

a stupendous failure. They would go back to their trade and speak no more of Jesus of Nazareth. They would henceforth be ashamed of his name. While in that state of abject humility, of complete discouragement, they are informed of the news of Christ's resurrection. They do not believe it. Had they expected it, they would have been convinced by the faintest evidence. But little by little their unbelieving hearts are convinced; the evidence becomes so clear that conviction is forced upon them. They now know that Christ is risen indeed. That conviction transforms them. They are full of courage, their zeal knows no bounds; no obstacle shall prevent them from preaching the risen Christ. Their life is threatened, the powers of the Jewish nation are against them; by their affirmation of the resurrection they declare that the rulers are perpetuating the blackest of falsehoods, by saying that the body of Jesus was stolen by his disciples when the soldiers were asleep. If they become not silent they will be beaten and put to death. But nothing can now reduce them to silence, the more they are opposed the more do they declare that Christ is risen and that the triumph of his cause is assured. Let any candid man answer the question: How could this sudden revolution of feelings take place in these men? What could produce it save the resurrection? Could anything short of the reality convert those unbelieving, discouraged, disheartened disciples into believing, zealous, brave preachers of a doctrine that would lead them to martyrdom? The only conclusion we can well arrive at is that of the text: "He is risen; he is not here."

4 *The results which followed the resurrection.*—Not to multiply proofs of this nature, let me simply indicate another line of thought that can be followed to arrive at the same conclusion. Can the opponents of Christianity explain with any degree of satisfaction the success of Christ's work without accepting the truth of the text? Can it be true that Paul went from Syria to Cyprus, through Pamphylia, Lycaonia, Phrygia, Galatia and other provinces, then over to Europe, through Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, Corinth and succeed to establish churches by preaching this one doctrine: Christ died and rose, and yet the doctrine be but a pure myth or imposture? Can it be true that this imposture has been able to transform the world wherever it has been taught? Surely, infidelity asks a little too much when it insists that we must accept its explanations. We accept the teaching of the gospel as a matter of faith, but more than this, we find it also to be an intellectual necessity.