

Pastor-teacher Don Hargrove  
Faith Bible Church <http://www.fbcweb.org/index.html>  
September 16, 2011

JEWISH APOLOGETICS (118) – with a Pastoral Exhortation  
<http://www.fbcweb.org/Doctrines/Jewish-Apologetics-117.pdf>

**Objection #101: Paul claimed that the Hebrew Scriptures prophesied the resurrection of the Messiah on the third day. Nowhere in our Bible is such a prophecy found.**

Brown's short response to this objection:

Paul's exact words are: "For what I received I passed on to you as of first importance: that Messiah died for our sins according to the Scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures . . ." (1 Cor. 15:3-4). As a Jew schooled in the Scriptures from his childhood, Paul was not thinking of just one passage but of several passages that pointed to the Messiah's resurrection on the third day. And remember: Paul was not trying to "pull a fast one" on anybody! And no one had pulled a fast one on him either. This is the tradition he received, and if someone taught him something that was not in his Bible, he would have known it immediately. In fact, when we study the Tanakh, we see that the third day is often the day of completion and climax—and so it was with the Messiah's death and resurrection!<sup>1</sup>

Following this, Brown provides Old Testament evidence of a three day motif.

However, I disagree with Brown. In our historiographical studies we have noted 1 Corinthians 15:3-4 and how "according to the Scriptures" refers to the gospels and undeniable historical fact. Paul is not talking about OT passages, he is referring to the gospels and the "tradition" he received from the eyewitnesses of the resurrection, the apostles.

With the concept of historiography in mind, I would like to make a few comments. I would like to thank all of those who have expressed their appreciation for the historiographical studies on the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Very few churches really develop historiography on the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Most of them have only a few tapes/messages on the resurrection

---

<sup>1</sup>Michael L. Brown, *Messianic Prophecy Objections —Volume 3*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2003), 179-81. In his book, Brown lists the objection and then gives a short response which is followed by a more developed response. This DDR series, for the most part, tracks the objection and his *short* response after which you will find my comments. I highly recommend his book if you are interested in his longer responses (there is far too much material to include in this series).

of Jesus Christ available. I have always thought it a bit odd that the history of America, the Romans, and the Germans would be developed but nothing on historical principles on the resurrection of Jesus Christ. What is more important: historiography on the Romanoff dynasty or on the resurrection of Jesus Christ? Defending America as a client nation, or defending the resurrection of our Lord? While allowances can be made for ministries that have not *yet* been philosophically and apologetically enlightened enough to develop such a study, it is hard to understand why pastors who develop these studies are looked down upon for doing so. What can be said in regard to believers who have no passion for the Logos or historical evidence for the resurrection of Jesus Christ, because they are too occupied with handling personal problems with (legitimate and wonderful problem solving) devices? They are so occupied with their own “plight” to really care about who and what Jesus Christ is. If they do not get/feel something out of a message, then what’s the point? Such a believer has no chance of ever entering into the promised life. They really are not interested in Truth or Reality as such. They are only interested in a functional view of Truth. They have become victims of their own making. So close and yet so far from Truth because they really were not interested in Truth *as such* (i.e. correspondence truth).

I have been in the doctrinal movement for over thirty years. The greatest people I have ever met are doctrinal believers. The worst people I have ever met are from a doctrinal background. What is the difference? Truth! Some love and seek Truth for its own sake! They love the Bible and Bible doctrine and all of those tools that enable them attain more truth more accurately—things like fellowship, apologetics, and philosophy. There are also those in the doctrinal movement who really only care for Truth in a functional way. If it functions for their benefit, then they are all for it. They reject critical thinking skills (developed in philosophy and

apologetics), and so others end up do their thinking for them. They are characterized by following a pastor as their hero (they can't listen to anyone else) and following "doctrine" in a rote manner rather than thinking hard and long about its truths. Without the development of critical thinking skills, what's left but someone else doing their thinking even with regard to God's Holy Word (many never even read the Bible on their own). I have noticed that these individuals may grow through the years in the *amount* of Bible doctrine, but they continue to deteriorate in the ability to use Bible doctrine correctly. I have heard the weirdest things from "doctrinal believers"—who of course depreciate the need for logic, philosophy, and apologetics (because they are too lazy to do the hard work). It is always easier to let someone else just tell them what is right. However, one never really learns unless one does his own thinking. I also know of doctrinal believers who, even after 20-30 years of Bible doctrine, live in stress and fear daily about health issues and anxiety with regard to family and personal issues. Does this sound like a healthy growing believer who went from being a baby believer to an adult believer—from an acorn to an oak tree for 20-30 years?

There are also many wonderful doctrinal believers. The dominant characteristic is that they love to learn—not just "get" some application to make them "feel" better and get them through another day. They love to learn because they love Truth. They grow year after year into a mighty oak tree through *personal* growth in Bible doctrine *undergirded* by critical thinking skills (philosophy, apologetics) under the ministry of the Holy Spirit.

Please do not take my comments as a slam against the doctrinal movement. It is the greatest movement as far as teaching Bible doctrine and the unique spiritual life in church history. However, it does have two weaknesses: one is in regard to the development of personal critical thinking skills (philosophy) and the other is in apologetics. Who can defend the idea that

it is OK for a believer to be in doctrine for decades and not be taught how to defend the faith in our hostile world? Who could defend the concept of an anti-intellectual doctrinal believer? I understand the concept of an anti-intellectual fundamentalist, but an anti-intellectual doctrinal believer who is interested in Truth—at least enough to want the pastor to know the original languages. I just don't get it.

My goal as pastor is to continue the development of doctrine and the unique supernatural spiritual life but *also* to lay broad and deep *personal* critical thinking skills as to what we are really talking about and how to detect and refute errors for grasping the faith deeper and defending it. There will be times when we will be deep into philosophical issues that may seem to be irrelevant. I promise you: They are not! The only things that are irrelevant are my lame jokes. They are my way of taking a break and lightening up from time to time.

If you are a truth seeker (correspondence view of Truth instead of functional view of truth) then FBC has much to offer. If you are just looking for Truth as a function to help you get this or feel that (faith-rest blessings, supergrace blessings, get out from under divine discipline), you are welcome to come to FBC, but I would ask you to reflect on what possible *reason/logos* you would give for why you are not interested in real truth—the whole truth and nothing but the truth? Only such truth frees. Apart from the whole truth, believers are not experientially free. For one thing: because of lack of development of personal thinking skills, they are sensate which means they live lustful lives—as evidenced by their conversations which always get around to their feelings or some sexual or lustful innuendo. Further, because of lack of conceptual developed, they often have gross and pagan views of the God, the Trinity, and the Lord Jesus Christ. Surely such a believer would want to change! Additionally, if you were told that Immanuel Kant has made a stronger impact on you than Jesus Christ, how would you respond?

Would you care enough to find out if this was true, or would you dismiss it in an unthinking manner?

Let's move forward in the Logos,

*Pastor Don*