

**Message# 195 - 6-26-2022 - Christians Believe that Jesus Fulfilled the Prophets - H2O  
Water Baptism Ended with the Old Covenant**

Preached first on 6/26/2022 on [www.molibertyradio.us](http://www.molibertyradio.us)

Good morning everyone. Thank you for tuning into the message this morning - in spite of the apparent crusade that is taking place against this ministry. I'll get into it in just a few minutes. But ultimately, because I'm preaching what God wants me to preach.

In just a one hour and ten minute message last week, we saw, from the Word, directly from the Scriptures how men got leprosy in the Bible. Leprosy - in the instances we looked at - was a direct punishment by God for sin. Leprosy was not something that someone contracted as a result of touching someone, or being in the same room with someone who coughed or sneezed. Leprosy was the result of sin.

If you recall, when I first started talking about leprosy a while back - and I admitted to you - I did not have any idea what leprosy was in the Bible. I told you I didn't go to the internet to research leprosy - because modern leprosy was probably not what Bible leprosy was and I only want to know what I know about anything - not just leprosy - I want to know what the Bible says.

Then, we find Jay Schamburg's 1899 article on Leprosy in the Bible. For all I know, Schamburg could have been a Jew. Jeff wrote to me and said Schamburg was possibly German - not Jewish - but I said it didn't matter - because Schamburg was making the claims he was making and citing Scripture to do so. Anyone could verify what he was saying by looking at the same Scriptures.

There was a time in the life of Christ when it seemed as though no one was speaking the voice of God - in which Jesus said - the stones would cry out and speak the voice of God.

The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handywork.  
And the heavens shall declare his righteousness: for God is judge himself. Selah.  
The heavens declare his righteousness, and all the people see his glory.

God is going to speak and his voice is going to be heard. As long as what we believe can be verified by the Word - it doesn't matter a whole lot who is citing the Word. Just go to the Word, if what is said is true, then so be it.

I found some things about Schamburg that were particularly unsettling to me after I read his article. But I cited his article because he cited Scripture to back up what he was saying in that article - and what he said aligned with Scripture.

Leprosy - in the Bible - which is all that matters - was a result of sin - and God directly smiting people with leprosy as a result of their sin.

And what was the Bible cure for leprosy?

Wash the clothes, bathe the skin, offer a sacrifice. It required works of the Law.

I don't understand the stumblingblock there. In the Old Covenant World - the Law was a good thing. It wasn't good enough - but for that time period - it was a good thing. That was the plan of God for the remission of sins. Why are people getting so upset when we show that - for lack of a better word - and I only use it because we are trying to expose the fraud when people are trying to say that Old Covenant "baptism" was changed to New Covenant "baptism" and as Michael so eloquently put it this week - they have changed the Old Covenant work of the Law into a New Covenant work of the law.

In the Old Covenant world - which did not fully pass away until the temple was destroyed in AD70 - leprosy - a disease brought on directly by God on those who transgressed His Law - which was what? - do you think just a few people in the first century? This was the century - the generation that killed the very Son of God.

Remember me saying that leprosy appeared to be rampant in the first century? I said that several times.

Well, now that we understand a little more what leprosy was, that now helps us understand the obsession with the pool of Bethesda and the pool of Siloam. That helps us understand why archaeologists - and again - who cares whether they are right or not - but it does explain why they say there were so many mikvehs in and around Jerusalem in the first century - and it absolutely explains why John was baptizing in the Jordan River for the remission of sins - which is exactly what Elisha the prophet of God told Naaman to do in order to be cured from leprosy - a disease brought on by violating the Laws of God.

What was the cure for leprosy as described in two complete chapters in Leviticus according to:

This shall be the law of the leper in the day of his cleansing.

What's the big deal? Why is this so hard to accept?

The Bible cure for leprosy was what John the Baptist was doing when he said, "I indeed baptidzo you in water."

Take another look at the Greek baptidzo for a second. Just look at Strong's. It's 907 in Strong's. And, please remember II Kings 5 - the story of Naaman - when you look at this definition again. How many times did Elisha tell Naaman to "bapto" himself? How many times did Elisha tell Naaman to dip himself in the river Jordan? Seven times.

Nine 0 seven in Strong's:

baptidzo

to dip repeatedly, to immerse, to submerge (of vessels sunk)

TO DIP REPEATEDLY

As part of the process for the remission of sins in the Old Covenant - those who followed - or even attempted to follow the Law God gave Moses - repeatedly dipped themselves in water in the Old Testament - when the "baptism" was an actual H2O water application - this is why there was such an obsession with the H2O in the Old Covenant World.

Now friends, in order to understand this, we've got to remove ourselves, once again, from false "church doctrine" that makes people believe that the books of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John - AND - the book of Acts - and all the people living in that time period - were living in the New Covenant World. They were not. They were ALL still living in the Old Covenant world.

The Old Covenant did not pass away until the temple was destroyed at AD70. Jesus made that very clear to His disciples in Matthew 24. What shall be the sign of thy coming - and of the end of the world - the end of the Old Covenant age. Then Jesus made it clear - when the temple was destroyed - not one stone left standing shall not be thrown down - when this happens - *that* is the end of the Old Covenant world - or the Old Covenant Age.

If we do not understand this - we will be completely lost concerning the Plan of Salvation for those of us living in the New World - the New Covenant - which was fully, finally, officially instituted at AD70 - when the temple and Jerusalem were completely destroyed.

Since that time - since AD70 when the temple was destroyed - it is not permitted for men to keep the Law God gave Moses concerning the ceremonies and the rituals. To do so is like a dog returning to its vomit.

Again, now, that is a comparison. The Old Covenant was not a particularly bad thing. It just wasn't good enough. It was not the ultimate, final plan. And comparing the Old

Covenant with the New One - the Old one looks like vomit. The New One is just so much better.

Turn, please, this morning, to II Kings chapter 15. Let's take another look at another instance of leprosy in the Bible. We aren't looking at leprosy through the lens of Wikipedia. We aren't looking at leprosy through a modern lens or what we perceive leprosy to be, how someone gets it, is it a mysterious corona-virus floating in the air that people just caught for being in the wrong place at the wrong time and needed a miraculously touch from Jesus in order to have this virus go away? We are looking at what the Bible says was the cause of leprosy and what the Bible says is the cure. Verse 1:

- [1] In the twenty and seventh year of Jeroboam king of Israel began Azariah [also known as Uzziah] son of Amaziah king of Judah to reign.
- [2] Sixteen years old was he when he began to reign, and he reigned two and fifty years in Jerusalem. And his mother's name was Jecholiah of Jerusalem.
- [3] And he did that which was right in the sight of the LORD, according to all that his father Amaziah had done;
- [4] Save that [except that] the high places were not removed: the people sacrificed and burnt incense still on the high places.
- [5] And the LORD smote the king, so that he was a leper unto the day of his death, and dwelt in a several house. And Jotham the king's son was over the house, judging the people of the land.
- [6] And the rest of the acts of Azariah [also known as Uzziah] , and all that he did, are they not written in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah?

Verse 5, again. How did Azariah, who was also called Uzziah, how did he get leprosy? And the Lord smote the King. That's what the text says. He didn't get it from someone else's cough, sneeze or touch - God Himself smote him with leprosy. Verse 6 tells us to go to the book of the chronicles for more details. So, let's go there. II Chronicles chapter 26, please, beginning in verse 1.

- [1] Then all the people of Judah took Uzziah [also known as Azariah], who was sixteen years old, and made him king in the room of his father Amaziah.
- [2] He built Eloth, and restored it to Judah, after that the king slept with his fathers.
- [3] Sixteen years old was Uzziah [also known as Azariah] when he began to reign, and he reigned fifty and two years in Jerusalem. His mother's name also was Jecoliah of Jerusalem.
- [4] And he did that which was right in the sight of the LORD, according to all that

his father Amaziah did.

[5] And he sought God in the days of Zechariah, who had understanding in the visions of God: and as long as he sought the LORD, God made him to prosper.

Oh, I hope you saw that.

and as long as he sought the LORD, God made him to prosper.

That is an eternal principle.

[6] And he went forth and warred against the Philistines, and brake down the wall of Gath, and the wall of Jabneh, and the wall of Ashdod, and built cities about Ashdod, and among the Philistines.

[7] And God helped him against the Philistines, and against the Arabians that dwelt in Gur-baal, and the Mehunims.

[8] And the Ammonites gave gifts to Uzziah [also known as Azari: and his name spread abroad even to the entering in of Egypt; for he strengthened himself exceedingly.

[9] Moreover Uzziah built towers in Jerusalem at the corner gate, and at the valley gate, and at the turning of the wall, and fortified them.

[10] Also he built towers in the desert, and digged many wells: for he had much cattle, both in the low country, and in the plains: husbandmen also, and vine dressers in the mountains, and in Carmel: for he loved husbandry.

[11] Moreover Uzziah had an host of fighting men, that went out to war by bands, according to the number of their account by the hand of Jeiel the scribe and Maaseiah the ruler, under the hand of Hananiah, one of the king's captains.

[12] The whole number of the chief of the fathers of the mighty men of valour were two thousand and six hundred.

[13] And under their hand was an army, three hundred thousand and seven thousand and five hundred, that made war with mighty power, to help the king against the enemy.

[14] And Uzziah prepared for them throughout all the host shields, and spears, and helmets, and habergeons, and bows, and slings to cast stones.

[15] And he made in Jerusalem engines, invented by cunning men, to be on the towers and upon the bulwarks, to shoot arrows and great stones withal. And his name spread far abroad; for he was marvellously helped, till he was strong.

[16] But when he was strong, his heart was lifted up to his destruction: for he transgressed against the LORD his God, and went into the temple of the LORD to burn incense upon the altar of incense.

This isn't hard. Look at the context. He really thought he was something. He took his eyes of the Lord and put them on himself.

[17] And Azariah the priest went in after him, and with him fourscore priests of the LORD, that were valiant men:

[18] And they withstood Uzziah the king, and said unto him, It appertaineth not unto thee, Uzziah, to burn incense unto the LORD, but to the priests the sons of Aaron, that are consecrated to burn incense: go out of the sanctuary; for thou hast trespassed; neither shall it be for thine honour from the LORD God.

[19] Then Uzziah was wroth,

He got angry, he got really upset.

and had a censer in his hand to burn incense: and while he was wroth with the priests, the leprosy even rose up in his forehead before the priests in the house of the LORD, from beside the incense altar.

[20] And Azariah the chief priest, and all the priests, looked upon him, and, behold, he was leprous in his forehead, and they thrust him out from thence; yea, himself hasted also to go out, because the LORD had smitten him.

[21] And Uzziah the king was a leper unto the day of his death, and dwelt in a several house, being a leper; for he was cut off from the house of the LORD: and Jotham his son was over the king's house, judging the people of the land.

[22] Now the rest of the acts of Uzziah, first and last, did Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz, write.

[23] So Uzziah slept with his fathers, and they buried him with his fathers in the field of the burial which belonged to the kings; for they said, He is a leper: and Jotham his son reigned in his stead.

There are even more details in here that are interesting. Once again, we see leprosy coming upon a man who violated the Laws of God. He didn't "catch" leprosy - he didn't get it from someone else's cough or sneeze - he was smitten with it because of his sin.

What I find interesting here is that there seemingly was no cure available to Azariah here. He lived with his leprosy for the rest of his life. Maybe he didn't seek forgiveness - the text doesn't say. Or, maybe he did actually have an incurable form as a result of his sin - which was actually more than just a sin - it looks to me like it was pure rebellion. Even when he was confronted with his sin - it seems as though he attempted to continue it through rebellion. God always deals with the sin of rebellion far more harshly than He does with other sins. I'm not going to get into that today - but there is absolutely Biblical support for such a claim.

Comparing the stories of Saul and David are great examples that I like to offer. Both of those men made grievous errors in their lives. But Saul's came from pure rebellion and God dealt with him far more seriously and quickly - than He did with David.

It is far worse to sin against the Authority of God than it is to sin against the Holiness of God.

Back to Azariah, Uzziah. He was smitten with leprosy because of his sin.

Leprosy, in the Bible, was a result of sin, of transgressing the Laws of God. And, when a cure was available, the cure was wash the clothes, bathe the skin and offer a sacrifice when the priest apparently felt like sufficient time had passed - possibly indicating the priest was satisfied that the sinner had completely repented of the sin that caused their leprosy.

Let's look at some more Bible passages related to leprosy. Why we would possibly think that the leprosy from the passages we are looking at in what people have erroneously called the "Old Testament" as opposed to the "New Testament" is - well - it's like what Schamburg said - it leads to grave error. What we are seeing concerning leprosy in these prior centuries to the first century - are the same thing. The leprosy of the first century was not some new thing. No more than "baptism" was a new thing in the first century.

Now friends - side note here - if you think what we are talking about here and the things I'm teaching here are "dangerous" and "heretical" - well - I guess you'll just have to decide for yourself. But all I have consistently done through this entire series - is present one Bible passage after another in support of what I'm teaching.

I read a passage - word for word - then get accused of "eisegesis." Strange. Verse 1, Numbers 5, leprosy is the result of sin. Then, the cure is offered.

[1] And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

[2] Command the children of Israel, that they put out of the camp every leper, and every one that hath an issue, and whosoever is defiled by the dead:

[3] Both male and female shall ye put out, without the camp shall ye put them; that they defile not their camps, in the midst whereof I dwell.

Does this not seem like a cruel thing to do to someone who was simply in the wrong place at the wrong time? Who can help it if someone sneezes on them or coughs on them and they "catch" a virus. Why is that that person's fault? Why does the person who just has a sickness, why are they put out of the camp? And especially a woman. Isn't that cruel? We should be helping sick people, not separating ourselves from them.

Well, when we don't understand what Bible leprosy was, and we only look at the Scriptures through our understanding because we think leprosy was a disease that someone caught - then look what that does. It even goes a step further and makes people think the "God of the Old Testament was a mean ole, blood thirsty killer who didn't care about people, didn't love people, He was a just a mean ole' vengeful, hateful dictator." We've all heard people say those things. Well, not knowing what Bible leprosy was - leads to grave error. Verse 4. Here come the details. This is not a completely new, different set of instructions. This is more detail as the lepers, the issues and those defiled by the dead:

[4] And the children of Israel did so, and put them out without the camp: as the LORD spake unto Moses, so did the children of Israel.

[5] And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,

[6] Speak unto the children of Israel, When a man or woman shall commit any sin that men commit, to do a trespass against the LORD, and that person be guilty;

[7] Then they shall confess their sin which they have done: and he shall recompense his trespass with the principal thereof, and add unto it the fifth part thereof, and give it unto him against whom he hath trespassed.

Leprosy in the Bible was a result of sin and God said to put those sinners outside the camp. He also said to put those out who had other issues of the flesh and those that were defiled by touching the dead. And what was the cure - the Bible cure - for all three of those things? Wash the clothes, bathe the skin, present yourself to the priest and offer sacrifices.

Let's look at another instance of leprosy in the Bible. We get our understanding from the Bible is where we should be - not from modern "science." This is II Samuel chapter 3, begin in verse 24. This whole chapter is a really sad story and there's a lot there that I don't want to get into this morning, so we'll start with verse 24. Joab had killed Abner. And David is now condemning Joab for what he did.

[24] Then Joab came to the king, and said, What hast thou done? behold, Abner came unto thee; why is it that thou hast sent him away, and he is quite gone?

[25] Thou knowest Abner the son of Ner, that he came to deceive thee, and to know thy going out and thy coming in, and to know all that thou doest.

[26] And when Joab was come out from David, he sent messengers after Abner, which brought him again from the well of Sirah: but David knew it not.

[27] And when Abner was returned to Hebron, Joab took him aside in the gate to

speak with him quietly, and smote him there under the fifth rib, that he died, for the blood of Asahel his brother.

[28] And afterward when David heard it, he said, I and my kingdom are guiltless before the LORD for ever from the blood of Abner the son of Ner:

[29] Let it rest on the head of Joab, and on all his father's house; and let there not fail from the house of Joab one that hath an issue, or that is a leper, or that leaneth on a staff, or that falleth on the sword, or that lacketh bread.

[30] So Joab and Abishai his brother slew Abner, because he had slain their brother Asahel at Gibeon in the battle.

[31] And David said to Joab, and to all the people that were with him, Rend your clothes, and gird you with sackcloth, and mourn before Abner. And king David himself followed the bier.

[32] And they buried Abner in Hebron: and the king lifted up his voice, and wept at the grave of Abner; and all the people wept.

[33] And the king lamented over Abner, and said, Died Abner as a fool dieth?

[34] Thy hands were not bound, nor thy feet put into fetters: as a man falleth before wicked men, so fellest thou. And all the people wept again over him.

[35] And when all the people came to cause David to eat meat while it was yet day, David sware, saying, So do God to me, and more also, if I taste bread, or ought else, till the sun be down.

[36] And all the people took notice of it, and it pleased them: as whatsoever the king did pleased all the people.

[37] For all the people and all Israel understood that day that it was not of the king to slay Abner the son of Ner.

[38] And the king said unto his servants, Know ye not that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel?

[39] And I am this day weak, though anointed king; and these men the sons of Zeruiah be too hard for me: the LORD shall reward the doer of evil according to his wickedness.

In the Bible, leprosy was the result of sin. Other issues of the flesh, we even see lameness here - the result of wickedness in the Old Covenant world. According to verse 29, other issues of the flesh were the result of sin.

What was the Bible cure for those who were truly repentant and wanted cleansing from their leprosy in the Old Covenant? Wash the clothes, bathe the skin, present yourself to the priest - and when the priest is satisfied that you have repented - because after a certain amount of time that's passed - God caused the leprosy to go away - then - present an offering for a sacrifice. Wash the clothes, bathe the flesh, offer a sacrifice for

the remission of sins. When you see the application of physical H2O water in the Bible - this is what it is. It was not something new that came onto the scene in the first century.

Leprosy and other issues of the flesh were the result of sin. And the cure was - wash the clothes, bathe the skin, offer a sacrifice. Sound like a broken record? Of course. I'm trying to get people to see why H2O was used in the first century - in the end of the Old Covenant. The H2O was inseparable from the remission of sins in the Old Covenant. Because that is what God's plan WAS. It's water and blood. Not just the blood - and not just the water. The two - physical blood and physical water were requirements for the remission of sins in the Old Covenant. Those physical things were then types and shadows - they pointed to the final - ultimate One Who could forgive sins. They pointed to the Messiah King, Jesus the Christ - Whose Water and Blood poured from His side on execution day - to begin the ending to the Old Covenant way of having sins forgiven.

At the end of the message last week, I received an email from Jeff that I would like to read to you. It's excellent. It again, provides solid Biblical support that leprosy and other issues of the flesh - in Bible times - were brought about by sin. Listen to this, quote:

When you recite the formula: 'wash the clothes, bathe the skin, then offer a sacrifice' and then overlay it to what John was doing... it makes more sense (to me) now when John said in Matthew 3:2 saying, Repent...(from breaking the law of Moses) and then in verse 6 we read them... confessing their sins.

And even in Mark 2:8-12 when Christ healed the sick of the palsy by saying which is easier to say, they sins be forgiven, or take up they bed and walk?

Alright. Stop right there for just a second. Open your Bibles, please to Mark chapter 2. Let's read beginning in verse 1.

[1] And again he entered into Capernaum, after some days; and it was noised that he was in the house.

[2] And straightway many were gathered together, insomuch that there was no room to receive them, no, not so much as about the door: and he preached the word unto them.

[3] And they come unto him, bringing one sick of the palsy, which was borne of four.

We have seen Christ cure the lepers - why - how - by a touch - and by the leper announcing, confessing that Jesus was the Christ. Now, we see another sick man being brought to Jesus. Leprosy was caused by sin - in Bible times. Other issues of the flesh -

we've already seen it - we just read from Numbers chapter 5 - leprosy and other issues of the flesh (II Chronicles 26 - even lameness brought on by sin - caused by sin - in Bible times. Now watch what Christ says to this man whom they brought to him - who was "sick with the palsy." Verse 4:

[4] And when they could not come nigh unto him for the press, they uncovered the roof where he was: and when they had broken it up, they let down the bed wherein the sick of the palsy lay.

[5] When Jesus saw their faith, he said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins be forgiven thee.

What?

"Son, thy sins be forgiven thee?"

Funny how I recall my days in quote "church" and what I mainly remember from those days, was the "preacher" saying the phrase, "Arise, take up thy bed and walk." I have to think they read verse 5 - but I cannot ever recall one of them emphasizing how important it was that Christ said to this sick man of the palsy - this man who could not walk - "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee." That's the first thing He said. Leprosy and other issues of the flesh, including lameness according to II Chronicles, were the result of sin. And under the Old Covenant Law God gave Moses, the requirement for remission of sins - leprosy and issues of the flesh - and touching dead things - was - wash the clothes, bathe the skin, offer a sacrifice. Conspicuously missing here - all three of those things. That's because Jesus was bringing about a change to the whole Old Covenant system and He was demonstrating it here in this passage and in many others. Now verse 6. Do you see what I'm saying? When Christ did the healing, when Christ did the forgiving of sins - the H2O was not applied:

[6] But there were certain of the scribes sitting there, and reasoning in their hearts,

[7] Why doth this man thus speak blasphemies? who can forgive sins but God only?

[8] And immediately when Jesus perceived in his spirit that they so reasoned within themselves, he said unto them, Why reason ye these things in your hearts?

[9] Whether is it easier to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed, and walk?

[10] But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (he saith to the sick of the palsy,)

Friends, here it is. It's as clear as can possibly be. Leprosy and other issues of the flesh - in Bible times - were the result of sin. In this instance, Jesus was healing, was forgiving sins, and the text is clearly showing that the sickness was the result of sin. Verse 11:

[11] I say unto thee, Arise, and take up thy bed, and go thy way into thine house.  
[12] And immediately he arose, took up the bed, and went forth before them all; insomuch that they were all amazed, and glorified God, saying, We never saw it on this fashion.

Jeff's email continues from this point, but I think we need to go on to verse 13 and beyond before we get back to Jeff's email. Verse 13.

[13] And He went forth again by the sea side; and all the multitude resorted unto Him, and He taught them.  
[14] And as He passed by, He saw Levi the son of Alphaeus sitting at the receipt of custom, and said unto him, Follow me. And he arose and followed Him.  
[15] And it came to pass, that, as Jesus sat at meat in his house, many publicans and sinners sat also together with Jesus and his disciples: for there were many, and they followed him.  
[16] And when the scribes and Pharisees saw him eat with publicans and sinners, they said unto his disciples, How is it that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners?  
[17] When Jesus heard it, He saith unto them, They that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.

Once again. We see Jesus equating sin with sickness. As I read these passages, you can't help but see once again - as I have shown you many times before - the little bit of H2O application that Jesus did - was well early on in His ministry. It seems as though once He changed the baptismal water into wine - we pretty much no longer see Him physically applying H2O to people. Once we saw Him telling the woman at the well that He was the Living Water - we don't see Him physically applying H2O to people any longer. Now back to Jeff's email, quote:

*Christ's power was to (is to) forgive sin...the palsy was the result of sin, Christ said so.*

*The words repent and turn from thy sin are not seen in Leviticus 13.*

Well, wait a minute. Not in those exact words. But what was taking place in Leviticus 13 required repentance. The acts of the Law, the deeds of the Law, the works of the Law shown from Leviticus 13-15, Numbers 6 and Numbers 19 and elsewhere, were because the sinner was repenting and making atonement for their sins according to the Law God gave Moses. Back to Jeff.

*But (certainly?) it had to be known in the leper's mind that he was leprous because of his sin. (right?) Yet the law never explicitly called for immediate repentance.*

I'm not totally sure how to respond to that part, Jeff. Everyone was/is a sinner. But not everyone was smitten with leprosy. From the instances we have seen when God smote people with leprosy - a case could be made that it arose from very serious sins. Each example dealt with very serious issues. I think that people who are following Christ - or those who were sincerely trying to follow the Law God gave Moses - probably had a repentant heart as soon as they committed their sin. We do see from Scripture how God deals more harshly with those who try to cover their sins. Back to Jeff.

*Aaron repented quickly without having to be told. Of course, he had just been visited by God!*

*Instead, we see they had to keep coming back every 7 days to see if he was clean. Are we to assume that they knew it was their own fault that they were unclean, and just preferred it that way?*

*He that is unjust, let him be unjust still? He that is filthy, let him be filthy still? He that is righteous, let him be righteous still?*

*But on the other hand, if a man did not repent, and remained unclean....after a while he would be joined by other sinners and they would probably form their own (sinful, unclean) community. And if life outside the camp had become established enough to sustain a happy (sinful) life, no wonder those outside the camp were so numerous.*

*Hmmm...Living sinfully outside the camp.*

*Does that in any way foreshadow what we see in Revelation 22:15...for without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers and murderers, and idolators, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie? Those outside are unrepented. Where darkness and gnashing of teeth occur.*

It's opening up, seeing it pop up again and again...it's exciting!

Great, Jeff. Really great observations. Mark 2 and some of the other healings and forgivenesses of sins directly by Christ does raise some other questions - at least in my mind. Answers to which I do not have right now - but I am confident will be revealed the more we study. But we have clearly seen from the Scriptures that the diseases discussed in the Bible - in Bible times - were a result of sins.

To have those sins forgiven according to the Law God gave Moses - they were required to wash the clothes and bathe the flesh - which is exactly what John the Baptist was doing. And, just like John said, "The One coming after me, whose shoe latchet I am unworthy to unlatch - He is going to do something totally different." And indeed, Mark 2 is a very good example.

John's H2O water baptism - for the remission of sins - was different than the way Christ forgave sins - in Mark chapter 2 - among others, as well.

Though I told you this raises others questions for me - I do think there is a clue there in that what we read in Mark 2 occurred in Capernaum. I'm not sure. There quite possibly is something to that. And what did Jesus tell that leper to do? Let's look at it. Go up to Mark chapter 1, begin in verse 40:

[40] And there came a leper to Him, beseeching Him, and kneeling down to Him, and saying unto Him, If Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean.

[41] And Jesus, moved with compassion, put forth His hand, and touched him, and saith unto him, I will; be thou clean.

[42] And as soon as he had spoken, immediately the leprosy departed from him, and he was cleansed.

[43] And He straitly charged him, and forthwith sent him away;

[44] And saith unto him, See thou say nothing to any man: but go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing those things which Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them.

Here we see clearly, just as clearly as can be, Jesus telling the healed leper to obey the Law God gave Moses concerning:

This shall be the Law unto you concerning leprosy.

I love verse 45.

[45] But he went out, and began to publish it much, and to blaze abroad the matter, insomuch that Jesus could no more openly enter into the city, but was

without in desert places: and they came to him from every quarter.

Why? Because Jesus healed leprosy. And so many people had it - and Jesus healed it and forgave their sins. I don't know why in Mark 2 the sins were forgiven seemingly apart from the Law God gave Moses. Maybe they were and we just aren't given enough details. Mark 1 sure does tell us that Jesus healed the leper of his sins - but then told the leper to go and obey the Law concerning leprosy. There's a lot for us to learn, isn't there?

We aren't stupid. We all know that Ted has pretty much launched a crusade against the things we are learning. I don't want to think he's doing it for any other reason than that he truly feels he is right - concerning the fact that H2O physical water must still be applied to the flesh in the New Covenant World for the remission of sins - and that we are wrong and he is trying to correct us. But this week, things seem to have escalated some and there has been a lot of direct dialog from Ted concerning this issue. He's even said he's doing everything he can do to warn everyone that we are talking about is dangerous.

There have been several that have written to and responded to Ted and all the emails have been really good. I don't have time to refer to all of them. But Michael sat patiently by all week long and basically stayed out of the conversation until he wrote to Ted late in the week.

We all know Michael is a prolific writer. He just has a great way with words and he's an excellent communicator with words. I want to share with you what he had to say. This email was just awesome. After I read it - well - actually Teresa read it first and she was just awestruck - then - I read it - and when I finished - I just wrote back to Michael and said the email left me speechless. I want to share it with you this morning. This is not intended to be "gang up on Ted hour." That's not at all what this is intended for. What Michael wrote is Biblically sound, solid teaching that I simply want to share with everyone. The fact that it was for Ted doesn't matter. It's for everyone who does not understand that the Law God gave Moses was done away with. There is now a new and better way than what was prescribed by the works of the Law. Quote:

*All,*

*I feel I need to weigh in on the subject—not because Charlie or anyone else needs any help, but because I think I have some further insight to offer. But the thread has become long, and this post will be long, so I've started its own thread. NOT to derail the other thread, which should happily keep running, but if anyone (or Ted especially) would*

*like to comment on mine, they will not have to worry about miscegenating with the former. The case I make is like theirs, but also unlike in some ways, so perhaps they should stay separate.*

*I am certain Ted*

Stop for a second. I am going to take a liberty here with Michael's words. He won't care. I am going to remove the word Ted - and simply replace it with something like "those who advocate for physical H2O in the New Covenant" or the "H2O demanders" or something like that. There's a whole lot more people, than just Ted, who demand the application of physical H2O water in the New Covenant. So let me start that paragraph again.

*I am certain [those that teach the requirement of H2O water are] propagating error with [their] teaching on baptism. Because [they are] propagating "church". It's that simple. How [they do] it is through iteration of a singular theme (in a few variations)—conceptualizing this thing of the "death" of the converted believer; the symbolic burial, the grave, and the "wateriness" thereof, in an old and tied ritual which began with the pagan Roman Catholic mystery cult and carried over to her daughters, the deceptively named "Protestants". Most "Church of Christ" or "Baptists" are blissfully unaware that they are just backslidden Roman Catholics anyway. Like everything else having to do with "church" it's all error and has nothing to do with the gospel of the Kingdom, which is the Christianity that Jesus taught.*

*Among many other passages and go-to favorites of [those] making [the] case that ritual water immersions are a [New Testament] institution, NOT associated with the [Old Testament] ritual washings, but only coincidental to them, [they seem] to prefer Romans 6:3-4 as a foundational. (It really doesn't matter, actually, if that assumption is wrong—let's proceed anyway).*

*Earlier in the former thread, [the water demanders] again [use] Romans 6:3-4 to "prove" the baptism being spoken of by Paul there is a water immersion. [It's been] repeated [that claim] a number of times now. So let's begin with this... There is nothing whatsoever in Romans 6 to insinuate a water immersion. That's just [them] sayin it's there. And this is both the root, and fruit of the problem.*

*I'd like to bring attention to the way this is done, as it's common to [their] method (as it is also common to church method, with which I am unfortunately very familiar). It's an old used car-salesman's trick. And not to disparage, but Ted probably is unaware of what he is doing—rather just repeating it out of muscle-memory. (I used his name there*

because I still am hopeful for Ted and want to continue giving him the benefit of a doubt. That was me speaking, now back to Michael.)

*[The H2O demanders say] this:*

*“whereby a dead man or woman is buried in the **watery grave of immersion** so that a new man or woman can be raised there from, per Romans 6:3-4.”*

*How many times have we heard that misplaced phrase? Does that make it so? I'll rephrase it a bit so we can better understand:*

*“Whereby [the H2O demanders make] use of a tautology as evidence the immersion of Romans 6:3-4 is a water cleansing ritual, based on [their] premise that immersion INTO Christ is a water cleansing ritual.”*

*That's the routine. That's how it's done, and that's how it's always done. After a while we become desensitized to it and fail to recognize it for what it is. Inadvertent or not, it's a scriptural sleight of hand.*

*In fact, “watery grave” is a favorite catch phrase of [the H2O demanders], which [is] from church tradition—most probably “church of christ” tradition. End quote.*

I want to stop right here for just a second.

There was a response given to this excellent article of Michael's. In particular to Michael saying that the “churches” use this phrase “watery grave.” Ted responded this way, quote:

**“Wrong!**

**It's a term I created (I've never heard anyone else use it) to explain what is verified by the Bible as the mode in Romans 6:3-4, which I'll get to later.”**

I found that to be incredible that Ted said “he created the term.” Michael said Ted uses the term out of “muscle memory” - from CHURCH. I went to the internet and typed in the phrase “watery grave for baptism” and it returned over 910,000 hits.

Friends, I have heard that phrase my entire life - and in direct preaching on Romans chapter 6. I then tried to find the earliest usage of that phrase in relation to Romans chapter 6. It's not out of the realm of possibility that the phrase did indeed originate with Ted - that he never got it from “church” and that he “never heard anyone else use that phrase.”

But the reality is, at least on the internet, C.H. Spurgeon preached a message entitled

### **Baptism - A Burial**

**Delivered on Lord's-Day Morning, October 30th, 1881, by  
C. H. SPURGEON,  
At the Metropolitan Tabernacle, Newington.**

His opening verse of Scripture?

"Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Romans 6:3-4

In that message, Spurgeon said this in 1881:

*"Now, by being buried with Christ in baptism, we set our seal to the fact that the death of Christ was on our behalf, and that we were in him, and died in him, and, in token of our belief, we consent to the **watery grave**, and yield ourselves to be buried according to his command. This is a matter of fundamental faith—Christ dead and buried for us; in other words, substitution, suretyship, vicarious sacrifice. His death is the hinge of our confidence: we are not baptized into his example, or his life, but into his death. We hereby confess that all our salvation lies in the death of Jesus, which death we accept as having been incurred on our account."*

I sent an email with numerous website links to "churches" where all different types of "churches" use the phrase "watery grave" and in direct reference to Romans 6. It's a CHURCH TERM. It's NOT in the Bible. Listen now as Michael begins to describe Romans 6. It's just awesome.

*I suspect this because I myself have heard this touted in churchianity and in their church music often. But astute readers will note that "watery grave" is not found in the text of Romans 6. In fact, it's nowhere to be found in the Bible. It's simply a made-up term to back up a made-up rite (New Testament baptism) claimed by the church. I presume he didn't mean to, but Ted (and I will use his name here because Michael is also trying to give him the benefit of a doubt) has effectively ADDED to the scriptures here, and in many other places, asserting [the] premise of H2O water immersion proves the conclusion.*

*Let's take a closer look at the text.*

Please turn to Romans chapter 6. This is verse 3. These are Michael's observations.

*Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ **were baptized into his death?***

*<sup>4</sup>Therefore we are buried with him by baptism **into death: that like as Christ** was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.*

*<sup>5</sup>For if we have been **planted together in the likeness of his death**, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection:*

*<sup>6</sup>Knowing this, that our old man **is crucified with him**, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. (Romans 6:3-6)*

*Did you catch it? Where do we see any reference to water? In fact, the word translated "baptized" doesn't mean water. It CAN refer to water and sometimes does in the context of the scriptures, but here...what reason or authority [do the H2O demanders] have to assert it does? There's absolutely no reason for it. The context, in fact, is NOT a death by water, but a death by crucifixion. It's right there in the text! No watery graves anywhere to be seen in this passage; it's simply being read into it... There's a Greek term for that but I can't remember it. (Well, Michael, it's eisegesis!)*

*Moreover, we are told (the church) that our New Testament baptism is OUR death—the "death of the old man"—and while it's true a Christian is a "new creation" and is putting off the deeds of the flesh, "crucified daily" (as Paul put it), the context here, and elsewhere, says otherwise... We are baptized into HIS death. We are IMMERSED into HIS death! Moreover, we are "planted together" (GK, [symphytos](#)) into the LIKENESS of His death. Which is directly compared to the likeness of His resurrection, in which we will also share. And if the immersion spoken of here is a "watery grave" ritual, then where in that analogy is the likeness to His resurrection? Do we come up out of the water an immortal and sinless being with a spiritual body? It does not compute.*

*I urge you to read the citation for that Greek word for "planted". It's a unique word used only this one time. In fact I'll provide the meaning: "born, or grown together with; of joint origin; congenital".*

*Born in the likeness of HIS DEATH. Can we all see this? Christ was crucified for our sins, not drowned.*

***For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of***

**sins..**

*How and why is this not the “baptism” being spoken of in Romans 6? It most certainly is!*

*Second witness. Jesus to His disciples before his execution [Matthew 20:22]:*

***“But Jesus answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with...?”***

*Was this a water baptism? Was Jesus about to go into a watery grave? Perish the thought.*

*BUT, if we are partaking in HIS death vicariously, by being immersed into Him spiritually—through faith—“planted together”, grafted into the same rootstock; ourselves a dead stem, growing anew out of a Living Root—then HIS crucifixion death for the remission of the “sins of many” becomes OUR death to sin. And our FAITH in His redemption resurrects us to DO the works He has given us. That is, if we believe He is indeed the Christ, the Son of the Living God, the true and only Savior and the ONLY Way to approach a Holy Father, we therefore partake of that sacrificial death.*

***For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.***

*Were any of us water baptized into Adam? Well then HOW did we “get into him”? We were born (symphytos) into Adam! His sin transferred to us vicariously, (if not congenitally) and thus our mortality we also inherited from him—but not willingly...*

*For the creature was **made subject to vanity, not willingly**, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope (Romans 8:20)*

*Contrarily, we who willingly believe in Christ, and believe in His death and resurrection “given for the sins of many”, by OUR FAITH in this are we saved. And those who hear His voice will FOLLOW Him. WHOSOEVER will, may now be IN Christ, and all who are WILL be “made alive”. Those remaining in Adam will all die. But Jesus affirmatively told us **“he that believeth in me shall never die”**.*

*This is profound stuff, but it’s not that deep really. It’s not about our death. It’s about taking part in HIS death, so that we may live eternal. This is what makes [the churches] backward teaching of baptism so egregiously wrong.*

[The H2O demanders] elsewhere mentioned Hebrews 9, affirming the passing away of the Old Covenant ordinances (which included the “washings”), saying in fact, “there is scriptural authority for such reasoning”. And I agree with [them] here. But where do [they] find a New Covenant initiation of “water of baptism” in that chapter to replace those ordinances? Where is this “watery grave” which washes away our sins? Instead, we read this,

“How much more shall **the blood of Christ**, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish to God, **cleanse (*katharizō*) your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?**” (Hebrews 9:14)

Again, we see clearly that it is by faith in His blood (NOT a church baptism!) by which we are saved and our sins remitted—CLEANSED from dead works! What works? The works of the Law! And why? To what end were we saved? To SERVE the Living God!

Again and again, [the H2O demanders make] reference to New Testament “baptisms” into Christ and [claim] these are water immersions—ostensibly symbolizing the drowning death of the believer—because that’s what [is] imprinted from the CHURCH, which is the antithesis to Christ’s Kingdom and the ENEMY of God (Ted himself proclaiming as much in a book he just finished)!

But Jesus has made no such institution. This we’ve learned from a long and diligent search of the scriptures—not for two weeks, but many years!

But here’s what Christ did establish. After He was risen, Jesus commissioned His disciples:

And that repentance and remission of sins **should be preached in his name** among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem...

And he commanded us to **preach unto the people**, and to **testify** that it is he which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead. To him give all the prophets witness, **that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins...**

Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation **through faith in his blood**, to declare his righteousness **for the remission of sins that are past**, through the forbearance of God.

Every one of those passages left out the most pertinent part of our salvation, according to [the H2O demanders]—so-called [water] baptism. Rather, faith and PREACHING are being exhorted! And what is being preached? What is the “cleansing agent” if not baptismal water for the remission of our sins, as [the church] would have it? Back to

Hebrews 9:21-22 again:

*“And almost all things are by the law **purged** (katharizō) with blood; **and without shedding of blood is no remission**. It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified (katharizō) with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.”*

*Once cleansed, we are free to serve God, and to walk in His light!*

*“**But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son CLEANSETH (katharizo) us from all sin.**” (1 John 1:7)*

*I can only reasonably conclude that for a lifelong student and teacher of the Word, as [many in the church claim], this concept can only be purposefully missed.*

**FINAL EXAMPLE AND CONCLUSION:**

*Let’s take a look at one last iteration of [the church’s] reasoning to sum up the argument.*

*[The church], in [some] of [their] books and preached messages, is steadfastly saying that although ALL Old Covenant rituals (including the washings) have been done away with, [and] we now have a NEW ritual washing—a **new work of the Law**—instituted by Christ, AFTER His resurrection, necessary to be saved from our sins. This New Water Immersion, [they allege], **MUST** be applied in a certain way, which just happens to be the way the “church of christ” does it, and for which we can’t seem to find any scripture references—but without which, we cannot be saved. It’s that crucial, and yet that esoteric, apparently. Simultaneously, [they declare] that the specifics of the ritual—the how, the who, and the what “doesn’t matter”! And to add to the confusion, [they maintain] that Mark 16 and Matthew 28 **PROVE** this assertion...*

*Why? Because the word transliterated “baptize” there means to immerse in wet water (of any form or fashion). How can we be sure about this? Because that’s what baptism means. Can we not see this is circular? And self-contradicting? Have we been like the “foolish Galatians” who have been all this time bewitched?*

*He that believeth and is ~~baptized~~ immersed shall be saved; but he that **believeth not** shall be damned (Mark 16:16)*

*Go ye therefore, and **teach all nations, baptizing immersing them** in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: (Matthew 28:19)*

*We see that word and think ‘church baptismal’. Take it out, it’s not scriptural. It’s exactly the same thing with “church” and ecclesia. Put in the proper English translation... It then takes on a whole new dimension and the spell is broken; it’s really no more mysterious than that.*

*This topic and this thread is nothing less than the dismantling of a false gospel, and the throwing down of a great idol. For which we should ALL be thankful, and in which we should all be heartily engaged.*

*What [we are graciously, and diligently doing] is explaining what the New Testament “washings” were all about. There’s no confusion here. John’s baptism was not a “new thing”. Christ did not institute a “New Covenant Baptismal Ritual” for the remission of sins. There is no such thing found in the scriptures. The idea is fully born out of Church. Which is State. Which is “Leviathan, that crooked serpent”. And there is **much more to come** by way of “purging” our consciences from these falsities so that we can finally understand the Kingdom of God, and thereby enter in—through the straight and narrow gate.*

*I’m looking forward to it.*

*Michael*

And I am, too, Michael. Well, just like I was the first time I read his email - I have nothing to say or add to what he said.