

The Holy Spirit in Baptism

In many quarters of theology there is a renewed interest in the work of the Holy Spirit. No subject however is further removed from speculation than this, because it has a very direct bearing upon the life of the church and of the individual believer. This may be seen, when the relationship with believers' baptism is envisaged. To a study of this relationship this paper is devoted. The immense importance of the subject calls for thoroughness on the one hand and for modesty on the other. I hope to fulfill these obligations by limiting this study to an exegetical treatment of the New Testament passages that are relevant, and by providing the conclusions with question-marks.

There are three texts in the New Testament that mention baptism and the Spirit in one sentence. Each of these is part of, and connected with larger areas of New Testament writing and thought, and their study leads us into these larger areas. They are :

1. *Mark 1: 8 and par.*, with which are to be connected *John 1: 26, 33, Acts 1: 5, 11: 15*; the larger area is here the whole of Acts with its manifold connections between the outpouring of the Spirit and the administrations of Baptism, behind which stands the Lucan conception of the work of the Holy Spirit.

2. *I. Corinthians 12: 13*, where the larger area is on the one hand the whole Pauline conception of Baptism and on the other hand the work of the Spirit in the converts, especially those aspects that are, like *I Cor. 12: 13*, expressed in the aorist tense, such as *I Cor. 2: 10, 12, 6: 11, Gal. 3: 2, 3, 14* and especially *Eph. 1: 13, 4: 30*.

3. *John 3: 5*, and the larger area is here the whole Johannine concept of the new birth, and here also belongs *Titus 3: 5*.

Baptism and the Spirit in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts

The saying of the Baptist about the stronger one who comes after him and who will baptize with the Holy Spirit is found in all four Gospels and the saying of the Risen Lord that before many days the disciples will be baptized with the Holy Spirit clearly refers back to it. But nonetheless the logion of the Baptist offers some very serious critical questions, the most important of which concerns its original form. Matthew and Luke have an addition to it: "and with fire," and the question is whether this is an addition or whether Mark has an omission. Bultmann¹ thinks that the original text did speak of a baptism with fire and that the fire is the fire of judgment.

The mention of the Holy Spirit is in his opinion, a Christian addition, which may have found its way into the tradition already in Q or afterwards at the combination of Q and M by Matthew and Luke. The latter seems hardly possible, since the connection of the logion with the following by means of a relative pronoun in both gospels points to a common source. On the other hand it is almost impossible to deny the logion in some form to M and therefore I would advocate the authenticity of the mention of the Holy Spirit in the logion of John the Baptist.

When we now examine the logion itself from the point of view of our present study, our first task is to analyse the idiom. Strack-Billerbeck records an expression: "in the fire he has dipped himself"² but this offers no explanation of the baptism with fire. And the Old Testament idiom offers a good many verbs in connection with the fire of judgment but none that may explain the baptism with fire, or comes close to it. The same is true for the baptism with the Spirit. No expression connected with fire or with Spirit can be found in the LXX which offers an explanation for the wording of the logion. This should not surprise us, since we know that *baptizein* is in the New Testament only connected with the rite of baptism and that the use of this verb and the related nouns *baptisma* and *baptistês* indicates that John's baptism and the Christian baptism were considered something new.³ How much more then a baptism with fire or with the Holy Spirit! Markus Barth has remarked that the idea of baptizing with Spirit was possible only because the idea of being completely dipped into liquid was no longer felt in the use of *baptizein* and *baptisma*, and he quotes for his support Schlatter and Lohmeyer.⁴ He assumes in the expression a reference to a specific happening, not to an abstract idea, but against this two things may be said. First that the idea of a baptism with the Spirit did not gain currency in the first churches, since it is mentioned only once outside Acts; had it been a widely used expression in the New Testament then *baptizein* might have lost its specific force and meaning. And secondly, if the baptism with the Spirit refers to a definite happening (in German: *Vor-gang*), then this happening certainly has found no fixed place in the life of the early churches. It seems therefore correct to assume that the expression "to baptize with the Spirit" is a formation by analogy, called forth by the comparison between the Baptist and the Mightier One. For that comparison dominates the logion, and the mentioning of the Spirit serves to bring out clearly the decisive difference between them. There is also no reason to suppose that John anticipated the replacement of his own baptism by the Spirit-baptism, because very clearly he did not envisage something like the church at all. Just as his own preaching, his baptism was preparatory to the coming of the Kingdom and therefore to the eschatological outpouring of

the Spirit and it was just because of the close links between his baptism and the outpouring of the Spirit, to be administered by the coming Messiah.

When we turn from the Gospels to Acts, we find the logion of the Baptist repeated twice, both times as a word of Jesus;⁵ but the difference between the Baptist and Jesus is remarkable: "John baptized with water, but you will be baptized with the Holy Spirit," which seems to point to a contrast between John's baptism and the baptism with the Spirit more clearly than the original saying. This may be due to Luke's inclination to ascribe to John only a water-baptism, as Haenchen⁶ remarks. Be that as it may, Jesus' words of the coming baptism with the Spirit have Pentecost in view, as is shown by the repeated "promise" the disciples must wait for the promise (14); Jesus receives the promise of the Spirit and pours it out (2 : 33); and the promise is to Israel and its children and all that are far off (2 : 38). In 11 : 15, 16 Jesus' word is repeated by Peter when reporting in Jerusalem on his visit to Cornelius and the reason is obvious. The initiative in this case has been throughout with God and it finds its consummation in the unexpected outpouring of the Spirit which more or less settles the case for Peter and is his final justification for administering the baptism. There is no need to exclude the mention of baptism in 10 : 47, 48 as a later interpolation, because in his report Peter does not refer to a baptism, as does Jackson,⁷ since as far as Jerusalem is concerned the decisive point is the Spirit, not the baptism. Here then we have a situation where baptism with the Spirit precedes water-baptism and calls for it. But, as we all know, there are different situations in Acts. In 8 : 12-17 no outpouring of the Spirit occurs either before or after the baptism until Peter and John "came down, laid their hands on them and prayed for them." They had only been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, which seems to imply that to receive the Spirit was a different matter for which so to speak authorized people had to come. Then there is the baffling story of Acts 19 : 1-7, where the so-called "disciples" have to undergo another water-baptism but this time in the name of the Lord Jesus, and when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came on them. The most astonishing thing here is that there are "disciples" who very certainly have never heard of the Holy Spirit and very probably not even of Jesus himself. Both make them rather poor and unintelligent disciples of the Baptist or, rather, show how far the movement of the Baptist's followers had departed from their master's message. For our present study these examples suffice to show that the relationship between the Holy Spirit and baptism is undefined in Acts. This is confirmed by a study of the kerygma in this book. The Holy Spirit appears but once in the speeches of Peter and that is due to the happenings of the moment. But bap-

tism, though in itself no part of the kerygma, is very closely connected with the complex of preaching, conversion and faith. And since faith is faith in the Lord Jesus, the believers are also baptized in that very name. The real problem then in Acts does not concern so much the relationship between baptism and the Spirit but between faith and the Spirit and ultimately between the Spirit and the Lord Jesus Christ.

There is but one example where the Spirit is given as a sign that the receivers are true believers and that is in 10 : 44 in the house of Cornelius, but as already said, this is in order to exclude all possible doubt in Peter and the Jewish believers with him that these uncircumcised were genuine believers. In other places the Spirit is not the foundation of faith; it is given to the disciples in order to equip them for their ministry as witness of the Lord and the major activity of the Spirit is connected with the missionary work, not with the conversion of those that believed. There is with Luke no room for the *pneuma pisteōs* as Paul has it.⁸ On the other hand Luke stresses the fact that all believers share in the gift of the Spirit; it is their common distinctive as contrasted with the Jews. But faith is never traced back to the creative activity of the Spirit, not even where the supernatural origin of faith is stressed as in 16 : 14. This is due, in the last analysis to Luke's view of the relationship between the Spirit and Christ. In Acts 2 : 33 Peter says that Jesus received the promise of the Spirit after he had been exalted to the right hand of God, but in the Lucan concept of the Spirit this can only mean that He received the Spirit in order to pass it on to his disciples, since He Himself was conceived and born of the Spirit and received the equipment of the Spirit after His baptism. But the Spirit is not his Spirit in the way Paul has it. The Spirit is power but this power is not the power of the resurrection. To receive the Spirit is different from faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, to be baptized with the Spirit is different from being baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Schweizer⁹ has pointed out that Luke speaks of the Spirit in an Old Testament terminology. He sees the Spirit as the Spirit of prophecy; its power is the power that enables extraordinary acts. But there are two limitations to this view. The first is that all members of the church share in the gift of the Spirit. This calls for a deeper and broader scope for the work of the Spirit. The second is that Luke has advanced already one decisive step beyond the views of Mark and Matthew as to the relationship between Jesus and the Spirit, With them the Spirit leads Jesus but with Luke Jesus acts full of the Spirit; that means: Jesus is the subject and not the object of the Spirit. And as already said it is Jesus who pours out the Spirit upon His disciples. These two aspects are more than limitations to the Old Testament concept of the activities of

the Spirit. They call for a reinterpretation of the relationship between Christ, faith and the Spirit, and that reinterpretation prepares the way for a deeper understanding of the work of the Holy Spirit. We find it with Paul.

Baptism and the Spirit in I Cor. 12: 13 and in the Corpus Paulinum

The only text in Paul where we find the Holy Spirit and Baptism explicitly together is I Cor. 12 : 13, and we will attempt an exegesis of this text and its context in order to make our way to the concepts that are behind it.

Both *v.* 12 and *v.* 13 are introduced by *gar* and they are therefore explanatory with regard to the preceding verse. But the *gar* in *v.* 12 seems at first sight a little out of place, since the unity of the body is not the explanation of the work of the one Spirit. It is more or less anticipatory because between the thought of the basic unity of the manifold charismata and that of the unity of the Church lie two others, viz. that the Church is a body and that this body is the creation of the Holy Spirit by means of baptism, and only the last one is explanatory of what precedes. It is a question more or less of an inverted order of thought. This inversion is due to the necessity of introducing two things at the same time and of letting the explanation of the one precede the other one. This adds considerably to the communication-load of both verses.

A further addition is the sudden equation of Christ and the Church. The N.E.B. goes a long way to eliminate this suddenness by transposing the equation to the beginning of the sentence: "For Christ is like a single body," but I feel that this does no justice to the intentionally startling: "so is it with Christ" at the end of 12. The real information of *v.* 12, to use once again a term borrowed from information-theory, is therefore not: the Church is a single body with many limbs and organs, but: Christ is a body and the unity of the members of that body is at the moment quite secondary. It becomes the focal issue from *v.* 14 on.

Only when this is borne in mind does an exegesis of *v.* 13 become possible. It prepares the way for the expression "we are baptized into one body"—*eis hen sōma ebaptisthēmen*. Markus Barth¹⁰ labels this translation as mystical but I have a suspicion that he banishes everything from the New Testament that does not fit into his juristic categories. Exactly because of the implicit equation of Christ and a body Paul could speak of baptism into one body as he spoke in Romans and Galatians of a baptism into Christ. And it stands to reason that both expressions are equivalent, unless it can be shown that the baptism with the Spirit is something different from the baptism referred to in Romans 6 and Galatians 3. For the

moment we must narrow down the scope of our investigation to the expression "baptized with the Spirit." If this is understood in the way of Acts, then the baptism with the Spirit is not the baptism with water; and then also the baptism into Christ is different from the baptism into the body. But that is excluded by the context and therefore the idea of a Spirit-baptism separated and apart from the baptism into Christ is to be dismissed.

There is also a formal consideration which supports this conclusion; immediately after *ebaptisthēmen* comes *eite Ioudaioi, eite Hellēnes*, etc. There exists no parallel between the varieties of gifts (v. 4) and the varieties of functions of the members of the body on the one hand, and the racial and social differences between the members on the other hand. But in Gal. 3 : 27 we find the same thought in a slightly different and expanded form in connexion with baptism, and the putting on of Christ, and it occurs again in Col. 3 : 11 in connexion with the putting on of the new man.

There is reason to suppose that this phrase of the barriers that are overcome in Christ, is part of a baptismal teaching and therefore it seems reasonable that also I Cor. 12 : 13 refers to the same baptism as Gal. 3 : 27, the baptism which is the putting on of Christ or the new man. This baptism is also a baptism into the one body.

But there must be a reason to mention the Spirit in connexion with this baptism. As a figure of speech the baptism with the Spirit was not unknown, though not exactly popular and widespread, as the concordance shows. But Paul never uses it except here and in I Cor. 10 : 2 and in both places in a figurative way, and the reason for that is clearly that he is dealing here with the Holy Spirit. He has described it as the source of the varied gifts and now he describes it as the source of the fundamental unity of the church and its members. But the very fact that he is able to connect the Spirit with the act of baptism shows that there must be some fundamental connexion between the work of the Spirit and baptism. What of this connexion?

We may resolve this question into two separate ones. First : what is Paul's concept of baptism, and second : what is his idea of that part of the work of the Holy Spirit that comes within the context of baptism? Paul's concept of baptism has been studied and described many times. Let me therefore quote Dr. Beasley Murray's summary of it : "Paul saw in baptism a sacrament of the Gospel. . . . Behind and in baptism stands the Christ of the cross and the resurrection, bestowing freedom from sin's guilt and power, and the spirit who gives the life of the age to come in the present and is the pledge of resurrection at the last day . . . Paul saw in baptism the sacrament of union with Christ . . . It involved union with Him in His redemptive acts, both in the rite and in subsequent

life which should conform to the pattern of the passion and resurrection. . . . It involved union with His Body, making the believer a living member, partaking of the life of the whole . . ."¹¹

Our next question concerns the work of the Holy Spirit. It comes within the context of Baptism in its initiatory aspects. It has long been noticed that most verbs used in connection with baptism occur in the aorist tense. Now in several passages which deal with the Holy Spirit we find also verbs in the aorist, sometimes in the active, unusually with God or the Spirit as subject, sometimes in the passive, either with men or with the Spirit as grammatical subjects. This gives as a clue to set apart for the purpose of our present study the initiatory aspects of the work of the Holy Spirit from the rest.

A scrutiny of the New Testament vocabulary with the aid of a concordance shows that Paul uses *lambanein* in connexion with the Spirit three or four times. This then seems to be the most general term and a study of its occurrences shows us at once the decisive steps that Paul has taken beyond Luke and its implications for the relationship between the Spirit and baptism.

In Gal. 3 : 2, 14 the Spirit or the promise of the Spirit is received "by hearing with faith" or "through faith." That reminds of the usage of Luke who repeatedly speaks of the receiving of the Spirit as a consequence of faith and baptism. But with Paul there is much more to it than in Acts. In I Cor. 2 : 12 he speaks again of the receiving of "the Spirit which is from God," this time in the context of a Christian theory of religious knowledge, so to speak, for this Spirit is given "that we might understand the gifts bestowed on us by God." These gifts are nothing else than "the secret and hidden wisdom of God," which in turn is the cross of Christ. This fundamental relationship between the understanding of the cross and the gift or the receiving of the Spirit underlies also such sayings as "the Spirit himself is bearing witness with our Spirit that we are children of God" (Rom. 8 : 16) and "no one can say 'Jesus is Lord' except by the Holy Spirit" (I Cor. 12 : 3). The Spirit is "the Spirit of faith" and to receive the Spirit is to enter into that relationship with Christ that is known as "faith." This is also borne out by the fact that for instance in Romans 8 we find as almost identical expressions : "those who are in Christ Jesus," "Christ in you," "you are in the Spirit," "the Spirit dwells in you." From this and other passages Schweizer concludes that the power of the Spirit is identical with the risen Lord, when He is considered not in Himself but in His dealing with the church.¹² For our study this means that to receive the gift of the Spirit is to be "in Christ" and to share his life. This brings us close to Paul's concept of baptism "into Christ."

Another occurrence of the phrase "to receive the Spirit" may

serve to lead us to the decisive step in our study. In Rom. 8 : 15, it reads : "you have received the Spirit of sonship," *pneuma huiiothesias*, which in the context of the verses 14-17, means the *pneuma* that witnesses to the *huiiothesia* is the coming completion of what Christ accomplished on the cross (Gal. 4 : 5), the redemption of the body (Rom. 8 : 23). To this we shall return presently; for the moment our concern is with something else. For the Spirit is not the only witness to the adoption. In Gal. 3 : 27 baptism plays the part of the witness. There is the sequence of thought : through faith you are sons of God, because you have put on Christ, and that you have put on Christ appears from your baptism which is a baptism into Christ. It seems to me that there is a parallelism between the Spirit and baptism with regard to the adoption and it should be worth while to investigate this parallelism somewhat nearer.

In Paul's baptismal vocabulary several words and concepts occur which elsewhere are connected with the Holy Spirit. Some instances will be given here : (1) In Rom. 6 death is closely connected with baptism. To be baptized into Christ is to have died and to be buried with him. This death means that we have been freed from sin, or "absolved from the claims of sin" (Moffatt). This chain of thought connects baptism with the concept of justification. Now in I Cor. 6 : 11 the justification is described as a work of the Holy Spirit. (2) Again in Rom. 6 we find a close connection between the newness of life and the resurrection of Christ, and the connecting link is baptism. But in Romans 8 the new life is the life according to the Spirit and the Spirit is the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead. Here again we find a close connection between the new life and the resurrection of Christ and here the connecting link is the Spirit.

We are, I think, then justified in concluding that in the terminology of Paul baptism and the Holy Spirit are almost interchangeable. But he never brings them together except in the text that served as our starting point. Why he does so, we can only guess. But perhaps the reason may be that he is conscious of having gone beyond the idea of the Spirit of the "Urgemeinde" and that he thinks it wise to refrain from connecting the Spirit with baptism in order to avoid confusion.

Before leaving Paul we return to the concept of adoption. As we noted, the Spirit witnesses to this adoption, or rather to its coming completion. As such the Spirit is "the first fruits" (Rom. 8 : 23, *aparachē*). Elsewhere Paul speaks of the *arrabōn*, the pledge of what is to come (I Cor. 1 : 22). Now in connexion with this "function" of the Spirit Paul uses the phrases of anointing and sealing and giving the pledge of the Spirit. These three verbs are in the aorist and may be taken to express aspects of the initiatory work of the Spirit, for there can be no doubt that both sealing and anoint-

ing refer to the Holy Spirit. It has been maintained that I Cor. 1 : 22 and Eph. 1 : 13; 4 : 30 have in view a rite of Confirmation different from baptism but Professor Lampe has shown sufficiently that there is no biblical foundation for this view.¹³ And if there is no reason to suppose that the New Testament knows of a rite or an experience different from baptism to which the concepts of sealing and anointing could apply, there remains the question what the *Sitz im Leben* of these concepts may be.

To this question there is no definite answer. The sealing is, as Lampe's able analysis has shown, for the age to come, whereas the anointing is best understood as an initiation to Christian service, or rather : a Christ-like service, since He is the Anointed One *par excellence*.

But the fact that *sphragis* from early times on has become the designation of baptism points to the conclusion that in the experience of a second generation of early Christianity the sealing of the believers was connected with baptism. This connection, however, cannot be traced back to Paul. To sum up : in Paul's writing and thinking the initiatory work of the Holy Spirit and baptism are described in such a way and in such terms that they seem to be interchangeable. The obvious reason for this is that the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ and the baptism is into Christ. With both the Spirit and baptism are connected the fruits of the Cross and the Resurrection : justification, newness of life, adoption. But nowhere the Spirit and baptism are mentioned together in one sentence except I Cor. 12 : 13 which because of its theme, is the exception that confirms the rule. The reason seems to be that the Spirit and baptism do not belong to the same category nor to opposite categories. They simply do not go into one category. The initiatory work of the Spirit begins before baptism, because it is the Spirit of faith, and it continues after baptism, because it is the Spirit of Christ that dwells in the baptized believer. Only in the momentary happening of baptism there is that close parallelism which we traced.

Baptism and the Spirit in John 3: 5.

The later part of the New Testament.

When we leave Paul and turn to the Johannine writings there is again but one text that mentions the Spirit and baptism in one sentence, i.e., John 3: 5. The exegetical problems involved in the combined mention of water and the Spirit as the origin of the new birth are widely discussed and described and there is no need to repeat here a story often told. Let me just summarize the main positions :

- (1) Bultmann¹⁴ regards the words as an interpolation due to the

desire of some unknown copyist to bring the Gospel into line with the Church's teaching regarding baptism, but his work has left too little trace in the textual tradition to take Bultmann's omission seriously. If accepted however there are no exegetical problems in this text to worry about, and it can be maintained that in John the sacraments play no part.

(2) C. K. Barrett thinks it possible to interpret the word "water" without reference to baptismal rites: "Birth from water" might be held (on the basis of the use in rabbinic Hebrew of *tifah*, a drop . . .) for semen to mean physical birth; the *kai* is then ascensive . . ." ¹⁵ But it remains to be seen whether the expression "of water and the Spirit," thus understood is a likely answer to Nicodemus' bewilderment and a sensible explanation of the *anōthen* of v. 3.

(3) H. Odeberg interprets the waters also as semen but the following *kai* as explicative and thinks that a spiritual or heavenly semen, to be compared (and perhaps equated) with the primal heavenly water, which is life-creating, is meant. ¹⁶ This interpretation also discards any reference to water-baptism. According to Barrett the evidence does not seem to be sufficient to support this interpretation.

(4) Markus Barth ¹⁷ takes the connective *kai* to be definitive and translates: "of water, that means: of the Spirit" and the concept of water and the Spirit is equivalent to the Johannine concept of "living water." The real baptism is only the Spirit-baptism. The Spirit is the water of which he is conceived who shall enter the Kingdom of heaven. The silent implication of this interpretation is that John 3 : 5 is directed against adherents of baptismal regeneration, and Barth addresses those adherents in very eloquent and devastating words, and he is not in the least embarrassed by the fact that he must confess that the Gospel of John only *wahrscheinlich* (!) opposes a Christian sacramentalism . . .

To my mind Barth is refuted in his main concern by John 3 : 5 itself. His sharp distinction between water-baptism and Spirit-baptism, which dominates his book from the first to the last page, forces him to resort to exegetical technicalities as the equation of water and Spirit. It is true that in 7 : 39 Jesus speaks of the Spirit under the image of the living water but that is a very natural procedure in connection with the feast. In our text there is nothing that suggests the same equation except the possible Christian sacramentalism in the background. When we follow the line from the beginning of John's Gospel we find the proclamation of the Baptist : the coming Kingdom, the baptism of repentance and the coming baptism of the Spirit. When Jesus enters upon the scene, the descending of the Spirit shows Him as the One, who baptizes with the Spirit. And in ch. 3 Jesus sums up His own preaching as to the

entering of the Kingdom. The water-baptism of John is not sufficient, that means: conversion alone is not sufficient; to it must be added a change much more radical than the *metanoia*: the new birth, and this birth is *anōthen*, it is from above, it is of the Spirit. But not of the Spirit alone, also of water. This can only refer back to the water-baptism of John, the only time that *hudōr* has been mentioned in a similar context. This means that the new birth does not supersede the rite of baptism. On the contrary it supposes it, not chronologically but theologically, because there is no new birth without conversion. There is in this text no indication that baptism is the means by which the Spirit is conferred. If that were the implication, we could expect more references to it in what follows, but in the *vv.* 6-8 it is exclusively the Spirit that brings the new birth. Especially *v.* 8 to my mind excludes the idea of baptismal regeneration.

But on the other hand the way in which water and the Spirit are joined suggests that there is more to be said than that the water stands for the baptism of conversion as preached and administered by John and that rebirth supposes conversion. Water and the Spirit, conversion and the new birth are one; they cannot be separated and, as the following verses make clear beyond doubt, it is the Spirit that is the creative element in both conversion and the new birth, and therefore also in water-baptism.

It should not, however, be forgotten that in John the Spirit is closely connected with the work and the person of Christ. Eternal life, the fruit of the new birth is to know God and Jesus Christ, whom God sent, i.e. to know God in the Incarnate Word, in the revelation in history, completed on the cross. And the Paraclete will take what is Jesus' and declare it. His work is to create a vital relationship between Jesus Christ and His believers, and that vital relationship rests upon the foundation of the fulfilled work of Christ in the cross and the resurrection. The relationship between the new birth and the work of Christ is also found in I Peter 1 : 3 and is genuine New Testament teaching.

This should be kept in mind when we discuss the much debated text Titus 3 : 5-7. In its context are found several words which are connected with the revelation in Christ: *eleos*, *sōzein*, *dikaioushai tē chariti* and, as Beasley Murray, following Bornkamm, has pointed out, there is a direct line with the earliest interpretation of baptism in Acts 2 : 33, 38.¹⁸ If the eschatological understanding of *palīngenesia* and *anakainōsis* is correct, then the text may mean that baptism initiates into the life of the age to come and of the great renewal by the Spirit, but I think that there is more realized eschatology or rather anticipated eschatology in this text. Might not the reference to the event of the outpouring of the Spirit be an indication that *palīngenesia* and *anakainōsis* are experienced by

the "us" that God has saved *dia loutrou*? We have good reason to suppose so. But to conclude that the *loutrou* mediates the *palin-genesia* is to go beyond the evidence. The genitives are best taken as defining and baptism therefore is understood as regeneration-baptism. This is more than we have found so far but it is still not baptismal regeneration.

Conclusions

Our exegetical inquiry is drawing to its end and our last task is to assemble the conclusions which we have reached :

(1) The New Testament shows no evidence of a Spirit-baptism, subsequent to the water-baptism, as an initiation to a full Christian life. The Lucan accounts in Acts must be regarded as expressions of immediate experiences and not as statements of theological reflection. The Spirit has nothing to give that is not included in the work of the crucified and risen Lord, and in baptism, the cross and the resurrection are realized and effected in the life of the believer. Only an imperfect understanding of the work of the Spirit can maintain the radical split between water-baptism and Spirit-baptism as we find with Pentecostal theology and with Markus Barth.

(2) The New Testament shows on the other hand no evidence of baptismal regeneration or of the bestowal of the Spirit in baptism. In the most daring and far-reaching words of Paul there is no mention of a bestowal of the Spirit, and neither does John make the new birth dependent upon the act of baptism. Only in one of the latest writings of the New Testament, viz. Titus, do we find expressions that might lend themselves to such interpretation. The sealing and the anointing with the Spirit show no clear and unequivocal connection with baptism. That from an early post-biblical date *sphragis* is used as a word for baptism only goes to show that later generations ascribed to baptism what was the work of the Spirit in the New Testament.

(3) There exists a parallelism between the initiatory work of the Spirit and baptism, especially in the thinking of Paul; this parallelism may have prepared the way for the conception of baptismal regeneration in later times, but Paul is too keenly aware of the categorical difference between the Spirit and the rite of baptism to admit their interchanging in his thought and writings. In the Fourth Gospel the Spirit and baptism appear in one breath but there can be no doubt that their parallelism is not one of co-ordination but of subordination.

(4) It may however be inferred from the New Testament that in baptism the Spirit is active and creative. For baptism is not isolated happening; it is believer's baptism and goes with conver-

sion and faith. Both faith and baptism are faith and baptism into Christ and the baptized believer shares in the life of Christ, the fellowship of his suffering and the power of his resurrection.

NOTES

¹ Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, 4th ed., 1958, pp. 116, 262.

² Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Vol. I, pp. 121f.

³ Kittel, *Theol. Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Vol. I, p. 528 (henceforth referred to as Th.W.B.).

⁴ Markus Barth, *Die Taufe-ein Sakrament?* 1951, p. 23.

⁵ *Acts* 1 : 5 ; 11 : 15, 16.

⁶ Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 1959, p. 111.

⁷ Jackson and Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. I, pp. 340f.

⁸ *II Cor.* 4 : 13.

⁹ Eduard Schweizer, *Th.W.B.*, Vol. VI, pp. 40gf.

¹⁰ *op. cit.*, p. 327.

¹¹ G. R. Beasley-Murray in A. Gilmore (ed.), *Christian Baptism*, 1959, p. 148.

¹² Ed. Schweizer, *op. cit.*, p. 431.

¹³ G. H. W. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit* (1951), Chapter V, p. 64-94.

¹⁴ Bultmann, *Das Johannesevangelium*.

¹⁵ C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St. John* (1958), pp. 174ff.

¹⁶ H. Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel* (1929), p. 64.

¹⁷ *op. cit.*, pp. 443-447.

¹⁸ *op. cit.*, pp. 143f.

J. REILING