

THE
Resurrection of Christ

THE FOUNDATION OF
HUMAN HOPE.

NO TRUE CHRISTIANITY POSSIBLE WITHOUT A BELIEF IN IT

A LECTURE

BY THE LATE

ROBERT ROBERTS,

Editor of "The Standard"

Published by the Author, 21, Hendon Road, Sparkhill, Birmingham

BIRMINGHAM

C C WALKER, 21, HENDON ROAD, SPARKHILL

—
1904

PRICE ONE PENNY.

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

THE first 22 verses of the 15th chapter of the 1st Corinthians having been read, Mr. Roberts said :—

The subject of to-night's lecture arises in two ways. It is suggested first by the common idea that a good man is saved when he dies, and his body goes to corruption. The idea is that the good man is not the body that dies, but an invisible immortal entity that gets away from the body and ascends to a state of disembodied blessedness in the sky. This supposed invisible, intangible, immortal man is supposed to join the ranks of the redeemed in heaven, and to enter into the joys of salvation.

It is manifest, if this be true, that such a man has no need of resurrection, and in no way depends upon the resurrection of Christ. If he is saved in heaven without a body, he can, of course, continue in salvation without a body, and thus the idea of resurrection becomes superfluous. Practically, it has been discarded from the theology of the day. Popular Christians would not say they denied the resurrection: they could not do that without going directly against the New Testament; but so far as spiritual requirements are concerned—so far as practical preaching goes, the resurrection has dropped into the back-ground. It is a doctrine that could be dispensed with without interfering with the character or applications of popular theology. Its absence would interfere with no hope and diminish no motive that may belong to popular theology. It is a doctrine that is, in fact, denied by many popular Christians; and their Christianity is not supposed to be any the less sound on this account.

A FUNDAMENTAL FALLACY.

What is the reason of this? It is to be found in the belief of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Man is believed to be in his essential nature a deathless being, and what is called death is merely the emancipation of a deathless being from the bondage of a dying body. Now is this view correct? Is it true that we do not die? Is it true that we have immortal souls? Harsh and dreadful

as it will seem to those accustomed to cherish common belief, the answer of the Bible to these questions is a distinct and uncompromising negative. Of this any unlearned person may satisfy themselves. The use of an English concordance will enable them in a certain way to put the doctrine to a satisfactory test. Let them look up the words immortal and immortality; they will never find them applied to man in his present state; they will find them applied exclusively to God. God is described as "the king immortal" (1 Tim. i. 17). God only is said to have immortality (1 Tim. vi. 15). As regards man, immortality is spoken of as a thing to be sought for (Rom. ii. 7); a something to be "put on" at the coming of Christ (1 Cor. xv. 50), as the attribute of the accepted alone (Luke xx. 30). As for the word "soul," they will find it often enough, but never in association with the word "immortal," and they will discover that it is applied to beast as well as man (Gen. i. 20; Job xii. 10). from which it will follow that the possession of soul is not equivalent to the possession of immortal soul. In fact, study will shew that soul in the Bible simply means life, without reference to the length of its duration.

CHRIST THE EXAMPLE OF ONE SAVED.

The resurrection of Christ has a powerful bearing on this question: because Christ is what we might call a specimen of a man saved. It may shock you to hear him so described, but it is a New Testament description. He is said to have been "a man approved of God" among the children of Israel (Acts ii. 22), who was saved from death (Heb. v. 7), who obtained eternal redemption (Heb. ix. 12). He is styled "the first begotten of the dead" (Rev. i. 5), "the first fruits of them that slept" (1 Cor. xv. 20). Now when we look at Christ in this aspect, we find that it is Christ as a body that is concerned, Christ as a body, lived; Christ as a body, died; Christ as a body, rose again—to die no more (Rom vi. 9), to live for evermore (Rev. i. 18) as a body. It is no question of an immortal soul in his case at all: and as his case is the governing case, of its own logical force, it would show that there must be something wrong in a theology that makes the saving of an immortal soul everything (of which the Bible does not speak), and the resurrection of the body nothing (of which the Bible has everything to say).

But this is not the bearing of the case we have to consider (in particular) to-night. There is another view before us to-night. We have to look at it in the light of an idea that is becoming very popular (whether in Swansea or not I cannot say), that a man may be a Christian, and an heir of salvation, and yet not believe that Christ

rose from the dead. A gentleman recently, preaching in what would be considered a Christian pulpit in Swansea, said, according to a newspaper report that was sent to me, that he did not believe in the bodily resurrection of Christ. Of course, if he did not believe in the bodily resurrection of Christ, he did not believe in *any* resurrection of Christ, for the gentleman professed a great admiration of Christ's spiritual qualities, and, therefore, could not be supposed to believe that Christ had been the subject of a spiritual resurrection, which would presuppose spiritual death.

THE ONLY BASIS OF CHRISTIAN HOPE.

Now, the question is, Can any man be a Christian at all, in the New Testament sense (and we need not care for the conventional sense), who does not believe in the resurrection of Christ from the dead? I will maintain to-night a very decided negative to that question. I will affirm, in the terms of the subject appearing on the bills, that the resurrection of Christ is the foundation of human hope, and that no true Christianity is possible without a belief in Christ's bodily resurrection, and you will not consider me uncharitable in maintaining this proposition, if I demonstrate to you that it is a true one.

I make a convenient start in the argument, by directing your attention to what has been read from 1 Cor. xv.: "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand." The speaker, you know, is Paul the apostle. Of this, there is no doubt whatever. I will not trouble you with the argument that proves this, beyond reminding you that this letter to the Corinthians has been before the world for 1,800 years, and that at the beginning of that time it was received as Paul's, while Paul himself was yet alive, and while the Corinthians were yet alive, who knew whether or not they had received it from him. A document, coming down to us with such credentials, is as authentic an utterance of the writer as if he were here present with us to-night. Please realise, therefore, that Paul the apostle is addressing us in the words we are considering. We are dealing with this matter at first hand: for we shall find that Paul had personally to do with the whole circumstances forming the basis of Christianity, and that if we cannot accept his guidance on the matter, a reliable guidance is an impossibility: and that less than the least importance is to be attached to the elegantly-expressed opinions of gentlemen living in the nineteenth century, so long afterwards, and at such a long distance from the matter, in every sense.

This Paul says, "I declare unto you the gospel BY WHICH ALSO YE ARE SAVED, *if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you.*" Now observe, whatever Paul is about to define as the gospel, he says that by that gospel "men are saved if they keep it in memory." You may not like this doctrine, but realise the issue. It is you *versus* Paul, and I ask, which is likely to know the truth of the matter? If Paul did not know the truth of the matter, how are you to know it? Realise also that Paul was not alone in this view—that a belief of the gospel he preached was necessary to salvation. Jesus himself said, "If ye believe not . . . ye shall die in your sins" (Jno. viii. 24). "Preach the gospel. *He that believeth, and is baptised, shall be saved; he that believeth not, shall be condemned*" (Mark xvi. 16). All the apostles, so far as we have their testimony recorded, proclaimed this same doctrine, that the first prescribed condition of human salvation was a belief of the gospel; and that, without a knowledge and obedience of the gospel, salvation was impossible.

A FIRST PRINCIPLE WITH PAUL.

Now, then, what is the gospel Paul had preached to them, upon their memory of which he declares their salvation depended? "I delivered unto you," he says, "first of all (or among the first things: for the gospel is made up of a variety of 'things,' as you may learn from Acts viii. 12)—I delivered unto you among the first things—[for every scholar is aware that this is a more accurate translation of *en protois*, than "first of all"; *en protois* is literally "among the firsts"]—"I delivered unto you among the first things, how that Christ died for sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and THAT HE ROSE AGAIN the third day according to the Scriptures, and that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve; after that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once: of whom the greater part remain unto this present; but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles. And last of all, he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time."

Now, in order to attach due importance to this utterance of Paul, let us consider for a moment who Paul was. He was not a man writing from convictions derived at second hand: nor from the mere force of conviction at all; but a man acting out an official obligation devolved upon him by personal interview with Christ. Originally, as you know, he was a young, but thorough-going Pharisee, who bent his whole strength to the endeavour to stop the Christian movement in Jerusalem, and afterwards in other places. He always remembered

this fact with self-abasement. In this very 15th chapter of Corinthians, you find him saying (verse 9), "I am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God." He never was a bad man in the modern sense of that phrase. His badness was the misguidedness of an honest man, who thought he was doing God service in opposing a movement which he imagined aimed at the overthrow of the divine system of the law of Moses. "Touching the righteousness of the law," you find him saying, "he was blameless" (Phil. iii. 6). It was ignorance that was at the bottom of his opposition: and, because of this, he was forgiven, as he says: "I obtained mercy because I did it ignorantly in unbelief" (1 Tim. i. 13). It is very important to recognise this. Many people make the mistake of supposing that Paul was originally an immoral man, which weakens the force of his whole case. He was far from being an immoral man. He was a man with a good conscience towards God—whose very zeal for God was the inspiring motive of his persecution of believers in Christ. So he tells us in his speech to the crowd in Jerusalem, who were thirsting for his blood (Acts xxii. 3-4). He told them he was once like them—thinking he was doing God service in killing Christians.

It was under the influence of such feelings that he obtained an official commission to undertake a persecuting journey to Damascus. It was while on this journey, executing this commission, that he changed from a persecutor into a "preacher of the faith that once he destroyed."

THE CONVERSION OF PAUL.

How was this change brought about? This is most important to consider. It was not by the argument of any one on the road. It was not by ruminating about the excellencies of Christ. It was not by the action of any hallucination. He himself tells us several times in his speeches and letters, and the writer of the Acts of the Apostles tells us—how it happened: and we can trust them, because their honesty is proved by their submission to a life-time of persecution, ended by the loss of life; and their sanity is proved by their remarkably lucid written compositions. What happened, happened before witnesses, for Paul was accompanied by a band of officers. As Paul afterwards told Agrippa in open court, "This thing was not done in a corner" (Acts xxvi. 26). It did not happen at night; it did not happen when Paul was alone; it did not happen and leave no visible effects, for Paul was blind for three days after, with scales formed on his eyes. It happened in every way as really, and actually, and tangibly as anything that ever happens to a traveller on a roadway.

CHRIST APPEARED TO PAUL. The brightness was blinding, and felled the whole company to the earth. The voice was one they all heard, but being in the Hebrew, did not all understand (the officials being Roman). Christ said to Paul, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" Saul (also called Paul) answered: "Who art thou, Lord?" And the Lord said, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. But rise; stand upon thy feet: for *I have appeared unto thee* for this purpose, TO MAKE THEE A MINISTER AND A WITNESS both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee" (Acts xxvi. 15-16). When Paul arose from the earth he was blind, and had to be led by the hand unto Damascus, where, after three days, neither eating nor drinking, he began, instead of executing his commission of persecution to "preach in the synagogues, that Christ was the Son of God" (Acts ix. 20). This he continued to do all the rest of his life long. It was on the strength of this incident that Paul claimed apostleship. "Am I not an apostle? . . . Have I not *seen Jesus Christ our Lord*" (1 Cor. ix. 1); an apostle, as he says, born out of due time. The "due time" to be made an apostle, was while Christ was still on the earth, and when a man might qualify for apostleship by being a personal companion and witness of the Lord's life and doings. This was the essential qualification for apostleship; for how could a man bear witness to what he had not seen? All the apostolic preaching was a preaching of what the preachers had "seen and heard" (Acts iv. 20). When a successor had to be appointed to Judas, anyone who had "seen and heard" was eligible. Thus, at the meeting at which the consultation for successorship took place, Peter said, "Wherefore of *those men which have companied with us* all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John unto that same day that he was taken up from us, *must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection*" (Acts i. 21).

PAUL A "WITNESS."

But although Paul did not answer to this description, his apostleship was not less real, as regards the essential qualification. He had been contemporary with Christ (though only as an enemy); he probably witnessed his crucifixion with the rest of the Pharisees; at all events, he was permitted to see the risen living Christ after his resurrection, and from his mouth direct to receive his command and authority to be an apostle and a preacher of the faith of Christ among the Gentiles "to whom," said Christ, "now I send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of

Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by the faith that is in me" (Acts xxvi. 17-18). He was, therefore, "a witness" in the most literal sense of the term,—one who could give evidence of the truth of what he declared.

This was the man to whom we are listening when we read the epistle to the Corinthians—a man who personally knew the truth of what he had to submit; a man personally and officially delegated by Christ to declare it; and to whom also, as an apostle, was fulfilled that promise of Christ to all the apostles, that he would send them the Holy Spirit, who would guide them, and dwell with them to the end, and be to them a comforter and an instructor, and a guide into all truth (John xiv. 26; xv. 26; xvi. 13). Paul claimed to have this gift of inspiration in various places (1 Corinthians ii. 12-13; xiv. 37)—a claim which rested upon something better than his own confidence—something better than mere words—for he wrought miracles, and spake miraculously with tongues (Acts xix. 11; 1 Cor. xiv. 18). Here then is Paul, a personal witness to Christ's living existence; Paul, an honest witness, as his course shewed; Paul, a competent witness, as his epistles prove; and in addition, here is Paul, an inspired man, bearing testimony before us this evening. Realise the fact. The words we are considering—the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians—were as certainly written by Paul as the pages of Josephus were written by Josephus in the same age of the world. Try and blot out of your imagination the 1,800 years that have elapsed since they were written. Try and imagine them to be coming from Paul's lips now. This is the way to catch their logical force.

MANY OTHER WITNESSES.

Remember that Paul was not alone in this testimony to Christ's resurrection. The fact of Christ's resurrection does not depend upon Paul's evidence, though largely strengthened by it. It was believed in and testified by many witnesses before him, while he was yet an enemy. "We are his witnesses," said they (Acts v. 32), long before Christ had appeared to Paul. Paul refers to this prior testimony in the chapter we are considering. "He (Christ) was seen (after he rose) of Cephas, then of the twelve, after that he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once." If you will carefully read the Acts of the Apostles, you will see how prominent and how strong was this feature in the apostolic teaching, ere Paul appeared on the scene. Yea, Christ himself spoke of it before his death. He "shall be mocked and spitefully entreated and spitted on, and they (the

Gentiles) shall scourge him and put him to death, and the third day *he shall rise again*" (Luke xviii. 32). In several other cases, which you will find on search, Jesus foretold his death and his resurrection. You will find that this prediction made his destroyers uneasy. When they had accomplished his destruction, they waited upon Pilate and said, "Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, In three days, *I will rise again*. Command, therefore, that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead : so the last error shall be worse than the first" (Matt. xxvii. 63).

Well, the sepulchre was made sure : but they might as well have let it alone. It would have been better for their side of the question if they had let it alone ; in that case they might have suggested a decent explanation of the apostolic movement. But now they were unable, in the least plausible way, to account for the disappearance of the body of Christ. It did disappear : it was in their custody for about three days. They denied the resurrection ; yet they could not produce the body, which would have silenced the apostolic testimony, which they were so anxious to stop. The only story they attempted was that the disciples stole away the body of the Lord while the soldiers of the guard slept : the stupidest story ever invented : for how could the guard know what happened when they were asleep : and who ever heard of Roman soldiers being asleep at their post ? And how could anybody break into a sepulchre, protected by a massive stone obstruction at the entrance, without waking the guard if they were asleep ? And what conceivable object could the poor dispirited disciples of Christ have in getting possession of the corpse of a master whom they expected never to die, and whose death was the shattering of their hopes for the time being ? And, with the corpse in their possession, how could they preach his resurrection with the spirit necessary to brave imprisonment and death ? Recollect their preaching was a preaching that men should turn to righteousness, that they should forsake falsehood and injustice, that they should turn from all ungodliness and embrace righteousness with a fervent heart. Is it conceivable that with such aims, they should proclaim a lie as the basis of their appeals ?

PREACHING THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS.

Yet, within two months of the crucifixion of Jesus, they appeared before the Jewish community in Jerusalem, with this proclamation : "This Jesus, God hath raised up, *whereof we are all witnesses*"

(Acts ii. 32). "Him God hath raised from the dead, *whereof we are witnesses*" (Acts iii. 15). "Jesus Christ, of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, God raised from the dead" (Acts iv. 10). "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus whom ye slew and hanged on a tree . . . and WE ARE HIS WITNESSES of these things" (Acts v. 30-32). "*We are witnesses of all things* which he did . . . whom they slew and hanged on a tree. Him God raised up the third day, and shewed him openly, not to all the people, but unto WITNESSES chosen before of God, even to us, *who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead*" (Acts x. 39-41). "We have not followed cunningly devised fables . . . but were EYE-WITNESSES of his majesty" (2 Peter i. 16).

Now, on what ground did the apostles and disciples advance their testimony to Christ's resurrection? You will see from these New Testament quotations that it was not on the ground of hearsay. It was on the ground of eye-witness: and, if a man is not to believe his eyes, there is an end to all belief. But men do believe their eyes, even if their eyes tell them a thing only once; when it is a case of telling them a thing over and over again, there is an end to all doubt and controversy. And this was the case of the resurrection. It did not rest on the eye-witness of one person, nor on the evidence of one occasion with however many witnesses. The evidence was that of many occasions to which many persons were related. Let us roughly outline the facts illustrating this important feature of the case.

First, we are all agreed that Christ died. Nobody doubts this. Jews and infidels, friends and enemies, all agree that Christ hung upon the cross, to which he was nailed, until he died; and that his dead body was taken down, and given by Pilate at their own request, into the care of two leading members of the Jewish Council, secret friends of Jesus till that time—Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea; and that these men wrapped the body in new linen with spices, and deposited it in the grave of the latter near by, at which, when the entrance was closed, a guard of Roman soldiers was posted, by order of the Jewish Council, with the consent of Pilate.

THE FACTS OF THE RESURRECTION. APPEARANCES OF JESUS.

Now, the evidence of the resurrection begins on the morning of the third day—that is, leaving for a moment, out of account, the direct information of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, that the angel descended and rolled away the stone, and that Jesus came forth alive, which, of itself, settles the whole case. We leave that out of account

here, because we are considering the evidence of the apostles as "witnesses." On what kind of facts does their evidence rest? First, then, on the morning in question—the morning of the third day after Christ's death, the women of the apostolic company, who had been intimate with Christ for three-and-a-half years, came to the grave, with the intention of anointing his dead body. On their way there, they wonder among themselves how they are to move the stone at the door of sepulchre. On their arrival, they find that the stone had been rolled away. In the grave they found the clothes in which the body had been wrapped. Whilst discussing in perplexity what the meaning of this might be, Christ appeared to them. They saw him, and spoke to him as really as before his crucifixion. He told them to go and tell his disciples that he was risen from the dead, and that he would go before them into Galilee. The women departed in great haste, and with mingled fear and joy, as was natural. They sought the apostles, and found them. They told them what had occurred. The apostles did not believe them. Peter and John went to the sepulchre, and found it empty, but saw nothing of Christ, and came back without conviction.

At the same time, two of their company were on a short journey into the country, to a place about eight miles off, called Emmaus. As they walked along the road, their conversation naturally turned on the dreadful occurrence of Christ's death, which had blighted all their hopes, and plunged them in deepest grief. While conversing mournfully on this subject, Jesus drew nigh, but held their eyes that they should not know him at that moment. He asked them what they were talking so sadly about. They expressed their surprise that he should be ignorant of the things that had happened, even if he were only a stranger in Jerusalem. He asked what things, and they proceeded to relate to him the facts of the crucifixion. When they had concluded, he appealed to the prophets whether these things ought not to have happened, and entered upon a running exposition of what had been written on the subject in Moses and the prophets. The journey was soon at an end with such interesting company. Jesus, not recognised, made as though he would have gone further, but yielded to the importunities of the two disciples, and went into the house with them. They sat down to refreshments: he was asked to give thanks: when he had done so, he released their eyes from the constraint to which he had subjected them, and they knew him. He then immediately closed them again altogether, so far as he was concerned, and he ceased to be seen of them; upon which they arose, and returned at once to the company of the disciples at Jerusalem.

They found them assembled, and in a state of agitation at the reports they had heard in the interim—of Christ's appearance to Peter, to Mary, to the other women. Their perturbation was greatly increased by the report of the two now returned from Emmaus; and while they were deep in their perplexities, the Lord himself stood before them. His sudden appearance threw them into a state of fear. We are informed, "They were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit." He said, "Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your heart? *Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I MYSELF*: handle me and see: for a spirit hath not *flesh and bones* AS YE SEE ME HAVE. And when he had thus spoken, he showed them his hands and his feet" (Luke xxiv. 37-40).

The narrative proceeds to inform us that while the disciples were still incredulous, in the excited state of their feelings, he asked them if they had any food in the place, that he might give them a further and conclusive evidence of his reality. They produced "a piece of a broiled fish and of an honeycomb, and he took it and did eat before them." "YE ARE WITNESSES," said he, "OF THESE THINGS" (verse 48).

One of the eleven was not there at that interview—Thomas. When the disciples told him of it, he refused to believe. The death of Christ was so undeniable and so unexpected that nothing but the evidence of his senses would convince him that Christ was alive. "Except," said he, "I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, *I will not believe.*" After about a week's interval, the disciples were again together, and Thomas with them; when the Lord made another appearance to them. The Lord, this time, addressed himself specially to Thomas, "Reach hither thy finger and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing" (Jno. xx. 25-28). Thomas could not resist the evidence of his senses; no man can. Thomas could only say, "My Lord and my God."

OVER FORTY DAYS OF INTERVIEWS.

There were several like interviews. They extended in all over forty days, at the end of which Jesus took formal farewell of his disciples, on the summit of the Mount of Olives, first telling them not to commence their testimony until they should receive the promised endowment of divine power from on high, which would enable them to bear testimony with effect, by the miraculous confirmation of their

testimony in the eyes of the people. "Tarry ye in Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high" (Luke xxiv. 49 ; Acts i. 4). In ten days, on the day of Pentecost, the promised effusion of the Holy Spirit occurred, filling all the house where they were assembled, manifesting itself in tongues of fire over the heads of the apostles, and enabling them to speak in all the languages of the Jews assembled in Jerusalem, at the feast, from every country under heaven. In these languages, they discoursed of the facts of Christ's death and resurrection, with the effect of inducing conviction in the hearts of 3,000 honest men: how could honest men resist such a combination of evidence?

Such were the antecedents of the work to which Paul was introduced by the appearance of Christ to him on the way to Damascus: such the evidence that Christ, who was crucified, was also raised from the dead, to die no more, but to live for ever in the glory and power of spirit-nature.

WHO CAN DENY IT?

"Now," says Paul here, in this 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians, verse 12, "if Christ be preached (and on such irresistible evidence) that he rose from the dead, how say some among you there is no resurrection of the dead?" There is need to ask that question to-night. "How say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" How comes it that some in Swansea can call themselves Christians, while maintaining that there is no resurrection of the dead? Do they think Christ prophesied falsely when he said he would rise again? Do they think the apostles spoke untruthfully when they said, "He is risen: we have seen him: we have eaten with him?" Do they think Paul told a lie when he said, "Last of all he was seen of me also?" If so, why profess to be Christians? Why not be consistent and reject Christianity as a fiction? Why not say Christ was a madman, the apostles liars, and Paul a hallucinated enthusiast? Why mock Christ with an admiration which means that, with all his excellence, he was a purveyor of falsehood? that with all his discernment, he was a mystic dreamer? that with all his holiness, he was a deceiver? that with all his moral beauty, he was a creator of lies? that with all his lowliness and kindness, he was a pretender and a demented man?

Again the question returns, "How say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" What is your reason? Do you say it is impossible? How do you know? Do you know all the possibilities? Do you say it is contrary to your ideas of what

ought to be? If so, do you set up your minds as the standard of what ought to happen in creation? Look into your reasons. You will find there is nothing in them. It is a mere setting up of human prejudice and imagination against the evidence of truth. The evidence cannot be set aside. There is no rational principle but one, upon which it can be construed harmoniously with all the involved elements of the case, and that is, that the resurrection of Christ really happened, and that he is really alive to-day, and is the keystone of the divine purpose with human life upon earth.

CONSEQUENCES OF DENIAL.

Paul says, if the resurrection did not happen, you cannot be saved. His words are: "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and *your faith is also vain*. . . . ye are yet in your sins. *Then they also that are fallen asleep in Christ are PERISHED.*" And he further says, as I formerly quoted, that it is only by the belief of the gospel, of which the resurrection of Christ is a part, that you can be saved, and only then by "keeping it in memory" (verse 2), or, as he elsewhere expresses it, "holding fast the confidence, and rejoicing of the hope, steadfast unto the end" (Heb. iii. 6).

Now, do you think Paul an authority on the truth of the gospel and its bearing upon us? If you do, can you hesitate to adopt the conviction that you cannot be a Christian without believing in the resurrection of Christ? If you do not think Paul an authority, who can be accepted as such? Do you prefer Mr. Suffield to Paul? Do you prefer the merely clever opinionists of the nineteenth century to the sober-minded men of the first century, who knew the facts, and lost their heads for their testimony to the resurrection of Christ? How can you be guilty of such a preference if you exercise the commonest of common sense? Rouse up to the reconsideration of the question. Open your eyes. Investigate for yourselves. Do not be misled by the elegant and pleasing fallacies that are being palmed upon society in clever writings and speeches. Remember that these fallacies are not original with the purveyors of them. They are but the re-echoes of the thoughts of one or two original thinkers, who have ventilated a plausible theory, marred by fundamental fallacies too subtle for mediocrity to detect, but expressed in a diction that captivates the too-confiding mind. You say these are rough words: they are. We want rough words sometimes. We want the truth; and sometimes it is sacrificed to that which is elegant and pleasing. Go back to the Bible for yourselves. Be sure and read it thoroughly

and long before you make up your minds. The issue involved is too momentous to be lightly dismissed. When you have made up your minds that it is a true and a good and a divine book, bind yourselves by its teachings, and you will then have possession of the glorious hope founded upon the fact of Christ's resurrection: for the promise of Christ is that at his coming he will raise from the dead and immortalise all who believe and obey him.

(The lecturer intended, in the course of his lecture, to quote one or two passages from "The Trial"—a book he recently wrote on the question, "Did Christ rise from the dead?"—in which the argument is conducted in the form of a trial for the sake of interest and clearness. The course of his remarks diverted him from this purpose: he can only, therefore, now recommend the interested reader to procure that book, in which the whole subject is treated in all its bearings in an exhaustive manner. It can be had at the address from which this is issued.)