

Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas
Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org

B1106 – February 6, 2011

Unbelieving Responses To The Resurrection

If you'll turn in the New Testament to Matt 28 we're going to deal with the unbelieving responses to the resurrection event. Throughout the years that we've gone through this framework I've tried to emphasize that each one of these stages of history has elicited a response. The first stage of history: the Creation, the Fall, the Flood and the Covenant the world has basically tried to forget and to bury. These are the Buried Truths of Origins. The world has mythologized these, ridiculed them, and in all ways tried to discredit them. The reason for that is because these events are revelatory of truths that are hated by the flesh, the fallen nature is at enmity with God, and the carnal mind cannot subject itself to the authority of Scripture. So it always seeks in its perversity to generate some alternate explanation for all this. It behooves us as Christians to know the tactics of the enemy and to understand why and how these are attacked.

Then during the second stage of history: the Call of Abraham, the Exodus, Mt Sinai, the Conquest and the Rise and Reign of King David, we said that during this period we have a period of time when the world is offended by the disruption, the idea that there can be one and only one group of people that have the truth. That disrupts me, that's not democratic, we haven't taken a Gallop poll on this, we haven't approved a vote on this, so this offends people.

Then the third stage of history: the Golden Era of Solomon, the Divided Kingdoms, the Declining Kingdoms, finally the Exile and Partial Restoration. These truths are basically looking at how God handles those in His own family and these we call disciplinary, the idea that if God has chosen you that doesn't give you the right to do whatever you want. You're in His family now and He is the authority and if you violate His authority and you rebel and

you don't learn to obey Him there are consequences to pay. He's going to spank you.

In the NT we're studying the fourth stage of history: the Birth, Life, Death and Resurrection of the King. These truths all show us what it's like when the King confronts the world. How does the world respond? And we've said right from the start, it's the question Jesus asked, "Who do men say that I am?" The disciples said they say this, they say that, and He said "But who do you say that I am?" In other words, Jesus Christ requires a response.

With the Birth of the King we said the issue there was the fact of the virgin birth. How do men respond to the claim of a virgin birth? And the issue there fundamentally is one's view of the nature of God and the nature of man. Can you have the Creator-creature distinction come together in one person? And the answer is no, that can't happen; therefore we re-interpret the claim with a cover-up, which was that fornication was involved. Mary fornicated with a Roman soldier. That's how the world responded to the virgin birth.

Then we come to the Life of the King and because unbelief cannot stand the intensity of revelation -Jesus presented of God in the four Gospels- it counter-claims by splitting the kerygmatic Christ off, that's the preached Christ in the NT Gospels, and they split that caricature off from the historical Jesus, the real guy of history. We know so much about history that we now know that it's not possible for the Christ preached in the Gospels to be the real Jesus. So the four Gospels are just a spin story, it's what these guys experienced emotionally, it's all religious emotion and they wrote the NT to portray their portrait of Jesus. Here the issue is fallen man trying to deal with the doctrine of revelation. Jesus Christ is the purest revelation of God the world has ever seen. And yet when the light came into the world men loved darkness rather than light because their deeds were evil. So they re-interpreted the Gospels as a spin the Church was putting on Jesus.

Then we come to the Death of the King and the justice of God is the issue. The response there when they face the cross is, boy wasn't Jesus a good example or He really was sincere about His religious beliefs or God is really serious about morality and that's what you get from Mr. Liberal over and over in the pulpit and most Christians eat it up, never realizing that the gospel hasn't even been touched. The doctrine here that is eschewed is

justice, God's justice is being met in the cross and that's too much to bear because then I'm face to face with who God is again and that's not comfortable so I morph the cross into a great example of a religious founder dying for his beliefs. That I can accept, but this Jesus on the cross dying to satisfy the just requirements of a holy God, people don't do that, that I can't accept.

Now we're going to deal with the responses to the Resurrection of the King. You can't be neutral about this. It's good to know these things because you'll find people sitting on the fence on these issues and you can force people to get off of the fence; you can't sit on the fence. You either sit on one side of the fence or you're on the other side of the fence, and it's good to know at least how the world system responds to this because you'll get people all the time that say well I don't believe Mary fornicated. Well then do you believe in the virgin birth? Well no, I don't really believe in the virgin birth. Well then what's your explanation? His claims propel a response.

The first response to the resurrection is found in Matt 28:11. This is one of the first responses to this event. "Now while they were on their way, behold, some of the guard came into the city and reported to the chief priests all that had happened. 12And when they had assembled with the elders and counseled together, they gave a large sum of money to the soldiers," see what's going on here? We're going to have a little payoff; how do we handle this hot potato? The world is a dark place and even in your own groups, your own businesses, I'm sure you've seen dark things. People who are in charge of things in the world usually don't like the truth because the truth gets in the way of their agenda. Matt 28 is the approach, let's not confront the problem, let's just cover it up for now, we're worried about political fallout. So that's what the story is. Right here in the pages of the NT you see one of these little smoke-filled conferences. So they assembled, and now we've got the money for the payoff, a large sum of money to the soldiers. Verse 13 "And said, 'You are to say, 'His disciples came by night and stole Him away while we were asleep.' 14'And if this should come to the governor's ears, we will win him over and keep you out of trouble.'" See the deal going on here? Nothing has changed down to the present day, the wheelin' and dealin' in the backroom still goes on. It goes on in our country; it goes on in every country on earth. It goes on in big corporation after big corporation, same thing. It goes on in small businesses. It's the same kind of stuff that goes on, and it was going on

here. There's nothing new under the sun. Verse 15, "And they took the money and did as they had been instructed; and this story was widely spread among the Jews," and notice the last clause in this verse, "widely spread among the Jews, and is to this day." To what day? The day of the writing of Matthew. So we have the first attempt at explaining away the resurrection. It was well known what went on. They couldn't get a hold of the body so the nearest thing they can do is pay off the guards to say it was stolen. Always follow the money. This is the theft theory and here's John Chrysostom, AD347-407, (300 years later this theft theory was still going on) dealing with proponents of the theft theory. So it was a theory that had a lifespan of at least four centuries. He's trying to show the resurrection was true over against the theft claim. He says, "For indeed even this establishes the resurrection.... For this is the language of men confessing, that the body was not there. When therefore they confess the body was not there, but the stealing of it is shown to be false and incredible, by their watching it, and by the seals, and by the timidity of the disciples, the proof of the resurrection even hence appears incontrovertible." Who is it that they're paying off here? Notice—the very people that were to prevent the theft. So that's why it had to be a large sum to the guards, because basically they had to say that they were derelict in their guarding duties; they so screwed up that gee, these unarmed, untrained amateur Jews come in against the armed guards, all trained, and take away a body. I mean, what were these guys doing? The point is that here we have a plot that is so incredible Chrysostom laughs at it in the fourth century. That's the theft theory, pretty easy to comprehend.

The second explanation for the resurrection was "It's a hallucination." There are a thousand different varieties of this one but you can categorize them all as hallucinations. They thought they saw Jesus alive but they were smoking weed or something. Turn to John 20:5. One of the things that the Holy Spirit does in Scripture is that there are notices in the details of the Gospels that look, at first glance, like unnecessary little things in the text, but I believe the Holy Spirit put those things into the text because being omniscient He knows exactly what goes on in men's hearts and He knows the kind of garbage and perversity that people come up with to try to cover up things. There are a whole series of these. One of them I think is great is at the end of Luke 11- someone in the crowd listening to Jesus turns, blurts out, "Blessed is the womb that bore you and the breasts that nursed you" and Jesus says, hey lady, you've got it all wrong. Blessed is the one who hears the word of

God and observes it. Why do you think the Holy Spirit embedded that little notice in the text? Because the Holy Spirit knew that people were going to shift the focus away from the word of God and over to Mary. And so just to put a blockade on the tendency of men's hearts to do that kind of thing He threw in there, no, she's not important, what's important is the word of God. Here's another interesting one, John 20:5. John came to the tomb before Peter, he could run faster which shows he was younger, and this is John's own report of what he sees in the tomb, "and stooping and looking in, he saw the linen wrappings lying there, but he didn't go in. 6 Simon Peter, therefore also came, following him, and entered the tomb; and he beheld the linen wrappings lying there, 7 and the face-cloth, which had been on His head, not lying with the linen wrappings, but rolled up in a place by itself." Why would a little incidental detail like that be put in the text? What does that tell us about the resurrection? It's as though the Lord, when He was resurrected, took this facial linen off, folded it up and put it aside. This is not a hallucination going on; it's a detail that one who's hallucinating about the mysterious absence of Jesus wouldn't necessarily think of some little detail like that. It's those little details that make the text credible. And it occurs in several places. We've already gone to the Luke passage where He appears in the room and people are just blown away, and the doubting Thomas incident, that's in John, here, put your hand in My side, and by the way, it's "in" my side, so it was a deep wound. Those are the little details. I believe the Holy Spirit puts those in the text to deliberately make this as difficult as possible for anyone to explain this away as hallucinations. Then we have 1 Cor 15, that's a passage you want to remember. If you don't have that prominently in your mind write it down, it's the major resurrection passage, it cites all the evidences, it shows you the order of the appearances, it shows you five hundred people saw Him. Were they all smoking something and saw the same hallucination at the same time and that's how they thought Jesus rose from the dead? That's one of the things that make the whole hallucination theory incredible. Here's Gary Collins, we're not agreeing with all of Collins' work here but he makes a cogent observation. This after years of investigating the psychology of people who hallucinate. "Hallucinations are individual occurrences. By their very nature only one person can see a given hallucination at a time. They certainly aren't something which can be seen by a group of people. Neither is it possible that one person could somehow induce an hallucination in somebody else..." So God the Holy Spirit put that

detail of over 500 people seeing Him in the NT in order to build the truthfulness and the validity of the resurrection.

But to show you that the hallucination theory is alive and well today, here's Carl Henry. Carl Henry became the editor of *Christianity Today* and he was the one who, over the years, stood up in every forum in the country, intellectually, for the gospel of Jesus Christ, a man of courage. By the way, his background wasn't clergy, Carl F. H. Henry was a reporter, he was trained as a journalist, and that's why this story is interesting.

Keep in mind what I'm trying to show in this quote. This is to show you how modern theologians handle the resurrection so you won't be fooled when you hear somebody talk about oh, I believe in the resurrection of Jesus. They all do, not the resurrection you or I believe in, they're just using the words. That's why you can go to any church, anywhere, and you can be fooled on Easter morning because 99 out of 100 are all talking about the resurrection, the resurrection this and the resurrection that. But they don't mean what you mean. So follow this if you will, and let's look at what Karl Barth says. This is a conversation that happened between Carl F. H. Henry and Karl Barth. Karl Barth along with Bultmann and some other men are the men who are the titans of 20th century neo-orthodox theology in America and Europe. They built it; they are the guys who taught the guys who teach pastors in seminaries, except for some of the conservative Bible based seminaries. These are the giants.

"When the question period began," in other words he had gone to hear a lecture by Karl Barth, and it was a press conference, and people from the United Press, Associated Press, and the radio stations were all there to hear this eminent European theologian from Switzerland. "When the question period began, I asked about the factualness, the historicity of the resurrection." This is a good model for us and it's right for us to ask questions; it's right for us to ask questions aggressively, in a public forum, and he's doing that. But notice how skillful this question is. Watch how he sets up Barth. "Over at the table are newspaper reporters,' I noted, 'the religion editor of United Press International, the Religious News Service correspondent, and the religion editors of the Washington papers. If they had these present reportorial responsibilities in the first century, was the event of the resurrection of Jesus Christ of such a nature that covering it would have

fallen into the area of their reportorial responsibility?” Why did he ask the question this way? Think, why is Henry asking the question in sort of a convoluted way? Why doesn't he just ask Barth “do you believe in the resurrection?” Why doesn't he ask it that way? Because the guy would say yeah, I believe in the resurrection, and nothing would be clarified. So here's an example of how you want to carefully set up the question so you don't get a lot of smoke blown in your face. You've got to ask a question crisply, politely, courteously, graciously but skillfully, because what you're trying to do is you're trying to find out what's going on with this person, do they or don't they believe. And here's an example where he doesn't come out and directly ask him, oh, do you believe in the resurrection? Oh, you do, oh well okay; you're a Bible-believing Christian. No, he's not a Bible-believing Christian but you're not going to learn that by asking a simple question. He's pinning him down. He says look, there are the reporters and I'm asking you if Jesus Christ rose from the dead, are you saying that you believe the resurrection is such that United Press International would report it as a news story, as something that happened. That's the question. It's an example of a wisely asked question and watch what happens. Barth's stuck now. He can't squirm out of this one. “That is, was it news and history in the sense in which the man in the street understands news and history?” Barth became angry.” You bet he became angry, all of a sudden his clothes got ripped off here, now he's got to expose himself by admitting in front of the United Press International and the news reporters and the religious editors of all the Washington papers what he really believes. “Since I had identified myself as editor of Christianity Today, he retorted, ‘Did you say Christianity Today or Christianity Yesterday?’ Rather taken aback, I replied only by quoting the Scripture text ‘yesterday, today, and forever,’ certainly a hurried misappropriation. Barth then responded to the question obliquely:” by saying “the resurrection had significance for the disciples of Jesus Christ! It was to the disciples that He appeared!” But that wasn't in the question at all. On the way out the United Press correspondent remarked to me, ‘We got his answer. His answer was no.’” Had he not done that, would a United Press reporter who hadn't studied the details of theology, picked up on what was going on? No, it'd have been on the 6:00 o'clock news Barth's a believer, because the reporters aren't trained to pick this up. So it has to be smoked out with clever questions, driving them to the point where they must admit what they believe.

Alright, we've handled two theories of the resurrection event. We've got the theft theory and we have the hallucination theory. Let's go to the third theory. This one, popularized by Hugh Schonfield's book called *The Passover Plot*. You still see this around and from time to time you'll read about it. We'll call it the plot theory. "It is by no means a novel theory that Jesus was not dead when taken from the Cross, and some will have it that He subsequently recovered." Schonfield traces this idea back to prior literature. It's just that Schonfield has popularized it in our day. But this is an older idea. "We have only to allow that in this as in other instances Jesus made private arrangements with someone He could trust, who would be in a position to accomplish His design.... There is no cause to doubt the crucifixion of Jesus, or that He had assistants to aid him in his bid for survival. We may accept that one of them was a member of the Sanhedrin, and we may agree to speak of him as Joseph of Arimathea, even if we cannot be positive that this was his name.... The first stage of the present action was the cross. We are told that there were bystanders there, and that one of them saturated a sponge with vinegar.... There was nothing unusual for a vessel containing a refreshing liquid to be at the place of exhaustion, and it presented no problem to doctor the drink that was offered to Jesus.... Directly it was seen that the drug had worked. The man hastened to Joseph who was anxiously awaiting the news. At once he sought an audience with Pilate... and requested the body of Jesus... Jesus lay in the tomb over the Sabbath. He would not regain consciousness for many hours, and in the meantime the spices and linen bandages provided the best dressing for his injuries.... A plan was being followed which was worked out in advance by Jesus Himself and which He had not divulged to his close disciples. What seems probable is that in the darkness of Saturday night when Jesus was brought out of the tomb by those concerned in the plan He regained consciousness temporarily, but finally succumbed." Schonfield goes on to say the plan went awry because Jesus didn't figure that the soldier was going to pierce Him with a spear, and that was an accident that happened and that kind of screwed up their plans. By the way, this is something else to observe, watch the text. Our God is so smart and so slick in the way He moves. The one thing that happened to Jesus that didn't happen to the other guys was that the soldier speared Him.

You see the theory has a problem with that. When you read these theories all of a sudden you realize they take pains, now how do we explain the fact that gee, the plan went awry because the soldier used the spear. But in the

real event why did God have the soldier use the spear? So that the water and blood came out, and that gives an idea of the severity of the wound and the condition of Jesus medically. That soldier, at exactly the right time, did something that he didn't do to the other two guys. And it was exactly the kind of thing that produced the evidence for the genuineness of the crucifixion. So Schonfield has a problem with it, because obviously if Jesus had already died then the plot went wrong now we've got a problem. How does He rise from the dead? Now he's got to come up with some way to salvage his explanation. He says, "A likely explanation of the circumstances is that all along, beginning with the young man first seen at the tomb by the women," who was an angel by the way, "one and the same man was being seen, and he was not Jesus. This man was bent on fulfilling what was perhaps a promise to Jesus when he lay dying after his removal from the tomb.... There was no deliberate untruth in the witness of the followers of Jesus to His resurrection." Get a load of this: after you get through all this, the whole thing's a big fabrication. So now you have Christianity built on a total fabrication at its core. So now he has to back up and say well, they didn't mean any wrong by it, because he wants to keep the morals, he wants to keep the good things of Christianity, so now he's got to have a problem here with all of this. "There was no deliberate untruth in the witness of the followers of Jesus to His resurrection. On the evidence they had the conclusion they reached seemed inescapable.... Neither had there been any fraud on the part of Jesus Himself. He had schemed in faith for His physical recovery, and what He expected had been frustrated by circumstances quite beyond His control."

Do you see what's happening here? Here we have an act, the resurrection; that is being sucked up and re-interpreted. You know the story I keep telling you about strategic envelopment? How unbelief absorbs and reinterprets the truth. It does the same basic thing over and over. The carnal heart really is not that creative. It does the same thing over and over and over. Here we have the resurrection, and what's happening when we look at that through the eyes of unbelief? It's surrounding it; re-interpreting it, yeah, it's a stupid thing, we can laugh at what they're doing, but do you see what unbelief is trying to do? It's trying to get a grip on this whole thing and explain the whole thing away. It always does that; watch for that. It's always either we strategically envelop the unbelief in our hearts with the word of God, or the

unbelief in our hearts strategically envelops it and re-interprets, one or the other wins.

That's the way in which unbelief denies the resurrection. But what I want to show you now is that even if we prove the factuality of the resurrection, the unbeliever still has an avenue to accept it. This is one of the brilliance of Cornelius Van Til's insights. Van Til taught apologetics many years at Westminster up in Philadelphia. He was able to think through the pagan worldview and come up with how they might answer. And he pointed out throughout his ministry that we Christians have to be careful that we don't present Christianity as isolated facts. You can't say look, just consider the fact of the resurrection. See the radical change in his followers, see the 500 witnesses, all that's true but you can't just say, hey, look at the resurrection as a fact, we've got this fact and that fact, and we focus everybody's attention on the facts related to this single event. On the Day of Pentecost you had all these Jews get focused on this one fact of these Galilean's speaking strange languages and when looked at as a disconnected, isolated fact of history, hey, I can accept that. I say they got drunk. And you see these alternative explanations over and over in Scripture by the pagan heart. What Van Til gleaned from Scripture about the pagan heart is that because it is so prone to doing this kind of maneuver that you can't throw isolated facts from the Scripture to the world. If you do what will the world do? Strategically envelop it, re-work it, re-interpret it.

So even if the world had 100% full proof that Jesus did rise from the dead they would seek to explain it some other way it. Why? Because the carnal mind is at enmity with God, it can't stand the truth, so it's got to always, everywhere, all the time, envelop it and try to neutralize it's convicting power. So here's a dialogue from Van Til of how they might do it. It's a conversation involving three men, Mr. White, Mr. Black and Mr. Gray. Mr. White is the consistent Bible-believing Christian. Mr. Black is an overt unbeliever. Mr. Gray wants to walk on both sides of the fence, he likes to accommodate, build bridges between unbelief and belief. And both Mr White and Mr Gray are having conversation with Mr Black and the dialogue explores what's going on. It's a fascinating series of conversations between these three. Here is Mr. Black responding to Mr. Gray's presentation of the fact of the resurrection. Mr. Gray has just presented the resurrection as an isolated fact, he's trying to accommodate. And here's Mr. Black's response.

“Now as for accepting the resurrection of Jesus,” continued Mr. Black, “as thus properly separated from the traditional system of theology,” what’s he saying? I like that you are presenting the resurrection apart from the theological framework of Scripture, which is right up my alley. I can look at it all day as an isolated fact of history, something mysterious happened in a tomb to this one body in Jerusalem, “I do not in the least mind doing that. To tell the truth, I have accepted the resurrection as a fact for some time. The evidence for it is overwhelming. This is a strange universe. All kinds of ‘miracles’ happen in it. The universe is ‘open.’” What does he mean by that, the universe is open? Anything can happen. The universe is contingent. In that kind of a universe anything can happen, “So why should not there be some resurrections here and there? The resurrection of Jesus would be a fine item for Ripley’s *Believe It or Not*. Why not send it in?”

See what Mr. Gray did in his presentation? He isolated the resurrection and what did Mr. Black do? He enveloped it, re-interpreted it, was able to accept the fact of the resurrection, but isolated from the meaning given by Scripture. What did we say as we started this chapter about the resurrection? It has to be understood in the light of the prior framework of theology that was laid down in the OT. You can’t present it as somehow separate. In 1 Cor 15, that passage of all passages, the greatest passage on the resurrection notice how Paul says “we delivered first unto you how Christ rose from the dead according to the Scriptures,” ...according to the Scriptures! What Scriptures? The OT. Paul did not just talk about an isolated event that occurred in the city of Jerusalem with one tomb and one body. That takes it away from the overall context. And that’s what Van Til’s warning against, don’t get sucked into doing that.

If you’ll turn to Exod 32 I want you to see the perversity and deceitfulness of trying to explain away things of Scripture. People will say well, if you could prove the resurrection factually I would believe. The answer is no you would not, not apart from the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit has got to open hearts; the Holy Spirit may use a good argument, the Holy Spirit may use a bad argument, the Holy Spirit may use Scripture, the Holy Spirit may use your testimony in someone’s life, the Holy Spirit may use a book. The Holy Spirit has many different avenues He can work, as we’ve all seen. How many people in this room came to Christ the same way? I’ll bet if we had a testimony here today of every person who trusted the Lord Jesus Christ every one of us

would have trusted Him differently, under different circumstances, with different things, and some of them just incredible... incredible stories of how we were led to the Lord. That's the Holy Spirit.

So the point is the Holy Spirit has to open the heart. It doesn't mean don't have a good argument; it doesn't mean don't make the gospel clear, it just means that after you've said what you're going to say and you've done your very best to give the very best testimony, the very clearest message you could possibly give, even after all that, that itself apart from the Holy Spirit will not regenerate a heart. It will not bring conviction. We always have to prayerfully depend on the Lord to do that.

Here is a classic in Exodus 32:1. What have the people just seen, just experienced? Ten plagues that systematically destroyed Egypt, they walked out with the royal treasury of Egypt, they walked through the Red Sea on dry land, they saw the greatest superpower's military machine drown in the Red Sea, they just heard the word of God speaking from Mt Sinai so forcibly they said oh, Moses, you go up there and talk to Him, as for us, you tell us what He says. So this is what these people experienced. Did they have any doubt in the factuality of the Exodus? Did they have any doubt in the factuality of God speaking from Mt Sinai? Yet look at what they do. "Now when the people saw that Moses delayed to come down from the mountain," like he stayed a million years, "the people assembled about Aaron and said to him, 'Come, make us a god who will go before us; as for this Moses, the man who brought us up from the land of Egypt, we do not know what has become of him.'" Verse 2, "And Aaron said to them, 'Tear off the gold rings which are in the ears of your wives, your sons, and your daughters, and bring them to me. 3Then all the people tore off the gold rings which were in their ears and brought them to Aaron.'" It's humorous in the Hebrew, verse 4 "He took this from their hand, and fashioned it with a graving tool, and made it into a molten calf; and they said, 'This is your god, O Israel, who brought you up from the land of Egypt.'" Were they denying the factual-ness of the Exodus? No, but what had they already begun to do? Here we go, they took the fact of the Exodus and they began to envelop it in a framework of unbelief. Now it wasn't the God of Scripture that promised Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, it was the new god that they had made, a god of their own understanding, but they've got the explanation now, by human speculation apart from divine revelation we

have come up with a final explanation for the Exodus, and here it is, these golden bulls, they've created their own God.

This is a dramatic illustration from real history of how within a matter of days and months after real revelation, historical revelation, a clear message, with God Himself speaking in Hebrew, not just Moses, this is what happens. So it is amazing, it's an indictment of all of our sin natures, what our sin nature is capable of doing is amazing. We will look back from eternity in the presence of the Lord and say how could I have been so stupid and so blind as to struggle to trust this word of God thing, what was I thinking?

That's what Van Til's Mr. White, Mr. Black and Mr. Gray conversation is trying to illustrate. Apart from the regenerating work of the Holy Spirit our hearts are dark places. Don't ever underestimate the darkness of our hearts. Our hearts are capable of horrible things and if you could peer into my heart for five seconds you'd be just as sick as if I could peer into yours. So don't fool yourself, apart from God's regenerating grace and his sanctifying work we'd distort every fact in the universe. That's the *modus operandi* of the sinful heart.

Alright, next week we'll press on to the doctrinal consequences of the resurrection, the doctrine of glorification.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2011