

PROPHECY REFUTES THE RESURRECTION

The Christian Church teaches that Jesus died on the cross and rose again three days later leaving his tomb empty and then for a while he appeared to his followers. It says the resurrection fulfilled Old Testament predictions made by God through the prophets and Jesus' own predictions that he would rise again. To defend this idea, the Church uses the Old and New Testaments in the Bible.

When somebody makes a prophecy, the principle thing is showing that it definitely was made before the event it predicted. There is no such assurance with the prophecies Jesus made about his rising. Not a single Old Testament prophecy can be proven to have been made before the event. The evidence for example that Daniel was written when it pretends to have been is lacking and is too open to interpretation. It shows clear examples of prophecies written down after the event - that is, cheating. That Jesus was going to depend on Old Testament lies and unreliable faith forgers says a lot about him.

In Luke 24 Jesus did not say "I am the Son of God and his prophet because I have risen from the dead and been seen", but said that he was to rise for the law and the prophets said it and the prophets' words verified the resurrection. The function of the witnesses is to say that the prophets have been fulfilled with regard to the resurrection more than to say that the resurrection happened but they were only allowed to believe in the resurrection because they saw it predicted (Luke 24:45-48).

Christians never worry about the fact that Jesus lied. The law and the prophets never mentioned the rising of the Messiah or of Jesus. The Old Testament prophecies of the resurrection are said to be ambiguous at best and are too scarce of detail to give us confidence in Christ. We never know if they mean recovering from serious life threatening illness or a resurrection. Or so we are told. But the most natural interpretation is that they refer to getting better from life endangering illness. So we do know. Far fetched interpretations of a text are fantasies not interpretations.

In the Dives and Lazarus parable Jesus teaches that even a resurrection will not convince those who will not listen to the prophets and the Law of Moses. This puts his own resurrection below the prophets in importance. If the prophets did not prophesy a resurrection then it never happened. We have Jesus' word for it.

In Matthew 22, Jesus was asked by the Jews that if seven men marry the same woman whose wife she will be in the resurrection. "But Jesus answered and said to them, "You are mistaken, not understanding the Scriptures nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven." The claim is that the Scriptures answer the question - they do not for they do not mention the resurrection as connected to marriage. And the power of God has nothing to do with it. God could be as powerful if a woman is married to her first husband or to none of the husbands. Jesus was anxious about lying about resurrection texts wasn't he? The same story appears in Mark the oldest and most credible gospel so if Mark is largely historical then Jesus was truly a liar.

Jesus stressed prophecy as his credential and said that his resurrection would only be a credential for him if it were prophesied. But his prophecies of the resurrection could have been written after the event. Even if Jesus fitted all the other prophecies the fact that the major one was not there and he thought it would prove that he was not the subject of the prophecies at all. Only a false prophet makes mistakes like that for there is no point in making prophecies if the subject of the prophecies who has to show that they are fulfilled misinterprets, for he would only be the subject if he were a prophet himself and able to see what the prophets meant.

The New Testament is telling us that prophecy is the supreme proof. But Jesus failed to prophesy his own resurrection in a convincing way! This points to him being a hoaxer, or if you like a hoaxer who got the assistance of the Devil, or to the gossellers being liars. Christianity is not based on faith but self-deception.

THE "PROPHESIED" RESURRECTION

Jesus thought that Isaiah 53 was a prophecy of him. It said that the servant of God would make his grave with the bad people and the rich in his two deaths according to the strict translation (page 198, The Passover Plot). This suggests that Jesus had to die for a minute on the cross and then die permanently later. Jesus could have planned to survive the crucifixion on the basis of this text.

Jesus said of his body that it was the Temple he would destroy and raise up in three days. This analogy looks like Jesus is saying his body would be burnt to ashes or something and be completely restored for the Temple would be turned into a heap of stones. All the gospels say that this never happened to Jesus though perhaps the John gospel is hinting that Jesus was removed from the tomb and cremated and it forgets this later. If destroyed just means being made lifeless Jesus is not

saying he will be restored to life on the third day. He says he will rebuild in three days so it could be a gradual process with him being alive all the time. In other words, he is rejuvenating after severe bodily trauma and injury. He told the apostles that he would rise in three days from the dead and Peter and the apostles knew what he meant (Matthew 16). His friends would have taken his body from the tomb in case he would rise and be killed again.

Jesus said that the Father loves him for dying and rising and then that nobody can take his life from him (John 10). His life was taken from him at the crucifixion. Christians say he used the killers to kill him so that it was not they who were taking his life. Interpretations like that make words useless. Take the plain sense. And the Bible does not say that God has that much control over free will. Is Jesus saying he will not die at all?

In the first three gospels, Jesus clearly predicts in detail what is going to happen to him and that he will be crucified etc. Obviously, the prophecies were written after the event for the gospels were.

If it were any other book that was doing this the Christians would be saying the prophecies were fraudulent. The verses that say the apostles forgot he said this say as much for they would not have forgotten that so the fact that Jesus never said it was disguised with the excuse that they had bad memories.

Deuteronomy 18 says that even if a prophet gives lots of correct revelations and one is in error the prophet must be entirely rejected. This implies that prophecy and not miracle is the test of a true prophet. Jesus did not provably declare his resurrection before it happened. If there had been anything supernatural happening in this we would be reading this in Isaiah or Jeremiah or somewhere, "And in many years from now, there shall be one that shall open his arms in death and he shall be carried from the high place of death. And where his remains will lie they will lie for a few days and then they shall not be there and he shall appear and he shall announce his resurrection from the dead." This is vague enough and yet clear enough. It mixes the right level of obscurity with the right level of detail unlike the prophecies Jesus depended on which have too many possible meanings. Only a false prophet gives false proofs for his mission. Jesus stands condemned by Deuteronomy 18. He didn't even try to pass the test. His prophecy about the destruction of Jerusalem was based on the Old Testament habit of predicting destruction for Jerusalem if it did not obey God and he thought it was apostate so it had nothing to do with seeing the future and everything with religious prejudice. And besides, the rest of his prophecies haven't happened yet. What right has a man to claim to be a prophet who should be obeyed by the people when his prophecies are not all fulfilled yet?

After the resurrection, Peter lied to a gullible crowd about Psalm 16 that said that God will not abandon his beloved to decay saying it was a prophecy of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. It only says that someone will be saved from death. It is too vague to read a resurrection into it and there is no need to. Remember, stick to the simplest interpretation. Jesus certainly agreed with this interpretation for he said that his resurrection was forecasted and there was nothing else in the Old Testament that came close to predicting it. But if it is a real prophecy then it supports the idea that Jesus survived death by crucifixion and was nursed back to health not that he rose again.

THE SIGN OF JONAH

When Lazarus dies and gets buried Jesus waits for four days before going to the tomb to raise him up. Jesus admits beforehand that his behaviour is about a plan to glorify God. If it is correct that his religion thought a dead body is alive three days after it dies for the soul is still there then Jesus had a reason to wait until day four. It was to be sure that Lazarus was really and properly dead to raise him up. Trouble is it means that Jesus is denying his own resurrection which happened in less than three days is a real resurrection or miracle!

In Matthew 12, after Jesus cast out a devil and chastised the Jewish leaders for saying it was the Devil did it he thought he had proven to them he could do miracles for and by God. Then they asked him for a sign and he replied that this evil age looks for a sign but will get none but that of Jonah. Just like Jonah was in the belly of the whale for three days and three nights (Jonah 2:1) so Jesus said he would be inside the earth. He means that he will rise again. This is the only place where he talks like this.

In Luke 11 he tells the crowd that the evil age seeks a sign but will get only the sign of Jonah for Jesus will be to the people what Jonah, the prophet of repentance, was to Nineveh. Then he preaches that he means calling the people to repentance. Either this is additional stuff and is not parallel to Matthew or it is Luke changing what Matthew wrote for he did not like it. But it is the Matthew version that is important. In it Jesus says that the only miracle he will do will be to raise himself from the dead. The other signs Jesus does will not be as convincing because they will be and have been done in private but this one will be done in public and nobody will be able to refute it. Or it could mean that the miracles all except his own resurrection will be real miracles, the rest are indeed signs but only natural signs worked by God and so are not miracles. The ambiguity is important because it means the Christians cannot be sure if they were miracles. My book, Non-

Miraculous Witnesses, proves that the Christians misinterpret the Gospels and see miracle stories where none were perhaps intended.

Jonah was literally three days and three nights in the whale. Jesus said he would literally do the same when he compared himself to Jonah and indicated that Jonah pictured him. Christians say that Jesus was only doing what we all do using the words for three days and nights non-literally like we would say we did a day's work when we only worked seven hours. But then why did he use the word nights? Days would have done and suited a non-literal meaning better. Nights is an emphasis on the literalism. And prophets cannot afford to confuse. The Christians are just trying to make the prophecy fit Matthew's belief that Jesus was buried part of Friday and all of Saturday and part of Sunday two nights in the grave. And also, his listeners heard him make a prediction and saw no reason to take him other than literally. So Jesus intended for them to take him literally. But he was only part of Friday, all of Saturday and part of Sunday night in the tomb. He was a false prophet according to the Law of Moses and that was enough to prove that the resurrection was a fake. It is interesting that he says he will be deep inside the earth which may suggest that he was to be buried in the ground inside the tomb which could have been why the body was thought missing and then when the fuss started Joseph came and secretly took it away when nobody was about.

THE RESURRECTED ONE HIMSELF DENIED HE WOULD RISE!

If Jesus himself said that he would not rise from the dead that would be damning for Christianity.

Some feel that when Jesus told a thief on the day they were dying that they would be in Paradise that day and how he said he would not drink wine again in this world and even refused bad wine on the cross to make the point that he was clearly thinking he was going out of this world for good. The resurrection appearances could actually have been holograms or images rather than real appearances of Jesus.

The sign of Jonah is a hint that one of the stories made up by the Church denied that Jesus did any miracle apart from rising from the dead. There is actually a clue in the Sermon on the Mount that Jesus never intended to be crucified or rise from the dead at all. He left a simple test for working out who was a false prophet. He said false prophets act like sheep but are wolves in disguise and he said you can tell that they are fakes by their bad works, their bad fruits. So basically if they do or say anything that cannot be provably excused they are fakes. This is a very simple test and that was what Jesus intended it to be – so yarns about the prophet only seeming to be evil for there is a higher purpose for what he does which only he can fathom are out for they make the criterion useless. Jesus did a lot of terrible things like dragging around apostles after him while he put their lives at risk and his by claiming to be the Messiah.

He insulted a demonised girl to her mother. He failed his own test. But his ideal was to look good and his ideal proves that he never intended to be crucified and rise again for if he did then he would have blatantly failed his test.

He said that heaven and earth would pass away and his word would not. Christians say he meant the sky not God's abode which is a lie for in those days the sky was thought to be just that, God's abode.

Jesus here denied that he would ascend to Heaven to live forever or rise in an immortal body for where is he going to go when Heaven is destroyed? His word would last beyond these meaning that his message that they would pass away would still be true then. Even if he meant the New Testament scriptures by his word, who needs them in Heaven? What would be the point of rising from the dead and going to Heaven if he still had a mortal body? He also stated that the Devil is a burglar and ties up the strong man before raiding his house meaning that the Devil only does things that look good. He never gave any philosophical proof that his resurrection could not be the work of the Devil and it is worthless without that philosophical exploration. Evil is unreasonable so it follows that this lack proves that the resurrection was satanically powered and engineered.

Jesus' disciples did not fast and John's did. Jesus explained that he would not let his own do that for they had him with them meaning that it was a time for rejoicing (Mark 2). He remarked that you do not put patches from new things unto old. And he said that his own disciples should wait until he was out of the world before fasting. Fasting was done to discipline the body. Jesus is forbidding his apostles to do that. Perhaps he thought that fasting was not about discipline but about pain for the sake of pain. If it was party-time, as he said, then after his death should be a bigger party for he is now with God and better at helping us than ever. When Jesus said that now was the time for celebrating he had no intention of surviving death or rising from the dead at that time. He did not even believe in life after death.

In John 2, Jesus causes trouble in the Temple and claims authority to put the buyers and sellers and their animals and stock out. The Jews asked him where he got this authority and what evidence he had to show he had it. He replied that they should destroy this Temple and in three days he will raise it up. He didn't say what he meant by that. John says he meant the temple of his body which would die and be raised up again three days later. The Jews assumed he meant he would demolish the Temple and rebuild it in three days. From this they concluded that he was mad. Jesus is declaring that the resurrection is

his big proof that he is the Messiah, Son of God and whatever else he claims to be. Would Jesus have misled them that way and made them think he wished to demolish the Temple? What other interpretation could they take of him? Maybe that is what he meant. Especially when he was attacking the Temple physically. It is tempting to think that the resurrection story could have started with a missing tomb. Then the apostles remembering the prophecy about the Temple decided it was his body he meant not the real Temple and decided they had enough to go on to proclaim a resurrection. In any case, Jesus was claiming the right to meddle even violently in Temple affairs without giving any evidence that he had authority to do so. He needed that evidence before he could act. But he didn't let that stop him. John puts this episode at the start of Jesus' ministry when he hadn't even started his ministry with its alleged miracles which worsens it all. He was not to be trusted.

Jesus said in Mark's Gospel that false Christs would appear before the destruction of the Temple. He warned his own apostles to be very careful that these Christs would not lead them astray. The Temple was destroyed in 70 AD. The gospel was written about that time. But where were the Christs who were so plausible that even the apostles had to watch out in case they were taken in? Mark's gospel ends with angels saying that Jesus rose from the dead and was going to meet his apostles in Galilee. Then it stops. The rest of the chapter is a forgery. Putting two and two together, Jesus probably was only seen during one apparition in Galilee and the other appearances of the risen Christ were either the work of demons or men pretending to be Jesus. The false Christs were all the appearances of somebody pretending to be Jesus. Is that why Mark stopped the gospel there? Was it because though it was thought Jesus rose that only one of the appearances could be trusted?

The resurrection failed to be his big proof for nobody saw him rising. That can be taken as support for a literal interpretation of his Temple prophecy.

Conclusion

The evidence is that the New Testament lied that Jesus' resurrection was predicted. The fact that the New Testament depended on misquoted and distorted sources to establish that Jesus rose proves that he did not.

WORKS CONSULTED

- Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible, John W Haley, Whitaker House, Pennsylvania, undated
- Conspiracies and the Cross, Timothy Paul Jones, Front Line, A Strang Company, Florida, 2008
- Evidence that Demands a Verdict, Vol 1, Josh McDowell, Alpha Scripture Press Foundation, Bucks, 1995
- Handbook of Christian Apologetics, Peter Kreeft and Ronald Tacelli, Monarch, East Sussex, 1995
- In Defence of the Faith, Dave Hunt, Harvest House, Eugene, Oregon, 1996
- In Search of Certainty, John Guest Regal Books, Ventura, California, 1983
- Jesus and the Four Gospels, John Drane, Lion Books, Herts, 1984
- Jesus Lived in India, Holger Kersten, Element, Dorset, 1994
- Jesus the Evidence, Ian Wilson Pan, London 1985
- Mind Out of Time, Ian Wilson, Gollanez, London, 1981
- Mother of Nations, Joan Ashton, Veritas, Dublin, 1988
- The Bible Fact or Fantasy? John Drane, Lion Books, Oxford, 1989
- The Encyclopaedia of Bible Difficulties, Gleason W Archer, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1982
- The Holy Blood and the Holy Grail, Michael Baigent, Richard Leigh & Henry Lincoln, Corgi, London, 1982
- The Jesus Conspiracy, Holger Kersten and Elmar R Gruber, Element, Dorset, 1995
- The Messianic Legacy, Michael Baigent, Richard Leigh & Henry Lincoln, Corgi, London, 1987
- The Metaphor of God Incarnate, John Hick, SCM Press Ltd, London, 1993
- The Passover Plot, Hugh Schonfield, Element Books, Dorset, 1996
- The Resurrection Factor, Josh McDowell, Alpha Scripture Press Foundation, Bucks, 1993
- The Resurrection of Jesus, Pinchas Lapide, SPCK, London, 1984
- The Truth of Christianity, WH Turton, Wells Gardner, Darton & Co Ltd, London, 1905
- The Turin Shroud is Genuine, Rodney Hoare, Souvenir Press, London, 1998
- The Unauthorised Version, Robin Lane Fox, Penguin, Middlesex, 1992
- The Vatican Papers, Nino Lo Bello, New English Library, Sevenoaks, Kent, 1982
- The Virginal Conception and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus Raymond E Brown Paulist Press, New York, 1973
- The Womb and the Tomb, Hugh Montefiore, Fount – HarperCollins, London, 1992
- Verdict on the Empty Tomb, Val Grieve, Falcon, London, 1976
- Who Moved the Stone? Frank Morison, OM Publishing Cumbria, 1997
- Why People believe Weird Things, Michael Shermer, Freeman, New York, 1997