

Part Four

Calvary Academy for Christian Development Lesson Outline

Christian Family Value System

Developing a Biblical Worldview

May 17, 2021

Any discussions about faith will always lead to questions about the Bible. The Bible is the *foundation* for what we believe and lays down the truths that we rely upon. For us, it is the key resource for settling questions, the final authority when we can't agree. Resting firm on the Bible's full Authority, without wavering or compromising its truth or our faith, is how we develop a biblical worldview—the lens through which we discern what's right and what's wrong in the eyes of God.

Lesson 2: Foundation - Establishing a Christ Centered Home

- Apologetics: Jesus – More than just a great Teacher

Q: Could Jesus have survived the Crucifixion?

All four gospels say he did not. In fact, **John 19:31-35** records that he died even earlier than expected. Since the Jews wanted the bodies to be removed before the Passover, the Roman soldiers came and broke the legs of those crucified. This way the victim loses all control over his body and dies quicker - there is little mercy even in that. But when the soldiers came to Jesus, he was already dead.

He wasn't just unconscious - the Romans made sure that he was dead by piercing his side with a spear. The fact that there was a sudden flow of blood and water didn't just prove that he was dead but even tells anatomists *how he had died* - rupture of the heart.

In **Mark 15:42-46** we read that, when Joseph of Arimathea came and asked for the body of Jesus, Pilate was quite surprised that he was already dead. He

asked the centurion if that was so and the centurion confirmed it. He probably had seen hundreds of executions, so he knew what he was talking about.

So, one thing is for sure - when Jesus was taken from the cross and placed in the tomb, *he was surely dead*.

- **Jesus rose from the dead.**

Again, all four gospels are very clear about that (**Matthew 28:1-7, Mark 16:1-6, Luke 24:1-8, John 20:10-17**). They describe how the women went to the tomb and found the stone rolled away and the grave empty. An angel was there and told them that Jesus wasn't there anymore but had risen. In **John 20:5-7** we read that the linen and burial cloth, folded up and separate from the linen, was still there. One thing is for sure - whoever was in that grave before didn't need the linen and burial cloth anymore - because he was alive.

Q: Could it have been that the disciples stole the body instead?

This is hardly possible. After all, the tomb was guarded by Roman soldiers and the disciples were too afraid to try to sneak past them, break the seal and take the body away. Besides, as devout Jews they were probably busy with their Passover duties. Furthermore, they wouldn't have taken the time to unwrap the body and fold the burial cloth before sneaking the body out again. Finally, the apostles didn't believe what the women told them (**Luke 24:9-12**), which doesn't make sense if they stole the body.

But we don't just have an empty tomb with a body missing. Jesus was alive. Hundreds of people have seen him in the next 40 days. Right after the disciples left the grave, he showed himself to Mary Magdalene (**John 20:10-17**), to the women who returned from the tomb (**Matthew 28:9-10**), to Peter (**Luke 24:34**), to the disciples on their way to Emmaus (**Luke 24:13-33**), to the apostles (**Luke 24:36-43, John 20:19-29**), later even to more than 500 believers at the same time (**1. Corinthians 15:6**).

So, Jesus didn't just disappear after he died - *he rose*.

- **Jesus rose in bodily form.**

The Gospels are clear about the fact that Jesus did rise in the same body that was placed in the tomb. Fortunately, we have the account of Thomas, who wasn't present at the time when Jesus showed himself to the apostles the first time (**John 20:24-28**). Thomas is a down-to-earth character. He only believes what he sees with his own eyes. He even said that he wouldn't

believe unless he was able to touch Jesus - and this is what finally convinced him that Jesus had in fact risen from the dead.

Q: Why, do you think this story is reported in the Bible?

It is written for all those who doubt that Jesus rose in bodily form. Thomas checked it out. He touched him and then he exclaims "My Lord and my God". What was standing in front of him was the Jesus he knew, the Jesus he had watched die, now alive again. There is no doubt about it.

Luke gives another important account. In **Luke 24:36-44** Jesus appears to His disciples but they believe they see a ghost. After all, Jesus is dead, isn't he? But Jesus, seeing their trouble, invites them to touch him "a ghost doesn't have flesh and bones, as you see I have". What can be clearer than that? And to top that he even asked them to give him something to eat. And the fish they gave him, didn't drop to the ground, as it would have when given to a spirit without physical body, but it was eaten by Jesus.

In **Luke 24:30-31, John 21:1-14, Acts 1:3** we have further accounts that emphasize Jesus' physical presence after his death.

So, the Bible clearly states that Jesus did in fact die and rise again, and that he rose in bodily form. We wouldn't need any more proof, but it is sometimes helpful to know that there is a lot of external evidence which confirms what the Bible says.

- Ignatius (AD 50-115), Bishop of Antioch attests to the crucifixion of Jesus Christ and that he rose again after three days. He relies on accounts of eyewitnesses that he personally spoke to.
- Both Jewish and Roman historians record that there were many eyewitnesses to the resurrection.

The Jewish historian Josephus records Jesus' crucifixion and that he had been seen by many eyewitnesses afterwards.

Tertullian (AD 160-220) writes that the Jews almost forced Pontius Pilate, the Roman governor of Syria, to sentence Jesus to death by crucifixion. He also states that Christ's ascension is far more certain than the alleged resurrection of some other well-known person (Romulus). That is as close to a historical proof as one can get from a Non-Christian.

Plinius, governor in Asia Minor in AD 112, writes to the Roman emperor that Christians were willing to die for their testimony, since he doesn't know how to handle the fact that he had to put so many of them to death.

- Ten thousands of researchers have gone through the records to see if they couldn't come up with at least one piece of evidence against the resurrection. They found nothing. Instead they found over and over again accounts of steadfast first- and second-century Christians who accepted contempt, opposition, persecution, imprisonment, torment, and even death. These early Christians had every reason to check out the basis for their beliefs. Some claimed to be eyewitnesses, others could track down a chain of people back to those witnesses, each checking out the reliability of the one before him. The fact that none of them wavered in his testimony indicates that they didn't just rely on some fictitious narration but on something that they had found to be the truth - the resurrection of Jesus Christ.
- Consider also the immediate consequences of the resurrection on the people who were eyewitnesses and on society.

Think of the transformation of a band of defeated cowards hiding behind locked doors one day **John 20:19-23** into a company that no persecution could silence anymore. No fabricated myth would have accomplished such a dramatic change.

Think of the church that got started on account of their testimony. For centuries it suffered from severe persecution, but no attempt to erase Christianity has ever succeeded. There would have been no Christianity if the belief in the resurrection wouldn't have a thorough foundation on truth.

Think of the many Christians over the past 2000 years whose life was radically changed after they turned from unbelief to Christ. No other reason than that Christ is actually alive can sufficiently explain that. No indoctrination, no matter how thoroughly can account for so many transformed lives.

- Consider the fact that the Jews tried to disprove the resurrection right from the beginning. They persecuted Christians (**Acts 9:1-2**) to make them deny Christ. If resurrection had all been a lie, they would have found out somehow where the body of Jesus Christ really was. But they couldn't produce the body - because it wasn't there.

Paul encountered mockery in Athens (**Acts 17:32**) when he talked about the resurrection of Christ - why not in Jerusalem? Because it was a known fact that the tomb was empty and that the body could not be found.

It is a good thing to be skeptical and check out things before you believe them. The Bereans did that (**Acts 17:11**) and were highly commended for this. But once the facts are clear it is irrational to reject the logical conclusions.

And this is exactly what refusing to believe in the resurrection is about. It is irrational, not based on facts but on the *dogma that there cannot be any supernatural events*. This however is a presupposition that is hard to justify. It would be the same as saying ``*there are no subatomic particles - it's just a myth physicists dreamed up to get money from the government. We can't see them, so they don't exist.*'' and completely rejecting any plausible evidence to the contrary. It doesn't make sense to argue that way, because it is detached from common sense and instead based on an absolute claim that cannot be substantiated.

Summary:

Since

- *the Bible*, the infallible Word of God, *attests* to the physical resurrection of Jesus Christ,

- there are *hundreds of eyewitnesses* which couldn't all have been liars or lunatics, and

- there are many *visible consequences*, which can only be explained if resurrection is for real

there is again only one logical conclusion: **physical resurrection is a fact**

Specific refutation of the objections

Now let us go back to the specific objections that people raised. We have enough evidence to prove them wrong. But if that shouldn't be enough to make people at least think about the possibility that Jesus did in fact rise from the dead, we can even show that these objections don't make sense - given the historical facts that we know about these times.

The Swoon Theory:

This theory claims that resurrection is a myth because Jesus never died in the first place. He only swooned - didn't show any visible life signs but was still alive when he was placed in the tomb. After several hours, he was revived by the cool air of the tomb, got up, took off his burial cloth and departed.

Q: Could that be a plausible explanation for what happened?

After all, medical knowledge wasn't that great at the time so the people who thought that he was dead could very well have been wrong. Aren't we told in **Mark 15:44** that Pilate was surprised that he was already dead? Doesn't that mean that most victims of crucifixion would still be alive at this time and Jesus, suffering from all the loss of blood and pain, probably just had passed out completely? And isn't it plausible that he did recover in the tomb after resting in the cool for several hours? Wasn't it pure ignorance on behalf of his disciples to assume that nobody

could survive crucifixion and that he must have been resurrected from the dead when they saw him alive again?

If we look at it from this angle, the theory seems to have some truth in it. But a closer look reveals that the theory - apart from being contradicted by all the evidence we presented - has several major flaws. Let us try to answer a few questions to find out how plausible the theory is in the light of what we know.

- *Did Jesus have a chance to survive crucifixion?*

I described crucifixion to you. It is a procedure so brutal, that even those who were taken off before they died seldom recovered. Once you're on that cross for more than an hour, your chances of surviving are almost zero - even under the most favorable circumstances.

Were the circumstances favorable for Jesus? This can hardly be said.

In **Mark 15:15,19** we read that Jesus was flogged and beaten on the head again and again before he was led out to be crucified. Many victims of flogging did not survive at all - shall we assume that he just shrugged it off and was still in perfect condition when he was nailed to the cross? According to **Mark 15:21** he couldn't even carry his own cross anymore! And then he was on the cross for more than 6 hours (**Mark 15:25,34-37**).

It is difficult to imagine that even the most powerful of men, after enduring all this, would not succumb to death.

- *But suppose for the argument's sake that he was still alive, when the Romans checked on him - could it be that they mistakenly declared him dead?*

The argument here is that the Romans didn't have enough medical knowledge to know whether a man is dead or still weakly alive. There is a certain amount of modern Western arrogance in that argument - as if there wasn't any medical knowledge in the ancient times. Can we rightfully claim that soldiers who had seen hundreds of dead and half-dead people, wouldn't know the difference?

Several executioners had examined Jesus before he was taken off the cross. One even pierced his side and saw a sudden flow of blood and water (**John 19:34**) - something you wouldn't see if a person is still alive. The Romans knew that as well as we know that today. How can anyone who wasn't at the scene, claim 2000 years later, that all this is nonsense and that Jesus wasn't dead after all? That simply doesn't make sense.

- *But, let's assume that in some miraculous way he did survive, and nobody noticed - how did he get out of the tomb again?*

Given that nobody realized that he was still alive, Jesus couldn't have been too vigorous when he was placed in the tomb. After all, he had been tortured severely, beaten on the head, lost an incredible amount of blood, was dehydrated, his ligaments were torn from hanging on that cross - and he had not received food, drink, or medical attention for more than 24 hours.

Now let's assume that the cool air did bring him back to consciousness again. How would he free himself from the many yards of grave clothes that were tightly wrapped around him? Even a healthy man will have trouble getting out of these. And if he got out of the grave clothes, how did he overcome the next obstacle - the stone that the three women together felt incapable of moving away (**Mark 16:2-3**). Where did he find all this strength after having suffered so severely? It is hardly realistic to believe that this is possible.

- *Well, let's go on with the argument and assume that he did get out. Could he have been completely well the next day?*

It was just a little more than a day after Jesus was taken from the cross. He had been so weak that he was taken for dead. He obviously was wounded severely. What would we do today with a person whose body had been so abused so badly just a day before? We would keep him in a hospital for at least a week with all the medical attention possible. Just think of the soldier (Jessica Lynch) that was sneaked out of the Hospital in Iraq - she spent more than a week in a hospital in Germany before they even started to think of moving her back to the US ... and you can be sure that Jesus was treated worse than she was. Can anyone believe that he was capable of moving around as if nothing had happened?

But according to **Matthew 28:9-10**, Jesus appeared pretty healthy when the women saw him. They worshiped him - so apparently there wasn't any need to attend to his wounds. In **Luke 24:13-31** we read that he walked 7 miles with the disciples to the village of Emmaus and then showed himself to the apostles. Does that sound like a person who had been tortured less than 48 hours ago? How likely is that?

- *Even if all the above could be explained, where did he go afterwards?*

His disciples saw him for 40 days and then he disappeared. Nobody ever saw him again, not even his closest friends. If even one person had seen him after Pentecost, even the slightest rumor that Jesus would still be alive on earth would have sent people searching. The Jews would have tried to find him to prove that all this rumor of resurrection and ascension is nonsense. Others would have hoped to see another miracle. The young church would

have fallen apart because many people would have doubted Peter's preaching. The early Christians, so rich in legends about fictitious and real characters, don't have a single legend about Jesus still being alive at that time.

So, Jesus must have withdrawn into total solitude while His church was rising around him, shaking the world in its foundations. He had no contact to any person in the world. He was absent from all of it, didn't even once desire to go into the world of people and find out. Why? How come he changed his character so suddenly into somebody who has no similarity to the Jesus we know before the crucifixion and the Jesus that appeared to his disciples? Does that seem plausible?

Looking at all the above arguments the swoon theory wouldn't make sense even if we wouldn't have all the evidence for Jesus' death and resurrection. And the evidence we have speaks so strongly against the swoon theory, that no rational person can honestly believe in it.

The Theft Theory:

This theory is the most popular attempt to deny the resurrection. According to this view, the disciples came during the night, stole the body from the tomb, and made it disappear. Later they spread the rumor that Jesus had risen from the dead and used the empty tomb as proof for their false claims.

Matthew 27:62-65, 28:11-15 records that this theory came into being immediately after the resurrection of Christ. The Jewish leadership was well aware of Jesus' claims that he would rise on the third day - probably much better than his disciples were at the time. They asked Pilate for guards as a protective measure and when that failed, they wanted the soldiers to tell that the disciples must have stolen the body. Initially they were quite successful, at least among the Jews. Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and others, when they write about the crucifixion also state that the disciples had stolen the body and deceived the people by delaying the public announcement until the 50th day, when the decayed body of Jesus had become unrecognizable.

Q: Can there be any truth to this argument?

Let's do a careful logical analysis again. While the empty grave doesn't necessarily prove the resurrection, it is a fact that needs to be explained. Someone must have interfered - the only question is who? There are only two possible answers - the empty tomb was *either a divine work or a human one*. We will show that the latter is impossible, so it must have been God whose work we see here.

So, let us assume that the body of Jesus Christ was removed by somebody. Who could have done this? Jesus' friends or his enemies? Did either of these have any reason or the power to do so? And if they actually did, wouldn't they have behaved differently in the following months and years? Let us take a closer look.

- *Much precaution was taken in securing the tomb against theft.* In **Matthew 27:62-65** we read that the chief priests and Pharisees explicitly asked Pilate to prevent that from happening. The tomb was sealed, and a Roman guard was posted.

Isn't it great that God allowed this to happen? Without the soldiers present at the tomb, it might have been possible that somebody stole the body. But because of the guard, the empty tomb is a much stronger evidence for what really happened.

- *Nobody took the body by force.* This is quite obvious because the soldiers didn't report that they were attacked. And besides, no unarmed person would dare attacking a Roman guard - after all, they were trained soldiers.
- *Nobody could have sneaked past the soldiers while they were awake.* After all, they were standing right in front of the grave and would have noticed anybody who was trying to get in.
- *The Roman guard could not have fallen asleep.* Military discipline among the Romans was extremely high, definitely higher than military discipline that we see in today's armies. It is well documented that the punishment for quitting post, sleeping on duty, and many other violations was *death*, not just some minor penalty. Various historical writers describe that the fear of punishment produced faultless attention to duty, especially during night watches.

Anyone who believes that even one of the guards at the tomb fell asleep overnight has not the slightest idea of what he is talking about. You have to assume that all of the soldiers present were irresponsible weaklings who didn't care about their job and had nothing to fear. You may see such sloppiness in TV series that ridicule military life, but when it comes to the Roman army, nothing could be further away from the truth.

- *Even if the soldiers were asleep, nobody could have taken the body out of the tomb without them noticing.* We have to keep in mind that there was a large stone in front of the tomb. Moving that stone would certainly have awakened at least one of the guards.
- *The guard's testimony that the disciples stole the body (Matthew 28:13-15) is nonsense.* If they were sleeping, how could they have seen the disciples? And if they were awake, why should they allow the disciples to take the

body? It simply doesn't make sense. Besides, admitting that they had fallen asleep or that they had allowed the body to be stolen was suicidal. They would have come up with some other story.

But the fact that they made exactly this nonsensical statement shows that they knew it to be wrong, that their superiors wouldn't believe them anyway, and that the chief priests would keep them out of trouble.

- *The grave clothes give a silent testimony that the body wasn't stolen secretly.* No one, who sneaks past a Roman guard, sleeping or not, to steal Jesus' body would have taken the time to unwrap the body, fold the clothes properly (**John 20:6-7**) and then leave with the body. They would have left as quickly as possible. But the orderliness of the scene indicates that this didn't happen - it is inconsistent with the whole concept of secretly snatching a body out of the grave.
- *The disciples didn't have the courage to steal the body.* When Jesus was arrested, everyone deserted him and fled (**Mark 14:50**). Peter even denied that he knew Jesus (**Mark 14:66-72**). It makes little sense that just a day later the disciples would assemble so much courage to go to the tomb, try to subdue the entire guard, and take the body out of the grave. They wouldn't even try that, because they had no reason to hope that they could get past the guard unnoticed.
- *The disciples did not even have a reason to steal the body.* They couldn't do more for their Lord than had already been done. And they certainly didn't have the desire to steal the body, spread a lie about his resurrection, and then try to make money by starting a church.

After all, they didn't understand the significance of the resurrection before they received the Holy Spirit, so they wouldn't know why they should claim that it happened if it did not. And secondly, starting a fake church within the Jewish society certainly wouldn't promise them any earthly rewards. They couldn't make money out of that but gave up everything they had, went to prison, 11 out of 12 apostles and many other disciples paid with their lives -- for something they believed to be a lie?

The whole idea that the disciples took the body is totally inconsistent.

- *Nobody else could have taken the body.* The Jews had no reason to do so in the first place. But even if they did, they would have produced the body as soon as the disciples started preaching the resurrection. How much easier could it get for them to discredit the Apostle's teachings?

Joseph of Arimathea wouldn't have moved the body without telling the apostles either before or afterwards. He was a secret follower and he

wouldn't have been silent about what he knew after the word about the resurrection was out. And besides, he surely couldn't have done it alone.

The Romans, too, had absolutely no reason to move the body. Pilate wanted peace, not some new teaching that would stir up unrest.

In conclusion, the facts of the case and common-sense reasoning speak clearly against the theory that Christ's body was moved. Isn't it great that God allowed the Jews to have guards placed in front of the tomb? This way we really know for sure that Jesus' body couldn't have been stolen. Without the soldiers present that might have been a possibility. But the way things are, we can be sure that Christ's body wasn't stolen, but resurrected by God.

The Hallucination Theory:

This theory is an attempt to disregard the Biblical testimony without explicitly stating that the Biblical account is wrong. It doesn't question that the disciples had seen Jesus appear to them, but it claims that these appearances weren't for real - they were just hallucinations. After all, the disciples had been under a lot of stress. They had lost their beloved Lord, remembered that he had predicted to rise on the third day, and then their mind was just playing tricks with them - they saw him, because they so deeply desired to see him.

At a first glance, the hallucination theory appears plausible to some degree. After all, these things do happen. We hear of a mother who lost her son in the war, sits at home meditating over the past, and suddenly thinks she sees him come through the door and even has a conversation with him. There is a movie about a brilliant mathematician who talked to an imaginary friend for years. Even mass hallucinations do happen.

Q: So, could it be the case that the disciples just had visions?

A closer look shows that the hallucination theory has some serious flaws.

- *Only particular kinds of people are prone to hallucinations.* You have to be highly imaginative (that's why some brilliant people cross the border to madness), emotionally somewhat unstable, and nervous or under a lot of stress.

But Jesus appeared to a variety of people of different psychological make-up and in different moods. Mary Magdalene (**John 20:10-17**) was weeping, to the women returning from the tomb (**Matthew 28:9-10**) were afraid, Peter (**Luke 24:34**) was full of remorse, Thomas (**John 20:24-28**) was down to earth and didn't want to believe, the Emmaus disciples (**Luke 24:13-33**) were distracted, the disciples in **John 21:1-14** were busy fishing, and the

500 believers mentioned in **1. Corinthians 15:6** were certainly not all of the same mindset.

- *All eyewitnesses testified to the resurrection for the rest of his life.* If all these people had only hallucinations, they must have continued to live in that mindset for the rest of their lives. Otherwise they would have recounted their testimony and disregarded it as a vision when they were threatened for their beliefs.

While somebody could claim that this may be the case for a handful of disciples, the transformed lives of Peter, Paul, Stephen, James, and many others show that this could not have been the case for *all* of them. People who are continuously subject to hallucinations do not become moral heroes, they do not appear as down-to-earth characters, strong leaders with practical wisdom.

- *There were many appearances and hundreds of witnesses.* They all saw the same Jesus and they all agree in their testimony. Mass hallucinations are extremely rare. You rarely find even two people who had visions about the same person and agree on what they saw. It is even more difficult if the visions happen on different occasions

Does it make sense to assume that 11 apostles, including the sober, doubting Thomas fell into a self-deception at the same time and envisioned exactly the same fairly complex event that we read about in **John 20:24-28**? Is it possible that the same happened simultaneously to 500 people? Is it possible that hundreds of people have exactly the same vision at the most different times and places but appear to be quite rational in all other situations?

- *Jesus' appearances appealed to different human senses.* The disciples saw him, talked with him, touched him, watched him eat. It is extremely unlikely that even two people would agree on what they experienced if the appearances had been mere hallucinations.
- *Hallucinations require people to be in some anticipating spirit.* Deep inside they must *want* to see what they believe to have seen. But Christ's followers were caused to believe *against their will*. They had other things on their mind. On three occasions (**Luke 24:13-33, John 20:15, 21:4**) the disciples didn't even recognize Jesus before he revealed himself.
- *Hallucinations usually recur regularly over a long period of time.* They either recur more frequently until a point of crisis is reached or less frequently until they fade away.

Both did not happen. The appearances stopped suddenly after 40 days, when the Lord ascended to Heaven (except for Paul, who had his only vision much

later). They didn't fade, and there was no point of crisis that made them go away. Not even one of the early eyewitnesses ever saw Jesus again.

- *If all appearances were just hallucinations, Jesus' body was still in the tomb.* The Jews could easily have produced the body when all this talk about the resurrection came up.

All in all, the biblical facts, common sense, and all insights of modern psychiatry speak against the hallucination theory and it would be irrational to hold on to it.

The Wrong Tomb Theory:

The basic idea of this theory is fairly simple. The women, and subsequently everyone else, went to the wrong tomb. The neighborhood of Jerusalem is full of rock tombs and you need precise notes to find a specific grave. Given all the confusion on the day of the crucifixion the women weren't careful enough to take precise notes where they laid him. After all, they could only watch from a distance. So, when they went back after the Sabbath, they probably went to the wrong tomb, found it empty, and were really confused. A gardener, working in the tomb guessed their intentions and tried to tell them that they had made a mistake. He said ``*You are looking for Jesus the Nazarene who was crucified. He is not here - see the place where they laid him*"', and probably pointed to the right tomb. But the women were frightened and fled the scene.

Q: Isn't that what (Mark 15:47-16:8) writes? Could they have gone to the wrong tomb?

Again, this theory is plausible only as long as you read the biblical accounts superficially.

- *The women knew exactly where the tomb was.* Both **Matthew 27:61** and **Luke 23:55** record that Mary, the mother of Jesus and Mary Magdalene observed carefully where the tomb was. They weren't at a distance. Matthew writes that they were sitting opposite the tomb. Luke makes clear that the women followed Joseph of Arimathea to the grave. One of the women was His mother - don't you think she would remember exactly where he was?
- *Peter and John ran to the tomb independently (John 20:3-8).* They didn't wait for the women to lead them to the grave, but ran. That means they knew where it was, too. How come they ran to the wrong tomb too? Even if they did make a mistake, it is inconceivable that they would end up at the same grave where the women had been.

- *If everyone went to the wrong tomb, Jesus' body was still in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea.* When the new teaching about the resurrection came up, the Sanhedrin could simply have gone to the correct grave and produced the body. That would have silenced the disciples forever.
- *The gardener could have solved the problem.* It is hard to imagine that he wouldn't remember what happened that morning when the apostles started preaching the resurrection. Why didn't he tell his side of the story?

The explanation is simple. There was no gardener in the first place. **Matthew 28:1-10** tells us that the young man was an angel of the Lord. And why should any gardener have worked in a cemetery at such an early hour? Why would he be *sitting* inside the tomb (it is way too early for a break)?

- *Certainly, Joseph of Arimathea would have solved the problem.* Even if everyone, the Jews, the Roman guard, the woman, and the disciples had gone to the wrong grave, Joseph of Arimathea definitely knew where his tomb was. He was the owner, and he would have gone to the grave to check out whether all this talk about the resurrection would be true.
- *The gospel of Mark is quoted incorrectly. (Mark 16:6)* records that the young man said ``*You are looking for Jesus the Nazarene who was crucified. He has risen! He is not here - see the place where they laid him.*'' If the text is quoted correctly, the whole idea that the young man pointed to some other grave doesn't make sense. He explicitly says that Jesus has risen - that's the reason why he is not in the grave anymore.

The Wrong Tomb Theory makes little sense. It doesn't arise from evidence but contradicts both evidence and common sense. Like all other theories that try to explain away the resurrection it arises from a disbelief in the possibility of God interfering with the natural course of events.

Summary

1. *The Bible*, the infallible Word of God, *attests* to the physical resurrection of Christ.
2. There are *hundreds of eyewitnesses* which couldn't all have been liars or lunatics.
3. There are many *visible consequences*, which can't be explained unless resurrection is for real.
4. All theories that try to refute the resurrection are inconsistent - they don't make sense.

If we take all this together, there remains only one logical conclusion: **The bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ is a proven fact.**