

Hell, a Closer Look - Some Questions Raised and Our Answers

Copyright © Graham G. Thomason, 2008
Revision dates: 28 August 2008; 19 March 2018 (Word title; Unicode), 30 January 2020 (Seth)
Very minor revisions: 15 June 2021, 8 January 2023.

Permission is granted to copy or publish this item for non-commercial use, provided this complete notice is included.
The item can be found at www.FarAboveAll.com

Our study *Hell, a Closer Look* has led to some questions which we show (in summary) with our answers.

Question 1

*Surely we infer from Gen 4:1 **And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, that Cain was a direct descendant of Adam and Eve, and thus not the progeny of rebel angels? Surely the following phrase also discounts your view: 'she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the LORD'** If you are correct, I would expect it to say 'I have gotten a man from the Serpent.'*

Answer

Firstly, it is essential to quote Gen 4:1-4:2a, not just Gen 4:1 in isolation.

And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the LORD. And she again bare his brother Abel. [AV]

The second birth is absolutely integral to the matter. Without it, we have half a truth. If one argues without both births clearly in view, any conclusions are purely nugatory.

Secondly, we are not attempting to *prove* from Genesis that Cain is “out of” the Serpent (Satan). We did not learn that *Cain was out of the wicked one* from Genesis 4, but from 1 John 3:12. We are simply attempting to show that Genesis *allows the possibility* of such to be the case, i.e. *does not exclude* such being the case (otherwise we have a problem with 1 John 3:12). Incidentally, we identify the Serpent as the Devil and Satan and the Dragon from Revelation 12:9.

Now the normal practice in Scripture before a birth is to indicate begetting, or the preceding union, in some discreet way. Compare verse 25:

²⁵And Adam **knew his wife again; and she bare a son, and called his name Seth: For God, said she, hath appointed me another seed instead of **Abel**, whom Cain slew. [AV]**

Why back in verse 2 do we not read, for example, *And Adam **knew his wife again** and she bare his brother Abel?* Is there a missing “*knowing*”? One might ask, “Are we sure who begot each of these sons?” The matter has not gone unnoticed. Some Jewish and Christian commentators have concluded that Cain and Abel must have been twins. Other matters being equal, that is a reasonable deduction. But they are not called twins (whereas Jacob and Esau are, Gen 25:24), and there is another, more sinister explanation, namely a case of *superfoetation*, i.e. where two eggs are fertilized from different sources, and the foetuses grow in the womb together. Superfoetation as a consequence of promiscuity is a well attested phenomenon today – and if it did not exist, it is doubtful whether we would have a word for it. And if we do have such as case with Cain and Abel, it is obvious that it is not Abel whose provenance is in question... **The order of births does not have to be the order of conception** (whatever it was). The way it has been described emphasizes how sinister the whole affair is, how careful we must be, with the shock that it was not Abel who was Satan's seed. As is so

often the case, it is the *second* one to appear that is the one that has God's approval, (though the first one may simply be Adamic seed not of the chosen line, of course) – cf. Ishmael vs. Isaac, Esau vs. Jacob, Saul vs. David, Adam vs. Christ, this world vs. the next.

Why does Seth replace Abel, and not Cain, the firstborn? Could it be that Cain was not a godly seed – a seed of God (Malachi 2:15)? Could it be that Abel was the seed God had put on the earth and that Cain came from a different – Satanic – source?

Without pressing the point, we think it is significant that after Eve's transgression, God in Gen 3:16 tells her to whom her desire shall be: **thy desire shall be to thy husband** - a discreet reference to the one to whom her (sexual) desire was when she was beguiled?

So as far as Genesis goes, we would say that there are indications that Cain is *out of the wicked one*, as stated in 1 John 3:12. This literal interpretation is not a new or completely radical view, though it is perhaps shocking to some. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Serpent_seed.

Regarding Eve saying, “**I have gotten a man from the LORD**”, Genesis 4:1, there are a couple of issues. One is that Eve is quite capable of jumping to the wrong conclusion. We should take the writer's (Moses') words as God's truth, and as a truthful record, but we should watch out with Eve's exclamations. The second point is a matter of Hebrew, because there are different translational possibilities.

וַהֲאָדָם יָדַע אֶת-חַוָּה אִשְׁתּוֹ וַתְּהַר וַתֵּלֶד אֶת-קַיִן וַתֹּאמֶר קָנִיתִי אִישׁ אֶת-יְהוָה:

And Adam (or: the man) knew Eve his wife; and she conceived and bore Cain, and said,

- “I have got a man, **accustative particle** Yahweh/Jehovah”

or

- “I have got a man **with** Yahweh/Jehovah”

We do not have the normal words for *from* (מִן, *min*, and מֵ-עַתָּה, *me-et*), but אֶת, *et*, which has two meanings:

- a sign that the object of the verb follows (a sign of the accusative), which is untranslated in English.
- *with* (sociative)

If she said, “I have got a man, Yahweh/Jehovah”, We would interpret this as

- “I have got the promised Man, the Messiah, the Lord, Yahweh/Jehovah (incarnate).”

In this case, Eve did not realise that 4000 years were to pass before the Messiah would come, and she was mistaken as to the line through which this would be.

Otherwise, we have to accommodate אֶת, *et*, into מֵ-עַתָּה, *me-et*, to get *from*, which we feel is stretching things.

The point about what Eve said is not essential to our discussion, and obviously some knowledge of Hebrew is needed here to appreciate it.

Question 2

Should we not understand references such as **of that wicked one** in 1 John 3:12 to refer to the example the people are following or the ways they are walking in rather than the physical origin of the individuals themselves? Is this not supported by scripture in Romans 4:11 - 12 where it says that Abraham is **the father of all them that believe** which is explained as referring to those who **walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham**? In the same way, if someone is referred to as being **of that wicked one** is it not because they walk in the steps and ways **of that wicked one**?

Answer (including an elaborated study of the evil seed)

Regarding Rom 4:11-12 etc., we agree that the word *father* can mean *having the walk / characteristics of*, as well as its literal meaning. But in 1 John 3:12 we have a different expression.

There is no ‘**of**’ (i.e. plain genitive) for this in the Greek of 1 John 3:12 – the AV is not really precise here. Nor is there any ‘**father**’ or reason to interpolate it in a spiritualized way. The Holy Spirit has avoided the words. The word in question is ἐκ, *ek*, (ἐξ, *ex*, before a vowel) which does not mean ‘**of**’. It is a preposition whose basic meaning is ‘**out of**’.

Examples:

- Καὶ ἔχων ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ χειρὶ ἀστέρας ἑπτὰ· καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ῥομφαία δίστομος ὅξεια ἐκπορευομένη, ...
And He had in His right hand seven stars: and out of His mouth went a sharp two-edged sword ... [Rev 1:16]
- ‘*Out of the mouth*’ also in Revelation 11:15 12:15 12:16 16:13 19:15 19:21; Matthew 15:11 15:18; also other places.
- Καὶ εὐθέως ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἐξελθόντες, ...
And immediately, when they had come out of the synagogue, ... [Mark 1:29]

Moreover, the word ἐκ often refers to natural origin:

- πρὸς παρθένον μεμνηστευμένην ἀνδρὶ, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωσήφ, ἐξ οἴκου Δαβὶδ· καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς παρθένου Μαριάμ.
To a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, (genetically) of the house of David, and the name of the virgin was Mary. [Lk 1:27]
- Καὶ ἦν Ἄννα προφῆτις, θυγάτηρ Φανουήλ, ἐκ φυλῆς Ἀσήρ - αὕτη προβεβηκυῖα ἐν ἡμέραις πολλαῖς, ζήσασα ἔτη μετὰ ἀνδρὸς ἑπτὰ ἀπὸ τῆς παρθενίας αὐτῆς, ...
Also, there was a prophetess, Anna, the daughter of Phanuel, (ancestrally) of the tribe of Asher; she was very elderly and had lived with her husband for seven years after her marriage (or: virginity). [Lk 2:36]
- ἐκ γένους Ἰσραήλ,
descended from the stock of Israel [Phil 3:5]
- Ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἱερεὺς τις ὀνόματι Ζαχαρίας, ἐξ ἐφημερίας Ἀβιά· καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν θυγατέρων Ἀαρών, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς Ἐλισάβετ.
There was in the days of Herod king of Judaea a certain priest by name of Zacharias from the division of Abia, and his wife was descended from the daughters of Aaron, and her name was Elisabeth. [Lk 1:5]
- Ποιήσατε οὖν καρποὺς ἀξίους τῆς μετανοίας· καὶ μὴ ἄρξησθε λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, Πατέρα ἔχομεν τὸν Ἀβραάμ· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι δύναται ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῶν λίθων τούτων ἐγεῖραι τέκνα τῶ Ἀβραάμ.
Well then, produce fruit worthy of repentance, and do not start saying to yourselves, “We have our father Abraham.” For I tell you that God is able to raise up children to Abraham from these stones. [Lk 3:8]

The word **ἐκ**, *ek* occurs in some English words of Greek origin, e.g. *eccentric*, which means *out-of-centre*, not *of-centre*. It is cognate with Latin *e* (*ex* before a vowel), occurring in dozens of English words, including *exit* (literally *he goes out*).

In 1 John 3:12, the Greek is:

οὐ καθὼς Κάιν **ἐκ** τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν,
ou kathōs Kain **ek** tou ponērou ēn
not as Cain, out of the wicked one, was

No more must we hear of '*father*' and '*of*' with reference to 1 John 3:12. The words are not there. Instead we read something directly physical. Why not take the statement in its plain meaning as it stands?

The same preposition is used of **whosoever is born of (ἐκ) God** e.g. 1 John 3:9, where more than behaviour (a new creation by God) is involved. This preposition is actually quite frequent in 1 John, and a complete discussion would be quite lengthy. In short, though, this epistle by an apostle of the circumcision (Gal 2:9) appears to be discussing the seed issue from the standpoint of recipients of, or those about to receive, the New Covenant with the House of Israel and the House of Judah (so not with the Gentiles), Jeremiah 31:31-31:34. They **know all things** (1 John 2:20) and **they have no need that any man teach them** (1 John 2:27) – a reference to Jeremiah 31:34. Now if the Jews have a new heart from God, what does John make of sinners amongst them? They are **of the devil** (1 John 3:8). Turning to the book of Revelation, they are, in short, **false Jews, they who say they are Jews but are not, the synagogue of Satan** (Rev 2:9).

Furthermore, 1 John warns of the antichrist (2:18, 2:22, 4:3) who is surely to be recognized as of satanic origin, the **man of sin** of 2 Thessalonians 2:3, **whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders** (2 Th 2:9). The antichrist/man of sin is no ordinary Adamic man. In the context of such dreadful and powerful satanic interference, why would John hold up Cain as the archetypal example, if all he is – is an ordinary Adamic sinner?

More on the evil seed

The evil seed is introduced in Gen 3:15, where God speaks to the Serpent (i.e Satan, Rev 12:9):

¹⁵And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel. [AV]

We count *two* seeds here, not one (apologies for labouring the point, but it sometimes seems necessary). There is enmity between Satan's seed and Eve's seed. We see the enmity throughout the Old Testament, through the attacks on Israel, especially the Messianic line, which if completely successful would have prevented the Messiah from coming. We have already discussed what appears to have happened in the Garden of Eden. In Gen 6:2, we read about an angelic irruption:

²That the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose. [AV]

The progeny were giants (not ordinary Adamic men), Gen 6:4

⁴There were giants (Hebrew: נַפְלִיִּם, *Nephilim, fallen ones*) in the earth in those days; ... [AV]

This first wave were all destroyed in the flood, but there were more to come. Continuing Gen 6:4,

⁴ ... and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men which were of old, men of renown. [AV]

We read of the Nephilim again in Numbers 13:33, already in the Promised Land. In that verse we read that they are the sons of Anak. The tribes are specified in Numbers 13:29: Amalekites, Hittites, Jebusites, Amorites and Canaanites. That explains why the Israelites were told to utterly destroy certain tribes e.g. Deut 20:17.

³Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass. [AV]

We don't know how anyone could justify this, which includes killing small children, as a righteous command from God, if they simply see the Amalekites as ordinary Adamic people. By the way, the same goes for Psalm 137:9, concerning the *daughter of Babylon*. Sceptics love to attack the Bible with this verse, and even many Christians seem upset or embarrassed by it:

⁹Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones. [AV]

But when this verse is understood in the context of the evil seed, we can rejoice greatly at it. This is Messiah destroying the alien progeny of the king of Babylon, who merges into Lucifer (Isaiah 14:12), i.e. Satan, who would corrupt and destroy humanity. Note also how a similar merging is described where the king of Tyre merges into the anointed cherub who was in the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel 28 – giving another reference to Satan.

Now Saul did not utterly destroy Amalekites (1 Sam 15:9). This nearly cost Israel its existence. In the book of Esther, Haman, **the enemy of the Jews** (Esther 9:10), was out to destroy the Jews. He was an Agagite (Esther 3:1), which means an Amalekite (1 Sam 15:8). If God had not intervened, Haman would have destroyed the Jews.

Having said these things, please note God will deal with the evil seed, and that it is not our job at all in this dispensation of grace to battle against flesh and blood (Eph 6:12).

Question 3

Who are ‘the children of the kingdom’ and ‘the children of the wicked one’ referred to in Matthew 13:38? Is this not stated in verse 41 which says the children of the wicked one are ‘all things that offend, and them which do iniquity’ and verse 42 which says the children of the kingdom are ‘the righteous’. There is no mention here of the children of the wicked one being the offspring of devils that have committed adultery with women.

Answer

A parable is a picture which represents reality. Christ Himself interprets the ‘tares’ as ‘the children of the wicked one’. To re-interpret the interpretation is to offer a rival interpretation of the tares. The interpretation already *is* the reality. Moreover, we read that *the devil sowed them in the earth*. **So the devil has sown his seed – his children – in the earth.** That makes perfect sense as it stands. Why look further, and end up by saying that the devil has not sown his seed in the earth?

<i>The parable</i>	<i>Christ's interpretation</i>	<i>Interpretation suggested by the question</i>
Tares sown in the field	The tares are children of the wicked one. The enemy that sowed them is the devil. The field is the world.	The tares are <i>not</i> the (literal) children of the wicked one. The devil did <i>not</i> sow his seed in the world...

The fact that the devil's seed *offends* [v.41], or has any other attributes, in no way invalidates **what it is**. As to how the devil did this, see these references:

- Gen 6:2 *sons of God* [i.e. angels, see Job 1:6, 38:7 etc.] *taking the daughters of men*,

- Gen 6:4 giants=*nephilim*, fallen ones (i.e. fallen angels)
- Consider Jude 6-7, (*angels that left their habitation*, and *strange flesh*, and note a reference to Cain in v.11!)
- Consider 2 Peter 2:4 (*angels that sinned*, and note the reference to *Noah* in v.5, so linking back to the days of Noah, taking us back to Genesis 6.)
- And, of course, 1 John 3:12 fits in with this very consistently.

It is our conclusion that the world is populated by three main categories of humans:

- Adamic believers, *found sheep*.
- Adamic non-believers, *lost sheep*.
- Children of the wicked one, *goats*.

We all grow up together in the world. We cannot tell for sure who is what. The purpose of the gospel, which we preach to all, is to convert lost sheep into found sheep.

Question 4

You also contend that the fire and punishment referred to in the Bible are not eternal. If I understand you correctly, you say that the term translated in the Authorized Version 'for ever and ever' in Rev 20:10 refers to the end of a final age and not 'for ever' as we would commonly understand it. My main difficulty with this argument is that this phrase is also used to refer to God Himself as in Rev 15:7 "...God, Who liveth for ever and ever" and Rev 10:6 "And swear by Him That liveth for ever and ever." To my mind this shows that the fire and punishment continues for the same length of time as God exists i.e. it is eternal. How do you answer this point?

Answer

If Rev 20:10 does not end up with the destruction of Satan, then we have a problem passage in one place or the other, since in Ezekiel 28, it is clear that Satan is being spoken of, and that he is eventually to be destroyed:

¹³Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; ...

¹⁸Thou hast defiled thy sanctuaries by the multitude of thine iniquities, by the iniquity of thy traffick; therefore will I bring forth a fire from the midst of thee, **it shall devour thee, and **I will bring thee to ashes** upon the earth in the sight of all them that behold thee. [AV]**

We would also expect a fatal blow to Satan from Gen 3:15, where God says to the Serpent

**it (the seed of the woman) shall bruise thy head,
and thou (the Serpent) shalt bruise His heel.**

The verb for *bruise* here, שָׁחַף (shuf), is strong and dictionaries include a meaning of *to crush*.¹ And when the Serpent 'bruised' Messiah's heel, it killed Him, (though it didn't stop Him from rising again in resurrection).

Isaiah 14 would also lead us to understand the end in some way of Satan, without as much as a burial. Note also the reference to *seed*.

¹²How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! ¹³For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north: ¹⁴I will ascend above

¹ Gesenius (in the English translation) and Sander & Trelen (*écraser*); Strong gives *to break*.

the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High. ¹⁵Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell [שְׁאוֹל (sheol), *the grave, underworld*], to the sides of the pit. ¹⁶They that see thee shall narrowly look upon thee, *and consider thee, saying, Is this the man that made the earth to tremble, that did shake kingdoms;* ¹⁷*That made the world as a wilderness, and destroyed the cities thereof; that opened not the house of his prisoners?* ¹⁸All the kings of the nations, *even all of them, lie in glory, every one in his own house.* ¹⁹But thou art cast out of thy grave [קֶבֶר (qever) *grave, burial place*] like an abominable branch, *and as the raiment of those that are slain, thrust through with a sword, that go down to the stones of the pit; as a carcase trodden under feet.* ²⁰**Thou shalt not be joined with them in burial**, because thou hast destroyed thy land, *and slain thy people: the seed of evildoers shall never be renowned.* [AV]

At the end of this answer we show one more reference showing that this adversary is to be destroyed.

We will now look carefully at the expression in question, in Rev 20:10 etc.

εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων
eis tous aiōnas tōn aiōnōn
unto the ages of the ages

The preposition εἰς can mean all sorts of things:

- motion towards: *to* Mat 2:1, Luke 11:49, Acts 22:30
- rest at after motion (pregnant use): *in* Heb 11:9, Acts 7:4, 1 Pet 3:20
- abstractions of motion and rest: 2 Pet 3:9, Phil 4:16, 2 Cor 11:3
- purpose: *in order to, with a view to, in the cause of* Heb 7:25, 2 Cor 2:12, Col 1:10, Col 1:11, Rom 15:2
- result: *resulting in, to* 1 Pet 4:2, 2 Tim 2:14, 2 Cor 7:0, Rom 4:18
- manner: *in such a wise that* 2 Cor 7:3, Heb 11:3
- cause: *because, at* 2 Tim 2:26
- destiny: *for, leading to, destined for, fulfilled in the form of* 2 Pet 1:8, Col 2:2, Col 3:10, Heb 10:39, Col 2:22, 2 Cor 9:11, Acts 8:20, 1 Pet 2:9, John 4:36, Rom 1:16, Heb 9:9, 1 Pet 2:2, Rom 9:21, 1 Pet 1:2, Rom 9:21, 1 Pet 1:2
- temporal usage: *until, ready for, against, awaiting, in* Eph 1:14, Gal 3:23, 1 Th 4:15, 2 Tim 1:12, 2 Pet 3:7, Jude v6, Acts 5:21, Eph 3:21, Acts 13:42, Heb 4:16

Moreover εἰς can take on the role of various other prepositions and some roles of the dative case, and it can introduce a nominal predicate. The Authorized Version does not generally attempt a specialised translation, and translates *unto*.

The word αἰὼν aiōn (and its Hebrew cognate עוֹלָם olam) basically means *age*, and as we have shown in *Hell, a Closer Look*, these ages are in principle temporary. However it does not preclude the meaning *for ever*, (or, when negated, sometimes *never*), within a certain context:

Ὁ δὲ δοῦλος οὐ μένει ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· ὁ υἱὸς μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.
*but the slave does **not** remain in the house forever* (Greek, literally: *for the age*) [Jn 8:35].

However, we must be careful when translating *for ever* in cases such as this:

Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς χθὲς καὶ σήμερον ὁ αὐτός, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.
Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today and for ever / for the ages / age abidingly [Heb 13:8]

We say 'be careful' inasmuch as time, in the form of ages, may itself come to an end, (and replaced by something better, we are sure). Christ is not only the Creator of matter and space (Col 1:16), but the creation of time (or, more strictly, *arrangement of the ages*) is attributed to God too, in Hebrews 11:3:

Πίστει νοοῦμεν κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ῥήματι θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὰ βλεπόμενα γεγονέναι.

Our translation is:

By faith we understand that the ages have been arranged by *the* word of God, in *such a way* that the *things* seen did not come about from *things* appearing *automatically*.

The AV translates:

*Through faith we understand that **the worlds** were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.* [AV]

The ages have a purpose, which is worked out in them (*eternal purpose*, =*age-related purpose* Eph 3:11). Certain things were prepared before them (*hidden things concerning the Lord of glory* Who was *crucified* 1 Cor 2:7-8). The purpose will be achieved, and we quote it at the end of this answer.

We now review εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων which we provisionally translated *unto the ages of the ages*. We could translate *for the purpose of the ages of the ages*, but we also get a good fit with εἰς in a temporal role, *in*, or *throughout* as in Ephesians 3:21

εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων
In all the generations of the age of the ages [Eph 3:21]
Throughout all ages, world without end [AV]

So in Rev 20:10 etc.

εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων
in the ages of the ages

If we take *of the ages* as a plural to indicate pre-eminence, then we have

εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων
in the pre-eminent ages

The expression εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων has a parallel in Luke 1:50:

Καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτόν.
*And His mercy is on those that fear Him **from generation to generation.*** [AV]

This suggests the meaning *from age to age*, which is similar to *throughout all ages*.

We have torment of three spiritual beings (Satan, the beast and the false prophet) *for the purpose of* or *in* these pre-eminent ages, whilst the fact that God lives *for the purpose of* or *in* these same pre-eminent ages is a cause for giving glory (Gal 1:5), a formula for swearing by (Rev 10:6) etc. There is no contradiction here. The big question is what happens next.

Scripture takes us as far as the *end* of 1 Cor 15: 24-28

²⁴**Then cometh the end**, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. ²⁵For he

must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. ²⁶The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. ²⁷For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. ²⁸And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all. [AV]

(Note in passing that it does not say *that the Father may be all in all*, as if the Son can be laid aside).

We can only suggest that this is the end (in the sense of time and purpose) of the ages. This being as far as Scripture takes us, we would probably be incapable of understanding what God has in store beyond that, though we know it will be very wonderful. To answer the question, though, we have a situation at the end where

- God is all in all
- The last enemy has been **destroyed**.

So no room for Satan!
