

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 Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

The main object of the book is to help ministers to deal with individual souls, and particularly in the matter of confession. There is a great deal of wisdom in these pages, and it is happily wisdom that can be absorbed and put in practice. We might summarize the contents somewhat as follows. Remember the differences in people's religious

nature, confession is not for everybody. But if you are to be a father in God, be accessible, be thorough, be open-eyed. Don't seek dominance. Get your remedy for an evil by suggestion, not dictation. These are some of the maxims that are developed in a book specially suitable for priests but not without its value for others, including laymen.

The Resurrection Appearances of Jesus.

BY THE REVEREND A. T. CADOUX, B.A., D.D., GLASGOW.

ONE of the most indubitable and extraordinary facts of ancient history is that certain Jews of the first century accepted a crucified Man as the Messiah of God. This fact witnesses the unique impressiveness of the Man in a way that concurs with what has been transmitted to us of His words and acts. But if we listen to the witnesses themselves, we have to acknowledge that the supreme wisdom and goodness of Jesus were not the only factors in their belief that He was the Christ. They grounded their faith not only on what they had experienced of His life and death, but on certain experiences after His death in which they were sure that they saw Him again and heard Him speak to them.

These things are indubitable, but when we ask what was the precise nature of the Resurrection experiences, it is not easy to be agreed upon a reply. The difficulties attending the attempt to harmonize the various gospel accounts of the Resurrection and the equally great difficulties intrinsic in each of them are too obvious to need emphasis. It evidently involves something supernatural, but it concerns a realm whose norms are unknown to us. Nor does it help to say that what is to us supernatural must be expected from a unique personality; because the Resurrection appearances are not repeated, so that we have no right to say that they are normal to the risen Christ. If, on the other hand, we say, as apparently we should, that these appearances were supernatural as necessary to meet the unique need of His followers immediately after His death, then their exact nature does not greatly concern us. What is important is that these experiences broke through the Jewish prejudice that would otherwise have left Jesus' truth of God in the grave.

Many modern Christians find that they can no longer hold the belief that Jesus rose bodily from

the grave, and took to heaven the very body that hung upon the Cross. That which can pass through closed doors cannot be said to be a human body in any sense intelligible to us. The difficulty is enhanced by the Ascension. What was not an impossible idea to the Jew, with his notion of a flat earth and overlying heaven, becomes grotesque to us. And another objection to this conception is that it makes the Resurrection precisely the sort of sign that Jesus condemned: it is taken as an act of God's power accrediting spiritual truth. But we have to acknowledge that it is precisely so that the first disciples, according to the early chapters of Acts, seem to have taken it. It was to them a miracle by which God proved that Jesus, though crucified, was Messiah. And all the gospel accounts emphasize the empty grave, which has no significance except for corporal resurrection, though, of course, this may reflect the mind of the generation that wrote the Gospels rather than that of the Apostles themselves. But if the Apostles looked on the Resurrection as a sign, it does not follow that they were right in doing so; for they frequently misunderstood Jesus. Nor may we argue that the results prove the correctness of their understanding on this point; for one of the most significant things in Christianity is Jesus' power to work through men who only partially understand Him.

Many therefore to-day believe that Jesus appeared after death not in 'the flesh' but in a glorified or heavenly body. And their claim is supported in part, at least, by our earliest and best witness, Paul, who in detailing the evidence (1 Co 15³⁻⁸) does not mention the empty tomb. It is perhaps beside the point to ask whether the body in which Jesus died was transformed, or whether the body in which He appeared was normal to His

risen spirit or was specially assumed, or of what it was composed; for whatever happened in this way would be so far from our mortal experience as to disqualify speculation on its exact nature. There are some to whom the results claimed by spiritualism are helpful in this respect: to others the mediumistic trance and other characteristics of spiritualism make the suggestion of this analogy distasteful. It is in any case probable that all that most Christians feel necessary to believe here is that what the disciples saw and heard was related to the living Jesus in such a way as to give means of identification and expression to His spirit, analogous to the way in which our features and voices express and identify us.

If we want to pursue the matter further, we are left with the alternative that what the disciples saw was either a 'spiritual body' normal to the risen spirit of Jesus, and made for their sakes abnormally visible and audible, or that the spirit of Jesus used whatever means might be available to express itself in that particular time and place.

The former is more commonly held and probably approximates to the thought of Paul. But it has its difficulties. For we have to ask, What is the relation of this spiritual body to the constant spiritual presence of Jesus with His followers? Is He more personally present, more indubitable, in the former than in the latter? Paul seems to have thought of a spiritual body of Jesus that arose from the grave and ascended into heaven, where it would abide until the last day, and whence it spoke to him on the road to Damascus. At the same time he had the experience of Christ with and in him, as an abiding personal presence, in the way contemplated also in Mt 28²⁰ and in Jn 14^{18, 19, 16¹⁶, 22}. It is difficult to relate these two ideas. We seem compelled to regard one as more exact than the other. And if it were not for the apostolic insistence upon the actuality of the Resurrection appearances, we should probably take it that we were intended to understand the ascension of Jesus and His session at the right hand of God as figurative of His full triumph, and that His presence with His Church was that which must be more literally understood. In any case we seem compelled to understand that the visible heavenly body of Jesus is not necessary to His most real and valuable personal presence.

These considerations make us see that there is not very much difference between those who think of Jesus as appearing to His disciples in a glorified body, and those who believe that the personality of Jesus found, for the occasion, the means of its

expression in the physical or psychical conditions of the universe. And when we have got so far, it becomes worth while considering what assistance psychology affords. For it is to be noted that Paul, our earliest and best witness, besides ignoring the story of the empty tomb, speaks (*loc. cit.*) of all the Resurrection experiences as though they were of the same kind as his own on the road to Damascus.

Now psychology has little hesitation in recognizing this experience of Paul's as that of a vision conditioned by his struggle against convictions which facts were forcing upon him. The fact of Christ and of His followers, including Stephen, had laid hold of those regions of Paul's self which were beyond the control of his accepted Pharisaic scheme of life. The Pharisee in him refused to acknowledge the reaction of the man to Christ, and struggled to suppress it. And what we struggle to suppress in ourselves may, under certain conditions, break into our consciousness in vision. So upon the Pharisee there broke in vision the question and the command of Christ, and Paul accepted the truth whereby thenceforth he lived.

May we not think the same of the disciples' vision of their risen Lord? They had left all to follow Him: had seen in Him the patently Divine: had confessed Him the Christ. And then came teaching about suffering and shame and death, which they did not understand. They followed to Jerusalem in bewildered faithfulness. They saw the amazing popularity of the first days overshadowed by priestly menace. Then came the agony of Gethsemane, when the Master seemed so little like Himself, and, hard upon that, the arrest and the Cross. They fled and left Him. All their Jewish scheme of things, inured in their race and imbibed from babyhood, cried out that there must be some mistake—this crucified man could not be the Messiah of God. And yet all that had made them once say, 'Thou art the Christ,' pressed to be remembered. And the agony of their great Friend and Master, the heroism and self-abandoning devotion of His suffering, the wonder of so great a love, must have come as a massive reinforcement of all the unsophisticated insight and honest recognition that had moved them to their great confession. That was the conflict: on the one hand, the appeal and hold of Jesus, of Jesus in His suffering and death, upon all that is deepest and most capable of supremacy in human nature, upon all that makes us capable of worship and loyalty; and on the other hand, the limited and imperfect scheme of things accepted from their race and time, and reinforced by social pressure. Given such a

conflict in such people and in such a time, and we should expect that with them, as with Paul, a vision of Christ triumphant would be the means by which His truth would celebrate its triumph in them.

To do justice to such a view as this we must remember the important place of the seen vision and the heard voice in Hebrew religion. These experiences are characteristic of the great prophets and seem essential to their work, for they lie behind the prophetic utterance, 'Thus saith the Lord.' When Amos wrote, 'The lion hath roared, who will not fear? The Lord hath spoken, who can but prophesy?'; when Isaiah saw the vision and heard the voice, 'Whom shall I send?'; when Jeremiah argued with God,—they were surely not merely giving literary expression to what they knew to be the conscious workings of their own minds. The Hebrew prophets knew well enough that the vision and the voice *might* be deceptive, but they regarded these experiences as, in fact, the highest vehicles of Divine truth.

Psychology justifies their valuation. For, as we have noted, under certain circumstances the seeing of a vision or the hearing of a voice is the only means by which the most valuable truth can get a foothold in the world. The prophet, being a morally sensitive man, is also a humble and an ardent man. He feels a truth that condemns what is universally accepted: how dare he think that he is right and all the world wrong? His modesty compels him to suppress the growing conviction, and this suppression induces a state of inward conflict which psychology tells us is liable to visions and voices. The suppressed truth breaks upon his consciousness as a heard voice, and his conscience recognizes its Divine authority. Then, and not till then, he can stand against the world and say, Thus saith the Lord. In vision and voice there came to the prophets immovable conviction for themselves and assurance against the world. And the function of vision and voice in breaking a way for truth through convention and prejudice is not confined to them. We see, for instance, in the case of Joan of Arc that vision and voice made genius and patriotism sure enough of themselves and impressive enough to others to break through the otherwise impregnable convention that left all power in the hands of high-born incompetence.

And why may not the means that brought objective truth to the prophets have served the disciples? We can easily understand that, apart from their own difficulty in accepting a crucified Messiah, the Apostles would have found it very

hard to proclaim the triumph of Jesus had they only been able to say, 'We feel,' or, 'We conclude,' for they would have been met by the unanimous voice of authority, 'We feel and conclude otherwise.' But if they could say, 'We saw,' authority had no reply.

It may be said that such an understanding of the Resurrection appearances makes them subjective only. But if suppression of truth induces a condition in which the suppressed truth breaks its way into consciousness by means of vision, the vision is rather a corrective of subjectivity, for it is the vehicle of ignored reality. It is true that certain elements of the appearance are found in the consciousness of the recipient, but that is true of ordinary perception: both are objective, though in a different way, if they are essential to the mind's awareness of reality. There is thus no reason why a vision of Jesus should not be as truly and directly expressive of His personality as the words heard by the prophets were truly and directly expressive of the will of God.

Another point may be noted here. It is the innate bent of personality towards unity which induces the reappearance in vision of any suppressed but important element of experience; and the more important the suppressed element is to the unity of personality, the stronger will be this pressure; hence it happens characteristically with moral and religious elements. And when we remember that in these cases the suppression of an element of personality means the refusal of consciousness to recognize an element of reality upon the recognition of which the wholeness of personal life depends, we see that if the Resurrection appearances were visions of this sort, they were the natural expression not simply of the surviving personality of Jesus, but of the truth that in Him human personality finds its wholeness, because in Him the universe in which man lives has the master-key to its unity.

Such a view of these visions (if they were such) and their validity implies, of course, what the visions themselves impart, *i.e.* the conviction that death did not make an end of Jesus, but that through death He is all the more God's regent, at the right hand of power, the essential agent of God's sovereignty in the soul of man. Doubt this, and the things that He makes supreme in God are not really supreme. And it would seem that we must look at it in some such way as this, if we would recognize the triumph of Jesus in His resurrection as a spiritual triumph, and not as a sort of attesting sign such as He condemned. It

must be the quality of His death that assures to us the fact of His resurrection, rather than the miracle of His resurrection that assures the godlikeness of His death. The spiritual rather validates the content of the appearances than depends on them for its validity. Indeed, it seems that the nature of the appearances can be understood only if His spirit had already triumphed in the hearts of His disciples. For He did not appear to them in the sorrow of soul in which He had left them. Whence the change? Death had released Him from bodily pain, but what had changed His sorrow to peace? If His sorrow was caused by the world's sin, the world of Israel and the Twelve and the Gentiles, had that cause been removed or diminished? If there had already been a change in the hearts of the Eleven, then there was the beginning and promise of victory, not otherwise. The appearance itself could not effect that change, for it could not have been of the sort it was until that change was effected. And any change effected by the miraculous nature of an appearance cannot be deeply spiritual: if they really needed a miracle to assure them that Jesus in His suffering

was nearer to God than Caiaphas in his success, then their misunderstanding of Him would only be confirmed by such a miracle. Considered in this way, we may regard the appearance of Jesus to His disciples in vision as the result of the working of His spirit in their hearts, winning them to His truth and fashioning for Himself from the psychic elements of their inward conflict the vision that should lift His triumph into the centre of their conscious life and give them the inward wholeness that is peace and power.

In this way we may see the triumph of His death achieved in the very conditions of actual life that gave human worth to the triumph of His personality. He reigns in the inevitable and surrounding facts of life. He reigns in and by means of what is the essential and characteristic and formative urge of personality—the urge to an ordered and inclusive unity. His triumph in us comes in that which it gives—the inward unity that is peace and power—our triumph over self-division in self-devotion to One who evokes our glad loyalty and entire worship. So upon the experience of His resurrection follows Pentecost.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Why People come to Church.

BY PROFESSOR A. J. GOSSIP, M.A., GLASGOW.

'Go to the ant, consider her ways, and be wise.'—
Pr 6^e.

WHY do people come to church? I don't know, you say. I wish they didn't. The singing is all right; and the prayers are not too bad; but the sermon never ends at all! I know, poor little tousley-head, with the fidgety hands, and the legs that can't keep still, and the wee voice that keeps whispering to Mother, 'Is he nearly done now!' There was a picture about that in *Punch* the other month that showed us a fed-up little soul so very anxious to get home, asking its mother hopefully, as if one chance was still left and it might come true, 'Mother! Mother! if the church went on fire, would he stop then?'

Yet, you know, people like to come to church. Whatever for? you ask. Because they are looking for something that they want, that they must have, and they think they can find it here.

And that brings me to the ants. You know what

they are, don't you? No! no! Not Aunt Jessie nor Aunt Any-body-at-all, but the creepy, crawly, little things that go running to and fro so busily upon the ground. They are a clever little folk the ants. They grow crops like the farmers! Did you know that? And they have games, just like your school, with huge crowds looking on. And they march out to battle in battalions under officers. Perhaps that isn't really clever; for war is a stupid thing. Yet it's strange, isn't it, that these tiny heads of theirs have brains wise enough to think out things like that. But the cleverest thing of all, surely, is this.

South Africa is, in places, a hot country, sometimes dreadfully hot. For months and months and months there is never a drop of rain, and the sun blazes down day after day, and the grass withers, and the trees shrivel up, and the sheep die, and all the streams are bare and dry, no longer streams at all, but just hot stones, too hot by far to touch. And yet, even there, the great heaps in which the ants live are moist and wet and full of the damp, steamy heat they love. And people couldn't understand it. Quite close the ground was hard and cracked and gaping; and clouds of