

The New Testament Doctrine of Judgment

BY J. J. ANDREW, LONDON

Part 1	1
Part 2	6
Part 3	14
Part 3	19
Part 4	23
Part 5	27
Notes and Addenda.....	31

Part 1

The Christadelphian, vol. 4, Pages 230-235, 1867

BY J. J. ANDREW, LONDON.

[Though this subject has been largely treated in recent numbers of the *Ambassador*, it has not been exhausted; and its great importance, from both a theoretical and practical point of view, will justify its further and continued exhibition to the mind of the reader, in the following and succeeding articles from the pen of Brother ANDREW, of London, who writes in a plain, intelligible, logical, and pleasing style.—EDITOR.]

IN considering this doctrine, the first point to be settled is, the meaning of the word “judge.” In the English language it is used in two different ways; the first is represented by such words as discern, distinguish, consider, determine, estimate, or form an opinion; the second not only comprises this meaning, but it further implies action as the result of the opinion formed, and, when applied to legal matters, is represented by such phrases as, bring to trial, pass sentence, doom to punishment, &c. The first meaning is applicable to animate or inanimate objects, to abstract or concrete questions; but the second has reference solely to the conduct of individuals. The Greek word used in the original text of the New Testament is κρίνω (*krino*), and its meaning, according to Liddell and Scott’s *Lexicon*, is as follows: “To separate, divide, put apart, inquire, search into, decide (a contest or dispute), judge of, estimate, bring to trial, accuse, arraign, pass sentence upon, condemn.”

It will be seen from this that its radical meaning is precisely the same as that of the English word “judge,” and likewise that it is applicable to both persons and things. It is only in its application to persons that our present inquiry relates; not, however, in regard to the relationship existing between man and man, but to that which exists between God and man. When man judges man, the innocent often suffer and the guilty escape; but when God judges man, the principles of justice are so infallibly carried out, that no one is punished or rewarded more than he deserves. God first prescribes a course for a man to pursue, and then judges him

by the extent of his obedience. This truth is set forth by Paul in the following words: "As many as have *sinned without law* shall perish without law; and as many as have *sinned in the law* shall be judged by the law."—(Rom. 2:12.) From this it is evident that only those who are acquainted with God's revealed will are responsible to him for their actions, and that all others will be amenable neither to his censure nor his praise. Hence, says the same apostle, "Where no law is, there is no transgression" (Rom. 4:15.) Seeing that all who are ignorant of God's law are not in a position to fulfil its requirements, it is but in accordance with the barest ideas of justice, that they should not be punished for doing that which it was impossible for them to know was contrary to the divine will. With the other class, the case is different; they are brought under a probationary process, in which they are plainly informed what course of conduct will entitle them to the Deity's approval, and what will subject them to his condemnation. In the one case, they will receive the gift of immortality; in the other, they will be punished with their many or few stripes, according to their deserts, and, finally, be destroyed. To decide these cases is a most important task, and could only be properly done by an infallible being—the Deity. Paul gives expression to this truth in the following words: "God will render to every man according to his deeds; to them, who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory, honour, and immortality—eternal life; but unto them who are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil."—(Rom. 2:6–9.) Solomon also informs us that "God shall judge the righteous and the wicked; for there is a time for every purpose and every work."—(Eccles. 3:17.) In his wisdom, God has seen fit that this work shall be performed by deputy, and hence the apostle says "As many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law, * * * in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men *by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel.*"—(Rom. 2:1, 16.)

The same truth was also affirmed by Jesus himself: "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the son."—(John 5:22.) This is undoubtedly one of the greatest honours bestowed upon the saviour of men, and its vast importance is evident from the fact that it is in accordance with Paul's gospel—that it is the gospel of salvation as preached by himself and the other apostles after Christ's death.

Respecting this gospel, the same apostle says, on another occasion: "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preached *any other gospel* unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."—(Gal. 1:8.)

If the preaching of another gospel brings a man into condemnation, it follows that if anyone preach the true gospel imperfectly, or in an adulterated form, he is subject to a proportionate amount of censure. It behoves all, therefore, who profess to have believed Paul's gospel, to examine themselves as to whether their knowledge of the divine truth, that "God shall judge the secrets of men by Christ Jesus," is "according to" or contrary to Paul's gospel.

For further testimony to the importance of this truth, we need only refer to the statement made by Peter in the house of Cornelius: “Jesus of Nazareth *commanded us* to preach unto the people, and *to testify that it was he* who was ordained of God to be *the judge of quick and dead.*”—(Acts 10:42.) When it is remembered that neither God nor his son Jesus ever did anything superfluous, or instructed others to do so, it must be seen that this command—said by Peter to have been given to the apostles—is one which must not, on any account, be disregarded, either by those who preach, or those who only believe the gospel proclaimed on this occasion.

1.—The plain fact contained in this declaration, that Jesus Christ is the judge of quick and dead, is one which no one believing in the inspiration of the Bible, would dare to deny. But a mere assent to these words of Scripture, without an intelligent understanding of their meaning, is of no use; any more than is a nominal belief in Jesus Christ, without knowing who and what he is, and what was the nature of his mission to mankind. For instance, a man might take Paul’s statement, “It is appointed unto men once to die, and after death the judgment” (Heb. 9:27), and without examining any part of scripture, might conclude that Jesus Christ judges men immediately after death; but this we know to be a most grievous error, because we are told that a certain time is fixed for the performance of this duty, and that time is the second appearing of the judge himself: “I charge thee, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who *shall judge* the quick and the dead *at his appearing* and his kingdom.”—(2 Tim. 4:1.) To believe, then, that Jesus Christ is the judge of quick and dead, comprises first of all the *time* when the event is to take place.

2.—The next point to be ascertained is, are the “quick and dead” to be in presence of the judge when he judges them? That this question must be answered in the affirmative, is evident from the following passage in the epistle to the Romans: “We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ.”—(Rom. 14:10.) Those who say that the dead are judged while in the grave, nullify this truth, and shew that they do not apprehend the true nature of the judgment; for if their view be correct, what necessity is there for anyone to stand before the judgment-seat? If persons are to be judged before being raised from the dead, there will be no necessity to judge them after that event. To understand correctly, therefore, what the judgment really is, it is necessary to know that the quick and the dead are to be judged while *in the presence of the judge.*

3.—The perusal of the apostle’s statement suggests a further question, viz., what is the object for which responsible beings are to stand before Christ’s judgment-seat? Is it to hear the condemnation or approval of each one pronounced? This is one object no doubt, but there is something else to precede that, viz., to deliver an account of their actions during their time of probation; for Paul says, in a subsequent verse, “everyone of us shall give account of himself to God.” In this statement we see a confirmation of the last conclusion we arrived at—that the dead are to be brought to life before being judged; because it is obvious that they must be alive when they give their account. Here there is another fact comprised in the apostolic teaching, concerning the judgment, that

all the disciples of Jesus Christ are *to give an account of their conduct to the judge.*

4.—The last and most important point to be settled is, what are the results which are produced by the judgment on those who are subjected to it? Does it merely define the degree of reward to be bestowed on each person, or does it bring punishment on the guilty and blessing upon the righteous? This question is, we think, very clearly decided by Paul in the following passage: “We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that everyone may receive the things *through the body*, according to that he hath done, *whether good or bad,*” (correct translation, see the *Emphatic Diaglott*).—(2 Cor. 4:10.)

Respecting that which a man “hath done,” we read in another epistle, “Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting.”—(Gal 6:7, 8.) The “bad” things are here defined as “sowing to the flesh,” and the “good” things as “sowing to the spirit.” The fruit to be reaped for the former is “corruption,” while that for the latter is “life everlasting.” Those, therefore, who “receive the things through the body according to that” which is “bad,” will suffer “corruption,” or, as Peter says, they “shall utterly perish in their own corruption” (2 Pet. 2:12), a result defined in the Apocalypse as “the second death.” But those who “receive the things through the body according to that” which is “good,” will be endowed with “life everlasting.” Hence, when Paul says “*We must all* appear before the judgment-seat,” he alludes, not to the latter class only, but to all the disciples of Jesus Christ, whether worthy or unworthy. It is obvious that neither class reap according to their good or bad deeds, previous to appearing before the judgment-seat; and it, therefore, follows that they must all appear there in bodies capable of either suffering “corruption,” or of being endowed with “life everlasting.” From this we conclude that *none of them possess immortal bodies when standing at the judgment-seat*, for, if they did, they would have been judged previously; the “dead” would have been judged in the grave, and the “quick” would have been judged before being summoned there.

Thus we see that to understand the judgment correctly, it is necessary to know what is its object—to *decide who are and who are not worthy of eternal life*; and this implies a knowledge of their condition when they appear before the judge—that they are *all to be destitute of immortality.*

We have now ascertained that an intelligent belief of the divine truth, that “God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ,” comprises the following items:

- 1.—That it is to take place at the second advent.
- 2.—That the quick and dead are to appear in the presence of the judge when they are judged.
- 3.—That they have all to give an account to the judge of their probationary career.

4.—That after the decision of the judge has been pronounced, the unworthy servants are to suffer punishment, and then be destroyed.

These, we think, are the only logical conclusions to be derived from Paul's teaching concerning the judgment; and, in proof that they are correct, we find them confirmed in other parts of scripture. Let us take, first of all, the teaching of Jesus himself, who illustrated these truths both by narrative and parable.

The twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew contains a full description of this momentous event. First, we have the fact stated that Jesus Christ shall perform his judicial duties when he appears in his glory: "*When the Son of Man shall come in his glory * * * then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats; and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left.*"—(verses 31 to 33.) Then we have the decision of the judge respecting the sheep and the goats, with a statement of his reasons, and, lastly, comes the carrying into effect of that decision. From the circumstance that those who are to be judged are here called "all nations," it is inferred by some that this narrative refers to national judgment; but this is evidently a mistake, because the judged ones are only composed of sheep and goats; and, respecting the former class, we read "Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, *inherit the kingdom* prepared for you from the foundation of the world."—(verse 34.) Until this event has occurred, no judgment on the Gentile nations will be inflicted, because:

1.—In the execution of them the Messiah is to be assisted by the resurrected righteous (Psalm 149:5–9), and "judgment" is not to be "given to the saints of the Most High" until the time comes that they receive authority to take possession of the kingdom (Dan. 2:22); for as servants of the "king over all the earth" (Zech. 14:9), one of the chief reasons why they have to "fight against the nations" (Zech. 14:3; John 18:36), and "execute upon the kings and nobles the judgment written" (Psalm 149:8), is in order that "the kingdoms of this world (may) become our Lord's and his Christ's.—(Rev. 11–15.)

2.—We are distinctly told that "judgment *must begin* at the household of God; and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God" (1 Pet., 4:17); so that the nations can none of them be judged until all the members of God's household have first appeared at the judgment-seat of Christ. The most probable meaning, therefore, of "all nations," is that those who stand before the judge will be composed of individuals gathered out of all nations, or, as they are represented in the Apocalypse, "redeemed out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation."—(Rev. 5:9.)

Respecting the second class, the goats, we find these words recorded: "Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand "*Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil [adversary] and his angels*" [messengers.]—(verse 41.) For the persons here mentioned to be brought before the judgment-seat, is a proof that they must have been

responsible to God, in some way or other, by a knowledge of his law; because only those who are under his law are to be judged by it, and they who are “without law shall perish without law.” The same may also be said of those who inherit the kingdom. **These two classes, comprising all who are subjected to this judicial process, are both composed entirely of responsible beings, and not a word is here said about the infliction of NATIONAL judgments on the unbelieving Gentiles.** If, therefore, the word “nation” is here interpreted to denote unbelievers, it is very strange that nothing is said about the punishment to be inflicted upon them. **One portion of the individuals comprehended under the term “nations” enter the kingdom, and the remainder are all consigned to the fire prepared for the political and ecclesiastical adversaries of Christ; thus shewing that this description of the judgment applies only to the household of God. This affords an additional reason for concluding that the word “nations” is here used only to describe those who have been gathered out of the sea of nations by the net of the kingdom.**

It will have been observed that the division of the multitude into two classes—the sheep and the goats, or the worthy and the unworthy—does not take place until after their appearance before the judge; and that the approval of the one and the condemnation of the other, follows their separation. The result of approval is entrance into the kingdom, while that of condemnation is the infliction of punishment ending in death. These results are summarized in the last verse of the chapter, as follows: *“These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous (shall go) into life eternal.”* If, as we learn from this narrative, the righteous are in such a condition when before the judgment-seat, that, at their separation from the wicked, they require authority to inherit the kingdom, and, at the close of the judicial process, the judge can consistently say of them *“they (shall go) into eternal life,”* is it not plain that they are not endowed with immortality until after the judgment? According to this description, it is evident that the judgment is for the express purpose of deciding who are worthy of eternal life. To say, then, that they are immortal before they appear there, is to reduce this important event to an empty, unmeaning ceremony—much in the same way as do those who affirm that men go to heaven at death.

Part 2

The Christadelphian, vol. 4, Pages 257-264, 1867

By J. J. ANDREW, LONDON.

THE next important utterance of Jesus Christ on this subject, is the parable of the nobleman and the pounds. In this parable, the judge is represented as a nobleman who goes into a far country (heaven) to receive a kingdom, and then returns home (the earth) to take possession of it. Before his departure “he called his ten servants, and delivered them ten pounds, and said unto them ‘Occupy (or trade) till I come.’” When he returned, those servants were brought before him, “that he might know how much every man had gained by trading.” Although there

were ten servants, the cases of three only are given; they are quite sufficient to show the principle on which the whole were treated.

The first said he had gained ten pounds by trading with one pound: whereupon his master said "Well, thou good servant, because thou hast been faithful in a very little, have thou authority over ten cities."

The second said he had gained five pounds by trading with one pound: whereupon his master said "Be thou over five cities." But the third returned the pound as it had been given to him, saying "I feared thee because thou art an austere man; thou takest up that thou layest not down, and reapest that thou didst not sow." To this his master answered "Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee." This he proceeded to do, by showing him that even if his fear for his master's severity prevented him from trading with the pound, it did not prevent him putting it into the bank, that it might simply have gained interest. Then "he said unto them that stood by, 'take from him the pound, and give it to him that hath ten pounds.'"

It is not difficult to perceive that this is but another mode of illustrating the judgment, and is intended to teach an aspect which is omitted in the narrative just noticed; namely, that all who are the true servants of Jesus Christ will be judged according to the manner in which they have, while in his service, used or misused their abilities. It also illustrates Paul's statement, that "everyone of us shall give account of himself to God:" a circumstance not mentioned by Jesus Christ, when speaking of the sheep and goats. Each of the three servants rendered an account of his stewardship; and it was the nature of that account which determined his destiny. The third one evidently did not know what his destiny would be, previously to sentence being pronounced, or he would not have uttered an excuse which enabled his master so triumphantly to condemn him out of his own mouth. And as the approval of the other two followed the delivery of their accounts, it necessarily follows that they also were unacquainted with their destiny previous to their approval being declared; for it will be seen that all the three were brought before him, "*that he might know* how much every man had gained by trading." Before this was done, it was impossible for him to praise or blame them, because he had been away into a far country, and consequently did not know how they had conducted themselves during his absence. It was absolutely necessary, therefore, that on his return they should deliver an account of their stewardship.

From the circumstance that the number of cities to be ruled over are mentioned in this parable, it is often inferred that the judgment is simply the bestowal of the rewards of the kingdom, in their various degrees, to the righteous after they have received the gift of immortality. But it is evident that this cannot be the sole meaning of the parable, because, firstly, if that view be correct, two at least, and probably the whole three, would have known their destiny before their master had seen them, and thus the delivery of their account would have been quite unnecessary; for if the nobleman had known which of the servants merited his approval, he would also have known what amount of reward they deserved.

Secondly, on such a theory it is impossible to account for the unprofitable servant being summoned at precisely the same time as the other two.

Thirdly, the authority to rule over ten or five cities is, in reality, the same thing as granting an entrance into the kingdom, or the bestowal of eternal life.

In the parable of the talents narrated by Matthew, which is doubtless but another version of the parable of the pounds recorded by Luke, the mark of approval is denoted by these words: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things; I will make thee ruler over many things; *enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.*"—(Matt. 25:21.)

For the judge to say "Be ruler over many things," is undoubtedly the same as saying "Inherit the kingdom prepared for you," or "Be thou over five cities," because all who inherit the kingdom will exercise regal authority; hence the Apocalyptic promise "To him that overcometh, will I give power over the nations." Then, again, it must be noticed that immediately after granting the power to rule many things, the nobleman said "Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." To do this it is requisite to be made like Christ—a partaker of the divine nature, so that if immortality had been previously bestowed, we are led to ask, with what appropriateness could the judge now invite him to enter into the joy of his Lord? Immortality is the gift of the King, with whom is deposited the lives of his faithful servants, and can only be enjoyed through the means of the kingdom; therefore as soon as a person has received that unspeakable gift, he will be certain of being made a "ruler over many (or few) things," for he knows that "*power over the nations,*" and the privilege of *reigning* with the Messiah, is an essential accompaniment of the possession of eternal life.

For these reasons, we think we may safely conclude that the parable of the pounds or talents does not teach that the judgment is merely the apportionment of positions in the kingdom to the righteous, but, on the contrary, that *it is for the purpose of deciding who are, and who are not, worthy to enter that kingdom.*

Such, then, are the two most elaborate of Christ's discourses concerning the mode in which "God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ." One is a simple narrative, and the other a parable. The former represents the whole number of those who are to be judged, but the latter brings before us three cases only as illustrations of the rest. The one is a collective view of the judgment, and the other an individual one. The main facts, however, in each case are precisely the same, and they fully confirm the statements of Paul:—first, as regards the *time*;—that it is to be at the second advent; second, as to the *manner*;—that the household of God are to be in the presence of their Master while being judged; third, in the *results*;—that the unfaithful are to be punished, and the faithful endowed with immortality.

And although the "account" to be given by each individual is not mentioned in the narrative, it is copiously illustrated in the parable. Thus we see that the teaching of Jesus on this important subject harmonises in every particular with

that of Paul;—a circumstance which might reasonably be expected, seeing that they were both inspired by the same spirit.

There is, however, one fact in connection with the parable, which it may be advisable to devote a little attention to before passing to another part of the subject. It will be said, perhaps, that the ignorance of the nobleman as to the conduct of his servants is not applicable to the judge of quick and dead, because Jesus Christ, as the representative of God, “knoweth the secrets of the heart,” and is therefore so well acquainted with the conduct of all his servants as to know what they deserve before raising them from the dead. This cannot be denied; but it must be remembered that the possession of such knowledge by the Judge will not in any way interfere with the “account” to be rendered by his servants; any more than does the foreknowledge of God destroy man’s free will. One of the objects for which they are to appear before the judgment-seat to give an account of themselves, seems to be,—not to inform the Judge of any facts of which he was previously ignorant,—but, in order that, if their report be unsatisfactory, they may be condemned out of their own mouths; and that thus the justice of the Deity may be fully vindicated.

The Almighty knows everything before it occurs, for it is essential to His attribute of Omniscience, but this does not prevent Him occasionally acting as if ignorant of certain deeds of mankind. An instance of this is to be found in the case of Adam and Eve. It cannot be doubted that as soon as they had sinned, God was aware of the fact; and yet He appeared to them by a representative, and spake to them as if ignorant of their transgression. He first said to Adam “Where art thou?” to which Adam replied “I heard thy voice in the garden and was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself.” This answer showed that he was ashamed of something he had done; so the next question put to him was “Who told thee that thou wast naked? Hast thou eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldst not eat?” Then follows the excuse of Adam, who blamed Eve; whereupon the woman was questioned, and she blamed the serpent. After this, sentence was pronounced on all three, and thus the punishment to which Adam and Eve were condemned was not declared until they had actually given an account of their sinful conduct during the time of their probation in the garden of Eden. Hence they were judged by their own words, like the servants in the parable,—the last of whom was condemned out of his own mouth.

When it is remembered that Adam occupied a peculiar position as the federal head of the human race, and that through his sin, death passed upon all men, it will be seen that a more significant case than this could not be adduced to illustrate the doctrine of the judgment as applied to the household of God. Adam was placed by God under a state of probation, with the opportunity of obtaining, by obedience, the blessing of immortality; but he sinned, and when that event occurred, his probational career in the garden of Eden came to an end, and he

had to give an account of his transgression to a representative of his Creator, that his own words might condemn him.

All who are to appear before the judgment-seat of Jesus Christ will also have lived under a probationary state, in which they were required to fulfil certain obligations, imposed by the Almighty as a condition necessary to obtain eternal life; and of their performance of these duties, they will have to give an account to the one whom God has appointed to be their Judge. Thus the parallel between the two cases is complete; or, as much so as is necessary to explain how it is that although Christ be acquainted with the destiny deserved by each of his servants, they are nevertheless required to render an account of their stewardship previous to receiving either reward or punishment.

A somewhat similar instance may also be found in the case of Cain killing his brother Abel. God must have known of Cain's transgression as soon as it was committed; and yet we read that "the Lord God said unto Cain Where is thy brother Abel?" To this Cain answered, with a lie, saying "I know not; am I my brother's keeper?" Had he spoken the truth, he would have imitated Adam, but his conscience was so hardened that he added to the sin of murder that of trying to deceive the messenger of the Almighty. Therefore, to show the futility of this, the Deity's representative at once charged Cain with his crime, and pronounced his sentence. This case shows us that the possession by Jesus Christ of a knowledge of the merits of each individual to be judged by him, so far from being superfluous, is absolutely necessary to enable him to detect whether any attempt is being made to deceive him with evasion or falsehood by his unprofitable servants; for the justice to be administered by him must be infallible.

Another object, and a most important one, for which an account is required to be given at the judgment-seat, is for the purpose of impressing on the minds of those amenable to it, the responsible position they occupy as *stewards of their Lord* and Saviour. This brings before us the moral aspects of the question, in relation to this life; and it shows us that a knowledge of this truth is designed to act as a constant stimulus to the people of God to do right, and a constant check against doing wrong; so that at the day of judgment they may be able to render a good account of their probationary career. The apostle John evidently refers to this aspect when he says "He that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him. Herein is our love made perfect, *that we may have boldness in the day of judgment.*"—(1 John 4:16, 17.) And also in a previous chapter of the same epistle, where he writes "And now, little children, abide in him, *that when he shall appear, we may have confidence and not be ashamed before him, at his coming.*"—(1 John, 2:28.) When the apostle wrote these two passages, he doubtless had in his mind the warning uttered by Jesus himself: "Whosoever, therefore, shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, *of him also shall the Son of Man be ashamed, when he cometh* in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels."—(Mark 7:38.) If these important injunctions were fully realised and borne in mind by those to whom they were

addressed, they must have exercised considerable moral influence on their minds in regard to their daily conduct; for in reality, they amount to an exhortation to do nothing by which the promised prize of immortality might be lost. For Jesus Christ to be ashamed of any of his disciples at his coming, is in reality to condemn them to “everlasting shame and contempt,” to “utterly perish in their own corruption.” But to “have boldness in the day of judgment,” is to be able to give such an account, that they can with confidence, say with Paul, “I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day.”—(2 Tim. 4:7, 8.) In requiring from all who have been, or are, in Christ, an account of their stewardship, we see that the Almighty has simply applied to divine things a principle which is quite common in the relations existing among mankind themselves—not in one, but in all classes and grades of society. No sensible man ever entrusts to another any duty to discharge, office to fill, or property to hold or dispose of, without requiring from him at some time or other, an account of the manner in which he has performed the work assigned to him. Instances of this will readily occur to the mind of anyone, not only in commercial, but also in social and political life; such for instance as the master and his servant, the merchant and his clerk, the captain and his sailors, the general and his soldiers, the constituency and its member of parliament, the House of Commons and its ministers, the shareholders of a company and their directors, or an ordinary benevolent society and its committee. In every one of these cases, the knowledge that an account *can be*, and in many of them *will be required* by those from whom their position is derived, acts as a useful check to keep them in the path of duty. And if this be the case in matters affecting the present life only, is it surprising or incredible that the Almighty should have adopted a similar effective method of influencing for good—and that their own good—those who are entitled to be called the children of God? Individually and collectively, they are entrusted with the knowledge of his truth, which it is their duty, and it ought to be their delight, to employ in the service of their master, who has honoured them with the titles of “brethren,” “sons of God,” “salt of the earth,” “light of the world,” &c. Is it unreasonable then, that he should require them to report to him at the day of judgment, as to the manner in which they have employed their time, talents, and opportunities on his behalf? More especially as they know that they are not their own, but have been bought with a price—even the price of the precious blood of one who was slain as a lamb without spot or blemish.

Those who say that Paul’s statement about appearing at the judgment seat to give an account to the judge, is figurative, take away this means of control devised by God, and thus lessen very materially that feeling of responsibility which it is intended to increase. For, if a disciple of Jesus Christ will have to appear at the day of judgment, face to face before his master, to give an account of his good and bad deeds, it is obvious that a knowledge of this fact must exert a very beneficial influence on his conduct; more so than if he knew that he would never be in danger of being condemned out of his own mouth. And it is also obvious that just in proportion as he realises and remembers this important fact,

so will “the truth” purify his heart, moulding his character to the divine standard of holiness, by leading him to obey the precepts of scripture, and to bring forth works befitting his high faith and high calling.

On what grounds Paul’s statements about the judgment-seat are interpreted figuratively, we are quite at a loss to imagine; for not only are they written in as plain and direct a manner as it is possible for words to make them, but they are comprised in epistles treating little, if any, on scripture symbols. “*We shall all stand*” (all who have been baptized unto Christ), he says, “*before the judgment seat of Christ,*” and to prove that he is right, he quotes from the prophet Isaiah, saying “For it is written, as I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and *every tongue shall confess to God;*” and from this he draws the following conclusion: “So then *everyone of us shall give account of himself to God.*”—(Rom. 14:10 to 12.) In his epistle to the Philippians, he further alludes to it: “Wherefore God hath highly exalted him (Jesus Christ) and given him a name which is above every name; that *at the name of Jesus every knee should bow,* of those in heaven, those on earth, and those underneath; and that *every tongue should confess that Jesus is Lord* to the glory of God the Father.”—(Philip. 2:9 to 11.) And we also find the apostle Peter inculcating it in his epistle: “Who *shall give account to him* that is ready to judge the quick and the dead.”—(1 Peter 4:5.)

Thus we have Isaiah, Paul and Peter, in addition to Jesus himself, all testifying to the important truth that an account must be rendered to the Judge, affording an amount of evidence sufficient to convince any reasonable mind.

The phrase “judgment seat” may not refer to a material structure, such as is generally used, any more than does the term, “throne of David;” but there can be no doubt that its use involves the exercise of the judicial function—a function too, which is to be exercised *when the judged ones are in the presence of the Judge.* The word used by Paul to describe the judgment seat of Christ, is precisely the same as is used to define the seat of judicial authority, occupied by Roman functionaries in the apostle’s day. The Greek word is *beema* (βῆμα), and its meaning is defined in Liddell and Scott’s Lexicon as “a footstep, raised step, tribune, rostrum.” This is the word used by Matthew in narrating the trial of Jesus Christ. Speaking of Pilate, he says “When he was set down on the *judgment seat,* his wife sent unto him,” . . . (Matt. 27:19.) John also uses it in narrating the same event: “When Pilate therefore heard that saying, he brought Jesus forth, and sat down in the *judgment seat,* in a place that is called The Pavement, but in Hebrew, Gabbatha.”—(John 19:13.)

In commenting on this verse, Dr. Adam Clarke says “The Pavement (λίθοστρωτου), literally a stone pavement; probably it was that place in the open court where the chair of justice was set, for the Prefects of provinces always held their courts of justice in the open air, and which was paved with stones of various colours—what is now termed Mosaic work. Gabbatha: that is, an elevated place; from “gaboli,” high, raised up; and it is very likely that the judgment seat was considerably elevated in the court, and that the governor went up to it by steps;

and perhaps these very steps were what was called 'The Pavement.' John does not say that 'The Pavement' is the meaning of the word 'Gabbatha,' but that the place was called so in the Hebrew. The 'place' was probably called 'The Pavement;' the seat of judgment 'Gabbatha,' the raised or elevated place."

It will not be denied that Pilate exercised judicial authority when Jesus was brought before him; and hence we may conclude that when the same Jesus occupies a position described by precisely the same word as that which Pilate occupied, he will exercise similar functions. For other instances of a like nature, we have only to refer to the Acts of the Apostles. In the 18th chapter we have an account of Paul being accused at Corinth of breaking the law. "And when Gallio was the deputy of Achaia, the Jews made insurrection with one accord against Paul, and brought him to the *judgment seat*, saying, this fellow persuadeth men to worship God contrary to the law."—(verses 12, 13.) But Gallio would not hear them, because the charge was one that affected only the Jewish religion; so we read "And he drave them from the *judgment seat*. Then all the Greeks took Sosthenes, the chief ruler of the synagogue, and beat him before the *judgment seat*. And Gallio cared for none of these things."—(verses 16, 17.) The 25th chapter contains an account of Paul being brought before Festus, in the narration of which, we find the following allusions to the Roman *judgment seat*. "And the next day (Festus) sitting on the *judgment seat*, commanded Paul to be brought.—(verse 5.) Then said Paul, I stand at Cæsar's *judgment seat*, where I ought to be judged."—(verse 10.) "Therefore when they were come hither, without any delay on the morrow, I (Festus) sat on the *judgment seat*, and commanded the man to be brought forth."—(verse 17.) In every one of these passages, the word used for "judgment seat" is Βῆμα (beema), and thus we have a very trustworthy standard by which to determine its meaning, when applied to the Judge of quick and dead. When the Spirit of God, speaking through the mouths of his prophets and apostles, uses the same word in various places, it is customary with those who understand how to "rightly divide the word of truth," to assign the same meaning in each place, unless such a mode produces a contradiction, or the context clearly shows that it requires a different interpretation; and in proof that this method of expounding scripture is a sound one, we need only quote Paul's injunction to "compare spiritual things with spiritual." In each of the cases quoted from Matthew, John and Luke, where beema is used, we see that those who were to be judged were brought before the judgment seat, to see whether they were guilty or innocent; and as the context does not require a different interpretation to be put upon this word when it is applied by Paul to divine things, we are not justified in affixing an entirely opposite meaning. The judgment seats on which Pilate, Gallio and Festus sat, were none of them figurative ones; how then can it be seriously contended that "the judgment seat of Christ" is but a figurative expression? The early christians were well acquainted with what a judgment seat was, who occupied it, what their duties were, and for what object individuals were brought before it; and therefore when Paul wrote to the Roman and Corinthian ecclesia about Jesus Christ's judgment seat, it would at once bring before their minds the judgment seats at

Rome and Corinth (before both of which Paul himself had to appear), and the uses and objects of the one would form the basis of their estimate as to the uses and objects of the other. If Paul had used the word in a sense different from that in common use, it is reasonable to suppose that he would have explained it. But he did not use it otherwise; on the contrary, he said that those who appear at the Almighty's judgment seat, will "receive *through the body*," according to their *good or bad deeds*. In other words, in order that the decision may be pronounced, as to whether they are guilty or innocent, and the sentence carried out accordingly; and not decide merely what amount of reward shall be bestowed upon them. No seat of judgment has ever yet been instituted for such an object; and it is a mere distortion of words to apply such a meaning to it. Indeed, so devoid of support is this perverted view, that we cannot but think that those who maintain it are liable to a charge similar to that brought by Peter against some of the early christians, who, being unlearned and unstable, did wrest the epistles of Paul, and other scriptures unto their own destruction.—(2 Peter 3:16.)

Part 3

The Christadelphian, vol. 4, Pages 289-295, 1867

By J. J. ANDREW, LONDON.

JESUS CHRIST bears the character of a judge towards his disciples only while they are in the position of *candidates for immortality*. As soon as they have obtained eternal life, he ceases to be a judge to them, because they have then become like himself, partakers of the divine nature, and can neither sin, suffer, nor die; they are then his brethren, not in name, but in reality—sons of God, and join theirs with Christ—and, consequently, entitled to share with him whatever he enjoys or possesses. He is to them King of kings and Lord of lords, not a Judge. He judged them when he decided that they were worthy of eternal life; but any positions of honour which he may give to them after that has taken place, will be in his character of their Elder Brother, or the Captain of their salvation.

Among the objections brought against the divine truth, that an account of each individual's career is to be given at the judgment-seat of Christ, is one which ought never to be uttered by those who profess to believe in the bible as a revelation from God to man. It is said that it will be impossible, from the length of time it will occupy, for each person who is to be judged, to give an account of his deeds, in this life, at the day of judgment. This apparent difficulty is not based upon any scripture testimony whatever, and might, therefore, be dismissed as totally irrelevant to an impartial examination of the subject in hand. But as it appears to be founded on an erroneous idea, we would just observe, that although the bible speaks of "the day of judgment," there is no reason to suppose that this "day" is limited to twenty-four hours. The "day of salvation" is a phrase comprehending several hundred years, the number of which cannot be precisely defined until it comes to an end; and we may, therefore, conclude that the day of judgment represents an indefinite period of time also. The Bible nowhere reveals what length of time the judgment of Christ's household will occupy, but we may be quite sure that it will not be conducted in a hurry, for God almost invariably

accomplishes his work in a gradual manner. Seeing that He has revealed, through the mouths of His prophets and apostles, that everyone of the disciples of Christ must report their conduct to him, nothing more ought to be required to convince all who believe in the power of God to carry out whatever he has predicted, that this will be duly performed. How it is to be done, and what length of time it will occupy, are details with which we have nothing to do. Sufficient is it for us to know the fact, and then believe it. God has always found ways and means of carrying out His designs hitherto, and he, doubtless, will do the same in this case. His thoughts are not as our thoughts, neither are His ways our ways.

Resurrection of two classes. It is contended by many that the resurrection at the second advent comprises only one class—the righteous; but we think the scripture testimony already produced is quite sufficient to disprove this theory. Not only have we ascertained that all “the quick and the dead” (who have been amenable to God’s law)—both just and unjust—will be judged by Jesus Christ at his appearing and his kingdom, but we have also seen that they are all to stand before his judgment-seat to render an account of their probationary career, before approval or condemnation. To do this, they must be raised from the dead; so that these two facts are alone sufficient to prove that the resurrection at the second advent comprises two classes—the righteous and the wicked.

But as this important truth is abundantly confirmed and illustrated in many other parts of scripture, we will adduce, more explicit testimony respecting it. Let us take, first of all, the statement of Daniel:—“At that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people * * * * And *many* of them that sleep in the dust of the earth *shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.*”—Dan. 12:1, 2. It will be admitted by most persons that Michael is intended to represent Jesus Christ, because he is the only one to whom has been assigned the honor of being the great prince of the Jewish nation. When he “stands up,” it will be for the purpose of “restoring the kingdom to Israel.” Consequently this passage refers to his second appearing, when he comes to restore the Jews to their own land. “At that time,” says Daniel, there shall be a “time of great trouble,” and “many that sleep shall awake.” But what do they awake for? Is it that they may enjoy the blessings of immortality? This is the case with a portion of them, for “some,” says Daniel “shall awake to everlasting life.” But what about the other portion not comprehended in this class? They are included in the “some” which, Daniel says, “shall awake to shame and everlasting contempt.” Here then are two classes distinctly spoken of as being raised from the dead at the second advent. Daniel first says that “many shall awake” from their deathly sleep, and then he divides them into two classes, and shows that the one are the righteous and the other the wicked. If therefore the wicked do not rise from the dead at the second advent, neither will the righteous be raised.

A parallel passage to this is to be found in John 5:28, where we read that Jesus said “Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which *all that are in the grave 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.” The “all” here mentioned, are, of course, not all mankind, but only that portion amenable to the judgment—those who have become responsible to God by a knowledge of His law or truth. Some of them will have been sufficiently obedient to entitle them to be called righteous; and, of these, Jesus says “They that have done good (shall come forth) unto the resurrection of life.” But there will be others who have been disobedient, and, therefore, deserving of punishment; of these, Jesus says “They that have done evil (shall come forth) unto the resurrection of damnation.” Thus we see there are two classes comprised in this prediction about the resurrection. It is true that the particular time for its occurrence is not stated, but from other parts of scripture, we know that a resurrection *is* to take place at the second advent; and as Jesus excludes from his discourses and prophecies all reference to post-millennial matters, we may reasonably conclude that it is the pre-millennial resurrection to which he refers. And when taken in conjunction with his description of the judgment already examined—which he expressly applies to the time when he comes in his glory—there can be no doubt that he alludes to the resurrection at his appearing and kingdom. This being so, how can this plain passage be reconciled with the theory which places the resurrection of the righteous at the beginning of the millennium, and the resurrection of the wicked at the end? Jesus first says, that a certain portion of mankind shall come out of their graves, and then, like Daniel, he proceeds to define their destiny; one part are to be brought into existence “*unto the resurrection of life,*” and the other “*unto the resurrection of damnation.*” A more clear and definite mode of stating that two classes will be raised at the same time could scarcely be devised.

If further testimony be required from the mouth of Jesus, we cannot do better than refer to his description of the dividing of the sheep and the goats. There can be no doubt that this takes place previous to the millennium, because the sheep are invited to enter the kingdom of the age to come, and the wicked are condemned to partake of the punishment preceding that age. There is nothing to lead us to suppose that any great space of time—such as a thousand years—intervenes between the approval of the one and the punishment of the other; but, on the contrary, their respective destinies are summarized in one sentence: “These (*the wicked*) shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.”—(Matt. 25:46.)

Turning to the parables of Jesus, we find the same truth repeatedly inculcated by him. This we have already seen to be the case in the parable of the nobleman and the pounds or talents, where the unprofitable servant is brought before his master at the same time as the two worthy ones; and, respecting him, the nobleman said to those standing by “Cast ye *the unprofitable servant* into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.”—(Matt. 25:30.) The nobleman’s absence has now been prolonged such a length of time, that it is absolutely necessary, for this parable to be fulfilled, that *the unprofitable servants shall be raised from the dead at the second advent*, for the purpose of being brought before Jesus Christ—the figurative nobleman—at the same time as the profitable ones.

In the preceding chapter of Matthew an important lesson is given to the disciples of Jesus—that of steadfastly watching for the coming of their Lord—in which the effects of vigilance in one servant, and carelessness in another, are clearly pointed out. “Of the one, Jesus says “Blessed is that servant whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing. Verily I say unto you, that he shall make him ruler over all his goods.”—(Matt. 24:46, 47.) But of the other, he says “If that evil servant shall say in his heart, my lord delayeth his coming * * * * *the Lord of that servant shall come* in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall cut him asunder, *and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites*; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.”—(verse 48–51.) The sentence pronounced upon this slothful servant is worded almost precisely the same as that against the unprofitable servant; and it shows, that at the second advent of the Master of God’s household, punishment will be inflicted on those servants who have slumbered or are slumbering when He comes. In order that this may be done, those who have died must be raised from the dead, and the living must be brought before the judgment-seat.

In the parable of the tares, we have a representation of the mixed condition of believers of the gospel of the kingdom. “The wheat,” we are told, “are the children of the kingdom,”—that is, those believers who walk worthy of their high calling, and receive an abundant entrance into the kingdom prepared for those who love and obey God. “**The tares,**” we are told, “**are the children of the wicked one,**”—a phrase which comprises, not only unbelieving adversaries, but also all believers who are not faithful to their master; for Jesus says “He that is not with me is against me”—(Matt. 12:30.) Respecting these two opposite kinds of children, it is said “Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of harvest, I will say to the reapers, gather ye together *first the tares*, and bind them in bundles to *burn them*, but gather the wheat into my barn.”—(Matt. 13:30.)

In the interpretation which follows, we further read “As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world (age). The son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and *them which do iniquity*, and *shall cast them into a furnace of fire*: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.”—Verse 40 to 42. Here again we have the punishment of wicked children represented as occurring at the same time as the bestowal of blessings on the good children,—who, being the wheat, must first be separated from the tares before they can be gathered into the barn. This parable is sometimes interpreted as referring to the destruction of Jerusalem; but even if it have a primary application to that event, we think that its ultimate fulfilment does not take place until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled; because: 1st.—It is called “the time of harvest,” and we know that those who will be saved in the present and past dispensations are the *first fruits of the harvest*.—(Jas. 1:18; Rev. 14:4). 2nd.—The description of the punishment to be inflicted on the wicked children is immediately followed by this statement: “*Then shall the righteous shine forth* as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.”—(Verse 43.) This is parallel to the verse in Daniel: “They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament” (Dan. 12:3), and, from the position which it occupies in the interpretation of the parable of the wheat and tares, **we**

may conclude that the burning of the tares *immediately precedes the glories of the millennial age.*

Of the same import also is the parable of the fishes: "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind; which, when it was full, they drew to shore, and set down and gathered the good into vessels, but *cast the bad away*. So shall it be at the end of the world (age); the angels shall come forth and *sever the wicked* from among the just, *and shall cast them into the furnace of fire*: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth."—(Matt. 13:47–50.) Interpreting the fish gathered into the net as meaning all who believe and obey the gospel of the kingdom, it is not difficult to see that the casting away of the bad fish is the punishment of the unrighteous believers, and that the packing of the good fish into vessels is the entrance of the righteous believers into the kingdom. Both take place at the same time, not one thousand years apart.

The parable of the marriage feast is the next one deserving attention. The kingdom of heaven is here likened to a wedding, and the first guests invited, are the Jews. But there were not sufficient of them accepted the invitation. Therefore, the Gentiles were invited to come in: and this continued until "the wedding was furnished with guests."—(Matt. 22:1–10.) When, however, the king came in to see the guests, he observed one who had not a wedding garment on, whereupon he said "Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having a wedding garment? And he was speechless. Then said the king to the servants, *Bind him hand and foot, and take him away, and cast him into outer darkness*; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."—(verses 11–13.)

When Jesus Christ appears again, it will be for the purpose of effecting the marriage of the Lamb with the church; but before it can be accomplished, it will be necessary for that church to be purified by extracting from it all who are not worthy to participate in the marriage tie; and all who are thus extracted will, it appears, be punished immediately.

In this separation of the worthy from the unworthy guests, we see an illustration of the psalmist's statement: "The ungodly shall not stand in the judgment, *nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous*."—(Psalm 1:5.)

The same truth is also conveyed in the discourse of Christ on the vine. "I am the vine," he says, "ye are the branches," when addressing his disciples. "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned."—(John 15:5, 6.) An unfruitful branch becomes withered as soon as it ceases to bring forth fruit, but it continues a broken branch until the husbandman trims the vine at the day of judgment. All branches which have become withered or broken will then be given to his messengers, to be cast into the fire to be burned, where there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. This will leave the vine in possession of fruitful branches only, and these will disseminate the fruits of the spirit among the nations, until all the earth be filled with the knowledge of the glory of God.

Paul likens the church of Christ to a temple or building (1 Cor. 3:9), the foundation of which is “the apostles and prophets.”—(Eph. 2:20.) In the erection of this building, all who are in the Christ are workmen—a term which may comprise *both good and bad labourers*. Paul exhorts Timothy to be an industrious and skilful one: “Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.”—(2 Tim. 2:15.) He also warns the Corinthians to be careful how they exercise their abilities in building; for “If any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, every man’s work shall be made manifest, for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire, and *the fire shall try every man’s work, of what sort it is.*”—(1 Cor. 3:11, 12). Now what is the lesson we learn from this? The members of Christ’s church are workmen engaged in building a temple, some of whom use gold, silver, and precious stones, while others use wood, hay, and stubble. When their Master comes, he will subject the temple to a fiery process, which will test every man’s work, burning up the perishable materials—the wood, hay, and stubble—but leaving the indestructible portion, composed of gold, silver, and precious stones. The building is then purified, and fit for the habitation of the Holy Spirit.

Part 3

The Christadelphian, vol. 5, Pages 1-6, 1868

By J. J. ANDREW, LONDON.

In all these parables and illustrations, the punishment of the unfaithful is represented as taking place—not a thousand years after, but—at the same time as the bestowal of blessings on the faithful, and, in some cases, it is even described as occurring *previous* to that event. How then can this be accomplished if the unrighteous are not to be raised from the dead at the second advent? The theory which places the resurrection of the just at the beginning of the millennium, and the resurrection of the unjust at the end, necessitates the separation of the former from the latter; but the parables of Jesus teach us that it is the unjust which are to be separated from the just, because they are not worthy “to stand in the congregation of the righteous”—(Ps. 1–5.) When this occurs, they will feel, with intense shame, the degradation of their position, and then will be fulfilled the words of Jesus: “Whosoever, therefore, shall be ashamed of me and of my words, in this adulterous and sinful generation, *of him also shall the Son of Man be ashamed when he cometh in the glory of his Father*, with the holy angels.”—(Matt. 8:38.) This passage of itself affords strong proof of the resurrection of the unjust at the second advent, because it is difficult to see how Jesus can be ashamed, at his coming in glory, of persons not then in existence; but what are we to say when we find that the individuals themselves are to feel ashamed on that occasion? That such is the case is evident from the exhortation of the apostle John: “And now, little children, abide in him; that when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be *ashamed before him at his coming.*”—(1 John, 2:28.) And not only are they to “be ashamed before him,” but others are to be witnesses of their shame. Hence the Apocalyptic meaning:

“Behold I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, *and they see his shame.*”—(Rev. 16:16). For a disciple to “keep his garments” is to take the advice given to the church at Laodicea: “I counsel thee to buy of me * * * * white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and “the fine linen is the righteousness of the saints.”—(Rev. 19:8.) For anyone to be “naked” is to be without “the garments of salvation”—“the robe of righteousness” (Isa. 61:10.) necessary to all who will be present at the “marriage of the lamb”—(Rev. 19:7.) Those who are in this destitute condition will constitute the “unrighteous,” who, Paul says “shall not inherit the kingdom of God.”—(1 Cor. 6:9.) When they appear at the judgment-seat, and the judge pronounces sentence of condemnation upon them, they will be like Adam and Eve were when they hid themselves among the trees of the garden of Eden, after eating of the forbidden fruit; they will be ashamed of themselves; their Master will be ashamed of them; and all who are present will be witnesses of their nakedness and shame. These events are predicted by Jesus Christ and his beloved apostle John; and all the three passages quoted unite in declaring that they will be fulfilled at the second appearing of the King of the Jews.

It is interred by some, from the use of the word “reward” in such passages as the following, that when Jesus appears he will merely bestow benefits upon the righteous: “The Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and *then shall he reward every man according to his work.*”—(Matt. 16:27.) “Behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me, *to give every man according as his work shall be.*”—(Rev. 22:12.) But this is a very narrow view to take of the word “reward,” and one which is not warranted by its use in other parts of scripture. For instance, David and Moses both speak of good being rewarded with evil: “They *rewarded me evil* for good, to the spoiling (depriving) of my soul.”—(Psalm 35:12.) “Whereupon have ye *rewarded evil* for good?”—(Gen. 44:4) We also find that the wicked are to be rewarded: “He shall *reward evil* unto mine enemies.”—(Psalm 54:5.) “The Lord preserveth the faithful, and plentifully *rewardeth the proud-doer.*”—(Psalm 31:23.) “The great God that formed all things, both *rewardeth the fool*, and *rewardeth transgressors.*”—(Prov. 26:10.) “The Lord shall *reward the doer of evil* according to his wickedness.”—(2 Sam., 3:39.) Paul also used “reward” in the same sense when writing of Alexander the coppersmith, who had been committing mischief: “Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil; the Lord reward him according to his works.”—(2 Tim. 4:14.) And in the Apocalypse we are told that mystical Babylon, when she has filled up the cup of her iniquities, is to be duly rewarded: “For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered *her iniquities. Reward her*, even as she rewarded you, and double unto her double according to her works; in the cup which she hath filled, fill to her double.”—(Rev. 18:5, 6.) In the book of Samuel we read of both good and evil being rewarded: “Thou hast rewarded me good, whereas I have *rewarded thee evil.*”—(1 Sam. 24:17.)

From these passages it is evident that the word “reward” is used in the sense of reaping, whether the fruit reaped be good or bad; and that, therefore, the “rewarding of every man according to his works” comprehends both blessings and punishments. The former are the fruits of the spirit, but the latter are the

fruits of unrighteousness; and they are both referred to by Solomon as follows: "The fruit of the righteous is a tree of life * * Behold the *righteous* shall be *recompensed* in the earth: much more *the wicked and the sinner*."—(Prov. 11:30, 31.)

The phrase "every man" is in itself sufficient to decide the meaning of the word "reward;" because, as we have already seen, all Christ's disciples—faithful and unfaithful—are to appear before him at his second advent, to reap that which they have sown. To "reward every man according to his works," therefore, is to give to them "the things through the body according to that which they have done, *whether it be good or bad*." The word "reward" is, in fact, used as a synonym for the word "judge," and hence we read; "The father, without respect of persons, *judgeth* according to every man's work."—(1 Peter 1:17.) The reason why it is used in this sense is to be found in the fact that when the bible was translated, this word had a more comprehensive meaning than at the present time; it meant "to recompense without reference to good or evil;" in proof of which we quote the following passages from early English writers; "Which, however, heaven and fortune still *rewards with plagues*."—(Shakspeare.) "*Rewarding* them with *traitorous recompense*."—(Herwood.) The principal passage in which the word "reward" is used in the modern sense, as applicable to blessings only, is the following: "And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, *and the time of the dead that they should be judged*, and that thou shouldest *give reward unto thy servants*, the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; *and shouldest destroy* them that destroy (corrupt, see margin) the earth."—(Rev. 11:18.) In this case, however, the context clearly shews the sense intended to be conveyed. It will be seen that the dead are first to be *judged*, and then the righteous portion are to be rewarded, and the unrighteous destroyed. From the testimony already quoted as to the mode in which the dead in Christ are to be judged, this passage cannot be adduced as affording any proof that they are to be judged while in the death-state; because in that case, they could not appear before the judgment-seat of Christ to give an account of their conduct, and to reap, through the body, that which they have sown.

It will, perhaps, be said that the class referred to as corrupting the earth, does not comprise the unrighteous disciples of Christ. The phrase is, doubtless, not confined to such persons, but we think it necessarily comprehends them, because all who adulterate or nullify the truth of God, whether believers or unbelievers, may be truly said to corrupt it. This is evident from Paul's injunction to Titus: "In doctrine shewing uncorruptness."—(Titus 2:7.) But even if this phrase be viewed as alluding specially to the great apostasy, there is sufficient evidence from the word "judged" that two classes will be raised at this "time of the dead," which is undoubtedly that of the second advent; for, as we have seen, the judgment is to apply to both sheep and goats. faithful and unfaithful, and is to take place after the resurrection, not before it.

For further proof that responsible sinners are to be punished at the appearing of Jesus Christ, we need only refer to such texts as the following, which present the dark side of that momentous event: "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from

heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them, that know not God, *and obey not the gospel* of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of His power.”—(2 Thess. 1:7–9.) “*The Lord cometh* with ten thousand of his saints, *to execute judgment upon all*, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds, which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches, which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.”—(Jude 14:15.)

It will, doubtless, at once be said by some, that these passages refer to the vengeance to be poured out upon the nations. That this is one of the truths they are intended to teach there can be no doubt; but then, it does not exclude the infliction of punishment on those unworthy servants, who are to be judged and condemned by Christ at his appearing and kingdom. On the contrary, if the passage be carefully examined, it will be seen that they are sufficiently comprehensive to embrace *both believing sinners and unbelieving sinners*. Paul says that vengeance shall be inflicted on them that “obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.” It is quite true that to obey the gospel is to believe it and be immersed; for, we are told that the mystery of the gospel was “made known to all nations for the obedience of faith;” but at the same time, it must not be forgotten that obedience to the injunctions necessarily arising out of it is required from all believers throughout the whole of their probationary career. Some of the early Christians manifested great disobedience to the gospel law of liberty, and, therefore, it was necessary for Paul to sharply rebuke them: “O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you that ye should *not obey the truth?*”—(Gal. 3:1.) If these Galatians continued in their disobedient state, can there be any doubt that at the second advent they will be “punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power?”

It is apparent that those who sin in the clear light of knowledge, do so under far greater responsibilities than those who sin in ignorance. It is scarcely reasonable, therefore, that the latter should be punished before the former. In the case of the Israelites, it is well known that they have been punished for their sins in accordance with the privileges they enjoyed: “*You only have I known* of all the families of the earth: *therefore, I will punish you* for all your iniquities.”—(Amos 3:2.) The divine principle illustrated in their history is this: the first to enjoy the favour of God shall be the first to be punished for the abuse of that blessing, a principle which is equally applicable to all others who occupy a similar position. “All these things happened unto them for our ensamples (or types); and they are written for our admonition, on whom the ends of the world are come.”—(Heb. 10:11.) Seeing then, that the fleshly Israel are but a type of the spiritual Israel, it follows that the whole of the latter will be judged, and the disobedient among them punished before those Gentiles who never believe the gospel nor obey its first commandment. This is absolutely essential to the fulfilment of the apostolic statement, that “*judgment must begin at the house of God.*” Writing to the early christians, Peter, in his first epistle, says “For the time is come (is coming; see *Diaglott*) that *judgment must begin at the house of God*; and if it first *begin at us*, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of

God? And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?”—1 Peter 4:17. **The truths taught by this passage are:**

1.—That “judgment” is to be administered on both believers and unbelievers.

2.—That the judgment of believers (righteous and unrighteous) will be so strict that the righteous scarcely will be saved.

3.—That the judgment of the unbelievers will result in severe punishment, but no salvation.

4.—That the judgment of believers is to take place before the judgment of unbelievers.

The chief point to be noticed is, that the “judgment” to which the house of God will be subjected, is but the beginning of a series of national judgments. The character of the former may be ascertained from the nature of the latter; and as we know that the judgment on the nations will consist almost wholly of punishment, it follows, as a logical sequence, that the judgment of God’s household must also comprise punishment. **If it do not, there is no point in the apostle’s argument; for on the supposition that the judgment of God’s household is merely the bestowal of rewards on the righteous after they have received immortality, what force or consistency is there in asking “if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?”** The process by which the righteous are to be saved—and that too, by a hair’s breadth, as it were—is the judgment, and as this will necessitate the rejection of the unrighteous, it follows that the judgment of the house of God is for the purpose of deciding who is and who is not worthy of salvation. If this result is obtained by raising the righteous only from the dead, leaving the unrighteous in their graves, then the judgment takes place while the members of God’s house are in hades; and, in that case, the bestowal of rewards on the righteous cannot be called the judgment, for they would then be subjected to two judgments, one while dead and the other when in the enjoyment of eternal life.

If it be said that the judgment Peter refers to, took effect at the destruction of Jerusalem, we would ask in what sense were the righteous saved at that time? It is true that the early christians were saved from the calamities of that event; but the apostle is writing about *eternal* not temporal *salvation*, and, therefore, the judgment he alludes to, must be essential to the bestowal of that salvation.

Part 4

The Christadelphian, vol. 5, Pages 28-31, 1868

BY J. J. ANDREW, LONDON.

ALMOST the only passage in which the resurrection of one class at the beginning of the Millennium is founded, is contained in the 20th chapter of

Revelations: “The rest of the dead lived not again, until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection.”—verse 5. “Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power.”—verse 6. Respecting the 5th verse, it should be known that, to say the least, it is of doubtful authority, for it is not to be found in two of the most ancient and reliable manuscripts—the Vatican and the Syriac. This of itself should lead all who place so much importance on it to re-consider the theory of which it is the corner-stone; a theory which introduces into Scripture nothing but discord. But even if it be accepted as genuine, it does not afford sufficient support for affirming the resurrection of only one class. The usual way, and the only sound one, of harmonising apparent contradictions, is to take that view which is supported by the most emphatic and abundant testimony, and then to ascertain how those passages of less force and emphasis can be reconciled with it. (See *foot note, p .31.*) If this mode be adopted with the verses under consideration, the only conclusion arrived at, will be that they cannot teach anything which would contradict the clear and abundant testimony already produced. There are difficulties in their interpretation at first sight, we freely admit, but let them be carefully examined with the context, and we are confident that all such difficulties will be satisfactorily cleared away.

The chapter opens with a declaration concerning the binding of Satan for a thousand years; that is, the depriving the political and ecclesiastical manifestations of the adversary—sin in the flesh—of the power and authority which they at present possess. This event cannot be fully accomplished until the end of the storm-period, which is to precede the thousand years, because the punishments to be inflicted on the nations during that time of great trouble, is for the purpose of subduing them to the authority of the Messiah. Until this period is at an end, it cannot be said that “An angel laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and Satan, and bound him a thousand years.”—verse 2.

In the accomplishment of this result, the resurrected righteous are to take part, for David writes “Let the saints be joyful in glory; let them sing aloud upon their beds. Let the high praises of God be in their mouth, and a two-edged sword in their hand; *to execute vengeance upon the people; to bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron; to execute upon them the judgment written: this honor have all his saints.*”—Psalm 149:5 to 9. Such being the case, it follows that the judgment of God’s household must be long past, and the judgment of the nations at an end, when Satan is bound for a thousand years.

We see, therefore, that this chapter begins by describing *events which follow*, and not precede, *the resurrection of the dead in Christ at his advent*—events too, which cannot possibly take place until the resurrection, and the events immediately connected with it, are all over. When the existing rulers are deprived of their authority, it will be necessary for their places to be occupied by some other persons; and these, as we well know, are the immortalised saints. Very appropriately, therefore, the statement about Satan’s binding, is followed by a description of these saints after they have assumed that “power over the nations”

promised to all who overcome the lusts of this world. "And I saw thrones, and *they who sat upon them*, and judgment was given unto them; and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God; and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years."—verse 4. For these events to be fulfilled, the millennium must have actually commenced; consequently, the verses which immediately follow can only be viewed from this stand-point: we must imagine ourselves reading them during, or at the beginning of the thousand years. What then, is meant by the phrase "This is the first resurrection?" Is it not the state of things described in the preceding verse? An affirmative answer is the only logical one that can be given, because the word "this" necessitates an allusion to something which has just gone before. The previous part of the chapter says nothing whatever about the bringing forth of the dead from the grave; but, on the contrary, describes only results which are subsequent to that event. The word "resurrection," therefore, must denote the state of things during the thousand years, and not the raising of the dead to life. This was the period or condition which Paul referred to when he said "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead."—(Philip 3:11.)

His desire was not simply to be raised from the death-state, because he knew that this event of itself would not produce blessings; for, as he had himself declared, "there shall be a resurrection of the dead: both of the just and *unjust*."—(Acts 24:15.) His desire was to attain to that resurrection-state which succeeds the restoration of the dead to life and the judgment. It is in harmony with this use of the "resurrection," that Jesus says "They that have done good (shall come forth) *unto the resurrection of life*, and they that have done evil (shall come forth) *unto the resurrection of damnation*."—(John 5:29.)

The "resurrection of life" to which the righteous are to come forth from their graves, is that state wherein they will enjoy immortality, but the "resurrection of damnation" to which the unrighteous are to come forth from their graves, is merely that state of punishment which lasts until their final destruction. That this extended meaning of "resurrection" was well understood by the Jews of that day, is evident from the conversation between Jesus and the Sadducees on a future life, in the course of which the latter said "*In the resurrection*, whose wife of them is she?"—(Luke 20:33.) To confine the meaning of the word in this sentence to the mere raising out of the graves is to reduce the question to an absurdity: but to view it as denoting the eternal state which results from the resurrection to life, is simply to interpret it in the most obvious manner. It is in precisely this sense that it is used in the Apocalypse in the passage under consideration: "This is the first resurrection." The resurrection-state is the sitting on thrones and reigning with Christ a thousand years.

Having now defined the meaning of the most important word in the above sentence, it will not be difficult to show what is signified by the one which precedes it. The word "first" is generally supposed to be confined to time, but this is a mistake; the original word comprehends both time and position or dignity, as will be seen by the following definition from *Liddell and Scott's Greek Lexicon*:

“πρωτος (prôtos); first, foremost, of number or place; first, earliest of time; first prize, foremost, won; first of all, above all.”

It is probably true that first in time is the primary meaning, but surely no one would assert that this excludes the use of the secondary meaning, when such is required. That the writers of the New Testament did frequently apply the secondary meaning—first in position—is proved by the following extracts: “And whosoever will be *chief* (prôtos) among you, let him be your servant.”—(Matt. 20:27.) “Herod on his birthday made a supper to his lords, high captains, and *chief* (prôtois) men of Galilee.”—(Mark 6:21.) “The high priests and the Scribes, and the *chief* (prôttoi) of the people sought to destroy him.”—(Luke 19:47.) “The Jews stirred up the devout and honourable women, and the *chief* (prôtous) men of the city.”—(Acts 13:50.) “And from thence to Philippi, which is the *chief* (prôtee, translated “first” in the margin) city of that part of Macedonia,”—(Acts 16:12.) “Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am *chief* (prôtee.)”—(1 Tim., 1:15.) See also Acts 17:4; 25:2; 28:7, 17.

In every one of these passages, the word which is translated “chief” is the same as that which is translated “first” in Rev. 20:5, 6. Thus we have the authority of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Paul for the application of the secondary meaning of the word prôtos, rendered by our translators as “chief.” Whether, therefore, it is used in the primary or secondary sense must be determined by the context.

As we have already ascertained that the word “resurrection” here denotes a state or condition, and also that there are two resurrection-states—one good and the other bad—it is not difficult to perceive that in the passage in question, prôtos means first in point of dignity or importance, not of time; and should, therefore, be translated “chief” like the instances already quoted. A confirmation of this is to be found in the verse which follows: “Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first (chief) resurrection: *on such, the second death hath no power.*” The “second death” is the consummation of the punishment to be inflicted on the unrighteous, and is, therefore, the conclusion of the resurrection-state of damnation. But those who come forth to the resurrection-state of life will not be subjected to the second death, and hence the state of things in which they have a part or portion is very appropriately called “the chief resurrection.”

After what has already been said about the stand-point from which the first six verses in Rev. 20 should be viewed, it will not be difficult to decide what is meant by the parenthetic sentence in the 5th verse: “But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished.” If this were represented as being uttered previous to the appearing of the Messiah, it would prove that no one was to be brought to life until the end of the millennium; and if it were uttered after the resurrection of the righteous only, it would prove that the unrighteous would continue in the death-state for one thousand years longer. But, as we have already demonstrated, that there is to be a resurrection of two classes at the advent, and that the “first resurrection” signifies the immortality-state subsequent to the judgment, neither of these suppositions can be maintained. We must then

survey it from the time described in the first four verses—that period when Satan is bound, and the thousand years reign has commenced. By this time, the unjust who have to appear at the judgment-seat of Christ, will have received through the body according to their bad deeds, and will, consequently, after suffering their many or few stripes, have been “punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power,” which is the second death. Hence, they will be forgotten, and be taken no further account of, for they will have no more “a portion in anything that is done under the sun.” Who then are “the rest of the dead who lived not until the thousand years were finished?” Are they not persons who have died subsequent to the second advent? This certainly appears to be the most obvious meaning. It seems to be for the purpose of shewing that no further resurrection of the dead to life will take place “until the thousand years were finished.” And here we would ask whether the words “were *finished*” do not in themselves imply that the thousand years had already begun? Taking them into conjunction with the preceding part of the chapter, we know that such must be the case, because some of the events described pertain only to the millennial age. A remembrance of this fact is the key to a correct interpretation of the two verses just considered, and it affords, we believe, the best (if not the only) solution of the difficulties which arise from a superficial examination.

Part 5

The Christadelphian, vol. 5, Pages 63-67, 1868

BY J. J. ANDREW, LONDON.

IT is now our duty to examine that much discussed chapter, the 15th of 1 Corinthians—a chapter which, when taken by itself and viewed superficially, appears to contradict some of the conclusions to which we have already arrived; but, bearing in mind the fundamental axiom, that no one part of God’s revelation can contradict another part, we shall be quite safe in asserting that any such discrepancies must be apparent, not real.

In reading this chapter, it is necessary to notice: 1—that the apostle is not giving a comprehensive exposition of the whole subject of the *Resurrection and Judgment*; 2nd—that he only deals with the resurrection of *one class*—the righteous; 3—that the judgment is not mentioned, but is, nevertheless, understood; because it is incredible to suppose that Paul would teach anything in one epistle which would contradict what he had written in another.

He begins his argument by asking how it was that some members of the Corinthian church denied the resurrection of the dead, and proceeds to shew that if they be right, their hopes of eternal life are entirely useless. If the dead rise not, says he, then Christ was not raised from the dead; and if this be the case, then, not only are all who profess the “one faith” still in their sins, but all who have died professing the same faith are perished. He then deals with the question as to the nature of the resurrection body, and, in so doing, illustrates his remarks by referring to a grain of seed, shewing that the death of a human being is no more an impediment to his restoration to life, than is the death of a seed to its springing up, and producing grain. If the seed is to reproduce itself, it must first die, and if,

after this, God is able to re-animate it, is He not equally able to bring to life the righteous who have died? The placing of the seed in the ground is often interpreted as applying to the committal of the body to the grave, and the springing-up of the blade to the coming-forth from the grave at the resurrection. From this it is inferred that, just as the blade differs from the seed which was sown, so does the resurrected body of the righteous differ from the body which was buried—the latter being mortal, and the former immortal. But is this, we are led to ask, a correct analogy? Does the sowing of the seed represent the burial of the body? If it does, what does the dying of the seed illustrate? The body has no death to undergo after burial, and surely it will not be said that it refers to the mouldering away of the dead body? This is not necessary to its resurrection; for if so, what is to be done with any who die within so short a period of the second advent, that their bodies will not have the requisite time to become incorporated with the dust of the ground? The seed dies after it is put into the ground, but the body dies before that event. This is the defect in the analogy—a discrepancy which some may think lightly of, and reply to by saying that a parable is generally given on account of its leading points, and, therefore, it is impossible to carry out all the details. But can we term the death of the seed in this parable an unimportant detail? Death is the very subject on which the apostle is discoursing; and so indignant does he become at anyone shewing so much incredulity of the power of God to raise the dead, as to ask what sort of a body they will possess when resurrected, that he exclaims, “Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened *except it die.*”—(Verse 36.) He then gives as an illustration the case of a grain, shewing that a seed which is sown is not the same as that which will hereafter exist; and between the two events, it must undergo death. If the death of the seed be not a prominent or essential point, what is the parable intended to teach? On this supposition, the statement just quoted, that a seed is not quickened except it die, has no force in it; to omit, therefore, to apply it to the subject under examination is to deprive the illustration of all its pith. This being so, and the death of the seed being analogous to the death of the man, it follows that the sowing of the seed must be applicable to some event in the lifetime of the individual. What then does this sowing consist of? A solution to this question is to be found in Paul’s epistle to the Galatians: “Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting.”—(Gal. 6:7, 8.) From this we learn that the sowing process extends over the whole probationary career—from immersion to death. He that gives way to the lusts of the flesh in this life shall, after the resurrection and judgment, suffer that corruption to which all human flesh is inevitably subject; but he that brings forth the fruits of the spirit in his daily conduct, shall, at the day of judgment, be endowed with spirit life, by being transformed from mortal nature to immortal. To realize this “corruption,” or this “life everlasting” is, as we have already seen, “to receive through the body according to that which has been done, whether good or bad:” and the time for accomplishing this is at the judgment. There it is that a righteous man receives a body corresponding with his good deeds, while an unrighteous man is compelled to retain a body corresponding with his evil deeds.

The springing-up of the blade is not even mentioned by the apostle; but, on the contrary, he says "God giveth to every seed *his own body*," whether wheat or some other grain. When, therefore, he says "So also is the resurrection of the dead; it is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption," what are we to understand by it? The raising of the wheat is not fully accomplished until its "own body" has been given to it, and this does not take place until the corn is full-grown. Consequently, the springing forth of the blade bears no analogy to the bestowal of an immortal body on the dead; it only exhibits the process of raising, not the full consummation. The good seed raises good wheat, but the bad seed raises bad wheat. So it is with the disciples of Christ. The children of the kingdom, in whom the gospel has taken a firm root, are raised to incorruptibility at the day of judgment; but the children of the wicked one, in whom the gospel has not taken sufficient root, are raised to corruption."

Perhaps it will be said that this is a strained interpretation of the word "raised," because, when used in reference to the resurrection of the dead, it always refers to the coming forth from the grave. It is true that it is frequently used to describe the raising of the dead to life—a process which does not require much time; but this does not prevent its being applied to a more lengthy process. In the narrative of Paul's labours at Antioch, it is used to describe the stirring up of a tumultuous mob: "But the Jews stirred up the devout and honourable women, and the chief men of the city, and *raised* persecution against Paul and Barnabas, and expelled them out of their coasts."—(Acts 13:50.) And in writing to the Romans, Paul applies it to the elevation of Pharaoh to the throne of Egypt. "For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, even for this same purpose have I *raised* thee up, that I might show my favour in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth."—(Rom. 9:17.) In neither of these passages is the event described so instantaneous as that of raising anyone from the sleep of death; and precisely the same word is used, not in English only, but also in the Greek—the meaning of which is defined as follows: ἐγείρω (*egeir*): "to awaken, wake up, rouse, stir, stir up, raise from the dead, raise or erect a building."—*Liddell and Scott's Lexicon*.

There is nothing in this definition to exclude the comprehensive application of the word "raise;" but on the contrary, we see that one of its meanings gives authority for such a use. To "raise or erect a building," comprehends the whole process, from the time when it first sprouts, to the full development of the ear. When the blade appears, it is merely in the process of *raising*, and it cannot be said to be *raised* until the corn is ripe. Thus it is with the resurrection of a righteous man: the body comes forth from the grave in a mortal condition, when it may be said to be in the process of *raising*; then it is brought before the judgment-seat to give an account to the Judge, and upon approval it is transformed into an incorruptible body. At this stage the process of *raising* is complete, and it can then be said that it is *raised*.

The full consummation of the process necessitates a change, because "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption."—(verse 50.) The apostle then proceeds to show how "flesh and blood" is to be fitted for inheriting an incorruptible kingdom. "Behold, I show you a mystery: we (all in Christ) shall not all sleep, but *we* (the righteous, whether

asleep or awake at the advent) *shall all be changed*, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump.”—(verses 51, 52.) Then follows a summary of the results in both cases, in which the word “raised” is used in the same comprehensive sense as in the passages already noticed; “For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.”—(verse 52). From the fact that Paul here speaks of the living only being changed, it is contended by some that the dead will not undergo the same change; but this is illogical, because in the preceding verse he had actually declared that “We shall all (whether living or dead) be changed.” The mode of bestowing immortality on these two classes differs: in the case of the dead, they have first to be brought to life, and then (after approved at the judgment-seat,) changed—the whole of which process is comprised in the phrase “raised incorruptible;” but the living have, of course, only to be changed from mortality to immortality. Having thus summarised the results with reference to the former, by saying “they shall be raised incorruptible,” it was necessary to add something respecting the latter, and this he does by saying “we shall be changed.” But his doing so is no proof that the dead will not have to undergo the same change as the living; for he continues, “So when this *corruptible* shall have put on incorruption, and this *mortal* shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, “death is swallowed up in victory.”—(verse 54.) While the bodies of the dead are mingled in the dust of the earth, they are in a state of actual corruption, but they must be brought forth from hades before they are entitled to the name “corruptible,” in order that they may appear before the judgment-seat in the same condition as the living; and when the Judge has signified his approval, they will be changed from corruption to incorruption. Then it is that Paul will realise his desire “*to be clothed upon* with our house, which is from heaven * * * that mortality might be swallowed up of life.” Then it is that his promise to the Philippians will be fulfilled: “The Lord Jesus Christ shall *change our vile body*, that it may be fashioned like unto his own glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.”—(Philip 3. 21.) Then it is—and not at the restoration to life, for that of itself is of no use without immortality—that those who were once dead will be able to say “O death, where is thy sting—O grave where is thy victory?”—(1 Cor. 15:55.)

If this could be uttered by the righteous immediately after emerging from the grave, then their destiny would be already fixed, the judgment would be forestalled, and their appearance before the Judge would be reduced to a mere empty ceremony—and thus the abundant and unequivocal testimony of scripture concerning this important event, would be completely nullified. To contend therefore for such a mode of restoring the dead to life, is very little better than saying that the righteous enter on their reward at death.

Notes and Addenda

The Christadelphian, vol. 5, Pages 95, 1868

BY J. J. ANDREW, LONDON.

THAT which causes a seed to germinate, is the vitality within it. A sound seed will spring forth, and if other influences are favourable, will develop into a full-grown plant; but a defective seed, whether the outward influences are favourable or not, will either produce an imperfect plant, or it will die away, and never come to perfection. Just so is it with the servants of the Deity: those in whom the spirit of God (as embodied in His word) dwells richly, will have sufficient vitality in them at the close of their probationary career, to entitle them, at the judgment, to be developed into full-grown incorruptible trees, by the very same spirit which has purified their hearts and minds; but those who are deficient of this spirit, will not develop into perfect plants, but will be cut down on account of their withered condition, and be cast into the fire to be burnt.

The change which is to take place, "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye," is synonymous with "this corruptible" or mortal being, putting on incorruption, and not with the restoration of the dead to life.

The statement that "the dead shall be raised incorruptible," when "the trumpet shall sound," is no proof that the raising or building up of the dead, from their present state of unconsciousness to the future state of incorruptibility, will take place instantaneously. The "trumpet" here spoken of is doubtless the seventh trumpet, the chief events of which are described in Rev. 11:15 to 18. These events extend over a series of years; and the resurrection and judgment are part of them, as appears from the 18th verse.

The phrases which speak of the righteous being "clothed upon," and "putting on incorruption," afford strong proof in themselves that they are restored to life in a mortal condition, because there must be a body of some kind in existence, in order to be "clothed" or to "put on immortality;" and that body must be a "corruptible" one—i.e., a body capable of decaying, and not in the actual state of corruption—as is the present condition of the dead.

Addenda

SINCE writing the foregoing, we have met with the following remarks by the late ARCHBISHOP WHATELEY, on Paul's comparison of the seed, which are valuable because they disprove the common theory that the burial of a dead body is analogous to the sowing of a living seed.

"It is worth while to remark that when he (Paul) speaks of our being 'sown in weakness,' some suppose he refers to the committing of a *dead* body to the ground—a body which has lost all the grace and beauty it may once have possessed, and from which the defacing hand of decay is about to sweep the last lingering traces of loveliness. But if you look more narrowly into the context, you will see, I think, that this cannot have been his meaning. For you will perceive

that it is our present *living* frame, and not our *dead* body, that he is all along contrasting with the resurrection-state. It is not with the mouldering mass of corruption which we are forced to hide in the ground out of sight, that the new body is compared; but with our present vile body, even in its best state; for even in its best state it is 'corruptible.' 'There is,' says he, 'a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. For so it is written, the first man, Adam, was made a living soul—the last Adam was made a quickening spirit.' The sense here is obscured by the word '*natural*,' which unfortunately is found in our version; for it quite disguises the connection of thought between this and the next verse, where Adam is spoken of as a 'living soul.' The real sense would be much better expressed in modern English, by saying, instead of 'natural body,' *animal* body; that is a body possessed of animal life; such a body, in short, as Adam had—'of the earth, earthy.' * * * 'There is,' says the apostle, 'an animal body, and there is a spiritual body; and these we derive from different ancestors: Adam was made a living animal, Christ is a quickening (that is, a life-giving) spirit.' Now here you see plainly, that it is not the contrast between an actual *dead* body and a living one, that he is thinking of, but of the difference between two frames—one merely animal, the other spiritual. If we are speaking of the burial of the *dead* body, it is not correct to say that it is sown, or buried, an animal body; for animal life has *departed* before it is laid in the ground. But if we take this 'sowing' to refer not to our burial, but to the *origin* of our present mortal frame—to our *entrance* into this world, not our departure—then the apostle's language is clear and pertinent. We *are* sown—we are brought into this world—with animal frames, with bodies weak and tender, with bodies taken from the dust of the earth, and hastening every day to corruption; and with these, the imperishable and glorious body which Christ will give, is fitly contrasted. What has put the idea into some people's heads, as the thought corresponding to *sowing*, is the 37th verse; and yet if you will look closely at that verse, you will perceive that it really makes the other way. 'That which thou sowest is not quickened (made alive) except it *die*.' The decomposition and breaking-up of the structure of the seed, he calls, figuratively, its 'death:' it is like death—a kind of dissolution—a great, and to a hasty observer, a seemingly destructive change, that takes place. The apostle, you will observe, does not say 'unless it corrupt,' but 'unless it *die*.' Nor does he call this change *dying*, unless he meant to compare it, not surely with corruption, but with *death*. And if so, it is plain the thing corresponding with that change must be *our death*. The seed is first sown, and then dies; and then springs up again. And if this be applied to man's condition—first *sown* into the world, then *dying*, and then *raised*; the comparison is intelligible and beautiful. But it will not agree with the case of a mere dead body. A corpse cannot die. It is dead already: dead *before* put into the earth. And therefore it would not have suited Paul's purpose to speak of it as *dying* seed. It must be therefore our present animal living-frame that he speaks of as seed which must *die* before it can be quickened. * * * * And this interpretation is confirmed by the words of our Lord himself, who employs the very same figure (John 12:24): 'Verily I say unto you, except a corn of wheat fall into the ground, and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.' Here he is evidently speaking of the glorious consequences of his own death.

Some Greeks had desired to see Him; and this had suggested to his mind the enlargement of the kingdom of God to all nations, which was not to take place till after his death, then just at hand. He compares himself, therefore, to a seed which must die before it becomes plentiful; and I need not remark that the idea of *corruption* can have had no place here, since he was not to 'see corruption.' Hence it is clear that it is to the death of a living man, not to the smouldering of a dead carcase, that he is comparing the change which takes place in a seed cast into the ground. And precisely similar, no doubt, is the thought of the apostle, who would hardly have made the actual corruption of the body a necessary condition of its being raised, when, in the case of Christ himself—the very type and example of the resurrection—no such corruption took place."—*Scripture Revelations Concerning a Future State*. 8th Edition, pp. 113—117. Lecture V.

The following quotation from the same author, as far as it relates to the *nature* of judgment, is worthy of the careful attention of all who hold the erroneous theory that the judgment is merely for the purpose of bestowing rewards on the worthy. His arguments, though directed against the orthodox view, are equally forcible against the one which necessitates the righteous possessing immortality before appearing at the judgment-seat of Christ.

"This leads me to remark another circumstance which throws difficulty on the subject [the argument between Christ and the Sadducees]; viz., the perpetually-repeated notices of the *Day of Judgment*, and allusions to it, both in our Lord's discourses and in those of his apostles, as to a time when (the dead being raised) all mankind shall be brought to trial before their all-seeing and unerring Judge, and receive from him their sentence. 'I charge thee,' says Paul to Timothy, 'before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who will judge the quick (i.e., the living) and the dead, *at his appearing and his kingdom*;' and in the epistle to the Romans 'As many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law, in the *day* when God shall judge the secrets of men, by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel.' What I mean is, that all these allusions to one particular *day*, are such as seem to imply that it is *then* that every man's condition will be finally fixed. Now it is indeed very conceivable that the souls of men, in a separate state, should remain in a happy or unhappy condition till the end of the world, and should then, at the resurrection, be reunited to bodies, and enter on a *different kind* of enjoyment or of suffering; this, I say, is in itself, very conceivable; but it is hard to conceive how, supposing *that* to be the case, the day of *judgment*, at the time of the resurrection, should be spoken of as it is in scripture; since each man would (in the case just supposed) not only *know* his final condition, but actually *enter upon* his reward or punishment, *before* the resurrection, immediately on his death; so that the *judgment* of the *last day* would be in fact forestalled. It seems strange that a man should first undergo his sentence, and afterwards be brought to trial—should *first* enter upon his reward or punishment, and *then* be tried; and then judged, and acquitted or condemned.

The great Day of Judgment being, to all appearance, so called from some analogy to what takes place in human courts, it seems more likely than not, that it should correspond with our judicial trials in the most essential points. Now the most important point in a judgment-day among men, is that each person is then

pronounced guilty or not guilty, and his future fate ascertained. It does indeed, sometimes happen, that a man knows perfectly well before-hand, what his fate will be. A criminal, conscious of his guilt, and aware of the overpowering evidence that can be brought against him, has been known to exclaim, the moment he is arrested, 'I am a dead man!' But if this were *always* the case—if matters were so conducted that *everyone* should be fully aware, before his trial came on, what would be the issue (nay, and had been actually undergoing his sentence), we should consider the whole ceremony of the trial, and the solemn pronouncement of the sentence, as no more than a matter of form. Now it does not seem likely that the great Day of Judgment, which is so much dwelt on in scripture, should have been so called from its resemblance to our judgment-days, merely in a matter of form, and not in anything essential.

It is true that if such a day were appointed among us, on which each man, though already certain of his acquittal or condemnation, should be finally dismissed, to receive his appointed sentence,—one to death, another to imprisonment or banishment, another to liberty, &c., this would indeed be a very *important* day; but it would not be important as a day of *judgment*. It would be rather a day of *execution*; —a day of *allotment*; —a day of *assigning* to each his destined reward or punishment: but the primary and most essential character of *judgment*, or decision, would be wanting; namely, the *ascertaining* of each man's doom. Yet such we must suppose the great judgment-day to be, if we suppose an intermediate state of consciousness, and consequently of reward and punishment. For, on that supposition, each man would know, beforehand, his own doom, and would only be afterwards removed from one kind of enjoyment or suffering to another. Now, not only the very use of the words 'judge,' and 'judgment,' seems unsuited to suggest to us this view of the transaction, but moreover the sacred writers, and especially our Lord Himself, seem to point out the day of judgment as that on which the *separation* will be made of 'the sheep from the goats';—on which the decision will take place as to each man's deserts,—the final destiny of each be *ascertained* and made known to himself: for example, "many will come *in that day*, saying, Lord, Lord, have we not preached in thy name * * * and in thy name done many mighty works? And then will I say unto them, I know you not; depart from me all ye workers of iniquity."—*Scripture Revelations Concerning a Future*. pp. 82–86—Lecture IV.