

**Message# 211- 10-16-2022 - Christians Believe that Jesus Fulfilled the Prophets - H2O  
Water Works of the Law Ended with the Old Covenant**  
Preached first on 10/16/2022 on [www.molibertyradio.us](http://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. We received a not so good report on Joan this week. Apparently, she fainted and as you can imagine, caused some grave concern with her children. I can only imagine what she must be going through with the loss of her husband, now being left to provide for her family. If anyone wants to help them - please let me know and I will tell you how to get in touch with her.

Please continue to pray for Martha. 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. I have not received any updates from Leon lately. I'll try to get something from him to report to you next week.

In last week's message, we left off with a discussion concerning Mark 16:16. Mark 16:16 is one of the few Bible verses that those who demand the application of physical water to the flesh as the means by which the grace of God is made available to those who practice this ritual. And, yes, I say few, because that is what they do. They'll state - almost robotically - 7 Bible verses they hang their entire theology on - and - Mark 16:16 is - for some reason - the one they cite first.

Last week, I showed you many verses that dealt with the ministry of Christ. I showed you what happened to people when they came to Christ. We find no specific mention of a single person coming to Christ - and Christ performs anything on them that even resembles what we see today - as a "church water ritual."

If you recall, two weeks ago, I read for you from the 1611 KJV translators introduction, where they admitted to using two words that were not previously accepted. They went through a sizable amount of foundation as to why they felt they were at liberty to use words that - in comparison to the Puritans for instance - they said their choice of words were not accepted by the Puritans - but because God had taken liberty to use divers (different) words when He spoke - then they had the liberty to use different words when they spoke.

They put it in writing. The two words they were referring to specifically: baptisme and church - in that order. I'm not saying the order makes a difference particularly, but they did. They said instead of using the word wash, they used baptisme. Instead of the word congregation, they used church. Obviously, I can't go into their motives, I wasn't there. But we can see from the centuries long fruit of what they did - this caused a tremendous amount of misunderstanding, not to mention how much controversy it has caused. I would say the misunderstanding is what has been the most damaging.

I say that because - as I have said before - I believe - that very few people have actually heard the Gospel in our lifetimes - let alone believed and obeyed the Gospel. Because broad is the gate that leads to destruction - the broad gate - the broad view - has become - "Some form of physical water being applied to the flesh, is what is needed for men and women, boys and girls to become 'Christians.'" And belief, belief that Jesus is Who the Scriptures say He is - has been pushed all the way back to the rear. It should be first and foremost - instead - in today's world - it's merely a passing, insignificant issue.

Of course, everyone believes that Jesus was the Son of God. That's it. We all believe that, so if belief is important, then, that's all been taken of.

What I am trying to get people to understand is that we need to understand what belief that He is the Son of God meant to those living in the first century. To say that Jesus - One Who was considered to be just a man - born from Joseph and Mary - out of wedlock no less - but to say that a mere man was the very Son of God - was a capital offense under jewish law. This was hugely hugely important. Today, it is so insignificant - it's just willy-nilly, ho-hum, everyone believes and has moved past that. Why, the Bible even says the "devils believe and tremble" no less.

But there is earth-shaking significance to Jesus being the Son of God. There is earth-shaking significance to Jesus being the One Who the Prophets foretold, the Law foretold. There is earth-shaking significance to Jesus being the One to Whom the promise made to king David - that there would not ever be someone sitting on his throne. This idea that Jesus was the Son of God, the fulfillment of the Law, the fulfillment of the Prophets, and the fulfillment of the Davidic Covenant was earth-shaking. It was not an insignificant passing belief that all men easily and readily come to. In the first century, there was significant risk from several different angles, for those who would believe that Jesus was the One the Scriptures foretold.

Turn to John chapter 11 for just a minute this morning. Let's begin in verse 45, please.

[45] Then many of the Judahites which came to Mary, and had seen the things which Jesus did, believed on Him.

This is after they had witnessed Jesus' raising Lazarus from the dead. Some believed that Jesus was Who the Scriptures said He was. To what extent, we don't know. The only reason I say that is because the Bible doesn't really tell us - beyond Mary and Martha - how many of those believers remained faithful to Jesus during His baptism. We know of Mary and Martha remaining faithful. We know some, most, maybe even all of His disciples did not remain faithful during Christ's baptism. Maybe that was because the full baptism was not complete until His resurrection. I don't know, just offering things to think about. Nonetheless, there is ample record that many people did believe on Jesus - even before His baptism. Now verse 46.

[46] But some of them went their ways to the Pharisees, and told them what things Jesus had done.

[47] Then gathered the chief priests and the Pharisees a council, and said, What do we? for this man doeth many miracles.

My question is. What difference does it make? Why are we even having a discussion as to "what do we?" How about setting up a "vaccine clinic in the synagogue?" I mean, how about bring Jesus into the synagogue and have a big announcement and allow everyone who wants to come to come and let's let Jesus heal people, raise the dead, feed the hungry. This Jesus is One great man who somehow - is able to do many miracles. Why were these people concerned about Jesus doing great and wonderful things?

The answer is not in eisogesis. The answer is not in trying to add some prejudices or biases or agendas into the Scripture to conjure up some new-fangled religious belief system. The answer is in knowing what the Scriptures say about the One Who was in question at this time. This is Jesus, the King of Israel. This is the Promised One that God promised to David hundreds of years before. This is the fulfillment of the Anointed One from the prophecy of Daniel. This is the King of Israel. Some people believed that and apparently were not concerned with the consequences of that belief. Or, maybe they didn't understand the consequences of their belief. But there were absolutely those there that DID understand the consequences - they knew what would quite possibly happen if they believed that Jesus was the fulfillment of the Scriptures and look at what was said. Verse 48.

[48] If we let Him thus alone, all men will believe on Him: and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation.

Friends, why was this written? Why is this in our Bibles? This goes back to the series of messages we had concerning Whosoever Will vs Predestination. There was nothing those people could have done to prevent the baptism of Jesus Christ. That baptism was foreordained before the foundation of the world. Those that believed and those that did not believe - that was all planned out and brought about - so the Scriptures would be fulfilled at exactly the time, place and people that God planned it all for.

The principle found in verse 48 is there for us. It is to show us the consequences of what could happen to those who believe that Jesus was the fulfillment of the Scriptures. Listen very closely - it does not have to be that way. It had to be that way in the first century - but it does not have to be that way for those who came afterward. But when you - me - anyone - no matter what time period we were born into - if we were born into a time period where people refuse to believe that Jesus was Who the Scriptures say He was - and the people of that time period - reject God being their King - and they choose to set themselves up kings like all the other nations - when people choose differently - when they choose to follow King Jesus - when they choose to believe that He was Who the Bible says He is - there is a great risk - that the opposers of Christ will come and take away both our place and our nation.

Because - when we believe - as was the belief system of the saints of the first century - that there is another King, One Jesus, and that faith causes them to do contrary to the decrees of Caesar - not because they are a rebellious lawless people - but because they have chosen to follow a different King with a different Lawbook, with a different set of decrees - there is a risk that the opposers of Jesus Christ and His Father will declare war on those people who follow Christ.

And again, it doesn't have to be that way. If the Government of God, if the Commonwealth of Israel would be lived by those who claim to be followers of Christ - our world - could be turned upside down - and in a relatively short amount of time. But it does not happen because the belief that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, has been turned into a willy-nilly, insignificant belief that everyone believes. The issue again is, do your beliefs change your life?

The issue before Caiaphas, the other chief priests and the council of the Pharisees, is exactly the same for us, as it was for them:

[48] If we let Him thus alone, all men will believe on Him: and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation.

Does your belief in Jesus Christ put you in a situation where the Romans - where the U.S., where the Canadians, where the Philipinos, where the British, will come and take away both your place and your nation?

We live in the most wicked, rebellious generation I've ever seen in my life. And it is not getting better. Sodomites, self-professing witches and warlocks, pedaphiles, are all in positions of their "governments" - yet today - for the greater part of it - a professing "Christian" has no concern from these modern day Romans. Continuing with verse 49:

[49] And one of them, named Caiaphas, being the high priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all,

[50] Nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.

[51] And this spake he not of himself: but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation;

[52] And not for that nation only, but that also He should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad.

[53] Then from that day forth they took counsel together for to put Him to death.

All of this because Jesus raised Lazarus from the dead? All of this because Jesus performed many great miracles among the people? No. A thousand times no. It was because they knew what the Promised Messiah was prophesied to do.

Jesus wasn't feared by these people because He performed miracles. They were worried that their place in the Roman government was threatened because the people were believing that Jesus was the King.

[54] Jesus therefore walked no more openly among the Jews; but went thence unto a country near to the wilderness, into a city called Ephraim, and there continued with His disciples.

The reason this series on baptisma is so important is because the "church water ritual" - well - "church" itself - is an affront - it's a stumblingblock for people in understanding what it truly means to believe on Him. It has changed the baptisma of Jesus Christ - which in the very Words of Christ - as He was explaining His baptisma to His disciples -

is a belief that His followers are to take up a cross - a symbol of execution by the state - take up that cross - be willing to lose everything you have - and follow Christ - and follow Him into the same kind of baptisma He went through. That isn't popular. That's not famous. Who wants that? Who wants to be willing to give up everything they have? Who wants to be willing to be thought of as a criminal? Who wants to be willing to follow Christ into the exact same type of baptisma He was immersed with?

Well, if someone came along and offered you a "church water ritual" instead of all that - wouldn't you jump on that? Wouldn't that be the wise choice? Wouldn't that be the most prudent route to take? Wouldn't that faith - that belief system - be the best way to go?

Today, well, I guess I shouldn't say today, it's probably always been this way, people want the easy way, the easy believism, the easy "baptism" that the "church" offers. That's why very few people even know to think there is something other than a "church water ritual" when they hear any variation of the Greek word bapto.

Because of what the 1611 KJV translators did - we are seeing the result - the untold damage caused - by what they did. Instead of being focused on the ministry of Christ - which was all about immersing people into belief that He was Who the Scriptures say He was - we have become swamped with a false religious system based on a physical water - "church water ritual" that does nothing for anyone who participates in it - beyond providing a false sense of security - a false faith - a system of belief not based on the Bible.

I said all that to say this, by the 1611 KJV translators refusing to stay true to what the physical water was meant for in the Old Covenant world - that being - wash the clothes, wash the flesh - and changing those words to a much more inclusive - "baptism" - the misunderstanding it created has changed the true Gospel of Christ into a lie. Turn to John chapter 4, please. Beginning in verse 1. I am going to read this exactly the way it appears in the KJV.

- [1] When therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John,
- [2] (Though Jesus Himself baptized not, but His disciples,)

Look at this. Because of the horrible translations in these two verses, it makes the Scriptures look like they contradict each other. You need to sit there and read those two

verses over and over and over - to try to make sense of it. If you are one who still thinks of a "church water ritual" when you hear any variation of the Greek word bapto - it becomes even more troublesome. I've got several questions here. The first one is how do we even know it's talking about anything to do with water - physical water? The Greek root word bapto - rarely even means water. It can mean physical water - but it's actually rare.

Keep your finger here in John 4 and go to John chapter 1, please. I wish I had time to read the whole chapter, but I won't for time's sake, and I want you to begin with me in verse 26. This is John the Washer speaking.

[26] John answered them, saying, I baptize with water: but there standeth One among you, Whom ye know not;

I do not believe we have any reason, or any Authority, to say that whatever it was that John was doing, he was not doing it with physical water. John was operating according to the Law God gave Moses, and physical water requirements were all over the Law God gave Moses. John washed people in water - physical water - wash the clothes, bathe the skin. Verse 27:

[27] He it is, Who coming after me is preferred before me, Whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose.

[28] These things were done in Bethabara beyond Jordan, where John was washing [the word should be washing] baptizing

(is a horrible translation. The Greek baptizo means

1. properly, to dip repeatedly, to immerge, submerge (of vessels sunk, Polybius 1, 51, 6; 8, 8, 4; of animals, Diodorus 1, 36).
2. to cleanse by dipping or submerging, to wash, to make clean with water; in the middle and the 1 aorist passive to wash oneself, bathe; so Mark 7:4 [where WH text ραντίσωνται]; Luke 11:38 (2 Kings 5:14 ἐβαπτίσασατο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ, for בָּטַל; Sir. 31:30 (Sir. 34:30); Judith 12:7).

The word here in John 1:28 should have been translated as washing - just like what was described in the Law God gave Moses. From the Hebrew to the English - it's wash. From the Greek to the English - it should have been wash or washing. John was Washing according to the Law God gave Moses. This should not be difficult. Verse 29:

[29] The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.

[30] This is He of whom I said, After me cometh a Man which is preferred before me: for He was before me.

[31] And I knew Him not: but that He should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come washing [baptizing] with water.

Why did John say that? Why did John say He was washing with water? Because the physical application of water - physical water to the flesh - was part of the Law God gave Moses that pointed to the Living Water that the Messiah would someday bring. Everything in the Old Covenant Law, everything in the Prophets, everything in the Psalms - it all pointed to the Messiah King. It was all types and shadows pointing to the Messiah. John is even making this point. This is why I am come washing with water - because I am pointing you to the One that was preferred before me, because He was before me. That's why I am come washing with water. My water washing is pointing you towards the Messiah. Verse 32, now watch.

[32] And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon Him.

[33] And I knew Him not: but He that sent me to wash [baptize] with water, the same said unto me, Upon Whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on Him, the same is He which washeth [baptizeth] with the Holy Ghost.

Friends, the 1611 KJV translators set in motion something that has become a monumental change to the Gospel. By refusing - with their own words - they admitted it - where they should have used washing - they inserted baptism - because they were not concerned with the scrupolosity - the error on the side of caution - instead of using the safe word - the word that had been always known as washing - they thought it better to insert a word that isn't even an English word - they put in baptizeth - instead of washeth - and now - people today - the only thing that can possibly enter their minds when they hear any variation of the Greek word bapto - is a "church water ritual."

John cannot be any clearer - even with the horrible corruption of his words - Jesus was washing in something other than water. The baptisma wherewithal Christ shall baptizo you - is not with water. "Mine is water," said John, "because my water points you to the Living Water that the Messiah brings. That Living Water is not physical. It is Spiritual."



Friends, even with the horrible translation, even without knowing the translators themselves said they chose to insert baptisme where washing should have been - we should be able to easily see that the baptisma of Christ is not with physical water. Now verse 34:

[34] And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God.

[35] Again the next day after John stood, and two of his disciples;

[36] And looking upon Jesus as He walked, he saith, Behold the Lamb of God!

John goes to painstaking efforts to say that his baptisma is water - and Christ's baptisma was not water. If a man refuses to see this, I don't know what else can be shown. Now go back to John 4.

As I said before, the 1611 KJV translators opened a can of worms - that once that can was opened - the damage has been incredible - to say the least. John 4, beginning in verse 1, again.

[1] When therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and washed [baptized] more disciples than John,

[2] (Though Jesus Himself washed [baptized] not, but His disciples,)

Is the Bible one big contradiction? Well, religion and "church" can certainly make it into one. Recall from the other passages of Scripture - I particularly reminded you again last week that John himself had two baptisms - one was an immersion into water - the second was an immersion into repentance.

There is simply no reason whatsoever - to reverse the teaching of John - that clearly - the baptisma of Jesus Christ was not with water - but with something Spiritual - and think that verse 1 is speaking of water. It is not speaking of water. It can't be speaking of water because Jesus' baptisma - as spoken of by John as clearly as anything there is in the Bible - is not a baptisma like John's. Now verse 2.

(Though Jesus Himself washed [baptized] not, but His disciples,)

As convoluted as the KJV writers made this, we can still - if we sit there and look at it long enough and hard enough - figure out what was going on. The baptisma of Christ from verse 1 is an immersion into belief on Him. Turn back to John 3. Look at the very last verse - right before we turn the page to John 4. This is again John the Washer

speaking and he is speaking concerning Jesus and says this, verse 31:

He that cometh from above is above all: he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth: He that cometh from heaven is above all.

[32] And what he hath seen and heard, that he testifieth; and no man receiveth his testimony.

[33] He that hath received his testimony hath set to his seal that God is true.

Even John is placing greater emphasis on belief than that of water. Verse 34:

[34] For he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him.

[35] The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into His hand.

[36] He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.

Even John is discounting his water baptisma and placing the emphasis on the baptisma into repentance. John 4:1-2

[1] When therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and washed [baptized] more disciples than John,

[2] (Though Jesus Himself washed [baptized] not, but His disciples,)

Jesus did not wash with physical water. There are absolutely baptisms here. No man can receive forgiveness, no man can come to the Father, no man can be born again - unless he has a baptism - but the baptism of Jesus Christ is not with physical water. Did His disciples wash with physical water? The text would lend itself to that. Verse 1, Jesus was washing people with the baptism that John said He would wash people with. Verse 2 seems to be saying that Jesus did not wash with physical water like John did. Then, we conclude verse 2, with the thought that some of Jesus' converts washed people like John did.

Does the verse want you to believe that the disciples that did the washing - seemingly like John did - John's Old Covenant washing - were they Peter, James and John? His closest disciples? The text doesn't say. Verse 1 leads us to believe that quite possibly, the ones being spoke of in verse 1 were not necessarily Peter, James and John or the rest of the 12. That's not really my point anyway. My point is that when it looks like the text is making mention of a physical water washing that resembled John's - the text says

Jesus did not perform that ritual - whatever it was. Now, very quickly, let's go through the rest of John 4, as we have done before, but it's especially important now. Verse 3:

[3] He left Judaea, and departed again into Galilee.

[4] And He must needs go through Samaria.

[5] Then cometh He to a city of Samaria, which is called Sychar, near to the parcel of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph.

[6] Now Jacob's well was there. Jesus therefore, being wearied with His journey, sat thus on the well: and it was about the sixth hour.

[7] There cometh a woman of Samaria to draw water: Jesus saith unto her, Give me to drink.

[8] (For His disciples were gone away unto the city to buy meat.)

[9] Then saith the woman of Samaria unto Him, How is it that Thou, being a Judahite, askest drink of me, which am a woman of Samaria? for the Judahites have no dealings with the Samaritans.

[10] Jesus answered and said unto her, If thou knewest the gift of God, and Who it is that saith to thee, Give me to drink; thou wouldest have asked of Him, and He would have given thee living water.

[11] The woman saith unto Him, Sir, Thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep: from whence then hast Thou that living water?

Friends, the very first verse of this chapter says that Christ was washing people. John said that Jesus would not be washing people with physical water - but with something Spiritual. This is the detail. This is the description of what Jesus was doing in verse 1. There's more to it than that because of the woman being a Samaritan - it meant that His baptism was for whosoever will. But what we are now seeing in this narrative - is a baptism by Jesus Christ. It's His Living Water - not physical water.

Friends, I have told you before, I am not easily offendable. I used to be. People used to say things to me that would hurt my feelings all the time. My wife will attest to this. I think something happened during those years of trials that we went through, but I'm just not the same as I once was in that regard. She'll even say to me, "Doesn't that bother you what people say?" And I'll just tell her, "No, they can say whatever they want, it just doesn't bother me anymore."

And, for the most part, I will tell you that things that are said, really don't bother me much anymore. But I will tell you this, when I've heard the phrase, "Charlie's Living Water "baptism", Charlie's 'Living Water found no where in the Bible 'baptism'" -

friends when I've heard that - I have had my feelings hurt. Not for me. I'll assure you of that because I have no Living Water "baptism." There is only One that can wash someone in His Living Water baptism and that is Jesus Christ. John chapter 4 is one of the most beautiful pictures of the Living Water baptism that belongs to Christ as we can find in Scripture. To disparage the Living Water baptism of Christ in any way, is deeply concerning to me. As if Charlie Steward invented the phrase "Living Water." No, that doesn't hurt my feelings for me, but it breaks my heart for my Lord and King Who was the Author of the phrase, Living Water. Keep your finger here, we'll be back. Turn to John chapter 7 beginning with verse 37, the Words of Jesus Christ:

[37] In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto Me, and drink.

[38] He that believeth on Me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.

[39] (But this spake He of the Spirit, which they that believe on Him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.)

[40] Many of the people therefore, when they heard this saying, said, Of a truth this is the Prophet.

[41] Others said, This is the Christ. But some said, Shall Christ come out of Galilee?

[42] Hath not the scripture said, That Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was?

Friends, the "church" argument concerning the Holy Ghost, speaking in tongues, healing the sick - that's not what any of this should be diverted to. All those "church" arguments are basically good for nothing. They are just diversions. Just things to move people's focus away from where it should be. This passage is speaking of the baptism that John said was Christ's. That's as clear as can be. And the baptism of Christ - once again - is called Living Water.

No where to be found in the Bible? Yeah. If someone wants to disparage the Living Water of Christ and call it something other than what it is - by placing some stinking man's name in front of it - yeah - that one certainly is no where in the Bible - but the Living Water of Jesus Christ? Friends, being washed in the Living Water of Jesus Christ is the only baptism that has any value in our world. If you have placed your trust in physical water - in any shape or form - friends I will tell you there is forgiveness. You can come to the cross and ask for forgiveness where there is healing and cleansing and a

baptisma, a washing by Jesus Christ that can make you a new creation in Christ.

If you have trust in a physical water washing - actually better stated because it is a "church" term - if you have trust in a physical water baptism - you are in desperate need of asking forgiveness, repent of that sin, and receive the Living Water washing that Christ offers. He started offering His Living Water washing in His ministry. We saw it when He changed the baptismal waters of the Old Covenant into wine. We see it here clearly in John 4 and again in John 7. The Living Water washing, the Living Water baptisma of Jesus Christ - has nothing to do with physical water. It is a Spiritual happening that occurs when a man, woman, boy or girl believes that Jesus Christ was Who the Law said He was, Who the Prophets said He was, Who the Psalms said He was - this Jesus - the King of Israel. Back to John 4, picking back up in verse 12. The Samaritan woman speaking to Jesus and saying,

[12] Art Thou greater than our father Jacob, which gave us the well, and drank thereof himself, and his children, and his cattle?

[13] Jesus answered and said unto her, Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again:

[14] But whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life.

Once again, we see the waters of the Old Covenant World being compared to the Living Water that only Christ can give. The waters - whenever we see physical waters in the Old Covenant - we are seeing things that we are to understand as being pointers to the Messiah.

As we have progressed through this study, one thing that has kind of been an eye-opener for me - is for men that have failed to see the waters - the physical waters of the Old Covenant as being types and shadows pointing to Christ. They seem to see the blood sacrifices. Some of them even see physical circumcision, but when it comes to the water - they just can't see it.

I have a theory that I've kind of been developing in my mind for a while. I'm not sure I'm even ready to share it with you yet, but I think I will go ahead. What some of these people have done, is, they have taken some of the verses from what most understand to be called the "New Testament" - and they have taken the definitions of "baptism" from the "church" and the "churchmen" - and they have used that the foundation for

their belief system - their faith - and since the proper foundation should have been from the Law and the Prophets - that may be why - whenever they hear of anything to do with water in the Bible - they can think of nothing but a "church water ritual."

I think they have this idea that John the Washer came up with something new, they fail to understand the clear teachings that John's washing was not like Christ's - but because of the transliteration into the word "baptism" - they are just not able to even consider something else. Then, when they are presented with something that doesn't fit their box - they respond - even with meanness, they'll say things like the presenter is concocting new things that have never been taught before - made up things never found in the Bible - when the reality is - when you go back and see the foundation of washing - wash the clothes, bathe the flesh - and you see that foundation in the Law and the Prophets - then it goes a long way towards helping us understand things such as what we read in Mark 1:1-2.

Though Jesus Himself washed [baptized] not....

Yes. Jesus did not perform Old Covenant washings. It was too important for people to see that He was the Living Water that the Old Covenant washings was pointing to. Verse 15.

[15] The woman saith unto Him, Sir, give me this water, that I thirst not, neither come hither to draw.

[16] Jesus saith unto her, Go, call thy husband, and come hither.

[17] The woman answered and said, I have no husband. Jesus said unto her, Thou hast well said, I have no husband:

[18] For thou hast had five husbands; and he whom thou now hast is not thy husband: in that saidst thou truly.

[19] The woman saith unto him, Sir, I perceive that Thou art a prophet.

[20] Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and Ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship.

[21] Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe Me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father.

[22] Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship: for salvation is of the Judahites.

[23] But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship Him.

[24] God is a Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in

truth.

[25] The woman saith unto him, I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ: when He is come, He will tell us all things.

[26] Jesus saith unto her, I that speak unto thee am He.

And here it is. Another baptisma. This is what the baptisma of Christ is.

I that speak unto thee am He.

Do we believe this? It's not a matter of having physical water applied to the flesh. It's a matter of do we believe this?

[27] And upon this came His disciples, and marvelled that He talked with the woman: yet no man said, What seekest Thou? or, Why talkest Thou with her?

[28] The woman then left her waterpot, and went her way into the city, and saith to the men,

[29] Come, see a Man, which told me all things that ever I did: is not this the Christ?

Last week, we saw over and over and over people coming to Christ. We saw over and over and over Jesus washing them with His baptisma - because they believed. We then went to Mark 16 where we saw Jesus just blasting His disciples because of their unbelief that He had risen from the dead - just like He had told them He would.

Then, we see Him telling His disciples

He that believeth and is washed [baptized] shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.

I have never, not even when I was playing "church" believed that this verse of Scripture is saying that belief and "church water ritual" was prescribed for "salvation." I've never believed that.

After I finished last week's message, I wondered if I had stressed a point enough as I was speaking about this Mark 16 chapter. I want to make some more statements about this chapter.

Beginning with John - who clearly said the baptisma of Christ and John's physical water

washing - were not the same thing. And we see evidence of this all through the ministry of Christ. Throughout the ministry of Christ not only do we not see Him performing anything that even resembles what John did - outside of a lone brief mention - instead - we see Him changing the Old Covenant baptismal waters into wine. We see Him calling people to Himself as the Living Water - then - when He gets right down to the hours preceding His betrayal, His trial, His beatings, His scourgings, His murder, then His resurrection - we see Him telling His disciples that THIS was baptisma - and they, too, would be immersed in, washed in, the exact same baptisma. Betrayals, trials, beatings, jailings, executions - then the promise of a resurrection from I Corinthians 15 - Jesus calls it baptisma - and tells His disciples that is what they can expect.

Then, we get to Mark 16:16 and we are expected to believe that Jesus is now telling His disciples to perform "church water rituals" - or "baptisms"- but this time - we'll just call them New Covenant "baptisms". Friends, the disciples knew of the multiple baptisms that the Bible speaks of with John's water - with John's immersion into repentance - with Christ's Spiritual, Living Water baptisma, and with Christ's immersion into His death, burial and resurrection - which is clearly called baptisma.

Demanding that Christ was telling His disciples to perform what John was doing - but only under a New Covenant commission is denying the baptisma that Christ clearly defined in Mark chapter 10.

Mark 16:16 makes absolutely no mention of physical water when the horribly transliterated word is used in Mark 16:16.

I have been accused of eisogesis for months now. It's been said it is the worst case of eisogesis ever. Adding to the Word for the purpose of an agenda, instilling a bias, yet those who demand physical water in the New Covenant can only see physical water in Mark 16:16 when they add the phrase "H2O water baptized" into the text.

Not only is there no mention of physical water in Mark 16:16 or in Matthew 28:18-20 - but to add it into the text is to completely change the meaning of the Gospel. It changes the Gospel into something the 1611 KJV translators even admitted - they would not be held to the same standards of the choice of words - that the Puritans used - namely "baptism" and "church."

Who is right? Who is wrong? We know as clear as can be, the Greek word ekklesia does not translate to the English word "church." "Church" comes from kurias or kuriakon. It



literally takes about 5 minutes of the most casual study to see that. Simple. First grade - pre-school Greek. And, then “baptism” is a transliteration. It's not even an English word. It's a combination of Greek and English. In the last 27 books of the Bible - it is a newly introduced word that was put there to make people think that what John was doing was something new. The word should have been washed - as it was in the first 39 books of the Bible.

In order to believe Mark 16:16 is referring to physical water - there must be no foundation of understanding water in the Old Covenant. There must be a belief that the only thing bapto can refer to is physical water. And there must be a belief that a “church water ritual” is all that we are meant to believe the word means in Mark 16:16.

Throughout this whole series, I've done all I can do to show people that whenever they hear any variation of the Greek word bapto - it does not always mean physical water. In fact - here we go again - when you study the word - it rarely means water.

Open your Bibles to I Corinthians chapter 12. We'll begin in verse 1. The purpose of reading this, as you will soon see, is not for the purpose of getting a “church debate” over something called “the gift of the Spirit.” That's not at all why I want you to read this. Look at verse 1:

- [1] Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant.
- [2] Ye know that ye were Gentiles [non-Judahites], carried away unto these dumb idols, even as ye were led.
- [3] Wherefore I give you to understand, that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed: and that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.
- [4] Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit.
- [5] And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord.
- [6] And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all.
- [7] But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal.
- [8] For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit;
- [9] To another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit;
- [10] To another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the

interpretation of tongues:

[11] But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will.

Now watch this.

[12] For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ.

[13] For by one Spirit are we all

Now read it directly as it's found in the KJV,

[13] For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.

Would anyone dare attempt to say that this is speaking of a physical water baptism? The entire chapter, every single verse is speaking of things Spiritual. Verse 13 is speaking of baptism - and it is Spiritual.

I think it is safe to say whenever the Scripture wants us to believe in a physical water baptism - the Scriptures will tell us so. As in when John was clearly saying, "I indeed wash with water..." But when the Scriptures do not say water, Mark 10, perfect example, Mark 16, perfect example, Matthew 28, perfect example, Acts 2, perfect example, I Corinthians 12, perfect example - when the Scriptures do not include physical water along with the word "baptisma, or baptizo, or bapto" - not only do we NOT have the Authority to assume physical water - but when we do - such as adding the phrase H2O to those passages - we run the very valid risk of altering the meaning of Scripture.

And, when we do see physical water in the text - it is talking about people trying to do what the Law God gave Moses commanded - concerning wash the clothes, bathe the skin. The physical waters seen in our Bibles are ALL - all of them - Old Covenant waters - and they are there to point to the Living Water washing that comes from true belief in Jesus Christ.

A couple weeks ago, I asked you to be sure and listen to Ted's Round 13: Baptism vs Baptism message. Sadly, that was a do as I say, not as I do. I did not make through the whole thing. But, I made it through a lot of it. He made a statement in that message that was something that he and I absolutely, 100% agree on. I want to play it for you this morning, then talk about it in closing. The reason is, is because he was trying to prove H2O water in his teaching on Mark 16. Please listen:

[You will need to listen to the Audio of this message to hear this part of the message.]

Notice he changes the word from baptized to immersed. And that's fine. Just about any word we could put there is better than the word "baptized" - but - because Ted has never preached a message that says "baptized" or "immersed" can mean anything other than physical water - physical H2O water - when he reads this text and tries to explain it - all his mind can do is think of a "church water ritual." Does his mind go to Mark 10:38-39? No. Does his mind go to John 4 or John 7? No, it doesn't. Because in his mind, Mark 10:38-39 and John 4 or John 7 does not reference physical H2O water - therefore those verses simply do not apply when trying to understand Biblical baptism. They are superfluous and irrelevant.

Ted's entire argument concerning what his book title is - "Baptism" - is this - this "church" teaches this, that "church" teaches that, but my "church" teaches this. This "church" teaches sprinkling. That "church" teaches pouring." That "church" teaches infant 'baptism.'" But my "church" teaches physical water, full body immersion at or beyond the age of 20 - for the remission of sins."

Friends, I'm not talking about anything related to "church." Unless you are hearing me say throw it all out. Every single one of them are wrong. They all - every single one of them are in the same boat - they all believe that whenever they see any variation of the Greek word bapto - it's talking about some form a "church water ritual" whether it be sprinkling H2O, pouring H2O, or immersing H2O. They are all wrong. They're all washed up. All of those arguments are "church" and "church" is as far away from truth as day is from night. Left is to right, east is to west.

Let's keep going with Ted.

[You will need to listen to the Audio of this message to hear this part of the message.]

Now listen. Ted speaks of Christ fulfilling the Old Covenant. Not completely eliminating it. Because up until 70AD when the temple was destroyed.

"Up until then, they could still sacrifice their required cattle and sheep and so forth, there at the temple. Not eliminated, fulfilled, but not eliminated until 70AD."

This is exactly what I have been trying to get people to see through this whole series. So Ted says it was perfectly fine for these people - after the death, burial and resurrection of Christ - they could still sacrifice their required cattle and sheep and so forth, there at the temple."

Yes! Now when I said that concerning Old Covenant washings, Ted said I had concocted something or other, I don't remember exactly what he said, but it was quite disparaging and he was referring to the fact that I was saying that during that time those in

Jerusalem were keeping the Law - but were doing so in the Name of - in the Authority of Jesus Christ. And Ted was really attacking me hard as if that was the dumbest thing he'd ever heard and that I had invented some new belief system.

I am saying, without apology and as firmly as I've ever stated it - whenever you see physical water in the Book of Acts being applied to people, you are seeing those people thinking they are fulfilling the works of the Law God gave Moses - but doing so in the Name of - in the Authority of Jesus Christ.

So, Ted, when you said these people had Authority to continue sacrificing cattle in the temple - were they doing so in the Name of - in the Authority of Jesus Christ - or were they doing so in the name of Moses? Were they going about the daily business of the temple in the Name of - in the Authority of Jesus Christ - or was it in another name?

If you recall, Ted has made the statement in the past, he made it at our Bible conference last spring, there is no way our New Covenant King would have allowed His disciples to continue with keeping the Law. Now that Ted has backtracked on this - and he called it the "crux" of the matter - maybe he will begin to see some of the other things we are bringing out. A great place to start would be in acknowledging that everytime we see any variation of the Greek bapto - it isn't talking about physical water.

As we finished with Mark 16 and Matthew 28, next week we'll look at the last chapter of the book of Luke. HINT: We won't find any physical water there, either.