

# WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO BE “BORN AGAIN”?

Bernie L. Gillespie © September 7, 2000 All Rights Reserved

---

## Part Six

---

### Does “Water” Mean Literal Water?

Many who urge that Jesus meant literal water in John 3:6, do so because they say they interpret Jesus’ words “literally”. I agree with interpreting the Scriptures literally but we must understand what that means ( Cp [Consistent Literal Interpretation](#) and [“Literal” Interpretation](#),<sup>1)</sup>. The “water = water

baptism” argument goes something like this:

“Jesus would not have said water if he did not mean literal water.” This argument adopts a “literalistic” view of the word “water” and fails to use sound principles for understanding language. The theological result leads its advocates to view the New Birth as a blending of *two* baptisms: one of water and the other of the Spirit. Is the argument, that Jesus meant only *literal* water, a sound one?

"HOW CAN A MAN BE BORN  
WHEN HE IS OLD?"  
NICODEMUS ASKED.  
"SURELY HE CANNOT ENTER  
A SECOND TIME INTO HIS  
MOTHER'S WOMB TO BE  
BORN!" JOHN 3:4 NIV

### Objections to Literal Water

My conclusion is “No” based on several objections to the *literalistic* interpretation of this passage. I call this view *literalistic* because it interprets something that is a figurative (connotative) expression as though it were a literal (denotative) one.

**First**, and most ironically, those who say it is literal water, cannot say it is literally baptism to which Jesus is referring in his use of the word “water,” because the word “baptism” is not present in the text. Therefore, the literalistic view cannot be truly literal, because one cannot literally find the idea of baptism in Jesus’ words in

John chapter three, or elsewhere. All that can be said is that Jesus spoke of water as *either* actual or figurative water. The problem with the actual water view is that Jesus uses the word “water” throughout John’s Gospel mostly in a figurative way. The problem with saying that the word “water” is figurative for the literal water of baptism is that “water” is not used as a figure of speech for “water” in Scripture. That is not how figures of speech work. They are always emblems of something other than themselves. Therefore, if one interprets “water” as literal water, one cannot be absolutely sure that it is baptism, because there is no reference to baptism by Jesus in John 3:1-5. If, on the other hand, the water is figurative of baptism, that is not consistent with the principle for interpreting emblems, because emblems do not symbolize themselves. They always correspond to something abstract or spiritual, rather than something physical.

It must be made clear right here, that the burden of proof is on those who say the word “water” means baptism. Why? Because the word or idea of baptism cannot be found any where in the New Testament connected with the idea or doctrine of the New Birth. One is “born of God”, “born of the Spirit”, “begotten . . . through the Gospel”, “begotten of the word of truth”, and “born again . . . by the word of God,” but not of baptism. Baptism is always spoken of in terms of death and not of life. (Romans 6). Baptism is not mentioned nor implied in any of these passages (my italics added):

John 1:13 children born not of natural descent, nor of human decision or a husband's will, but *born of God*. NIV

John 3:8 . . . So it is with everyone *born of the Spirit*. NIV

1 Corinthians 4:15 Even though you have ten thousand guardians in Christ, you do not have many fathers, for in Christ Jesus *I became your father through the gospel*.

James 1:18 He chose to give us *birth through the word of truth*, that we might be a kind of firstfruits of all he created. NIV

1 Peter 1:23 For you have been *born again*, not of perishable seed, but of imperishable, through the living and enduring word of God. NIV

1 John 2:29 If you know that he is righteous, you know that everyone who does what is right has been *born of him*. NIV

1 John 3:9 No one who is *born of God* will continue to sin, because God's seed remains in him; he cannot go on sinning, because he has been born of God. NIV

1 John 4:7 Dear friends, let us love one another, for love comes from God. Everyone who loves has been *born of God* and knows God. NIV

The **second objection** would be based on the way Jesus used figurative language in his teaching ministry. When we examine the language Jesus used in John's Gospel we see a pattern. Jesus frequently used the word “water” to refer to the work of the Holy Spirit. We might ask those who think Jesus meant literal water: “Was Jesus being “literal” when he said: Whoever eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is real food and my blood is real drink.”? (John 6:54f) Would those arguing for literal water in John 3:5 argue for literal blood and flesh in John six? Not unless they wish to be accused of cannibalism. Did Jesus mean, when he said that he was the “manna from heaven,” that he was a literal loaf of bread? Where this form of literalistic interpretation takes us is obvious. Actually, the real spirit of literalism is not to force the words of Scripture into a wooden denotative mold, but to take the words of Scripture exactly as the authors (thus God) intended them. If the writer intended an expression to be figurative or symbolic then the “literal” interpretation of that expression may be figurative in order to comply with the author's intent. It is the intent of the speaker or of the author that determines the meaning of a text. This is a fundamental principle for reading the Bible.

There is a **third objection** for rejecting the view that Jesus must be speaking literally of water every time he uses the word water. Jesus speaks about water both literally and figuratively in the Book of John. The key to each occurrence is to properly determine the way Jesus speaks in each passage. The mistake would be to assume he is speaking literally when he is really speaking figuratively (and vice versa). We must look at how Jesus used the word “water” throughout the Gospel of John.

In chapter two, verse seven, Jesus speaks of literal water when he turned the water into wine at Cana. In chapter four, he speaks of the literal water from the well and the living waters that he can give her.

Jesus answered her, "If you knew the gift of God and who it is that asks you for a drink, you would have asked him and he would have given you living water." . . . Jesus answered, "Everyone who drinks this water will be thirsty again, but whoever drinks the water I give him will

never thirst. Indeed, the water I give him will become in him a spring of water welling up to eternal life." [John 4: 10,13,14 NIV]

Here Jesus uses the word "water" as an emblem of the Spirit. At Cana and at Samaria it is easy to tell Jesus is not speaking figuratively, because the context makes it clear it is physical water. It is literal water being poured into the water jars. And it is an actual well from which the woman is drawing literal water. But, in instances where there is no immediate referent to literal water, Jesus most likely speaks figuratively, especially when he seeks to convey a spiritual reality such as the work of the Spirit. For instance, at the Feast of Tabernacles convocation he cries out:

Whoever believes in me, as the Scripture has said, streams of living water will flow from within him. [John 7: 38 NIV]

We could use the literalist argument here and say that, when Jesus says water, he means literal water. But is that true? No, that is not even how the advocate of literalism interprets this passage. Jesus is not speaking of a open fire hydrant shooting water out of the believers chest. He is speaking of the life giving work of the Holy Spirit in the believer's heart and life. Since Jesus speaks figuratively of water, throughout the Book of John, to convey great spiritual truth, we must determine if he does so in John 3:5. I propose that the John 3:5 use of the word "water" is emblematic. In this case, the water is a symbol of the Holy Spirit. Everything points in this direction. He is relating an obvious spiritual truth to Nicodemus. The only way Nicodemus can understand or enter the Kingdom of God is by the "begetting of God" through the work of the Holy Spirit. And he mentions the word "Spirit" in conjunction with the word water. The obvious emphasis of Jesus is on the work of the Holy Spirit.

A **fourth objection** would be that, to make water, either a separate birth, or component of the one New Birth, is not a sound interpretation of the Greek grammar used by John. There is only one birth, there is only one source: the Spirit. The phrase *ek hydatos kai pneumatos* - "out of water and Spirit" - should not be rendered "of the water and of the Spirit" as though there were two births. The preposition *ek* (of, out of) applies to both the water and Spirit as though they are one element (hendiadys) and not two. Also, the word *ek* refers to source rather than means.<sup>2</sup> That is, the "of" in, "of the water and Spirit," expresses that the "water and Spirit" are the source of the "birth" and not the means. This corresponds best with Jesus' statement that Nicodemus must be born "from above." The birth is from God, or out of the Spirit. The "birth" is not simply something done with the Spirit as if it were the instrument.

The Spirit is the actual source. This agrees with all the rest of the New Testament. God sends a seed of new life and implants it in the sinner who is already dead in sins. This seed, God’s Spirit, produces (gives birth to) His divine life within the sinner in order to regenerate him. This is what enables the sinner to “see” and to “enter” the Kingdom of God, whereas before he or she could not by their own ability.

Grammatically, it is proper to interpret the phrase of John 3:5 as, “born of the water, even the Spirit”.

The word water is used symbolically in John 3:5, either (1) of the Word of God, as in 1 Pet. 1:23 (cp. The symbolic use in Eph. 5:26), or, in view of the preposition *ek*, out of, 2) of the truth conveyed by baptism, this being the expression not the medium, the symbol, not the cause, of the believer’s identification with Christ in His Death, Burial and Resurrection. So the new birth is, in one sense, the setting aside of all that the believer was according to the flesh, for it is evident that there must be an entirely new beginning. Some regard the *kai* ‘and’ in John 3:5, as epexegetic [explanational use of *kai*] – ‘even,’ in which case the water would be emblematic of the Spirit, as in John 7:38.<sup>3</sup>

The *kai* in verse 5, then, is an instance of the ascensive use of the conjunction, and the verse should be translated, “Unless a man is born of water, even the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.”<sup>4</sup>

One of the leading Greek language resources today makes this comment to aid Bible translators in managing the subtle nuances of the language found in John 3:5:

Generally speaking a preposition tends to be repeated before a series of nouns joined by *kai* more frequently in biblical Greek than in non-biblical Greek. Sometimes, therefore, the non-use of a second or third preposition in NT Greek may be theologically significant, indicating that the writer regarded the terms that he placed in one regimen as belonging naturally together or as a unit in concept or reality. *Ex hydatos kai pneumatos* (Jn. 3:5) shows that for the writer (or speaker) “water” and “Spirit” together form a single means of that regeneration which is prerequisite for entrance into the kingdom of God (= birth *anōthen*, Jn. 3:3, 7). No contrast is intended between an external element of “water” and inward renewal achieved by the Spirit. Conceptually the two are one.<sup>5</sup>

A good key for how to interpret this phrase, “water and Spirit,” is given to us by the writer of the Book of John himself. In John 7:38, 39 we read his gloss:

Whoever believes in me, as the Scripture has said, streams of living water will flow from within him." By **this he meant the Spirit**, whom those who believed in him were later to receive. Up to that time the Spirit had not been given, since Jesus had not yet been glorified. (NIV [bold mine])

John makes an editorial comment on the words of Jesus and states that the "streams of living water," which "will flow from within" the believer, is "the Spirit". This helps us to make sense of what Jesus means when he says "of the water and Spirit." He means "of the water, even the Spirit." And as we have seen, it is very natural to translate *kai* as "even". We even see *kai* translated this way all through the New Testament. In each of the following verses it is plainly understood that "and" (*ka*) does not mean that "God" and "Father" are two different things, but in fact one and the same:

Romans 15:6 so that with one heart and mouth you may glorify the God and [kai] Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. NIV

2 Corinthians 1:3 Praise be to the God and [kai] Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of compassion and the God of all comfort, NIV

Galatians 1:4 who gave himself for our sins to rescue us from the present evil age, according to the will of our God and [kai] Father, NIV

Theologically, and doctrinally, we know that the Father is God. In light of this, it is not inconsistent to translate "God and Father" as "God, even the Father. In the same way we can render "born of the water and Spirit" as "born of the water, even the Spirit." It makes the best grammatical, contextual, exegetical, theological, and doctrinal sense.

All the above points and objections are not perfect nor the only proof that Jesus meant water figuratively. It does, however, best fit all the possible understandings. Since this is the only place in the entire Bible where we find the phrase, "born again of water and Spirit," we must take care not to force a conclusion short of considering all of the good evidence: 1) Jesus used figurative language; 2) He used water as a symbol of the Spirit throughout the Book of John; 3) Judicious scholarship interprets water as figurative or emblematic; 4) Proper translation of the Greek language favors the symbolic interpretation; 5) Sound, theological reasoning - the general sense and the message of the whole Bible - predisposes one to accept water as a symbol of the Spirit; 6) The vast majority of Protestants of the great

majority of denominations historically interpret “water” to be symbolic of the work of the Spirit.

In determining the doctrinal teaching of Christ, one should not unreasonably press their personal or traditional interpretation of John 3:3,5 – especially, when it is determinative of one’s very doctrine of salvation. If one teaches that the word “water” means baptism because baptism is already assumed as part of salvation, then one’s motives are suspect at that point. And the integrity of accompanying exegesis comes into question, as well. For most of my life, I have interpreted and preached that the “water” of John 3:5 refers to water baptism. This conviction was held firmly in my faith for over thirty years. But, Scripture changed my mind. I had to change my teaching because it did not harmonize with what Scripture taught about the Gospel. I was led to see that sound Biblical interpretation does not build an entire system upon the questionable interpretation of a single verse. The doctrine of the New Birth must be established on the entire body of teaching found in sacred Scripture.

### Use of “Water” in the Gospel of John

Looking at the context of the Gospel of John we can discern a pattern that will help us to better understand Jesus’ use of the word “water.” Throughout the Book of John, water is used to represent many different things. John uses the word “water” to refer to the water baptism of John the Baptizer. But, in that instance there is a contrast between the water of John’s baptism to the baptism of fire to come through Jesus. In chapter two, Jesus’ first miracle of changing water into wine symbolizes the old kingdom (water) being replaced with the miracle of the new age of the kingdom (new wine) inaugurated by Jesus. When Jesus encountered the woman at the well in chapter four, water is used as a symbol of eternal life.

But whoever drinks the water I give him will never thirst. Indeed, the water I give him will become in him a spring of water welling up to eternal life. (John 4:14, NIV)

Baptism obviously cannot be in Jesus’ mind here. In this case, the eternal life is “given” to the woman to “drink” and it was to be “a spring of water welling up into eternal life.” It makes the most sense to understand this as the work of the Holy

Spirit in the human heart. This would be consistent with the message of Jesus to Nicodemus.

Nicodemus was an eminent representative of orthodox Judaism. Now John records an interview Jesus has with one who stood for a class which was wholeheartedly despised by orthodox Judaism. . . .In the former incident Jesus spoke of the importance of the new birth. Here His theme is the living water which He came to bring to men. The terminology is different, but the basic message is the same.<sup>6</sup>

Notice that when Jesus gave her this promise, Leaving her water jar, the woman went back to the town and said to the people, "Come, see a man who told me everything I ever did. Could this be the Christ? (John 4:48f). Her heart was opened by the Spirit to the truth of who Jesus was. She left her physical water because she now had drunk of the spiritual water of Christ. She left literal water for the spiritual water which it symbolized. This proves to be a difficult fact for those with a literalistic interpretation of "water."

In the next chapter, an invalid man cannot get into the water which, the local legend claims, is stirred by an angel to affect a miraculous cure. Jesus does not offer him that water. He gives him healing separate from the water of the pool. Thus, Jesus preempted the pool to attract faith to himself. In this instance, water corresponds to a myth rather than the divine gift of new birth. The man was healed or "saved" by the direct work of the Holy Spirit, and not by literal water.

In the next scene, Jesus cries out to the multitude and speaks of, "the work of the Spirit in the believer as "streams of living water." Whoever believes in me, as the Scripture has said, streams of living water will flow from within him. (John 7:38 NIV) This cannot be the waters of baptism, but is the same spiritual thirst-assuaging waters offered by Jesus to the woman at the well. If one were to accept the general symbolic referent for "water" throughout the Book of John, then one must conclude that "water" represents the life-restoring gift of God's Spirit given to the sinner by Christ.

In Jn 7:38f. The living water that flows from within the believer is explained in terms of the Holy Spirit. Something similar is required here. Jesus is speaking of the new life that He will give, a life connected with the activity of the Spirit.<sup>7</sup>

Resorting to many outside proofs to identify the “water and Spirit” of Jn. 3:5 with water-baptism and Spirit-baptism totally ignores the very passage from which it comes. Jesus speaks to Nicodemus in figurative language about spiritual realities. To be born again is to NOT be born of the flesh (physical or humanity), because flesh (physical or that which is of humanity) can only produce flesh (physical or that which of humanity). Only Spirit (non-corporeal or that which is of God) can produce Spirit (non-corporeal or that which is of God). I believe Jesus means that only the Spirit of God can produce New Birth. If one is to see or enter the kingdom, God’s Spirit must effect the transformation necessary and not human nature. The fallen condition of the human heart is so severe or extreme that nothing short of divine intervention - resurrection - will remedy it. The Bible states emphatically that we are all “dead in sins.” The heart is deceitfully wicked. All our righteousness is as an unclean thing (Hebrew word here is a menstrual rag). The mind of Man is darkness. He loves evil. And his will is bent to oppose God at every turn. There is nothing in sinful man which can effect a New Birth. It must come from “above.” It must be the work of God’s Spirit.

New birth is not water baptism, it is not Spirit baptism, it is not repentance, it is not faith! It is God’s gift of new life, planted in the human soul, and given from His merciful heart to invigorate our sin-hardened, stone-dead hearts. New Birth is God’s gracious act of spiritual enablement, rendering us capable to know, believe, and love Him. The work of the Spirit empowers us to obey the greatest commandment: love the LORD our God with all our hearts, all our minds (to understand and know Him), all our soul (our wills to choose to obey Him), and all our strength (in all our behavior). It is God raising us up from spiritual death, to a new life in which we have a new relationship with Him.

W. E. Best<sup>8</sup> helps us see the difference between regeneration and baptism though this comparison chart below:

Regeneration		Baptism	
1.	Regeneration is by the Holy Spirit	1.	Baptism administered by human agency
2.	Regeneration is instantaneous operation of God	2.	Baptism must wait for baptizer and water
3.	Regeneration changes the nature of the heart	3.	Baptism external manifestation of change
4.	Regeneration is the gift of life	4.	Baptism act of obedience of that life
5.	Regeneration enables recipient to put away the flesh	5.	Baptism does not put away flesh

No where in the Scripture is baptism spoken of in terms of birth. Baptism does not function to give spiritual birth. It functions as the burial of the spiritually dead (Romans 6). It is the resurrection which functions to give life. Baptism is a burial of the dead, not the production of the living. It is always a symbol of death - to the world, the flesh and the Devil. We are not born through baptism, because baptism is our identification with Christ's death on the Cross. Baptism is where we count ourselves as dead with Christ. By contrast, regeneration is not represented by symbols of death, but always of metaphors of life.

So, what did Jesus intend by the word “water”? I would assert that he is using metaphoric or emblematic language to graphically convey truths too big for mere human words. This is a common pattern throughout the Gospels. Jesus used water as an emblem because the Divine impartation of regenerating life, to change the heart of a sinner, is a much grander truth than human words can fully convey. Jesus took a common element used for cleansing and life sustenance to portray the nature of the work of the Holy Spirit.

## Summary: Water Refers to the Work of the Spirit

In light of what has been said, both the two-births and two-components theories have to be seriously questioned. It is more consistent to interpret Jesus' use of water simply as another way to speak of the work of the Holy Spirit. There is precedence for this. The Bible speaks of the work of the Spirit as refreshing, life-giving waters in many places:

"The poor and needy search for water, but there is none; their tongues are parched with thirst. But I the LORD will answer them; I, the God of Israel, will not forsake them. I will make rivers flow on barren heights, and springs within the valleys. I will turn the desert into pools of water, and the parched ground into springs." (Isaiah 41:17f NIV)

With joy you will draw water from the wells of salvation. (Isaiah 12:3)

"Come, all you who are thirsty, come to the waters; and you who have no money, come, buy and eat! Come, buy wine and milk without money and without cost." (Isaiah 55:1 NIV)

They feast on the abundance of your house; you give them drink from your river of delights. (Psalm 36:8 NIV)

There is a river whose streams make glad the city of God, the holy place where the Most High dwells. (Psalm 46:4 NIV)

The Spirit and the bride say, "Come!" And let him who hears say, "Come!" Whoever is thirsty, let him come; and whoever wishes, let him take the free gift of the water of life. (Revelation 22:17 NIV)

In others passages, it speaks of water representing the Spirit as a cleansing agent. For example, Ezekiel the prophet prophesied these words very familiar to Jesus and Nicodemus:

For I will take you out of the nations; I will gather you from all the countries and bring you back into your own land. I will sprinkle clean water on you, and you will be clean; I will cleanse you from all your impurities and from all your idols. I will give you a new heart and put a new spirit in you; I will remove from you your heart of stone and give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit in you and move you to follow my decrees and be careful to keep my laws. (Eze.36:24-27 NIV)

A recent, highly respected scholarly examination of the meaning of the phrase “water and Spirit” strongly supports the figurative view of “water.”

This position has much to commend it. The association of *hw* and *pneuma* in the OT as symbols of cleansing and renewal is frequent. There is also a particular emphasis in Judaism on the Spirit and his eschatological function regarding an inner change of heart. . . . rabbinic writings show that the ideas of purification and creation by God’s Spirit were active in Jesus’ time.<sup>9</sup>

The figurative interpretation reaches back to Ezekiel’s prophecy (36:25-27) where God promised to cleanse the people by sprinkling them with clean water and giving them a new heart and a new spirit. It is a “reference to the dual work of the Spirit (3:6) who simultaneously purifies and imparts God’s nature to man.”<sup>10</sup> Thus, the birth is one, and the elements represent the dual work of the one Holy Spirit.

The “water,” “new spirit” and “new heart” can be seen to correspond to Jesus’ message of new birth by water and Spirit. Notice that all three are the work of the Spirit, both in the prophets foretelling and in the promise of Jesus. The straightforward interpretation, in which the Spirit acts as cleansing and renewing, should be preferred over the more complicated interpretation of two elements as referring to two-births or two baptisms. This would be a more Biblically consistent way to understand Jesus’ use of the word water: as a symbol for the cleansing, life-giving Spirit of God. “In view of the overall context, it appears that being born of water is synonymous with being born of the Spirit.”<sup>11</sup>

I acknowledge that a number of Christian traditions, many early Church fathers, and various past and present Bible commentators find allusions to baptism in the word “water.” These cannot be rejected out of hand. I am willing to submit to the wisdom and knowledge of those much more capable than myself. My problem in challenging the water-as-water-baptism view is not with the importance and necessity of baptism. No student of the Bible could be justified in slighting the commands to be baptized by Christ and the Apostles. My problem is with the misinterpretations of the nature of baptism which require one to place faith in baptism and only in the Gospel as *a part* of the “salvation experience”. To identify water baptism either with Regeneration or the New Birth is a serious theological, doctrinal error. This error will invariably have serious implications for one’s faith in the work of Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit.

What principally concerns this writer is that some, in order to buttress unsound doctrines of salvation, attempt to make literal water, the instrumental agent of cleansing, when in fact, the Bible points to the Spirit of God as the agent of cleansing, and faith as the instrumental means. The Spirit of God alone, without any human agency or religious action, effects the cleansing of the New Birth. This is consistent with the essence of Jesus’ teaching to Nicodemus. To insert the notion that Jesus was saying to Nicodemus he could not be regenerate until he submitted to a rite of baptism, seems to be nothing more than a forced, contrived, interpretive leap in support of one’s cherished presumptions. Certainly, Nicodemus did not understand what Jesus said as referring to baptism because he makes no comment to that effect. Nor is there the slightest hint of such a belief or teaching in the remainder of John’s Gospel. It seems reasonable to think that Nicodemus would have naturally reacted by saying, “I have kept all the ordinances of washing under Moses, so why do I need to be baptized to enter the Kingdom of God?” This he did not say or even vaguely imply. We must take great care neither to place words in his mouth nor require of him and others what Jesus did not require.

---

Next Part: **Does “Birth of the Spirit” Mean “Spirit Baptism”?**

#### ENDNOTES

1. Thomas Ice, “Consistent Literal Interpretation,” Online, Accessed:11 May 2001 Available at: <http://www.raptureme.com/tt6.html>; “Literal’ Interpretation,” Online, Accessed:11 May 2001 Available at: <http://www.valleybible.net/resources/AdultEducationClasses/BibleInterpretation/interpretation.literal.shtml>
2. Dana & Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, p. 102-3.
3. W. E. Vine, *An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words*, (New Jersey: Fleming H. Revel Company, 1966), Vol. 4, pp. 201-2..
4. Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985), p. 1098.
5. *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, Colin Brown ed., (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979), p. 1178.

6. Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1971), p.254.
7. Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1971), p.260.
8. W. E. Best, *The Born-Again Phenomenon*, p. 37f.
9. Linda Belleville, “Born of the Water and Spirit:” John 3:5, *Trinity Journal*, 1 NS (1980) pp. 125-141.
10. D. A. Carson, *Exegetical Fallacies*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book, 1996) p. 42.
11. Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985), p. 1098.