

I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

How Names Reveal That the Bible Writers Were Eyewitnesses

(February 28, 2025)

FRANK:

Ladies and gentlemen, a brand new granddaughter has arrived. Our first granddaughter. This is our fourth grandchild, but the first girl. My son Zach and his wife Lily just had their first baby. Zach is the one, by the way, that wrote 'Hollywood Heroes' with me, the book 'Hollywood Heroes: How Your Favorite Movies Reveal God'. Anyway, the baby, their little girl just came on Sunday. I was actually preaching out in California and Zach said that she, the baby's coming.

So, I brought my iPhone up to the podium during each of the three services and said, sorry. I'm going to be checking my iPhone during me preaching because if this happens, I want to know right away. And she came. Her name is Juliana, was born just this past Sunday. Cutest little thing. I just dropped my wife off at the airport. She's going up to see them. They live up in the D.C. area. They're both officers in the Air Force. They both work in the Pentagon. And so, my wife is on her way right now to see little Juliana up there in the Washington D.C. area.

I'll be up there, Lord willing, on Thursday because providentially, our William and Mary event got postponed because of snow. And so, we're going to be at William and Mary, Lord willing, this coming Wednesday, March 5th I think that is. Let me check the date. I think it is March 5th, Wednesday night. Yes, March 5th, William and Mary. The details are on our website. Well, the next day it's only two and a half hour drive to Alexandria, Virginia, the D.C. area.

I'm just going to drive up there and spend a couple days up there with little Juliana and my wife and I will come back on Friday. But it's just amazing when you get a new grandbaby or as you know, a new child, your own child. Now, when you see a new child come into the world, you don't go, evolution! You go, this is amazing! How does this happen? I mean, how do we get new life like this through this nine month process? From the moment of conception, you've got a new 100% genetic human being.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

The baby has its own genetic code. It has its own blood type, it has its own sex, obviously. It's not just a part of the mother's body, it's a human being. And nine months later, in a normal pregnancy, they come into this world, and it is just spectacular. Now, the name of this baby is Juliana. And you go, hey, that's a nice name. It's probably relatively popular. But you know what names do? Names can help us discover whether someone writing in a particular era is actually an eyewitness because as you know, names change.

And what I want to talk about today, names change in terms of their usage at different times in different places. What I want to talk about today is a piece of evidence that even many Christian apologists don't know about. And it is the evidence that was discovered by Dr. Richard Bauckham back in his book, 'Jesus and the Eyewitnesses'. I want to say that book came out somewhere around 2007 or 2008, somewhere around there.

He is a British scholar of the New Testament, and he did some amazing research to look into the name usage in the New Testament. And what he found was, I think, pretty spectacular. Because what he found was, what he concluded as a result of the evidence was that the New Testament writers had to either be eyewitnesses in 1st century Israel or had to have known eyewitnesses at that time because they get the name usage in that area right.

And what we'll do here, and we'll talk about other evidence, eyewitness evidence in this program as well, if we get to it. But what we're going to do here is just point out from our own country how names change. In fact, let's go back about 100 years ago. Let's go back to the 1920's. Think for yourself, ladies and gentlemen. What were the names, the top male names in 1920? Can you think of some names? Think about maybe very old uncles you have or old grandparents you might have or your great grandparents.

What were the names that you heard given to men? Because you know, our Social Security Administration, despite the fact that they have several million people who right now are like between a hundred and two hundred years old, according to Elon Musk, who's doing a great job pointing out the waste, fraud, and abuse in our government. But one thing that Social Security Administration does well is it keeps track of how people are named in every decade, in every year. And then they have on their website, the Social Security website, you can track the most popular names in every decade or even a particular year.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Well, let's go back to the 1920's. What were the top male names? Let me give you the top 10. You've probably thought of some of them already. Some of them are still in use today, but they're not the most popular names today. Here are the top 10. The number one name, Robert. Number two, John. These are people born in the 1920's. Then James. Number four, William. Number five, Charles. Number six, George. Number seven, Joseph. Number eight, Richard. Number nine, Edward.

And number 10, Donald. And honorable mention, number 12, Frank. Frank, yes. Number 12. You have an Uncle Frank? An old Uncle Frank or something? Number 12 in the 1920's. Number 11 was Thomas, just so you know. Okay? So, yeah, they're the top 12 names, male names. What were the top male names in the most complete decade we have to us, the 2010's? So, 90 years later, here they are: Noah, Liam, Jacob, William. Oh, William.

William made it again. So, there is a-- Yeah. William was number four in the 1920's and the 2010's, William was still number four. William, hanging tough. Mason wasn't found in the 1920's. Ethan, not in the top ten 1920's. Michael, not in the top ten in the 1920's. Alexander, number eight. Number nine, James. Let's see. I think James may have made the list in the 1920's. James, yes, James was number three. But in the 2010's, it was number nine.

And then number 10, Elijah. So, out of the top 10 names in 1920, if I'm reading this properly, only two of them made the top ten, 90 years later. How about the women? Let's take a look at the women for a second. The top names for women in the 1920's, what do you think number one was?

Think about it, right? Think Catholic for a second. Yeah, you got it. Mary. Mary, number one. Number two, Dorothy. Number three, Helen. Number four, Betty. You know any kids named Betty now? Number five, Margaret. Number six in the 1920's, Ruth. Number seven, Virginia. Number eight, Doris. Number nine, Mildred.

Ladies and gentlemen, do you know any babies named Mildred today? No babies named Mildred. Number 10, Francis. And we'll keep going just for laughs. Number 11, Elizabeth. And

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

number 12, Evelyn. Okay, let's go to the top 12 names of the 2010's, women names. Number one, what do you think it is? What is it? Emma. Number two, Olivia. Number three, Sophia.

Number four, Isabel. Number five, Ava. I have a niece named Ava. Number six, Mia. Number seven, Abigail. Number eight, Emily. Number nine, Charlotte. The Queen City, ladies and gentlemen. That's what we're in right now. Number 10, Madison. Number 11, Elizabeth. Elizabeth made it, I think both lists. Yeah. She's number 11. She hung tough with Elizabeth. And number 12 is Amelia. Only one out of the top 12 names from the 1920's made the top twelve 90 years later.

Only one. Why? Because name usage changes over the decades. And this is, I think, pretty convincing evidence the New Testament writers were actually eyewitnesses. We're going to see it when we come back from the break. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist' with me, Frank Turek, on the American Family Radio Network. Our website is CrossExamined.org. That's CrossExamined with a D on the end of it, .org. We're going to be back in just two minutes, so don't go anywhere.

What's in a name, ladies and gentlemen? A lot. In fact, names can help us discover whether or not the New Testament writers were eyewitnesses and we're discovering they were. In the first segment, we were talking about the most popular names per decade used here in the United States. And they changed almost completely. Eighty to 90% of the names that were really popular 100 or 90 years ago are not popular at all now. They're new names that are being used.

In fact, we talked about the number one name for men in the 1920's was Robert. You know what? Do you know what the number one name or let me easy for me to say, too many names here. Do you know where Robert is now in the ranking? It was number one in 1920's. Right now, Robert is number 89. Number 89. How about Mary? Remember we said Mary was number one among females in the 1920's?

How about now? Mary is 135th among women in the United States now, popularity in terms of names. A hundred and thirty-fifth after being number one for decades early on. Now it's 135.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Very few Mary babies out there. I mentioned Frank was number 12 in the 1920's. You know where Frank is now? Frank in the US is number 468.

Who names their kid Frank anymore? I mean, come on. Frank? What a crazy name. Now, we don't name our kids Frank anymore. It went from number 12 to 468. How about Mildred? Remember I mentioned Mildred? Actually, Mildred right now is-- Or Mildred in the 1920's was number nine. The number nine most popular female name. You know what it is now? It's like 1458th among women, something like that.

You can plug it into AI, so we know it's true. I mean, it's really, it's like it's not even on the list. It went from number nine to like 1458th because name usage changes. You got any Agnuses? Anybody get named Agnes now? How about Dolores? You know anybody named Dolores? Not even Margaret is popular anymore. Elizabeth is still hanging in. But you don't get Helen. You rarely get a Dorothy.

You might get some more Ruth's. Ruth might be making a comeback. Virginia, not so much. Doris? No, you're not getting many of these names. Bertha? No, not happening. You know any kids named Bertha now? No. Because name usage changes, and it changed in first century Israel. In fact, Richard Bauckham has this in his book, 'Jesus and the Eyewitnesses'. If you get the book, and you ought to get it.

It's a classic book already. You ought to get the new edition that came out in 2017 called 'Jesus and the Eyewitnesses'. And when you look at the name usage in the first century in that area, in the area of Israel, it matches up with the names that the New Testament, the New Testament sites in both Gospel and Acts. I'll give you some of the stats here.

What Bauckham is using is a database that another scholar first developed. And the database spans, I think, about four to 500 years. But most of the names from the database are from first century Israel. And the lady that originally compiled this data took it from writings, and even inscriptions, and even cemeteries. She got the names that were very popular at this time period.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

And here is what Bauckham did as he came along, and he compared those names that she found to the names cited in Gospel and Acts. And here are some of the findings, 15.6 of the men in the Israeli area-- Some call it Palestine, although Palestine did not become a name for this area until 135 A.D. because the Emperor Hadrian tried to stamp out Christianity and Judaism. And he tried to do it by changing the name of what we call Israel to Palestine after the arch enemies of the Israelis, the Philistines.

So, the name Palestine really came in about 135 A.D. from the Roman emperor Hadrian. And there's never been a Palestinian country. Just this area was called Palestine because it was always occupied by somebody else. And it was Hadrian that gave it the name. But in this area, the Palestinian or Israeli area, 15.6 of the men had the name Simon or Joseph. In the Gospel in Acts, 18.2% of the men had the name Simon or Joseph.

In the Palestinian area in the first century, 41.5% of the men had one of the nine most popular names at the time. In Gospel and Acts, it's almost identical, 40.3% of the men had one of the nine most popular names. In the area of Israel or Palestine, in the first century, 7.9% of the men had a name no one else had.

And in Gospel and Acts, 3.9% of the men had a name no one else had. In this area in the first century, 28.6% of the women had the name Mary or Salome. In the Bible, Gospel and Acts, 38.9% of the woman had the name Mary or Salome. And there's other data too, but it's showing a very close correspondence. Meaning that if the New Testament writers had tried to invent characters in the first century and they weren't there, they didn't have access to eyewitness testimony, then it's highly unlikely they would have gotten such a close congruence of the names.

They wouldn't have gotten the names correctly. And Bauckham also found that the popularity of Jewish names at the same time in Egypt were almost completely different than those used in Israel at that time. So, the New Testament writers had to have testimony from first century Israel to get the names right. In fact, it was J. Warner Wallace in his newest version of 'Cold-Case Christianity', where he points this out. He kind of summarizes Bauckham's stuff.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

So, if you don't have Bauckham's book, you can get 'Cold-Case Christianity' off your shelf, the newest edition. And here's what Jim says. He's summarizing Bauckham. Here are the top men's names in Palestine or Israel in the first century: Simon, Joseph, Eleazar, Judah, Johanan, or John, and Joshua, or Jesus. Right? Those are the top six names for Jews.

The top six names in Egypt at the same time were completely different with the exception of Joseph. All the other names are different. Oh, sorry. Joseph and Eleazar are the same. Eleazar is number one, Sabadius is number two. Then you get Joseph, then you get Dastinius, Papius, and Ptolemius. Four of those names aren't even on the list of the names in Palestine.

In other words, the names between Palestine and Egypt are drastically different at that time. So, if they were writing from Egypt using Jewish names used in Egypt, they wouldn't have gotten the names correct. So, this shows that they were eyewitnesses or at least had eyewitness testimony from their sources.

And Jim goes on also to mention this. I'm talking about Jim Wallace now. This is from 'Cold-Case Christianity'. He says when names are very common, people find themselves having to make a distinction by adding an extra piece of information. He says, my name is Jim Wallace, but I'm often confused with Jim Wallace, different spelling, the founder and editor of 'Sojourners' magazine. That's a lefty Christian magazine. And so, Jim says, for this reason, I will sometimes add the additional descriptor of ColdCaseChristianity.com when describing myself.

He says, I am Jim Wallace of ColdCaseChristianity.com as opposed to Jim Wallace of 'Sojourners'. When you see the addition of a descriptor, you can be sure the name being amended is probably common to the region or time in history. We see this throughout the Gospel accounts. The Gospel writers introduce us to Simon Peter, Simon the Zealot, Simon the Tanner, Simon the Leper, and Simon of Cyrene.

What do you got there? You got several Simons. You've got 1, 2, 3, 4. You've got five different Simons in the New Testament. And because the name was so popular, it was the most popular name in Israel in the first century. The writers, in order to keep people from being confused, would add that descriptor or that differentiator after their name. I'm talking about Simon Peter, not Simon the Zealot, not Simon the Tanner, not Simon the Leper, Simon of Cyrene.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

I'm talking about Simon Peter. He goes on to say, the name Simon was so common in the area of Palestine in the first century, that the Gospel writers had to add to the Scriptures to differentiate one Simon from another. This is something we would expect to see if the gospel writers were truly present in the area in the first century and familiar with the common names of the region and the need to better describe those who possess those popular names. Jim Wallace goes on to say, Jesus the Hebrew Joshua was one of these popular first century names in Palestine, ranking sixth among men's names.

For this reason, Jesus was one of those names, often requiring an additional descriptor for clarity's sake. Interestingly, the gospel writers themselves, when acting as narrators, didn't use descriptors for Jesus, even though they quoted characters within the narrative who did.

Matthew, for example, repeatedly referred to Jesus as simply Jesus when describing what Jesus did or said. But when quoting others who use Jesus' name, Matthew quoted them, identifying Jesus as Jesus from Nazareth in Galilee, Jesus the Galilean, Jesus of Nazareth, Jesus who was called the Christ, Jesus who was crucified.

Why the difference? Because Matthew, as a narrator of history, simply called Jesus by his first name over the course of many chapters. His readers are already familiar with the person of Jesus Matthew introduced early in the account. But Matthew accurately recorded the way we would expect people to identify Jesus in the context of the first century. Matthew appears to be acting merely as an eyewitness recorder of facts, limiting himself to Jesus when he's doing the talking, but accurately reporting the way he heard others refer to Jesus.

This is extremely interesting to me, ladies and gentlemen. I hope it's interesting to you because it's showing they really were eyewitnesses. A lot more after the break. You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek. Back in two minutes.

Sorry, Aunt Mildred, but nobody wants to use your name anymore. And that helps us understand that the New Testament writers were either eyewitnesses themselves or at least had eyewitness testimony because they didn't pull anachronism with names in the New Testament. They had the name usage right.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

You know, it's like today, if you were trying to write-- First of all, if you were trying to write a novel, say of the 1920's, and you didn't have any access to the names used in the 1920's and you started using names we use today for women, you wouldn't get them right.

You wouldn't. Right? You'd be naming characters in the 1920's, you know, with the trendy names we have now, like Emma, Olivia, Sophia, Isabel, Ava, Madison, you know, Charlotte. You wouldn't be using the names because you didn't know them. You wouldn't be using Mary, Dorothy, Helen, Betty, Margaret, Ruth, Virginia, Doris, Mildred and Francis because you didn't know. Just like if-- Well, first of all, I mean, these New Testament writers, they didn't have access to the tools we have.

They didn't have the internet, quite obviously. They didn't have the Social Security Administration to say what were the names used back in the first century so I could write an historical novel about what happened? By the way, we'll get to it a little bit later. There was no genre known as historical novel in the first century. I'll get to that a little bit later. The bottom line is this. If the authors of the Gospel in Acts did not base their writings on eyewitness testimony from Israel in the first century, it's highly unlikely they would have gotten the names right for that time and place.

It would be like one of us trying to write a novel set at a different time in a foreign land without any means of investigating the names at the time. Do you think we would get the names right? No. The New Testament writers couldn't have faked the names. Now, there's a lot more evidence that the New Testament writers are telling the truth when it comes to the fact that they have eyewitness testimony. I think, of course Matthew and John are eyewitnesses.

I think Luke and Mark have access to eyewitness testimony. When we wrote 'I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist', we discovered we didn't know anything about the names that Bauckham had come up with because Bauckham had come up with that after we wrote 'I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist'. But in a future update of 'I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist', we will include that. But what we did discover was that names in the 1st century of prominent people, the New Testament gets right.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

And I'm about to name a number of people that have all been found either in the dirt or in other writings from the first century. So, these are all people that the New Testament sites that are real people in history, either confirmed by archaeology or other writings from non-Christian sources. Jesus. Okay, we'll start with Jesus. Yes, he's recorded by non-Christian sources. He's also found in archeological discoveries.

His name is on the James Ossuary. The James Ossuary, that was his brother. Where the ossuary, which was disputed for a while, they thought it was a forgery. We've discovered it's not a forgery. It comes from the first century and so does the inscription. This ossuary was the burial box of his brother James, apparently, who was killed as a martyr in the city of Jerusalem in 62 A.D. as described by Josephus, the Jewish historian, and also another writer, Hegesippus, who lived later.

His burial box has James, son of Joseph, brother of Jesus. Also, there's an inscription found in Israel with the name Jesus on it that comes within the first 200 years of Jesus. They just found another inscription, in fact, an entire floor. I don't have all the details on it yet, but they discovered this in a prison in Megiddo, the ancient town of Megiddo.

And they discovered this mosaic floor where it says Jesus is God. I think this comes from the 200's A.D. We'll cover that in a future show. It's a relatively new discovery, but there's inscriptions and also several mentions of Jesus in writings. Agrippa 1 has been discovered. Agrippa 2 has been discovered, either in writings or coins. Ananias, Annis, Arteus. All these, by the way, they're all listed in 'I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist'.

I'm listing 34 people from the New Testament that have been discovered either in the dirt, archaeology, or through other writings. Bernice, that's the wife of Agrippa too. Josephus mentions her. Caesar Augustus, many people mention Caesar Augustus. Caiaphas. You know, we have Caiaphas's ossuary. That's the burial box that Caiaphas was put in. The high priest who sentenced Jesus to die, he's been discovered. That's a fabulous discovery. It was made in 1990.

It's actually in the Israel Museum, with some other Jesus related archaeological discoveries. Claudius, he's been discovered, or he was mentioned by Josephus. Drusilla, that's the wife of Felix, also mentioned by Josephus. The Egyptian false prophet mentioned by Josephus. He's

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

mentioned in Acts. Erastus, several inscriptions about Erastus. That's from Acts 19. Felix mentioned him. Tacitus and Josephus talk about him. Gallio, we have an inscription. That Gallio inscription found in Delphi, Greece enables us to date all of Paul's writings because it's a stake in the ground.

Gallio is the guy who had Paul brought before him by some angry Jews who were essentially saying, Paul is teaching against Jewish law. And Gallio, who is the governor of Corinth at the time for one year, he basically says to the guy who brought the charge against Paul, the synagogue leader by the name of Sosthenes, he brings this before Gallio thinking Gallo is going to care, and Gallio doesn't care.

And he basically says, why are you bringing this to me? This is an issue for your law. This has nothing to do with Rome. And so, he basically dismisses the case. And it says right there, I want to say this is Acts 18. Yeah, it's Acts 18, that the guy who brought this charge, his name is Sosthenes. He's the synagogue leader. He starts to get beaten up by the crowd.

Now, notice this, ladies and gentlemen. This is for me, super interesting. Go to 1 Corinthians, chapter 1. First Corinthians, chapter 1. This is the first verse. Check this out. Paul, called to be an apostle of Christ Jesus by the will of God and our brother Sosthenes, to the church of God in Corinth. And the letter continues. Paul is writing to the church in Corinth just after this event occurred.

And he's writing as if he's writing with Sosthenes. Now, he doesn't explain why Sosthenes is in his letter, as if he's one of the writers of the letter. But I think we can read between the lines here. What happened? After Sosthenes was beaten up by the crowd as described in Acts 18, after trying to get Paul charged with something. I think what Paul did is, Paul took him under his wing and said, hey, brother, let me help you here.

And Sosthenes, the guy that was trying to convict Paul of a crime, became a Christian. And then Paul puts him in the letter back to that church. Man, that's powerful, because now he's writing back to the church and he's saying the former leader of the synagogue is now a Christian. Now, it's not explicitly pointed out, but it seems to me that's probably what happened.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Who else has been discovered? Gamaliel from Acts 5. Josephus talks about him. Herod Antipas, he's found in coins, I believe, and also Josephus mentions him.

Antipas is the one that wanted, you know, John the Baptist's head on the platter. He was the guy in charge when Jesus was crucified. Herod Archelaus, Matthew 2. Matthew is told in a dream to, you know, Herod's dad, you can bring Jesus, the baby Jesus back from Egypt. But as soon as Matthew, or as soon as Joseph hears that Archelaus is ruling down there in Judea, he says, I don't want to go there. I'm not going there. I just fled his father, a homicidal maniac who wanted to kill all the babies.

I'm not going to Judea. I'm going to go north of his jurisdiction. I'm going to go up to Nazareth. And Josephus tells us why Matthew, or Josephus tells us why Joseph is afraid of Archelaus. He doesn't tell us directly, but he tells us what Archelaus had done. In 4 B.C., there was a disturbance at the temple and Josephus tells us that Archelaus sent troops and killed 3,000 Jews that year in and around the temple.

It was so horrible that Passover that year was canceled. So, a lot of the Jews who had gone to Israel for Passover, who had lived in Egypt, were probably walking back on the road from Israel back to Egypt. And Joseph's making his way back up to the Holy Land. And he probably says to them, hey, what's going on? Why aren't you staying in Passover? Didn't you hear? Archelaus just slaughtered 3,000 of our brethren.

Passover is canceled. So, he's going, man, I'm not going back there. I'm going to go north of his jurisdiction. That's, by the way, an undesigned coincidence. That's another piece of evidence the New Testament writers are telling the truth, when details in one writing corroborate details in another. In this case, details in a writing from a non-Christian source, Josephus, is corroborating details in Matthew. When Matthew says, when he heard about Archelaus he was afraid, and he went to Nazareth instead.

Josephus is the one that tells us why Archelaus was a bad guy, and you should be afraid of him, not the Bible. Yet, it's authenticating or corroborating what the Bible is saying. It's giving reason for why Joseph is afraid of Archelaus. Also, you've got Herod Philip I, Herod Philip the Great, or

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Herod Philip II, Herod the Great, Herodias, Herodias's daughter Salome. That's the one that asked for the head of John the Baptist.

She's in Josephus. James, I mentioned, has an ossuary and James is also mentioned by Josephus. John the Baptist, Josephus mentions him. Judas the Galilean, also mentioned by Josephus. Licinius in Luke 3:1, he's mentioned in an inscription and also by Josephus. Peter the Apostle Peter, there are several citations for Peter obviously in the New Testament and there are inscriptions that we'll talk more about right after the break.

You're listening to I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist with me, Frank Turek on the American Family Radio Network. Website CrossExamined.org. Don't forget William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia this coming Wednesday, March 5th. Hope to see you there. It'll also be live streamed. Check out our website. More in a minute. Don't go anywhere.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm talking about some archaeological discoveries today about characters in the New Testament that we found in archaeology, we also have found in other writings, non-Christian writer's writings at the time. And I forgot to tell you guys. Well, maybe I've told you before but right now as we speak, the archaeology series that we recorded, 22 one hour lessons, the top archaeological discoveries in the Bible.

We're airing them on our TV show. That's Wednesday nights at 9pm Eastern Time. And if you don't have DirecTV, it's on DirecTV channel 378. If you don't have DirecTV, it's on Roku, R-O-K-U, and look for NRBTU, National Religious Broadcasters TV.

You can find it there. If you can't find it there, if you can't find it on DirecTV or you can't find it, you don't have Roku, it's on this new technology sweeping America right now. It's called the internet. Have you heard of this? Yeah. If you go to our website CrossExamined.org at 9pm Eastern Time, look for TV, and we'll have a box where we're streaming the show. And so many of the inscriptions that I'm talking about here, or ossuaries I'm talking about, we actually show you visually on the TV program.

So, check out the TV program. Right now, we're just talking about that there have been inscriptions found in what we think is Peter's house in Capernaum and also in a church in

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

Bethsaida because Peter started in Bethsaida. That was his hometown. Then he moved over to Capernaum. And we think Peter's house, because there's been inscriptions and even graffiti related to Peter and Jesus in the house, which is literally a 20 second walk from the synagogue that we read about when we're reading about Jesus healing these people, the lame man in the synagogue in say Mark 2.

We read about it there. We also read about Jesus healing Peter's mother-in-law in his house. I want to say that's Mark 8, maybe? I'd have to look that up. But it's in the Gospels, the Synoptics. Anyway, these two locations are very close to one another. And if you go to Capernaum today, and we're going to go again in October. In fact, we're right now putting together details for an October trip to Jordan, Israel, and Egypt.

It's going to be the granddaddy trip of them all. And we're going to release the details hopefully in the next couple weeks. Keep an eye on our website for that. Anyway, when you go to Capernaum, you'll see what looks like the Millennium Falcon has landed in Capernaum. It's not the Millennium Falcon, but it looks like it. It's a church, a Roman Catholic church built with a glass floor. And when you go in it, you can look down and see the original house. Or it's really, it was a house of Peter, we think. And then a Byzantine church built over it.

You can see it through the floor. So, there's been inscriptions mentioning Peter there. Also, Pilate has been discovered in inscription in Caesarea. Several coins with Pilate have been found on it. There's been a ring with a seal on it that Pilate would use to seal messages. And he's mentioned of course by Josephus, he's mentioned by Philo, he's mentioned by Tacitus. These people have all been discovered. Quirinius has been discovered in Josephus.

He's mentioned in Josephus. Festus is mentioned by Josephus. Sergius Paulus, there's inscriptions found. He's found in Acts 13. Simon of Cyrene, the guy that carried Jesus's cross. Well, his son Alexander had an ossuary, and the ossuary said Alexander of Cyrene, son of Simon. So, the burial box of the son of the guy that carried Jesus's cross we found. Tiberius Caesar, of course, has been found in many writings.

So, that's 34 people I just mentioned that have been found in either the dirt or in other writings that the New Testament talks about. These are New Testament characters. In fact, there have

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

been seven people discovered in the dirt that are affiliated with the crucifixion of Jesus. Well, six, about six and a half.

I'll tell you the half here in a minute. Here are the six historical figures associated with the crucifixion of Jesus that have been confirmed through archaeology. Jesus, I mentioned, he's inscribed on an ossuary of his brother James, and a couple other discoveries as well. Peter, inscriptions found in Capernaum and Bethsaida. Caiaphas, the high priest, found his ossuary. Herod Antipas, we found in coins. Pilate, he's I just mentioned, found in inscription coins and a ring seal, and Simon of Cyrene, inscribed on the ossuary of his son. That's six.

What's six and a half? Well, we found the tomb of Annas. He was the high priest, the father-in-law of the high priest, Caiaphas. And they probably had a period where they were co-serving as the high priest. So, his tomb was discovered south of the temple where Josephus said it was, but his name was not found. So, Josephus says here's where Annas's tomb is. We go there. It fits the description that Josephus talks about.

We haven't found an inscription that said it was Annas's tomb, but it was Annas's tomb. So, it's like six and a half people that have been discovered. All right, now you can't make this stuff up. And if you look at 'I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist', we also list 84 eyewitness details from the book of Acts. We list 59 from the gospel of John. Those are from some historians. For example, the Acts details come from Roman historian, Colin Hemer, and the John details come from New Testament scholar, Craig Blomberg.

By the way, we have a course from Craig Blomberg on Online Christian Courses on the historical reliability of the New Testament. You may want to check that out. In fact, we've got two courses coming up right now. One is the online CIA course, and we've got several signed up for the non-presenting version. But we have some seats left for the presenting version, where you'll present to either me, Greg Koukl, Natasha Crain, or Alisa Childers. And we'll help you with your presentation and question answering skills.

And then you'll get the benefit of all the other presenters via video. People like J. Warner Wallace, and Richard Howe, and David Wood, and Allen Parr. I just saw Allen just the other day down at the NRB conference in Dallas. He's doing well. And many other instructors.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

So, check out CIA, the online CIA course. And we're going to have in-person CIA in Florida, in the end of July into August. We got Florida because hell was booked for August. [Laughter] Anyway, we got a great church down there which is the church that is headed by my friend Chip Bennett, which is Grace Church there in Sarasota.

Fabulous church. We're going to do CIA down there. So, check all that out. Anyway, we've got all these eyewitness details. We've got 140 plus just from Acts and the Gospel of John, and they're spread out. There's a bunch spread out elsewhere. We've got all these names I just mentioned. We've got the names that were mentioned by the New Testament. They're all right for the period and the place as we mentioned at the top of the program. But some people will say, well that's the Spider-Man fallacy.

What's the Spider-Man fallacy? Well, this doesn't mean the New Testament's true. This could be an historical novel. It's like saying since Spider-Man is set in real New York City, Spider-Man must be true. That's a Spider-Man fallacy. But there's a lot of problems with this, friends. First, you can't explain why independent non-Christian writers collectively reveal a storyline congruent with the New Testament. In other words, if you add up the non-Christian writers talking about what happened in the New Testament, they give you a storyline congruent with the New Testament.

They say the disciples believe Jesus rose from the dead. Of course, the non-Christian writers don't believe Jesus rose from the dead. But they're saying the disciples believed he rose from the dead. If the non-Christian writers thought Jesus had risen from the dead, they would be Christian writers. Okay? But the point here is they're giving a story congruent with the New Testament.

How could they do this if this was a novel? They couldn't. Why would they? They couldn't do it, but they're given a story congruent with the New Testament. Second, this Spider-Man fallacy can't explain why the New Testament writers and other Jewish followers of Jesus gave up their sacred religious beliefs and then endured persecution, torture, and death.

Why would they have died for a fictional story? They wouldn't. The third problem with this Spider-Man fallacy charge is that historical novelists usually do not use names of real people for

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**



I don't have enough **FAITH**
to be an **ATHEIST**

with Dr. Frank Turek **PODCAST**

their main characters in their stories. If they did, those real people, especially powerful government officials, would deny the story, destroy the credibility of the authors, and maybe even take punitive action against them. But we've got all these real people in the text. And finally, the New Testament is-- The reason this is not the Spider-Man fallacy is the objection is anachronistic because the genre of historical novel did not originate until the 1800's.

So, this is 1800 years too early. In fact, C.S. Lewis makes that point while emphatically arguing the Gospels are not some made-up story meant to entertain like today. Here's what Lewis said. He said, now, as a literary historian, I'm perfectly convinced that whatever else the Gospels are, they are not legends. I have read a great deal of legend and I'm quite clear that they are not the same sort of thing. They are not artistic enough to be legends. From an imaginative point of view, they are clumsy. They don't work up to things properly.

Most of the life of Jesus is totally unknown to us, as is the life of anyone else who lived at that time. And no people building up a legend would allow that to be so. Apart from bits of the Platonic dialogues, there are no conversations that I know of in ancient literature like the fourth Gospel. There is nothing even in modern literature until about 100 years ago. Lewis, of course, is writing about 100 years ago or 70 years ago, when the realistic novel came into existence. In other words, the realistic novel, the historical novel, did not even begin.

The first one we know of is like in the early 1800's. So, this is not the Spider-Man fallacy. The New Testament documents contain multiple independent accounts of these events by nine different authors. And it's anachronistic to say it's an historical novel. Of course, if it was, it would require a grand conspiracy over a 20 to 50 year period, of these nine authors who are all spread all over the ancient world. They couldn't pull this off as a novel if they wanted to.

All right, friends, it's been great being with you. Lord willing, we'll see you here on the midweek podcast on Tuesday that will not be broadcasted on AFR. You need to find the I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist podcast in order to hear that. Friends, don't forget, William and Mary this Wednesday. And next weekend, March 8th and 9th, I'll be in St. Louis. Check the website for details. God bless.

**CROSS
EXAMINED
ORG**

