

Notes

- 1 This essay is abridged from an article by the same title, originally published in *Gregorianum* 83/4 (2002): 615–35, by permission of the author. Its format has been adapted to the style used in this volume.
- 2 Details are given in N. T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God* (London: SPCK; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003).
- 3 Dio Cassius, *Hist.* 51.16.
- 4 1 Sam 28:3–25.
- 5 See e.g. Rom 1:4; 1 Cor 15:20–28.
- 6 1 Cor 15:23.
- 7 See, e.g., N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Christian Origins and the Question of God, vol. 2) (London: SPCK; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), chapter 11.
- 8 See N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 175–81 for a description of various movements.
- 9 1 Corinthians 15; 1 Pet 1:3–5; etc.
- 10 Acts 2:24–36, etc.; Rom 1:4; 15:12; etc.
- 11 The "sign of Jonah," or at least the comments on it which are paralleled in Matthew and Luke (Matt 12:41–42; Luke 11:30–32); the *palingenssia* in Matt 19:28; and the command not to tell about the transfiguration until the Son of Man has been raised (Mark 9:9f.). See further N. T. Wright, "Resurrection in Q?" in *Christology, Controversy & Community: New Testament Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole*, ed. D. G. Horrell and C. M. Tuckett (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 85–97.
- 12 Against S. J. Patterson, *The God of Jesus: The Historical Jesus and the Search for Meaning* (Hamburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1998), chapter 7, who suggests that Jesus' first followers began by saying He would be raised from the dead in the future and soon changed this into the claim that He already had been.
- 13 Similarly with attempts along the lines of "they experienced the Spirit." Other people did this—e.g., Qumran—without deducing that their leader had been raised from the dead.
- 14 Phil 3:20f.
- 15 Verses 3–9; see too 1 Thess 4:14a.
- 16 Here belongs also, properly, an account of Paul's conversion and the ways in which it was, and he and the others knew it was, peculiar; in other words we cannot assimilate all encounters with the risen Christ to the blinding light on the Damascus Road.
- 17 I have in mind here not least the treatment of E. Schillebeeckx, *Jesus: An Experiment in Christology* (London: Collins, 1979), e.g. 390ff.
- 18 Acts 12:15.

The Resurrection of Jesus' Timeline

Gary R. Habermas

Distinguished Professor of Apologetics and Philosophy and chairman of the department of philosophy and theology at Liberty University in Lynchburg, Virginia (USA)

Perhaps the majority of defenses of Jesus' resurrection concentrate on three different aspects: the failure of naturalistic theories to explain this event, historical evidences for Jesus' appearances, as well as the empty tomb. In this essay I will take a different tack. I will begin with the late first century and work my way back to the death of Jesus in about AD 30.¹ My purpose will be to establish a different approach to the proclamation of the resurrection. I contend that current critical scholarship even agrees to the exceptionally

early date of this proclamation as well as the eyewitness nature of those who made the claims.

Before beginning, we need to set a couple of key parameters regarding the study of historiography. Certainly in the recent writing of history, perhaps the two major components of any study are, wherever possible, to secure testimony that is both eyewitness and as close as possible to the events in question, especially when there are also enough data to answer alternative scenarios. Eyewitness testimony

plus early observation are certainly crucial. They were also valued in ancient times as well.²

AD 60–100: The Composition of the Gospels

When speaking of the death and resurrection of Jesus, most evangelical apologists begin with the reliability of the four Gospels. A popular approach often argues that these books were written either by apostles (as with Matthew and John) or their close associates (as with Mark and Luke) and that these volumes were written between AD 60 and 100. The point is that since these books were written 30 to 70 years after Jesus' death, they provide excellent material for reconstructing the earliest years of the Christian faith. As such we can learn credible information regarding Jesus' crucifixion as well as His resurrection appearances.

On the other hand, however, nonevangelical scholars generally dispute these specific authors although they change only slightly the dates of composition. They usually treat the four Gospels as anonymous documents although there are some notable exceptions.³ Scholars differ as to how much of the Gospel accounts reflect reliably historical information. Like the dates given by evangelicals, these books are usually dated between AD 60 and 100, although the critical tendency is to date the Synoptic Gospels a little later. Mark is often placed at about AD 70, while Matthew and Luke are dated about AD 80–85. There is widespread agreement regarding John, which is generally placed by all scholars in the last decade of the first century. Even critical scholars tend to differ only slightly from these common dates.⁴

How do these critical conclusions affect the defense of the resurrection men-

tioned above? Interestingly, in spite of questioning the authorship of the Gospels, critical scholars have also defended the historicity of the resurrection although they usually emphasize Paul's epistles.⁵ Even for those who prefer the Gospel traditions, we are somewhere between three and seven decades after the events in question.

Especially since we are dealing with the events of ancient history, this is a relatively short period of time. After all, the well-known biography of Alexander the Great, included by Plutarch in his *Lives*, was composed approximately four centuries after Alexander's death.

AD 50–62: Dating the "Authentic" Pauline Epistles

As just hinted, most critical scholars today rely chiefly on Paul's epistles when speaking of particulars regarding Jesus' death and resurrection. Of the 13 books that bear His name, six to eight are accepted as being authentic. In the latter group the unanimously accepted texts include at least Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, and 1 Thessalonians. Philemon and Colossians are sometimes included, as well. These books are usually dated in the decade between AD 50 and 60. Even critical scholars agree regarding both Paul's authorship and the dates.⁶

These "authentic" Pauline epistles are preferred even over the Gospels because of the critical belief that we know the author and dates of composition for these writings whereas we do not know the authors and are somewhat less specific regarding the dates of the Gospels. Further, Paul spends less time on the life of Jesus in general but provides important specifics regarding Jesus' death and resurrection appearances from a much earlier

time.

The key text in this regard is certainly 1 Cor 15:3ff. In the previous two verses, Paul refers to his earlier preaching to this audience. So while the epistle was written approximately 54–55, Paul's original preaching in Corinth would have been dated at least a couple of years earlier, perhaps as early as 50, as noted by Koester.⁷

We have some important reasons for favoring Paul's epistles over the Gospels. Paul wrote this material concerning Jesus' death and resurrection appearances in 1 Cor 15 just 25 years after the crucifixion of Jesus, but he preached this message to the Corinthians several years earlier, about 20 years after the events. This latter figure is only half the time span from Jesus to the Gospel of Mark and less than one-third the distance between Jesus and the Gospel of John. As we will see, Paul's account provides far more reasons than these.

In one of the most important comments in the entire New Testament, Paul tells us that he received the material in 1 Corinthians 15:3ff from someone else. As he states: "For what I received I passed on to you as of first importance" (1 Cor. 15:3).⁸

This comment opens an entirely new window on the question of reliability. Here we must interrupt briefly our current discussion. What if there were some way to know the nature of the earliest apostolic preaching and teaching between the years of AD 30 and 50? What if we knew some of the content of the earliest Christian preaching prior to the writing of the first New Testament book? Some will say that we already have this sort of material in the book of Acts. However, that book is regularly dated between AD 65 and 85, or 35 to 55 years after the cru-

cifixion.⁹ Again, this is a respectable time frame for ancient reports. But what if we had material from even prior to the early Pauline epistles?

Actually, several New Testament portions make precisely this claim. We just mentioned one of the texts in 1 Cor 15, where Paul states that he passed on precisely what he had received from others (v. 3). Paul mentions two other examples in the same book, both of which occur in chapter 11. He praises his hearers for holding firmly to the traditions or teachings he passed on to them (v. 2). Later he reported that he had received the tradition regarding the Lord's Supper and passed it along to his readers (11:23).

Many other texts in the New Testament make similar claims. Sometimes a teaching is introduced with the words, "Here is a trustworthy saying."¹⁰ Somewhat reminiscent of 1 Cor 11:2, the early Christians were to continue in the teachings or traditions they had received (2 Thess 3:6).

On other occasions, even though there is no explicit statement from the author that a tradition is being passed on, critical scholars are still in wide agreement with regard to a number of these texts. They are often indicated by the sentence structure, diction, parallelism, and other stylized wording. Sometimes these texts are apparent because the syntax breaks between the citation and the larger text, just like when we try to quote someone today and we sometimes cannot make our syntax fit theirs. On still other occasions texts contain brief theological snippets that appear to be passed down for purposes of memorization. A great example is what is generally agreed by both liberals and conservatives alike to be a Christological hymn in Phil 2:6–11.

One benefit of these early traditions

(also called creeds or confessions) is that they reproduce teachings that are sometimes earlier than the book in which they appear. Therefore, if the material is also deemed to be reliable, especially if it appears to be apostolic in nature, then it exhibits both trustworthy comments that are also early, sometimes exceptionally so.¹¹

Precisely for this last reason we must ask what is the most likely scenario for Paul's reception of the tradition in 1 Cor 15:3ff? The apostle claims in a straightforward manner that he passed this information on as he received it. Do we have any information regarding when Paul may have received this account? And who passed it on to him? Since it concerns the death and resurrection appearances of Jesus, the center of early Christianity, having some indication of Paul's source is important.

AD 34–36: Paul's First Trip to Jerusalem

Strangely enough the next stage in the process was discovered not by biblical conservatives but by critical scholars. Further, there is near unanimity regarding these conclusions from those who address the issues. Paul asserts more than once that he received traditions from others and passed them on to his hearers. Does he give any indications of where and when he obtained these data?

From everything we know, Paul was a careful scholar. He had been trained well in the Old Testament tradition, referring to himself as an individual who was exceptionally zealous for the Law, as a Pharisee and "a Hebrew of Hebrews" (Phil 3:4–6). He had advanced beyond others of his own age and distinguished himself by supporting without question the tradition of Judaism. As such, he vio-

lently persecuted early Christians (Gal 1:13–14). Then he testified that he met the risen Jesus, accounting for the total transformation of his life (1 Cor 9:1; 15:8–10; Gal 1:15–16).

Paul attests that immediately after his conversion, he did not consult with anyone. Since he had seen an appearance of Jesus and had been instructed by him to preach to the Gentiles, he did not think it was necessary to check this all out with others. Jesus' authority was greater than that of anyone else. However, three years later he did visit Jerusalem and spent 15 days with Peter and James, the brother of Jesus (Gal 1:15–18).

What happened during this incredible meeting involving these three great Christian leaders? It must have been eventful, to say the least. In the now famous words of Cambridge University New Testament scholar C. H. Dodd, "We may presume that they did not spend all the time talking about the weather."¹²

What did they discuss? It might be said that the first rule of literary criticism is to interpret a text in its context. Applying that rule here, the context both immediately before and immediately after Paul's statement concerns the nature of the gospel message. Therefore, critical scholars have long thought that the context makes clear that this subject would form the center of this historic meeting. Besides, what else would Paul and the other two apostles more likely discuss other than the center of their faith? For these reasons it is widely concluded that the gospel constituted the focus of their conversation.

Further, the majority of critical scholars who answer the question think that Paul received the early tradition recorded in 1 Cor 15:3ff. during this visit to Jerusalem and that he received it from

Peter and James, who, incidentally, are the only other individuals besides Paul whose names appear in the list of Jesus' resurrection appearances. Based on the usual date for Paul's conversion of between one and three years after Jesus' crucifixion, Paul's reception of this material in Jerusalem would be dated from approximately four to six years later, or from AD 34–36. On many occasions I have documented this critical scholarly conclusion as to when and from whom Paul received this material.¹³ Bauckham has also recently noted the scholarly consensus on this point.¹⁴

Besides the subject matter itself and the three individual names in the list of appearances, another hint regarding this process is found in Gal 1:18. When speaking of his time with Peter and James, Paul used the Greek term *historesai*, which is often defined as gaining knowledge by personal inquiry or investigation.¹⁵ So Paul apparently meant us to understand that he was using this quality time with the other two apostles in order to probe their understanding of the gospel message. But even without his telling us this, it makes the most sense of his taking a trip to Jerusalem to speak with the major apostles there. Moreover, the topic was important to Paul, for he paused afterward to tell his reader: "I assure you before God that what I am writing you is no lie" (Gal 1:20).

We must keep in mind here the vital difference between the formal tradition that Paul passed along to others, which as far as we know was written down for the first time in 1 Cor 15:3ff., and the particular *content* about which that tradition speaks. Virtually nothing depends on Paul's having received this tradition during precisely this meeting in Jerusalem,

even though that is when critical scholars tend to place it. By far the more important matter concerns Paul's knowledge of the gospel content as preached by Peter and James, the brother of Jesus, which comprises the creed. Thus, all we really need to know here is that Paul discussed the gospel particulars with them, and this seems well assured.

In fact, critical scholars are so sure about this last point that Dodd concluded, "The date, therefore, at which Paul received the fundamentals of the gospel cannot well be later than some seven years after the death of Jesus Christ. It may be earlier." Therefore, "Paul's preaching represents a special stream of Christian tradition which was derived from the main stream at a point very near to its source." And lest some say that Paul confused this message, Dodd concludes, "Anyone who should maintain that the primitive Christian gospel was fundamentally different from that which we have found in Paul must bear the burden of proof."¹⁶ But we do not have to take C. H. Dodd's word for all this. I have listed dozens of contemporary critical scholars, including skeptics, who espouse the general scenario we have outlined here.¹⁷

Thus, the majority of critical scholars think that Paul received his traditional material on the death and resurrection of Jesus from Peter and James the brother of Jesus while he was in Jerusalem, approximately a half dozen years after Jesus' crucifixion. I made the further point that even if one questions the precise time and place of Paul's actual reception of this credal material, it is exceptionally difficult to avoid the conclusion that these three apostles at least discussed the nature of the gospel content at that time.

AD 45–50: Paul's Later Trip to Jerusalem

Here we must digress a bit in our time line before we can keep moving backward toward Jesus' death. This occasion was better left until after the previous discussion. Immediately after describing his trip to Jerusalem, Paul relates that he visited the city of Jerusalem again, 14 years later (Gal 2:1). During what year did this second meeting occur? Paul dates it from his previous discussion in chapter 1, causing scholars to wonder whether Paul meant the time from his conversion or from his first trip to Jerusalem. Also, scholarly opinion varies as to whether the meeting in Gal 2:1–10 is the same as the account in Acts 15:1–31. Regardless, the difference is slight. Koester prefers a date of AD 48.¹⁸

Once again Paul's topic is clearly that of the gospel. It seems to me that verse 2 is among the most incredible comments in the New Testament. Paul attested that he specifically journeyed to Jerusalem to visit the leading apostles, in order to set before them the gospel message that he had been preaching "for fear that I was running or had run my race in vain" (Gal 2:2).

What an incredible admission! Here we have the apostle to the Gentiles acknowledging that he submitted himself to the apostolic authorities in Jerusalem in order to ascertain if the gospel message he was preaching was on target. Had he been mistaken, there could have been dire circumstances for the Gentile members of the early church, hence Paul's fear.

Besides Peter and James, the brother of Jesus, the apostle John was also present (2:9). It is difficult to miss the stellar makeup of this group. One could hardly imagine a single authority in the early church more influential than these four.

We are told that Paul's companions Barnabas and Titus were also present (2:1). To this group Paul presented his gospel message for their inspection. The verdict was that the other three apostolic leaders "added nothing to my message" (2:6). Further, they extended fellowship to Paul and Barnabas, recognizing their mission to the Gentiles (2:9). The other apostles did exhort them also to take care of the poor, which Paul says he was eager to do anyway (2:10).¹⁹

Paul could not have hoped for a better verdict! We assume that he, Peter, and James were on the same page regarding Paul's first visit to Jerusalem. But here he specifically asked for a judgment regarding the central message that he preached to the Gentiles and found that there was no conflict between his gospel teaching and that of the other apostles. Especially when we consider that these were the most influential leaders in the early church, the value of such a positive verdict could hardly be overemphasized. They were all on the same page with regard to the most sacred proclamation in early Christianity.

Again we are reminded of C. H. Dodd's statement that Paul and the other early apostles all agreed when it came to the gospel message.²⁰ Paul made clear that the early gospel preaching was concerned with the person of Christ, His death, burial, resurrection, and appearances (1 Cor 15:3–4). Paul is clear about this in other places as well, where he also quotes other early creedal traditions (such as Rom 1:3–4; 10:9). Similarly, the book of Acts also defines the early apostolic preaching of the gospel as referring to the deity, death, and resurrection of Jesus.²¹ Interestingly, many critical scholars also consider a number of these Acts texts to be other early traditions that predate the book itself. Dodd was one of the leading

authorities here, and he found the same gospel specifics in these Acts texts as in the writings of Paul.²²

After Paul cites the early creedal text in 1 Corinthians 15, he mentioned the other apostles and affirmed that they were preaching the same message of Jesus' resurrection appearances as he was (15:11; cf. vv. 12–15). His readers could get the same information from either source. Here we see the reverse side of Gal 2:1–10. There the three chief apostles affirmed Paul's gospel message. Here Paul asserts that they were teaching the same central message of the resurrected Christ that he preached.²³

For ancient texts, perhaps never do we see this sort of cross-checking by the major authorities, all at such an early date. Howard Clark Kee amazingly asserts that this material is so strong that "it can be critically examined and compared with other testimony from eyewitnesses of Jesus, just as one would evaluate evidence in a modern court or academic setting."²⁴ We conclude that Paul, Peter, John, and James the brother of Jesus were the right people, at the right place, at the right time, all proclaiming the same message!

AD 30–35: Back to the Date of the Actual Events

After our brief backtracking in order to place Paul's later trip to Jerusalem in its proper perspective, we are now ready to move to the final scene. Here we want to ask about those who had knowledge of these historical events prior to Paul's own reception of the data, including the creedal formulation. After all, Paul's obtaining the knowledge of these events beyond his own appearance of the risen Jesus was not an end in itself. We must track backward to the original occurrences themselves.

Working backward from Paul, then, these accounts had already been cast into succinct oral summaries for use in teaching, especially when most people were apparently illiterate. Slightly prior to that are the original recollections and accounts of these occurrences by those who knew of them. As we have just seen, we know that the entire process could take place quickly, based on the difference between the events themselves, the preaching of this data, and its recording just a relatively short time later. Critical scholars readily concede that the early Christians believed certain events had taken place with regard to Jesus. Ultimately, these events either occurred or they did not.

Therefore, prior to Paul's trip to Jerusalem and his discussion with Peter and James, the brother of Jesus, regarding the gospel data (which was perhaps also the time when he received the original creedal tradition in 1 Cor 15), Paul was obviously not the first one to have this report. At least the other two apostles, presumably along with others, had to know the information before Paul did. Now we are getting close to the beginning, since both Peter and James are listed among those who saw the risen Jesus, as is especially clear in 1 Cor 15:4,7. The only more foundational data are the actual events themselves.

How should we date each of these strands? We have seen that Paul's first trip to Jerusalem is usually placed at 35 or 36, and Paul's conversion at three years before that, or about 32 or 33. Since Paul believed that he saw an appearance of the recently dead and now risen Jesus, the crucifixion would have occurred earlier still. But that event could not have happened long beforehand, as indicated by Paul's acquaintance with those who knew Jesus well, such as his brother James and

his chief apostle Peter. Jesus' death had occurred shortly before the appearances. If any of the early confessions embedded in the Acts sermons²⁵ can also be granted as reliable reconstructions of the earliest preaching, then the resurrection was preached from the beginning, immediately after Jesus' death.

How early do critical scholars date this pre-Pauline creed? Even radical scholars like Gerd Lüdemann think that "the elements in the tradition are to be dated to the first two years after the crucifixion... not later than three years after the death of Jesus."²⁶ Similarly, Michael Goulder contends that Paul's testimony about the resurrection appearances "goes back at least to what Paul was taught when he was converted, a couple of years after the crucifixion."²⁷

An increasing number of exceptionally influential scholars has recently concluded that at least the teaching of the resurrection, and perhaps even the specific formulation of the pre-Pauline creedal tradition in 1 Cor 15:3ff., even dates to AD 30! In other words, there never was a time when the message of Jesus' resurrection was not an integral part of the earliest apostolic proclamation.²⁸ No less a scholar than James D. G. Dunn even states regarding this crucial text: "This tradition, we can be entirely confident, was *formulated as tradition within months of Jesus' death.*"²⁹

Therefore, Paul received creedal material in Jerusalem just five years or so after Jesus' crucifixion that was actually formulated earlier, perhaps dating all the way back to shortly after the death of Jesus. But regardless of where we date this creedal tradition itself, the underlying content of the gospel message regarding the death and resurrection of Jesus goes back to the beginning. In other words, it was the central message of the early apo-

stolic church from its inception.

Conclusion: Bringing It All Together

The Gospels contribute many worthwhile items to a discussion of Jesus' resurrection. These texts fall well within the range of admissible sources, especially for the ancient world. However, by following the critical model and emphasizing the "authentic" epistles of the apostle Paul, we begin at a point perhaps 10 to 40 years before the Gospels. But this strategy also brings additional benefits, such as the early creedal traditions which Paul reports.

In the case of 1 Cor 15:3ff., critical scholars agree that Paul's reception of at least the content of this proclamation, and probably the creed itself, go back to the mid-AD 30s, when he spent two weeks with Peter and James, the brother of Jesus. But these two apostles had the material before Paul did, and the events behind the reports are earlier still.

This is probably the chief argument that persuades the majority of scholars today that the proclamation of Jesus' resurrection originated in the earliest church. Virtually all critical scholars think this message began with the real experiences of Jesus' earliest disciples, who thought that they had seen appearances of their risen Lord.³⁰ It did not arise at some later date. Nor was it borrowed or invented. As Bauckham asserts, "There can be no doubt that . . . Paul is citing the *eyewitness testimony* of those who were recipients of resurrection appearances."³¹ This is the chief value of this argument. It successfully secures the two most crucial historiographical factors: (1) the reports of the original eyewitnesses, which are (2) taken from the earliest period. This is the argument that has rocked a generation of critical scholars. The historicity of Jesus' resurrection appearances is indeed strongly evidenced.

Notes

1. I am using “about AD 30” as the crucifixion date, but if it were 33, as some scholars say, then the dates would simply move forward. While the earlier dates would change, the distances in between would remain the same, up until 1 Corinthians (about 55).
2. For example, second-century historian Lucian of Samosata wrote arguably the only ancient work on the art of historiography, entitled *How to Write History* (in *Lucian in Eight Volumes*, trans. K. Kilburn, The Loeb Classical Library, vol. 6 [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959]). Lucian addressed the subject of weeding out subjective factors from the historian’s work (6:7–15, 72–73, 39–43), as well as the proper use of eyewitness testimony, unlike the unnamed historian who claimed to be an eyewitness but Lucian decided he plainly was not (6:43–47)!
3. For the best recent example of a critical scholar who defends the use of reliable and even eyewitness traditions behind the Gospels, see R. Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006).
4. For example, B. D. Ehrman, *The New Testament: A Historical Introduction to the Early Christian Writings*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University, 2000), 43; R. W. Funk, R. W. Hoover, and the Jesus Seminar, *The Five Gospels: The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus* (New York: Macmillan and Polebridge Press, 1993), 128.
5. The best example is N. T. Wright, *The Resurrection of the Son of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003). For Wright’s conclusions on the Gospel data, see especially chapter 9; for Paul’s testimony, see chapters 5–8.
6. For example, Ehrman, *New Testament*, 44; Funk and Hoover, *Five Gospels*, 128; H. Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 2 vols., *History and Literature of Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), 2:103–4.
7. Koester, *Introduction*, 2:103–4.
8. Scripture references are from the New International Version (NIV).
9. J. Drane, *Introducing the New Testament* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986), 236–38.
10. See 1 Tim 1:15; 3:1; 4:9; 2 Tim 2:11; cf. Titus 1:9.
11. For the best treatment of this subject, see the classic volume by O. Cullmann, *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, trans. J. K. S. Reid (London: Lutterworth, 1949); cf. J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, trans. N. Perrin (London: SCM, 1966).
12. C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980, repr.), 16.
13. For examples, see G. R. Habermas, *The Historical Jesus: Ancient Evidence for the Life of Christ* (Joplin, MO: College Press, 1996), especially 152–57; “The Resurrection Appearances of Jesus,” in R. D. Geivett and G. R. Habermas, *In Defense of Miracles: A Comprehensive Case for God’s Action in History* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1997), esp. 263–70.
14. Bauckham, *Jesus*, 265–66.
15. See W. Farmer, “Peter and Paul, and the Tradition Concerning ‘The Lord’s Supper’ in I Corinthians 11:23–25,” *Criswell Theological Review* 2 (1987): 122–30.
16. Dodd, *Apostolic*, 16.
17. For these lists, see G. R. Habermas, *The Risen Jesus and Future Hope* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2003), endnotes 75–102, in particular.
18. Koester, *Introduction*, 2:103.
19. See Paul’s efforts to take up offerings on behalf of poor believers (1 Cor 16:1–4; 2 Cor 8:1–15).
20. Dodd, *Apostolic*, 16.
21. For a number of these passages, see Acts 1:21–22; 2:22–36; 3:13–16; 4:8–10; 5:29–32; 10:39–43; 13:28–31; 17:1–3, 30–31.
22. Dodd, *Apostolic*, 17–31, especially 19, 24, 26, 31.
23. For this agreement between Paul and the other apostles on the nature of the gospel message, see M. Hengel, *The Atonement* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 38, 69; J. P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (New York: Doubleday, 1987), 118; H. D. Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul’s Letter to the Churches in Galatia*, Hermeneia Series (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 76; B. Meyer, “Resurrection as Humanly Intelligible Destiny,” *Ex Auditu* 9 (1993): 15; Bauckham, *Jesus*, 266.
24. H. C. Kee, *What Can We Know About Jesus?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 1–2.
25. Such as those listed in endnote 21.
26. G. Lüdemann, *The Resurrection of Jesus*, trans. J. Bowden (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 38.
27. M. Goulder, “The Baseless Fabric of a Vision,” in G. D’Costa, ed., *Resurrection Reconsidered* (Oxford: Oneworld, 1996), 48.
28. L. W. Hurtado, *How on Earth Did Jesus Become a God? Historical Questions About Earliest Devotion to Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), esp. 4; cf. Bauckham, *Jesus*, 264–68, 307–8; Wright, *Resurrection*, 319, 553–34, 583.
29. J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, vol. 1 of *Christianity in the Making* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 825 (Dunn’s emphasis).