

The One Hope Of The Christian's Calling

By Norm Fields

Introduction:

This will be a fairly short response. Unlike Mr. Warner, I feel no necessity to repeat myself and “rehash” everything I have already written. What I will do here is show where Mr. Warner has made several false accusation regarding what I have already written and to make one final attempt to bring Mr. Warner to his senses regarding the false doctrine of Premillennialism. I will also include some simple charts for the purpose of summary and to expose how Mr. Warner has either purposely misrepresented what I have written or has simply not understood himself.

Supposedly Unanswered Arguments:

Warner lists several points that he says I have not answered and/or ignored. He says that my so-called ignoring of these points actually establishes them to be true. So, apparently, all Mr. Warner has to do to “prove” his arguments is to reject any objections to them. That is what he is doing in this discussion. Just because Mr. Warner doesn’t accept the offered objections doesn’t mean no opposing arguments have been made.

Here is Mr. Warner’s list of arguments that he claims I have ignored:

1. The Personal, Eternal Land Promise to the Patriarchs Remains Unfulfilled.

Warner’s denial notwithstanding, I answered this argument in my first rebuttal to Warner’s “The Abrahamic Covenant,” pages 13-14.

Maybe Mr. Warner did not look up the verses I submitted there, as I just referenced them instead of inserting the complete text into my response. Let me help Mr. Warner out here by including the text I referred to.

And the Lord gave unto Israel all the land which he swore to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it, and dwelt therein. And the Lord gave them rest round

about, according to all that he swore unto their fathers: and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them; the Lord delivered all their enemies into their hand. There failed not aught of any good thing which the Lord had spoken unto the house of Israel; all came to pass (Joshua 21:43-45).

LOOK HERE MR. WARNER!

If I could think of anything else to emphasize what Joshua says here I would do it! Mr. Warner says I didn't answer his argument regarding the Land Promise being unfulfilled. I don't have to answer it! The Bible does a fine job of showing it to be false without any help from me.

Warner says the only way it could be fulfilled would be for God to fulfill it "personally" to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. But Joshua says the promise God made to their fathers was fulfilled when it was given to the "house of Israel." The promise was made to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and fulfilled to the house of Israel.

2. The Promised Land Inheritance Will Be Made Permanent Through Jesus Christ.

Again, this was answered in my first response to Warner. I pointed out there that the promise to Abraham was broader than the physical land of Canaan. Warner says it can only apply to the Land, however, the Land promise was fulfilled (see above).

It was the promise of all nations being blessed through Abraham's seed that was fulfilled in Christ (Gen. 12:1-3; 22:17-18).

*Gen 12:1-3, Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee: 2 And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: 3 And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and **in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.***

*Gen 22:17-18, That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; ¹⁸ And **in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed;** because thou hast obeyed my voice.*

This promise, that Mr. Warner fails to even acknowledge, fits perfectly with Paul's context of Christ bringing Jew and Gentile together in the church. Notice the following chart tying the context together.

Promise of Land Or Salvation?

Gal 3:8, And the scripture, **foreseeing that God would justify the heathen [Gentiles] through faith**, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, **In thee shall all nations be blessed.**

Gal 3:13-14, Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: ¹⁴ **That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ**; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.

Gal 3:16

Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.

Gal 3:26-28, For **ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.** ²⁷ For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. ²⁸ **There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.**

[Open Chart](#)

3. The Eternal Land Inheritance Was Future From David's Perspective.

Here Mr. Warner chides me for not responding to his use of Psalm 37. Psalm 37 has absolutely nothing at all to do with the Land promise! The context of that Psalm is the benefit of righteousness over wickedness.

In Psalm 37:3 the Hebrew is more accurately understood as "Dwell in the Land," as in the NKJV. This has relevance to the passages Mr. Warner emphasizes (i.e. 37:9-11). According to the context of the Psalm, the humble (meek) would be able to dwell in the land with God's blessings where the wicked would be cut off from the Land.

This was written prior to the captivity and restoration of Israel and Judah. The prophets repeatedly spoke of the remnant that would be restored to the Land after God's punishing the wickedness of Israel and Judah.

Warner thinks he has a solid argument in Psalm 37 because he is willing to use Scripture grossly out of context. This tendency to twist the Scripture out of context has been demonstrated over and over again. I think in his last "rebuttal" the tendency has reached a fever pitch.

4. The Hope Of Jesus' Apostles Was The Same As David's And Abraham's Hope.

Using Psalm 37 out of context again as "David's hope," doesn't help Warner's argument. That Psalm does not refer to the land promise as being yet unfulfilled, it does not refer to "David's hope," it does not refer to Premillennialism. Jesus did not use this Psalm in reference to the Land promise. The apostles did not use this Psalm in reference

to the Land promise. No commentator I have checked used this Psalm in reference to the Land promise. As far as I can tell, only Mr. Warner has used this Psalm in reference to the Land promise. Maybe Irenaeus, Warner's favorite commentator, used the Psalm this way. If he did I am unaware of it but it wouldn't be the first time Warner has followed him in a misuse of Scripture.

I discussed the common misconception addressed by Jesus in his preaching in my rebuttal of Warner's opening argument in round one (Fields 1B, pg. 8-9). Just because Mr. Warner is not willing to accept my answer to this argument doesn't mean I didn't answer it.

5. The Post-Pentecost Hope Was The Same As The Pre-Pentecost Hope.

Warner says that I have "mostly ignored" his arguments on this point. Again, I'm not sure how Warner's rejecting my answer to his arguments equals ignoring his arguments. I responded to his use of Acts 3:19 on page 9 of my rebuttal to his opening argument in round one. I also responded to his use of Romans 8 on pages 10 and 11 of that same paper.

Maybe Mr. Warner should have presented further argument on these points in round one of the debate instead of dragging them over into this second round. He is supposed to be dealing with my opening argument to round two, not rehashing round one.

Presuppositions VS. Exegesis

Warner accuses me of basing my understanding of 1 Corinthians 15, and the resurrection in general, on "Gnostic" presuppositions. I find it very ironic that Mr. Warner repeatedly accuses me of being a Gnostic or holding Gnostic views (24 times, I counted!). The irony of it is that the father of Warner's own Premillennialism, Cerinthus, was one of the earliest known Gnostics. And, for the record, I never said any of the disciples were Premillennialists. Find it if you can! This is simply another example of Warner's tendency to twist words. At least he doesn't discriminate. He is just as willing to twist my words as he is to twist God's.

Warner accuses me of being Gnostic in my views but anyone familiar with the Jehovah's Witnesses would probably say Warner is among their group. I wonder if Mr. Warner even allows for a 144,000 to go to heaven? Does he believe that man has an immortal soul at all, or is he a purely physical being. How far does his similarity with the Watchtower Society go?

I will continue with some further positive argument here on 1 Corinthians 15 and we will see if my understanding is based on presuppositions or sound exegesis.

The issue being addressed by Paul in 1 Corinthians 15 was not the nature of the resurrection body. It was whether there was such a thing as the resurrection from the dead. Some were denying that the dead would be raised. Keeping company with such false teachers was a corruptive influence on the brethren (1 Cor. 15:33). What we may glean from the nature of the resurrection body is an incidental raised in the course of this discussion on the fact of the resurrection.

It is in answering an anticipated objection to the resurrection of the dead that Paul reveals something of the resurrection body (1 Cor. 15:35f). He says that there are all kinds of *different* bodies (vv. 39-41). The point being, all bodies are not the same. Then he says, "So also is the resurrection of the dead" (42). That is, the body that is raised is *different* from the body that died. He says that difference is between "natural" and "spiritual." The body that dies is a "natural" body, the body that is raised is a "spiritual" body. *They are not the same body!*

The "natural" body is likened to Adam's body of the dust of the earth (47). The spiritual body is likened to the Lord from heaven (47). If Paul was talking about the physical body of Adam and the physical body of Christ where would be the difference? It is not Christ's physical body that our future spiritual body is being likened to. It is his preincarnate spiritual body from heaven that is the example of the resurrection body (48-49).

Warner tries to parallel the "natural" and "spiritual" bodies here with other passages dealing with being spiritually minded rather than carnally minded. It also appears that he makes reference to the natural man and spiritual man of 1 Corinthians 2:13-16, where Paul is contrasting the inspired man to the uninspired man as relating to the revelation of God's wisdom. What does that have to do with the resurrection? There is no parallel in the context whatsoever.

Anyone engaging in sound exegesis can see that Paul is not talking about lifestyle here. He is talking about the body in which we will be raised. He goes on, right after saying that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, to say that "we shall all be changed." Changed from what into what? Warner says changed from a physical body into a physical body. Paul says from a physical body into a spiritual body. I'm going to stick with Paul and pray for Warner.

Notice the following chart:

The Resurrection Body

1 Cor 15:46-49, Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. **47** The first man is of the earth, [made of dust]; the second man is the Lord from heaven. **48** As is the [man of dust], such are they also that are [made of dust]; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. **49** And as we have borne the image of the [man of dust], we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.

Gen 2:7, And **the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground**, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.

1 Cor 15:50, Now this I say, brethren, that **flesh and blood** cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.

1 John 3:2, Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and **it doth not yet appear what we shall be**; but we know that, when he shall appear, **we shall be like him**; for we shall see him as he is.

Flesh and Blood = Dust of the Earth - Cannot Inherit The Kingdom of God
Heavenly = Be Like Him - Not Seen Yet - See At His Coming

[Open Chart](#)

Warner says that the same body that was put in the grave will come forth from the grave. Paul says it will be a different body!

If the same body that went into the grave is the one that comes forth from the grave then what does that say for the victims of murderous abortion? Does it mean they will be raised in the same fetal body that went to the grave? Does it mean that every stillborn child will be raised in the same physical fetal body that went to the grave? How far do we go, every child gone to the grave before the age of accountability will be raised in the same immature body that went to the grave? Will they remain in their fetal, infant or immature body for all eternity? No, Scripture says they will be changed (1 Cor. 15:51, 52).

Warner uses Jesus' body as an example of our resurrection body, saying that to deny a physical resurrection is to deny that Christ was raised. **He actually uses the scars of Christ as "proof" of a physical resurrection!**

So, not only will we be raised in the same physical body that went to the grave (fetal, infant, immature, elderly and decrepit) but we will also be raised with the same scars,

wounds of our death, etc.? Those who died in fires, car wrecks, abortion, beheadings, and the like, I would not imagine will be very happy with their resurrection bodies!

“Oh, no,” Warner will say, “God will restore them to a perfect body.” But he said that our resurrection would be exactly like that of Jesus. Jesus was raised in the same scared flesh that went into the grave.

The reason Jesus was raised in that same flesh was not to show us what our resurrection body would be like. John says we do not yet see what we will be like (1 John 3:2). Rather, it was because his earthly ministry was not yet completed. His change from a physical body to a spiritual body occurred when he was taken up in the clouds, same as ours. We will not be raised to reside on this earth again. We will be raised to the clouds to ever be with the Lord.

1 Thess 4:17, Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord.

Was Job talking about a physical resurrection?

In this last response from Warner I cannot help but think that he is willfully abusing the word of God. I pray that it is not the case, that he is simply wrong in his understanding and not dishonest. If that is the case then it may be that he will turn from his error. But if he is willfully being dishonest with the word of God it is not likely that he will be reached with the truth.

When Mr. Warner cites Job’s reference to his flesh being destroyed and then standing before God in his physical body as “proof” that Job believed in a physical resurrection, it is difficult for me to believe that he is that misguided about what the passage actually says.

Certainly, Job’s flesh had been destroyed! But he was not dead and in the grave. Throughout the discourse Job had been calling for a hearing with God so that he could make the case for his innocence and know the reason his flesh had been so destroyed. He is not talking about a resurrection of the dead. Nothing of the sort can be taken from the context.

Job gets his day in court with God, though it is not as he expects (Job 38-42). Job’s flesh was restored (Job 42:10). The context has nothing at all to do with the resurrection of the dead.

When I compile these manuscripts for the reader I will be careful to place a warning in the front. WARNING - Mr. Warner is prone to lift phrases that appear to support his views out of their natural context and twist them into saying something they don't say.

I pray that Mr. Warner will repent of his sore mishandling of the word of God.

No, Mr. Warner, Job's words are hardly the description of the spiritual resurrection I have presented. Job's words are not a description of any kind of resurrection at all!

Is Ezekiel's Dry Bones A Picture Of The Resurrection?

It is incomprehensible that Mr. Warner expects any serious Bible student to believe that Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones is evidence for his physical resurrection.

Ezekiel was prophesying to the children of Israel *in captivity!* The vision of the dry bones being restored is a prophetic vision of Israel being restored to the land, not of the resurrection of the dead.

Immediately following the vision of the dry bones is the prophecy of the two sticks. Before the captivity they were a divided kingdom but when they were restored to the land they were brought back together in a united kingdom.

Ezekiel 37 is dealing with the promise of restoration from the captivity *not* the resurrection of the dead! Should I insert the warning here again? (see above).

[Click here](#) for an outline of Ezekiel's vision of dry bones that presents the true context of the Scripture.

The Resurrection Of The Righteous And The Wicked

One of the things that Mr. Warner must do in defense of his false doctrine is to deny the simultaneous resurrection of the righteous and the wicked. He has rejected John 5:28, 29 as evidence of such a simultaneous resurrection, as he must do, so I will present him with some further passages to deny if he can.

Matt 25:31-33, When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: 32 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: 33 And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left.

Acts 17:30-31, And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent: 31 Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will

judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.

*2 Thess 1:6-10, Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; 7 And to you who are troubled rest with us, **when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, 8 In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: 9 Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; 10 When he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe** (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day.*

The righteous and the wicked are raised at the same time to appear before the judgment seat of Christ (2 Cor. 5:10). They will be separated one from another (Matt. 25:31-33). The wicked will be cast into hell and the righteous welcomed into the kingdom of heaven (Matt. 25:46). The righteous will be glorified with Christ while the wicked are punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord (2 Thess. 1:6-10).

These passages do not refer to separate events occurring many years apart. They refer to what will happen in one hour of one day! God created the universe in six days, does Mr. Warner doubt that he can judge mankind in one hour?

In his attempt to show a separate resurrection for the wicked and the just Mr. Warner once again twists Scripture to fit his warped view of Christ and his kingdom. He completely ignores how Christ places Daniel's vision of Daniel 12:2 in the context of the destruction of Jerusalem.

Speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, Jesus said,

*Matt 24:15, When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, **spoken of by Daniel the prophet**, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand:)*

Daniel wrote about the "abomination of desolation" in Daniel 12! His vision of many rising from the dust is in the context of that event when God would show once and for all that Judaism was no longer his chosen system of obedience. Those Jews who had converted to Christ and continued in obedience to God would shine as God's faithful servants. Those who had rejected Christ to be destroyed in Jerusalem's fall would suffer the everlasting consequences of such rebellion against the will of God.

Now that I have given the accurate understanding of the passage in its context, let me just allow Mr. Warner his misuse for a moment. He says there will be a separate resurrection for the just and the unjust. He attempts to use Daniel 12:2 as evidence. He supposes the the word "many" shows that some will be raised while others are not. But even if I allow Mr. Warner his use of Daniel 12:2 it still does not prove what he seeks to

prove. He has to separate the just and the unjust. Daniel 12:2 does not so separate them. Even if “many” meant some would be raised while others were not, which it doesn’t mean, the “some” that are raised in that passage are a mix of just and unjust, not one to the exclusion of the other. Mr. Warner’s “proof” is not only used out of context and twisted, it doesn’t even say what he needs it to say.

John 14 - Heaven or “Little Apartments”

Mr. Warner would have us believe that when Jesus told his disciples that he was going to prepare a place for them he was actually talking about the little apartments in the temple. Let me speak further of John 14 and see if Mr. Warner’s argument holds up.

*John 14:1-6, Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. 2 In my Father’s house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. **I go to prepare a place for you.** 3 And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; **that where I am, there ye may be also.** 4 And **whither I go ye know, and the way ye know.** 5 Thomas saith unto him, Lord, we know not whither thou goest; and how can we know the way? 6 Jesus saith unto him, **I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.***

In my last paper I gave several passages detailing where God is. He is in heaven, his dwelling place! Jesus said he was going to the Father. He was going to prepare a place. He would come back to receive his disciples so they could be in that place. He says that place is with the Father! How much clearer can it be? Christ is coming to take the righteous back to heaven to be with the Father.

I gave a long list of things referred to in Scripture as being in heaven for the righteous. Warner chided me and said none of these passages refer to the righteous as being in heaven. He said that Christ will bring those things back for us when he comes again. But wait! Jesus said that through him we will come unto the Father. Where is the Father? In heaven!

Where was Jesus going? To heaven!

*John 17:5, And now, O Father, **glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.***

*John 17:24, Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, **be with me where I am;** that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.*

*Heb 1:3, Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, **sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high;***

Why would his disciples need to know the way there if he was going to come back here to stay? He is the way to the Father, our way to heaven. We cannot get there except through him. Its not talking about worship or fellowship, though we cannot have those relations with the Father except by Christ. It is talking about being able to go where Christ was going! "Where I go you know, and the way you know."

The Earth or The Land

In 2 Peter 3:10f Peter describes the destruction of the earth and uses the word "elements" to refer to the totality of the destruction. Once again Warner ignores the immediate context of Peter's writing to deny what the passage clearly teaches.

The word "elements" refers to the smallest or foundational part of an orderly system, like the creation. Warner finds the word used in other passages for systems other than the creation to try and show that Peter is not talking about the creation.

The word must be defined by its context. In 2 Peter 3:10 and 12 the context is clearly referring to the physical creation. So, even though the word itself does not necessitate the physical creation the context does. "Elements" in 2 Peter 3:10, 12 refers to the foundational or smallest part of matter being destroyed.

Conclusion:

I have shown in the course of this debate that Christ is reigning over God's kingdom now from the right of God in heaven. I have shown that Christians look forward to an eternal home in heaven with God at the coming of Christ. I have shown that this world will be utterly destroyed. I have shown that there will be no millennial kingdom on this earth. I have shown that Mr. Warner is really good at twisting Scripture out of its natural context.

Now it is up to the reader to study the word of God in light of what has been said and hold only to what is found true. Warner's view requires him to contradict clear passages of Scripture and to twist them into harmony with his misuse of highly symbolic prophetic passages. I pray that this discussion will be helpful in turning people away from the false hope of Premillennialism. There are no second chances! We must be prepared to meet the Lord in the air at his coming.

I want to thank Mr. Warner for his allowing me to participate in this discussion and to pray for his repentance from his false doctrine.