



Reasonable Faith



Study Guide

WILLIAM LANE CRAIG

Table Of Contents

Preface	Page 1
Questions on the Preface	Page 3
Questions on the Introduction	Page 4
Questions on Chapter 1	Page 7
Questions on Chapter 2	Page 11
Questions on Chapter 3	Page 15
Questions on Chapter 4	Page 25
Questions on Chapter 5	Page 33
Questions on Chapter 6	Page 38
Questions on Chapter 7	Page 43
Questions on Chapter 8	Page 47

PREFACE

Reasonable Faith is a handbook of Christian Apologetics. As explained in the Introduction to the book, Apologetics is that branch of Christian theology which seeks to provide a rational justification for the Christian faith. Just like an American football team, Apologetics comprises both offense and defense. When it goes on the offense, Apologetics seeks to provide positive arguments and evidence in support of Christianity's truth claims. When it goes on the defense, Apologetics seeks to answer the objections of opponents to Christianity's truth claims. In order to avoid the unfortunate connotations of the word "offensive" (and, to a lesser extent, even "defensive"), we can refer to these two approaches as positive apologetics and negative apologetics.

Reasonable Faith is an exercise in positive apologetics. That is to say, it does not seek to answer objections brought against the Christian faith; rather it attempts to build a sound and convincing case for the Christian faith.

Such an approach has considerable advantages. In an age of information overload, the average Christian cannot be expected to be able to answer the challenges posed by every competing worldview which he might encounter. But if you have a positive case of the truth of the Christian worldview, then you automatically have a good reason for thinking that any competing worldview is false, whether it be atheism or Buddhism or Islam or Mormonism or Scientology or what have you. Moreover, if the person you're talking to doesn't have comparably good reasons for thinking that his worldview is true (and how many people do?), then you have given that person a good reason to leave his view and become a Christian. Since most people have no good reasons at all for believing the worldviews they hold, you'll be miles ahead if you have good arguments in favor of a Christian worldview, even if you can't answer every objection that might be brought against it. So when it comes to Apologetics, it's best to have a good offense in place before working on the defense. Later you can go on to study objections to Christianity's truth claims and the various responses to them.¹

A positive apologetic for a Christian worldview will comprise two broad components: (1) *natural theology*, which attempts to provide arguments for the existence of God, and (2) *Christian evidences*, which seek to provide warrant for a specifically Christian theism. *Reasonable Faith* provides both. The case it presents is based on the twin pillars of cosmological, teleological, moral, and ontological arguments for God's existence and the historical evidence for the resurrection of Jesus. It issues in a broadly Christian view of the world which will be the common property of all the major confessions of Christendom, whether Catholic, Orthodox, or Protestant.

A book like *Reasonable Faith* may be something of a shock to readers accustomed to reading only for entertainment. In light reading one may skim or skip ahead without

¹ Those interested in going on to study defensive apologetics may consult chapters 25-31 of J. P. Moreland and William Lane Craig, *Philosophical Foundations for a Christian Worldview* (Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press, 2003).

much loss of understanding. But in a book like *Reasonable Faith* almost every sentence pushes the argument forward another notch, so that if you try to skim you may soon find that you've lost your way. Attentiveness will be repaid with increased understanding. Some readers have commented that they found it necessary to read *Reasonable Faith* with an open dictionary at their side. That's not a bad idea if some of the vocabulary is unfamiliar to you.¹ The level of the book is that of a university upperclassman and will not prove too difficult for you if you pay attention and take your time.

I know that the arguments presented in *Reasonable Faith* are effective because I use them all the time in evangelism and in debates with top non-believing scholars of our day. This study guide is designed to help you master the contents of the book. It may also serve as a discussion guide for small group book studies. In order to assist you in finding the relevant passages in *Reasonable Faith* to answer the study guide questions, the page numbers are indicated in parentheses at the end of each question. By answering and discussing the key questions posed, you will acquire mastery of the material. I can promise that you that once you do, you will be well-equipped to give an answer to anyone who should ask you for a reason for the hope that is in you (I Peter 3.15).

¹ Also useful on this score is C. Stephen Evans, *Pocket Dictionary of Apologetics and Philosophy of Religion* (Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press, 2002).

QUESTIONS ON THE PREFACE

People usually just skip the Preface of a book; but in the case of *Reasonable Faith*, there is some helpful information that you don't want to miss.

1. What two approaches to the subject of Apologetics does *Reasonable Faith* not address? (page 12)

Avery Dulles, the author of the book on the history of Apologetics mentioned in the Preface, has recently written an article which you may want to read, in which he describes the revival of Apologetics going on today. Dulles, who is a Catholic Cardinal and Professor of Religion and Society at Fordham University, says, "All over the United States there are signs of a revival. Evangelical Protestants are taking the lead . . . And their method succeeds. The churches that combine a concern for orthodoxy with vigorous apologetics are growing. Their seminaries attract large numbers of enthusiastic students."¹ Praise the Lord!

With respect to evangelical apologetic systems, you might also consult *Five Views on Apologetics*, edited by Steven B. Cowan (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2000), which contrasts classical, evidential, Reformed, presuppositional, and cumulative case approaches to Apologetics.

2. How is *Reasonable Faith* structured? (12) What were the *loci communes*? (12)

3. What four divisions does each chapter of the book include? (13)

¹ Avery Cardinal Dulles, "The Rebirth of Apologetics," *First Things* (May 2004), p. 20.

QUESTIONS ON THE INTRODUCTION

1. Look at the definition of Christian apologetics. (page 15) What is the significance of the three elements of this definition, that Apologetics

- (1) is a “branch of Christian theology”
- (2) seeks to provide “a rational justification,” and
- (3) focuses on Christianity’s “truth claims”?

2. What four purposes does Apologetics serve? (15)

3. What three vital roles does Apologetics play? (16-23)

4. Why are Christians who depreciate the value of Apologetics because “no one comes to Christ through arguments” so short-sighted? (17)

5. Why is the idea that we live in a post-modern culture a myth? Why is this misdiagnosis of our current cultural situation potentially so disastrous? (18)

6. Self-examination question: To what degree have I been intellectually engaged with my faith?

7. In what two respects can Apologetics strengthen believers? (19-21)

8. Share some way in which you as a believer have been strengthened through the study of Apologetics. Be specific.

9. What biblical grounds are there for the use of Apologetics in evangelizing unbelievers? (21-22)

10. Why should we not be discouraged if many unbelievers remain unconvinced by our apologetic arguments? (22)

11. Why should we be concerned about that minority of persons who will respond positively to apologetic arguments? (22)

12. List the broad divisions and sub-divisions of Apologetics. (23-24)

13. What are the two reasons *Reasonable Faith* focuses on offensive Apologetics? (24-25)

QUESTIONS ON CHAPTER 1

HOW DO I KNOW THAT CHRISTIANITY IS TRUE?

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

1. After reading this section, summarize some of the basic alternatives for understanding how reason and faith relate. Up to now which of these alternatives is closest to your own thinking? How would you have answered the question in the chapter's title?

II. ASSESSMENT

1. Key to this chapter is the distinction between *knowing* and *showing* Christianity to be true. (page 43) Explain the difference between the two.

2. At the most fundamental level, how does one know that Christianity is true? (43-47)

3. What, then, is the role of argument and evidence in our knowing Christianity to be true? (47-48)

4. How can one respond to the objection that Christian claims to a self-authenticating experience of the Holy Spirit are invalidated by analogous non-Christian claims or by artificially-induced experiences? (48-50)

5. Explain how one shows Christianity to be true. (51-52)

6. What is the difference between a deductive and an inductive argument? (52-53)

7. What two prerequisites are there for a sound deductive argument? (52)

8. Try to formulate a valid deductive argument for Christianity.

9. Construct an argument for a Christian hypothesis like "God raised Jesus from the dead" using Bayes' Theorem. (53-54)

10. Why is it not enough to present sound arguments to show Christianity to be true? What more is required? (55)

11. What is the role of the Holy Spirit in our showing Christianity to be true? (56-57)

12. How might one respond to the objection that believers and unbelievers have no common ground on which to argue? (57)

13. What points of discussion do you have?

III. PRACTICAL APPLICATION

1. Did you find the distinction between knowing and showing Christianity to be true helpful? Why or why not?

2. What implications does the teaching of this chapter have for your personal spiritual formation?

3. What are the implications of this chapter for evangelism?

4. How is effectiveness in apologetics to be defined? (60)

QUESTIONS ON CHAPTER 2
THE ABSURDITY OF LIFE WITHOUT GOD

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

1. What is cultural Apologetics? What is its proper place in building a case for the Christian faith? (pages 65, 86)

2. Share some examples from contemporary music, literature, or film of the human predicament.

II. ASSESSMENT

1. What two prerequisites must be met if life is not to be absurd? (71-72)

2. What three broad areas illustrate the absurdity of life without God? (72)
How do these differ from one another?

3. Explain why life is meaningless without immortality and without God. (72-74)

4. Explain why life is valueless without immortality and without God. (74-75)

5. Explain why life is purposeless without immortality and without God. (75-77)

6. How should you respond to someone who says, "I don't believe in God, but my life is meaningful"? (Hint: Is belief in God a prerequisite of life's having meaning? What is the difference between saying that life is absurd without God and saying that life is absurd without belief in God? Suppose someone believes in God, but God does not exist. Is his life absurd? Suppose, on the other hand, that God does exist; is the atheist's life then absurd—or just tragic?)

7. What is the practical dilemma faced by the atheist? (78)

8. What should you say to someone who responds to this dilemma by saying that moral values are just social conventions we can adopt to live together in harmony? (88)

9. What should you say to someone who says, "You don't have to believe in God in order to live a moral life"?

10. Explain L. D. Rue's case for a "Noble Lie." Give some examples where his various options have been adopted in different societies. (85-85)

11. How does biblical Christianity solve the human predicament? (86)

12. What points of discussion do you have?

III. PRACTICAL APPLICATION

1. Did those of you who were once atheists feel the human predicament described in this chapter? If so, describe that experience. If not, why not?

2. Develop some questions to help people who are thoughtless or preoccupied with other things to sense the human predicament.

3. Does your heart respond to God with worship and adoration for imparting meaning, value, and purpose to life?

QUESTIONS ON CHAPTER 3

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD (I)

With this chapter we come to the first pillar in our positive case for the truth of the Christian faith. It is so important that you may want to invest more time in the study of the next two chapters than others.

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

1. Describe the revolution which has been going on in Anglo-American philosophy since the late 1960s. (pages 93-95)

2. What are some of the basic types of arguments in favor of God's existence? (95-106) Be able to identify each one with a sentence or two.

3. Did you notice that the roll of defenders of these arguments sounds like a *Who's Who* of the great minds of Western intellectual history? What does that tell you about your heritage?

II. ASSESSMENT

1. Give from memory the five steps of the Leibnizian cosmological argument. (106)

2. Why is the first premiss not susceptible to the objection that some truths may have no explanation for their truth? (107)

3. What defense might you give on behalf of the first premiss of the argument? (107)

4. Explain why the typical atheist is himself committed to the truth of the second premiss. (108)

5. Why is the second premiss quite plausible in its own right? (108)

6. What response can be made to someone who claims that perhaps the universe exists by a necessity of its own nature? (108-110)

7. How does the *kalam* cosmological argument reinforce the Leibnizian cosmological argument? (111)

8. Give from memory the three steps of the *kalam* cosmological argument. (111)

9. What three reasons can be given in defense of the first premiss of the argument? (111-112)

10. What should you say to someone who, like Mackie, says that it makes more sense that the universe came into being uncaused than that God caused the universe to come into being? (112-113)

11. How might you respond to critics who claim that premiss (1) is true only for things *in* the universe, but it is not true *of* the universe itself? (113-114)

12. What can you say in response to persons who claim that quantum physics furnishes an exception to the causal principle? (114-116)

13. State in a sentence the four lines of evidence marshaled in support of the second premiss of the kalam cosmological argument. (116, 120, 125 140)

14. Give from memory the three steps of both of the philosophical arguments for the beginning of the universe. (116, 120)

15. Explain the difference between an actual and a potential infinite. (116-117)

16. Why is it a mistake to claim that the use of the actual infinite in mathematics proves that an actually infinite number of things can exist? (117)

17. Illustrate the absurdity of an actually infinite number of things. (118-119)
Invent your own illustration.

18. How should you respond to someone who says, "These absurdities result because our finite minds cannot comprehend the infinite"? (119)

19. How should you respond to someone who says, "If an actually infinite number of things could exist, then these allegedly absurd situations are exactly what we should expect"? (119)

20. What should you say to someone who says, "If an actual infinite cannot exist, then God must not be infinite"? (119, note 46)

21. Explain the difference between the so-called A-Theory of time and the B-Theory of time. How does the A-Theory underlie the second philosophical argument for the beginning of the universe? (121)

22. Illustrate the impossibility of forming an actually infinite collection by adding one member at a time. (121-124)

23. How should you respond to someone who says, "But from every point in the infinite past, there is only a finite distance until today. Therefore, there is no problem in traversing an infinite past"? (123)

24. Explain how the standard Big Bang model implies an absolute beginning of the universe. (126-128)

25. What should you say to someone who says, "Maybe there was some physical reality prior to the Big Bang which caused it"? (127)

26. What are the weaknesses of the steady state model? (128-129)

27. What problems does the oscillating model face? (129-130)

28. What is the fatal flaw of vacuum fluctuation models? (131-132)

29. What does the Borde-Guth-Vilenkin theorem imply for inflationary models of the universe? (133-134)

30. Explain how quantum gravity models support the beginning of the universe. (134-136)

31. What fatal flaw afflicts pre-Big Bang scenarios featuring an infinite past? (137-138)

32. Why does the cyclic ekpyrotic model fail to avert the absolute beginning of the universe? (138-139)

33. How does thermodynamics imply a beginning of the universe? (140-141)

34. Explain Boltzmann's Many Worlds Hypothesis and why it was deficient. (141-142)

35. What implications does thermodynamics have for the oscillating model? (144-145)

36. Why is the conjecture that our universe was birthed by a mother universe via black hole tunneling untenable? (145-146)

37. What problems face the inflationary multiverse as a means of avoiding the beginning of the universe? (146-150)

38. What attributes of the First Cause may be deduced from the *kalam* cosmological argument? (152)

39. Why must the cause of the universe be personal? (152-154)

40. What should you say to someone who asks, "If everything has a cause, what is God's cause?" (155)

41. What should you say to someone who says, "The beginning of the universe cannot have a cause because causes must exist before their effects, but there was no time before the Big Bang"? (156)

QUESTIONS ON CHAPTER 4
THE EXISTENCE OF GOD (II)

42. State the three steps of the teleological argument from fine-tuning. (page 161)

43. What is fine-tuning? (158)

44. What should you say to someone who says, "If the constants and quantities had different values than they do, then other forms of life might well have evolved." (159)

45. Why is it irrelevant to claim that in universes governed by different laws life might well exist, even though the constants and quantities would have different values than they do? (159-160)

46. What are the explanatory options for fine-tuning? (160-161)

47. Why is the hypothesis of physical necessity implausible? (161-169)

48. How should you respond to someone who says that just as in a lottery someone has to win, no matter how improbable, so some universe must exist, no matter how improbable? (164-165)

49. What's wrong with saying that the fine-tuning doesn't require an explanation because if the universe weren't fine-tuned, we wouldn't be here to be surprised about it? (165-166)

50. What's the problem with saying that there exists a World Ensemble of randomly ordered universes and our world just happens to be one member of the ensemble? (166-170)

51. What two things does Dawkins overlook in his "Who designed the designer?" objection? (171-172)

52. Give from memory the three steps of the moral argument. (172)

53. Distinguish moral values from moral duties. (172-173)

54. What does it mean to say that moral values and duties are objective? (173)

55. Why on naturalism do objective moral values not seem to exist? (173-175)

56. Why on naturalism do objective moral duties not seem to exist? (175)

57. Explain the distinction between moral ontology and moral epistemology often overlooked by the argument's critics. (176)

58. Why is it premature for the naturalist simply to take human flourishing as his explanatory stopping point? (177)

59. What three objections might be brought against Atheistic Moral Platonism? (178-179)

60. Construct an argument for scepticism about our five senses parallel to an argument for scepticism about our moral sense.

61. How should you respond to someone who says that our moral sense is the delusory result of socio-biological influences? (179-180)

62. Respond to the Euthyphro Dilemma. (181-182)

63. Why is it not arbitrary and implausible to take God as one's explanatory stopping point? (182)

64. State from memory the six steps of Plantinga's ontological argument. (184-185)

65. Explain the difference between epistemic possibility and metaphysical possibility. Why is this important? (185)

66. What intuitive warrant is there for the first premiss of the ontological argument? (185)

67. How do the usual parodies of the argument fail? (185-186)

68. How can we defend our intuition that a maximally great being exists in the face of the intuitive possibility that a quasi-maximally great being exists? (186-187)

69. What a posteriori warrant might we offer for the first premiss of the ontological argument? (187-188)

70. What response can be offered to the objection that the ontological argument is question-begging? (188-189)

I. PRACTICAL APPLICATION

71. What does the revolution in Christian philosophy tell you about the claim of the so-called “new atheists” that theists are morons?

72. Suppose someone, upon hearing the *kalam* cosmological argument, accuses you of “God-of-the-gaps” reasoning—using God to plug the holes in our scientific knowledge. What should you say? (Hint: What is the scientific evidence used to prove here?)

73. Suppose someone says that appealing to God as Creator or Designer is not a legitimate explanatory hypothesis but just a way of expressing our ignorance. How might you respond?

74. Suppose that someone responds to the moral argument by saying that religion is not a reliable guide to the discovery of moral values and that the God of the Bible is, in particular, morally repugnant. How should you answer? (195)

75. Which of these arguments do you find the most persuasive and why?

QUESTIONS ON CHAPTER 5

THE PROBLEM OF HISTORICAL KNOWLEDGE

Having laid our theistic foundations, we now begin to construct the groundwork for a later presentation of Christian evidences. A case for God's decisive revelation in Jesus requires that objective knowledge of the past is attainable and that God's supernatural action in the world is possible and identifiable. In the next two chapters these crucial questions are addressed.

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

1. Wherein lies the uniqueness and the scandal of the Christian religion? (page 207)

2. How did the medieval use of signs of credibility serve as a precursor to historical apologetics? (209-210)

3. How did the rise of historical apologetics parallel the development of modern historiography? (211-215)

4. Why was this parallel development aborted? (215-219)

II. ASSESSMENT

1. What are the two major objections to the objectivity of history? (219-222)

2. What is the difference between historical constructionism as a philosophy and as a methodology? (222-223)

3. What's wrong with constructionism as a philosophy? (223-225)

4. Why is constructionism as a methodology not a problem? (225-226)

5. Assess the supposed difference between a scientist and a historian with regard to their access to their objects of study. (226-227)

6. Why does the “theory-ladenness” of observation not undermine the objectivity of science or history? (227-230)

7. What is a historical fact? (231)

8. What’s wrong with saying that historical facts exist only in your mind? (231)

9. Criticize the notion of a “meaningless fact.” (231-232)

10. What criteria can be used in testing historical hypotheses? (233)

11. Why does the lack of neutrality on the part of a historian not support historical relativism? (234-235)

12. List three considerations which reveal that historians do believe in the objectivity of history. (235-237)

13. What is the importance of naturalism as a presupposition of historical inquiry? Is it justified? (238-240)

III. PRACTICAL APPLICATION

1. How can we avoid making unrealistic claims about the historical evidence for the Christian faith? What fundamental dilemma should we insist on? (242)

2. Sometimes historical scepticism among laymen is based on unsophisticated objections such as, "You can't prove anything about what happened so long ago!" What confusion does this objection embody? (Hint: Which is crucial to historical proof: the gap between the evidence about some event and today or the gap between the event and the evidence about that event? Does good evidence become poor evidence just due to the passage of time?)

QUESTIONS ON CHAPTER 6

THE PROBLEM OF MIRACLES

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

1. How did Newtonian physics make God's miraculous intervention in the world seem incredible? (pages 248-249)

2. Summarize Spinoza's two arguments against the possibility of miracles. (249-250)

3. Summarize David Hume's two-step argument against the identification of miracles. (250-251)

II. ASSESSMENT

1. Why does the indeterminacy in nature allowed by some interpretations of quantum physics *not* suffice as a defense of miracles? (259-261)

2. Why are miracles *not* “violations of the laws of nature”? (261-263)

3. How should miracles be defined? (263)

4. What could conceivably bring about an event which is naturally impossible? (263)
What are the implications of this for Apologetics?

5. What is the flaw in Spinoza’s first argument against miracles? (264)

6. Why is Spinoza mistaken in thinking that the admission of a miracle would overthrow a natural law? (265-266) How is this relevant in the case of someone who responds to the evidence for Jesus’ resurrection by shrugging his shoulders and saying, “I guess that dead men do rise after all!”?

7. What would allow us to identify Jesus' miracles and resurrection as genuine miracles rather than the effects of unknown natural causes? (266-268)

8. What two more or less independent claims does Hume's "in principle" argument make? (270)

9. In asserting that no amount of evidence could ever establish a miracle, what factor did Hume overlook? (270-271) How does this factor come to expression in the probability calculus? (271-272)

10. How is the slogan that "Extraordinary events require extraordinary evidence" exposed as false in light of the probability calculus? (273)

11. Why can it not be assumed that the intrinsic probability of a miracle is terribly low? How would the inclusion of the fact of God's existence in one's background knowledge affect the intrinsic probability of a miracle claim? (275)

12. What should you say to someone who claims that in order to study history, one must presuppose that miracles do not happen? (276-277)

13. Why are Hume's "in fact" arguments not insuperable? (277-278)

III. PRACTICAL APPLICATION

14. All of the illustrations in this section about the importance of the question of miracles for biblical criticism and the science/religion dialogue are epitomized in James D. G. Dunn's treatment of the virgin birth of Jesus in his *Remembering Jesus* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2003), p. 347. Dunn suggests that belief in Jesus' virginal conception was a theological elaboration of the basic affirmation that Jesus' birth was from the Holy Spirit (which need not imply a virginal conception). He admonishes the reader that "Here we also need to be aware of the biological and theological corollaries of insisting that the virginal conception/birth was a historical fact" and cites approvingly Arthur Peacocke's assertion that "any theology for a scientific age" has to start with the assumption that in order to be fully human Jesus had to have a human father.

This is nonsense. In order to be a fully human male, Jesus had to have both X and Y chromosomes. But he had to get genetic material from a human father only if miracles are impossible. The presumption that he had to get genetic material from a human father is a corollary of Peacocke's naturalism. By contrast, the biological corollary of the historicity of the virginal conception is that at least some of Jesus' genetic material was supernaturally created. The theological corollary is that God can create a fully human being out of nothing should He so choose (*cf.* the cases of Adam and Eve on creationist views of origins). We see here how a gifted biblical scholar can be led astray through his philosophical naiveté.

Can you point to other examples of this problem?

QUESTIONS ON CHAPTER 7
THE SELF-UNDERSTANDING OF JESUS

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

1. How has the portrait of the historical Jesus changed from the Old Quest through the New Quest to today? (pages 287-296)

2. How does the "burden of proof" issue underlie the negative use of the so-called criteria of authenticity? (292-293)

II. ASSESSMENT

3. Why is Meier's distinction between the historical Jesus and the real Jesus inept? How ought the distinction to be rightly drawn? (296-298)

4. Why is "the criteria of authenticity" a misnomer? How are they to be rightly understood? (298)

5. Explain some of the most important criteria of authenticity. Think of examples of events/sayings in the Gospels which are shown to be authentic by use of such criteria. (298)

6. What fundamental problem confronts those who deny that Jesus made any claims implying his divinity? (300)

7. Give a defense of the authenticity of Jesus' claim to be the Messiah. What is the theological significance of Jesus' messianic self-understanding? (301-310)

8. Give a defense of the authenticity of Jesus' claim to be the Son of God. What is the theological significance of Jesus' filial self-understanding? (310-314)

9. Give a defense of the authenticity of Jesus' claim to be the Son of Man. What is the theological significance of Jesus' self-understanding as the Son of Man? (315-318)

10. What is "implicit Christology?" (319)

11. Explain several examples of implicit Christological claims made by Jesus. (319-327)

III. PRACTICAL APPLICATION

12. How is popular anti-Christian polemics still largely stuck in the Old Quest?

13. How is the material discussed in this chapter useful in sharing the Gospel with Muslims?

14. How can the material discussed in this chapter serve to contextualize the evidence for Jesus' resurrection?

QUESTIONS ON CHAPTER 8
THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS
I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

1. What was the dilemma posed by the traditional apologetic for Jesus' resurrection? What further argument did the traditional apologetic offer on behalf of Jesus' resurrection? (page 342)

2. How did Strauss undercut the traditional dilemma? (345-347)

3. Describe the recent change in scholarly opinion concerning the historicity of Jesus' resurrection. (349)

II. ASSESSMENT

4. A historical case for Jesus' resurrection will comprise what two steps? (350)

5. How should we respond to Bart Ehrman's claim that there can in principle be no historical evidence for Jesus' resurrection? (350-353)

6. Why are John Meier's reservations about a historical case for Jesus' resurrection misconceived? (353-357)

7. Why are Dale Allison's doubts about Jesus' physical resurrection unfounded? (357-359)

8. What are the inductive grounds for inferring Jesus' resurrection? State the three facts to be explained. (360)

9. Which of the lines of evidence supporting the fact of Jesus' empty tomb do you find the most convincing? Explain it. (361-371)

10. Using McCullagh's criteria for justifying historical hypotheses, assess one of the naturalistic hypotheses offered to explain the fact of the empty tomb. (371-377)

11. Explain how the post-mortem appearances of Jesus are multiply attested. (376-381)

12. Defend the physicality of Jesus' post-mortem appearances. (382-384)

13. Using McCullagh's criteria for justifying historical hypotheses, assess the Hallucination Hypothesis as an attempt to explain the post-mortem appearances of Jesus. (384-387)

14. How can the traditional argument based on the origin of Christianity be effectively recast? (387-389)

15. Why can the origin of the disciples' belief that God had raised Jesus from the dead not be plausibly explained in terms of pagan influences? Of Jewish influences? (390-395)

16. Using McCullagh's criteria for justifying historical hypotheses, assess the Resurrection Hypothesis. (397-399)

17. How can the theological significance of the fact of Jesus' resurrection be accurately discerned? (399)

III. PRACTICAL APPLICATION

18. Isn't it quite amazing, when you think about it, that the historical evidence for an event so extraordinary as the resurrection of Jesus should be so good?
