

THE RESURRECTION

I want to share with you some things in the area of why I believe Christianity is intellectually acceptable and how it appeals to the mind. ¶1

Tonight I'm going to be speaking in the area of the Resurrection. Before I do that, I need to give you a little background including several misconceptions I had of Christianity when I set out to refute it. The more I studied the Historical Biblical Christianity, the more I realized the many of my concepts of Christianity were totally wrong. After I became a Christian and started to travel and meet Christian leaders and Sunday school teachers and pastors – I found out they had the same misconceptions as Christians that I had as a non-Christian. Before I get into the material of “The Resurrection,” I need to give you two or three misconceptions I had, because it will help you to evaluate not only what I say tonight, but the things you will hear and read for the rest of your life. ¶2

The first two misconceptions have to do with the area of faith. The first is this: I always thought the Christian faith was a blind faith. I thought it was an ignorant faith. I thought Christianity is something you “took by faith,” meaning it was a blind faith. But the more I studied Historical Biblical Christianity, the more I realized that the Christian faith is an intelligent faith. Almost every time in Scripture – when a man or a woman is called upon to exercise faith – it is an intelligent faith. Jesus said in John 8, “You shall know the truth.” He didn't say to ignore it. He said, “You shall know the truth and the truth shall set you free.” In Matthew 22, a lawyer was trying to nail Jesus in the corner. He came out with a leading question and said, “Rabbi, what is the greatest commandment of all?” Jesus replied, “...to love the Lord thy God with all your heart and all your mind.” Now I don't know about you, but my heart cannot rejoice in what my mind rejects. God has given me a mind to know him, a will to choose him, and a heart to love him. And I'm convinced that all three need to be operational in a maximum, joyful relationship with God through Jesus Christ. The problem with most believers: their faith stops with their heart and their blood pump stops before it gets to their mind. And if there is one area of our lives God wants us to yield to Him to ¶3

glorify Himself, it is through our minds. It is an intelligent faith. Never is an individual called upon to commit intellectual suicide by trusting in Christ – it's the other way around. We are told to always be ready to give an answer for the hope that is in you. Study to show thyself approved unto God; a workman need not be ashamed. If anyone should be a secure individual when it comes to knowledge, it ought to be a Christian. Really! A Christian ought to be a secure individual. The reason is this: As a Christian you have no fear of the truth – at least you shouldn't. It doesn't matter what area it is. One of the easiest place to talk about Jesus is in the university. Why? They never challenge you – some day they are going to. I like it when people challenge what you say and in universities they don't! They just take it in, come to Christ, grow and go on into Christian work. I'm serious! I get supported by men and women who really sacrifice for me to do the easiest thing in the world – they evangelize university students.

The reason I love it when someone challenges what I say is ¶4 because if what I say is not true, then I want to know it. And that is why you can go into the university and just relax and enjoy being challenged in what you believe. Because if it's not true, then you certainly don't want to believe it. And this is why a Christian should be so secure and should enjoy having his or her faith challenged, more so than almost anyone else in the world, because our basis is truth. Now somebody will say to me, "Can you prove to me with 100% certainty that Jesus Christ is the Son of God?" I'll say "No." They will chuckle and say, "See you take it by faith" – meaning a blind faith. My response is, "Faith yes, credulity absolutely not." My wife says I ought to explain what credulity means and I think I better. Credulity basically means believing something whether it's true or not. A business man came up to me the other day and says, "Oh Josh, my entire life I've been using it wrong." That is so anti-Christian it's pathetic.

Or I'll be speaking on the Resurrection and a student will ¶5 say, "Can you prove to me with 100% certainty that Jesus Christ was raised from the dead?" My answer is "No." Then they'll laugh and say "See you take it by faith" – meaning a blind faith. I tell them, "Faith, yes, credulity, absolutely not." Let me show you what I mean. We live in a contingent

universe. In a contingent universe it's pretty hard to prove anything 100% except maybe in the area of math. But except in the area of math, it's pretty hard to prove anything 100% because there are so many contingencies. Now, let me show you this attitude that says if you can't prove 100%, forget it. In a contingent universe it's rather ridiculous.

Let me illustrate this. Is there a pilot in the room? And I don't mean a Roman leader. Do you fly with Frontier? I went to Frontier and they always lose baggage. So I said to Frontier, "I want my amplifier and my sound system to go to Pittsburg. Then I want my garment bag to go to Washington DC and my speakers to go to LA. I also want my largest suitcase to go to Taiwan." And the lady said, "We can't do that." I said, "You did yesterday!" ¶6

In flying your plane, can you come up with 100% certainty that your plane will not crash? No. So does that mean you don't check it out? What does it mean? It means you check it out more, because you cannot come up with 100%. This attitude says if you can't prove it 100%, then forget it. It would be like a pilot going out to the plane, but since he can't come up with 100% certainty it won't crash, he doesn't run a pressure check, check the gas or anything else – he just gets in and takes off. That isn't faith – that's simple stupidity. This is faith as I look at it from the Christian perspective: I would go and check the plane out. I would run a pressure check, check the gas, and make sure the rudder was ruddering. Ha! Shows you how much I know about planes! Do rudders rudder? But I would come up with maybe a 97% probability that that plane is safe. And my faith is my commitment where the evidence leads. Faith almost always goes with the evidence – not contrary to it. And as a result of a contingent universe, you can check something out all the more. ¶7

The second misconception I had was that I thought the Christian faith was a subjective faith. I thought it didn't matter what you believed, as long as you believed it enough. I thought if you could drum up enough faith and believe it and it did something for you, then that was beautiful. But the more I examined Historical Biblical Christianity, the more I realized that with the Christian faith, when it comes to salvation (if by that you mean as the Bible does – a personal ¶7A

relationship with God through Jesus Christ and the forgiveness of sin) – there must always be an object to one’s faith. The Biblical Historical Christian faith is an objective faith. It is faith in Jesus.

Now let me illustrate this. I was at Ohio State debating with the head of the philosophy department, Dr. Von Iton, a self-proclaimed Marxist. We’re debating the Marxist theory of man as an economic creature. In my part of the presentation, I made a statement of how crucial the resurrection was to me as a person adhering to the Historical Biblical Christian faith. Dr. Von Iton interrupted me before it was his turn and said, “Mr. McDowell, the issue is not the Resurrection. It doesn’t matter if the Resurrection took place or not. The important thing is; do you believe it happened?” What was he saying? He was saying what most people in society believe today. That it didn’t matter what truth I believed, as long as I believed it enough. I said, “Sir, that’s ridiculous.” I continued, “As a person adhering to the Historical Biblical Christian faith, it matters what is the truth I believe, because if what I believe is not true, I have no right to my faith. I have no right to be doing what I am doing.” ¶8

After the debate, a Muslim student came up. We had a tremendous talk. I enjoy talking with people from various religious faiths. What better way to find out what somebody believes? He made a statement to me, “Josh, I know some Muslims that have more faith in Mohammad than Christians have in Christ.” I said, “Sir, that’s not the issue. The issue is not how much faith do you have. The issue is who do you have your faith in.” A young lady at Berkeley said, “I know Buddhist’s that have more faith in Buddha than a lot of you Christians ever have in Christ.” I said, “Lady that’s not the issue. The issue is not how much faith you have; the issue is who you have your faith in.” If the issue is not how much faith you have, the Bible wouldn’t say the faith of a mustard seed; it would say the faith of a watermelon. The emphasis is always on the object – faith in Jesus. You see, the value of faith – now listen to these three phrases. ¶9

The value of faith is not in the one believing, but in the one who is believed. The key to faith is not in the one trusting, but in the one who is trusted. The efficacy or the worthiness of faith, is not in the faithfulness of the one exercising the ¶10

faith, but the faithfulness of the one who has the faith exercised in.

This is why I'm convinced no one can be saved by faith. If ¶11
you mean a personal relationship with God through Jesus
Christ and forgiveness of sin – you can't be saved by faith.
You can't be! It's one of the greatest heresies taught today in
Christianity – salvation by faith. I wasn't saved by faith and
believe me, I'm saved. I've got a relationship with God
through Jesus. But it was never by faith. Look at it this way,
if you could be saved by faith, you wouldn't need Jesus. You
could save yourself if salvation was by faith! This has
probably led more people astray in Christianity.

You ask, so how are you saved? I'll tell you how I was saved ¶12
the Biblical way. Ephesians 2. **By grace, through faith, but**
not just by grace through faith, it is by grace, through faith in
Jesus. You see, I was saved by the grace of God. What
Christ did on the cross for my sins, His burial, His
resurrection – faith was just the arm that received all that
Jesus did. The problem with so many Christians is that they
think they've been saved by faith; therefore, they try to go
through life trying to build up their faith to stay saved. To
them I say – forget about faith, fall in love with Jesus. The
more you fall in love with Christ, the more knowledge you
gain in Him, and the more faith God gives you to trust Him.
“Faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the Word of God.”
Some of you still looked perplexed. Let me illustrate it.

A young lady in the university said, “Josh, I still think I'm ¶13
saved by faith. My whole lifetime I've been taught that.” So
let's do here what I did there. Let's take someone here. Lois,
let's say you have faith in that deer's head. You have all the
faith in the world. You really believe. Would you have a
relationship with God and His forgiveness of sin? Say no.
Now, let's say you take that same faith and place it in Christ
with the forgiveness of sin, and a relationship with God.
Would you have it? Yes! What made the difference? The
object! You had faith in both situations. I mean, you can sit
here and believe and exercise all the faith you want in the
deer head. And you still won't get a doe! You got the faith
but what makes the difference is the object of the faith. It is
faith in Jesus because Jesus gives the value to the faith; the
faith does not give the value to the object. This is why I

don't pray for a great faith in God, I pray for faith in a Great God.

Daniel 11:32 says, "Those who know their God should do great exploits." If someone comes to me and says, "Boy, I really want God to use my life, what should I do?" the first thing I would say is, "Get to know the One you want to serve." Get to know God. Those who know their God should do great exploits. ¶14

I was in Garmish, Germany lecturing for the military. I was supposed to fly up to Holland to do a TV special for the government station there. I was tired, I missed my wife and my kids – I just wanted to go home, so I sent them a telegram that said I can't make it and I'm going home (never thought I'd turn my back on a nationwide TV special). I got a telegram right back from the station saying they would send a crew right down. So they came down to the Bavarian mountains. As they were setting up the cameras, the man directing it said, "Josh, we had one of your movies on national television in Holland." I said, "Well, how did it go?" He said, "Very well. But I disagreed with you in one area." And I thought, just one? He probably thought his wife was cuter than mine. And I said, "What area is that?" And he said, "The area for making a defense for Christianity." And I said, "Okay, I guess we do disagree." He said, "No, you can't make a defense for Christianity. What you need is that encounter with God; that experience with God!" And I said, "Ooh, we really disagree." He said, "No, no, what happens if you make a defense for the resurrection and somebody would come along shows the resurrection never took place – all Christianity would crumble." I said, "Good point." I continued, "That's exactly what Paul said. The apostle Paul said, if Christ would be not raised from the dead, our faith is in vain – 1 Corinthians 15." And he said, "No, no, you have to have that encounter with God; that experience with God." I said, "Well, have you had that encounter with God?" He said, "Yes." I said, "How did you know you had an encounter with God or just an upset stomach?" ¶15

Look, everybody in the world is running around talking about an "encounter with God." University students, you know, they go up into the mountains and have an "encounter with God," but all they did was bump into a pine tree. My ¶16

question is, “How do you know if your encounter was with God or if was just an upset stomach? How do you know if you needed salvation or just an Alka Seltzer?” And do you know that he didn’t have an answer? He placed his whole walk with Christ upon a subjective experience. I said to him, “Well then, the only way you can know that your encounter is with the true God, is a God that has revealed Himself to you in an objective way through the scriptures and given you a mind to understand Him controlled by the Holy Spirit. God has to reveal it to you in an objective revelation in the scriptures.”

You see, our emphasis today in all of Christianity, not just outside of Christianity, is on the subjective. ¶17
Like Debby Boone’s, song “You Light Up My Life.” The colloquial expression, “He turns me on.” And she sings the most heretical phrase that describes our society, and it says “It can’t be wrong, when it feels so right.” So many people miss that. And yet that’s where people are – that’s their whole morality. They think...if it feels good and looks good it must be right and if doesn’t its wrong. As Christians we cannot be caught up in that because we have objective revelation from the very nature of God on what truth and reality is.

The next misconception I had is in the area of science. I ¶18
always figured if you couldn’t prove something MTAC p42
scientifically, then it probably wasn’t true or at least it wasn’t worthy of acceptance. Many of you might have that right now in your mind. If somebody came in here and said, “If you can’t prove it scientifically then it’s probably not true,” most of you, deep down would say, “Yeah, that’s probably right.” That’s wrong. The more I did my homework, I found out how ridiculous that statement was.

When I speak on the Deity of Christ, professors say to me, ¶19
“Josh, we live in the 21st century. Can you prove the Deity of Christ scientifically?” I say, “No, of course not.” Then they laugh and say, “Well see you take it by faith.” Meaning a blind faith. I’ll be speaking on the resurrection and a graduate student will say, “Look, Josh, we live in the age of modern science. Can you prove the resurrection scientifically?” I tell them, “No.” They literally will chuckle and say, “Oh I see, you take it by faith,” meaning a blind faith. I do take it by faith, but it is an intelligent faith!

I was at a university in California, one of the best schools in this country. I just finished speaking on the Resurrection, and stayed around for about another hour answering questions. I saw this fellow go behind the crowd. And whenever they go behind you know they are going to yell out. So he went behind and yelled out and said, “Just a minute Mr. McDowell. I am a graduate student in science. I’ve been trained and I personally cannot accept anything that cannot be proven scientifically.” It was all I could do to keep from laughing. My son is only 4 ½ and he has more common sense than that. I said “Sir, you can’t even prove your own statement scientifically. Does that mean you don’t believe it?” It’s like the person that says, “Oh I hear it all the time.” There aren’t any absolutes! There’s at least one – that “There aren’t any absolutes!” One reporter in Boston said, “I’m absolutely sure there aren’t any absolutes!” ¶20

You might say, “Now Josh, aren’t you overstating your point?” No, I’m understating my point. You see, 19 out of 20 people in the university cannot even define the scientific method. You ask, “How do you know?” As of last week, I’ve asked about 260 History majors. The moment I meet a History major, I’ll say, “Give me a definition of History.” Only 3 have been able to. Out of 260. I’ve never figured it out how you can study history without a definition of it. But we do it today. It’s the same thing with science. They can’t give a definition of the modern scientific method. If you can’t give a definition of it, how can it really be a problem to you? Yet everybody’s appealing to it, but they can’t define it. Now let me show you what I mean. ¶21

When you study the life of a person or an event within history, it can be very difficult to determine what happened. There are two basic ways: The Modern Scientific Method and the Legal Historical Method (I like to call it the Evidential Method) which lawyers use in the court of law. Now let me illustrate the two. ¶22
MTAC p42
[ppt251]
E4Rp132

The Modern Scientific Method (which is covered quite extensively in *More Than A Carpenter*) is based upon showing that something is true by repeating the event in the presence of the person questioning the fact. The Modern Scientific Method is based upon a controlled environment ¶23
MTAC p42
[ppt252]
E4Rp132

where an event can be repeated over and over again with several key ingredients: 1) observation has to be able be made of it; 2) can be repeated over and over again; 3) done in a controlled environment; 4) data is drawn from it; 5) a hypothesis is empirically verified from the data drawn. But the scientific method can only be applied in a controlled situation where it can be repeated over and over and over...and that's a very few things in society. Let me illustrate.

[ppt264]

I make this statement: Ivory soap floats. Mrs. Miller says "It does not." I say, "It does, too." She says "It does not." I said, Mrs. Miller, I'll prove it to you. I take her to my kitchen and put 8 ½ inches of water in the sink at 82.7 degrees Fahrenheit. I have a bar of ivory soap, I have a controlled environment, 82.7 degrees, everything else is the same – the lights are on a certain way, it is the same sink and the same water and we start to repeat it. Plunk, Plunk, Plunk. Even try a couple behind the back. We did it 100 times, made our observations, drew our data, and verified our hypothesis. The hypothesis "Ivory soap floats" was empirically verified 100 times. If the scientific method of observation, repeated observation, and empirical verification was the only means of proving anything – if you were a student in a university, you could not prove you had a tough history exam last Friday at 10 o'clock in the morning. You can't repeat a tough history exam, last Friday, at 10:00 today, because it wouldn't be last Friday, in a controlled environment, observation made, data drawn, and hypothesis empirically verified.

¶24

Let's say you're a businesswoman. You could not prove that last Friday you were in your office at 10:00am. Scientifically you can't repeat last Friday, 10:00am, be in your office today, in a controlled environment, observation made, data drawn and hypothesis empirically verified.

¶25

[ppt271]

You couldn't prove you cooked Christmas Dinner, a very delicious Christmas dinner for your children, husband and friends last Christmas. You can't repeat last Christmas's dinner, delicious last Christmas dinner, in a controlled environment, observation made, data drawn and hypothesis empirically verified. You see, the scientific method is very limited. In fact, there is hardly anything, to tell you the truth

¶26

[ppt270]

MTACpp42-43
E4Rpp132-134

that it applies to.

¶27

Now the other method is The Evidential Method. Any lawyer knows the difference. It's documented in McCormick's *Handbook of Evidence*, Wigmore, and others. All of them would touch on it and explain the two – it just seems that no one is reading them.

¶28

MTAC p43
[ppt276-279]

The Evidential Method is based upon showing that something is true beyond an unreasonable doubt. In other words, a verdict or a conclusion is reached on the basis of the sufficiency of the evidence. There are three types of evidence: written testimony, oral testimony and physical testimony (fingerprints, notebooks, eyeglasses, etc.). By using the Evidential Method, if you were a student you could prove beyond an unreasonable doubt that last Friday at 10:00am, you had a difficult history exam. Your professor could give testimony of it or the person you sat next to, or your friends. Maybe you'd have an exhibit, like cheat notes inside your cuff. But you couldn't prove it scientifically.

[ppt280-283]

[ppt284-295]

E4Rpp132-134

You businesswomen, beyond unreasonable doubt, could prove you were in your office last Friday morning, at say 10:00. Your secretary gave testimony of it, or an associate that was there. Maybe you had conference participants that could give testimony of it, or maybe you had a document notarized with the time, place, etc. But you couldn't prove it scientifically.

¶29

E4Rpp132-134
MTACpp42-43

You homemakers, beyond unreasonable doubt, could prove that you cooked a delicious Christmas dinner last Christmas for your husband, your family and friends. Your husband gave testimony of it, your neighbors and friends that were over. Maybe your daughter has an exhibit – she gained twenty pounds in her left arm. But you couldn't prove it scientifically. It's so limited. For example, try to prove scientifically that George Washington crossed the Delaware and surprised the British. I mean you can't repeat George Washington crossing the Delaware, surprising the British in a controlled environment, observations made, data drawn, and hypothesis empirically verified. After the third time they'd never be surprised. I could just see them, "Okay guys, here they come again. Act surprised!" SURPRISE!

¶30

E4Rpp132-134
MTACpp42-43

Try to prove this. Did Shakespeare write Hamlet? You can't repeat that in a controlled environment, observation made...somebody says, "so what?" ¶31
[ppt289]
MTACp44

Did Patrick Henry say, "Give me liberty or give me death or did he just say let me go?" You can't repeat that in a controlled environment, observation made, data drawn, and hypothesis empirically verified. ¶32

Was John F Kennedy assassinated in Dallas, by a man standing from the Book Depository? You can't prove that scientifically. You can't repeat that in a controlled environment, observation made, data drawn...they'd like to be able to right now, but you can't. Scientific method doesn't even apply. ¶33
[ppt293]
MTACp44

Now when it comes to an event within history, you have to apply the Evidential Method. And I'd like to do that tonight to the Resurrection. The timing is perfect to do it to the Resurrection, to apply the Evidential Method; otherwise to come to a conclusion based upon the sufficiency of the evidence. ¶34
MTAC p128
E4R 176-177;
192-193

Let me read a portion from Matthew 27. I'll be reading from the New American Standard. Good enough for Matthew, good enough for me. Commencing with verse 57 – Don't turn in your Bibles if you have them, just listen to me here: ¶35
[ppt1022;
1042-1044;1126-1128]

“When it was evening, there came a rich man from Arimathea, named Joseph, who himself had also become a disciple of Jesus. This man went to Pilate and asked for the body of Jesus. Then Pilate ordered it to be given to him [after he cut all the red tape.] And Joseph took the body and wrapped it in a clean linen cloth, and he laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out in the rock; and he rolled a large stone against the entrance of the tomb and went away. And Mary Magdalene was there, and the other Mary, sitting opposite the grave. Now on the next day, the day after the preparation, the chief priests and the Pharisees gathered together with Pilate, and said, "Sir, we remember that when He was still alive that deceiver said, 'After three days I am to rise again.' "Therefore, give orders for the grave to be made ¶36

secure until the third day, otherwise His disciples may come and steal Him away and say to the people, 'He has risen from the dead,' and the last deception will be worse [or as we used to say in Texas, it would be worser] than the first." Pilate said to them, "You have a guard; go, make it as secure as you know how." And they went and made the grave secure, and along with the guard they set a seal on the stone."

After initially spending over 1,000 hours of researching this subject, in the leading libraries of North America and England, I came to the very obvious conclusion that the resurrection of Jesus Christ is, by far, the most vicious, wicked hoax ever foisted on the minds of men and women today. Or, it is the most fantastic fact of history. ¶37

It is either the greatest farce or the greatest fact. It is either the greatest historical event or it's the greatest historical hoax perpetuated upon humanity. Jesus Christ had three credentials: the impact of His life upon history through changed lives, the fulfillment of prophecy in His life, and the resurrection. Over and over again, Jesus prognosticated that on the third day He would be raised from the dead. He said, "Destroy this temple, and three days I will raise it up again." They said, "This He spoke of His body." He was going into Jerusalem and His followers came to Him and said, "Hey man, don't go there, they'll kill you!" He said, "Guys, you don't understand." He said, "I gotta go to Jerusalem; go through the Jerusalem conspiracy trial. I'm going to be beaten; I'm going to be crucified and buried, but on the third day, I'll be raised from the dead." ¶38
E4R p211

Even His enemies understood Him. His enemies came to Pilate. The Jewish leaders came to Pilate and said, "Look, when that deceiver was still alive, He said in three days that grave would be empty. We had better make it secure, or the second deception would be greater than the first." And you know that Christ placed a lot of emphasis on the Resurrection. Everything that Jesus Christ taught, lived and died for depended on one thing – an empty tomb and His appearances following. The resurrection of Jesus Christ in Christianity stands or falls together. You want to attempt to refute Christianity? All you'd have to do is explain away the resurrection and it would totally crumble. I've thrown that ¶39
E4Rp183

challenge out to so many people.

You see, Christianity is almost diametrically opposite of all other major religions. Almost all other major religions are based upon a philosophical proposition or a theological ideology. Christianity is based upon the identity of its founder, who lived in history, and a historical event in time, space, dimension, and history. Space – there was a tomb and there was a cross – if you had rubbed your hand over the cross you probably would have gotten a sliver. Time is the third day, the sixth hour, the ninth hour, etc. Any event within history is based upon the resurrection. This is why if anyone wants to attempt to refute it, it's best to initiate it in a history class, not a philosophy class, even though it has tremendous philosophical overtones. Now I'd like to take a different approach to this subject than what many people do. I want to take the approach of circumstantial evidence from a legal perspective.

¶40
[ppt191]
E4Rp116

When I enrolled in law school, my hero was Dr. Simon Greenleaf. He was the man. He and Dr. Story were the two men who put Harvard Law School on the map. He wrote the famous *Three Volumes on the Laws of Legal Evidence*. He was the Wigmore of his day. Even Wigmore and all the others go back and document him and quote him.

¶41
MTAC p138
[ppt207-212]

Greenleaf was a skeptic, always mocking the Christians in his law classes. One day the Christians got tired of it. They challenged Dr. Greenleaf to take his three famous *Volumes on the Laws of Legal Evidence*, and to apply it to the Resurrection. Pretty good challenge. After much persuasion, he said he would. He did, and in the process ended up becoming a Christian. He went on to write a book and came to the conclusion that the resurrection of Jesus Christ is one of the best established events of history according to the laws of legal evidence administered in the courts of justice.

¶42

There were two men at Oxford, Lord Littleton and Benjamin Gilbert West. They were fed up with the Christian faith. They wanted to give the fatal blow to destroy it. You know, I wish more people would set out to destroy Christianity – we would have more Christians. Plus they would know why they believe. These men knew they had to refute two things:
1) The conversion of Saul of Tarsus – the apostle Paul. I

¶43
MTAC pp122-123
[ppt1263-1271]
[ppt1265]

know many professors that have become Christians through just that issue. In fact, in *More Than a Carpenter*, I have a chapter documenting how significant the conversion of Paul is. The second thing they had to be able to refute was the resurrection. Lord Littleton chose the conversion of Saul of Tarsus. Benjamin Gilbert West chose the resurrection. They each took a leave of absence, went their own individual ways to do research and study, and when they returned they were going to write a book together to refute the myth of the resurrection.

[ppt1264-1268]
MTACpp122-123

When the two men returned, they were both a little sheepish to share their findings, because each one independently had come to the exact opposite conclusion of what they set out to prove, and in the process had become an ardent follower of Christ. They went on to write a book together called *Observations of the History and the Evidence for the Resurrection*. Dr. Greenleaf had something printed on the flyleaf, which all of you ought to consider – “Reject not, until you have examined the evidence.”

¶44

There was a lawyer who wrote under the name of Dr. Frank Morris. He was brought up in a rationalistic background. He thought the lifestyle of Jesus Christ was the most beautiful lifestyle ever lived. But when he got to the resurrection, he was irritated because he thought someone had come along and tacked down a myth that had destroyed the beautiful life of Christ. It irritated him so much that he decided to write a book to refute the myth of the resurrection. He figured that an intelligent, rational approach to the evidence of history would totally refute it. He was so sincere in gathering his information – he took his own money and went to Palestine to do his research. While he was over there, he too, committed his life to Christ. He went on to write a book that’s out on paperback now called, *Who Moved the Stone?* And the first chapter is significantly titled, *The Book That Refused to be Written*.

¶45
MTACp139
[ppt203-206]

Now what did these men find? What caused them to drastically change their thinking? I discuss their findings and those of other researchers and historians in *New Evidence That Demands a Verdict* and in *Evidence for the Resurrection*. Thomas Arnold – the famous headmaster of Rugby and many others...set out to refute the Resurrection

¶46
[ppt196-198]
MTACp137

and then became Christians. What did they find?

Very briefly I'd like to share with you what they found and some of the things I've discovered. Everything I share is documented in either the *Evidence for the Resurrection, New Evidence That Demands a Verdict*, or my tape. I get tired of people writing and speaking and not documenting what they say, because you can't check them out. So everything's there, and you can totally check it out. ¶47

You might call this the dead truth about first Easter. ¶48

Let us look at the precautions taken. The first precaution was a solid rock tomb. It says Christ was placed in a new tomb, hewn out of a solid rock. The Jewish tombs had entrances 4½ to 5 feet tall. That's why when the women panicked and ran back and told the men, Peter and John ran to the tomb and it says John leaned over. Inside there were places for three cadavers – in the left, the front and the right, often the head protruding in the wall 8 ½ to 11 inches, with the shoulders slightly elevated. Solid Rock Tomb. ¶49
MTAC p128
[ppt1022; 1028]

The second precaution John touches on was the way the body of Christ was prepared. It was prepared according to the burial customs of the Jews. It is said that over 100 pounds of aromatic spices were used. You say wait a minute, that's a lot of spices and would make a lot of tea. Well, it would. But 100 pounds wouldn't be big deal for a great leader. Gamaliel, the contemporary of Jesus that Saul of Tarsus studied under, was a grandson of the great Jewish scholar Helel. When Gamaliel died they used 86 pounds of spices. One account says that when Herod died it took 500 servants to carry the spices, so 100 pounds was not a big deal. They would take the body and place it on a slab of stone. They would straighten all the members. Then they would take the aromatic spices mixing with a cement or gummy consistency. They would start with a piece of linen cloth about 30 centimeters wide and begin to wrap the body from the feet. In between the folds, they placed the aromatic spices with the cement consistency. They would wrap up to the armpits, put the arms down below the fingertips, and wrap the neck and a separate piece around the head. In this situation, I would estimate an encasement of approximately 117-120 pounds. As the next precaution, Matthew says a ¶50
MTACp128
E4Rp174
[ppt996-999;1013]
E4Rp175
[ppt1014]
[ppt1018]
[ppt1017]

large stone was rolled against the entrance of the door. Mark said the stone was extremely large. Now that phrase in the Greek language of the university students was kind of like – wow! Get a load of that rock! Now how large was an extremely large, get a load of that rock, stone? In some of the oldest manuscripts we have; in the Mark 16 portion it says within the text, “A stone [a stone that cannot be moved] by 20 men.” Now, what’s the significance of that?

E4R pp176; 192-193
[ppt1125-1140]

In the rules of transcribing a manuscript, if a transcriber is putting in his own thoughts or the thought of his day, he would make a marginal reference out to the side. But, if he was copying a marginal reference of the original manuscript with the thought of that day, they would usually put within the text, but within parentheses. Now this phrase, the stone cannot be moved by 20 men, I am convinced now that it had to come from a first century manuscript – within a few years of the death and resurrection of Christ.

¶51

After I lectured at Georgia Tech, by far one of the most studious universities I have ever been in around the world, two non-Christian engineering professors were at my talk on the Resurrection. Later they went on a tour of Israel with the University. They remembered what I had said about the stone. So as engineers, they calculated, from using the same type of stones in the days of Christ, what size was needed to roll against the 4 ½ to 5 foot doorway. They wrote me a letter with all the technical information, and put it in simple English in the back. They said that it would have to have a minimum weight of 1 ½ to 2 tons. No wonder they said an “extremely large stone”.

¶52
E4R p176
[ppt1129]

The next precaution: A Roman guard was placed at the tomb. You see, the Jews had a problem with the Christians. The Romans had a problem with the Jews. So the Jewish leaders called the Roman leaders and said, “Look, when that deceiver was still alive, He said in three days that the grave would be empty. We’d better make it secure – or the second deception will be greater than the first.” So Pilate said, “A guard you have, go make it secure.” Now some people reading through this will say that Pilate just meant that you have your temple, please take your temple and go make it secure. If that’s what you want to believe that it is okay, but check out chapter 10 of *New Evidence That Demands a*

¶53
MTACp128
E4Rpp176-177; 193
[ppt1023; 1041-1048
1141-1145]

Verdict. The guards were like green berets. If a temple policeman fell asleep, he was burned with his own clothes by the captain of the guard. A temple policemen could not sit down; he could not lean against anything while he was on duty. He had to be standing on both feet equally when he was on guard.

[ppt1046]

The phrase, “A guard you have,” uses the Greek word *koustodian* – comes to us through Latin *kroustodian*. It means someone more responsible. There are several sources you could check out. One is a man named Flavius Vegetius Renatus. Vegetius was a military historian that lived several hundred years after the time of Christ, when the Roman army started to deteriorate in its discipline. Vegetius wrote a manual to the Roman emperor, encouraging them to instill the methods of offensive and defensive warfare of the Romans at the time of Christ. It’s called the *Military Institutes of the Romans*. These methods were so good our government used them to train the green berets that fought in Vietnam. Then Dr. George Krid, at Indiana University, did his doctoral dissertation on the koustodian. There is also a dictionary out on Greek and Roman antiquities by Dr. William Smith. These and other sources point out that koustodian was not a 1, 2, 3, man force. A koustodian was anywhere from a 4-16 man security unit. Each man was trained to protect 6 square feet of ground. The 16 men that manned the square – four on each side – were supposed to be able to protect 36 square yards against an entire battalion and hold it. Anywhere from 4 to 16 of these men were placed at the tomb of cross. In *Evidence for the Resurrection*, I point out the economic, political and religious reasons for those precautions.

¶54
E4R p177
[ppt1051]

[ppt1060-1062]

Another precaution: It says a seal was placed on the tomb. Vegetius says that the seal could only be placed in the presence of the Roman guard, after the guard examined what they were to protect. The seal was made up of two pieces of rawhide with four clay packs on the outside, and a large clay pack in the center with a Roman insignia embedded in it. Now, the seal was not put there to make it more difficult to open it. The seals in those days were items of authentication. In other words, when that seal was put on, that guard unit staked their life, that what they were to protect was there. It was authenticating the situation.

¶55
MTAC p128; 130
E4R p184
[ppt1024-1032]

[ppt1030]

I think these precautions will suffice for our time tonight. ¶56

Now something happened. I mean it's rather obvious that something happened almost 2000 years ago, something this world hasn't gotten over yet. Something happened...every textbook in every university has a date referring Anno Dominae, the year of the Lord. Something happened which took 12 Jewish men, turned their lives upside down and all but one died a martyr's death. ¶57

There was Thomas, doubting Thomas. He said, "I won't believe unless I put my finger in his wounds!" And he died a martyr's death. Now there are a lot of theories that show the resurrection is a fraud. I recommend that you read all of them. I try to document in my books those worth documenting. The more I read them, the more I am convinced the resurrection took place. I often say, the shallowness of the critics speaks louder than the voice of the Christian. ¶58 [ppt827-829] E4Rp135 MTACp13

This is what the Bible said took place. Put the evidence in history. The Bible says there was a great earthquake and an angel of the Lord came and the guardian fell as dead. Now let me tell you, for that guardian to fall as dead, that'd be quite an earthquake or about a 7.2 angel. It said the angel rolled the stone away. The angel didn't roll the stone away so Jesus could come out. He rolled the stone away so we could go in and see that the tomb was empty. God never leaves a stone unturned. This was the theory presented at that time throughout Jewish literature and it was propagated all over the known world. The theory says some of the temple police panicked. The guard panicked. Some of them remained there and the others went into the high priest. You say, "See, they went to the high priest – it shows you they were temple police." Uh-uh, check out the context. The high priest tried to bribe them. They said, "If you take this money and spread it abroad that while you were sleeping (we'll see why no one would believe that) the disciples tip-toed through the tomb, moved the stone over, stole the body, became what I call a part of 'the bod-squad,' and they started to spread abroad that Christ had been raised from the dead. If you do that, then when it comes to the Roman governor's ears, it will keep you from being cut off or killed." The ¶59 [ppt1386] E4Rpp204-206

reason they went to the High Priest is because they knew that the high priest was the only one that could get to the Roman governor to even possibly save their necks and even then I don't think they did.

Now whether you say the disciples stole the body or what – here's several things that you have to deal with, such as the breaking of the Roman seal. They feared the breaking of that Roman seal. It stood for the power and authority of the Roman Empire. When that seal was broken, the FBI, CIA, and everyone else the Roman Empire had would be thrown into finding that man or men, and when they were found, it was automatic crucifixion upside down – where literally your guts run into your throat. Oh, they feared. I mean, those disciples were a bunch of cowards. They went out and hid themselves in their own home. Thomas went out and denied Christ. Breaking the Roman Seal.

¶60
MTACp132
E4Rpp216-210
[ppt1464-1471]

Next, every time somebody approached that tomb, an amazing statement was made in the Greek and Aramaic, that's often lost in the English rendering. It says, "the stone was rolled up the slope, away from not just the entrance, but in the positional way for an entire massive sepulcher, which one verb describes it as being picked up and carried away." Now if they wanted to just tip toe and steal the body, why all that effort to move one and a half to two ton stone up a slope and away from the entire tomb. That guardian would have to have cotton in his ears and earmuffs on to not hear that one. That would have been recorded on the Richter scale.

¶61
E4Rpp176; 192-193
[ppt1131-1140]

Then you got the problem of the guards. I'll tell you why nobody believed they fell asleep – you can check out Polybius or even better *Justin's Digest, Number 49*, which contains a list of 18 things a guard was put to death for. In fact, if they didn't know who failed in the duty, they drew lots to see who was killed. One of the ways they were put to death; they would strip their clothes, and burn them alive in a fire started with their own garments.

¶62
E4R p193
[ppt1141-1145]

Then you've got this problem. The tomb wasn't empty. You say, yes it was. No, it wasn't. You say it was, too! It was not! The women panicked. You would too! And they ran back. It says that Peter and John ran to the tomb and John got there first. He didn't go in, it says he leaned over –

¶63

remember the entrance. And he looked in, and he looked over where the body was placed and there were the grave clothes. The head piece where the head was, body where the body was, empty, and caved in a little. The body of Christ had passed right through it into a new existence. Let's face it – that would make you quite a hot shot believer – at least for the moment. You could go on and on. If Jesus didn't die then, when did he die? Why is it that we have no record in history of anyone going back to the tomb to pay homage to their great leader after one propagation about the resurrection? Pretty simple – who wants to go back and worship an empty tomb – only tourists do that today.

[ppt1146-1148]

You say, well the Romans and the Jews took the body. Now why would they do that? Well, that's rather simple Josh – then there wouldn't be any deception. Sounds good until you start to think about it. Why would they do the very thing that would cause all their problems? If the Romans or the Jews had the body, they would say, "Hey look, we got it!" And if that didn't suffice, they would say, "Hey look, we put it over here, and showed the beacon storage slip." And if that wasn't good enough, why didn't they take the body of Christ, put it in a carriage and march it right down through the center of Jerusalem? They'd have killed Christianity – not in the cradle, but in the womb. There wouldn't have been any Christianity. You see, a lot of people can't get it through their heads that Christianity is a bodiless faith! Let me tell you, if there would have been a body, there would never have been a faith.

¶64
MTACpp133-134
E4Rpp220-221
[ppt1584-1597]

An Islam student once said to me in the movie *Mohammed, Messenger of Peace*. They say behind every joke there's a carnal truth. And he said, "Oh you poor Christians. You don't really know where you're going." He said, "We go to the tomb of our master, we have his body. You go to the tomb of your master, and it's..." And I said, "Go ahead and say it. It's empty!" And, oh, how I would have loved to have a photo of that person's expression. Because it was the first time he realized. I mean, history confirms – even the enemies of Christianity confirm that the tomb was empty.

¶65

Look at the family of Jesus – now don't tell me that Jesus didn't have any brothers and sisters. Now I know that this is a conflict with some people of Catholic persuasion and some

¶66
[ppt1522-1526]

people of the Protestant persuasion. But I'm convinced in history that He had brothers, not cousins, but brothers. When He was alive, did His brothers and sisters believe in Him? No! They thought He was a lunatic. They thought He was deranged by going around and saying, "I am the Way, the Truth and the Life. No one comes to the Father but by Me. I am the Vine, you are the branches. I am the Shepherd, you're the sheep." What would you do if your brother did that? It's the same thing! They laughed and they mocked Him; they ridiculed Him. They said, "Look Jesus, do you want people to believe in you? Why don't you go up to Jerusalem? Go where you find those hardest to convince." After their brother died a heinous death on the cross, it downgraded the family. You see, the crucifixion for a Jew was horrible. Because not only did they speak of the curse of God, but it was so bad that the Romans would not even crucify a Roman. It was that degrading. And a Jew wouldn't either.

When Jews used crucifixion, they continued to crucify the person even after they were dead. They wouldn't even let them die on the cross—after they were dead. They would string him up as someone cursed God for blaspheme or something like that. It downgraded the family name. So He went through the heinous death on the cross and was buried. Where do you find those hardest to convince? You find them in the upper room with the disciples waiting for the Holy Spirit to be sent. Most of them became martyrs. James becomes a leader – I mean you always found him with the Pharisees. He becomes a leader of the Jerusalem church. He writes an epistle. "I, James, a servant of God, in the Lord Jesus Christ..." His brother! He laughed and mocked him. Think of this in history. What happened? In a matter of days, their lives upside down – and most of them became martyrs. The only thing I know is 1 Corinthians 15, "And then he appeared unto James, His brother, the resurrection."

Here are two theories presented in classrooms, and I'll wrap it up. In classrooms where my wife and I have lectured, I always have to wait towards the end of my talks, because I always have to psych myself up. This one is good. I hear this one all the time. This is why it is so easy to lecture in universities. The first is that the women went to the wrong tomb. No really, I hear that all the time. They hadn't been

¶67

[ppt1194-1198]

MTACpp94-95
E4Rpp197-198

¶68

MTAC p131
E4R pp202-203

liberated yet, they were a little frustrated, and it was getting a little dark. You know, it was a private burial area, they saw everything. They went to the wrong tomb. Now that's pretty good, unless you really think that through and then you'd have to say that the men went to the wrong tomb. Then the Jews went to the wrong tomb. Then the Romans went to the wrong tomb. Then the angel must have gone to the wrong tomb. Then Joseph that owned the tomb must have gone to the wrong tomb. I mean, that takes more faith than I could ever dream up.

[ppt1131; 1136]

[ppt1332; 1337]

[ppt1333; 1337]

[ppt1334; 1338]

[ppt1336]

Here's the other one. I also hear this one all the time. I call it the "swoon theory." It teaches that Jesus really didn't die. It would say that He just passed out, lost a little blood, was put in a damp tomb and resuscitated. Now what they'd have to say, and I document this in *Evidence for the Resurrection*, is that he went through six trials, not one or two, there are six different trials – he went through three Roman and three Jewish – he was beaten badly – almost beyond description. You read documented in history in the *Evidence for the Resurrection* what it meant to be flagellated. I mean, literally sometimes, your back would be opened up and they could see your inner organs. There were nine strips of leather with lead balls on the end of them with sharp prongs coming out and glass and steel in them, and they whipped you 39-40 times with it. The Jews said that 40 was the law, so they'd only do 39 in case they miscounted. So the Romans would always rub it into the Jews that they did a few more. So you probably got 43, 44, 45 lashes. And it would literally open up so you could see the inner parts. They took and drove spikes into his hands. He was so weak he couldn't even carry his own cross bar. They drove spikes into his hands and his feet, brought the cross up and dropped it in the hole – crucified him – but didn't kill him.

¶69

MTAC p132

E4R pp221-225

[ppt1371-1375; 1625-1643]

E4R p222

[ppt1635]

[ppt1635]

E4Rp222

[ppt1637]

Afterward the guards came along and thrust a spear in His side. Eyewitness accounts said blood and water came out separated – even a nurse's aide could tell you that's the sign of death. In this case, it must have been Jesus Christ superstar because it didn't kill Him. Four professional executioners signed His death warrant – they must had been mistaken or stoned on grass. They took Him down, wrapped Him in 100+ pounds of aromatic spices and linen. I guess He must have just breathed through it – I got it! He had a

¶70

E4Rp222

[ppt1637]

E4Rp222

[ppt1638]

snorkel. It probably came out of His nose, up over His ears and out. Anyway, 100+ pounds of encasement. Put in a damp tomb, rolled a 1 ½ to 2 ton stone against the entrance and then put a 16 man security unit there. An amazing thing happened. If it went according the way they said, it is a far greater miracle than the resurrection. I mean, literally, you think about it. They said that the damp tomb, that damp, wet tomb, instead of killing Him healed Him. It's too bad we can't bottle damp tombs. Are you serious? Somebody has a bad cold and the go to the doctor, and he says, "Young man, all you need is three bottles of damp tombs." And anyway, the damp tomb, instead of killing Him, healed Him. And this is the only way to explain it. He must have jumped up, hobbled over to the stone, pushed the stone out of the way, tied the guardian up with His linen cloth, and appeared to the disciples as Lord of Life.

E4Rp222
[ppt1641]

[ppt1642]

A professor at the University of London said to me, "Josh, anyone who would believe that would have the intellect of somebody who calls themselves a poached egg." Jesus Christ is alive. In fact, the only way I am able to share what happened in my life, the only way I even have that testimony is because Jesus Christ was raised from the dead. If He wasn't, there's no explanation for it. And it's so beautiful. Christianity is not a religion – it's a relationship because Christ became the God-man, took the sins of the world upon Himself and went to the cross. When Jesus said, "It is finished," He took all the sins of the world, and the holy, just righteous Father poured His wrath upon His son. And at that moment, Christ dealt with every sin and He was buried. And He was raised again. Remember when the women approached Jesus and He said, "Don't touch me. I have not yet ascended to the Father." And then later He said to Thomas, "Reach out and touch me." Did you ever wonder why He did that? This is why. When they had the yearly temple celebration, everybody stood outside when the high priest went into the Holy of Holies with the sacrifice for sins of the nation of Israel. And everybody waited out there because they had the fear that their sacrifice was not accepted they all would be doomed and the high priest would be consumed. And they'd wait out there intensely. When the High Priest came back out through the door, great praise to God broke out. Because then they knew their sacrifice had been accepted. Jesus said, "Do not touch me; I

¶71

have not ascended to the Father.” Between that time and Thomas, He had ascended to the Father in heaven. And because He was able to say to Thomas, “Touch me,” it showed that His sacrifice was totally acceptable by God the Father – for every sin we have ever committed. And then He says, I offer you a relationship. Because He was resurrected, He lives! As my wife, Dottie says, “Honey, because He lives, He has an infinite capacity to enter a man or woman’s life and change it from the inside out.” And that’s why it is a relationship – because He was resurrected, He lives. And through an intelligent step of faith, He will enter our lives with the Holy Spirit. But it is all dependent upon the resurrection.

I hope you have a greater appreciation for the Resurrection ¶72
and a greater desire to learn more about it because it’s so crucial. I think every Christian ought to do a study of the Resurrection scriptures. It’s significant to everything – to our walk with Christ.