

deputation of the Jewish colony at Rome. And the allusion would be as intelligible as at Jerusalem itself. For the Jew was everywhere, and wherever the Jew, there was his Messianic hope.

Are convictions thus familiar wherever the Old Testament was read to be ruled out of significance by mere modern dislike of miracle and revelation? Are they to be classed with the figments of a perverted Christianity—with “transubstantiation,” “devotion to our Lady,” or even with clerical misconceptions “of the Church’s organization in the first two centuries”?¹ Are they not rather the key to all the high spiritual life of God’s ancient people, a spiritual life which is ours as a heritage from them, and of which the Hebrew psalmody remains to this day a most sublime poetical embodiment? Was not their source indeed that Holy Ghost who we still say “spoke by the prophets”? Was not their goal and object from the first He whose immediate care after His resurrection was to convince disciples of His fulfilment of what had been written?—“beginning at Moses and all the prophets, and expounding unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself”?

ARTHUR C. JENNINGS.



ART. IV. — THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST AS PROVED BY ST. PAUL’S EPISTLES.

AT the commencement of this article it may be well to state the position which the writer would assign to the historic evidences of the Christian verities. Admitting that in former days they may have been too much dwelt on, and that a cold assent to the truth of Christianity, resting on such evidences, may often be mistaken for that life-giving faith which works by love, yet to reject them as of no importance, and to rely—as some are inclined to do—wholly on intuitions and spiritual perceptions, seems to be casting aside one of the great helps to faith which has been mercifully granted us. To judge from the Scriptural account, the faith of the Apostles rested not merely on inward enlightenment, but on the fact that they had seen the Risen Lord. Should we not hail historic evidence of the great fact to which they testified, as lifting us in some measure to the vantage-ground of sight on which they stood, even before the illumination of Pentecost?

¹ “Liberal Catholicism,” *Contemporary Review*, December, 1897.

The illiterate, who have never known a doubt, are often far enough removed from real faith; but when their heart is touched, and they are honestly seeking after salvation, no intellectual difficulty bars the way. The man of culture and of thought, especially in this day, is often opposed by many such obstacles before he can trust in a living Saviour. Any evidence which removes or lessens these, whether it be Christ's character and teaching in the Gospels, the adaptation of Christian truth to the wants of man, and its actual effects in individuals and in the world, or the historic proof of the Resurrection, or any other, is a welcome boon to such anxious and honest seekers after truth.

The object therefore proposed is to state briefly one part of the evidence of Christ's Resurrection, which in the present state of New Testament criticism appears to the writer especially strong.

Four Epistles of St. Paul—viz., that to the Romans, that to the Galatians, and the two to the Corinthians—are by the most destructive critics admitted to be the genuine writings of the Apostle, and to have been written at the time and in the circumstances in which they purport to have been written. In all of these the Resurrection of our Lord is treated as a fact universally believed by those to whom the Apostle wrote—and by others also. It is not maintained, as much of his teaching had need to be, by argument, but is rather used as the admitted premiss of further conclusions, and as the sure basis of the faith; and it should be particularly observed that St. Paul does not speak of this belief as held by himself and his own converts only, but as common to the Jewish Christians also, who owed their conversion to other teachers, and as taught by the original Apostles. The following passages establish these points: Rom. i. 3, 4; Gal. i. 1—"Jesus Christ our Lord, who was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." "Paul, an apostle, by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised Him from the dead." 2 Cor. iv. 14—"Knowing this, that He which raised up our Lord Jesus, shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall present us with you." The whole passage 1 Cor. xv. 3 to 22 should be read, as it is long to quote. Verses 3 and 4 show that the Resurrection was one of the primary and elementary truths of the Gospel: "I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." Then follows an account of Christ's appearances to the Apostles and others, as well as to Paul himself, with the conclusion

(verse 11), "Therefore, whether it were I or they, so we preach, and so ye believed." He further proceeds, on the ground of this undisputed fact, to argue for the resurrection of all that are Christ's at His coming (verses 12 to 17): "If Christ be preached that He rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen: and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are proved false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that He raised up Christ." And while in verse 11 (given above) we see that the faith which St. Paul preached was preached also by the Twelve, in Gal. i. 23. we learn that it was already the received faith of the Church at the time of his conversion. He writes: "I was unknown by face unto the churches of Judæa which were in Christ: but they had heard only, That he which persecuted us in time past now preacheth the faith which once he destroyed. And they glorified God in me." That is at a period, according to different chronologies, three to seven years after the Resurrection had taken place.

Further, St. Paul tells us (Gal. i. 18) that on an occasion at latest ten years after this great event (it may have been only five or six), he went to Jerusalem on a visit to St. Peter, and stayed a whole fortnight in his house. Is it likely, is it morally possible, that he made no inquiries respecting the appearances of their common Lord when he was in the house of him to whom, of the Apostles, He had first appeared, and on the very spot where those appearances to him and to others had taken place? We feel this to be impossible, but if any think otherwise, St. Paul's own words make the matter sure. He says (Gal. i. 18, 19) that on this occasion he saw, besides Peter, James, the Lord's brother. Now, in his enumeration of the appearances of the Risen Saviour (1 Cor. xv.) he expressly speaks of one to James, mentioned by no other writer in the New Testament. Why is this? Clearly because, having been with St. Peter, and having met St. James, he had learned of this appearance from him to whom it had been granted. St. Paul, then, as we reasonably conclude, *did* learn during this visit facts concerning the Risen Lord, and that immediately from those who had seen and conversed with Him after His Resurrection. Their testimony was the testimony of eye-witnesses. St. Paul's report of it we have in our hands, written or dictated by him, and admitted to have been by him truly believed and honestly reported to others. Can any historical proof be stronger? There is simply one witness interposed between ourselves and St. Peter and St. James, who, according to the strongest presumptive evidence, as given,

above, declared that they had seen the Risen Lord. St. Paul's writings have annihilated the distance of time. We all but stand ourselves by Christ's empty tomb, and hear the cheering word, "He is not here; He is risen."

We have, then, in these Epistles two lines of proof—the first, which has been briefly traced above, their testimony to the faith of the founders of the Jewish Church, and of that Church itself, when St. Paul first became known to them as a Christian. The second line deals with the further fact of St. Paul's conversion, and of his own confessedly deep-rooted conviction of the reality of Christ's Resurrection.

But before proceeding to this second line of proof, let us dwell a little longer on the first. We started with St. Paul's Epistles, because our opponents have put these in our hands as beyond dispute, whilst round the Gospels and Acts they raise the dust of controversy, gradually, indeed, being dispersed by the wind of truth, but still obscuring the evidence, if they are appealed to in the first case. But look at them in the light which these Epistles throw upon them, and their aspect is changed. We feel now that we are in the presence of real men, with their convictions, their words, their actions. St. Paul tells us that he sojourned among some of the original Apostles, and conversed with them on several occasions (see Gal. ii. 9); and all that we read of them in the later chapters of the Gospels, and in the Acts, harmonizes with his description. The historical character of these later records is thus confirmed by the unimpeachable testimony of a truthful man, who speaks to us from the midst of the persons and facts which the records describe. If our Risen Lord appeared to St. Peter and St. James, as they themselves, as above concluded, told St. Paul that He did, there is no difficulty in receiving the further statements of the Gospels and the Acts, that He appeared to many others, and that, as St. Luke puts it, "He showed Himself alive after His Passion to the Apostles whom He had chosen, by many proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." Rather we feel that the whole state of things which followed the Resurrection and Pentecost, as narrated in the Gospels and Acts, comes forth from the sphere of dimness and shadow into the light of reality and truth.

One other point must be briefly noticed. These original disciples were not only convinced of Christ's Resurrection, that they had actually seen and conversed with Him risen from the dead, whom they had known so well in His life—not only so sure of this, that in the face of opposition and persecution "they ceased not to teach and to preach" Him as the Living Saviour, but their whole character

was strangely revolutionized. They became, not simply in courage, but in moral and spiritual wisdom, new men, living witnesses of the Risen Christ having fulfilled His latest promise, and having endowed them with the Holy Spirit and power. It has yet to be explained—rather, it never can be explained without admitting the gift of the Comforter—how their religious fervour was never moulded by the false types of devotion which surrounded them, and their long-cherished ideas and prepossessions were lost in a diviner light. How, for instance, Jewish exclusiveness was exchanged for world-embracing love—the deep-rooted expectation of an earthly kingdom, with its outward glory, yielded to trustful acquiescence in a life of discipline whose reward was not yet; how formalism, asceticism, zealotry, theosophy, found no place in the pure and humble but joyous energy of a spiritual life, the beginning and earnest of life eternal; how, in a word, their new faith, instead of rendering these men fanatics, made them enthusiasts indeed in the best and noblest sense, but wise, sober-minded, gentle, forbearing and patient towards all men, and careful in enforcing political, social, and domestic duties. We may freely admit, without depreciating the glorious illumination of Pentecost, that this great renewal of Jewish minds was not perfected in a day; that there was a gradual loosing from the ancient moorings, a conflict for a while between the old darkness and the new and “marvellous light”; but we ask, and have a right to ask, whence came that new light, and by what power was its final victory achieved. In short, how did these disciples, with whom the Gospels make us familiar, become what they certainly did become, *not* intensified Jews, but fit founders of a catholic religion? And to this question can any other answer be reasonably given but that their convictions rested on fact, that they knew that they lived in union with a living and glorified Saviour, and that by His promised Spirit they were being guided into truth, and their judgment and character conformed to His own holy mind?

But now to revert to the history of St. Paul himself, our second line of proof. It has been, and is, maintained that before his conversion the Apostle was unsettled in mind and already half convinced—perhaps by the arguments and martyrdom of Stephen—of the truth of the Christian faith, and was only trying by excess of Jewish zeal to drown these growing convictions; and that, whilst in this mental state of conflict he was journeying on his mission of persecution, a thunderstorm, and possibly a sunstroke, completed the work. In the abstract such a mental condition is not inconceivable, but the suggestion of it in this case is liable to two fatal objections. In the first place, it is entirely opposed to the state-

ments of those records from which alone we learn of St. Paul's conversion; and, further, it utterly fails to account for his subsequent character and life. Read Acts xxvi. 9-20, St. Paul's latest account of this great crisis: "I verily thought within myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth"; and then follows, without any intervening matter, the narrative of his bitter persecution of the saints, down to the very moment of the vision which arrested him on the way to Damascus. Those who will carefully read the passage referred to will feel the full force of these remarks, and they are confirmed by the fact that amongst the many allusions to St. Paul's conversion in the Acts and the Epistles no counteracting statement can be adduced, none which lends the slightest colour to the sceptical view stated above. The record is dead against it.

But, further, this theory wholly fails to account for St. Paul's character as so fully and distinctly brought before us in his actions and his writings. First as to his personal belief in the Resurrection. We have seen that he does not rest this wholly—at least, so far as others were concerned—on the appearance granted to himself. In 1 Cor. xv. he enumerates several appearances to the Apostles, individually and collectively, and to 500 brethren at once, and, as has been mentioned, leaves on the reader's mind the conviction that he had learned particulars from St. Peter and St. James. Also, it must be noted how clearly he draws the line between these objective appearances of the Risen Christ, which were matters of history and the possession of the whole Church, and those "visions and revelations of the Lord" by which he himself was subsequently directed and comforted in time of need. He was not, then, such an enthusiast as to confound mental impressions with objective realities, or to overlook or be indifferent to the testimony of others; and whenever we see St. Paul in delicate or dangerous circumstances, we see a man of ready wit and practical ability—no dreamer absorbed in reveries, but, as we should say, very wide-awake, and capable of discerning and adopting the best methods of dealing with his surroundings. The latter chapters of the Acts, in particular, give many instances of his presence of mind. But to look at the still more important point, his Christian character. Here, as in the case of the original Apostles, we find ourselves utterly at a loss to explain the facts before us, except by admitting Divine interposition and influence. We have seen that these Apostles needed Pentecost, as well as Easter, to qualify them for their work; so St. Paul writes that he "neither received the Gospel of man nor was taught it, but by revelation of Jesus Christ," for that it had pleased God "to

reveal His Son in "him. And again, "God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." And verily the effects of such inward revelation and enlightenment are evident in St. Paul's new life of faith and patience. He had been a man of strong purpose, carried formerly to relentless cruelty and the forcing of the consciences of those who differed from him. He is a man of strong purpose still, and seeing clearly the nature of the Gospel, he is firm and strong, even vehement, in denouncing any teaching which he discerns will counteract its essential truths. But how does he now deal with the weak and scrupulous believer? We have but to read Rom. xiv. to see a wondrous transformation of the Jewish persecutor. He no longer compels the feeble-minded to submit to what he himself perceives to be true, but leaves them to the guidance of that Spirit who had given him more perfect insight, and to the coming judgment and approval of their common Lord. He knows and is persuaded by the Lord Jesus that there is nothing unclean of itself. "But," he adds, "to him who esteemeth anything unclean, to him it is unclean. One believeth that he may eat all things; another, who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not, and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth, for God hath received him. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up." This is not the judgment, these are not the counsels of delusion and fanaticism, but of one who consciously lives in the light of truth, and whose heart is made tender and thoughtful for others by drinking in the love of Christ. Truly this fierce man has become "gentle among" all who are true-hearted, however short of perfect wisdom, and "even as a nurse cherisheth her children, so being affectionately desirous of them, he is willing to impart unto them not the Gospel only, but also his own soul, because they are dear unto him." We have to account for this new temper in St. Paul's case, as in the case of the Twelve; and those who will adequately study the subject, and let reason and conscience speak, will find it very difficult, if not impossible, to give any explanation of the problem without admitting the two grand facts of the Resurrection of Christ and the gift of the Holy Spirit.

It is wearisome as well as painful to turn from so well-attested and blessed truths to the objections, new and old, which have been, and are still, urged against them. We say objections, for arguments they can hardly be called, and would not probably be adduced as such, were it not necessary for those who deny the fact of the Resurrection to support

with some show of historical reasoning the proposition with which they start, and on which they really rely, that a miracle is impossible. Of course, if this axiom be true, it follows that all our evidence for a fact which contradicts it must be false; and it matters little to such opponents whether their attempts to answer our arguments be weak or strong. But to those who believe in God a miracle is not impossible; nay, though from its very nature it must be rare and inexplicable, it may be even probable, if necessary to effect a grand and beneficent moral result. And such we maintain that the fact of Christ's Resurrection was.

None, now, but the most ignorant would assert that the Apostles were impostors. Very few advocates could be found of a once-received theory that our Lord never really died, and that, being raised from His death-like swoon by the spices and coolness of the sepulchre, he escaped in some way or other from that prison-house, to prolong or end quickly a sickly existence; whilst His Apostles—one must suppose commissioned by Him—went forth to preach the falsehood of His life in glory. The popular theory is that which Renan has adopted, and which is commonly called the visionary hypothesis. The faith of the Resurrection, according to this talented and imaginative writer, owes its existence to the delusive impressions of the sensitive Mary Magdalen. She first, in the tumult of sorrow and hope, imagined that she had seen the Lord; and, raised by her report to the fit point of cerebral excitement, first one and then another of the Apostles and disciples believed that they had seen Him also. And thus the fact, which is attested by the strongest historical and moral proofs, is dismissed as the baseless and beautiful creation of a devoted woman's brain. But for the seeing of visions psychologists demand a previous state of mental prepossession, the dominance of a fixed idea. And here the very contrary condition was present. Those faithful women, Mary Magdalen and others, why were they so early at the sepulchre? They went to complete the embalming of the *dead*, not in hope of seeing the *living*. And the rest of the disciples, so far were they from expecting Christ's Resurrection that they rejected the testimony of those who had seen Him, and scarcely trusted their own eyesight when He appeared amongst them. And we are distinctly told by one of them that "as yet they knew not the Scripture that He must rise again from the dead." There is, then, here no room for the theory of a fixed expectancy, disposing to delusive visions and creating what it hoped for—the latest and most popular attempt of the sceptic to explain the inexplicable. But even when we look at the bare fact alone, without remembering

what above has been insisted on, its marvellously great and enduring effects, it seems by the clearest historical proof to be conclusively established. And this is the recorded judgment of a historian of great power and independence of mind, the late Dr. Arnold of Rugby. "I have been used," he writes, "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 one fact in the history of mankind which is proved by fuller and better evidence of every sort to the understanding of a fair inquirer than the great sign which God has given us, that Christ died and rose again from the dead." The Christian, indeed, has other and deeper arguments to trust; he "has the witness in himself." It is not a teacher alone, or an example, however perfect, which he requires, but rather a living Saviour, to be to him the Source of life. The Atonement, assured by the Resurrection, the indwelling Spirit, the guidance and sympathy of a heavenly friend—these are his daily, hourly need, the staff and comfort of his perilous way. And only in confidence that, like the protomartyr, he too shall be enabled to say, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," can he peacefully and joyfully contemplate the unknown darkness of death. Into this inner sanctuary of faith the unbeliever, indeed, in his present mind, cannot enter; yet he, too, may draw a last argument from the testimony of those who believe. He admits that true Christian character and conduct have blessed, and still bless, the world. If, then, the believer assures him, as he certainly will, that the vitality and endurance of this character are derived from faith in a risen and living Saviour, will he not recognise in this a further evidence—subsidiary, it may be called, but of deep significance and far-reaching power—that "we have not followed cunningly-devised fables," but that our "Lord is risen indeed," and "is able to save to the uttermost them that come unto God by Him"?

HAY S. ESCOTT.

ART. V.—SOME NOTES ON CAPITAL AND LABOUR.

EXTRACTS FROM MRS. FAWCETT'S MANUAL OF POLITICAL ECONOMY—(Concluded).

WE now turn for a short time to the dreams of the socialists. It must be remembered that there is no production of wealth without exchange, and that "exchange implies the existence of private property. The expression "exchange of wealth"