

# The History of the World

## Part 2

Jeffrey L Vaughn, PhD  
Coauthor Beyond Creation Science

I have a few short topics of tremendous importance to discuss.

Christ's "Resurrection?"

The Resurrection

Covenant History

# Christ's "Resurrection?"

We had a very important question yesterday that's needs a more detailed discussion. It's also a great example of one of the main points of my talk yesterday.

I'm going to get a lot of flak online for this from people who will purposefully misunderstand this issue.

The "official" Churches of Christ/independent Christian Church position is and has always been, "use Bible words to discuss Bible things."

We're not as good at that as we imagine.

## Christ's "Resurrection?" (cont.)

Concerning Christ's "rising/awakening from the dead," we've always succumbed to tradition and called it "The Resurrection." This has created confusion with "the standing again" which is also called, "The Resurrection." Because of this confusion, we are often forced to add nonbiblical words so we can distinguish between these two distinct events.

## Christ's "Resurrection?" (cont.)

To this is added another confusion. Many consequently assume that "our" resurrection must be the same as Christ's "resurrection." Except that it can't be, so they add an endless array of self-contradictory caveats to the issue.

The issue comes down to two Greek words, one that is never translated "resurrection" but is always assumed to mean "resurrection" and another Greek word that is almost always translated "resurrection."

# Christ's "Resurrection?" (cont.)

The first is the Greek verb, "*egeirō*."

- <sup>3</sup> For I delivered to you first of all that which I also received: that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, <sup>4</sup> and that He was buried, and that He **rose again** [*egeirō*] the third day according to the Scriptures, (1Cor 15:3-4 NKJV)

(An important side note that a lot of our critics ignore is that Christ, not Christ's body, was buried and rose again.)

# Christ's "Resurrection?" (cont.)

The second is the Greek noun, "*anastasis*."

- <sup>42</sup> So also *is* the **resurrection** [***anastasis***] of the dead. *The body* is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption. (1Cor 15:42 NKJV)

Because "*anastasis*" is a noun, it is an event, not something that someone does.

(The equally important side note is that "the body" experienced the event, the resurrection.)

# Christ's "Resurrection?" (cont.)

The first is the Greek verb,  
"*egeirō*."

- to arouse, cause to rise
  - to arouse from sleep, to awake
  - to arouse from the sleep of death, to recall the dead to life
  - to cause to rise from a seat or bed etc.
  - ...

The second is the Greek noun, "*anastasis*."

- a raising up, rising (e.g. from a seat)
- a rising from the dead
  - that of Christ
  - that of all men at the end of this present age
  - the resurrection of certain ones history who were restored to life ([Heb. 11:35](#))



# Christ's "Resurrection?" (cont.)

The first is the Greek verb,  
"*egeirō*."

**The KJV translation:**

rise (36x), raise (28x), arise (27x), raise up (23x), rise up (8x), rise again (5x), raise again (4x), *miscellaneous* (10x).

The second is the Greek noun, "*anastasis*."

**The KJV translation:**

resurrection (39x), rising again (1x), that should rise (1x), raised to life again (with G1537) (1x)

# Christ's "Resurrection?" (cont.)

The first is the Greek verb,  
"*egeirō*." (Quick count.)

Used with Christ's  
"resurrection" 50 times.

Also used for all other  
"resurrections" of dead  
people.

Used with "The Resurrection"  
8 times

The second is the Greek noun,  
"*anastasis*." (Quick count.)

Used with Christ's  
"resurrection" 7 times.

Never used for a  
"resurrection" of dead  
person.

Used with "The Resurrection"  
37 times

## Christ's "Resurrection?" (cont.)

The comparison is not absolute, but it is overwhelmingly significant.

The use of "*egeirō*" in the context of "The Resurrection," shows it is always used for a specific detail of "The Resurrection."

Considering details such as this, a proper analysis would certainly show that Christ's "resurrection" was, as Christ promised, a sign of something different, "The Resurrection."

# Christ's "Resurrection?" (cont.)

What does it mean?

The use of "*egeirō*" (to awaken) for Christ's "resurrection," I believe, is a deliberate allusion to the first Adam awakening from his deep sleep. Like the first Adam, the last Adam's bride was made from what issued from the wounded side.

In contrast, the "*anastasis*" (the standing again) was the undoing of Adam's "hiding." Because of Adam's sin, Adam could no longer stand with/before God. But by the power of the Resurrection, the standing again, we can stand, we now stand with/before God.

• t

• t

# The (General) Resurrection

In 1Cor. 15, Paul discusses the resurrection of “the body.”

Among Christians in general and Full Preterists in particular, there is a major disagreement between what is called, “the Individual Body View” (IBV), and the what is called, “the Corporate Body View.” (CBV)

CBV is common in the East. IBV is common in the West. Outside of Full Preterism, very few Christians in the West have even heard of CBV. It is common for Western Christians to confuse Eastern CBV with universalism.

# The (General) Resurrection (cont.)

The various Individual Body Views basically claim that Jesus got a new “spiritual” body and that at the Resurrection, Christians (or maybe everyone) will get a new “spiritual” body.

Though there are variations, it’s basically a physically immortal, “glorified body,” that can walk through walls and glows in the dark.

All of the various Individual Body Views claim that Christ replaced His physical body with a “glorified body.” When? There are three common answers, but the major players pretend these differences do not exist.

# The (General) Resurrection (cont.)

Where did the old body go?

What is a “spiritual body?” If it has flesh and bones (but no blood?) and eats fish, it’s not “spiritual” in the same sense as “God is spirit,” which is why I prefer to make the distinction of “other-physical.” It seems as if this new body operates under different physics, much like Young Earth Creationists claim used to exist before the Fall.

And why does Christ, who is God, need a body, to sit next to God the Father in heaven, who is spirit and does not have a body?



# The (General) Resurrection (cont.)

Ed Stevens claims Christ gave up his physical body during his ascension and replaced it with His resurrection body.

And why doesn't Stevens call it an "ascension" body to ease the confusion of those trying to keep track of all the different Individual Body Views?

Ed Stevens has a sermon, The Fruit of the Collective Body View, where he calls out CBV (and originally Don Preston and William Bell by name) accusing us of causing all this confusion with the various versions of IBV. Sorry. It's not us. IBV owns their own confusion.

# The (General) Resurrection (cont.)

In contrast, there is only one Corporate Body View. It has a few small variations to adapt to Futurism and Preterism.

This view is as old as the Nicene Creed and was held by those who wrote the Nicene Creed.

Ironically, those in the West, who claim to be “creedal” ignore this history and accuse us of heresy for holding this very old view of the Resurrection. (To be fair, we didn’t understand this view from Eastern sources, but only came to see it in those Eastern sources after we discovered the view in Scripture.)

# The (General) Resurrection (cont.)

Specifically, the church is the resurrection body, “the body” of 1Cor 12 (which almost everyone agrees) and “the body” of 1Cor 15 (where the dispute occurs) is the church.

In this view, the Old Covenant Body which was dead in Adam, was buried and the New Covenant Body, the church was raised up.

This is a legal resurrection. It is not a “physical,” “spiritual,” or “other-physical” resurrection. The church was raised up as the new legal entity, the covenant people, the glorified body of Christ.

The (General) Resurrection (cont.)

Maybe we should call it “the Church Body View” of the resurrection.

Would this reduce confusion among our critics who hold to IBV?

# The (General) Resurrection (cont.)

Don Preston likes to use “reconciliation” as a synonym for “resurrection.” This is very good, using Bible words to discuss Bible things

I’d like to propose another synonym.

We need to recognize that the resurrection was “the adoption.”

As Luke 3:38 said, Adam was “the son of God.”

Adam ceased being a son. At “the restoration of all things,” we were restored as sons of God.

# The (General) Resurrection (cont.)

Let's break this down.

In Genesis 2, Adam was given all of the things a rich man would be expected to provide his son, a home, land, wealth, work, and a wife. (See Chapter 11 of Beyond Creation Science)

In Genesis 3, Adam sinned against God and God took everything from Adam (except his wife) (See Chapter 11 of Beyond Creation Science) and gave it to another (Ez. 28).

# The (General) Resurrection (cont.)

Isaiah 65:23 promises that in the New Heaven and the New Earth, God's people would no longer be under the curse of servanthood, of bondage, because God's people and their descendants (us) would be the seed of the blessed Lord.

In Romans 8, those in Christ are no longer have the spirit of bondage but have the spirit of adoption. We are children of God and joint heirs with Christ.

“Behold what manner of love the Father has given onto us, that we should be called the sons of God!” (1 John 3:1a)

## The (General) Resurrection (cont.)

In conclusion:

We hold to CBV: The Church Body View of the Resurrection.

The Church Body View of the Resurrection is the finalized adoption of the church.





# Covenant History

In the beginning, The Crown created the Virginia Colony. The Virginia Colony was formless and void and darkness was over the surface of the deep and the spirit of The Crown hovered over the waters.

And The Crown said, “Let us make Captain John Smith in our image, in our likeness so that he may rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air and the beasts of the field” and The Crown created Captain John Smith in their image to rule over The Virginia Colony.

# Covenant History (cont.)

As Americans, this is our creation story. It continues with the settling of the colonies, the Revolution, our establishment as a separate nation, and all the good and bad in our history, all the way up to today.

It doesn't matter if your ancestors came with Captain Smith in 1607 or if you were naturalized/adopted yesterday. This is your creation story. General George Washington is your father and Captain John Smith is your first father.

## Covenant History (cont.)

The 40 or so survivors of the original Virginia Colony have no living descendants. We were all adopted into this story. The moment we (or our ancestors) became Americans, this became our creation story.

# Covenant History (cont.)

What sort of creation was this?

Physical creation? Certainly not.

This was a legal creation. It was the creation of a covenant. The founding of a nation is the creation of a covenant.

Some will argue that a nation is a physical thing. Not true. The land was already here. Some of it was land no person before wanted. Some of it was bought from the people who were here before. And some of it was taken by force. All that land was held by a nation that declared legal title to that land and was willing to defend that land with physical force.

## Covenant History (cont.)

Every country, every people, has their creation story. It has been common in our western culture to assume that all these stories are their description of physical creation. Are they?

As Americans, we have our own creation story. We know it is historical. We know it is about our legal/covenant creation. We know it is not about physical creation. What is it about our culture that denies every other people a similar story about their history, about the creation of them as a legal people in covenant with each other?

## Covenant History (cont.)

A nation is made up a set of laws, a system of courts to enforce those laws, the people of that nation, and the land that nation claims and is willing to defend.

Historically, that nation had a patron god and a ruler who was the legal heir or “son” of that patron god. Sometimes, that ruler was the nation’s god. This became popular in Christian Europe under the name, “Divine Right of Kings.”

## Covenant History (cont.)

This is what the second part of Colossians 1:16 describes, “For by Him were all things created that are in heaven and that are on earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominions or rulers or authorities: all things were created by Him for Him.”

Paul’s example of “all things created” was a government.

Paul’s understanding was that Adam was the head of a government with numerous officials at different levels of authority.

We’ve been trained to read and understand that verse in a manner totally foreign to Paul’s understanding.



# Covenant History (cont.)

Is Genesis 1 a story about Physical Creation (PC)? Or is it this kind of story, a story about Covenant Creation (CC)?

When we started Beyond Creation Science, Tim Martin and I were vaguely aware of a Covenant Creation understanding that had existed before AD 1800. We had limited understanding of that history and couldn't find anything to clarify our understanding.

Ultimately, we had to develop our understanding from scratch, from Scripture, so we would know what to look for.

## Covenant History (cont.)

It took a few starts, but finally something came together.

The observation that literally finally worked was The Lord of the Rings and its relationship to Tolkien's, The Silmarillion.

The Silmarillion was an after thought, written to try to set up the stage, the world, in which The Lord of the Rings was contained in.

The Silmarillion is essentially irrelevant to the story of The Lord of the Rings.

# Covenant History (cont.)

Scripture is the “story” of God’s covenants with His people. The details of the physical stage that story is set on are pretty much irrelevant to the covenant story.

If you decide where the covenant story begins, then you’ve decided which part of the story is The Sillmarillion of the Bible. The physical backstory means very little. The covenant story is the story.

# Covenant History (cont.)

Some people start the story in Genesis 2. They have made Genesis 1 irrelevant to the covenant story.

Some people start the story with the Fall. This is common with the different “lapsarian” views of Calvinism. They have made everything in Genesis before the irrelevant.

Some people start the story Noah, Abraham, or Moses. They have made some portion of the patriarchs irrelevant.

Some people start the story with the return from captivity. They have made most of what came before irrelevant.

# Covenant History (cont.)

As I mentioned, before we “invented” Covenant Creation from scratch, we couldn’t find out much of historic Covenant Creation. Actually, we couldn’t see what was in front of us.

According to Vatican Scholar Santiago Sanz Sanchez, Covenant Creation was the primary Creation view in Europe from about AD 1200 to sometime after AD 1800.

Before Dispensationalism, Covenant Creation was dominant. Dispensationalism changed the definitions and suddenly Genesis was PC.