

BAPTISMS

IN THE

KING JAMES BIBLE

Or

How God's Bible dictionary is replaced by the wisdom of this world

VOLUME ONE

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED 2012

OTHER BOOKS BY DAVE REESE:
Hebrews, Matthew, Wild Rides, Daniel, I Timothy,
Right Division Volume One, ABC's of Right Division Volume Two.
Books and other study materials online at www.right-division.com or by
writing Box 357 2435 E. North St. Suite 1108 Greenville SC 29615
daverese6@msn.com

A TEXTBOOK FOR BIBLE STUDENTS

VOLUME ONE

Title: Baptism in the King James Bible

Table of Contents

Foreword

Introduction

Chapter One The Basics

Chapter Two Washings and Baptism in the Old Testament

Chapter Three Baptism unto Moses

Chapter Four Baptism With Water

VOLUME TWO

(Separate Issue)

Table of Contents

Chapter Five **Baptism Into Water-** *THE GOSPEL OF GRACE: OUR BAPTISM*

Chapter Six **Baptism By the Spirit-** *INTO THE BODY OF CHRIST*

Chapter Seven **Baptism With Suffering-** *BY THE LORD JESUS CHRIST*

Chapter Eight **Baptism With Fire and the Holy Ghost**

Chapter Nine **General Remarks on Water Baptism in the Church Age**

APPENDIX: **Baptism Chart: Message, Mode, Manner, Messenger
Israel and the Eschatological Meaning of Baptism
The Body of Christ and One Baptism**

FOREWORD

An unusual incident took place in a small jungle village located on a tributary of the Orinoco River in Venezuela, South America. To get there from the nearest town, it would take six months by boat in rainy season or about an hour and half in a single engine Cessna 185. All these times and distances that mattered were marked by how far you were from the little bustling Venezuelan/Columbian border town of Puerto Ayacucho.

The night before, the buzzing and whirring of insect wings, all the evening sounds, stopped as if cut off by a switch—a jaguar's roar terrified small quarry; it was designed to make them reveal their night hiding places. It was very effective in getting my attention! We were in our hammocks in a small square hut with two foot high rock walls—the upper part in flimsy mosquito screen. After several tense minutes the quiet gave way to a subdued cacophony of the early morning. Gradually, the Amazon's dawn brought new sounds of birds, dogs, and the screams of the traveling howler monkeys in the far trees. Morning's bright rays broke through green foliage and chased the night shadows and early fog away.

Three men already sip on eye opening coffee and sit before a computer monitor powered by a bank of batteries. Solar panels are strung upon the roof, ready for the light of day. The men concentrate on the screen and compare the same squiggly lines, curves, circles, with those on the worn humid-weakened sheets of paper before them. These represent months of laborious linguistic teamwork to create a written language from the variety of vocal grunts, breath, tongue and lip actions and even certain facial expressions made by the local tribe.

Not only was the *creation* of a written language necessary, the next step had been to teach the people *how to read* their own language. Both were needed in order to reach the final goal: a *translation of God's Words* into the tribal language. The translation had begun in Genesis with the creation record and now had completed the account of Cain's murder of his brother, Abel.

In contrast to the dirty loincloth on his bronze body, the Amerindian marveled at the coverings over the white men's bodies. Even their tender feet were wrapped! Charcoal marks on his cheeks, earlobe plugs, and feathers spoke of jungle spirits. The banana leaf tied to the leather string around his waist made his *stomach* speak to him; it carried a small dried payara and piece of cassava bread for breakfast.

As the natural light flooded the village area that morning, the Holy Spirit began to penetrate dark centuries of cultural and language blindness with the Light of God's word. Reading the Genesis translation of Cain's rejection by God and Cain's murder of Abel, He seriously studied his own vocal sounds written before him that he could now read. Things he read yesterday said the same things this morning—a magic paper that remembered what had been said before! And, just as amazing, it did not make any mistakes and spoke not only in his head but to his heart inside.

After several minutes of earnest study, he said, with quaking voice to the missionaries, "My people, we are not like Abel. We are all like Cain! What can we do?"

Astonished, I realized the power of God's Word had come through a simple translation that utilized the Biblical context of events that began in one garden to speak to a man in another "garden." Complicated theological depths had been plainly realized on a most simple level. The Bible context in his limited language had thoroughly, powerfully, and effectually convicted a man of sin against God and showed him his need to make it right. Of course, this initial conviction of sin was followed up by more Bible truth.

Almost 6,000 years separated the first garden from that Amazonian jungle garden; centuries of devil worship had usurped worship of the True God; the fear and superstition of spirits in the trees, mountains, rivers and animals were fixed in the minds and hearts of generations. Into all this and through it all, the living, powerful, two-edged Sword of God came and with one stroke, smote the power of the enemy. Within the simplicity of a limited vocabulary, the word of God is just as powerful and effective in the jungle as in a stained glass cathedral where words are as plenteous as grains of sand.
(a composite article of real life experience by the author)

INTRODUCTION

The Bible, of necessity, requires God's power to hold it fast against the man's incessant, wicked pursuit to change or to passively ignore it. God, as He was pleased to do so, placed within languages the laws to guarantee transmission of His word. In confusion of the "language of all the earth"¹ the power of God's word was excluded. A careful reading of the text does not indicate new languages being introduced but rather the inability to understand language due to an aberration of the minds.

Briefly stated, God enables the human mind to understand context of language and that context reveals critical meanings. If we are to understand Bible terms like "baptism" "confession" "church" "gospel" "remission"-- indeed, the Bible itself—it is the Bible context, it's use of the words, how, when, where and to whom in what place. All of these answers in their original Biblical context, when moved accurately into the target context is *translation*. To force a Biblical word to mean the same as the extra-biblical use of that word is not translation.

"Either words of a language must each designate only a single notion—a single fasciculous of thought—the multitude of notions not designated being allowed to perish; or the words of a language must each be employed to denote a plurality of concepts...Of these alternatives, the latter is the one which has been universally preferred; and, accordingly, all languages by the same word express a multitude of thoughts, more or less differing from each other." (*Sir William Hamilton. Logic, p 436*).

This basic rule of language is universal: All languages must, in using the same word in different contexts, allow that word to carry a variety of meanings, differing one from another. So it is with the word "baptism" as is

¹ The confusion of language *and* speech occurred at the Tower of Babel.

7 Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech.

8 So the LORD scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off to build the city.

9 Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the LORD did there confound the language of all the earth: and from thence did the LORD scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth. (Genesis 11:7-9)

evidenced by the variety of opinions over centuries when men have tried to force one meaning to it in every instance. This is especially true in law, science, medicine, or religion. No other word has carried such confusion in religion for so long. Therefore, previous attempts to force the word to have one meaning everywhere, use the wrong method of discovery. This book attempts to correct the longstanding error. When you find a master key that opens every lock in every instance, you must admit its authority.

Baptisms in the King James Bible follows these principles: (1) The King James Bible (KJB) is the inspired word of God in English. (2) Key definition of the ecclesiastical or technical term "baptism" is found within the context of the King James Bible rather than forcing one meaning by extra-biblical sources, such as Classical Greek or tradition, or even the Church Fathers. (3) Instead of being an action, baptism is revealed as a Bible *condition* that is precipitated or produced by an *action*. (4) Baptism, when defined as a Bible condition, demands that all instances of baptize, baptized, baptisms, etc., can not uniformly mean pour, immerse, dip, or sprinkle. *This fact removes the assumptive authority from the "Greek expert" and proves his Classical Greek definitions of baptism cannot stand before any competent translation into any language.*

The KJB's wisdom in manifold *transliteration* of "baptizo" "bapto", etc., and the forms while *translating* the required few is justified by language rules within the context (word usage, both far and near) and syntax (proper use of parts of speech to construct a complete thought: a sentence). These factors, among many other linguistic marvels, add to the universal recognition of English as the language of "the times of the Gentiles" as well as the King James Bible's transcendence over the world's literature. This literary supremacy is not surprising because the King James Bible is the Word of God that has and will continue to give eternal Light and Life in a dark and dead world.

Faced with a multitude of words, a person who concludes by one instance or a few similar usages that all others are exactly the same, is at least a gambler but most likely he eventually becomes a babbler. The scenario has been repeated in religion in the most ingenious way. Rip a verse or word from a Bible book, gloriously magnify it while ignoring other usage, then explain away or allegorize any conflicts with other Bible verses or words.

It does not stop there because although most religious enterprises go "belly up" in a short while, many do remain and some even flourish to worldwide admiration by device and craft. The god of this world is always

alert to those who will prostitute their God given talents to his course programs. Men willing to do so may find themselves as a King or just a plain bum. It all depends upon their willingness to pay the price of their soul. “For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?” (Mark 8:36-37).

Water baptism by any mode has never been spiritually effectual to salvation. In spite of being “saved by water” (1 Peter 3:20), of the eight persons in the ark not one got wet. All who got wet perished. In all ages, water baptism never saves any soul. To understand that baptism is *the result of an action rather than being the action* opens a door to understand all the baptisms in the Bible. Proper interpretation seeks to find out to whom is this spoken? Jew, Gentile, or church of God? (1 Corinthians 10:32). The answer helps us see that there is more than one mode of baptism in the Bible and allows us to know to whom each baptism is intended and for what purpose. Thereby, in the highest sense, we do not biblically “offend” any of the three groups by our study. An indispensable rule for Bible study as well as conduct is: “Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God:” (1 Corinthians 10:32).²

Baptism does not mean “immersion” in all cases; *Baptism* does not mean “dipping” in all cases; *Baptism* does not mean “sprinkling” in all cases; *Baptism* does not mean “pouring” in all cases. Baptism may be accomplished by any one of the four modes (or actions) but the message that the baptism accompanies defines the manner in which baptism is done and what mode is used when bringing about that particular baptism. The messenger completes the particular meaning. The simplistic and erroneous assumption that a “baptism” (noun) always means “an immersion” or “a pouring” or that “baptize” (verb) always means “to immerse” or “to pour” obscures the true meaning of the Bible translation and creates confusion and error.

Why another book about baptism? First, too many simply do not know what the word “baptism” means, nor do they have any idea of when and why they were baptized. “Rightly dividing the word of truth” (2 Timothy 2:15) has been ignored by most, grievously misused by others and is a source of sensational, platform jokes for a few. A proper study of baptism demands comparison and division of what is doctrine *to* us and what is application *for* our learning—in the Bible.

² *offence*: “to sin” or “to lead into sin” such as Romans 5:15-18. Also *offence*: “to displease” such as Romans 9:30-33; Galatians 5:11; 1 Peter 2:7-8.

Two books illustrate a longstanding theological reason for another look at how Bible words are defined:

One is by a notable Baptist scholar, Dr. T. J. Conant, D.D., **The Meaning and Use of Baptizein: Philologically and Historically Investigated, American Bible Union, 1877**. This book is a study of how "baptizo" was used in secular Greek writings prior to the New Testament (NT) manuscripts and what was written by the Church Fathers after the NT. He comes to the conclusion that "to baptize" means "to dip" or "to immerse" and that proper baptism is always by immersion, although he did cite some evidence of sprinkling or pouring which he deemed insignificant.

The above book was incited by a particular translation incident in a Burmese translation of the Bible. It is best to give here a short version of the events described by Dr. Henry C. Vedder.³

"In the year 1816, the American Bible Society was formed by delegates representing seven denominations of Christians. There had been local Bible Societies previous to this time. This organization was intended to be a national society, in which all American Christians might co-operate. Its formation was due to the success of the British and Foreign Bible Society, The object of the Society was avowed, at the time of its organization, to be 'the dissemination of the Scriptures in the received versions where they exist, and in the most faithful where they are required.' Perhaps Doctor Judson's greatest service in the cause of missions was the translation of the entire Bible into the Burmese language. It was his life-work, and remains to this day the only version of the Scriptures in that tongue. All competent witnesses have borne testimony from the first to the faithfulness and elegance of his translation.

It was well understood on all hands, through official communications and otherwise, that the missionaries sent out by the American Baptists, in all their versions of the Scriptures endeavored to ascertain the precise meaning of the original text and to express that meaning as exactly as possible, transferring no words into the vernacular for which a proper equivalent could be found. In accordance with this principle, Doctor Judson's version rendered baptizo and its cognates by a Burman word meaning to immerse, or dip. During this same period appropriations were voted for the circulation of other missionary versions, made by other than Baptist missionaries, yet made on the same principle of translation, though they did not agree with Judson as to the meaning of baptizo. In 1835 the propriety of this course was for the first time questioned. In that year application was made to the Society for an appropriation to aid in printing and circulating a version of the Scriptures in Bengali, made on the principle of Doctor Judson.

This application was discussed in committee and in the full Board for many months. The Baptist members of the Board vainly urged that the Society had already appropriated eighteen thousand

³ Vedder, Henry C., A Short History of the Baptists, 1907, pp. 336-340.

dollars for the circulation of Doctor Judson's version, with full knowledge of its nature; that this was the only version in Burmese in existence, and that the alternative was either to circulate this or deprive the Burmese of the gospel; and that the adoption of another rule introduced a new and necessarily divisive principle into the Society's policy. At length, by a vote of twenty to fourteen, the managers rejected the application and formulated for the guidance of the Society a new rule regarding versions-that they would "encourage only such versions as conformed in the principle of their translation to the common English version, at least, so far that all the religious denominations represented in this Society can consistently use and circulate said versions in their several schools and communities." At its next annual meeting in May, 1836, the Society approved the action of the managers. Of course this decision made it impossible for Baptists to co-operate with the Society except at the sacrifice of their self-respect. In April, 1837, a convention was held in Philadelphia, composed of three hundred and ninety delegates from twenty-three States, and the American and Foreign Bible Society was organized, Doctor Cone being elected president. Dr. Charles G. Sommers, of New York, was the first corresponding secretary, and William Colgate the first treasurer. From the first there was difference of opinion among the supporters of this Society on one question, namely, the making of a new version of the Scriptures in English. Baptists were practically a unit in maintaining that all new versions into foreign languages should faithfully render every word of the original by the corresponding word of the vernacular. Fierce denominational conflicts resulted from this division of effort among Baptists regarding the Bible work. Many continued from the first to co-operate with the American Bible Society, especially in the circulation of the received English versions. The remainder who took any interest in Bible work were divided in their affections between two organizations, and the participants of each waged a hot warfare against the others. At every denominational gathering the strife broke out. The newspapers of the denomination were full of it, and in time the churches became heartily tired and showed their sentiments by discontinuing their contributions. "made from time to time toward a reunion of the American and Foreign Bible Society and the American Bible Union, and one or both Societies tried to effect a union with the American Baptist Publication Society. These efforts, which continued from 1869 to 1880, and even afterward, proved complete failures."

Missionaries, the majority of whom were Baptists, decided to break with the customary practice of transliterating the forms of "baptism" and make all baptisms immersions. The Bible Union composed of various Protestant denominations had funded the project and were very offended that the translation project had taken such a downward plunge. Dr. Conant's work was to justify the Baptist action.

The second book was by a Presbyterian scholar, Dr. John W. Dale, **Classic Baptism. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishers. 1886** was, of course, a response to Dr. Conant's immersion position. Dr. Dale studied the same area as Dr. Conant, and came up with a firm conclusion that baptism

is by pouring (although some evidence of immersion was found). Almost every serious study on baptism since the two books were published has been a rehash of the same arguments.

Both men did an honest study of baptism but in line with the original manuscript and Classical Greek fervor that fed the mid-nineteenth century Bible criticism. As far as we know, they were thoroughly sincere but at the same time they looked in the wrong place and in the wrong manner for the definition of "baptize." Dr. Dale, in my opinion, did a more comprehensive study and was closer to the issue by his conviction that *baptizo* (in Classical Greek) was a kind of condition and could be brought about by any one of several actions.

Dr. Dale and Dr. Conant were aware of contextual use of terms but the emphasis was upon the context *found in the various Classical Greek and extra-biblical sources*. The Bible context in the original language, if diligently observed, results in certain critical terms being clearly defined in the target language through translation dynamics that occur within the various contexts (both near and far). It appears they failed to note or appreciate this unique phenomenon of our English language. *Both men were snared by trying to be scholars rather than being practical Christians: believing what the Bible said, where it said it*. Perhaps a predisposed attitude existed toward normal-literal interpretation? Was there prejudicial decision against dispensational study? Were Amillennial or Postmillennial convictions present? No one can positively identify any or all the vagarious reasons why men take the views they hold dearly.

In the midst of all this I do not pretend to be a linguistic expert. I am very practical minded in that my burden is more to help the average Bible student than to engage in high powered scholastic arguments. I would rather help one student to have absolute trust in the Bible than win one thousand theological arguments in the scholars' union. I should say that in my mind there is a very practical double edged method of definition in the King James Bible. I believe certain critical ecclesiastical terms or theological definitions are capable of being discerned if two principles are diligently followed.

First, as noted above, it seems that like scholars before and after them, neither man considered what I see as the major point: God placed an unusual method of deciding the meanings of special Biblical words within the KJB's context. Second, a more subtle feature of translation accuracy is that the same Hebrew/Greek word often demands more than one meaning or, as is the case with *baptism* in certain instances, no translation at all.

Confusion results when there is an attempt to force a Greek word to mean the same thing wherever it is found. This misleading rule is called “uniform translation” and unfortunately, is used in most modern translations. For example, even though the English terms *covenant* and *testament* in the KJB are translations of the same Greek word (*diatheke*)—the English word *covenant* does not carry the same Bible meaning as the English word *testament*. The Biblical context demands that *diatheke* be translated *covenant* in one place and *testament* in the other, exactly as the KJB does, otherwise, there is an error of interpretation in several passages. The *New International Version (NIV 2011)* is a prime example in which testament is not found in the Biblical text, although both Old Testament and New Testament division of books are noted in the NIV table of contents.

How a group of translators could miss the following simple Bible truths I’ll leave the reader to answer: A covenant may have blood and death associated with it but neither of the two is necessary to a covenant, i.e., Genesis 9:9-17; a testament has certain aspects of a covenant (such as promises or prophecy to a specific group) but it always requires blood and death, i.e., Matthew 26; Hebrews 7:22,9:15-20. Paul is never the minister of the *New Covenant* but is always the minister of the *New Testament* (2 Corinthians 3:6). The basis of the New Covenant is the New Testament but the New Testament is not the New Covenant per se. Biblical context of English translation demands a distinction between the two terms in various places but “uniform translation” creates an error. To make all usage of *baptismois* “baptisms” or *baptizo* “immerse” is to commit the same error. God is not the author of confusion (1Corinthians 14:33).

Along the same vein of thought, perhaps in some Bible teacher’s mind, *aphesis* means both *forgiveness and remission*, but this is because he believed the lexicographer’s book and ignored Bible context. In the King James Bible it is of tremendous importance where one or the other is used. The Greek term (apart from Bible context) may be translated as “forgiveness” but a uniform rule that forces all usages of *aphesis* to be translated as “forgiveness” or even as “remission” will produce doctrinal error.⁴

Why did this uniform translation rule begin and when are legitimate questions. We only have time here for a brief, generalized answer; details would take us away from the task at hand.

⁴ See *Some Better Thing: A Commentary on the Book of Hebrews*. Dave Reese, 2007, for a more detailed study and examples of “remission” and “forgiveness” as well as “covenant” and “testament.”

As evolutionary thought in the mid 1800's fired a geological and anthropological search for our ancestry, both real and imaginary, the religious world quite naturally followed the secular world (it always does) in a frantic search for older and "more accurate" biblical manuscripts. Conveniently discovered in a Mt. Sinai monastery garbage can and a secluded shelf in the Vatican Library, two manuscripts (Sinaiticus and Vaticanus) were foisted as superior to any of the over 5,000 extant NT manuscripts with a proven track record and use of over 1700 years.

With the godless mother of evolution (Romans 1:18-32) and the father of lies (John 8:44), higher criticism was born anew. Verbal-Plenary inspiration of Scripture was relegated to the "original manuscripts only" while Scripture preservation was given a back seat. All of this meant that the Bible was no longer THE BIBLE but was on its way to becoming "a bible" without real authority in its words.

In a short period of one generation, Scripture memorization and sound doctrinal teaching became a non-issue since words, phrases, and some entire verses were no longer found in the flood of translations based on the two new "older" manuscripts. Between 1881 and 1965 new Bible translations into English grew to a billion dollar enterprise by the 1970's and as of 2011 shows no sign of slowing.

With Bible "sales" as the focus, Bible study went out the window. Simplistic translation methods matched the dumbed-down English translations to the dumbed-down readers educated in the dumbed-down monkey ancestral classrooms. "See Jane run. Run, Jane run. See Dick run. Run, Dick run." Sacred truths which had been carefully examined in the classrooms where students had at least preparatory education in Hebrew and Greek and where bouts of hot air could be squelched—have been thrown onto the street to be tossed around by half-baked, ill-informed, internet whizkids who have nothing to do but seek some new argument. *The Bible or any Bible is no longer Holy.* No one takes their shoes off when on Holy Ground anymore.

In the twenty minute devotional classes Israel and the Church are no longer separate entities. The Second Coming of Christ is not needed since we have iPhones, iPads and CNN. "The Bible For Dummies" (an actual book) serves our needs. "Slaughterhouse religion" with all its gore belongs in grandpa's T-Model along with his dangerous shotgun; it does not belong in our cramped US Government green hybrids. Therefore, why lay such heavy linguistic burdens on lake bound members such as "remission/forgiveness"

“Two Advents of Christ” and “Israel/Church” differences? Make it simple, short, and sweet for larger numbers and more cash flow.

The critical rule shown in this work is that the context of the Bible *source* (common Greek) and *target* language (in this case, English) reveal meanings of the individual source terms (Greek) not available in secular usage. The target language will at times form certain definitions of its own if proper translation is done and the results are allowed. I see no reason to not expect the same result in other major target languages. We do not address those in this work. I have a limited knowledge of translation efforts of the Bible into a Philippine dialect, Ilonggo/Hiligayon and the Chinese Mandarin. In my opinion, there are principles in the target language that dictate translation by its contextual rules. The principle is the same as our English contention. But we must leave that evaluation to native speakers who are able Bible students in English, Mandarin, Hiligayon and other languages.

This work does not preclude any sources in translation or interpretation from one language to another. The translator(s) may find valuable assistance from any number of materials. A general rule is that the more access the translator has to various language resources such as dictionaries, grammars, Bible history, lexicons, commentaries, translations, and especially the monumental work of all languages, the King James Bible, the more informed he can be and, consequently, make a good translation.

Some previous and contemporary works claim to define King James Bible (KJB) words. With charity toward the authors, I will not name them. Some of these definitions are based entirely upon editions of the Webster 1828 Dictionary. The definitions are *religious* but not altogether biblical or *Scriptural*. Webster believed the KJB, along with other errors, had indelicate passages offensive to females. He even followed his dictionary with a translation of his own to reflect that belief. This eventually went the way of all translations that are supposed improvements on the KJB—obscurity. ⁵

THE BIBLE METHOD OF TERM DEFINITION

⁵ Noah Webster, ed., *The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments, in the Common Version. With Amendments of the Language*. New Haven: Durrie and Peck, 1833. Reprinted Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1987. Webster was concerned with how women viewed the accurate but coarser English terms that “called a spade,”—what is now called *political correctness*. Webster’s Bible in Genesis 34, Exodus 7, Exodus 16, Psalm 38, and John 11, “stink” is replaced with the words “odious,” “putrefy,” and “offensive.” In Genesis 38, Leviticus 19, 21, Deuteronomy 22, Judges 2, Psalm 106, Ezekiel 16, 23, and Ephesians 5, “whoredom,” “whore,” “went a whoring,” and “whoremonger,” he replaced with: “lewdness,” “lewd woman,” “harlot,” “went astray,” and “lewd person.” According to Webster, Nevada has only “houses of lewdness.” Perhaps a more appropriate title for his translation should have been, *The Ladies’ Parlour Bible*.

First, there must be faith in the authenticity and authority of the Bible. By this I mean we are to realize that the King James Bible (KJB) is more than just another translation. It means that we must accept the fact that God Who is the Author/Creator of language also governs languages so that the inspiration/preservation of our Bible is due to His safeguard.

“By him all things consist” (Colossians 1:17) then natural laws of physical creation and the laws of the spirit world mean nothing without the Divine Enforcer actively enforcing His laws. If care is made over God’s General Revelation in physical creation, how much more care He exercises over His Special Revelation, the Bible!

Thy word is very pure: therefore thy servant loveth it. (Psalm 119:140)

Thy word is “very pure”---the law is stated and the law guarantees its continued purity—“is very pure.” The person who has faith in the Bible in his hand can receive the same blessings David did when he wrote and read Psalm 119. But some might object, “Did not Drs. Conant and Dale (p.7) believe *the Bible*?

Therein is the problem and that of most: neither man believed *the Book in his hand* was absolute truth. Both viewed Bible inspiration as a past event, solely confined to the original manuscripts and that only errant copies are available since the originals have passed away.

In their view, as in almost all, inspiration of the originals was perfect but preservation of copies was flawed. God performed miracle after miracle with the originals but stopped before the first copy and left the ongoing copy process to man. An endless scholarship search to uncover the flaws of copies and reproduce the original wording is the shifting, uncertain authority of religion from 100 A.D. until Jesus comes again. (In some critics’ minds, it would be “*IF He does actually come again.*”). “Original only inspiration” does not stand the test.

Timothy did not have any original manuscripts but Paul said he had known the Holy Scriptures from his youth. The Scriptures he had known were profitable in all matters of faith and practice.

15 And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.

16 All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:

17 That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. (2 Timothy 3:15-17).

The Scriptures Timothy had were "given by inspiration of God" and they were centuries removed from the "originals." The double edged method is to first believe you have the inspired word of God and then practice "rightly dividing the word of truth." (2 Timothy 2:15). A comparison of things that are the same and things that are different then carefully keeping them in the right place to the right people of the Bible at the right time is the Divine method of Bible study.

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. (1 Corinthians 12:5-6).

Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. (2 Timothy 2:15).

Within the philological studies of man's literature there is some gain in considering the various contexts of a term, but to miss the essential study key of Bible context is a major blunder. It seems the goal of many is now centered on the study of man, his books, and how to please men rather than learning more of the word of God and seeking to please Him.

THE RESULTS OF SCEPTICISM IN AUTHORITY AND STUDY

As a result of the long standing skepticism towards Bible authority (noted above), with needless disputes over works, rituals, and ceremonies such as baptisms, there are: (1) the denials of any water baptism for this present Church Age. (2) assertions that water baptism is essential to salvation. (3) no agreements among many as to the mode of baptism (4) permissive practices in baptism but also some strict prohibitions on non-essentials in the ordinance (5) traditional views of the ordinance in major denominations without any instruction of the baptism's meaning and purpose and (6) experience focused baptisms of the Holy Spirit with (7) an almost total blindness to the baptism by the Spirit into the body of Christ.

What does the word "baptism" mean in the Bible? *The word "baptism" indicates that a Biblical action performed by God or man with, in, or by the Holy Spirit or a physical element produces that condition of baptism; the meaning, manner, mode, and specific message related to that condition are defined by the contextual usage.* In later chapters the reader will find a definition of baptisms performed by man and baptisms performed by God.

A CONTRAST OF TWO BAPTISMS

Below is a look at two of the baptisms in the Bible. The differences between the two are sufficient to stir a Bible student to examine further the theme of this book: there are several distinct baptisms in the Bible, each

with its own mode and manner determined by the message and the messenger.

Notice the difference between the baptism that occurred in Exodus 14 and the baptism Paul refers to in 1 Corinthians 1. I trust the reader will also read the OT passages dealing with the Red Sea as well as all of Paul's comments regarding baptism in 1 Corinthians along with our brief comparison below:

1 Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea;

2 And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; (1Corinthians 10:1-2)

But lift thou up thy rod, and stretch out thine hand over the sea, and divide it: and the children of Israel shall go on dry ground through the midst of the sea. (Exodus 14:16)

For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect. (1 Corinthians 1:17)

Paul's reference to baptism here is "under the cloud" and "through the sea" and by that action created the condition of baptism. The baptism was a vital identification "unto Moses." It was not "in Moses" or "by Moses" but "unto Moses." It was by following Moses they were delivered from Egypt and by following Moses they will be safe: Moses is God's spokesman to Israel and to disobey him was to disobey God. One might claim this statement by Paul was only metamorphic--if so, it is the mightiest of metaphors for the people lived or died by their continued obedience to the "Law of Moses." God spoke to Moses and Moses spoke those words to the people of Israel and carried Israel's words to the Lord; no one spoke directly to God except Moses. (Exodus 19:7-8; Numbers 12:8).

(1) The Exodus passage through the Sea was an essential baptism. Those who did not participate in that baptism perished. *Paul's baptism was not essential* for he could say: "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius;" (1 Corinthians 1:11-17) Paul was able to thank God he had baptized *so few* but the Exodus baptism *involved all*: "And were all baptized unto Moses..." Those not so baptized in like manner in Exodus—perished. *Moses baptism was essential, Paul's was not.*

(2) Exodus was a baptism "unto Moses" but the Corinthians were not baptized unto Moses or unto Paul. They were baptized unto Christ: "Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?"

(3) No records were kept on those Paul baptized: "I know not whether I baptized any other" but the baptism of all unto Moses was recorded in God's eternal word! See Numbers 1:1-3.

(4) Moses baptism was *a mass event*, over 1.5 million at one time; Paul's baptisms were *few, mostly private, unnoted*, and evidently *individual*.

(5) The baptism unto Moses was preparatory to, not because of. God officially made the "children of Israel" the "nation of Israel" and Moses became as God (as he was to Pharaoh Exodus 7:1) to Israel and God's faithful servant to Israel (Numbers 12:6-8) after the Red Sea baptism.

(6) After being in physical bondage, the nation of Israel will be physically and materially blessed. (Exodus 33:1-4)

(7) The children of Israel did not get wet *in the sea*; they went *through the sea*. Paul's baptism is one of personal identification with the representation of having gone down into the watery grave and coming up from the watery grave—an identification with the past and finished work of Christ.

(8) The nation, including babies (!!) was baptized. Later, they will go through Jordan in the same manner (at flood season and completely dry) but with Joshua ("Jesus" Acts 7:47) at the head of the nation. Paul's baptism pictures a *past* entrance into the Person and Work of Christ by consenting believers; but "baptized unto Moses" pictured a *future* entrance of Israel into the Land and blessings of God.

(9) Finally, no one knew they had been baptized in Exodus and no one knew it was a baptism until Paul revealed it in the NT.

The justification of our book title should be evident: *Baptisms in the King James Bible*. We have noted the great gulf between two baptism events in the Bible. There are other baptisms to consider and all of them are seen to be divergent from each other as we allow the Bible to define itself.--Dave Reese, January, 2011

CHAPTER ONE THE BASICS

I. BAPTISM IN THE BIBLE

"If every time "dear" appears it must mean a term of affection, whatever the context, our language is too stiff to understand and is weak. If every time "love" appears it must mean one word related to physical touch, we can never be sure of what is really said. The same predicament is true of the Bible and baptism." –Anonymous.

The meaning of the Bible word *baptism* cannot be determined by the Hebrew, Greek, or English lexicons and dictionaries; the New Testament (NT) usage does not allow a one word universal definition like "immersion" or "pouring." The Biblical context of baptism must be considered so as to gain knowledge of its message, manner, and mode and thereby gain understanding of its importance.

I think I should state my position on baptism for this present Church Age lest some think our position is uncertain. *I believe that immersion is the proper mode of baptism under the gospel of grace.* This study proves the point and makes specific the relation of the gospel with the ordinance.....

**THIS CONCLUDES THE PREVIEW
ORDER THE BOOK NOW**