have concluded from the wording of John  
vi. 62, that our Lord must have intended  
an ascension *in the sight of some of those  
to whom He spoke,* and that the Evangelist  
himself *gives that hint, by recording those  
words without comment, that he had seen  
it?*

Then again, is there any thing  
in the bodily state of our Lord after His  
Resurrection, which raises any even the  
least, difficulty here? He appeared suddenly, and vanished suddenly, when He pleased :—when it pleased Him, He ate,  
He spoke, He walked; but his Body was  
the Body of the Resurrection ;—only not  
yet his *Body of Glory* (Phil. iii. 21),  
because He had *not yet assumed* that  
glory: but that He *could* assume it, and  
did assume it at his Ascension, will be  
granted by all who believe in Him as the  
Son of God. So that it seems, on *à priori  
grounds,* probable that, *granted the fact  
of the Ascension,* it did take place in some  
such manner as our accounts relate :—*in  
the sight of the disciples, and by the uplifting of the risen Body of the Lord towards that which is to those on this  
earth the visible heaven.*

This being so, let us now, secondly, regard the matter  
*à posteriori.* We possess two accounts of  
the circumstances of this Ascension, written  
by the same person, and that person a contemporary of the Apostles themselves. Of the *genuineness* of these accounts there  
never was a doubt. How improbable that,  
St. Luke should have related *what any  
Apostles, or apostolic persons might have  
contradicted?* How improbable that the  
universal Church, founded by those who  
are said to have been eye-witnesses of this  
event, should have *received these too ac-  
counts as authentic, if they were not so?  
That these accounts themselves* are never  
referred to in the Epistles, is surely no  
argument against them. If an occasion  
had arisen, such as necessitated the writing  
of 1 Cor. xv., there can be little doubt that  
St. Paul would have been as particular in  
the circumstances of the Ascension, as he  
has been in those of the Resurrection. The  
fact is, that by far the greatest difficulty  
remains to be solved by those who can  
imagine a myth or fiction on this subject  
to have arisen in the first age of the  
Church. Such a supposition is not more  
repugnant to our Christian faith and  
reverence, than it is to common sense and  
historical consistency.