

"BORN OF WATER"

by

Ronald Welsh

Submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the degree of Master of Divinity in
Grace Theological Seminary
May 1981

Title: BORN OF WATER
Author: Ronald N. Welsh
Degree: Master of Divinity
Date: May, 1981
Advisor: Charles R. Smith

In Jesus' seemingly simple statement of John 3:5, the phrase *γεννηθῆναι ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος*, has sparked the interest of exegetes and theologians down through the centuries. As a result, with an array of knowledgeable men there came a confusing array of interpretations.

This monograph took the form of four chapters. Each chapter contributed toward an understanding of the phrase in question. Chapter One dealt with the background information, Remote and Immediate Contexts; Chapter Two dealt with the actual examination of the phrase, viewing each word separately. Also, considered in this section was the passage in 1 John 5:6 which was briefly examined to determine the relationship of *ὕδατος* to John 3:5; Chapter Three presented each view which was postulated to interpret the phrase. The views were examined for their merits, as well as their drawbacks; the examination of each of the views culminated in Chapter Four where the suggested interpretation for John 3:5 was discussed, that of Repentance as Symbolized By Baptism View.

It was indicated that Repentance as Symbolized By Baptism View was a better option. The writer then stated that true repentance resulted in genuine conversion. It was at this point that a word study was undertaken for the purpose of showing that repentance was just not a New Testament word concept but that the Old Testament talked about it as well.

The writer then attempted to show that *ὕδατος* was used as a symbol to indicate cleansing internally. For it was indicated, and rightly so, that genuine cleansing cannot take place without true repentance. When this repentance and cleansing takes place, the act is signified with an external act, namely baptism. It is known that this was arrived at by indirect means; however, it is believed that there are scriptural grounds to support this conclusion.

Accepted by the Faculty of Grace Theological Seminary
in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree
Master of Divinity


Adviser

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	v
ORIGINAL TEXT	viii
Chapter	
I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF JOHN 3:5	1
Remote Context	1
Immediate Context	2
II. EXEGESIS OF JOHN 3:5	7
Examination of the Phrase <i>ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος</i> <i>δεν νη 05 ε ε</i>	7
A Comparison of 1 John 5:6	12
Contextual Setting of Verses 1-4	13
Exegesis of 1 John 5:6	13
Relationship of 1 John 5:6 to John 3:5	15
III. VARIOUS VIEWS AND REBUTTALS	17
A Brief Survey of the Ordinance of Baptism	17
Baptismal Regeneration View	19
Rebuttal of Baptismal Regeneration View	24
Proselytizing Baptism View	26
Rebuttal of Proselytizing Baptism View	28
Christian Baptism View	28
Rebuttal of Christian Baptism View	29
Excursus of the Various Views and Rebuttals	31
Water as an Interpolation View	31
Rebuttal to Water as an Interpolation View	32
Water, Even the Spirit View	33
Rebuttal to the Water, Even the Spirit View	33
Natural Birth View	40
Rebuttal to Natural Birth View	41
Water Is the Word View	41
Rebuttal to the Water Is the Word View	42
IV. REPENTANCE AS SYMBOLIZED BY BAPTISM VIEW	48
CONCLUSION	59
.	
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	61

ABBREVIATIONS

BAG	W. Bauer, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich, Greek-English Lexicon of the N.T.
BDB	F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament
TDNT	G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (eds.), Theological Dictionary of the New Testament

INTRODUCTION

This monograph addressed the phrase of John 3:5
γεννηθῆναι ἐξ ὕδατος "born of Water." This phrase has been a subject of much debate over the years. It is peculiar to this passage, and occurs nowhere else in scripture. Therefore, the principle of correlation of scripture to aid in the study was of little help in this instance. As a result, much has been written concerning this phrase, with good men of the Word espousing and defending their position with equal hermeneutical skill.

It also must be kept in mind that there are groups, such as the Church of Christ, that have used this phrase to propogate their distinctive teaching. This has contributed to some believers being led contrary to what the Bible teaches concerning the new birth and the subsequent act of baptism.

It is with this perspective of seeking Biblical understanding that the phrase was examined. This examination has taken the form of four chapters: (1) Chapter One--Historical Background of John 3:5; (2) Chapter Two--Exegesis of John 3:5; (3) Chapter Three--Various Views and Rebuttals of John 3:5; and (4) The examination of each one of these chapters culminated in Chapter Four in which is

presented the view espoused by the writer, namely, Repentance as Symbolized by Baptism.

Taking a cursory look at these chapters it may be seen why it is important to examine these various areas. Chapter One deals with the historical background surrounding John 3:5. Using the events in the remote context of chapters 1-3 along with the events in the immediate context of chapter three itself will serve as a vehicle to help give understanding as to what the phrase means. Chapter Two deals with the exegesis of the verse to deduce what it is saying. Along with this the investigation of 1 John 5:6 has been undertaken to determine any connection between the word *ὕδατος* in each verse.

Chapter Three deals with the various views and rebuttals. The views examined are as follows: Baptismal Regeneration View, Proselytizing Baptism View, Water Baptism (Christian Baptism) View, Water is Viewed as an Interpolation View, Water Even the Spirit View, Natural Birth View, and Water is the Word View. The examination follows this pattern: (1) summation of the view, (2) reason for its support, (3) the adherents to the view, and (4) the reasoning for its rejection, which is the rebuttal. The intention is to be as fair and as accurate as is possible in this examination.

Chapter Four deals with the view espoused by the writer. In this chapter two arguments are utilized to substantiate the view. The chapter intends to show that

though the last two views of Chapter Four are viable options, this view is a better option. Following Chapter Four will be a Conclusion summing up the writer's thoughts on the monograph.

Of interest to the reader also will be a note concerning the Version of the Bible that was utilized. All scripture references cited in the monograph are from the King James Version of the Bible, unless otherwise indicated.

ORIGINAL TEXT

ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς, Ἀμήν ἀμήν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μή
τις γεννηθῇ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, οὐ δύναται
εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ

CHAPTER I

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF JOHN 3:5

Remote Context

In chapter one of John are recorded for the reader statements concerning the person of Jesus Christ. There are statements concerning His deity, as found in John 1:1 which reads, "In the beginning was the Word, . . . and the Word was God." Another statement concerns His humanity. John 1:14a states, "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us. . . . " Further in the account there are statements concerning His mission to the world found in 1:29, 36. These verses state, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world," and "Behold the Lamb of God." It was prior to this time that John was baptizing the baptism of repentance in preparation for the Messiah, and the baptizing of Jesus for the beginning of His ministry. All of these statements in chapter one set the stage for the remaining twenty chapters of the book.

Continuing on into chapter two, Jesus is seen at a marriage feast in Cana of Galilee. This is the place where Jesus began His miracles as is stated in 2:11a, "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee." The first of these miracles was the changing of water into

wine. The following verses state that after the feast Jesus proceeded to Capernaum for a few days, then proceeded again to Jerusalem where the Passover was about to take place. It was while Jesus was in Jerusalem that He cleansed the temple of the money changers, declaring in 2:13-16 that this was His Father's house and that they had made it a house of merchandise. This reply by Jesus set the stage for this great pronouncement of His resurrection, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up."

Following this incident He continued to do miracles, through which many people believed. However, as the text relates, He did not commit (or entrust) Himself to them. The reason for this being that many of them had a superficial belief based upon miracles.¹ It was not genuine conviction as to who He was. What they needed was repentance and salvation. These events lead directly into the account in which is found the verse under study in this monograph, namely John 3:5.

Immediate Context

As chapter three of John begins there is a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, who comes to Jesus. His coming is stated as being in the night time. This suggests the possibility that Nicodemus did not want others to be

¹Merrill C. Tenney, John: The Gospel of Belief (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1948), p. 85.

aware of his visit to Jesus. The fact that he came at night would also suggest that he was not there for just mere curiosity, but rather with questions that needed answering.

In considering this man called Nicodemus, it is to be seen that he was no ordinary Jew. He was a man of some repute. He was a Pharisee and a member of the Sanhedrin, the religious ruling body of Israel, and therefore learned in the Old Testament scriptures.

As one reads further he finds that the word "Rabbi" is used in addressing Jesus. Apparently Nicodemus held Jesus in high regard for he addressed Jesus using this term "Rabbi." Rabbi is from רַבִּי which means "Lord, master." It was used then as an honorary title for outstanding teachers of the law.¹

Immediately upon being addressed by Nicodemus, Jesus answered very succinctly, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Jesus at this juncture does not waste any time in getting to the heart of Nicodemus' problem. One must keep in mind the prevailing attitude of a Pharisee. This attitude was also reflected by others such as the Scribes, priests, and rulers. This attitude was one of complacency, self-satisfaction, and of pride. This attitude is

¹Walter Bauer; William F. Arndt; and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, 2nd edition, revised and augmented by F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick W. Barker (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979), p. 733.

illustrated by the parable given in Luke 18:11-12, when a Pharisee said in the temple, "God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican. I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess." The Pharisees, as the others, probably had considered themselves entitled to the kingdom because they were descendants of Abraham and had kept the Law blamelessly. Nicodemus, probably having this in mind, needed to have his thought pattern redirected again to what God required.

In order to do this Jesus had to first of all put in proper perspective the statement He was about to make. The significance of the word *ἀμὴν* is brought out by Schlier, in the Theological Dictionary of the New Testament,

The point of the Amen before Jesus' own sayings is rather to show that as such they are reliable and true, and that they are so because Jesus Himself in His Amen acknowledges them to be His own sayings, and thus makes them valid. The one who accepts His word as true and certain is also the one who acknowledges and affirms it in his own life and thus causes it, as fulfilled by him, to become a demand to others.¹

So, *ἀμὴν*, which means "so let it be, truly," was used to preface his remark.² *Ἀμὴν* is the Greek transliteration of the Hebrew word *אָמֵן* meaning "truly." *אָמֵן* is an adverb of

¹Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, s.v., "*ἀμὴν*," by Heinrich Schlier, Vol. 1, ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), p. 338.

²BAG, p. 45.

the verb $\gamma\acute{o}\chi\eta\iota$, which means "to confirm, support." It expresses the idea of reliability, firmness, faithfulness.¹ In ascribing that usage to $\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta\acute{\nu}$ it would seem to indicate that the statement which is about to be made is reliable, firm, not to be changed. The fact that the same two words, $\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta\acute{\nu}$ $\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta\acute{\nu}$, are used indicates an emphasis. Thayer supports this idea of emphasis in his statement, "The repetition of the word $\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta\acute{\nu}$ employed by John alone in his Gospel . . . has the force of a superlative, most assuredly. . . ."² This same pattern of $\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta\acute{\nu}$ is used in verse five which this monograph is concerned with. This verse will be dealt with in more detail in the next section on the exegesis of John 3:5.

One also needs to take note of the use of the pronouns utilized in the opening part of this third chapter of John. Some of these pronouns are definite, and some are indefinite. In verse five Jesus addresses Nicodemus with a definite pronoun (personal) $\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ (you) dative, singular, denoting a single person. The $\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ along with $\epsilon\gamma\omega$ are rarely used of an imaginary person ("anybody").³ However, as Jesus enters into the main body of the address he changes

¹Francis Brown; S. R. Driver; and Charles N. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), p. 53.

²Joseph Henry Thayer, Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1974), p. 32.

³Herbert Weir Smyth, Greek Grammar (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), p. 299.

the pronoun to an indefinite pronoun $\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ ("someone or anyone"). The word $\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ can be used as either a substantive "anybody" or "anyone" or as "somebody."¹ This would point to the fact that Jesus not only had Nicodemus in mind but humanity in general.

¹A. T. Robertson and W. Hersey Davis, A New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament, "Pronoun," Part IV, by A. T. Robertson (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977; Harper & Brothers, 1931), p. 272.

CHAPTER II

EXEGESIS OF JOHN 3:5

Having laid some background for this verse, an exegetical study of this verse will be undertaken. Since the opening words of John 3:5 were covered in chapter one, they will not be dealt with here. At this time there will be an examination of the phrase γεννηθῆναι ἐξ ὕδατος, meaning "born of water," as introduced by Jesus in John 3:5.

Examination of the Phrase

One may be wondering why the term πνεύματι, "Spirit," is not being dealt with here as well. The reason for this is that there appears to be very little disagreement over what the word has reference to. For verification of this statement appeal is made to five scholars of the Word. Westcott makes the following comment.

It can then, scarcely be questioned that as Nicodemus heard the words, water carried with it a reference to John's baptism, which was a divinely appointed rite (1:33), . . . the spirit, on the other hand, marked that inward power which John placed in contrast with his own baptism.¹

Westcott went on further to say how this new life was brought about, resulting from the direct action of the Holy

¹B. F. Westcott, The Gospel According to St. John (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962), p. 50.

Spirit through Christ. This indicates that the Spirit in John 3:5 is the Holy Spirit.

Lange in his commentary on this verse says that this new life is communicated by the Holy Spirit. He states, "The idea underlying all forms of baptism, is the forgiveness of sins on condition of repentance. This is the negative part of regeneration, while the new life communicated by the Holy Spirit is the positive part, . . ."¹ Thus he is making "Spirit" in John 3:5 and Spirit of God synonymous.

Concerning this subject Kent states very succinctly that although there is general agreement that the reference to "Spirit" in 3:5 denotes the Holy Spirit, considerable difference of opinion surrounds the interpretation of "water."²

Barnes in his commentary says this being born of the Spirit was predicted of the Saviour; that He should baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire (Matthew 3:11). By this is clearly intended that the heart must be changed by the agency of the Holy Spirit. Barnes goes on further

¹John Peter Lange, Commentary on the Holy Scripture, "John" (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.), pp. 126-127.

²Homer A. Kent, Jr., Light in the Darkness (Winona Lake: BMH Books, 1974), p. 58.

Spirit through Christ. This indicates that the Spirit in John 3:5 is the Holy Spirit.

Lange in his commentary on this verse says that this new life is communicated by the Holy Spirit. He states, "The idea underlying all forms of baptism, is the forgiveness of sins on condition of repentance. This is the negative part of regeneration, while the new life communicated by the Holy Spirit is the positive part," ¹ Thus he is making "Spirit" in John 3:5 and Spirit of God synonymous.

Concerning this subject Kent states very succinctly that although there is general agreement that the reference to "Spirit" in 3:5 denotes the Holy Spirit, considerable difference of opinion surrounds the interpretation of "water." ²

Barnes in his commentary says this being born of the Spirit was predicted of the Saviour; that He should baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire (Matthew 3:11). By this is clearly intended that the heart must be changed by the agency of the Holy Spirit. Barnes goes on further

¹John Peter Lange, Commentary on the Holy Scripture, "John" (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.), pp. 126-127.

²Homer A. Kent, Jr., Light in the Darkness (Winona Lake: BMH Books, 1974), p. 58.

to say, and rightly so, that this great change is in the Scriptures ascribed uniformly to the Holy Spirit.¹

Calvin, in writing about this verse, states that all must be born anew and that the Holy Spirit is the author of this second birth. As one continues through his presentation on this subject it becomes evident that he believes the word water to be the type of the Spirit.² All this is to say that he believes the "Spirit" here to be the Holy Spirit.

Lastly, in this discussion, Barrett will be consulted. He says men must be prepared by a radical renewal, a new birth effected by the Spirit, who comes (as it were) as the advanced guard of the new age.³ Here he states by implication that the spirit in John 3:5 is the Holy Spirit.

At this time focus will be placed on the phrase γεννηθῆ ἐξ ὕδατος itself. The study of this phrase will be in its individual parts so as to determine the meaning. The first part to be considered is γεννηθῆ. This word is an aorist, passive, subjunctive form of γεννᾶω, which means "birth." Looking further at this word one finds that

¹Albert Barnes, Barnes on the New Testament, Vol. II, "Luke-John" (Glasgow: W. G. Blackie and Company, Printers, n.d.), pp. 223-224.

²John Calvin, Calvin's Commentaries, "The Gospel According to St. John, 1-10," trans. T. H. L. Parker (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959), p. 65.

³C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John (London: S.P.C.K., 1965), pp. 174-175.

the infinitival form in John, *γεννηθῆναι*, is always used with a reference to "point of origin."¹ It is also worth noting that in John the ethical or religious consequences of the birth are set forth and thus indicate the sphere in which this word is used.² *Γεννάω* the root of *γεννηθῆναι* is seen this way by Thayer, "Metaphorically viewing this . . . peculiarly, in the Gospel and 1 Epistle of John, of God conferring upon men the nature and disposition of his sons, imparting to them spiritual life, i.e., by his own holy power prompting and persuading souls to put faith in Christ and live a new life consecrated to himself."³

In summing up this part of the discussion, if one takes the meaning of *γεννάω* coupled with the form of the word found in verse five, this would give the sense of this birth applying to the spiritual origin of someone by God at a particular time. This birth would affect the religious outlook and standing for the future.

This word *γεννάω* takes further significance when associated with *ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ* of verse three. Since there have been references to a birth from God it should be possible to support this birth of God from this portion of scripture, and it is. The word used to lend support is *ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ*.

¹Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, s.v., "*γεννάω*," by Friedrich Buchsel, Vol. I, ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), p. 671.

²Ibid.

³Thayer, p. 113.

This word will be considered by its etymology and usage to derive its meaning. Within these two areas this word will be utilized for the study here.

ἀνωθεν --etymology of *ἀνωθεν* is derived from *ἀνω*, which is an adverb of place. It has a sense of "from on high."¹ In the Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, from now on referred to as TDNT, it states,

In the New Testament it is normally used of heaven in its natural (John 11:41--and Jesus lifted up (*ἀνω*) his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me.) or religious sense (Philippians 3:14--I press toward the mark for the prize of the high (*ἀνω*) calling of God in Christ Jesus.) For early Christianity, as for Judaism and Hellenism, it is natural to think of the Deity in heaven and thus equate divine and heavenly.²

When used in the New Testament it predominately is viewed from the sense of "above," or "top." This is reflected in its uses in that the thirteen times it is used in the New Testament, ten times it has the meaning of "above" or "top."

Taking this into account and applying it to verse three it can be seen that the context seems to indicate an action which is heavenly, and could it be said, divine? Having this in mind could it be taken a step further? Since the phraseology of John 3:5 is identical with verse three, with the exception of *ἀνωθεν*, it would seem to be

¹Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, New Edition, revised and augmented, Vol. I (Oxford: Clarendon Press, n.d.), p. 169.

²TDNT, s.v. "ἄνωθεν," by Buchsel.

hermeneutically proper to assume they are talking about the same thing, namely a birth from above, of divine origin.

Continuing on to the second part of the phrase the preposition ἐξ is confronted. ἐξ, the form of ἐκ, is used before a vowel. The usage of this preposition here is the genitive. This particular usage expressed "motion outwards," "separation from"--"from out of," "from among," and "from."¹ Its original meaning is "out of," and it never varies! The limit is marked by the object of the preposition.² It can therefore be concluded that the preposition has something to say concerning how its object is to be viewed. The preposition ἐξ is the appropriate choice of prepositions to show how this spiritual birth is achieved.

A Comparison to 1 John 5:6

A brief discussion at this time will be given in attempting to determine the meaning of ὁδωτός. It is worth noting that there exists a similar phrase to John 3:5 in the 1 Epistle of John. It would appear necessary to consider its bearing, if any, on the meaning of ὁδωτός. The phrase in question is found in chapter five, verse six. In order for verse six to be interpreted correctly, it must be placed in its proper context.

¹G. Abbott-Smith, A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921), p. 492.

²Robertson and Davis, p. 256.

Contextual Setting of Verses 1-4

The first five verses are setting forth a testing pattern. If one claims to be born of God, he must believe that Jesus is the Christ. Not only this, for if a person is truly born of God it can be evidenced by his love for the children of God. Taking this a step farther, the fact of his obedience to God is also representative of his relationship to God. Lastly, if one claims to be born of God, a believer in Christ, he is overcoming the world. If all this is not evident in the life of this person then it cannot be proven that he is truly born of God. This last statement leads directly into verse six. In the original text these verses are only separated by a semicolon. In verse six the writer of the epistle is explaining more fully the person being discussed at the end of verse five, specifically, Jesus Christ.

Exegesis of 1 John 5:6

In this section just significant phrases of the verse will be examined. One of the phrases under consideration is *ὁ ἐλθὼν ἐν ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος*. This phrase was obviously intended to draw the reader's attention to the facts which would serve as a convincing testimony about the person of Jesus. The expression *ὁ ἐλθὼν* marks a definite historical first coming of Jesus, since the aorist tense is used with the participial form of the verb *ἔρχομαι*. This coming was by *ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος*.

The words ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος are fairly clear as to how they are translated, water and blood. However, the question arises as to what the phrase means? To ascertain the meaning it is important that the second phrase be brought to bear at this point, ἐν τῷ ὕδατι καὶ ἐν τῷ αἵματι. The first thing that should become readily apparent is the change of the preposition from δι' to ἐν. δι' indicates a sense of "by means of" when used with the genitive, and a parallel passage of this use is found in Hebrews 9:12--"Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." Whereas, in this second phrase ἐν is used indicating a sense of "in," a position within boundaries."¹ A parallel passage for this usage of ἐν is found in Hebrews 9:25--"Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others." The significance of these differences will become apparent as the discussion progresses.

Proceeding further in the phrase the fact that both the objects of the prepositions have an article is also noteworthy. When an article is used in front of a noun it particularizes the noun. This means that a particular emphasis is in view. Surmising that there are but two acts by which this could be applied it would seem logical to

¹Robertson and Davis, p. 254.

suggest that these have reference to Christ's baptism (*ἕλκτος*) and His death (*αἵματος*). This is especially true in light of the fact that this would uniquely identify the one who had come, namely, Jesus Christ. Plummer, in the Cambridge Bible Series, says, "Christ's baptism and death were in one sense the means by which, in another sense the sphere in which His work was accomplished."¹ Plummer goes on to explain why these statements were made concerning Christ,

The Gnostic teachers, against whom the Apostle is writing admitted that Christ came "through" and "in" water: it was precisely at the Baptism, they said, that the Divine Person had any share in what effected "through" and "in" blood: for according to them the Word departed from Jesus at Gethsemane. St. John emphatically assures us that there was no such separation. It was the Son of God who was baptized; and it was the Son of God who was crucified.²

Relationship of 1 John 5:6 to John 3:5

Summarizing this discussion, one can see that what is in view here is really defense of Jesus Christ--who He was, and how He came. It has no connection with the verse John 3:5 either grammatically or contextually. Looking at the verse grammatically, it is seen that there is an article before *ἕλκτος* in 1 John 5:6 whereas no article exists before the word in John 3:5. Contextually a defense and

¹A. Plummer, "The Epistles of St. John," The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, eds. F. H. Chase and A. F. Kirkpatrick (Cambridge, England: University Press, 1906), p. 109.

²Ibid., p. 109.

presentation of His person in 1 John 5:6 is in question, whereas in John 3:5 the question in view is if one is prepared for the kingdom.

The word ὕδατος in John 3:5 has spawned various views. These will be examined for their validity, and rebuttals will follow each interpretation.

CHAPTER III

VARIOUS VIEWS AND REBUTTALS

Before entering into an examination of the first view, it would be appropriate, if not, important to put the Ordinance of Baptism in proper perspective. To follow then is a brief survey of this ordinance. This is for the purpose of laying a suitable foundation for some of the views which will be dealt with in the course of this discussion.

A Brief Survey of the Ordinance of Baptism

Baptism is a symbol of three basic facts. One, the believer's salvation experience. This points out symbolically the part each person of the Trinity had in one's salvation. Looking at each person's part separately, it is seen that the Father is the Source: as set forth in 1 John 4:14--and we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world. The Son is the channel: this is set forth in Acts 4:12--Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved. Lastly, in this connection, the Holy Spirit is the divine agent who applies the work of salvation to the believer. This is clearly seen in sources such as 1 Corinthians 12:3 where it

reads--"For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." Also, Titus 3:5 states "that it is not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Two, baptism sets forth the believer's position--risen with Christ in his death, burial, and resurrection. This is brought out clearly in verse three through six of Romans chapter six.

Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death . . . For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.

Three, baptism is also to be regarded as a testimony, in symbol, in three ways: (1) It is a public confession of faith in Christ. This is the occasion when the believer testifies symbolically of the repentance that has taken place in his life. This repentance is that which every believer undergoes. This concept of repentance is brought out in the book of 1 Thessalonians, where is found verse nine which states the following, "For they themselves shew of us what manner of entering in we had unto you, and how ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God." In Acts 2:41 is found support for the concept of public confession--"Then they that gladly received his word were baptized." If one looks to the previous three verses

he will find that this was made possible because of verse 2:38--Repent, . . . For unless one has truly repented he is not qualified for baptism; (2) It is a public testimony of obedience to the command of Christ as expressed in Matthew 28:19--"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit"; (3) It is a public ceremony giving a believer an entrance into and recognition by a local body of believers. This is expressed as well by the last part of the verse in Acts 2:41--(they) were baptized and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls.

It should be apparent from this brief survey the importance of this subject from the Biblical perspective. This is why baptism should not be taken lightly. Nor should it be overemphasized to the point of teaching a position that is not scripturally correct. Having dealt briefly with the concept of baptism the evaluation of various views in relation to baptism will be taken up beginning with the view of Baptismal Regeneration.

Baptismal Regeneration View

This view is not new but has been advocated throughout church history. It is essentially saying that baptism is efficacious in some way in regenerating a person, that is in giving him new life. There are many who hold to this view, but only a small sampling will be dealt with in this discussion of the view.

he will find that this was made possible because of verse 2:38--Repent, . . . For unless one has truly repented he is not qualified for baptism; (2) It is a public testimony of obedience to the command of Christ as expressed in Matthew 28:19--"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit"; (3) It is a public ceremony giving a believer an entrance into and recognition by a local body of believers. This is expressed as well by the last part of the verse in Acts 2:41--(they) were baptized and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls.

The importance of this subject from the Biblical perspective should be apparent from this brief survey. This is why baptism should not be taken lightly. Nor should it be overemphasized to the point of teaching a position that is not scripturally correct. Having dealt briefly with the concept of baptism the evaluation of various views in relation to baptism will be taken up beginning with the view of Baptismal Regeneration.

Baptismal Regeneration View

This view is not new but has been advocated throughout church history. It is essentially saying that baptism is efficacious in some way in regenerating a person, that is, in giving him new life. There are many who hold to this view, but only a small sampling will be dealt with in this discussion of the view.

Beginning with the Church Fathers, two men will be considered due to the respect given them by their peers and their influence and guidance on the church. The first to be considered will be St. John Chrysostom, who has been referred to as the greatest expositor and preacher of the Greek church. He is one who is still held in high honor in the Christian world.¹ Augustine was the intellectual head of the North African area and the entire Western church of his time.² He was the champion of orthodox teaching against such doctrines as Manicheanism, Donatism, and Pelageanism. He was and continues to be revered among Christians.

It has been stated previously that John Chrysostom believed in baptismal regeneration. This is indicated in statements from two of his works. In the book, Ancient Christian Writers, there is a section containing one of his works "Baptismal Instructions." In it he states, "He saved us, says St. Paul, through the bath of regeneration and renewal of the Holy Spirit."³ He goes on further in answering a question of why the bath is not called the bath of remission of sins but rather the bath of regeneration.

¹History of the Christian Church, "John Chrysostom," ed. Philip Schaff, Volume III (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1950), pp. 933-934.

²Ibid., p. 994.

³John Chrysostom, "St. John Chrysostom: Baptismal Instructions," trans. Paul W. Harkens, Ancient Christian Writers, eds. Johannes Quasten and Walter J. Burghardt (New York: Newman Press, 1963), p. 135.

The reason is that it does not simply remit our sins, nor does it simply cleanse us of our faults, but it does this just as if we were born anew. For it does create us anew and it fashions us again, not molding us from earth, but creating us from a different element, the nature of water.¹

Regarding Augustine it is to be shown that he also held to this particular view. In his work "Writings Against the Pelagians" he has a section called "Writings on Forgiveness of Sins, and Baptism." In this section he says, "For what Christian is there who would allow it to be said, anyone could attain to eternal salvation without being born again in Christ,--(a result) which He meant to be effected through baptism, at the very time when such a sacrament was purposely instituted for regenerating in the hope of eternal salvation."² He further states his position in his agreement with the statement of the Christians of Carthage, who say, ". . . baptism is nothing else than 'salvation,' and the sacrament of the body of Christ nothing else than 'life.'"³ Augustine then asks the question, "Whence, however, was this derived but from the primitive, as I suppose, and apostolic tradition . . . that without baptism and partaking of the supper of the Lord it is

¹Ibid., p. 139.

²Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, "St. Augustine: Writings Against the Pelagians," Volume V, ed. Philip Schaff (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, rep., 1978), p. 23.

³Ibid., p. 28.

impossible for any man to attain either the kingdom of God or to salvation and everlasting life?"¹

Proceeding forward from Augustine one group that has held this view is the Roman Catholic Church. In studying their book, Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma, by Ludwig Ott one finds the following statement,

The Council of Trent (1546) declared that after the promulgation of the Gospel there could be no justification without Baptism or the desire for the same. The necessity of baptism for salvation, according to John 3:5 and Mark 16:16, is a necessity of means, . . . The necessity of means does not derive from the intrinsic nature of the sacrament itself, but from the designation of Baptism as an indispensable means of salvation by a positive ordinance of God.²

This statement by Ludwig Ott is further confirmed by consulting the Roman Catholic translation of the Bible. In their Douay Version, dated 1938 one reads in the footnote to John 3:5, "Unless a man be born again; By these words our Saviour hath declared the necessity of baptism; and by the word water it is evident that the application of it is necessary with the words."³

In 1970 another translation of the Catholic Bible was published, The New American Bible. Here in a footnote to John 3:5 the following statement is made. "The Council of Trent declared that water here is not a metaphor but

¹Ibid.

²Ludwig Ott, Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma, ed. James Canon Bastible, trans. Patrick Lynch (Rockford, IL: Tan Books and Publishing, Inc., 1960), p. 356.

³The Holy Bible (New York: The Douay Bible House, 1938), p. 115.

means real water. This passage has had an important role in baptismal theology."¹ It would appear from just a casual reading of this that they were backing off slightly from their former position. If it were not for the previous citation which showed their true position, it would seem that their position had changed.

Having ascertained that there were Church Fathers as well as whole groups that hold to the view of Baptismal Regeneration, it will now be shown that there is an eminent scholar and commentator of the modern era who holds this view, H. A. W. Meyer. He writes in his commentary, "Jesus now explains more fully the *ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος* water, inasmuch as the man is baptized therewith (Eph. 5:26) for the forgiveness of sins (Acts 2:33, 22:16), and spirit, inasmuch as the Holy Ghost is given to the person baptized in order to his spiritual renewal and sanctification; both together . . . the birth from above is produced (*ἐκ*), and therefore baptism is the *λουτρὸν παλινγενεσίας* (Titus 3:5)."²

In regards to the previous statement of Meyer's that both together constitute regeneration, Weisse stated that to make regeneration depend upon baptism by water was

¹The New American Bible, ed. Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle (Paterson, NJ: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1970), p. 106.

²Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, The Gospel of John, Vol. III, Meyer's Commentary on the New Testament (Winona Lake: Alpha Publications, 1979), p. 123.

little better than blasphemy. Meyer stated that Weisse was greatly in error.¹ Meyer went on further to observe that, "The necessity of baptism in order to participate in the Messianic kingdom (a doctrine against which Calvin in particular, and other expositors of the Reformed church, contend) was certainly its basis in this passage."²

Rebuttal of Baptismal Regeneration View

In answer to this view, two lines of defense will be presented, Scriptural and Logical. Beginning with the scriptural defense, one will see that not only is the general tenor of scripture against this view but even specific verses address themselves to this view as well.

As one observes the general tenor of scripture regarding baptism and its significance, it is quite evident that this could not be used in any efficacious way. In the previous section on baptism it was stated that the significance of baptism is to cite two examples: a testimony in symbol of public confession for a salvation experience that has already taken place; and also a symbol of the believer's position in Christ.

Further, in support there are two specific verses found elsewhere that categorically deny baptismal regeneration. One of these is found in Ephesians 2:8, 9 where it

¹Meyer, p. 123.

²Ibid., p. 124.

reads--"for by grace are you saved through faith, and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast." Here it states that a person's salvation is by the grace of God and not from anything one can earn or merit. This is illustrated by the words "it is a gift of God." At this juncture a question should be asked. Is it possible to work for a gift? Of course not! A gift is something given because the giver desires and is able to give it. This verse in itself refutes this view. Yet, there is another verse which also speaks on this subject, namely, Titus 3:5. This verse says "that it is not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit." Observing the first part of this verse one finds the phrase, "not by works of righteousness which we have done." This phrase states that there were no righteous works that were done which could obtain salvation. Most people would agree that baptism would be considered a righteous work. Continuing on to the last part of the verse there appears the phrase *λουτρὸν* *παραγενέσεως* "washing of regeneration" which is taken to support baptismal regeneration. Modisett provides more understanding to the interpretation of the phrase by this statement:

βαπτίζω or one of its cognates, is the only word selected by inspiration to specify baptism . . . the exclusive force *βαπτίζω* in connection with Christian baptism, is an external physical act, to dip, to immerse, to plunge, at the hands of men . . . *γεννάω* of

John 3:5 and *πνευματικές* wherever used carry the sense of internal, unseen, spiritual work.¹

βαπτίζω which is used to specify baptism in a physical act is not found in this verse, but rather *πνευματικές* which is used to designate a spiritual work. Thus, it is seen that an internal action is in view, not an external one. Taking this statement and applying it to Titus 3:5, it is seen that since *βαπτίζω* is not used, or any of its cognates with *λουτρὸν*, it is faulty exegesis to interpret this verse to support baptismal regeneration.

This brings the reader to the second line of defense--that of the logical defense. This view would seem to indicate that if baptism was the means to salvation, then Christ did not have to pay the price, and his death would have been for nothing. Nothing was ever done by the Lord unnecessarily. Whatever was done was done for a purpose. Taking this all into consideration, the baptismal regeneration view is totally unacceptable.

Proselytizing Baptism View

Before analyzing the view there must be an understanding of what is Proselytizing Baptism. This was for Gentiles only, in that, if a Gentile wanted to enter into the religion of the Jews he needed to go through this baptism.

¹M. M. Modisett, "Born of Water" (Louisiana: Journal Book Office, 1870), pp. 19-21.

The purpose of the baptism was for the cleansing of the proselyte from the impurity of idolatry and restoration to the purity of a new-born man.¹ This new-born man is expressed in the illustration that he terminates all former family ties and is considered a new-born child.²

Some who adhere to this view include the following: The Seventh-Day Adventists and John J. Owens. First, in regard to the Seventh-Day Adventists the statement is made in their commentary concerning John 3:5 which follows. "The reference to 'water' is a clear allusion to water baptism, which was ministered to Jewish proselytes and was practiced by the Essenes."³

The commentator, John J. Owen, also expresses his support of this view by saying, "The phrase born of water was used of proselytes, who had been publicly inducted into the Jewish religion by the ceremony of baptism."⁴

¹The Jewish Encyclopedia, "Baptism," Volume 2, ed. Isidore Singer (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1903), p. 500.

²Encyclopedia Judaica, "Proselytes," Volume 13 (Jerusalem: The MacMillan Company, 1971), p. 1183.

³The Seventh-Day Adventist Bible Commentary, "The Gospel According to St. John," ed. Francis D. Nichol, Volume 5 (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1956), p. 928.

⁴John J. Owen, Commentary on the Gospel of John (New York: Charles Scribner and Company, 1869), p. 44.

Rebuttal of Proselytizing Baptism View

In answer to this view there are two points to keep in mind: (1) As was indicated earlier this baptism was for Gentiles only coming into the Judaic religion. Since it was shown that the pronoun of John 3:5 was used to apply not only to Jews but also Gentiles for entrance into the kingdom, the weight of this fact alone would rule out this view. (2) Since the question of how one is to gain entrance into the kingdom was directed to Nicodemus, this view could not be what is meant by the writer. For it was established earlier, in the Historical Background, that Nicodemus was a Jew himself and proselytizing baptism is only for Gentiles thus excluding him.

Christian Baptism View

This view states that baptism is the immersion of a believer in water, in token of his previous entrance into the communion of Christ's death and resurrection or, in other words, in token of his regeneration through union with Christ.¹ This act is unique to this Church Age.

This position is held by a number of men. First to be cited will be Barnabas Lindars, in the New Century Bible. Even though he does not outrightly state that this view is to be seen in John 3:5, he does not exclude it outrightly either. In fact the next statement he makes leaves

¹Augustus Hopkins Strong, Systematic Theology, Vol. 1-3 (Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1907), p. 931.

open for interpretation that very possibility. He says, "It is not absolutely necessary to assume John is referring to the sacrament of baptism when he uses this phrase (water and Spirit) . . . But the impression that Christian Baptism is meant is hard to resist."¹

In contrast to Lindars, Plummer comes out very clearly in stating that *Ujatos* refers to Christian baptism. He states, "The outward sign and inward grace of Christian baptism are here clearly given, and an unbiased mind can scarcely avoid seeing this plain fact."² He continues further and states quite confidently, that to a well-instructed Christian there was no need to explain what was meant by being born of water and the Spirit.³

Rebuttal of Christian Baptism View

In answering this view two points must be kept in mind, namely: (1) the time-slot in which this was to be practiced; (2) the purpose of this baptismal view, especially as it relates to John's baptism.

Examining the first point it is to be understood that this baptism could not have been meant by the Lord because this particular baptism would not be initiated for yet a while. If one views the starting of the Christian

¹Barnabas Lindars, "The Gospel of John," New Century Bible, eds. Ronald E. Clements and Matthew Black (Greenwood, SC: The Attic Press, 1972), p. 152.

²Plummer, p. 102.

³Ibid.

baptism with Pentecost, as does this writer, then it is not possible for this view to fit John 3:5. At this point Jesus was still going about preaching repentance to the Jews. This can be seen from the verse in Luke 13:3 which says--"except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." The preaching of repentance was for the Jews to turn from their rebellious ways and accept Jesus as the Messiah and prepare for the kingdom.

The Christian baptism did not come into practice until Matthew 28:19-20. This is so for it was at this time that Jesus instituted it. This took place just before He left to enter Heaven. He also gave His last command with the fact that all power was given to Him in Heaven and earth.

Continuing on into the second point it is to be realized that Christian baptism and John's baptism are two different practices. It needs to be noted here that they both symbolize the act of repentance that has taken place. However, it also needs to be noted that there are distinct differences between the two. Christian baptism symbolizes a believer's union with Christ, a distinct relationship characterizing the Church Age. John's baptism, per se, was for the purpose of preparing those to believe and receive the Messiah when He came--"the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight." John did baptize in the wilderness, and preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of

sins. The next day John sees Jesus coming unto him, and he says, "Behold the Lamb of God, which takes away the sins of the world." A more in depth discussion of John's baptism will be undertaken in the last view of this monograph.

Excursus of the Various Views and Rebuttals

Water as an Interpolation View

It is important to understand what an interpolation is before setting forth the view. A good definition of interpolation is provided by James Moffatt, who writes, "An interpolation means the addition of passages to an original composition, or the incorporation of later verses, sections and even words, in a writing which has come down from some earlier period, either (a) at the hands of the author himself, or (b) by subsequent edition of the volume, after the writer's death, or (c) by scribes (or editors) of the text."¹

Those who espouse this view are saying that the ὕδατος καὶ are an interpolation in John 3:5. One who holds such a view is J. H. Bernard. He holds that the Apostle John was the one who performed the interpolation, and states, "We conclude that the words ὕδατος καὶ . . . are due to a restatement by John of the original saying of verse three, and are a gloss, added to bring the saying of

¹James Moffatt, An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911), p. 36.

Jesus into harmony with the belief and practice of a later generation."¹ Another proponent of this view is Bultmann. He states very clearly, " . . . but they (ὁσαυτος καὶ) are, in my opinion, an insertion of the ecclesiastical redaction."² Bultmann does not state clearly, however, if he considers John as the one who did the interpolation.

Rebuttal to Water as an Interpolation View

This view is to be rejected by the very fact that there is no textual evidence for the omission of ὁσαυτος καὶ . C. K. Barrett puts it very succinctly, "There is no textual ground whatever for the omission of ὁσαυτος καὶ as an interpolation; they are undoubtedly the work of the writer who published the gospel, and must therefore be interpreted as part of the text."³ This is further supported by Schnackenburg, who says,

The authenticity of the words ὁσαυτος καὶ has been often challenged, on the grounds of this being due to an 'ecclesiastical' redaction, but without sufficient grounds. Textual criticism provides no reason for doubting that they belonged to the original constitution of the Gospel.⁴

¹International Critical Commentary, "The Gospel According to St. John," Vol. 1, J. H. Bernard (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929), p. 104.

²Rudolph Bultmann, The Gospel of John, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1971), p. 138.

³C. K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John (London: S.P.C.K., 1965), p. 174.

⁴Rudolf Schnackenburg, The Gospel According to St. John, trans. Kevin Smyth, Vol. 1 (Freiburg: Herder, 1965), p. 369.

Schnackenburg went on to state in a footnote that *ὑδατος* *καὶ* are only missing in the Vulgate Codex Harleian 1023.

Water, Even the Spirit View

This view sets forth the position that *καὶ* should be rendered "even," i.e. "water, even the Spirit," thus making the word "water" a type of the Holy Spirit. This position has two features that commend it: (1) There are two references that do lend support to this interpretation. These verses are John 7:38-39 and John 4:13-14.

He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said,
out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water,
(But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that
believe on him should receive.)

Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him
shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him
shall be in him a well of water springing up into ever-
lasting life.

(2) Rendering "water" as a type of the Holy Spirit would explain the omission of "water" in the remaining part of the discussion with Nicodemus.

Rebuttal to the Water, Even the Spirit View

Nevertheless, in spite of the positive features there are two objections that need to be voiced: (1) The justification to translate *καὶ*, "even," as an ascensive, instead of the continuative "and," is questionable. A. T. Robertson states concerning this ascensive use,

"The notion of 'even' is an advance on that of mere addition which is due to the context, not to $\kappa\alpha\iota$."¹ If the context is the determining factor, as Robertson indicates, then there are two places in Scripture where this usage of $\kappa\alpha\iota$, the ascensive would be seen. One is Mark 2:28 and the other is Acts 22:25. In Mark 2:28 it reads, "Therefore the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Here the $\kappa\alpha\iota$ is rendered "also," but it seems that "even" could be used as well. The second verse under consideration is Acts 22:25 which reads, " . . . Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned?" Here the $\kappa\alpha\iota$ is translated "and," but here also the $\kappa\alpha\iota$ could have been rendered "even." In fact, it is worthwhile to note that the two of the newest translations the New American Standard and the New International Version, reflect these options, either in a whole or in part. The New American Standard translates $\kappa\alpha\iota$ as "even" in Mark 2:28 but leaves the $\kappa\alpha\iota$ as "and" in Acts 22:25. Whereas, the New International Version renders $\kappa\alpha\iota$ in both verses as "even."

So, with this in mind is there then justification to render the $\kappa\alpha\iota$ in John 3:5 as "even?" If one is to hold this rendering he must then be able to verify from scripture that "water," $\psi\alpha\lambda\alpha\sigma$, and Holy Spirit are speaking of the same reality, for that is meaning which would be

¹A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), p. 1181.

conveyed using "even." This rendering would suggest that the *ὕδατος* is to be named as a type of Holy Spirit.

If one is to determine if water indeed, is a type it must first of all qualify for such. This brings up yet another objection. (2) The usage of *ὕδατος* "water" as a type of the Holy Spirit. There are a number of principles that are used to determine the validity of whether something is a type. (a) There must be some notable point of resemblance or analogy between the type and antitype.¹ Examples of this would include Jonah whose spending three days and nights in the belly of the whale is a type of the Lord, who was to spend three days and nights in the heart of the earth (Matthew 12:40). In regard to this principle of analogy, there is little to support water as the Spirit. This is evidenced by few examples in the Old Testament, such as Ezekiel 36:25 which reads--"(then) will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean." Also, there is the passage in Isaiah 44:3, "For I will pour upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon dry ground: I will pour my spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring." There are also the two previously cited passages from the New Testament John 7:37-38 and John 4:13-14. (b) The second principle is that a type must prefigure something in the future. That is to say, the type is a person, institution, office, action, or event, by means of which

¹Milton S. Terry, Biblical Hermeneutics (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.), p. 247.

some truth of the Gospel was divinely preshadowed under the Old Testament dispensation.¹ An example of this would be 1 Corinthians 15:45--the first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. One finds no such prefiguring of *ὕψατος* with *πνεύματος* between the Old and the New Testaments. It should also be noted that it seems odd that Jesus would mention the type and then present the antitype in the same breath. (c) The resemblance must be designated. An example of this would be Melchizedek--a king and a type of Christ as seen in Hebrews 7:2-3. "To whom (Melchizedek) also Abraham gave a tenth part of all; first being by interpretation king of righteousness, and after that also King of Salem, which is, King of Peace; Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually."

A fact that is noteworthy is that the type must be inferior to the antitype. One cannot expect the shadow to equal the substance.² There seems to be no instance where this principle is true in relation to *ὕψατος* and *πνεύματος*.

Two adherents of this view will now be consulted: Calvin and Morris. Calvin in paraphrasing what he thought Jesus was saying when he states, " . . . that no one is a son of God until he has been renewed by water and that this

¹Ibid., p. 258.

²Ibid., p. 252.

water is the Spirit who cleanses us anew and who, by His power poured upon, imparted to us the energy of the Heavenly life when by nature we are utterly barren.¹ Calvin clarifies his position even further by his statement, a few lines down, "By water therefore is meant simply the inward cleansing and quickening of the Holy Spirit."²

Morris, in his book on John sets forth the various interpretations of ὕδατος in John 3:5, and his option was for this view.

It seems to one that the second explanation (this view) is the most likely. . . . We should accordingly take the passage to mean born of 'spiritual water,' and see this as another way of referring to being born 'of the spirit.'³

This leads one to another consideration that is, as to whether the phrase ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος is to be construed as an ἐν δὲ αὐτοῖς, hendiadys. Calvin, himself, thought this to be an ἐν δὲ αὐτοῖς, which he used to support his position.

Before continuing this line of thought it is important to furnish the reader with a definition of this construction. "Hendiadys" is, "That by which the use of two words connected by a copulative conjunction are to express

¹John Calvin, "Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John," Calvin's Commentaries, Vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1949), p. 65.

²Ibid.

³Leon Morris, "The Gospel According to John," New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1971), p. 218.

a simple complex idea, especially two substantives instead of one substantive and an adjective or attributive genitive."¹ A simple definition is found in reference to Hebrew usage, "Any phrase composed of two Hebrew words joined by a simple waw which together communicate one idea rather than two. By this arrangement one of the words becomes the emphasized attributive of the other."² Further support of this definition is found in Bullinger, "It (hendiadys) is found in Latin as well as in Hebrew and Greek, . . . is two words of the same parts of speech, joined by the conjunction 'and.'"³

It is quite surprising that A. T. Robertson, in his exhaustive work A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in Light of Historical Research, has very little to say about this construction. The extent of his comment is that of giving one example of this construction, found in James 4:2--"kill and desire to have"--and then referring the reader back to a section in dealing with figures of speech where he states succinctly, "We need not tarry over antiphrasis, ambiguity, hendiadys, . . . most of it is the rattle of dry bones and the joy of dissection is gone."⁴

¹Smyth, p. 678.

²Michael Spence, "Hendiadys in the Pentateuch: An Investigation" (Unpublished Master of Divinity Thesis, Grace Theological Seminary, May, 1978), pp. 37-38.

³E. W. Bullinger, Figures of Speech Used in Bible (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1970), p. 657.

⁴Robertson, pp. 1383, 1206.

This, of course, brings up the question as to whether ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος constitutes a "hendiadys?" If the phrase in question is viewed as such it would be translated thus, "a watery Spirit." For the ὕδατος would be seen as a attributive adjective, describing what kind of Spirit it was.

Another example where the usage of this construction would prove to be nonsensical is Luke 3:16, "John answered, saying unto all, I indeed baptize you with water; but one mightier than I cometh, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose; He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." If one takes the last half of the verse and applies the construction of ἐν πυρὶ ἁγίῳ it would reflect this, "He shall baptize you with the fiery Holy Ghost." This makes the verse sound as if John is describing what kind of Spirit would baptize them. This is not what is in view, rather, the fire is talking of judgment as evidenced by the verse which follows it, verse 17, "Whose fan is in His hand, and He will throughly purge His floor, and He will gather the wheat into His garner; but the chaff He will burn with fire unquenchable."

Summarizing this view, it would appear from the discussion relevant to καὶ, concerning its rendering to be "even," that this could not be accepted. This is based on for the following reasons: (1) The context would not demand this; (2) The usage of types as well would not

demand this. Further, that even the consideration of the construction *ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἄνθρωπος* to lend support is without basis.

Natural Birth View

This view sets forth that there must be a physical birth prior to a spiritual birth. So one might say his spiritual birth is contingent upon being an entity. This particular view has some good qualities to commend it, namely that it seems to fit verses 3, 6, and 12 where the earthly origin comes into the discussion in contrast to the Spirit. Two adherents to this view are Odeberg and Spriggs. Odeberg in answering the question of how a person can be born physically again states:

. . . it is as you say, the process must be repeated, for that which is born from sarcical semen remain sarcical, can never in itself become spirit, and that which is to become spirit must be born spiritually from a spiritual semen. This, it may be suggested, is the real sense of *ἐς ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος* : the *ὕδωρ* is that which in the spiritual process corresponds to the semen in the sarcical process.¹

D. G. Spriggs concludes strongly in favor of the Natural Birth View. He states,

The context of John 3:5 really requires that "water" should in some way or other refer to natural birth. . . This seems to meet all requirements and also helps to remove a problem in the interpretation of 1 John 5:6.²

¹Hugo Odeberg, The Fourth Gospel (Amsterdam: B. R. Gruner BV, 1974), p. 44.

²D. G. Spriggs, "Meaning of 'Water' in John 3:5," The Expository Times, 85 (February, 1974):149-150.

Rebuttal to Natural Birth View

This view also must be unacceptable for three reasons: (1) no parallel exists to support the connection of water birth with physical birth in Scripture.¹ Nor, indeed, are there any precedent cultural norms that would support this?² This in itself does not warrant rejecting this view, but it does seem odd that the Lord would use concepts that were unknown to his hearers to teach a doctrine, especially one as important as this one. (2) It seems superfluous that the Lord would demand physical birth as a requirement along with spiritual birth since it is rather obvious that unless one is born physically there is no need of a spiritual birth. (3) This passage (1-13) is a passage dealing with the new birth; so whatever is taught within these confines is for the understanding of the one to whom the passage was directed.

Water Is the Word View

This presents the teaching that the written Word is to be interpreted from *ὕδατος*. This word along with *πνεύματος* is to bring about the new birth. There are two lines of argumentation that are given to lend support to

¹Donald Guthrie and J. A. Motyer, eds., The New Bible Commentary, revised (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1970), p. 936.

²Zane Hodges, "Water and Spirit - John 3:5," Bibliotheca Sacra, 135:539 (July-September, 1978), p. 212.

this view: (1) Scriptural correlation and (2) grammatical structure.

In the first line of argumentation--scriptural correlation, certain verses are called upon for support. These include: Ephesians 5:26; 1 Peter 1:23 and John 15:3. The reason, it appears, why these particular verses were used is that they teach that the Word is used in a sense of cleansing. And since water is a cleansing agent it serves as a remarkable symbol for the instrument, the Word of God.

In the second line of argumentation--grammatical structure, the syntax of the phrase *ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ* is called upon for support. The use of *ἐξ* in this instance points to the idea that "water and spirit" are to be viewed as one. Concerning *καὶ*, this points to the fact that words joined by *καὶ* express that they are on the same level, either both material or both spiritual.

Rebuttal to the Water Is the Word View

According to the first line of argumentation--scriptural correlation certain verses were called upon for support. In examining these verses there is found some interesting conclusions. To repeat, one must keep in mind that the concept involved in John 3:5 is birth; spiritual birth. John 15:3 is not talking about birth, but rather, as evidenced by the context, discipleship, and cleansing from defilement for more effective discipleship. In 1 Peter 1:23 there is a reference to spiritual birth,

"Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." The phrases "Being born again . . . by the word of God," are the references to the birth. If one consults the Greek language he would find that the preposition (by) is $\delta\epsilon\iota$. $\delta\epsilon\iota$ has the sense of instrumentality (with the genitive.) Thus it is saying that the Word is the instrument the Spirit uses to bring one to Christ. In John 3:5 the emphasis is not on $\delta\epsilon\iota$, denoting the instrumental, but $\epsilon\kappa$, denoting origin.

Turning one's attention to Ephesians 5:26, here again is another verse that is not addressing the issue of birth but rather sanctification. The relationship of husbands and wives picturing the church is seen being cleansed in the word. In pursuing this verse one sees that there is a definite article before $\tau\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$. When a definite article is used, the noun to which it is attached is particularized, denoting a specific noun. Thus $\tau\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ here specifies a particular $\tau\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$. How should one interpret this? It is believed the answer is in $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, the preposition. $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ with the dative case has the sense of "in the sphere of." So the place that $\tau\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ is to operate in cleansing is the word of God. Summarizing this, one can see from the previous discussion that this verse has little bearing, especially in regards to spiritual birth, on John 3:5.

In addition to these verses two others are cited to support the connection between of "water and Spirit."

One of these is Ezekiel 36:25-26. "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean . . . A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you." The other verse is Isaiah 44:3. "For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground: I will pour my spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring."

These are cited because one who holds this view, Dr. Homer Kent, explains, "In view of the fact that Nicodemus was expected to know something about new birth (3:20), the conclusion seems inescapable it must have been revealed to some extent in the Old Testament."¹ The previous statement is true that Nicodemus should have been aware of such verses, for John 3:10 does say--Jesus said unto him (Nicodemus), "Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?"

However, the question arises, do Ezekiel 36 and Isaiah 44 relate water as being the word? The answer is indeed questionable. These verses could by their statement teach a baptismal cleansing, viewing water as baptism and not the word. Or, possibly the water is a type of the Holy Spirit. While the context itself is similar to John 3:5, that of preparation for the kingdom, the verse itself does not suggest that one has to view the water as the word.

¹Homer A. Kent, Jr., The Light in the Darkness: Studies in the Gospel of John (Winona Lake: BMH Books, 1974), p. 59.

The second line of argumentation--grammatical structure is brought into consideration. Here syntax of the phrase $\epsilon\zeta \upsilonδατος καὶ$ is under examination. Concerning the use of the preposition $\epsilon\zeta$ Dr. Hoyt states,

There is just one preposition 'of' used with 'water and the Spirit.' The conclusion is a most important one. Since there is just one preposition governing the entire phrase, this points to the fact that the words 'water and Spirit' are to be regarded as one thing, and not as two separate things.¹

The problem comes when the conjunction $καὶ$ of the phrase is considered. Concerning $καὶ$ once again Dr. Hoyt is cited,

In the phrase, water and Spirit are joined by what is called the coordinate conjunction 'and.' This conjunction is used to join things that are on the same level or in the same sphere. By this we mean that these two things must be either material on the one hand, or they must be either spiritual on the other hand. One cannot be material while the other is spiritual.²

In responding to this, a good example of where this would not hold true is found in the phrase of Luke 3:16, $\epsilon\nu πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρὶ$. In this phrase is found the construction described above in Dr. Hoyt's statement. This is the same construction as found in John 3:5. In this it is clearly not two spiritual concepts, or even two material concepts, but rather two different concepts. Here $πνεύματι ἁγίῳ$ is the "Holy Spirit" of God; and the $πυρὶ$ being

¹Herman A. Hoyt, The New Birth (Findlay: Dunham Publishing Company, 1961), p. 45.

²Ibid., p. 46.

the expression of the Messiah's judgment by fire as evidenced by the following verse.

Summarizing the view one can see that neither the scriptural correlation nor the grammatical structure seems to lend adequate support to render *ὁ λόγος* as applying to the Word.

At this time there will be a listing of four men who hold this view: Hoyt, Kent, Boice and Ironside. Dr. Hoyt states, "The nature and function of water is to cleanse. As it serves as a remarkable symbol for the instrument which prepares the way for the new birth."¹ He further says, "Judicial cleansing through the operation of the Word of God must precede and prepare the way for the operation of the Spirit of God in regeneration."²

Proceeding further Dr. Kent states his argument concerning the relation between cleansing and the Word, "Hence it is concluded that new birth involves the cleansing action of God's word which shows man his sin and announces salvation in Christ."³

Dr. Boice in his presentation of the various views adopts this view with these words, "Water is also a metaphor for the Written Word of God, the Bible . . . and that the written word of God together with the working of His

¹Ibid., p. 48.

²Ibid., p. 51.

³Kent, p. 60.

Holy Spirit is the means by which this new birth is accomplished."¹

Lastly, Ironside comments, clearly in response to the question of what is the water by which we are born again, "You find that it is the recognized symbol for the Word of God . . . It is the water of the Word."²

¹James Montgomery Boice, The Gospel of John, Vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1975), pp. 245-246.

²H. A. Ironside, Addresses on the Gospel of John (New York: Loizeaux Brothers, Bible Truth Depot, 1946), p. 96.

CHAPTER IV

REPENTANCE AS SYMBOLIZED BY BAPTISM VIEW

Before entering into the view it is only fair that there be given credit to the two previous views: Natural Birth and Water Is the Word. Both of these views are viable options that have features to commend themselves to the interpretation of ὕδατος in John 3:5. However, this view is suggested as a better option.

It must be realized that unless one has experienced true repentance he is not in a position of being genuinely converted. Unless true evangelical repentance is present there can be no real intimation of the forgiveness of sins, nor any sure evidence of being justified.

A treatment of the word "repentance" is in order before entering into the main body of the view. Two Greek words which convey the idea of repentance are μετανοέω and μεταμέλομαι. Μεταμέλομαι being derived from the root μετανοέω. The basic idea of μετανοέω involves a "change of mind." The context must determine the object and nature of this change.¹

¹Charles R. Smith, "Repentance," Grace Seminary Spire, 4:2 (Spring, 1977):6-9.

There must be caution in comparing or contradicting the two Greek words, since they can be overlapping in their usage. It is seen that each one emphasizes a different aspect of repentance. *μεταρέλκομαι* emphasizes the emotional aspect; whereas *μετανοέω* emphasizes the volitional aspect. In Matthew 27:3 there is an example of the emotional aspect, "Then Judas, which had betrayed Him (Jesus), when he saw that He was condemned, repented himself, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders." In Luke 15:7 there is an example of the volitional aspect, "I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repented, more than over ninety and nine just persons, which need no repentance." As was seen in the first example repentance involved the emotional aspect. However, it must be kept in mind that merely this aspect will not produce genuine repentance. This is evidenced by the example of Judas who repented in that he "sorrowed," but he did not have remorse for sin nor did he exercise the volitional aspect of believing toward God. This volitional aspect was brought out in the second example where repentance is presented as a requirement for salvation. It would seem obvious that here "repentance" includes the concept of faith. For indeed, faith involves "change of mind from unbelief to acceptance."

And yet it must be kept in mind that there are places where the words "repent" and "believe" are given

separately. Two such cases indicating this are Mark 1:15 and Acts 20:21. In Mark 1:15 are found the words, "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye, and believe the gospel." And in Acts 20:21 where Paul was instructing the Ephesian elders he stated, " . . . repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ."

Summing this up, it is important to see that if true repentance is to be realized there must be both the emotional aspect--that sorrowing for sin, acknowledging that one is wrong and has done wrong--as well as the volitional aspect which affects the person's will causing him to look up by faith and receive the salvation that has been provided.

Now in turning to the Old Testament, it is seen that repentance was expressed there. There are two Hebrew words that convey the idea of "repentance." They are *QNJ* and *נָשׁוּבָה*. *QNJ* emphasizes the emotional aspect. Its basic meanings in the Niphal are "be sorry," or "suffer grief."¹ This is illustrated in the life of Job where it is recorded in 42:6, "Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes." *נָשׁוּבָה* emphasized the volitional aspect. Its basic meaning is that of "turn back, return."² This is expressed in two places; Ezekiel 14:6 and Ezekiel 18:30. In the first reference the Lord requests of Israel,

¹BDB, pp. 636-637.

²Ibid., p. 996.

"Repent, and turn yourselves from your idols; and turn away your faces from all your abominations." A similar pattern is found in Ezekiel 18:30 where the consequences of refusing to obey instruction of the Lord are stated, "Therefore I will judge you, O house of Israel, every one according to his ways, saith the Lord God. Repent, and turn yourselves from all your transgressions; so iniquity shall not be your ruin."

While it is to be understood that although QQ? and ??? have different basic meanings, they still both denote the idea of movement away from a position formerly held. In fact not only are both words used equally as in the cases of Jeremiah 4:28 and Exodus 32:12, but also religiously as synonyms (Jeremiah 8:6 with 31:18).

In the case of being used equally, it is seen in Jeremiah 4:28--where judgment is in view-- QQ? is used, "For this shall the earth mourn, and the heavens above be black; because I have spoken it, I have purposed it, and will not repent, neither will I turn back from it." Exodus 32:12 also has reference to judgment concerning worshipping the molten calf. Moses addressing God, uses the word ???,

Wherefore should the Egyptians speak, and say, For mischief did he bring them out, to stay them in the mountains, and to consume them from the face of the earth? Turn from thy fierce wrath, and repent of this evil against they people.

Turning to the case of being religiously synonymous, Jeremiah 8:6 is an example of this, the word used here is QQ?, "I hearkened and heard, but they spoke not

aright: no man repented him of his wickedness, saying, What have I done?" The terrible state of the nation of Judah before the captivity is in view.

Another verse would be Jeremiah 31:18 where Israel is talking concerning itself, the word *נָשׁוּבָה* is in view, " . . . Thou has chastised me, and I was chastised, as a bullock unaccustomed to the yoke: turn thou me, and I shall be turned; for thou art the Lord my God."

Thus it is seen that not only is repentance taught in precept in the Old Testament, but also in example. In Psalm 51 is one of the greatest examples of this. This is the confessional psalm of David. This psalm is significant at this juncture because of the usage of *נָשׁוּבָה* in this passage. The word is used to indicate David's desire (volition) to be restored to fellowship. So one can see that the concept of repentance was not unknown in the Old Testament.

Relating the two Greek words with the two Hebrew words there is found some equivalence between the words. As Behm, in the Theological Dictionary of the New Testament indicates,

μετανοέω is used fourteen times for the Hebrew *נָשׁוּבָה* in the Niphal, meaning "to repent something," similar to the idea of *מִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה*. The Hebrew word for repentance, *נָשׁוּבָה*, is frequently used for significance in the Old Testament of man's turning from his evil ways, and returning to the Lord. *μετανοέω* is never used to express the religious and moral act of

conversion which is conveyed by ^{2.7} *ψ*, yet it must be understood that they are related.¹

Having examined the two words conveying the idea of repentance in the Old Testament, now the concept itself will be considered relative to its prerequisite for residence in the kingdom. In this regard two verses will be consulted: Ezekiel 11:18-20 and 36:25-26. Giving attention to the first reference it says, "I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them an heart of flesh." Obviously, as was stated previously, a new relationship is in view. This becomes more apparent when viewed in relation to verse 18, " . . . they shall take away all detestable things thereof and all the abominations thereof from thence." Although the word "repentance" is not present in this verse, certainly the concept is there. For the evidence of this change is found in verse 20 where it states that "they will walk in my (God's) statutes, and keep mine ordinances, and do them. Only those who have truly "repented" can fulfill this condition.

Similar wording is found in Ezekiel 36:25-26, which reads, "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the

¹Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, s.v., "*μετάνοια*," by J. Behm, Vol. IV, ed. Gerhard Kittel (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1968), p. 989.

stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh." Here, as in Ezekiel 11:18-20 a new relationship is in view. Here, also as in 11:18-20 the relationship is made possible by the verse before, namely 25, "Then I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you." However, there is a difference in these verses, in that, the concept of repentance is not stated, but rather, implied. For unless repentance is a part, cleansing can not take place. In the verse just stated there is found a phrase which says, "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean." Just a note to alert one to the fact that although the word "ye" is in the plural thus indicating the combined nation of Israel is under consideration, it must be kept in mind that individuals make up nations, so what is seen as needed for the individuals is needed for nations as well. Looking further it is seen that the word רָאָה, clean, is used. This word expresses a process whereby moral impurity was to be done away. How did this cleansing take place? The answer is found in the next word, namely, מַיִם, "water." Now it is true that physical water can not wash away impurity as scripture, in many places, indicates. One of the ways "water" is used in the scripture is in a symbolic sense, as evidenced by the previous verses. It is to be indicated that the word for "water" is מַיִם of which the corresponding word in the New Testament is ὕδατος, found in John

3:5. Since it has been determined that one usage of the word is of cleansing, it is perfectly legitimate to view the external purification as a symbol of internal cleansing.

Other places where $\gamma\gamma\phi$ is used is found in Psalm 51:2 where David is asking to be cleansed from his sin, Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin." In Jeremiah 33:8 $\gamma\gamma\phi$ is also found, "I will cleanse them from all their iniquity, and I will pardon all their iniquities." All of these cases involved sin being cleansed.

The cleansing effect of water is seen everywhere in the Ancient Near East in regards to religious celebration in the form of cultic washings. In Egypt idols, the king, priests, and the dead had water sprinkled on them. In the religious sphere it remains an art of purification. Thus it could be said that with fire, blood and oil water is by far the most commonly used means of ritual cleansing.

The following references gives one a sampling of the usage of water as a cleansing agent:

(1) Ceremonially--Numbers 19:7--then the priest shall wash his clothes, and he shall bathe his flesh in water, and afterward he shall come into the camp, and the priest shall be unclean until the even. Numbers 8:7--And thus shalt thou do unto them (Levites), to cleanse them: Sprinkle water of purifying upon them, and let them share all of their flesh, and let them wash their clothes, and so make themselves clean.

(2) Symbolically--Ezekiel 36:25--A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. Isaiah 44:5--For I

will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground: I will pour my spirit upon seed, and my blessing upon their offspring.

In conclusion, the cleansing thus effected through the Spirit answers to all the aspects of the ceremonial cleansing of the Old Testament. There is the actual moral change in the individual, the clean heart, the renewed spirit, the godly life.¹ May it be submitted that a medium by which internal cleansing was symbolized was by baptism. As Plummer states it, "Baptism is actual internal purification."² Thus baptism symbolized the fact that sin was forsaken, and Christ the Messiah was received, this is repentance. With this argumentation one could see why Jesus would have been surprised enough to ask the question, " . . . art thou a master of Israel and know not these things?" (John 3:10.) Indeed, if the Old Testament taught that such a condition was necessary for entrance into the Kingdom then Nicodemus should have known it. For it must not be forgotten that these spiritual demands and blessings of the kingdom are not new; they are not exclusively New Testament revelation.

It is also found that repentance meets the sense of the preposition $\xi\varsigma$. For as had been mentioned the

¹Robert B. Girdlestone, Synonyms of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1976), p. 146.

²W. H. T. Dau, "Baptism," International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Vol. 1, Gen. ed. James Orr (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1939), p. 395.

preposition had the sense of origin. Repentance would express this, in that, through the acknowledgement of sin, then confessing them, finally turning away from sin to God enables a person to be in a position for God through His Spirit to accomplish the work of grace in his life. For only through repentance can one be in a position for the new birth.

The validity and necessity of repentance even today is very amply brought by an impressive array of references. These start with Jesus and continue through the epistles of the New Testament. Beginning with Jesus in the Gospels, one sees that repentance was Christ's message in His ministry. Just to cite a couple of verses: Matthew 4:17 reads, "Repent; for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand." And Luke 13:3 which reads, " . . . except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." In Luke 24:47, Jesus says, that repentance along with remission of sins was and is to be preached among all nations. Thus this places the responsibility upon all believers to preach this teaching.

Leaving the Gospels and entering the epistles, repentance is seen in such texts as Acts 17:30, where Paul in Athens, addressing the Greeks, vindicates what God expects. The verse says, . . . the times of ignorance therefore God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent. Continuing on to the book of Romans, considered by many Paul's theological treatise there is found repentance also. The place this is found is chapter 2

verse 4 where it says, . . . "or despisest thou the riches of His goodness and forbearance, and longsuffering, not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?" All of this gives but a sampling of the attention the New Testament gives this word. Thus one can see the importance of such a teaching.

With all this supportable evidence at one's disposal it would appear appropriate then to espouse this view as the suggested interpretation of John 3:5. Two adherents of this view are: Tenney and Westcott. Tenney writes,

'Water' would recall to the inquirer the ministry of John the Baptist, whose preaching of repentance and of baptism would be fresh in his mind. Such a step as this for Nicodemus would involve humiliation, a virtual acknowledgement that he, a Pharisee, needed to repent just as a Gentile outside the law needed repentance.¹

Westcott ends this discussion with a very confident assertion concerning this view,

It can then scarcely be questioned that Nicodemus heard the words, water carried with it a reference to John's baptism, . . . Thus the words, taken in their immediate meaning as intelligible to Nicodemus, set forth, as required before entrance into the kingdom of God, the acceptance of the preliminary rite divinely sanctioned, which was the seal of repentance and so forgiveness.²

¹Merrill C. Tenney, John: The Gospel of Belief (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1948), p. 87.

²B. F. Westcott, The Gospel According to John (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company), p. 50.

CONCLUSION

The writer has sought to arrive at a Biblical understanding of the phrase *γεννηθῆς ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος* in John 3:5. This study took the form of four chapters. Chapter One discussed the historical background that was to assist in interpretation. Chapter Two involved the exegesis of the phrase itself; seeking to derive what it said. Chapter Three set forth each view. In that chapter each view was examined for its merit, as well as its drawbacks. The examination of each view culminated in Chapter Four where the suggested interpretation for John 3:5 was discussed this being Repentance as Symbolized by Baptism View.

It was indicated that the interpretation adopted was a better option. The writer then stated that true repentance resulted in genuine conversion. It was at this point that a word study was undertaken for the purpose of showing that repentance was just not a New Testament word or concept but that the Old Testament talked about it as well.

The writer then attempted to show that *ὕδατος* was used as a symbol to indicate cleansing internally. For it was indicated, and rightly so, that true and genuine cleansing cannot take place without true repentance. When this repentance and cleansing takes place the act is

signified with an external act, namely baptism. It is known that this was arrived at by indirect means. However, it is believed that there are scriptural grounds, as evidenced, as well as logical grounds to support this.

Then references to the New Testament were also considered so as to show that repentance was a characteristic teaching not only of John the Baptist, the apostles, but also the Lord Jesus. Thus the view adopted, though based more by indirect evidence, is that of cleansing as symbolized by baptism; because without true repentance genuine cleansing and conversion cannot take place, therefore baptism was a symbol of the act of true repentance, as all baptism is.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbot-Smith, G. A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1921.
- Anderson, Sir Robert. The Bible or the Church. London: Pickering and Inglis, n.d.
- Barnes, Albert. Barnes on the New Testament. Vol. II. "Luke-John." Glasgow: W. B. Blackie and Company, Printers, n.d.
- Barrett, C. K. The Gospel According to St. John. London: S.P.C.K., 1965.
- Bauer, Walter; Arndt, William F.; and Gingrich, F. Wilbur. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1963.
- Bernard, J. H. A Critical Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John. Vol. 1. The International Critical Commentary. Ed., A. H. McNeile.
- Boice, James Montgomery. The Gospel of John. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1975.
- Boston, Thomas and Goodwin, Thomas. The Necessity of Repentance. Mac Dill, AFB, FL: Tyndale Bible Society, n.d.
- Brown, Francis; Driver, S. R.; and Briggs, Charles N. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.
- Bullinger, E. W. Figures of Speech Used in the Bible. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1970.
- Bultmann, Rudolph. The Gospel of John. Trans. by G. R. Beasley-Murray. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971.
- Burton, Ernest DeWitt. The Epistle to the Galatians: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary. Revised; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1970.

- Calvin, John. "The Gospel According to St. John, 1-10," Calvin's Commentaries, trans. T. H. L. Parker. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959.
- Chamberlain, William Douglas. The Meaning of Repentance. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1943.
- Chrysostom, John. "St. John Chrysostom: Baptismal Instructions." Trans. Paul W. Harkens. Ancient Christian Writers. eds. Johannes Quasten and Walter J. Burghardt. New York: Newman Press, 1963.
- Dau, W. H. T. "Baptism." International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Vol. 1. Gen. ed. James Orr. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1939.
- Encyclopedia Judaica. "Proselytes." Vol. 13. Jerusalem: The MacMillan Company, 1971.
- Gifford, Robert C. "Repentance." Unpublished Master of Divinity Thesis. Grace Theological Seminary, 1974.
- Girdlestone, Robert B. Synonyms of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1976.
- Godet, Frederick Louis. Commentary on the Gospel of John. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing Company, n.d.
- Guthrie, Donald and Motyer, J. A., eds. The New Testament Bible Commentary. Rev. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1970.
- Hastings, James. The Great Texts of the Bible: St. John I-XII. Edited by James Hastings. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912.
- Hodges, Zane. "Water and Spirit--John 3:5." Bibliotheca Sacra. 135:539 (July-September, 1978).
- Hoyt, Herman A. Expository Messages on the New Birth. Winona Lake: BMH Books, 1961.
- Ironside, H. A. Addresses on the Gospel of John. Vol. 1. New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1943.
- Kent, Homer A., Jr. Light in the Darkness: Studies in the Gospel of John. Winona Lake: BMH Books, 1974.

- Lange, John Peter. Lange's Commentary. Trans. by Philip Schaff. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.
- Lenski, R. C. H. The Interpretation of St. John's Gospel. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961.
- Liddell, Henry George and Scott, Robert. A Greek-English Lexicon. New edition, rev. and augmented. Vol. 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press, n.d.
- Lindars, Barnabas. "The Gospel of John," New Century Bible. eds. Ronald E. Clements and Matthew Black. Greenwood, SC: The Attic Press, 1972.
- Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm. "The Gospel of John." Vol. III. Meyer's Commentary on the New Testament. Winona Lake: Alpha Publications, 1979.
- Modisett, M. M. "Born of Water." Louisiana: Journal Book Office, 1870.
- Moffatt, James. An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911.
- Morgan, G. Campbell. The Gospel According to John. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, n.d.
- Morris, Leon. "The Gospel According to John." New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1971.
- Moulton, James Hope. A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol. III. "Syntax." Nigel Turner. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1963.
- Moulton, W. F. and Geden, A. S. eds. A Concordance to the Greek New Testament. Fifth Edition. H. K. Moulton. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1978.
- Nichol, Francis D. ed. The Seventh-Day Adventist Bible Commentary. Vol. V. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1956.
- Odeberg, Hugo. The Fourth Gospel. Amsterdam: B. R. Gruner B.V., 1974.
- Ott, Ludwig. Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma. James Canon Bastible, ed. Patrick Lynch, trans. Rockford: Tan Books and Publishers, Inc., 1963.

- Owen, John J. Commentary on the Gospel of John. New York: Charles Scribner's and Company, 1869.
- Plummer, A. "The Epistles of St. John." The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. eds. F. H. Chase and A. F. Kirkpatrick. Cambridge, England: University Press, 1906.
- Quasten, Johannes and Burghardt, Walter J., eds. Ancient Christianities. New York: Newman Press, 1963.
- Reynolds, H. R. "Gospel of St. John." The Pulpit Commentary. Vol. I. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph and Company, n.d.
- Robertson, A. T. and Davis, W. Hersey. A New Short Grammar of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977.
- Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the New Testament in Light of Historical Research. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934.
- Ryle, J. C. Expository Thoughts on the Gospels: St. John. Vol. I. New York: Robert Carter and Brother, 1875.
- Schaff, Philip, ed. "John Chrysostom." History of the Christian Church. Vol. III. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1950.
- _____. "St. Augustine: Writings Against the Pelagians." Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Vol. V. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolph. The Gospel According to St. John. Trans. Kevin Smyth. Vol. I. Freiburg: Herder, 1965.
- Shaffer, Jack Lee. "Born of Water and Spirit." Unpublished Diploma in Theology. Grace Theological Seminary, 1944.
- Smith, Charles R. "Repentance." Grace Seminary Spire. 4:2. Spring, 1977.
- Smyth, Herbert Weir. Greek Grammar. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Spence, Michael. "Hendiadys in the Pentateuch: An Investigation." Unpublished Master of Divinity Thesis. Grace Theological Seminary, May, 1978.

- Spriggs, D. G. "Meaning of 'Water' in John 3:5." The Expository Times. 85. February, 1974.
- Strong, Augustus, Hopkins. Systematic Theology. Vols. I-III. Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1907.
- Strong, James. The Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1890.
- Tenney, Merrill C. John: The Gospel of Belief. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1948.
- Terry, Milton. Biblical Hermeneutics. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.
- Thayer, Joseph Henry. Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. New York: American Book Company, 1886.
- The Holy Bible. New York: The Douay Bible House, 1938.
- The Jewish Encyclopedia. "Baptism." Vol. II. ed. Isidore Singer. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1903.
- The New American Bible. ed. Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle. Paterson, NJ: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1970.
- Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. s.v. "ἄνθρ." by Heinrich Schlier. Vol. I. Ed. Gerhard Kittel. Trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964.
- Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. s.v. "ἄνθρ." by Friedrich Buchsel. Vol. I. Ed. Gerhard Kittel. Trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964.
- Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. s.v. "ἄνθρ." by Friedrich Buchsel. Vol. I. Ed. Gerhard Kittel. Trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964.
- Westcott, B. F. The Gospel According to St. John. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962.
- Willis, John R. ed. The Teachings of the Church Fathers. Montreal: Palm Publishers, 1966.
- Wilson, John G. The Doctrine of Baptism. Philadelphia: Daughaday & Becker, Publishers, 1870.

Winer, George Benedict. A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament. Enlarged and improved. Andover:
Warren F. Draper, 1897.