

IX The Resurrection Today

The artless and straightforward narrative of the resurrection of Christ in the Gospels presents a difficult dilemma for modern thought. If, in order to avoid acceptance of a miracle which would be embarrassing to the normative principles of science, its genuineness be rejected, the whole structure of Christian truth degenerates into a superstition containing at best an insecure modicum of ethical principles. If, on the other hand, the fact be freely admitted as an article of faith, the naturalistic interpretation of the world must be discarded. Can the Gospels be taken as accurate historical reports, or are they idealized projections of theological teaching, stated in cultural terms which are no longer relevant? Or do they embody a truth which cannot be expressed adequately by the language of any culture, but which, on the other hand, cannot be explained away by any intellectual device?

The Biblical evidence for the verity and importance of the resurrection is incontrovertible. Whether the Gospels be four contemporaneous witnesses of equal value, or whether they represent successive stages of a tradition which increasingly magnifies the miraculous element, they agree that Jesus rose from the dead on the third day. The differences between them are no greater than those between other firsthand sources of acknowledged historic events, and from a purely literary standpoint they are worthy of equal credence.

In recent years, theological critics have become increasingly aware of the cogency of this evidence, and although they have been reluctant to concede the accuracy of all the statements of the Gospels, they have admitted the central truth. G. D. Yarnold, discussing the account of the empty tomb in Mark 16:1-8, says:

For was not the knowledge of the empty tomb the necessary first step to faith in the resurrection of the Lord? Entering, "they saw a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment." Implicitly in this earliest narrative he is already an angel, although the word is not used; a messenger from God, sent to disclose a spiritual truth. In this first-century account the angel is manifest to sight and hearing. But to a modern intelligence their alleged visible appearance is a source of difficulty, and is naturally regarded as myth--no longer either useful, or necessary, for our own understanding of the truth of the gospel.¹

Ramsey, in commenting on the same phenomenon in the Markan and Matthean accounts, holds that the stories were "embellished" with gratuitous additions, even prior to their being reduced to written form. Having reviewed Matthew's allusion to a great earthquake, the descent of an angel, and the paralysis of the guard, he adds, "Such is an editor's embroidery of his source; and if elaboration of the tradition took place in the written stage it is reasonable to think that it took place in the oral stage, too."²

The language of these current writers marks a mediating position between the skepticism of nineteenth-century rationalism, which dismissed the concept of physical resurrection as scientifically impossible, and the faith of historic Christianity, which has accepted the testimony of the Gospels at face value. Both Yarnold and Ramsey agree that an actual event took place which can become a foundation for faith; they admit that there must be a core of truth to be

1 G. D. Yarnold, *Risen Indeed* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959), p. 17.

2 A. Michael Ramsey, *The Resurrection of Christ* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946), pp. 61,62.

"embroidered." On the other hand, they are uncertain just where a line should be drawn between sober fact and subjective fancy.

Obviously the problem is vexing for the average man who judges the world by his observation and who tends to accept a uniformitarian philosophy of its operation. For him miracles do not happen; in his opinion any unusual phenomenon is the effect of some natural law imperfectly understood or perhaps totally unformulated. He should remember that by his own premises "law" may be the action of God, whose customary method underlies "natural law," but whose freedom to do His personal will may occasionally be manifested in "miracle."

The accompaniments of the resurrection such as the angels, the clothing of Christ, the food that He ate in the presence of His disciples may pose questions difficult to answer. Why should there be disparity in the number of the angelic beings who appeared at the tomb? Why should a heavenly being need material clothing, or eat bread and fish? Are these concomitant features essentially absurd, accretions that must be stripped away in order that the pure truth of a "spiritual" resurrection may be preached without hindrance?

Whether the appearances of Jesus after the resurrection are to be accepted as objective contacts of the disciples with a material body or whether they were only projections of their memory of Him in the days before the Passion, these accompaniments would necessarily be normal. If Jesus had a tangible body, even though it were differently constituted from others, He would have to appear in clothing in order to avoid alarming the disciples. He partook of food, not because He needed nourishment, but in order to convince them that He was not an insubstantial wraith.

If His appearances were objective, it is not surprising that they should resemble the experiences of previous days, since a radical dissimilarity would be more bewildering than reassuring to the disciples. Reality depends upon a sense of continuity. If Jesus desired His followers to believe that He had risen from the dead, He would necessarily manifest Himself in a form that they would recognize, and would offer proof that His existence was independent of their imaginations. His being was not contingent upon material substance, but He chose to make it the vehicle of self-disclosure in order that those who witnessed the revelation might be fully assured of His reality.

Because of the uniquely convincing character and effects of these appearances, they cannot be dismissed abruptly as delusions. Recent writers who grapple with this problem tend to explain the visions as "objective" apparitions impressed upon the minds of the disciples by the Lord, who had already ascended. Such impressions would be "objective" because they were unsought and because they were imprinted on the consciousness of the recipients as vividly as any natural images perceived by the retina of the physical eye, but they would not emanate from a tangible body standing immediately before them.

Several varieties of this hypothesis have been proposed and rejected. The appearances cannot have been purely subjective illusions, conjured up by wishful thinking or daydreaming. Renan's dictum, "Heroes do not die,"³ assumes that the disciples were stubbornly sure that Jesus would not die, and therefore, since they expected to see Him risen, they projected His image into the "appearances" recorded in the Gospels. According to the available evidence which is as reliable as the accounts of the appearances themselves, the disciples did not expect that Jesus would rise, and the entire experience of the resurrection was unanticipated and unsought. It could not have

3 E. Renan, *The Apostles*, translated from the original French (New York: Carleton, 1866), p. 55.

been superinduced by wishful thinking.

A second hypothesis equates the appearances of Jesus with spiritualistic seances, in which the personality of the dead Christ was reproduced through a medium or else manifested itself by ectoplasm. The varied circumstances of these appearances militates against such a theory. Jesus was manifested under conditions quite different from those of the ordinary seance. He appeared to the disciples at dawn on the shores of Galilee (John 21:4-14); to Mary Magdalene in the morning by the door of the empty tomb (20:11-17); to Cleopas and his companion on the afternoon of the first day of the week (Luke 24:13-16); and to Paul at high noon on the Damascus road (I Cor. 15:8; Acts 26:13). In these instances no medium was present, nor did the procedures follow the usual method of conjuring up a spirit. Certainly the resurrection phenomena do not fall within the ordinary category of such apparitions.

As a compromise between abandoning completely the verity of the resurrection and accepting the full implications of the perpetuation of Jesus' physical body, Michael Clark has renewed the "telepathic" theory, though he has modified it in the direction of a fading materialism. According to his summary, the first appearances were definitely corporeal, though not material like our bodies; the later appearances were increasingly non-material.

Jesus died on the cross, but was raised from the dead by his Father. In his new state he was no longer clothed by the old material body of his incarnate life, but by some kind of spiritual body such as St. Paul attempts to describe for us.

Without a body of flesh, Jesus wished to convince his disciples that he was alive and had transcended death, and continue the teaching which Calvary had interrupted. He could not do this merely by impressing their minds with the certainty of his survival. Nobody else would have believed them, and they would not have had enough conviction to continue to believe in the face of opposition. . . .

Jesus therefore communicated with his disciples--we do not know how, so we call it "telepathy"--and caused their minds to project an apparition of his body as they had known it. This would demonstrate to them, in the only way in which they could understand, that it was really he who was teaching them and that he had truly conquered the powers of Death. . . .

The teaching which Jesus was giving his disciples and the doctrines which he was implanting in their minds, were projected by them along with the apparitional figure so that they heard the apparition giving them the teaching which Jesus wished them to absorb and reflect upon.⁴

Clark is obviously reluctant to surrender the objective reality of the resurrection, and adopts this hypothesis to evade the difficulties involved in the appearance and disappearance of a material body.

One may admit at the outset that "seeing" involves more than the physical effect of reflected light on the mechanism of the eye. The stimulus thus given must be relayed to the brain, and thence to the consciousness, which acts accordingly. Memory, which does not entail physical sight, can recall scenes and can be an equally potent stimulus. If it were possible for God to implant the

4 Michael Clark, *The Easter Enigma* (London: Faber and Faber, Ltd., 1959), pp. 194-195.

reality of Christ's continuing existence and personal presence directly in the consciousness of the disciples without physical intervention, the resurrection would be no less real and no less a miracle. It would, furthermore, differ from a purely subjective illusion or from a psychic "manifestation."

The chief objection to this telepathic theory is the fact of the empty tomb. If Jesus manifested Himself solely by impressions transmitted by telepathy, while His body still reposed in Joseph's garden, the disciples might have been convinced that His personality had survived, but not that He had risen physically from the dead. On the other hand, if His body did disappear from the tomb, and they professed to have seen Him and to have eaten with Him, telepathy would be insufficient to account for the event.

To escape from this dilemma Clark asserts that a telepathic message from Christ affected the minds of the disciples, who then had a "mental projection" of the image of Jesus⁵ and put into His mouth the words which accompanied the apparition. The disciples guessed that the apparition was the same body that Jesus had borne on the cross, but they were mistaken. The "body" which they saw would not have registered on a camera, nor would it have made sounds that could have been recorded on a tape.

In order to complete this hypothesis, the author is compelled to affirm that the concept of an actual material appearance is a mistake. "We disagree with the interpretation which Luke 24:39 shows the disciples put on their experiences."⁶ He even contends that "God deliberately caused the disciples to err by believing in a physical Resurrection because that would be less harmful than the otherwise inevitable mistake of thinking of Jesus as a disembodied ghost, one of the shades in Sheol."⁷ His explanation assumes that the supposed error of the disciples was permitted in order that they might appeal more effectively to the thinking of their generation.

While it is true that revelation is progressive in character, God cannot stoop to deceit. To suggest that the appearances of Christ were "deliberately" presented as real when they were only telepathic communication demands more of the reader's credulity than the miracle would ask. If the fundamental statements of Scripture cannot be taken at face value in their original setting, one might as well relinquish any expectation of drawing sound conclusions from such elusive material.

Acceptance of the literary evidence does not predicate a complete knowledge of its nature. The physical composition of the resurrection body, the laws that govern its operation, and its relation to the visible world order remain in the realm of mystery. Nevertheless, the mystery cannot be dismissed by relegating it to irrationality or impossibility, for the deeper probing of natural phenomena discloses scientific problems of equal magnitude. The resurrection cannot be reproduced in a test tube or observed by a telescope. It can best be described as the intervention of divine power in the disintegrative process of decay, by which dissolution is arrested and the regenerative power of God is manifested.

The modern debate over the resurrection is not confined to opposing assessments of historical evidence. For many thinkers, the prime question is not whether the resurrection is real, but whether it is relevant. Reinhold Niebuhr, in a popular article, "The Religious Traditions of our

5 *Ibid.*, p. 211.

6 *Ibid.*, p. 214.

7 *Ibid.*, p. 215.

Nation," published in the *Saturday Evening Post*, said:

Incidentally, most modern Biblical scholars take it for granted that Christ's resurrection was not a public event in the same sense as the crucifixion, but rather a spiritual experience of his disciples, a symbol of the early Christian faith that Christ's death represented the climax of a historical drama in which both the divine mystery and the human situation were definitively clarified. The resurrection stories, however dubious as records of "public" historical events, are witnesses to the fact that the church, which was formed by the inspiration of the life and death of the man Jesus of Nazareth, did not regard his death as merely the martyrdom of a noble man but as a drama in which the ultimate mysteries about God and man were clarified.⁸

Dr. Niebuhr's estimate of the resurrection is typical of several modern theologians. He maintains that it may never have occurred in the same way that the crucifixion did--an event visible to all comers, incorporated in the public records of the Jewish and Roman officials, both attested by witnesses who observed the entire process and supported by natural probability. The process of the resurrection was not observed by anyone; only its results were visible. Since they seemed inherently incredible, it is easier to assume that the episode was a symbolic description of Jesus' victory over death, cast in this form by His followers to give greater coherence to the message which they preached. In fact, as long as the active revelation of God in the person of Christ is accepted, the miraculous return from the dead is inconsequential.

Karl Barth adopts a similar position in his commentary on Romans 6:4: ". . . the feature of the Resurrection . . . is a parable of our eternity. . . . We have already seen that the rising of Jesus from the dead is not an event in history elongated so as still to remain an event in the midst of other events. The Resurrection is the non-historical relating of the whole historical life of Jesus to its origin in God."⁹

Barth's recent testimony to the resurrection seems somewhat equivocal. Under his discussion of "Jesus, Lord of Time," he says:

We may relegate it [the Easter story] to the periphery, or regard it as an incidental and dispensable feature in the story. But whatever our own personal attitude to the resurrection may be (and there are many alternatives to choose from) we can at least agree on one point. . . . It is not peripheral to the New Testament, but central; not inessential or dispensable, but essential and indispensable. And it is all this, not in a different sense, but exactly in the sense in which the New Testament takes it. . . . Either we believe with the New Testament in the risen Jesus Christ, or we do not believe in him at all.¹⁰

Barth thus defends the centrality of the resurrection in Christian theology but does not at this point affirm a personal faith in the *bodily* resurrection.

Nevertheless, Barth seems to accept the verity of the physical accompaniments of the resurrection even though he does not consider them to be of prime importance. "Jesus Himself,"

8 Reinhold Niebuhr, "The Religious Traditions of our Nation," *Saturday Evening Post*, 233 (July 23, 1960), 26, 27, 45, 48.

9 Karl Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Oxford: University Press, 1933), p. 195.

10 Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, Vol. III, Part ii (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, [1960]), pp. 442, 443, 445.

he says, "did rise again and appear to His disciples. This is the content of the Easter history, the Easter time, the Christian faith, and Christian proclamation, both then and at all times."¹¹ Again, "It is impossible to erase the bodily character of the resurrection of Jesus and His existence as the Resurrected," he says. "Nor may we gloss over this element in the New Testament record of the forty days, as a false dualism between spirit and body has repeatedly tried to do. For unless Christ's resurrection was a resurrection of the body, we have no guarantee that it was the decisively acting Subject Jesus Himself, the *man* Jesus, who rose from the dead."¹²

Although the language quoted above intimates that Barth believes in the bodily resurrection of Christ, one cannot be quite sure what he means. Undoubtedly he adheres to the present existence of the person of Christ in a continuing state of conscious life. The emphasis on faith in the "Easter event" combined with a deprecation of the material accompaniments of the resurrection makes his reader wonder how far faith can extend without some foundation in experience.

Barth, however, is more conservative in his position than Bultmann; for where Barth is ambiguous, Bultmann is negative. The latter has introduced a more radical method of interpretation in "demythologization" (*Entmythologisierung*). He contends that the Bible was written by men steeped in the cultural concepts of their own day and writing to others who lived in and understood that culture. The teachings of Scripture, therefore, cannot be directly applied to the present generation, living in a different intellectual climate and consequently thinking in a different idiom. In the process of interpreting the Bible one must discard the forms of the past era and rephrase its teachings in a more acceptable modern style.

Within limits Bultmann's principle is workable, for it is obvious that figures of speech will change with culture. If the Bible were being written today it would probably contain allusions to automobiles, electronics, space flight, the United Nations, and numerous other things that were totally unknown two millennia ago. On the other hand, occurrences affecting elemental human existence do not change radically. Birth, speech, work, and death remain the same, and no amount of philosophical verbiage will alter them.

Bultmann's view of the resurrection has been quite adequately represented by Burton H. Throckmorton in his recent work on *The New Testament and Mythology*. He offers three reasons why the resurrection cannot be accepted as a "proving miracle" for the meaning of the cross, and consequently of Jesus' life. "Moreover, the resurrection cannot be understood as a miracle that proves the meaning of the crucifixion even though it is so understood in the New Testament when it speaks of the empty tomb and of the bodily appearances. The resurrection cannot be a proving miracle because (a) it is unbelievable, (b) witnesses cannot prove it, and most important (c) because it is itself an object of faith and one object of faith cannot prove another."¹³

Bultmann's criticisms are not fatal to the miraculous nature of the resurrection, because he has failed to distinguish between an event that is improbable and one that is incredible. Admittedly Christ's resurrection is a unique phenomenon, for it differs even from the instances of resuscitation accomplished by the prophets and by Jesus Himself. If it were not unique, it would not be significant. Whether or not one can believe that such an event actually occurred will be

11 *Ibid.*, p. 445.

12 *Ibid.*, p. 448.

13 Burton H. Throckmorton, *The New Testament and Mythology* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, [1959]), p. 57.

determined by his presuppositions rather than by the historical record. The written accounts are as valid as any history can be; the problem lies in their interpretation. Granted an omnipotent personal God who seeks to reveal Himself through the application of His power to the salvation of men, the resurrection is not unbelievable. On the contrary, it is the logical result of the conflict between the powers of good and of evil, between God and death. Death was decreed by God to be the check and punishment of sin (Gen. 3:3; Rom. 6:23), but He never intended that it should defeat His purpose. God, to be God, must win the ultimate victory in the same field where the original failure occurred. If the first Adam succumbed to death, the second Adam must triumph in life. The negation of resurrection would be less believable than the event which the New Testament relates.

The objection that "witnesses cannot prove it" is based on an artificial antithesis of knowledge and faith. Throckmorton argues:

If Jesus had been raised in a physical body, his resurrection would have been a historical event to be demonstrated simply by pointing to him; and Jesus would have been seen by multitudes in Galilee and Jerusalem, and presumably on the road in between by men and women who had never been his disciples. All would have believed, for his resurrection would have been revealed to all. No; his resurrection would have been *revealed* to no one, for it would have been a historical event. If Jesus' resurrection had been a historical event, none could have *believed*, for it would have been *revealed* to none, and would have been known by all. It would have been an event to be recorded as verifiable history, rather than an event to be preached as revelation: but it was the latter. It was the event in which God revealed, to eyes that could see, the significance of the crucifixion and the ultimate meaning of life. What I can see and hear and touch, I know, I do not believe; but I desire to believe more than to know.¹⁴

He assumes that any fact substantiated by witnesses cannot possibly become an object of faith. If, therefore, the resurrection is a cardinal article of faith to those who received the revelation, it is not a part of provable history, and witnesses are consequently irrelevant.

The New Testament, however, does join knowledge and faith. The disciples of Jesus were essentially witnesses, for they declared what they had seen and heard (I John 1:1-3). Between the historical occurrences of the Easter week and the continuing awareness of the presence of Christ no barrier existed. The material manifestations in space and time afforded the foundation for the faith that extended beyond the tangible and temporal facts. John, standing within the empty tomb and gazing at the graveclothes, "saw, and believed" (John 20:8). The facts which he observed compelled him to acknowledge the spiritual reality that transcended them.

One may object that the written accounts were composed much later than the beginning of public preaching and therefore represent a modification or exaggeration of the original testimony, so that the "history" is only a fabricated illustration of the concept of resurrection. Such a conclusion is unacceptable because it implies an unreliability of the records that would jeopardize not only the history but also faith itself. If the knowledge of the witnesses is irrelevant, their faith becomes illusory.

Furthermore, the effectiveness of a witness depends upon his reliability and upon the attitude of the person to whom his testimony is given. If witnesses could not prove the resurrection, it was not because they lacked data but because the recipients of their message were impervious to

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 70.

truth. No proof is convincing to a person who has closed his mind. If he thinks that testimony is unbelievable, it will fail to carry conviction, regardless of the strength of supporting evidence.

The third criticism, that one object of faith cannot prove another, is subtle but not decisive. Any historical event may become an object of faith once it has occurred. Since it can never be exactly repeated, knowledge must depend on records and upon consequences, for witnesses will not survive many years. Historians believe that Columbus discovered America in 1492, but it would be impossible to re-enact the episode with the same personnel, equipment, and surroundings in order to demonstrate its verity. The earliest written accounts provide the basis of confidence; faith in the reality follows. The discovery of America thus accepted becomes in turn another link in historical thinking concerning the development of American civilization. Similarly, the records of the resurrection supply the "proof" upon which a larger faith builds the concept of eternal life in Christ.

If Bultmann's criticisms be carried to their logical conclusion, the objective historical character of the resurrection must be abandoned. To quote Throckmorton, "The descriptions of the resurrection that are recorded in the New Testament are, then, to be read and understood as mythological. They are not to be taken literally as though they were self-authenticating accounts of a provable occurrence."¹⁵ The language of historical revelation is thus reduced to ambiguous symbols which have no stable meaning, but which must be reevaluated for every generation. "Demythologization" implies that the physical reality of an empty grave or the disposition of the graveclothes would be only the convenient method of expressing in the language of the first century that Jesus had survived death. The literal meaning of these statements would be inconsequential, and only the general truths imbedded in them would remain cogent.

Such a view does injustice to the writers of the New Testament. Writing for a generation later than the time of Jesus, and for a people who lived outside of Palestine, they might have utilized a symbolism drawn from their immediate surroundings, as Plato did in some of his *Dialogues*. On the contrary, they stressed the physical phenomena accompanying the resurrection because they believed that the historical facts had permanent validity. Although they were puzzled by these events, they did not regard the evidence as mythological, nor did they attempt to explain it. Had the witnesses created the stories for illustrative purposes, they would not have mentioned their own bewilderment. They recorded their experience in simple and direct words insofar as it was germane to the proclamation of their message, and left the unexplained aspect for the review of others.

To assert that they deliberately represented the "event" of the resurrection as an outward physical occurrence for the sake of making it comprehensible to a materially minded public implies either that they falsified the facts or that their reasoning was far more subtle than their writings imply. The Gospels bear no trace of double meaning. To impose allegorical significance upon them contradicts the plain understanding of history. Although one may concede that belief in the person of Christ rather than in the activities connected with Him constitutes saving faith, it is still true that the nature of the person can be known only through these activities. To dissolve the facts into meaningless myth is no real aid to faith.

Richard Niebuhr defines Bultmann's concept of *myth* as "the typical expression of that naive mentality that projects internally apprehended meanings upon the screen of the cosmos, quite

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

heedless of the difference between objective and subjective truth."¹⁶ He implies that there is an intrinsic confusion between external fact and inward consciousness in the minds of the writers of the New Testament. They were confident that Jesus was alive, and thus expressed their assurance by predicating the material manifestations. Such a conclusion does injustice to these men. They stressed the physical phenomena accompanying the resurrection because they believed that their faith was permanently valid. Although the resurrection becomes a pattern of inner spiritual life, the factual event must initiate the pattern. Every copy presupposes an original, and if the Christian life is a continuous resurrection, it is based on the one great historic act by which God demonstrated His power over death and assured believers of a similar victory.

One further comment on Bultmann's method might be suggested. If the language of the New Testament means only that the truth of resurrection was expressed as a phenomenon to make it intelligible for the mentality of the first century, what guarantee does Bultmann offer that his explanation is more valid? Has he "demythologized" the narrative of the Bible only to "re-mythologize" it for the twentieth century? Is his personal interpretation more worthy of permanent credence than the original assertion that Jesus rose bodily from the grave? If it be granted that the resurrection narratives are "myth" in the technical sense of that term, Bultmann has failed to explain adequately why the myth should take the particular form that it did, or why the thought-forms of the present should necessitate a complete abandonment of the language of the past. If "myth" means essentially the definition of a concept in terms derived from the usages of a prevailing culture, the statements of the New Testament are as valid today as ours will be a millennium hence.

"Myth," then, is a convenient method of conveying truth in a popular figure which becomes a technical term. If the terms become increasingly unfamiliar to succeeding generations, either their meanings must be kept alive by arbitrary definition or else the concepts must be expressed in newer and more familiar images. Such redefinition, however, does not alter their essential value, nor does it mean that they are no longer relevant. Rather, it sets the established truths in a new light, preserving their variety and intensifying their relevancy.

Quite possibly the future may bring some new explanation of the resurrection, but the fact will remain that Jesus returned from the dead to resume physical existence and to renew contact with His disciples. Such is the plain statement of the Gospel witnesses which no amount of sophistry can discredit.

Can these facts be relevant to modern life? Will they fit the intellectual mood of this scientific era? To be sure, they cannot be re-enacted as an experiment in chemistry can be repeated at will in the laboratory. They are not reactions of matter subject to the will of an investigator but are events in the life of a person which can never be repeated with identical movement and emotion. The birth of a child cannot occur more than once, yet the birth itself is a permanent reality which cannot be undone or disputed.

In similar fashion the resurrection of Christ remains the great unshakable reality of the ages. He can never die and rise again; He has died to sin once for all, and He lives now unto God. There can be no change in the imagery, for life and death are basic to all existence and cannot be defined in more comprehensive terms. Because they are ultimate, they are comprehensible in every generation and are always vital to every sphere of human relationship.

16 Richard R. Niebuhr, *Resurrection and Historical Reason* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1957), p. 54.