

Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas
Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org

B1104 – January 23, 2011
The Meaning Of The Resurrection

Sadducees and I didn't know for sure so I looked into that. The question was along the lines of what did the Sadducees believe about the afterlife if they didn't believe in resurrection. The clearest source on this is Josephus and he says they did not believe in the immortality of the soul. They were the ancient materialists. When you die that's it, to dust you would return and that's all there is, you don't exist anymore. They didn't believe in anything related to the immaterial; they didn't believe in rewards or angels or any of that. That's why when they pose the question about the woman who had seven husbands and which one would be her husband in the resurrection it's all just smoke. They are laughing at the resurrection but in the end it was Jesus laughing at them for not reading the text. In Exod 3 resurrection was clearly taught, at least Jesus thought so, and they didn't try to answer Him. That was a potato that was too hot to handle and they backed down.

Someone came with a series of issues: what about babies that die, what kind of resurrection body are they raised with? What age do they appear? Will they be transformed into a body they would have matured into? Will we know them? What about people who have deformities in this world, that were born with deformities? Missing limbs, conjoined twins, there are a whole lot of questions you can get into in this department. I think it's safe to lump these into two categories. First, what age will the resurrection body appear? I think, and I can only think, because we only have one example of a resurrection body to reason from and that's the Lord Jesus Christ. I think that our resurrection bodies will appear in their optimal condition. Probably 20-25 years old at present aging rates. That probably goes for children that died as infants as well, they'll appear as mature. Mothers will be re-united with their babies but they'll be grown up. I think J. Vernon McGee speculated that the infants would be resurrected as infants and the parents would be

able to raise them in the millennium. It's a nice thought but I don't know. The Scriptures just don't answer all of our questions. They just give us what's sufficient and leave the rest to our speculation. The other category of question was deformities and I'll say a few things. For one, we don't know how deformed we are to begin with. All of us have deformities. If we were put up against Adam and Eve as originally created I think we'd be pretty embarrassed. They might even ask us what we are? Because we're a sick relic of what God originally created. Apart from that, the basic answer is that probably only Jesus Christ will have scars on His resurrection body from this life. We know he has the scars because people saw them and touched them. And in the Revelation He's a Lamb, standing as if slain, so the scars are still there. But those are the only scars in resurrection. And that's sobering because His scars are the scars from our sin which He willingly took upon Himself. He's the only human being that wasn't subjected to scarring and here He's going to be the only one that carries scars. And it's a scary reminder of our sin and His grace. You want to talk about impressing upon you the grace of God, go think about the scars He carries in His resurrection body for all eternity just so you can walk around unscarred. It's marvelous that He does this for us. And when that moment actually comes in history when we're in our new bodies and we're perfect that's going to usher forth a thanksgiving we could never work up now. The praise will just flow because we'll see all of what it meant for Him to take away our infirmities.

Finally, someone came with an issue that relates to the millennium: don't we have mortal and immortal living together in the millennium? The answer to that is yes, you do. You have immortal, resurrected human beings living alongside mortal, unresurrected human beings. And it sounds strange, what is this going to look like? But it's not that strange because where have we had mortal and immortal living together before in history? Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ walked around in an immortal, resurrection body for 40 days with mortals and it didn't appear to be a problem. You could talk to Him, touch Him, eat with Him; it wasn't some spooky experience. So this has been seen before. We've even had a larger segment of history that had mortal and immortal walking around together. Anyone know when it was? The immortals weren't resurrected but they were immortals! The world before the Flood. What did God station at the entry point of the Garden of Eden? Angels. The only government you read of before the Flood is angels. So apparently you had immortal living alongside mortals then. They got a little

too close when they started coming into the daughters of men and so God cut that off. But the point is that history has seen this before and so it's not too strange that it will occur again. It just sounds strange because history has been suppressed and maligned.

Then this person asked if the millennium has mortal and immortal living together then when does the new heaven and new earth begin? That's an involved question, on the surface it can appear simple but if you dig into the textual material related to this it's not so simple. The Scriptures insist that the resurrection of Christ ushered in the eschatological hope. What do we mean by that? We mean that He is the first piece of the new heaven and new earth. Think about it. If the resurrected Christ is not the first piece of the new heaven and new earth then what kind of changes does He have to undergo before He can be a part of it? See, the moment you say He's not the first part of the new creation you have to say He's somehow deficient. That's why we have to insist that the resurrected Christ is the first brick, so to speak, of the new creation. There are no further refinements that need to be made to Jesus Christ. That piece is complete. So technically it's already begun in Him. He ushered in a new world order in AD33 and that's why the NT suddenly insists that all men repent. It didn't do that in the OT. It did that in the NT after the resurrection. Why? Because once Christ is risen a new world order has begun and if a new world order has begun then what does that mean about the present world order? It's passing away, it's fading out, it's wearing thin, time is running out and judgment is around the corner. That's why the preaching of the gospel is presented so urgently in the NT. That's why Paul tirelessly went forth on his missionary journeys. He and the apostles recognized that the end of the world had come upon them. 2,000 years later we've lost this sensation but it's no less true today than it was then. The end of the world came in AD33. So in one sense the new heavens and new earth has already begun. Jesus Christ is the first brick. Then we have other bricks being laid, every time a person believes in Christ they're regenerated and they're given a new nature, that's a brick in the new heaven and new earth. There's no deficiency in the new nature. How does 2 Cor 5:17 refer to the new nature? The believer? As a new creation." That isn't just flowery language; yeah, the new guy in the group now, the guy added to our congregation. No, it means another piece of the new creation has been laid in this person. That's why Satan is so infuriated when someone believes in Jesus Christ. Satan doesn't have any part in the new creation, he's been

allotted to the lake of fire and so it infuriates him to see one by one God call people out of the rotten clay of humanity and mold them into bricks for the new creation. It must be infuriating to watch this from Satan's side. You remake them God, why won't you remake me? Sorry. Redemption in that sense is reserved for humanity not angelic beings; Jesus Christ came and died as a man, not an angel. So in one sense the new heavens and new earth have begun in that you have the Lord Jesus Christ resurrected and you have a people being called out by His name to populate the new creation.

As per the formal initiation of the new heavens and new earth you have Isa 65 and 66 and in Isaiah's book he envisions the new heaven and the new earth and in his vision he sees death in the new heaven and new earth. That really bothers Christians when they read it the first time because all they've ever done is read the NT picture in Rev 21-22 and now they come to the OT and they see death in the new heaven and new earth and they say, now wait a minute the NT says no death, no suffering, no pain, what is this? And what it is is a manifestation of the problem I'm always harping on about our failure to pay attention to the OT. If we paid attention to the OT and we read it first we wouldn't have these problems when we came to the NT. The OT predicts the new heaven and new earth in a very general way and you can tell by the description it's not the present universe; youth die at 100 and that is very clearly not our present universe. If someone dies at 100 today they're an old person, you're a youth at 15. So in Isaiah's vision you do see death in the new heaven and new earth, but age and maturation rates are much slower. In other words, if you were an OT saint and you didn't have Rev 21-22 then your picture of the new heavens and the new earth would have different reproductive rates, different maturation rates, different ages at death and you're not sure how it is all going to work out to where you have no death and suffering. And that's because the total revelation of the new heavens and new earth doesn't come in the OT. It's given piece by piece. We have the piece in the NT about the resurrection of Christ, and then we have the piece in the NT about those who believe and become new creations, instantly, at the moment of faith. Then we have the final piece in Rev 19-22 and there we learn that the new heavens and new earth actually has two phases; the millennium and the eternal state. And that satisfies us because now we can see how in phase one, the millennium, we can have death, mortal and immortal living alongside of one another. And then we can have phase two, the eternal state where we have no death, no suffering, and no pain. That's

the way the picture develops so far as the Scriptures are concerned. The key to remember is that Christ ushered this all in with His resurrection. And we want to elaborate on that pivotal event today.

We talked about the fact of the resurrection, what we're doing now is developing the meaning of the resurrection. Here's a quote from Dr. Ladd who was one of the prominent evangelical NT theologians for many, many years. "Jesus' resurrection is not an isolated event that gives to men the warm confidence and hope of a future resurrection," he's saying it's not to be considered by itself, all alone, outside of a network of beliefs, it's part of a bigger plan. You've got to see the resurrection in light of the bigger plan, so it is not an isolated event, "it is the beginning of the eschatological resurrection itself. If we may use crude terms to try to describe sublime realities, we might say that a piece of the eschatological resurrection has been split off and planted in the midst of history. The first act of the drama of the Last day has taken place before the Day of the Lord."

So with the resurrection we now have something that is quite amazing and this becomes the basis, actually, for the Christian life, living an exchanged life, Christ's life, and all the rest of the stuff that flows out from this. This is our first glimpse at this class of truth, and that is - that if this is the line of history and we have the end of history here with the eternal state, what has happened with the resurrection is that one person, Jesus Christ, has personally gone through this last moment of history long before it arrives. He is the leader; He is leading the way as the King of kings into the eternal state. So in one sense it has already begun, He is resurrected and He's complete, He's finished, He's arrived, and He's the first member of the human race to make it. The fact that He made it means that the resurrection is occurring right as scheduled. It isn't going to be thwarted now because the key guy is in place. He's already, as it were, at the finish line and He's proven that humanity is going to get there because He's gotten there. This produces a rather awesome view of history. More and more the NT authors saw this and they're hungrily lapping up this truth and using it to build a whole series of great promises for the believer.

I want you to pause for a moment and just reflect that when you see the resurrection not just as an isolated event, but you see it in its cosmic setting, that the end of this universe has already begun with the resurrection of Jesus

Christ, that He has inaugurated the next universe. He's the first part of the new creation, the new heavens and the new earth that's yet to come; it already exists in at least one human body right now, today, at the right hand of the Father. There's no question about God creating all things new; it's already begun with the resurrected Jesus Christ.

“What is the significance then of Jesus' resurrection within Biblical thought? *It is the presence of the ultimate goal of history within history today.* ... No other religion or philosophy of history can point man to what the final goal of history looks like. Communism, for example, makes stupendous claims of the future 'redeemed' classless society, but it cannot offer today an actual concrete example of the kind of person who will live in that society.” No prototype. “Biblical Christianity, on the contrary, can point to the resurrected God-man King as the kind of person who will inhabit the Kingdom of God forever,” and John picks this up.

Turn to 1 John 3:2. It's explicitly stated in this language, but it's usually missed because we don't see the resurrection in its proper Biblical context. 1 John 3:2 is a great summary and it shows the apostles were right on track; this is exactly the way the apostles were thinking. “Beloved, now we are children of God, and it has not appeared as yet what we shall be. We know that when He appears, we will be like Him, because we will see Him just as He is.” Obviously he's talking about coming back in the resurrected body. We will be like Him at that point, when we are raptured we will have a body like His body. He ties it in to the whole plan of salvation because the previous verse, 3:1, “See how great a love the Father has bestowed upon us, that we should be called children of God, and such we are. For this reason the world does not know us, because it did not know Him.” But verse 2, “now we are the children of God,” now, present, “and it has not appeared as yet what we shall be.”

So John says there are a lot of things; I don't know all the details, but that's the incomprehensibility of our God. He's omniscient, I'm not omniscient, the apostles were not omniscient, and they had to trust just like we have to. But we know one thing: that when He appears, we're going to be like Him. We're going to share in His existence. A few weeks ago we started this event by pointing out that Buddha didn't rise from the dead, Confucius didn't rise from the dead, Mohammed didn't rise from the dead. Jesus Christ is the only

person in world history that ever rose from the dead. Ever! There have been resuscitations, there have been men of extreme longevity walking the planet but show me where there's been a resurrection. It's absolutely unique because only in Christianity does history culminate in the person of Jesus Christ.

Let's look at some of the NT references. Last week we looked at some OT references. Let's turn to Colossians just to get some of the flavor of how the resurrection comes off in the NT epistles, which aren't really concerned with the fact of the resurrection so much as they're concerned with the conclusions of it. Col 1:15, this passage is Christology, he's teaching the depth of the person of Christ, "And He is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation." Jehovah's Witnesses take this "first-born" to mean that Jesus Christ is the first created being. That misses the whole point. The point of verse 15 is that He is the One who is heir of the creation, He is the One to whom it will be given, He is the Lord over all creation. If they'd just read one more verse, verse 16, "For by Him all things were created," *all* things, a-l-l, ALL things are created, see they'd know He wasn't created. Verse 17, "And He is before all things, and in Him all things hold together. ¹⁸He is also the head of the body, the church; and He is the beginning, the first-born from the dead," notice this. What is Paul doing in verse 18? He's picking up the resurrection. Jesus Christ is "the first-born from the dead; so that He Himself might come to have first place in everything." Who gets there first? Jesus does.

Col 3:1 is a practical exhortation. It says: "If then you have been raised up with Christ," and that's the mystery in the epistles, there is a spiritual resurrection that happens at regeneration that is preparatory to our physical resurrection, and it's past tense, it's already happened, it happened at the time you trusted Christ. The problem is that we live in a sinful world, a fallen world; Satan blinds our minds to this great truth. The life of the Lord Jesus Christ now in His resurrection body somehow gets transferred at the moment of regeneration to us. "If then you have been raised up with Christ (and you have), keep seeking the things above, where Christ is, seated at the right hand of God." So he insists that our focal point is on this eschatological end of history, that we are to keep in mind, not only the Lord, but the Lord in His resurrection body, that He's already arrived and making a place for us.

Turn to Acts 17 in the New Testament. We want to summarize what is behind, what is offensive about the resurrection in particular. Everything about the word of God is offensive, but what we want to deal with is what is the particular area of offense? Why does it threaten people? Do you know what the world's most threatening piece of literature is? It's the Bible. Look at people squirm when you bring it out. It's just proof positive of the offense of the word of God to the unregenerate heart. But what in particular is offensive?

Acts 17:30-32 - because Paul is using the resurrection in this address to the Athenian's and he's not talking about the cross. It always fascinates me that here's a gospel presentation but no mention of the cross of Christ. And if you did this today I'm sure in a lot of evangelical circles people would say well, what a sorry gospel presentation, you never mentioned the cross. Why didn't Paul mention the cross? Think. What was the issue? Why do people put a false spin on the cross? What's the hidden background issue of the cross? The justice of God. So if people don't have any sense of the justice of God you can talk about the cross until you're blue in the face and there's no need for the cross if they're not clear on the justice of God. There's no need for the cross because I'm okay, you're okay, all we have to do is repent a bit and feel sorry and we're going to be acceptable to God. We don't need all this blood stuff.

Here Paul is going to deal, not with the cross because that's an advanced truth, but he goes to the resurrection; but resurrection is not an isolated fact. Notice how he weaves it in. Verse 30, he says, "Therefore having overlooked the times of ignorance," i.e. the civilization that rose out of Noah, the Gentiles, "God is now declaring to men," in other words, He didn't do this before, this is new, He's declaring to all men "that all everywhere" all culture groups, all linguistic groups, this is a universal claim... how would a modern person respond to this? You can't go into foreign cultures with that idea, those people have their own culture, their own beliefs, you shouldn't go in there and bother them, you're invading, your corrupting their cultural beliefs, you're not being considerate of them, you're interfering with them. Well, yes you are, not you so much as God, God is interfering with them and God is saying that all cultures are dwelling in a time of ignorance, ever since the paganization after Noah and the tower of Babel, the whole Noahic civilization suppressed the truth and fell into ignorance. It was darkness for the Gentiles, now the Light has come and now He's calling all men to "repent,"

and why? Verse 31 “because” now watch the framework, here’s the context for the resurrection, and this is why the resurrection is not treated as an isolated event. Here’s the resurrection but it’s bracketed inside a structure? What is the structure in Acts 17 that the resurrection is set into? Look what he does, verse 31, “because He has fixed a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness through a Man whom He has appointed, having furnished proof to all men by raising Him from the dead.” Do you see that the resurrection is put into a larger frame of reference of the end of history? What does that mean? That man is accountable for his actions. This is ultimate accountability. Here all men are held accountable. Ultimate accountability. So that’s the context of the resurrection.

That tips us off as to why there’s a grand conspiracy to cover up the resurrection. If the resurrection is clearly perceived and truthfully perceived it is a reminder to the human heart that this is going to happen to you. This is the unavoidable last stop on the train. The resurrection is where everybody gets off; the resurrection is the end of the story. You’re coming to the end of your life and you’re going to have to give an accounting for your life. Oh I don’t want to hear that. So what do they say? Verse 32, “Now when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some began to sneer,” so Paul had a problem. Did he fail in his evangelism? No. He no more failed than you do when you witness to members of your own family that are the hardest ones to witness to. You feel thwarted, you feel defeated, look at Paul. How many of Jesus’ own brothers and sisters believed on Him while He was alive? From what we can tell, the only report in the NT is they doubted Him. What’s the matter; He didn’t live a Christ-like life in His own family? Surely not! It was because of the blindness, the timing of the Holy Spirit and everything else. The point is that when you see the resurrection in Scripture remember verse 31, it is set in the context of the end times; it is a signal that the last chapter of history is now being written.

So realize that resurrection is not welcome in society because it confronts each one of us with our future permanent state. To get the full force of what we’re saying here, if you remember the diagram on good/evil, we have that split in the road and at that split is where your future is permanent. In other words, at that point you can never ever, ever, ever be changed again, no more falls and no more grace and no more gospel and no more just as I am’s, permanent status quo. That’s what the resurrection does. The resurrection

seals the doom of the damned and it seals the security of the saved. And never the twain shall meet. It is a very sobering truth when it's considered.

I'm doing this because you'll hear all kinds of Easter sermons and it's nice and wonderful, but if you listen to them, they're always talking about the resurrection gives hope; good message, the resurrection gives hope. How much hope did it give the Athenians? When the resurrection was preached in its Biblical context, yes, it does give hope to those who want fellowship with God forever and ever, yeah. Does it give hope to everyone? No, because it's a message of doom, it's a message that resurrection will happen and once you're resurrected you're either resurrected unto life or resurrected unto damnation; once it's happened, no more changes. You can't turn in the ticket, no refunds, it's all over. That's very sobering to understand that, and it's that permanence, that sudden end of choice that is so scary about resurrection.

I have two quotes here from Dr. Pilkey about resurrection. The first quote deals with the fact that the resurrection kind of thing was anticipated by the Egyptians. Most of you have read about the pyramids; you go down there and they had all kinds of food where the Pharaoh's were buried and this kind of thing. Quite clearly the Egyptians believed in an afterlife and quite clearly they believed in a physical afterlife because they didn't believe that it was spiritual food; it's real food, the grain is still there. So they must have anticipated that these guys in these tombs would rise up and be hungry and want something to eat. Now it's a crude thing, but the point is, doesn't it show permanence? And doesn't the Egyptian architecture show the fact that we want to build forever and ever and ever. See, this was known to the sons of Noah in the early history.

If you follow this quote, "[The resurrection] sheds eternal light on the heroic dimension of human existence. The connection between the grandeur of the Egyptian pyramids and Egyptian beliefs about resurrection is quite apparent. Men have also known, through the subjective power of the human spirit, that they are destined for one kind of immortality or another. Those who doubt the resurrection are to be pitied because they have allowed the elegiac spirit of mortality to take possession of their souls." I love this sentence, "Doubt of the resurrection is the intellectual correlative of simple depression." "Doubt of the resurrection is the intellectual correlative of simple depression," in other words, there's no purpose; history is not going anywhere, there's no final goal,

etc. “and modern materialist skeptics have sunk below the level of the Noahic pagans.”

The next quote: think of this in light of Acts 17 which we just studied. He’s talking about C. S. Lewis and his rational approach. “Lewis’ apologetic approach, grounded in reason, is not well adapted to those parts of the world where apostasy has advanced so far that anarchy reigns,” we’re close to that, “and Freud’s ‘dark power of the Id’” for those of you who don’t remember Freud, Sigmund Freud, Jewish psychologist and psychiatrist, and atheist had this explanation that the core of all human existence is the sex drive, and everything was sexual, deep down the whole motif of human existence is sexual. The “dark power of the Id’ vies for immediate social supremacy.” What he’s saying here is that where you basically have paganized societies decaying, the nice gentleman apologetic doesn’t often work, just because you don’t have gentlemen, you don’t have people willing to sit down and reason together. I’m sure you’ve all had that experience, the more you get into Scripture and try to have an intelligent conversation they just don’t get it. That’s what he’s talking about.

“Confrontation with such satanic power was the specialty of Charles Williams. The final form of apologetics is supernaturalistic, apocalyptic, and notice the third noun, “judgmental. It threatens” keep Acts 17 in mind, “it threatens the enemies of Christianity with the consequences of unrepentant death,” what’s that mean? Going to the end of the station without a ticket, “unrepentant death.” The resurrection reminds us that history is going to come to an end; that’s why it is offensive. Now it’s not saying that we have to be gross about it, it’s not saying that we have to be nasty when we talk this way. What he’s saying is that that’s the way Paul acted at Athens, because he was in a deeply pagan society and he spoke of the resurrection as the *end*, and the fact that the *end* is already *ending* because you’ve got one guy already going into eternity with a resurrection body, the Lord Jesus Christ. So the end of history is imminent. “It threatens the enemies of Christianity with the consequences of unrepentant death, requiring them to choose heaven or hell today and experience one or the other tomorrow.... Although most apostates are infuriated by threats of judgment, the human conscience remains open to this very elemental sort of conviction....” Blow away the smoke and everybody agrees to this.

“In Christian apologetics, the greatest of all doctrines is the resurrection of the dead, an idea so powerful that it, rather than sex,” referring to Freud “holds the key to the mystery of human existence. Wherever it is clearly conceived as a metaphysical reality,” what does he mean by that? It’s not a hallucination, it’s not just an idea. It refers to an actual reality, a real thing that takes place in history, a metaphysical reality, “wherever it is clearly conceived as a metaphysical reality, resurrection annihilates every premise and every conclusion of the Marxist, Freudian, and Darwinian schools of thought. It erases the premise of Marxism by positing a version of humanity independent of the natural food chain,” what is he saying there? What’s a Marxist basically believe? That food and material things are the basis of happiness. That’s why you want the dictatorship of the proletariat, that’s why communist students would give their lives with great dedication to communism, and the conquest of the world, because they thought they were bringing in a materialist paradise. But the resurrection, the body isn’t dependent on food; it’s not going to be destroyed because you don’t have your Wheaties in the morning. The resurrection body doesn’t care about driving a Rolls Royce. The resurrection is happiness independent of all these things that the Marxists are busy trying to create. The resurrection body walks through walls; I don’t need your material doors. So that’s what he means here.

“It erases the premise of Marxism by positing a version of humanity independent of the natural food chain; it cancels the premise of Freudianism by furnishing a degree of vitality so absolute that temporary sexual euphoria loses all meaning,” in other words, this is a permanent, as it is, ecstatic existence, it doesn’t depend on what my hormones are doing this morning, it doesn’t depend on my arousal, it doesn’t depend on my body chemistry. My happiness is built into the resurrection body because it was built to be in the continual presence of God. So there’s this ecstasy of existence independent of temporary sexual euphoria. Who cares, the resurrection body bypasses that. “and it destroys the whole point of evolution,” this is a great quote, “it destroys the whole point of evolution by bringing mankind to absolute physical perfection in an instant of transformation.” What does Paul say about how long it takes for them all to be changed? No million year change. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. How does that happen? What happens to the molecules, what happens to the energy field? What happens to this decomposed human body? Boom, all of a sudden it’s there, not a million

years; it doesn't even take an hour. It's suddenly there. That's what he means, the resurrection, if you conceive of it, look at how powerful this idea is and why it's profoundly threatening.

Finally, a quote from Chuck Colson, I had to throw this quote in here because it's so appropriate for our own day, to show how the fall of the Soviet Union, at the end of the Iron Curtain, what was the subject that was dealt with right smack dab in front of Mikhail Gorbachev as he was reviewing the armies of the Kremlin as they marched by the reviewing stand to pay allegiance. All of you remember in the cold war, they used to have the military units of the Soviet, they always had their rockets and they would walk by, some of them goose-stepping as they went by, and you'd have this stoic old group of guys up there all in black coats, with the red flags, and in the back you had this fantastic picture of Lenin. This went on year after year. But look what happened, something that didn't make the papers.

“It was May Day, 1990. The place, Moscow's Red Square...As the throng passed directly in front of [Mikhail Gorbachev] standing in his place of honor, the priests hoisted their heavy burden toward the sky.” These were some orthodox Christian priests. It was a big cross. “The cross emerged from the crowd. As it did, the figure of Jesus Christ obscured the giant poster faces of Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, and Vladimir Lenin that provided the backdrop for Gorbachev's reviewing stand.” And then they began to shout, “Mikhail Sergeyevich!” one of the priests shouted, his deep voice cleaving the clamor of the protesters and piercing straight toward the angry Soviet leader. ‘Mikhail Sergeyevich! Christ is risen!’ In a matter of months after that final May Day celebration, the Soviet Union was officially dissolved.”ⁱ

How appropriate, the last military review in front of the Kremlin. Who was it at the end of the parade but some Christians that held up the cross and said Christ has risen, and the Soviet Union fell apart. I think that's a wonderful, eloquent portrayal of the role of the resurrection in history. One you won't read in Time Magazine. Powerful, powerful repercussions.

ⁱ Charles W. Colson, *Being the Body*, 1992, Word Publishing, p. 231.

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2011

