

5. The Resurrection of Jesus

a. Some Comments on the Shroud of Turin

Nearly all the evidence seems to point to authenticity except radiocarbon dating, which suggests it was made in 1300's

Looks like a case of fraud, but not sure whether medieval (14th cen) or modern (20th cen)

Meanwhile, should not be used as evidence since it raises more questions than it solves

In any case, truth of resurrection does not depend on authenticity of shroud

b. The Evidence for the Authenticity of the Gospel Accounts

see my "Biblical Narratives of Easter Week: Are They Trustworthy?" IBRI RR 1

also Craig Blomberg, The Historical Reliability of the Gospels (IVP, 1987); and Josh McDowell, He Walked Among Us: Evidence for the Historical Jesus (Here's Life, 1988)

Blomberg's conclusions:

- even using modern NT critical approach, if miracle not rejected a priori, Gospels look very good
- using secular historical methods, if miracle not rejected a priori, Gospels look very good

c. The Alternatives Don't Look Very Good

(see discussion in my Gospel History Course Notes)

(1) Coma Theory (Paulus, 1828)

Jesus went into coma on cross, revived in tomb but unconsciousness on cross would be fatal walking on nail-pierced feet a good trick! Jesus did not make "walking wounded" impression on disciples

(2) Hallucination Theory (Strauss, 1835; Lake, 1907)

Jesus died, but women/disciples had grief-induced hallucinations in which they thought they saw him alive but hallucinations do not produce long-term, multiple witness, multiple sense appearances; authorities would have checked tomb as soon as story began to be uncomfortable for them

(3) Fraud Theory (Priesthood, AD 30; Reimarus, 1775; Schonfield, 1965)