

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

# The Efficacy of Baptism

BY NORMAN HILLYER

THE New Testament reflects that special and temporary missionary situation faced by the first preachers of the Gospel. Whatever interpretation may be placed on possible New Testament references to the baptism of infants, therefore, it is clear that the theology of baptism expounded in the Gospels and Epistles applies primarily to adults capable of a full conversion experience. The discussion which follows is limited accordingly.

It is taken for granted in the New Testament<sup>1</sup> that the mode of entry into the Christian Church is by baptism<sup>2</sup>. Paul, for example, assumes that the Colossians (whom he has never met, Col. 2 : 1) have been baptized (2 : 12) as he has been himself (Acts 9 : 18 ; 22 : 16). When he writes to the Roman Christians, he can begin to elaborate discussion about the significance of baptism by saying : " Have you forgotten that, when we were baptized . . . ? " (Rom. 6 : 3, NEB).

Some have questioned whether in fact baptism was from the outset a necessary mark of the Christian profession.<sup>3</sup> For example, we have no record of the baptism of the Apostles, the hundred-and-twenty disciples, the brethren of the Lord, or " the women " of Acts 1 : 14. Apollos appears in Acts 18 : 24 as an ardent teacher of the " things concerning Jesus " yet " knowing only the baptism of John ". The men of Ephesus, whose story immediately follows (Acts 19), are described as " disciples "—and usually the term means " Christians "—though they had received only John's baptism. In the latter case alone is Christian baptism subsequently mentioned.

Yet it is gratuitous to assume from silence that the others were the only Christians in the primitive Church not to be baptized. It is not even necessary to adopt the reasonable supposition that in the period of transition, when the effects of the ministries of John and Jesus overlapped with those of the Apostles and their contemporaries, " borderline cases were sure to occur " <sup>4</sup>. Maybe : but if Jesus as His general practice baptized, or caused to be baptized, those whom He made disciples, it is highly unlikely that any of the Twelve were left out<sup>5</sup>. Presumably Jesus Himself would have baptized the Twelve on their appointment (and the account may give a hint of this)<sup>6</sup>, and commissioned them in turn to baptize in His name. This would resolve the crux in the Fourth Gospel as to whether Jesus baptized or not (John 3 : 22, 26 ; 4 : 1, 2)<sup>7</sup> and also explain why the hundred-and-twenty are described as " disciples " (Acts 1 : 15).

So far as Apollos is concerned, we are told that Priscilla and Aquila " expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly ", and this instruction might well include a word about being baptized into the Name of Jesus. It is noteworthy that the following story about the Ephesian disciples does refer to their subsequent Christian baptism.

This is presumably mentioned because of its direct association with the gift of the Spirit. Luke no doubt thought it needless to repeat the point about baptism in the case of Apollos. It could be taken for granted as part of normal instruction.

The recognized place of baptism from the earliest days is demonstrated in the case of Cornelius and his company. Although they had already received the Holy Spirit (Acts 10 : 47), Peter as a matter of course at once orders their baptism in water. The sequence—the gift of the Spirit followed by water-baptism—is admittedly unusual (cf. Acts 18 : 25). No doubt in this case it was necessary for God to give a special sign of the Spirit to convince Jewish Christians from Jerusalem that Gentiles were to be allowed into the Church on equal terms. The full significance of Joel's prophecy about "all flesh" had not come home to Peter and his audience when he quoted it in his sermon on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2 : 17).

It is probably along similar lines that an explanation may be offered over the problem raised by Philip's baptism of the Samaritans (Acts 8), and what appears to be the exceptional failure of the gift of the Spirit to be bestowed at the same time. If an official deputation of Jewish believers from the Holy City itself were used as the channel of the gift, it would be convincing proof that the Lord had indeed thrown open the way for "dealings with the Samaritans".

Also in Acts 8 is the story of the Ethiopian eunuch. Presumably he did not simply guess that he needed to be baptized, but was responding to something Philip had already said on the subject. No doubt Philip would have taken his exposition up to the events of the Day of Pentecost and the results of Peter's sermon. The response of the Three Thousand in confessing their new found faith in baptism would be the clue the eunuch would grasp as "they came to a certain water". Although "the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip and the eunuch saw him no more", the fact that the Ethiopian went on his way not disappointed, but rejoicing, implies clearly enough that he too at his baptism had received the gift of the Holy Spirit, for Luke constantly links the Spirit with joy.

We may conclude thus far that Christian baptism was without exception the undoubted mode of initiation into the Church from the earliest days, and that closely associated with the rite was Christ's promised gift of the Holy Spirit.

\* \* \* \*

Next it is clear from the record that New Testament baptism was administered once and for all<sup>9</sup>. This reflects the character of Christ's death (ἐφάπαξ, Rom. 6 : 10), and contrasts sharply with the efficacy of consecration in the mystery religions where "eternal" life is measured in terms of twenty years or so<sup>9</sup>. It is plain from all that is said about Christian baptism in the New Testament, and from the scriptural views of the nature of the rite, that repetition could never have been considered. It is perhaps to baptism that the uncompromising words of Heb. 6 : 4-6 refer, when the writer speaks of the impossibility of "renewing again unto repentance those that have been once enlightened"<sup>10</sup>.

The unrepeatable nature of Christian baptism points to its primary meaning being that of initiation, rather than forgiveness<sup>11</sup>. Had cleansing from sin been the fundamental thought, repetition would have been natural, and Tertullian could never have made his taunt, "Jewish Israel washes daily, because it is defiled daily"<sup>12</sup>. This distinction is made all the more prominent when the practice of the Christian Church is compared with the frequent ritual ablutions common to religions of antiquity. The way had been prepared, however, for the single baptism of initiation.

The Jewish reception of proselytes<sup>13</sup> was threefold. It consisted of circumcision, baptism by immersion before witnesses, and the presentation of an offering in the Temple<sup>14</sup>. Of these rites, baptism assumed a growing importance. Towards the end of the first century Rabbi Joshua and Rabbi Eleazer could debate whether baptism or circumcision was the essential rite of initiation into Judaism<sup>15</sup>. At all events, most rabbis were soon teaching that the "point of no return" came at the moment when the proselyte emerged from the water. Thenceforth he was considered to be a newly-born son of Abraham's family<sup>16</sup>. "When he is baptized, he is regarded in all respects as an Israelite," commented the rabbis<sup>17</sup>. A new life awaited him. "He who separates himself from the uncircumcision is like one who separates himself from the grave," was a principle of the school of Hillel<sup>18</sup>.

Not many actual baptisms are described in the New Testament<sup>19</sup>, but all report that the converts were baptized into (εἰς) the Name of Jesus (or Jesus Christ, or Christ)<sup>20</sup>—that is, into the ownership, the protection of Jesus, and into membership in Him<sup>21</sup>. Εἰς τὸ ὄνομα is a technical term in Hellenistic commerce for "into the account of". An account bears the name of its owner. In baptism the name of Christ is pronounced, invoked, or confessed by the one who baptizes, or the one baptized (Acts 22 : 16), or both<sup>22</sup>. Henceforth the convert belongs to Jesus.

Though mediated by men, baptism is the action of God (Eph. 5 : 26). Unlike the self-baptism of Jewish proselytes, Christian baptism is administered by others. The passive form of the verb predominates in the New Testament<sup>23</sup>.

John's novel action in baptizing candidates himself<sup>24</sup> had already prepared the ground for this, and the change draws attention to a fundamental aspect of Christian baptism : it is based four-square on the action of God in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and has no meaning outside this. Thus, while John proclaims the remission of sins prior to the death of Christ, this is in anticipation of that redemptive act<sup>25</sup>.

The only two occasions on which the word "baptism" is used by Jesus Himself are both in explanation of His approaching passion. His question to the sons of Zebedee, "Are you able to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" (Mk. 10 : 38f.) is associated with His drinking the cup of suffering<sup>26</sup>. Submersion by water is a frequent metaphor in the Old Testament for being overwhelmed by great grief and anguish<sup>27</sup>. This all highlights the second saying,

rendered by Moffatt : " I have a baptism to undergo. What tension I suffer, till it is all over " (Lk. 12 : 50). While the words certainly reflect the awful anticipation of bearing the world's sin, it may be that, taking a hint from " for the joy that was set before Him " (Heb. 12 : 2), Jesus may well have foreseen the deep significance of His death and resurrection for the inauguration of the Kingdom of God<sup>84</sup>.

In passing, we may say that our Lord's association of death with baptism would explain the facility with which Paul could link together the same ideas, without any suggestion that this teaching was strange<sup>85</sup>. The same would apply to the association of Spirit, water, and blood in 1 John 5 : 8, and the Fourth Gospel's substitution of the feet-washing incident for any direct reference to the Last Supper<sup>86</sup>.

Christ's baptism in water at the hands of John was prophetic of the true baptism of the Cross<sup>81</sup>. In other words, Jesus was not anticipating a good-will mission of healing, teaching, and friendly intercourse, but identifying Himself with sinners, and setting Himself on the road to His ultimate goal of substitutionary sin-bearing<sup>82</sup>.

Indeed, Christ's baptism in Jordan may be seen in wider terms still as prophetic of His entire ministry, as it is unfolded in His life of submission to the Father, His death, resurrection, and ascension, and His sending of the Holy Spirit.

By the same token of going through the water of baptism Christ's followers are similarly identified with Him<sup>83</sup>. The outward act of baptism, as it were, represents that act of God done once and for all for man's salvation in the death and resurrection of Jesus. Baptism implements that act for each successive believer<sup>84</sup>. It is proleptic of all the consequences of faith-union with Christ, and these consequences will be gradually unfolded in the course of the believer's earthly life, and consummated at the Parousia<sup>85</sup>.

The fact that Christian baptism is a re-presentation of the baptism of Jesus implies that it is by baptism in water, and not through any other ceremony, that the believer enters into the possession of the Spirit, which is imparted through his membership in Christ<sup>86</sup>.

\* \* \* \*

Although, as we have seen, water-baptism appears to be taken for granted as the rite of entrance into the Christian Church, it is equally clear from the New Testament that the reception of the Spirit is considered to be the essential mark of genuine Christian life<sup>87</sup>. Paul's first question to the disciples he found at Ephesus was, " Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed ? " (Acts 19 : 2). So elsewhere in the New Testament<sup>88</sup> a contrast is explicitly drawn, not between two versions of water-baptism, Johannine and Christian, but as John himself put it, " I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance. . . . He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire ".

Fire may refer to the Day of Judgment<sup>89</sup>, if " repentance " and " fire " are taken as parallel expressions referring to actions taken over sin. But the important new element in Christian baptism is the Holy Spirit, and indeed Mark's version (1 : 8) is limited to mentioning this particular. The Spirit, imparted neither by Jewish proselyte bap-

tism nor by John's baptism, though perhaps partly recognized by the Covenanters at Qumran<sup>40</sup>, is bound up with the person and work of Christ. Thus the gift of the Spirit is not to be viewed as an extra added to the demand for repentance, through the latter element in John's baptism is certainly carried on in Christian baptism<sup>41</sup>. Peter's pentecostal sermon links the two : " Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins ; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost " (Acts 2 : 38).

Since immersion in water signifies clearly enough the washing away of sins<sup>42</sup>, the use of another symbolic action for the bestowal of the Spirit, namely, the laying on of hands (Acts 8 : 17 ; 19 : 6), might easily lead to a conclusion that the gift of forgiveness and the gift of the Spirit were distinct and separate. Our Lord Himself seems to be guarding against the danger of separation in His words to Nicodemus : " Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God " (John 3 : 3-5). It is in fact arguable that we may have here a hendiadys for " born of spiritual water " <sup>43</sup>.

The early Church discussed at length the problem of the relation between baptism by water and the sacrament of the Spirit. Tertullian in his treatise on baptism (ch. 3) goes right back to Gen. 1 : 1 and points to the essential connection between the Holy Spirit and water from the beginning<sup>44</sup>.

Paul can put the position quite bluntly : " If a man does not possess the Spirit of Christ, he is no Christian " (Rom. 8 : 9f.) ; " For all who are moved by the Spirit of God are the sons of God " (Rom. 8 : 14f.) ; " We were all brought into one body by baptism, in the one Spirit . . . and that one Holy Spirit was poured out for all of us to drink " (1 Cor. 12 : 13). The teaching that the Spirit has been given, in some measure at least, to all Christians as such can be regarded as fundamental to all Paul's other utterances concerning the Spirit.

This is especially true in cases where Paul has baptism in mind. " To prove that you are sons, God has sent into our hearts the Spirit of His Son, crying Abba, Father " (Gal. 4 : 6 ; cf. Rom. 8 : 15f.), suggests that we could not utter the baptismal response, or indeed say the Lord's Prayer, if God had not sent His Spirit into our hearts. " No one can say, ' Jesus is Lord ! ' except under the influence of the Holy Spirit " (1 Cor. 12 : 3), points in the same direction when we remember that " Jesus is Lord " is a confession of faith, almost certainly baptismal (Rom. 10 : 9f.). This does not mean that Paul had not carefully considered whether a man could possibly make an insincere profession of faith. He took it for granted that those who were baptized had received the Spirit<sup>45</sup>.

\* \* \* \*

There are, however, some grounds for not equating the experience of the Spirit in baptism with the pentecostal gift. Never once did Jesus even hint that the Eleven Apostles needed regeneration, though He certainly did make it clear that they needed power for service. Jesus Himself describes them as " clean ", while deliberately excluding Judas Iscariot (Jn. 13 : 10), and assures them that their names are written in heaven (Lk. 10 : 20). If the Lord's words mean anything,

there can be no doubt that the Eleven were born-again men before that spectacular event on the Day of Pentecost when, as Jesus had promised, they received the power of the Holy Spirit so that they might go about their Master's business. Clearly this is intended to refer to something more than the initial spiritual life closely associated in the New Testament with water-baptism. Since the latter, however, is our subject, the meaning of "the power of the Holy Spirit" cannot here be pursued. For our present purpose suffice it to say that water-baptism and the Spirit belong theologically together<sup>46</sup>, while acknowledging that the relationship between the two is open to much discussion<sup>47</sup>.

It is astonishing to us today that only forty years ago a standard work on the sacraments could be written without discussing the Holy Spirit<sup>48</sup>. Twenty years ago it was said<sup>49</sup> that water-baptism, "though regularly practised by the Church from the outset, was only the negative preliminary—the emptying of the vessel, preparatory to its positive filling. It represented (and helped to effect) repentance—an essential element, of course, in Christian conversion, and incorporation in the Body of Christ, but only a preliminary element preparing the way for the positive reception of power. It corresponded, in fact, to the mission of the Baptist, who was the forerunner pointing forward to the greater One. Baptism with the Holy Ghost by that greater One was the real focus of the experience. Baptism (in water) was necessary but only as a negative preliminary." This seems to relegate baptism to little more than a symbol, a view not lacking today, but one which hardly squares with the New Testament doctrine.

It is striking that there are passages in the New Testament where faith and baptism are, in their effects, treated almost as synonymous: "Ye are all children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ" (Gal. 3 : 26f.); ". . . buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him through faith in the operation of God" (Col. 2 : 12 ; cf. Rom. 6 : 1-11 with Rom. 6 : 18-23).

The New Testament reiterates that salvation is both a divine gift and also involves a personal and moral relationship to God. It follows from the former that it cannot be obtained by any human moral effort ; from the latter that it cannot be achieved by any human ceremony. The efficient cause of salvation is therefore always the grace of God, offered to men by the preaching of the Word, and received by faith.

But loyalty to the New Testament forbids us to go to the other extreme and interpret baptism purely symbolically—that is, to say that it is only a "badge or token" of our profession as Christians, and has no vital part to play in the reception of salvation. Both Peter (for example, Acts 2) and Paul (for example, Rom. 6) speak of baptism as really effecting what it symbolizes. The explanation may be that Scripture makes no sharp dichotomy between the spiritual and the material. It is assumed that, if a spiritual fact is real, it will have its concrete manifestation.

The spiritual experience of conversion, for example, needs to be given expression. If it remains something purely spiritual and

individual, it remains "in the air". It has to be brought into the visible context of the Christian community, and there realized and crystallized, and so deepened and completed (Rom. 10 : 9f.).

It is so with church life. The Church, the fellowship of Christ and His people, is the Body of Christ. Is Christ divided? No. Then the believer, who by faith is constantly united to Christ, needs to demonstrate this visibly in the Lord's supper—and that too is no empty symbol, but a real communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. Failure to realize that, warned Paul, could lead to physical results of sickness and death, and those facts were real enough (1 Cor. 11 : 30)<sup>80</sup>.

It is so with morals. It is worth glancing back at Jewish thought on this. From rabbinic sources it is apparent that the baptism of a proselyte was the occasion of his instruction in "some of the lighter and weightier commandments" by "two men learned in the Law" (Yeb. 47 a, b; Gerim 13. 4). The exact content of the instruction given to proselytes at baptism is not certain. But it is likely that there are examples of early Jewish catechetical material underlying the Two Ways enshrined in the *Didache*, the *Epistle of Barnabas*, and the *Mandata of Hermas*<sup>81</sup>. If, as seems probable, the original practice of Christian baptism is in many respects akin to Jewish proselyte baptism, we should expect it to be the occasion of moral instruction like its counterpart in Judaism.

Thus Paul in Rom. 6 is enlarging upon the union of the Christian with Christ in death and resurrection. To explain the meaning of this, he writes: "Surely you know that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus have been baptized into His death". And later he makes it obvious that this meant that the baptized person was to consider himself "dead unto sin". Paul's manner of referring thus to baptism, in order to enforce the ethical implications of dying and rising again (with Christ), suggests that the Christian had been made aware at his baptism of the moral nature of the new life upon which he was embarking. The inference is justified that in the early Church, as in Judaism, baptism was an important occasion for ethical teaching<sup>82</sup>. But where Christian teaching seems to have gone far beyond anything Judaism could offer is in setting forth not only the moral ideal, but also the power by which that ideal could be realized<sup>83</sup>. Rabbinic teaching looked for moral renewal only in the age to come<sup>84</sup>.

The Christian attitude is brought out in 1 Peter 3 : 21. The "prayer for a clean conscience before God", that longing for "clean hands and a pure heart" without which a man could not "ascend into the hill of the Lord" nor "stand in His holy place", is actually realized by means of a moral re-creation, the dynamic of which is none other than that same power of God through which Jesus was raised from the dead<sup>85</sup>. Likewise Paul lists the vile excesses of those who belonged to a city whose very name was a byword for gaudy, fast, and loose living: "And such", he reminds the Corinthian Christians, "were some of you". (Did he linger thankfully over that past tense? "Such *were* some of you"—prostitutes, drunkards, racketeers, foul-mouthed?) "But ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God" (1 Cor. 6 : 9ff.).

Here is no reference to an empty ritual ceremony, but to the occasion when a divine dynamic power had remade and revitalized seemingly rotten lives. Paul was not exaggerating. We hear of similarly dramatic transformations today amongst the drug- and sex-ridden youths of New York<sup>86</sup>. It is true that Paul has to go on to rebuke moral lapses which had since taken place in the Corinthian Church. Alarming though some of those things are, they cannot detract from the fundamental change in the lives of the Corinthian Christians, which Paul traces to their baptism.

Perhaps the miracle is in one sense not all that baffling, when we recall the dynamic divine life released in the Church by the resurrected Christ. He who takes a familiar action like baptism symbolizing a negative cleansing away of sin, is not content to leave men to fend for themselves with their new start. Christ also provides the positive agent of holy living through His gift of the Spirit.

Yet the Bible does not regard baptism as something which acts mechanically<sup>87</sup>. The Israelites of the Exodus period had all received baptism into the fellowship of Moses in cloud and sea, yet, "most of them were not accepted by God, for the desert was strewn with their corpses" (1 Cor. 10 : 5).

In the New Testament no support is given to any magical or superstitious notions of baptismal efficacy, and this is readily illustrated by the case of Simon Magus (Acts 8 : 13, 21). Indeed it is likely that a whole list of New Testament characters—Judas Iscariot, Ananias and Sapphira, Demas, Hymenaeus, Philetus, and Nicolas—received Christian baptism without noticeable benefit<sup>88</sup>. No doubt the Apostle Paul would have had much to say had he lived in the twentieth century and witnessed the spiritual deadness and ethical insensitivity of many baptized Christians. He would have made some pungent contrasts between baptized nominal Christians of today with some of the members of the Society of Friends and of the Salvation Army, who do not practise baptism at all<sup>89</sup>.

\* \* \* \*

All the views of New Testament baptism claim biblical support and weighty proponents. Some points, however, are generally common ground. Baptism is a rite of purification (1 Cor. 6 : 11 ; Tit. 3 : 5 ; 2 Pet. 1 : 9). It incorporates the individual in the Body of Christ (1 Cor. 12 : 13). It is inseparably linked with regeneration, or being born again. The facts are there ; but when it comes to their interpretation there is debate without end<sup>90</sup>—particularly concerning the precise relationship between baptism and regeneration, of which there are three main views : (1) The change called regeneration is directly dependent upon baptism and takes place at the same moment ; (2) baptism is merely a symbol of this change, a public witness to the fact that it has already occurred in the case of a true believer ; (3) baptism is the ordinance which portrays the specific provision for our regeneration, namely, redemption, concentrates our faith on this as a definite issue, and in normal cases is its sacramental expression.

The first view takes no account of the moral position of the candidate and suggests a merely mechanical act. The second view, that baptism is simply a public acknowledgement of Christian committal, disregards

the frequent New Testament assertion that the spiritual benefits symbolized by baptism are being realized in and through that ordinance.

The third view seems the only tenable one. Regeneration is conditioned upon faith in Christ and His atoning work, and baptism has been appointed to concentrate that faith upon the specific features of that atonement and to give it definite expression. The coronation of a monarch is perhaps suggestive. The ceremony does not make a man king, but it is the complement of his accession and is deemed to be necessary to proclaim his lawful kingly position<sup>61</sup>.

Regeneration in the New Testament is represented as radical and far-reaching, making the recipient a new creation, with whom old things are passed away and all things have become new (2 Cor. 5 : 17)<sup>62</sup>. It produces deliverance from conscious and habitual sin, and victory over the world (1 Jn. 3 : 9 ; 5 : 4). It is a birth by the Spirit which constitutes him who undergoes it "spirit" (Jn. 3 : 6). It induces a sense of liberty and spontaneity in religious life which is in the strongest contrast to all legal bondage and constraint (Jn. 5 : 8). It carries with it the privilege of a new and spiritual sonship towards God, and the blessed assurance of it.

All this represents something far more than mere "capacity" for divine things, a view sometimes associated with the regeneration of infants<sup>63</sup>.

In the New Testament the terms "regeneration" and "rebirth" are infrequent. With the sole exception of Tit. 3 : 5 ("the washing, or laver, of regeneration"), the words are applied to the total conversion experience and not specifically to baptism, still less to infant baptism. "Baptismal regeneration" as applied to infants may be a useful metaphor ; it is not biblical<sup>64</sup>.

Regeneration is not only an event in point of time. It is also a process. The "new man is being renewed" continuously, day by day, according to Col. 3 : 10, and, as the context shows, Paul is referring to the moral living for Christ which has replaced the "old man with his doings" (Col. 3 : 9). The same thought is in 2 Cor. 4 : 16 : "Though our outward man is decaying, yet our inward man is renewed day by day", and the reason given is that "the things which are not seen are *eternal*" (2 Cor. 4 : 18). The Fourth Gospel speaks of one who received Christ as being given not simply the status of a child of God, but significantly describes the event as a continuing process : "For as many as received Him, to them gave He *power to become . . .*" (Jn. 1 : 12).

This paper has touched but the fringe of a vast subject—witness Paul's many applications of it : if he speaks of victory over sin, he reminds the Roman believers that they died to sin by dying with Christ, and to this their baptism testifies (Rom. 6 : 3, 4). If he exhorts the Ephesians to hold fast the unity in the Spirit through the bond of peace, he recalls to them the one baptism (Eph. 4 : 5). If he would check party-spirit, he tells the Corinthians to recollect that through baptism they belong to Christ, for they had not been baptized into the name of Paul (1 Cor. 1 : 12-16).

Baptism reminds believers that the old has passed away ; they have

been washed, justified, and sanctified through the saving grace of God (1 Cor. 6 : 11), whose sons they had become through faith, and of which their baptism was the representation and corroboration (Gal. 3 : 26-29)<sup>65</sup>.

Christian baptism, in its full-orbed New Testament sense, thus proclaims the all-sufficient completed work of Christ for the believer. It is no wonder that when Luther needed strength and help in his Christian life, he was accustomed to exclaim "*Baptizatus sum!*". The modern evangelical in similar difficulties is more likely to remind himself of his conversion. But theologically he speaks the same language.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Acts 2 : 38, 41 ; 8 : 13, 16, 36 ; 9 : 18 ; 10 : 47 ; 19 : 3 ; Rom. 6 : 3 ; 1 Cor. 6 : 11 ; 12 : 13 ; Gal. 3 : 27 ; Eph. 4 : 5 ; Titus 3 : 5 ; Heb. 6 : 2, 4 ; 1 Peter 3 : 21.

<sup>2</sup> C. F. D. Moule, *Worship in the New Testament*, p. 47.

<sup>3</sup> J. Weiss, *The History of Primitive Christianity*, pp. 50f. ; F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. I, pp. 338ff.

<sup>4</sup> G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament*, pp. 94ff., 97.

<sup>5</sup> J. Warns, *Baptism*, p. 21.

<sup>6</sup> Mt. 10 : compare especially the results of their mission (verses 1, 7, 8) with the final command to baptize, Mk. 16 : 15-18, and note the signs which "shall follow them that shall believe" after their baptism. These considerations apart, there would seem to be a powerful *a fortiori* argument that the Apostles were baptized at some time. Christ would hardly leave them in something of a false position, commanding them to baptize others, Jews and Gentiles alike, if they themselves had not undergone baptism. And what more appropriate moment for their baptism than their commissioning as apostles ?

<sup>7</sup> Warns, *op. cit.*, p. 21 note.

<sup>8</sup> Moule, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

<sup>9</sup> G. Kittel, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Vol. I, p. 542.

<sup>10</sup> J. F. Bethune-Baker, *The Early History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 24, note 3.

<sup>11</sup> W. K. Lowther-Clarke, *Liturgy and Worship*, p. 414 ; Moule, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

<sup>12</sup> *De Baptismo*, xv.

<sup>13</sup> Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, Vol I, pp. 102-112.

<sup>14</sup> W. D. Davies, pp. 121f.

<sup>15</sup> Yeb. 46a ; Strack-Billerbeck, Vol. I, p. 106.

<sup>16</sup> R. P. Martin, *Worship in the Early Church*, p. 90.

<sup>17</sup> Bab. Yeb. 48b ; Daube, 110.

<sup>18</sup> D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 137.

<sup>19</sup> Moule, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

<sup>20</sup> Acts 8 : 16 ; 10 : 48 ; 19 : 5 ; Gal. 3 : 27 ; Rom. 6 : 3 ; R. Schnackenburg, *Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul*, pp. 20ff.

<sup>21</sup> Moule, *op. cit.*, p. 53 ; cf. James 2 : 7.

<sup>22</sup> Kittel, Vol. I, p. 540.

<sup>23</sup> Kittel, Vol. I, p. 540. The middle voice occurs only in Acts 22 : 16 (cf. 1 Cor. 6 : 11) ; and the reflexive not at all.

<sup>24</sup> A. M. Hunter, *The Work and Words of Jesus*, p. 35.

<sup>25</sup> We have a parallel with regard to healing, according to Mt. 8 : 17.

<sup>26</sup> The expression occurs frequently in the Old Testament : Ps. 75 : 8 ; Is. 51 : 17f. ; Jer. 49 : 12 ; Lam. 4 : 21 ; Ezek. 23 : 31f.

<sup>27</sup> Ps. 42 : 7 ; 69 : 2, 15 ; 124 : 4, 5 ; Is. 43 : 2.

<sup>28</sup> Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 94.

<sup>29</sup> Rom. 6 : 4 ; 1 Cor. 6 : 14 ; Col. 2 : 12f. ; Eph. 4 : 6 ; cf. 1 Pet. 1 : 3 ; Beasley-Murray, p. 132.

<sup>30</sup> G. W. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit*, p. 40.

<sup>31</sup> W. F. Flemington, *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism*, p. 31 ; Lampe, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

<sup>83</sup> G. W. Bromiley, "The Baptism of Jesus," in *Christianity Today*, Vol. IX (12), 1965.

<sup>84</sup> Moule, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

<sup>85</sup> Flemington, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

<sup>86</sup> Lampe, *op. cit.*, pp. 45, 318.

<sup>87</sup> Lampe, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

<sup>88</sup> J. R. S. Taylor, *Baptism and Confirmation*, p. 31. The Old Testament background is supplied by Ezek. 36 : 25ff. John 3 could suggest a baptism of wind and fire : the chaff blown away and consumed by fire, a judicial baptism. But the usual New Testament interpretation of πνεῦμα is "spirit".

<sup>89</sup> Acts 1 : 5 ; Mt. 3 : 11 ; Mk. 1 : 8 ; Lk. 3 : 16.

<sup>90</sup> O. Cullmann, *Baptism in the New Testament*, p. 10.

<sup>91</sup> *Manual of Discipline* (IQS iv. 20f.) : "He will cleanse him of all wicked deeds with the spirit of holiness (by a holy spirit—Black) ; like purifying waters He will shed upon him the spirit of truth (to cleanse him) of all abomination and falsehood" (G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, pp. 77f. ; see also M. Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, p. 133.)

<sup>92</sup> And among the Covenanters : W. H. Brownlee ("The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline," in the *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, supplementary studies, pp. 10-12) quotes : "Perverse men . . . may not enter into water to (be permitted to) touch the purity of the holy men, for they will not be cleansed unless they have turned from their wickedness." Cf. G. E. Wright, *The Biblical Doctrine of Man*, p. 90, note.

<sup>93</sup> Lampe, *op. cit.*, p. 70, suggests the laying on of hands is primarily a token of fellowship and solidarity.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. at Qumran : a neophyte must "be cleansed so that he may purify himself with water for impurity and sanctify himself with rippling water." Wright, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

<sup>95</sup> D. M. Baillie, *The Theology of the Sacraments*, p. 44.

<sup>96</sup> D. E. H. Whiteley, *The Theology of St. Paul*, p. 125.

<sup>97</sup> cf. Acts 10 : 45-47 ; 19 : 1-6 ; 1 Cor. 12 : 13, etc.

<sup>98</sup> Moule, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

<sup>99</sup> O. C. Quick : *The Christian Sacraments*, 1927. The Holy Spirit is casually mentioned twice in 259 pages, and not in the Index.

<sup>100</sup> C. F. D. Moule : "Baptism with Water and with the Holy Ghost" in *Baptism and Confirmation*, 1945 (J. R. S. Taylor, et al.), p. 31.

<sup>101</sup> J. P. Hickenbottom : "The Sacrament of Baptism and its Relationship to Confirmation," in *Baptism and Confirmation* (*ibid.*) pp. 23f.

<sup>102</sup> Davies, p. 121. The oldest description of the Two Ways in Jewish literature is in Test. Ash. i. 3-v. 2, but even this appears secondary and dependent on some even earlier document. R. H. Charles : *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 1908, p. lvi. The *Testaments* are dated by Charles c.109-106 BC.

<sup>103</sup> Davies, p. 122.

<sup>104</sup> Flemington, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

<sup>105</sup> Strack-Billerbeck, Vol. II, p. 421 ; Schnackenburg, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

<sup>106</sup> Flemington, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

<sup>107</sup> D. Wilkerson : *The Cross and the Switchblade*.

<sup>108</sup> Whiteley, *op. cit.*, pp. 172f.

<sup>109</sup> J. C. Ryle, *Knots Untied*, p. 72.

<sup>110</sup> Whiteley, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

<sup>111</sup> Baillie, *op. cit.*, pp. 16f.

<sup>112</sup> C. S. Carter and G. E. A. Weeks, *The Protestant Dictionary*, pp. 77f.

<sup>113</sup> Lampe (*op. cit.*, p. 59) thinks there may be a connection in thought in 1 Peter between the Flood as a type of baptism, and the "rebirth" begun by Noah as a type of the spiritual regeneration of the Christian. Cf. the Philonic notion of Noah inaugurating man's δευτέρα γέννησις after the Flood.

<sup>114</sup> Carter and Weeks, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

<sup>115</sup> Moule in *Baptism and Confirmation*, p. 32 (see note 48).

<sup>116</sup> Warns, *op. cit.*, pp. 31f.