

The New Testament Story of the Resurrection.

Lecture XIV

A

L

Before beginning this lecture I want to make two or three general remarks.

First. It is frequently said that the truth or falsity of the doctrine of immortality is involved in this question of the resurrection of the ~~dead~~ Jesus. There is no connection between the two. The idea of immortality is a faith in the value of human life. The question of the resurrection of Jesus is one of historical criticism, based upon evidence. If it can be demonstrated that Jesus was raised from the dead, that proves nothing about immortality, it simply proves that Jesus was raised from the dead. For how long, no one knows, If it is proved that the stories are not true what effect has it. ~~upon~~ It simply means that they are not true stories.

Second. There seems to be a feeling that this subject is one which should not be ~~handled~~ handled in a critical manner, but which should be accepted as a whole on faith. That any critical attitude towards it is sacrilegious. To that I can only answer ~~that~~ "The statement of historic fact that cannot bear the strain of critical examination is valueless.

Third. This is a very large question, and I can touch only the detail of it.

Paul's Attitude.

The reason why the Athenians interrupted Paul in his speech Areopagus at Athens was because his hearers did not believe in the Resurrection of the Dead. The Sadducees did not believe in that Doctrine. In fact there were some in the Christian Church who did not believe in the idea. That is the reason why Paul was writing his first Epistle to the ~~Thessalonians~~ Corinthians. Some of his people there did not believe that Jesus was raised from the dead. Paul writes to set them straight upon this point. So the oldest bit of document that bears upon this question of the Resurrection of Jesus is the ~~document~~ 15th. Chapter of First Corinthians. In this Chapter Paul sets down in order the details of the events and the Witnesses thereof.

MOREOVER, brethren, I²² declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, ²³which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; ²⁴By which also ye are saved, if ye ²⁵keep in memory ²⁶what I preached unto you, unless ²⁷ye have believed in vain.

³ For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according²⁶ to the scriptures;

⁴ And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according²⁷ to the scriptures;

⁵ And that he was seen ²⁸of Cēphas, then of the twelve;

⁶ 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.

⁷ After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles.

⁸ And last of all²⁹ he was seen of me also, as of ³⁰one born out of due time.

⁹ For I am the least³⁰ of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God.

¹⁰ But by the grace of God I am what I am: and his grace which *was bestowed* upon me was not in vain; but I laboured more abundantly than they all: yet not I,³¹ but the grace of God which was with me.

¹¹ Therefore whether *it were* I or

they, so we preach, and so ye believed.

¹² Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, ¹³how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?

¹³ But if there² be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen.

¹⁴ And if Christ² be not risen, then *is* our preaching vain, and your faith *is* also vain.

¹⁵ Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ: whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not.

¹⁶ For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised:

¹⁷ And if Christ be not raised, your faith⁴ *is* vain; ye are⁵ yet in your sins.

¹⁸ Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished.

¹⁹ ^aIf in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable.

²⁰ But now ^vis Christ risen from the dead, and become ^zthe firstfruits of them that slept.

²¹ For ^asince by man *came* death, ^bby man *came* also the resurrection of the dead.

²² For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

²³ But ^cevery man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming.

²⁴ Then *cometh* the end, when he shall have delivered up ^dthe kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power.

²⁵ For he must reign, ^etill he hath put all enemies under his feet.

²⁶ ^fThe last enemy that shall be destroyed *is* death.

²⁷ For he ^ghath put all things under

his feet. But when he saith all things are put under *him*, *it is* manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him.

²⁸ ^hAnd when all things shall be subdued unto him, then ⁱshall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.

²⁹ Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for the dead?

³⁰ And ^kwhy stand we in jeopardy every hour?

³¹ I protest by ^{2l}your rejoicing which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord, ^mI die daily.

³² If ³after the manner of men ⁿI have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? ^olet us eat and drink; for to morrow we die.

³³ Be not deceived: ^pevil communications corrupt good manners.

³⁴ ^qAwake to righteousness, and sin not; ^rfor some have not the knowledge of God: ^sI speak *this* to your shame.

³⁵ But some *man* will say, ^tHow are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?

³⁶ *Thou* fool, ^uthat which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die:

³⁷ And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other *grain*;

³⁸ But God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body.

³⁹ All flesh *is* not the same flesh: but *there is* one *kind* of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds.

⁴⁰ *There are* also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial: but the glory of the celestial *is* one, and the *glory* of the terrestrial *is* another.

⁴¹ *There is* one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars: for *one* star differeth from *another* star in glory.

⁴² So also *is* the resurrection of the dead. It²⁸ *is* sown in corruption; it²⁹ *is* raised in incorruption:

⁴³ It²⁷ *is* sown in dishonour; it *is* raised in glory; it *is* sown in weakness; it *is* raised in power:

Lecture XII Resurrection.

44 It is sown a natural body; it^{is} raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body.

45 And so it is written,²⁰ The first man Ad'am was made a living soul; the³⁰ last Ad'am was made a quickening spirit.

46 Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual.

47 The¹ first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven.

48 As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly.

49 And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.

50 Now this I say, brethren, that² flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.

51 Behold, I shew you a mystery: We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed,

52 In a moment,³ in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.

53 For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal⁴ must put on immortality.

54 So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death⁵ is swallowed up in victory.

55 O⁶ death, where is thy sting? O⁷ grave, where is thy victory?

56 The⁸ sting of death is sin: and the strength of sin is the law.

57 But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jē'sus Chrīst.

58 Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast,⁹ unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as¹¹ ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord.

This is the first oldest written statement that we have concerning the resurrection.

There are some important facts to be noted in connection with it.

Paul was at Ephesus. He had received a letter from the Corinthians (VII, 1) in which they had asked him concerning certain questions of doctrine. Also news had come to him from members of the Household of Chloe that there were some cases of lax discipline, and that some among them denied the Resurrection. The Epistle was written to settle these matters. So that Paul's statements in Chapter 15 are deliberate answers to the persons who doubted the truth of the resurrection.

The first point to note is that Christ died for our sins, ~~was~~ according to the Scriptures, that he was buried; and that he hath been raised on the third day according to the scriptures.

Second. That he appeared first to Cephas, then to the twelve, then he appeared to above five hundred brethren at once and finally to Paul.

Third. Paul makes no distinction between his own witness, and that of the others, although the others saw ~~Jesus~~ Jesus before the ascension.

Next it is to be noted that these Corinthians have asserted that there is no resurrection from the dead. Paul is refuting them by asserting the resurrection of the Dead "for if there is no resurrection of the dead then Christ has not been raised. If Christ has not been raised, then is our preaching vain."

Paul then demonstrates the resurrection, but his demonstration is not historical or scientific, but speculative. See Chap. 15/20 -- 28. It does not rest upon facts of experience but upon the argument that ~~as~~ in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive."

~~But after~~ The question arises naturally at this point why if Paul knew of the events that are recorded in the Gospels he did not refer to the records of the resurrection of Jesus, and the resurrection of the saints at the time of Jesus' death. ~~W~~ But not so he has an entirely different story to tell. Cephas then the twelve and then five hundred.

Fifth . Whereas the Gospel stories make it very plain that it was a physical resurrection, that the body was raised, Paul takes great pains to argue that it was a spiritual body, not of the flesh but an incorruptable, i.e. a body that could not decay or decompose. Moreover Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven.

Such then is the earliest record concerning the resurrection. It is spiritual, demonstrated principally by argument, and in so far as appeal is made to the ~~living~~ experience at the tomb, the statement of fact varies from the statement in the gospel.

First of all, then, as we turn to the Gospels and study them^{they} comparatively we find a certain common thread, and many peculiar^{ie} characteristics. From the beginning of events ~~xxxx~~ on the resurrection morning until the ascension, (John gives the time as 40 days) there is only one alleged incident where all four gospels agree in the narration of events. But even in this general agreement, the differences in very important facts are serious. The one common incident to all four gospels is the visit to the tomb on the morning of the Resurrection. Eliminating all disagreements and contradictions, and combining the story briefly into one tale, it would read about as follows.

Now on the first day of the week Mary Magdalene went to the tomb, and seeth the stone taken away. Found the tomb empty. Is ~~xxxx~~ amazed and distressed. Is told that he ~~is~~ "The Lord" is risen. That she is to tell the disciples. They do not believe they story that she tells them. Then (if you include Mark 16/9-20) Jesus risen appears unto them and talks with them. (But in this last statement there is not^{an} incident common to the four gospels, but the general idea of appearance is common)

But when we come to a study of the parallel account in detail, we are impressed by the many curious and often contradictory detail. In the scene at the tomb, as the chart indicates, the records do not commend themselves. For example. Matthew has Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary go to the tomb. Mark has Mary Magdalene, Mary the Mother of James and Salome; Luke has Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Joanna, while John has Mary Magdalene alone but before she enters the tomb she runs after Simon Peter and John to come with her.

In the second place the time is interesting . Matthew says that they went to the tomb as it began to dawn ; Mark says "Very early on the first day of the week, when the sun was risen; Luke says, that it was at early dawn, while John says that Mary went, "While it was yet dark."

Then the stone is another matter of interest. First of all let it be noted that the stone was a flat circular stone such as was commonly used as doors of tombs. "Rolling" was the common way of opening the door.

Matthew says, "and behold , there was a great earthquake ; and an angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled away the stone and sat upon it. His appearance was as lightning, and his raiment white as snow." Mark says, " and they were saying among themselves, - Who shall roll away the stone from the door of the tomb ? and looking up , they see that the stone is rolled back for it was exceeding great."

Luke has the very simple statement of fact, " and they found the stone rolled away from the tomb." John also has the simple statement, -- "and seeth the stone taken away from the tomb."

Information.

Mary and the others were come to the tomb thus get certain information. to the effect that Jesus is risen, and that she is to bear a message to the disciples. In Matthew this information comes from the Angel who had rolled away the stone, and was sitting on it outside the tomb. According to Mark they enter the tomb, and find a young man arrayed in white sitting on the right side. He tells Mary Magdalene what to do. According to Luke they enter into the tomb and are perplexed about what they find. "And it came to pass, ~~that~~

while they were perplexed thereabout, behold, two men stood by them in dazzling apparel."

But according to John Mary does not enter the tomb, but stoops and looks in, "and she beholdeth two angels in white sitting, one at the head, and one at the feet where the body of Jesus had lain."

According to Matthew and John they do not enter the tomb. According to Mark and Luke they do.

These illustrate the differences where there is a common narrative. They are not differences in unimportant detail, but differences of important fact. If a witness on a stand should say that at a definite place at a definite time he saw one angel, and then later should concern the same time and place that he saw two angels, and again that he saw one man, and then two men, we would begin to question whether he had seen any thing at all.

Or take the matter of the appearances of Jesus. According to Matthew he appears but once, to the Disciples on the Mountain in Galilee. According to the ~~origin~~ oldest Mark, there is no record of his appearance, but in the Pseudo ending of Mark, he appears ~~first at Jerusalem~~ first ^{at the way to} at Emmaus, then to all at Jerusalem, ~~then on the mountain, and then at Bethany.~~ ^{from whence he ascends into heaven} Luke gives the Emmaus appearance in great detail, then with Jerusalem and then at Ascension at Bethany. John ~~with the disciples~~ records three appearances. With Mark and Luke he records the appearance at Jerusalem, then he has an appearance to Thomas and the rest, and the third one at the sea of Galilee. Paul accounts for none of these appearances, but says that Jesus appeared first to Peter, then to the Twelve, and finally to

500.

The second Mark ending and John record an appearance to Mary Magdalene, which is not found in the other two.

But according to Matthew Jesus specifically tells the Marys that the Disciples are to depart into Galilee, and there they shall see him. "But the eleven disciples went into Galilee, unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them." ~~And~~ ^{when} And/they saw him, they worshipped him but some doubted him! The Jesus spoke unto them.

But the other records know nothing of the Galilee Mountain. The other three have the first appearance to the Disciples assembled in Jerusalem. But the meeting at Jerusalem was on this first day also. The distance from Jerusalem to Galilee is at least 50 miles as the crow flies. Either the disciples had some means of rapid transit, or these two meetings did not take place at the same time. But what is still more to the point both of these meetings are described as meetings where the first appearance took place. ~~Further words these are not descriptions of events, but tradition, etc~~

So one might go on pointing out these disagreements ~~almost~~ almost ad infinitum. But at this point it is desirable to turn to another line of consideration, namely the relation of these later events as described to the records in the earlier part of the Gospels. There are several points that might be taken up here. but two will suffice. One is suggested by the phrase found in Matthew 28/17? "But some doubted."

And the other by the statement, to the effect that the disciples did not yet know that he must rise from the dead in order to fulfil the Scripture

But Some Doubted.

Just why this statement appears in the story is not easy to account for. In Matthew for example we have it in connection with the account of Jesus' appearance on the Mountain in Galilee.

"But the eleven disciples went into Galilee, unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him, some worshipped him ; but some doubted."

This seems very difficult to believe. That after Jesus had met ~~them~~ them by appointment, and talked to them, and confirmed all the story of the Marys to them, that any of them should doubt the fact of their personal experience. Does this phrase represent the record of a fact. The Matthew Gospel is generally regarded as the one Gospel that had its origin in Palestine, ~~possibly~~ why then does this record ~~appear~~ to the effect that some doubted appear.

The answer is ~~indicated~~ indicated by another record peculiar to Matthew. That is the record to the effect that the Pharisees under Pilate caused a guard to be placed at the tomb, because they feared that the disciples would steal his body away , and ~~then~~ then say that he had arisen from the dead. This guard was placed as agreed, and when they reported to the Pharisees what had happened, the Pharisees bribed them with money to tell every one that they fell asleep , and while they slept , the disciples came to steal the body. ~~Then~~ Then occurs one of those naive remarks in these stories that show its real character," "And this saying was spread abroad among, and continueth to this day." ~~In~~

In other words ~~Matthew~~ the writer of the Matthew Gospel knew of a story to the effect that Jesus was not raised from the dead, but that his body was stolen. He inserts this story of the guards, peculiar to Matthew, to account for that tradition.

But also he knew of a tradition that doubted the Resurrection story, and that it ~~was~~ claimed the backing of the Disciples. Else why should he introduce the phrase, " But some doubted."

According to Luke he has to demonstrate to them by showing them ~~that~~ his wounds. " in answer to their doubtings , even ~~and~~ after he had explained the Scriptures to them , and how he was supposed to rise from the dead,

"See my hands , and my feet , it is I myself ; Handle me and see ; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye beheld me having. And when he had said this he showed them his hands and his feet. And while they still disbelieved for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye anything to eat ? And they gave him a piece of broiled fish. And he took it and ate before them."

Still further doubt. What does it mean ?

According to John there are three appearances to the ~~disciple~~ disciples. Here they have to be shown by the same process of feeling the sides and feet, and eating fish etc. They are even more exacting in John than elsewhere. But in John that appears another of those casual remarks that tell more than they should. ~~xxxxxx/xx~~ Mary Magdalene had been to the tomb . She had summoned Peter and John. They had come to the tomb, and looked in. They saw that it was empty, but they went away to their homes, 20/ 9/ "For they knew not the scripture that he must rise again~~xx~~ from the dead."

This then is given by the Gospels not only in John but also in Luke as an explanation for their doubts, What I want to point out here is this fact, the recognition of doubt among the disciples concerning the fact of the resurrection. Also the recognitin

as in the Matthew Guard story , of the persistence even to ~~this~~ the day of writing of a tradition concerning the stolen body. Why was the doubting clause inserted, and why was the clause that not until after the resurrection did the disciples know that his resurrection was foretold in the scripture. The answer is that these observations were incorporated into the story to help explain the fact that in spite of the Earthquake at Jesus death, and the raising from the dead at that time of several saints, and in spite of the earthquake at the time of the resurrection, no one knew anything about these facts. We have in these slips the necessary errors that creep in in the reading of mythical matters into the fabric of history. It always betrays itself.

But this first consideration, "But some doubted" leads to the second. We have the mention of the fact of doubt. Also we have the attempt to overcome that doubt by actual physical handling and eating. It is no illusion but the real thing, -real body, and real flesh and blood wounds, and real fish~~x~~ that Jesus eats.

Scripture fulfilled.

John says plainly in 20/ 6 that the ~~disciples~~ ^{two favorite disciples} did not yet know that from the Scripture he must rise again." Again according to Luke he shows them that his rising from the dead is according to the Scripture, ~~which~~ which foretold that on the third day he should rise from the dead.

Now how does this situation that the disciples did not know until after his death that he should rise from the dead, and that the Scripture foretold it, square up with the idea that Jesus regarded himself as Messiah. In these last chapters it is said that the Disciples did not know that he must be raised up on the third day. What do the rest of the Gospels say?

The answer is plain. In three different parallel passages we have the statement. First Matthew 16/21-28, Mark 8/31-9/1 and Luke 9/22-27. we have practically the same words used, - "From that time began Jesus to shew his disciples, how he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and the third day be raised up."

in the second place after the story of the transfiguration he tells Peter and James and John particularly that they should ~~not~~ tell ~~the rest of the disciples~~ no man of what they had seen until the son of man should be ^{risen} ~~raised~~ from the dead". This is common to Matthew and Mark.

Again in Matthew 17/ 22-23, Mark 9/ 30-32. it says that Jesus taught the disciples, "That the Son of man shall be delivered up into the hands of men, and that they shall kill him, and the third day he shall be raised up."

Again in Matthew 20/ 17-19, Mark 10/32--34, and Luke 18/31-34. while they are about to start for Jerusalem Jesus takes

"the twelve apart, and in the way he said unto them, 'behold we go up to Jerusalem; and the son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests and the scribes; and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him unto the gentiles to mock, and to scourge and to crucify; and the third day he shall be raised up."

After all this deliberate instruction concerning his death and crucifixion, and especially this deliberate and special taking aside of the disciple for the purpose of telling them about it, it sounds absurd to read in the accounts of the resurrection of their terror and surprise at seeing him risen, or their stubborn unbelief, and the necessity not only of showing them the wounds but also of breaking bread with them before they could overcome their unbelief. Yet there was hardly two interval between the two alleged events. Then to have John take up the statement flatly that they did not yet know that according to scripture he must rise from the dead.

What it all means is that these records are, not historical, nor are they possible sources of historical facts. They are legends, or myths which, for dogmatic reasons in part, and in part for other reasons have been associated with the person of Jesus. That the events as described in the Gospels, the physical resurrection with the flesh and blood, the wounds, the eating of fish etc did not take place at all we have two good witnesses. The first is the gospel records themselves, for they say so many things unintentionally that their intentional story is spoiled. The second witness is the witness of Paul. The Gospels ~~of~~ bear witness to a physical resurrection. Paul to a spiritual resurrection declaring flatly that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God,

Where did these stories come from.

First the doctrine of the Resurrection was a common one among the Jews. The Pharisees believed it. The Sadducees were the only ones who did not believe it. That was not a question at issue among the Jewish Christians, and for many years after the death of Jesus the followers of Jesus were confined to the Jews almost entirely, or at least to proselytes. The question at issue among them was whether or not Jesus was the Messiah. Luke 24 /21 touches what seems to be a ~~valid~~ sound spot, "In the story of the appearance to of Jesus to those on the way to Emmaus, in response to question by Jesus , they say," The things concerning Jesus of Nazareth which was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people: and how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him up to be condemned to death and crucified him. But we hoped that it was he that should redeem Israel."

That sounds natural and human. Some messianic leader he might have been regarded by the followers, and they might have continued their work which he had begun, only to have their faith in his simple human teaching taken up and transformed into faith in his possible messianic conception. Whatever may have been the kernel of fact in his life, it seems demonstrated by the hopeless confusion of records that all the Messianic , and "son of God" material that gathered about his life story is legendary if not mythical in character.

Paul gives the cue in his various records *of* his conversions , and his doctrine of the resurrection. His risen Christ whom he saw was by his own demonstration not flesh and blood, but spiritual, seen in a vision and a trance. (There may be valid psychic phenomena here) . The witness of him would be the second

in his glory to usher in the messianic kingdom. As we saw ~~before~~ in a previous lecture the interest of Paul was not in Jesus of Nazareth but in the Risen Christ. Now the new Testament Gospels were not written by those who ~~believed~~ hoped that he should redeem Israel, but by those who believed in the risen Christ, not the Messiah so much as the "Son of God" which Philo of Alexandria and others like him were teaching.

~~After the~~ After recovering from the shock of Jesus death his disciples rallied about the faith in him as the heavenly Messiah not because they had witnessed his resurrection of a body as described in the Gospels, but because they believed in his worth and teaching. They were going to continue to follow in his way of living. To this person Jesus whom the Palestinian Jews followed, ~~and~~ Paul attached all the Greek Christ and Logos material. Beginning in the small way in the faith of the disciples in the integrity of their Jesus, it ends in the Worship of the Son of God ~~idea~~ to whom all these contradictory stories about the resurrection are attached.

Where did they come. ? Within recent years we have been getting answers to that question. We find that this idea of the death and resurrection. For Example Krishna was slain. At his ~~and~~ death dark circles were around the moon and the sun was darkened at noonday. He descended into Hell, rose again from the dead and ascended bodily into heaven, and ascended into heaven, many persons witnessing his ascent." Similarly Buddha. In fact we are finding that this myth of the death and the resurrection of a God is common all over the world. Prof Frazer's volume ~~in~~ "The dying God " in the Golden bough series gives a vast amount of illuminating material upon the general subject. But the point is

that practically all over the world from time immemorial people have celebrated some kind of a spring festival like our easter, with customs, and ideas closely akin to our easter customs. Its essential theme has been the conflict of the seasons, the life of summer with the death of winter. In one form or another this is the background of the whole easter ~~like~~ celebration. The eggs, flowers etc, are natural witness to this. Also many of the primitive folk customs that have survived; For example in Bohemia is the folk song of Easter time. "Now carry we death out of the village/ The new Summer into the Village/ Welcome, dear Summer/ Green little corn. In very primitive time a part of the religious rite of this spring festival was the human sacrifice. That ~~survived~~ survived in various forms. First it survived in the substituting of an image in place of the real human. which has survived to this day in some of the remote peasant districts. We saw that ~~it was~~ ~~practised~~ human sacrifice was practised at a very late date among the Jews. ~~But~~ But more direct is the ritual of Adonis practised among the Greeks of Western Asia and Greece.

" At the festivals of Adonis the death of the God was annually mourned , with a bitter wailing, chiefly by women.; Images of him , dressed to resemble corpses, were carried out as to burial, and then thrown into the sea or into springs. Other aspects of this festival indicate that it was practised in the spring. This dramatic celebration of the death and resurrection of Adonis was connected with the conflict of spring and summer, ~~which we know as~~ ~~Easter~~

But particularly interesting at this point is the Myth and Ritual of Attis celebrated in Western Asia . Attis appears to have been a god of vegetation, and his death and resurrection were

were celebrated annually in the spring of each year. ~~The ceremony~~
~~occurred of the celebration~~ The cult was very strong at Rome, and
 the celebration herein described is such as was celebrated at
 Rome ~~in~~ before the birth of Christ.

Attis was said to have been born of a Virgin mother, ~~Anna~~ in
 a miraculous manner. The manner of his death is uncertain, but the
 story
~~legend~~ is that he was turned into a pine tree. Each year his
 death an resurrection was celebrated after this fashion.

"On the 22nd of March, a Pine tree was cut in the woods, and
 brought into the sanctuary of Cybele where it was treated as a
 great divinity. The duty of carry the sacred tree was intrusted
 to a guild of tree bearers. (Witness the suggestion of Palm
 Sunday.) The trunk was swathed like a corpse with woolen bands
 and decked with wreaths of violets, for violets were said to have
 sprung from the blood of Attis, as roses and anemones from the
 blood of Adonis ; and the effigy of a young man , doubtless Attis
 himself, was tied to the middle of the stem."

"On the second day of the ~~ceremony~~ festival, the twenty third
 of March, the chief ceremony seems to have been the blowing of
 trumpets. The third day, the 24 of March was known as the day of
 Blood: the archigallus or high priest drew blood from his arms
 and presented it as an offering. Nor was he alone in making this
 bloody sacrifice" At all events , we can hardly doubt that
 the Day of Blood witnessed the mounning for Attis over ~~him~~ an
 effigy of him which was afterwards buried." The image thus laid

"~~But when night had fallen the sorrow of the worshippers was~~
~~turned into joy~~ in the sepulchre was probably the same which ~~it~~
 had hung upon the tree."

"But when night had fallen, the sorrow of the worshippers was turned into joy? For sud only a light shone in the darkness; the tomb was opened : the god had risen from the dead; and as the ~~priest~~ priest touched the lips of the weeping mourners with balm, he ~~was~~ softly whispered in thair ears the glad tidings of Salvation. The resurrection of the god was hailed by his disciples as a promise that they too would issue triumphant from the corruption of the grave. "

" On the morrow , the twenty fifth day of March , which was reckoned the vernal equinox, the divine resurrection was celebrated with a wild outburst of glee. At Rome and probably elsewhere the celebration took the form of a carnival. It was a festival of Joy." Comapre Day of Pentacost. Goods in common.

"The next day was given to repose and rest, followed by a ceremonial washing of all sacred apparatus in the stream.

One or two other facts connected with this Attis cult throw light on the situation. There were mystery ceremonies including a Baptism which washed away the persons sin, and he was said to have been born again into eternal life. This baptismal rite was carried out as its central place on the Vatican Hill in Rome at or very near the spot where the ~~great~~ St Peter's now stands. Further the name "Attis seems to mean "Father" , and Attis was often called "Papas" , ~~the name~~ the name which we translate ~~as~~ Pope.

In Egypt the deather and Resurrection of the God Osiris at ~~h~~ the same season of the year, ie. the plowing season was celebrated. In some parts of Egypt small images of Osiris were buried with the dead to insure the resurrection.

"An eminent scholar has recently pointed out the remarkable resemblance between the treatment of Christ by the Roman soldiers at Jerusalem, and the treatment of the mock king of the Saturnalia by the Roman soldiers of Durostorum. In other words in some places in some of these festivals instead of an Image of the God they took a criminal and actually carried out the sacrifice of the ~~body~~ God by making the criminal pay the penalty. It has been suggested, and it is possible that all that story of the releasing of Barrabas and Christ may be related to this custom. That the Jews at Jerusalem in their festival of the Purim kept up an ancient custom of hanging or crucifying an effigy of Haman is certain. The Christians were very sensitive about the bearing of this upon their own mysteries. So there seems to be some close relationship here.

1) What then is the relation between these two lines of facts that I have developed. On the one hand the very confused and uncertain and contradictory accounts of this alleged resurrection ; on the other this wide spring festival during which the death and resurrection of Gods was celebrated under varying forms and many of them so closely suggestive of the accounts concerning the death and resurrection of Christ.

We know by deliberate confession of a contemporary Church Father that the Christmas celebration, and the christman legends were of pagan origin, and that in the fourth century the Christians being unable to stamp out the Pagan Winter Solostice festival which the birth of their God mithra was celebrated , deliberately took over the whole ceremony ~~legend and all~~ myth and all, and substituted ~~it~~ Jesus. We have every reason in the world except a direct statement for believing that this is what was done with the spring festival of Easter when in various parts of the roman Empire, the death and resurrection of the God of vegetation was celebrated.