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THE BIBLE-A SUPERNATURAL BOOK

THE contents of the Bible furnish abundant evidences of revelation and proofs of inspiration. The words of the prophet addressed to Ephraim, “I have written unto him the great things of my law,” apply no less to us than to him. The things of God’s word are great in both magnitude and multitude. The men of God have written the many things of God’s Law, and they have written the majestic things of his Word.

The anticipations of the Bible in the realms of history, science, archaeology, oceanography, gravity, evaporation, electricity, embryology, meteorology, astronomy anthropology, physiology, and even pathology, all combine to testify to its supernatural character. The men of the Bible were not men of science and could not have spoken and written the things which they did not
know without supernatural aid. They spoke and wrote of things wholly outside the range of human knowledge and realm of human information.

**The universal adaptation of the language of the Bible is evidence of the supernatural knowledge of the men who wrote it.**

A striking illustration of this truth is observed in the fact that words in different generations change, but unlike the books of men, the words of the Bible are not weakened when translated into various languages.

Another forceful example is noted in the words by which the Bible legislates against all of the degradations of sin, without the vulgarity of men in words that name the wickedness of the things against which it legislates.

No less notable are the references in the Bible to results of modern research in the discoveries that harness and utilize such elements as light, heat and steam, with all of the forces of the material universe enfolded in, the bosom of science and unfolded by its advances—down to the atom, or up to all that it can produce—yet in words that brought no conflict between these intima-
tions and the limited information of the people who lived at the time these words were uttered.

It was not ancient human wisdom in these men; it was divine revelation to these men. That being true the Bible is the Word of God in the exact sense that these men were writing the words of God. In the lives and examples of these men of the Bible are innumerable instances that may be offered to support this conclusion.

**The teaching and conduct of the apostles were not the words and the actions of mere men.**

(1) Take the examples of the disciples and apostles of Jesus Christ.

Throughout the gospel of John, this disciple of the Lord invariably uses the third person when referring to himself, laying no claim to the honor and glory for himself that the closer relationship with the Lord in which he stood would have given to him.

In the things that Peter wrote, instead of claiming the credit and taking the glory for anything that he saw or said, he always let it be known that the Lord Jesus showed him these things.
In the instances of the signs wrought by them before the people to confirm their teaching, Peter and John together refused the honor and disclaimed any power of their own to do these things.

When a large number of persons whom he had taught wanted to found a party on his name, Paul rebuked his partisan followers and exalted only the name of Christ. When he knew that bonds awaited him at Jerusalem, Paul went there anyway, rejecting the entreaties of friends and brethren to avoid the certain danger of death at the hands of the Jews who were seeking his life.

When he later stood before Felix, Festus and Agrippa, Paul pleaded only for their conversion, and not for his defense or release. Napoleon accepted the adulation of his subjects. The apostles of the Lord gave all the honor and the glory to whom it was due. Let skeptics explain it. We know. These disciples of Jesus and apostles of Christ knew that what they taught was true. In this fact is the explanation of their conduct—that their actions were not the actions of mere men, and their words were not the mere words of human minds.
The supernatural qualities of the primitive church are the marks of divinity corroborating the claims of Christianity.

Among these numerous citations may be mentioned, first, the union and the discipline of the early church, accomplished by the teaching of the apostles of Christ. It exemplified the unity for which Jesus had prayed on the notable occasion of John 17, “Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one.”

The unity of this prayer, commonly called “Christian unity,” is not a thing yet to be attained—it was accomplished, the prayer answered and its import fulfilled, when the church was established and became one “through their word.” That unity exists today wherever an aggregation of people may be found, large or small, few or many, who are one through the word of the apostles of Jesus Christ. Such unity does not depend on what denominational churches are ever going to do about party names and party creeds, nor what the digressive “Christian Church” will ever do about innovations in
the work and the worship of the church. That prayer of the Lord for the oneness of all who should believe on Him “through their word” was fulfilled in the simple unity of the New Testament church, the union and discipline of which is a plain supernatural mark of the early church.

Second, the miraculous endowments ascribed to the members of the original church, distinguish it as a divine institution. The supernatural gifts of the apostles, prophets and teachers of the primitive church can be accounted for on no other premise. To deny the possession and exercise of such special endowments is to reject the value of such testimony as evidence which would be at once accredited and accepted by any judiciary body in the land today.

Third, the virtues of the first Christians in the midst of pagan practices and Roman surroundings attaining as they did the divine life, attests the divine claims of the true religion they espoused. Their “behaviour” was such within the Roman Empire that their “good works,” put to the test, “glorified God.” So said Peter. And his fellow
in the apostleship, Paul the prisoner, said: “Nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.” The lives of the disciples of Jesus, the apostles of Christ, and the members of the primitive church are an unanswerable argument against criticisms of the skeptics.

Fourth, the influence of the hope of the future life, grounded in the assurances of Jesus and the promises of the gospel, is a supernatural characteristic of Christianity. If there is no life beyond this life, and no death but that which ends this life, no man could think of it nor the possibility of it. A child who speaks of heaven must be taught. Men learn by education and speak what is revealed to them. But the teachings of Jesus flings us too deep into the future for mere men to utter, and too far away for mere man to conceive. The hope of the future life heralds the truth of the gospel and confirms the claims of Christianity.

Fifth, the inflexible zeal of the disciples of Jesus Christ between Jewish prosecutions
on one hand and pagan persecutions on the other is incontestible evidence that they knew what they believed was true; they had a good way to know it; they had seen and heard, and with Paul they could all say: “For I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day.”

The consistency of the conduct of the adherents of Christianity together with the claims of its divine origin bring it outside the range of the natural and into the realm of the supernatural.

The moral objections to the Bible argue with equal force and application against nature.

The difficulties that appear in the Bible are present also in nature, and can be understood in one as well as in the other. If it be argued that the Bible permitted destruction of life, so does nature, and the examples ‘are at hand in cyclones, floods and disease. ‘If it is objected that the Bible required sacrifice of life to propagate its religion, so does nature, examples of which are numerous also, such as insects in the water and ani-
mals in slaughter, and everything else that nature decrees shall be slain for the good and the food of man, to sustain his life. If it be further and finally contended that the Bible presents various contradictions in the nature of things, we again say, so does the order of things in nature—such as, woman's dependence on man; storms at sea; a mother and her babe, when the mother dies and the babe survives in health; then comes disease, pain and death, with all of the seeming contradictions of nature.

There is no argument that the skeptic may urge against the Bible's contrariness to order and lack of harmony with life that does not inveigh with equal logic against the contradictions of nature.

The Bible is a life and death book. Its teaching is such that no one ever regrets accepting it. Its promises are the only ones that bring comfort. It is a guide in meditation, a stay in life and a strong arm in death.
The character of the claim and exercise of authority by Jesus and his apostles have the marks of divinity.

(1) The authority of Jesus.

Matthew declared that he “taught as one having authority” (7: 29), without philosophizing on the teaching, simply announcing the truths, and with no argument to prove the truths declared. Mere men do not write and speak after that manner. Inspiration alone speaks with the authority of announcement without philosophy and argumentation.

(2) The example of Paul.

Before the Athenian court when the apostle Paul quoted a pagan poet he reasoned to show that the poet’s statement was right (Acts 17: 28), but he never did so when announcing the truths of divine revelation.

(3) The Spirit in the prophets.

The prophets of the Old Testament ministered the things of the future which they did not understand. (1 Pet. 1: 11-12). They testified in advance of things “now reported.” But they wrote with positive declara-
tion, announcing future things as though they were present, and without misgiving, their language allowing for none of the exigences of failures attached to human prediction.

These are but a few of the many evidences that the writers of the Bible were inspired men.

Skepticism is “poor and miserable and naked and blind.” It is a system of resisting and refusing, denying and dying. It can settle nothing and it can fix nothing. It never did and never does and never can propose anything good or make any man better. It offers no recompense for right or retribution for wrong. It is the total absence of light, of knowledge and of faith. It is groping in the darkness of despair. Just what have skepticism and infidelity done for this world? The answer is nothing under the sun. The page is blank on the side of the credits in the ledger of deeds. But the Bible bulges with the blessings of Christianity to man and the world bears eloquent testimony in its by-products, through the fruits of its teaching, that the Bible is the revelation of God.
QUOTES

It IS generally known that it is a habit of the premillennialists among us to quote from the writings of the leaders in what is called the "Restoration Movement," in an effort to find sanction for their present day millennial creed. It is also becoming more and more known that they have not been too scrupulous in their quotations and in the handling of the writings of these men. But occasionally from new sources comes indications of the prevalent misconceptions that many people have formed of the teaching of some of the great men of the nineteenth century. Comes now a letter conveying to me the suggestion that despite my recent quotations from McGarvey on verbal inspiration, that I must really not have read McGarvey,
as I had apparently overlooked the premillennial teaching in his writings! And this from the intellectual cultus of California. So it now behooves me to give the readers a sample of "McGarvey's premillennial teaching."

When Glenn V. Tingley, the Birmingham, Ala., premillennialists asserted in debate with me that McGarvey was a premillennialist, I fed him on the following quotations, and he lost his appetite for McGarvey. We certainly do not aim to even leave the impression that because McGarvey is "unimpeachable" as a scholar that he is infallible as a teacher. We know wherein he was mistaken on some things, but he was neither a modernist nor a premillennialist, and such schools of thought among us now can get no comfort from his writings. We have heard him on inspiration, now hear him on premillennialism.

It was well known to the Jews, as it is now to all interpreters of the prophetic Psalms, that David habitually speaks in the first person when prophesying of Christ; and in any given case, if it is made clear that he does not speak of himself, the conclusion is said that he speaks of Christ .. it also corrected their
conception of an earthly reign of the Christ, and showed them that he was to sit on David’s throne after his resurrection, not before his death.” (Commentary On Acts, page 33.)

“He had made him Lord by causing him to sit on God’s own throne, to rule over angels and men; and he had made him Christ by causing him to sit on the throne of David according to promise. It was God’s throne because it was the throne of universal dominion; and it was David’s throne, because it was the lineal descent from David which made Jesus rightful king. From this conclusion the Jewish hearers of Peter learned that, contrary to their previous conception, the promised Christ was to sit, not on an earthly throne, however glorious, but on the throne of the universe. (Commentary on Acts, page 36.)

Doubtless, much of the current confusion over what “McGarvey says” is due to the Standard Commentary series, published under the names of McGarvey & Pendleton. But the bulk of this commentary was by Pendleton, and should not be ascribed to McGarvey at all. In fact, as a whole, it should not bear his name. The death of McGarvey occurred when this work on the New Testament epistles had only proceeded to eighth chapter of Romans—all after that belongs to Pendleton alone. As an example of Pendleton’s immediate disregard of McGar-
vey, he inserted the comment on the Greek verb *psallo* in Rom. 15:9 as permitting the use of mechanical instruments in music in the worship of the church, knowing full well that McGarvey repudiated the argument that any such meaning is attached to the New Testament use of *psallo*. This is what McGarvey said:

If any man who is a preacher believes that the apostle teaches the use of instrumental music in the church, by enjoining *the singing of psalms*, he is one of those smatterers in Greek who can believe anything that he wishes to believe. When the wish is father to the thought, correct exegesis is like water on a duck’s back. (*Biblical Criticism*, page 116)

That is a rather severe rebuke to Pendleton, his colleague, who did that very thing in reference to *psallo*, and put it in the Standard Commentary, after the death of McGarvey. In every debate I have held with regressive preachers on the music question, they have quoted Pendleton’s comment on *psallo* as being what “McGarvey said”—and every time they did it, their ignorance and dishonesty were exposed.

The same thing is being done now by various writers who attempt to lend sanction to
their schisms and prestige to their perversions by quoting, or misquoting, the writings of these men. It has never been, and is not now, my idea to prove any point of scripture teaching by what men have said; but when the opposers of the truth appropriate the names of great men to enhance their heresies, it is right and proper that their dishonesty be reproved and the integrity of the teaching of good men of the past be vindicated. We all know that some of these good men were in error on some points, but we are not minded to be silent when they are misrepresented on the points wherein they were right, and allow their teaching to be perverted.

The same thing is true of other important names. Take Lard, for instance. That he held certain theoretical views on a future millennium, no one denies; but that it was the modern millennialism of a restored national Israel, of the sort promoted and propagated today, Lard himself denies. Read his own words in his Commentary on Romans:

“It is strenuously maintained that, as a nation, Israel is yet to be restored to divine favor. With those entertaining this view I cannot agree. As a nation Is-
rael, in my opinion, will never be restored. The only restoration that awaits them is individual ... on the condition alone of belief in Christ, can they ever regain the divine favor .... it will be as individuals and not as a nation. They will then exist as constituent parts of the church, and not dwell apart by themselves as a nation. The individual Christianization of the Jew is one thing, their re-nationalization quite another. In that, I believe up to a large number; in this, not at all.” (Romans, page 347.)

* * * *

“But in endeavoring to forecast the probable future of the Jews, two things are to be steadily kept in mind. 1. That no miracle will be worked in order to effect their conversion. The gospel is God’s power for salvation. Consequently, he who is not saved by it will never be saved at all. All will be done to save the Jews that is now being done to save Gentiles, but no more. 2. That the future salvation of Israel does not imply their restoration to their ancient home in Palestine. The former is a great necessity, the latter is none. When converted, the Jew can be just as happy, dispersed as they now are, as though they were all crowded back into Judea; and certainly they can be far more useful. The gospel is not designed to prepare men for an earthly Canaan, but for a heavenly.” (Romans, page 371.)

Another example is Robert Milligan, whom millennialists among us are wont to claim. Regardless of any “views” he may have indulged, here is what he says on points
which involve the very heart of the millenial heresy:

"According then, to the testimony of Peter, Jesus Christ was, on the day of Pentecost, seated on the throne of David, not in Jerusalem, as the Jews anticipated, but in heaven at the right hand of God. He was exalted to the rank and dignity of a Prince as well as a Saviour. And hence, for the first time in the history of the world, those who gladly received the word, were commanded to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. And hence, a few years after this, Paul in his letter to the Colossians, made it a subject of thanksgiving that God had delivered them from under power and dominion of darkness, and had translated them into the kingdom of his dear son. We need scarcely add that what was in this respect true of the Colossians, was equally true of all other Christians; that they had all, in like manner, been translated into the same kingdom." (Milligan, in Millennial Harbinger, 1858, page 69.)

* * * *

"When we say that this language is symbolical we simply affirm that it is similar to other parts of the Apocalypse. Very few persons, we presume, will insist on a strictly literal interpretation of this passage. That an angel, in the ordinary sense of this term, will ever descend from heaven, and literally lay hold on the Dragon, that Old Serpent, which is the Devil and Satan; that he will bind him with a literal chain of gold, silver, iron, brass, or any other kind of material; that he will literally cast him into the bottomless pit and lock him up, as a culprit is confined in a jail or
penitentiary; that during the period of his imprison-
ment the souls of the martyrs and of those who had not
worshipped the beast and his image will sit on the lit-
eral thrones, and literally reign with Christ, while all
the rest of the dead will slumber in their graves; and
that at the expiration of one thousand years the literal
chain will be literally taken off Satan, the doors of his
prison opened, and he permitted thus to go out once
more to deceive the nations-This we presume is rath-
er too literal for almost anyone.” (Scheme of Redemp-
tion, page 567.)

And now, after all of the apologies for
men and what they have said have been
made, the thing we most need is not a “thus
saith” Campbell, Milligan, Lard and Mc-
Garvey-but a “thus saith the Lord,” for all
that we do.

I appreciate your new publication. I appreciate,
too, your friendship of more than thirty years ....
When I think of your standing on the firing line hold-
ing up your TORCH, I think of John McCrae, a poet-
soldier who died in 1918. As if in premonition of his
death, he wrote:

Take up the quarrel with the foe;
To you from falling hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high.
If you break faith with us who die,
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow,
In Flanders fields.

-J. Eddie Weems (Los Angeles)
THE PURPOSE OF BAPTISM

The question of what a scriptural subject of baptism must understand in order to render obedience in that act has again been brought to attention. A writer on the subject congratulates himself that he preaches for a church that does not question the validity of one's immersion, so long as the one himself is satisfied with it. This is not a new point of view but it is certainly a wrong viewpoint. Paul asked the twelve at Ephesus into what they had been immersed. Was Paul holding an inquest over these immersed people? They were satisfied with their immersion, which (being John’s baptism) was even for the remission of sins. Though they were baptized for that purpose, they still did not obtain the remission for which they were baptized, because something else was wrong with that baptism. If, then, the
baptism of the twelve was invalid when they believed it to be for the remission of sins, because they were mistaken on another vital point, what about the validity of one’s baptism who does not believe it is for the remission of sins, hence wrong on that vital point?

We are told that baptism has numerous designs, the understanding of which is not essential to its validity. But there is one of these various and sundry purposes of baptism, it is contended, that must be always understood. If it is true that there are multiple purposes of baptism, by what authority does a man select one of these purposes, out of the many, as the one which must be understood? What right has anyone to say that this one must be while the others may not, be understood? That is a rather singular standard of discrimination, and a peculiar assumption of authority for an arbitrary selection of essentials and non-essentials.

It is interesting also to note that the one purpose picked as the essential one, is a “design” that is nowhere mentioned with the command to be baptized, and nowhere named by either Jesus Christ or his apostles as being the design of baptism. It is argued
that this one necessary purpose of baptism is to obey God. The other purposes of baptism, such as remission of sins, washing away sins, to get into Christ, to be saved, and even to receive the Christ whom God would send—all these are designs, we are told, which may not be understood, but the design to obey God is the one which must be understood. Now what is the basis of any such selection? I submit to you that if baptism has several designs, no man can select one and sift the others.

At this point, as altogether too often it has been done, Alexander Campbell was called up as a witness, and made to testify that it is not necessary to understand the sundry designs of baptism in order for baptism to be valid. It is always a mistake to attempt to prove anything by men, but a definite mistake to offer Campbell as a witness on that point. It was Alexander Campbell who insisted that baptism has one design only—only one, and that is the remission of sins.

Hear the substance and summary of his argument on this point, taken from Christian

The form of the expression is exceedingly familiar and intelligible; and, were it not for an imaginary incongruity between the means and the end, or the thing done and the alleged purpose or result, no one could, for a moment, doubt that the design of baptism was “for the remission of sins.”

The form of the expression is the most common in language, and especially in the simple and sacred style of the apostles and evangelists. From the few examples at the foot of the page, any one can see with what little reason and evidence anyone can intimate that the form of the expression does not indicate the design of an action. Indeed, if this preposition does not intimate design, we might well ask, what other word in that language could suggest such an idea?

Nor is it only casually intimated that New Testament baptism was ordained for this purpose. It is the only purpose for which it was ordained; whether in the hands of John or the twelve apostles. What could be more plain or intelligible than such forms of expression as the following:- . . . "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.” (Mk. 1:4) It was not a baptism, but the baptism of repentance. It was not for remission of sins, but for the remission of sins. The fixtures of language could not more safely secure the intention of an institution. It was not because your sins have been remitted; but it is for, or in order to the remission of sins. . .
So far, then, as the force of the preposition is of any consequence or value to show a connection between baptism and remission of sins, it is incontrovertibly indicative of that connection. But were it translated in every case into or unto (versions of the word very common in all writings, sacred and profane), it is as certainly, though not so obviously to all minds, indicative of such connection. To baptize into remission, or unto remission, intimates that the subject of that act is about passing into a new state; as entering into partnership, or entering into marriage, indicates that it is for such purposes the action, whatever it may be, is performed. "Unto what, then, were ye baptized?" (Acts 19:3), is equivalent to the question, For what were you, then, baptized; or, into what were you, then, baptized? In either case the relation of the person baptized is changed. . .

Now if there be but one baptism, and if it appear that both the New Testament dispensations of baptism, by John and by the apostles, clearly affirm a connection between baptism and remission of sins-must it not follow that the only divinely instituted baptism is for the remission of sins.

It may, however, tend to the confirmation of those halting between two opinions, to inquire whether there be any other connection between baptism and anything else noted in the Christian scriptures; and, if so, of what nature and kind it is?

In the first place, then, no one is commanded to baptized for anything else, than for the remission of sins. This is a very important fact, and worth> of much reflection. . .
Evident, then, it is, that there is no specific design on account of which any one can constitutionally be baptized, except it be for the remission of sins previously committed. . .

True, when immersed into Christ, we have “put on Christ”; and, of course, are in him and under him. . . Still, through faith and repentance, we are commanded to be baptized for one specific purpose, just as much as we celebrate the Lord’s Day and the Lord’s Supper for a specific purpose. . .

Having, then, philologically ascertained that, in the sacred writings of the apostles and evangelists of our King, the baptisms of the New Testament were all for the remission of sins, and for no other specific purpose; our second leading inquiry must be, In what sense is baptism for the remission of sins? The connection between baptism and remission being now fully ascertained and established, the nature of that connection comes deservedly under our immediate examination.

No matter what Campbell may have said before, during the course of the rather checkered religious career in which he made many changes, he was right when he wrote this statement about the design of baptism; and after learning this truth I have no information that he ever turned from it.

It is true that the design of baptism is stated in various expressions, but the lang-
language employed clearly indicates the one and the same design or purpose. Such terms as regeneration, reconciliation, conversion, and the new birth are all descriptive of the same thing. So it is that the expressions, “shall be saved;” “for remission of sins;” that your sins may be blotted out;” “wash away thy sins; ” and “baptized into Christ,” are all simply different ways of saying the same thing; and if a subject of baptism understands the truth of any single one of these statements, he understands the truth of all of them, for they all express the same truth, pointing to the one same end, or design.

Another mistake on the point involved here lies in the failure to distinguish between design and result. They are not the same. The Lord’s Supper has one design, expressed in the phrase “in order to the memory of me.” The preposition “in” is eis (in order to), hence “do this in (eis) in order to the memory of me.” Can one observe the Lord’s Supper who does not know that it is “in memory”-a memorial of Christ?

While it is true that the Lord’s Supper has but one design, there are several results at-
tached to its observance, one of which, for instance, is proclaiming Christ till he comes—"as oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he comes."

So it is with the statement of Acts 3, when the apostle said, "and he shall send the Christ." Sending Christ was not the design of baptism, as stated in Acts 3: 10 in the command to "be converted, that your sins may be blotted out"—it was a result of the state of conversion into which they entered. But if it is insisted that sending Christ is the design of their baptism, then it would only mean that the people were baptized in order to receive Christ, and again that is but another statement of the same truth, for how can one be baptized into Christ without receiving him? Baptism has only one design, no matter how many statements of it, and one who understands any statement of it, understands the truth of every statement.

So when Paul asked the twelve, "into what were ye baptized"—he asked the vital question. Applying the question to a denominational baptism, no man can be baptized
into a human denomination and get into Christ by the same act. If one is baptized into the Baptist church, he is not baptized into Christ, because Christ is not in the Baptist church and the Baptist church is not in Christ. If he is in it, one might be baptized into it and get into him; or if it is in him, one might be baptized into him and get into it. But he is not in it, and it is not in him, therefore no one can be baptized into him and get into it, nor be baptized into it and get into him.

It is time for brethren to quit (and I thought most of them had) preaching to denominational people that they are in the wrong place, and when convincing them of it, just leave them where they are, satisfied with their baptism. Personally, I have unsatisfied several thousand denominational people with their baptism, and have baptized more Baptists than any other brand.

Jesus Christ said, “Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” He that believeth-what? The gospel. The idea that all one must believe
in order to be baptized is the mere fact that Jesus is Christ did not originate with the gospel. One may believe the fact that Jesus is Christ, and not believe the gospel. “He that believeth (the gospel) and is baptized, shall be saved.” When a man believes that he is saved before he is baptized, he does not believe the gospel, and he cannot be baptized, in any scriptural, valid sense. When one is baptized into a denomination, knows that he is being baptized into one, no matter what he believes about baptism, it becomes an institutional act, a denominational baptism.

Preachers of the gospel should preach the gospel to denominational people on baptism, and quit encouraging them to be satisfied with something they have done which is no part of the gospel, and therefore no act of obedience to God.

To obey God is the general purpose of every thing one does in life publicly and privately, religiously and otherwise. But that expression is not a specific design attached to positive institutions. Suppose someone eats the Lord’s Supper to obey God who does not know that it is in memory of Christ.
Could he observe the Lord’s Supper? Paul says that in order to observe it, the body and blood of the Lord must be discerned. Hence, simply to obey God would not be a sufficient “design.” So it is with baptism—it has one specific purpose, and without the knowledge of that purpose, one cannot obey God in the command. As well say one can observe the Lord’s Supper without discerning the body and blood of the Lord, as to claim that one may be baptized who does not know and believe the scriptural purpose.

“Now it ought to be distinctly noted, that although the burial and resurrection of Satan, or of the antagonist powers symbolized by the dragon and Satan, are first spoken of in the vision; still the resurrection of the souls of the mighty dead—the revival of such spirits on earth, though next described, is first in fact, and in occurrence: since Satan and his innumerable hosts are not to encompass the city of the saints till some time after the thousand years, or the revival of the “rest of the dead’. Have we not, then, I appeal to the unprejudiced readers, much more reason and consistency in explaining the first in contrast with the second symbolic resurrection, as we have it clearly intimated in the context, than to imagine a second literal resurrection to suit a first literal resurrection. Indeed, as first implies a second of the same sort, we
are constrained to make both either literal or figurative. But the doctrine of two literal resurrections is nowhere taught in scripture, unless it be taught in this passage; and certainly to select out of the midst of so many symbols, as we find in this passage, one phrase, and make it not only literal and unfigurative, but also to found on it the doctrine of two distinct corporal and literal resurrections, would be a dangerous precedent—and without a parallel in sound criticism and good sense—not only in the Bible, but in any other similar composition in the world. Where have we a first and second resurrection in any other passage of Jewish or Christian scriptures besides this? And where have we a hint of one literal resurrection, from any Prophet or Apostle? I know of none. It appears, therefore, like building a castle upon the ice, to found the theory of two proper resurrections upon such data as this passage affords."-(Harbinger, 1941, p. 1945.)

Certainly we need to hear from you on the issues confronting the Lord’s people today. You have always spoken out when issues were issues. Let Torch make it hot for those who would destroy the independence of the congregations. You have my best wishes always.-George W. Dehoff.

Neat and attractive in appearance... worthy and weighty in contents... deserves favorable reception and wide circulation my wholehearted support.-Ted W. McElroy.

Has the faculty of getting around three times while the average man does once.

Supply of laugh never known to give out, likewise his supply of unadulterated good humor, with which he fairly bubbles over.

Knows all the jokes, and more than that can take one as well, and has the rare faculty of appreciating a joke on himself as much as on the other fellow.
Always ready to do his part, carry his end of the load and just a little more if necessary. Has the reputation of giving a square deal and treating the other fellow white. Business with him is business plus the human element.

Never accused of pretending to be something he is not, genuine through and through.

Considered a good office man, and has had experience, but he is just as good on the outside.

Knows people, is one of them, and likes to meet folks. Seems just naturally to take to them, and they return the compliment.

Has been known to attempt speech making, but that was years ago. Now his speech making is confined to few words: “What do you want for it?”

Hobby and recreation: Attending church; when not buying cotton can be found at the Church of Christ.

One hundred percent pure wool. Ask the first fellow you meet.

---

Note: The July Torch, No. 1, was issued at the end of the month. This issue, No. 5, combines Nov.-Dec., so that No. 6 may be issued the first of January 1951. This will not affect the number of issues-VOLUME ONE will contain TWELVE NUMBERS.
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