

Reproduced by kind permission of The Christadelphian Magazine & Publishing Association, Birmingham, UK. All rights reserved.

This Christadelphian publication is no longer in print.

Please read all literature alongside your bible, so that you can see the accuracy and truth of the message for yourself

This Pamphlet reproduces the eleventh of a course of twelve addresses arranged for the first Sunday of each month during 1949, by the

CHRISTADELPHIAN (CENTRAL) ECCLESIA,
In the
Midland Institute, Birmingham

To show that it is not only possible but reasonable to believe those foundation truths of Christianity upon which doubt has been cast by some modern writers.

Dare we believe?

PHYSICAL RESSURECTION

IN the Bible, physical resurrection appears at once as a doctrine and an accomplished fact. As a doctrine, it fits perfectly into the coherent whole of Bible teaching. Fundamental to the Bible system is the notion of man's mortality because of sin; the matter is succinctly put by Paul "[the wages of sin is death](#)" (Rom 6 v 23). Man is thus subject to the law of mortality which prevails throughout the realm of nature; scientists have for some time been speaking of energy wasting away, of an entire cosmos running down, moving inexorably towards a condition of coldness and death. Stars are born and stars die; the earth left to itself would in its turn become cold and uninhabitable. Dwarfed into insignificance by the universe in which he lives, man is impotent to arrest the process of decay.

Thus nature and man alike stand in need of regeneration. It must be to some power standing outside the natural order and able to reverse its processes, that we must look for salvation. The Bible speaks to us of a God who is willing, as He is able, to save the world He made. In that work of regeneration, the salvation of man takes a prominent place.

TWIN PRINCIPLE OF CORRUPTION

As we exist to-day, our personality is exhibited in and through a perishing organism; there is active in us a twin principle of moral and physical corruption. God's first act is to rescue the personality. His Word brings home to those who will receive it, the consciousness that they die because of sin, a realization which brings submission to God's will and awakens the desire for His mercy. This moral and spiritual rebirth is a departure from the natural order, and is essentially the work of God. The God who intervenes to quicken the spiritually dead, intervenes anew to raise our bodies from the

dust and clothe them with His own imperishable nature. First comes spiritual, then physical, resurrection. The raising of a body long dead, its particles mingled with the soil, the re-endowment of that organism with personality, and its immortalization, may place a strain upon our credulity, but the God who created man is fully able to recreate him.

THE FIRSTBORN FROM THE DEAD

So much God showed when He raised Christ from the grave, crowning thus a life of perfect obedience. In Christ's body the whole drama of redemption was enacted; normally the instrument of sin, the body became with Christ the instrument of righteousness. Sin, conquered on its own ground, had no right to levy death: as Peter said of Jesus "[Whom God raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it](#)" (Acts 2 v 24). Made like unto the angels to die no more, Christ is able to declare: "[I am he that liveth, and was dead ; and, behold, I am alive for evermore](#) " (Rev 1 v 18). Christ represents the beginning of a new creation, the firstborn from the dead, (Col 1 v 15) the new Adam (1 Cor 15 v 45). He is the firstborn of many brethren,(Rom 8 v 29) and his resurrection is the assurance of the raising again of many who sleep in the dust(Dan 12 v 2). The doctrine of resurrection acquires henceforward a new meaning and a new power; it no longer rests upon a promise of God, it has become a human experience.

If this conviction is to be conveyed to men, there must be witnesses to testify that Christ's resurrection is a real event. This testimony has been preserved for us in the pages of the New Testament. What is its weight, what is its value? Those are questions which must now occupy us.

THE EVIDENCE OF THE RECORDS

The resurrection records, especially those at the end of the Gospels, have been subjected to the most minute criticism. Enemies claim to have detected in them discrepancies and contradictions which call for their rejection, while men of faith through the ages have found in them firm ground for their conviction that Christ indeed rose from the dead.

To the argument of discrepancy, and other critical submissions, we shall presently return. The solid and substantial agreement of the records would seem obvious enough. There is common material in the narratives, a note in one Gospel being sometimes considerably expanded in another, but there are also important details peculiar to a single record. In this way the Gospels serve to corroborate and complement one another.

The relevant passages should be carefully studied. Notice how Matthew 28 mentions the visit of two Marys to the sepulchre; the stone sealing the tomb has been rolled away and an angel tells them that Christ is risen. Jesus later reveals himself to the women. Mark 16 mentions the visit of the same women with another named Salome, the empty sepulchre, the presence of a young man clothed in a long white garment and his message that Christ is risen; verses 9 and 50 speak of Christ's appearance to Mary -Magdalene. Luke 24 gives much the same details; the visit of the two Marys (accompanied according to verse 10 by other women), the empty sepulchre, the presence, this time, of two men in shining garments, and the message that Christ is risen. There is no mention in Luke of the appearance to the women. John 20 concentrates attention on Mary Magdalene, though she is clearly not alone—she uses the pronoun "[we](#)" in verse 2. Finding the tomb empty, Mary reports the matter to Peter and John who hasten to the sepulchre to see for themselves; later, Mary Magdalene has the supreme joy of seeing the risen Lord.

To return to Matthew 28; the end of the chapter records the appearance of the eleven on a mountain in Galilee and the commission to preach the Gospel and baptize believers. The further

details in Mark 16 include an appearance to two disciples out in the country, a revelation to the eleven while at table, and the commission to preach and baptize. Luke 24 expands considerably Mark's mention of the appearance to the two disciples; these make their way, according to verse 13, to a village called Emmaus. The record here is very circumstantial and mentions how in the course of their conversation the risen Christ showed them in the Old Testament the passages relating to himself. The chapter goes on to give most impressive evidence of a revelation to the eleven; to convince the apostles that it is truly their Lord, Christ says: "[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](#)" (verse 39). He then eats in their presence. We notice, too, that Christ "[opened their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures](#)" (verse 46); this is very significant in the light of subsequent events. Luke 24 contains in addition a passing reference to an appearance to Peter and the record of Christ's ascent to heaven. John fills out the evidence with his story of the revelation, on the day of the resurrection, to his eleven apostles, locked behind doors for fear of the Jews; Thomas is absent and expresses his scepticism: "[Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my hand into his side, I will not believe](#)" (John 20 v 25). A week later his request is granted and unbelief gives way before the evidence of sense. John 21 contains the beautiful story of the risen Lord appearing to seven of his disciples on the shores of Galilee; five are mentioned: Peter, Thomas, Nathanael, James and the "[disciple whom Jesus loved](#)" (John). After fishing in the sea all night in vain, they see a stranger on the margin of the lake; he bids them cast in their net on the right side. The catch miraculously fills their nets. Now they know that the stranger is Christ. They come to land and find a fire lit, ready, to warm and cheer them after their night's vigil. A meal awaits them, too. These simple details, the inference that Christ has prepared the fire and a meal, show that it is truly Christ despite the miracle of his resurrection he remains the same loving, attentive Master. Then follows the moving scene in which Christ thrice asks Peter whether he loves him, and thrice bids him care for his flock.

APOSTOLIC WITNESS

Outside the gospels, there is in Acts 1 a record of the ascension from the Mount of Olives; this took place in the presence of the apostles, to whom, according to verse 3, Christ "[also showed himself alive after his passion by many proofs, appearing unto them by the space of forty days, and speaking of the things concerning the kingdom of God](#)" (R.V.). Furthermore, at the beginning of 1 Corinthians 15, Paul lists the appearances to Peter, to the apostles, to above 500 disciples at once, many of them still alive, to James, the Lord's brother, again to the apostles, then to Paul himself. A truly impressive list, explaining among other things the remarkable conversion of James and Paul; the first, unfriendly to Christ during the ministry (John 7 v 5), became one of the leaders of the Church at Jerusalem; the second, Paul, once an ardent persecutor of the disciples, became the tireless and self-sacrificing propagator of Christianity.

None can deny that what we have just reviewed constitutes a considerable body of evidence; it is weighty and, in many places, detailed and circumstantial. Some might cavil at the use of Mark 16: 19-20 which does not appear in the two oldest Greek manuscripts, although many other texts support it. This is not the moment to debate the issue (Any reader interested in evidence for the authenticity of Mark 16 v 19-20 should consult Dean Burgon's "*The Last Twelve Verses of Mark*"); we have seen how it takes its place by the side of the other records and this is a strong argument for its authority. Even if it is not adduced as evidence, we are still left with a powerful witness that Christ literally and physically rose from the dead.

The nature of Christ's immortalized body, and his behaviour after his resurrection are, unfortunately, subjects which cannot now detain us, but it is interesting to note that the records of Christ's appearances remind us of his own words that the children of the resurrection are equal unto the

angels (Luke 20 : 6). The reader should compare the New Testament records with passages like Genesis 18, Judges 6: 11-24 ; such a study will bring out the harmony of Bible teaching on the subject of the immortal state.

THE APPEARANCES

As we review the narratives, we see how prominence is clearly given to the appearances to the apostles: "[And ye are witnesses of these things](#)" (Luke 24 v 48) were Christ's own words after his resurrection. This fact is uppermost in the apostles minds as they choose a successor to Judas. Peter underlines the qualifications: "[Wherefore of these 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 1 v 21-22)

THE EVIDENCE OF HISTORY

The tremendous influence of the actual events and the power of the witness, soon make themselves visible. In Jerusalem, within a short distance of the empty tomb, publicly and unafraid, Peter boldly proclaims the resurrection of Christ (Acts 2). Here is a changed man. Early in the ministry Christ had named him Peter, a rock. There was little of rock-like steadfastness when Peter slunk at the back of the judgment hall, cursed, and thrice denied his lord. But Christ had declared even before his defection that Peter would be converted and strengthen his brethren (Luke 22 v 32). After his resurrection Christ had appeared privately to Peter, and this must have been a major factor in his conversion. Now the transformation is obvious. No terrors assail Peter as he rebukes the Jews for crucifying Christ and proclaims the reality of the resurrection. Moreover, his skilful handling of the Old Testament, contrasted with his earlier failure to understand Christ's sacrificial mission (Matt 16 v 22-23) and his inability, with the others, to understand that Christ should rise from the dead (Mark 9 v 31-32), bears eloquent testimony to the fact that Christ opened the understanding of the disciples. Furthermore, the remarkable Success of Peter's preaching, leading to the conversion of thousands (Acts 2 v 41, 4 v 4) recalls the words of Christ that his disciples would accomplish greater works than the Lord himself (John 14 v 12).

The rapid progress of the Christian church leads inevitably to persecution. Peter and John are brought before the Jewish leaders; official threatenings leave them undismayed. The admonition from the rulers to cease their preaching prompts the apostles to reply: "[Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard](#) " (Acts 4 v 19-20)

THE CHURCH'S GROWTH

We must resist the temptation to follow the narrative in all its pulsating detail, accumulating as it does evidence of the resurrection and building up a picture at once coherent and convincing. Many of the details are miraculous but they appear in the story as a pattern appears in cloth.

What enthalls in the narrative is the rise of the Church which we see growing out of the facts of Christ's resurrection as a tree grows out of its roots. The phenomenon is unique. The call is to righteousness, to truth and sanctity, to a new life as proclaimed and exhibited by the apostles. They are unanimous in ascribing this new life to the risen Lord. It is unthinkable that they should be lying when they declare that Christ is really risen. What conceivable motive could they possess? Perhaps they are mistaken. Yet who ever knew an error so gross give-rise to a faith so confident and exalted?

THE CRITICAL CONTENTION

Yet critics tell us that Christ never actually rose from the dead. Modernists like Dr. Barnes (See section on the resurrection in *"The Rise of Christianity"*, pages 164-178) affirm that the story of the resurrection of Christ, and indeed the whole conception of physical resurrection, must be regarded as a myth. Resurrection is a miracle, a breach in the uniform working of nature and therefore inadmissible to a modern mind. Physical resurrection, we are told, is one of the mental categories of the ancient world. The march of knowledge, the scientific outlook which has grown up over the last three hundred years, have rendered such ideas completely obsolete. Today we must have a faith which can command scientific sanction and be harmonized with the modern conception of the uniform functioning of nature.

However, lest it should appear that his thinking is stultified by a priori reasoning and his mind thus closed to evidence subversive of his position, Dr. Barnes is prepared to admit the possibility that the resurrection of Christ might represent a single and momentous exception. (Ibid, page 164). Nevertheless, he avers that a dispassionate examination of the resurrection narratives reveals their mythological character ; we are in the realm of romance, not history. The tradition of Christ's resurrection slowly took shape and became crystallized in its present form long after the death of Christ. There is nothing new about this theory, neither are the arguments advanced to bolster it in any way novel. They rest mainly upon the alleged contradictory character of the records, and their late dating.

AN INCONSISTENCY

What can be said in reply to this thesis? Let us first look at the a priori objection to miracle. It is curious how many modernists, Barnes among them, refuse to be governed by their own premises. The conception of the uniformity of nature takes no cognisance of spiritual values and Barnes believes in the primacy of the spiritual. He seems quite clearly to state his belief in the survival of Christ, in his ascension to eternal life.(Ibid, page 170) This could only be in a disembodied form as literal physical resurrection is ruled out. In other words, we are offered, instead of the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the body, the Greek idea of the immortality of the soul. The position is frankly summarized by another modernist, Dr. Fosdick, in his book *"The Modern use of the Bible"* (1924 edition, page 98) ". . . **Let us consider certain typical contrasts between Biblical thinking and our own. For example, I believe in the persistence of personality through death, but I do not believe in the resurrection of the flesh. Many of our forefathers could not conceive, immortality apart from a resurrected body. The resurrection of the flesh was a mental setting in which alone they supposed that faith in life everlasting ever could be found . . . The basis for this physical phrasing of immortality is plainly laid in the Bible"**.

Now here is a most singular phenomenon. Modernists reject bodily resurrection because it is unscientific and represents one of the outmoded notions of the first century, but this does not preclude many of them from professing a doctrine which is clearly at variance with all that modern science teaches. The picture of a wasting universe, with all forms of life doomed to vanish, has no place for a doctrine of personal immortality. Indeed, if there is any proposition incapable of experimental demonstration, it is that anything-is immortal. The critical case would be more convincing if it was at least consistent. We are afraid that the modernist uses the argument of the uniformity of nature very much as the Russians use the veto.

A PRE-CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

There is a further objection to the doctrine of personal immortality. It is pre-Christian and pagan in origin, going back to Plato in the fourth century, and beyond to Pythagoras. What then are we to make of the modernist rejection of physical resurrection on the ground that it is an outdated concept of the ancient world? This much can be said for the Bible doctrine; it recognizes the reality of death, as does modern science, and affirms that death is absolute and eternal unless God intervenes to recreate body and personality. Moreover, experimental evidence for the truth of resurrection is offered in the records of the rising of Christ. The Platonic doctrine, on the contrary, has no kind of scientific basis as we have already shown; we may apply it to the observation that Professor Farrington makes regarding another idea of Plato's: "It is a mischievous inroad of philosophy on the domain of science" (*Science in Antiquity*, page 127)

THE FIRST CENTURY NOT CREDULOUS

To give plausibility to the critical case, it is usual to represent the idea of bodily resurrection as fitting in with the crude notions of the ancient world. We have seen that by no means all the ancient world favoured the doctrine. We think it would be more exact to say that belief in physical resuscitation was exceptional rather than normal. We recall that when Paul spoke at Athens, the city of Socrates and Plato, "some mocked " (Acts 17 v 32) when he referred to the resurrection of the dead. On a later occasion, Paul was moved to say to King Agrippa, "Why should 'it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead? "(Acts 26 v 8) words which have a curiously modern ring. Even the Sadducees, who counted among them the high priestly family, denied the resurrection, (Luke 20 v 27) thus showing that sceptical bishops had their counterpart in the Jewish world. The apostles themselves found the idea of resurrection new and unfamiliar. Although Christ plainly foretold his death and rising from the dead, (Matt 16 v 21, 17 v 22-23, 20 v 17, and especially Mark 9 v 31-32): it is obvious that when Christ was buried, the hopes of the apostles were dashed and they never expected to see their leader again. Doubting Thomas, who disbelieved even the evidence of his fellow apostles and required to see the print of the nails and the mark of the spear, has become proverbial. He represents, at least in this matter, the hard-headed materialist of today. We might note in passing what Christ said to him: "Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed : blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed " (John 20 v 29)

Can we wonder in view of all this that the doctrine of resurrection was sometimes in danger even in the Christian church? It is the heresy of some which moves Paul to write the great chapter on resurrection—I Corinthians 15. He says unambiguously "But 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 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"(13-15). With characteristic realism, Paul faces the consequences of heresy and shows how the rejection of bodily resurrection destroys the whole Christian position.

VARIATIONS IN ACCOUNT

Turning from the a priori objection to resurrection, we look at the other critical arguments, prominent among which is the alleged contradictory character of the Biblical records. This may appear at first sight a criticism difficult to answer. To attempt to do it in detail is impossible in the compass of this essay. For an extended treatment of the subject we refer the reader to James Orr's book, *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, a work both scholarly and sane. However, we shall make one point. It is not unknown for witnesses of an event to appear to contradict one another over details. Often such discrepancies can be harmonized when all the facts are known. James Orr cites an

interesting case to illustrate this: a class in history was asked to discover by how many votes the French king Louis XVI was condemned. Using various sources, the class gave three different answers the vote was unanimous, there was a majority of one, there was a majority of 145. Strangely enough, all three answers were correct because, on different occasions, three separate votes were taken.

SUPPOSED DATE OF THE DOCUMENT

Another argument that is employed is the late date at which the New Testament documents were written. Here Dr. Barnes unearths ideas of the Tübingen school of the last century, ideas long since regarded as exploded. The chorus of scholarly disapproval when Dr. Barnes' book appeared ought to make him at least doubt the soundness of his position. Sir Frederick Kenyon in his book, *The Bible and Modern Scholarship*, says some exceedingly hard things about *The Rise of Christianity*. F. F. Bruce, the Head of the Department of Biblical History and Literature in the University of Sheffield, wrote an article in the April-June, 1947, number of the Review Science and Religion, and in it pointed out that Barnes ignores the work of leading British and Continental scholars; Bruce makes this remark **"To go through this book and pick out one by one the statements and arguments which are vulnerable on historical and literary grounds would require enough space for a book almost as large as the *The Rise of Christianity* itself"** Recently, in a series of broadcast talks, C. H. Dodd, of Cambridge University, has been discussing the origins of the gospels. He places the Gospel of Mark around A.D.65, thus taking us back to within just over a generation of the time of Christ.(Listener, Sept 29, 1949, page 531)

THE EPISTLES OF PAUL

But there is other evidence. There are the epistles of Paul, of earlier composition than the Gospels. Take for example, the Epistle to the Romans, assigned by Dr. Barnes himself to around the years A.D. 55-56 but, typically, he safeguards himself by alleging its composite authorship. Dr. C. H. Dodd, however, in his introduction to a commentary on the Romans, discusses the authorship of the Pauline epistles and says : **"No serious criticism admits any doubt of the four great epistles, those to the Romans, the Corinthians (two), and the Galatians "**. Let the reader study these epistles for himself and note the massive testimony they give, especially the Corinthians and Romans, to the resurrection from the dead. Let us look rapidly at four passages from the latter epistle

- (1) "Jesus Christ our Lord . . . declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead" (1: 3, 4).
- (2) "God, who quickeneth the dead. . ." (4: 17).
- (3) "Therefore we are buried with 'him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father. . ." (6: 4).
- (4) "The word is nigh thee; even in thy mouth, and in thy heart that is, the word of faith, which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy, mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou, shalt be saved" (10: 8, 9).

We see from this last quotation how, already, before A.D. 60, a belief in the resurrection of Christ was counted among the basic affirmations of Christianity.

CONFLICT AMONG THE CRITICS

Perhaps the strongest, demonstration of the authenticity of the Christian records is the attempt of the critics to be constructive. Unanimous in rejecting the story of Christ's literal resurrection, the critics agree about little else. The multiplicity and variety of theory advanced is bewildering and one

cannot help reflecting that though there is only one correct solution to a problem there can be an infinite number of false ones. Whatever hypothesis the critic chooses, he has to face the unquestioned fact of the Church's growth and expansion. Confronted with the clear and concordant picture in Acts 1, many have recognized that the driving force came from the apostles' conviction that Christ had risen. Some have accordingly tried to account for their certitude by suggesting that Christ did not die but swooned, and later recovered consciousness; others have maintained that the apostles mistook the tomb. Examined closely such theories reveal some obvious weaknesses. Strauss, one of the most remorseless critics, attacked the suggestion that Christ had swooned; how could a broken figure, weak from loss of blood, inspire his followers with the evangelizing and self-sacrificing zeal exhibited by the apostles? Moreover, something must have happened to Christ after his recovery. No critic can tell us precisely what it was. As for the suggestion that the apostles were mistaken about the tomb, quite apart from the improbability of such an error, we have to bear in mind that the authorities would have been only too happy to enlighten the apostles and the public; it was the most effective way of silencing the disciples once and for all.

Dr. Barnes has a theory, by no means new, which makes the problem of the tomb still more acute. According to his hypothesis, Christ was duly buried but his spirit continued to dwell with, and animate, his disciples. This consciousness of Christ's continuing presence, a highly spiritual conception, gave rise, so it is alleged, to the materialistic notion that Christ had physically risen from the dead—a most curious example of inversion. It was then that the legend of the visits to the tomb, of the post-resurrectional appearances, of the ascent to heaven, took shape. Does it not seem utterly incredible that nobody, friend or foe, had the wit to point out, when such stories started to circulate, that Christ was still in his grave?

DOES CHRIST'S SPIRIT ALLOW ERROR?

What a strange thing is this Spirit of Christ which Dr. Barnes so much, admires! It is incapable of distinguishing-between fact and fiction. But there is a more serious aspect. The early chapters of Acts record the persecution of the leading apostles and chapter 5: 33 mentions the intention of the Jewish leaders to assassinate them. Is this detail true? Whether it represents a late tradition or not, if the record is not true, then it is gross libel. Is this the fruit of the indwelling Christ?

How sad it all is. The critics, while admiring the noble growth of Christianity, sever the trunk from its roots and try to find new ones; they fail. *The Rise of Christianity* contains these two statements "**By every law of probability Christianity ought to have perished. That it survived is—do we exaggerate?—the supreme miracle of history**" . . . "**The process by which a scattered group of frightened men became a resurgent community is hidden from us: the seed grew in secret**" (page 174)

But let us leave the critics, and the sterile atmosphere of controversy; it will be more edifying to return to the Scriptures where we can find an anchor of the soul both sure and steadfast. In the Bible we can find clear attestation that Christ rose from the dead, attestation that we can accept with every confidence. As we read the Acts and the epistles we see that conviction transforming men and leading them to live nobler lives. They pursue high ideals and preach a convincing message, knowing their faith to be founded upon rock. At the very heart of their teaching is the glad news of the resurrection, for the rising of Christ represents God's mercy active in a world of sin; it is the triumph of good over evil, of life over death. In the body of Christ where sin was vanquished, mortality, the wages of sin, gave way to life eternal; a frail, perishing organism was changed into a body endowed with divine nature.

Down the ages comes the invitation to share in Christ's triumph, to believe that if we follow his example of love and sacrifice, we shall also participate in his resurrection : "If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you". (Rom 8 v 11) We commend these words to the reader; we know of no finer epitome of the Christian faith.

T. J. BARLING.

DARE WE BELIEVE?

Twelve addresses designed for those who feel that there is a conflict between modern knowledge and religious belief.

The Need For Belief
The Scientific Outlook and the Christian Faith
Christianity and Evolution
Miracles
Biblical Criticism
Revelation and Reason
The Meaning of Inspiration
The Virgin Birth and Divine Sonship
Sacrifice and the Blood of Christ
Physical Resurrection
The Exclusive Element in Christianity