



not saved through water? Of course not. Nevertheless, that's what some in the religious world would have us believe. Bible doctrine teaches that Noah's salvation was a figure or type of our salvation! Consider brother William J. Stewart's biblical comparison of Noah's salvation and our own.

[Noah] was in danger of death (Genesis 6:13, 17); we are in danger of death (Romans 3:23; 6:23). He was saved by God (Genesis 7:16); we are saved by God (Titus 3:4-5). He was saved by grace (Genesis 6:8); we are saved by grace (Ephesians 2:8-9). He was saved by faith (Hebrews 11:7); we are saved by faith (Romans 1:16). He was saved by obedience (Hebrews 11:7); we are saved by obedience (Romans 6:17). He was saved by water (1 Peter 3:20); we are saved by water (1 Peter 3:21).

Why should one who believes in Christ be baptized? Because the Bible clearly says so, and that will never change despite the many ways people will try to distort God's Word to meet their preconceived notions. Have you put on Christ as a raiment in baptism (Gal 3:27)? Paul taught that only those *in* Christ do not stand condemned (Rom. 8:1). Why not choose to obey God today?



Faithful Sayings Issue 13.15 April 10, 2011

4700 Andrews Ave.
Amarillo TX 79106
806-352-2809
www.olsenpark.com

Welcome Visitors

We are so glad that you joined us today.
Please come again.

● Let us know if you have any questions.

ISSUE

13.15

BULLETIN OF
THE OLSEN
PARK CHURCH
OF CHRIST

Faithful Sayings

April 10
2011



Services

Sunday: 9:30 AM
10:20 AM
6:00 PM

Wednesday: 7:00 PM

Elders:

Pat Ledbetter
Jeff Nunn
Kyle Pope

Deacons:

Dean Bowers
Eddie Cook
Bill Davis
Steve Dixon
Pat Goguen
Jack Langley
Neil Ledbetter
Brady McAlister
Walker McAnear
Lance Purcell
Rusty Scott

Evangelists:

Kyle Pope
Jason Garcia

Why Should I Be Baptized?

By Jason Garcia

Many of our religious friends today stand ready with arguments that allegedly disprove the need for one who comes to Christ to be baptized in order that his or her sins may be forgiven. God has taught us that the Truth can be found in His Word, regardless of the numerous assertions that claim otherwise (2 Pet. 1:3; 2 Tim. 3:16). We appreciate that our friends try to defend their position from the Scriptures, however I believe they misapply what Scripture teaches. Let us focus on some of their teachings or counter-claims and weigh them against all Scriptures to see if they harmonize with God's Doctrine concerning baptism in the New Covenant.

Teaching #1 – *“Mark 16:16 should not be considered authoritative because it is excluded from some of the earliest New Testament manuscripts.”*

What does Mark 16:16 say?
“Whoever believes and is baptized will be saved, but whoever does



not believe will be condemned” (ESV). Yes, it is true that this verse along the others (9-20) are not included in Sinaiticus and Vaticanus. However, one or both of these manuscripts will exclude Genesis 1:1-46:28; 2 Kings 2:5-7, 10-13; Psalm 106-137; Matthew 3; 16:2-3; Luke 6:1; 22:43-44; 23:34; John 5:4-5; 8:1-11; 9:38; 19:33-34; 21:25; Acts 8:37; Romans 16:24; 1 Timothy; 2 Timothy; Titus; Philemon; Hebrews 9:8-13:25; and Revelation. Would our friends willingly admit that these passages



Olsen Park church of Christ

should be omitted from our Bibles today? Certainly not. The fact of the matter is that we must rely upon a vast amount manuscript evidence to collate the Scriptures God has preserved for us. Furthermore, more than one hundred years before Vaticanus and Sinaiticus were completed, Ireneaus, who lived ca. 120-205 A.D. quoted Mark 16:19 (see Ireneaus, “Against Heresies”). Much more could be said to establish the authenticity of Mark 16:9-20, but I will leave any further investigation to you.

Teaching #2 – “Acts 2:38 has been mistranslated in most Bibles, and does not prove that one needs to be baptized to have his or her sins forgiven.”

An alternative rendering of the text is usually offered to substantiate this claim, and it’s something to the effect of “Repent and be baptized each and every one of you, *because* your sins have been forgiven”. How does this phrase in Act 2:38 read in all contemporary, literal translations? It reads, “**for the forgiveness** (or remission) **of your sins**” (NASB, NKJV, ESV). You’ll notice the major difference in translation is the word “for” has been replaced with “because” in our friend’s translation. They will contend that the original language does support the translation given in our Bibles and that is why they opt for the alternative. They echo A.T. Robertson in claiming that Matt. 12:41 has the correct rendering of the word used in Acts 2:38 that is translated “for” in most Bibles. In Matt. 12:41 Jesus said, “**The men of Nineveh will rise up at the judgment with this generation and condemn it, for they repented AT THE PREACHING OF JONAH, and behold, something greater than Jonah is here**” (emphasis mine). The reason I’ve emphasized the phrase “at the preaching of Jonah” is because this is the text which they claim parallels Peter’s statement in acts 2:38, and just as Jesus taught, men repented at or *because of* Jonah’s preaching, so Peter is also teaching one should repent and be baptized because they are forgiven. Here’s what the original language looks like:

Acts 2:38.....*eis aphesis hamartia*
“...for the forgiveness of sins...”

Matthew 12:41.....*eis ho kerugma ionas*
“...at the preaching of Jonah...”

One does not have to be a Greek scholar to see that the phrases in the original language look nothing alike save for the Greek word “*eis*”. There is, however, another New Testament text which is an exact parallel to Peter’s statement in Acts 2. In Matt. 26:28 Jesus, in establishing the memorial of the fruit of the vine, said, “**for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many FOR THE FORGIVNESS OF SINS**” (emphasis mine). Here’s the language comparison again:

Acts 2:38.....*eis aphesis hamartia*
“...for the forgiveness of sins...”

Matthew 26:28.....*eis aphesis hamartia*
“...for the forgiveness of sins...”

Again, one doesn’t have to be a Greek grammarian to see which two of the three different texts match up in the original language! Jesus, said that He shed His blood *for the purpose of* forgiving man’s sins. If one interprets Acts 2:38 to teach that sinners are baptized because their sins are already forgiven then consistency demands that he interpret Jesus’ words in Matthew 26 to say He shed His blood because man’s sins were already forgiven! Would anyone at all familiar with Bible teaching dare maintain such a blasphemous position?

Teaching #3 – “1 Pet. 3:21 does not teach baptism in water saves one soul, but is best understood as a public declaration of one’s identity in Christ.”

Peter was inspired to write, “**Baptism, which corresponds to this, now saves you, not as a removal of dirt from the body but as an appeal to God for a good conscience, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ**” (1

Pet. 3:21). What was he referring to in the context when he said “corresponding to this”? In the previous verse Peter said, “**God’s patience waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was being prepared, in which a few, that is, eight persons, were brought safely through water**” (1 Pet. 3:20). Peter cites Noah and His family as examples of God’s deliverance due to His patience. How is it that God saved them? There are a number of ways we could answer: the ark, the plans He gave to Noah, the time He gave to Noah, etc. How did *Peter* say Noah and his family were saved? He said “eight persons were brought safely through water”, and immediately he says “corresponding to *this...*” (ESV), “there is an anti-type...” (NKJV), “the like figure...” (KJV), “after a true likeness...” (ASV), “corresponding to that...” (NASB). Stop for a moment and think, would it make any sense for Peter to say that eight people were saved *through water* and corresponding to that we are