaism: the early Christians who used the Greek term baptizein did not coin an (artificial) loan word from another language in order to describe what they were doing when they marked the fact that people had repented of their sins, turned to God, had come to faith in Jesus, and pledged their allegiance to Jesus as Israel's Messiah, Savior, and Lord in a public act of immersion in water.

Two factors make awareness of a “technical meaning fallacy” in the rendering of baptizein as 'to baptize' difficult. First, since all Bible translations agree in their use of the English word 'to baptize' as translation of the Greek term, the only exceptions being Mark 7:4 and Luke 11:38 where baptizein is usually translated as 'to wash' or 'to bathe', the readers of these translations are never informed about the standard meaning of the Greek term. Second, commentators, with very few exceptions, regarding baptizein as a technical term which needs no elaboration as such “notwithstanding questions regarding the origins of Christian water baptism, the connection between water baptism and Spirit baptism, or the question whether infants were baptized in the earliest churches. A good example is W. Bieder whose entry on baptidzo and baptisma in the Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament includes no explanation of the Greek terms.

The standard lexicons for classical and New Testament Greek, especially the latter, facilitate the technical meaning fallacy. The venerable Greek-English Lexicon by Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott and Henry Stuart Jones, whose ninth edition (with Revised Supplement by Peter G. W. Glare) reports three senses in the entry for baptidzo.

1. *dip plunge, to be drowned, (of ships) sink, flood (the city); transferred sense; overwhelm, flood, to be drenched, soaked in wine, over head and ears in debt;*
2. *draw wine by dipping (the cup in the bowl);*
3. *baptize*

The verb bapto is explained in terms of the following senses:

1. *1a immerse in a liquid, dip;
1b of slaughter;*
2. *colour by immersion, dye:*

I quoted from this book to show you again, that not every time you hear the word baptize - you should think of water. What this man exposes is that associating the word baptism with water - is a fallacy created by something called "church."

The Greek would never immediately associate the word with physical H₂O water. It is dishonest to teach someone to associate the word baptism instantly with a water ritual created by something called "church."

As I was alluding to the words of John the Baptist - he speaks of two baptisms - one - indeed - as he said - had something to do with water - but the other clearly did not. And, the one that clearly did NOT refer to physical H₂O water - was the baptism that Christ would be baptizing with.

Why, when those two baptisms are clearly seen, we are immediately drawn to water - as opposed to say - fire - is amazing to me.

At the very beginning of Schnabel's book, he said:

Translators of the New Testament who translate Baptizein with 'baptize' have to assume that the readers of their translation are familiar with the meaning of the English term - a technical religious term that is not used in contemporary English in non-Christian or non-religious contexts.²

In the book, the footnotes this statement are this:

Only the noun 'baptism' is used in a non-religious sense, albeit rarely; note the

expression 'baptism of fire,' understood as "the undergoing of any severe ordeal or painful experience" or a "soldier's first experience 'under fire' in battle" (Oxford English Dictionary on baptism, 2B.

Every time we hear the word baptism - we should not be immediately drawn to the water ritual created by something called "church." That is not honest. And, it's actually quite deceptive.

But, yes, *absolutely yes now*, we do see what seems to be physical H₂O water being called baptism in our Bibles. Yes, we do. And when we see those acts - when we see them clearly associated with physical H₂O water - they are required washings under the Law God gave Moses. That is all we see in the Bible related to physical water. It's Old Covenant. There is no Old Covenant baptisms or washings - which were clearly deeds of the Law - they were the works of the Law - none of those Old Covenant deeds of the Law - were carried over into the New Covenant.

But what about Mark 16:16, Matthew 28:19-20, Acts 2:38, Acts 22, Romans 6, Galatians 3, Colossians 2, and I Peter 3?

Alright. When we see what appears to be physical H₂O water rituals - those are works of the Law - deeds of the Law - from the Old Covenant. But, remember, not every time we see the word baptism - does it mean physical H₂O water. It is dishonest to associate baptism with physical water. Rarely does the word actually mean water. It does - sometimes - reference physical H₂O water - but it's rare.

Two weeks ago, we examined Romans 6, along with Matthew 28:19-20 and Acts 2:38. Those passages are not referring to physical H₂O water. Being baptized into Christ's death - means being baptized into His death. No where does it say baptized into water in Romans chapter 6. Being baptized into Jesus' name means being immersed into His Authority - into His name. It doesn't say water. It is not a water ritual. It means being immersed, fully consumed by, fully taken over by, the Authority of Jesus Christ in our lives.

When I read from Eckhard Schnabel earlier, I told I don't even know who he is, but I really liked what I was reading, at least the excerpts of what I was reading. He made another statement that I really liked, quote:

The "theological implications" of Christian water baptism should surely not control how the Greek term baptizein is translated, particularly in a passage which describes an

action involving water in a purely Jewish context. Christian baptism as “introduced by the churches” was unknown in Second Temple Judaism: the early Christians who used the Greek term baptizein did not coin an (artificial) loan word from another language in order to describe what they were doing when they marked the fact that people had repented of their sins, turned to God, had come to faith in Jesus, and pledged their allegiance to Jesus as Israel's Messiah, Savior, and Lord in a public act of immersion in water.

So-called “christians” today - H₂O water baptized, poured, sprinkled, immersed or all three and sometimes many times over - are in this society - the very first ones to stand and place their hands on their hearts and “pledge allegiance to the flag of the united states of america - and to the republic for which it stands.”

I'll assure you of this one thing - no way would the followers of Jesus Christ in the first century pledge their allegiance to anyone or anything not named - not under the Authority of Jesus Christ. Every single “church” in this country that I've ever seen, whether inside of the place or outside of it - flies the united states flag over its buildings and the people inside of them.

It was said of the apostles, those who had truly been baptized into Christ, by the way - none of which the Bible records a physical H₂O ritual “baptism” - but it was said of them, “These that have turned the world upside down are come hither, whom Jason hath received, and these all do contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying there is another King, One Jesus.”

There's not a “church” in America today that H₂O water baptizes in the Authority of the One Who is the Only King, the Only Potentate. Every single H₂O water baptism in every single “church” in America is performed in a “baptistry” that has the u.s. flag standing within feet of those waters.

That is the origin of physical H₂O water baptism. It came from the traditions of those things called “churches” and they are not functioning in the Name of - in the Authority of Jesus Christ - they are functioning in the name of - in the authority of the godless state.

To my knowledge, I have spoken Ted's name only two times in all this series. This series - at least from where I am coming from - has never been me vs Ted. Or “Charlie's Living Water baptism vs Ted's H₂O water baptism.” I would challenge any of you that have

been listening that are undecided on this most important issue - to go and read Ted's books on baptism. I have, myself, read them at least 5 times, maybe even more than that. After you have read his books on H2O water baptism, go to the internet and type in "What does the Church of Christ believe about baptism." Click on any link that comes up. You will find what Ted teaches to be exactly what every single 501(c)(3) government controlled "Church of Christ" teaches concerning physical H2O water baptism.

Friends, the government controlled "churches" in America - those institutions that demand men "obey the governments of men" - are not only not the authority on what the Bible teaches concerning man's responsibility to his Creator - but those institutions are in the place they are in to make sure people will not even know about - let alone consider the fact that they are to Come out from among the little g "governments" of the world and pledge their sole allegiance to King Jesus and His Father and His Father's Kingdom and Laws.

I submit to you friends today, that being baptized into Christ means that someone has repented of their sins, turned to God, had come to faith in Jesus, and pledged their allegiance to Jesus as Israel's Messiah, Savior, and Lord.

That is definitely NOT a baptism that any "church" that I have ever heard of in almost 60 years teaches.

Before we examine another instance of true baptism in the New Covenant - I want to show you another example of an Old Covenant baptism. I want to show you from the Bible - not from man's tradition - but from the Bible - where its origins came from.

In the book of Acts, when we see what looks like physical H2O water being applied to a man's body - that is something that was done to fulfill the Law God gave Moses - either as part of a healing of an infirmity - or as a part of cleansing prior to entering the temple.

Turn please to John chapter 9. We'll begin reading in verse 1.

[1] And as Jesus passed by, he saw a man which was blind from his birth.

[2] And his disciples asked him, saying, Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?

[3] Jesus answered, Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents: but that the works of God should be made manifest in him.

[4] I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work.

[5] As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world.

[6] When He had thus spoken, He spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and He anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay,

[7] And said unto him, Go, wash in the pool of Siloam, (which is by interpretation, Sent.) He went his way therefore, and washed, and came seeing.

[8] The neighbours therefore, and they which before had seen him that he was blind, said, Is not this he that sat and begged?

[9] Some said, This is he: others said, He is like him: but he said, I am he.

[10] Therefore said they unto him, How were thine eyes opened?

[11] He answered and said, A man that is called Jesus made clay, and anointed mine eyes, and said unto me, Go to the pool of Siloam, and wash: and I went and washed, and I received sight.

Alright. What was this man's infirmity? He was blind. And what did Jesus do to this man? He made some mud out of his spit and the clay, put it on the man's eyes and told him to do what? Verse 7:

And said unto him, Go, wash in the pool of Siloam, (which is by interpretation, Sent.) He went his way therefore, and washed, and came seeing.

Is this all that Jesus did to this man? No it is not. If you recall when we looked at this a few weeks ago, the end of the chapter was the great conclusion. The man once again met Christ after an inquisition from the Pharisees and the man who was once blind believed that Jesus was the Christ and he worshipped Jesus as the Christ.

Three things to remember here as we move on.

- 1) The man was blind.
- 2) Jesus told the man to go and wash in the pool of Siloam. And immediately, he was cured of his blindness. In this story, it was the washing in the pool of Siloam that cured the blindness. Was it a ritual? Was there something healing about the water? Not enough in the text to know. All we know is that the man was blind. Christ told him to go and wash in the pool of Siloam and he received his sight.
- 3) The man believed that Jesus was the Christ.

Now, turn back to John chapter 5. Let's look at another cleansing pool. The pool of

Bethesda. Apparently, physical H₂O water that for the most part, is not even addressed by the “churches” today because they are mostly interested in fairytales and fantasies as opposed to what the Bible really intends for us to know - but let's take another look at the pool of Bethesda. Verse 1:

- [1] After this there was a feast of the Judahites; and Jesus went up to Jerusalem.
- [2] Now there is at Jerusalem by the sheep market a pool, which is called in the Hebrew tongue Bethesda, having five porches.
- [3] In these lay a great multitude of impotent folk, of blind, halt, withered, waiting for the moving of the water.

I want you to particularly note verse 3. Who were the people laying beside the pool of Bethesda waiting for the moving of the water? One such of these people were the **blind**. What was going on here? What was all this about? I don't know. There isn't enough in the text for us to know what this was all about. I'm sure we could go to the synagogue and read from the rabbis what they want us to know about this. We could possibly go to the Mormon temple and read what Joseph Smith wanted his followers to know what this meant. But as for the Bible, there simply is not enough detail here to know exactly what was going on. What did this all look like? We don't know. Verse 4 offers some, but still not enough to know exactly what was going on.

- [4] For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had.
- [5] And a certain man was there, which had an infirmity thirty and eight years.
- [6] When Jesus saw him lie, and knew that he had been now a long time in that case, he saith unto him, Wilt thou be made whole?
- [7] The impotent man answered him, Sir, I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool: but while I am coming, another steppeth down before me.
- [8] Jesus saith unto him, Rise, take up thy bed, and walk.
- [9] And immediately the man was made whole, and took up his bed, and walked: and on the same day was the sabbath.

So again, in this story, we see what seems like the physical application of H₂O water for curing - among other things - blindness. From John 9 - the pool of Siloam - used for curing blindness.

Just thought of something. When we read the rest of the story, we find the Pharisees furious that Jesus healed this man on the sabbath. But they were not furious that people were in the pool - on the sabbath. Why? Because the pools were also used for cleansing prior to entering the temple. (Sidenote, that was.)

Here in John 5, we see something happening with the pool of Bethesda but Jesus cured the lame man without the water. Nonetheless, there was something of great medicinal value in the first century - with the pool of Siloam and the pool of Bethesda. Was it only ritual in nature? We simply do not know. There's not enough in the text. But once again, in the Old Covenant World - we see great value and importance being placed on physical H2O water.

As I was preparing for this message, I did what I asked you to do. I went to the internet and did a search for "What does the Church of Christ" teach about baptism?

<https://www.christianlandmark.com/the-church-of-christ-teaches-the-truth-on-baptism/>

I clicked on a totally random link. Paragraph E cites the next passage of Scripture that we are going to look at this morning. It is the apostle Paul reciting his conversion experience. We'll look at it in a minute. Before we do, I want to read to you the following from a "church" of Christ article entitled, The Church of Christ Teaches the Truth on Baptism, paragraph E, quote. As I read this, I would like for you to recall the article from Eckhard Schnabel where he said it is fallacy to use the church definitions of the word baptism - as opposed to the Greek definitions of the word. Baptism in the Bible is not a "church" ritual as we have all been told our entire lives. Here's the quote from the "church" of Christ:

E. Does the Bible say what baptism does? Let us consider the following scriptures. In 1 Peter 3:21 it reads, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

Stop right there for just a second. Go ahead, we better do this, no, I'll save it for next time or in the near future - I have another place I'm headed and I want to make sure I save time this morning. But I will say this - this verse is making a clear distinction between Old Covenant baptism - which was the putting away of the filth of the flesh - wash the clothes - bathe the skin - and being baptized - fully immersed - fully consumed

by - the resurrection of Jesus Christ. That's what the verse is saying. Continuing with the article:

Acts 22:16 reads, "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."

Alright. Stop right here again for just a second. Let's jerk Acts 22:16 out of our Bibles and place it on the table and build a doctrine around this verse. Taking this verse all by itself - especially with the dishonest assumption - the fallacy - that H2O water baptism is something new that came onto the scene in the first century - with this other new thing - the "church" leading the way with this new supposed Bible understanding.

"And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."

Let's US not tarry, this morning. Let's go to Acts 22 and read the whole story - not just this one verse. Begin in verse 1. This is Paul speaking and basically giving a brief autobiography of his life.

- [1] Men, brethren, and fathers, hear ye my defence which I make now unto you.
- [2] (And when they heard that he spake in the Hebrew tongue to them, they kept the more silence: and he saith,)
- [3] I am verily a man which am [an Israelite], born in Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, yet brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel, and taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers, and was zealous toward God, as ye all are this day.
- [4] And I persecuted this way unto the death, binding and delivering into prisons both men and women.

Well friends, what does this mean?

He was brought up according to the perfect manner of the Law of the fathers - was zealous toward God - the same as they were - and he persecuted those who were what? He persecuted those that had embraced Jesus as the Christ. That's what Paul said he used to do. But wait a minute - remember Acts 21? James said that he and the thousands of other Judahites which believed and were zealous of the Law. Why then would Paul have been persecuting them? It is because they were zealous of the Law - but not according to the same way the Jews were. James and the rest of the believers in

Jesus the Christ - were zealous of the Law - but were doing so in the Name of - in the Authority of Jesus. The Jews did not accept Jesus as the Messiah. It was a capital crime in their eyes to keep the Law in the Name of - in the Authority of Jesus. But all through the book of Acts - that is exactly what we find the true believers in Christ doing. They were zealous of the Law. They were entering into the temple. They were washing themselves - in the Name of - in the Authority of Jesus Christ.

All through the ministry of Christ, every time He did something miraculous, every time He healed someone, every time He preached and taught, He taught that He was the Messiah. He was the King. He had the Authority and Power from God to do what He was doing. And the Jews hated Him for it. Why then, just a very short time difference between Christ walking on the earth doing the things He did, and the events of the book of Acts taking place - why would we think it some strange thing that the people in Jerusalem would be divided - those keeping the Law in Christ's name - and those refusing to keep the Law in Christ's name? Why do we struggle with this so much? It's pretty easy to see - or should be. Verse 5.

[5] As also the high priest doth bear me witness, and all the estate of the elders: from whom also I received letters unto the brethren, and went to Damascus, to bring them which were there bound unto Jerusalem, for to be punished.

[6] And it came to pass, that, as I made my journey, and was come nigh unto Damascus about noon, suddenly there shone from heaven a great light round about me.

[7] And I fell unto the ground, and heard a voice saying unto me, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?

[8] And I answered, Who art Thou, Lord? And He said unto me, I am Jesus of Nazareth, Whom thou persecutest.

[9] And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid; but they heard not the voice of Him that spake to me.

[10] And I said, What shall I do, Lord? And the Lord said unto me, Arise, and go into Damascus; and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do.

[11] And when I could not see for the glory of that light, [Saul had been blinded] being led by the hand of them that were with me, I came into Damascus.

Saul, which would later be named Paul - was blind. When meeting the voice of Christ on the Damascus road, the light that accompanied Christ's voice to Saul - had made him blind. Please remember, as we continue - that Saul was now blind.

[12] And one Ananias, a **devout man according to the Law,**

[12] And one Ananias, a **devout man according to the Law,**

having a good report of all the Judahites which dwelt there,

Again. Here we are in the book of Acts - after the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. After the ascension to the throne - after He was officially crowned King - and here is another believer - who - the text says it as plainly as can be said - **he was a devout man according to the Law.**

The 10 commandments? No. This is not the Law this is talking about. This is talking about the Law God gave Moses. And Ananias had recognized that Jesus was the Christ - and he was now keeping the Law God gave Moses but doing so - in the Name of Jesus Christ - in and by the Authority of Jesus Christ.

Friends, it's not until a little later on, as we progress through to the end of what we call the New Testament - when the passing of the temple - the ending of the Law - the establishing of the New Covenant begins to get fully explained.

Truly we see - if we'll just look at it - we see the vanishing of the Old - turning into the revealing of the New. It was not an instantaneous event as most people think. The Old Covenant did not end at the cross. The Old Covenant did not end at the resurrection. The Old Covenant did not end when Jesus ascended to the throne. He ascended to the throne to **rule over** the ending of the Old Covenant. The Old Covenant did not end - officially - until the temple was destroyed. That was the official end of the Old Covenant World - and the official beginning of the New Covenant World.

Why do I say it that way? Could you say the New Covenant World began at the resurrection? Of course you could. You could say the New Covenant began at His birth. You could say it began when His birth was prophesied. But, in this transition period - we still see believers in Christ - those who had embraced Christ - we still see them keeping the Law God gave Moses - but doing so in the Name of - in the Authority of Christ. We also see those not living in Jerusalem fully forsaking the Law God gave Moses. It was perfectly fine to do both. As long as you were keeping the Law God gave Moses in the Name of - in the Authority of Jesus Christ - in Jerusalem - you could keep the Law.

And, as James clearly told Paul - it was expected of those living in Jerusalem to keep the Law God gave Moses but do so in the Name of - in the Authority of Jesus Christ. At least - for a little while longer. This is why we see another instance of a follower of Jesus Christ - being labeled as **a devout keeper of the Law**. Now, in verse 13, Ananias meets with Paul and look what happens.

[13] Came unto me, and stood, and said unto me, Brother Saul, receive thy sight. And the same hour I looked up upon him.

[14] And he said, The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will, and see that Just One, and shouldest hear the voice of his mouth.

[15] For thou shalt be his witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard.

[16] And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.

I want you to notice here, very distinctly.

Came unto me, and stood, and said unto me, Brother Saul, receive thy sight. And the same hour I looked up upon him.

The healing was not instant. It was “in the same hour?”

Was this something new? Did Ananias just come up with this all by himself when he told Saul to arise, be baptized, and wash away thy sins? Or did Ananias do to Saul exactly what Jesus did when he encountered blind people? Jesus told the blind man to go wash in the pool of Siloam. Other blind people were trying to get put into the water of the pool of Bethesda. What Ananias told Saul to do was not something new. Ananias told Saul to do exactly what Jesus told blind people to do.

And not only that, the church of Christ, totally butchers this verse of Scripture with the way they teach it.

arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.

Saul was washing away his sins? If Old Covenant H2O water baptism was somehow changed into New Covenant baptism - the individual involved now has the power to wash away their own sins? Doesn't make any sense at all. Not in light of the finished work of Jesus Christ.

But what about the story of Naaman, the Syrian leper. What did Elisha the prophet tell him to do - Go wash, go dip yourself, go baptize yourself seven times in the river Jordan.

Ananias, a devout keeper of the Law, told Saul to go and keep the Law - but do so in the Name of Jesus Christ. This was not some “church” ritual that Ananias told Saul to do.

Every time we see what appears to be physical H2O water in the Bible - it is related to the Old Covenant Law God gave Moses. It is related to cleansing leprosy, the healing of other infirmities, or cleansing prior to entering the temple. It is not some ritual performed to enter into the New Covenant. That baptism has nothing whatsoever to do with physical H2O water - but is rather a baptism, an immersion, a being fully consumed by, of being fully committed to, of pledging one's allegiance to - the King of kings and Lord of lords. It is by faith - not of works - not by the deeds of the Law - lest any man should boast.

The “church of Christ” article continues:

In Galatians 3:26-27 it reads, “For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.” From the above scriptures, we can see that baptism saves, washes away sins, and puts one into Christ. With such testimony, who would say that baptism is not essential?

In conclusion this morning, let's begin to examine Galatians 3:26-27 a little closer. In order to do so, just like we did with Acts 22, instead of jerking one or two verses out of the Bible and trying to make a complete doctrine out of it, let's look at the whole chapter, beginning in verse 1:

[1] O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?

[2] This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?

Once again, who is Paul talking to here? Are these believers or are they unbelievers? “Saved” or lost? They were believers in Jesus Christ. Friends, non-believers do not receive the Spirit of God. Only believers. But, there was a problem. As we have progressed away from the days of the book of Acts now, as the Old Covenant is vanishing more and more - there is a real need for God to reveal more of this to those

who had embraced Christ.

In the book of Acts, we saw, James and many others - who were believers - and were ZEALOUS of the Law. We saw it. It's clear. But as the Old Covenant is fading more and more with each passing day - we now see the Spirit of God revealing more and more of the New Covenant.

That is why Paul is writing to believers in Christ - and is explaining to them that the keeping of the Law is not what brought them to Christ. It was their faith - it was their belief - it was their system of belief that told them that indeed this Jesus was the Christ. That is what brought them in. It was not the works of the Law. Salvation came from their faith - not from keeping the Law.

It was not from their physical baptisms - not from their physical washings - not from their sacrifices and offerings in the temple - it was from their faith - by which at one time - they were keeping the Law - but doing so in the Name of - in the Authority of Christ.

And Paul is explaining that it was not in keeping the Law - it was in their faith that Jesus was the Christ.

Look, last weekend they were at the temple participating in the services of the temple according to the Law God gave Moses. Then, they were convicted of their rejection of Jesus as Christ and they embraced Christ. There is no written record in the book of Acts where they were told to stop going to the temple. There is no written record in the book of Acts where they were told to stop Old Covenant baptisms.

This weekend, they came to the temple to participate in the services of the temple - only difference is - they were now doing those things in the Name of Christ.

Now, Paul is starting to explain to them that their acceptance into the Kingdom of Christ had nothing to do with the fact they *were* keeping the Law. Verse 3 - and this isn't a condemnation like we would understand it today. If someone called us foolish - we'd get all mad and puffed up - Paul is just saying - you didn't understand.

[3] Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?

He's saying you need to understand that your salvation came from your faith - it was your belief - not the physical aspects of the Law God gave Moses. Apply that to today.

So, your salvation came as a result of your repentance and of your faith towards Christ and of God - but it required a physical H2O water baptism of the flesh to accomplish it?

You began spiritually - but it was only because of a physical act? That is exactly what Paul is saying. I'm running out of time. We'll have to finish this next week. Quickly turn to Colossians chapter 2. See exactly what Paul said here in Galatians but to the Colossians. Verse 11.

[11] In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ:

Is this physical circumcision or spiritual circumcision? This is clearly spiritual. Now verse 12.

[12] Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.

So, we go from spiritual circumcision - to commanding physical H2O water baptism?

Friends, it is dishonest to make people think that every time you see the word baptism - you are supposed to think of it as physical H2O water.

Buried with him in baptism....

That is not physical H2O water. That is being immersed into Christ's death. Water is not mentioned in verse 12 - no more than physical circumcision. It is spiritual circumcision and it is spiritual baptism. You begin in the spirit - then you become complete by the physical works of the Law? Who hath bewitched you? Who hath fooled you?

This spiritual baptism - this is the baptism that John was speaking of. Friends, I'll take this baptism over John's H2O water - every single time! Oh, I have so much more. But I'm out of time.

Thank you for listening this morning. Here's another great song from our brother, Paul.

[4] Have ye suffered so many things in vain? if it be yet in vain.

[5] He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?

[6] Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness.

[7] Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.

[8] And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.

[9] So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.

[10] For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.

[11] But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith.

[12] And the law is not of faith: but, The man that doeth them shall live in them.

[13] Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree:

[14] That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.

[15] Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto.

[16] Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.

[17] And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect.

[18] For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise.

[19] Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.

[20] Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one.

[21] Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law.

[22] But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.

[23] But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed.

[24] Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.

[25] But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.

[26] For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.

[27] For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.

[28] There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.

[29] And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.