

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jtvi-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php)

JOURNAL OF  
THE TRANSACTIONS  
OF  
The Victoria Institute,  
OR,  
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

---

VOL. LIV.



LONDON:

(Published by the Institute, 1, Central Buildings, Westminster, S.W. 1.)

---

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

1922.

## 642nd ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING.

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B,  
THE CENTRAL HALL, WESTMINSTER, S.W., on Monday,  
May 1st, 1922, at 4.30 p.m.

ALFRED T. SCHOFIELD, Esq., M.D. IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed and the Hon. SECRETARY announced the election of the following as Associates:— John Henry Purchase, Esq., T. H. Gelllett, Esq., Albert Hiorth, Esq., C.E., the Rev. L. G. Bomford, M.A., and the Rev. and Mrs. H. E. Cooper. Dr. Schofield drew attention to the Election of Mr. Hiorth, who was a distinguished Norwegian Engineer.

The Chairman then introduced to the Meeting, the new President, the Very Rev. Henry Wace, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. Dr. Schofield then vacated the chair in favour of Dr. Wace.

Dr. Wace then called upon the Rev. J. O. F. Murray, D.D., Master of Selwyn College, Cambridge, and Hon. Canon of Ely, to read his paper on "The Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ."

---

### THE EVIDENCE FOR THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST.

BY THE REV. J. O. F. MURRAY, D.D., Master of the Selwyn  
College, Cambridge, Hon. Canon of Ely Cathedral.

The Resurrection of Jesus Christ is the central event of human history. I do not imagine that any historian is likely to challenge Mr. T. R. Glover's judgment when he says in *The Conflict of Religions Within the Roman Empire*, "Jesus of Nazareth does stand in the centre of human history; He has brought God and man into a new relation; and He is the personal concern of every one of us." His appeal to men is through His Cross, seen in the light of His Resurrection. The Resurrection is, therefore, the pivotal point on which our whole estimate of His Person and Place in the Universe depends. It must be obvious, therefore, that it is impossible in the limits of a single paper to deal adequately with "The evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ." It will be necessary to concentrate on a special part of it. And I propose to concentrate attention on that part of the evidence which is supplied by the New Testament.

At the same time the evidence constitutes, I believe, an organic and closely interrelated whole. And no single part of it can be rightly appreciated, or bear the whole weight of the momentous

conclusion, in isolation. It is of vital importance, therefore, that we should make an effort, however inadequate, to set the fact itself in its full context, before we come to close quarters with the special department of the evidence on which our faith in the fact rests that I have chosen for detailed examination. For though the evidence of the New Testament seems, at first sight, a simple enough matter of literary and historical criticism, the manifold divergences between experts, to all outward appearance equally qualified, and equally desirous of arriving at the truth, is enough to warn us that the problem is not so simple as it seems. Du Bose's paradox is fully justified. "The Resurrection is the best attested and the most incredible fact in history." It provides, therefore, a searching test of our readiness to reconsider our premises, our willingness to follow reason whithersoever it may guide us irrespective of our *præjudicia*. The fact is that it is impossible to come to the consideration of the evidence for the Resurrection, or indeed of any other evidence, with a strictly open mind. Our estimate of the trustworthiness of the Evangelists, and of the sources of information at their disposal, is at every point determined by the "canons of probability," which we lay down for ourselves when we start on our enquiry. The phenomena with which the narratives deal are certainly unique. If the accounts that they give are to be taken at their "face value," they are evidence of the operation of a force, of which we have as yet no other example in human experience. If they stood by themselves, Dr. Rashdall would no doubt be justified in his contention that "any hypothesis would be more possible" than that they are veridical. But they do not stand by themselves, and my first contention is that no justice can be done to the evidence of the Gospels unless the experience that they record is seen in its full context of human history.

We need not for our present purpose go back to trace the Hand of God in the training of His people Israel, and the background of prophetic preparation which the Gospels everywhere imply. It is enough to remember that Jesus claimed to be "the Christ, the Son of the Blessed": that in intention at least He died to redeem mankind, and to bring in the Kingdom of God, throwing the whole weight of the world's salvation on His Father in heaven, in obedience to Whose Will He went unflinchingly to the Cross. This on the one side, and on the other this. Belief in the Resurrection, belief in the fact that this sublime confidence was not misplaced, but that Jesus was indeed raised from the dead, as St. Paul says, "by the glory of the Father," is the keystone of the Christian Creed. That faith transformed the timid, vacillating, broken-hearted band of disciples, making them indomitable witnesses of His sovereignty, and sending them forth into all the world as indefatigable heralds of the Gospel of His

Peace and of the glory of the Cross of shame. That faith is still after nineteen centuries, in spite of tremendous upheavals in the social and political condition of the world, and in spite of the inconceivable extension of the horizon of human thought, the spring of the deepest and most inwardly transforming experience in the lives of countless myriads of those who are called by His Name, so that He is at this moment the spiritual power centre of the whole life of the Church and through the Church of the world: not only because He has given us an assurance of personal immortality by "bringing life and incorruption to light by the Gospel," but by exerting an immediate, personal, redeeming and transforming influence on those who believe in Him, which carries with it a moral evidence in heart and conscience, which P. T. Forsyth\* rightly maintains goes deeper than any merely logical demonstration.

At this point an objection is sure to rise in many minds who are willing enough to go the whole way with me so far. Surely, they will say: "The root of the matter is just here. You cannot compare in intrinsic importance acceptance of the fact of the Empty Tomb with realisation of the present living power of Christ. Why worry us and endanger such faith as we have with the consideration of what is after all only a physical detail? Can we not with Harnack accept 'the Easter Faith' that Christ is risen, while we throw over, or suspend judgment on, 'the Easter Message' of the Empty Tomb? We believe whole-heartedly that Jesus conquered death. We do not know, and to tell the truth we do not care, what became of His Body. We have the kernel of the truth: the narrative, which has served as a protective husk to it in the past, has done its work, and may cheerfully be consigned to oblivion."

This attitude is a not-unnatural reaction to an attempt to press the evidence of "miracles" farther than it will go, and to treat this, the Divinest of signs, as if it had a power in itself to coerce assent. No power from without can compel conviction. Even the Son of God Himself, as Symeon warns His Blessed Mother, must be to the end "an ambiguous sign." The Divine element, the Hand of God, in a "miracle" can never, any more than the inner meaning of a Parable, be perceived by those that are without.

At the same time, I do not think that it is only due to my Scotch pertinacity that I find it impossible to acquiesce in this position. The kernel and husk metaphor is attractive, but I am not convinced that it really applies to the relation between one part of the evidence for our Lord's Resurrection and the rest. It was natural piety, no doubt, which made the faithful women

---

\**The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*, p. 200.

so anxious to do all honour to the dead Body of their Lord. The words to Mary of Bethany in St. John xii. 7 suggest that He Himself anticipated, and at least did not discourage in prospect this reverent and affectionate attention. "Let her," He said, "keep the ointment against the day of my embalming." I do not think that we can, even at this distance of time, without loss, be completely indifferent to what became of His Body.

I have indeed no wish to insist on acceptance of the fact of the Empty Tomb as a condition precedent to any genuine faith in the Resurrection. But I do plead with those, who while rejecting the Easter Message yet accept the Easter Faith, to remember that their faith itself assures them that something happened after the Death of Jesus, which is none the less super-normal, none the less differentiates Him from all other men that its results are manifested in the spiritual rather than in the material sphere: and that, therefore, the *a priori* objection to the Easter Message, which has hitherto dominated all their criticism of the Gospel narratives, the objection, I mean, that it requires us to believe in an event which is absolutely unique in human experience, no longer holds. Something unprecedented certainly took place in the spiritual sphere, and it is at least conceivable that that event in the spiritual sphere had a counterpart in the material.

I do not, of course, mean to suggest that a present spiritual experience can guarantee the occurrence of any specific fact in the past. Nor should we on the strength of it be any less careful to allow for the fallibility of human testimony, especially when it comes from simple people who find themselves in unfamiliar circumstances. But at least the assumption that their experience must fit into a normal mould disappears. We are no longer compelled to treat the narratives as the free creation of pious imaginations trying to justify to others a conviction which rests for the narrator on quite other grounds. It is strange how differently the Gospel stories read when we lay aside for the time the rôle of a barrister, whose one object is to discredit an adverse witness, and come to them sympathetically, believing that they have something to teach us, which may be as yet "undreamt of in our philosophy." We can, indeed, hardly arrive at a fair estimate of the actual strength of the evidence as long as we approach it with presuppositions which would make it impossible for us to accept it, even if it were true.

Let us come, then, once more to an examination of the New Testament evidence. It is well on all grounds to begin with the Epistles of St. Paul. His correspondence, we must remember, was incidental and unsystematic. He was writing in each case to correspondents already grounded in the Christian Tradition, and acquainted with at least the outline of the Gospel story. He does not go back on ground already traversed in their pre-

liminary instruction, unless it is necessary for the elucidation of some point of present interest. It is fortunate for our present purpose that questions were raised in Corinth touching the general resurrection of the dead, which led St. Paul to recall the evidence for the Resurrection of our Lord.

There is, we must remember, no suggestion that anyone in Corinth challenged the fact of that Resurrection: but, as in St. Paul's view, the doctrine of the general resurrection was determined and defined directly by our Lord's, he took occasion to recall their attention to it, and to summarise concisely the evidence to which he had from the first appealed in support of it.

I have given reasons elsewhere\* for believing that the list of witnesses, which he recites goes back in substance to the very beginning of the history of the Church. We must not forget that he had himself been in close contact with two of the most important witnesses whom he names within three years of his Conversion. He tells us, indeed, nothing about the nature of the appearances attested by these witnesses, but he regards his own experience on the way to Damascus, in spite of some abnormal features, as the same in kind as theirs, and he uses the list as a whole as the basis of an argument on behalf not merely of personal immortality, but of a resurrection of the dead, which is in some sense corporeal.

On this point I have elsewhere† called attention to Professor Kirsopp Lake's acute analysis of St. Paul's argument in his book on the *Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*. He points out that St. Paul's conviction that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God" is proof positive that he did not believe that the Body of the Risen Lord was of flesh and blood; and from a comparison of the passages in which St. Paul describes the resurrection bodies of Christians, and the transformation of those who will be alive at the "Parousia" he concludes as follows:

"The evidence points to his belief in a kind of transubstantiation of the body from flesh and blood into spirit, and in this sense he not merely held the doctrine of the resurrection of the *body* as distinguished from the resurrection of the *flesh*, but in so far as the flesh was changed into spirit, he may even be said to have held the doctrine of the resurrection of the *flesh*, if 'resurrection' be taken to include this process of change."

And again:

"The result, then, of an examination of the passages in which St. Paul speaks of the nature of the resurrection body of Christians points to the fact that he believed that at the resurrec-

---

\**Cambridge Theological Essays*, p. 329 f.

†*Church Quarterly Review*, April, 1916, p. 83.

tion of Jesus His Body was changed from one of flesh and blood to one which was spiritual, incorruptible, and immortal, in such a way that there was no trace left of the corruptible body of flesh and blood which had been laid in the grave."

This is, I think, sound and illuminating exegesis, and the conception itself is as remarkable as it is definite. By what steps are we to suppose that St. Paul arrived at it? Unfortunately, Professor Lake is quite certain that St. Paul's view is mistaken. So he goes on to point out an interesting, though not complete, parallel to his thought from what may be a contemporary Jewish writing. His object is to suggest that the doctrine of resurrection, which St. Paul had been taught as a Jew, would have implied the disappearance of the crucified body from the tomb in the event of a real resurrection.

We may readily grant that, if St. Paul held such a doctrine, and it is possible that he did, it would have helped him, after he became convinced of the fact that the Lord was risen, to understand the Christian tradition, with which Professor Lake believes him to have been familiar, that the women found, or thought that they had found, the tomb empty on the Third Day. But surely it is strange that it does not occur to Professor Lake to state that the phenomena of the empty tomb, especially in the form in which St. John records them, of which more anon, would of themselves supply a complete foundation for the very remarkable form that the doctrine of the resurrection body takes in St. Paul. Indeed, it fulfils exactly the conditions of "the specific fact," implied but not stated in 1 Cor. xv., to which Professor Lake refers. It would supply a basis for his doctrine of the resurrection body of Christians, and a date for the Resurrection of the Lord. Room must be found for a word on this second point. The origin of the conviction that the Resurrection took place on "the Third Day" cannot, as Professor Lake admits, be traced to the Old Testament. Nor would it be a necessary inference from the date of the first appearance of the Risen Lord to scattered and fugitive disciples in Galilee. Yet the date was fixed in the tradition which St. Paul received (1 Cor. xv. 2): and it, and it alone, accounts for the peculiar veneration of the first day of the week in Christian circles. I believe, therefore, that though St. Paul does not refer in so many words to the fact of the empty tomb, his argument shows that he believed in it. When we consider the significance of the fact for him both before and after his conversion, it is difficult in the twentieth century to challenge evidence which brought conviction to Saul of Tarsus.

When we pass from St. Paul to the canonical Gospels we come into touch with at least four distinct sources of evidence. St. Mark indeed was probably in the hands of each of the other three. Yet each of them clearly had access to independent sources of informa-



tion. The narrative in the true text of St. Mark is, we must remember, incomplete. It breaks off in the middle of a sentence after v. 8. The closing verses (9-20) in our common text are an Appendix added later, apparently early in the second century. It combines elements, which seem to depend ultimately on St. Matthew, St. Luke and St. John, but in a less pure form.

The independence of the authorities is shown by the difficulty of harmonising them. The most serious difference relates to a promised appearance in Galilee. This is foretold by our Lord before His Passion in St. Matthew and St. Mark: and an angel at the Tomb sends a message to the disciples through the women, reminding them of the promise. The fulfilment of the promise is recorded in St. Matthew. It is probable that St. Mark originally contained a parallel account.

The appointment of a rendezvous in Galilee is, of course, quite consistent with earlier appearances in Jerusalem, such as are recorded in St. Luke and St. John. St. Matthew himself records one to the women. The difficulty is that St. Luke in his Gospel carries on the account of the appearance on the first Easter Day without a break to what looks like an account of the Ascension. It is possible, though by no means certain, that when he wrote his Gospel, he thought that the Ascension took place on the same day as the Resurrection, and was unaware of any appearances in Galilee. He certainly records an express command from the Lord bidding the Apostles tarry in Jerusalem. In any case, before he wrote "Acts" he had learnt that the two events were separated by forty days, and the command to tarry in Jerusalem in "Acts" relates expressly to the period between the Ascension and the Day of Pentecost.

The differences in regard to the experiences of the searching party or parties of women at the Tomb are not so serious. They represent a conflict of testimony only too natural in accounts derived from different members of a group in a time of great excitement. There is, indeed, considerable plausibility in the suggestion that the differences may really be due to the fact that there were two distinct parties of women who visited the Tomb, one coming from Bethany, the other with Joanna from Herod's Palace in Jerusalem.

However this may be, all these independent sources of information take for granted that the Tomb was empty. This includes, we must remember, in the case of St. Matthew, the statement, for which he pledges his personal authority, with regard to the current Jewish explanation of the emptiness of the Tomb: and in the case of St. Luke, not only the source from which he drew the account of the visit of the women, but also that from which he drew the account of the walk to Emmaus. It is implied also in the speeches of St. Peter (ii. 31) and St. Paul (xii. 35) which he records in "Acts."

It is really a hopeless task to attempt, as Professor Kirsopp Lake does, to reduce all these authorities to one, and to maintain that the only solid nucleus of fact implied in them, which can survive the acid test of criticism is that a party of women were met by a young man whose innocent attempt to explain to them that they were looking into the wrong tomb frightened them so much that they ran away and said nothing to anyone. For instance, in India, I am given to understand that it is not unusual for a man, when pressed for payment on a bogus claim, instead of challenging the claim directly to put in a forged receipt. But this will hardly justify us in assuming that the Jews invented the lie with regard to the stealing away of the Body by the disciples to explain a groundless claim on the part of the Christians that they had found the Tomb empty.

The account in St. John presents indeed features which will repay more careful examination. It is chiefly remarkable for the stress laid on the position in which the grave-cloths, including the napkin that had been about the head, were found lying in the Tomb. This seems at first merely a picturesque detail, which indeed, like the reference to the water pot left behind by the Samaritan woman, suggests the presence of an eye-witness, but seems to have no further significance. The only moral that I remember having seen drawn from it related to the tidiness of the Ministering Angels.

As soon, however, as attention is drawn to the fact, it becomes clear that the presence of the grave-cloths without the Body is a very remarkable phenomenon. It precludes at once the hypothesis that the Body had been stolen, or, as has been most ingeniously suggested, swallowed up by the earthquake. It equally, I think, precludes the hypothesis of a recovery from a prolonged trance or swoon. Lazarus, we remember, came forth from his tomb bound hand and foot with grave-cloths and his face bound about with a napkin. One suggestion, as far as I know, and only one has been given, which simply and completely accounts for the phenomena. It is the suggestion worked out with great skill by the Rev. Henry Latham, Master of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, in *The Risen Master*. It is that at the Resurrection the Lord's Body passed out of the grave-cloths, leaving them undisturbed, just as afterwards it passed freely into and out of a room with closed doors.

Some such interpretation as this "the disciple whom Jesus loved" must have put on the facts, for "he saw and believed." He was, indeed, I fancy, a little ashamed of having needed the assistance of the sight to quicken his faith, for he goes on to say apologetically, "For as yet they knew not the Scripture that He must rise from the dead." A deeper faith, he seems to feel,

would have been able to dispense with ocular demonstration, and to earn a share in the blessing pronounced on those who believed without having seen.

Now if this is, as I cannot doubt, the true interpretation of the scene, sketched in the fewest possible strokes by the Fourth Evangelist, we are, I imagine, shut up to one of two alternatives. Either the writer is a consummate literary artist, who has invented with extraordinary ingenuity, a purely imaginary experience to establish the Church's faith in the Resurrection, and yet has the self-restraint to leave the precise nature of this new corroboration to be divined by his readers, or he is recording in the simplest and most objective form a definite historical experience. And I have no doubt which of these is the simpler hypothesis, if we approach the subject purely as a literary problem.

Such in substance is the New Testament evidence in regard to the Empty Tomb. I must apologise once more for my insistence on this grossly material topic. But I do not see how otherwise to meet what we are told by most competent observers\* is the present situation in regard to the inexhaustible problem of miracles. There is, we are told, a greater readiness to admit their possibility, coupled with a keener realisation of the fallibility of human testimony. This is the modern form of Huxley's demand for expert evidence. This is no doubt a perfectly reasonable demand. At the same time the nature of the qualification that we demand of our witnesses must have some relation to the nature of the fact to which they have to testify. And I am still waiting for an answer to the question, which I asked in *Cambridge Theological Essays* (p. 323):

"If the fact to be established is the fact of an empty Tomb, why should we doubt the evidence of eyes that were searching for the Body that had lain in it as the most precious treasure that the world contained?"

We have no time to examine the different narratives of the appearances of the Risen Lord in detail. I must content myself with recalling attention to three points which may fairly be regarded as characteristic of them all.

The first is the delicate accuracy of their psychology. Read, for instance, St. John's account of the appearance to Mary Magdalen, or St. Luke's account of the walk to Emmaus. Let a scholar like Dr. Westcott, in his *Revelation of the Risen Lord*, make the narratives live before you, not by reading anything into them, but simply by helping you to realise what a scholarly grasp of language shows to be already there. Then, again, mark the conflict of emotions in the hearts of one group of disciples after

---

\*F. R. Tennant, *Constructive Church Quarterly*, Dec., 1921, and E. Bevan, *Hellenism and Christianity*, p. 233.

another as they find themselves in the presence of One Who had come back to them from the dead. Is that subtle interplay of doubt and joy and awful reverence consummate art or is it a simple transcript of actual experience?

Take another point. We are familiar enough in these days with communications that purport to come to us from "within the veil." One main objection in the way of taking them seriously springs from the character of their contents. They are so trivial, and so obviously coloured by the medium through which they are transmitted. It is easy to account for them by telepathy, or as an uprush from the sub-conscious of earlier impressions. Test the reported words of the Risen Lord from this point of view. Write them out one by one and study them as a whole. See if these two points do not stand out with luminous clearness. First, that as a whole they ring true. They bear the stamp, and think what that implies, of genuine utterances of the same Lord who speaks to us in the rest of the Gospels. We find no difficulty in accepting them as they stand (except to a certain extent in the Appendix of St. Mark) as a faithful embodiment of His teaching. And next, they cannot be merely the revival of impressions already received in the course of the previous Ministry. They deal with the new situation created by the Death and the Resurrection. They have a new content, a changed emphasis. They embrace a wider horizon. The words as they stand are a strong support to our belief that the disciples came into real contact with their Lord after He had risen from the dead. They are a substantial guarantee of the truthfulness of the narratives in which they are embedded.

We come lastly to the most difficult element in these narratives, the physical implications. We are apt to suppose that we know more about matter than we do about mind. We are prepared, if reason is shown, to believe that real communications passed from the Risen Lord into the minds of His disciples. We may even accept the account of an appearance to the eye in the old familiar form. But are we not justified in saying that it is a physical impossibility that He can have submitted His risen body to the evidence of touch, or broken bread before them, let alone actually partaken of food before He once more vanished from their sight?

And yet what right have we to dogmatize about physical impossibilities? If in every other respect the evidence fully justifies the demands of the highest reason, are we not bound to suspend our judgment before we throw over its authority here? The whole situation, I repeat, is admittedly unique. It cannot be safe to rule out any of the recorded phenomena simply on the ground that they run counter to our pre-conceptions. No doubt the evidence on this side of the narratives is nothing like so strong as the

evidence for the Empty Tomb. The fact to be attested is in itself super-physical. But I do not see that it adds any fresh difficulty, if we once accept the fact that the Tomb was empty as evidence that a spiritual transformation had passed over the material body that had been laid in it.

It is a truism to say that we do not know what matter in itself is. The whole relation of mind and matter baffles imagination: but we are being forced to recognise not only that the physical organism reacts on the mind, but also that the physical processes of our bodies can be directly affected and controlled by our psychical or spiritual condition. If that is true even now, is it incredible that after death the spirit of man may attain to perfect sovereignty over the organism, whatever may be its essential nature, in and through which he has developed his distinctive personality? May it not be that the First-begotten from the dead has given us in these strange ways such light on this coming sovereignty as with our limited powers we are in this life able to receive?

#### DISCUSSION.

Dr. SCHOFIELD, after thanking Canon Murray for his most excellent paper, pointed out that it had been said that the Resurrection of Jesus Christ was at the same time the most incredible event in the world's history, and the best established fact. With the first statement few would agree who recognised our Lord's Deity; while most who have studied the evidence will endorse the latter.

I am glad on p. 146 the Canon has called attention to the widespread theory of the day respecting "the husk and kernel," said to be a revival of Rosicrucian teaching. This represents that while the miraculous stories of the New Testament—the Virgin's Birth, the Resurrection of our Lord, Lazarus and others—are but the husk, and can be thrown away, we must never throw away the great spiritual truths these allegories teach. In short, that these facts in the Gospels are fiction, though they may contain valuable truth. This specious error is widely spread in London to-day.

With regard to Professor Kirsopp Lake's remarks about flesh and blood, we do well to remember S. Paul's statements in 1 Cor. 15, "It is sown a natural body (that is, one in whom the blood is the life), it is raised a spiritual body." This is entirely different from a spirit. The latter, the Lord says, has not flesh and *bones* "as ye see Me have." Not, be it remarked, "flesh and blood," but "flesh and bones"; for in this body the spirit is the life. On p. 149 I must call attention to a most important sentence of the Canon's: "It (the Resurrection on the third day), and it alone, accounts for the peculiar veneration of the first day of the week

in Christian circles" (and we may add, in the world's history). This fact is so remarkable and important that I should like to elaborate it a little.

Supposing (in the manner of Mr. Wells) an inhabitant of Mars were to arrive here to look into our manners and customs, and on Sunday enquired into the meaning of the crowds he would see going to our religious buildings, combined with the closing of all our offices and shops.

He would be told that the first day of the week was the general holy day. Asking if it had always been so, he would be told "No; that the last day of the week had been so kept for thousands of years." In answer to further enquiries, he would learn that the change took place at the Christian era because Christ was alleged to have arisen from His grave upon that day. The surprise he would naturally express on the power of such a "fable" to alter a sacred day would be deepened when he learned that the central ceremonial of the day was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in memory of his death.

"Then He died on that day?"

"No, He died on the Friday."

"Then He instituted this memorial on that day?"

"No, that was on the Thursday."

"Well then, it was the sacred day at that time?"

"No, that was on the Saturday."

And thus he would discover that the only event in the world that was deliberately commemorated (for centuries) on the day IT DID NOT happen was Christ's death, and that the only reason for flying in the face of all custom was the belief that a greater event than even the death on the Cross took place on the first day of the week.

The only conclusion possible to draw in the face of these facts (quite apart from Scripture statements of its truth) is that the Resurrection is a fact. I consider the above picture, though very roughly drawn, a good illustration of the testimony to Christ's rising on the third day that can be drawn from the fact of Sunday, and the Lord's Supper being taken on that day.

Rev. J. J. B. COLES quite agreed with the remarks of Dr. Schofield as to the absence of blood in the Lord's resurrection body. In 1 Cor. xv. 45 we read, "The first man, Adam, was made a living soul; the last Adam, a quickening spirit." This referred to the risen body of the Lord Jesus, and not, as is generally supposed, to His Deity, as in St. John v. 21. This energising vital power had taken the place of blood (see St. John xix. 34).

Lieut.-Colonel G. MACKINLAY said:—I thank Dr. Murray warmly for the tenor of his able paper immediately expressed in his opening words, "The Resurrection of Jesus Christ is the central event of

human history." We are told in 1 Cor. xv. 20 (x.v), "Now hath Christ been raised from the dead, the first fruits of those that are asleep."

What were the first fruits? They were early produce offered to Jehovah on the morrow of the Sabbath after the Passover (Lev. xxiii. 10-11). Now our Lord died at a feast of Passover. His Resurrection synchronised with the date of the waving of the first fruits, as both events took place on the morrow of the Sabbath after the Passover. Can it therefore be admitted with Professor Lake and Dr. Murray (see page 149) that no indication is given in the Old Testament that the Resurrection took place on the third day after the Crucifixion (see also Jonah i. 17 and Matt. xii. 40)?

Space prevents allusion to more than a very little of the evidences of the Resurrection in the Gospels, but we may notice very briefly the emphatic testimony of St. Luke, given (according to his custom) by three-fold repetition of miracles of raising from the dead by our Lord.

1. The *only* son of the widow of Nain.
2. The *only* daughter of Jairus.
3. The raising up from a living death of the demoniac, just after the Transfiguration, who was an *only* child.

We are surely very pointedly reminded of the loved *only* Son of the Father raised up from the dead by the power of God. There are many incidental touches which confirm us in this conclusion. We have only room for the following:—

The word *monogenes*, translated in each case *only* (born), is not employed again by St. Luke; but in other parts of the New Testament it always indicates the Lord Jesus Christ, except in Heb. xi. 17, where it refers to Isaac, alluded to as a type of Christ. *Monogenes* is used in the Septuagint as the equivalent of the Hebrew word *yachid* in Ps. xxii. 20, "Deliver . . . My Darling from the power of the dog," a word undoubtedly referring to our Lord Jesus Christ.

All the evangelists record direct prophecies by our Lord of his coming death.

Lieut.-Colonel MOLONY pointed out that a very strong line of evidence as regards the empty tomb is deducible from Matthew xxviii. 15.

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS classed himself with those sometimes called unbelieving believers, saying he would have been a rank atheist had he not been a Christian. In driving through the cemetery of a large Lancashire town last week, which he was told contained a larger population of dead than those living in the town, and realizing that even one of our London cemeteries contained near ten millions of dead, it seemed hard to believe that the greater part of this vast number of dead (for he was assured that the majority of the human race would benefit by the work of Christ)

would be raised. This showed the immense importance of the fact of Christ's Resurrection.

If fifty or more years ago he had told that meeting that he had that afternoon been conversing with someone in South Wales, he would have been regarded as romancing, but now any stupid person would make and another stupid person could use a telephone. He remembered one connected with the making of the first telephone telling him the thrill with which he heard for the first time the human voice transmitted along the wire; but when once the original telephone worked all the rest was a mere matter of detail. So with the Resurrection of Christ. If God once broke the power of death by raising Him, He could easily raise millions, as the Apostle Paul said to Agrippa, "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you if God should raise the dead?" The moment we bring God into the difficulty, it disappears.

As regards the present implications that Christ's Resurrection were intended to have for us, he judged that it set all our hopes, whether for ourselves or for humanity, upon a new basis, and instanced two remarkable utterances of S. Paul when in prison and under most depressing conditions. The first was in Philippians iii. 11, where he wrote of the one goal before him, as being his attainment of the Resurrection, that is from among the dead, no matter by what means, even a martyr's death, that he reached it. The other was in his last letter to Timothy (chap ii. 8), wherein he exhorted him to "Remember Jesus Christ raised from the dead according to my Gospel," an exhortation we would do well to give heed to for ourselves.

Mr. W. HOSTE said:—I think the value of the paper we have listened to consists not only in its positive advocacy, but in the light it throws on the weakness of our opponents' arguments, and all the more for the impartiality with which we have heard them stated to-day. The theory that the women found the grave empty, only because they went to the wrong one, might have had strength had our Lord been buried in a cemetery instead of a garden, in which John tells us there was "*a new sepulchre.*" In this sepulchre these very women had seen Him laid barely three days before. Dean Rashdall must not expect us to follow him in rejecting well attested evidence simply because unusual and, undreamt-of in our philosophy, otherwise the negro chief was right in scouting the idea of solid water. The testimony of Dr. Arnold is well-known and eloquent. "I have been used for many years to study the history of other times and to examine and weigh the evidence of those who have written about them, and I know of no fact in the history of mankind which is proved by better and fuller evidence of every sort, to the understanding of a fair enquirer, than the great sign which God has given us, that Christ died and rose again from the dead."



As for what Dr. Murray says on p. 145, are we to be ready to reconsider our premises and submit the most sacred matters of our life to impartial investigation, to keep up our reputation for open-mindedness, and in the cant phrase of the day, "to follow the truth at any cost," which not seldom means, I fear, "giving up the truth at very small cost"? Are the legitimacy of the King, one's father's word, one's mother's character, and still less the resurrection of our Lord, to be subjects on which, at the bidding of the first unbeliever, I am to profess an open mind? The ocular and tangible proofs which satisfied large numbers of our Lord's disciples, naturally as sceptical as ourselves, may well satisfy us. The Lord was at pains to prove the reality of his corporeal Resurrection. "Handle Me and see for a spirit hath not flesh and blood as ye see Me have." His body was the same—it bore the marks of Calvary, yet not the same, real and tangible, but possessed of new spiritual properties. One hesitates even to attempt to explain, but may we not illustrate the wonderful change of the same body into a new body, by allotropy, the well-known property of certain substances of existing under different modifications, distinct in their physical and chemical properties? Thus, for instance, carbon exists in octahedral form of extreme hardness as the diamond, in hexagonal form of moderate hardness as graphite, and again as lampblack. A piece of yellow phosphorus heated under pressure is wholly changed into red phosphorus, with very modified properties. May not flesh occur in the two conditions—natural and spiritual.

I would close with the testimony of a great statesman and physicist, the late Lord Salisbury: "To me the central point is the Resurrection of Christ, which, I believe. Firstly, because it is testified by men who had every opportunity of seeing and knowing, and whose veracity was tested by the most tremendous trials . . . during long lives. Secondly, because of the marvellous effect it had upon the world. As a moral phenomenon, the spread and mastery of Christianity is without a parallel. I can no more believe that colossal moral effects lasting for 2,000 years can be without cause, than I can believe that the various motions of the magnet are without a cause, though I cannot wholly explain them."

Rev. F. E. MARSH said:—There are three facts which proclaim the Resurrection a fact, and these are: The clothes as found in the sepulchre; the testimonies of those who saw Him alive; and the difference it made in the lives of those who saw Him. Let us ponder the first. When Peter and John came to the sepulchre, one thing which specially impressed them was "the linen clothes lying." Mark, not the empty tomb. John first "saw the linen clothes lying," but he did not enter the tomb first. Peter went into the tomb first, and "seeth the linen clothes lie"; then John went in, and he "saw and believed." What was it which specially impressed John? The fact of the tomb being empty certainly did; but more

than this, the clothes were lying as if they still enclosed the body of Christ. He, being raised, would naturally leave the clothes behind. The wrappings being there, could not make any impression, except there was something very peculiar about them. I believe there was something peculiar about the clothes. It seems to me that the grave clothes were lying as they had been in their convolutions round Christ's body. The clothes had never been unwrapped, but they were as if they still enclosed the body. Just as the chrysalis of the butterfly, after the butterfly has emerged from the case, the case retains the form of the chrysalis, although the insect has gone from it. The only difference being, the butterfly comes out of the end of the case, while with regard to Christ, He would pass through the clothes without disturbing them, as He passed through the locked doors of the Upper Room afterwards.

The custom of the East was not to put a shroud on a dead body, but to swathe it round and round with bands, as Dean Alford says: "The word rendered grave clothes is explained to mean a sort of band or tow, used to swathe infants." When we remember this, the statement is the more impressive, for the clothes were lying as if they enclosed the body of Jesus, but He was not within them. The word rendered "lying and lie," in John xx. 5, 6, is twice rendered "set" in the same gospel, (ii. 6, xix. 29) in speaking of vessels set in particular places. It is also used of a city which "lieth" foursquare in Rev. xxi. 16. In each case there is the thought of order, deliberate action, and fixedness.

The MASTER of SELWYN, in conclusion, thanked the members for their reception of his paper. It had been so appreciated that he had no criticisms to which to reply.