

When Jesus left no writings then what does that say or what might it mean?

If Jesus had really been a new messenger from God, had he really been the Son of God, some writings of his would have been left behind. He left nothing at all. There are no writings attributed to Jesus. There are no archaeological artefacts. It is impossible to believe that God would have done nothing to make sure that some direct evidence to Jesus existed. All we have is hearsay. Hearsay isn't always wrong but it is not very convincing. God didn't ensure that any direct evidence for Jesus survived therefore God doesn't care if we doubt or even disbelieve the existence of Jesus.

What is even more incredible and impossible to explain is this. Why did everybody forge writings and traditions in the name of the apostles and some other New Testament characters, but not Jesus himself? Even Gnostics never attributed any of their books to Jesus but to his apostles or some other disciple of Jesus. And Gnostics often believed that Jesus was a vision seeming to be a man not a man and sought direct revelation from him. Yet they came up with no book claiming to be the direct word of Jesus or even to be something that Jesus had written. If Gnostic and orthodox Christians believed in Jesus as someone who had been on earth, they certainly did not believe that there was any sensible reason for thinking he had been. They had their reasons yes. But these reasons had nothing to do with the kind of evidence a detective or historian or archaeologist would consider.