

**Message# 203 - 8-21-2022 - Christians Believe that Jesus Fulfilled the Prophets - H2O
Water Works of the Law Ended with the Old Covenant**
Preached first on 8/21/2022 on www.molibertyradio.us

Good morning everyone. Thank you again for tuning into the message this morning.

We have had several of you ask us about getting together this fall and I want to let you know we are working on putting something together. It looks like the second or third weekend of what they call "October" is what we are working towards. Tentatively, we are looking at a resort facility in Stockton, Missouri (about an hour northwest of where we used to meet at Maranatha). It's a different type of facility than Maranatha - but we believe it will accommodate our needs and be a very enjoyable place to meet. I'm not going to push this as a "conference" like I have done in the past.

The purpose is not to debate. The purpose is for like-minded people to get together for a couple days and fellowship and be an encouragement one to another. If you are interested in coming, please email me at charlie@godsendusmen.com and we'll provide you with as many details as we have available to us right now. That's about all I'm going to say about it for now.

I also want to let you know that our believers in the Philippines are going through a very trying time right now and they need our prayers. Joan's husband is now in the hospital. They have been doing everything they could do to treat him at home but apparently things have gotten worse to the point he is now in the hospital. The whole ordeal is so hard on her and her children because they are trying to remain true to the Government of God while everyone around them has been ramping up the pressure on them to forsake their faith and well, "Why can't you just be like everyone else?"

Please remember to pray for Joan and her family, her husband, and all they are going through right now in the Philippines.

Alright. Let's get right into today's message. Once again, at the conclusion of last week's message - the emails came in. And as always, fantastic. Just great. This one came from Jeff - it's on the website in the Comments section now just before Michael's email - which I also received comments as to how great that email was. This is short from Jeff, quote:

I haven't read Schnauble, but after listening to this message, I now know how it feels to read Schnauble...it makes my head hurt...in a good way! There's just so much information to take in, but I love it.

And you're right, we don't need the Orthodox Jewish Bible to show John's washing to be a work of the law...but it sure does prove it, clearly. Matthew 3 Verse 11 should end the discussion...He shall give you tevilah (immersion)...HE SHALL GIVE, HE SHALL GIVE, HE SHALL GIVE....It's His work, on us, that ONLY HE CAN GIVE.

How can we expect salvation if ANYONE ELSE does the work that only He can do?

And again in verse 14, even John preferred Christ's washing over his own...THAT should end the discussion, too. And what you showed by contrasting the first of the end, to the last of the end...(from John's writings)...perfect and on target.

Cant wait for next week...turning the corner, Part Two...! End quote.

Well, Jeff. I wish it was that easy for everyone. But when you have believed something for 20, 30, 40 even 50 years or more - it can be really tough to even get someone to consider another viewpoint - especially one that isn't very popular. And, I'll go so far as to say one that has been - and I believe this - purposely hidden - purposely kept from people.

In my email yesterday, I asked you to be prepared to look at Thayer's Greek Lexicon's definition of baptisma. I gave a very simple link to Thayer's Greek Lexicon in the email. In the message notes for today, I have a link to where you can download a copy of the entire book. I wonder how many of you have ever seen this? I know that lots and lots of people have seen Strong's Concordance and that's fine. I use that resource a lot. Have done so for many years. But remember, and not that this means much, you can take it or leave it, but Schnauble said that Strong's is basically like a kindergarten or first grade study of the Greek. That's not disparaging Strong's, it's just saying that Strong's is a very basic, beginner type level at looking at how Greek words were used hundreds, maybe even thousands of years ago. There are a lot more tools available to us for obtaining the meanings of Greek words - than just using Strong's Concordance.

Thayer's Greek Lexicon is one such tool. When you take a look at it - if you have never done so before - it's probably going to blow your mind compared to what you may be used to from Strong's Concordance. Strong's is easier to navigate - but Thayer's offers

so much more information it's amazing.

While Schnauble's work goes into a lot of the old world Greek uses of the word baptisma as found in Greek literature - where Schnauble cites a handful of Greek authors - and of course - that's perfectly fine - as he wasn't writing a thousand page book - but Thayer's goes into even more detail and provides even more proof of what he is saying - particularly for our study - into the definition of the Greek word baptisma.

So, be warned, be prepared to have your brain explode when you look at Thayer's Greek Lexicon - but - while you are looking at it - remember above all things: We do not have to be Greek scholars to understand what the Word of God wants us to know about Jesus the Christ.

There is enough in the Scriptures all by themselves - for us to know that the baptisma of Christ - was totally different than the baptisma of John.

Please open your Bibles to Matthew chapter 3. We've read the whole chapter many times before, let's get right to the point, verse 11, please. This is the voice of John the Washer. There is a difference between the baptizo of John and the baptizo of Christ. They are not the same.

[11] I indeed baptizo [baptize] you with water unto repentance:

The Greek word for the transliterated word baptize is baptizo. The word means to wash.

If we look at Strong's definition, look at what Strong's does. This is his definition of baptizo:

to immerse, submerge; to make whelmed (i.e. fully wet); used only (in the New Testament) of ceremonial ablution, especially (technically) of the ordinance of Christian baptism:

The first part of his definition is perfectly fine.

to immerse, submerge; to make whelmed (i.e. fully wet)

But the second and third parts of his definition are disasters.

used only (in the New Testament) of ceremonial ablution, especially (technically) of the ordinance of Christian baptism:

That is totally incorrect. That is a wholly w-h-o-l-l-y “church” definition of a Greek word. And not only that - he uses a transliterated word to define a Greek word. That is not acceptable - not on any level is that acceptable. I'm not going to call that purposeful deception - I have no idea what was in this man's heart - but it is - not in a disparaging sense am I saying this word - but it's ignorant. It's ignorant to provide someone a definition of a word - especially a Greek word - by answering with a transliterated word - a made-up word - never before used and certainly never used in the Greek.

It's the same circular argument we've been talking about since this series began. What is “baptism”?

And the answer comes back, “You know, it's “baptism.”

“No, I mean, what is 'baptism?’”

“Oh, you mean immersion.”

“What is 'immersion'?”

“It's 'baptism', silly, how can you not understand what I'm saying to you?”

At the end of Strong's attempt at defining baptizo - he finally gets it right. And remember, this is coming from Matthew 3:11 - John saying that “he baptizo in water” and this is the last word in Strong's definition for baptizo. After he defines baptizo as Baptist, then as baptize - he finally gets it right - he writes the word “wash.”

—*Baptist, baptize, wash.*

Verse 11 again:

[11] I indeed baptizo - wash - [baptize] you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptizo - immerse, submerge, to whelm - [baptize] you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire:

John makes it abundantly clear that his baptizo is with water - yes - it is an Old Covenant washing according to the Law God gave Moses. That should be simple. We should need Strong's - we should not need Thayer's - we should not need Schnable for us to see that John was in the Old Covenant World and John was fulfilling the Law God gave Moses and calling people of that day into repentance for failing to obey the Law God gave Moses. That is not hard. That should be really really simple. But it isn't. Why? Because hardly no one teaches the Law God gave Moses and shows how the water - physical H2O water - was inseparable from the Law God gave Moses. All anyone ever wants to talk about is the blood, the blood, the blood. But in the Law God gave Moses - clearly - as easily seen as anything else in the Bible - it was the water and the blood. Not just the blood. Water and blood. We see it all over the Law God gave Moses but it is NEVER taught. I don't get that - but you know it and I know it, too. Water and blood was required in the Old Covenant for the remission of sins.

So, of course, John's is referring to his baptisma as a baptisma with water. Says it - plain as day. But in referencing the coming baptisma of Christ - there is no mention whatsoever of water. It's a different baptisma.

“All I'm doing is baptizo in water - but the One coming after me - whose shoe latchets I am unworthy to loosen - He is going to baptizo with something totally different. You will be baptizo by Him with the Holy Ghost and with fire.”

Christ's baptisma was different from John's baptisma. For the life of me, I cannot understand why this is so difficult to see. “Church of Christ” preachers - such as the late Pete Peters - among countless others - when claiming to speak of the baptisma of Christ - point to the baptisma of John - and say - this, too - is the baptisma of Christ.

In this verse alone - where we clearly see TWO baptismas - one is clearly defined by the speaker himself as being a washing - a physical water washing - such as is ONLY found in the Law God gave Moses. And the baptisma of Christ is clearly shown to have nothing whatsoever to do with physical water. Hence, we need to continue looking at the rest of the definitions of baptizo to try to figure out the difference between John's baptisma - his baptizo in water - and Christ's baptisma - His baptizo in the Holy Ghost and fire.

Let's examine the definitions of the Greek from Thayer's. Granted, it is more difficult to read it from Thayer's - it is easier to read the online version found on the blueletterbible.com site - and the online version and the original 1800s version seem to be the same. What's online and what is in the written one, seem to be the same. This

might get a little tedious - but it is necessary.

I've spent so much time trying to show Old Covenant washing - from the Law God gave Moses - now I'm trying to show what New Covenant baptisma is. They are not the same thing. New Covenant baptisma is not physical H2O and if someone tells you it is - they are trying to bring you back under the Law God gave Moses which can never fully take away sin.

<https://www.blueletterbible.org/lexicon/g907/kjv/tr/0-1/>

βαπτίζω; [imperfect ἐβάπτιζον]; future βαπτίσω; 1 aorist ἐβάπτισα; passive [present βαπτίζομαι]; imperfect ἐβαπτιζόμην; perfect participle βεβαπτισμένος; 1 aorist ἐβαπτίσθη; 1 future βαπτισθήσομαι; 1 aorist middle ἐβαπτισάμην; (frequently [?] from βάπτω, like βαλλίζω from βάλλω); here and there in Plato, Polybius, Diodorus, Strabo, Josephus, Plutarch, others.

I.

1. properly, to dip repeatedly, to immerge, submerge (of vessels sunk, Polybius 1, 51, 6; 8, 8, 4; of animals, Diodorus 1, 36).

Let's stop right there for just a second. To dip repeatedly. To dip repeatedly. When I have asked the simple question - what is "baptism" - to which I am yet to get a straight answer from anyone - this is one of the most confusing parts to me. Because, you know, we're not as dumb as something people think we are. I've seen "church water 'baptisms.'" I've seen lots of them. The "preacher" gets in the "church mikveh" - I mean baptistry - and he says a brief incantation over the candidate (that's what the jews call their prospective person to be fully body immersed in the mikveh) - he says a brief incantation over the candidate - then puts his hand - usually covered with a handkerchief over the candidate's nose - and puts the candidate backwards down into the water - then raises the candidate back up to his or her feet - usually to a round of amens, applause, or both. One time down under then back up.

But the very first definition of baptizo in Strong's and in Thayer's and from the work Schnauble did - is to dip repeatedly. Repeatedly clearly means more than once - at least I think it does. So, all of you who think that "church water 'immersion'" is what the Bible commands - and you were only dunked once - I have news for you - what you are trusting in - doesn't even fit the very first definition of baptizo - unless you were dipped repeatedly in a fluid - which water is a fluid. Or, unless you were immersed into the water like vessels sunk - which do not come back up from the depths of the water.

Interesting, because unlike those who have been blasting me, I have shown what baptizo looks like - from the Scripture. And one of the best, clearest examples was Naaman the leper who was told by Elisha to go to the river Jordan and dip 7 times - bapto seven times. I know of no "church" anywhere in the world - that baptizos someone 7 times in their mikveh baptistry. What the "churches" do - led by the example of the "church of christ" - is a made-up religious ritual that has no basis in Scripture. That's why they refuse to even answer our simple question, "What does it look like?" The Old Covenant water ritual was to dip repeatedly, to immerge, to submerge like vessels sunk. The second definition from Thayer's. And I have come to understand these aren't necessarily listed in order of importance, they are simply the different uses or definitions of the word. Number 2 usage of baptizo.

2. to cleanse by dipping or submerging, to wash, to make clean with water; in the middle and the 1 aorist passive to wash oneself, bathe; so Mark 7:4 [where WH text ῥαντίσονται]; Luke 11:38 (2 Kings 5:14 ἐβαπτίσαστο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ, for לַבַּיִת; Sir. 31:30 (Sir. 34:30); Judith 12:7).

I have shown you Mark 7 many times. The washing of pots and cups and many other such like things you do. When you come from the market, except you baptismos, etc.

I was reading from a "church of christ" website the other day and the writer was quoting from Young's Literal Translation of the Bible. When it is useful for the cause - sure - but what about reading from Young's Literal Translation of the Bible when it isn't useful to the cause? Listen to this, this is Young's Literal Translation of the Bible - Mark chapter 7:

<https://www.biblestudytools.com/ylt/mark/7.html>

And gathered together unto him are the Pharisees, and certain of the scribes,
having come from Jerusalem,
2 and having seen certain of his disciples with defiled hands -- that is, unwashed
-- eating bread, they found fault;
3 for the Pharisees, and all the Jews, if they do not wash the hands to the wrist,
do not eat, holding the tradition of the elders,

Now watch this closely. Young's Literal Translation - quoted by the "church of christ" preachers in other passages - but certainly never quoted here:

4 and, [coming] from the market-place, if they do not baptize themselves, they do not eat; and many other things there are that they received to hold, baptisms of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and couches.

5 Then question him do the Pharisees and the scribes, 'Wherefore do thy disciples not walk according to the tradition of the elders, but with unwashed hands do eat the bread?'

6 and he answering said to them -- 'Well did Isaiah prophesy concerning you, hypocrites, as it hath been written, This people with the lips doth honor Me, and their heart is far from Me;

7 and in vain do they worship Me, teaching teachings, commands of men;

8 for, having put away the command of God, ye hold the tradition of men, baptisms of pots and cups; and many other such like things ye do.'

9 And he said to them, 'Well do ye put away the command of God that your tradition ye may keep;

How interesting. You mean "baptism" - baptisma - doesn't always mean a "church water ritual" for the remission of sins? Friends, bapto, baptismo, baptisma, baptizo, baptizein - can - sometimes mean water - but the truth is it rarely means water - but when it does in our Bibles - it is either talking about the Law God gave Moses - wash the clothes, bathe the skin - or it is referring to the Pharisees' traditions which made God's Word of no effect in the lives of the people who observed those traditions.

"Baptism" - a false word to begin with - baptisma - if we won't translate it as wash or washing - or metaphorically as overwhelming - we should just stick with the Greek word if we will not translate it as it should be done.

Now, the third definition of baptizo - not in order of importance - but rather another definition of the word. Yes, indeed, I've never said anything different - sometimes the word refers to a liquid - to dip repeatedly in a liquid - but other times - it has nothing whatsoever to do with the physical act of dipping into a liquid. Definition 3 from Thayer's.

3. metaphorically, to overwhelm, as *ιδιώτας ταῖς εἰσφοραῖς*, Diodorus 1, 73; *ὀφλήμασι*, Plutarch, Galba 21; *τῆ συμφορᾷ βεβαπτισμένος*, Heliodorus Aeth. 2, 3; and alone, to inflict great and abounding calamities on one: *ἐβάπτισαν τὴν πόλιν*, Josephus, b. j. 4, 3,

That is a definition of baptizo.

3; ἡ ἀνομία με βαπτίζει, Isaiah 21:4 Sept. hence, βαπτίζεσθαι βάπτισμα (cf. Winers Grammar, 225 (211); [Buttmann, 148 (129)]; cf. λούεσθαι τὸ λουτρόν, Aelian de nat. an. 3, 42), to be overwhelmed with calamities, of those who must bear them, Matthew 20:22f Rec.; Mark 10:38; Luke 12:50

I hope this sinks in!

(cf. the German etwas auszubaden haben, and the use of the word e. g. respecting those who cross a river with difficulty, ἕως τῶν μαστῶν οἱ πεζοὶ βαπτιζόμενοι διέβαινον, Polybius 3, 72, 4; [for examples see Sophocles' Lexicon under the word; also T. J. Conant, Baptizein, its meaning and use, N. Y. 1864 (printed also as an Appendix to their revised version of the Gospel of Matthew by the "American Bible Union"); and especially four works by J. W. Dale entitled Classic, Judaic, Johannic, Christic, Baptism, Phil. 1867ff; D. B. Ford, Studies on the Bapt. Quest. (including a review of Dr. Dale's works), Bost. 1879]).

Now. Those were the definitions as found in other Greek literature. And as we saw in relation to being overwhelmed with calamities and afflictions - citing Mark 10:38. Great. Not necessary in understanding the Word of God - but helpful.

Just so others may not accuse me of not reading the rest of Thayer's on baptizo - I am going to continue. However, we will begin to see what Schnauble noted that the religious men - those who believe in something called "church" - have deceptively - tried to force the "church" definition of baptizo, baptismos, baptisma, bapto, etc., where it does not belong. Quoting Thayer's:

II. In the N. T. it is used particularly of the rite of sacred ablution, first instituted by John the Baptist,

Alright. I have addressed this already. This is not accurate. He starts out by saying, "In the New Testament..." No. That is "church" understanding that has been added and is not correct. John the Washer was Old Covenant. John was an Old Covenant character in the Bible. John the Washer never was a part of the New Covenant. Just because John is introduced in the Gospels - does not mean he was New Covenant. He was not and that is simple, Bible 101.

Further, John's own words say that his baptisma was water - but Christ's baptisma was something totally different. Thayer continues - and this is not correct and I'll stand

against it when it is not correct. I'll give them credit when it's correct, but I'll stand against it when it is not.

afterward by Christ's command received by Christians and adjusted to the contents and nature of their religion (see βάπτισμα, 3), viz., an immersion in water, performed as a sign of the removal of sin, and administered to those who, impelled by a desire for salvation, sought admission to the benefits of the Messiah's kingdom; [for patristic references respecting the mode, ministrant, subjects, etc. of the rite, cf. Sophocles Lexicon, under the word; Dict. of Chris. Antiq. under the word Baptism].

a. The word is used absolutely, to administer the rite of ablution, to baptize (Vulg. baptizo; Tertullian tingo, tinguo [cf. mergito, de corona mil. § 3]): Mark 1:4; John 1:25f, 28; John 3:22f, 26; John 4:2; John 10:40; 1 Corinthians 1:17; with the cognate noun τὸ βάπτισμα, Acts 19:4; ὁ βαπτίζων substantively equivalent to ὁ βαπτιστής, Mark 6:14 [Mark 6:24 T Tr WH]. τινά, John 4:1; Acts 8:38; 1 Corinthians 1:14, 16. Passive to be baptized: Matthew 3:13f, 16; Mark 16:16; Luke 3:21; Acts 2:41; Acts 8:12, 13, [Acts 8:36]; Acts 10:47; 16:15; 1 Corinthians 1:15 L T Tr WH; 1 Cor 10:2 L T Tr marginal reading. WH marginal reading. Passive in a reflexive sense [i. e. middle, cf. Winer's Grammar, § 38, 3], to allow oneself to be initiated by baptism, to receive baptism: [Luke 3:7, 12]; Luke 7:30; Acts 2:38; Acts 9:18; Acts 16:33; Acts 18:8; with the cognate noun τὸ βάπτισμα added, Luke 7:29; 1 aorist middle, 1 Corinthians 10:2

Interesting verse that he leaves out - Acts 2:38.

(L T Tr marginal reading WH marginal reading ἐβαπτίσθησαν [cf. Winer's Grammar, § 38, 4 b.]); Acts 22:16. followed by a dative of the thing with which baptism is performed, ὕδατι, see bb. below.

b. with prepositions;

aa. εἰς, to mark the element into which the immersion is made: εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην, Mark 1:9. to mark the end: εἰς μετάνοιαν, to bind one to repentance, Matthew 3:11; εἰς τὸ Ἰωάννου βάπτισμα, to bind to the duties imposed by John's baptism,

Ok. Stop again. If everything he has been talking about was referring to John's baptism - then yes. I totally agree. Every single reference he gave - the Gospels and the Book of Acts - then one early reference in I Corinthians - that is exactly what I've been trying to get people to see. At the beginnings of the first century - while clearly still in the Old Covenant World - when we see what looks like the application of physical water to the flesh - we are seeing the people obeying the Law God gave Moses. But as we progress towards the end of the Old Covenant world - we see it fading away - and giving way to

the New Covenant world - clearly we see less and less of the physical water - and more and more of the Spiritual Water - the Water of Life provided by Christ. Continuing with Thayer. Now watch this. This is something else he says is baptizo.

Acts 19:3 [cf. Winer's Grammar, 397 (371)]; εἰς ὄνομά τινος, to profess the name (see ὄνομα, 2) of one whose follower we become, Matthew 28:19; Acts 8:16; Acts 19:5; 1 Corinthians 1:13, 15; εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, to obtain the forgiveness of sins, Acts 2:38; εἰς τὸν Μωυσῆν, to follow Moses as a leader, 1 Corinthians 10:2. to indicate the effect: εἰς ἓν σῶμα, to unite together into one body by baptism,

TO PROFESS THE NAME OF ONE WHOSE FOLLOWER WE BECOME! That is a definition of baptizo. BAPTISM DOES NOT ALWAYS MEAN A "CHURCH WATER RITUAL."

Now wait. Which is it? Which definition of baptizo would you like us to use here, Mr. Thayer? To unite together into one body by baptism? Is this

to bind to the duties imposed by John's baptism

Or is it,

to profess the name (see ὄνομα, 2) of one whose follower we become

He goes on:

1 Corinthians 12:13; εἰς Χριστόν, εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ, to bring by baptism into fellowship with Christ, into fellowship in his death, by which fellowship we have died to sin, Galatians 3:27; Romans 6:3

Now wait again. Which is it? Which definition of baptizo would you like us to use here, Mr. Thayer? To unite together into one body by "baptism"? Is this

to bind to the duties imposed by John's baptism

Or is it,

to profess the name (see ὄνομα, 2) of one whose follower we become

I wonder if this is all confusion on their part as well. Were they caught up in the whole

“church” thing of the circular? “What is baptism?” “Well, it's baptism.”

But there's several different definitions of baptizo. Which one is it? To make it easier, is it John's or is it Christ's? The two are not the same. That's what John himself said and we really don't need all this Greek to tell us. The reality is - if we just stuck with the Bible - we'd all be much farther ahead of where we find ourselves now.

[cf. Meyer on the latter passive, Ellicott on the former].

bb. ἐν, with the dative of the thing in which one is immersed: ἐν τῷ ἰορδάνῃ, Mark 1:5; ἐν τῷ ὕδατι, John 1:31 (L T Tr WH ἐν ὕδ., but compare Meyer at the passage [who makes the article deictic]). of the thing used in baptizing:

Answering the question, what is baptizo, with the word “baptizing” is exactly the argument Schnauble was using - and Schnauble was directly referring to these men in the 1800s when he was exposing this. If you ask someone what it means to be “baptized” - you can't answer - “it's baptism.” That doesn't get it. But when you believe that the “church definition” is acceptable - and when someone says the word “baptize” and immediately - just like Pavlov's dog - someone's mind is instantly taken to a “church water ritual” they either saw once or even participated in - that's where all the confusion comes in. These guys are as confused then - as they are today. You can see it over and over again - when they define a word with the same word. When you look at Strong's 908 for baptisma - his definition is baptism. Well friends, I don't claim to be as smart as James Strong was - but I will tell you this - if I had tried to answer my children's questions when they were growing up - with answers like these - they would have thought I was the dumbest thing around. “Why is the sky blue, Daddy?” “Well, it's because it's blue.” “Why is the sun hot, Daddy?” “Well, great question, son, it's because it's hot.” That's exactly what these guys are doing.

As I have looked through this over and over and over - when we see John's washing - we'll see them use the word washing - and that's great - but I have yet to find them refer to the many passages in the Law God gave Moses - that clearly says - wash the clothes, bathe the skin. If you don't understand that - you won't understand what John was doing. John was not doing something new. He did not bring something new to the scene as the forerunner of Jesus Christ. Continuing with Thayer.

ἐν ὕδατι, Matthew 3:11; Mark 1:8 [T WH Tr marginal reading omit; Tr text brackets ἐν]; John 1:26, 33; cf. Buttman, § 133, 19; [cf. Winers Grammar, 412 (384); see ἐν, l. 5 d. α.]; with the simple dative, ὕδατι, Luke 3:16; Acts 1:5; Acts 11:16.

Now watch this. He says this is another example of a definition of baptizo. And this, he gets right.

ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ, to imbue richly with the Holy Spirit (just as its large bestowment is called an outpouring):

We need to give him credit here. He is letting his readers know there are more definitions of the word - than just the water. Where I take exception to Mr. Thayer is where at the outset of this particular paragraph he tries to infer that baptizo is only used in the water ritual. Now, he's showing other uses. I don't know if it's confusion on his part or what it is. Maybe when you guys read it, you can figure out what he's doing. But he is now showing other instances where the word does not have anything to do with physical water.

Matthew 3:11; Mark 1:8 [L Tr brackets ἐν]; Luke 3:16; John 1:33; Acts 1:5; Acts 11:16; with the addition καὶ πυρὶ to overwhelm with fire (those who do not repent), i. e. to subject them to the terrible penalties of hell, Matthew 3:11. ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου, by the authority of the Lord, Acts 10:48.

*cc. Passive ἐπὶ [L Tr WH ἐν] τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, relying on the name of Jesus Christ, i. e. reposing one's hope on him, **Acts 2:38.***

That is certainly interesting. He says that relying on the name of Jesus Christ, reposing one's hope on him - is baptizo. And look at what verse he cites. **Acts 2:38.**

Finally, he goes to I Corinthians 15 and reverts right back to one of John's baptizo - which is the basis for where the Mormons perform H2O water - full body immersions - in the place of people who have died. We touched on that earlier in this series.

dd. ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν on behalf of the dead, i. e. to promote their eternal salvation by undergoing baptism in their stead, 1 Corinthians 15:29; cf. [Winers Grammar, 175 (165); 279 (262); 382 (358); Meyer (or Beet) at the passage]; especially Neander at the passage; Rückert, Progr. on the passage, Jen. 1847; Paret in Ewald's Jahrb. d. biblical Wissensch. ix., p. 247; [cf. B. D. under the word Baptism XII. Alex.'s Kitto ibid. VI.].

So, even with wading through much of what is clearly not Biblically discerned - and I am specifically talking about when he says that Christ's baptizo was the same as John's or an extension of John's - or turned into it from John's - which John himself clearly said was not - nonetheless - Mr. Thayer still provides ample proof that from the Greek - the word

baptizo does not always means water.

Turn back with me again to Mark chapter 10. Let's begin again with verse 32. Just like last week, I am going to read the text - even though it is not an accurate English translation - I am going to read the text exactly how it is found in our Bibles today.

[32] And they were in the way going up to Jerusalem; and Jesus went before them: and they were amazed; and as they followed, they were afraid. And he took again the twelve, and began to tell them what things should happen unto him,

[33] Saying, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests, and unto the scribes; and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to the Gentiles:

[34] And they shall mock him, and shall scourge him, and shall spit upon him, and shall kill him: and the third day he shall rise again.

[35] And James and John, the sons of Zebedee, come unto him, saying, Master, we would that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall desire.

[36] And he said unto them, What would ye that I should do for you?

[37] They said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left hand, in thy glory.

[38] But Jesus said unto them, Ye know not what ye ask: can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?

[39] And they said unto him, We can. And Jesus said unto them, Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized:

Friends, we don't need to be Greek scholars, like Thayer and Strong and even Schnauble. There is more than one baptisma in the Bible. Whenever we hear the word baptize or baptism - why is it that our minds are instantly brought to a vision of a "church water ritual" and not this - Mark 10:38-39? Why do we not instantly think of this baptisma. This is the baptisma of Jesus Christ. Why is this not more important than the baptisma of John? Why do we not instantly think of the baptisma of Christ? As opposed to the baptisma of John?

I'll tell you why. It's really simple. It's because the baptisma of John is easy. "You mean all I need to do is let someone dunk me into some water, and I can get my sins forgiven and I can go to heaven and not burn in hell for eternity?" "Yes, my son, that's all you need to do. Well, repent of your sins, then get dunked." "Well, sign me up. That sounds

easy enough.”

Who wouldn't prefer the baptisma of John over the baptisma of Christ? That's a no-brainer. Look again at verses 38 and 39. I told you last week, these two consecutive verses contain the Greek words baptisma and baptizo more than any other two consecutive verses in the Bible - yet no one wants to talk about this - as baptisma. The water is way easier than this is.

[38] But Jesus said unto them, Ye know not what ye ask:

You don't know what you're asking for when you ask for my baptisma.

can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?

[39] And they said unto him, We can. And Jesus said unto them, Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized:

I want us this morning to go up to verse 1 of Mark 10 and read what was happening prior to this. Let's begin in verse 1.

[1] And He arose from thence, and cometh into the coasts of Judaea by the farther side of Jordan: and the people resort unto Him again; and, as He was wont, He taught them again.

[2] And the Pharisees came to Him, and asked Him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife? tempting Him.

[3] And He answered and said unto them, What did Moses command you?

[4] And they said, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put her away.

[5] And Jesus answered and said unto them, For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept.

[6] But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female.

[7] For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife;

[8] And they twain shall be one flesh: so then they are no more twain, but one flesh.

[9] What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

[10] And in the house His disciples asked Him again of the same matter.

[11] And He saith unto them, Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry

another, committeth adultery against her.

[12] And if a woman shall put away her husband, and be married to another, she committeth adultery.

[13] And they brought young children to Him, that He should touch them: and His disciples rebuked those that brought them.

[14] But when Jesus saw it, He was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God.

[15] Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein.

[16] And He took them up in His arms, put His hands upon them, and blessed them.

[17] And when He was gone forth into the way, there came one running, and kneeled to Him, and asked Him, Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?

[18] And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou Me good? there is none good but One, that is, God.

[19] Thou knowest the commandments, Do not commit adultery, Do not kill, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Defraud not, Honour thy father and mother.

[20] And he answered and said unto him, Master, all these have I observed from my youth.

[21] Then Jesus beholding him loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest: (ONE THING THOU LACKEST) go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, take up the cross, and follow Me.

That is the baptisma of Christ. There's no mention of water - there's no mention of John's baptisma. It was take up the cross! Take up Christ's baptisma.

[22] And he was sad at that saying, and went away grieved: for he had great possessions.

This what Christ's response was to someone asking Him how to inherit eternal life. Why is there no mention of water? I would certainly think that "preachers" today - and "church of christ preachers" would be quick to say things like, "Well that was before the cross. That was before the King's New Covenant commission to be immersed for the remission of sins." But wait a minute. Those same men that say those things are always the first ones to run to John chapter 3 and talk about John's water "baptism" and say

that Jesus' water "baptism" was a New Covenant conversion or extension of what John was doing. Which one is it? These guys are all too quick to run to John chapter 3 and point to verse 23

And John also was baptizing in Aenon near to Salim, because there was much water there: and they came, and were "baptized".

Back and forth they go. Jesus is clearly pointing to the way to eternal life in Mark 10 and there is not the slightest mention of water "baptism." John's water "baptism" was still good, wasn't it? Why did Christ not even mention John's water "baptism?" Did John's water "baptism" end when John died? Was it there just for a short time, then when he was murdered by the state - it died with John - only to be resurrected again by Christ later on?

John's water - was not John's. John was calling men and women into repentance for not applying the water the way God told Moses it was supposed to be done.

"You have changed the Word of God by your traditions. You have compelled men to wash when God did not command it. You changed the water requirements under the Law God gave Moses by your own traditions."

And John was calling men back to the Law God gave Moses. The correct usage of the water as it was found in the Law. This is the Law concerning leprosy. This is the Law concerning touching dead things. This is the Law concerning Nazarites. This is the Law concerning the priesthood. This is the Law concerning washing before entering the temple. John was not doing something new. And John's washings - which were not John's - but rather Moses' - did not end when John was murdered.

So why did Jesus not command water for the remission of sins and eternal life for this man in Mark 10? I don't know for sure. The text doesn't say. But much is found in verse 20:

And he answered and said unto Him, Master, all these have I observed from my youth.

Clearly, the man said he had been keeping the Law. He more than likely had water previously applied to his flesh under the Old Covenant Law - but the application of Water - spiritual Water that Christ wanted - had nothing to do with the Laws God gave

Moses. This could be why Jesus did not command water here. It had nothing to do with Jesus had not commissioned water until Mark 16 or Matthew 28. That doesn't make any sense at all. Now verse 23.

Before that - let me say this again. Listen closely. I have made this statement before - I want to make it again as clearly as I can possibly make it.

If a man has not been baptizo into Christ - let me say it this way - a man woman boy or girl - cannot become a Christian cannot be a follower of Christ - I'm trying to say this as simply as I possibly can. A man must be baptizo into Jesus Christ - a man must have a baptisma - in order to be a follower of Jesus Christ, to have his sins forgiven, to become a Citizen of the Kingdom of God, to receive everlasting life - unless that person has been baptizo - he is not been born again.

But friends, the baptisma of Jesus Christ, being baptizo into Jesus Christ - has absolutely nothing whatsoever with physical water - and friends - if you have placed your trust in physical water for anything to do with being in Christ - you need to repent, ask forgiveness for this grievous error and place your trust in the faith - the system of belief - that the baptisma of Jesus Christ is of faith, by grace, applied to us by God alone, and that not of ourselves, not of our own works, but the gift of God. And take up the cross and follow Him.

There is a baptisma required for salvation - but has nothing to do with physical H2O water. Now verse 23 of Mark 10.

[23] And Jesus looked round about, and saith unto His disciples, How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!

[24] And the disciples were astonished at His words. But Jesus answereth again, and saith unto them, Children, how hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God!

[25] It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.

[26] And they were astonished out of measure, saying among themselves, Who then can be saved?

[27] And Jesus looking upon them saith, With men it is impossible, but not with God: for with God all things are possible.

[28] Then Peter began to say unto him, Lo, we have left all, and have followed thee.

[29] And Jesus answered and said, Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake, and the gospel's,

[30] But he shall receive an hundredfold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions (WITH BAPTISMAS) ; and in the world to come eternal life.

[31] But many that are first shall be last; and the last first.

[32] And they were in the way going up to Jerusalem; and Jesus went before them: and they were amazed; and as they followed, they were afraid. And He took again the twelve, and began to tell them what things should happen unto him,

[33] Saying, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests, and unto the scribes; and they shall condemn Him to death, and shall deliver Him to the Gentiles:

[34] And they shall mock Him, and shall scourge Him, and shall spit upon Him, and shall kill Him: and the third day He shall rise again.

Please pay particularly close attention here. It is of great importance that we see the characters named here in this next section. Verse 35.

[35] **And James and John, the sons of Zebedee**, come unto Him, saying, Master, we would that thou shouldest do for us whatsoever we shall desire.

[36] And he said unto them, What would ye that I should do for you?

[37] They said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left hand, in thy glory.

[38] But Jesus said unto them, Ye know not what ye ask: can ye drink of the cup that I drink of?

What is Christ talking about? What is this cup He is talking about? He is talking about the cup of His impending execution. He's talking about His torture and subsequent death. It's His baptisma that He's talking about.

But Jesus said unto them, Ye know not what ye ask: can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptizo [baptized] with the baptisma [baptism] that I am baptizo [baptized] with?

Now watch again.

[39] And they said unto Him, We can. And Jesus said unto them, Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of; and with the baptisma [baptism] that I am baptizo [baptized] withal shall ye be baptizo [baptized]:

Friends, baptizo is required. Baptisma is required. But it has absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with water - physical water. This is the baptisma of Christ. This is what John was talking about when He said the One coming after me is going to baptizo you with something totally different. Friends, this is it. This is the baptisma of Christ. It isn't water.

This morning we have spent a great deal of time on the word baptizo. Here, in Mark 10 - this is the baptisma of Christ. We need to look at the definition of baptisma.

Once again, there's not a whole lot of reason to look at Strong's first grade Greek. Other than to show what Schnauble was saying that a lot of these men in the 1800s obtained their definitions from "church." Strong's says baptisma is baptism. Thanks a lot. That really helps.

What does Mr. Thayer say? This is very interesting. Quote:

βάπτισμα, -τος, τό, (βαπτίζω), a word peculiar to N. T. and ecclesiastical writings, immersion, submersion;

baptisma may be peculiar to the N.T. but bapto is not. I've shown you the instances of bapto found in the Greek Septuagint - the Greek translation of the Hebrew first 39 books of the Bible. Number one definition of baptisma from Thayer's.

1. used tropically of calamities and afflictions with which one is quite overwhelmed: Matthew 20:22f Rec.; Mark 10:38; Luke 12:50 (see βαπτίζω, I. 3).

What I find interesting here is that, if you recall, when he was defining baptizo, his first definitions were related to John's water and he cites all the many Bible references to John's physical water.

But here, with the Greek word baptisma, his first definition and the passages he cites are Matthew 20:22, Mark 10:38 and Luke 12:50. We have not yet looked at Luke 12:50. Please turn there for just a minute.

[49] I am come to send fire on the earth; and what will I if it be already kindled?

[50] But I have a baptisma [baptism] to be baptizo [baptized] with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!

[51] Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division:

This is Thayer's FIRST DEFINITION of baptisma.

Friends, this is, using a horribly transliterated word - the baptism of Christ. This is what John was speaking about in Matthew 3. The Mark 10 passage - referring to His death as baptisma - this is the baptisma of Christ. There are clearly more than one baptisma in our Bibles. The baptisma of John with water - and the baptisma of Christ - which has nothing whatsoever to do with water.

I've said before, I'll say it a thousand times more - if I have a choice between the baptisma of John and the baptisma of Christ - I'll take Christ's every day, every time I am faced with a choice - I'll take Christ. And, friends, you better, too. John's water was fulfilling the Law God gave Moses. It was a work of the Law. That Law has been done away with. Trusting in the works of the Law, the works of the flesh, are invalid in the New Covenant world in which we live.

The definition of baptisma - the very first definition -

used tropically of calamities and afflictions with which one is quite overwhelmed:

The word tropically there means figuratively. Identifying figuratively with the calamities and afflictions of Jesus Christ - with which one is quite overwhelmed - is what New Covenant baptisma is. And friends, in the world in which we live in right now - that figurative baptisma very well might turn into a physical one.

Remember John and James from Mark 10:38-39? Jesus told them, "You will indeed undergo the baptisma that I am getting ready to undergo." Remember how Christ had previously told His disciples that some of them would be beaten, some of them would even be killed for His name sake. Christ had just told James, the son of Zebedee that indeed, James would undergo the same baptisma that Christ did. In closing this morning, turn to Acts chapter 12. We'll read beginning in verse 1. Remembering Mark chapter 10 - the things he said to John and James - the baptisma that he required of the rich man - which was - go and sell everything you have, give it all away, take up the

cross and follow me - that was the baptisma of Christ for the rich man - of which he went away from. John's water would have been so much easier than Christ's.

[1] Now about that time Herod the [little k] king stretched forth his hands to vex certain of those who had chosen King Jesus and the Government of God. [church].

[2] And he killed James the brother of John with the sword.

James did, in fact, undergo the baptisma of Christ.

Yea, and all that will live Godly in Christ Jesus, shall suffer persecution.

The first definition of baptisma is *used tropically of calamities and afflictions with which one is quite overwhelmed:*

I suppose giving your life for Christ is definitely a baptisma. Being quite overwhelmed with Jesus the Christ to the point where calamities and afflictions come upon your life because of your faith, your system of belief that Jesus was the One Who fulfilled the Law and the Prophets - that is the baptisma of Christ - and water is mentioned nowhere. No where in our Bibles do we see John or James, the sons of Zebedee partaking in the water baptisma of John. But we definitely see them partaking of the baptisma of Jesus Christ.

The first definition of baptisma in Thayer's Greek Lexicon:

used tropically of calamities and afflictions with which one is quite overwhelmed:

The second definition of baptisma by Mr. Thayer is this:

2. of John's baptism, that purificatory rite by which men on confessing their sins were bound to a spiritual reformation, obtained the pardon of their past sins and became qualified for the benefits of the Messiah's kingdom soon to be set up: Matthew 3:7; Matthew 21:25; Mark 11:30; Luke 7:29; Luke 20:4; Acts 1:22; Acts 10:37; Acts 18:25; [Acts 19:3]; βάπτ. μετανοίας, binding to repentance [Winer's Grammar, 188 (177)], Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3; Acts 13:24; Acts 19:4.

New Covenant baptisma is

used tropically of calamities and afflictions with which one is quite overwhelmed:

Old Covenant baptisma is

of John's baptism, that purificatory rite by which men on confessing their sins were bound to a spiritual reformation, obtained the pardon of their past sins and became qualified for the benefits of the Messiah's kingdom soon to be set up:

It is quite possibly the most important thing to understand in our Bibles - the baptisma of John - or the baptisma of Christ. They are not the same thing. Knowing that in the New Covenant world - there is only one baptisma - we better make sure we have had the right one applied to us.