

sary "to have faith in a fact:" religious belief must not hang on history and must be independent of all facts, "which would hold good apart from that belief." Whether Christ rose from the dead can not, therefore, be of moment to the Christian; all that is of any significance is the religious conviction that He was "not swallowed up in death, but passed through suffering and death to glory, that is, to life, power, and honor." "Faith has nothing to do with the knowledge and the form in which Jesus lives, but only with the conviction that He is the living Lord." And in the case of the resurrection of Christ this detachment from history is especially well for Christianity. For there is really no sound reason for believing that Jesus rose from the dead in the literal sense which has been attached to those words. "The mere fact that friends and adherents of Jesus were convinced that they had seen Him . . . gives to those who are in earnest about fixing historical facts not the least ground for the assumption that Jesus did not continue in the grave." The candid historian will indeed feel bound to surrender the fact of the bodily resurrection of Christ to the assaults of recent criticism.*

The effect of this new attitude toward the resurrection of Christ, if it could be justified, would obviously be to turn the flank of the Christian position. Christianity has concentrated her defense at this impregnable point, and feels herself safe until it be captured. The new foeman bows politely and declares that he prefers to enter the Christian domain by some other road; the so-called Gibraltar, if it be rock at all, and not a mere stage construction of laths and brown cloth, holds no key-position and may best be simply neglected. Christianity is not built on the rock of fact in any case, he tells us; it is a castle in the air, adjusting itself readily, as it floats over the rough surface and solid earth, to all sorts of inequalities and changes of ground, and is best entered by disengaging ourselves from the soil and soaring lightly into its higher precincts. No doubt the professed purpose of this new determination of the relation of Christianity to fact is to render Christianity forever unassailable from the point of view of historical science; if it is independent of all details of history it can not be wounded through the critical reconstruction of the historical events which accompanied its origin. But the obvious actual effect of it is to destroy altogether all that has hitherto been known as Christianity; the entire detachment of Christianity from the realm of fact simply dismisses it into the realm of unreality. Men may still call by the name of "Christianity" the possibly "iridescent" dream which still remains to them, but a "Christianity" which stands out of relation to historical facts is plainly a very different thing from the old Christianity, all of whose doctrines are facts, and which was, above all things, rooted in historical occurrences. And this is particularly apparent with regard

* A. Harnack, "History and Dogma," E-T., vol. i., pp. 85, 86, note: compare the later tract, "Christianity and History," p. 84.

to the
indiff
wholl
from I

It
more
tures
reccion
It wou
broadl
Lord
reccion
His s
The ea
urrecti
32; iv
that sp
i. 21;
vior; t
all the
lar two
the sup
In a co
hath no
are alik
of their
tion of
him an
so that
preache
on their
on its
the wh
pending
fact. A
bleness
it as his
of belie
readers.
raised,"
well tha
the othe
of such
the apos

* Comp
adduced.