

IRREFUTABLE PROOF CHRISTIANITY IS TRUE

A Summary of the Works of Norman Geisler

by Shawn Nelson

IRREFUTABLE PROOF CHRISTIANITY IS TRUE:

A SUMMARY OF THE WORKS OF NORMAN GEISLER

Copyright © 2013 by Shawn Nelson.

Published by GeekyChristian.com, Temecula, CA. info@geekychristian.com

See bibliography for works summarized. Each work is under respective copyright by Dr. Norman Geisler.

For more free eBooks, visit <http://geekychristian.com/free-christian-ebooks/>

Introduction

Here's an irrefutable argument summarized from the works of Dr. Norman Geisler which proves God exists, Christianity is true, and anything opposed to biblical truth is false.

Where to Start?

You may prefer to start at the beginning and read all the way through. Or, if you find philosophy confusing (or boring!), you may just want to jump to those parts that you find most interesting. Either way, this material is deep. And it's a logical argument, so each point builds on the previous. It's recommended that this proof be digested in pieces, that you keep this reference in a safe place, and that you return back as needed to continue the next piece.

Guide to Jumping Ahead

You can click any of these links to jump ahead to what you're most interested in:

- [I want proof that God exists from philosophy.](#)
- [I want to see evidence that God exists from science.](#)
- [I want proof that miracles are possible.](#)
- [I want proof that the New Testament is reliable.](#)
- [I want proof that Jesus Christ is God in the flesh.](#)
- [I want evidence that Jesus was raised from the dead.](#)
- [I want proof that the entire Bible is the Word of God.](#)
- [I want to know why Christians are so narrow minded.](#)

Or, if you are fine with starting at the beginning, you can proceed from here.

Irrefutable Argument Proving Christianity is True

1. Truth about reality is knowable.
2. Opposites cannot both be true.
3. The theistic God exists.
4. Miracles are possible.
5. Miracles performed in connection with a truth claim are acts of God to confirm the truth of God through a messenger of God.
6. The New Testament documents are reliable.
7. As witnessed in the New Testament, Jesus claimed to be God.
8. Jesus' claim to divinity was proven by a unique convergence of miracles.
 - a. His claim was confirmed by his fulfillment of prophecies.
 - b. His claim was confirmed by his miraculous and sinless life.
 - c. His claim was confirmed by both his prediction and accomplishment of his resurrection.
9. Therefore, Jesus was God in human flesh.
10. Whatever Jesus (who is God) affirmed as true is true.
11. Jesus affirmed that the Bible is the Word of God.
12. Therefore, it is true that the Bible is the Word of God and whatever is opposed to any biblical truth is false.

(1) Truth about reality is knowable.

It will be argued here that (1) the correspondence view of truth is the only correct view of truth, (2) that truth is absolute, and that all other views are self-defeating, and therefore cannot be correct, and (3) that truth about reality is knowable.

The Correspondence View of Truth

Truth is what corresponds to its referent. Truth about reality is what corresponds to the way things really are. All non-correspondence views of truth imply correspondence, even as they attempt to deny it. The claim: "Truth does not correspond with what is" implies that this view corresponds to reality. Then the non-correspondence view cannot express itself without using a correspondence frame of reference.

The Absolute Nature of Truth

All truth is absolute. There are no relative truths. For if something is really true, it is really true for everyone

everywhere, and for all time. The statement $7 + 3 = 10$ is not just true for mathematics majors, nor is it true only in a mathematics classroom. It is true for everyone, everywhere.

Relativism is Self-Defeating

The claim that truth is relative is an absolute claim. People who say truth is not absolute but relative are saying that the only absolute truth is the statement, "There is no absolute truth." Or, if somebody says, "It is only relatively true that relativism is true" they suggest that statement might be false for some people (that it might be absolute).

The denial of absolute truth is self-defeating. It claims that relativism is true for everyone, everywhere, and always. But what is true for everyone, everywhere, and always is an absolute truth.

If relativism were true, the world would be full of contradictions. If one person says, "There is milk in the refrigerator", and the other insists, "there is no milk in the refrigerator"—and they are both right—then there must both be and not be milk in the refrigerator. If relativism were

true, I would be right even when I am wrong. It would mean that I could never actually learn anything, either, because learning is moving from a false belief to a true one—that is, from an absolutely false belief to an absolutely true one.

Agnosticism

While relativism denies absolute truth, epistemological or philosophical agnosticism denies *knowing* any truth. This type of agnosticism says that truth about reality is unknowable.

Agnosticism Relating to Knowledge

Epistemological agnosticism asserts that truth about reality is unknowable, that we only know appearance, not the underlying reality of something. This, however, is self-defeating. This kind of agnosticism claims to know the truth about reality that we cannot know any truth about reality.

Skepticism is similar to agnosticism. It holds that we should doubt all truth. We should suspend judgment on all truth claims about reality. We can only know sensory data, but

not the underlying reality. Skepticism is also self-defeating because the claim “we should be skeptical about everything” would include being skeptical about skepticism. It also claims that doubt is the only thing that should not be doubted.

Agnosticism Relating to God

In relation to God, there are two kinds of agnosticism. Strong agnosticism says we can't know anything for certain anything about the existence and nature of God. Weak agnosticism says we don't know anything for sure about God—but we could if we had enough evidence. Strong agnosticism is self-defeating. Somebody who says we cannot know anything for sure claims to know for certain that we cannot know anything for sure.

A weak agnostic is somebody who holds that God is unknown, or that we do not presently know for certain whether God exists, but that we *could* if we had enough evidence. Weak agnosticism, therefore, is not opposed to theism. It simply refrains from drawing a conclusion.

Limited vs. Unlimited Agnosticism

Agnosticism can be further defined as limited and unlimited.

Unlimited agnosticism holds that all reality (not just knowledge of God) is completely unknowable. Limited agnosticism holds that we can know something about the nature of God, but not everything because of human limitation. This latter view is compatible with theism (and is desirable).

Realism

One of the central problems of knowledge is how should we perceive the external world. There are three positions: realism, dualism and idealism. It will be argued here that realism is the correct view.

Dualism: Truth is Distorted by Perception

Dualism suggests there are two types of existence.¹ The first type of existence is the independent world which is external to us, and second is our perception of this world through our senses. It is argued that we cannot know anything for certain because there is a difference between what we perceive and reality. Ultimately dualism is reducible to skepticism, and like skepticism, it is self-defeating. The dualist who says, "We can never know truth about reality because of our distorted perceptions," is saying we can know *that* truth about reality.

Idealism: There is no External World to be Known

Idealism suggests that material objects cannot exist independently of the mind. There is no independent,

¹ Note that we are not talking about metaphysical but epistemological dualism.

external world of material objects but rather a subjective world that exists between states of consciousness. This view has never had a wide following because it goes against common sense. Even David Hume acknowledged the reality of the external world, and he was arguably the greatest skeptic who ever lived. We all seem to be aware that we could not be aware of anything unless there was something independent of our consciousness to be aware of, and therefore, external objects do in fact exist, apart from our own minds.

Realism: We Can Know the Real World

Finally, there is realism. In contrast to dualism and idealism, realism holds that there is a reality that exists which is external to our minds, and we can know it. Realists hold that our thoughts do in fact correspond to the real world.

Realism asserts that there are undeniable first principles by which we can know reality and that these first principles are self-evident. These first principles are discussed in the next section. Once these terms are known, it is clear (self-

evident) to a rational mind that they are true, and they form the basis for our ability to understand reality. If we did not have self-evident principles for knowing reality, we would have to conclude that it is impossible to know anything for certain about reality.

Realism seems to be the most plausible view. Therefore, it is logical to conclude through abductive reasoning that realism is true, and we can have accurate knowledge about the nature of reality. Realism argues against agnosticism and skepticism.

(2) Opposites cannot both be true. First Principles

Realism affirms that there are undeniable self-evident principles by which we can know reality. These principles are the foundation for knowledge. Without these principles, nothing about reality could be known. As we shall see, these principles prove that theism is true, namely that there is one infinite being and at least one finite being.

List of First Principles

Here is the list of self-evident First Principles. They are literally undeniable because one cannot deny them without using them.

(1) *The Principle of Existence* (being is or exists).² Something exists. The one who denies this by saying "I don't exist" must exist in order to deny it.

² The term "being" is defined here as "that which is" and non-being is that which is not.

(2) *The Principle of Identity* (being is being). A thing is identical to itself. This cannot be denied unless it is implied. Asserting that "A is not identical to A" assumes that A is identical to itself otherwise one could not know the other is not identical to it.

(3) *The Principle of Non-Contradiction* (being is not non-being). Opposites cannot both be true at the same time and in the same sense. This is undeniable since the claim "opposites can both be true" assumes that the opposite of this claim cannot be true.

(4) *The Principle of Excluded Middle* (either being or non-being). There is nothing between being and non-being. Hence, something must either be or not be. It cannot actually both be and not be at the same time and sense. This principle is undeniable since the denial of it is a contradiction.

Logic and God

These First Principles make rational thought possible and form the basis for logic. With logic, we can know whether a

particular line of thinking is valid or invalid. Therefore logic is an indispensable requirement for all thought and for discovering truth about reality.

The Discovery of Logic

It's important to understand that mankind did not invent or create logic; we *discovered* it. The philosopher Aristotle (384 BC) was the first to discover and articulate these laws. From these laws, propositions can be determined to be valid or invalid. Inferences can then be further made by drawing conclusions from valid propositions. There are many kinds of logical methods (deduction, induction, abduction, adduction), yet all depend on these three basic principles.

God is a Rational Being

As we shall see, God is a rational Being, and logic actually flows from His very nature. It is impossible for God to lie (Hebrews 6:18) or contradict Himself (2 Timothy 2:13) because of His rational nature. Therefore the laws of logic have eternally existed in the nature of God.

Humans are Rational Beings

Since humans are created in the image of God, we also are rational beings. Thus, the laws of reason are how we discover reality. Logic is essential to our discovery of not just general revelation (nature and the physical world), but also special revelation (Bible study).

Objections to Logic

Some have objected that “Eastern” thought avoids logic. However, all three of the basic principles are literally undeniable. In other words, one cannot argue against them without using them. Therefore, nobody can deny them.³

Types of Rationality

There are different types of rational argumentation. Inferring from one or more propositions what follows necessarily is *deduction*. *Induction* (which forms the basis of the scientific method) is reasoning from a particular to the

³ See First Principles, principles 2-4 for examples.

general. With induction something can only be proved to a certain degree of probability (unless one has a perfect induction which is rare). *Adduction* is inference drawn from direct encounter with something. And *abduction* is inferring a certain explanation is more plausible or credible than competing explanations.

(3) The theistic God exists.

It is possible (and valid) to argue God's existence using all four methods of rationality. Here, a deductive argument will be given, followed by a few inductive arguments. We will also look at some alleged disproofs for God and common objections.

Deductive Argument for God

The following is what must necessarily follow from the First Principles listed above:

(1) – (4) see “List of First Principles” above.

(5) Non-being cannot cause⁴ being. This is *The Law of Causality*. Nothing cannot cause something since nothing

⁴ The term “cause” here is defined as efficient cause (that *by* which something comes to be). This is in contrast to something's formal cause (that *of* which something comes to be), instrumental cause (that *through* which something comes to be), exemplar cause (that *after* which something comes to be), material cause (that *out of* which something comes to be) and final cause (that *for* which something comes to be).

does not even exist, and what does not exist cannot cause anything. Only something can produce something.

(6) An effect is similar to its cause. This is *The Principle of Analogy*. Like produces like. Being shares being for this is all that it has to share. Being cannot give what it doesn't have. For it must have it (being) before it can give it.

(7) A being is either necessary or contingent but not both.

(8) A necessary being cannot cause another necessary being. By its nature a necessary being cannot come to be or cease to be.

(9) A contingent being cannot cause another contingent being. A contingent being's non-being is possible. Without a necessary being to cause it, there is nothing to account for why it is actual. It cannot actualize itself.

(10) A necessary being is a being of Pure Actuality with no potentiality.

(11) A being of Pure Actuality cannot cause another being of Pure Actuality. The being it causes has potential to not be.

(12) A contingent being is a being of actuality with potentiality.

(13) Therefore, a contingent being is both like and unlike its cause.

(14) I am a contingent being. I undeniably exist and am contingent because I came to be and change.

(15) But only a necessary being can cause a contingent being.

(16) Therefore a necessary Being exists that created me and every other contingent being.

Further inferences necessarily follow from this conclusion. This being must be one, indivisible, simple, infinite, uncaused, immaterial, immutable, omniscient, omnipotent, omnipresent, rational, personal, morally perfect and omnibenevolent.

The short version of the above argument is: (1) Something exists, (2) but nothing cannot cause something, (3) therefore an eternal and necessary Being exists.

Inductive Arguments for God

Provided a logical argument is valid, we can arrive at a conclusion with absolute certainty through deductive reasoning. In contrast, we can only obtain a certain level of probability with inductive reasoning.⁵ Both types of reasoning are valid. Yet, we live in a scientific age and the scientific method is based on inductive reasoning. As a result, people tend to place more value on inductive reasoning which uses an evidence-based approach to discovering truth. Here are some evidence-based, inductive arguments for God.

Biological Interdependence

When we look at life, we see irreducibly complex systems that depend on each other for existence. This is true at a macro and micro level. The human body is composed of systems such as the pulmonary system, the digestive system, the skeletal system, etc. These systems must all be

⁵ Unless it's a perfect induction which is rare.

fully functional because they depend on each other.

Darwinian evolution is not an adequate explanation for how multiple interdependent systems can originate, especially between both male and female organisms simultaneously. Nor has macro evolution ever been observed.

The Anthropic Principle

Conditions on Earth seem to be fine-tuned for life. There are over 100 factors that are required to make life on earth possible. Some of these factors are the amount of oxygen in the air, the distance of the earth from the sun and its tilt, the characteristics of water, the strength of gravity, and even the presence of Jupiter in the solar system.

Argument from Specified Complexity

Life is complex. The more we study and analyze it, the more complexity we discover. Even Richard Dawkins admits that there is the equivalent of 1,000 copies of the Encyclopedia Britannica inside a simple single celled organism. Recent discoveries in genetics and DNA have added to our

understanding of just how complex and specified life is. Scientists have discovered that the mathematical pattern of our DNA is the same as that of human language. We speak of the “DNA code” and scientists have reverse-engineered DNA and are now attempting to program new life forms through synthetic biology. It is reasonable that a program requires a Programmer and that specified complexity requires an Intelligent Designer.

Argument from First Cause

We now know the universe is not eternal but had a beginning. We know through the Second Law of Thermodynamics that the amount of usable energy in the universe is decreasing. We also know the universe is expanding. If we extrapolate backwards we come to a singularity. We have discovered cosmic background radiation coming at Earth from all directions and the ripples or “galactic seeds” which were predicted if such a singularity were to have occurred. We also know through Einstein’s Theory of Relativity (which has recently been proven through experimentation) that space, matter and time are co-related (cannot have one without the other) which proves the

universe had a beginning. If the universe had a beginning, it must have a Beginner.

The idea of a multi-verse (to which we have no evidence) does not solve the issue of causality, but merely pushes it back. There cannot be an infinite number of universes causing universes. There would still need to be a Beginner.

Definition of Theism

Theism (which has just been proven) is the worldview that there is an infinite, personal God that exists both beyond and in the universe. This God created the universe, and intervenes within it through miracles. Christianity, Judaism and Islam are all theistic religions. In contrast to this, there are six other worldviews: (1) atheism says no God exists beyond or in the universe, (2) pantheism says God *is* the universe, (3) pan-en-theism says God *is in* the universe, (4) deism says God is *beyond* the universe, but not in it, (5) finite godism says a finite God exists beyond and in the universe and (6) polytheism says there are many gods beyond the world and in it.

What do Theists Believe?

Theists hold these beliefs: (1) God exists beyond and in the world, (2) the world was created *ex nihilo*, (3) miracles are possible, (4) people are made in God's image, (5) there is moral law and (6) there are future rewards and punishment for all people.

Theism as it Describes God

In terms of God's nature, theists believe God's existence is not confined to this world. In other words, the physical universe is not all there is. God exists beyond the world and operates independently of it. While He is beyond it, He does continue to operate within it by sustaining and governing it. Theists believe God can and *does* intervene periodically inside the world through miracles.

Theism as it Describes Creation

In regard to world, theists believe the world is not eternal. It was not created from existing material but from nothing (*ex nihilo*) through the will and decree of a non-contingent Being

of Pure Actuality. Theists believe man is a contingent being who bears a likeness to his Creator. In other words, people are created in God's image which means they have free will and are inherently valuable. Since God is a moral being, and humankind is created in God's image, people are obligated to obey the moral law. The moral actions of each individual will be judged or rewarded (there is no reincarnation or second chance after death).

Alleged Disproofs of God

God cannot be disproved. Very few atheists have tried to prove God *does not* exist. None have succeeded. Here are the top arguments.

Cosmological Disproof of God

The cosmological argument against God's existence states that (1) God is a self-caused being, (2) but it is impossible to cause one's own being for a cause is prior to its effect, and one cannot be prior to oneself, (3) therefore, God cannot exist. This fails because theists do not hold God is self-cause but uncaused—it is a straw man argument.

Moral Disproof of God

The moral argument against God's existence argues that (1) an all-good God would and could destroy evil, (2) but evil is not destroyed, (3) therefore such a God does not exist. This fails because the first and second premises are ambiguous. If God were to defeat evil in the future, which *is* what theists claim, then the argument actually supports theism.

Teleological Disproof of God

The teleological argument against God's existence says (1) the universe was either designed or else it happened by chance, (2) but chance is an adequate cause of the universe, (3) therefore, the universe was not designed. It is argued in support of the second premise that anything is possible given an infinite amount of time. However, this is incorrect because we now know that an infinite amount of time has not elapsed.

Objections to Proofs For God

Atheists haven't yet offered any valid objections to theism. Here are some common objections and why they are not logically valid.

Aren't Theists Guilty of Exempting God From Causality?

This objection says, "Theists argue that everything needs a cause but then make an exception for God. If God doesn't need a cause then the universe doesn't need one either."

The response to this is that theists do not argue that *everything* needs a cause but that *effects* need a cause. The theistic definition of God is an eternal uncaused Being of Pure Actuality. This definition means He doesn't have a beginning and doesn't need a cause. Science has shown that the universe, however, does have a beginning, and therefore does need a cause.

Aren't there Exceptions to Causality in Mathematics?

Another objection is, "In mathematics, an infinite series is possible, even quite common. Thus, an infinite series of causes does not always need a First Cause." The first problem with this is that it confuses abstract realm of thought with the concrete world of physical reality. While it is true that there are an infinite number of abstract points between two people in a room, you cannot fit an infinite number of people between them. The second problem is that it is not possible to have an infinite number of moments before today because an infinite series is by definition endless and has no end. However, today is end of every day before today. Therefore there cannot be an infinite number of causes before today.

(4) Miracles are Possible.

Theism says that an infinite, personal God who exists beyond the universe but who also operates within the universe. And from time to time, this theistic God performs miracles. We see that miracles are *possible* because theism is true, *probable* because God is all-good and omnibenevolent, and *actual* in history through miracles.

Definition of a Miracle

We know that the universe operates in a general, orderly way. This natural, standard mode of operation is what makes science possible. A miracle is a special act of God which breaks this normal course of events. In other words, miracles are events not occurring through natural processes, but through supernatural power.

Miracles are not improbable events (e.g., a skydiver surviving free-fall because a tree softened the impact), providential acts (e.g., George Washington crossing the Delaware River against all odds because of fog rolling in), or psychological events (e.g., false pregnancies or placebo healings). What

many people attribute as a miracle today can be the work of deceptive religious leaders through illusion, trickery or even hypnosis. None of these events are supernatural, and none are miracles.

Creation Is the Greatest Miracle

The biggest proof that miracles can and do occur is creation itself. The universe, with all of its diversity, the Earth with all of its vastly complex and interdependent life forms, and reality itself had a beginning. This beginning was not through a natural process, but a supernatural one.

Therefore, the first and greatest supernatural event of all time is creation itself. It is undeniable that this miracle of reality occurred, and therefore is the greatest evidence for miracles.

Historical Proof for Miracles

Since we have proved a theistic God who *can* and *does* perform miracles (with at least one being undeniable) we would expect to find acts of supernatural intervention throughout history. The biblical record claims to be such an

account of divine intervention. The question of whether miracles have occurred historically becomes a question of whether the Bible is historically reliable. It will be argued later that the New Testament documents and writers are a reliable witness. But for now I will argue the plausibility and purpose of miracles.

(5) Miracles performed in connection with a truth claim are acts of God to confirm the truth of God through a messenger of God.

There are many reasons for miracles. But miracles performed in connection with a truth claim are acts of God to confirm the truth of God through a messenger of God. In other words, the miracles of the Bible were performed by God to show that the message was true and of divine origin. Therefore, discredit the miracles and you discredit the messenger and the message; prove the miracle and you prove the messenger and the message.

Arguments Against Miracles

Many widely respected philosophers consider David Hume's argument against miracles to be the greatest. This argument can be summarized as follows: (1) A miracle is by definition a rare occurrence. (2) Natural law by definition is a description of regular occurrence. (3) The evidence for the regular is always greater than that for the rare. (4) A wise

man always bases his belief on the greater evidence. (5)

Therefore, a wise man should never believe in miracles.

Should We Really Reject Anything that's Happened Once?

Point three in Hume's argument is clearly false. (1) The origin of the universe is a single event to which Hume and other naturalists claim multiple lines of evidence point. (2) The spontaneous generation of first life is considered to be a single event and there is no evidence of this repeating.

Based on Hume's argument a wise man should not believe that creation has occurred, nor that life has occurred because these are both single events (rare!) and we have never observed them reoccurring in nature. (3) It is also easy to argue that what is proposed to be evidence is not evidence at all. Macro-evolution has never been observed in nature, yet it is considered to be "fact" by naturalistic scientists, despite having never observed it occurring in nature. It must certainly be a rare event if we have no observation of it at all within the duration of the scientific

age. Based on Hume's argument, no wise man should believe in evolution.

Should a Wise Man Base Belief On Odds?

Point four is also false. What Hume fails to acknowledge is that a wise man bases his belief on facts, not odds. If Hume's argument were valid, we should not believe that it is possible to win a game of poker with a royal flush, since statistically the odds of getting two pair are far greater than getting a royal flush. We should not believe in the possibility of being dealt a perfect bridge hand since the odds are 1,635,013,559,600 to 1, but this has happened. In fact, we would have to reject any rare event in history such as George Washington crossing the Delaware River, or the extraordinary, unprecedented exploits of Napoleon Bonaparte.

Miracles Prove Truth Claims

There is no way to verify the truth claims of Christianity unless miracles are possible and actually happen. As

mentioned previously, miracles performed in connection with a truth claim are acts of God to confirm the truth of God through a messenger of God.

Old Testament Miracles Confirmed Truth Claims

In the Old Testament, when Moses asked God, “What if they do not believe me?” (Exodus 4:1), God gave Moses a series of miracles to perform (the leprous hand miracle, his staff turning into a snake, pouring water on the ground and it turning into blood). These miracles were intended to be the proof to the people that he was a prophet of God, that he had spoken to God, and that his message could be trusted as being true. Likewise, Elijah calling down fire was proof he was indeed a true prophet of God (1 Kings 18:36).

New Testament Miracles Also Confirm Truth Claims

Miracles also confirmed the truth claims of people in the New Testament. Nicodemus said to Jesus, “Rabbi, we know you are a teacher come from God for no one can do these

signs that you do unless God is with him" (John 3:2). Jesus confirmed that he had power to forgive sins by healing a paralyzed man (Mark 2:10-11). When John the Baptists began to doubt whether Jesus was really the Messiah, Jesus told his messengers to report back all of the miracles that they had seen, namely the healing of the blind, lame, leprous, deaf—and even the dead were raised (Luke 7:20-22). All of these miracles were intended to confirm Jesus' teaching as being truth from God. Furthermore, we find that miracles were divine confirmation that the teaching of the apostles was true (2 Corinthians 12:12).

Why Miracles Confirm Truth Claims

Some might argue that miracles do not necessarily confirm truth. We can trust that miracles given in connection to truth claims confirm truth claims for the following reasons. (1) If a theistic God exists, then miracles are possible. (2) A miracle is a special act of a theistic God. (3) A theistic God is all-knowing (omniscient). (4) A theistic God is also a morally perfect Being. (5) An all-knowing, all-perfect God cannot err or deceive. (6) Hence, a theistic God would never act to confirm something as true that was false. (7) Therefore,

miracles connected with a message confirm it to be from God.

(6) The New Testament documents are reliable.

It will be argued here that the New Testament documents are historically reliable because the events were accurately recorded by reliable witnesses and the manuscripts were accurately copied and preserved.

New Testament Manuscripts

In terms of sheer number of manuscript copies, the New Testament is in a category by itself. It is the best textually supported book from antiquity.

More Manuscripts than Any Other Ancient Works

We have 5,800 partial and complete copies of the original Greek New Testament manuscripts dating as far back as the first and second centuries. These were translated early into Syriac, Coptic, Arabic, Latin and other languages, giving us another 19,000 copies of the text. Furthermore, we have 36,289 quotations by the early church fathers that we can

use to reconstruct the New Testament if we had to (every book and nearly every chapter).

No Other Ancient Work Comes Close

Nothing else in the ancient world comes close to the New Testament's manuscript attestation. The second most documented ancient work after the Bible is Homer's *Illiad* with a mere 643 copies. Beyond that, we have 200 copies of the works of Demosthenes, twenty copies of Tacitus' *Annals*, ten good copies of Julius Ceasar's *Galic War*, eight copies of the works of Herodotus, seven of Pliny, and seven of Plato. It's quite common for works of antiquity to survive on only a handful of manuscript copies.

New Testament Manuscripts Are Earlier

No other book in the ancient world has a narrower time gap between original composition and its copies. Most other ancient books survive on manuscripts that were copied about *a thousand years* after they were composed. Works

like the *Odyssey* are a rare exception, with one copy made *five hundred years* after the original.

In contrast, the New Testament gap is not one thousand, five hundred, or even a few hundred years, but less than twenty-five to one hundred and fifty years. The earliest *undisputed* New Testament manuscript is the John Ryland Papyri (P52) dated 117-138 AD. Its discovery location in Egypt suggests it had been in circulation for quite some time, placing the original date of composition in the first century AD. The Bodmer Papyri is a complete copy of the New Testament dating around 200 AD, just 100 years after the originals. If a person rejects the New Testament on the grounds of manuscript evidence, they would have to reject all other works of ancient antiquity also.

What About Manuscript Errors?

Critics often point to the variations between manuscripts as proof that the record is not accurate. However, even the biggest New Testament critics like Bart Ehrman admit that none of these copyist errors are theologically significant, but are simply slips of the pen, accidental omissions, misspelled words or inadvertent additions (Ehrman, *Misquoting Jesus*,

2007, 55). To illustrate the types of “errors” we are talking about, compare copies of a message: “YO# HAVE WON \$1,000,000”, “YOU HAVE #ON \$1,000,000”, and “YOU HAVE WON \$# ,000,000”. Even though there are copyist errors, the message comes through and we can accurately reconstruct the original message with certainty.

Critics have exaggerated the number of such errors by counting copies of mistakes. But in reality, with very few exceptions⁶ these mistakes are minor and do not have any significant impact on the text. In fact, multiple scholars have concluded independently that 98.33% to 99.9% of our manuscripts are free from significant errors whatsoever, which is remarkable considering the amount of manuscripts we have.⁷

⁶ There is evidence that these passages were added later and were not part of the original: the passage saying there are three who bear witness (1 John 5:7), the story of the woman caught in adultery (John 7:53-8:11), and the ending of Mark which discusses handling snakes and drinking poison as a proof of faith (Mark 16:9-20).

⁷ Westcott and Hort estimates 98.33% pure, Ezra Abbott 99.75%, A. T. Robertson 99.9%

The Historicity of the New Testament

Some doubt the Jesus of the New Testament. Others go so far as to say that Jesus never even existed and that everything written about him is a forgery. How does this stack up to the evidence?

Based On Eyewitness Testimony

The apostle John repeatedly pointed to the fact that he was an eyewitness of the life, crucifixion, burial and resurrection of Jesus from the dead (John 19:35; 21:24; 1 John 1:1).

Likewise, Peter claimed to be an eyewitness and that they were merely teaching what they had seen (Acts 2:32; 4:19-20; 10:39-40; 2 Peter 1:16). Paul challenged those who doubted the resurrection to talk to the 500 witnesses who had seen Jesus alive after the resurrection, the majority of whom were still alive (1 Cor. 15:3-8). Luke was diligent to base his accounts (the books of Luke and Acts) on eyewitness testimony (Luke 1:1-4).

There Were Nine Authors Documenting Testimony

There were nine different authors (Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Peter, James, Jude, and the writer of Hebrews) of twenty seven books. All of these authors were either direct eyewitnesses of the events or were contemporaries of eyewitnesses.

Legal Experts Confirm the Testimony As Credible

Modern legal experts have confirmed that the eyewitness testimony in the New Testament is authentic, and that any impartial person in a court of law would have no reason to doubt the credibility of the testimony.⁸

⁸ See works of Simon Greenleaf, Thomas Sherlock, Frank Morrison, John Montgomery.

Archeology Confirms the Testimony

Not one archaeological discovery has ever conflicted with the Bible. On the contrary, there have been many archaeological discoveries that support it. We know the locations of places like Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Nazareth, Bethany, the Jordan River and the Sea of Galilee. We have also found artifacts like a coin of Caesar Augustus, inscriptions regarding people like King Herod, Pilate, and Caiaphas, and places like the synagogue in Capernaum, the pool of Siloam and the steps of the temple. We've even discovered examples of crucifixion and tombs (including one that is empty!).

The Dating of the New Testament

Critics argue that the New Testament was written too late, and therefore could not have been written by eyewitnesses or their contemporaries, and that it cannot be trusted as a historically reliable document.

Critics Need More Time For Myths And Errors

Critics attempt to put as much time as they can between the writing of the New Testament documents and when the events actually occurred. More time allows for more mistakes in oral tradition and for mythologies to develop.

Argument for Early Date for Luke/Acts

Noted Roman historian Colin Hemer argues for an early date of AD 60 to 63 for Acts based on what we do not see: (1) there's no mention of the fall of Jerusalem in AD 70, (2) the Jewish war of AD 66, (3) persecutions by Nero in late 60s or (4) the death of James in AD 62. Since the Gospel of Luke was written before Acts (Acts 1:1), this also dates Luke's Gospel before AD 60/63, less than thirty years after Jesus' resurrection.

Paul's Early Letters Corroborate Gospel Details

The majority of New Testament scholars and critics accept that Paul wrote Romans, Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and that these books were written between 55 and 61 AD. That means that in less than two decades after the events of Jesus took place (30 to 33 AD), we have confirmation of at least twenty seven details of the gospels such as Jesus was Jewish (Gal. 3:16), he was descended from David (Rom. 1:3), he was born of a virgin (Gal. 4:4), etc.⁹ Most important is Paul's confirmation of the burial and resurrection of Jesus from the dead and the fact that he appeared to more than 500 witnesses in 1 Corinthians 15:3-7, composed in 54/55 AD, just *twenty two* years after Jesus' resurrection.

⁹ See <http://callup.org/27facts> for complete list.

Critics Beginning to Accept These Early Dates

More and more critics are beginning to accept these early dates. John A. T. Robinson, leader of the “death of God” movement revised his dates saying all books were written between AD 40 and 70, with Matthew as early as AD 40, Mark AD 45, Luke AD 57 and John AD 40.¹⁰ William F. Albright emphatically adds that there is no longer a basis for accepting any book beyond AD 80 (Albright, *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands*, 136).

No Time For Myths To Develop

Most critics now admit that the entire New Testament was composed between 70 to 100 AD while most of these eyewitnesses were still alive. There is not enough time between the events and writing for myths to have developed.

¹⁰ See <http://callup.org/redating>.

No Signs of Mythological Embellishment

There is good evidence for the authentic nature of the New Testament documents. (1) There are differences between narratives, yet the writers did not attempt to harmonize their stories. (2) The writers included material that made Jesus look bad (e.g., his own family thought he was insane). (3) They did not try to remove difficult passages. (4) They included self-incriminating information (they were slow to understand, fell asleep when they should have been praying, denied the Lord). (5) They included difficult sayings of Jesus (deny yourself, suffer, eat His flesh and blood). (6) They clearly reported the words of Jesus by distinguishing their own words from those of Jesus. (7) They didn't deny their testimony even when threatened with death. (8) They claimed repeatedly that they were eyewitnesses (or in Luke's case had talked to eyewitnesses). (9) The reporting that women had witnessed the resurrection before men. (10) They challenged their listeners to check the facts for themselves from other eyewitnesses. (11) Something significant must have happened for them to seemingly

overnight discard long-held Jewish traditions (e.g., worshipping on the Sabbath and eating pork). (12) They mention too much detail (over thirty historical people) for it to be myth.

Too Much Accurate Detail To Be A Fabrication

Historians have noted the high degree of accuracy in the book of Acts.¹¹ Even a casual reader of Luke 3:1-2 can see the high level of detail as Luke ties the beginning of John the Baptist's ministry to no less than seven people's public office. Furthermore, Luke is accurate in his frequent description of routes, places, officials, customs, idioms and practices of his day, many details of which would only be known to first-hand eyewitnesses. This is significant because Luke also wrote the Gospel of Luke and claimed that it was as accurate of account as he could possibly make it (Luke 1:1-4), basing it on eyewitness testimony.

¹¹ See works of Adrian Sherwin-White, Thomas Arnold and Colin Hemer.

Conclusion: The New Testament is a Reliable, Accurate Testimony

Because a theistic God exists, miracles are possible. Since miracles are possible, they can be used to confirm that truth claims come from God. The historical writings of the New Testament contain eyewitness testimony of miracles and corresponding truth claims. These writings can be trusted. Now I will prove from these documents that its central figure, Jesus Christ, not only rose from the dead, but is God. Therefore, whatever, Jesus says is truth. And anything opposed is false.

(7) As witnessed in the New Testament, Jesus claimed to be God.

Having proved that the theistic God exists, that miracles are possible, and that the New Testament is reliable, the central claims of Jesus will now be examined.

Jesus Claimed to be Messiah who was to be God

The Old Testament promised a future Messiah who was to be God. The Messiah would be the Lord (Psa. 110:1; Isa. 51:11), King (Zep. 3:14-15) and God (Isa. 9:6; Psa. 45:6; Isa. 42:10; Zep. 3:17). The promise was that Yahweh, the LORD, was coming to dwell among people (Zech. 2:10; 9:9; Eze. 37:27; Lev. 26:12; Psa. 68:18). It would also be Yahweh Himself who would be crucified (Zech. 12:10). Jesus claimed to be this Messiah and in so doing claimed to be God (Jn. 4:25-26; Mt. 14:61-62).

His Disciples Claimed Jesus Was God

Many are familiar with the famous passage in John 1:1: "In the beginning was the Word; the Word was with God, and the Word was God". But there are many other clear passages in the New Testament that teach Jesus is God. Paul says, "In Christ all the fullness of deity dwells in bodily form" (Col. 2:9), that "He is the image of the invisible God" (Col. 1:15), that Jesus "did not consider equality with God something to be grasped" (Phil. 2:6) and that Christ is the "eternally blessed God" (Romans 9:5). The writer of Hebrews says that Jesus is the "brightness of His (God's) glory, and the express image of His person" and that Jesus "upholds all things by the word of his power" (Heb. 1:3) and then applies passages concerning the LORD Yahweh to Jesus himself, proving that Jesus is Yahweh of the Old Testament (compare Heb. 1:8-9 with Psa. 45:6-7 and Heb. 1:10-12 with Psalm 102:25-27)

Jesus Claimed To Be God

Jesus claimed to be God. (1) He claimed to be Yahweh, or the "I AM" LORD of the Old Testament (Jn. 8:58). The Jews clearly understood what he was saying because they picked up stones to stone him (v. 59). (2) He forgave sins. The Jews understood this as a claim to deity (Mk. 2:5-7). (3) He claimed he should be honored in the same way the Father is honored (Jn. 5:23). (4) Only God is to be worshiped (Mt. 4:10; Ex. 20:1-4; Deut. 5:6-9) and Jesus accepted worship from the disciples (Mt. 14:33; 28:17), the rich young ruler (Mt. 9:18), a leper (Mt. 8:2), a Canaanite woman (Mt. 15:25), the women at the tomb (Mt. 28:9), Thomas (Jn. 20:28), a blind man (Jn. 9:38), a Gerasene man (Mk. 5:6) and James and John's mother (Mt. 20:20). (5) He put his words on the same level as God's words. He said his words would not pass away (Mt. 24:35) and will judge all (Jn. 12:48). (6) Jesus accepted the titles of deity (Jn. 20:28; Mt. 16:17-18).

(8) Jesus' claim to be God was miraculously confirmed by (a) his fulfillment of many prophecies about Himself.

Jesus made bold truth claims, one of which was that he was God. His proof for his claims was (1) that he precisely fulfilled Old Testament prophecy, (2) his miracles and sinless life and (3) his resurrection from the dead.

Old Testament Prophecies Concerning Messiah

Jesus was not born in a religious vacuum. The Old Testament contains hundreds of prophecies concerning a Messiah who would come to the world. These prophecies, beginning as far back as the Fall (Genesis 3:15) and continuing through the age of the prophets (e.g., Isaiah, Jeremiah, Malachi), provided vivid details about who Messiah would be and what he would do.

Types of Things the Old Testament Predicted

Not only would Messiah be part of the human race (Gen. 3:15), but other precise details about him were foretold, including his ethnic group (from Abraham, Gen. 12:1), his tribe (Judah, Gen. 49:10), his dynasty (David, 2 Sam. 7:12). Not only that, but these prophecies detail *how* he would be born (from a virgin, Isa. 7:14), *where* he would be born (in Bethlehem, Mic. 5:2), and *when* he would present himself as Messiah (AD 33, Dan. 9:24).

Examples of Prophecies Jesus Fulfilled

Here are *some* prophecies Jesus fulfilled: (1) He was born of a woman and was therefore human (Gen. 3:15). He was from the lineage of (2) Seth (Gen. 4:25), (3) Shem (Gen. 9:26) and (4) Abraham (Gen. 12:3). (5) He was from the tribe of Judah (Gen. 49:10) and (6) house of David (2 Sam. 7:12; Jer. 23:5-6). He was (7) born of a virgin (Isa. 7:14) in (8) Bethlehem (Mic. 5:2). (9) He was heralded by a forerunner (Isa. 40:3) and (10) proclaimed as a king (Zech. 9:9). (11) He

suffered and died for our sins (Isa. 53:5-12) in (12) precisely AD 33 (Dan. 9:24-25) having (13) had his side pierced (Zech. 12:10). And most importantly, (14) he rose again from the dead (Psa. 16:10; Isa. 53:10; Psa. 2:2,6-7).

Fulfillment of Prophecy Confirms Jesus' Truth Claims

Mathematician Marvin Bittinger has calculated that the probability of just nine prophecies coming true regarding Jesus Christ is 1/10 to the 76th power. This would be like filling a domed football stadium with sand and finding the exact same grain of sand *four times in a row* hidden in random locations each time (*The Faith Equation*, pp. 116-118).

(8) Jesus' claim to be God was miraculously confirmed by (b) his sinless and miraculous life.

Jesus' Miracles Confirm His Truth Claims

Jesus performed over 60 miracles according to the eyewitness documents, with many more implied. These miracles included healing people with incurable diseases, people born with birth defects and handicaps (e.g., blind and lame), and even raising people from the dead. In some cases the recipients exercise no faith at all (so the result could not be psychosomatic). In all cases the miracles were accompanied by a truth claim (Mark 2:10). These miracles confirm the validity of his truth claims (Acts 2:22; Heb. 2:3-4).

Jesus' Sinless Life Confirm His Truth Claims

Jesus claimed to be without sin. He challenged his opponents: "Which one of you can convict me of sin?" (Jn.

8:6). The people who knew Jesus best and spent the most time with him (his disciples) had the clearest picture as to the real character of Jesus. They describe him as a man without blemish or any defect whatsoever (1 Pet. 1:19), whose speak was without deceit (1 Pet. 2:22), righteous (1 Pet. 3:18), pure (1 Jn. 3:3), and without sin (2 Cor. 5:21; Heb. 4:15).

Jesus' Sermon on the Mount

Jesus' delivered arguably the most ethical sermon ever given to mankind, the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. 5-7). In this message, he taught the highest rule is to love others the way one wants to be treated, to not judge others self-righteously, to love your enemies, not retaliate, not be a hypocrite, not just be righteous on the outside, but in one's heart, to be merciful, honor one's word, help the poor and forgive. He not only taught it, but he lived it out.

His Opponents Could Not Find Fault

Even Jesus' opponents recognized his sinlessness. His betrayer, Judas, felt remorse for betraying "innocent blood" (Mt. 27:4). Pontius Pilate said after carefully examining Jesus, "I find no fault in him" (John 19:6) and then tried to excuse himself from condemning a "just person" (Mt. 27:24). The Roman officers who weekly performed crucifixions, upon observing the manner in which Jesus died, declared Jesus to be "a righteous man" (Lk. 23:37) and even "the Son of God" (Mt. 27:54).

Jesus' Basis for Death Shows He Had No Sin

His opponents could not come up with anything against Jesus except the following accusations. The Romans accused Jesus of being a king which was forbidden (Lk. 23:3). The High Priest and the Sanhedrin charged him with claiming to be the Messiah and deity (Mk. 14:64). And the crowd claimed Jesus taught that the people should not pay taxes to Caesar (Lk. 23:2), which was not true (Mt. 17:27).

The eyewitness account clearly teaches that Jesus lived a sinless life, and that nobody could accuse Jesus of *any* sin.

(8) Jesus' claim to be God was miraculously confirmed by (c) both his prediction and accomplishment of his resurrection.

Jesus' biggest miracle was his own resurrection of himself from the dead. This is the strongest proof that his claims were true. The Old Testament (Isa. 53; Dan. 9:24,27; Psa. 22:14-15, 25-27; Psa. 16:9-11) and Jesus himself predicted his death, burial and resurrection (Mk. 8:31; Jn. 2:19-21; 10:10-11; Mt. 12:39-40; 16:4; 17:22-23; 21:42).

Proof of Jesus' Death

There are some who contend that Jesus never actually died. However, there is overwhelming proof that Jesus died and was buried. (1) The nature of his wounds ensures that he was dead (flogging by cat-of-nine-tails, bearing his cross, having a spear pierce his side; Mk. 5; Jn. 18). (2) His mothers and disciples witnessed his death (Mk. 15:40; Jn. 19:25-26; Lk. 22:54). (3) Jesus' dying words were heard by many standing near the cross including a roman Centurion (Lk.

23:46-47). (4) The Roman executioners pronounced him dead after careful examination (Jn. 19:33). (5) Pilate double checked to be sure (Mk. 15:45). (6) The Jews never denied the story of the death and placing of Jesus' body in the tomb of a Sanhedrin member (Jn. 19:38). (7) First and second century non-Christian writers record the death of Jesus (Josephus, Tacitus, Thallus, Lucian, Phelgon, the Jewish Talmud).

Proof of the Resurrection

There is also overwhelming proof that Jesus was resurrected from the dead. Over 500 witnesses saw him alive on twelve occasions. They touched his physical body, saw the crucifixion scars and ate with him four times. These witnesses include Mary (John 20:10-18), other women (Mt. 28:1-10), Peter (1 Cor. 15:5), two disciples (Lk. 24:13-35), all of the apostles (Mt. 28:16-20), over 500 brethren (1 Cor. 15:6) and Paul (Acts 9:1-9). His disciples testified that his resurrected body had flesh and bones (Lk. 24:39), physical wounds (Lk. 24:39), and could be touched and handled (Jn. 20:27). Jesus even ate food four times to prove that he was not a spirit (Lk. 24:30; 24:42-43; Jn. 21:12-13; Acts 1:4).

Perhaps one of the strong proofs of the resurrection is that many of these same disciples would go on to die as martyrs for their belief in the resurrection of Jesus. Not one recanted of their position or confessed that they had made it up in the face of persecution.

(9) Therefore, Jesus was God in human flesh.

Jesus claimed to be the Messiah and the Son of God (deity).

Miracles performed in connection to a truth claim are acts of God to confirm the truth of God through a messenger of God. Therefore, his miracles and resurrection from the dead confirm his truth claim and prove that Jesus is God.

(10) Whatever Jesus (who is God) affirmed as true is true.

God cannot err unintentionally because He is all-knowing (omniscient) and He cannot err intentionally because He is morally perfect. Therefore, the logical conclusion if Jesus is God is that whatever Jesus affirmed is true is really true.

Couldn't Jesus Err in His Human Nature?

Evangelical Christians assert that Jesus is one person with two natures: he is fully God and fully man. Some have said that Jesus could have erred because he was human like the rest of us, and as the saying goes, "To err is human."

However, humans do not always err. While it may be rare, sometimes books are published that do not contain any errors, such as a phone book.

What About Accommodation?

Some argue that Jesus was merely accommodating the people of his time by accommodating himself to their false

beliefs about God, the Bible, origin of mankind, etc. However, even a casual reader of the Gospel accounts can see that Jesus wasn't interested in accommodating people's false beliefs. He rebuked the Pharisees and teachers of the Law, calling them blind guides, hypocrites, and white-washed tombs (Mt. 23). He did not tolerate the false practices of the money changes in the temple (Jn. 2). He rebuked those who nullified the Word of God through their traditions (Mt. 15:3,6). He plainly told the Sadducees that they were in error (Mt. 22:29). This is not the behavior of one who accommodates himself to others.

What About Passages That Seem To Indicate Limitation?

What about passages that seem to indicate Jesus was limited in knowledge in some fashion? For example, Jesus said he did not know the exact time of his second coming (Mk. 13:32). While it may be a mystery, it is not an example of error. He refrained from teaching on any area of ignorance as a human being. If a person refrains from commenting on

things he or she is not aware of, they have not made any errors.

Whatever Jesus Taught, He Did So With Divine Authority

Whatever Jesus taught, he did so with divine authority (Mk. 1:22,27). He taught authoritatively that (1) everything in heaven and earth had been placed under his authority (Mt. 11:7). (2) Everything had been delivered to him by the God the Father (Mt. 11:27). (3) His words would not pass away (Mt. 24:35). (4) We are to observe everything he has commanded us (Mt. 28:20). (5) He claimed to be from God the Father and everything he spoke was true (Jn. 8:26). (6) His words would judge all mankind on the Day of Judgment (Jn. 12:48).

(11) Jesus affirmed that the Bible is the Word of God.

Jesus clearly believed the Bible of his day, the Old Testament, was the Word of God. Jesus affirmed that the Old Testament is (1) divinely authoritative (Mt. 4:4,7,10), imperishable (Mt. 5:17-18), infallible (Jn. 10:35), inerrant (without error) (Mt. 22:29), is historically reliable (Mt. 12:40; Mt. 24:37-38), scientifically accurate (Mt. 19:4-5) and has ultimate supremacy (Mt. 15:3,6).

Which Old Testament Books Did Jesus Consider to be Scripture?

Jesus applied his view of Scripture to the entire Old Testament as a whole, calling it “the Word of God” (Jn. 10:35), “the Scriptures” (Jn. 5:39) and “Your (Jewish) Law” (Jn. 10:34). He indicated that everything from start to finish was to be considered Scripture (“From Abel to Zechariah” Mt. 23:35). He cited from all sections of the Old Testament, from Moses through the Prophets (Mt. 5:17; 7:12; Lk. 16:31; 24:27,44). He also cited from most Old Testament books specifically. The Jews considered twenty four books to make up their

Bible (the *Tanakh*) and Jesus quoted from all but three (Judges, Esther, and Song of Solomon).¹²

What Is Jesus' View of the New Testament?

Obviously the New Testament Scriptures were written after Jesus' ascension into heaven. But a strong case can be made that Jesus also affirmed beforehand that the New Testament writings would be just as authoritative as the Old Testament. (1) Jesus taught that the Holy Spirit coming after him would guide the apostles in *all* truth (Jn. 14:26; 16:13; Eph. 2:20). (2) Only eyewitnesses of the resurrection were apostles (1 Cor. 9:1; Acts 1:22). (3) The New Testament writings are the only record we have from these apostles. (4) Therefore, the New Testament is the "all truth" Jesus promised.

¹² Jesus simply did not have a need to cite from the remaining three.

(12) Therefore, it is true that the Bible is the Word of God and whatever is opposed to any biblical truth is false.

Not Saying Truth Found *Only* Through the Bible

This doesn't mean there is no truth apart from the Bible. Truth we obtain from Scripture is called special revelation. Truth obtained through science and reason is called general revelation. Both avenues are valid for obtaining truth. Even the Bible indicates the validity of general revelation (Rom. 1:19-20; 2:12-15; Psa. 19:1; Mt. 5:17-18; Jn. 10:35). Truth is absolutely true for all people in all places regardless of whether it is found inside the Bible or apart from the Bible.

There Can Be Moral Truth Apart From the Bible

It's not surprising then to find some truth in other religions. Moral truths are found in other religions because all people

show the work of the law written on their heart (Rom. 2:15). This is why we find the Golden Rule expressed in different forms through various philosophies and religions which are directly contrary to theism.¹³ Many religions teach their followers to honor their parents, to not lie, steal, murder, love others, etc.

There Can Be Theological Truth In Other Religions

The Bible says that God has reveals Himself to all people: “For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse” (Rom. 1: 20). Truth about God’s nature is clearly *perceived*, but it is not *received*. It’s therefore not surprising to find some theological truth even in religions that are directly opposed to Biblical teaching.

¹³ Confucius taught a negative version Golden Rule: “Do not do to others what you would not have them do to you.”

Whatever is Opposed to the Word of God is False

This last point, and the conclusion to the argument for Christianity, is that the Bible is the Word of God. Through general revelation we can know *some things* about God. Using rationality and reason, we understand that there must be a creator and designer of this vastly complex universe. We can also clearly understand that there is an absolute moral law. We know right from wrong by our own reaction when wrong is done to us, and we intuitively know we should not treat people this way. However, there is a limit to what we can know about God through logic, rational senses and reason.

This is why special revelation is important. While we're limited with general revelation, we can know *everything* God has chosen to reveal to us through special revelation. Through special revelation, we learn of the truths of (1) the tri-unity of God, (2) the virgin birth of Christ, (3) the deity of Christ, (4) the all-sufficiency of Christ's atoning sacrifice for sin, (5) the physical and miraculous resurrection of Christ, (6)

the necessity of salvation by faith alone through God's grace alone based on the work of Christ alone, (7) the physical bodily return of Christ to earth, (8) the eternal conscious bliss of the saved and (9) the eternal conscious punishment of the unsaved. There are many other religions and world-views which stand in opposition to these teachings, and therefore all of these other teachings are false.

Final Conclusion

It is therefore proved that Christianity is true, and all other opposing truth claims are false. Here is the entire argument for Christianity in review: (1) Truth about reality is knowable. (2) Opposites cannot both be true. (3) The theistic God exists. (4) Miracles are possible. (5) Miracles performed in connection with a truth claim are acts of God to confirm the truth of God through a messenger of God. (6) The New Testament documents are reliable. (7) As witnessed in the New Testament, Jesus claimed to be God. (8) Jesus' claim to divinity was proven by a unique convergence of miracles. (9) Therefore, Jesus was God in human flesh. (10) Whatever Jesus (who is God) affirmed as true is true. (11) Jesus affirmed that the Bible is the Word of God. (12) Therefore, it is true that the Bible is the Word of God and whatever is opposed to any biblical truth is false.

What Now?

If you are ready to take the next step and receive Jesus Christ as your personal Lord and Savior in order to know that your sins are forgiven, visit www.callup.org.

Bibliography

Geisler, Norman. *Big Book of Christian Apologetics, The: An A to Z Guide*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2012.

—. *Systematic Theology, Vol. 1: Introduction, Bible*.

Minneapolis, MN: Bethany House Publishers, 2002.

—. *Twelve Points That Show Christianity Is True*. Matthews, NC: Bastion Books, 2012.

Geisler, Norman, and Paul Feinberg. *Introduction to*

Philosophy: A Christian Perspective. Grand Rapids, MI:

Baker Book House, 1980.