

Mass Thursday of St. Mar-  
tin I, p. 1047. 2nd col.  
of the Saints; 3rd ad lib.

University of Notre Dame  
Religious Bulletin  
November 11, 1936.

Because of Army trip, Mass  
for the team this week, will  
Friday, main church, 6:25.

-----  
Common Premise For Arguing Resurrection.

Question X. What's the evidence for the Resurrection?

Answer. (Continued) The premise common to the Christian and to the intelligent skeptic is the belief that the disciples preached the Resurrection of Jesus Christ in Jerusalem shortly after the Crucifixion. A strong case for the Resurrection could be established solely on the basis of this inescapable fact.

There are of course people who deny the historic existence of Jesus of Nazareth just as there are people who assert that the earth is flat. If your opponent is not prepared to concede that Jesus of Nazareth was crucified, that His disciples expected an earthly triumph, that their messianic hopes were shattered by the Crucifixion, and that they returned to Jerusalem to preach the Resurrection, you should recommend him to settle his differences, not with the Christians, but with all scholarly and intelligent skeptics who have examined this problem. For these minimum beliefs are accepted by every skeptic of standing. His quarrel, then, is not with Christians but with the unanimous verdict of scholarship.

No intelligent skeptic denies that the disciples collapsed when Jesus was arrested. Men do not readily confess to cowardice, and the story that the disciples twice fell asleep when they should have been keeping watch is not the kind of thing they would have been likely to invent.

"All forsook him and fled." This statement occurs in the most primitive accounts which the most exacting of Higher Critics admit to be derived from eye-witnesses, or from men in close contact with eye-witnesses. "If evidence were needed," as Mr. Morrison observes in his remarkable book Who Moved the Stone?, "of the high standard of veracity prevailing in the Early Church, we have it here in its most convincing form."

The disciples forsook Him and fled. Seven weeks later these timid, broken men are ready to risk imprisonment and death to preach the Resurrection of one whom they forsook in despair. A psychological evolution such as this is a fact as solid as a stone, an earthquake or an avalanche. It is our duty as scientific investigators to put forward an adequate explanation of so tremendous a fact.

And we have to explain not only the psychological transformation of the disciples but also the Empty Tomb. That is the crux of the problem.

Mr. Morrison, an agnostic with a great knowledge of Jewish history and of the Jewish background, sat down before the problem of the Resurrection and determined to find a naturalistic background. He was beaten in this attempt and fell back after prolonged study on the fact that Christ rose from the dead, the only possible solution which he could accept without doing violence to his intellectual honesty. Read his book, Who Moved the Stone? (To be continued.)

Father Shea Moves Up Front.

You remember that some days ago we published an appeal from Father Shea, Bengal missionary, whose important flivver is dangerously near seizure by creditors. He needs quickly just as much of \$500 as he can get. So far we have \$74.80 in his fund. Are there others who will hurry in contributions to keep his fund alive and growing?

PRAYERS: (deceased) friend of Charles O'Malley (Lyons); relative of Bob Campbell (Morr.). Ill, father of A. Kranzfield (O.C.); mother of Prof. Bartholomew; Tom Moran appendectomy (Cav.); Al Burns (Fresh.); Dick Swisher (How.); Jerry Clifford (How.); at request of Indianapolis club, Arthur Cosgrove at Butler College; grandmother of John Ryan, '35; mother of Dick Leahy (Dillon); Jack Sheehan. Two special intentions.