

**Message# 208- 9-25-2022 - Christians Believe that Jesus Fulfilled the Prophets - H2O
Water Works of the Law Ended with the Old Covenant**
Preached first on 9/25/2022 on www.molibertyradio.us

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

I want to read something that came from Johannes - Joan's oldest son. This is a series of short emails but I think it's important that I share this with you. This is the first one:

Dear Sir Charlie,

It hurts so much sir that daddy died in the institution of false gods.

It hurts so much that I didn't have any faith at all in the King to have at least driven him home and not had waited for my "licensed" grandpa to come pick us up from the house to the hospital.

Now I am judged till the day I die that because of having faith without works I was dead nevertheless I will be carrying it. It is indeed a punishment for me for being my own god. But thanks be to God that He has triumphed after all the arguments I made with my closest relatives because now I can answer to their faces that the institutions of false gods can never give life to those who were innocently fooled by them.

Johannes

I believe my email response to him - is not just appropriate for this young man - but I believe it has value for all of us.

Johannes – One of the greatest things that our faith in Christ gives us is this:

If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just, and will FORGIVE us our sins, and cleanse us from all unrighteousness.

Do not carry that burden with you any longer. Be mindful of it and learn from it – hopefully so as not to repeat it. But you must not carry that burden. Leave it with Christ and carry on.

There is therefore no now condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus.

This is absolutely NOT a “license” to repeat.

*What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?
God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?*

You have confessed. Certainly you have asked the Only One Who can forgive. Now leave it and move on determined not for it to happen again. Our life in Christ is a joyful one. So find joy in forgiveness. Knowing that you have been forgiven, knowing that you have the faith once delivered to the saints – go on unto greater perfection in Christ.

*Blessings,
Charlie*

That of course, applies to all of us. Confess our sins, leave them with Christ and move on. Then he wrote again. Listen very closely to what this young man is saying.

Sir if I may state this but we who say that have faith haven't yet gathered ourselves together to become a country for our God where He is our King and we His people as is part of the work, the fullest of our immersion in Him. The truth even hurts more that while pondering about it, a question stands on how indeed can we see Our God's Home if we ourselves are literally outside, far from each other as brethren? Good for you Sir as the Preacher of the Lord preaching the reality of His Kingdom, you lived what you preached therefore it is evident that indeed you are saved of the Lord but as for us members we once more are left to be devoured by ravenous wolves. But we thank God that Jesus the Christ is the first and the last shepherd the Son of David.

Then my response:

Johannes – We are also devoured by ravenous wolves – but delivered also. Just yesterday, Jerry was arrested for no “driver’s license.” He spent 3 hours in their stinking jail – but he was set free!

We are all trying to live as Citizens of the Commonwealth of Israel following the Great Shepherd. And we are always mindful that because we are His friends, the world hates us. If the world hated Him, it will hate us, also.

The Commonwealth of Israel is supposed to be everywhere. Yes, it would be great if we were much closer. But your people are required to be Citizens of the Commonwealth of Israel – just like my people are. You and your family are the initial stones that Christ is

using to build His Government in the Philippines. Yes, it is going to be rough times getting started. But you have a tremendous, blessed work to do.

YOU and your family – are no less the Commonwealth of Israel than we are. Our responsibility is to be used to build His Universal Government everywhere there are people.

You cannot expect the world around you to welcome you or even be kind to you. Even though you are not their enemy, they will consider you to be since you will not join them. But better to be a friend of Christ, than the friend of the world.

Charlie

Friends, I've said this before to all of us. It would be great - if all of us were living much closer together. Even those who are living in the Philippines - it would be great if we were closer. I'd love to be able to go and visit with Joan and her family. I'd love to go and visit with Michael - who is only 1,000 miles (or even less away) - not thousands of miles away. But the Government of God is supposed to be covering His entire earth. There's a reason why He created different races and different languages. His intention is for the Gospel of His Government to cover His entire Creation. I hope and I hope that you are hoping and praying with me also that Joan and Johannes and Cathy and their families will reach others in the Philippines to build the Commonwealth of Israel there.

For those of us here on this land - if we cannot move closer - then we need to be building the Commonwealth of Israel wherever we are. The Commonwealth of Israel is not only where a group of white people gather together on a piece of land. The Commonwealth of Israel is wherever any group of people gather together for the purpose of living the Government of God. The world - those that oppose Christ - those that oppose the Government of God - they are the ones who are covering the entire earth right now. Our job is to cover the earth with the message - the Good News - the Gospel - that there is Another King, One Jesus. That needs to be going on everywhere.

You no doubt heard me mention in the emails that Jerry underwent a baptizo this week. He spent several hours in the jail because he did not possess a document identifying him as a u.s. citizen - a friend of the world. So, the world considered him to be not their friend. They thought it was a good idea for them to at the very least - ruin his day. Jerry was released and didn't even have to spend a night in their stinking jail.

I need you to listen to me this morning and hear this loud and clear. All Jerry was trying to do was make a living. No man anywhere has the “right” to prevent someone from trying to make a living. Working and earning increase by the sweat of your brow is one of the very first commandments that God has decreed. That is a Law of God.

If a man does not work, neither shall he eat.

And if a man is working don't you dare try to stand in his way. You don't need man's permission to do what God commanded you to do. In fact, to ask another man for permission to work - to do something that God has made Law - is to deny His Lordship. This is a very serious thing. The work that God has blessed Jerry with requires him to move himself, move his truck, move his tools, move his trailer all over God's Earth - not man's earth. Not the state of Missouri's earth. It's God's earth. He created it. He owns it. If you are working as God's Law demands - and you are not harming anyone or their property in the process - then no man has the “right” or the Authority from God to hinder you.

And, I'm telling you again, if you ask permission from a man to do something that God has already commanded you to do - that is denying His Lordship. That is denying that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh. Friends, this is where the rubber meets the road. This is where faith - our system of belief - becomes action. He is God - or man is god.

The reason very few people know this is because most people have learned what they think they know about the Creator from some godless institution called “church.” The god of the “church” is the state. The “church” tells people they must obey the state - to obey the state is to obey god. Yes. That is correct. To obey the state - is to obey god - and that's a little g.

This issue of not possessing state issued paperwork is no small thing. Who do you belong to? Do you belong to the state and it's little g god? Or do you belong to the God of Heaven? It's really that simple. And friends, nothing is going to change until those who call themselves God's people - begin to act like it. Until they begin to actually put what they say they believe into action - not only are things not going to change - they are going to get worse. The only thing that can stand in the way of evil - is the people of God living like the people of God.

This week, in Christian County Missouri - how ironic the name - was the first time one of those cops heard someone tell them - “You are not the Government of Romans 13.”

Because, of course, that's one of the things they said to Jerry when they had him kidnapped. No, if you were the Government depicted in Romans 13, you would have by no means committed the capital offense of kidnapping of one of God's sons. That's also, very easy. No, if you were the Government depicted in Romans 13, you would have heaped praise upon Jerry for working - for obeying the Laws of God. Instead, you thought it was a good idea to kidnap him - armed with guns - and put him in a cage for a little while - while you got your kicks and jollies out of trying to terrorize a Godly young man for obeying the Laws of God.

So, yes, Johannes, we, too are thought of as food for the devouring wolves - those that clearly do not know or obey the Laws of God. Nor do they respect the Commonwealth of Israel - the only Authorized Government in existence today.

Which brings me to another point. I've kind of said this before - and since the opportunity has arisen - I'll just share it again. While I am not easily offended - I do from time to time have righteous indignation - which certainly has its time and place.

In our day and age - it is simply unthinkable that someone - a cop in this example - has never been told that he is not a representative of the Government described in Romans 13. I am pretty well sick and tired of hearing people call themselves the "Israel of God" - "Christian Israel" etc., when they are not. This issue was dealt with a long long time ago. It's actually a pretty sobering thought - but apparently - people still don't get it. For just a minute, please, turn to the book of Revelation. Chapter two, please, this principle is actually found in two places in this book. Verse 9.

[9] I know thy works, and tribulation, and poverty, (but thou art rich) and I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Judahites, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan.

Chapter 3, now, verse 9:

[9] Behold, I will make them of the synagogue of Satan, which say they are Judahites, and are not, but do lie; behold, I will make them to come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee.

This should have been a warning that should have been preached and preached and preached - so that no other man would be found guilty of this. The movement that has given us "Christian Identity" "Christian Israel" - they call themselves Judahites. They call

themselves Israelites - but to them it is only a figment of their imaginations. I've made the challenge a hundred times before - "so you call yourself 'Israel'. Okay. Open your billfolds - lay the contents out on the table - and as they say - "Let's see some identification." "Let's see what your papers say." And we all know what we will find, don't we?

I realize there are many nice people - I have friends (hopefully I still have them after this message) - people I call my friend - people who are nice to me - who call themselves Israel - but they are not. They are card-carrying U.S. citizens. They have the i.d. to prove it. They fly the state flags on their vehicles. They call themselves "Israel" - but everything else in their life says otherwise.

If only the people on this land - who called themselves "Israel" - would act like it - fake it if you have to - there would be no way that a cop - anywhere on this land - would hear for the first time - there is another King, One Jesus. It's one thing to say it. It's another thing altogether to live it.

So, yeah, it's a bit offensive. It's a turn-off, really. To hear people say to us they are "Israel" - when we know that everything else in their life says they belong to the U.S.

I hear it, when people say they are scared to live right. I don't understand it. I don't understand fear - if we truly believe the Words of Christ. Fear and true belief are not compatible.

Finally, I received this from Johannes:

I am thankful really sir Charlie to our Lord for your presence in spirit that indeed though you are not here it feels rather the opposite. Please Sir send my regards for those who by their love for God have spared some of their life's savings for us. May the Lord be true to His promises by blessing them and you as well who have opened the door for His Children. I have witnessed it that though we here as relatives do not agree with each other in the faith but still opened doors to us were blessed how much more for you there as the people who chose Jesus as Christ and lived it.

Once again, for those of you who have sent something to Joan and her blessed family, I thank you, too. I do hope that more of you will consider doing something - anything. Nothing is too small. Their family is deserving of our support. I wouldn't encourage it the way I do if I do not believe in what they are doing. In many ways, I've told you

before, it might actually be harder for them to live the Government of God - even than it is for us.

Alright. Speaking of things offensive.

I want you to know - that thankfully - as the days go on - God has blessed me even more with the fact that whenever I hear any variation of the Greek word bapto - I no longer immediately think of anything to do with water - physical water. Lots of study, lots of meditation on what Christ said His baptisma is - has finally washed me and made me clean of that false deception.

I have not preached a physical water baptisma for more than 30 years. But until we really got going with this study - and I realized the absolute need for this in-depth study - I, myself, did not realize how important it is that our minds are not immediately drawn - to - captivated by - consumed with - the baptisma of Christ - instead of a false "baptism" taught by something called "church."

So, what was offensive? Well, it's that. It's what I just said. It is an offense to Jesus Christ, the Son of God, for men and women boys and girls to not immediately be drawn to His baptisma - but instead - when they hear the sound bapto - they are drawn back to the Old Covenant way - which could never fully take away sins. It was never perfect. It was never good enough. All the physical water could do was wash the clothes, bathe the skin. It was temporary. It could never do what the Living Water brought by Jesus the Christ could do.

It is offensive - it is inexcusable - it is one of the greatest reasons why this world is in the condition it is in today - because men refuse to teach what is truly the baptisma of Jesus Christ.

Turn with me once again this morning to Matthew chapter 3. We'll only read a couple of verses - we should all know this by now - be very familiar with this entire chapter. Verse 11, please, this is John the Washer speaking:

[11] I indeed baptizo you

Everyone knows - or certainly should know - the word baptize is a transliteration. It is not a translation. It is a made up word and it should not be in our Bibles. By far, because we understand how water was used in the Law of God and in the Prophets found in the

first 39 books of our Bibles - an immensely better and real English word would have been “wash.” In the very first English Bible - the Wycliffe version - Mr. Wycliffe DID translate the word here as “wash”:

I wash you in water into penance; but He that shall come after me is stronger than I, Whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; He shall baptize you in the Holy Ghost and fire.

I'm not sure - but for possibly the influence of something called “church” in his day - I'm not sure why didn't use the word “wash” in both places - that is a bit strange - but nonetheless - at least when he was referring to whatever it was that John was doing - he used the English word “wash”.

Because I am trying to reeducate - I'm trying to get people to go back and study how the Greek word bapto was used in the Greek language - I have chosen rather than to translate the Greek into English - which is what should have been done - I'm just leaving the actual Greek word in the verse - as a constant challenge to get people to study for themselves.

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

Let's stop again. How about that seemingly insignificant little word there - “indeed”. I've said it before. John is saying, “All I'm doing is washing you in water. That's all I'm doing here.”

We haven't looked at how Mr. Thayer defined this seemingly insignificant word, so let's do that for just a minute. For those of you who have ears to hear and eyes to see - you will definitely see the importance. Mr. Thayer, quote:

μέν, [men] a weakened form of μήν [mane], and hence, properly a particle of affirmation: truly, certainly, surely, indeed — its affirmative force being weakened, yet retained most in Ionic, Epic, and Herodotus, and not wholly lost in Attic and Hellenistic writers (μέν 'confirmative'; cf. 4 Macc. 18:18).

Once again, let me remind what Mr. Thayer's expertise is. Particularly in this instance, he is drawing you to ancient Greek literature. He's not trying to give you “churchmen” definitions - at least here with this word. He is saying, this is how this word was used in ancient Greek writings. Continue.

Owing to this its original meaning it adds a certain force to the terms and phrases with which it is connected, and thus contrasts them with or distinguishes them from others.

That was hugely important. For those of you more sophisticated than I am - I hope you see this. John is saying what I am doing is not like what He is going to be doing. "All I'm doing is washing with water. But the One coming is going to wash you in something totally different." Back to Mr. Thayer:

Owing to this its original meaning it adds a certain force to the terms and phrases with which it is connected, and thus contrasts them with or distinguishes them from others. Accordingly, it takes on the character of a concessive and very often of a merely distinctive particle, which stands related to a following δέ [ge] or other adversative conjunction, either expressed or understood,

Again, now, listen closely. I even get this. I may be unsophisticated - but I get this. You will, too, no matter the level of education you have - if you will see this for yourself.

and in a sentence composed of several members is so placed as to point out the first member, to which a second, marked by an adversative particle, is added or opposed. It corresponds to the Latin quidem, indeed, German zwar (i. e. properly, zu Wahre, i. e. in Wahrheit (in truth)); but often its force cannot be reproduced. Its use in classic Greek is exhibited by Devarius i., p. 122ff, and Klotz on the same ii. 2, p. 656ff; Viger i., p. 531ff, and Hermann on the same, p. 824f; others; Matthiae, § 622; Kühner, ii., p. 806ff, § 527ff; p. 691ff; § 503; (Jelf, § 729, 1, 2; § 764ff); Passow, and Pape (and Liddell and Scott), under the word.

I. Examples in which the particle μέν is followed in another member by an adversative particle expressed. Of these examples there are two kinds:

1. those in which μέν has a concessive force, and δέ [ge] (or ἀλλά) introduces a restriction, correction, or amplification of what has been said in the former member, indeed... but, yet, on the other hand. Persons or things, or predications about either, are thus correlated: Matthew 3:11, cf. Mark 1:8 (where T Tr WH omit; L brackets μέν); Luke 3:16

Now. Be careful. Here is where we heed the warnings of Eckhard Schnauble in regards to some of these 19th century teachers. When Mr. Thayer sticks to the ancient Greek writings - it's great. But sometimes, not always, he defers to "church" and the "churchmen". We need to be careful. You can see it when he does it. I am going to go ahead and read what he said - but I absolutely do not agree. He just said the word

indeed means

Owing to this its original meaning it adds a certain force to the terms and phrases with which it is connected, and thus contrasts them with or distinguishes them from others.

In other words, the first is different from the second. But then, he says this:

(where the meaning is, 'I indeed baptize as well as he who is to come after me, but his baptism is of greater efficacy'; cf. Acts 1:5);

Well, no. What is being said here is that His baptism is totally different from the first. That's what it means in the Greek. The first is different from the second.

Matthew 9:37 and Luke 10:2 (although the harvest is great, yet the laborers are few); Matthew 17:11f (rightly indeed is it said that Elijah will come and work the ἀποκατάστασις, but he has already come to bring about this very thing); Matthew 20:23; Matthew 22:8; Matthew 23:28; John 16:22; John 19:32; Acts 21:39 (although I am a Jew, and not that Egyptian, yet etc.); Acts 22:3 (R); Romans 2:25; Romans 6:11; 1 Corinthians 1:18; 1 Corinthians 9:24; 1 Corinthians 11:14; 1 Corinthians 12:20 (R G L brackets Tr brackets WH marginal reading); 1 Corinthians 15:51 (R. G L brackets); 2 Corinthians 10:10; Hebrews 3:5; 1 Peter 1:20, and often. μέν and δέ are added to articles and pronouns: οἱ μέν... οἱ δέ, the one indeed... but the other (although the latter, yet the former), Philippians 1:16f (according to the critical text); ὅς μέν... ὅς δέ, the one indeed, but (yet) the other etc. Jude 1:22f; τινες μέν... τινες δέ καί, Philippians 1:15; with conjunctions: εἰ μέν οὖν, if indeed then, if therefore... εἰ δέ, but if, Acts 18:14f R G; Acts 19:38f; 25:11 L T Tr WH (εἰ μέν οὖν... νυνὶ δέ, Hebrews 8:4f (here R G εἰ μέν γάρ)); εἰ μέν... νῦν δέ, if indeed (conceding or supposing this or that to be the case)... but now, Hebrews 11:15; κἄν μέν... εἰ δέ μήγε, Luke 13:9; μέν γάρ... δέ, 1 Corinthians 11:7; Romans 2:25; μέν οὖν... δέ, Luke 3:18; εἰς μέν... εἰς δέ, Hebrews 9:6f μέν... ἀλλά, indeed... but, although... yet, Romans 14:20; 1 Corinthians 14:17; μέν... πλήν, Luke 22:22. (Cf. Winers Grammar, 443 (413); Buttmann, § 149, 12 a.)

2. those in which μέν loses its concessive force and serves only to distinguish, but δέ retains its adversative power: Luke 11:48; Acts 13:36; Acts 23:8 (here WH text omits; Tr brackets μέν); 1 Corinthians 1:12, 23; Philippians 3:1; Hebrews 7:8; ἀπό μέν... ἐπί δέ, 2 Timothy 4:4; ὁ μέν οὖν (German er nun (he, then))... οἱ δέ, Acts 28:5f; ὅς μέν... ὅς δέ, and one... and another, 1 Corinthians 11:21; οἱ μέν... ὁ δέ (he, on the contrary), Hebrews 7:20f, 23f; ἐκεῖνοι μέν οὖν... ἡμεῖς δέ, 1 Corinthians 9:25; εἰ μέν οὖν... εἰ δέ, Acts 18:14f (R G); Acts 19:38; 25:11 (L T Tr WH); and this happens chiefly when what

has already been included in the words immediately preceding is separated into parts, so that the adversative particle contrasts that which the writer especially desires to contrast: *ἐκάστῳ... τοῖς μὲν ζητοῦσιν... τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας* etc. Romans 2:6-8; *παῖς... ἐκεῖνοι μὲν... ἡμεῖς δὲ* etc. 1 Corinthians 9:25; add, Matthew 25:14f, 33; Romans 5:16; Romans 11:22.

3. *μὲν... δέ* serve only to distribute a sentence into clauses: *both... and; not only... but also; as well... as*: John 16:9-11; Romans 8:17; Jude 1:8; *πρῶτον μὲν... ἔπειτα δέ*, Hebrews 7:2; *ὁ μὲν... ὁ δέ... ὁ δέ*, *some... some... some*, Matthew 13:8; (*ἕκαστος... ὁ μὲν... ὁ δέ*, *each... one... another*, 1 Corinthians 7:7 L T Tr WH); *ὅς μὲν... ὅς δέ*, *one... another*, Matthew 21:35; Acts 17:32; 1 Corinthians 7:7 (R G); *οἱ μὲν... ἄλλοι (L οἱ) δέ... ἕτεροι δέ*, Matthew 16:14; *ὧ μὲν γάρ... ἄλλῳ δέ... ἐτέρῳ δέ* (here T Tr WH omit; L brackets *δέ*), 1 Corinthians 12:8-10; *ἃ μὲν... followed by ἀλλά δέ* (three times, Matthew 13:4f, 7f; *ἄλλος μὲν, ἄλλος δέ*, 1 Corinthians 15:39; *τοῦτο μὲν... τοῦτο δέ*, *on the one hand... on the other; partly... partly*, Hebrews 10:33, also found in secular authors, cf. Winer's Grammar, 142 (135). *μὲν* is followed by another particle: *ἔπειτα*, John 11:6; 1 Corinthians 12:28; James 3:17; *καί νῦν*, Acts 26:4, 6; *τά νῦν*, Acts 17:30; *πολύ (R G πολλῶ) μᾶλλον*, Hebrews 12:9.

II. Examples in which *μὲν* is followed neither by *δέ* nor by any other adversative particle (*μὲν* 'solitarium'); cf. Winer's Grammar, 575f (534f); Buttman, 365f (313f) These examples are of various kinds; either

1. the antithesis is evident from the context; as, Colossians 2:23 ('have indeed a show of wisdom', but are folly (cf. Lightfoot, in the place cited)); *ἡ μὲν... σωτηρίαν*, namely, but they themselves prevent their own salvation, Romans 10:1; *τά μὲν... δυνάμεις*, namely, but ye do not hold to my apostolic authority, 2 Corinthians 12:12: *ἄνθρωποι μὲν (L T Tr WH omit μὲν)... ὁμνύουσιν*, namely, *ὁ δέ Θεός καθ' ἑαυτοῦ ὁμνύει*, Hebrews 6:16. Or,

2. the antithetic idea is brought out by a different turn of the sentence:

Once again, the first part of the sentence is different from the second part of the sentence.

Acts 19:4 (Rec.), where the expected second member, *Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, is wrapped up in *τουτ' ἐστὶν εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν*; Romans 11:13 *ἐφ' ὅσον μὲν κτλ.*, where the antithesis *παραζήλω δέ κτλ.* is contained in *εἴπωσ παραζηλώσω*; Romans 7:12 *ὁ μὲν νόμος κτλ.*, where the thought of the second member, 'but sin misuses the law,' is expressed in another form in Romans 7:13ff by an anacoluthon, consisting of a change from the disjunctive to a conjunctive construction (cf. Herm. ad Vig., p. 839), we find *μὲν... τέ*, Acts 27:21; *μὲν... καί*, 1 Thessalonians 2:18; in distributions or partitions, Mark

4:4-8 (here R G μέν... δέ... καί... καί); Luke 8:5-8; or, finally, that member in which δέ would regularly follow immediately precedes (Herm. ad Vig., p. 839), Acts 28:22 (yet see Meyer at the passage; cf. Buttmann, § 149, 12 d.). Or

3. the writer, in using μέν, perhaps had in mind a second member to be introduced by δέ, but was drawn away from his intention by explanatory additions relating to the first member: thus Acts 3:13 (ὄν ὑμεῖς μέν — Rec. omits this μέν — etc., where ὁ Θεός δέ ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, cf. Acts 3:15, should have followed); especially (as occasionally in classical Greek also) after πρῶτον μέν: Romans 1:8; Romans 3:2; 1 Corinthians 11:18; τόν μέν πρῶτον λόγον κτλ., where the antithesis τόν δέ δεύτερον λόγον κτλ. ought to have followed, Acts 1:1.

4. μέν οὖν (in Luke 11:28 T Tr WH μενοῦν), Latinquidem igitur, (English so then, now therefore, verily, etc.) (where μέν is confirmatory of the matter in hand, and οὖν marks an inference or transition, cf. Klotz ad Devar. ii. 2, p. 662f; (Herm. Vig., pp. 540f, 842; Buttmann, § 149, 16)): Acts 1:18; Acts 5:41; Acts 13:4; Acts 17:30; Acts 23:22; Acts 26:9; 1 Corinthians 6:4, 7 (here T omits Tr brackets οὖν); ἀλλά μέν οὖν, Philippians 3:8 G L Tr; εἰ μέν οὖν, Hebrews 7:11.

5. μέν solitarium has a concessive and restrictive force, indeed, verily (German freilich) (cf. Klotz, Devar. ii. 2, p. 522; Hartung, Partikeln, ii. 404): εἰ μέν, 2 Corinthians 11:4; μέν οὖν now then, (German nun freilich), Hebrews 9:1 (cf. Buttmann, as above. On the use of μέν οὖν in the classics cf. Cope's note on Aristotle, rhet. 2, 9, 11.)

6. μενουγγε, which see in its place.

III. As respects the position of the particle: it never stands at the beginning of a sentence, but yet as near the beginning as possible; generally in the second or third place, by preference between the article and noun (examples in which it occupies the fourth place are Acts 3:21; 2 Corinthians 10:1; Colossians 2:23; Acts 14:12 Rec.; the fifth place, Ephesians 4:11; Romans 16:19 R WH brackets; 1 Corinthians 2:15 R G; (John 16:22, see below)); moreover, in the midst of a clause also it attaches itself to a word the force of which is to be strengthened, as καί ὑμεῖς οὖν λύπην μέν νῦν ἔχετε (but L T Tr WH... οὖν νῦν μέν λύπην), John 16:22; cf. Winers Grammar, § 61, 6. The word is not found in the Rev. or in the Epistles of John.

In a nutshell - much easier for us dumbed-down - mostly government schooled indoctrinated - the word indeed is used to contrast one thing from another. Which is exactly what the text says itself. The Greek here is pretty cool if you feel like you need that - but John is simply saying that his washing is different - contrast my washing to Christ's washing - they are not the same thing. That's what John is saying.

[11] I indeed baptizo you with water unto repentance: but He that cometh after

me

Should we stop here at the word “but”? Why not? Let's not take any word for granted. What does Mr. Thayer say about this word? I can't hardly believe someone could say so much about a little three letter word - but here goes. I'm not going to read it all because it's long - I'll just give some highlights - but I am putting the whole thing in the message transcript - which will incidentally - become a book of its own. At least that's the plan. Here are some highlights for the word “but” - from the ancient Greek. (In bold are my highlights.)

δέ [ge] (related to δή, as μέν to μήν, cf. Klotz ad Devar. ii. 2, p. 355), a particle adversative, distinctive, disjunctive, but, moreover (Winers Grammar, § 53, 7 and 10, 2); it is much more frequent in the historical parts of the N. T. than in the other books, very rare in the Epistles of John and the Apocalypse. [On its general neglect of elision (when the next word begins with a vowel) cf. Tdf. Proleg., p. 96; WHs Appendix, p. 146; Winers Grammar, § 5, 1 a.; Buttmann, p. 10f] It is used:

1. universally, by way of opposition and distinction; it is added to statements opposed to a preceding statement:

Listen to that again.

1. universally, by way of opposition and distinction; it is added to statements opposed to a preceding statement:

ἐὰν γὰρ ἀφῆτε... ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀφῆτε, Matthew 6:14f; ἐὰν δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς κτλ. Matthew 6:23; ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι, Mark 2:20; it opposes persons to persons or things previously mentioned or thought of — either with strong emphasis: ἐγὼ δέ, Matthew 5:22, 28, 32, 34, 39, 44; ἡμεῖς δέ, 1 Corinthians 1:23; 2 Corinthians 10:13; σὺ δέ, Matthew 6:6; ὑμεῖς δέ, Mark 8:29; οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας, Matthew 8:12; αἱ ἀλώπεκες... ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρ. Matthew 8:20; Luke 9:58; πᾶς ὁ λαὸς... οἱ δὲ φαρισαῖοι, Luke 7:29f; ὁ δὲ πνευματικός, 1 Corinthians 2:15, and often; — or with a slight discrimination, ὁ δέ, αὐτὸς δέ: Mark 1:45; Mark 5:34; Mark 6:37; Mark 7:6; Matthew 13:29, 37, 52; Matthew 15:23ff; Luke 4:40, 43; Luke 5:16; Luke 6:8; Luke 8:10, 54; Luke 15:29; οἱ δέ, Matthew 2:5; Mark 3:4; Mark 8:28, etc., etc.; with the addition also of a proper name, as ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς: Matthew 8:22 [Tdf. omits ἰ.]; Matt 9:12 [R G Tr brackets]; Matt 9:22 [Tdf. omits ἰ.]; Matt 13:57; Mark 1:41 [R G L marginal reading Tr marginal reading]; ἀποκρ. δὲ (ὁ) Σίμων, Luke 7:43 R G L brackets; ἡ δὲ Μαρία, Luke 2:19, etc.

2. μὲν... δέ, see μὲν.

He says it is used after negative sentences.

3. **after negative sentences, but, but rather** (German wohl aber): Matthew 6:19f (μὴ θησαυρίζετε... θησαυρίζετε δέ); Matt 10:5f; Acts 12:9, 14; Romans 3:4; Romans 4:5; 1 Corinthians 1:10; 1 Corinthians 7:37; 1 Thessalonians 5:21 [not Rec.]; Ephesians 4:14; Hebrews 2:5; Hebrews 4:13, 15; Hebrews 9:12; Hebrews 10:26; Hebrews 12:13; 1 Peter 1:12 (οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς ὑμῖν [Rec. ἡμ.] δέ); James 1:13; James 2:11.

That's interesting. After this, Mr. Thayer says to reference Matthew 10:5-6. That says:

[5] These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not:

[6] But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.

Interesting, isn't it. Jesus said - "Don't do this - BUT - instead - do this." That's a reference Mr. Thayer gives to define the word "but" in Matthew 3. Admittedly, Mr. Thayer has deviated from the ancient Greek in some ways here and has gone to giving a Bible reference - and in this instance - he nailed it. Credit where credit is due. In the notes, you'll find other references to the word "but". You can look at them for yourself.

Even without the Greek - we should know the word but means - I said this to you - but now I'm saying something else. I'm contrasting one thing with the other. The two things we're talking about are distinctly different one from another. Listen to this, number 4 for the word "but" from Mr. Thayer's Greek Lexicon:

4. it is joined to terms which are repeated with a certain emphasis, and with such additions as tend to explain and establish them more exactly; in this use of the particle we may supply a suppressed negative clause [and give its force in English by inserting I say, and that, so then, etc.]:

I see that and absolutely agree. John is saying, "All I'm doing is washing with water." Friends, water washing for the forgiveness of sins is Old Covenant. It has negative connotations. It wasn't good enough. It was something that was going to be replaced. And it was replaced with the Washing of the Baptisma of Jesus Christ. And it is nothing like John's baptisma. We really should not need the work Mr. Thayer did on the Greek to understand this. We know what the word "but" means. And the way we use it is

what is intended. “I said this” - “but what I really want you to know is this.”

Romans 3:21f (not that common δικαιοσύνη which the Jews boasted of and strove after, but δικαιοσ. διὰ πίστεως); Romans 9:30; 1 Corinthians 2:6 (σοφίαν δέ οὐ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου); Galatians 2:2 (I went up, not of my own accord, but etc.); Philippians 2:8; cf. Klotz ad Dev. ii. 2, p. 361f; L. Dindorf in Stephanus Thesaurus ii. col. 928; [cf. Winer's Grammar, 443 (412)].

Now listen to this definition. Number 5.

5. it serves to mark a transition to something new (δέ metabatic); by this use of the particle, the new addition is distinguished from and, as it were, opposed to what goes before:

Oh my goodness. Listen to that again.

5. it serves to mark a transition to something new (δέ metabatic); by this use of the particle, the new addition is distinguished from and, as it were, opposed to what goes before:

Oh man. That is awesome. John's Old Covenant water washing was OLD. And Christ's baptisma was new. And Christ's baptisma has nothing to do with physical water. It was something new. How about that? John's water washing was Old Covenant. It was Old. The baptisma of Jesus Christ which has nothing to do with water - physical water - was NEW!

Matthew 1:18; Matthew 2:19; Matthew 10:21; Luke 12:13; Luke 13:1; John 7:14, 37; Acts 6:1; Romans 8:28; 1 Corinthians 7:1; 1 Corinthians 8:1, etc., etc.; so also in the phrase ἐγένετο δέ, see γίνομαι, 2 c.

6. it introduces explanations and separates them from the things to be explained:
John 3:19; John 6:39; 1 Corinthians 1:12; 1 Corinthians 7:6, 29; Ephesians 5:32, etc.; — especially remarks and explanations intercalated into the discourse, or added, as it were, by way of appendix: Mark 5:13 (ἦσαν δέ etc. R L brackets); Mark 15:25; 16:8 [R G]; John 6:10; John 9:14; John 12:3; τοῦτο δέ γέγονε, Matthew 1:22; Matthew 21:4. Owing to this use, the particle not infrequently came to be confounded in the manuscripts (of secular writings also) with γάρ; cf. Winer on Galatians 1:11; Fritzsche on Mark 14:2; also his Commentary on Romans, vol. i., pp. 234, 265; ii., p. 476; iii., p.

196; [Winers Grammar, 452 (421); Buttman, 363 (312)].

7. after a parenthesis or an explanation which had led away from the subject under discussion, it serves to take up the discourse again [cf. Winer's Grammar, 443 (412)]: Matthew 3:4; Luke 4:1; Romans 5:8; 2 Corinthians 2:12; 2 Corinthians 5:8; 2 Corinthians 10:2; Ephesians 2:4; cf. Klotz ad Devar. ii. 2, p. 376f.

8. it introduces the apodosis and, as it were, opposes it to the protasis: Acts 11:17 R G (1 Macc. 14:29; 2 Macc. 1:34); after a participial construction which has the force of a protasis: Colossians 1:22 (Colossians 1:21); cf. Matthiae 2:1470; Kühner, 2:818; [Jelf, § 770]; Klotz as above, p. 370f; [Buttmann, 364 (312)].

9. καὶ... δέ, but... also, yea and, moreover also: Matthew 10:18; Matthew 16:18; Luke 2:35 [WH text omits; L Tr brackets δέ]; John 6:51; John 15:27; Acts 3:24; Acts 22:29; Romans 11:23; 2 Timothy 3:12; 1 John 1:3; 2 Peter 1:5; cf. Klotz as above, p. 645f; Buttman, 364 (312); [also Winer's Grammar, 443 (413); Ellicott on 1 Timothy 3:10; Meyer on John 6:51]. καὶ ἕαν δέ yea even if: John 8:16.

10. δέ never stands as the first word in the sentence, but generally second; and when the words to which it is added cannot be separated, it stands third (as in Matthew 10:11; Matthew 18:25; Mark 4:34; Luke 10:31; Acts 17:6; Acts 28:6; Galatians 3:23; 2 Timothy 3:8, etc.; in οὐ μόνον δέ, Romans 5:3, 11, etc.), or even in the fourth place, Matthew 10:18; John 6:51; John 8:16; 1 John 1:3; 1 Corinthians 4:18; [Luke 22:69 L T Tr WH].

How about this? Keep your finger in Matthew 3 and turn to Matthew 6. Begin in verse 25.

[25] Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?

[26] Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they?

[27] Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature?

[28] And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin:

[29] And yet I say unto you, That even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.

[30] Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to day is, and to morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?

[31] Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed?

[32] (For after all these things do the Gentiles seek:) for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things.

[33] But [but, but] seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.

All those other things are what the world seeks after. BUT - BUT - not so for you. That's what they do - BUT - BUT - you do something totally different.

That's the exact same thing in Matthew 3. "I wash in water - physical water - but He will wash you in something totally different." The second is not the same as the first. Back to Matthew chapter 3.

[11] I indeed baptizo 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 you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire:

Friends, this is not hard. Without the Greek - this is not hard. In simple, first grade English - the Baptisma of Christ is not with physical water. It is with the Holy Ghost and with fire. Wow. People want to start a fighting match and call it "Baptism vs. Baptism". The fight is not with me. I'm not participating. It's been a one-sided boxing match.

I've never said that John's water "baptism" was wrong or bad. All I've ever said is that the Scriptures themselves say - John himself said - the physical water wasn't good enough. There's another baptisma on its way - and it is nothing like John's Old Covenant physical water - wash the clothes, bathe the skin. Verse 12:

[12] Whose fan is in His hand, and He will thoroughly purge His floor, and gather His wheat into the garner; but He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.

Whose fan is in His hand.

Should we ask what is a fan? Of course not. We all know, it's something that is waved in the air to cool us right? It's something that hangs from the ceiling in order to move the air. That's what we think. Back to Mr. Thayer.

πτύον, πτυου, τό, frequent in classical Greek from Homer down, Attic πτεον Winers

Grammar, 24 ((perhaps from the root, pu, 'to cleanse'; cf. Curtius, p. 498f)), a winnowing-shovel (A. V. fan; cf. B. D. under the word , at the end; Rich, Dict. of Antiq., see under the words, ventilabrum, pala 2, vannus): Matthew 3:12; Luke 3:17.

We are on the subject of baptisma. It's a winnowing-shovel. A winnowing shovel that separates the chaff by the wind. And it comes from a Greek root word that means "to cleanse". Separating the wheat from the chaff is a baptisma. And it has nothing whatsoever to do with physical water. It is called a cleansing - and it doesn't involve physical water. I heard a "church of christ" preacher once say that this is certainly not something we should be desirous of. This baptisma was of fire, of judgement, of damnation. Really? I think we better read it again.

Whose fan is in His hand, and He will throughly purge His floor, **and gather His wheat into the garner**; but He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.

His baptisma is when He gathers His wheat. It's not just when He burned up the chaff. It was not just judgement and damnation to the lost. It's when He gathers His wheat. And once again, notice, who is the one doing the baptizo. HE GATHERS HIS WHEAT. Christ's baptisma is not with physical water. And it's nothing we can do. It what He does. Verse 13.

[13] Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptizo of Him.

Yes. Jesus was asking John for a water washing. Jesus was 30 years old and was entering the service of the temple. He was fulfilling the Law God gave Moses.

[14] But John forbad Him, saying, I have need to be baptizo of Thee, and comest Thou to me?

Once again. Clear as can be. Once we understand the two baptisms of Matthew chapter 3. John had just proclaimed that his water baptisma was not like Christ's baptisma. Do you really think John was asking Jesus to baptizo John with physical water? Doesn't make a lick of sense. In order for John to be performing the works of the Levitical priesthood - he had already been washed in physical water. And, of course, when we understand the role of physical water in the Old Covenant world - we would know beyond any shadow of a doubt that Jesus had not fulfilled the requirements yet - in the Law God gave Moses - to perform the physical water rituals contained in the Law.

John was without question - speaking to the fact that it was he - John - who desired the baptisma of Christ - not that Christ would baptizo John with John's Old Covenant physical water baptisma. In order for John to be doing what he was doing - he was already washed in physical water.

So - take away everything we've seen from the Greek. Doesn't mean a thing in the grand scheme of things. We see two - and two only - baptismas from Matthew 3:11-14. John's physical water baptisma - and Christ's baptisma by the Holy Ghost and by fire - nothing whatsoever to do with physical water.

Turn again, please to Mark chapter 10. Beginning again, please with verse 32. Speaking of Jesus and His disciples.

[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 baptizo with the baptisma that I am baptizo with?

Three times in one verse alone. A form of the Greek word bapto is found. There is even a reference to drinking something. The language here - as so many other times we see from Scripture - it looks like it could be physical. I mean, here are the words cup and drink. How could that not mean a liquid? We see words like cleanse and purify and wash - "baptize" - don't they always mean a liquid? Don't they always mean water?

Of course they don't. And here is the greatest example of all. Here we find Jesus explaining what His baptisma is. John already said that Christ's baptisma had nothing to

do with water. Christ's baptism was not like John's. And here, in His Own Words - as clearly as anything we have ever seen in the Bible - Jesus is explaining what John prophesied. Turn over to Mark chapter 14, please, begin with verse 1, we need to move quickly.

[1] After two days was the feast of the passover, and of unleavened bread: and the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take Him by craft, and put Him to death.

As we read this morning, we cannot forget how that just a few days prior to this, Jesus has told His disciples this was going to happen. He said this was His baptism. He called this His cup.

[2] But they said, Not on the feast day, lest there be an uproar of the people.

[3] And being in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper, as He sat at meat, there came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment of spikenard very precious; and she brake the box, and poured it on His head.

[4] And there were some that had indignation within themselves, and said, Why was this waste of the ointment made?

[5] For it might have been sold for more than three hundred pence, and have been given to the poor. And they murmured against her.

[6] And Jesus said, Let her alone; why trouble ye her? she hath wrought a good work on Me.

[7] For ye have the poor with you always, and whensoever ye will ye may do them good: but Me ye have not always.

[8] She hath done what she could: she is come aforehand to anoint My body to the burying.

Friends, this is what He was talking about in Mark chapter 10. This is the baptism of Jesus Christ. He's talking about His burial. Why do these so-called "churchmen" always think of a "church water ritual" when they hear any variation of the Greek bapto - instead of this - the baptism of Jesus Christ which He clearly spoke of in Mark 10?

[9] Verily I say unto you, Wheresoever this gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, this also that she hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her.

[10] And Judas Iscariot, one of the twelve, went unto the chief priests, to betray Him unto them.

[11] And when they heard it, they were glad, and promised to give him money. And he sought how he might conveniently betray Him.

[12] And the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the passover, His disciples said unto Him, Where wilt Thou that we go and prepare that Thou mayest eat the passover?

[13] And He sendeth forth two of His disciples, and saith unto them, Go ye into the city, and there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water: follow him.

[14] And wheresoever he shall go in, say ye to the goodman of the house, The Master saith, Where is the guestchamber, where I shall eat the passover with My disciples?

[15] And he will shew you a large upper room furnished and prepared: there make ready for us.

[16] And His disciples went forth, and came into the city, and found as He had said unto them: and they made ready the passover.

[17] And in the evening He cometh with the twelve.

[18] And as they sat and did eat, Jesus said, Verily I say unto you, One of you which eateth with Me shall betray Me.

[19] And they began to be sorrowful, and to say unto Him one by one, Is it I? and another said, Is it I?

[20] And He answered and said unto them, It is one of the twelve, that dippeth with Me in the dish.

Kind of ironic here isn't it? We're talking about bapto, we're talking about the baptisma of Christ and how it doesn't have anything to do with physical water - and Jesus says

that dippeth with Me in the dish.

Go ahead. Look it up. That word dippeth. It comes from the Greek word embapto.

to whelm on, i.e. wet (a part of the person, etc.) by contact with a fluid:—dip.

That's funny. He that baptizeth with Me in the dish. But funny how that word bapto - embapto is the Greek word that Christ used - and it has nothing whatsoever to do with physical water.

[21] The Son of man indeed goeth, as it is written of Him: but woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! good were it for that man if he had never been born.

[22] And as they did eat, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take, eat: this is My body.

[23] And He took the cup, and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them: and they all drank of it.

Here's a cup. Is this the same cup He was talking about from Mark 10? There are "churchmen" out there who demand something called "communion." It's a "church ritual" and you have to partake of this "church ritual" called "communion" in order to be "saved." Is this the cup Jesus was talking about when He was describing His baptisma in Mark 10? Keep reading.

[24] And He said unto them, This is My blood of the new testament, which is shed for many.

[25] Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God.

[26] And when they had sung an hymn, they went out into the mount of Olives.

[27] And Jesus saith unto them, All ye shall be offended because of Me this night: for it is written, I will smite the Shepherd, and the Sheep shall be scattered.

[28] But after that I am risen, I will go before you into Galilee.

[29] But Peter said unto Him, Although all shall be offended, yet will not I.

[30] And Jesus saith unto him, Verily I say unto thee, That this day, even in this night, before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny Me thrice.

[31] But he spake the more vehemently, If I should die with Thee, I will not deny Thee in any wise. Likewise also said they all.

[32] And they came to a place which was named Gethsemane: and He saith to His disciples, Sit ye here, while I shall pray.

[33] And He taketh with Him Peter and James and John, and began to be sore amazed, and to be very heavy;

[34] And saith unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful unto death: tarry ye here, and watch.

The agony of Christ is beginning.

[35] And He went forward a little, and fell on the ground, and prayed that, if it were possible, the hour might pass from Him.

He knew that His baptisma was at hand.

[36] And He said, Abba, Father, all things are possible unto Thee; take away this cup from Me: nevertheless not what I will, but what Thou wilt.

Friends. This is the cup He was talking about in Mark 10. This is the baptisma of Jesus Christ from Mark 10. Mark 10 are the very Words of Christ explaining to His disciples what John meant concerning the One Who would baptizo with something that was New - something that was not physical water. In Christ's Own Words - this is the cup of His baptisma from Mark 10. Before He was even arrested, Christ Himself was agonizing over what He knew was coming and He asked His Father to allow - if it were possible - the cup - the baptizo of fire - the baptisma of trial - to pass from Him.

Friends, it is so offensive to see and read the unbelievable agony and terror that was going through Jesus the man in His baptisma. And for men to discount this and say that this is not the baptisma of Christ. But rather - some meaningless "church water ritual" that was based on the Old Covenant Law God gave Moses. This is the baptisma of Christ. We are reading it this morning.

[37] And He cometh, and findeth them sleeping, and saith unto Peter, Simon, sleepest thou? couldest not thou watch one hour?

[38] Watch ye and pray, lest ye enter into temptation. The spirit truly is ready, but the flesh is weak.

[39] And again He went away, and prayed, and spake the same words.

[40] And when He returned, He found them asleep again, (for their eyes were heavy,) neither wist they what to answer Him.

[41] And He cometh the third time, and saith unto them, Sleep on now, and take your rest: it is enough, the hour is come; behold, the Son of man is betrayed into the hands of sinners.

[42] Rise up, let us go; lo, He that betrayeth Me is at hand.

[43] And immediately, while He yet spake, cometh Judas, one of the twelve, and with him a great multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priests and the scribes and the elders.

[44] And he that betrayed Him had given them a token, saying, Whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is He; take Him, and lead Him away safely.

[45] And as soon as he was come, he goeth straightway to Him, and saith, Master, master; and kissed Him.

[46] And they laid their hands on Him, and took Him.

[47] And one of them that stood by drew a sword, and smote a servant of the high priest, and cut off his ear.

[48] And Jesus answered and said unto them, Are ye come out, as against a thief, with swords and with staves to take Me?

[49] I was daily with you in the temple teaching, and ye took Me not: but the Scriptures must be fulfilled.

[50] And they all forsook Him, and fled.

[51] And there followed Him a certain young man, having a linen cloth cast about his naked body; and the young men laid hold on him:

[52] And he left the linen cloth, and fled from them naked.

[53] And they led Jesus away to the high priest: and with Him were assembled all the chief priests and the elders and the scribes.

[54] And Peter followed Him afar off, even into the palace of the high priest: and he sat with the servants, and warmed himself at the fire.

[55] And the chief priests and all the council sought for witness against Jesus to put Him to death; and found none.

[56] For many bare false witness against Him, but their witness agreed not together.

[57] And there arose certain, and bare false witness against Him, saying,

[58] We heard Him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and within three days I will build another made without hands.

[59] But neither so did their witness agree together.

[60] And the high priest stood up in the midst, and asked Jesus, saying, Answerest Thou nothing? what is it which these witness against Thee?

[61] But He held His peace, and answered nothing. Again the high priest asked Him, and said unto Him, Art Thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?

[62] And Jesus said, I am: and ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.

Thousands of years later, right?

[63] Then the high priest rent his clothes, and saith, What need we any further witnesses?

[64] Ye have heard the blasphemy: what think ye? And they all condemned Him to be guilty of death.

[65] And some began to spit on Him, and to cover His face, and to buffet Him, and to say unto Him, Prophecy: and the servants did strike Him with the palms of their hands.

[66] And as Peter was beneath in the palace, there cometh one of the maids of the high priest:

[67] And when she saw Peter warming himself, she looked upon him, and said, And thou also wast with Jesus of Nazareth.

[68] But he denied, saying, I know not, neither understand I what thou sayest. And he went out into the porch; and the cock crew.

[69] And a maid saw him again, and began to say to them that stood by, This is one of them.

[70] And he denied it again. And a little after, they that stood by said again to Peter, Surely thou art one of them: for thou art a Galilaean, and thy speech agreeth thereto.

[71] But he began to curse and to swear, saying, I know not this Man of Whom ye speak.

[72] And the second time the cock crew. And Peter called to mind the word that Jesus said unto him, Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny Me thrice. And when he thought thereon, he wept.

Now chapter 15. Friends, we are reading what Jesus told His disciples what was going to happen to Him. This is what He told them in Mark 10 - and He called it baptisma. When we hear the word bapto or any variation thereof - why are we not immediately drawn to this? Why are we not immediately thinking of the words of Christ Himself when He called this being baptizo with the baptisma wherewithal ye shall also be baptizo with? Mark 15:1.

[1] And straightway in the morning the chief priests held a consultation with the elders and scribes and the whole council, and bound Jesus, and carried Him away, and delivered Him to Pilate.

[2] And Pilate asked Him, Art Thou the King of the Jews? And He answering said unto him, Thou sayest it.

[3] And the chief priests accused Him of many things: but He answered nothing.

[4] And Pilate asked Him again, saying, Answerest thou nothing? behold how many things they witness against Thee.

[5] But Jesus yet answered nothing; so that Pilate marvelled.

[6] Now at that feast he released unto them one prisoner, whomsoever they desired.

[7] And there was one named Barabbas, which lay bound with them that had made insurrection with him, who had committed murder in the insurrection.

[8] And the multitude crying aloud began to desire him to do as he had ever done unto them.

[9] But Pilate answered them, saying, Will ye that I release unto you the King of

the Jews?

[10] For he knew that the chief priests had delivered Him for envy.

[11] But the chief priests moved the people, that he should rather release Barabbas unto them.

[12] And Pilate answered and said again unto them, What will ye then that I shall do unto Him Whom ye call the King of the Jews?

[13] And they cried out again, Crucify Him.

[14] Then Pilate said unto them, Why, what evil hath He done? And they cried out the more exceedingly, Crucify Him.

[15] And so Pilate, willing to content the people, released Barabbas unto them, and delivered Jesus, when he had scourged Him, to be crucified.

[16] And the soldiers led Him away into the hall, called Praetorium; and they call together the whole band.

[17] And they clothed Him with purple, and platted a crown of thorns, and put it about His head,

[18] And began to salute Him, Hail, King of the Jews!

[19] And they smote Him on the head with a reed, and did spit upon Him, and bowing their knees worshipped Him.

[20] And when they had mocked Him, they took off the purple from Him, and put His own clothes on Him, and led Him out to crucify Him.

[21] And they compel one Simon a Cyrenian, who passed by, coming out of the country, the father of Alexander and Rufus, to bear His cross.

[22] And they bring Him unto the place Golgotha, which is, being interpreted, The place of a skull.

[23] And they gave Him to drink wine mingled with myrrh: but He received it not.

[24] And when they had crucified Him, they parted His garments, casting lots upon them, what every man should take.

[25] And it was the third hour, and they crucified Him.

[26] And the superscription of His accusation was written over, THE KING OF THE JEWS.

[27] And with Him they crucify two thieves; the one on His right hand, and the other on His left.

[28] And the Scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And He was numbered with the transgressors.

[29] And they that passed by railed on Him, wagging their heads, and saying, Ah, Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days,

[30] Save Thyself, and come down from the cross.

[31] Likewise also the chief priests mocking said among themselves with the

scribes, He saved others; Himself He cannot save.

[32] Let Christ the King of Israel descend now from the cross, that we may see and believe. And they that were crucified with Him reviled Him.

[33] And when the sixth hour was come, there was darkness over the whole land until the ninth hour.

[34] And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? which is, being interpreted, My God, My God, why Hast Thou forsaken Me?

[35] And some of them that stood by, when they heard it, said, Behold, He calleth Elias.

[36] And one ran and filled a sponge full of vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave Him to drink, saying, Let alone; let us see whether Elias will come to take Him down.

[37] And Jesus cried with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost.

[38] And the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom.

[39] And when the centurion, which stood over against Him, saw that He so cried out, and gave up the ghost, he said, Truly this Man was the Son of God.

[40] There were also women looking on afar off: among whom was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the less and of Joses, and Salome;

[41] (Who also, when He was in Galilee, followed Him, and ministered unto Him;) and many other women which came up with Him unto Jerusalem.

[42] And now when the even was come, because it was the preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath,

[43] Joseph of Arimathaea, and honourable counsellor, which also waited for the Kingdom of God, came, and went in boldly unto Pilate, and craved the body of Jesus.

[44] And Pilate marvelled if He were already dead: and calling unto him the centurion, he asked him whether He had been any while dead.

[45] And when he knew it of the centurion, he gave the Body to Joseph.

[46] And he bought fine linen, and took Him down, and wrapped Him in the linen, and laid Him in a sepulchre which was hewn out of a rock, and rolled a stone unto the door of the sepulchre.

[47] And Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses beheld where He was laid.

Please go back to Mark chapter 10. Verses 38 and 39.

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

that I drink of? and be baptizo with the baptisma that I am baptizo 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 baptisma that I am baptizo withal shall ye be baptizo:

Friends, it is at the very least offensive - and at the very most - blasphemous - to say that the baptisma of Jesus Christ is a "church water ritual."

Jesus' Own Words declare what His baptisma is. Christ's baptisma is when we are so consumed with what He did, what He was, Who He was, that we take up His cross - be willing to go through all that He went through - allow ourselves to be mocked by the world for standing with the King. Allow ourselves to be persecuted for standing with the King. This is what baptisma is. Beginning with Mark 10 - then going through the end of the book - we see everything that Christ spoke of concerning His baptisma - we see it come to pass.

Then, after seeing all this, and we come to Mark 16:16 - we think Jesus is telling His disciples to skip Mark 10 through 15 as if it's not even there and go back to John's physical water baptisma? You better believe that's offensive. That is disgraceful. That is making a mockery of the baptisma of Christ - clearly defined by Christ in Mark 10 - then demonstrated to everyone when He fulfilled not only His prophecy from Mark 10 - but the prophecies found in the Law and in the Prophets.

In closing, I ask again. Do you finally see that whenever we hear the word bapto - we should be drawn to the baptisma of Christ described in Mark 14 and 15 - instead of the water baptisma of John?