

Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas
Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org

B1103 – January 16, 2011

The Resurrection In The Old & New Testaments

Turn to 1 John 1 because I want to be sure that we understand the difference between three words; resurrection, spirit and resuscitation ..., these are words that if you're not careful you won't read Scripture right in certain areas, and people tend to be sloppy, so let's clarify vocabulary a moment. In 1 John 1:1-2 it's the bodily presence of the Lord Jesus that John insists upon. "That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we beheld and our hands have handled, concerning the Word of life—[2] and the life was manifested, and we have seen and bear witness and proclaim to you the eternal life, which was with the Father and was manifested to us—," and of course this refers to the incarnation but by way of resurrection. It refers to His resurrection body and it's observable by all the empirical senses. So when the Lord Jesus Christ appeared to Thomas, Thomas could touch Him, Thomas could feel Him; we would say scientifically today His resurrection body had mass that weighed something, it took up space, the body consumed food, and yet the body had this new ability to disappear and reappear. We don't really know its chemistry, the resurrection body is a new thing, it never happened in history before the Lord Jesus Christ; it's scheduled to happen again, but how the transformation happens nobody knows. What the new body is like nobody knows; nobody's done a chemical analysis, a physical analysis, or an electrical analysis of a resurrection body. The resurrection body is a black box so far as it's composition. But at least what is known about it is that it's open to empirical perception by all our present senses. And most importantly it's indestructible. We'll get into that theme a little more.

Flip over to 1 Cor 15 which is the central passage in the NT on resurrection, any time you have a question about resurrection remember 1 Cor 15, in your mind have this as your key passage. We mentioned last time how Christ

appeared to five hundred people, etc. Paul goes on to mention certain things about it. For example, in verse 40, “There are also heavenly bodies and earthly bodies, but the glory of the heavenly is one, and the glory of the earthly is another.” Notice the prior verse, verse 39, he begins this assuming the classification scheme from Genesis, it’s a direct allusion to Gen 1. Here’s is why you want to be so careful about disconnecting pieces of the Scripture. You can’t do that. You’ve got to keep the Scriptures as a unit because here Paul clearly says “All flesh is not the same flesh, but there is one flesh of men, and another flesh of beasts, and another flesh of birds, and another flesh of fish.” He’s distinguishing what? The created kinds from Gen. There are certain kinds, certain categories. There’s man kind, only one kind of man, animal kinds, bird kinds and fish kinds. And you can’t cross these kinds. There are built in boundaries. You can’t slide from one kind into another kind. This is one of the verses that shocked me out of my evolutionary thinking. I thought, well, Genesis is just poetic myth, it’s not literal. Well, if that’s the case then resurrection is just poetic myth because Paul builds the whole doctrine of resurrection on the classification scheme of Genesis. Are we going to evolve over vast periods of time into a resurrection body? I think not. Not according to the text. The text says you don’t evolve from one kind to another kind. Verse 39 is setting up the argument for verse 40 “There are also heavenly bodies and earthly bodies...” verse 41 “There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon,” so he’s distinguishing one kind of body from another kind of body.

Now he makes a series of assertions that describe this resurrection thing, and in verse 42 he says, “So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown a perishable body, it is raised an imperishable body.” The metaphor there is what? It’s an everyday experience, it’s planting. He’s talking about sowing a seed and the seed grows into a plant. So God, through the apostles, is trying to touch something in our experience that we know to relate to us something about our not-yet experience of resurrection. There’s an analogy here. So God says that if you want to think properly about this resurrection, think in terms of a seed; think in terms of planting a seed. And you watch this amazing thing happen, this little seed with it’s DNA is put in the soil and you water the soil and it germinates and up sprouts this plant, all out of a tiny seed, the blueprint for the entire plant is all in that little tiny seed. You can get a giant tree out of it, but the seed is still so tiny, the whole program is written there. If that analogy is valid, what does it tell us about the relationship of our

future resurrection bodies to our body now? They are related, it's not a total discontinuity. That means there's a relationship between who you are now and who you will be then. It's not a total break. There's continuity between our present bodies and our resurrection bodies. That means you can be identified and I can be identified in the resurrection. We're not going to go about meeting all new people, you will meet new people, but you'll meet old people you knew before. So there is continuity.

But verse 43 also says there are discontinuities, it says one "is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power." So there are differences between our present bodies and our resurrected bodies. Notice also in the language in verse 42, the first one is perishable, but the second one is not perishable. This is utterly foreign to our experience because we live in a fallen world. In fact, had we been in the garden prior to the Fall Adam and Eve's body was destructible; it was perishable; it wasn't perishing, but it was perishable, it could have died, but the resurrection body apparently can't die. This is a very sobering thing because it means there are no more chances. Once we are resurrected, there are no more conversions, there's no more redemption, everything is fixed from that point on. So it's a sobering thought that whatever we want to do to shape our lives for eternity has to be done now. Once the resurrection body happens, whatever it is that happens locks us in, so that any potential is fixed, static. Yes, we have all eternity to worship God, our future experience is not static, but the resurrection body that we will worship God in will be static and that resurrection body is related to the present life that we live.

Verse 44, "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual body." ⁴⁵So also it is written, "The first man, Adam, became a living soul.' The last Adam became a life-giving spirit." A citation from Gen 2; he builds his doctrine of resurrection out of Gen 2. Again, you can't disconnect the pieces of Scripture, it's all interlocked. ⁴⁶"However, the spiritual is not first, but the natural, then the spiritual. ⁴⁷The first man is from the earth, earthly; the second man is from heaven." That's another interesting observation. In Gen 2 where did the first body come from? God shaped the dirt, the chemical structure of the earth. Now he's saying the resurrection body doesn't come from the earth. It is shaped from heaven, shaped from above. We don't know exactly all that goes on but the power that shapes it comes from heaven. Verse 48, "As is the earthy, so

also are those who are earthy; and as is the heavenly, so also are those who are heavenly. ⁴⁹And just as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. ⁵⁰Now I say this, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; nor does the perishable inherit the imperishable.” So the “resurrection” body is related to Gen 3, the second great event, which is the Fall. Remember the slide that shows the problem of good and evil; we said paganism has no final separation of good and evil; it’s a position of utter despair. It’s amazing that brilliant, intelligent people are so blinded, not being regenerated, that they can’t see that their worldview has evil going on forever. There’s no escape. You can talk reincarnation all you want to, but there’s no getting out, there’s no escape, it just keeps on going.

But the Bible says God originally created the universe very good, man rebelled and brought in evil so we have a good/evil mix for a time. God tolerates that for a time, that time is the day of grace, but then with His resurrection it’s at that point He starts separating the good from the evil. Of course, He’s already doing that in justification and sanctification, but now with a resurrection in history, at this point there is no turning back. At that point the split has occurred, there is a very definite line in the sand and there are no more crossovers. So that’s why resurrection is an extremely powerful and very moving event, and we’ll talk more about that as we go on. But the meaning of the resurrection is that it’s the beginning of eternity, the beginning of a new world, a new creation is being ushered in.

It’s not becoming an angel. An angel has something like a spirit body. And temporarily what can angels do? Can angels manifest in physical bodies? Apparently so - they ate food in the OT. Two angels moved the stone that covered the tomb in the NT. So evidently they could show up here wearing a cowboy hat and boots and we would not perceive them to be different. It’s fascinating to speculate about angels appearing as people and then just disappearing. You’ve all heard stories about these strange encounters with this unknown person that shows up, and then lo and behold they’re gone; they don’t know where they came from, no tracking of them, no DNA left behind. And people wonder whether that was a real person or whether it was an angel, we don’t know. Angels can do that. Angels are ministering spirits, but angels are not the same as resurrection. They can have a temporal version of an immortal human body. Angels apparently can morph, they can change form, because in the Psalms it talks about God giving the Law

through angels who appeared as flames of fire, so the angels can appear as fire but they can also appear as people. The angels have this transformation ability. That's not the same as our resurrection bodies. So be careful. That was the issue with Thomas. He thought what the other apostles saw was just Jesus' spirit. When Samuel came up to King Saul, he didn't have a physical body, but he was clothed; it was some kind of spirit body. This is the state in death prior to the resurrection. And angels are spirit bodies, they don't seem to have physical mass, but resurrection does.

The third word we want to understand is resuscitation. An example is in John 11 with Lazarus. This is a resuscitation. This is not a resurrection; it may be emblematic of the resurrection, it may be an illustration of some things of the resurrection, but by itself this is not resurrection. It's rather remarkable; this is a miracle, just like the resurrection is a miracle. In John 11:39 Jesus instructs them to go to the grave of Lazarus. "Martha, the sister of the deceased, said to Him, Lord, by this time there will be a stench; for he has been dead four days." So now we're talking about a corpse. Verse 40, "Jesus said to her, 'Did I not say to you, if you believe, you will see the glory of God?'" 41 And so they removed the stone. And Jesus raised His eyes, and said, Father, I thank Thee that Thou heard Me. 42 And I know that You hear Me always; but because of the people standing around I said it, that they may believe that Thou didst send Me.' 43 And when He had said these things, He cried out with a loud voice, 'Lazarus, come forth.' 44 He who had died came forth, bound hand and foot with wrappings; and his face was wrapped around with a cloth. Jesus said to them, 'Unbind him, and let him go.'" A startling example. The point is that Lazarus would eventually die again because the resuscitated body is still a mortal human body, miraculously changed, and the soul reunited; his soul had separated from his body. If you work at a funeral home I hope you don't have too many resuscitations, you get the guy all embalmed, fluids exchanged and then it's reversed and the fluids are replaced with fresh blood and everything else. That's a resuscitation; you're coming back in the exact same body, it's CPR.

So resuscitation, spirit and resurrection; we're talking about resurrection. We're not talking about a spirit body; we're not talking about resuscitation, we're talking resurrection. The Bible asserts that resurrection happened, it was observed. Jesus walked around, showed Himself alive by many infallible proofs.

Now we want to concentrate not just on the fact of the resurrection, but we want to deal with more of the meaning and the interpretation of it. So we're moving now to the meaning of the resurrection, how it is viewed in Scripture. There's a context, every word has a context, and we're going to go back into the OT to get the flow, the flavor and the context of resurrection, because unfortunately today many Christians have never heard of the resurrection in terms of the OT. They've heard the story of Jesus rising from the dead, it's told every Easter. They go through the whole NT story, which is wonderful, but let's not forget that the people who lived that story, who did visit the tomb on the third day, who talked to Jesus afterward, were all Jews who knew the OT. Moreover, the Lord Jesus told His disciples, before the resurrection this was going to happen. But He didn't have any NT Scriptures, Jesus didn't have 1 Cor 15, He didn't have the Gospel of John, He didn't have the book of Hebrews. He had nothing, He had no NT.

So in teaching about the resurrection what Bible did Jesus have to use to teach about it? He had to teach out of the OT. Gee, I never saw the resurrection in the OT. A lot of people never saw it; it's not too obvious in the OT. So we're going to take some time to move to the meaning of the resurrection, and to do that we're going to go back to the OT. We want to understand how Jesus understood this, and how He wanted His disciples to understand it.

Luke 20:27 is a central passage on the resurrection prior to the resurrection. Jesus is still operating under the dispensation of the Law, the Church hasn't started, resurrection hasn't occurred. "Now there came to Him some of the Sadducees (who say that there is no resurrection)." Now if you're reading along in a text and you see something like that written, what does that tell you about the Jewish community and the doctrine of the resurrection? If someone were to come to you and tell you that, well, Judaism didn't know any resurrection, that's a figment of the Christian imagination. How does this verse tell you that it is wrong? It says "the Sadducees (who did not believe in the resurrection)," well what does that mean? It means that other Jews did believe in the resurrection. When did they believe - before or after the resurrection of Jesus? They believed it before the resurrection of Jesus. Judaism had a resurrection, so it's not true that the resurrection is something new that Christians made up after Jesus' resurrection. It's

embedded in the OT. The Sadducees were just one subset of Jews that happened to deny it. Verse 28, “and they questioned Him, saying, ‘Teacher, Moses wrote us that if a man’s brother dies, having a wife, and he’s childless, his brother should take the wife and raise up offspring to his brother. 29Now there were seven brothers; and the first took a wife, and died childless,’ 30and the second 31and the third took her; and in the same way the seven also died, leaving no children.” You’d think by number four or five you’d think twice about marrying this lady. 32Finally the woman died also. 33In the resurrection therefore, which one’s wife will the woman be? For the seven had her as wife.” That’s one heck of a story they came up with. Verse 34, “And Jesus said to them, ‘The sons of this age marry and are given in marriage, 35but those who are considered worthy to attain to that age,’ that’s the future age to come, ‘and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage; 36for neither can they die any more, for they are like angels, and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection.’” So the first thing Jesus said, and see what He’s doing, let’s follow His logic. His logic is deep here. This is not an easy passage to go through, and it’s mind blowing and boggling to think how the Lord Jesus Christ handled OT Scripture. The stuff that He got out of that text would probably embarrass us, we’d walk away thinking boy, I never even started my Bible study, look what this guy is pulling out of the text.

First of all, He’s challenging the method of the Sadducees. Here’s Mr. Sadducee, and what he has done is he has taken the natural world, the natural world from creation to his moment in time, and he’s learned certain things about it, things like marriage, things like reproduction. In fact, he’s learned all about the natural body, he’s learned all about reproduction, he’s learned all about marriage. Now here’s the fallacy in the reasoning. He has automatically assumed that all of that stuff is the same across this resurrection barrier, that it’s the same on the other side of the barrier as it is on this side. Oops! On what basis do you make that assumption? That was the underlying assumption to the whole argument, so notice how Jesus handles the arguments here.

What He does, He looks at the whole argument that’s been built on this assumption, and He pulls out the rug. He denies the very method of the Sadducees argument, because the Sadducees argument is an unwarranted extrapolation. Just like today we extrapolate present processes backward into

history and claim the universe is billions of years old because radioactive decay rates over the last 50 years are constant. So, the first thing He does is He undercuts the logic. Now let's see what He does. Verse 37, "But that the dead are raised," now He comes to the doctrine of resurrection, "But that the dead are raised, even Moses showed, in the passage about the burning bush, where he calls the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." Let's stop there and go back to that text: Exod 3:6 and let's put ourselves back there. By the way, why do you think he uses this text? What books do the Sadducees have in their Bible? They had a smaller Bible than the Pharisees. The Pharisees accepted all the OT just like you and I have it. But the Sadducees only accepted the first five books. So look where Jesus takes them? Book 2, Exodus; is Exodus part of their Bible? Yes it is.

So let's see what Jesus pulls out of their Bible. Exod 3:4, "When the LORD saw that he turned aside to look," remember the burning bush, it wasn't strange to see a bush on fire but not burning up, that was strange. Moses said, now wait a minute here, verse 4, "When the LORD saw that he turned aside to look, God called to him from the midst of the bush, and said, 'Moses, Moses!' and he said, 'Here I am.' ⁵Then He said, 'Do not come near here; remove your sandals from your feet, for the place on which you are standing is holy ground.' ⁶He said also, 'I am the God of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.' Then Moses hid his face, for he was afraid to look at God. ⁷And the LORD said, 'I have surely seen the affliction of My people who are in Egypt, and have given heed to their cry because of their taskmasters, for I am aware of their sufferings,'" etc.

In verse 6 there is a clause that Jesus picks up on, and it's this: "I am the God of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." I'm sure most of us would read that, I would, as a historical reference to the past. In other words, when God is saying "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, we would think of it, straightforward reading, that what He meant to say is "I am the God of the man who lived centuries ago, I am the God of his son, Isaac, who also lived centuries ago, I am the God of Jacob, who lived centuries ago," much like we might say I am the God of John Calvin, I am the God of John Wesley, and we would all accept that and we would say that's a historical reference, you know, He's the God of that person back there.

Apparently the Lord Jesus Christ says that's not how we should have taken this, we should have seen something else about this passage. When the Lord picks up on this, turn back to Luke, now He's going to tell us what we should have seen in that passage. He says, notice in verse 37 He's teaching about the resurrection, He says, "but that the dead are raised," so the fact that resurrection occurs, "even Moses shows," well now how the heck did Moses show, he never even talked about the resurrection in Exodus 3:6, but Jesus said if you studied that passage out you have to believe in the resurrection. Why Lord? Why do I have to believe in the resurrection based on that verse, that doesn't look straightforward to me? Well, it must have been straightforward to Him because that's what He's saying. We can't say Jesus' argument here in verse 37 is wrong, the logic is faulty. He says that the resurrection "Moses showed," where, He quotes just that part of the verse, that "I am the God of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob."

Then He explains Himself in verse 38, "Now He is not the God of the dead, but of the living, for all live to Him." That's hard to think about, there's an awful lot embedded in the argument there. This is the kind of argument Paul does in the NT. He gives you step one and then he moves to step 19 and he expects you to be able to fill in the rest of the steps. That's what the Lord's doing here, He doesn't go over all the individual steps in the logic chain, but He says if you understand what I'm saying in Exod 3:6 you will inevitably believe in the resurrection.

So the challenge to us is can we reconstruct the logic that the Lord Jesus Christ is using here to get this deduction. It appears that His logic is something like this. He starts out, step one: God, let's just say God of Abraham, and it is present tense, God is, He *is* the God of Abraham. It doesn't say He was the God of Abraham. It says He is the God of Abraham. Now every once in a while you run into people and they say we can't trust the Bible because there's a lot of different variations in the text. Do you notice that this argument is built on one verb tense? So when you hear this little argument, well we can't really trust the Bible because men have copied it and men make mistakes so there are all these problems with the text. Well, then how come the Lord Jesus Christ can build an argument on the present tense of a verb in a sentence. In His day at least people knew what a present tense was, you have to have a few more steps of explanation today. But the God of

Abraham *is*, and apparently the logic of this is that if God *is* the God of Abraham, that this Abraham who's dead must not be in a proper relationship to this God until He's raised from the dead, because Abraham isn't resurrected in Exod 3.

So all we can conclude by looking at the conclusion of the argument is that Jesus Christ is saying, if God, God of X implies that X must be immortal, and must exist forever and ever, and the reason we say that He's arguing that he must be immortal because if he's not immortal, then he can sin and fall away, and therefore to be immortal means when the road bifurcates between good and evil, that he will go on the good road and be immortally saved, imperishably saved. But there's more to the argument than even this, because this by itself doesn't say that the life or existence of immortality is necessarily bodily resurrection.

So the Lord Jesus Christ also has to add that this immortality is a resurrected immortality, it's not eternal existence. How would He make that argument? Why couldn't a person say well, for God to be God of X, X could just be an immortal spirit? He lost his body at death and now he perpetuates. Why isn't that sufficient? The implication Jesus gets out of Exod 3:6 is that this state cannot satisfy the relationship with God, Abraham already was an immortal spirit but Jesus says this relationship with God doesn't satisfy in Exod 3:6, there has to be a resurrection body. So that if the person's out of the body, due to death, here's death, there's the soul, the body is gone, this cannot be the final state of affairs but rather the body must be re-worked, there must be a resurrection body that is immortal, and only that can satisfy the relationship with God.

So Jesus is arguing that the body also must be eternally saved, you can't just save the soul or spirit, you have to have the body saved or you do not have the full relationship with God. There are forty or fifty fine points of argument in this whole thing, and He just skips right to the end in verse 38, "Now He is not the God of the dead, but of the living, for all live to Him." Verse 39, "And some of the scribes," by the way, caught the argument and they "answered and said, 'Teacher, You have spoken well.'" And the others didn't dare raise any more questions. That ended that discussion.

Let's see what we can tie together. What did we learn about the resurrection body? What do we learn about the first body? When God created in Genesis, what was the picture in Genesis 2? Go back to that picture, what does God do? He prepares a body and then what does He do to the body that He's prepared? He breathes into that body. And what does it say? And the person "became a living soul." So you have a formula that body plus spirit equals soul. Therefore can the soul be complete without the body? There's a completeness sub-argument to Jesus' larger argument. And He appears to be arguing that salvation is incomplete unless it also includes the body; you've got to deal with the body. And His logic must be built on the original creation design that man isn't really man without a body. Angels can be angels without bodies, but men and women cannot be in full relationship to God without bodies.

There are other instances in the OT of a belief that something like this had to happen. Turn to Gen 17. We're going to pick up some specific references in the OT that, if I was going to prove the resurrection, I think I would feel more comfortable with than Exod 3. That's because I don't have a full grasp on everything that's contained in passages like Exod 3. Gen 17:7, notice what word is used of the Abrahamic Covenant. It says "I will establish My covenant between Me and you and your descendants after you throughout their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be God to you and to your descendants after you." Again we hurriedly read this like it means He will be the covenant of this guy, and then he dies, and then He's going to be the covenant of this descendant, and he dies, and the covenant of this descendant and he dies, covenant of this descendant and he dies, etc. whereas the meaning of the text seems to be that the covenant keeps on going to the guy over here; not just Isaac and Jacob and all the descendants, yeah, that's true, but it remains a covenant for Abraham. Somehow Abraham's resurrection is guaranteed by this covenant, without a body he can't have this full covenant relationship with God. So it implies a resurrection body.

Abraham recognized that something had to be implied by this. Remember in Gen 22 the sacrifice of Isaac. They go up to sacrifice, and he tells the people that he leaves behind that my son and I are going to come back to you. So he had to believe in resurrection. You could argue well, that's just a belief in resuscitation, not resurrection. But I think the Lord would argue with us about that, based on the way He's handling Exod 3:5-6, that He meant more

when I said to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob I'm going to be your God forever; I mean that I'm going to raise you up from the dead and I'm going to be your God forever; I'm not going to leave you naked without your body, I haven't saved you completely, I haven't saved you fully and completely until I've given you your resurrection body. My work is not finished until then.

Then you have the strange case in Gen 5:24 of Enoch who was raptured. You have the strange case of Elijah. What's their state now? Are they resurrected? There's something strange going on there. It's like they're raptured and whether they're given a resuscitated body or something in the interim or what goes on, there's some strange thing going on there. We don't have to solve the whole mystery to appreciate the fact of what's going on. If God calls Enoch and Elijah to Himself, while they're yet living, before they died in their mortal bodies, something happened there, some transformation took place. It shows that death is an unnecessary thing; God can bypass that if He chooses, which He will at the rapture of the Church. A lot of people are going to bypass death. It's not necessary for our bodies to die, but whether it dies or not it is going to be changed. It's got to be changed because man was designed to have a body; unlike angels, God made a body for man.

There are two passages in the OT that you would have thought Jesus would have gone to because these two verses do mention the resurrection explicitly. The first one is Isa 26:19. He makes this statement in verse 19, he says "Your dead will live; their corpses will rise. You who lie in the dust, awake and shout for joy, for your dew is as the dew of the dawn, and the earth will give birth to the departed spirits." That is a very strong pro-resurrection verse, and it's coming at a time when they needed hope because they saw everything collapsing around them.

Another explicit passage is Dan 12:2; this is quite clear, nobody argues this. "And many of those who sleep in the dust of the ground will awake, these to everlasting life, but the others to disgrace and everlasting contempt." That introduces another sobering thing that one usually doesn't hear about when the resurrection doctrine is taught - that all men will receive resurrected bodies. That's the destiny of all men. When we go back to this good/evil diagram, when God chooses to separate, all men will receive resurrection bodies, and that's what's so chilling about the resurrection.

We're going to see that more and more the resurrection is a very scary doctrine, because the resurrection says that once you're resurrected you can't die again. You are now forever locked in concrete, as it were, into the destiny that you have chosen. Those who have received Christ, those who have believed on Him will be resurrected unto life, because they have given up good works and they've said that if I'm ever going to attain righteousness, it's going to be Christ's righteousness. For those who have said I'm going to do it myself thank you, God will say fine, do it yourself, and will be faced with a horror of living in a resurrected body of death, forever and ever, that can never be destroyed, but can feel pain, etc...There's no relief in this resurrection because there's no way to get back out of the resurrection body. That's why it's called a horror. It's a resurrection to life *and* a resurrection to condemnation. This is why the gospel is so tremendously important. When Daniel is speaking he mentions both resurrections; he says "these to everlasting life, but the others to disgrace and everlasting contempt." Notice the word "everlasting" is used for both.

There's one other passage, Job 19:25. Isa 26:19; Dan 12:2, and Job 19:25, "As for me, I know that my Redeemer lives, And at the last He will take His stand on the earth. ²⁶"Even after my skin is destroyed, Yet from my flesh I shall see God; ²⁷Whom I myself shall behold, And whom my eyes will see and not another." In verse 26, "from my flesh I shall see God." Job is written early, just after the Flood. It's the earliest book written in the OT and that early resurrection was understood. So it's not new with the NT. The resurrection is implicit and explicit in the OT.

We've clarified some terms; we've looked at OT and NT texts. Next week we're going to go on to capitalize on the meaning of the resurrection and then we'll be turning to some of the unbelieving responses and you'll be shocked. And once again it reveals men's hearts, that men are desperately wicked. And because of that they'll believe anything except what the Scripture says.

[Back To The Top](#)