

**Message# 217- 11-27-2022 - Christians Believe that Jesus Fulfilled the Prophets - H2O
Water Works of the Law Ended with the Old Covenant**
Preached first on 11/27/2022 on www.molibertyradio.us

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

I want to ask you again to please keep one of our brothers who is going through great trials right now in your prayers right now. Continue prayers for Joan and her family, Martha and Leon, and continue to pray for my Mom this week. Pray for Jerry. He's pretty sick right now and has been for a couple days. The wedding is next weekend. So he needs to be healed up soon.

In the email I sent out last week, I put a note there that if anyone would like us to add something to a prayer list, just let me know and I'll get that added.

One week left now. The wedding ceremony for Jerry and Chrissy is still on. The plan is for the 4th of this coming month in Springfield, Missouri. I had mentioned to some of you that if you did not receive an invitation but would like one - or would like a picture of Jerry and Chrissy - just let me know and we'll send that out to you.

Alright. Getting closer and closer now. We are down to what I believe are the last 2 passages of Scripture to be dealt with in the conclusion of this series - I have been directly dealing with the handful - the minute handful of Scriptures that those who demand the application of physical water to the flesh as having anything to do with salvation in the New Covenant world - use in trying to persuade people that Christ demanded physical water to be applied to their flesh as part of - or for some - the entire process - of salvation.

What I have been trying to get people to see through this series - is that application of anything physical - fleshly - whether it to be the obvious - that blood sacrifices have ended - the obvious passing away of physical circumcision - and the obvious passing away of a requirement to apply physical water to the flesh - *in any way shape or form* - any or all of these requirements - if they are commanded for people in the New Covenant world - those commands are from people who are trying to keep the Old Covenant - with its ordinances and ceremonies - and rituals - that is an attempt to keep all of that alive.

Which friends, is nothing less than an attack on the Son of God, who was sent to, among other things, finish the physical requirements of the Old Covenant world for the remission of sins. Jesus Christ took all the requirements of the Old Covenant World and He nailed them to His cross. He ended them. He put an end to the Old Covenant way for the remission of sins. That way was never good enough. The Scriptures - through the writings of Paul - after the events that took place in the Book of Acts had come and gone - Paul - through a direct revelation from Jesus Christ Himself - finally gave a full explanation of the passing of the Old Covenant and the establishing of the New Covenant. I'm speaking specifically of the Book of Hebrews.

But, all through the rest of Paul's writings, he does all he can do to let his readers know that the works of the Law, the blood sacrifices, the circumcision of the flesh, the many diverse washings - known to most people today as "baptisms" - a word that should not even be in our Bibles - all those things were no longer to be done in the New Covenant World.

Salvation now, in the New Covenant world, came about 100% by grace through faith - not of works - lest any man should boast - it is the gift of God - for believing that Jesus Christ was the Son of God.

And, understanding that belief that Jesus of Nazareth was the Son of God, this too, is nothing like what has been taught by something called "church" and that which was bought by something called the "laity". Believing that Jesus of Nazareth was the Son of God involves believing that He fulfilled ALL the Law and ALL the prophets. It's believing that He was the rightful heir to David's throne and that He took that throne via His resurrection from the dead - and that He put down all rule, all power, all authority that God ever allowed men to have - that He reestablished the Government of God over His Creation - turning things back to where they were before the days of Samuel where the people had demanded kings like all the other nations - Jesus restored His Father's Creation back to where He - and He alone possesses the only God Ordained Government that men are allowed to have.

Not only was Jesus Christ, King of kings and Lord of lords - everyone says that - He was the LAST of the Kings that God has allowed for His Creation. If a man does not believe these things about Jesus of Nazareth, then saying that Jesus was the Son of God, is nothing more than lip-service. In fact, it is even LESS than whatever is meant by the passage, "the devils believe and tremble." James 2:19.

Yes. Absolutely, positively, without a doubt, whatever superlative you want to use, just go ahead and insert it, salvation comes totally by belief. There are no works that a man can do to achieve salvation in the New Covenant World. It is a 100% Spiritual occurrence. The grace of God applied because of faith - belief on the part of the recipient.

But, but, but....the belief that Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of God - will change your life. The Spiritual will affect the physical. You can't believe that Jesus of Nazareth was the Son of God and not see the effect of it in a person's life. If you believe that Jesus was the Christ - that belief will change your life.

I talk to so many people who are hung up on the "truth" that "you mean there's nothing I can do? I have to do something, right. Don't I have to pay something? Don't I have to go to "church?" Don't I have to get "baptized?"

There is no work that a man can do that can equal the work that Jesus of Nazareth did.

Turn again, please, to Ephesians chapter 2. Paul, who lived in the end of the Old Covenant World, was giving a glimpse into what was happening somewhat at that time, but what would one day soon, be the full implementation of the New Covenant World. Look, beginning in verse 4. This, written to the believers in Ephesus. Not the believers specifically in Jerusalem. But to those believers in Ephesus who were not bound to the temple and the temple acts in Jerusalem.

- [4] But God, who is rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us,
- [5] Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;)
- [6] And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus:
- [7] That in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus.
- [8] For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God:
- [9] Not of works, lest any man should boast.

What works is he talking about? He's talking about what was required under the Old Covenant. The works of the Law that were required under the Law God gave Moses. Those works - among other things - were - blood sacrifices accompanied by water

washings.

I say this weekly now, it is an amazing thing to hear the “churchmen” speak of the passing of the blood sacrifices - the works of the Law - but they never include the various water washings that were also required works of the Law.

When John the Washer came preaching a washing of repentance and an “all I'm doing is washing with water” - this was for the remission of sins. There are never any mentions of John the Washer offering sacrifices or even telling people to go to the temple and sacrifice animals for the remission of sins.

We need to think about this. What John was doing, was in the Old Covenant World. If the water washing was for the remission of sins - in the Old Covenant World - and this was before the cross - then how did what John was doing seemingly do away with the sacrifices? We were always taught that “it was the blood sacrifices of the Old Covenant - you know - because the blood sacrifices pointed to Jesus dying on the cross.”

Then, again, what was John doing? Washing in repentance for the remission of sins. So God gave the Law to Moses. Then, when John showed up on the scene, God gave John something that replaced Moses? John's water washing replaced Moses' blood sacrifices?

No “churchman” that I have ever known has provided anything that would even come close to answering this question. To me, it should be a huge controversy that would fuel the fires of enemies of God and the Bible that would call this one of the biggest fallacies that was ever in the Bible.

And, yes, if someone does not understand that what John was doing, was actually leading the people into obeying the Law God gave Moses - then what John was doing makes absolutely no sense whatsoever. For John to arrive onto the scene and all of a sudden start “baptizing people for the remission of sins” without even the slightest detail recorded in the Scripture as to how this replaced Moses' Law - or added to Moses' Law - that this was something new in the plan of God - without the slightest bit of explanation - is mind boggling to me.

The truth is, John was not doing something new. The people did not need an explanation of what John was doing. He was leading them into repentance and in obeying the Law God gave Moses - which demanded - wash the clothes, bathe the

flesh.

Just like Jesus came to change the physical sacrificial system of animal sacrifices. He also came to change to the physical system of the various washing requirements contained in the Law God gave Moses.

Last week, I was actually a little more than a spectator watching two young men discussing the subject of “baptism” as known and taught by “church” and the washing of repentance as taught by the true followers of Christ. That statement - is absolutely not to be construed to mean that one of the individuals that understood the Living Water of Christ as not being physical - was in the Government of God - and because the other young man did not understand it that way - that young man was not in the Government of God. I'm not saying that at all.

What interested me most of the conversation, was how obvious it was, that, as I've said hundreds of times now, that when most people hear the word “baptism” - a word that should not even be in our Bibles - the only thing their mind can conceive - is a “church water ritual.” The word “baptism” to most people - has no other meaning - than a “church water ritual” of some kind, whether dunking, sprinkling, pouring, what have you - the word “baptism” can mean nothing other than something involving physical water.

Surely I have done this in this series before, I know I have done this search many many times, now. But I just went online again, and all I did was type in the word “baptism”. The first thing that came up was a wikipedia article. Now listen, when I cite something that is not from the Bible (like this wikipedia article) - I'm not citing it is if it is authority. I cite it - for reasons such as this one - to simply say - “This is what others have said.” Call it opinion, call it whatever. I've cited Josephus before. I'm not saying Josephus is Bible. He wasn't even a follower of Christ. This wikipedia article is “church.” You know what I believe about “church.”

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Baptism>

Bear with me as I read this article this morning. The link will be on the website and in the transcript, it's a simple, but good read - a good informational read. Listen to this:

Baptism (from Koinē Greek: βάπτισμα, romanized: váptisma) is a form of ritual purification—a characteristic of many religions throughout time and geography. In

Christianity [churchianity - my note], it is a Christian [church - my note] sacrament of initiation and adoption,[1] almost invariably with the use of water.[2][3] It may be performed by sprinkling or pouring water on the head, or by immersing in water

Listen to this:

or by immersing in water either partially or completely, traditionally three times, once for each person of the Trinity.[4][5][6]

Why three times? We know that bapto means to dip repeatedly - right? Where did they come up with 3 times? This leads us to believe that they get their 3 times due to the Father, Son and Holy Ghost reference.

I've pointed out before, that the Biblical record of the Prophet Elisha - Prophets were raised up by God in the Old Covenant to show people how they were violating the Laws of God. Elisha told Naaman to "baptize" himself - seven times in the River Jordan. Elisha was simply providing more details concerning how God intended the Law concerning Leprosy to be obeyed. That's the origin of the use of bapto. The washing as part of the repentance for having leprosy.

The article continues and I'll read this exactly the way it is on the webpage:

The synoptic gospels recount that John the Baptist baptised Jesus.[7][8][9][10] Baptism is considered a sacrament in most churches, and as an ordinance in others.

Did you catch that? A sacrament in some. An ordinance in others. In other words, a required element of salvation in some - this would include Catholics, Mormons, Church of Christ and some others. Though they would certainly recoil at the thought of being called a "church" - the jews require full body immersion in physical water - in order to receive "salvation." An ordinance, demanded, yes, but not required as part of a "salvation process." This would be Baptists, Methodists, those of that ilk. For today, specifically, I want that word ordinance to stick with you - all the way to the end of this message. The article continues:

Baptism according to the Trinitarian formula, which is done in most mainstream Christian [church - my note] denominations, is seen as being a basis for Christian [CHURCH - NOT Christian - my note] ecumenism, the concept of unity amongst Christians [churchians - my note].[11][12] Baptism is also called christening,[13][14]

although some reserve the word "christening" for the baptism of infants.[15] In certain Christian denominations, such as the Lutheran Churches, baptism is the door to church membership, with candidates taking baptismal vows.[16][17] It has also given its name to the Baptist churches and denominations.

So as not to make the Churches of Christ feel left out - they, too, teach exactly the same thing - that "baptism is the door to 'church membership.'" Continuing. Now listen to this. Particularly for those who only think the word "baptism" means water - means only physical water:

Martyrdom was identified early in church history as "baptism by blood", enabling the salvation of martyrs who had not been baptized by water. Later, the Catholic Church identified a baptism of desire, by which those preparing for baptism [water - my note] who die before actually receiving the sacrament are considered saved.[18] Some Christian thinking regards baptism as necessary for salvation, but some writers, such as Huldrych Zwingli (1484–1531), have denied its necessity.[19]

So...even in this obviously biased writing - leading readers to the thinking that "baptism" is strictly a religious term - I might agree that in its origins - that's exactly what it was. I'd refer people back to the writings of Mr. Schnaubel where he provided very persuasive arguments that a "church definition" and understanding of bapto, baptizo, baptisma, baptismos - a "church definition" was used in translations - as opposed to what should have been used - which was Greek definitions. But early on in this article - the astute reader will see that this word "baptism" has more than just one understanding.

So far, the article speaks of physical water. Now, it speaks of a "baptism by blood" - which refers to martyrdom. And it speaks of something the catholics have called a "baptism of desire." As long as you were in the process of preparing for water "baptism" - you were "baptized in desire" - so if you died before you got applied - then you were still "saved" - according to the catholics. Continuing:

Quakers and the Salvation Army do not practice water baptism at all.[20] Among denominations that practice water baptism, differences occur in the manner and mode of baptizing and in the understanding of the significance of the rite. Most Christians [churchians - my note] baptize using the trinitarian formula "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit"[21] (following the Great Commission), but Oneness Pentecostals baptize using Jesus' name only.[22] Much more than half of all

Christians [churchians - my note] baptize infants;[a] many others, such as Baptist Churches, regard only believer's baptism as true baptism.[23] In certain denominations, such as the Eastern and Oriental Orthodox Churches, the individual being baptized receives a cross necklace that is worn for the rest of their life, inspired by the Sixth Ecumenical Council (Synod) of Constantinople.[24][25] [Ha. That'll do it. Let's wear something on our neck. That'll save us from vampires, I guess.]

Mandaeans undergo repeated baptism for purification instead of initiation.[26] They consider John the Baptist to be their greatest prophet and name all rivers yardena after the River Jordan.[26][27][28]: 45

There's a pretty big problem. No, John the Washer was NOT the greatest prophet! Jesus Christ of Nazareth was the greatest Prophet!

Listen to this. In the last paragraph of the first section of this article:

The term "baptism" has also been used metaphorically to refer to any ceremony, trial, or experience by which a person is initiated, purified, or given a name.[29]

In the introduction to this very lengthy article on “baptism” - if the reader is paying attention - the one who compiled this article is including language that lets the reader know that even the word “baptism” does not always mean physical water.

In fact, we've shown that the truth is, in the Greek's understanding of bapto, it can mean physical water - but it's actually rare. The next section of this article is titled Etymology. This is a bit disappointing in that it's quite short, but, there is still something interesting in this section.

Etymology [The Study of the Origin of Words]

Catacombs of San Callisto: baptism in a 3rd-century painting

*The English word baptism is derived indirectly through Latin from the neuter Greek concept noun *báptisma* (Greek *βάπτισμα*, "washing, dipping"),[b][30] which is a neologism in the New Testament derived from the masculine Greek noun *baptismós* (*βαπτισμός*), a term for ritual washing in Greek language texts of Hellenistic Judaism during the Second Temple period, such as the Septuagint.[31][32] Both of these nouns are derived from the verb *baptízō* (*βαπτίζω*, "I wash" transitive verb), which is used in Jewish texts for ritual washing, and in the New Testament both for ritual washing and*

*also for the apparently new rite of **báptisma**.*

Let's stop here for a minute.

*and in the New Testament both for ritual washing and also for the apparently new rite [ritual] of **báptisma**.*

Who introduced this apparently new rite of baptisma? Wasn't that John the Washer according to these people? Was John the Washer in the Old Covenant or the New Covenant?

Turn to Matthew chapter 14 for just a minute. Begin in verse 1:

- [1] At that time Herod the tetrarch heard of the fame of Jesus,
- [2] And said unto his servants, This is John the Washer [Baptist]; he is risen from the dead; and therefore mighty works do shew forth themselves in him.
- [3] For Herod had laid hold on John, and bound him, and put him in prison for Herodias' sake, his brother Philip's wife.
- [4] For John said unto him, It is not lawful for thee to have her.
- [5] And when he would have put him to death, he feared the multitude, because they counted him as a prophet.
- [6] But when Herod's birthday was kept, the daughter of Herodias danced before them, and pleased Herod.
- [7] Whereupon he promised with an oath to give her whatsoever she would ask.
- [8] And she, being before instructed of her mother, said, Give me here John Washer's [Baptist's] head in a charger.
- [9] And the king was sorry: nevertheless for the oath's sake, and them which sat with him at meat, he commanded it to be given her.
- [10] And he sent, and beheaded John in the prison.

John the Washer arrived on the scene before Jesus of Nazareth was born. Their lives did cross. Jesus was born not too long after John was born. But John the Washer was murdered by the state - long before the implementation of the New Covenant, before the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. John was born, lived, and died in the Old Covenant World.

This is another really big problem this thing called "church" has produced. People look at a Bible and they see this division - end of Malachi - that's the end of the Old Covenant. Then they see just before Matthew - "New Testament" - and they think what

they are now reading in Matthew, Mark, Luke and John is the “New Testament, or New Covenant.” That is as far from the truth as anything can be. All of what we are reading in our Bibles was written prior to the full implementation of the New Covenant world.

What John was doing - was what everything else in the Old Covenant Law and the Prophets did - he pointed people to the Messiah. John's “All I'm doing is washing with water” was pointing people to the Living Water which was Jesus the Christ. It was Old Covenant works of the Law that pointed people to Christ. That's one of the reasons why his emphasis was so much on the water.

I wonder if - just like today - where people misidentify - or don't even identify at all - the place of physical water in the Law God gave Moses - I wonder if God raised John the Washer to show people of that time how much they had forsaken the water requirements of the Law. It wasn't just the blood. It was the blood and the water. Jesus didn't just fulfill the blood, He fulfilled the blood and the water.

John did not bring something new to the New Covenant. **Jesus brought something new to the New Covenant.** John's part was in bringing an end to the Old. Jesus was the One Who was establishing the New.

John said it - it's recorded over and over - “All I'm doing is washing with water, but the One coming after me, whose shoe latches I am not worthy to unloose, He will wash you with something totally different. It's not with water - not with physical water - but with the Holy Ghost and with fire.”

Christ's washing - for those who still don't get it - Christ's “baptism” is not with physical water. It is not like John's. John's physical water washing was not new. It was Old Covenant. Christ's washing with the Holy Ghost and with fire - **that's** what was new.

The “church” has completely missed this - just like they have completely missed everything else they teach. I'm telling you friends, if anything you think you believe about the Bible has been shaped or formed or molded by something called “church” - you better reevaluate. You better consider the source.

If you are listening to voices today - and those people have not figured out that the word “church” and the concept of “church” has no origin in our Bibles - you better reevaluate. You better be careful. Just like we are carefully examining this “baptism” article today.

I've never told anyone they should or should not listen to others - just be careful about what you are hearing. You may need to have the skill of a surgeon - dissecting what truth you can - and discarding what should not be taken.

Continuing with the article, the etymology, the study of the origin of words:

*The Greek verb báptō (βάπτω), "dip", from which the verb baptízō is derived, is in turn hypothetically traced to a reconstructed Indo-European root *gʷabh-, "dip".[33][34][35]*

Listen to this. This is pretty good.

The Greek words are used in a great variety of meanings.[36] βάπτω and βαπτίζω in Hellenism had the general usage of "immersion," "going under" (as a material in a liquid dye) or "perishing" (as in a ship sinking or a person drowning), with the same double meanings as in English "to sink into" or "to be overwhelmed by," with bathing or washing only occasionally used and usually in sacral contexts.[37]

Listen again. This is pretty good.

The Greek words are used in a great variety of meanings.[36] βάπτω and βαπτίζω in Hellenism had the general usage of "immersion," "going under" (as a material in a liquid dye) or "perishing" (as in a ship sinking or a person drowning), with the same double meanings as in English "to sink into" or "to be overwhelmed by," with bathing or washing only occasionally used and usually in sacral [religious - my note] contexts.[37]

Whenever we hear the word bapto - or any variation thereof - it does not always mean physical water. In fact, this article says that in the English - it is only used occasionally and when it is - it's mainly found only in religious texts. That's exactly what Mr. Schnaubbel said and proved quite convincingly.

Let's go on a little further. I realize we've talked about some of this before, but when we get into today's Bible text - it is important that these understandings are once again firmly into our minds. **It doesn't always mean physical water** - and if we approach the Scriptures thinking that bapto or any of its variations only means physical water - we're going to miss it. And miss it badly. And the issue of salvation is not one we need to miss.

Listen to this. This section is called *Meaning of the Greek verb baptizein*.

The Greek-English Lexicon of Liddell and Scott gives the primary meaning of the verb baptízein, from which the English verb "baptize" is derived, as "dip, plunge", and gives examples of plunging a sword into a throat or an embryo and for drawing wine by dipping a cup in the bowl;

He's saying this is what this means. We aren't talking about a "church water ritual" -

unless plunging a knife into the throat of someone.

for New Testament usage it gives two meanings: "baptize", with which it associates the Septuagint mention of Naaman dipping himself in the Jordan River, and "perform ablutions", as in Luke 11:38.[64]

Since this wikipedia article is citing Scripture. Let's just check it out to make sure. Turn to Luke chapter 11. Begin in verse 37, speaking of Jesus:

[37] And as He spake, a certain Pharisee besought Him to dine with him: and He went in, and sat down to meat.

[38] And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that He had not first washed before dinner.

Friends, the Greek word for washed here is baptizo.

he marvelled that He had not first [BAPTIZED] washed before dinner.

Why did the translators use the word wash - correctly - in this passage? Why did they not use the word "baptized"? Here, they got it right. Why the inconsistency? Verse 39:

[39] And the Lord said unto him, Now do ye Pharisees make clean the outside of the cup and the platter; but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness.

[40] Ye fools, did not he that made that which is without make that which is within also?

Jesus is describing "church water 'baptism'" to a tee. All the physical water can do is wash the outside. It can only "baptize" the outside. How ridiculously foolish for men to think they can wash their insides - by washing their outsides. How ridiculously foolish for men to think they can cleanse their insides by "baptizing" their outsides.

The Pharisees were the ones that we so quick to say, "Look what we did. Look at the works we have done. We did this. We did that." But Jesus said you can't clean the inside by "baptizing" the outside. It's amazing to see how people cannot grasp the simple teachings of Christ. But, again, when someone mistranslates bapto and people do not see things because of their blinders by "church" - I get it. I see how they can miss it.

So, it's "baptize" in some passages, but when it doesn't fit the narrative, or when they

can safely slip it by the unsuspecting and the naive - it becomes wash.

Naive? Last night Teresa and I caught a little snippet of the local news. These do-gooder wannabes on the news were touting some local charity and they said, "Your gift of only \$1 will feed four needy people for one meal." We just looked at each other - and shook our heads. Really? Wow. I'd sure like to know what type of meal four people could eat today - for \$1. I'm just amazed at the stuff people say and try to make others believe it.

The wikipedia article continues.

Although the Greek verb baptízein does not exclusively mean dip, plunge or immerse (it is used with literal and figurative meanings such as "sink", "disable", "overwhelm", "go under", "overborne", "draw from a bowl"),[64][65] lexical sources typically cite this as a meaning of the word in both the Septuagint[66][67][68] and the New Testament.[69]

"While it is true that the basic root meaning of the Greek words for baptize and baptism is immerse/immersion, it is not true that the words can simply be reduced to this meaning, as can be seen from Mark 10:38–39, Luke 12:50, Matthew 3:11 Luke 3:16 and I Corinthians 10:2."[70]

That was awesome! That statement was really great!

Two passages in the Gospels indicate that the verb baptízein did not always indicate submersion. The first is Luke 11:38, which tells how a Pharisee, at whose house Jesus ate, "was astonished to see that he did not first wash (ἐβαπτίσθη, aorist passive of βαπτίζω—literally, "was baptized") before dinner". This is the passage that Liddell and Scott cites as an instance of the use of βαπτίζω to mean perform ablutions. Jesus' omission of this action is similar to that of his disciples: "Then came to Jesus scribes and Pharisees, which were of Jerusalem, saying, Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash (νίπτω) not their hands when they eat bread".[71] The other Gospel passage pointed to is: "The Pharisees...do not eat unless they wash (νίπτω, the ordinary word for washing) their hands thoroughly, observing the tradition of the elders; and when they come from the market place, they do not eat unless they wash themselves (literally, "baptize themselves"—βαπτίσωνται, passive or middle voice of βαπτίζω)".[72]

Scholars of various denominations[73][74][75] claim that these two passages show that invited guests, or people returning from market, would not be expected to immerse

themselves ("baptize themselves") totally in water but only to practise the partial immersion of dipping their hands in water or to pour water over them, as is the only form admitted by present Jewish custom.[76] In the second of the two passages, it is actually the hands that are specifically identified as "washed",[77] not the entire person, for whom the verb used is baptízomai, literally "be baptized", "be immersed", [78] a fact obscured by English versions that use "wash" as a translation of both verbs.

Zodhiates concludes that the washing of the hands was done by immersing them.[79] The Liddell–Scott–Jones Greek-English Lexicon (1996) cites the other passage (Luke 11:38) as an instance of the use of the verb baptízein to mean "perform ablutions", not "submerge".[80] References to the cleaning of vessels which use βαπτίζω also refer to immersion.[81]

As already mentioned, the lexicographical work of Zodhiates says that, in the second of these two cases,[82] the verb baptízein indicates that, after coming from the market, the Pharisees washed their hands by immersing them in collected water.[79] Balz & Schneider understand the meaning of βαπτίζω, used in place of ραντίσωνται (sprinkle), to be the same as βάπτω, to dip or immerse,[83][84][85] a verb used of the partial dipping of a morsel held in the hand into wine or of a finger into spilled blood.[86]

Again - whenever we hear what sounds like bapto - or the several variations of it - it's not always talking about physical water - and it definitely is not talking about a "church water ritual."

A possible additional use of the verb baptízein to relate to ritual washing is suggested by Peter Leithart (2007) who suggests that Paul's phrase "Else what shall they do who are baptized for the dead?"[87] relates to Jewish ritual washing.[88] In Jewish Greek the verb baptízein "baptized" has a wider reference than just "baptism" and in Jewish context primarily applies to the masculine noun baptismós "ritual washing"[89]

The verb baptízein occurs four times in the Septuagint in the context of ritual washing, baptismós; Judith cleansing herself from menstrual impurity, Naaman washing seven times to be cleansed from leprosy, etc.[90]

Additionally, in the New Testament only, the verb baptízein can also relate to the neuter noun báptisma "baptism" which is a neologism unknown in the Septuagint and other pre-Christian Jewish texts.[91]

This broadness in the meaning of baptízein is reflected in English Bibles rendering "wash", where Jewish ritual washing is meant: for example Mark 7:4 states that the Pharisees "except they wash (Greek "baptize"), they do not eat",[92] and "baptize" where báptisma, the new Christian rite, is intended.[93]

Alright, before we get into the text for today, let me say something else. I have made the statement and have actually used the word in the reading of the text for quite a while - a far better - a million times better word than "baptize, baptism, baptized" - a far better English word - would have been "washed, washing". The reason is, because then, it would have a lot more easily identifiable with its true origins - the Law God gave Moses - wash the clothes, bathe the skin.

A problem that I am seeing arise - is that people then hear the word wash - and again - the only thing they can think of things pertaining to physical water.

Turn to Psalm chapter 51 again, please. We saw this not long ago. I believe we need to see it again. Begin in verse 1.

- [1] Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy lovingkindness: according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out my transgressions.
- [2] Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin.
- [3] For I acknowledge my transgressions: and my sin is ever before me.

David is pleading for an inward cleansing. This is not a physical bath that he's asking God for. This is not a physical washing. He's asking for a washing, a cleansing, of his iniquity and his sin. And, is this something that David can do for himself? Or is this something he is asking God to do to and to do it for him? God is the only one capable of cleansing, of washing the inside of a man.

The hebrew word for wash here is kaw-vas. It means a washing in physical water. But the text is clearly showing that David is not asking God to physically wash him.

When I have said that a much better word for "baptize" is wash - in some instances - where the text has physical water in it - sure - wash with physical water. But in the other times - even where we would use the word - we are referring to an inward washing. A washing of the heart, a washing of the soul, a washing of the mind. A cleansing of the heart. It's not John's "All I'm doing is washing with water."

Now ye are clean through the Word which I have spoken unto you.

The contrast that Jesus taught in Luke 11 is perfect. The Pharisee was demanding that Jesus apply physical water to His flesh. BAPTIZE yourself in water. And Jesus response was that they needed a Spiritual cleansing - a Spiritual washing. All your physical "baptisms" can do is clean your outside. You need to be washed with the Living Water of Jesus Christ which is only applied by grace through faith. Psalm 51:4.

[4] Against Thee, Thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in Thy sight: that Thou mightest be justified when Thou speakest, and be clear when Thou judgest.

[5] Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.

[6] Behold, Thou desirest truth in the inward parts: and in the hidden part Thou shalt make me to know wisdom.

This just cannot be any clearer. He's talking about a washing of the inside.

[7] Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow.

Now, if someone wanted to challenge me on this that this washing David was asking for was indeed physical water. Well, okay, we could certainly go back to the Law God gave Moses and find the hyssop, and we could find physical water for cleansing lepers making their skin white as snow. So, either way, our argument wins. I believe, though, David is clearly asking God to perform a Spiritual washing on his inward parts. It comes as a result of David's repentant heart. And it's called a washing. It is a Spiritual washing.

[8] Make me to hear joy and gladness; that the bones which thou hast broken may rejoice.

[9] Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities.

[10] Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me.

David is asking for a washing - but it is not with physical water.

In the last 27 books of our Bibles, when we see bapto or any variation thereof, and the text contains the reference to physical water, I believe that is how we are to understand the meaning of those verses. And, whenever we see physical water in the last 27 books - just like the first 39 - we are seeing people obeying the Law God gave Moses.

And, when we see bapto or its variations and the text does not reference physical water - then we are to understand the Scriptures are leading us to Spiritual washing, to Spiritual overwhelming, to Spiritual death, to being fully consumed by, to being fully taken over, to Spiritually identifying with the death, burial and resurrection of Christ.

As we have been progressing through the mere handful of Bible passages that those who demand the application of physical water to the flesh - and they claim it is a commission by Jesus Christ Himself, the truth is, we are seeing passages of Scripture that not only do not mention physical water - but can only mean things pertaining to Spiritual matters.

Last week, we looked at Galatians 3:26-27. Not only was there no mention of physical water in those 2 verses, but we thoroughly examined the rest of the chapter of Galatians 3 and found Paul pleading with the Galatian Christians not to be fooled, bewitched into believing that their salvation had anything to do with the works of the Law.

The next few verses of Scripture those who demand physical water to the flesh claim supports their position is found in Colossians chapter 2. Please turn there. They will go to verse 12, jerk it out of the Bible, lay it on the table and proclaim a “church water ritual” as the only thing this could possibly be referring to. And then shake their head in total bewilderment as to how anyone could see anything other, than a “church water ritual” when they see this passage. The word there is “baptism.” What is it about “baptism” that you don't get?” Verse 12:

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

“See, “church water ritual. How could you see this and STILL not understand that a 'church water ritual' is what is meant by 'buried with Him in 'baptism''? What is the matter with you, Charlie. You must be lost. That is the only way you cannot see this. That this is talking about physical water.”

As I have said many times before, in the last 27 books of our Bibles, we have seen “baptism” refer to several things. John's “All I'm doing is washing with water.” We've seen John himself speak of Christ's washing with the Holy Ghost and His washing with fire. We've seen John's washing of repentance. Right there, alone, there are 4 - to use a horrible word - “baptisms”. There are 4 of them right there.

Keep your finger here in Colossians 2 and turn back to Mark chapter 10. Begin in verse 33 as Jesus Himself is speaking to His disciples,

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

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

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

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

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

Oh my, the thought just entered my mind. We all know where this is going. Jesus is calling His death, burial and resurrection - a "baptism." And James and John are asking to be one on the right hand and one on the left hand. Call it whatever you want - eisogesis maybe - but the thought entered into my mind of Jesus on the cross - with one on His left and one on His right. And then continue and listen to what Jesus tells James and John.

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

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

Not including the baptizing of pots and cups and many other such like things they did - we now see a 5 "baptism" found in what are commonly known as the Gospels. This is a "baptism" that Jesus Christ Himself defined. This is referring to His betrayal, His trial, His beatings, His mockings, His death, burial and His resurrection. This - the text says - the text in our English Bibles says - this is the "baptism" of Jesus Christ and Jesus Christ tells His disciples, they too SHALL BE - you WILL BE - baptizo with the baptisma withal I am baptizo with.

This is a "baptism" and it is Christ's "baptism" and it is a "baptism" that He tells His Own disciples they will be "baptized" with. This is His death, burial and resurrection.

Go back to Colossians 2:12.

[12] Buried with Him in “baptism”, wherein also ye are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead.

Buried with Him. Buried with Him in “baptism.” Which one of these 5 pre-mentioned “baptisms” is Paul talking about? Well, this is about as simple as it can possibly get.

The Mark 10 passage where Jesus is talking about His death, burial and resurrection and He calls it “baptism” - then Paul is talking about “Buried - buried - buried with Him in “baptism.” This is the “baptism” that Jesus was describing in Mark 10.

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

The Mark 10 “baptism” - the death, burial and resurrection of Christ - the one where Christ told His disciples THEY WOULD WITHAL BE BAPTIZO WITH THE SAME BAPTISMA.

Oh my goodness, friends. This makes all the difference in the world. Thinking that the baptisma of Colossians 2:12 is a “church water ritual” instead of believing in the Son of God so much that you are willing to take up a cross - a symbol of execution by the state - and follow Jesus Christ - even unto death - to lead people to believe that this Colossians 2 verse can only mean a “church water ritual” - oh my how we've missed it.

I thank God, and it is only through the grace of God that in my entire adult life, I've never thought for a second that Colossians 2:12 is calling men and women, boys and girls to a “church water ritual.” Even taking that verse of Scripture and jerking out of the Bible and laying it on a table all by itself - I don't see how anyone can mistake this as a “church water ritual.”

However, I've seen it for myself - many times. When people have been conditioned, like Pavlov's dogs that whenever they see any variation of the Greek word bapto - it can only mean a “church water ritual” - I see how the error is made and how it continues to live.

As I continued to watch the discussion that I told you about earlier between the man who understands the many variations of the Greek bapto - and the man who only understands bapto as a “church water ritual” - my heart began to break and I felt

tremendous compassion for the man who couldn't see anything other than the physical water. It is a blindness - and I'll go so far as to say - through no fault of their own - even though we know we are not blameless - I just mean to say that there are victims of false teachers - our world is full of them - false teachers and their victims. But I had compassion for this man because he had been brain-dirtied into thinking that the only possible thing he could understand when he heard or read the word "baptism" was a "church water ritual."

Go up to verse 1 of Colossians chapter 2 just like we did last week with Galatians 3 and let's read.

[1] For I would that ye knew what great conflict I have for you, and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh;

[2] That their hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love, and unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding, to the acknowledgement of the mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ;

Paul wanted these believers to be comforted, to have love one for another - and to have the riches of the full assurance of understanding. We may not have the riches of the world - I'll assure you of that. But having full assurance of the understanding of the Word of God is worth far more than any riches the world has to offer.

[3] In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.

[4] And this I say, lest any man should beguile you with enticing words.

Does that sound familiar? Sure it does. It's the same language Paul used in Galatians. It seems as though one of Paul's greatest concerns for these believers was that someone would come along and bewitch them - entice them away from the truth. These are the same people that Paul had been preaching to while away from Jerusalem where we read in the Book of Acts. These, just like the Galatians, were the ones Paul had been telling - "You are not bound to the Laws God gave Moses." And Paul was concerned that some of those from the Jews would come into them and try to take them back from the faith in Christ - and bring them back to the Law of works.

[5] For though I be absent in the flesh, yet am I with you in the spirit, joying and beholding your order, and the steadfastness of your faith in Christ.

[6] As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in Him:

So many times I know people read this verse 6 and verses like it and just do not understand the magnitude of what is contained in this verse. These people had believed that Jesus of Nazareth was the Son of God. He was the Promised Messiah. He was the King. They believed this. They had received Christ - King - Jesus - as their Lord - the One Who was Supreme in Authority.

[7] Rooted and built up in Him, and stablished in the faith, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with thanksgiving.

[8] Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ [the Anointed King].

This is an absolute gold mine of information here as to what we are supposed to be believing and living and applying in our lives. When you heard the phrase “after the tradition of men” - what thought came to your mind? I'll tell you what came to my mind. How about, “as the washing of pots and cups and many other traditions of men” - that's a paraphrase - but that Mark 7 passage immediately came to mind when I read verse 8. Not enough time today to begin to get into the “rudiments of the world, and not after Christ” but we will at some point. Verse 9:

[9] For in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

[10] And ye are complete in Him, which is the Head of all principality and power:

Now verse 11. There's a ton here. Can't cover it all today. But watch.

[11] In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ:

This is Spiritual circumcision. It's also not speaking concerning Abraham's physical circumcision. The plan is to come back here next week - on a side-track - to talk about this. Just like “baptism” is not talking about a “church water ritual” - whenever we hear the word circumcision - we should not always think about Abraham's circumcision. This verse is not talking about Abraham's fleshly circumcision. This is talking about an entirely different definition of circumcision.

But for today, it's clearly talking about a Spiritual circumcision. It is a circumcision made without hands. That is Spiritual. That is simple. Easy to see. That Spiritual circumcision in

putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ:

Paul is totally consistent here as with the rest of his writings. Salvation in the New Covenant World is not according to the works of the Law. It is by grace through belief - through faith - through the system of belief that Jesus of Nazareth was the Son of God and all that that entails. Verse 11 is Spiritual. There is nothing physical about the circumcision Paul is speaking of. Now verse 12.

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

So Paul makes it abundantly clear from verse 11 he is not talking about a physical circumcision - but - when he gets to verse 12 - he makes a total 180 degree turn and we are now being told he is talking about a physical "church water ritual" when the Greek word baptisma is used?

I suppose if you already have convinced people that the only thing that can possibly be meant by any variation of bapto is a "church water ritual" - then - if you took them to verse 12 and made sure they didn't look a verse 11 - maybe you could keep that charade going.

It's no wonder the Bible is a laughing stock in the world today. Between these idiots like Kenneth Copeland and Benny Hinn and Peter Popoff and Rev. Fartman Tilton - surely you've all seen that video - if not - just youtube it for a great laugh - but between all those morons masquerading as representatives of Christ - then - with the more believable teachers trying to convince people that Colossians 2:11 is clearly Spiritual - but verse 12 is clearly physical - it's no wonder we're in the shape we're in today.

The Bible is seen by many as just a book filled with contradictions and hypocrites.

I'm out of time this morning. But let's just quickly get through the end of this chapter. The plan will be here to come back here again one more time. Verse 13:

[13] And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses;

[14] Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross;

[15] And having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them

openly, triumphing over them in it.

[16] Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days:

[17] Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.

[18] Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind,

[19] And not holding the Head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.

[20] Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ [baptized with Christ, dead with Christ] from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances,

[21] (Touch not; taste not; handle not;

[22] Which all are to perish with the using;) after the commandments and doctrines of men?

[23] Which things have indeed a shew of wisdom in will worship, and humility, and neglecting of the body; not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh.