

**Message# 204 - 8-28-2022 - Christians Believe that Jesus Fulfilled the Prophets - H2O
Water Works of the Law Ended with the Old Covenant**
Preached first on 8/28/2022 on www.molibertyradio.us

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

I am sorry to report to you that Joan's husband did pass away last weekend. They have the funeral for him this past week in the Philippines. We need to continue to pray Joan and Johannes and the rest of the family. Pray for Cathy and for her family as well.

A while back Jeff was able to send her some money through a friend of his' PayPal account. I don't have PayPal - and as you know - I'm certainly not a man of finance - let alone international finance. There are some financial needs there due to the loss of her husband and the children's dad. If any of you would like to help her out - I know that it would be appreciated. She let me know of the need a few weeks ago - but asked me not to let you know about it. I am just going out on my own here and letting you know anyway. If anyone knows how we can help her out - please contact me and we'll take the next step. Teresa and I would like to send her something, too. So, if anyone would or could be willing to help us figure something out that would be great.

Friends, you know this, during the course of this series - which began all the way back in what they call "January", I have mentioned the name of Ted Weiland only a handful of times. Most of you already know that Ted and I have been friends for many years. Our friendship goes back to at least 2007 or 2009, I don't recall exactly which. I had know of him before that, even, but we have had a friendship for many years now.

I have known for that entire time that he preaches the physical application of water to the flesh as inseparable for salvation. He teaches something called "baptism as a requirement for salvation." I too, teach, baptisma - as you know - I'm doing all I can to stop using the erroneous, made-up word "baptism" - because it is not a Bible term. It has no place in our vocabulary as Christians - other than to speak against it - as loudly as we possibly can. But, I teach a baptisma that is Christ's baptisma - and it absolutely forbids physical water.

But I have known that Ted and I do not agree on this for as long as I have known him.

He is somehow, under the impression that this series of messages have been for the

purpose of proving him wrong. Yet friends, you all know, as I said a minute ago, that I have rarely even mentioned his name during this series. On the other hand, if you have listened to his messages lately, you have heard him say my name hundreds of times. In the rare times that I have even listened to his messages this year - I have heard him say some pretty mean things about me. "Don Quixote style sword rattling?" What is that? "Worse case of eisogesis ever preached?"

Eisogesis?

Eisegesis is the process of interpreting text in such a way as to introduce one's own presuppositions, agendas or biases. It is commonly referred to as reading into the text.

Once again, in the few times I have actually listened to his preaching this year, I have heard him read passages - such as Colossians 2:12, which says:

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

I have heard him quote that verse like this:

*Buried with him in **(H2O water)** baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.*

Yet, I am the one that is constantly accused of "eisogesis" adding to the Word to fit my own agendas, etc. If that is not adding to the Word, I don't know what it is.

We've had some private conversations about this lately and I'm just amazed at the accusations thrown at me - which - when I read them - it's like, "Wow, that is the pot calling the kettle black" if I've ever seen it.

Well, adding to the Scripture is worrisome - but so is deleting from the Scripture - or claiming that you are quoting someone - and then omitting their statement. It's sleight of hand either way - and it isn't right.

I have never accused Ted of intentional deception. I have never accused Ted of having a black heart. I've never believed - still don't believe it. But I absolutely believe that he himself has been deceived by church of christ "preachers" - who just like Bible prophecy - just like Romans 13 - just like the Law of God - just like the CONstitution -

and countless other “church” teachings - they deceived him when he was very young - and as he seems to have shed a lot of their teachings - this one is very difficult to let go of. I don't want to alienate Ted. I don't want to lose his friendship. But I do want him to see the error that he has taught for so many years and which so many people have followed.

Ted has written a tremendous book exposing the evils of the U.S. CONstitution. It is the document that is responsible for the laws, statues and treaties made in agreement thereof. But why do we never hear any messages in relation to coming out from the laws, statues and treaties created by the CON? To me, the answer is quite simple. Once someone has been H2O water “baptized” - and I'll go ahead and use the word “baptized” because it is a false word offering a false sense of security - but when someone gets H2O water “baptized” - then they are “under the blood, covered by the blood” and thereby it doesn't really matter whether they stop obeying the laws, statues and treaties created by the CON.

My daughter, Chrissy, and her fiance', Jerry, are set to be married on 12/4 this year. Neither of them have ever been H2O water “baptized” - but both of them are two of the most committed - baptizo in King Jesus young people you will ever meet. They have both given their lives to be followers of the Government of God. They make no claim or association with man's little g “government” and have publicly, openly stated their Citizenship to be solely in the Commonwealth of Israel. Chrissy will be 4 months shy of her 20th birthday. Jerry will be nearly 25. If Ted were asked to perform the ceremony - he would turn them down. Not because of Chrissy, but because Jerry is over the age of 20 and has not been H2O water “baptized” according to the method Ted believes - which - by the way - he *still* will not tell anyone what that method is.

Reverse the clock ago year or so. I am personally aware of a young man who is a CONstitutionalist. He is a U.S.A. citizen. Some have tried to reach him and get him to renounce his u.s. citizenship and become a Citizen of the Government of God, the Commonwealth of Israel. That has not happened. However, because the young man was H2O water “baptized” - Ted performed the marriage ceremony.

This is so totally backwards it's such a head-scratcher.

One young couple who has hook-line and sinker embraced the baptisma of Jesus Christ - and is rejected - while someone else who has embraced the u.s. CONstitution hook-line and sinker - but because he is H2O water “baptized” - is accepted.

This is just weird to me. It's totally backwards. But this is what happens when there is a failure - and or a refusal - to learn and understand how the physical water was used in the Old Law God gave Moses - which clearly shows us what the people were doing in the first century - which then helps us know the many different definitions of the Greek word baptisma - which then helps us understand the Scriptures.

As I have said before - many times before - we do not need to know the Greek - like Joseph Thayer, or Eckhard Schnauble or even James Strong - we do not need to be Greek scholars to understand that there are several meanings of the word baptisma. It's nice to see when these guys show what they have learned and some of their learning aligns flawlessly perfect with the Bible. That's pretty cool, I'll give them that all day long. But we do not have to have the education and head-knowledge they have - in order to understand the Bible.

A knowledge of the Bible is a thousand times better - than having a head so full of Greek and Hebrew that we can speak it, read it, interpret it like it's a second or even a first language.

Reading the Law God gave Moses - shows us that physical water is written all over the Law. It's blood and water - water and blood. It's not just the blood, it's not just the water. Why? Because everything in the Law and the Prophets pointed to the Messiah King. And on His execution day - the Roman soldier thrust a spear into His side and water and blood poured from His side. These aren't just words. They aren't just filler concepts to take up pages in the Bible - there's a reason for all of it.

The physical water elements found all over the Law and the Prophets - even going back before the Law and the Prophets - to the first week of Creation as we saw early on in this series - pointed to the One Who could give someone Water - that by drinking of that Water - His Water - they would never thirst again.

If we do not understand the physical Water of the Old Covenant - we will not understand the spiritual Water of the New Covenant. Will you think on this for just a second on how simplistic that is? Old Covenant = physical water. New Covenant = Spiritual Water. That is so basic, so simple, even a little children get it.

Old - New. Old - New. Old - New. You could just about preach a message and just say "Old - New, Old - New."

But friends, if we don't understand the water in the Old - we cannot understand the Water in the New.

You know I have not even spoken Ted's name but a handful of times this whole year-long series. But after last week's message, as I was showing Teresa, Chrissy and Jerry some things - I just feel like I have to share these things with you.

My messages have been about the jews' teaching. They've been about the catholic's teachings, they've been about the mormons. All of those religions - led front and center - foremost of all them - all of those religions demand physical H2O water applied to the flesh - or else - you are not "saved." Led front and foremost by the jews. Ted teaches the same thing. I can't help it - I won't apologize for it - if he is offended when I preach against the jews' religion - because he teaches the exact same thing - just with a few different words - well. I don't want to lose a friend. I want to restore a brother. I want to gain a friend. But not at the expense of the truth.

Pretty much all the religions of the world demand H2O water - and every single one of them are wrong. Every single person that demands physical water for any spiritual purpose in our world - is wrong. If they are doing it on purpose - shame on them. If they are doing it because they are deceived - in our world - there still is no excuse - and hopefully they will repent and get right with God. But I will preach the baptisma of Christ as opposed to the baptisma of John's physical water - and whatever happens, happens. In Matthew 3 - John says - as plainly as it can be said - "I baptizo in water - but Christ will baptizo in something totally different." That's about as easy as it gets.

After last week's message - I went to Ted's book about what he calls "Baptism." The reason I went there is because in the online version - if you go to the last page - you will find him saying that he is citing Joseph Thayer's Greek Lexicon. He says he is providing the definition of the Greek word baptizo.

We read Thayer's definition last week. The whole thing. I will remind you again this morning. The first definition in Thayer's Greek Lexicon is:

1. prop. [he did not list this abbreviation in the beginning of the book, but most people think - prop. means properly] to dip repeatedly, to immerge, to submerge (of vessels sunk, Polyb. [Polybius] 1, 51; 6, 8, 8, 4 and Diod. [Diodorus Siculus] 1,36.

Polybius and Diodorus are not cited here for Biblical purposes. They were Greeks.

Brittanica says this about Polybius:

Polybius, (born c. 200 BCE, Megalopolis, Arcadia, Greece—died c. 118), Greek statesman and historian who wrote of the rise of Rome to world prominence.

Wikipedia says this about Diodorus Siculus:

Diodorus Siculus, or Diodorus of Sicily (Greek: Διόδωρος Diodoros; fl. 1st century BC), was an ancient Greek historian. He is known for writing the monumental universal history Bibliotheca historica, in forty books, fifteen of which survive intact,[1] between 60 and 30 BC. The history is arranged in three parts. The first covers mythic history up to the destruction of Troy, arranged geographically, describing regions around the world from Egypt, India and Arabia to Europe. The second covers the time from the Trojan War to the death of Alexander the Great. The third covers the period to about 60 BC. Bibliotheca, meaning 'library', acknowledges that he was drawing on the work of many other authors.

These were Greek, not Christians. They were not authors of the Bible - or writers of the Bible.

Mr. Thayer is not quoting these men because they were “Christians” - he is quoting them because they were Greeks and he is providing the documentation to their Greek writings which he claims gives him the authority to define the Greek word baptizo as - “to dip repeatedly.” That is the very first definition he provides. As I have learned - the first definition does not necessarily mean in order of importance - that's the order he is using when the word has several different meanings.

Nonetheless, his first definition of baptizo is: “to dip repeatedly.”

Last week, I contacted several people who I knew listened to the message and I asked the question, what is the definition of baptizo? I will just tell you - no one got it right. It's okay for this week - but going forward - when I ask again - one of the definitions I am looking for is - “to dip repeatedly.” Just a heads up, there for those of you I'm going to quiz about when this over.

Friends, this is extremely important. It's not just dip - it is “to dip repeatedly.”

Once again, Mr. Thayer cites Greek writers, Greek historians, from thousands of years

ago - so they claim - and says that when those Greek writers used the Greek word baptizo in their writings - it was when they were writing about “to dip repeatedly.”

Now, as I have said before and will reiterate this morning - if you never heard of Mr. Thayer, if you never heard of Polybius, if you never heard of Diodorus Siculus - and all you had was the Bible - you would know - that baptizo means “to dip repeatedly.”

Why? Because before you ever got to the Greek word baptizo in your studies - you would have known about the Law concerning leprosy. And you would have seen that Law in great detail when we got to II Kings chapter 5, verse 14, look at it again, please, start in verse 10 - this is Elisha the Prophet of God telling Naaman the leper how to get rid of his leprosy:

[10] And Elisha sent a messenger unto him, saying, Go and wash in the Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again to thee, and thou shalt be clean.

Then, in verse 14:

[14] Then went he down, and dipped himself seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God: and his flesh came again like unto the flesh of a little child, and he was clean.

Right here in this simple little story, we see the action of Leviticus 12 - 14. We see the river Jordan - which is the most prominent water we find John the Washer in. We see Elisha using the word wash in verse 10, and we see seven times - dipping repeatedly in verse 14.

I have shown you from the Greek Septuagint - which is the Greek translation of the Hebrew - the Greek word for dipped - baptizo. This is Old Covenant baptism in full glory - in great detail.

Mr. Thayer, when he goes on with the rest of his definitions of baptizo - offers II Kings 5:14 - in addition to his citations of Polybius and Diodorus - he offers II Kings 5:14 to authorize his definition of the word baptizo - “to dip repeatedly.”

In addition to his, he offers Mark 7 as in the washing of pots and cups. He also offers Luke 11:38 - washing hands before eating. All of those things are dipped repeatedly. And, maybe even more importantly than that - those verses use the English word wash.

This is totally consistent with the Law God gave Moses which was wash the clothes, bathe the flesh. Whenever we see the application of physical water to the flesh - no matter where we find it - clearly in the Old Covenant - in Leviticus, Numbers, II Kings, etc., or in the Gospels and in the Book of Acts - we are seeing people obeying the Law God gave Moses. Washing and bathing - that's all physical H2O water can do for someone. In the Old it was definitely ceremonial at times - we see that - when we read the Law God gave Moses. But it was physical and it was ceremonial. But it was fulfilling the Law God gave Moses. It was works. It was an act. It was part of the sacrificing of animals - it was a part of the physical shedding of blood. Many times the water and the blood were mixed together in the ceremonial part of the Law. Why? Because it symbolized the Water and the Blood that flowed from the side of the crucified Christ.

And just like the blood - the physical blood - has been removed from the Covenant - so has the physical water. And anyone who demands physical water today for the remission of sins - does so - because they do not understand the role physical water played in the Old Covenant. And friends, when you read their writings for justifying the physical water today - you can see as clearly as can be how they are deceived. How they have never understood the application of the physical water to the flesh in the Old Law God gave Moses.

The definition of baptizo is "to dip repeatedly." I'll say repeatedly - as I said last week - for those of who are under the deception that physical H2O water is demanded today - and you were not dipped repeatedly - and I'll go so far as to say seven times - in flowing, running water - then you have missed it altogether on many fronts. You not only depended on something that wasn't Biblically applicable for today - but when it once WAS once Biblically accurate for people - you didn't even do it the way the Bible shows it was supposed to have been.

That's why I have asked repeatedly, "This 'baptism' you are demanding of people, what does it look like?" And I STILL have not received an answer. Having someone tell you "the Bible is silent on the issue, or it doesn't matter", well friends, that might fly with some people - but it doesn't fly with me. I'm a "Thus saith the Lord" kind of man. Always have been, always will be. You show me from the Bible what it is I'm supposed to do - and I'll do it so fast it will make your head spin. But, they can't do it. They won't do it. It's not in the book - except for what we find in Leviticus, Numbers and II Kings.

Their ridiculous answer to our simple question is, always: "It's 'baptism' dummy."

The definition of baptizo is “to dip repeatedly.” I don't need Thayer's. I don't need Schnaubel. I don't need Strong's. I don't need to be a Greek scholar - I just need to know my Bible.

On the fourth page of Ted's book on “baptism” - he provides several definitions of words related to “baptism” - which he uses to introduce his own presuppositions, agendas or biases. The reason I take such great exception to this and why it is so important to show you - is because he claims to be citing Mr. Thayer. He says he is using Mr. Thayer's definition for the Greek word baptizo.

<https://bibleversusconstitution.org/onlineBooks/baptism-immersion.html>

Please look at this for yourself, but I will read it for. This is how he says he is quoting Mr. Thayer's definition of baptizo.

baptizo; 1. properly, to dip ... to immerge, submerge (of vessels sunk, Polybius 1, 51, 6; 8, 8, 4; of animals, Diodorus 1, 36). 2. to cleanse by dipping or submerging, to wash, to make clean with water ... to wash oneself, bathe.... Metaphorically, to overwhelm.... 3. and alone, to inflict great and abounding calamities on one: ebaptisan teen polin, Josephus, b. j. 4, 3, 3; hee anomia me baptizei, Isa 21:4, Sept. hence, baptizesthai baptisma (compare W., 225 (211); (Buttmann, 148 (129))); compare louesthai to loutron, Aelian de nat. an. 3, 42), to be overwhelmed with calamities, of those who must bear them, Matt 20:22 f, R; Mark 10:38 f; Luke 12:50.

But that's the only time any of those verses are mentioned.

Listen again:

1. properly, to dip ... to immerge, submerge (of vessels sunk [etc.].)

Now wait a minute. There is a word missing. And in my opinion, it is a huge omission. What happened to the word “repeatedly.” Why did he replace the word “repeatedly” with “..”? I asked him, and I received a reply which I'll read shortly.

I've said a thousand times - we MUST clear our minds of the filthy image that every time we hear the word “baptism” - we instantly have this mental picture in our minds of a “church water ritual” that we either have participated in ourselves - or we have seen who knows how many times. With the exception of a youtube video we saw this

past week where the “preacher” dropped this large black woman who he was “baptizing” then somehow the microphone cable got wrapped around her neck as she flailed away in the mikveh - I mean baptistry - with that exception - every single time I've seen the “church water ritual” - it's dipped one time backwards - then right back up - out of the mikveh - and onto the next.

If any of you have ever witnessed “to dip repeatedly” - I would like to know about it. Other than the large black woman that the “preacher” dropped - who without a doubt - dipped repeatedly - while a whole bunch of them jumped in and tried to get her back on her feet.

The word “repeatedly” needed to be removed because it didn't fit. If someone were to read that - they might get confused. So, let's just remove that and replace it with three dots.

The reality is, someone might read it, get confused, then decide to go look for themselves to get an answer that might not be what the “church of christ” wants people to find out. Again, I am NOT saying that Ted is purposely deceiving people. I absolutely say there are others who call themselves “preachers” that are in the business of purposely deceiving people - but I still do not believe that Ted is one of them. I truly believe he believes what he believes - because he thinks it's the truth.

Here is the answer I received from Ted:

As I pointed out in a response to a previous query from you, knowing that many people will not take the time to read large portions of scripture or long quotations, whenever I can I streamline both scriptures and quotations.

In this instance, I did not feel it was pertinent information for the following reasons:

1) I know of no other Greek lexicon that substantiates such a statement.

2) If accurate, it's just one component that explains baptizo. In other words, not every time baptizo (whether water, fire, suffering, Spirit, etc.) occurred, did it have to be repeated multiple times.

3) There is no evidence in the New Testament of anyone being water immersed repeatedly. If that were necessary, it would have been necessary for a number to be

attached to baptizo as to how many times is required, or, for example, John would have never finished with immersing those he immersed. He'd have been forever at the Jordan.

4) Joseph Thayer is not alive for us to ask, but I suppose he could have been referring to baptizo being used, for example, to dye a garment red, which might require more than one dipping, or immersion, to accomplish the task. If that's the case, it wasn't pertinent to my point and so I streamlined the quotation for the reasons mentioned above.

Alright. I am going to respond to each point. Again, let me read it again.

As I pointed out in a response to a previous query from you, knowing that many people will not take the time to read large portions of scripture or long quotations, whenever I can I streamline both scriptures and quotations.

My exception to this is that he says he is citing Mr. Thayer. But he removes one word - in my opinion - quite possibly the keyword in the description. Repeatedly. In one of the greatest illustrations of bapto we find in our Bible - the story of Naaman - we find Elisha telling Naaman to dip himself seven times in the river Jordan.

When he said he was pointing out something from a previous query from me - that, too, was in relation to a deletion of his - which - again - I felt he deleted one of - if not the most important parts of a verse of Scripture - and to me - it's a pattern. It's a pattern - not to save time or space - but to make sure someone gets HIS presuppositions, biases or agenda. Replace "repeatedly" with "..."? In another part of his email - when I asked him about Old Covenant washings - he said they were superfluous and irrelevant to his discussion on "New Covenant immersion."

You cannot understand what those people were doing in the first century, if we do not understand what they were doing in the first 39 books of the Bible. They were not doing something new - when it came to the application of physical water to the flesh. They weren't doing something for hundreds of years, then all of a sudden, come up with something new. They were Judahites. They were trying to live according to the Law God gave Moses. That's what they were supposed to be doing. They weren't all scribes and Pharisees in the first century. There were plenty of them that accepted John and plenty of them that accepted Jesus - before His death, burial and resurrection - and they were keepers of the Law God gave Moses.

This is *why - and not that we need to know it* - but this is why archaeologists claim there were mikvehs all over and surrounding Jerusalem in the first century. This is why God called Hezekiah the greatest king of Judah up until his time. He brought flowing river water into Jerusalem via conduits.

Not everyone living in Jerusalem in the time of John the Washer and in the ministry of Christ - were evil scribes and Pharisees. Some were devout believers. Some were doing everything they could to obey the Law God gave Moses. They were washing the clothes, bathing the flesh. It's all over the Gospels and the Book of Acts.

Not saying Ted, please hear this, but there are plenty of "churchmen" out there who do not want people identifying what John was doing with the water of the Old Covenant. This is why so many people are under the impression that John was doing something completely new. He was not. To hide the word "repeatedly" from the definition of baptizo - is to mislead people - intentionally or not - it is misleading - especially when you are saying you are citing a respectable source.

I asked Jeff last week - to go to Ted's book and read Mr. Thayer's definition of baptizo. He read it once and said nothing. I said, "Read it again." He read it again and said nothing. I said, "Read it again." He still didn't see what it was I was trying to get him to see. I said, "What is Mr. Thayer's definition of baptizo?" Jeff then said, "Whoaaa." When he saw that "repeatedly" was replaced with "..." - he saw it. How many other people have read church of christ documents such as this one - and just read it and never questioned for a second why or what the "..." is there for?

In Jeff's defense, he did not know from the beginning that Ted was citing Mr. Thayer. At the end of the citation, you see footnote 7. Which, when you click it, Ted says he is citing Mr. Thayer. Look, I'm not saying Ted is doing something nefarious or evil - someone has deceived him. In his mind, I believe he sincerely thinks there is no reason to include "repeatedly" in the definition - because in his mind - when he hears the word "baptism" just like nearly every single other person in the world - he thinks of a "church water ritual" where someone goes down backwards one time in some water and right back up.

But baptisma does not always mean water. Bapto, in fact, rarely means water. It can mean water. Water is a fluid, it is a liquid. But so is blood. So is dye - d-y-e. So is vinegar. Baptisma also has a 100% spiritual meaning. I also asked Ted how he could write a book on "baptism" and not even mention Mark 10:38-39. He answered that "that baptism

was not the purpose of his book. The purpose of his book was to define and explain New Covenant immersion in physical water.” That was paraphrased, but that is what he said for all intents and purposes. Presuppositions, agendas and biases.

I told him I find this as a pattern. It is a pattern of not wanting people to equate what was going on in the Gospels and in the Book of Acts with what God had prescribed in the Law God gave Moses. I do not believe Ted's pattern is purposeful or intentionally deceptive - he does not understand the inseparable nature of the physical water and the physical blood requirements found in the Law God gave Moses.

On the other hand, I, we, those who have been taking a sincere look at this - do - believe that the water requirements found in the Law are neither superfluous or irrelevant.

Ted's next response to me was:

1) I know of no other Greek lexicon that substantiates such a statement.

Well, just because Ted does not know of any others - does not make it so. This proves my point completely. "Ted doesn't know." I have shown - not only from Thayer's - but I've shown from Eckhard Schnauble's work. There are so many Greek references for dipped repeatedly - it's astounding. That is, if you need other Greek references. The Greek references are nice. It's even fun to look at them and study them - but ultimately - we don't need them. It's pretty cool when they agree with the Bible - absolutely - but in the end - we just need the Bible. To dip repeatedly is all over the Law God gave Moses. Whether it's dipping and spinkling blood seven times, whether it's sprinkling the water, or dipping seven times - repeatedly is all over the Law God gave Moses?

Why? Why repeatedly? What's so important about that in the Law God gave Moses? Turn to Hebrews 6 again this morning, please. We'll begin in verse 1 - why is repeatedly so important?:

[1] Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God,

If you recall when we looked at this previously, I do not believe he is telling them to forsake the principles of the doctrine of Christ - but rather - keep them. We are leaving

the principles of the doctrine of Christ in place - and we are going to forsake the other things - as in

not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works.

Keeping the Law God gave Moses was keeping the foundation of repentance from dead works.

Through this series, I have had people that have questioned the fact that they just can't believe that Peter and James and John and Phillip were keeping the Law after the resurrection of Christ. Well friends, they absolutely were. They were daily in the temple - the text says so. The text even shows James telling Paul there were thousands of Judahites that believed and were zealous of the Law. That's pretty clear.

If those true followers of Jesus Christ were not still attempting to keep the Law - then why did Christ tell Paul to instruct them with letter after letter - telling them that keeping the Law was profiting them nothing? Who were all these letters written to? They were written to believers who were still keeping the Law. They were still thinking their works of the Law were benefiting them. That's why the letters were written. Come on, friends, think about that. If they already knew they weren't supposed to be keeping the Law - then the letters would have been useless. Verse 1 again:

[1] Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God,

[2] Of the doctrine of BAPTISMOS [baptisms], and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment.

The writer of the book of Hebrews is telling Christians - followers of Christ - in the first century - to move on from the doctrine of baptismos.

Once again, conspicuously missing from Ted's book and the rest of the "church of christ" for that matter. I'm not saying Ted alone has done this - they all have. Some because they simply do not understand the place physical water had in the Law God gave Moses - but some because they don't want people to know the truth. Trusting in the works of the Law means damnation. You better believe there are forces out there - people in high spiritual places - flesh and blood people - not spirits and demons like the "church world is obsessed with" - there are people out there who do not want people

to come to the knowledge of the truth of the Bible. They do not want people to find this information out.

This is why I asked Ted, “Why is there no definition for baptisimos in his book on “baptism?” Is this part of the pattern? He doesn't think there is a pattern - and rightly so - he's not doing what he's doing because he's a bad guy. I absolutely see it as a pattern - and it is a pattern.

What is the definition of the Greek word baptisimos? That's the Greek word here in Hebrews 6:2. Not disparaging Mr. Strong, but his work is kindergarten Greek. He says the word comes from baptizo - great so far - and the definition is

βαπτισμός baptisimos, bat-tis-mos'; from G907; ablution (ceremonial or Christian):— baptism, washing.

Thank you. You defined baptisimos as ablution (ceremonial or Christian) then told us “it's 'baptism.' And round and round the merry go round goes. He did tag washing to it, which is appreciated, but it's still just kindergarten, first grade Greek. Maybe that's all it was intended to be. I don't know. Let's get a little more advanced - we really don't need to - because those of us who have studied this - us - as in me and you - not just me - we already know this is talking about the washings found in the Law God gave Moses - wash the clothes, bathe the skin, wash the elements found in the temple, put basins in the outer court so people can wash their hands and feet before they enter the temple, etc., etc. We already know what this means without the Greek. But just for kicks, let's look at a little more advanced study of the Greek. Let's go back to Mr. Thayer's again.

Baptisimos, second paragraph, page 95. The Greek beta looks very similar to our B. Alpha looks like our A. A tee looking letter with two legs instead of one makes the sound of a P in the Greek. A sort of io combination makes the z sound and the m looking letter with the beginning dropping below the baseline makes the m sound then you can see the rest of the word and sound it out as baptisimos.

Thayer's:

a washing, a purification effected by the means of water, Mark 7: 4,8; of the washings prescribed by the Mosaic law, Hebrews 9:10.

Yes. That's it. Not because of Thayer's. Not because of the Greek. But because that's

what we know the washings found in the Bible were. Whenever we see the application of physical water to the flesh in our Bibles - anywhere in our Bibles - we are seeing people obeying the Law God gave Moses.

“Well, Charlie, I just can't believe those early Christians in the Book of Acts were keeping the Law.” Then, why did the writer of the Book of Hebrews tell them it was time to move on from them? Come on, brethren. This shouldn't be that hard. But it is. Because most people have never understand the water in the Law. And if they say they did - they determined - just like our brother Ted - it was superfluous or irrelevant. This is grave error.

The reason the writer of Hebrews was telling them to move on from the “doctrine of baptismos” as found in our English Bibles - is because some of them were still doing them. Verse 3:

[3] And this will we do, if God permit.

[4] For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost,

Baptisma in the Holy Ghost - once you were enlightened and learned this.

[5] And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come,
[6] If they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame.

Keeping the works of the Mosaic Law is crucifying Christ afresh - putting Him to an open shame. It's saying that His Work - what He did in His life, in His death, in His resurrection wasn't good enough. There must be something we have to do. There must be some sort of works of repentance that we can do that are good enough to be accepted by God the Father.

Now go over to Hebrews chapter 9. Still looking for why it is so important that we understand why - in the Old World - repeatedly - was so important for us to understand. Dip seven times. Dip repeatedly. Sprinkle seven times - sprinkle repeatedly. Why is omitting the word repeatedly from the understanding of baptizo so grievous?

[1] Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary.

[2] For there was a tabernacle made; the first, wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shewbread; which is called the sanctuary.

[3] And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the Holiest of all;

[4] Which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant;

[5] And over it the cherubims of glory shadowing the mercyseat; of which we cannot now speak particularly.

[6] Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God.

[7] But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people:

[8] The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing:

Now watch closely.

[9] Which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience;

[10] Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings [the Greek here is baptisimos] , and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation.

[11] But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building;

[12] Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered **in once he entered in once he entered in once he entered in once** into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.

[13] For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh:

[14] How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?

[15] And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.

[16] For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator.

[17] For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth.

[18] Whereupon neither the first testament was dedicated without blood.

[19] **For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water,** and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people,

[20] Saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you.

[21] Moreover he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry.

[22] And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission.

[23] It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with **better** sacrifices than these.

The New Covenant is better and it is not physical!

[24] For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us:

[25] Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others;

[25] Nor yet that he should offer himself often

How about the word repeatedly here where we see often. Of course.

[25] Nor yet that he should offer himself repeatedly

The Greek word is pollakis which comes from poloos - which has - of course - **repeatedly** in its definition. But we still don't need the Greek. Speaking of Christ -

[26] For then must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now **once ONE TIME - ONE TIME - NOT REPEATEDLY** - in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.

Friends, this is why it is so important to understand Old Covenant baptizo as “to dip repeatedly.” The Old “repeatedly” was replaced by Jesus Christ as a once and for all. His work - what He did - ended the Old Covenant baptismos - because the Old Covenant baptismos could not take away sins permanently. The works of the Law were performed repeatedly. This is why “church of christ” preachers have told people they need to get “baptized” as many times as it takes to get it right.

If you remove the word “repeatedly” from the understanding of baptizo - there is no possible way you can understand what the application of the physical water to the flesh was all about in the Bible.

In another of Ted's answers, he says this:

3) There is no evidence in the New Testament of anyone being water immersed repeatedly. If that were necessary, it would have been necessary for a number to be attached to baptizo as to how many times is required, or, for example, John would have never finished with immersing those he immersed. He'd have been forever at the Jordan.

The Bible definition of baptizo is “to dip repeatedly.” There is no way Ted or anyone else - including me - can say how many times - 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 - no way any of us can say how many times they went into the water in the first century when they were obeying the Law God gave Moses. We can see when they went into the water - but we have no idea what they did once they were in the water. All we know for sure is that in the Bible model - whenever the water was applied to the flesh - it was done repeatedly. From one of the clearest examples we find in the Bible - Elisha told Naaman to dip seven times in the river Jordan. There is no other more detailed description than that one in our Bibles.

Once again, it goes towards the question I have asked over and over and over. “If physical water application to the flesh is required today - what does it look like?”

The answer: “The Bible is silent on the issue” - doesn't get it.

Baptisma does not always mean water. That has been proven over and over. In noticing conspicuously, that the word repeatedly was replaced with “...” in Ted's book - I also asked him why in a book about “baptism” he has no discussion of Mark 10:38-39.

His answer was that in his book - he was only trying to prove physical immersion into physical water as the definition of New Covenant "baptisma."

Ok. That is presuppositions, agendas and biases.

But that's not the only definition of baptisma. And, in light of the easy, simple understanding that John distinctly referred to two baptisms - his with water and Christ's with something spiritual - not physical water - I am deeply concerned when people try to say that the only possible baptisma for the New Covenant is John's baptisma.

We make no mention of the Words of Christ to His disciples when He tells them they will partake of His baptisma - which has nothing to do with water - physical water?

Christ's baptisma is a baptisma that overwhelms someone with the afflictions and calamities that He went through at His execution. That is not a "church water ritual" in any shape or form.

Please take your Bibles in closing, and turn to I Peter chapter 3. What I've tried to get you to see - and thank the Lord - all of you that I have heard from see this - but as we see the progression from the end of the Old Covenant World - to the beginning of the New - we see a move - further and further from the physical temple. Of course, we do. They kept going to the temple to try to teach in the Authority of Jesus Christ - and they kept getting beaten, thrown in jail, killed, of course - would you keep going to the same place every week to get your brains beat in? No you wouldn't.

Finally, Paul told them - YOU are the temple. YOU are the temple God. You don't have to keep going to the physical temple only to get beaten and killed or thrown in jail. So, as they went less and less to the temple - it became apparent to some - not all - but to some - that the physical washings required for entrance into the temple - were losing their validity. Until finally - Paul made it abundantly clear - the divers washings (baptismos) were ending for good.

This is why we see - less and less of what appears to be the physical application of water to the flesh - and more and more of what is MOST CERTAINLY - the definition for baptisma as in identifying ones' self with the death, burial and resurrection of Christ - in a spiritual way - not with water works of the Law.

When I told you about Ted omitting the word “repeatedly”, I also asked why he would omit a discussion on Mark 10. I also asked why, in his definition of baptisma - also in Part 4 of his online book - why does he say he is citing Thayer - in which he provides definition 1 - omits definition 2 - and goes straight to definition 3. He doesn't see this pattern of omission as important - because he does not understand the importance of water in the Law - and he has found it “superfluous and irrelevant” for the purpose of his book.

I Peter 3, beginning in verse 1. I want you to keep in mind who is the author of this letter. I'm telling you that Peter - finally figured it out. As we get nearer and nearer to the end of the Old Covenant and the beginning of the New - Peter - just like John - from where we read in I John about the spirit, the water, and the blood - Peter figured out what baptisma in Christ was all about.

[1] Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives;

I don't have time to discuss it this morning, but pay attention to how many times the word conversation is used in this chapter. Conversation does not mean the words you say - it means the manner of life - the way you live. That's what it means in this chapter.

[2] While they behold your chaste [way of living] conversation coupled with fear.

[3] Whose adorning let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold, or of putting on of apparel;

[4] But let it be the hidden man of the heart, in that which is not corruptible, even the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price.

[5] For after this manner in the old time the holy women also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves, being in subjection unto their own husbands:

[6] Even as Sara obeyed Abraham, calling him lord [small l not capital L]: whose daughters ye are, as long as ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement.

[7] Likewise, ye husbands, dwell with them according to knowledge, giving honour unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered.

[8] Finally, be ye all of one mind, having compassion one of another, love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous:

[9] Not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing: but contrariwise blessing;

knowing that ye are thereunto called, that ye should inherit a blessing.

[10] For he that will love life, and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil, and his lips that they speak no guile:

[11] Let him eschew evil, and do good; let him seek peace, and ensue it.

[12] For the eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, and his ears are open unto their prayers: but the face of the Lord is against them that do evil.

[13] And who is he that will harm you, if ye be followers of that which is good?

[14] But and if ye suffer for righteousness' sake, happy are ye: and be not afraid of their terror, neither be troubled;

[15] But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts: and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear:

[16] Having a good conscience; that, whereas they speak evil of you, as of evildoers, they may be ashamed that falsely accuse your good conversation [manner of life] in Christ.

[17] For it is better, if the will of God be so, that ye suffer for well doing, than for evil doing.

[18] For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit:

Now watch. There is a ton here in verse 19 - I don't have time this morning - but listen.

[19] By which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison;

[20] Which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water.

eight souls were saved by water - prior to the Old Covenant even - eight souls were saved by water.

Now verse 21:

[21] The like figure

We're coming back to this next week. I don't have time this morning. The like figure - it's figurative, it's representative, it's not the same thing - it's like something. It's a type, it's a shadow.

[21] The like figure whereunto even “baptism” doth also now save us

Ok. Stop. “Baptism” doth also now save us. What is the definition of baptisma? Are we talking about the baptisma of John with water - “well there it is, Charlie - it says water.” Yeah, the like figure, figurative speaking. There it is, “baptism doth also now save us.”

What baptisma saves us? Look at what is in parentheses. If we don't understand this - there is no way we can understand what this means.

(not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,)

Friends, how is this any clearer? Peter is saying I'm not talking about the baptisma which is the putting away of the filth of the flesh. I'm not talking about John's baptisma. I'm not talking about the water works of the Law. I'm talking about the baptisma that NOW saves - not the Old baptisma - I'm talking about the New baptisma - that baptisma of Christ.

I'm talking about the answer of the good way of life toward God -

by the resurrection of Jesus Christ:

[22] Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him.

The verse that all these water demanders claim is about physical water “baptism” is saying the exact opposite. It's saying - as clearly as anything in the Bible - I'm not talking about Old Covenant washing away of the filth of the flesh - that's not the baptisma I'm talking about. I'm talking about the baptisma that Christ told His disciples about from Mark 10 - the baptisma of His death, burial and resurrection.

Oh my, friends, which baptisma saves us?

Go to Ted's book and see it for yourself. It's on the very first page. Listen to how he quotes this verse:

...God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein ... eight souls were saved by water.

Presuppositions, agendas, biases.

The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (... the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ. (1 Peter 3:20-21)

He completely leaves out the phrase

not the putting away of the filth of the flesh

and replaces it with "...". And I am the one accused of eisogesis? Friends taking away from the text is equally as bad as adding to it.

This is because he does not understand how the water being applied to the flesh in the Law God gave Moses was so vitally important. He, and all those who demand physical water to the flesh - are telling people to obey the works of the Law for salvation.

Friends, this was not bash Ted hour. I realize in fact it sure seems to be. But I am trying to expose the erroneous teaching that physical water to the flesh saves today. Nothing could be further from the truth. Ted is by no means the only one that teaches this. Ninety nine point nine nine nine percent of "preachers" in this world preach it - and every single one of them is wrong.