

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 22.—OCTOBER, 1892.

I. THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

THEY to whom the Bible is a sufficient rule of faith have this great question happily settled for themselves. For in the gospel, life and immortality are clearly brought to light. The doctrine is expressly asserted in a multitude of places, and is necessarily implied in the whole moral system which the Bible teaches. But unfortunately there are now many who hold the word of God as not authority. Christendom is infested with schools of evolution and materialism, which attempt to bring this great truth in doubt by their "philosophy, falsely so-called," and which mislead many unstable souls to their own undoing.

To such as will not look at the clear light of Scripture, we propose to offer the inferior light of the natural reason. The sun is immeasurably better than a torch, but a torch may yet save the man who has turned his back on the sun and plunged himself into darkness, from stumbling over a precipice into an unseen gulf. We claim that we are entitled to demand the attention of all such doubters to the rational argument; for as they have set up philosophy against the Bible, mere honesty requires them to listen to philosophy, the true philosophy, namely:

There is certainly probable force in the historical fact that most civilized men of all ages and countries have believed in the immortality of their souls, without the Bible. Even the American Indians have always believed in the Great Spirit, and expected a future existence in the happy hunting grounds. The

V. THE PENTECOSTAL BAPTISM.

WE venture to say that comparatively few persons have any clearly defined ideas of the Pentecostal baptism; and the views of these few differ widely. We propose in this paper a scriptural study of the subject.

Its importance none will gainsay. The administrator of this baptism is unquestionably the glorified Jesus; nor will it be disputed that John predicted of him that he should baptize. With water it is expressly said that Jesus baptized not, though his disciples did. As a baptizer, John contrasted himself with Jesus. He humbled himself as one who baptized with water only, while of Jesus he said that he was greater than himself, inasmuch as he should baptize with the Holy Ghost. That he so baptized for the first time on the day of Pentecost is surely indisputable. On the eve of our Lord's ascension, he said to his disciples: "Behold I send the promise of my Father upon you; but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high." (Luke xxiv. 49.) This promise of the Father, Peter declares to be the Holy Ghost first given at Pentecost: "Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." (Acts ii. 33.) This promise of the Holy Ghost, Jesus himself identified with the baptism with the Holy Ghost: "Being assembled together with them, he commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which saith he, ye have heard of me; for John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." (Acts i. 4-5.) When Peter rehearsed the case of Cornelius, he said: "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." (Acts xi. 15, 16.) It is clear that the predicted baptism with the Holy

Ghost was first fulfilled on Pentecost. But why should we be so painstaking to prove from the Scriptures that which no one will deny? It will appear in the sequel that there is abundant reason for the emphasis.

The fact being established, we proceed to inquire as to its significance. What is baptism with the Holy Ghost? Here Christians part company. It is to be remarked, too, that their paths of divergence are not coincident with denominational lines. It may possibly be that our reading has not been very extensive, but it seems that the nature of this baptism is a field of speculation not yet staked off by formulated creeds. Here and there, parties from every ecclesiastical state and territory have claimed to find rich pockets of gold and auriferous strata. Theories are eagerly advanced, earnestly advocated and ardently embraced; but yet it seems to the writer that none of these theories have been subjected to close scriptural tests.

The theory most popular now, especially in Y. M. C. A. circles, is that of which Mr. Moody may be regarded as the honored champion. Mr. Moody is a devout Bible student, as everybody knows, and therefore his opinions justly have weight. His theory, if we may designate it his, is that the baptism with the Spirit *endues the Christian with power for service*. Christians are exhorted to pray for this baptism—a pentecostal baptism with power. Some Christians, therefore, are said to have it, while many others have it not.

Scriptural support for this “power-for-service” or “endowment-with-power” theory is sought in the words already quoted from Luke’s gospel: “Tarry ye . . . until ye be endued with power from on high.” Also in Acts i. 8: “Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you.” Also the citation from Joel: “I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy,” etc. Countenance for this theory is sought also in the statement that tongues of fire sat upon each of them, when they were filled with the Holy Ghost; which tongues of fire are held to be symbols of consuming zeal. But is it a fact that tongues of fire sat upon each of them? The text says: “Cloven tongues like as of fire,” or luminous tongues. The

correctness of the interpretation that Pentecost fulfilled not only the baptism with the Spirit, but also the baptism with fire is here assumed. But is it so absolutely certain that this was the baptism with fire predicted by John? Such an interpretation reduces the baptism with fire to a mere coincidence and collateral of the baptism with the Spirit, while John's language respecting it is so grave as to lift it up into coördination with the other baptism. Said John: "Now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees; therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire. I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire: whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." (Matt. iii. 10-12.) Is it not more correct to say that the whole race will be baptized? they who receive him, with the Holy Ghost; and they who reject him, with fire; when he with flaming fire will take vengeance upon them who obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness.

Mr. Moody lays great stress also upon the preposition "*on*" or "*upon*." The Spirit, he correctly says, is *in* every believer, but the Pentecostal baptism, he asserts, was *upon* believers, enduing them with power for service. He contends that the promise of the Comforter to be in the believer, as given in John xiv.-xvi., was fulfilled, not at Pentecost, but on the day of Christ's resurrection, when we are told in John xx. 22, that Jesus breathed on the apostles (save Thomas, who was not present) and said: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." But see what John the Evangelist says of the anointing with the Holy Spirit, a figure which unquestionably represents the Spirit as "poured out," "shed upon" him who received him: "The anointing which ye have received of him abideth *in* you." (1 John ii. 27.) Such language should warn us against putting too much confidence in a theory whose corner-stone is a single preposition.

Furthermore, Mr. Moody is hard put to it when he is constrained to find in John xx. 22, in Christ's act of breathing *on* the apostles,

the fulfilment of the promise that the Spirit who was with them should also be in his disciples. If in that incident we do not find an enduement with power (just the very thing Mr. Moody says it was not) then it should be hard to find it anywhere. "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this he breathed *on* them and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." If this was not an enduement with power (infallibility in declaring the conditions of salvation), we know not what it was. Certainly there is nothing in the incident which marks it as the fulfilment of the promise of the indwelling Spirit. On the contrary, the fact that Jesus had not yet taken his final departure is positive disproof, for Jesus had told them: "It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send him unto you." (John xvi. 7.)

But there is no need to weigh pros and cons in the consideration of this enduement-with-power theory, as though the argument were nearly evenly balanced. The scriptural disproof is clear and overwhelming in the indisputable fact with which we set out, and which Mr. Moody himself receives,—that the Pentecostal baptism was the predicted baptism with the Holy Ghost. Prior to Pentecost there had been no such thing as baptism with the Spirit. The evangelist says, "the Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified." (John vii. 39.) Paul says: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us, . . . that (*iva*—in order that) we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." (Galatians iii. 13, 14.) The ascending Jesus said: "Behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you." (Luke xxiv. 29.) And Peter says: "Being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost." (Acts ii. 33.) Unquestionably, this *promise* was ~~not~~ fulfilled before the *glorification* of the risen Jesus, and yet power for service, as an endowment of the Spirit, was not uncommon in the ages prior to Christ's exaltation. Therefore the baptism with the Spirit is not enduement with power. Read Exodus xxxi. 2-6: "I have called by name Bezaleel, . . .

and I have filled him with the Spirit of God in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship; . . . and I have given with him Aholiab; . . . and in the hearts of all that are wise-hearted I have put wisdom, that they may make all that I have commanded thee." So, too, God raised up judges in Israel to deliver his people from their foes. To Jeremiah the Lord said: "Before I formed thee, . . . before thou camest forth out of the womb, I sanctified thee; and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations." (Jer. i. 5.) Such instances of enduement with power for service by the Spirit of God are too numerous for citation here. The day of Pentecost bore witness to extraordinary and miraculous power, but such power was exerted by Old Testament saints, and by the apostles in our Lord's sojourn on earth. Even the power of raising the dead was conferred on the prophet Elisha. True, we read in Acts ii. 4, "They were all filled with the Holy Ghost," as a qualification for service, but of John the Baptist it was said by the angel that he should "be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb." Zacharias and Elizabeth, his parents, were filled with the Holy Ghost. So, too, as we have seen, was Bezaleel. It is clear, therefore, that enduement with power at Pentecost was not in fulfilment of the promised baptism, which was conditioned upon the glorification of Jesus.

Equally crushing is another fact: this baptism with the Spirit was on *all* believers. The enduement theory exhorts Christians to pray for this baptism. It declares that some Christians have never received it. Inefficiency in the ministry, unfruitfulness in service, is attributed to the lack of this baptism. Now we are far from saying that some Christians are not more efficient than others. Few men have been so useful as Mr. Moody; and we are equally far from denying that very much unfruitfulness is due to a lack of consecration. Many are never, and probably none are at all times filled with the Spirit. To be filled with the Spirit, all should earnestly seek, but absolutely all true Christians do receive, the baptism with the Spirit.

The proof of this proposition is not lacking. We read in John vii. 37-39: "Jesus stood and cried, If *any* man thirst let him

come unto me and drink. He that *believeth* on me, as the Scriptures 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, for the Holy Ghost was not yet given because that Jesus was not yet glorified.)” This bestowment of the Spirit, consequent upon the glorification of Jesus, and so identified with the Pentecostal baptism, was for *all* believers. Compare the passage just quoted with 1 Cor. xii. 13: “By one Spirit are *we all* baptized into one body . . . and have been *all* made to drink into (of) one Spirit.” The passage heretofore quoted from Gal. iii. 13, 14, is also to the point. Christ was made a curse for us “that we might receive the promise of the Spirit *through faith*.” To the whole Galatian Church Paul wrote: “Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law or by the *hearing of faith*? Are ye so foolish, having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?” (Gal. iii. 2, 3.) Of Christ’s exaltation Peter, speaking for the apostles, said: “We are witnesses of these things, and so is also the Holy Ghost whom God hath give to them that obey him.” (Acts v. 32.) So too, in speaking of Cornelius and his household, he says: “God gave them the like gift as he did unto us who *believed* on the Lord Jesus Christ.” To the Pentecostal audience, when they asked what they must do to be saved, he replied: “Repent and be baptized every one of you in (*upon i. e.* believing upon) the name of the Lord Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise (*promise*, again) is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.” (Acts ii. 38, 39.) We have very great respect for Mr. Moody, but in the face of this plain teaching we cannot agree with him in a theory which restricts the baptism with the Holy Spirit to only a few earnest Christians.

There is another theory, emanating from no such amiable and devout temper, but on the contrary prompted by the wish to be rid of the Spirit’s baptism altogether, and which yet has more apparent Scriptural support than the theory we have just discussed. This theory identifies the Pentecostal baptism with the gift of tongues, and regards it therefore, as a thing of the past. It is

obscurely, but extensively propagated, and its animus is hostility to any baptism, save that immersion into water which is so-called.

The advocates of this theory contend for a gift of power qualifying for service, but a gift which was miraculous, novel, temporary, and conferred only by the laying on of the apostles' hands. If against them we urge that the baptism with the Spirit was unknown prior to Pentecost, their answer is: Certainly, the gift of tongues was something novel. If we allege that all Christians were baptized with the Spirit, they will not demur, but will assert that all received the gift of tongues, and that therein the gift of the Spirit was exhausted. This, too, is a power-for-service theory, but even more specious than the other, inasmuch as it adheres to the miraculous nature of that power, as a matter of fact, to its novelty, as an exercise of power, to faith only as the condition, and to the laying on of the apostles' hands as the means of its bestowment. Its vice is that, in confounding the gift of the Spirit himself with a manifestation of the Spirit, it discards a fundamental truth of the gospel. Its refutation will lead us nearer the true nature of the Pentecostal baptism.

This identification of the Spirit with the gift of tongues derives some plausibility from the Scriptural phraseology which so often seems to confound a grace with its appropriate sign. Thus, to the disciples at Ephesus, Paul said: "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? . . . And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues and prophesied." So to the Pentecostal audience Peter said: "Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth *this*, which ye now *see* and *hear*." Again, in Acts x. 45, 46, we read that they of the circumcision with Peter were astonished "Because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost, *for* they *heard* them speak with tongues."

But it were arbitrary to insist that these passages obliterate the distinction between the Spirit as cause and the gift of tongues as effect. It is legitimate to see in the miracle only a sign of the Spirit's presence. They of the circumcision with Peter were astonished that on the Gentiles was poured out the gift of

the Spirit; they were doubtless convinced that such was the case, because the gift of tongues was regarded as the appointed sign of baptism with the Spirit by the glorified Jesus. To the Spirit are referred all miraculous manifestations of divine power and all gracious affections. He worketh in us to will and to do of God's good pleasure. "Now the God of hope fill you with all peace and hope in believing, that ye may abound in hope through the power of the Holy Ghost." (Rom. xv. 13.) And again in verse 19 the apostle speaks of "mighty signs and wonders by the power of the Spirit of God." Against any confusion of the Spirit with his manifestations the apostle seems to protest: "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit." (1 Cor. xii. 4.) We are expressly told in Acts ii. 4, that *as* the Spirit gave them utterance, they began to speak with tongues. Said Jesus: "Ye shall receive power, *after* that the Holy Ghost is come upon you." (Acts i. 8.)

It cannot be maintained that the promise of the Father was specifically the gift of tongues. Peter at Pentecost claimed for the gift of tongues that it was in fulfilment of Joel's prediction, that in the last days God would pour out of his Spirit upon all flesh, as a result of which men should dream dreams, see visions, and prophesy, while many other wonders and signs should appear; but nothing was said of tongues. Again, those disciples at Ephesus, upon whom Paul laid his hands, and who received the Holy Ghost, not only spake with tongues, but also prophesied. Again, it were absurd to say that Christ was made a curse for us in order that, in fulfilment of the "Father's promise," the early Christians might receive the power to speak with tongues—a gift which the Spirit said should cease, and which, accordingly, has ceased. And again, it is right here that this theory breaks down utterly and obviously, for while it admits that only faith was the condition of the Spirit's bestowment, it fails to note that the promise of the Father is given all believers since Pentecost, while the gift of tongues was not conferred upon every believer even in the apostolic age. "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." (Rom. viii. 9.) "Hereby know we that we dwell in him and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit." (1 Jno.

iv. 13.) In 1 Cor. xii. 13, the apostle says: "By one Spirit are we *all* baptized into one body;" but in verse 4 he had said: "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit." These gifts in verse 7 are called manifestations of the Spirit. "To one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom;" to another, this; to another, that; and "to another (v. 10) divers kinds of tongues." In verse 30 he asks: "Have all the gift of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?" The obvious answer is, No. In 1 Cor. xiv. 5, he says: "I would that ye all spake with tongues." All did not; but all were baptized with the Spirit. The "promised" Spirit has not been withdrawn; but, as Paul predicted, tongues have ceased.

We may note further, that in comparison with other gifts Paul seems to esteem lightly the gift of tongues. In 1 Cor. xiii. 1, he says: "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal." In xiv. 5, he says: "I would that ye all spake with tongues, but rather that ye prophesied; for greater is he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues." The Corinthian Christians were ambitious to possess showy gifts, especially that of tongues, but he tells them in xiv. 12, "forasmuch as ye are zealous of spiritual gifts, seek that ye may excel to the edifying of the church;" and in verse 19 he plainly shows which is most for edification: "*In the church* I had rather speak five words with my understanding . . . than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue." It is obvious that all believers did not receive the gift of tongues; but all do receive the baptism with the Spirit. Furthermore, some received the gift of tongues who were not baptized with the Spirit. The case of Simon Magus is in point. It is said of him that he believed, *i. e.*, he professed faith, and in conferring the gift of tongues by laying on of hands, it were unreasonable to suppose that the apostles excepted him, when we are told that they did not perceive he was in the bonds of iniquity until his proffer of money betrayed to them the real state of his heart. It was no part of the apostles' work to distinguish spurious from genuine believers, and therefore professed believers might receive the gift at the hands of the apostles, while only real believers were baptized by Jesus with the Holy Spirit. Some professing faith re-

ceived the gift of tongues; while all true believers received the baptism.

The refutation of this theory is not superfluous. Certainly not in this discussion, for it opens the way for considering the divine purpose in the gift of tongues. The Pentecostal baptism cannot be adequately considered if we take no cognizance of this purpose.

What, then, was its meaning and use? The apostle tells us that tongues were for a sign. In Mark xvi. 17, our Lord spake of it as such, and as only one sign among many: "These signs shall follow *them that believe*; in my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with tongues," etc. Whenever any one was sent of God with new revelations to men, God always accredited their mission with miraculous signs. Thus Moses when sent of God as Israel's deliverer, showed signs in attestation of his mission. So, too, even the testimony of Jesus was corroborated by miracles. Jesus appealed to his works: "Believe me for the very works' sake." By these Nicodemus was convinced: "No man can do these miracles which thou doest except God be with him." "How shall we escape," says the inspired writer of Hebrews, "if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him; God also bearing them witness with signs and wonders, and divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost according to his own will."

But the crucifixion of Jesus must have seemed to the world an effectual disproof of his Messianic claim. True, his disciples testified as eye-witnesses that he was risen and ascended into heaven. But who would believe so stupendous a claim? Where was the boasted king and kingdom of Israel? Nothing but signs and wonders, marvellous and startling, would convince the world that the pretensions of Jesus had not met with disastrous failure. On this point the disciples themselves were anxious. They asked the Master (Acts i. 6), "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel? And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power. But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall

be witnesses unto me." The power to work miracles, which they had before the Lord's crucifixion, had been suspended at his death; but it should be restored, accrediting them as witnesses unto him—after the promised baptism with the Spirit by himself. Luke's former treatise narrated what Jesus "began to do and to teach." The Book of Acts narrates what this same Jesus continued to do and to teach. It was of first importance, to prove that Jesus was not dead but living. "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye crucified, both Lord and Christ." Peter hastened to disclaim the healing by his own power of the lame man at the Gate Beautiful, and referred it to the living Jesus: "Why look ye so earnestly on us, as though by our own power or holiness we had made this man to walk? The God of our fathers hath glorified his Son Jesus . . . whom God hath raised from the dead; whereof we are witnesses . . . And his name, through faith in his name, hath made this man strong." "With great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus."

But it was not enough to prove the resurrection and glorification of Jesus. It was necessary to show that God had made Jesus "*Lord and Christ*," "Prince and Saviour." In his Messianic office what was he doing? What great work was he doing as the Christ? John had predicted that he should baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire. The first baptism was an essential part of his redeeming work, for he was made a curse for us that we might receive the promise of the Spirit. John the Evangelist and Jesus himself had declared that this baptism would be consequent upon the exaltation of Jesus. And so on the day of Pentecost Peter argues that the gift of tongues was the appointed sign of the promised baptism with the Spirit which was then given; and points to the coming baptism of Christ's enemies with fire by a citation from the Psalms: "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool." Pentecost, the feast of first fruits, was fittingly chosen for the baptism with the Spirit. Because this baptism was not self-evidencing to those who were not the subjects thereof, therefore an appropriate sign was necessary. Therefore the language of Paul

in 1 Cor. xiv. 22: "Tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not." So it was that "*in the church*" Paul esteemed a few words of prophecy more for the edification of believers than many words in an unknown tongue. And inasmuch as the baptism with the Spirit was something hitherto unknown, a novelty, like the gift of tongues, was divinely chosen as its appropriate sign. Signal appropriateness is seen also in that it qualified its possessors to be witnesses, as on Pentecost, to men from every nation under heaven, that they might hear, every man in his own tongue, the wonderful works of God.

That the baptism with the Spirit is not self-evidencing is forcibly shown in the case of the first Gentile converts. To the apostles even, in this case, the gift of tongues was a necessary sign that the Spirit was given, for they were unprepared to believe that to the Gentiles also God had granted repentance unto life. And therefore it was that without the laying on of Peter's hands, which indeed he would have refused, Jesus, the Prince and Saviour, bestowed on Cornelius and the others the gift of tongues as a sign of their baptism with the Spirit by himself. Therefore Peter said: "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" But for the appropriate sign Peter and they of the circumcision with him would have scouted the thought that Cornelius and his friends had received the Spirit. And let it be noted, as bearing directly on the nature of baptism with the Spirit, that Peter here speaks of it as necessarily associated with repentance unto life, and as guaranteeing salvation.

This sign of the tongues is associated with the "promise of the Father" as is no other miracle. In the case of the Samaritans, Philip preached Christ and wrought miracles; casting out devils and healing the lame and the palsied. But Philip did not confer the gift of tongues, neither at this time nor at the baptism of the eunuch. When the apostles heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent Peter and John, who "prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost, for as yet he was fallen upon none of them; only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then laid they their hands on them and they re-

ceived the Holy Ghost." We are next told that Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given. That throughout the narrative the gift of tongues is called the Holy Ghost shows only how intimately the former was associated with the latter as its appropriate sign. The case of these Samaritans was somewhat similar to that of Cornelius. Their position may be conceived as half way between Jew and Gentile. Jesus himself had made disciples among them, and they received the rite of circumcision. But still not being Jews, Peter and John deemed their case uncommon and before laying hands upon them prayed that they might receive the sign of their baptism with the Spirit. This would dispel all doubt and settle their status.

But why was this power which Simon sought to buy conferred by the apostles only? A word here in passing as to the dogma of confirmation. The theory of confirmation by the laying on of hands is so palpably a blunder, that it deserves scant notice. The three passages which speak of confirming the disciples are these: "Confirming the souls of the disciples" (Acts xiv. 22); "Exhorted the brethren with many words, and confirmed them" (Acts xv. 32); "And he went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches" (Acts xv. 41). In the first place, the parties confirmed were established churches, Christians who had often sat at the Lord's table. Secondly, they were confirmed, not by laying on of hands, but by exhortation with many words; by instruction they were established in the faith. Thirdly, it were absurd to suppose that the laying on of hands, with the consequent gift of tongues, was unknown to these churches till long after their organization. Fourthly, Judas Barsabas and Silas were not apostles, and, therefore, were, like Philip, incompetent to confer the gift of tongues, but were chief men among the brethren, whom they confirmed with many words. The laying on of hands by the apostles secured confirmatory evidence that Jesus was baptizing believers with the Holy Ghost, as the apostles were appointed to testify. Confirmation as a rite, wholly divorced from the doctrine of baptism, arrogating to confer the Spirit himself, which not even an apostle dared to claim, and challenging credence without the miraculous evidence which accredited apostles, is an eccentric vagary, a rash invention.

Let us return, then, to inquire why this power of conferring the gift of tongues was confined to the apostles. As a divine attestation of the truth of apostolic testimony to the Messianic exaltation of Jesus, it was indispensable that no one should be able to confer the sign save the chosen witnesses of Jesus. It certified their truth as witnesses. The believer receiving the gift became thereby a dispenser of the glad tidings to people of other nationalities. In miracles of healing the recipient experienced the power of the Spirit in his own behalf; by this miracle he was enabled to exercise miraculous power for the good of others. Whether the subject himself understood what he was saying is in dispute, but it is unquestionable that the hearers understood the wonderful things of God which were spoken in their own tongues. They were taught to regard it as a sign that the believer in Jesus received the Holy Ghost, according to the sermon of Peter: "Ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." In answer to the question, Whence received you this wonderful gift of tongues? the response would be, At the hands of the apostles, who witness that the crucified Jesus is risen, and ascended, and seated at the right hand of God, and has received of the Father the promised Spirit wherewith to baptize his followers. Thus the sign overwhelmingly corroborated the testimony of the apostles. And what sign could have been more fittingly chosen to accredit them whose mission was to go into all the world and preach the gospel to all nations?

It being settled that the gift of tongues was only a sign, and a sign of the baptism with the Spirit himself by the glorified Jesus, we return to the original question: What means this baptism? What do people mean when they pray for a Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit? They mean that the mass of Christians may be revived, and that a multitude of sinners may be converted. They mean, in a word, to pray for a great revival.

Was there no such thing as a great revival before Pentecost? There were revivals in the days of Josiah, and Nehemiah, and John the Baptist. But of one thing we are assured, there was never before a baptism with the Holy Spirit. Pentecost witnessed something more than a grand revival.

That the Spirit operates upon the heart, effecting a saving change of the soul's disposition, enabling it to embrace Jesus Christ, is true; but that this is what the Spirit does *in his baptism* is an utterly untenable theory. The strange thing is that this is the current theory. Strange, in view of the fact that God had converted saints before Pentecost. Strange, in view of the fact that none but believers were so baptized at Pentecost. Disciples, and disciples only, were baptized by the Spirit. No one will contend that these were not already the subjects of saving grace. With the exception of Judas, Jesus pronounced the apostles "clean." Nor can it be disputed that none but believers were baptized with the Spirit. This point has already been sufficiently elaborated. These three facts, the novelty of this baptism, its administration to believers only, and the reality of conversion prior to Pentecost, utterly subvert the theory that by the baptism with the Spirit is wrought a change of heart. Pentecost inaugurated

THE INDWELLING OF THE SPIRIT.

"The *anointing* which ye have received of him abideth *in you*." (1 John ii. 27.) Is it objected that the Spirit dwelt in believers prior to Pentecost? Then, in the first place, will some one tell us what the baptism with the Spirit really was? We think we have shown conclusively that it was not enduement with power; nor was it the gift of tongues; nor was it the work of converting the sinner unto God.

In the second place, if the Spirit, prior to Pentecost, made the body of the believer a "habitation of God," "a temple of the Holy Ghost," what does Jesus mean when he says of the Spirit: "He is (abides) *with you*, and *shall be in you*"—*παρὸ ὑμῶν μένει, καὶ ἐν ὑμῶν ἔσται.* (John xiv. 17.) The ordinary explanation of these words is entirely arbitrary, inadequate, and unsatisfactory. That explanation makes Jesus say that hereafter the apostles would have a clearer conception of the truth. It makes him reiterate, in other words, his statement that when the Spirit was come he would lead them into all truth. Such was indeed to be the case, but it does not explain in what sense the Spirit was to come, he being already *with* them. Jesus said: "It is expedient that I go away, for if I

go not away the comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send him unto you." It is said that not until the death, resurrection and glorification of Jesus could the disciples have a reassuring and comforting knowledge of the Messiah's finished redemption, and in this sense "the Spirit was not given because Jesus was not glorified." But again we ask, how does this comport with the fact that the comforter was then *with* them?

And further, let us recall the fact that the gift of the Spirit by the glorified Jesus was in fulfilment of his promised baptism. Now of that baptism it is written that by it we are all baptized into one body; by it we are baptized into Christ. Surely this language means something more than a better understanding of the gospel. Surely when Paul wrote, "Christ is made a curse for us, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit," he meant something more than a clearer conception of the plan of salvation. Surely when Peter preached, "Repent . . . and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost," he was not promising a clearer conception of the gospel. When Paul wrote to the Galatians, he surely did not mean to ask them if they received a completer view of the gospel by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith.

Upon this criticism it may be retorted, that it proves too much; that it makes the Pentecostal baptism a saving grace, inasmuch as baptism into Christ is essential to salvation. Such indeed it is. Our Catechism teaches that baptism (with water) signifies our engrafting into Christ. Surely baptism with water is a sign and seal of baptism with the Spirit. And inasmuch as there is but one baptism, inasmuch as Jesus has never administered but one baptism with the Spirit, then undoubtedly the baptism of Pentecost was that whereby we are now by one Spirit baptized into Christ.

But, the reader cries, how then were the Old Testament saints saved? Well, that is a problem. Recalling the words of Peter that baptism doth now save us (1 Pet. iii. 21), and the admitted fact with which this article sets out, that the predicted baptism with the Spirit was first administered at Pentecost, has the reader a theory which suffices to solve the problem? But, you will ask, how is it possible for the Old Testament saints to be saved without the

effectual calling of the Holy Spirit? The stubborn fact confronts us that Old Testament saints and disciples of Jesus prior to Pentecost, had been effectually called by the Spirit and were in a state of salvation. They were believers, and believers only were recipients of the Pentecostal baptism: Therefore, the baptism with the Spirit is not that effectual calling by which the Spirit works faith in us. The Spirit was *with* the disciples and the Old Testament saints in effectual calling, and in all his functions, ordinary and miraculous, but he was not *in* the saints until at Pentecost the crowning grace of baptism was administered by Jesus. As to the nature of this baptism, we would say that it is *not an operation*, but the *impartation* of the Spirit. It is not any work of the Spirit on the heart, but the communication of the Spirit himself. "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be the Spirit of Christ dwell in you." The baptism with the Spirit has nought to do with sanctification or regeneration in the popular sense of those words, but with justification, of which it is the consummation because it makes us one with Christ. Jesus took part in our human nature, that we might be made "partakers of the divine nature." "He was made a curse for us that we might receive the Spirit." The Spirit never made a human body his temple, till he dwelt in the body of Jesus. When Jesus said, destroy this temple, he spake of the temple of his body, of which the ancient temple with its Shekinah was a type. When Jesus took to glory the body of a holy and righteous man, then redemption was finished, and the bodies of saints became habitations of God through the Spirit. We have fellowship *with* Christ in his finished work and its reward, only by fellowship (partnership) *of* the Spirit. "The communion of the Holy Ghost" is his indwelling, the Holy Ghost communicated. We are . . . justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God. We have access unto the Father by one Spirit. By the fellowship of the Spirit we are baptized into Christ.

But still the question recurs: how then were the Old Testament saints saved? The answer is easy. The sacrifice of Jesus for sin was just as necessary for their salvation, and yet Jesus had not

died. We say, the virtue of his death was anticipated for believers prior to his advent. Much more then was this baptism anticipated, for as we have seen repeatedly, Christ was made a curse that we might receive the baptism. If then for Old Testament saints the procuring cause was anticipated, how much more the resultant baptism. The one secured and the other consummated the work of justification. For sanctifying operation on their hearts, working repentance, faith, perseverance, joy, holiness, the Spirit was *with* the saints prior to Calvary.

This exposition harmonizes passages of Scripture seemingly at variance and removes, we venture to allege, a great stumbling block in the way of Calvinistic theology, viz: the gift of the Spirit after faith. "In whom after that ye believed ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise." (Eph. i. 13.) "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" (Acts xix. 2.) These are only two of the many passages adduced by Arminians to sustain their dogma that faith is not the gift of God, that faith preceeds regeneration, meaning thereby a change of heart. But is regeneration a change of disposition? This is the common view, but is it correct? Is regeneration the work of the Spirit enabling us to embrace the grace offered in God's call? What Scripture says so? We challenge the proof. On the contrary we think it clear that regeneration is identical with the baptism with the Spirit. The word regeneration—as also its equivalent *παλιγγενεσία*—appears but twice. In Matt. xix. 28, we have: "In the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit upon the throne of his glory." The other and only relevant passage is Tit. iii. 5, 6: "Nor 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, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour." The *and* is here equivalent to *even* the washing of regeneration, even the renewing, etc. The words "washing of regeneration," clearly associate regeneration with baptism, and the last clause defines the baptism to be that with the Holy Ghost. So that the only passage which contains the word, associates it with the Pentecostal baptism which is "shed upon us abundantly through Jesus Christ" the administrator, and

which has been shown to be the communication of the indwelling Spirit. So much for the word "regeneration."

When we speak of regeneration every one's mind turns to our Lord's interview with Nicodemus. Twice in Jno. iii. 3 and 7, Jesus speaks of birth again or from above (*ἄνωθεν*); and three times (*Ib.* v., vi., viii.,) this birth is said to be of the Spirit. In verse 5 we have the words "born of water and of the Spirit." Here again the *and* is epexegetical and equivalent to *even*—born of water, even of the Spirit. The first baptism is ritual; the second, real. Thus again the new birth is identified with that baptism with the Spirit of which baptism with water is the sign and seal. This relation between the two, was also asserted by Peter when he said: "Who can forbid water that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we." Now, as we have clearly shown, the work of the Spirit, in the effectual calling of all God's saints in all ages is not to be confounded with the baptism with the Spirit which was first administered by Jesus at Pentecost; nor, therefore, with the new birth. With this view our Catechism is in full accord.

Our attention is arrested by the fact that the Scriptures are comparatively silent upon a matter of such transcendent importance as regeneration. Jesus said: "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God," and yet none of the evangelists, save John, say anything about it, and he, only in the third chapter. Further, in all the New Testament the idea of regeneration, or birth of God, is mentioned only by John in his gospel and frequently in his first epistle, except once, as we have seen by Paul, twice by Peter in his first epistle i. 3, 23 (*ἀναγεννάω*), and once by James (*ἀποζευξέω* i. 8).

We do not overlook the fact that Paul speaks of the adoption of sons (*υἰοθεσία*) and the Spirit of adoption, and that accordingly, believers are frequently called the sons and children of God. And right here again, let us note that they who are born of the Spirit are all the children of God *by* faith in Christ Jesus. (*Gal.* iii. 26.) They receive the Spirit by the hearing of faith. Regeneration is not therefore that effectual calling whereby the Spirit "doth persuade and enable us to embrace Jesus Christ,"

but it is the baptism with the Spirit whereby we are engrafted into Christ, and, having fellowship with him in his Spirit, are thereby one with him, and have fellowship also in all the awards of his obedience unto death.

Not one scintilla of evidence is there in all the New Testament that regeneration is effectual calling. We are not made the sons of God by the sanctifying work of the Spirit in our hearts; but by being baptized into Christ we are made sons of God in him, and heirs of God because joint heirs with him. No amount of righteousness ever attained by man on earth will justify his adoption into the family of God, but by faith in Christ Jesus, we are all the children of God. It is therefore much to be regretted that the Committee of Confessional Revision for the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (northern), should have introduced new matter which invites the Assembly to put the seal of its approbation upon a popular error which the symbols as they now stand fail to countenance. The report reads: "The act of *regeneration wherein* being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is enabled to answer God's call and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it." In effectual calling, the Spirit enables us to embrace Christ; and this he has done in all ages; but regeneration is the indwelling of the Spirit, granted for the first time on the day of Pentecost in the baptism with the Spirit, after Christ had taken to glory the first human body that was ever a temple of the Holy Ghost.

So far from the Scriptures furnishing evidence that in regeneration the Spirit enables us to embrace Christ, they teach, on the contrary, that it follows faith. We have decisive testimony to the identification of new birth and the indwelling of the Spirit in Romans viii. 9. Jesus had said, Ye must be born again; that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit. Paul wrote to the Romans: "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit (regenerated), *if so be the Spirit of God dwell in you.*" Birth of the Spirit, baptism with the Spirit, communion of the Spirit, indwelling of the Spirit, these are all one and the same. While, as we have seen, the Scriptures seem to say little about regeneration, in point of fact it is a cardinal and conspicuous doctrine.

The same great truth is taught under the expression "sanctification of the Spirit." The believer is a saint, not because of personal holiness, but because he is "sanctified in Christ Jesus" (1 Cor. i. 2), accepted in the beloved. This sanctification is of the Spirit, because he baptizes us into Christ. So are to be understood 2 Thessalonians ii. 13, and 1 Peter i. 2: "Chosen to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit," and "elect through sanctification of the Spirit." Salvation is not through sanctification wrought in us personally, but because we are sanctified in Christ Jesus. We have the key in 1 Corinthians vi. 11: "Ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and *by* the Spirit of our God."

So, too, we are not "new creatures" because renewed in the spirit of our minds, but "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature"; and in Christ are all they who are baptized into him by the Spirit. So, also, our "quickenings" is not due to a change wrought in our disposition. No man is alive unto God because he is changed, but because he is risen with Christ in baptism.

We repeat: The pentecostal baptism was the first administration of baptism with the Spirit. It was, therefore, something never before experienced by the saints. Hence it was not effectual calling, nor was it an ordinary revival, nor was it endowment for service. It was the fellowship of the Spirit, the gift of the indwelling Spirit, regeneration. Its effect was to baptize into Christ, to give fellowship (partnership) with Christ in the redemption wrought by him; to new-create; to quicken, or make alive in Christ. Prior to Pentecost all this was anticipated for the saints, just as was the sacrifice of Christ. They without us were not made perfect. Since Pentecost every one who receives Christ is at once baptized with the Spirit.

The prayer for a Pentecostal baptism is not, therefore, properly a prayer for Christians, but for the salvation of sinners, and that in great numbers, through faith in Jesus and baptism with his Spirit. He that believeth *and is baptized* shall be saved.

In conclusion, baptism with the Holy Ghost is baptism into Christ. Such baptism is not a sanctifying change of heart (*μετάνοια*), but the consummation of the work of justification.

The Son, by his own righteousness, has obtained eternal redemption for us; that redemption is applied to us, or made ours, by the impartation of his Spirit. It is, therefore, a baptism into Christ by the Spirit. The fellowship *of* the Spirit secures fellowship *with* Christ in righteousness and glory.

This view of the application of redemption was beautifully taught in Old Testament baptism. Under the old dispensation, there was no purification from serious or seven-day defilement except by the application of sacrifice in the sprinkling of the ashes of the burned heifer. That only was a baptism which applied the sacrificial element. The living water, in which was mingled a little of the ashes, was the vehicle of conveyance and the type of the Holy Spirit by whom we are sprinkled with the blood of Jesus, by whom his sacrifice avails for us. This, and not the Old Testament rite—not the washing away of the filth of the flesh—is that baptism which doth now save us. It applies to us the work of Christ, and thus purifies or sanctifies us, not in our own persons, but in Christ Jesus.

So we have one real sacrifice and one real baptism; on the other side of Calvary, one prophetic, typical sacrifice and one prophetic, typical baptism; on this side of the cross, one symbolic sacrifice and one symbolic baptism. We have one baptism.

JOHN W. PRIMROSE.