

ing at. All of this goes back to this question: Is a child *katharta* (clean) or *akatharta* (unclean) when he's born in a Christian household? Origen and Augustine said "*akatharta*." Paul said "*katharta*." Clean and *hagia* (holy). It is not unclean. So you can see that the theology of baptism gets very much tied up with this.

Now I don't need to go on. I am quite aware that I am walking on eggs right now. I know that Stanislaus Lyonnet got suspended in Rome for teaching what I am teaching. I didn't find that out until I threw this out in a class one day and someone called me aside and said, "You know what you're doing?" That's why Lyonnet's commentary on Romans doesn't get beyond chapter 5. I don't know if you know this story or not. One of my good friends, the former president of the University of San Francisco, was in my seminar. He thought he'd better tip me off before I waxed eloquent on that subject again because the man who is the most reputable of all New Testament scholars, I suppose, at the *Biblicum* would be Lyonnet. I don't know how you rate him. I wrote a commentary on Romans while I was in Rome. I was sort of full of this at that time. I learned it, so I know that I'm walking on shaky ground right here. But we have to say quite frankly, and I think we want to be frank with one another, that this is the place where the Roman Catholics and the Lutherans have to look at their theology of a child. I have found people like the Dutch Catholics, particularly Piet Schoonenberg, more open than your German scholar Jeremias on this subject. And Stanislaus Lyonnet agrees with my position. Well, I always like to cheer Catholics like Lyonnet; but you see here is where the debate is.

I require each of my students to read a good background book on every phase of systematic theology when I teach it. I am Professor of Systematic Theology and Piet Schoonenberg's paperback is

what we use for sin. Now some of our conservative students get in a little difficulty when I say, here is the textbook on sin. They look at that paperback published by Notre Dame University by Piet Schoonenberg, S.J. The way I have of getting my students ecumenical is to have them find out. If I tell them that a great Catholic says so-and-so, they don't believe it. After they pass the test on his book, they do. Of course, Schillebeeckx says very much the same thing. But here is a place where I think tradition needs to be questioned -- namely regarding the theology of the child [note that the Calvinistic view and Anglican view are different here].

Baptism and I Corinthians 10

Now what are we talking about? Getting back to this question of what it means to be baptized into Christ's body. Let's get to the passages now. You have to put two passages together, I Corinthians 10 and I Corinthians 12. I Corinthians 10 seems to me to be very primitive. And, by the way, when I use the word "primitive" there's nothing derogatory about it; it means just as far back as you can go -- that's a good term to me and not a bad term. So I want to warn you that I'm not saying a derogatory thing when I call something primitive. I mean primary; I mean back to the roots. To me, I Corinthians 10 [Jeremias and I do agree on this] is perhaps an early Christian catechism before they had any New Testament Scriptures written at all. Now how did Paul catechize them? He took the Red Sea crossing back in the book of Exodus and taught these pagans in Corinth what it meant to be a Christian. How did he do it? He said, when you get baptized you pass through the Red Sea; when you learn the moral teachings of Christianity you come to Mt. Sinai; when you have communion you eat the bread that comes from heaven; when you receive the Spirit you drink the water that comes from the rock. You can find all that.

This is what we find right here, and this passage is very important for understanding incorporation into the body of Christ because Paul begins this tenth chapter this way:

"I want you all to know, brothers, that your fathers were all under the cloud, and they all passed through the sea. And they were all baptized into Moses" [now watch that] "...they were all baptized into Moses" [he did not say into Christ]. "They were baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea, they all ate the same spiritual food and they drank from the same spiritual drink, from the rock that followed them. That rock was Christ. We can't go into all this in detail because as you go on down he says that these are types [such as I've just briefly summarized] and that therefore our warning is here, and that we shouldn't presume on immorality, because he who thinks he stands may fall. Now, that's not a famous Baptist text, but he says it.

And here is another thing that is very important. These words are followed immediately by what I think is the most primitive interpretation of communion in the church. In vs. 16 and 17 [as he talks about communion here, you'll see why I'm putting the two together in 16 and 17], he says, "Already you were baptized into Moses." And then, "the cup of blessing which we bless," [that's right out of the Passover]; "the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not *κοινωνία*? Is it not communion in the body of Christ?" The answer expected is "yes." "The loaf which we break, is it not communion in the body of Christ?" And, of course, both times he expects the answer "yes." We commune in his blood, we commune in his body by drinking the cup and eating the loaf. But here is the interpretation: "For we who are many are one loaf, one body." Of all the theories about where Paul got his idea that the church is the body of Christ, I think it grew out of the communion service. I

know, I think, 16 theories. I think that the communion is where Paul got his idea of the body of Christ. I think it came right here. The first time he says "body of Christ" you can see the clue to where he got it. As he took a loaf made out of many grains of wheat and blessed it in the name of the Lord Jesus, and all of them ate it, that said, "That's what we are. We who are many are one loaf, one body." And so you see here what the body of Christ really means, and we all partake of the one loaf.

"Drinking the Spirit"

Now then, having said that, this is all background to the idea of incorporation. And I would say this: remember in early Christianity, baptism and communion were right together. They were not two things, but one. You know that's commonplace. But, you see, we have lost this -- we separate them. We have theories about communion that conflict with our theories about baptism, etc. They have to be brought back together in what the Anglicans today call "primitive wholeness," and I agree with that point of view.

Getting down to the crucial text in the incorporation in the body of Christ, this is what he said in I Corinthians 12: "Just as the body is one and has many members and all are members of the body, being many, are one body, so also is Christ." He shocks you there. "So is Christ." You expected him to say, "the body of Christ." Well, he'll say it in the next verse, but these are synonyms for it. To be a member of Christ, the contemporary Christ, is the same as being a member of the body of Christ, but you really get his realism when you let him say it the way he says it, "so is Christ." Now since he means the same, in the next verse he says, "for by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body. Whether we're Jews or Greeks, whether we're slaves or free, we were all

made to drink the one Spirit." Now why on earth did he use that verb? Made to drink the one Spirit. "Drinking the Spirit." Why? We saw it in chapter 10 a while ago. They came through the Red Sea, got out in the wilderness, smote the rock, the water flowed forth, they drank it. What he's saying here is this, that's a type. When Christ was crucified, he was the rock. The Rock was smitten; the water flowed out. Christ was crucified; the Spirit was poured out. So just as they drank the water from the rock in the wilderness, now you drink the Spirit. He would never have used this verb "drink the Spirit" had it not been that he was speaking typologically. The typology we mentioned a while ago is in his mind or he would not have used a verb like that--"drinking the Spirit."

Baptism for the Dead

I really must say just a word about the other text in I Corinthians on baptism, lest you think I'm afraid to touch it, and that is 15:29, which is baptism for the dead. Now of course this has become the happy hunting ground of American Mormons. At least one good thing has come out of it. Many of my distant relatives were Mormons, and so I can find the genealogy of my family for eight centuries because they wanted to see if any of us were unbaptized. But we have this fixation on this text. But it does say two things I want to mention in going along; namely, he asks "Why are you baptized on behalf of the dead if the dead are not raised?" He's saying two things here that I think we need to ponder. I don't want to get bogged down on this controversial text. But he is saying this, that there is a vital relationship between the living and the dead. We might have a good discussion on that, I'm sure. And you can be baptized on behalf of the dead. He's saying that there is a more vital relationship between the living and the dead than we usually assume. And, second, that there will be a resurrection of the

dead; and certainly that is an important thing with Paul. If you baptize for the dead, you must believe they are going to benefit from it at the resurrection. Now this at least serves to point out this realism we are talking about, and I translate it literally, "to baptize on behalf of the dead." Now I think that what it means is that these were people who intended to get baptized. They weren't, but someone was baptized on their behalf and, therefore, they'll benefit from it. Well, I simply mention that because someone would ask me, why didn't you touch on I Corinthians 15:29. But, nearer to the central thoughts of Paul will be the passages in Galatians and Romans. Just one in each, but how significant they really are.

The Dynamite in Galatians 3:27

Galatians 3:27 is always hidden away there in the controversy with Judaism, but here we see Paul's theology brought out, I think, in a very powerful way. "As many as were baptized into Christ" [notice he's still using that language--baptized into Christ] "have put on Christ. For there cannot be Jew and Greek." [For there's no Jew or Greek. Well you know what he means --this distinction no longer holds. Of course Jews can be saved, Christians can be saved, but that distinction is not made any more now.] "For there cannot be the distinction between a slave man and a free man. For there cannot even be the distinction between a male and a female, for we are all one in Christ Jesus." Now I can understand why a great social philosopher said one time when this text was read in his presence, that preachers are the bravest men in the world. They can tote more dynamite around in the New Testament without letting it go off than any people he ever saw. Because you see here race-prejudice. No Jew or Greek. That was an emotional statement; that was a provocative statement that there is no distinction between a Jew and Greek. The Jews and Greeks

both thought there was a very important distinction. No difference between a slave and a free man. Roman law thought there was a great deal of difference and you'd better not get between a man and his slave. Slavery still exists in the world, often where Christianity has had some influence. The difference between a male and a female. Women last year for the first time could vote in Switzerland. We're all one in Christ Jesus. You see what we mean. Baptism is not just something we get together in an ecumenical mood and argue about. If we really believe this, we have something that meets the needs of our time.

To Die With Christ

Let's now go to the text that Beasley-Murray would say is the most important text in Paul, namely Romans 6, the first 11 verses. Actually, I don't think Paul is talking about baptism here. He simply brings baptism in as an illustration. You have to remember what we've been saying so far for this to mean anything. First four verses. Now here is a place where I would apply form history. He's simply dealing with a very practical problem in a diatribe style, which is very common in Romans. "What shall we say? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid. We who died to sin, how shall we any longer live in it?" And then he brings baptism in to rebuke those who live like pagans after they are baptized. "Don't you know that as many as were baptized into Christ" [notice that language is still with us] "were baptized into his death?" If you were baptized into Christ, you died with Christ. "We were buried therefore with Christ through baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the father, even so we also should walk in the newness of life." An interesting text from many angles. The "glory" there means the shekinah glory, which raised Jesus from the dead. Sometimes Paul says the Spirit raises from the

dead. The main point is that if you are a Christian and know the meaning of baptism you'll know that you died with Christ and that you've been raised up with Christ.

A Hymn of Death -- and Life

Now then, after saying this about baptism, he gives what I believe to be a two-stanza hymn, a very impressive two-stanza hymn, which says nothing about baptism but perhaps is a baptismal hymn. You know what we mean. The hymnology of the New Testament has become a very interesting subject in form history. But notice verses 5, 6 and 7 talk about our death and resurrection; verses 8, 9 and 10 talk about his death and resurrection. If you write it down in Greek, you can see that the lines just parallel one another. Put them down side by side. Verse 5: If we become united with him in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection. [See the parallelism?] Knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be done away, so that we would no longer live in bondage to sin. For he that died is set free from sin. [You see the sixth parallel there. I mean there are three parallels with that tremendous statement.] Separate lines 3 and 4 here. That sounds like a hymn to me. Now that's what he's saying about us and he said some of the things we already said here, that our old man [you know the old man and the new man--Adam and Christ] was crucified with him, that the body of sin, over against the body of Christ, might be done away. You're taken out of the body of sin over into the body of Christ. Put off the old man and you put on the new man. You recognize this as Paul's great doctrine of the two Adams, the first and the last. It's psychologically true that this happens that our old man is crucified and we are made new creatures in Christ. This is true, and this is based upon historical fact which is certainly the center of some discussion today

about the historicity of the resurrection. Paul would not have called it the resurrection if it had not been historical, I think. But in verse 8, he goes over the same line, "for if we died with Christ, we believe that we shall live with him." Notice both times it's in the future---that we shall live with him. It's our resurrection he's talking about. His resurrection is past; our resurrection is in the future. So, "if we died with Christ, we believe we shall live with him." Notice again, "knowing this," just like he did the other time [it's a different word but it means the same thing.] "Knowing this, Christ being raised from the dead dies no more. Death no longer lords it over him." See the parallel? Why? "For the death he died, he died to sin once for all" once, never to be repeated. "And the life that he lives, he lives to God." Now what I'm trying to point out here, we have a marvelous practical problem related to the death and resurrection of Christ, and perhaps we have a baptismal hymn to give it its climactic application, because its climactic application comes in the next verse. "Even so, reckon yourselves to be dead to sin, alive to God through Jesus Christ." That's just the exhortation at the end. Well, it is certainly important, and I believe it's climactic. It's not the primary passage in Paul about baptism, but it is the climactic one. It's the one toward which these others have been leading.

Circumcision of the "Body of Flesh"

When we come to the prison letters, the two passages are in Colossians 2 and Ephesians 4. I'll say just a few words about Colossians since I've already mentioned the Calvinist tradition. I perhaps should focus on just the 11th and 12th verses. I may say that I believe G. Schille, a German writer, has pointed this out as a possible hymn also; from verse 9 down through verse 15 perhaps has a four-stanza hymn. I think that's right my-

self, but we can't deal with the literary questions tonight except to point out that verses 11 and 12 are really, you might say, almost the proof of the Calvinist tradition. We talked about the Catholic and the Lutheran a moment ago and how important original sin was. The more reformed tradition has stressed Colossians 2:9-12 where it is said that "all the fullness of deity dwells bodily in Christ and in him you are made full in him who is the ruler and the authority." And then comes this interesting statement, "in whom you were circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands in the putting off of the body of flesh." The commentaries, of course, are divided over what it means by "the body of flesh." Is it Jesus' own body of flesh that was stripped off when he was crucified? Many of the German commentaries do say that. Or is it a psychological term, that the body of sin is sloughed off when we become Christians? Now here you'd find a great difference. The church fathers, almost uniformly, would say that just as they lopped off the skin when they circumcised the Hebrew boys, so our sins are lopped off when we become baptized. Many Protestant writers would say that this has to do with Jesus having his physical body stripped off on the cross. Beasley-Murray takes that view. I believe the church fathers are right myself, that he's talking about it not in the terms of the physical flesh of Jesus here, but the psychological flesh. Incidentally, the King James even puts the sins of the flesh in the manuscript. Some of the Greek manuscripts have it in. And I think that this is a case where the textual addition is correct. But anyway, this is the idea of Christian circumcision. You were circumcised with a circumcision in the putting off of the body of flesh in the circumcision of Christ. I think it means that we are circumcised when we become Christians and does not refer to the crucifixion of Christ, because the next line says, "being buried with him in baptism in which you were raised through faith in the

working of God who raised him from the dead." I think the 12th verse really gives justification to the Patristic view, namely, that circumcision simply means this: we lop off our sins just like the Hebrews lopped off the flesh. That's the simplest way I know how to put it. Jean Daniélou has traced this idea through in a very fine way in his book on The Theology of Jewish Christianity. This, to me, seems to be nearer than what we find in many commentaries.

Regeneration Before Baptism?

Now, so much for that. You know why this is important? I'll throw a little historical theology in here. You see, at the Reformation when the Anabaptists rejected infant baptism, Zwingli and Calvin justified baptism on the basis of circumcision, that baptism took the place of circumcision. I've written a whole chapter in my book on this, as to whether baptism took the place of circumcision or not, because the argument is since they circumcise in infancy, therefore, we should baptize in infancy. This is a distinctive thing in the Calvinist tradition. You should always remember that in Calvinism, you are not baptized to be regenerated; you are baptized because you are already regenerated. You are regenerated because you are born into a Christian household, and by the promise of God we presume that every Christian child is regenerated. So Calvinism is quite different from the Catholic and the Lutheran traditions at this point. Regeneration is prior to baptism, and so it's the promise of God to a child born into a Christian household that accounts for his regeneration. Now this runs into trouble today when you have thousands and millions of people who were baptized in infancy and don't act as though they are regenerated. The Dutch Reformed Church had real problems on this. You mean all these atheists are presumed to be regenerated? Well, of course, according to their theology, we'd

say yes because they were born into a Christian household. So I throw that text out because you see how this relates to our discussion today. Of course, Emil Brunner, Karl Barth and Markus Barth have whipped up quite a little storm on this subject because they're Reformed. When I first met Prof. Cullmann, he wanted to know if I had met his "Baptist" colleague, Prof. Barth. They were having their lively debate at that time. So the Lutherans have already had their debate on what we are talking about. The Reformed have had their debate, particularly between Cullmann and Barth, both father and son. But so much for that text. I simply want to highlight it, to point out that it seems to me that to get anywhere in ecumenical discussions, we have to take things like this and come to them and try to find a solution. That's the reason we isolate them because we want to discuss them, and to discuss them with the hope that there will be a constructive outcome.

One Baptism Makes Us One

Now, in Ephesians 4, we have what is perhaps another hymn. Notice what we are doing here? We've hit two hymns here just recently, the sixth chapter of Romans and the second chapter of Colossians, I think. We come to another which is both a creed and a hymn, Ephesians 4:4-6. We can almost be sure that we're seeing a short creed there because when you read it in Greek: "one body and one spirit" no verb appears. Well we have to say, "There is one body and one spirit" when we put it into English. Then Paul adds five more "ones." "Just as you were called in one hope that belongs to your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism," and then in the seventh one, "one God, the father of us all who is above us all, through us all and in us all." Now this, to me, is a marvelous composition. Read it one way, it is seven "ones"; read it another way, it is three "threes." It's a mosaic of Christian teaching. We don't have time tonight to explore

what all those words mean, but I think if we do we'll find that this is almost a digest of the heart of Christianity, "one body and one spirit." We've already talked about that. "Just as you were called in one hope that belongs to your calling." Prof. Moltmann has made us aware of the one hope that belongs to our calling. "One Lord." Well, of course, that is the center of the Christian belief about Jesus. "One faith." That is the belief that this Jesus is Lord. "One baptism." That means you're baptized in His name, I'm baptized in His name. That makes us one. "One God." "Father of all." Three things about Him. He is "above us all, through us all, in us all." So we see what incorporation means by a great passage like this.

Water and the Word

There is one other passage in Ephesians that one might think has to do with baptism [I do, myself], where he says the "washing of water with the word." The great passage in Ephesians 5:26, I think, does mean the same thing that we saw in I Corinthians 6:11 a while ago: the idea of washing away. Now it's interesting in Ephesians 5:26, it's the washing water with the word, the water and the word. I might say symbolically that's our greatest problem today, bringing the word and the water together.

You see, we Protestants want to talk about the word. You might say Catholics symbolically talk about the water. Well, let's talk about both, the water and the word, the washing of water with the word. Now, I would say if I criticized my good friends, Karl and Markus Barth, I would say "all word and no water." Because they're not sacramental enough for me. I think the water is significant, myself. They emphasize too much the cognitive element to the exclusion of the ritual act. You may be surprised at a Baptist saying that, but

I'm more sacramental than Karl Barth. Tell it not in Dixie! Well, let's come to the greatest text. And here is another hymn. Notice what we've done here tonight. We're on our fourth hymn here in just a few minutes.

The Visible and Invisible, Side by Side

Titus 3:5 is the text, but it's part of a hymn, and you have very little difficulty in seeing this. Burton Scott Easton, many years ago, pointed this out as a hymn in Titus 3. Titus 3:4-7: you see his beautiful Hebrew parallelism coming. You know when we say poetry we don't mean it rhymes necessarily, but in Hebrew it's thought that is important. "When the kindness of God our Saviour and his love toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit; which he poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour, by being justified freely by his grace we might be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." Well, I just quickly put it that way to point out how poetic that passage really is. But the parallelism that is most central for us tonight is the one in 3:5. The washing of regeneration, that's what we see, the physical thing. Here is the bath of regeneration. What's going on? Washing people in water. What's going on? You not only have a visible sign; you have an invisible grace. The washing of regeneration should always have its correlary. It may not -- you may not -- you may just have people going in water -- as we say in the Southern Baptist life, "You dip 'em and drap 'em." This may have no more than that -- just dipping them and dropping them. I know that, but that is not the way it ought to be. Or you may have Quakers who don't have any water at all, but that is not apostolic Christianity. Apostolic Christianity has the visible and invisible side by side, one body, one Spirit. That's the way you

always have it. One body - you see that. What creates it, you don't see that. You see, it's always the visible and the invisible coming together. It seems to me this is the problem. Now here is a wonderful statement - "the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit." Because water baptism and Spirit baptism were so closely tied in Paul's mind that it was just like two sides of a door. The outside, you see -- that's water baptism. The inside, you don't see -- that's Spirit baptism. And it is only when these two things are correlaries that we have New Testament theology, it seems to me. So we can't be spiritualists that neglect the water baptism and we can't be, well, materialists and neglect the Spirit baptism. Somehow we must bring the two together.

From the "Body of Sin" to the "Body of Christ"

Now that brings me to the close of my remarks. Of course you can see what we have been trying to do. We have seen that Paul has much in common with other New Testament traditions, particularly "Identification" with Acts and "Purification" with many places in the New Testament. But if you ask what is Paul's distinctive view of baptism, it is the sign and the symbol and the sacrament [use all the language you want to], or the mystery, if you want to get the Greek Orthodox in on it, by which we move out of the body of sin into the body of Christ. That is what it signifies. And when the visible sign is by faith related to the Spirit of God, there is both something we see and something we do not see. Just as the church is something we see and something we do not see. Just as Christ is, we see, the historical Jesus who is the incarnate word. On and on. It seems to me that these are always the things that must be kept together in our Christian faith.

BAPTISM IN THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

First of all, I think not only Scott Bartchy, but all of you for making these three days in Tuebingen real happy ones for me and my wife. For the sake of those of you who are with us for the first time, last evening we discussed Baptism in the Pauline Tradition. Tonight we want to discuss Baptism in the Acts of the Apostles. In many ways the theology of baptism in the Acts of the Apostles is summarized in the sermon that is found in Acts chapter two, in just three verses. You remember that after the sermon of Peter in which he had proclaimed the fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecies and had told how they were fulfilled by telling the story of Jesus, the listeners cried out because they were pricked in their hearts, "What shall we do?" And his reply was, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For the promise is to you and to your children and to all who are far off and to as many as the Lord our God shall call unto Him." I think when you go through the Acts of the Apostles and see the relationship between the baptism with water and the baptism of the Spirit, that you immediately see that this is a summary which is a projection of all that is to be seen in the Acts of the Apostles. Now there are many side trails in the Acts of the Apostles both from the point of view of language and literature which I must of necessity bypass, but I request of you who would like for me to deal more with some of the literary and linguistic questions to read my book published in 1968 by the Presbyterians again, called Spirit of the Living