

Water Baptism...just do it

By Wm Tipton

Instead of discussing whether water baptism 'saves' a person...an issue we personally believe is conditional seeing that some folks repent of their sins yet are unable for whatever reason to be baptised...I'd like to discuss whether water baptism was practiced AFTER Jesus had ascended and after Pentecost and the coming of the Holy Spirit.

Some seem to think that after a time that water baptism was removed from our faith or something, but I personally do not believe that is the case.

The day of Pentecost and the coming of the Holy Spirit is recorded in Acts 2, as we well know, so do we see any water baptisms going on after this baptism of 'fire' spoken of in Gods word?

6 entire chapters later we have a very clear baptism in water being practiced still. If Spirit baptism is all that is *required* or expected at this point, then why is this even occurring? (of course we expect some to come up with illogical reasoning's and excuses, but read it for yourself and take no ones word for anything. Does it make sense to YOU that this water baptism is taking place *IF* it is no longer of any issue?)

Act 8:36-39

And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? (37) And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. (38) And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him

And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more: and he went on his way rejoicing.

This next passage is quite clear. These HAD already recieved the Holy Spirit and yet WERE going to be baptized in WATER as well.

Act 10:44-48 While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. (45) And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. (46) For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God.

Then answered Peter, (47) Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? (48) And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. Then prayed they him to tarry certain days.

Now, dear reader, is there any doubt in your mind about what is clearly shown there?

These who HAD already received the Holy Spirit were commanded to be baptized in water. we know its water since they had ALREADY received the Holy Spirit.

Here is yet more evidence that water baptism is practiced in the church

Now I say this, that each of you says, "I am of Paul," and "I of Apollos," and "I of Cephas," and "I of Christ."

Has Christ been divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Or were you baptized in the name of Paul?

I thank God that I baptized none of you except Crispus and Gaius, lest anyone should say that I had baptized in my own name.

Yes, I also baptized the household of Stephanas. Besides, I do not know whether I baptized any other.

For Christ did not send me to baptize, but to preach the gospel, not in eloquent wisdom, lest the cross of Christ should be deprived of its power.

(1Co 1:12-17 EMTV)

Are we to believe that Christ did not send Paul to baptize men into His name and Spirit ?

Paul shows us here that he did not baptize men himself, nor was he called to, and this conclusively shows us that he is referring to water baptism as it would be absurd for Paul to claim that Jesus did not call him to 'baptize' men into the Spirit.

These who argue against water baptism do so with their own personal agendas.

Do not let these who teach falsely rob you of the blessing of water baptism...