

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #112; August, 2007 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830; Ph. (419)435-2836

Fax (419)-435-7571; E-mail caemahiser@sbcglobal.net

TO THOSE WHOM THE COVENANT BELONGS

A NON-UNIVERSAL CULTURE AWARENESS INSTRUCTIONAL PUBLICATION

This is a non-copyrighted teaching letter.
Please feel free to make as many copies as you wish, but not to edit.

A MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER

This is my one hundred and twelfth monthly teaching letter and continues my tenth year of publication. Since *WTL* #88 we have been presenting a series defending the apostle Paul. With the last lesson, #111, along with this one, and in upcoming lessons, I will continue commenting on Paul's writings directly or indirectly. There are a lot of misconceptions concerning Paul's writings and I will attempt to clear these misunderstandings up. The very first thing we must understand is Paul's Yahshua-given mission, which almost everyone applies to the so-called "Gentiles" (a Latin term which no New Testament writer ever employed either in spoken or written word). I will repeat here what I said in lesson #111:

Paul makes it very clear at 1 Corinthians 11:1: "**Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ.**" So don't ever accuse Paul of starting a new religion! And inasmuch as Yahshua Christ Himself said at Matthew 15:24: "**But he answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.**" So neither did Paul go to anyone other than "the lost sheep of the house of Israel", or he could never have made such a statement as he did at 1 Corinthians 11:1! I will be repeating this admonition (meaning rebuke) several times in this upcoming series. A "rebuke" or "reprimand" is not a very nice thing to have to give, but it must be made very clear that Paul was never called to take the Gospel, meant for lost Israel only, to any non-Israel heathen people! There are two terms used in most translations which cause much confusion: "jew" and "gentile", and until we comprehend the original meanings, we will continue to be as blind as bats. Because I have addressed these two misnomers several times, I will not repeat them here, but they would be better rendered in the majority of cases "nation" and "Judaeon" or "Judahite". And as for the term translated "jew", we must differentiate between the counterfeit "bad-fig-jews" and the genuine pure-blooded "good-fig-Judahites", and they are as different as night is from day.

In order to comprehend Paul's mission to the "ethnê" (lost Israel nations), we must go back to 2 Kings 17:7-23 to where lost Israel was last heard of in the Old Testament: "⁷ **For so it was, that the children of Israel had sinned against Yahweh**

their God, which had brought them up out of the land of Egypt, from under the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt, and had feared other gods,⁸ And walked in the statutes of the heathen, whom Yahweh cast out from before the children of Israel, and of the kings of Israel, which they had made.⁹ And the children of Israel did secretly *those* things that *were* not right against Yahweh their God, and they built them high places in all their cities, from the tower of the watchmen to the fenced city.¹⁰ And they set them up images and groves in every high hill, and under every green tree:¹¹ And there they burnt incense in all the high places, as *did* the heathen whom Yahweh carried away before them; and wrought wicked things to provoke Yahweh to anger:¹² For they served idols, whereof Yahweh had said unto them, Ye shall not do this thing.¹³ Yet Yahweh testified against Israel, and against Judah, by all the prophets, *and by* all the seers, saying, Turn ye from your evil ways, and keep my commandments *and* my statutes, according to all the law which I commanded your fathers, and which I sent to you by my servants the prophets.¹⁴ Notwithstanding they would not hear, but hardened their necks, like to the neck of their fathers, that did not believe in Yahweh their God.¹⁵ And they rejected his statutes, and his covenant that he made with their fathers, and his testimonies which he testified against them; and they followed vanity, and became vain, and went after the heathen that *were* round about them, *concerning* whom Yahweh had charged them, that they should not do like them.¹⁶ And they left all the commandments of Yahweh their God, and made them molten images, *even* two calves, and made a grove, and worshipped all the host of heaven, and served Baal.¹⁷ And they caused their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire, and used divination and enchantments, and sold themselves to do evil in the sight of Yahweh, to provoke him to anger.¹⁸ Therefore Yahweh was very angry with Israel, and removed them out of his sight: there was none left but the tribe of Judah only.¹⁹ Also Judah kept not the commandments of Yahweh their God, but walked in the statutes of Israel which they made.²⁰ And Yahweh rejected all the seed of Israel, and afflicted them, and delivered them into the hand of spoilers, until he had cast them out of his sight.²¹ For he rent Israel from the house of David; and they made Jeroboam the son of Nebat king: and Jeroboam drove Israel from following Yahweh, and made them sin a great sin.²² For the children of Israel walked in all the sins of Jeroboam which he did; they departed not from them;²³ Until Yahweh removed Israel out of his sight, as he had said by all his servants the prophets. So was Israel carried away out of their own land to Assyria unto this day.”

Not only was the ten-tribed northern kingdom of Israel carried away, but we read at 2 Kings 23:26-27: “²⁶ Notwithstanding Yahweh turned not from the fierceness of his great wrath, wherewith his anger was kindled against Judah, because of all the provocations that Manasseh had provoked him withal.²⁷ And Yahweh said, I will remove Judah also out of my sight, as I have removed Israel, and will cast off this city Jerusalem which I have chosen, and the house of which I said, My name shall be there.”

So approximately 600 to 750 years from the captivities of Israel and Judah, Paul was commissioned to go to these cast-off people with the message of the Gospel. The casting off of Israel and Judah was equivalent to being divorced, and there are several passages with that kind of terminology. By Old Testament law, once a person divorced his or her spouse, and that spouse was found with others (in this case other gods), it was then unlawful to remarry that spouse once more, and this same provision applied to the divorce of Yahweh from Israel. But there was a provision that if one of the divorced parties were to die, then the other party could lawfully remarry. Therefore, Yahweh took it upon Himself to come in the flesh as Yahshua and die so that He could remarry Israel. And by His death, the requirements of the law had been met and He was free to take lost Israel once more as His bride. This was the Gospel (good news) that Paul took to the lost Israel nations. The price of the law had been met and Israel was redeemed (purchased back), and no other people are included. It is only from this premise that one can understand the mission and writings of Paul. If the reader is already aware of, or is willing to adopt these essential precepts, we can get on with our exploration of Paul's epistles.

Another very important premise we must establish is the fact that the Gospel (good news of redemption for Israel) could not be announced until after Christ's death and Resurrection. Anything before that time would be premature, for before that time the redemption (purchasing back) had not taken place, and for that job, Paul was especially chosen.

Another concept that must be dispensed with is the false doctrine of being "born again". The Greek says "born from above" and in simple terms means being born of the heavenly race. I have also addressed this issue several times in my writings and won't repeat it here. It was only Nicodemus who misunderstood it, and nominal-churchianity takes the same position as Nicodemus. What is important is where Paul stated at Galatians 3:16: "**Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.**" William Finck, in his *The Letters of Paul*, has a much better translation of this verse, and it reads thusly: "**Now to Abraham the promises have been spoken, and to his offspring. It does not say 'and to offsprings', as of many; but as of one: 'and to your offspring,' which are anointed.**" The seed in the KJV phrase "And to thy seed, which is Christ" should be applied to Abraham's seed "Israel" rather than "Christ", although Christ was one of Abraham's seed. The plural "seeds" are those who can trace their lineage back to Abraham but who are not under the Covenant. William Finck furnishes an explanation on this verse with a note thusly:

"Note 39: Here Paul contrasts σπέρματι, Dative singular of σπέρμα (4690), with its Dative plural, σπέρμασιν. Thayer says of σπέρμα 'the singular is used collectively of the *grains* or *kernel*s sown', although later Thayer claims that this is not so here, perverting Paul's use of the word and calling it 'genius'. In the context of this and other of Paul's epistles, I must read this to be a comparison of the several races sprung from Abraham: Jacob-Israel with Ishmael (Gal. 4:21-31), with Esau-Edom (Rom. 9, 10, and 11), and even those from Keturah.

“The word ‘seed’, as in English, also in Greek and Hebrew is a singular used collectively, of many of a single type. The Greek plural of σπέρμα appears in the N.T. only at Matt. 13:32 and Mark 4:31, where diverse types are meant. This is true in Old Testament Hebrew also, where zera (2233, ‘seed’) occurs in the plural only at I Sam. 8:15, where it is used of crops, and diverse varieties are implied.

“Many may point to the verb ἐστίν here, properly the singular ‘is’ (of εἰμί, 1510) but here ‘are’, and it is easily demonstrable that ἐστίν is often translated ‘are’ when referring to a collective noun, or a collection of objects. One need not look further than Gal 4:24 and 5:19 for examples of this, and Luke 18:27 is another example.

“Since σπέρμα may be translated ‘race’ (Liddell & Scott, σπέρμα, II. 2.), in all fairness, I may have done better to translate this verse: ‘Now to Abraham the promises have been spoken, and to his **race**. It does not say ‘And to **racess**’ as of many; but as of one: ‘and to your **race**’, which is Anointed.’”

I hope all of this demonstrates some of the problems we encounter when we read Paul’s epistles. It all boils down to this: Sometimes what we think we are reading is not at all what is being said. Now the explanation given by nominal-churchianity is that the seed at Galatians 3:16 is “spiritual seed”; that somehow Abraham had “spiritual seed” as well as natural seed. And they usually insinuate that the “Gentiles” are the spiritual seed, thus they create a dual gospel, one for the so-called “Jews” and another for the so-called “Gentiles”. They even go so far as to say that Yahweh’s promise to make Abraham’s seed (Gen. 22:17), “as the sand which is upon the sea shore” as being the “Jews”, and becoming as numerous as the “stars” at (Gen. 15:5) as being the “Gentile church”. They will go further to say that the “Jews” are God’s earthly kingdom, while the “Gentiles” are God’s “heavenly church”. And yet these same people will cite Gal. 3:28 and declare there is no difference between a “Jew” and a “Gentile”. Well, if in their estimation there is no difference, why is one on earth and the other in heaven? This passage would better render “Jew” and “Gentile” as “Judaean” and “Greek”, because truly in context at this passage, they are both Israelites that are being referred to. It’s like the verse at Colossians 3:11 which says: “**Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free: but Christ is all, and in all.**” The Greeks of this verse are Israelites; the Judaeans of this verse are Israelites (not to be confused with the bad-fig-jews); the circumcision of this verse are Israelites; the uncircumcision of this verse are Israelites; the Barbarians of this verse are Israelites; and the Scythians of this verse are Israelites. And when it says, “... Christ *is* all, and in all ...”, the “all” is not speaking of non-Israelites.

At Galatians 3:19, the term “seed” is again used by Paul, and in this verse it is referring to Yahshua the Christ. Paul explains why Moses introduced the law at Sinai, and how long it would be mandatory. But let’s read the verse: “**Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.**” The law was given by Yahweh through Moses at Sinai as a measure to keep Israel within moral and genetic parameters so they could survive as a race of people until the coming of the “seed” (Christ), at which time He would write the law in

the hearts of His people. The existence of the law never ceased with the coming of Christ, but only the method of enforcement. Under the Old Testament it was of necessity harsh and cruel, but starting with the New, it became a desirable code of living guided by the Holy Spirit. A mediator is a go-between, and did not Moses serve as a mediator, delivering the law from Yahweh to the Israel people? And when the “seed” came, did not Christ Himself become the final mediator once and for all?

At Galatians 3:21, a far more important question is asked: “**Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law.**” This verse is simply asking, does the law hold precedence over the promises, or do the promises hold precedence over law? The answer is: The promises hold precedence over the law. William Finck, in his *The Letters of Paul* translates this verse thusly: “**Therefore is the law in opposition to the promises of Yahweh? Certainly not! If a law had been given having the ability to produce life, indeed justification would have been from of law.**” This verse is simply stating that if we don’t have the promises of Yahweh, we don’t have anything! The promises are called covenants, and, therefore, we have the Edenic Covenant, the Adamic Covenant, the Noahic Covenant, the Abrahamic covenant, the Mosaic Covenant, the Palestinian covenant, The Davidic Covenant, the Solomonic Covenant, and the New Covenant, all of which take precedence over the law. But, how long would these covenants have lasted had we not had the moral law, “Thou shalt not commit adultery”, which means thou shalt not mix thy race? The tenth commandment is the one that says, “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s wife.” Was Yahweh so inept that He made two commandments just alike? What would happen today if nominal-churchianity would speak out against race-mixing? But rather, they defend the ones who do intermix.

We shall now critique another interesting verse at Galatians 3:8 as translated by the KJV. It is intriguing because, for a change, the translators did a better job of translating the Greek term “ethnos”, which is #1484 in the Strong’s Greek dictionary of his concordance. Had the KJV translators done as well on both the Old and New Testaments, we might have a better insight on Holy Writ today. Let’s now read Galatians 3:8 as per the KJV: “**And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.**” It should be noted that in this verse both the words “heathen” and “nations” are from the Greek word “ethnos” which is assigned #1484 in Strong’s.

I will now copy this same verse from the E-sword program which will show the Strong’s numbers behind each word: Gal 3:8: And(1161) the(3588) Scripture(1124), foreseeing(4275) that(3754) God(2316) would justify(1344) the(3588) heathen(1484) through(1537) faith(4102), preached before the gospel(4283) unto Abraham(11), saying, In(1722) thee(4671) shall all(3956) nations(1484) be blessed(1757). Notice, as I stated above, both the words translated “heathen” and “nations” here are the Greek word #1484, “ethnos”. I believe that the translators found themselves in a quandary, as the Old Testament from which this verse is taken says, in part (Gen. 12: 3): “... and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed ...” This tells us two things: (1) that the

“nations” of Galatians 3:8 and the “families” of Genesis 13:3 are the same people, and (2) that Paul understood that the many nations that Abraham’s seed would become were the same people as those translated “Gentiles” in most (but not all) of the New Testament. This verse at Gal. 3:8 becomes quite intriguing, as not even the KJV translators could avoid the true meaning. Abraham was promised by Yahweh that his seed would become many nations, and Paul was commissioned to go to those same nations of people.

But all of these translational errors may not have been the fault of the King James Version translators, as they may have inherited the problem. The first man known to translate the New Testament from Greek into Latin was Saint Jerome, born at Strido, Dalmatia near 340 to 350 A.D. to Christian parents. He was educated at Rome. He is said to have had a vision during a period of illness, causing him to decide to become an ascetic. Hence, he went into the desert of Chalcis, later traveling to various cities of the eastern part of the Roman Empire. He visited such cities as Antioch and Constantinople, where he became impressed with the teachings of St. Gregory of Nazianzus and started to write theological tracts. In 382, he returned to Rome, and there undertook to translate the works of the scholar and theologian Didymus of Alexandria. Far more important, he revised and retranslated the Latin Bible using older Greek manuscripts. Evidently, Latin manuscripts were already in existence at Jerome’s time, but we are not informed by whom they were translated. Anyway, Jerome’s translation later became the version known as the Vulgate. It should be obvious, then, that the Latin term *gentilis* (Gentiles) was first used in these Latin translations. But in the 4th century A.D., the term *gentilis* had an entirely different meaning than is attributed to the term today. The Latin term for “nation” is “gens” and is a root word for *gentilis*, which was later transliterated “Gentiles”. Evidence for this can be found both from the *Junior Classic Latin Dictionary*, Latin-English and English-Latin, by Antonio J. Provost, head of the Modern Language department, University of Notre Dame, and *The American Heritage Dictionary Of the English Language*, New College Edition, with the Indo-European roots appendix.

Secondly, portions of the Latin version of the Bible were first translated into English by John Wycliffe. Wycliffe was born in Yorkshire, England around 1324, and died Dec. 31, 1384. Descending from a noble family, he was educated at Oxford University and appointed master of Balliol Hall, later called Balliol College. He was made rector of Lutterworth in Leicestershire, and became noted as an opponent of the religious orders against whom he directed scathing religious writings. Upon a dispute between Edward II and the papal court in regard to certain tribute money which the king refused to pay, Wycliffe came forward with a number of tracts supporting the king. In 1377 he found himself summoned before a convocation at St. Paul’s Church by Courtenay, Bishop of London, but was assisted by friends, breaking up the meeting by provoking much confusion.

Wycliffe originally was a Nominalist, but later was attracted to the teachings of St. Augustine. With skepticism, he examined the contemporary teachings of the Roman church, and found himself in a position obligating him to object to many of them, using the Scriptures to support his position. He further lashed out against the combined

power politics and economic abuses carried on by the church of Rome, and considered it to be anti-Christian. He condemned the worship of saints, questioned any benefit gained by having celibate priests, fought against the doctrine of transubstantiation, and against oral confession.

But there is evidence that Wycliffe did not complete his English translation of the Latin Bible. There are two versions, and the first attempt to complete Wycliffe's translation was taken over by Nicholas of Hereford (one of Wycliffe's followers), then completed by another unknown hand. Those who finished the work continued to follow the Latin style, which shows in strained or graceless English renderings. Later, Tyndale (although using Greek and Hebrew manuscripts), adopted some of Wycliffe's writing style. (Wycliffe information gleaned from *The World Scope* and *Collier's* encyclopedias.)

What should we conclude from this evidence? Answer: It should be manifestly evident, had Tyndale translated directly from the Hebrew and Greek, the term "Gentiles" would never have appeared in his translations. Since Wycliffe lived in the thirteen hundreds, his understanding of the Latin term *gentilis* was probably "nation" rather than today's corrupted definition "non-Jew". For the Latin word "gentile", *Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* cites its origin as: "Middle English, from Late Latin *gentilis*, from Latin *gent-*, *gens* nation", and the meaning for the Latin *gens*: "a Roman clan embracing the families of the same stock in the male line with the members having a common name and worshiping a common ancestor."

Hopefully, this will resolve some of our questions concerning Paul's teachings, but we haven't even scratched the surface yet. It may be somewhat comparable to being in a third grade arithmetic class while Paul is teaching calculus, let alone having to deal with the corrupt translations. But if one fervently desires, and keeps an open mind and will pray, the Spirit will reveal it to him. Much of Scripture is purposely written so certain people will never understand it. That's the reason for the parables, symbols, euphemisms, and metaphors.

The next passage we are going to tackle is Galatians 3:23-26 which reads: "²³ **But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed.** ²⁴ **Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.** ²⁵ **But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.** ²⁶ **For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Yahshua.**" Paul is not addressing individual Israelites in these verses. Rather, he is speaking of all the 12 tribes from the time of the giving of the law at Sinai until the first Advent of Yahshua. The long period the tribes of Israel spent under the Mosaic law, handed down by Yahweh, was a training period for immature children. As children, when we didn't obey the rules we were spanked, and we had to learn our lessons the hard way. After approximately 700 years out of our 2,520 years (or seven times) punishment, we had matured to the point that the fullness of time had come for Yahshua to arrive at his first Advent. From the giving of the law until the Crucifixion of Yahshua, the law was our schoolmaster. We were, as it were, "shut up" or "locked up" in our unbelief. In this condition, our only salvation was the fact that we were the inheritors of Yahweh's promises given to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. We can claim no other! When it says here "But before faith came ...", it simply means before

the gospel was proclaimed or published. And how can one have faith in something of which he has never heard? With the language of this passage, Paul can only be addressing the lost sheep of the house of Israel, of whom the Galatians were a part. One must remember, however, that the faith had not fully come until the completed work of the death, burial, and resurrection of Yahshua.

Let us compare how William Finck translates Galatians 3:23-26 in his *The Letters of Paul*: “²³ **But before the faith was to come we had been guarded under law, being enclosed to the faith destined to be revealed.** ²⁴ **So the law has been our tutor for Christ, in order that from faith we would be deemed righteous.** ²⁵ **But the faith having come, no longer are we under a tutor;** ²⁶ **for you are all sons of Yahweh through the faith in Christ Yahshua.**”

Let us now continue by reading Galatians 3:27: “**For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.**” You will notice that it doesn’t say anything here about one being baptized into a denomination having put on Christ! If you ask the average churchgoer how he became a member of his church, he’ll usually answer, “I was baptized into it.” Being baptized into Christ is entirely different than the Old Testament ritual of Baptism which John the Baptist practiced. There is not a drop of water in this verse; it’s as dry as a bone. John the Baptist clearly stated at Matthew 3:11: “**I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and *with* fire ...**” It is quite clear from this verse that the mode of baptism was changed from the old cleansing of the Old Testament, but again, this would not happen until after the death, burial, and resurrection of Yahshua. Therefore, it was necessary for Christ Himself to be baptized with John’s water baptism. To put on Christ implies to be clothed with Him, His character, His manner, and His precepts. And believe it or not, Yahshua insists on racial purity. Therefore, anyone who promotes or tolerates multiculturalism or miscegenation in any way, shape or manner definitely is not clothed with Christ!

As there was not a drop of water in the baptism unto Christ at Galatians 3:27, neither is there a drop of water in the baptism unto Christ at Romans 6:3-4, which says: “³ **Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Yahshua Christ were baptized into his death?** ⁴ **Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.**” To be “baptized into his death” means to be nailed to a cross, not dipped into a pool of water. Because Yahshua died in our stead, in essence, we were nailed to the cross with Him, even though it was nearly 2000 years ago. Not only were we nailed to the cross with Him but we were buried in the tomb with Him. And as Christ was raised from the dead, so shall we be raised in resurrection to life like Him and “walk in newness of life” both in this life and the next. Anyone who doesn’t believe that we died with Christ should take a look at Rom. 6:8 which says: “**Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him ...**”

Another verse where baptism is as dry as a bone is found at 1 Corinthians 12:13: “**For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether *we be* Judaeans or**

Greeks, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.” Here the word “drink” might imply water, but it can not be the numerous lakes, reservoirs, streams, rivers, creeks, pools or baptistries people have been dunked into all over the world. To show that this verse doesn’t have a drop of water in it, it says we are baptized into one body, which eliminates all of these water sources. One could be baptized a hundred times in water, but it wouldn’t accomplish what is described in the two passages at Galatians 3:27 and Romans 6:3-4!

Another baptism that didn’t have a drop of water in it, and was dry as a bone, is found at 1 Corinthians 10:1-4: “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;** ³ **And did all eat the same spiritual meat;** ⁴ **And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was the Anointed.**” That there wasn’t a drop of water with this baptism and that it was as dry as a bone can be verified at Exodus 14:16: “**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.**” It was rather the Egyptians who were baptized with water, and drowned.

Another passage where there isn’t a drop of water in baptism and is as dry as a bone is found at Ephesians 5:25-27 where it says: “²⁵ **Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it;** ²⁶ **That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word,** ²⁷ **That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.**” The “water” here at verse 26 is only symbolic, thus not an application of actual water. This “washing of water by the word” is the very best form of baptism found in the entire Bible for cleaning away all false doctrine. It is a baptism we need daily throughout our lives.

At Colossians 2:10-12 we have another example of baptism that doesn’t have a drop of water in it, and is as dry as a bone. Not only that, but we have a “circumcision not made with hands” and a knife. Inasmuch as the circumcision is made without hands, it would appear, like the circumcision, we have a baptism without water!: “¹⁰ **And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power:** 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:** 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.**”

Earlier we got on the subject of being clothed with Christ. To get an example of that, we need to turn in the Old Testament to Isaiah 61:10, which reads: “**I will greatly rejoice in Yahweh, my soul shall be joyful in my God; for he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness, as a bridegroom decketh *himself* with ornaments, and as a bride adorneth *herself* with her jewels.**” No doubt, Paul had passages like this in mind when he wrote the third chapter of Galatians. It would be an interesting project to check the cross-references in our Bible to count how many times he did just such a thing.