

**Message# 209- 10-02-2022 - Christians Believe that Jesus Fulfilled the Prophets - H2O
Water Works of the Law Ended with the Old Covenant**
Preached first on 10/02/2022 on www.molibertyradio.us

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

I want to remind you again to continue prayer for Joan and her family. They need our help. If anyone wants to help them - please let me know and I will tell you how to get in touch with her.

Please pray for Martha. She and her husband Leon are longtime listeners and friends of this ministry. Leon stood by our family several times while we were going through our trials. Martha has cancer and it is spreading. They don't do medical doctors. Pray that God will use the natural resources He has provided us to bring healing to Martha.

Before we get into today's message, listen to this song. It has been a blessing to me through the years and I'm sure it will bless you, also. It's a tad bit contemporary - but listen to the words. I'm sure you'll understand why I find such a blessing from it.

For those of you that might ask, that was Bob Carlisle and the song was Living Water.

*I feel Your touch, I can feel Your heart,
As I'm lying here, alone in the dark.
I feel Your voice gently say, "Come to Me."
I long for Your love as the earth longs for the rainfall.
I'm weary - Lord, I've wandered this desert too long.
So come, living water, flow through me like a river,
My heart's been thirsting so long.
Flood through my soul, and pour out your mercy.
Come, living water, fill me.*

*Lord, so many times You've called my name,
And I've turned my face the other way.
Yet before I even saw the womb, You loved me.
How can I be so blind
When I alone have created my darkness.
Forgive me, and wash me clean again.*

*So come, living water, flow through me like a river,
My heart's been thirsting so long.
Flood through my soul, and pour out your mercy.
Come, living water, fill me.*

I've actually heard for myself and have heard from many of you concerning those that oppose the Living Water that only Christ can bring. It's amazing to me that someone could actually say the words "Living Water" knowing that they are descriptive terms of Jesus Christ - and say them in a disparaging way. That's pretty sad.

Scrupolositie. I hope you took my challenge yesterday and did your own search as to what the word means. As I was doing my own research - I admit - I started with the 1828 Webster's Dictionary because the word is not used today. At least that's what I thought initially. It's certainly not a word that most of us common folk use. But it is still used today by a very select - much more "educated" people than we. I'll get to it in just a minute.

If I could somehow categorize the emails that I receive based on topic, I would have to say that one of the most frequently asked questions I receive is related to the name of the Creator. I have my own opinions as to why that is such a hot topic and I'll share it with you. For those of you who may have asked - and again - I'll tell you - it's been an often asked question - and I give - for the most part - the same answer.

I believe that there are so many people out there who are perplexed as to why God does not make Himself revealed today - in the same way we see Him revealed in the Bible. I've often heard and I'm sure you have too, "If God doesn't destroy America for its sins, He'll have to apologize to Sodom and Gomorrah." I believe I know why God has seemingly hidden His face in our generations. I believe it is because He works through His Nation - the Commonwealth of Israel - and for all intents and purposes - that Nation does not exist. It does not exist because of a lack of knowledge and it does not exist because of rebellion. "Our laws, and our statues, and our treaties - SHALL BE THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND."

To me, it's pretty simple. But for a lot of other people, they are looking for that silver bullet. There must something we are doing wrong as to why we cannot seem to move God to do this or that. And for many people, they have been told that it's because we don't say His name correctly. We've called Him God or Lord - or the horror - we've even

called His Son - Jesus. And because we don't say His name correctly - He is not hearing us.

So is it Yahweh? Or maybe it's Jehovah. No, can't be that because there was no letter J back then. So, there wasn't the letter J - does that mean people weren't making the "j" sound, either? Maybe He responds to Yehovah. Or maybe it's not that at all. Maybe it's El Shaddai. Or Elohim. Or I AM. Or maybe it's Jehovah Jireh. Then, we shouldn't say Jesus. That should be Yeshua. Or is it Yahshuah? Or maybe it's Yehoshawah. Or Yehoshavah.

I'm not making light of this, not at all. You do not know how bad I wish I knew exactly what His name is, what He wants us to call Him, and how He wants it pronounced.

So, about 35 years ago, I went through these studies myself. And you know what? I just threw my hands up and said, "He either doesn't want us to know right now, or it doesn't matter as much to Him as it does to us." And I concluded this, it's not nearly as important that I know how to pronounce His name - as it does that He knows how to pronounce my name.

And, I'll say this. I would NEVER discourage anyone from doing that type of study. If you feel that is what you want to study, then by all means. And if you want share what you have learned with the rest of us, by all means. Please do so. But know that your studies are likely going to lead you to the jews, the rabbis, the "churches" even. So, keep your eyes wide open while you are seeking. Even the 501(c)(3) government "churches" and synagogues, the Mormon temples - they might have what looks like some truth here and there - as they say - "even a blind squirrel gets a nut sometimes" - but ultimately - "buyer beware" when you enter those waters looking for truth.

So, why did I say all this? What's is got to do with scrupolosity. For those of you who have been following this ministry for a while, you'll recall that I used to say the name "Yahweh." I still say it from time to time, but not very often. I'm not saying it's wrong to say it. I'm not going to be so dogmatic to say if you don't say it, you are offending the Creator. I am not ever going to say if we don't pronounce the Creator's name correctly - He turns His back on us. After all, as we have proven many times before, name means Authority anyway. Are we living our lives in the Authority of the God, the Lord - meaning the One Who is Supreme in Authority - are we living by His Authority - or are we living by the false authority of mere men? That's what matters the most.

Anyway, I was taking a brief look back into the name issue again this past week. I was doing so because I thought I heard a preacher say one time that in the Introduction to the King James Bible of 1611, the translators said instead of translating the tetragrammaton - which by the way - wasn't even an English word in 1611. It turns out that I didn't have that correct. It was in the foreword to the Revised Standard Version that explains why those translators used LORD or GOD (in all caps) instead of what was in the Hebrew. That was in the RSV, not the KJV. Which interestingly enough, most of the translators seem to agree the Hebrew should be pronounced in some form of "Yah-way" while some other translators seem to think it should be pronounced as "yeh-ho-vah". Strong's concordance says the word is "yeh-ho-vah" others say "yah-way." Again, none of this my point. The name - saying the name is not what is the most important. It's living by the Authority of the God of Heaven, the Creator, the One Who is Supreme in Authority. It's by doing what you do, living the way you live, by the Authority of the Creator.

Taking the name of the Lord thy God in vain.

Here's what I believe that means. How about saying that the God of Heaven demands that people obey earthly "governments"? That is taking the name - the Authority of the Creator - and using it incorrectly. It's not in the pronunciation that matters. It's using the Authority - giving the Authority of God where it does not belong. That's using the Name of the Lord thy God, the I AM that I AM in vain.

So, trying ever so hard to get to my point, I mistakenly thought the translators of the 1611 KJV said they were the ones who inserted LORD and GOD instead of the Hebrew name and I wanted to go back and read the Introduction to the 1611 KJV so I could see it for myself. Lo and behold, I didn't find anything there, (they didn't say anything about it) but when I got to the second to the last paragraph of the 8 or 9 page, fine-print, microscopic type, you will, as I was, be amazed at what I found. Had nothing to do with the name - but everything to do with Authority and "salvation." Has everything to do with the "silver bullets" that so many people have been looking for. Listen to this from the 1611 KJV Translators Introduction:

<https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/1611-Bible/1611-King-James-Bible-Introduction.php>

An other thing we thinke good to admonish thee of (gentle Reader) that wee have not tyed our selves to an uniformitie of phrasing, or to an identitie of words, as some

peradventure would wish that we had done, because they observe, that some learned men some where, have beene as exact as they could that way. Truly, that we might not varie from the sense of that which we had translated before, if the word signified the same thing in both places (for there bee some wordes that bee not of the same sense every where) we were especially carefull, and made a conscience, according to our duetie. But, that we should expresse the same notion in the same particular word; as for example, if we translate the Hebrew or Greeke word once by Purpose, never to call it Intent; if one where Journeying, never Traveiling; if one where Thinke, never Suppose; if one where Paine, never Ache; if one where Joy, never Gladnesse, &c. Thus to minse the matter, wee thought to savour more of curiositie then wisdom, and that rather it would breed scorne in the Atheist, then bring profite to the godly Reader. For is the kingdome of God become words or syllables? why should wee be in bondage to them if we may be free, use one precisely when wee may use another no lesse fit, as commodiously?

Why were they concerned about what the atheist thought about their translation.

What in the world does that mean? I know that people from West Virginia call a toilet - a commode. What does commodiously mean? From Webster's 1828:

COMMODIOUSLY, *adverb Conveniently; in a commodious manner; suitable; in a manner to afford ease, or to prevent uneasiness; as a house commodiously situated; we may pass life commodiously without the restraints of ceremony.*

It seems to me they are actually saying some of the words they chose may have been because they were easy or convenient or preventing uneasiness and not so much because they were accurate. That's a bit concerning to me. And I hope it is to you. And how about this?

For is the kingdome of God become words or syllables?

Well, in some ways, yes. Does it really have to be said that words are important? That's incredible, that is an incredible statement. Yes. In order to understand the Kingdom - the Government of God - we better be dealing with accurate words as much as we possibly can and even accurate syllables - if those syllables affect the meaning of what God wants us to know.

The words “baptize” and “baptism” to most people - I'd say 99.9% of people in the world today - when they hear those words - they immediately think of a “church water ritual.” If the words wash and washing had been used - like they should have been - whenever people hear or read those words in our Bibles - they would immediately associate it with the washings in the Law God gave Moses as it related to physical water. They would know that there was Old Covenant washing of the clothes, bathing, washing of the flesh. And they would then know that sanctification, salvation, in the New Covenant World, comes by the washing of water by the Word of God, or “Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you.” They would then easily understand the baptisma of John the Washer and the baptisma of Jesus Christ which John himself said had nothing whatsoever to do with physical water.

But the 1611 KJV writers admitted - it's been there for all to see for 411 years - instead of maintaining the preciseness of the word washing - they thought it was perfectly fine to use a brand new word instead. Words do matter. Meanings do matter. It does make a difference what we believe.

Continue:

A godly Father in the Primitive time shewed himselfe greatly moved, that one of the newfanglenes called , though the difference be little or none; and another reporteth, that he was much abused for turning Cucurbita (to which reading the people had beene used) into Hedera. Now if this happen in better times, and upon so small occasions, wee might justly feare hard censure, if generally wee should make verball and unnecessary changings. We might also be charged (by scoffers) with some unequall dealing towards a great number of good English wordes. For as it is written of a certaine great Philosopher, that he should say, that those logs were happie that were made images to be worshipped; for their fellowes, as good as they, lay for blockes behinde the fire: so if wee should say, as it were, unto certaine words, Stand up higher, have a place in the Bible alwayes, and to others of like qualitie, Get ye hence, be banished for ever, wee might be taxed peradventure with S. James his words, namely, To be partiall in our selves and judges of evill thoughts. Adde hereunto, that nicenesse in wordes was alwayes counted the next step to trifling,

Webster's 1828,

TRI'FLING, participle present tense Acting or talking with levity, or without seriousness or being in earnest.

1. adjective Being of small value or importance; trivial; as a trifling debt; a trifling affair.

TRIFLING, noun Employment about things of no importance.

Back to the KJV 1611:

Adde hereunto, that nicenesse in wordes was alwayes counted the next step to trifling, and so was to bee curious about names too: also that we cannot follow a better patterne for elocution then God himselfe;

Now listen to this:

therefore hee using divers words, in his holy writ, and indifferently for one thing in nature: we, if wee will not be superstitious, may use the same libertie in our English versions out of Hebrew & Greeke, for that copie or store that he hath given us.

I don't understand this. God Himself had liberty to use different words as He so chooses - and because of that - they - mere men - also had the liberty to use differing words in English from the Hebrew and the Greek? Obviously, there is no possible way we can go back in time to fully understand their motives. But they are still providing us with some valuable insight as to what they did in their translation - arguably - the most widely used English Bible of all time. The next statement is earthshaking. Listen to this. I'll read the whole thing, then we'll break it down. They are talking about words those chose and why they chose them.

Lastly, wee have on the one side avoided the scrupulositie of the Puritanes, who leave the olde Ecclestiall words, and betake them to other, as when they put washing for Baptisme, and Congregation in stead of Church: as also on the other side we have shunned the obscuritie of the Papists, in their Azimes, Tunike, Rational, Holocausts, Præpuce, Pasche, and a number of such like, whereof their late Translation is full, and that of purpose to darken the sence, that since they must needs translate the Bible, yet by the language thereof, it may bee kept from being understood. But we desire that the Scripture may speake like it selfe, as in the language of Canaan, that it may bee understood even of the very vulgar.

Lastly, wee have on the one side avoided the scrupulositie of the Puritanes,

What does scrupolositie mean? They admit they have avoided the scrupolositie of the Puritans. Right away, we think of the English word scruples. Yes, we are correct to think of the word scruples. In our modern English, scruples may be thought of this way:

a feeling of doubt or hesitation with regard to the morality or propriety of a course of action.

Or,

hesitate or be reluctant to do something that one thinks may be wrong.

Having scruples means that we err on the side of caution. If we are uncertain about something, if we make a mistake, it is better to be careful, cautious, than regretful.

The word here, though, is scrupulosities. Webster's 1828 says this:

SCRUPULOS'ITY, noun [Latin scrupulositas.]

1. The quality or state of being scrupulous; doubt; doubtfulness respecting some difficult point, or proceeding from the difficulty or delicacy of determining how to act; hence, the caution or tenderness arising from the fear of doing wrong or offending. The first sacrilege is looked upon with some horror; but when they have once made the breach, their scrupulosity soon retires.

2. Nicety of doubt; or nice regard to exactness and propriety.

So careful, even to scrupulosity were they to keep their sabbath.

3. Niceness; preciseness.

So the King James translators of 1611 said they avoided the scrupolositie of the Puritans - the niceness, the preciseness, the doubt, the fear of being wrong or offending.

So, at least from the words of the 1611 KJV translators - they admit they were not afraid of using a different word - I mean - God Himself used different words - so why not them? The Puritans - they said - kept the word washing - while the KJV translators - not being afraid to make a mistake - not being careful to maintain niceness or preciseness -

they thought it perfectly fine to use a transliterated word - baptisme - for where washing was previously used and understood. And, instead of keeping the word Congregation like the Puritans - they decided to use a different word - a word that didn't even come from the Greek ekklesia - the word came from kurios or kuriakon - they decided they had the liberty to use the word "church" instead.

I find it amazing - they used the word scrupolositie when saying they did not want to be restrained - like the Puritans. They avoided the scrupolositie of the Puritans. So instead of using the word washing - which was precisely what they should have done - they instead used the made up word baptisme. And instead of keeping the word Congregation - they used a word that didn't even come from the Greek word - ekklesia - they used "church" instead. This is amazing.

I told you a little bit ago, when I read the word scrupolositie, I initially thought I would only find that word in Webster's 1828. The word is still used today in the world of psychology. From the u.s. "governments" National Institute of Health. (The audacity to call themselves that.) Here's a definition of scrupolosity:

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18226490/#:~:text=Scrupulosity%20is%20a%20psychological%20disorder,is%20highly%20distressing%20and%20maladaptive.>

Scrupulosity is a psychological disorder primarily characterized by pathological guilt or obsession associated with moral or religious issues that is often accompanied by compulsive moral or religious observance and is highly distressing and maladaptive.

The Puritans, apparently from the words of the 1611 KJV translators, were obsessed with preciseness when it came to words used - such as washing and congregation. And the 1611 KJV translators refused to be held by those standards. Less they be called highly distressing and maladaptive. (I added that as an attempt at humor).

Now, here is something I discovered that is troubling and suspicious to me. If you try to research the Puritans. If you start with something simple like, doing a search for: 'What Bible did the Puritans use?' At least in the 1599 Geneva Bible that I have - the words baptism and church are all over it. I'm confused then, by what the 1611 KJV translators are actually talking about. Yet, they specifically say the Puritans were OCD, obsessed, obsessive compulsive disorder - by insisting on the preciseness of using the word washing instead of baptisme and congregation instead of church.

Where is this evidence? Has it been removed? Have all traces of this been removed?

Where is the proof that the Puritans refused to use the word baptisme? Where is the evidence the Puritans refused to use the word "church" and they were actually afraid to use those words for fear of being wrong? That's what the KJV translators said. If someone wants a challenge to do some searching - I think the fruit of that search would be far more likely to be reaped as opposed to someone believing they could find out exactly how Adam referred to God in the Garden of Eden. Or exactly how Moses pronounced God's name while standing in front of the burning bush. If you want something to research, I would love to see someone do some research on that.

There's possibly some old writings from Puritan preachers - probably when they were in jail writing to their loved ones. Or when they were being chased across the countryside like wild animals - maybe in their downtime in a cave somewhere - they were able to jot down some notes that got preserved. I don't know. But there must have been a reason why the 1611 KJV translators specifically called out the Puritans for their refusal to use the words baptisme and "church." To me, that would be fascinating. Not to mention how beneficial it would be to helping people understand what the Gospel is.

Open your Bibles this morning, please, to Matthew chapter 3. Once again, verse 11. The words of John the Washer.

[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:

There are two baptisms here. Plain as day. Easy to see. Irregardless of the intent of the 1611 KJV translators - there are clearly two baptisms spoken of by John the Washer. One, John's, was an Old Covenant water baptism that we can find all over the Law God gave Moses. I make no apology for those people out there - no matter what their level of sincerity is - I make no apology for the fact they never knew that water - physical water - was just as much a requirement under the Law God gave Moses - that the shedding of the physical blood of lambs, goats, bulls, etc. were. For certain types of sins - transgressions of the Law God gave Moses - there were very specific ways commanded in the Law God gave Moses for the application of physical water to the flesh. Without such - there would be no remission of those sins. It's all over the Law and it's all over the Prophets. Easy, easy, easy to see. And if we do not understand the physical applications of water under the requirements of the Old Covenant Law, there is no way we can understand the role water has in the New Covenant - physical or Spiritual.

John's physical water baptism was Old Covenant. Christ's New Covenant baptism - which John said was soon coming - was by the Holy Ghost and by fire. It had nothing to do with physical water. To say that one undergoes the Holy Ghost and fire baptism of Jesus Christ by undergoing the physical water baptism of John the Washer - is - and again - no matter the level of sincerity - it rises to the level of blasphemy. It rises to a level of denying the finishing work of Jesus the Christ. And as we have been seeing the last several weeks - it denies the very description that Christ Himself gave when He - by His Own Words - and then by His Own actions - by His actions - and the actions of others against Him - He demonstrated what His baptism was.

His baptism - the baptism that John the Washer foretold of - was that cup containing His arrest. His beatings, His mockings, His scourgings, His execution - but last - and most important - His resurrection. That is how He defined His baptism.

Turn to Mark chapter 10, please. Of course, we will read again, verses 38 and 39.

[38] But Jesus said unto them [to His disciples that had traveled with Him to Jerusalem just prior to His betrayal, arrest and subsequent execution], Ye know not what ye ask: can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptizo with the baptism 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 baptism that I am baptizo withal shall ye be baptizo:

This is Jesus Christ defining His baptism. John the Washer said He is going to baptizo you with something totally different. And here it is. This is Jesus providing the definition of His baptism. This is as plain as day. Here it is - and just like John the Washer said - His baptism has nothing to do with my water baptism. "All I'm doing is washing the clothes, bathing the flesh - but the One coming after me, Whose shoes I am not worthy to unlatch - He is going to baptizo you in something totally different. It's not water. It's with the Holy Ghost and with fire. It's a Spiritual baptism that comes from above - but it's also going to cause physical trials, physical fires, and even the physical closing of the eyes in what some people think is 'death'".

Oh but friends, not only is the baptism of Christ the willingness to follow Him in what the world thinks is death - but the baptism of Jesus Christ also ends with the promise of a resurrection. Just like Jesus was betrayed. He was arrested. He was mocked and

beaten and finally executed. But that wasn't the end of it. He rose again from the dead. Just as He had said when He described what His baptisma was in Mark chapter 10.

To say that Jesus Christ was speaking of a water baptisma that had any similarities to John's physical water baptisma of Matthew 3 is - and again - it's sad that there are so many people that are so passionate about their belief and trust in John's Old Covenant Water baptisma - but to say that Jesus is referring to a "church water ritual" when He is telling His disciples in Mark 10 that they will, "You shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of, You shall also be baptizo with the baptisma that I am baptizo with" - can we really not see how we have lost our scrupolositities to say such things?

Whenever we hear the false word "baptism" or the false word "baptize" it does not always mean water - physical water. In fact, when we study the Greek word bapto - we find that it rarely means physical water. It can mean physical water - but it's rare. Listen again, I think I have read it before, but listen again to how Wycliffe translated Mark 10:38-39:

38 And Jesus said to them, Ye know not what ye ask; be ye able to drink the cup, which I shall drink, or be washed with the baptism, in which I am baptized?
39 And they said to him, We be able. And Jesus said to them, [Truly] Ye shall drink the cup that I drink, and ye shall be washed with the baptism, in which I am baptized;

The Orthodox Jewish Bible - and the only reason I quote this for you - is to show you it is not always referring to physical water - when the Greek baptisma or baptizo or bapto is used:

38 But Yeshua answered, "You don't know what you're asking! Can you drink the cup that I am drinking? or be immersed with the immersion that I must undergo?"
39 They said to him, "We can." Yeshua replied, "The cup that I am drinking, you will drink; and the immersion I am being immersed with, you will undergo."

He's talking about His betrayal. His trial. His beatings. His execution. And it is called baptisma. It is an immersion into death. Immersion does not always mean physical water. This is immersion into the passion of Christ. Has nothing to do with physical water.

The Good News Translation says this:

38 Jesus said to them, "You don't know what you are asking for. Can you drink the cup of suffering that I must drink? Can you be baptized in the way I must be baptized?"

39 "We can," they answered. Jesus said to them, "You will indeed drink the cup I must drink and be baptized in the way I must be baptized.

Even with the horrible use of the word baptized, we can still clearly see it's not talking about water - physical water. it's the betrayal. The trial. The beatings. The execution. And then His resurrection. That is what the baptisma - that is what the "baptism" - call it what you will - that's what it is.

I can certainly see why most people would prefer a "church water ritual" as opposed to the baptisma that Christ told His disciples they would be immersed in. I get it. Taking up the cross is not nearly as much fun as a "church water ritual" followed by great applause and pizza party.

But friends, none of this was my plan. This is the Gospel. This is what it means to become a follower of Jesus Christ. When we live in a world that hates Christ - if we belong to Him, if we have partaken of His baptisma, the world is going to hate us, too. When we identify with Christ - by belief - by belief that He is the Son of God - by belief that His Father is the Supreme Ruler of Creation - and men and women, boys and girls are to submit to His Government and His alone - in a world that refuses His Rule and Reign - they aren't going to be happy with those of us who have been baptizo into His baptisma.

By now, I know that those of you who have been listening to this series - you know - and hopefully many of you now have been washed clean of the deception that bapto only means physical water - whenever you hear any variation of the Greek word bapto - you instantly think of the betrayal, the trial, the mockings, the beatings, the subsequent execution of Christ - and then His triumphant resurrection from the dead - where He began the process of putting down all of man's earthly rule and reinstated the days prior to I Samuel 8 where God allowed the nation of Israel to have kings like all the other nations. He put down all rule and all authority. He ended the Old World kingdom, the Old World way of doing things so that the Rule of His Father would be once again the Only Government that men are allowed to have for themselves.

When we identify with this, when we believe this, THEN are we baptizo with Him. Turn in your Bibles, please to Romans chapter 6. Beginning with verse 1.

- [1] What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?
- [2] God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?
- [3] Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptizo into Jesus Christ were baptizo into His death?

Friends, after everything we know, everything we have learned about washing, about bapto, about the baptisma of John the Washer versus the baptisma of Jesus Christ - how could we possibly read this verse of Scripture and have our minds conjure up - and I mean that in the most negative sense I can come up - how can our minds be drawn to a "church water ritual"?

Baptizo into His death. This is the baptisma of Christ - this is not John's Old Covenant physical water baptisma. This is the baptisma that Christ defined in Mark chapter 10. This is the baptisma of Jesus Christ that we read about from Mark 14 and 15. This is not water - physical water.

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

This is

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:

This is

Ye shall drink the cup that I drink, and ye shall be washed with the baptisma, in which I am baptizo;

This is

The cup that I am drinking, you will drink; and the immersion I am being immersed with, you will undergo.

Romans 6:3 says

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

This is not John's Old Covenant washing, and it absolutely is not into a "church water ritual."

Verse 4:

[4] Therefore we are buried with Him by baptisma into death:

Friends, this is the baptisma of Jesus Christ. It is not John's Old Covenant washing. It is definitely not a "church water ritual". This is serious business. This is dying to one's self. Being willing to get rid of every single thing you possess, take up the cross - which is a symbol of the death penalty for criminals - for those who refuse to bow to men's little "governments". It's treasonous in their eyes. It's unpatriotic. It's worthy of death. But it doesn't matter - because we - just like all those who went on before us in Christ

Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season;

[26] Esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt: for he had respect unto the recompence of the reward.

It doesn't matter for those who choose Christ

not fearing the wrath of the [earthly] kings: for he endured, as seeing him who is invisible.

It doesn't matter for those who choose Christ because we would rather identify with those

[33] Who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions,

[34] Quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens.

[35] Women received their dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection:

[36] And others had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonment:

[37] They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented;

[38] (Of whom the world was not worthy:) they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth.

[39] And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise:

[40] God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.

It doesn't matter to those of us who have chosen the baptisma of Jesus Christ instead of a worthless "church water ritual" - those who have allowed Jesus to baptizo us - because

Wherefore seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us,

[2] Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.

Listen again, very closely, Romans 6:4:

[4] Therefore we are buried with Him by baptisma into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.

[5] For if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection:

Remind yourselves over and over and over of the Words of Christ as HE defined His baptisma - He defined His baptisma

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:

This is what Romans 6 is talking about. It's not talking about physical water.

[6] Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin.

Do you really think a “church water ritual” crucifies the old man? Do you really think a “church water ritual” destroys the body of sin? The Old Covenant water washing rituals - could not do this. The Old Covenant blood sacrifices could do not this. Believing that Jesus Christ was the Son of God - and being willing to give up our lives to follow Him - that's the baptisma that is powerful enough to do the things described in Romans 6 - and it has nothing whatsoever to do with physical water. We are talking about the Living Water that comes from Jesus Christ. We are talking about a Living Water baptisma that is ALL OVER - from cover to cover - the Living Water baptisma of Jesus Christ is the whole meaning of the Bible.

I'd say all scrupolosity has been lost when men determine that the only baptisma found in the Bible is a baptisma that involves physical water. To disparage the Living Water of Jesus Christ and His baptisma is an incredibly dangerous thing to do.

[7] For he that is dead is freed from sin.

[8] Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him:

Isn't that awesome? The guarantee - and that's exactly what it is - the guarantee that in this world - you will undergo similar trials that our Lord went through - but because we believe - just like His disciples - we shall also live with Him. Worth it all. No trial. No scourgings, no beatings, not even an execution - can outweigh the final benefit of wherewithal you also shall be baptizo with My baptisma.

In conclusion this morning, I am going to do something I have not done yet in this series. With just the things some of you have told me you have heard, I could have done this so many times already. But I am going to ask each of you - even for those of you who have said you are no longer listening to Ted's preaching - I want you to go and listen to his Round 13: Baptism vs Baptism message.

I want to say this. I still do not believe that it is Ted's intention to lead people away from the Kingdom of Christ. But, I will say, the message of demanding water baptisma today - is a message that does in fact - lead people away from the true baptisma of Jesus Christ. I do not believe that Ted preaches with the intent to drive people from the

Gospel. I do not believe that. Ted was deceived, misled, many years ago by a “church of christ” preacher that did to Ted what was done to the Galatians Christians as described by Paul in Galatians 3. Turn there for just a minute, begin in verse 1:

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

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

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

While I do not believe Ted is intentionally trying to lead people away from the Gospel - nonetheless - the belief system that he adopted from the “church of christ” is a belief system that absolutely does all it can do to keep people from knowing what the baptisma of Jesus Christ is. This is why, as I mentioned a few weeks ago - if you go back and read his book on - what he titles - “baptism” - you will find no discussion of Mark 10 - the baptisma of Christ that Jesus Himself defined. Jesus told us - as clearly as anything there is in the Bible - what His baptisma is.

When I asked Ted why he chose not to discuss Mark 10 in his book, his answer was that it was not relevant to what he was discussing in his book. He said the purpose of his book was to prove that “baptism” was only full body immersion into water. In other words, if a “baptisma” (even one mentioned by Christ Himself) mentioned in the Bible was not pointing to physical - as he says over and over and over - H2O water - then it was not relevant to his discussion.

I told him I just couldn't imagine how anyone could discuss baptisma from the Bible - and NOT do into great detail concerning Mark 10 - the passage where Jesus defines His baptisma.

Ted thinks all of us who believe in the baptisma of Jesus Christ defined in Mark 10 are lost - condemned. While John the Washer clearly spoke of two baptismas - his water baptisma and Christ's Spiritual baptisma - it is beyond belief - incomprehensible to me that when reading of Ephesians 4's one baptisma - the only thing someone can possibly think this means - is John's water baptisma. Or, way after the fact, saying that John's water baptisma - and Old Covenant water baptisma - was what was turned into Christ's New Covenant baptisma. That's a mind-blower, to say the least.

I was saddened when I heard Ted say that his Round 13: Baptism vs Baptism would be his last on the subject. After hearing or reading all that he has read concerning this subject from this series of messages - which I will assure contained many things that he has never before heard or considered - for him to continue to place his trust in a physical H2O water "baptism" as he calls it - is deeply troubling.

No, being buried with Christ by baptisma - has nothing whatsoever to do with physical H2O water.

What is the "being buried with Christ by 'baptisma' from Romans 6? Let's close this morning with an example from the Bible. Turn to Acts chapter 6, please. This is the part of the story of Stephen. Beginning with verse 1. The baptisma of Stephen is what this should be titled - in fulfillment of Mark 10:

[1] And in those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations.

[2] Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables.

[3] Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business.

[4] But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word.

[5] And the saying pleased the whole multitude: and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas a proselyte of Antioch:

Men filled with faith, belief and the Holy Ghost - doesn't say anything about water.

[6] Whom they set before the apostles: and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them.

[7] And the word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith.

[8] And Stephen, full of faith and power, did great wonders and miracles among the people.

Ha. Just saw that. Fulfillment of Mark 16:16-17.

[9] Then there arose certain of the synagogue, which is called the synagogue of the Libertines, and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians, and of them of Cilicia and of Asia, disputing with Stephen.

[10] And they were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake.

[11] Then they suborned men, which said, We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses, and against God.

Ironic how similar this is to the baptisma of Jesus Christ.

[12] And they stirred up the people, and the elders, and the scribes, and came upon him, and caught him, and brought him to the council,

[13] And set up false witnesses, which said, This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place, and the law:

[14] For we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us.

[15] And all that sat in the council, looking stedfastly on him, saw his face as it had been the face of an angel.

Chapter 7.

[1] Then said the high priest, Are these things so?

[2] And he said, Men, brethren, and fathers, hearken; The God of glory appeared unto our father Abraham, when he was in Mesopotamia, before he dwelt in Charran,

[3] And said unto him, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and come into the land which I shall shew thee.

A picture of being baptisma in Christ - for Abraham.

[4] Then came he out of the land of the Chaldaeans, and dwelt in Charran: and from thence, when his father was dead, he removed him into this land, wherein ye now dwell.

[5] And he gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on: yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him, when as yet he had no child.

[6] And God spake on this wise, That his seed should sojourn in a strange land; and that they should bring them into bondage, and entreat them evil four hundred years.

[7] And the nation to whom they shall be in bondage will I judge, said God: and after that shall they come forth, and serve me in this place.

[8] And he gave him the covenant of circumcision: and so Abraham begat Isaac, and circumcised him the eighth day; and Isaac begat Jacob; and Jacob begat the twelve patriarchs.

[9] And the patriarchs, moved with envy, sold Joseph into Egypt: but God was with him,

Joseph's baptism.

[10] And delivered him out of all his afflictions, and gave him favour and wisdom in the sight of Pharaoh king of Egypt; and he made him governor over Egypt and all his house.

[11] Now there came a dearth over all the land of Egypt and Chanaan, and great affliction: and our fathers found no sustenance.

[12] But when Jacob heard that there was corn in Egypt, he sent out our fathers first.

[13] And at the second time Joseph was made known to his brethren; and Joseph's kindred was made known unto Pharaoh.

[14] Then sent Joseph, and called his father Jacob to him, and all his kindred, threescore and fifteen souls.

[15] So Jacob went down into Egypt, and died, he, and our fathers,

[16] And were carried over into Sychem, and laid in the sepulchre that Abraham bought for a sum of money of the sons of Emmor the father of Sychem.

[17] But when the time of the promise drew nigh, which God had sworn to Abraham, the people grew and multiplied in Egypt,

[18] Till another king arose, which knew not Joseph.

[19] The same dealt subtilly with our kindred, and evil entreated our fathers, so that they cast out their young children, to the end they might not live.

[20] In which time Moses was born, and was exceeding fair, and nourished up in his father's house three months:

[21] And when he was cast out, Pharaoh's daughter took him up, and nourished him for her own son.

[22] And Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and was mighty in words and in deeds.

[23] And when he was full forty years old, it came into his heart to visit his brethren the children of Israel.

[24] And seeing one of them suffer wrong, he defended him, and avenged him that was oppressed, and smote the Egyptian:

[25] For he supposed his brethren would have understood how that God by his hand would deliver them: but they understood not.

[26] And the next day he shewed himself unto them as they strove, and would have set them at one again, saying, Sirs, ye are brethren; why do ye wrong one to another?

[27] But he that did his neighbour wrong thrust him away, saying, Who made thee a ruler and a judge over us?

[28] Wilt thou kill me, as thou diddest the Egyptian yesterday?

[29] Then fled Moses at this saying, and was a stranger in the land of Madian, where he begat two sons.

[30] And when forty years were expired, there appeared to him in the wilderness of mount Sina an angel of the Lord in a flame of fire in a bush.

[31] When Moses saw it, he wondered at the sight: and as he drew near to behold it, the voice of the Lord came unto him,

[32] Saying, I am the God of thy fathers, the God of Abrham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. Then Moses trembled, and durst not behold.

[33] Then said the Lord to him, Put off thy shoes from thy feet: for the place where thou standest is holy ground.

[34] I have seen, I have seen the affliction of my people which is in Egypt, and I have heard their groaning, and am come down to deliver them. And now come, I will send thee into Egypt.

[35] This Moses whom they refused, saying, Who made thee a ruler and a judge? the same did God send to be a ruler and a deliverer by the hand of the angel which appeared to him in the bush.

[36] He brought them out, after that he had shewed wonders and signs in the land of Egypt, and in the Red sea, and in the wilderness forty years.

[37] This is that Moses, which said unto the children of Israel, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear.

[38] This is he, that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sina, and with our fathers: who received the lively oracles to give unto us:

[39] To whom our fathers would not obey, but thrust him from them, and in their hearts turned back again into Egypt,

[40] Saying unto Aaron, Make us gods to go before us: for as for this Moses, which brought us out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him.

[41] And they made a calf in those days, and offered sacrifice unto the idol, and rejoiced in the works of their own hands.

[42] Then God turned, and gave them up to worship the host of heaven; as it is

written in the book of the prophets, O ye house of Israel, have ye offered to me slain beasts and sacrifices by the space of forty years in the wilderness?

[43] Yea, ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch, and the star of your god Remphan, figures which ye made to worship them: and I will carry you away beyond Babylon.

[44] Our fathers had the tabernacle of witness in the wilderness, as he had appointed, speaking unto Moses, that he should make it according to the fashion that he had seen.

[45] Which also our fathers that came after brought in with Jesus into the possession of the Gentiles, whom God drave out before the face of our fathers, unto the days of David;

[46] Who found favour before God, and desired to find a tabernacle for the God of Jacob.

[47] But Solomon built him an house.

[48] Howbeit the most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands; as saith the prophet,

[49] Heaven is my throne, and earth is my footstool: what house will ye build me? saith the Lord: or what is the place of my rest?

[50] Hath not my hand made all these things?

[51] Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye.

[52] Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and they have slain them which shewed before of the coming of the Just One; of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers:

[53] Who have received the law by the disposition of angels, and have not kept it.

[54] When they heard these things, they were cut to the heart, and they gnashed on him with their teeth.

[55] But he, being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up stedfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God,

[56] And said, Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God.

[57] Then they cried out with a loud voice, and stopped their ears, and ran upon him with one accord,

[58] And cast him out of the city, and stoned him: and the witnesses laid down their clothes at a young man's feet, whose name was Saul.

[59] And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.

That's what Stephen said. Almost the exact same thing that Jesus said.

[60] And he kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge. And when he had said this, he fell asleep.

And this was the baptisma of Stephen. Very similar to the baptisma of Jesus Christ - just like He said His followers would be baptizo with. And it has nothing to do with water - physical water.