

Intro:

How do you *know* Jesus rose from the dead?

How do you like that for an Easter morning start ;) Good morning by the way, and happy Easter!

If somebody asked you this question today at your local turkey gathering, could you present a logical, reasonable answer? I mean, other than saying that *the Bible says* He rose from the dead, could you actually successfully present a clear and logical case *proving* the resurrection? Raise your hand if you think you could prove it to us right here and now. How many?

This is what we are celebrating today! And you mean to tell me you couldn't prove it?! It's no wonder atheists laugh at us Christians isn't it. . . can't even prove the most fundamental basic beliefs. . .

I have good news for you. I wasn't able to answer that on the spot either. Sorry, that was the bad news. And as for the good news, today I'm going to prove that Jesus rose from the dead!

Sit down and stop clapping. You need to know something before we start: I'm going to prove Jesus rose from the dead by doing the most obvious thing; **NOT** proving that Jesus rose from the dead. I'm going to prove it, *by not proving it*.

Rabbit trail: did you know people deny that the holocaust ever happened? No for real, people do that!

INSERT PICTURE

I really wonder what sort of eye-witness statements they analyzed. . .

Scientific and forensic **PROOF**. . . That's amazing! To me, proof is something that is indisputable, unchallengeable, undeniable, irreversible, because if it wasn't, it would cease to be proof, and it would just be *evidence*. Are you thinking with me? Not all evidence is proof, and some is even false or misleading! To say they have proof is so indescribably ignorant, it borders on the line of *insanity*. Why would I say that? Check this out. Anyone know what this is?

INSERT PICTURE

This picture was taken inside this building:

INSERT PICTURE

This is Yad Vashem; the holocaust memorial built in Israel. Please, go though that and come back and see if you can still deny that it happened.

INSERT PICTURE

These are holocaust survivors.

INSERT PICTURE

These are shoes from some of the victims at Auschwitz, Poland.

Now let me ask you, what kind of evidence are you willing to accept as proof?

Some rabbit trails are worth following. . .

Alright, let's get to work.

Point No. 1 The Resurrection

Really the best way to prove the resurrection is to start with the resurrection right? That's the logical start: prove the question at hand. If I was to do that I'd read it right out of the Bible!

I'd read Mark 16:14

Later He appeared to the eleven as they sat at the table; and He rebuked their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they did not believe those who had seen Him after He had risen.

There! It says right there that Jesus appeared to His recently reduced disciples, and He rebuked their unbelief, because it says ***they did not believe those who had seen Him after He had risen.*** They had the opportunity to hear from first-hand witnesses who had seen the risen Savior, and then they also got to see Him with their own eyes. We have eleven first-hand witness in one verse. Not to mention the hundreds more that also saw Him.

Rabbit trail No. 2: this rabbit trail may have more logical evidence to support the resurrection than anything else I might say this morning. . .

One theory against the testimony of Jesus' disciples is that the disciples thought up a lie, and they thought it up quick. "Let's make it good," they said, "Let's make it stick!" Its such a crazy thought that rhyming like Dr Seuss here is very appropriate.

I want to know this: you're saying 11 of Jesus disciples lied about this story? Ok, let's think that through for a second (remember, what you already believe shouldn't alter the facts if you're being objective); how many people do you know are willing to die for something they **know** is a lie? Think about it. People die every day on this earth for what they believe, but

when it comes to facing torture and death, **nobody dies for what they KNOW is a lie.** **EVERY** disciple died a horrible martyr's death, with the exception of one: some say John was dipped in boiling oil, but didn't die, but was horribly scarred for life. There's no way that these disciples died like they did for having made up a lie, they died because they were **first hand witnesses** of the truth! Can you see the logic to this reasoning?

The mind really is a weak thing, when it is presented with torture and death, the mind will easily crack under something it *knows* to be a lie. But when the mind believes something to be true, there is almost no end to what that mind is willing to go through.

INSERT PICTURE

Know what I mean? These guys didn't know it was a lie. They didn't know they were going to end up in Hell, without seventy virgins or whatever they were told! Agonizing torture for all eternity. . . They didn't know that. If they had, they wouldn't have gone through with it!

A question arises on the point of the 9/11 terrorists: does the fact that they were willing to die create some validity to their belief? Just like the disciple's martyrdom proves the resurrection?

Let me read part of an article by a man named C Michael Patton. (I've never heard of him before this, I hope you'll understand this isn't an endorsement):
<http://www.reclaimingthemind.org/blog/2009/04/what-happened-to-the-twelve-apostles-how-their-deaths-evidence-easter/>

The part that I took starts like this and I quote:

However, some might object to my reasoning. You may object to my reasoning. The question that gives rise to the objection is this: Don't many people die for something they believe? Does this mean that if you die for something, it is true? To be sure, many people have died for something that they believed and this does not make it true. The 9-11 bombers believed something and died for that belief, but their deaths do not give credence to the validity of their beliefs in any way.

INSERT PICTURE

There is a big difference in dying for something that you believe having RECEIVED the basis for that belief from someone else AND dying for something that you believe because you WITNESSED the events that establish the belief.

Read that over again, think it through. I'll continue quoting:

From a historical stand point, the difference is as great as day and night. The suicide bombers and others who die for their faith are dying for something that they believe because they have heard it from someone else. This adds no valid verification to what they believe from a standpoint of evidence or reason. It would be like me dying for my faith in Christ's resurrection. All that this would prove is that I truly did believe that Christ rose from the grave, but it would not verify in any way that He actually did rise from the grave. Why? Because I did not see it. I was not a first hand witness.

Now if I died a martyr's death saying that I saw Christ die and rise from the grave with my own eyes that would be a different story. Why? Because it would not verify a belief handed down from someone else, but a belief in something that I witnessed firsthand. At this point, you have only three options for explaining the Apostles' belief: 1) Say that they died for a lie knowing that it was a lie, 2) that they were delusional or crazy, or 3) that was the truth, Christ did rise from the grave.

To say that they died knowing it was a lie places a great burden of proof upon the proponent of this view and completely lacks in any historical credibility (no matter how many attempts have been made to substantiate such). It would take a much greater leap of faith to believe this than to believe that they were telling the truth and Christ actually rose.

INSERT PICTURE

Remember, the possibility of an alternative does not amount to probability.

Thank you very much Mr. Patton, I hope the rest of your work is of the same quality!

End of rabbit trail No. 2, with no apology.

Really, my next best course of action ***should be*** to read the testimonies of the two on the road to Emmaus in Luke 24, and then perhaps read the testimony of Mary Magdalene in John 20. Isn't it amazing the power of the testimonies of first-hand witnesses in a court of law? But somehow not here. Not to the world. You know why? They don't accept the Bible as the Word of God, and they don't even accept it as a good history book! Of course you're not going to believe the stories of the disciples and Mary Magdalene if you think that they could have forged them to protect their fake Messiah!

I would use these testimonies as proof, but not right away, we need to do something else first before any of this means anything. To the unbeliever. Always try to understand the mind of the person you are trying to convince.

Point No. 2 Death

Since we're trying to prove that Jesus rose from the dead, its important to realize that trying to prove the resurrection assumes one thing: Jesus died! Elementary, isn't it? Really, to get to the resurrection, we need to know *if* Jesus died on that cross in the first place, or was it all an elaborate facade?

Let me read to you from the Qur'an. I know right? Nobody believes that book. **FALSE.** We've recently heard from Rob Linstead how many people believe that book in our own country!

Here's what the Qur'an says in *Yusuf Ali 4:157-158*

*That they said (in boast), "We killed Christ Jesus the son of Mary, the Messenger of Allah"—but they **killed him not, nor crucified him**, but so it was made to appear to them, and those who differ therein are full of doubts, with no (certain) knowledge, but **only conjecture** to follow, for of a surety they killed him not—nay, Allah raised him up unto Himself; and Allah is Exalted in Power, Wise."*

The Qur'an isn't the only book to claim that Jesus' death was faked. This next article is from wikipedia:

Early proponents of this theory include German Karl Friedrich Bahrdt, who suggested in around 1780, that Jesus deliberately feigned his death, using drugs provided by the physician Luke to appear as a spiritual messiah and get Israel to abandon the idea of a political messiah. In this interpretation of the events described in the Gospels, Jesus was resuscitated by Joseph of Arimathea, with whom he shared a connection through a secret order of the Essenes — a group that appear in many of the "swoon" theories.

Around 1800, Karl Venturini proposed that a group of supporters dressed in white — who were, with Jesus, members of a "secret society" — had not expected him to survive the crucifixion, but heard groaning from inside the tomb, where Jesus had regained consciousness in the cool, damp air. They then frightened away the guards and rescued him.

A third rationalist theologian, Heinrich Paulus, wrote in works from 1802 onwards that he believed that Jesus had fallen into a temporary coma and somehow revived without help in the tomb. He was critical of the vision hypothesis and argued that the disciples must have believed that God had resurrected Jesus.

Interesting isn't it?

INSERT PICTURE

There are variations to these theories that include Pilate being bribed to allow Jesus to be taken down before death, and this book written in 1899 called Jesus in India, written by Hadhrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian , which claims that Jesus traveled to India *after surviving* the

crucifixion.

By the way, I don't appreciate reading and trying to understand the theories that mystify Jesus. It leaves me feeling like I'm betraying God by researching the ways to make it possible for His non-existence. But how can I believe something, and be afraid to check it out? If it is true, there is nothing that man can do, especially me, to change that. But what I **DO** enjoy is reading about men who have thoroughly debunked these myths. It's so nice to read a voice of reason sometimes. Let me show you. . .

David Strauss wrote in his book *The Life of Jesus for the People*, vol. 1, 2nd edition, <http://www.godandscience.org/apologetics/deathjesus.pdf>

"It is impossible that a being who had stolen half dead out of the sepulchre, who crept about weak and ill and wanting medical treatment... could have given the disciples the impression that he was a conqueror over death and the grave, the Prince of life: an impression that lay at the bottom of their future ministry."

And even better are the writings of medical authorities, to borrow the term, who have analyzed the scourging and death of Christ from the Greek New Testament! Let me read to you from a book called *On the Physical Death of Jesus Christ*, by William D. Edwards, Wesley J. Gabel, and Floyd E. Hosmer:

They start by clarifying their sources like this:

The source material concerning Christ's death comprises a body of literature and not a physical body or its skeletal remains. Accordingly, the credibility of any discussion of Jesus' death will be determined primarily by the credibility of one's sources. For this review, the source material includes the writings of ancient Christian and non-Christian authors, the writings of modern authors, and the Shroud of Turin.

INSERT PICTURE

Using the legal-historical method of scientific investigation, scholars have established the reliability and accuracy of the ancient manuscripts.

These guys understood the importance of the material they were to review! No point in doing a medical review of a fake account. . . here's what they say:

Flogging was a legal preliminary to every Roman execution, and only women and Roman senators or soldiers (except in cases of desertion) were exempt. The usual instrument was a short whip (flagellum or flagel-lum) with several single or braided leather thongs of variable lengths, in which small iron balls or sharp pieces of sheep bones were tied at intervals. Occasionally, staves also were used. For scourging, the man was stripped of his

clothing, and his hands were tied to an upright post. The back and legs were flogged either by two soldiers (lictors) or by one who alternated positions. The severity of the scourging depended on the disposition of the lictors and was intended to weaken the victim to a state just short of collapse or death. After the scourging, the soldiers often taunted their victim.

The scourging was supposed to have brought the victim just short of collapse or death, and Jesus is supposed to have survived crucifixion yet?!

The book also says this:

Since no one was intended to survive crucifixion, the body was not released to the family until the soldiers were sure that the victim was dead.

The book finishes with this:

INSERT PICTURE

*Thus, it remains unsettled whether Jesus died of cardiac rupture or of cardio respiratory failure. However, the important feature may be not **how** he died but rather **whether** he died. Clearly, the weight of historical and medical evidence indicates that Jesus was dead **before the wound to his side was inflicted** and supports the traditional view that the spear, thrust between His right ribs, probably perforated **not only** the right lung but also the **pericardium and heart** and thereby ensured His death.*

Accordingly, interpretations based on the assumption that Jesus did not die on the cross appear to be at odds with modern medical knowledge.

Now somehow we are supposed to make all that fit to the theory that Jesus didn't die, spent some time in the tomb (depending on theory it could be one night, two nights, or three nights), and was seen walking all over the country shortly thereafter? No, I don't think so. This myth is so thoroughly debunked by modern medical science that you have to be somewhat ignorant to hold this view.

So, if Jesus rose from the dead, which assumes that He died on the cross, that can mean only one thing: He must have been alive! He couldn't have died and rose from the dead if He wasn't alive to begin with. Strange how obvious that is once it's been said. If you can prove His life to be false, you can avoid the trouble of swoon theories all together (little tip for those in that camp).

Last Point: No. 3 Life

Ok, in regards to Jesus living life as a man on earth, there are only three possible conclusions we could possibly come to. So nice to narrow things down isn't it? Simplify. . .

1. He **didn't** exist. That one is easy to remember
2. He existed, and was a lunatic
3. He existed, and is everything the Bible says He is

Let's examine option number 1: the idea that Jesus never existed. This is from the website dailycaller.com, written by Chuck Ross. Here's a bit of the article:

INSERT PICTURE

So I guess this Joseph Atwill has some “findings” that Jesus was a “false god” created by the Romans. I'm listening! Chuck Ross goes on to say that “Richard Dawkins circulated the press release for Atwill's gig on Twitter, but said that he did not necessarily endorse Atwill's findings. Richard Dawkins, the genius of the century, tweeted this in regards to the existence of Jesus:

INSERT PICTURE

According to Dawkins the Gospels are clearly mostly false (and he did use the word mostly, notice that? not totally), the *possibility*, “*that Jesus didn't exist at all is of only marginal extra interest.*” This is the epitome of the brains of our time. So very sad. . .

Back to the article by Chuck Ross, let me read a portion of it for you:

Atwill maintains that governments — including the Romans — create those “false” histories and gods “to obtain a social order that is against the best interests of the common people.”

“When the Romans had exhausted conventional means of quashing rebellion, they switched to psychological warfare,” said Atwill, whose talk is sub-headlined, “Is Christianity the Genesis of Modern Psychological Warfare?”

“That’s when the ‘peaceful’ Messiah story was invented. Instead of inspiring warfare, this Messiah urged turn-the-other-cheek pacifism and encouraged Jews to ‘give unto Caesar’ and pay their taxes to Rome,” said Atwill, who claims that his book “Caesar’s Messiah” was the best-selling work of religious history in 2007.

Bart Ehrman, a popular Biblical scholar at the University of North Carolina whose most recent book “Did Jesus Exist?” tackles many “mythicist” theories, calls Atwill’s theory crazier than most.”

“I don’t deal with [Atwill] simply because he’s not a big deal even among the conspiracy-theory mythicists themselves,” Ehrman told The Daily Caller News Foundation.

Ehrman, an agnostic who has written books arguing that parts of the New Testament are

forgeries, still maintains that Jesus existed. Mythicists, he argues, merely seek to tear down Christianity.

“And what better way to malign the religious views of the vast majority of religious persons in the Western world, which remains, despite everything, overwhelmingly Christian, than to claim that the historical founder of their religion was in fact the figment of his followers’ imagination?” wrote Ehrman in a Huffington Post column.

This seems to be Atwill’s intention. “Although Christianity can be a comfort to some, it can also be very damaging and repressive, an insidious form of mind control that has led to blind acceptance of serfdom, poverty, and war throughout history,” said Atwill.

So what would you do with a man like Atwill who claims to have proof that Jesus is a false god made up by the Romans? Would you have better proof to counter him with? For the record I would like to say this: **Atwill does not have any proof whatsoever, nor “findings” as he says, he has ideas that CANNOT be verified by history, and his conclusion is his own, drawn up by a heart full of sin, and scared to death that hell could be real, and that God is just, and just as real.**

There are various other arguments that Jesus is a made up historical figure. Arguments like “If Jesus existed, why did no historians of the time write about him?”

INSERT PICTURE

“You know Bill, there is a book. . .” (quoting from the Ken Ham vs Bill Nigh debate)

Some even claim that the reference to Jesus by the historian Josephus may have been forged. Of course right? What else could it possibly be??

Some also claim that the Gospels themselves have too many contradictions to be of any use to anyone, and discredit themselves. I'd like to make a quick small point there: my Dad has done an amazing job with harmonizing all four synoptic Gospels, and compiled a very impressive PDF that I believe is free for anyone to get a copy of, and **there are no contradictions**. Plenty of different information! But contradictory? No. Now think this through for a moment, if one Gospel records one disciple being present, for example, and the other records two disciples being there, is that a contradiction? No! One simply recorded more than the other! If one Gospel recorded Jesus being in the tomb for two days, and another records Him being in the tomb for three days, now you would have a contradiction! And one more small point: since when do historians write things down exactly like the next historian, word for word? If I asked all of you to record everything I've said this morning, most of you wouldn't have the same thing, and none of you would have everything!

Thank you, I am done with small points now. Contradiction is a false claim.

Mostly the arguments amount to this: the Bible isn't real, or trustworthy as an accurate history book, and therefore you cannot use it to prove Jesus existed, you must use other sources.

Secular sources.

Sources from people who weren't believers.

Sources who want nothing to do with Jesus. . .

You see the problem with where this is going?

If all I ever read was that book by Hadhrat Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of Qadian, I would probably believe that Jesus faked His own death too! No, to find truth we must have our minds open to the most objective, reasonable, and logical evidence presented.

I'd get into this more, but I'll cover it a little later so for now, on to the next possible conclusion.

Number 2: Jesus existed, but only as a man. A lunatic at that. This is by far the most popular view I have come across. I guess when it becomes too hard to do away with the life of Jesus, you have to accept it, but try to remove "God" from the equation.

Bart Ehrman, our unbiblical "biblical" historian who believes Jesus existed, wrote a column for huffingtonpost.com, I'd like to read part of that for you:

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/bart-d-ehrman/did-jesus-exist_b_1349544.html

With respect to Jesus, we have numerous, independent accounts of his life in the sources lying behind the Gospels (and the writings of Paul) -- sources that originated in Jesus' native tongue Aramaic and that can be dated to within just a year or two of His life (before the religion moved to convert pagans in droves). Historical sources like that are pretty astounding for an ancient figure of any kind. Moreover, we have relatively extensive writings from one first-century author, Paul, who acquired his information within a couple of years of Jesus' life and who actually knew, first hand, Jesus' closest disciple Peter and his own brother James. If Jesus did not exist, you would think his brother would know it.

Moreover, the claim that Jesus was simply made up falters on every ground. The alleged parallels between Jesus and the "pagan" savior-gods in most instances reside in the modern imagination: We do not have accounts of others who were born to virgin mothers and who died as an atonement for sin and then were raised from the dead (despite what the sensationalists claim ad nauseum in their propagandized versions).

Moreover, aspects of the Jesus story simply would not have been invented by anyone wanting to make up a new Savior. The earliest followers of Jesus declared that he was a crucified messiah. But prior to Christianity, there were no Jews at all, of any kind whatsoever, who thought that there would be a future crucified messiah. The messiah was to be a figure of grandeur and power who overthrew the enemy. Anyone who wanted to make up a messiah would make him like that. Why did the Christians not do so? Because they believed specifically

that Jesus was the Messiah. And they knew full well that he was crucified. The Christians did not invent Jesus. They invented the idea that the messiah had to be crucified.

One may well choose to resonate with the concerns of our modern and post-modern cultural despisers of established religion (or not). But surely the best way to promote any such agenda is not to deny what virtually every sane historian on the planet -- Christian, Jewish, Muslim, pagan, agnostic, atheist, what have you -- has come to conclude based on a range of compelling historical evidence.

INSERT PICTURE

Whether we like it or not, Jesus certainly existed.

This Bart Erhman is a apparently a scholar, trying desperately to “prove” that Jesus wasn't anything more than a man, but yet he fully acknowledges the fact that Jesus walked on this earth as a man, and that His existence can be proved from *historical sources*. In fact he says *the claim that Jesus was simply made up falters on every ground*. Erhman has obviously done a lot of study into history in order to come to this conclusion, but he has one problem: he made up his mind *before* he even *looked* at the evidence. He now has to make everything fit his worldview, and his heart desperately wants God and Jesus and sin **NOT** to exist because **IF** they do, Bart Erhman is a sinner on his way to hell for all eternity. The Bible says, “*Who is a liar but he who denies that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist who denies the Father and the Son.*” I John 2:22

Bart Erhman, its time to WAKE UP; your eternal destination depends on it!

I want to read you another article; this one on Jesus as the Son of God, written by Josh McDowell.

Remember, we have already seen how many of the top minds in the world, believer and unbeliever alike, know that Jesus walked on this earth as a man.

Here's part of the article:

Jesus claimed to be God. He didn't leave any other option open. His claim must be either true or false, so it is something that should be given serious consideration.

Jesus' question to His disciples, "But who do you say that I am?" (Matthew 16:15) has several alternatives.

First, suppose that His claim to be God was false. If it was false, then we have only two alternatives. He either knew it was false or He didn't know it was false.

Was He a Lunatic?

If it is inconceivable for Jesus to be a liar, then couldn't He actually have thought Himself to be God, but been mistaken? After all, it's possible to be both sincere and wrong.

Remember the 9/11 picture I just showed you?

*But we must remember that for someone to think himself God, especially in a fiercely monotheistic culture, and then to tell others that their eternal destiny depended on believing in him, is no light flight of fantasy but the thoughts of a **lunatic in the fullest sense**.*

Was Jesus Christ such a person?

Someone who believes He is God sounds like someone today believing himself Napoleon. He would be deluded and self-deceived, and probably he would be locked up so he wouldn't hurt himself or anyone else.

Yet in Jesus we don't observe the abnormalities and imbalance that usually go along with being deranged. His poise and composure would certainly be amazing if He were insane.

Noyes and Kolb, in a medical text, describe the schizophrenic as a person who is more autistic than realistic. The schizophrenic desires to escape from the world of reality. Let's face it; claiming to be God would certainly be a retreat from reality.

In light of the other things we know about Jesus, it's hard to imagine that He was mentally disturbed. Here is a man who spoke some of the most profound sayings ever recorded. His instructions have liberated many individuals from mental bondage.

Clark H. Pinnock asks: "Was He deluded about His greatness, a paranoid, an unintentional deceiver, a schizophrenic? Again, the skill and depth of His teachings support the case only for His total mental soundness. If only we were as sane as He!"

A student at a California university told me that his psychology professor had said in class that "all he has to do is pick up the Bible and read portions of Christ's teaching to many of his patients. That's all the counseling they need."

Psychiatrist J. T. Fisher states: "If you were to take the sum total of all authoritative articles ever written by the most qualified of psychologists and psychiatrists on the subject of mental hygiene -- if you were to combine them and refine them, and cleave out the excess verbiage -- if you were to take the whole of the meat and none of the parsley, and if you were to have these unadulterated bits of pure scientific knowledge concisely expressed by the most capable of living poets, you would have an awkward and incomplete summation of the Sermon on the Mount. And it would suffer immeasurably through comparison. For nearly 2,000 years the

Christian world has been holding in its hands the complete answer to its restless and fruitless yearnings. Here ... rests the blueprint for successful human life with optimism, mental health, and contentment."

There are some things in that statement that I don't agree with, but the point remains: Jesus was not a lunatic! It is not possible for a lunatic to live, and teach, like Jesus did.

THEREFORE, if Jesus did exist, and He wasn't delusional or crazy, or even remotely any of those things, the only option that remains is. . .

Option Number 3. Its going to finish everything up for us. If you were a jury, and I a lawyer making my case, this is how I would wrap it up, unafraid of counter-evidence.

The last possible conclusion we can come to regarding the life of Jesus is that He was actually what He claimed to be: the Son of God. **FINALLY!** We can start making some sense now.

Acts 1:1-3 says "(1) *The former account I made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began both to do and teach, (2) until the day in which He was taken up, after He through the Holy Spirit had given commandments to the apostles whom He had chosen,(3) to whom He also presented Himself alive after His suffering by **many infallible proofs**, being seen by them during forty days and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.*

Do you really believe there are **many infallible proofs??**

We've seen some of them already.

We've seen how even some of the best **secular** minds don't deny the existence of Jesus, and in fact say its ridiculous and useless to argue such. So I hope I've established as best I can in your minds that Jesus is a historical person whose existence on earth can be proven historically. Jesus was here. The footprint He left as He lived on this earth is so large the only way you could miss it is if you're too small to see it. The best historians today and in the past could see that there was more than enough proof for the existence of Jesus. The real problem is that people twist facts and history to show that Jesus was not the Son of God, just like people trying to show that the holocaust wasn't real. STOP IT. We live in the year 2014 AFTER DEATH. After Whose death?? Its amazing that the whole world recognizes that period in time, and refer to Jesus' death every time they write the date, or say the date, or even think of the date. Ironic isn't it?

Like I said I want to wrap this up, and I'm going to do that by showing you a prophecy. You'll find it in Isaiah 53:7-10. Use a highlighter or a pen or something and mark this in your Bible, you'll need again.

For the record there are many types of Christ in the Old Testament pointing forward, and prophecies as well. Its just full to the brim. For my purpose I chose to use Isaiah 53.

Turn to Isaiah 53 verses 7-10

***7He was oppressed and He was afflicted,
Yet He opened not His mouth;
He was led as a lamb to the slaughter,
And as a sheep before its shearers is silent,
So He opened not His mouth.***

***8He was taken from prison and from judgment,
And who will declare His generation?
For He was cut off from the land of the living;
For the transgressions of My people He was stricken.***

***9And they made His grave with the wicked—
But with the rich at His death,
Because He had done no violence,
Nor was any deceit in His mouth.***

***10Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise Him;
He has put Him to grief.
When You make His soul an offering for sin,
He shall see His seed, He shall prolong His days,
And the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand.***

Do you know when the book of Isaiah was written? All of the sources I have found all agree, Isaiah was written in the early 700's. BEFORE CHRIST. Yes, Before Christ!

How is it possible that Isaiah could write this 700 years before any of it happened??

Verse 7 states “***He was oppressed and He was afflicted,
Yet He opened not His mouth,***” and later in history its recorded that He never defended Himself. How many normal men do you know face the death penalty in court without defending themselves?

Verse 7 also states “***He was led as a lamb to the slaughter,***” and later in history its recorded that He was not only born where the sheep are born, and as my Dad showed recently, born where the best sheep are born and raised for sacrifice, but also that He entered the city through the gate that the Passover lambs would have taken.

Verse 9 states “***they made His grave with the wicked,***” and later in history its recorded that He was crucified between two thieves, and that He took the place of one of the worst villains in custody at the time: Barrabas.

Verse 8 states “ ***He was cut off from the land of the living,***” and later in history its recorded that He was pierced with a spear to ensure that He died!

Verse 10 states “ ***He shall prolong His days,***” and later in history its recorded that in three days He rose from the dead!

A good friend presented me with a problem recently; couldn't Jesus have read Isaiah, and the other prophets, realized He fit, and manipulated all the rest? Do you know how much bribing and manipulating it would take to accomplish all of what we just read? And then to live a perfect life like we have recorded for us?? There is no possible way a normal human being would have been able to do it. All the types of Christ portrayed in the Old Testament; all the prophecies fulfilled. . . It's just not possible. The odds are very similar to the odds that nothing blew up, and evolved into everything. It would take a miracle and that's exactly what happened.

I apologize for only showing this passage from Isaiah, but for the sake of time I must go on.

How was it possible then for Isaiah to know what was going to happen?

Let me tell you how it's possible, and I'll put it like Eric Hovind did here recently: Either Isaiah knew everything, and that means EVERYTHING past, present, and future, OR, he knew Someone who knows everything. Is there anyone you know of in history that's been able to prophecy something that happened centuries later?? Isaiah's prophecy came true seven hundred years later! There's no way that is possible without the help of a higher power; Someone who knows the future. You cannot simply ignore this kind of evidence. You can't even simply explain it away! What possible explanation is there that would make any sense from a human perspective? There is none.

INSERT PICTURE

By the way, check out this chart while I go on here. Notice the accuracy of the New Testament manuscripts as compared to other secular history books? Mind boggling isn't it? How is that possible, seeing as the Bible is a complete fake, a forgery, a fraud! The credibility of all other history books pales when compared to the accuracy of the Bible. Look at the number of manuscript copies! 5600!! And 99.5% accuracy! Wow. . .

SUMMARY: We have records of prophecies made hundreds of years before Jesus was born of the virgin Mary. We have seen that even the best secular minds, including Richard Dawkins, know that Jesus walked on this earth. He was here. You can go to Israel today and walk down the Via Dolorosa on the same stones that He walked. We have seen from the best medical minds that Jesus certainly died, and not only ***certainly died***, but probably died ***before*** the spear even pierced His side! We have heard the testimony of more than just eleven trustworthy eye-witnesses who saw Jesus after He died, and also saw Him ascend into Heaven. The **only thing** we **haven't seen** is Jesus coming a ***second time***. It's going to happen, don't

worry! Every other promise Jesus made He has kept, I have no doubt He will keep that promise too.

The real question this morning, the one that **REALLY** needs answering is **NOT** “Did Jesus rise from the dead 2000 years ago?” The real question **is**: If **YOU** die today, where will you spend eternity? If you have trouble answering that question you are not a believer. Think about it for a minute: what is a believer? Someone who **believes**! If you are doubting, one thing is certain; you are not believing.

John 3:16

For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever BELIEVES in Him shall not die, but have everlasting life.

THAT'S the message of Easter! Not bunnies. Not eggs. Not controversy over the existence of God.

God exists, the proof is there. Infallible proofs, like prophecy! And He sent His Son to die for **you because you are a sinner. The proof is there on both accounts.** You don't need to change your life before you can be saved, but repentance and faith **will change your life!**

Romans 6:5-6 *For if we have been united together in the likeness of His death, certainly we also shall be in the likeness of His resurrection, knowing this, that our old man was crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be done away with, that we should no longer be slaves of sin.*

If you wait past today you could be too late, and tomorrow is no guarantee. If the Holy Spirit has touched you this morning now is the time to act!

INSERT PICTURE

Heaven and Hell are as real as the Word of God, don't spend eternity wishing you hadn't denied what you knew to be true.

Today we celebrate the resurrection of Jesus Christ, Who died and rose again for the salvation of all mankind. This is a good day to give your life to Him.