

No.

114

"IF YE THEN BE RISEN WITH CHRIST, SEEK THOSE THINGS WHICH ARE ABOVE, WHERE CHRIST SITTETH ON THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD." COL. 3. 1.

BAPTISM IN ONE SPIRIT.

An Address (revised) at

At Wattam's Hotel,

Feb. 16, 1912.

by

PERCY W. HEWARD.

Correspondence welcome:

Scriptural literature for Believers

Gottlieb-Daimler-Str.1 – 74343 Sachsenheim – GERMANY

An Address by Mr. P.W.Heward,
At Wattam's Hotel, Feb.16, 1912.

Our subject this evening is announced as the Baptism in the Spirit, but as the exact expression that occurs is Baptism in One Spirit, desiring to keep to Scripture language we have put that as the heading. It is most important to understand the word "Baptize", and the word "Spirit", if we are to know what Baptism in the Spirit is. "Baptize" is actually a Greek word, not English at all, brought over from the Greek, even as the word "Amen" is brought over from the Hebrew, and the word "Hallelujah". "Baptize" signifies "IMMERSE" and the immersion may be in water and may be in anything else. The word "Spirit" denotes in itself "breath" the breath of life but it is particularly used as the Name of One Person in our glorious triune God - The Holy SPIRIT Who BREATHES life to poor sinners.

Now we pass on to our first point - Baptism in Scripture. In Luke 12:50 our beloved Lord said that He had a Baptism to be baptized with and He was straitened till it was accomplished. You recollect how when the sons of Zebedee came to Him in Matt. 20, He spoke about a Baptism of suffering, and therefore we may view the words of the Lord in Luke 12:50 as referring to Baptism under wrath, the wrath of God, and Baptism under sufferings, the persecutions of man. Thus a baptism of sufferings is mentioned in Scripture. Again there are the typical baptisms - some by Divine appointment, as those of Hebrews 9 and 10 where the English version has rendered "divers washings"; others simply by the traditional appointment as in Mark 7:4. We have the baptisms of beds, etc. in Pharisaic ritual, but apart from this we have in Heb. 6:2 the definite statement of "the doctrine of Baptisms". It is noteworthy that here we have "Leaving the principles (the first principles) of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on to perfection". So repentance is a foundation. Faith is a foundation. The doctrine of Baptisms is a foundation. The laying on of hands is a foundation. Resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment are put here as part of the foundation, therefore the "BAPTISMS" here spoken of are not something of Judaism but the foundation in connection with Christianity. If the thought of Judaism were here, we should not find these words "The foundation of repentance FROM dead works". Judaism had dead works, not repentance from it, hence we have not here Judaism but Christianity. And "leaving the first principles" does not mean ignoring them, but building up from them, going on from them, progressing beyond them. Here then we have brought before us at the very foundations of Christianity "BAPTISMS" yet only one "DOCTRINE" to the two. Now albeit other words are used in the plural, the word Doctrine is never used in the plural, regarding the Truth. Sinful doctrines are frequently mentioned in the plural, never the Doctrine of Christ, and this may suggest a precious thought here - we have the one DOCTRINE OF BAPTISMS for parts and two aspects were definitely related, and pointed the one to the other. I do not say that the baptism of sufferings is included here. In 1 Cor. 14 we find that the baptism in water is at once leading on to a mention of sufferings, for we read there about those who are baptized, and at once the apostle says "Why stand WE in jeopardy every hour?" to imply that baptism in water led to a baptism of sufferings, but though we would not exclude that aspect the primary thought in Heb. 6 seems to be the two baptisms that are mentioned emphatically in the later Scripture - baptism in water and baptism in the Holy Spirit. They were both made fundamental for further "building up". We find both in Acts 2 as soon as the church was formed, so it is not surprising that we have here the foundation doctrine of baptisms.

We come to the second point. BAPTISM IN THE HOLY SPIRIT so definitely promised in Matt. 3:11. John the Baptist said "I indeed baptize you in 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 in the Holy Spirit and 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". The baptizing in the Holy Spirit and fire, contrasted with the burning up with unquenchable fire. And this prophecy of the baptism in the Holy Spirit is prophesied at the beginning of Mark, also at the beginning of Luke and at the beginning of John. Every gospel begins with it, and when we come to the book of Acts it is the same there. In Acts 1:5 the Lord Jesus says "John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit, not many days hence". It is worthy of notice that there the expression is not merely as our translation puts it "Baptized WITH the Holy Spirit" but "IN the Holy Spirit". Now this baptizing in the Holy Spirit was in every case promised as the personal baptizing of Christ. Baptizing in water was not the personal baptism of Christ. "Jesus Himself baptized not, but His disciples". He particularly omitted the act, NOT because He was unwilling to do it, NOT because He did not wish any to be baptized in His Name or "into" His Name, BUT because He would emphasize that the baptism in the Holy Spirit was HIS baptizing. The fact that it was in every case PROMISED in the Gospels and the Acts seems to make clear that it was future. Till the day of Pentecost, there is no case of baptizing in the Holy Spirit in the earlier Scriptures or in the Gospels. There were divers workings of the Holy Spirit, but there is no mention of the baptism of the Spirit, therefore we may take it as definitely future then, just as the Divine words "Thou art a stone, and upon this

Rock I WILL build My church". But as soon as we reach Acts 2 and Pentecost, baptizing in the Holy Spirit is manifested; it is no longer viewed simply as future. We find that when the Spirit of God came, He came with fire, fulfilling the words of Matt. 3:11. The whole house was filled in connection with the sound and the wind, and therefore those who were in the house were immersed in the Spirit, and to make it yet clearer we are told in Acts 2:4 "They were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance", and as we read on in that same chapter the apostle says to those listening (v.38) "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, for the promise is unto YOU and to your children and to all that are afar off even as many as the Lord our God shall call", that is to say, the PROMISE of the baptizing in the Holy Spirit, This passage has sometimes been taken out of its context, as if to suggest that the act of baptism was to them and to their children as children, but it is dealing with the gift or promise of the Holy Spirit, "To YOU and to your children and to all that are afar off", that is to say (1) to YOU, (2) to the nation of Israel linked with you, and (3) to the Gentiles, although I do not think Peter fully realized all he was inspired to say. Then come the qualifying words that qualify the whole verse. "AS MANY AS THE LORD OUR GOD SHALL CALL". Now it is worthy of notice that in Acts 2 there is the manifestation of the baptism in the Holy Spirit, and further on in the Acts it is just the same. This baptism is no longer viewed simply as future, but in Acts 11 we find (v.16) "Then remembered I the word of the Lord how that He said "John indeed baptized with water but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit". Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as unto us who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ what was I that I could withstand God?" So this was plainly that which was spoken before by the Lord. Baptism in the Holy Spirit is thus linked with the Day of Pentecost and onwards.

Now we do well to consider the accompaniments of this baptism. In Acts 2 we find that when there was a manifestation of the Spirit there was a "MIGHTY RUSHING WIND" and there were TONGUES OF FIRE" and they "SPAKE". In verse 33 the Holy Spirit thus describes it - "Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit He hath shed forth this, which ye now SEE AND HEAR". There was then something visible in connection with the baptism of the Holy Spirit. When we come along to Acts 8 we find that those who were in Samaria believed Philip preaching the things concerning the Name of Jesus Christ and the kingdom of God and were baptized, in verse 11, but there was nothing visible, so far as we know, upon them. There was in the case of Philip, for he was doing miracles, but in the case of others we are not told of anything; but the apostles came down from Jerusalem to Samaria; and when they were come down they prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit, for as yet He was fallen upon none of them, only they were baptized into the Name of the Lord Jesus. This shows that there could be baptizing in the Name of the Lord Jesus and yet not the receiving of the Holy Spirit, for the apostles prayed for them that they MIGHT receive Him. "Then laid they their hands on them and they received the Holy Spirit", "And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Spirit was given, he offered them money". So here we see the gift of the Holy Spirit falling from heaven, yet THROUGH the laying on of hands. Now Simon SAW that the Holy Spirit was given and therefore he desired to have a like power. There was evidently something visible in those who had received.

We come to Acts 10:44, "While Peter yet spake these words the Holy Spirit fell on them which heard the Word, and those which believed were astonished as many as came with Peter, /because that on the Gentiles had been poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit, for they HEARD THEM SPEAK WITH TONGUES (That was the evidence) and magnify God". "Can any man forbid water?" said Peter "That these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Spirit as well as we?". Thus we see here that there was a "SIGN FOLLOWING" in that they heard them speak with tongues. Ch.11 emphasizes the same thought, referring to the same event. "As I began to speak (v.15) the Holy Spirit fell on them as on us at the beginning". So there was a similarity - "As on us at the beginning". In Acts 19 too we have that which is a dispensational manifestation of the Spirit. Paul went to Ephesus and found certain ones who had not heard of the Holy Spirit's dispensational coming, and he laid his hands on them, and the Holy Spirit came on them, "and THEY SPAKE WITH TONGUES AND PROPHESED". In every case therefore we have an accompaniment, and 1 Cor. 12 which contains the title of our Bible study, makes this definite statement (v.7) "But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man", so we have here the thought of a manifestation of the Spirit, and it goes on after a few verses, "For in one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have been made to drink into one Spirit". So that in every case there seems to be a stress on certain accompaniments, and those visible. We have not yet found in these introductory displays of God's power a case of an invisible baptism in the Holy Spirit, nor would the term "baptism" suggest something invisible. (see the appendix). But we would add that there may be that which is, after the initial evidence of change of dispensation visible from God's standpoint befitting the heavenly aspect of the "one body" though not manifested in an earthly way. Just as the word "body" with which it is related, it implies a visibility. Birth is invisible in its beginning, there comes

a manifestation of it; but baptism is necessarily visible from the beginning to the end. (But not manifested in an earthly way as stated above.)

A word on other descriptions. We never find being baptized in the Spirit described as a birth; we do not find it described as the continued indwelling of the Spirit; it is called the gift of the Spirit, the pouring out of the Spirit, the filling of the Spirit, the receiving of the Spirit, as well as the "Baptism of the Spirit", or rather - being baptized in the Spirit - but it is never identified with the word "Birth" or with the word "indwelling". All the passages at which we have just looked will help in this. Having so said, I should like to distinguish very definitely as already hinted, a distinction between, Birth and Baptism. Shall we turn to John 3? A man of the Pharisees, Nicodemus, comes to the Lord Jesus and says "Rabbi" we know that Thou art a Teacher, come from God" and the answer comes "Verily, Verily, I say unto you, Except a man be born again (or born from above) he cannot see the kingdom of God". Nicodemus said "How can a man be born when he is old?". Nicodemus thinks Christ refers to a natural birth, Jesus answers "Verily, Verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit". Now this has been taken by a large number of commentators to mean Baptized in water. Baptism is not Birth, it is distinct from it, never identified with it in Scripture. That Baptism has a close relationship to birth is true, but it is not the same, any more than circumcision was Jewish birth. Circumcision was subsequent to a natural birth, and Baptism is consequent on spiritual birth. Baptism is always in Scripture thus marked out distinctly, and here we have, in John 3, the birth of the Spirit. It is remarkable that in the latter part of the chapter we have the mention of Baptism.

Q. What is the literal translation of verse 5?

A. "Born out of water and of Spirit" cf. "He sent from above, He took me, He drew me out of many waters". Born out from the water of wrath, like Moses was.

Q. Born out wrath?

A. Yes, out of the place of wrath.

Q. I never heard that before.

A. This seems the most natural way of taking it. The nearest parallel that one knows is in Psalm 18:16. It is remarkable too that the work of the Spirit of God "The wind" is brought out in that context.

Q. "Except a man be born again" does not refer to Christ?

A. No, no, See the contrast in John 3:31.

Q. But the Psalm would refer to believers?

A. Yes, necessarily many of the Psalms have a twofold reference.

Q. But the first thought would be the Lord Jesus.

A. The first thought is, I suppose, David.

Q. But above David?

A. Well, there are certain verses in the Psalms which only apply in the Lord in their fulness and He was delivered and raised up from wrath, but I should not like to make the Messianic application the only thought unless the Holy Spirit explains in this way. As to Christ the waters of ungodly men seem meant. Moses is a good example of this. You notice that the Lord explains the thought "Born from ABOVE" by "Born out of WATER" which exactly fits with the Psalm, "He sent FROM ABOVE and drew me OUT of many waters".

So we have Birth and Baptism definitely distinguished. Birth always in Scripture precedes Baptism. Now it is only fitting that it should be so, because there must be the birth before there can be the Baptizing of that which is born, or of the one who is born. Birth is the beginning of a new life; baptism is the confession of it.

Moreover, Birth and Baptism are distinguished another way, not only chronologically but the one is prepared for invisibly, the other should be prepared for visibly, though could work as in Acts 10, and grant the blessing suddenly and unexpectedly. The one is PREPARED FOR by God alone, not by the one born; the other, by the one to be baptized. Birth is not our responsibility, baptism is usually linked with living responsibility, hence with a confession of sin, and of faith. It is remarkable here that we have the birth explained as birth out of water, and out of the Spirit, and just as there were aspects of the birth, so there are two baptisms, which nevertheless have one doctrine, and so in one sense only one baptism, One baptism was in water, to correspond with the birth out of water, the other baptism was in the Spirit, to correspond with the birth out from the Spirit.

Now we pass along to the types of Scripture Baptisms. We are distinctly told in 1 Peter 3 that the experience of Noah at the time of the flood afforded a type of Baptism. There we find that eight souls were saved THROUGH water, of which baptism is made a corresponding type. The Lord's people were saved, not by the water, but brought through it, as the word implies, - passing through the water of wrath, but delivered. When we turn to 1 Cor. 10, we find another type of baptism - we read concerning Israel "baptized unto Moses (or INTO Moses) in the cloud and in the sea" before going into the wilderness. This is plainly a type of baptism in water. They were surrounded by the waters, and after they had been brought to feel their need of deliverance and had trusted in the Passover lamb - this was almost their first experience. It was followed by a wilderness-life, but the wilderness-life was, by Divine appointment, very brief. It was only sin that kept them there nigh forty years, and it is remarkable that at the end of the wilderness-life, which would have been so brief had they

been faithful, there was another passing through water. Now I have no doubt that when they stayed there a whole generation, as those who were in the first passing through the water had died, the second passing through the water becomes a type again of water baptism, and if they had obeyed had gone on quickly through the wilderness, the short journey, the baptism in the river Jordan would have been very quickly after the baptism in the Red Sea, and might have been a type of the baptism in the Spirit. Though God could have taken them up directly from Kadesh-barnea and after the passing through Jordan, for the 2nd generation, may have been a further type of water baptism. The same people would have quickly passed through two baptizings one bringing them to the wilderness of separation, the other to the land of promise; now, the baptism in the Spirit was particularly linked with the work of the Holy Spirit, ^{in connection with the coming down of Ananias. The Holy Spirit} came down to be the Earnest of the INHERITANCE; He came to pour out the powers of the age to come, consequently the passing through the water of Jordan would have been, if they had been obedient, rather a type of the baptism in the Holy Spirit, it would not have led into rejection, it would not have led into the wilderness, but it would have led towards the glory. It was a baptism just as the first baptism, but though related, it would have had a distinct goal. The period of waiting in between the two, if they had been obedient, would have only been like the few days between the resurrection of the Lord, and the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. In accord with this fact, we find that whereas the going through the water of the Red Sea is in Exodus (which is parallel with the Gospels), the going through the Jordan is in Joshua (which is parallel with the Book of Acts), and deals with the entering in upon the inheritance. Now this part of Joshua is strikingly parallel with what took place in the Acts, and we have the parallel with the Lord's Supper as well in the Passover being kept, and so forth. Having noticed these types we come to a few heart-searching inferences.

First as to popular beliefs. If this is the teaching of the Word of God, how solemn is the present day assumption of giving the Holy Spirit by the laying on of hands of a man-appointed prelate. How awful is the teaching before God of the Church of England, and of other daughters of Babylonianism! May not this be to alter Scripture and to boast of a false gift. Furthermore, if baptism in the Holy Spirit was linked, as in every case it is in the Acts, with baptism in water, how dangerous is the teaching of those who say. We are baptized in the Spirit; we do not need the baptism in water" - the teaching of Quakerism, and also the teaching of some linked with old-fashioned Independents is dangerous, and if I mistake not, may help like all error, a measure of self-confidence. Oh for more humbling.

APPENDIX.

Grateful to God for preserving from so many errors, during years of privilege in service for Him. I realize my own imperfection. Hence I have removed some sheets from No. 114 of Typewritten Addresses for they contain, though with some helpful and humbling thoughts, erroneous expressions concerning His gracious continuance of blessing and His working in days of weakness. I was very conscious (in 1912) of the sad disunity of God's dear children, (and would ever feel this), and realizing that the earthly manifestation of unity was not being set forth as a witness, I thought we could not speak of the "one body" and of being baptized into it, in its heavenly (and primary) aspect, as it does (blessed be God) still exist before Him. Oh to learn more of His truth and to have a full orb'd view to His glory.

May I now very briefly summarize thus:-

- (1) The early church was brought into a new position and dispensation, and there is an appropriate period of being manifestly baptized in the Spirit in the fresh spheres fulfilling the gracious prophecy of Acts 1:8.
- (2) The gift of tongues was fittingly linked setting aside the primary use of Hebrew, and thus contrasting with the olden days, going to all nations where they were, and not bringing in via Jerusalem and incorporation with earthly Israel. (Notes on this are available).

But we do not read of this sign twice in one place; and the Lord gave the blessing sovereignly (even when in Cornelius' house the Jewish disciples might have hesitated as to baptism) as a WITNESS that Gentiles were brought in. The evidences of God's work seem to be always granted, with special signs, at the commencement of a new dispensation.

May we not truly say that if we fulfil Acts 2:38. God still grants us the gift! He does not fail. 1 Cor. 12:13 surely still applies. There was no promise of the continuance of the gift of tongues, (which served a special Divine purpose then) nor of similar other manifestations, but the dispensation is not ended, and the unity "in Christ" is secured by His finished work. We believe and do not require "signs" (1 Cor. 14:22), we walk by faith, and experience His gracious gift of the Holy Spirit. But we would enter more fully into our Lord's prayer in John 17, and pray more fervently for more manifested unity among the redeemed, "till we all come into the unity of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God into a perfect manner, into the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ" (Eph. 4:13).

Correspondence welcome:

Scriptural literature for Believers

Gottlieb-Daimler-Str.1 – GERMANY – 74343 Sachsenheim