

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS.

VII.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE APPEARANCES—THE RISEN BODY.

THE appearances of Jesus already considered—those, viz., to Mary Magdalene, to the women, to St. Peter, on the day of Resurrection, and that to St. James later—were all of a private or semi-private nature. Isolated, under varying conditions, designed for personal comfort and confirmation, taking place well-nigh simultaneously, the manifestations to one and another on the Resurrection day afforded no room for self-deception, or for collusion, or for the contagious action of sympathy. It would seem as if, on this first day, by manifestations to individuals chosen for their peculiar receptiveness or representative character, Jesus desired to lay a broad basis for assurance of His Rising, before He appeared to His disciples as a body.

Another example of this semi-private form of manifestation to which attention must now be directed was the appearance of Jesus to *the two disciples on their way to Emmaus*, the full account of which is furnished by St. Luke.¹ The name of only one of these favoured disciples is given—Cleopas :² otherwise both are unknown. Chosen for this honour as representatives of the wider circle of disciples, doubtless also for the susceptibility discerned in them for the reception of Christ's communications, they form a link with the general Apostolic company. From it

¹ Luke xxiv. 12-35.

² Ver. 18.

they had just come, after hearing the reports of certain of the women and of others who had visited the tomb,¹ and to it they returned after their own meeting with Jesus, to find the company in excitement at the news of the Lord's appearance to St. Peter, and to witness another appearance of the Master.² Theirs was the singular privilege, shared, so far as is known, by St. Peter only, of beholding the Risen Lord twice on one day!

The story of St. Luke is simple and direct, with every internal mark of truthfulness. The disciples were on their way to Emmaus, a village about two hours' walk from Jerusalem,³ when Jesus overtook them, and questioned them as to the nature of their communings. Their inability to recognize Him is explained by the statement: "Their eyes were holden that they should not know Him."⁴ Their simple recital of the events of the past few days and expression of their disappointed hopes—"We hoped that it was He who should redeem Israel"⁵—with their mention of the women's tale of the "vision of angels, who said that He was alive,"⁶ gave Jesus the opportunity of reproving their unbelief, and of expounding to them as He alone could the meaning of the Scriptures regarding Himself.⁷ As the day was closing, they constrained Jesus to abide with them; then, at the evening meal, as Jesus blessed and brake the bread, and gave it to them, "their eyes were opened, and they knew Him; and He vanished out of their sight."⁸ Recalling how their hearts had burned

¹ Vers. 22-24.

² Vers. 34, 36.

³ Ver. 13; cf. Josephus, *Jewish Wars*, vii. 6, 6.

⁴ Ver. 16.

⁵ Ver. 21.

⁶ Ver. 23.

⁷ Vers. 25-27. The Lord's exposition of the Scriptures here and later (vers. 44-6) may have turned on the sufferings and fate of righteous men and prophets in all ages, and on the predictions of the future triumph and glory of the Sufferer in Ps. xxii. (vers. 22-31) and Isa. liii. Psalms like the 16th and prophecies like Zech. xiii. would also have place (cf. Hengstenberg, *Christologie*, iv., Appendix iv.).

⁸ Vers. 30-1.

within them as He opened to them the Scriptures, they hastily rose, and returned at once to Jerusalem.¹ According to the Appendix to St. Mark, their testimony, like that of the women earlier, was not at first believed²—a fact very credible when the strangeness of their story, and the difficulty of harmonizing the appearance at Emmaus with that to St. Peter at Jerusalem, are considered.³

It is apparent from many parts of his Gospel that St. Luke had access to a Jerusalem tradition of primitive origin and high value, and this narrative, which probably took shape at the time from the report of the disciples,⁴ is, in its clear, straightforward character, evidently one of the best-preserved parts of that tradition. Critics, accordingly, while of course rejecting its testimony to the bodily appearance of Jesus, commonly treat the Emmaus narrative with considerable respect. Renan, for instance, after his manner, takes the picturesque story simply as it stands, transforming the stranger into “a pious man well versed in the Scriptures,” whose gesture in the breaking of bread at the evening repast vividly recalled Jesus, and plunged the disciples into tender thoughts. When they awoke from their reverie, the stranger was gone!⁵ A. Meyer sees in the appearance to Simon and the naming of Cleopas and Emmaus evidence that St. Luke’s source contained “valuable old material.” His chief objection is that St. Paul does not mention an incident which, if true, must have been “of priceless significance as a proof

¹ Vers. 32-3.

² Mark xvi. 12, 13.

³ It is told in Luke xxiv. 41 that, even when the Lord Himself appeared among them, the Apostles and disciples “disbelieved for joy.”

⁴ Cf. Latham, *The Risen Master*, pp. 135-7.

⁵ *Les Apôtres*, pp. 18-21. Renan’s description is characteristic. “How often had they not seen their beloved master, in that hour, forget the burden of the day, and, in the abandon of gay conversation, and enlivened by several sips of excellent wine, speak to them of the fruit of the vine,” etc. (p. 11).

of the Resurrection.”¹ Professor Lake allows that the story “reads as though it were based on fact,” and thinks it “is probably a genuine remnant of the original tradition of the Church at Jerusalem, which has suffered a little in the process of transmission.”² It is supposed to preserve a recollection of appearances in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, afterwards woven into connexion with the Apostles (thus also A. Meyer). The reference to the appearance to Simon, assumed to be Galilean, is excised.³ Against these arbitrary conjectures, the simplicity and directness of the narrative—its “air of reality”—sufficiently speak.⁴

The real points of difficulty in the narrative are those which touch on the mystery of the Lord’s Resurrection body. Such are (1) His non-recognition by the disciples through “their eyes” being “holden” (or, as in the Appendix to St. Mark, His appearance to them “in another form”⁵); (2) His vanishing from their sight at the table; (3) His appearing on the same evening at Jerusalem. These points are better held over till all the facts of a similar nature are in view.

The time had now arrived when these private appearances of Jesus were to give place to His more public manifestations of Himself to His disciples. Accordingly, still on the Resurrection evening, and in connexion with the visit of the Emmaus disciples just described, we come to the *first* in order of the important series of *the appearances of the Lord to His assembled Apostles*. This, as in a marked degree typical, will repay careful study.

1. The witnesses to this *first appearance to the Apostles* are St. Luke⁶ and St. John,⁷ supported by St. Paul.⁸

¹ *Die Auferstehung Christi*, pp. 132-3.

² *Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, pp. 218-19. ³ *Ibid.* pp. 103, 219.

⁴ On general objections to the narrative, cf. Loofs, *Die Auferstehungsberichte und ihr Wert*, pp. 27-8. ⁵ Mark xvi. 12.

⁶ Luke xxiv. 36-43. ⁷ John xx. 19-23. ⁸ 1 Cor. xv. 5.

The story, in St. Luke, is the continuation of the Emmaus narrative ; in St. John it is a distinct episode, and furnishes in its commencement the important detail that, when Jesus appeared, "the doors were shut where the disciples were, for fear of the Jews."¹ This makes more emphatic the marvel of Christ's sudden appearance in the midst of the disciples, which yet is implied in both narratives. "Jesus," St. Luke says, "Himself stood (ἑστῆν) in the midst of them."² St. John speaks similarly: "Jesus came and stood in the midst."³ This practical identity of language in an undoubted part of the text should predispose us to consider favourably the two succeeding clauses in St. Luke, likewise identical with, or closely akin to St. John's, on which doubt is cast by their absence from some Western texts. They are these: (1) Ver. 36 reads, as in St. John: ⁴ "And saith unto them, Peace be unto you." (2) Ver. 40 reads: "And when He had said this, He showed them His hands and His feet," where St. John has: "And when He had said this, He showed unto them His hands and His side."⁵ The passages are here accepted as genuine; ⁶ but, whether expressed or not, the showing of the hands and the feet in the latter is implied in St. Luke's preceding words: "See My hands and My feet," etc.⁷

Up to a certain point, therefore, the two narratives agree almost verbally. That of St. John, an immediate witness, confirms that of St. Luke, and with it supports the authen-

¹ John xx. 19. ² Luke xxiv. 36. ³ John xx. 19. ⁴ Ibid.

⁵ John xx. 20.

⁶ Alford's notes may be quoted. On ver. 36: "Possibly from John; but as the whole is nearly related to that narrative, and the authority for the omission weak, Tischendorf is certainly not justified in expunging it." On ver. 40: "Had this been interpolated from St. John, we certainly should have found 'feet' altered by some to 'side,' either here only, or in ver. 39 also." The R.V. retains both clauses in the text.

⁷ Luke xxiv. 39.

ticity of St. Luke's narrative generally. The astonishment and doubt which the Lord's sudden appearance occasioned is reflected in both. St. Luke's language is the more vivid. "They were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they beheld a spirit."¹ Even after the Lord's reassurances, and His invitation, "Handle Me, and see: for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold Me having," it is declared, "They still disbelieved for joy, and wondered."² The removal of doubt is implied in St. John in Christ's showing His hands and His side, and the "joy" is corroborated in the words: "The disciples therefore were glad when they saw the Lord."³ The whole account is psychologically most natural, and sheds vivid light by contrast on the theories which see the origin of belief in the Resurrection in an eager credulity and proneness to mistake hallucinations for reality on the part of the Apostles.

At this point St. Luke and St. John part company, each giving an incident not related by the other. St. Luke tells how, at His own request, the disciples gave Jesus a piece of a broiled fish [the words "and of a honeycomb" are doubtful], and He "ate before them"⁴ (a like "eating" seems implied in the later scene in St. John at the Lake of Galilee).⁵ St. John, on the other hand, tells of a renewed commission to the Apostles, and of how Jesus "breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye [the] Holy Spirit. Whosoever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained."⁶ Into the controversies connected with these solemn words, this is not the place to enter. It may be that here, as elsewhere, Jesus is contemplating the existence of a spiritual Society, and is investing His Apostles with disciplinary

¹ Ver. 37.² Ver. 41.³ John xx. 20.⁴ Luke xxiv. 43.⁵ John xxi. 4-13.⁶ John xx. 21-3.

authority to deal with sins which affect the standing of members in that Society.¹ Or the deeper thought may be that the remission or retention of sins is bound up *ipso facto* with the reception or rejection of the message which He commits to the Apostles to bear. Whatever the nature of the authority, the text makes plain that its exercise is conditioned by the possession of the Holy Spirit. It is not necessary to assume that the actual imparting of the Spirit was delayed till Pentecost. The act of breathing and the words used by Jesus imply that the Spirit was then given in a measure, if not in the fulness of the later affusion.² St. John, too, knew that the Spirit was not given till Christ was glorified.³

In this incident, as in the earlier appearances, while proof is given of the reality of Christ's risen body, and of its identity with the body that was crucified and buried, not less plain evidence is afforded of the changed conditions under which that body now existed. The fact is meanwhile, again, only noted. When, however, the critics import into these narratives a contradiction with St. Paul's conception of Christ's Resurrection body,⁴ and, to heighten the variance, arbitrarily transfer the appearance to "the twelve" mentioned by St. Paul in 1 Corinthians xv. 5 to Galilee, it must be pointed out that they not only break with a sound Jerusalem tradition, of which St. Paul must have been perfectly aware, but assert what, on the face of it, is an incredibility. What motive or occasion can be suggested for a convening of "the twelve" (or eleven)

¹ Cf. Matt. xviii. 17, 18. See also Latham, *ut supra*, pp. 168-74.

² "Arrha pentecostes" (Bengel). "That preparatory communication, that anticipatory Pentecost" (Godet).

³ John vii. 39.

⁴ Thus Henson (*Hübert Journal*, 1903-4, pp. 476-93); Weizsäcker, A. Meyer, Loisy (*Les Evangiles*, ii. p. 772), etc. On the other hand, cf. Loofs, *ut supra*, pp. 27-9, 33.

in Galilee to receive an appearance? ¹ And how difficult to conceive of the simultaneous experience of such a vision by a band of men so brought together! Better, with A. Meyer, to cast doubt on the appearance altogether. ²

2. Eight days after this first appearance—St. John here again being witness—a *second appearance of Jesus to the Apostles* took place in the same chamber, and under the like conditions (“the doors being shut”). ³ The peculiar feature of this second meeting was the removal of the doubt of St. Thomas, who, it is related, had not been present on the earlier occasion. ⁴ St. Thomas, in a spirit which the “modern” mind should appreciate, refused to believe in so extraordinary a fact as the Resurrection of the Lord in the body on the mere report of others, and demanded indubitable sensible evidence of the miracle for himself. “Except I shall see in His hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and put my hand into His side, I will not believe.” ⁵ Graciously, at this second appearance, Jesus gave the doubting Apostle the evidence he asked—“Reach hither thy hand,” ⁶ etc.—though, as the event proved, the sign was not needed. The faith of the disciple was greater than he thought, and the sight and words of Jesus sufficed, without actual examination, to bring him to his Lord’s feet in adoring acknowledgement. The love and reverence that lay beneath his doubts came in a surge of instantaneous devotion to the surface: “My Lord and my God.” ⁷ Yet, as Jesus reminded him, there is a higher faith still—that

¹ According to Loisy, it was St. Peter, who had one day seen Jesus when fishing on the Lake of Tiberias (see below), who “no doubt [!] gathered the eleven, and kindled with his ardour their wavering faith” (ii. p. 224).

² *Ut supra*, p. 139. After disposing of all details, Meyer concludes that there is a “kernel” of truth in the story. The vision theory is discussed in next article.

³ John xix. 24–9.

⁴ John xx. 24. ⁵ Ver. 25. ⁶ Ver. 27. ⁷ Ver. 28.

which does not need even seeing, but apprehends intuitively that in the nature of the case nothing else could be true of One in whom the Eternal Life was revealed. "Because thou hast seen Me, thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."¹

The confidence instinctively awakened by this striking narrative of the Lord's treatment of a doubting spirit is not disturbed by the inability that may be felt to explain why the Apostles should still be at Jerusalem a whole week after they had received the direction to meet the Lord in Galilee. Various reasons might be suggested for the delay. It appears from St. Matthew that the place and time of the Galilean meeting were definitely "appointed."² There was therefore no need for departure till the time drew near. It was, besides, the week of the Passover feast, and there was urgent cause why the Apostles, in the new circumstances that had arisen, should remain at Jerusalem to bear their own testimony, allay doubts, meet inquirers, check false rumours and calumnies.³ When they did journey northwards, it would probably still be in company. The departure may well have taken place in the course of the week succeeding that renewed appearance of Jesus on the eighth day. Very significant must that second meeting on "the first day of the week"—the anniversary of the Rising—have been felt by the disciples to be! It consecrated it for them anew as "the Lord's Day"!⁴

3. In harmony with this view of the succession of events, the scene of manifestation is now transferred to Galilee, and *the third appearance* of the Lord to His disciples took place, as recorded in St. John xxi., on the shore of the Lake of Galilee ("Sea of Tiberias").⁵ The chapter (xxi.) is a

¹ Ver. 29.

² Matt. xxviii. 18.

³ Godet suggests as a reason "the obstinacy of Thomas" (*St. John*, iii. pp. 319, 339).

⁴ Rev. i. 10.

⁵ John xxi. 1.

supplement to the rest of the Gospel, but is so evidently Johannine in character that, with the exception of the endorsement in verses 24-5, it may safely be accepted as from the pen of the beloved disciple.¹ Seven disciples were present on this occasion, of whom five are named ("Simon Peter, Thomas, Nathanael, the sons of Zebedee").² All five are Apostles, if, as is probable, Nathanael is to be identified with Bartholomew. This creates the likelihood that "the two *other* of His disciples" were Apostles also—unnamed, perhaps, as Luthardt suggests,³ because not elsewhere mentioned in the Gospel. At every point the life-like touches in the story attest the writer as an eye-witness. The disciples had spent a night of fruitless toil in fishing. At break of day, Jesus appeared to them on the shore, and, as yet unrecognized, bade them cast their net on the right side of the boat.⁴ The unprecedented draught of fishes which rewarded their effort revealed at once to St. John the presence of the Lord. "It is the Lord," he said.⁵ St. Peter, on hearing the words, girt his fisher's coat about him ("for he was naked"), and cast himself into the sea, while the others dragged the net to shore.⁶ Arrived there, they found a fire of coals, with fish laid on it, and bread; after other fish had been brought, Jesus invited them to eat, and with His own hands distributed the bread and the fish.⁷ It is remarked that, whilst the disciples now knew it was the Lord, none durst inquire of Him, "Who art Thou?"⁸ It seems implied, though it is not directly stated, that Jesus Himself shared in the meal. The scene

¹ "Some (e.g., Zahn) prefer to take the chapter as the work of a disciple, or disciples, of St. John. But style, allusions, marks of eye-witness, speak to its being from the same hand as the rest of the Gospel (thus Lightfoot, Meyer, Godet, Alford, etc.). The attestation (ver. 24) covers this chapter equally with the others. The Gospel never circulated without it.

² Ver 2. ³ *Com. on St. John*, iii. p. 358.

⁴ Ver 6. ⁵ Ver. 7. ⁶ Vers. 7, 8. ⁷ Vers. 9-13. ⁸ Ver. 12.

that followed of St. Peter's reinstatement (the three-fold question, answering to the three-fold denial, with its subtle play on the word "lovest,"¹ St. Peter's replies, Christ's "Feed My lambs," "Feed My sheep") is familiar to every reader of Scripture.²

It need hardly be said, that, with all its delicate marks of truth, this narrative of the Fourth Gospel meets with short shrift at the hands of the critics. Its symbolical character is thought to rob it of all claim to historicity. The theories propounded regarding it are as various as the minds that conceive them. One curious speculation, adopted by Harnack,³ is that St. John xxi. represents the lost ending of St. Mark. Professor Lake thinks that "there is certainly not a little to be said for this hypothesis."⁴ In reality it has *nothing* in its favour, beyond the probability that the lost section of St. Mark contained the account of some appearance in Galilee.⁵ Most take the first part of the chapter to be a version, with adaptations, of St. Luke's story of the miraculous draught of fishes. Strauss sees in it a combination of this "legend" in St. Luke with that of St. Peter walking on the sea.⁶ Only in this case St. Peter does *not* walk on the sea. The newest tendency is to find in it a reminiscence of the appearance of Jesus to St. Peter, transferred to the Lake of Galilee.⁷ The second part of the story Renan accounts for by "dreams" ("One day Peter, dreaming, believed that he heard Jesus ask him, 'Lovest

¹ ἀγαπᾷς (vers. 15, 16): φιλεῖς (ver. 17). St. Peter uses φιλῶ.

² Vers. 15-19.

³ *Chronologie*, i. pp. 696 ff. Harnack follows Rohrbach. Others see the lost conclusion of St. Mark behind Matt. xxviii. 16-20.

⁴ *Ut supra*, p. 143.

⁵ As already said, style, names (Nathanael, Cana in Galilee, Didymus, etc.), and whole cast of the narrative speak for Johannine authorship and rebut this Marcan theory.

⁶ *New Life of Jesus*, ii. pp. 131-2.

⁷ Thus, e.g., Loisy: "He [St. Peter] had seen Jesus one day in the dawn when fishing on the Lake of Tiberias," etc. (*ut supra*, p. 224).

thou Me ? ' ' ' ') : most regard it as a free invention.² In these hypotheses it is the imagination of the critics, not that of the Evangelist, that is active. It is enough here to oppose to them, conflicting and mutually destructive in themselves, the direct and satisfying testimony of the disciple who was *there*. It is, no doubt, a miracle that is recorded—a miracle of the “providential” order—but the resemblance with St. Luke begins and ends with the fact that it is a draught of fishes. Circumstances and connexion are totally different. In a symbolical respect, it may well have been designed as a reminder and renewal of the call originally given, and a confirmation, suitable to this period of new commissions, of the pledge which accompanied that call : “From henceforth thou shalt catch men.”³

Noteworthy in this narrative, as in the preceding, is the combination in Christ's Resurrection body of seemingly opposite characters ; on the one hand, mysterious (supernatural) traits veiling recognition, and exciting awe in the beholders ; on the other, attributes and functions which attest its physical reality, and identity with the body that was crucified.

4. Chief among the appearances of Jesus after His Resurrection is unquestionably to be ranked the great meeting *on the mountain in Galilee*, of which St. Matthew alone preserves the record.⁴ St. Matthew's testimony, however, is not wholly without corroboration. It is commonly assumed that St. Mark also had intended to give some account of this meeting,⁵ which is usually, and no doubt correctly, identified with the appearance which St. Paul mentions “to above five hundred brethren at once, of whom

¹ *Les Apôtres*, pp. 33-4.

² Keim takes this view of the whole chapter (*Jesus of Nazara*, vi. pp. 314-18. ³ Luke v. 10.

⁴ Matt. xxviii. 16-20.

⁵ Cf. Mark xvi. 7.

the greater part remain till now.”¹ St. Matthew, indeed, speaks only of “the eleven disciples” in connexion with the meeting. He does so because it is with the Commission to the Apostles he is specially concerned. But the wider scope of the gathering is already evident in his own intimations regarding it. The meeting had been in view from the day of Resurrection. The summons to it was addressed to the “disciples,”² who are by no means to be confined to the Apostles. The place, and, we must suppose, the time also, had been definitely “appointed.”³ It was to be in “a mountain” in Galilee—a place suitable for a general gathering. The intention, in short, was a collective meeting of disciples.

To this place, accordingly, at the appointed time, the Apostles and other disciples repaired, and there, faithful to His promise, Jesus appeared to them. The expression “when they saw Him”⁴ suggests some sudden appearance, while the clause “came unto them,”⁵ in the succeeding verse, points to approach from some little distance. In so large a company susceptibility would vary, and it is not surprising that it is on record that, when Jesus was first seen, “they worshipped Him, *but some doubted.*”⁶ The statement is a testimony to the genuineness of the narrative; it is also an indirect indication of the presence of others.⁷ In the small body of the eleven there is hardly room for a “some.” Whatever doubt existed would vanish when the Lord drew near and spoke.

With such a view of the Galilean meeting, objections to the genuineness of the great Commission, “Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations,” etc., lose most of

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 6.

² Matt. xxviii. 7, 9. In ver. 10, “brethren.”

³ Ver. 16. On the whole incident, cf. Latham, *ut supra*, pp. 280-94.

⁴ Ver. 17.

⁵ Ver. 18.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Cf. Latham, pp. 291-3; Allen, *St. Matthew*, pp. 303, 305.

their force. Based as it is on the august declaration, "All authority hath been given unto Me in heaven and on earth," and culminating in the promise, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world,"¹ the Commission will be felt by most to hold its proper place. If Jesus really rose, these, or words like these, are precisely what He might be expected to use on such an occasion. Doubt of the words, as a rule, goes along with doubt of the Resurrection itself.²

[The Appearance to St. James³ was dealt with in last paper.]

5. Shortly after the great meeting in Galilee, the Apostles returned again to Jerusalem—from this time on, as every one admits, the continuous scene of their residence and labours. The fact that they did return is confirmatory evidence that some decisive experience had awaited them in the north. A link, however, is still wanting to connect the previous events with the waiting for Pentecost, and the bold action immediately thereafter taken in the founding of the Church. That link is found in *the last appearance of the Lord to the Apostles*—the appearance alluded to by St. Paul in the words, "then, to all the Apostles,"⁴ and more circumstantially narrated by St. Luke, who brings it into direct relation with the Ascension.⁵ A difficulty is found here in the fact that in his Gospel (chap. xxiv.) St. Luke proceeds without break from Christ's first appearance to "the eleven" to His last words about "the promise of the Father" and the Ascension at Bethany; whereas in Acts i. he interposes

¹ Cf. Latham, pp. 282-6; Allen, pp. 306-7.

² The critical questions in this section are chiefly two: (1) Whether St. Matthew here follows the lost ending of St. Mark (some, as Allen, favour; others doubt or deny); and (2) whether the words, "Baptizing them into the name," etc., should be omitted (after Eusebius). Prof. Lake says: "The balance of argument is in favour of the Eusebian text" (p. 88). Against this another sentence of his own may be quoted: "The text is found in all MSS. and versions" (p. 87).

³ 1 Cor. xv. 7.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Luke xxiv. 44-53; Acts i. 5-12.

“forty days” between the Resurrection and Ascension, and assumes appearances of Christ spread over the whole period. Not only Strauss, Keim, Weizsäcker, etc., but also Meyer and many other critics, emphasize this “contradiction.” It may reasonably be suspected, however, that a “contradiction” occurring in books by the same writer, addressed to the same person, one of which is formally a continuation of the other, has its origin, less in the fault of the author, than in the failure of the critics to do justice to his method. St. Luke, in his second work, betrays no consciousness of “contradiction” with his first, and his acquaintance with St. Paul, and knowledge of the list of appearances in 1 Corinthians,¹ make it, as formerly remarked, unthinkable that he should have supposed all the events between the Resurrection and Ascension to be crowded into a single day. Neither, as a more careful inspection of his narrative in the Gospel shows, does he suppose this. The sequence of events in chap. xxiv. makes it clear that it was already late in the evening when Jesus appeared to “the eleven.”² A meal followed. After this, if all happened on the same evening, there took place a lengthened exposition of the prophetic Scriptures. The disciples were then led out to Bethany, a mile and a half from the city. There they witnessed the Ascension. Afterwards they returned to Jerusalem “with great joy,” and were continually in the Temple. Is it not self-evident that there is compressed into these closing verses of the Gospel far more than the events of one day?³ Conscious of his purpose to write a fuller

¹ Weizsäcker thinks that St. Luke’s mention of the appearance of St. Peter “depended on the writer’s acquaintance with the passage in Paul” (*Apostolic Age*, ii. p. 11).

² The disciples had returned from Emmaus after an evening meal there.

³ Latham justly says: “I will not listen to the supposition that the events of Luke xxiv. 36–53 all happened in the one evening—this would make the Ascension take place in the dead of night” (p. 155).

account of the circumstances of the Lord's parting with His disciples, the Evangelist foreshortens and summarizes his narrative of the instructions and promises which had their beginning at that first meeting, and were continued later.¹ Similarly, the citation of Christ's words in the closing verses of the Appendix to St. Mark must be regarded as a summary.

The last meeting of Christ with His Apostles took place, as we definitely learn from Acts i. 4, when He was "assembled together with them" at Jerusalem. It was then that His final instructions were given. Even here the scene changes insensibly to Olivet, where the Ascension is located. Jesus might have simply "vanished" from the sight of His disciples, as on previous occasions, but it was His will to leave them in a way which would visibly mark the final close of His temporal association with them. He was "taken up," and "a cloud received Him out of their sight."² As they stood, still gazing at the spot where He had disappeared, angels, described as "two men in white apparel" (if ever angels were in place, it surely was at the Resurrection and Ascension), admonished them that, as they had seen Him depart, so in like manner He would come again. The visible Ascension has its counterpart in the visible Return.

It is the same picture of the Ascension, essentially, which is given in the close of St. Luke's Gospel: "He parted from them, and was carried up into heaven."³ It matters little for the sense whether the last clause is retained, as probably it should be, or, with some authorities, is rejected, for the context plainly shows the kind of "parting" that is intended (cf. "received up," ἀναλήμψεως, in chap. ix. 51).

¹ Cf. Godet, *St. Luke*, ii. p. 358; Plummer, *St. Luke*, pp. 561, 564. Luthardt says: "Luke draws into one the entire time from the day of the Resurrection to the Ascension" (*St. John*, iii. p. 356).

² Acts i. 10, 11.

³ Luke xxiv. 51.

The Appendix to St. Mark, likewise, correctly gives the meaning: "He was received up (*ἀνελήμφθη*) into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God."¹ Not only in these passages, but throughout the whole of the New Testament, it is implied that Jesus, after His Resurrection "passed into the heavens," was exalted and glorified.²

The facts are now before us. It remains, as far as it can be reverently done, to sum up the *results* as to the nature of the body of the Lord during this transitional period between Resurrection and Ascension, and to consider briefly the problems which these raise. This, with the full recognition that, in the present state of knowledge, these problems are, in large part, necessarily insoluble.

"I am not yet ascended" . . . "I ascend."³ In these two parts of the one saying of Jesus the mystery of the Resurrection body is comprised.

On *earth*, as the history shows, Jesus had a body in all natural respects, corruptibility excepted, like our own. He hungered, He thirsted, He was weary, He suffered, He died of exhaustion and wounds. In *heaven*, that body has undergone a transformation; has become "the body of His

¹ Mark xvi. 19.

² John vi. 62, xx. 17; Eph. iv. 8-10; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Heb. iv. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 21, 22, etc. On the Ascension, cf. Godet, *St. Luke*, iii. pp. 367-71; Latham, chap. xii. Only a word need be said on the objection urged from Strauss down that the Ascension is confuted by its connexion with a now exploded cosmogony. A recent writer, Prof. A. O. Lovejoy, states the objection thus in *The Hibbert Journal*, April, 1908, p. 503: "This story [of the Resurrection] is inextricably involved with, and is unintelligible apart from, the complementary story of the Ascension, with its crude scene of levitation; and this, in turn, is meaningless without the scheme of cosmic topography that places a heaven somewhere in space in a direction perpendicular to the earth's surface at the latitude and longitude of Bethany." The objection really rests on a crudely realistic view of the world of space and time, as if this was not itself the index and symbol of another and (to us) invisible world, to which a higher reality belongs (in illustration cf. Stewart and Tait's *The Unseen Universe*). Reception into this unseen world is not by way of spatial transition.

³ John xx. 17.

glory.”¹ In comparison with the natural, it has become a spiritual—“a pneumatic”—body, assimilated to, and entirely under the control of, the spiritual nature and forces that reside in it and work through it. In the interval between the Resurrection and the Ascension its condition must be thought of as *intermediate* between these two states—no longer merely natural (the act of Resurrection itself proclaimed this), yet not fully entered into the state of glorification. It presents characters, requisite for the proof of its identity, which show that the earthly condition is still not wholly parted with. It discovers qualities and powers which reveal that the supra-terrestrial condition is already begun. The apparently inconsistent aspects, therefore, under which Christ’s body appears in the narratives do not constitute a bar to the acceptance of the truthfulness of the accounts; they may rather, in their congruity with what is to be looked for in the Risen One, who has shown His power over death, but has not yet entered into His glory, be held to furnish a mark of credibility. How unlikely that the myth-forming spirit—not to say the crudeness of invention—should be able to seize so exactly the two-fold aspect which the manifestation of the Redeemer in His triumph over the grave must necessarily present!

Let these peculiarities of the Lord’s Risen body be a little more closely considered.

1. On the one side, the greatest pains are taken to prove that the body in which Jesus appeared was a *true body*—not a spirit or phantasm, but the veritable body which had suffered on the Cross, and been laid in the tomb. It could be seen, touched, handled. It bore on it the marks of the Passion. To leave no room for doubt of its reality, it is told that on at least two, probably on three, occasions, Jesus *ate* with His disciples. With this accords the fact that the

¹ Phil. iii. 21.

grave in which the body of Jesus had been buried on the Friday evening was found empty on the Easter Sunday morning. It was seen earlier that it was undeniably the belief of St. Paul and of the whole Apostolic Church that Jesus rose on the third day in the very body which had been buried.¹

2. On the other hand, it is equally evident that the Resurrection body of Jesus was *not simply natural*. It had attributes proclaiming its connexion with that supra-terrestrial sphere to which it now more properly belonged. These attributes, moreover, however difficult to reconcile with the more tangible properties, can still not be regarded as mere legendary embellishments, for they appear in some degree in all the presentations.

The peculiarities chiefly calling for notice in this respect are the following :—

(1) There is the mysterious power which Jesus seems to have possessed of withdrawing Himself in greater or less degree from the *recognition* of those around Him. In more than one of the narratives, as has been seen, it is implied that there was something strange—something unfamiliar or mysterious—in His aspect, which prevented His immediate recognition even by those intimate with Him ; which held them in awe ; while again, when some gesture, word, or look, revealed to them suddenly who He was, they were surprised, as the truth flashed upon them, that they had not recognized Him sooner.

The instances which come under this head differ, indeed, in character. It is possible that the failure of Mary Magdalene to recognize Jesus at the beginning² may have been due

¹ Ménégoz says : “ The mention of the third day would have no sense if Paul had not accepted the belief of the community of Jerusalem that on the third day Jesus went forth alive from the tomb ” (*La Pêché et la Rédemption d'après S. Paul*, p. 261 ; quoted by Bruce).

² John xx. 14.

to her absorption in her grief; but it was probably in part occasioned also by some alteration in His appearance. It is said of the Emmaus disciples that "their eyes were holden that they should not know Him";¹ elsewhere that He appeared to them "in another form."² The former expression need not perhaps be pressed to imply a supernatural action on their senses. It may mean simply that they did not know Him; that there was that about Him which prevented recognition. Yet when He was revealed to them in the breaking of bread, they appear to have marvelled at their blindness in not discerning Him sooner. In the incident at the Sea of Tiberias, the disciples may have been hindered from recognizing Jesus by the distance or the dimness of the dawn. The narrative, nevertheless, implies something in Christ's aspect which awed and restrained them, so that, even when they knew Him, they did not ask, "Who art Thou?"³

(2) It is an extension of the same supernatural quality when the power is attributed to Jesus of withdrawing Himself from *sensible perception* altogether. At Emmaus, we are told, "He vanished out of their sight."⁴ On other occasions He appeared and disappeared.⁵ Here, apparently, is an emerging from, and withdrawing into, complete invisibility.

(3) The climax in supernatural quality is reached when Jesus is represented as withdrawing Himself wholly from conditions of space and time, and as *transcending physical limitations*—in appearing, e.g., to His disciples within closed doors,⁶ or being found in different places at short intervals, or, finally, in ascending from earth to heaven in visible form.⁷ A body in which powers like these are mani-

¹ Luke xxiv. 16.

² Mark xvi. 12.

³ John xxi. 12.

⁴ Luke xxiv. 31.

⁵ Luke xxiv. 36; John xx. 19, 26.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Luke xxiv. 51; Acts i. 9. On the Ascension, see note above.

fested is on the point of escaping from earthly conditions altogether—as, in truth, the body of Jesus was.

Little help can be gained from natural analogies in throwing light on properties so mysterious as those now described, or in removing the feeling of incredulity with which they must always be regarded by minds that persist in applying to them only the standards of ordinary experience. Daily, indeed, are men being forced to recognize that the world in it holds more mysteries than they formerly imagined. Probably physicists are not so sure of the absolute impenetrability of matter¹ or even of the conservation of energy as they once were; and newer speculations on the etheric basis of matter, and on the relation of the seen to an unseen universe (or universes), with forces and laws largely unknown,² open up vistas of possibility which may hold in them the key to phenomena even as extraordinary as those in question. In another direction, Mr. R. J. Campbell finds himself able to accept the physical Resurrection, and “the mysterious appearances and disappearances of the body of Jesus,” on the ground of a theory of a “three-dimensional” and “four-dimensional” world,³ which probably will be incomprehensible to most. Then the Society of Psychological Research has its experiments to prove a direct control of matter by spirit in extraordinary, if not preternatural, ways.⁴ Such considerations may aid in removing prejudices, but they do little really to explain the remarkable phenomena of the bodily manifestations of Jesus to His disciples. These must still rest on their connexion with His unique Person.

¹ Cf. Stallo's *Concepts of Modern Physics* (Inter. Scient. Lib.), pp. 91-2, 178-82.

² Cf. *The Unseen Universe* (Stewart and Tait), pp. 166, 189-90.

³ *The New Theology*, pp. 220-24.

⁴ Cf. Myers, *Human Personality*, ii. pp. 204 ff.; Sir Oliver Lodge, *Hibbert Journal*, April, 1908, pp. 574 ff.

Specially suggestive in this last relation are the indications in the Gospels themselves that, even during His earthly ministry, Christ's body possessed powers and obeyed laws higher than those to which ordinary humanity is subject. Two of the best attested incidents in the cycle of Gospel tradition—His Walking on the Sea,¹ and the Transfiguration²—will occur as examples. Mighty powers worked in Him which already suggested to Herod One risen from the dead;³ powers which might be expected to manifest themselves in a higher degree when He actually did rise.

JAMES ORR.

HAVE THE HEBREWS BEEN NOMADS?

I.

It is generally received that the Israelitic nation is the offspring of Nomad tribes. The patriarchs were like the sheikhs of the Beduin tribes of our time. After the Exodus those tribes turned again to their old manner of life. Then they conquered Palestine and passed from the nomad to agricultural life.

This supposition is one of the pillars in the building of the higher criticism and the history of the religion of Israel. If the Israelites did not pass to agricultural life before the time of the Judges and Kings, it is very improbable that they would have possessed laws dealing with the cultivation of the fields and with harvest festivals. Such laws must be of much younger origin than the Israelitic tradition assumes and cannot date back to the days of Moses. In

¹ Matt. xiv. 22-33; Mark vi. 45-52; John vi. 51-71. In St. Matthew's narrative St. Peter also shared this power till his faith failed.

² Matt. xvii. 1-8; Mark ix. 2-8; Luke ix. 28-36. Wellhausen (*Das Evang. Marci*, pp. 75-6) actually supposes that the Transfiguration was originally an appearance of the Risen Christ to St. Peter. Loisy follows him in the conjecture (ii. p. 39).

³ Matt. xiv. 2.