

# "DEATH REIGNED FROM ADAM TO MOSES."

A Discussion on the Extent of Resurrection

By

Eld. D. C. Robison, Salem, Ohio, and

Eld. L. E. Conner, Cleveland, Ohio.

Church of God General Conference: McDonough, GA, <https://coggc.org/>

## The Restitution Herald

teaches the establishment of the Kingdom of God on the earth, with Christ as King of kings, and the immortalized saints as joint-heirs with Him in the government of the nations; the restoration of Israel as a nation; the literal resurrection of the dead; the immortalization of the righteous; the final destruction of the wicked, and life only through Christ. Also a thorough belief in repentance, and immersion in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; as prerequisites of the forgiveness of sins, and a holy life as essential to salvation. We believe and teach the "restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began."

Send for a copy. Address,

The Restitution Herald, Oregon, Illinois.

Published by

THE RESTITUTION PUBLISHING CO.,

Oregon, Illinois.

Archives

236.8

0752d

1918

c. 2

Church of God General Conference: McDonough, GA, <https://coggc.org/>

## DEATH REIGNED FROM ADAM TO MOSES.

---

“Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.”—Rom. 5:14.



BROTHER AND SISTER write asking for us to give our understanding of this text, and this we will do to the best of our ability.

Take in connection all that part of the chapter from the 12th verse, on, and let us analyze:

1st, Sin entered by one man, and death by sin.  
2nd, Sin is not imputed (or counted) where there is no law.

3rd, There was no law from Adam to Moses.

4th, Yet death reigned over all during that time, even against them who had broken no positive law as Adam did.

5th, All such, dying, paid the penalty for a crime of which they were not guilty, for since there was no law, sin was not counted against them. Therefore, their death could not be unto condemnation as of having broken law.

6th, Then they are dead without condemnation. They never had the light of law. They were given no choice in the matter. They died as the result of another's sin.

7th, In this, Adam was a figure of him (Christ) who was to come.—v. 14.

Of what does this figure consist?

(a) "As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned (in Adam, without sin on their part):

(b) Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto the justification of life.—v. 18.

We take it, then, that as Adam brought all men under condemnation, even those who were not guilty of death by lack of law; even so, Christ has been ordained to lift that penalty off of all such, regardless of any action on their part. Adam was a figure of Christ in this respect. Paul's argument here can be understood to mean nothing less than this,—that as Adam condemned the race without any participation on their part, so Christ extends the free gift of life (not eternal life) to all regardless of any participation on their part.

This truth agrees with other Scripture teaching. John (1:9) says concerning the Word which became flesh (Jno. 1:14), "That was the true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world."

The Word was that light. But God had no Word (or law) from Adam to Moses. They who died dur-



ing that time never saw that light, and yet that Word is given to light every man that cometh into the world.

In other words, Paul's idea expressed in Rom. 5, is that Christ by obedience is designed of God to undo all that Adam did by his disobedience. In addition to this, those who live by faith in Christ have eternal life and glory and honor.

Christ, then, assures mankind a general resurrection from the Adamic death, and when it takes place, no man can say, Our fathers have eaten a sour grape and therefore our teeth are set on edge, but every man shall die for his own iniquity (and not for the iniquity of another, as is the case of those who died from Adam to Moses).

Ezekiel must have had this idea (ch. 16) when he spoke of the return of Sodom, Samaria and Israel. Church of God General Conference, McDonough, GA, <https://coggo.org> Read all of Ezekiel 16. Then reason it out.

With the view held by many, that all of God's efforts are being spent to save the few that are especially called now, one would be led to think that God had begun something that was proving in large measure a failure. But taking the view here expressed by Paul (Rom. 5), the wonderful plan of God is seen in all of its beauty and we at once begin to realize how great and how good God is. John the Revelator saw it in its completion, for he saw the brightly illumined city, the New Jerusalem, with Christ as its chief luminary, and outside of it "the nations of them that are saved walking in the light of it." Our God is not a failure! His Word has gone out and it will not return unto him void.

Get this truth and you will feel yourself begin

to grow in love at once.

Submitted in love,

S. J. Lindsay.

THE FOREGOING was published in The Restitution Herald, Oregon, Illinois, under date of December 18, 1918, and to this was received a reply as follows:

#### DEATH REIGNED FROM ADAM TO MOSES.



THE CHAPTER from which the above is taken is used to prove the universal resurrection of all Adam's race.—Rom. 5. The writer believes that if it is rightly analyzed it teaches a limited resurrection. The resurrection serves two purposes, viz., the raising of the righteous to eternal life and the unrighteous to judgment. These purposes are accomplished in one resurrection at different periods. John 5:29; 3:18; Rev. 20:5; 11:15; 1 Cor. 15:23. A brief review of the first four chapters of the Roman letter will help us to understand correctly the fifth. Paul, in the first three chapters concludes his argument by saying, What then? are we (the Jews) better than they (the Gentiles)? No, in no wise; for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin. Rom. 5:9. In verse 23 he repeats the same thought. In the 24th he states that the righteous are justified by the grace of God through the Lord Jesus as a propitia-

tion or atonement for sin. In verse 25, we learn that through his blood past sins were remitted. This can be accomplished through faith, repentance, obedience and a holy life. In chapter four Paul proves the above statement to be true by stating that righteousness was counted to Abraham through faith. In the last three verses Paul concludes his argument by stating that what was written concerning Abraham was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him, but for us, also. To conclude,—that righteousness is imputed to us through faith. In the beginning of Rom. 5, the Apostle states that the righteous are justified by faith and have peace with God through the Lord Jesus Christ. In the following ten verses he rejoices that God thro' Christ had accomplished the atonement by the means of which we become reconciled to the Father. The atonement was wrought out by Christ which assured him eternal life. Reconciliation is our work and removes our alienation and permits us to say, Our Father who art in heaven, with the assurance that we will be heard.

Beginning with the 12th verse and closing with the 21st, the Apostle gives us a logical argument of the origin of sin and its effect upon the race. In verse 12, the Apostle states clearly and logically that sin entered into the world by one man and death by sin; so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.

We wish here to state as our proposition,

1st, Death, or the sentence of death passed upon all men.

2nd, That righteousness is counted to all who

believe.

The latter are not counted as dead, but sleeping in Christ. It is easy to set up a suppositional proposition and apply the rules of logic and prove it. This is the proposition in opposition to the above, That God must raise all who have never heard of Christ to give them justice. The second proposition may be as logically proven as the first and have no element of truth in it. The 13th verse lacks clearness in its translation. It reads as follows: For until the law sin was in the world. But sin is not imputed where there is no law. We herein give the translation given in the 20th Century, Even before the time of the law there was sin in the world; but sin cannot be charged against a man where no law exists. There is but one logical conclusion to be drawn from the above statement, viz., That since the time that Adam was placed in the garden there has been a law, the penalty of which is death. Adam's disobedience brought death into the world by which he was returned to dust. In this sentence there is no hope of a resurrection to mortal nor immortal life. In verse 14 Paul writes that death reigned from Adam to Moses, over even them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression. In this scripture we have two classes, first, Adam the head, and second, his offspring. To prove that the second class have any right to a resurrection it must be proven that their head will have the power to raise them. Paul states that there is a resurrection for all who die in Adam but there is an order, first Christ, afterward they who are his at his coming. Paul is here writing to those who believed the gos-



pel. He further states that if Christ be not risen they who sleep in Christ are perished. Every son and daughter of Adam is an alien to God and can only be counted righteous through faith. If a righteous person becomes unrighteous his resurrection will be to condemnation. Jno. 5:29; 3:18. In verse 14 we have two classes who are counted under sin but of different degrees. Adam committed a wilful sin. When he ate the fruit he knew that he was in disobedience and was a legalized sinner. In 1 Tim. 2:14, we read that Adam was not deceived. This constitutes him a wilful sinner. There is a class who are not wilful sinners but have sin counted to them through entailment. For this class Christ obtained eternal redemption that they might seek reconciliation through Christ's righteousness. Jehovah's mercy is seen through these conditions. He could have left the whole race in the same condition that he did the animals to which he gave the same breath and a degree of intelligence. The sons of men are regarded as beasts. They have no promise of a resurrection. Conditions are implied in God's dealings with the race and his adopted children. The first must remove their alienation in order to become a child of God. The second must overcome in order to receive the crown. We have sought in vain for a scriptural statement of a resurrection for the purpose of correcting the lives of those who had died in ages past.

However, we do find that the resurrection will raise those who are righteous and those who have apostatized and crucified afresh the Son of God. We also find those who stand before the great white

throne for judgment. Those are made up of the apostate dead of all ages and those who die during the thousand years. In our investigation of scripture we find but one resurrection but two events. In 1 Cor. 15:24, Paul writes, Then cometh the end, or consummation, when he, Jesus, shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, etc. The end here spoken of is not the delivering up the kingdom but the time when the last enemy which is death is destroyed. This clause is parenthetical of the consummation. The resurrection began when Christ was quickened unto eternal life. When Jesus comes again the resurrection will quicken those who are Christ's of all ages. Its end will come when those whose names are written in the books have been cast into the lake of fire which is the second death, from which there is no resurrection. The expression, second resurrection, is not found in the book. We find the first resurrection spoken of, from which some argue that there must be a second. The word first is translated from the Greek word "prota," and means chief, or important. I have never been able to find where a corrective judgment was extended to any except those whom God has put under discipline.

The Bible teaches a retributive or final judgment and a corrective judgment. Those who have been visited with a retributive judgment have suffered the penalty of the second death which is final. Those destroyed in the flood and those of Sodom and Gomorrah belong to this class. Israel was placed under a corrective judgment. Those not benefited were destroyed. Paul writes of a number whose

carcasses fell in the wilderness. The church of the living God is under discipline and is therefore under a corrective judgment. Those not benefited will suffer a retributive judgment. The claim that all must hear the gospel preached to vindicate God's justice is based upon the doctrine of inherent goodness.

Submitted in love,

Salem, Ohio.

D. C. Robison.

### DEATH REIGNED FROM ADAM TO MOSES.

L. E. Conner.



**O**N PAGE 82, Restitution Herald of Dec. 18 1918, appears an article upon above subject by Bro. D. C. Robison. I do not believe that Bro. R. presents the correct view, according to the scriptures, and does not give the proper interpretation of the scriptures cited in said article. I, therefore, desire to consider the subject of resurrection with him, through The Restitution Herald, as to its universality, or its limitations, as taught in the 5th chapter of Romans and other scriptures referred to by him.

I fully recognize and appreciate the godliness, sincerity, honesty and ability of Bro. R., and the fact that his views upon this subject are what generally may be spoken of as being more narrow than my views, does not cause me to esteem him less highly, nor to exclude him from my fellowship as a brother

in Christ; as I entertain no such thought or feeling. But I believe him to be wrong in his contention upon this phase of the subject of resurrection; and that the so-called broader view is plainly taught in these and other scriptures; and that the broader interpretation brings out more clearly the harmony of the scriptures, and reveals more clearly God's plan of salvation, and shows more clearly his great love for all his creatures; and also reveals more clearly his justice and mercy in dealing with mankind, than is revealed according to the so-called narrow view.

I may be wrong in my interpretation of the scriptures, and if so I desire to be convinced of my error, and therefore enter upon this investigation, not for the purpose of controversy, but to bring out more plainly, if possible, the teachings of the scriptures upon this subject.

Bro. R. makes some statements, the full purport and meaning of which are not entirely clear to me; and therefore, as I endeavor to follow and, in a way, to review his article, I shall ask to be corrected if I misinterpret them. What we desire is truth, and not to belittle nor ridicule one another nor our respective views which we honestly and sincerely entertain. Let these be our prompting motives in our investigation.

Bro. R. says, "The writer believes that if it (Rom. 5) is rightly analyzed it teaches a limited resurrection. The resurrection serves two purposes, viz., the raising of the righteous to eternal life and the unrighteous to judgment."

I understand the righteous to be those who have

been justified by faith, whether they lived before or since the birth of Christ; but it is not clear to me as to who are included in the unrighteous class, according to Bro. R's view. When no qualifying terms are used, I would understand the unrighteous to include all those who are not righteous. If a less number is meant in this statement, where does Bro. R. place the limit?

The next statement is, "These purposes are accomplished in one resurrection at different periods." John 5:29; 3:18; Rev. 20:5; 11-15; 1 Cor. 15:23 are cited as proof texts upon this proposition. John 5:29 reads: "And shall come forth, they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." This text surely does not prove that there is to be but one resurrection, simply because the subjects of resurrection are mentioned in one text or in the same connection, apparently. Two distinct classes are here mentioned, one class being raised to life (eternal), and the other class is raised to damnation (judgment). This being true, in what sense can it be one resurrection? The fact that the resurrection of these different classes are mentioned in one text does not prove that there is but one resurrection. In Isa. 9:6-7, the birth of Christ and his sitting upon David's throne, and the establishing of justice and peace upon the earth are all mentioned in one text and apparently all in one connection; but are we to understand that all this prophecy was to be fulfilled in one event, performed at different periods? Was the birth of Christ, to mortal life, and his coming in power and glory to judge the world to be one coming



or event at different periods? The wide difference in nature, and the intervening time, whether long or short, between the events, make these separate and distinct appearings, events and accomplishments, though parts of God's plan of salvation. Likewise is this regarding resurrection.

John 3:18 gives no testimony upon the subject, as I can see, and I pass it. Rev. 20:5 reads, "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection." In this text the rest of the dead being mentioned as not living until the thousand years were finished would surely indicate that there were other dead that had been raised prior to the time when the rest lived again. And in order to get the sense and meaning of the text, the 4th verse must be read in connection with the 5th. In the 4th verse those who had suffered martyrdom for the Master's cause are spoken of as living and reigning with Christ a thousand years. This indicates that they must have been resurrected at or before the beginning of the thousand years mentioned.

Then the rest of the dead being mentioned in the text as not living until the thousand years were finished would indicate that at least a thousand years intervene between the resurrection of these two classes, the first class being raised to reign with Christ and the others raised to judgment.

I submit that in no sense can these different classes be considered as being of one resurrection.

But it may be said that the closing statement in this text—"This is the first resurrection"—shows that all that is said before in the text about raised

up classes refers to one resurrection. This cannot be true, according to the scriptures. The first sentence of the 5th verse—"But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished,"—does not appear in the Vatican manuscript nor in the Syriac.

But giving it full credit, when reading the 4th and 5th verses together, as they contain the one complete text, the sentence—"But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished"—must be parenthetical, and the statement—"This is the first resurrection"—refers to those mentioned in the 4th verse as living and reigning with Christ a thousand years. This is further confirmed by the statement immediately following, in the 6th verse—"Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

These last mentioned in the 6th verse are, without question, of the same class mentioned in the 4th verse, and the "rest of the dead" mentioned in the 5th verse, giving full credit to its authenticity, are of the same class as those mentioned later on in the chapter (vs. 12-13).

In the 4th and 6th verses a class of priests and rulers that have been raised in incorruptibility, immortality, are mentioned, and in the 12th and 13th verses a multitude, apparently of all other classes, or grades are spoken of as being raised up and going into judgment; and these texts, instead of proving that all that are raised up are of but one resurrec-

tion, appear to me to prove conclusively that they are of widely different resurrections, both as to nature and time. 1 Cor. 15:23 will be considered in due time.

Insofar as I now see, I quite agree with Bro. R's interpretation, generally, of the first four chapters of Romans and the first 12 verses of the 5th chapter, and also his proposition 1, Death, or the sentence of death passed upon all men. 2, That righteousness is counted to all who believe (are of faith). But the statement—"The latter are not counted as dead"—seems to me to be incongruous, in connection with the subject of the resurrection of the dead.

The faithful who have died are spoken of by the apostles as "them that sleep in Jesus," but they are also spoken of by him and in the same connection as "the dead in Christ." 1 Thes. 4:14-16. It is doubtless true that in the Lord's mind, plans and purposes, the dead are only held in temporary suspension of life, as contrasted with the Sadducees' idea of death, viz., That there would be no resurrection of the dead.

But that same principle holds good as regards the unrighteous dead, and in fact, in all of God's plans and purposes, as indicated by Paul's statement—"even God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things that be not, as though they were." This does not indicate to me that God does not count or consider that death reigns over all, good, bad or indifferent alike, in this world, and that other like evidences of sin in the world are realities, for these are all fully recognized, counted and considered by him. But, none of these things can frustrate his plans and purposes, which will be fully consum-

mated in the end, sin with all of its attending evils only having the effect, apparently, of suspending for a time the full enjoyment of the life and blessings that God intended for his people. Is not this the more correct interpretation?

I am not quite sure that I understand Bro. R's statement concerning "a suppositional proposition," to which the rules of logic may easily be applied and the proposition proven." But he proceeds, "This is the proposition in opposition to the above: That God must raise all who have never heard of Christ to give them justice. The second proposition may be as logically proven as the first and have no element of truth in it."

I am quite unable to see wherein the "second proposition" is in opposition to Bro. R's first proposition, viz., 1, Death or the sentence of death passed upon all men. 2, That righteousness is accounted to them that believe" (have true faith). Permit me, however, for the purpose of this consideration, to paraphrase Bro. R's second proposition as follows: "That all the dead will be raised, and that God will do justice with all mankind."

The latter clause—"That God will do justice with all mankind"—is not an issue between us, as we all believe that, I am sure. And thus the issue is reduced to the simple question: Does the 5th chapter of Romans, with other scriptures, teach that all the dead will be raised; or that only a limited number will be raised? This is the phase of the subject of resurrection upon which we seek light in this investigation; and let us not be impatient to get through with the subject, but let us consider it carefully,

If this chapter, Romans 5, teaches that only a limited number of the dead are to be raised, then the other scriptures teach it. And if it teaches that all the dead will be raised, then the other scriptures teach it, for there is harmony. And I shall endeavor to make no "suppositional propositions" nor statements based upon mere presumptions as premises from which to reason into final conclusions.

Rom. 5:13 is the next text cited by Bro. R. It reads, "For until the law sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed where there is no law." Bro. R. says that this text lacks clearness, and gives the 20th Century N. T. translation, which gives the same thought, but in somewhat different language, and then he says, "There is but one logical conclusion to be drawn from this statement, viz., That since the time that Adam was placed in the garden there has been law, the penalty of which is death. Adam's disobedience brought death into the world by which he was returned to dust. In this sentence there is no hope of a resurrection to mortal or immortal life."

Let us look at this text with its context, without which it not only lacks clearness, but is almost meaningless; but in connection with the context presents a plain truth for our consideration. In the 12th verse Paul states that sin entered into the world by, or through, one man (Adam), and death by sin; and in this way death passed upon all men, for that (by whom all) have sinned.

What law was given to man, the violation of which brought sin and death upon all mankind? Answer: "And the Lord God commanded the man (Adam) saying, Of all the trees of the garden thou



mayest freely eat except the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Gen. 2:16-17. . This was the law that was violated and thus brought sin and death into the world. But did that law remain to govern Adam's offspring? Sin and death, the result and penalty for the violation of the commandment, remained, as Adam was sent from the garden to till the ground; but the law which had been violated did not remain that they might keep it inviolate and thus redeem themselves from the curse that had come upon them from no fault of their own. Their teeth had been set on edge by a sour grape which their father had eaten, and therefore, Paul says that sin is not imputed where there is no law, and from his making this statement in this connection I conclude that he considered that those here referred to were under no law, such as would make them responsible to God to the extent that he would impute sin to them. Surely this is Paul's thought, if language means anything.

The 14th verse shows clearly that death reigned over them all during this period, though they were innocent themselves of having violated the law of sin and death.

It is quite true, of course, that in these three verses there is no promise of a resurrection to any of the race. These statements are evidently intended to show how sin and death entered the world and fastened themselves upon the innocent, and it remains for other scriptures to show by what means and to what extent those who thus have suffered are to be redeemed from the domination of such death.

Continuing his interpretation of the 14th verse Bro. R. says: "In this scripture we have two classes, first, Adam the head, and second, his offspring. To prove that the second class have any right to a resurrection it must be proven that their head will have power to raise them."

Is not this a sort of "suppositional proposition" and assumption? Upon what scripture statement is such a proposition based? If that be true how will the unrighteous, whom Bro. R. admits are subjects of resurrection, be raised up? Who is their head? The Savior once said to a certain class, "Ye are of your father, the devil." These men were surely unrighteous and therefore must be brought to judgment. Who is their head? A theory is good only when it is based upon a sure foundation, which, in this case should be God's Word, and I submit that Bro. R's Church of God General Conference: McDonough, GA, <https://coggc.org/> last statement lacks this foundation.

But Bro. R's contention is further darkened to me by his statement that, "Paul states that there is a resurrection for all who die in Adam, but there is an order," etc. I firmly believe that statement, but I cannot see the harmony between this statement and his contention that all of Adam's race will not be raised. Bro. R. continues, "Paul is here (1 Cor. 15: 22-23) writing to those who believe." This is true, but the same is true of all of Paul's writings, so far as we have any record. But he was not writing concerning those that believe only.

Let us examine this text and try to get its true meaning. Believers of the narrow view interpret the text to mean that as all that are associated with Adam by nature die, in like manner also, all who are associated with Christ by faith shall be made

alive. This I believe to be a plain and faithful statement of their interpretation. If I have not stated it correctly I desire to be corrected.

Believers of the broader view interpret the text to mean that, as by or through Adam all men die, likewise, by or through Jesus Christ all men shall be made alive. We believe that the "all men" in the latter clause of the text is just as broad as the "all men" in the first clause, and that it covers the same class.

This difference in interpretation appears to come largely from the difference of meaning and use made of the preposition *in*, which appears in the text, first as related to Adam, and second, as related to Christ.

This same little word appears in a very great many places in the scriptures, and its meaning and import are determined largely from the connection in which it is used. Church of God General Conference: McDonough, GA. <https://coggc.org/> The word *in* appears in the New Testament as a translation of more than a dozen different Greek terms; and likewise it has many shades of meaning, according to the particular connection in which it is used.

In Acts 17:28, Paul uses it thus: "For in him we live and move and have our being." All will recognize this statement as Paul's declaration to the idolatrous Athenians, that our life and all things that we have and enjoy come from God. The idea of our being in God by nature or by faith was not meant. But from the fact that by, or through God's power we live, etc., and because of his goodness and mercy we ought to have faith in and worship him, rather than the objects worshipped by the Athenians, which were made by their own hands, and in which there was no life nor power.

The word in, in this text is a translation of exactly the same Greek term,—“en,” as the word “in” used in 1 Cor. 15:22; and if it unquestionably means by, through, or because of, or similar idea in the one case, is it unreasonable to give it the same meaning in the other text, when the context so fully warrants it?

But it is contended that in 1 Cor. 15, Paul is writing to the household of faith, and therefore when he speaks of resurrection it is confined to the household only. This cannot be true, surely. The purpose of this chapter was not to show that there are certain limitations in resurrection, but that the dead are to be raised, as some had denied that fundamental truth. And Paul proceeds to point out to them that if such contention be true, the apostles had been Church of God General Conference: McDonough, GA, <https://coggc.org/> giving false testimony, their faith was vain, etc., and that those who had sacrificed so much for Christ and had died had perished, all their labor and sacrifices having been in vain.

Having called attention to these fatal errors and directing their minds to the logical conclusions of such error, he proceeds to make positive statements, not in a specific, detailed manner, but in a general way, covering in a few short verses the facts concerning death coming into the world through Adam, and the resurrection through Christ, the reigning of Christ on the earth until the work of restitution shall have been completed, death, the last enemy, having been destroyed. He stated that there was to be order in the resurrection, but did not go on to specify in detail the entire order. He mentioned in this connection only the first in the order, Christ and they that are his.

If those of the order, rank, or band here specified "they that are Christ's," were the only ones to be raised, how about the unrighteous who, it is admitted, are to be raised to judgment?

But let us consult other authorities for whatever of light they may be able to cast upon this text, not commentators, but translations of the text.

American Revised: "For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive."

Douay Translation: "And as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive."

Rotherham Translation: "For just as in the Adam all die, so also in the Christ shall all be made alive."

Moffett Translation: "As all die in Adam, so shall all be made alive in Christ."

McNight Translation: "Therefore, as by Adam all die, so also by Christ all shall be made alive."

Church of God General Conference: McDonough, GA, <https://coggc.org/>

Syriac—Murdock's Translation: "For as it was by Adam that all men die, so also by the Messiah they all live."

Emphatic Diaglott: "For as by Adam all die, so by the Anointed, also, will all be restored to life."

Twentieth Century: "For as through union with Adam all men die, so through union with the Christ will all be made alive."

Of all these versions the last one quoted is the only one which renders the text in such form as to indicate that the idea of relationship, natural or spiritual, is the thought in the text. And even in this rendering the "all" in the last connection is not necessarily limited to a less number than is covered by the "all" in the first connection. The real thought which this version presents is that just as there was



a union with Adam which brought death to all, there is likewise a union with Christ which will cause all men to live.

The "Twentieth Century" is recognized by many Bible students as being a rather "loose" translation; and as its authors themselves say that their purpose was to present the New Testament in Modern English rather than the English of three hundred years ago, strengthens the charge that in this version commentary is mixed with translation. But I submit that if the Apostle meant to state that because of the union of mankind in general, which was an involuntary union, death came to all, he also meant to state that likewise because of a like involuntary union with Christ, through God's grace and free gift.

This being the view expressed I desire to ask, upon what statement of the scriptures is the theory that the unrighteous includes only those who have apostatized and crucified the Son of God afresh based?

Now let us turn to John 5:29 once more. This verse contains only a part of a statement by the Savior, and to be understood must be read in connection with the 28th verse. The whole of the text reads, "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation."

To get the full import of this text it is well to consider the 25th verse, which reads, "Verily . . . . . I say unto you, the hour . . . . now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that

hear shall live.”

It is very evident that the dead here mentioned are limited to certain persons from the use of the qualifying phrase, “And they that hear shall live.” This statement, or possibly its demonstration in their presence, it is also evident, caused those present to marvel at the statement, or possibly at the demonstration of his power, which caused him to say, in the language of the text: “Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and come forth,” etc.

Not only was the Savior telling them that there is to be a resurrection, but he was telling them the extent to which it would reach by using the qualifying phrase, “all that are in the graves.” What authority, therefore, has anyone for limiting those that are to be raised to a less number than “all that are in the graves”? And if the latter phrase when used by the Savior in this connection does not mean what it would ordinarily be understood to mean, what does it mean; and what authority have we for giving it any other than its ordinary meaning?

I once heard a brother undertake to limit this statement in this way. He said: “Are we to understand that when the scriptures say that, ‘Then went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region round about to Jordan, and were baptized,’ etc., are we to suppose that every man, woman and child in the city and country went out?” If this be the answer or explanation offered, I have to say that it is not for me to state the extent nor the limitations meant by the latter quotation. But had the statement been made that John’s voice was heard in Jerusalem and those that heard it went out; but that

all that were in Judea heard his voice and went out, I would understand the writer to mean that all that were in Judea went out. What less could it mean with any degree of accuracy?

But it may be said that the number is limited to the two classes,—“they that have done good and they that have done evil.” Well, let us look at this part of the text. The first class, they that have done good, I take it, raises no question. But who compose “they that have done evil”? Are they apostates only, and if so where is the authority for placing such limitations? Statements relating to Bible doctrines should be supported by at least one plain, simple statement of an inspired Bible writer if such statement is to be given full credit.

The word evil is a translation of the Greek term *phanla*, which means worthless, and which includes much more than apostate.

This makes the text mean, as it appears to me, those whose lives have been good, as God reckons it, for the purpose of salvation, come forth to life (eternal), and those whose lives have been worthless, as God reckons it, come forth to damnation.

An examination of the word damnation will further assist us in getting hold of the full import of the text. Damnation in this text is a translation of the Greek term *krisesz* (*krisis*) and its literal meaning is: 1st, A separating, putting apart; hence a picking out, choosing. 2nd, A deciding, determining, a judgment, sentence. 3rd, A trial. Authorities:—Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon; Donegan's Lexicon; Young's Analytical Concordance and Emphatic Diaglott.

According to these authorities damnation, judg-

ment, does not simply mean the hearing of evidence, passing and executing of the death sentence, as many suppose.

The word crisis in common use with us is a literal transfer of the Greek krisis, and is used in medical science to designate the critical period in an illness, but does not mean that the patient may not recover. And when applied to moral, social and business affairs it means, "the point of time when it is decided whether any affair or course of action must go on, be modified, or be terminated," etc. And I submit that the Savior could not have selected a word that would more fully cover the case, that we might be able to comprehend, in a measure, the great work of the Lord in judging the world.

And, I submit that the above is a most reasonable analysis of the text; the most logical conclusion being that the great body of the dead, "all that are in the graves," are here divided into two general classes, the first class including those qualified for future (eternal) life; and the latter class including all those not thus qualified, and who come forth to judgment, the Lord and Judge of all the earth, who will do right, to deal with them in justice and mercy according to his will.

Brother R. makes another statement which I am not sure that I fully understand. He says, "There is a class who are not wilful sinners, but have sin counted to them through entailment. For this class Christ obtained eternal redemption that they might seek reconciliation through Christ's righteousness."

The first sentence of this statement being true, is it not also true that all of Adam's offspring have

sin counted to them "by entailment"? Is not that the meaning of Paul's statement,—“and so death passed upon all men, for that (in whom) all have sinned?” Is it not counted that all have sinned, not wilfully, voluntarily, but through Adam? And is not this the way that sin came to mankind by entailment? If all are not included in this class, where is the line of limitation to be drawn? Kindly base answer upon a scriptural statement.

He further says, “We have sought in vain for a scriptural statement of a resurrection for the purpose of correcting the lives of those who had died in ages past.”

I hope that Bro. R. will bear with me if I do not comprehend these statements. I want light, and I am unable to see the consistency in the above statements. If Christ obtained eternal (?) redemption for those who did not sin wilfully, but to whom sin was counted through entailment, that they might seek reconciliation through Christ's righteousness, are they not to be raised up for the purpose of correcting their lives that they may be reconciled to God? Surely their lives were not correct simply because they did not sin wilfully, but ignorantly! And surely they would not be subjects of eternal redemption except through knowledge and faith in God through Christ!

If these questioned statements can be simplified and harmonized, and placed upon a scriptural basis citing texts, I shall be glad to consider them further.

I now come to Bro. R's statement, “The expression, second resurrection, is not found in the book....the word first....means chief, or import-



ant." Admitting this to be entirely true it does not necessarily follow that there is to be no resurrection except that spoken of as the first, or chief resurrection.

Let us look at the text in which the term "first resurrection" is found, and those in connection with it once more. Rev. 20:5. "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection." As I have stated before, if we will read the context, the 4th and 6th verses, it will clearly appear that the first, chief resurrection refers to the priests and ruling class that are to be associated with Christ in the government of the nations of the world. These, I take it, are raised to immortality, as it is declared that upon them the second death shall have no power.

But the rest of the dead, those who have no part in the first resurrection, do not live until the thousand years have expired.

From this statement are we not fully justified in concluding when the thousand years are finished the rest of the dead are to live again? And if so, in what resurrection are they to have a part? Not in the first, chief resurrection, surely.

We now come to verses 12, 13: "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God....and the sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged every man according to their works." Does not this class embrace those of whom the Savior spoke, "they that have done evil (whose lives, as pertaining to eternal life have been worthless), unto the resurrection of damnation" (judg-

ment, trial)? These could not have had part in the first resurrection; for if so they would not have come up to judgment, and on none of them could the second death have any power; and they would have been priests of God and of Christ, and would have reigned with him a thousand years, according to verse 6.

Therefore, call this last mentioned resurrection by whatever number or name you may, "second," "third," "general," "subordinate," or other qualifying term as may be thought will designate its place in the great plan; but with no degree of propriety nor correctness can it be said that this is any part of the first resurrection.

It will also be observed that in these texts we have these statements: 1. Verse 5, "The rest of the dead," with no limitations, lived not again until the thousand years were finished, and 2, verse 13, "The sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell (hades) gave up the dead which were in them," etc. When this takes place, how many, and who, of all that have died, will be left, undisturbed, in death?

The Savior's declaration was that "all that are in the graves....come forth." John 5:28, 29. And in Rev. 20:4-6, ..12, 13, is revealed the sight which exemplified this great truth to John.

But Bro. R. says, "Those who have been visited with retributive judgment have suffered the penalty of the second death, which is final. Those destroyed in the flood and those of Sodom and Gomorrah belong to this class." If this statement were accompanied with a plain, simple Bible text cited, declaring this to be God's plan or purpose it would

be more convincing.

The phrase, second death, occurs in the scriptures but few times, and only in the book of Revelation so far as I know. Its application seems to be described in Rev. 20:14; 21:8. But I know of no authority for applying it to the case of the flood and other cases where destruction came to mankind and other creatures through decrees from Jehovah. Nor do I know of any instances in which "retributive," or "final," are used in the scriptures as qualifying terms with judgment; and I know of no place in the scriptures where the destruction of any of those mentioned is described or spoken of as retributive or final destruction or judgment, nor any other term of like import. If Bro. R. knows of such scriptures, in this connection is a good place to cite the texts.

The Sodomites are spoken of by Jude as having suffered the vengeance of eternal fire. The qualifying term, eternal, however, modifies fire, showing the unquenchability of God's means of destruction, and not the finality of the destruction as a punishment or retributive judgment.

God overturned and destroyed the kingdom of Judah with his eternal power; but that does not signify endless destruction of that kingdom, as it is promised restoration.

But in order to determine whether the destruction of the cities of the plain was a retributive, final execution of God's power in destroying those people, though sinners they were, let us examine the scriptures further. We turn to Ezekiel, 16th chapter. This is a long chapter, and therefore only short extracts can be quoted here. But the reader

will observe that sore judgments are determined against Jerusalem and her people, Judah and Israel.

Coming to verses 44, 45, and reading on, her lineage is traced, which brings her into such relationship to the heathen world that she is excluded from the right to boast of her exclusive, superior blood. Verse 26 speaks of Samaria and her daughters as Judah's elder sister, and Sodom and her daughters as her younger sister, Samaria being the chief city upon the hill, the others surrounding her in that district doubtless are recognized as Samaria's daughters.

Likewise, Sodom being the chief city in the Jordan valley, in her day, the cities surrounding her in the valley, among which were Gomorrah, Admah and others, were mentioned as Sodom's daughters.

Church of God General Conference, McDonough, GA, <https://coggc.org/>

It is admitted that these cities were corrupt, and for that reason God overthrew them. Likewise, because of the corruptness of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel God overthrew them. But the fact does not signify that such overthrow and destruction was to be a perpetual termination of their existence.

Read verses 47-50, and it will be seen that although Judah and Israel had not walked after the ways of Sodom, yet her ways were more abominable and her sins greater than those of her sister, Sodom. In verse 49 Sodom's sins are set out as pride, fulness of bread, . . . idleness and failure to help the needy, committing of abominations, and haughtiness, and for these reasons God "took them out of the way, as he saw good." But no word is used to signify that he had executed final or retribu-

utive judgment upon them.

In verse 51 (Ezek., 16th chapter), the Lord says that Judah had multiplied her abomination more than her sisters, Samaria and Sodom, and thereby had justified her sisters by her own abominations; and continuing in verse 52, he says that Samaria and Sodom are more righteous than Judah. Read on to verse 53, where he says, "When I shall bring again their captivity, the captivity of Sodom and her daughters, then will I bring again the captivity of thy captives in the midst of them."

Verse 55, "When thy sisters, Sodom and her daughters, shall return to their former estate.... then thou and thy daughters shall return to your former estate." The Lord, through the prophet, continues by reminding his people of their wickedness, and in verses 60, 61, says,

Church of God General Conference: McDonough, GA, <https://coggc.org/>  
 "Nevertheless, I will remember my covenant with thee in the days of thy youth, and I will establish unto thee an everlasting covenant. Then thou shalt remember thy ways, and be ashamed, when thou shalt receive thy sisters, thine elder and thy younger (Samaria and Sodom and their daughters, verse 46), and I will give them unto thee for daughters, but not by thy covenant." If not by her covenant, by what will it be done? By God's goodness and mercy, according to his wisdom and grace.

When we read these declarations of God's plans and purposes our grateful hearts can only give expression through the language of the Apostle, "O; the depths of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God."

Man is selfish, vindictive and Shylock like, demands the last drop of blood. But God's ways are

not our ways, nor are his thoughts our thoughts. Pride, selfishness and prejudice rule us to a large degree, and to our shame; while mercy, love and goodness move our Father in his dealings with us, to his eternal honor and glory.

In view of the declarations concerning the Sodomites, etc., above cited, upon what basis and authority does the statement that they "have suffered the penalty of the second death, which is final," rest? But Jesus also has given us some evidence concerning the Sodomites. In Luke 6:11, where he is instructing the twelve as to the course they should pursue in their evangelistic work, when they were not received by a city, he says, "Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for that city."

Church of God General Conference: McDonough, GA, <https://coggc.org/>

If he had said that it was more tolerable for Sodom....in the day of their judgment than it will be for that city in the day of its judgment, then the case might not look so promising for Sodom. But I submit that there is not one plain statement in the scriptures to the effect that the destruction of the world by the flood, and others at different times because of their corruptness was their final cutting off, and that there is to be no resurrection for them.

It may be asked, "For what purpose are those whose ways have been crooked, and their conduct not only bad and sinful, but corrupt and abominable, to be raised up? Are they to be given another chance, and then another," etc.?

In reply to such possible inquiry I have to say that in this investigation I am not concerning my-



self particularly as to all of God's purposes. The question to which I am devoting my attention in this particular investigation is, "Do the scriptures teach that the resurrection will be limited to the righteous and apostates only, and possibly some other limited class; or do the scriptures teach that all the dead will be raised?"

All of God's plans and purposes are for the best possible good to the human family; and if his plan is to raise up only a limited number of those who die that will be done for the reason that his plans and the good of mankind would be best conserved in that way; and if he has declared his plan to be to raise all that die, it is because that will best conserve his purposes for the good of mankind.

Not that I have any doubts as to the purpose of God in raising all the dead, as I have very decided views in that regard; but the fact need have no part in this particular investigation.

In Bro. R's last statement he says, "The claim that all must hear the gospel preached to vindicate God's justice is based upon the doctrine of inherent goodness."

I have no doubt that Bro. R. sincerely believes that his last statement fairly represents the ground upon which we, of the broader hope, so-called, base the doctrine of the resurrection of all the dead. But in that regard he has, I feel sure, honestly misinterpreted us. Permit me, therefore, to paraphrase his statement so that it may more correctly express the true principle involved, as follows: "The claim that the light of God's truth, revealing his will, must come to all mankind, is based upon God's word, and demonstrates God's justice and inherent

goodness.”

Notwithstanding our natural self-esteem, we are not unmindful of the truth expressed by our Lord when he said, “There is none good but one, that is, God.”

We now return to Rom. 5:15. Here Paul speaks of the offense of one (Adam) which caused the death of many (Adam’s posterity), and the gift of grace (God’s favor) through Jesus Christ, which abounds unto many. And in verse 16, judgment to condemnation, by one (Adam) and the free gift (Christ and his sacrifice) unto justification, are mentioned.

The question is, Does the “many,” unto whom the free gift by grace mentioned in verse 15, came, include the “many” whose death is caused by one (Adam) mentioned also in that verse, or does it include only a limited number, those who have heard and accepted the gospel, or other limited class? And does the judgment to condemnation, and those justified through the free gift mentioned in verse 16, refer to the same class, or are there limitations applied, if not specially mentioned?

From the reading of these texts I would understand that the same class is meant in the various references. But verse 18 surely makes the meaning clear. It reads, “Therefore, as by the offense of one (Adam), judgment came on all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one (Jesus Christ), the free gift came upon all men to justification of life.”

By this statement it seems to be clear that all who came under condemnation, which was death, through the disobedience of Adam, are to be recipients of justification of life. resurrection, through

the obedience of Jesus Christ. Therefore, I am unable to see wherein this chapter teaches the resurrection of a less number, by God's grace, through the gift of Jesus Christ, than were condemned to death through the disobedience of Adam, viz., the whole family of mankind.

I have endeavoerd in this investigation not to speculate, nor to assume premises from which to reason into conclusions; nor to put strained constructions upon Bible statements; nor to wrest any text from its natural, proper and true connections.

There are many statements in the scriptures, the meaning and full imports of which are not clear to me; and I recognize the fact that we do not all interpret them alike, although honest and sincere in our efforts to interpret them correctly. But I believe that if we would all take the plain, positive statements of the scriptures as the great outstanding truths upon the respective subjects, and seek to harmonize the statements which are not so clear and simple with the more plain and clear ones, regardless of our own ideas as to how it ought to be, it would assist us in coming more nearly to a unity of belief upon these doctrines.

Submitted in love for the truth, for the charitable consideration of those interested.

L. E. Conner.



**H**ANKS to Bro. Conner for his review of my article in Restitution Herald on the above subject, dated Dec. 18, 1918. We would rather be the subject of harsh criticism than to know that our article had failed to awaken any interest. We are assured with Bro. C. as our critic that there will appear no harsh criticism.

We can heartily extend to him the same kindly feelings that he has to us in his opening remarks. The difference in our views may be plainly stated in this proposition, viz., Will Jehovah raise the entire human family or will the resurrection be confined to a limited number?

We believe that the scriptures plainly teach that there will be two classes raised, viz., the righteous and the unrighteous. The righteous will be those who will come forth immortal. The unrighteous are those who have been righteous and become apostates. The terms godly and ungodly as used comprise the same classes. We have also a third class that we will designate as sinners. This is clearly stated by Peter (1 Peter 4:18). If the righteous scarcely be saved, where will the ungodly and the sinner appear? It is evident that the writer had these three classes in his mind when he wrote this letter. Provisions are made in Jehovah's purpose to raise the first named classes. Now if Bro. C. will give us chapter and verse stating that God has promised a resurrection to those who have never

heard the gospel preached, we will become a convert to the theory of a universal resurrection. If so it will end our controversy.

To be classed among the unrighteous we must first be counted righteous through faith. Paul states (Rom. 14:23), Whatsoever is not of faith is sin. Further on this subject the Apostle states (Rom. 3:9) that both Jew and Gentile are under sin. In 11:32 it is stated that God concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all. Again, in Gal. 3:22, this thought is carried still further. He states that the scriptures hath concluded all under sin that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. Jehovah in his purpose has counted all of Adam's race under sin that he might save those who believe. The faith is the only power that God will use to render men righteous and entitled to a resurrection to immortality. Jehovah's justice cannot be called in question because his creatures fail to comply with the terms of the gospel. God's witnesses are recorded in Acts 14:17, and consist of our temporal blessings as well as his witnesses who proclaim the gospel of the kingdom of God.

Bro. C. will agree with me when I state that there will be a resurrection of the righteous and the unrighteous. The first to eternal life and the second to a future judgment of condemnation. He fails to see that the class called sinners are not included in the unrighteous class. Therefore he teaches that all are entitled to a resurrection. Those who have never heard the gospel to an opportunity to hear and believe. In Bro. C's three articles he has failed to state his proposition and apply scripture

as proof. He has spent his time and force in trying to weaken my statements. He has labored to show that the sentence passed on Adam did not affect the race. I stated that the same sentence was passed upon the whole Adamic race with this modification, that their sin was not premeditated or after the similitude of Adam's transgression. They were born under the law of sin and death which would hold them until made free by the law of the spirit of life. Rom. 8:2. The law of the spirit of life is the gospel. Paul says, I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ for it is the power of God unto the salvation to every one that believes. What of those who believe not, but reject the gospel? I wish to state here that the promise of a resurrection is always conditional. The righteous to eternal life, the unrighteous to a condemned life. Could language be plainer than "the wages of sin is death but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord"? Rom. 6:23. A resurrection is implied in the promise made to the woman. Gen. 3:15. It is exemplified in the offerings required of Cain and Abel. One was counted righteous and the other was counted under sin. The marginal rendering of this is, Shut up unto sin. Sin will hold every one of the Adamic race except those who have become apostates. I have previously stated that the resurrection could be applied only to a limited number and at stated periods for a specific purpose. Please note the purpose of Jehovah in the destruction of the antedeluvians. God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and it grieved him at the heart. The Lord said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth. The Lord saw that the imagination,



the purposes, the desires were evil. For this purpose he destroyed them from the face of the earth. It is further stated that every living substance was destroyed. Will Jehovah raise such characters to discipline them in the coming age? It seems to me that if all would give a clear interpretation to the language of Solomon they would see that sons of men are classed with the beasts. I said in my heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them and that they might see that they themselves are beasts. Eccl. 3:18. The truth in the above scripture is that Jehovah classifies together the sons of men and the beasts. All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again. To prove that the sons of men are entitled to a resurrection you must prove that beasts are entitled to the same favor. The sons of God were those who called themselves by the name of the Lord. (Margin, Gen. 4:26). The sons of men were the children of Cain. These two classes are plainly marked throughout the scriptures. These classes are implied in the teaching of Jesus to the Sadducees. They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and a resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage. Neither can they die any more. They are equal to the angels, and are the children of God. The worthy are only entitled to the benefit of the resurrection. Others are placed in the Sadducee class being the children of men. We ask why and when raise all of Adam's race? 1. They say, To give them an opportunity to hear the gospel preached. 2. In the future age or in the kingdom age. This class choose to make their chief argument on John 5:28, 29; 1

Cor. 15:22. I wish first to notice John 5:28, 29.

I am asked to state why I limit the resurrection spoken of here to two classes. It has been God's purpose to count righteousness to those who believed the gospel. Abraham believed God and it was counted to him for righteousness. Righteousness is counted by God to those who obey. Goodness may be acquired by the individual. Neither are inherent in man born of woman. A righteous person can become unrighteous and a subject of a resurrection to judgment. With this thought before us let us examine carefully John 5. A part of this chapter relates to the resurrection and judgment. The Father hath committed all judgment to the Son. Jesus then states that the hour now is when the dead (a definite dead) shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live. The reason is that the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself. This is evident, that the Son did not possess the Father life, but it was a gift. This life will be given only to the obedient and overcomers. From the limiting clause, "they that hear shall live," it is evident that there is a class who will not hear. The resurrection herein spoken of cannot benefit those who hear not. This thought is further emphasized by the 28th and 29th verses. Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth. The class who are benefited by the resurrection are those who hear. They are further qualified by the phrase, in the graves. We have two qualifying elements, one a clause, the other a phrase. The word all cannot be extended to the whole race. The all in this connection are those

who hear the voice of the Son of God and live. We will have an occasion to speak of "all" when we examine 1 Cor. 15:22. The 29th verse speaks of those who have done good and those who have done evil. The good are evidently the righteous. Those who have done evil are the unrighteous as no others are spoken of in this connection. One class is raised to life eternal, the other to a future judgment of condemnation. In James 1:15 we read, When lust hath conceived it bringeth forth sin, and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death. Such have received their wages, which is death.

We now wish to examine critically 1 Cor. 15:22. In the contention over this text all depends on whether the word "all" is or is not a limited term. Bro. C., in his review, contends that it has a universal application and that all must be raised through Christ. If this be true all must be raised to the same kind of a life, which is eternal life. We claim that this text must be interpreted to harmonize with the whole chapter. We insist that this chapter affords no proof of a resurrection to mortal conditions. The resurrection taught in this chapter can only be applied to those who believed in the resurrection of the Christ. The Apostle states that if Christ be not raised your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. That is, ye are still sinners. He states in the next verse, Then they, also, which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. Not a single promise to those who have fallen asleep in Adam. This chapter begins with the thought that the gospel preached by Paul afforded the only means of blessing through the resurrection. Note, please, Paul declared the gospel by which they were saved if they believed

not in vain. A vain belief would naturally leave them under the power of the Adamic death. That is, it would leave them where Adam was returned, to the dust from which he came. In my former article I stated that verse 23 limited the meaning of the preceding verse. The thought is not complete in verse 22, but is extended, including the following verse which reads as follows, But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming. Read the 22nd verse and the first sentence in the 23rd verse, and you have universal salvation. Eliminate the modifying clause, viz., Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming, and you have a gospel that saves all of the Adamic race. In further proof that this chapter can be applied only to those in Christ we call your attention to Paul's answer to the two questions contained in verse 35. He writes, That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die. This statement requires that we explain the meaning of "is not quickened except it die." In John 24:12, we have the key that unlocks the mystery. Verily verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat, or grain of wheat, fall into the ground and die it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.

Now permit us to apply the figure used by Jesus and Paul. In John 24:12, we have two grains. The one dies, the other abides alone. Jesus taught in this connection that a grain to produce fruitage must be vitalized. If a germ of life in a grain is deadened, it remains in the ground and produces no fruitage. This text must be applied to Jesus, the Son of the living God. Jehovah vitalized his Son by giving

the life that abides forever. John 5:25. Jesus received this vitalization through the resurrection. The fruitage will be given this life through the same process. This completes the statement made in 1 Cor. 15:22, 23. There can be no other logical conclusion as we have shown by divine testimony. We will dismiss this part of our subject by saying that the all in Adam can be extended no further than the all in Christ. The phrase "in Christ," limits the phrase "in Adam," by applying it to those who believed in the death of Christ. See verses 3 and 4.

We will now notice the statements made by Bro. C. on Ezek. 16. We have by careful study made ourselves familiar with this chapter. We now change places with Bro. C. and become the critic. Let us state that the subject of resurrection is not even inferred in this chapter. It is a case of "a drowning man catching at a straw." I wonder why Bro. C. omitted the first fifty verses of this chapter? We commend our readers to a careful study of these verses. They relate to the filthy condition of Jerusalem or the kingdom of Judah. Note carefully the conditions implied. The 51st verse recites this fact that Judah had multiplied her abominations more than her sisters, Samaria and Sodom. We infer from this that all had practiced the same abominations, but Judah to a greater degree. Sodom was destroyed by fire because of her wickedness. Israel or Samaria was removed and her government destroyed. Judah was overturned with the promise that she would be restored to the rightful heir, Jesus the Christ. Ezek. 21:27. What were the conditions of these three sisters? We reply, that of filthiness and abominations of all kinds. No greater crimes could

be charged against them for which the law provided a punishment. Bro. C. says to read on to verse 53, where it says, When I shall bring again their captivity, the captivity of Sodom and her daughters, then will I bring again the captivity of thy captives in the midst of thee. All that can be claimed in this language is that the three sisters will be restored to their former conditions of abominations and sinful practices. Verse 55 confirms my statement in this regard. When Sodom and her daughters are returned to their former estate then thou and thy daughters shall return to your former estate. The simple truth is that the writer is using the strongest irony to show that their punishment was just. The covenant spoken of in verses 60 to 63, is the covenant that will restore Israel and Judah to very different conditions. It will not be a return to a "former estate" of filthiness and abominations. The prophet states the conditions of the covenant in verse 63. That thou mayest remember and be confounded, and never open thy mouth any more because of thy shame, when I am pacified toward thee for all that thou hast done, saith the Lord.

In all of Bro. C's articles he has failed to define his broader views on the resurrection, merely stating that all of Adam's race will be raised. Certainly they cannot be raised until after the righteous dead have been raised. I demand that they prove that this particular resurrection takes place during the thousand years in which Jesus and his saints will reign. The only hint of a resurrection during this period is found in Rev. 20:5, which places the resurrection at the close of the thousand years. Here John brings to our attention a judgment of a class

not hitherto raised. Let us note the facts as stated in Rev. 20:11-15. The Revelator saw a great white throne and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. Note that Gog and Magog had been destroyed and the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are. Nothing of a sinful nature is now left. Then our attention is called to a resurrection of a class not hitherto judged. They are made up of the dead small and great who stood before God. We are then informed from whence they came. The sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them. Here we have a mixed multitude gathered from the different places in which they had fallen. They are made up of two classes. The names of one class were recorded in the books. Another class was recorded in the book of life. Each class was judged according to their works. It is written that, Whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire. This lake of fire is the second death. This prepares us for the following scene of the new heaven and the new earth in which there is no curse. I can see but two purposes in the resurrection. 1, To give immortality to those whom God has counted righteous and have lived a godly life. 2, To raise those who have apostasized and put Christ to an open shame. This class is brought to view in Heb. 10:29. Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy who hath trodden under foot the Son of God and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath



done despite unto the spirit of grace.

We shall now conclude our article by stating that we still believe that there was a chief or but one resurrection which is extended from the resurrection of Jesus the Christ to the resurrection of the righteous dead. These will be raised at the coming of Christ. The resurrection of all the righteous dead is pendant on the resurrection of Christ. We have no apology to offer for writing our two articles, believing that we are sustained by a sufficient Bible testimony to prove our position, viz., That the resurrection is limited to a specified class, the righteous and the unrighteous.

D. C. Robison.

Church of God General Conference: McDonough, GA, <https://coggc.org/>

**I**T IS NOT my purpose to continue this discussion without limit, but I desire to consider some of Bro. R's statements in his last two articles under above heading; and for the convenience of the reader will try to refer to these statements in the order in which they appear.

In his article in Restitution Herald of Feb. 26, he says, "We believe that the scriptures plainly teach that there will be two classes raised, viz., the righteous and the unrighteous. The righteous are those who will come forth immortal. The unrighteous are those who have been righteous and become apostates. The terms godly and ungodly as used comprise the same classes. We have also a third class

that we will designate as sinners," etc.

In this statement the dead are divided into three classes, viz., 1st class, the righteous—godly, who will come forth immortal; 2nd class, the unrighteous—ungodly, those who have once been righteous and have become apostates; 3rd class, sinners.

Bro. R. says that he believes that the scriptures plainly teach that the first two mentioned classes will be raised. That the scriptures plainly teach that the righteous and the unrighteous will be raised up there can be no question. But where do we find the scriptural testimony upon which to base the statement that the unrighteous class is limited to apostates, and that those called sinners compose a separate, a third class?

Statements of Bible doctrine, if they are to be given full credit, let me repeat, must be based upon Bible texts; and Bro. R. not only fails to cite a proof text upon which to found the above statement, but I submit that there is no such text to cite. In 2 Thes. 2:8-10, wicked and unrighteous are applied to the same subject. The primary meaning of the term unrighteous is, "not righteous, evil, wicked, sinful." Likewise the meaning of ungodly is, "not godly, not having regard for God, disobedient to God, wicked," etc. In Psa. 73:3, 12, "wicked," and "ungodly," are applied to the same persons. And in 2 Pet. 2:5, the Apostle, in speaking of the world in Noah's time, says: "and spared not the old world....bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly."

Bro. R. states that the ungodly are apostates and will be raised up, but the world destroyed by the flood will not be raised, as they "suffered the penalty of the second death, which is final." How

his views, as he states them, and the declaration of Peter above quoted can be reconciled, I do not know, unless Bro. R. can see his way clear to change his views that they may harmonize with the inspired statements and facts.

Further on Bro. R. says, "Bro. C. will agree with me when I state that there will be a resurrection of the righteous and the unrighteous. The first to eternal life and the second to a future judgment of condemnation." I do not know whether I agree with his entire statement or not. I fully agree with the first part of the statement, down to and including, "the first to eternal life." But I don't know what he may mean by "a future judgment to condemnation." If this questioned phrase were to be found in the scriptures I might be able to determine its meaning from its context and by comparing it with other scriptures; but standing as it does I neither agree nor disagree. I don't know.

His next sentence states the situation correctly when he says, "He fails to see that the class called sinners are not included in the unrighteous class."

Bro. R. has misinterpreted my statements if he concludes that I have "labored to show that the sentence passed upon Adam did not affect the race," and I cannot imagine how he could form such conclusions from anything that I have written. The plain statement of the scriptures is that "as by one man (Adam) sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Were it not for the truth set out in that text I would have no occasion for endeavoring to show that all are to be raised to life again.

I pass over some further statements of Bro. R.

without comment, except to offer this general criticism, viz., that too many statements are made without citing plain scriptural texts upon which to base such statements. However logical our argument may be upon a Bible subject, unless the premise from which we reason be based upon a plainly stated proposition of the scriptures, our deductions cannot be relied upon with safety, so it seems to me.

We now come to consider Eccl. 3:18, cited by Bro. R., in which text the sons of men are associated with beasts. Solomon states in what respect they are thus classed and associated, viz.,

“For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing (death) befalleth them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other, yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no preeminence above a beast for all is vanity. All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again.” Verses 19 and 20.

According to the scriptures, Gen. 3:17-19; Rom. 5:12, this is the condition with all mankind. There is not a hint in all the scriptures that the phrase “sons of men,” is applied to the offspring of Cain, and to them only. If Bro. R. knows of such Bible text here is the place to cite it. He has warned us against reasoning from “suppositional propositions,” and he reserved no rights in that warning.

I submit that the phrase, “sons of men,” as its companion phrase, “children of men,” is of general application to the human family, and never applied to a certain class unless qualifying terms are used.

The singular form is, “son of man,” and the short form, “a man,” the shortest being “man.” In Psa. 115:16, we read, “The heaven, even the heavens are

the Lord's; but the earth hath he given to the children of men (sons of men)." Surely this does not mean that the Lord gave the earth to the sons of Cain, only.

The singular form, "son of man," is of very frequent occurrence in the scriptures, especially in Ezek., chapters 2, 3 and 4, and our Lord frequently spoke of himself as the "Son of man," as we all are aware. And in the above mentioned scriptures, Eccl. 3:19, the shorter form, "a man," is used, and refers to the same general class mentioned in verse 18 as the "sons of men;" and the indefinite article "a" being used, with no modifying term being used, it is given general application, which is in complete harmony with all the scriptures relating to man in his present, mortal nature.

Bro. R. says, "To prove that the sons of men are entitled to a resurrection you must prove that the beasts are entitled to the same favor." According to what logic (?) such a conclusion can be arrived at I cannot understand. An application of that principle to Bro. R's views may serve to test the theory. He believes that the saints will be resurrected but that sinners will not be. Are not saints and sinners of the same nature? Are they not both men? Do they not both die alike? Have they not both the same breath? Do they not both go to the same place? Are they not both of the earth, and do they not both turn to the earth again? Then, according to Bro. R's reasoning, must not both be raised if one is raised?

Job 3:13-19, pictures the grave as the place where all classes, great and small, kings and counsellors. princes. wicked and weary, servant and mas-

ter, all rest together; and in 17:13-16, Job says that the grave is to be his waiting house, and that corruption and the worm are to go down together and be his companions, and in Job 25:6, man and the son of man is called a worm in death. But does that indicate that these companions are to receive the same favor that is to be bestowed upon Job, if he is to be resurrected?

It may be said that such a thought is preposterous, and it is; but I submit that such conclusion is as fully justified in the one case as in the other; the plain fact being that it is by no means justified in either case.

We now come once more to John 5:28, 29. Regarding this scripture and its context Bro. R. speaks of qualifying elements, a clause and a phrase, etc., all of which, together with the quotations given and the applications and statements made does not make his exposition plain and harmonious to me. This may be due, somewhat, to the fact that I entertain a different view as to the interpretation of the text; and I recognize the possibility of a bias of mind not easily overcome in trying to get in my mind his exact thought. As I see it, his exposition lacks clearness, simplicity and harmony; and I believe that our Lord's teaching as regards the facts of the resurrection are simple and harmonious. Let us try once more to get hold of the truth taught in this scripture. For the sake of brevity I will not repeat the full text, but ask the reader to take his Bible, turn to John 5, and follow it carefully. The first mention of the raising up of the dead is in the 21st verse, in which it is declared that the same power to raise and give life to the dead which the Father

exercises is also exercised by the Son.

The 22nd and 23rd verses speak of judgment and honor. In verse 24 the Savior is speaking of living men who will hear and believe not only the Son, but the Father, also, and states what the results of such belief will be, viz., that he "hath (prospectively) everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation (judgment), but is passed (prospectively) from death unto (everlasting) life."

In this verse no apostate is included; only the faithful believer.

Now read verse 25. There are two interpretations that may be given to this text. First, the literal interpretation, and, second, the so-called spiritual interpretation. The literal interpretation is, that the Savior was declaring his intention to call some who had died, back to life, at that time, as he had done in the case of Lazarus and others, and thus exemplify the statement made in verse 21.

The so-called spiritual interpretation is, that the dead mentioned in the text were unbelievers, who were "dead in trespasses and sins," and were to become believers, thus becoming "alive to Christ," and to be reckoned as having passed from death unto life, as mentioned in verse 24.

Either of these interpretations may be considered logical, the correctness of the respective conclusions depending upon the correctness of the premises from which the respective interpreters reason into final conclusions.

I accept the literal interpretation as being the correct one, although the other interpretation does no violence to the general truths taught in the chapter, as I am able to see it.



Verses 26 and 27 speak of the life and authority the Father had given to the Son; and now verses 28 and 29, which we here quote:

“Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth,” etc.

If the statement were, that all that had heard his voice during their lifetime, and who are now in the graves, or some similar statement of limitation, shall come forth, then there would be good grounds for saying that, so far as this text is concerned, the resurrection will be limited to a certain class. But the plain declaration is: “all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth.” And why should we try to limit it to only a small portion of those that are in the graves when the text says “all that are in the graves”? Church of God General Conference: McDonough, 1877 https://cogc.org/

Bro. R. examines critically 1 Cor. 15:22. I have, in a former article, followed and reviewed his reference to this text, and shall not take space to go into it further here, except to call attention to a few things in connection with his interpretation of the text with the other portions of the chapter.

This chapter is the one in which the theory of the resurrection is discussed and explained. The resurrection as a fact, and the extent to which it is to be applied is referred to in many places, and many statements are made; but the theory and principles and logic of the resurrection are considered and discussed in this chapter as in no other place in the scriptures.

Furthermore, the statements made in other places in the scripture upon the subject of resurrection are all in harmony with the doctrine of resur-

rection as taught in this chapter, and never in violation of any of the principles or theory therein given.

In Bro. R's examination of this text (verse 22) he says, "We insist that this chapter affords no proof of a resurrection to mortal conditions." And again, "A vain belief would naturally leave them under the power of the Adamic death," and then attempts to show that the resurrection is limited to "Christ, the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming."

I called attention to this in a former article, and now again I ask, If this be the limit of the resurrection how and when will the unrighteous, ungodly, apostates be reached by the resurrection? And if none come forth to mortal conditions, they must all come forth to immortal conditions. And does not an apostate have a vain belief? If there is to be but one resurrection, but two events, as Bro. R. has stated, and that statement taken with his argument here, the two events would be, Christ the first fruits, the first event, and afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming, the second event.

Are the unrighteous, ungodly apostates reckoned as being Christ's? If not, where do they have part in the resurrection of two events? To my mind that theory is not in harmony with the plain statements of the scriptures.

Bro. R. now comes to the consideration of Ezek. 16, and becomes my critic, which is entirely proper, and I invite such kindly criticism. If I have misinterpreted the scriptures I want to know it. He says that in this chapter the resurrection is not even inferred, and that it is a case of a "drowning man

catching at a straw." Really, I had not thought that my position was so dangerous as that.

He wonders why I omitted the first fifty verses of the chapter. I omitted specific reference to the first 43 verses for the reason that nothing is stated in that part of the chapter and to which specific reference is necessary, and it is a very long chapter, as I stated when I first mentioned this chapter.

Coming to Bro. R's comment on verse 53, he says, "all that can be claimed in this language is that the three sisters (Samaria and her daughters and Sodom and her daughters) will be restored to their former conditions of abominations and sinful practices."

Were we to grant that this is what was promised, may I ask how Sodom and her daughters, that had been destroyed and had not existed for more than a thousand years before the promise was made, are to be restored to such former conditions without a resurrection? When they existed in the former conditions they were alive and active; and can they be restored to those conditions without being bro't back to life and activity?

I see no irony in God's promises. I take no exceptions to Bro. R's interpretation of verses 60-63, except that he appeared to have overlooked verse 61, in which the Lord declares that when Judah shall have remembered her ways, etc., then she shall receive her sisters, Samaria and Sodom and their daughters, and the Lord says that he will then give these sisters to Judah for daughters.

Surely this is not irony; and if such promises can be kept and fulfilled without raising up the Sodomites I shall be interested to know by what method.

And if the declaration of the Savior that it shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment than for cities that lived and died more than a thousand years after Sodom's destruction does not mean what it says, what does it mean?

Again, Bro. R. says, "I demand that they prove that this particular resurrection (the resurrection of those not classified as righteous and apostates, I take it) takes place during the thousand years in which Jesus and his saints will reign."

I do not know, I am sure, why such demand is made. I have not stated, nor do I believe, nor do I know of anyone who does believe that all the dead will be raised during the thousand years mentioned. I know of no statement in the scriptures that any of the dead will be raised during that period. On the other hand, if the first sentence of Rev. 20:5 is authentic, it seems quite clear that no resurrection of the dead takes place during the thousand year period there mentioned. There is some authority to the effect that this text is not authentic; and if it were eliminated we would be without any statement as to whether any of the dead are to be raised during that period or not; and whatever opinion we might form in that regard would be more or less speculative, as I see it. It is not for me to pass upon the weight of the authority for the elimination of the text mentioned, and therefore it is not marked out of my book.

There is no statement in the scriptures, so far as I know, which indicates that the reign of Christ and the completing of the work of restitution is to be limited to the thousand year period. On the contrary, it is evident to me that it will not be com-

pleted during that period. A large part of the scene as given in Rev. 20, is represented as taking place after the thousand year period. The statement in 1 Cor. 15:25, is that "he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet." How long time this will require we are no where told, so far as I know, and in Eph. 2:7, we are told that in the ages to come God is to show the exceeding riches of his grace, etc. The number and length of the ages to come are not given, but they will be sufficient for the work that is to be done.

Bro. R. is surely right when he says that "certainly they (those not reckned as being Christ's) cannot be raised until after the righteous dead are raised." The plain statement is that "the dead in Christ shall rise first," and I have never heard that statement questioned.

Church of God General Conference: McDonough, GA, <https://coggc.org/>

In conclusion, I submit that in the careful consideration Bro. R. has given this subject he has made many statements relative to the purposes of the resurrection, its limitations, etc., but has not cited one Bible text in which a plain statement is made to the effect that the resurrection is to be confined to the righteous and apostate dead, nor any other special, limited classes. On the other hand, I submit, in their order, and for the careful consideration of the reader the following testimonies, which I believe to be in point, to-wit:

1. "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." John 5: 28-29.

2. "But this I confess unto thee, that....so worship I the God of my fathers....and have hope toward God....that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Acts 24:15-16.

3. "Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." Rom. 5:18.

4. "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." 1 Cor. 15:42.

5. "And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell (grave, margin) delivered up the dead which were in them." Rev. 20:13.

In this investigation and discussion my object has not been to determine nor to consider the purposes for which the dead are to be raised up, but rather to determine, from the scriptures, to what extent over the entire field of dead is the resurrection to reach; or if all are not to be raised, to what portion, class or classes of the dead is the resurrection to be limited. And to my mind, the above cited scriptures, in positive statements, and in plain, simple terms, answer that question.

L. E. Conner.

Church of God General Conference: McDonough, GA, <https://coggc.org/>



Johnson  
236.8  
C952d  
1918  
c.1

Eschatology

also  
check

Church of God General Conference: McDonough, GA, <https://coggc.org/>

