

# The Christian.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,

By Barnes & Co., under the auspices of the Home Mission Board of the Disciples of Christ of the Maritime Provinces.

TERMS: - 50 Cents Per Annum in Advance.

All questions and communications, business or otherwise, intended for publication, to be addressed:

"THE CHRISTIAN,"

P. O. Box 53,

St. John, N. B.

EDITOR:

DONALD CRAWFORD, - - - NEW GLASGOW, P. E. I.

CO-EDITOR:

T. H. CAPP, - - - - - St. John, N. B.

SAINT JOHN, N. B., DECEMBER, 1884.

## NOTICE!

THE MANAGERS of the paper have decided to send THE CHRISTIAN to each subscriber until an explicit order is received by the Publishers for its discontinuance. And should any one miss getting his paper, write at once, and the cause will be investigated. And, if our correspondents fail to see their articles in a certain issue, let them not be discouraged, but consider that, perhaps, for some good reason, they have been set aside for another No.

Before the Jan. issue of our paper, the festivities of the year will have commenced, so we take this opportunity of WISHING YOU ALL THE COMPLIMENTS OF THE SEASON.

## EDITORIAL.

### BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

The baptism of the Holy Spirit is an expression in frequent use by those who hold views widely differing as to its meaning. One man claims to have that baptism, and makes much account of it as an assurance of Divine acceptance, and also a sufficient reason for rejecting water baptism, although the Saviour Himself submitted to it, and positively enjoined it upon all of His disciples.

Another contends that the apostles were literally baptized with the Holy Spirit, and makes that baptism a model of water baptism. He says: "The baptism of the Holy Spirit was pouring, and so is the baptism of water; that pouring is the meaning of baptism, whether it be of water or Spirit. Were this so, all that could be gained from it is that the Holy Spirit was baptized, for pouring out is a predicate of the Spirit and not of the apostles. The Spirit was poured out, the apostles were not poured out. If, therefore, pouring out and baptizing are the same, it follows, inevitably, that it was the Holy Spirit and not the apostles that was baptized."

Another contends that the apostles were literally baptized in the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, in fulfillment of the Saviour's promise, in Acts i. 5. "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence;" by which promise He endorsed and confirmed the prophecy of John in Mark i. 8.

If these different parties would stop and thoughtfully consider the following questions it might prove to them immensely beneficial: 1st. Did any of the New Testament historians say that the apostles or any others were baptized with the Holy Spirit? They, assuredly, did not. 2nd. Do we know anything which happened to the apostles

which these historians did not record? Perhaps no one will affirm that we do. 3rd. Did Luke record the fulfilment of the Saviour's promise to the apostles without using baptism or its equivalent? He did. In Acts ii. 1, 2, 3, Luke tells the fulfilment of what Jesus promised the apostles in Acts i. 5, without the use of any word that means baptism.

We now ask: Have we a right to give a different record of the transactions of Pentecost from Luke? Should a thousand voices answer at once: "We have a right to say the apostles were baptized with the Holy Ghost on Pentecost, for the Saviour said they would be so baptized, and it was fulfilled on that day, it would not answer our question. Have we a right to give a different record from the inspired record of Luke of the events of Pentecost? This, surely, is not an unreasonable question to press, especially on those who wish to speak where the Bible speaks, and to be silent where it is silent, and to such we appeal with affectionate earnestness.

Can we see why John and Christ used "baptize" when describing what would happen the apostles at Pentecost and Luke did not when recording it? The reason seems very plain. They predicted that event, and used figurative language, the language of prophecy, but Luke recorded that event, and used literal language, the language of history. A plain history of events must be in literal language. Sometimes Christ used figurative language in predicting future events at other times. He did it plainly in literal words, e. g. He spoke FIGURATIVELY when engaged about things plain and visible, whose literal terms He borrowed to figuratively describe the future and unseen.

#### EXAMPLE.

Whosoever drinketh (*literal*) of this water (*literal*) shall thirst again; But whosoever drinketh (*figurative*) of the water (*figurative*) that I shall give; (John iv. 14) Labor not for the meat (*literal*) that perishes; But for that meat (*figurative*) which endureth unto, etc., etc.; Except ye eat (*figurative*) the flesh (*figurative*) of the Son of Man and drink (*figurative*) His blood (*figurative*) ye have no life in you; (John vi. 27: 53.) John truly baptized (*literal*) with water, but ye shall be baptized (*figurative*) with the Holy Ghost; (Acts i. 5.)

Christ spoke LITERALLY in predicting future events, where no other subject is used in contrast, and no literal terms are borrowed.

#### EXAMPLE.

Verily, I say unto you, one of you shall betray me; (John xiii. 21.) Even this night, before the cock crows, thou shalt deny me there; (Mark xiv. 30.) For He (the Son of Man) shall be delivered unto the Gentiles, and shall be mocked and spitefully entreated and spitted on, and they shall scourge Him and put Him to death, and the third day He shall rise again; (Luke xviii. 32)

When the Saviour, weary and faint, with journeying under Samaria's scorching sun, sat on Jacob's well, and asked a drink from the woman who came to draw water, a conversation ensued about drinking that water. Jesus used the terms *drink* and *water* to describe the receiving of His *salvation*, and spoke of its blessed consequence. In like manner He spoke to the men who had eaten of the loaves which He had so blest and multiplied as to feed and fill them by the thousand, and borrows the term *sat* to figuratively describe the reception of His own Word which will eternally feed and satisfy every one that comes unto Him. Few will deny that Jesus used these words figuratively. To us it appears equally evident that John, when baptizing in water and addressing those whom he had just baptized, on the greater work of Jesus, spoke figuratively, when saying, He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, as well as the Saviour, when making that refer to the time when the apostles would be miraculously filled with the Holy Spirit.

There can be no doubt that the predictions of Jesus, both figurative and literal, were fulfilled and recorded in the New Testament. What He said of eating His flesh and drinking His blood, of drinking of the water which we would give, etc., as well as

of the apostles' baptism with the Holy Spirit were all fulfilled, and stand on record as a part of inspired history. And here we call attention to two facts very important to our present investigation:

1st. The things which Jesus predicted in *literal* language are recorded in the very language which He used, because literal language is the language of history. The historians say, "Judas did *betray* Him, Peter did *deny* Him. He was delivered unto the Gentiles, and mocked and spitefully entreated, and spitted on. And they scourged Him and put Him to death, and the third day He did rise again. The very words Jesus used to foretell these things the historians used to record them. And had Jesus used as a literal word, Ye shall be *baptized* with the Holy Spirit; Luke would as literally say, They were *baptized* with the Holy Spirit, there being no reason for his using different language.

2nd. The things which Jesus predicted in *figurative* language the historians record but not in the same language for the reason already stated. What He said of eating His flesh and drinking His blood, of drinking of the water of life, was fulfilled in the thousands converted at Pentecost, in the salvation of the believing Samaritans, and that of Saul and the jailor and his house, of the Corinthians, the Thessalonians, etc. But, inspired history, while it faithfully records all, says nothing about eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of Man, because it is not historical language. Nor does Luke in recording the event of Pentecost use the language Jesus employed when predicting it. \* \* \* We have given a good deal of attention to this subject, and the more we study it the deeper is our conviction that baptize is not a proper word to literally describe the gift the apostles received at Pentecost. Among the reasons for this conclusion are the following:

1st. Although Jesus often promised the apostles the gifts of the Holy Spirit, both ordinary and miraculous, He never used baptize but once; and that once when contrasting these gifts with John's baptism.

2nd. When Luke tells us all we know about what was done to the apostles on that day he neither says they were baptized or had anything done to them resembling baptism.

3rd. There was present on that occasion neither the literal element in which to baptize them nor the personal Administrator to do it. How, then, could they be literally baptized?

With these convictions we regard it as a mistake to say that the apostles or others were baptized with or in the Holy Spirit, and a mistake of injurious consequences, leading to evils neither few or small. But we leave its further consideration for a future article. In the meantime we submit our honest convictions to the thoughtful consideration of our readers, asking them to defer judgment until they test them with the Word of God. When we are through we will be most happy to hear and spread before our readers criticisms adverse or otherwise, provided they are in a Christian spirit and not too long for the size of THE CHRISTIAN. Such criticisms should be addressed to the Editor with the writer's name. As none can be saved or fitted for Heaven without the Holy Spirit we should speak of Him as the oracles of God speak, for we are treading on holy ground. D. C.

The brethren in Boston have changed their place of meeting from Horticultural Hall, on Tremont street, to Wesleyan Hall, No. 36 Bromfield street. Their services are every Lord's day, at 3 p. m.

The following, which we clip from one of our morning papers, will be read with a feeling of sadness by many of our readers, as they call to memory the earnest efforts and stirring appeals of D. Banks