

## **IF ONE GOOD HISTORIAN SHOWS THAT THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS STORY DOES NOT FIT THE STANDARD NEEDED FOR BELIEVING THEN THAT OVERRIDES EVEN THE RELIGIOUS OPINION OF THE WHOLE CHURCH**

The gospels say that a miracle healing man called Jesus Christ lived. They say he died by crucifixion and three days later he rose again. The tomb he was placed in was found wide open with the stone that had been across the entrance moved back and the tomb was mysteriously empty. His body was gone. Certain witnesses claimed that Jesus appeared to them as a resurrected being.

The gospels were written decades after the alleged resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. Even then they don't like to say a lot about the resurrection as if it was an embarrassment. The crucifixion of Jesus proved he was a fraud but his resurrection supposedly showed that those who reached this conclusion were wrong. But did it really happen? Was it a just legend? Its more than just a statement but a collection of data that may contain enough legends to put bones on the story.

The Gospels are an understandable exception to what classical historians normally deal with, because classical historians rarely if ever deal with the written records of a highly revered religious figure who had very little contemporary significance to anyone but his followers when he was alive and to his worshippers after his death and where the entire written record comes only from those who worshipped him. Because of this, using the myth growth rates observed in other ancient records as a baseline to say what should be observed in the Gospels is a mistaken approach." From *Doubting Jesus' Resurrection* by Kris Komarnitsky.

The same source gives us, "Jan Vansina explains why the Gospels, and the oral traditions that lie behind them, are not independent sources in this sense: ... We cannot assume that the testimony of two different informants from the same community or even society is really independent. This is very important. In history, proof is given only when two independent sources confirm the same event or situation, but... it is not possible to do this with oral tradition wherever a corpus exists and information flows are unstemmed (i.e., in most cases). Feedback and contamination is the norm.... No one will consider the three synoptic Gospels as independent sources, even though they have different authors... they stemmed from one single oral milieu, from one corpus in one community. Once this is realized, it is easy to see that it also applies to John, the fourth Gospel..."

And it quotes Wolfhart Pannenberg: "A single judgment of a sober historian easily outweighs a majority vote, in my opinion. Historical judgment must remain a matter of argument. A majority vote may express the dominant mood of a group, possibly its prejudices, but is not very helpful in judging claims to historical truth or authenticity."

### **MYTH OR SYMBOLISM?**

There is not a huge difference between a myth and a symbolic story. Many feel that the Jesus story or parts of it is symbolic storytelling rather than myth.

Earl Doherty writes that he has to "agree with Ehrman not to style the Gospel story as a "myth." That story did not arise out of the same processes as the myths of Attis or Osiris, though elements introduced into them may have been inspired by common mythemes in the traditions of the time attached to savior gods or famous historical figures. "Allegory" and "symbolism" are perhaps the closest terms we could use to style the Gospels, some of it representing sectarian faith..."

### **HEARSAY**

It is only hearsay that Jesus said he rose! "Jesus was able to tell us he rose from the dead for he rose from the dead therefore his resurrection is true." That is not an argument.

### **THE CHRISTIAN REPLY**

Even if they admit one good historian carries more weight than the opinion of the whole Church, Christians counter that this could in fact show we should agree that Jesus rose. They say they have good historians who override what those who say he didn't rise.

### **MINIMAL FACTS OBJECTION**

The main attempt by Christian historians to ground the credibility of the resurrection vainly uses something call minimal facts.

Certain facts are gleaned from the New Testament data that seem very strong. Habermas and Licona tell us they are,

Jesus died on the cross.

His apostles and others believed he rose and appeared.

Paul an antichrist was suddenly converted to Jesus after the resurrection.

James a skeptic brother of Jesus also converted.

The tomb was empty.

The list comes from what scholars including sceptic ones (supposedly) virtually agree on.

We are not told that Muslim theologians following the Qur'an say Jesus did not die on the cross or resurrect. If the Qur'an passes the evidence test then it may override the crucifixion narrative.

The tomb being empty is not the point but when it was emptied. Nobody can get evidence that Jesus was in it when the tomb was closed. What if the burial was a trick?

The notion that the body was raised is assumed. We are left only with apparitions and considering how most apparitions reported in the Catholic Church are not taken seriously it shows that apparitions alone show nothing.

Plus the vision lied that the Old Testament predicted his rising. It went as far as to upbraid anybody for not seeing those forecasts. That was harsh for they are simply not there.

Plus there was no independent checking of the gospel accounts. Even a half-done one would be better than nothing.

We find that non-historians running a religion and preaching its faith cannot match one person who knows what they are doing with history. The New Testament speaks to history and does not allow for fanciful mystical interpretations.

