

not one of the commands, for a command from God must be obeyed.

The next question asked refers to Jacob's vow, and our brother asks: "Was Jacob's vow a part of the law?" I answer no, which will answer also the next question, because Jacob did not make an offering of any kind at the time. And then our brother refers to Num. vi: 13, 21, showing us the nature of the offerings in connection with a Nazarite vow, and then states, "These Paul must offer to the Lord in teaching the Nazarite vow." In answer I will say that offerings of that kind did not begin (as our brother is aware), with the law of Moses, for by reading Gen. iv: 4, we learn that Abel offered a similar offering; and we could refer to other places before Moses' law came in force. But it was the offerings for the sin of the whole nation, (if I understand aright), that began with Moses and ended at the death of Christ, which was well understood before Christ died, for by turning to John i: 29 we read, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." But at the same time it seems that there was no clear conception of the abolishing of other offerings that began before Moses and which had been blended with Moses' law, if we may judge from Paul's actions.

Our brother next states that the vow I referred to in Acts xviii: 18, "Some eminent commentators claim that for Aquila," even allowing it as the eminent commentators claim, that same Aquila was well acquainted with the new order of things, for we read in Acts xviii: 25-26, that he instructed a man "mighty in the scriptures," "and expounded unto him the way of the Lord more perfectly." So that in taking the vow he must have made a mistake too, allowing that God had revealed that all kinds of vows were abolished.

Our brother next asks, "Will he affirm it was part of the law. If so we demand the proof and ask him as a favor to tell us the nature of the vow taken at Cenchrea."

I will say, if we may judge from circumstances, I think we may infer it was a Nazarite vow, because we read of no other vow that required the head to be shorn, if so, then it was one of the customs of the law of Moses. Our brother asks, "What does he mean by the law of Moses proper?" I answer, I mean by the law of Moses proper, all those laws that were given to the Israelites, that were not given, or not in use before Moses' administration; for there were many things in use before Moses' time, that were blended with the law of Moses, such, for instance, blood for blood, offering of sacrifice, taking of vows, and circumcision, and those laws that plainly prefigured the Christ, were taken away at His death, and others, (Judging by how the administrators of the New Covenant carried it out) were for awhile retained among the Jewish Christians and Jewish Christians alone, until God gave to the Apostles a revelation to the contrary, or until God had scattered the Jewish priesthood by the overthrow of their worship and the destruction of their Temple. And as for Paul claiming to be perfect, or rather, I claiming it for him because I made use of some of his last words, was not my meaning, for he claimed to be chief of sinners, but when I make use of an Apostle's words, when he was near the close of life, where he states, he had "kept the faith," we are in duty bound to receive it, or else we have room to doubt other things he has done or said, which would be a sad state of things indeed. Yours, W. M.

Everywhere a Christian should be a positive power, so that wherever he carries himself, he will carry the power of Christianity.

BAPTISM OF HOLY SPIRIT

NUMBER II.

I find by reading the April number of THE CHRISTIAN, that I have overlooked an important reason why the baptism of the spirit cannot mean a literal immersion, viz., "there was present on that occasion neither the *literal* element in which to baptise them, nor the *personal* administrator to do it."

Let us try to get this argument into the form of a syllogism, and see how it looks.

A literal immersion in the spirit requires water, and a person to immerse the subject in it.

On Pentecost there was neither water nor such person. Therefore no immersion in the spirit did, or could take place on Pentecost.

But why waste time on ordinary reasons, when we have such overwhelming ones as those given in the last CHRISTIAN. We are told that the spirit is not a *literal* element, and that Jesus was not *personally* present on Pentecost.

By the way, I am called to witness to those two facts. It is well to get credit for intelligence, but I must decline the honor, as I do not know that the Holy Spirit is not a *literal* element, nor that Jesus was not personally present on Pentecost. The reader's of THE CHRISTIAN will be ready to enquire, "is Stewart also among the prophets?" I answer no.

The mystical method of interpretation, so common among the advocates of sprinkling and pouring, is founded on two assumptions. First they assume that a certain word ought to be understood in a figurative sense, and secondly that the figurative use of a word changes its meaning. It is quite natural that those who have no Scripture authority for their practice should use that method. But I never expected that it would fall to my lot to oppose it in one of our own papers. For the benefit of our young and inexperienced readers, I would say, that the figurative use of a word never changes its meaning.

By referring to the writings of Brother Campbell, I did not mean to find fault with those who differ from his conclusions. But I venture to say, that any person who undertakes to overturn his reasons, will require something more solid than figures, shadows, and loose assertions. However, I give credit to any person who tries to advance new ideas. Bro. Stevenson's letter, for instance, has called out two excellent articles from Bro. Ford and W. M., and that of Bro. H. Murray, "Be sure you are right," has the ring of true metal. Let those who have advanced thoughts speak out, but let them not expect to screen themselves behind a private correspondence.

ROBERT STEWART.

Lot 48 P. E. Island.

On the above my remarks will be brief.

Bro. Stewart constructs a syllogism with a false major premiss and seems to be amused with its false conclusion. Well! what of it? It was he who said, "A literal immersion in the Holy Spirit requires water." I said nothing of the kind. So the syllogism is entirely his own. Again he declines the honor I gave him for intelligence and says, "I do not know that the Holy Spirit is not a *literal* element nor that Jesus was not *personally* present (at Jerusalem) on Pentecost." Well! I really thought he did know "those two facts" but as I was mistaken, I must be more careful in the future.

He asks, "Who ever heard of figurative elements before?" Sure enough, who ever did? I said, "If the Holy Spirit is called an element it must be in figurative language." We find him so called in John vii: 28-29 and elsewhere.

What he says of Bro. Campbell and of any person who undertakes to overturn his reasons he

is quite safe in saying. His remarks, too, of those who have advanced thoughts and the courage necessary to speak them out are true and sound.

Since writing the above a new piece commencing with "The Mystical Method, &c.," came from Bro. Stewart containing the following:—"For the benefit of our young and inexperienced readers I would say that the figurative use of a word never changes its meaning."

My respect for Bro. Stewart makes it painful to see such things from his pen in THE CHRISTIAN but as he is urgent to have them inserted it is thought best to let them go forth. *The figurative use of a word never changes its meaning!* which is about the same as saying "Be sure when you see a figure that it is a reality and not a figure."

If what he says is so, then Jesus meant the very flesh which was torn by the nails that fastened Him to the cross and the very blood that followed the soldier's spear, when he said, "Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man and drink His blood ye have no life in you."—John vi: 53. And when the Lord called them gods, to whom the word of God came (John x: 34-35) the figurative use of the word god did not change its meaning, hence Israel with divine approval had "gods many." Webster says, "words are used *figuratively* when they express something *different* from their usual meaning." So the reader must be very young that will accept Bro. Stewart's *Ipsi dixit*.

The opposition to my articles on the baptism of the Holy Spirit reminds me much of Luther's argument for the "presence" in the Eucharist. When he met Zwingli in the Hall near Marburgh, in presence of a large company of nobles and theologians he wrote with chalk in large letters in Latin, "THIS IS MY BODY." All arguments that were brought against Luther showing that Jesus used figurative language and had said the flesh profiteth nothing—that his real body was not eaten but ascended up where he was before, &c., &c. All was met with Jesus' words, "This is my body." In the present case it has been shown that Jesus used a figurative word when he said, "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit. Although he had frequently promised that gift to the apostles, he never used *baptized* but once and that when speaking of John's baptism. That the inspired historians never said they were baptized but always described it as different from baptism. That nothing is said of burying them in the Holy Spirit and raising them out of it, which is the true meaning of New Testament baptism. All is met by, "But Jesus said they would be *baptized*."

When Luke and Peter tells us what happened to the apostles and the first Gentile converts they either did or did not tell the truth and the whole truth. They are the inspired historians. When we tell what was done we act as historians not as prophets. When we are satisfied to give the same history they gave the matter is settled. I have no doubt this will be plainly seen in the not very distant future. D. C.

DEATHS.

McLAUGHLIN.—At Lord's Cove, April 28th, 1885. Mr. Thomas McLaughlin, aged 84 years.

The deceased came to this Island in early life, and, although not rich on his arrival, he possessed a good constitution and the will to work. Through industry and care he not only succeeded in providing for a large family, but also in gathering together considerable property—real and personal, all of which he leaves on passing the line which separates time from eternity.

Whether our days be many or few, may they be given to God.

Cook.—May 5th, 1885. Mrs. Ella Cook, beloved wife of Mr. Edgar Cook, after a short illness passed from life and earthly hopes; to that which is, to us, now unseen. Mrs. C. was aged only 18 years, died in the first year of her married life; her earthly