

2010

Seeing a Pneuma(tic Body): The Apologetic Interests of Luke 24:36–43

Daniel A. Smith

Huron University College, dsmith89@huron.uwo.ca

Follow this and additional works at: https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/huron_theologypub

Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), [Christianity Commons](#), and the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

Citation of this paper:

Smith, Daniel A. "Seeing a Pneuma(tic Body): The Apologetic Interests of Luke 24:36–43." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 72/3 (2010): 530–50.

Seeing a Pneuma(tic Body): The Apologetic Interests of Luke 24:36-43

DANIEL A. SMITH

Huron University College

London, ON N6G 1H3, Canada

LUKE 24:36-43 narrates a recognition scene, an appearance of the risen Jesus to the Eleven and others.¹ Jesus appears suddenly and greets his startled followers (vv. 36-37), addresses their doubts/disputations (διαλογισμοί [v. 38]), describes the composition of his body (v. 39), shows them his hands and feet (v. 40), and eats some fish in their presence (vv. 41-43). Numerous commentators note the “apologetic” interest of the author in this passage, emphasizing a “materialistic” or “bodily” view of the resurrection appearances.² Rhetorically, the subject of this passage is Jesus’ postresurrection bodily existence, concerning which πνεῦμα (“spirit”) and σὰρξ καὶ ὀστέα (“flesh and bones”) are juxtaposed (v. 39). The narrator connects the fear of the disciples with their perception that they were seeing a “spirit” (v. 37), and Jesus identifies their internal dialogue as the source of their

¹ C. H. Dodd, “The Appearances of the Risen Christ: An Essay in Form-Criticism of the Gospels,” in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot* (ed. D. E. Nineham; Oxford: Blackwell, 1955) 9-35, here 16-18; Gerhard Lohfink, *Die Himmelfahrt Jesu: Untersuchungen zu den Himmelfahrts- und Erhöhungstexte bei Lukas* (SANT 26; Munich: Kösel, 1971) 148.

² E.g., G. B. Caird, *The Gospel of St. Luke* (Pelican Gospel Commentaries; Baltimore: Penguin, 1963) 261; Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (5th ed.; THKNT 3; Berlin: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 1969) 449; Vincent Taylor, *The Passion Narrative of St Luke: A Critical and Historical Investigation* (SNTSMS 19; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972) 114; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (2 vols.; AB 28, 28A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981, 1985) 2:1574; Reginald H. Fuller, *The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives* (New York: Macmillan, 1971) 115; Norman Perrin, *The Resurrection according to Matthew, Mark, and Luke* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977) 66-67; George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity* (2nd ed.; HTS 56; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006) 246-47.

disturbed state of mind (v. 38).³ Resolution comes when Jesus corrects the misperception of the Eleven, the authentic resurrection witnesses in Luke-Acts (Luke 24:46-48; Acts 1:22; 2:32; 5:32; 10:39-41), who here think they have seen a πνεῦμα (v. 37). Jesus puts the Eleven's (and the readers') disputing hearts to rest by displaying his risen body, saying, "See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see that a spirit [πνεῦμα] does not have flesh and bones as you see that I have" (v. 39). Luke thus identifies the disciples' disputations/doubts as resulting from a "pneumatic" view of Jesus' postresurrection body and offers a response to such a view.

Although commentators generally agree that Luke 24:36-43 is apologetically motivated, there is considerable disagreement as to the precise view or views Luke may have been opposing. In this essay, I evaluate proposals that Luke 24:36-43 provides a narrative answer to (1) ghostly interpretations of the appearances, (2) magical-daimonic interpretations, (3) docetism, (4) Marcionism, and (5) Pauline views of the nature of the resurrection. Luke's apologetic interest here need not revolve around one such option to the exclusion of others. Any viable proposal, however, should be consistent with the plausible linguistic, cultural, and theological setting of the author, and with the narrative and theological interests displayed in Luke 24 and the rest of Luke-Acts. The fact that Luke locates these "doubts" narratively within the Eleven's circle suggests that insider (even "apostolic") views of the resurrection are the subject here, rather than outsider views (contrast Matt 27:62-66; 28:11-15).⁴ Although later readers deployed this narrative apologetically against the alternative interpretations of the resurrection appearances noted above, I will argue that there are good grounds for considering Paul's (or Pauline) views of the resurrection body as the object of Luke's apologetic.

I. Luke 24:36-43 and Postmortem Apparitions

The physicality of Jesus' resurrected body in this story and the negation of the term πνεῦμα are often taken as evidence that Luke was attempting to dispel the notion that the disciples had seen only Jesus' ghost. This view, ubiquitous in

³ διαλογισμός, which commonly denotes "thought" or "deliberation," signifies in Luke interior dialogue or debate that is always known to Jesus and always answered by him (Luke 2:35; 5:22; 9:46-47; 24:38). Only here can the word mean "doubts": see BDAG, s.v. διαλογισμός; G. Schrenk, "διαλέγομαι κτλ.," *TDNT* 2:93-98, here 97.

⁴ W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: Clark, 1988-97) 3:652-53; Wim J. C. Weren, "'His Disciples Stole Him Away' (Mt 28,13): A Rival Interpretation of Jesus' Resurrection," in *Resurrection in the New Testament: Festschrift J. Lambrecht* (ed. R. Bieringer et al.; BETL 165; Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2002) 147-63.

the secondary literature, also informs current translations of 24:37, 39.⁵ Post-mortem apparitions were well known in ancient times, and today such experiences are well documented in the social sciences.⁶ In ancient descriptions of such apparitions, the individual is often clearly recognizable, for ghosts normally were thought to retain the physical characteristics (including wounds and clothing) of the person who had died.⁷ Neither in antiquity nor today, however, would anyone conclude from such an apparition that the person seen was “alive” (as claimed of Jesus in Luke 24:5, 23; Acts 1:3; etc.) or “risen” (Luke 24:6, 34; Acts 2:24, 32; etc.). Consequently, the idea that the disciples had seen only Jesus’ ghost would have troubled early Christians, including Luke, for whom Jesus’ vindication and exaltation depend on his resurrection and ascension.⁸ For Luke the truth of the resurrection kerygma requires that Jesus’ body did not decompose in the tomb but was raised by God, as Luke 24:1-12 shows narratively and as Acts 2:22-36 shows exegetically. Is Jesus’ demonstration that his risen body is composed of “flesh and bones” and that he is not a “spirit” evidence that Luke was attempting to refute “ghostly” interpretations of the resurrection appearances? Although several factors seem to corroborate this view (the word “spirit,” the tangibility of Jesus’ body, the fear of the disciples), there are two significant objections.⁹

First, the materiality/physicality of Jesus’ risen body in Luke 24:39-40 is not inconsistent with ancient descriptions of ghosts, as many suppose. According to Daniel Ogden, descriptions of postmortem apparitions in Greco-Roman literature

⁵ E.g., Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke* (5th ed.; ICC; Edinburgh: Clark, 1922) 559; I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 902; Robert C. Tannehill, *Luke* (Abingdon New Testament Commentary; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996) 359; François Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (4 vols.; EKKNT 3; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989–2009) 4:584–85; Fuller, *Formation*, 115; A. J. M. Wedderburn, *Beyond Resurrection* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999) 57, 74; Dieter Zeller, “Erscheinungen Verstorbener im griechisch-römischen Bereich,” in *Resurrection in the New Testament* (ed. Bieringer et al.), 1–19, here 12; N. T. Wright, *Christian Origins and the Question of God*, vol. 3, *The Resurrection of the Son of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003) 657–58; Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life*, 246. English translations reflecting this view include *NRSV*, *NJB*, *NIV*, *NLT* (New Living Translation).

⁶ Dale C. Allison, Jr., *Resurrecting Jesus: The Earliest Christian Tradition and Its Interpreters* (New York/London: Clark, 2005) 269–83; Zeller, “Erscheinungen Verstorbener,” 4–12.

⁷ D. Felton, *Haunted Greece and Rome: Ghost Stories from Classical Antiquity* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1999) 14–18; Daniel Ogden, *Greek and Roman Necromancy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001) 221; Gregory J. Riley, *Resurrection Reconsidered: Thomas and John in Controversy* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995) 48–51; Deborah Thompson Prince, “The ‘Ghost’ of Jesus: Luke 24 in Light of Ancient Narratives of Post-Mortem Apparitions,” *JSNT* 29 (2007) 287–301, here 290.

⁸ Acts 2:23–24, 31–35; 3:14–15; 4:10–11; 5:30–31; 10:39–40; 13:27–37; see also Origen *Cels.* 3.22; 7.35, according to whom Celsus used σκιά for the ghost of Jesus.

⁹ For the motif of fear, see Homer *Od.* 11.36–43; Pliny *Ep.* 7.27.6; also Mark 6:49; Matt 14:26; Wis 17:14; for intangibility, see *Od.* 11.206–14; Philostratus *Vit. Apoll.* 8.12.

range “from insubstantial . . . to superhumanly substantial.”¹⁰ Although ghosts were often described using “the obvious metaphors of insubstantialness: shadows, breaths of air, smoke, and dreams,” ancient literature provides numerous examples of ghosts being tangible and having physical characteristics and capabilities.¹¹ In the view of Gregory J. Riley, by the first century “‘life’ in the underworld had . . . become far more substantial, and the dead had become correspondingly more tangible.”¹² Riley still argues, however, that Luke 24:39 was intended “to counter the idea that the risen Jesus was some type of ghost or phantom,” though he admits that “this stratagem was not secure against objection.”¹³ Deborah Thompson Prince also notes that the physicality of the risen Jesus in Luke 24 does not prove that his appearance was different from ghostly apparitions. She argues that Luke’s depiction of the risen Jesus, which incorporates multiple features normally associated with different types of apparitions, was intended to work “within the parameters of the [Greco-Roman] literary and cultural expectations of the audience to express a phenomenon that surpasses those expectations.”¹⁴ She thus contends that Luke intended to depict the appearances of the risen Jesus as unique, but does not investigate the apologetic motivation for having Jesus declare himself not to be a πνεῦμα.

This leads to the second, and more crucial, objection: whereas “ghost” and “spirit” overlap semantically in modern Western languages, πνεῦμα was not a word typically used in classical or Hellenistic Greek for a postmortem apparition.¹⁵ There was a wide range of terms available to the author if the concern was to dispel the idea that the followers of Jesus had seen his ghost. According to D. Felton, φάσμα, φάντασμα, εἶδωλον, δαίμων, σκιά, ψυχή, εἰκών, ὄψις, and δόκησις were all used (without clear differentiation) for “ghost.”¹⁶ To the Greek mind, it was the soul (ψυχή) that escaped the body at death and that could, if not at rest, appear to the living (Plato *Phaed.* 81d). The term πνεῦμα could be used anthropologically

¹⁰ Ogden, *Greek and Roman Necromancy*, 220.

¹¹ Ibid. See also Felton, *Haunted Greece and Rome*, 25-29, on “revenants,” that is, reanimated corpses, for which ancient Greek used standard “ghost” language.

¹² Riley, *Resurrection Reconsidered*, 53-58, here 55. According to Sarah Iles Johnston (*Restless Dead: Encounters between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999] 159-60), earlier Greek sources show that ghosts, being insubstantial, would afflict the living through the agency of divine beings or through psychological means. Later texts do not restrict the dead to such indirect tactics (Ogden, *Greek and Roman Necromancy*, 220).

¹³ Riley, *Resurrection Reconsidered*, 53.

¹⁴ Prince, “‘Ghost’ of Jesus,” 297.

¹⁵ Earlier commentators sometimes understood this as a “popular” meaning of πνεῦμα, but without any philological basis. See, e.g., Burton Scott Easton, *The Gospel according to St. Luke: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary* (New York: Scribner, 1926) 364.

¹⁶ Felton, *Haunted Greece and Rome*, 23-24, 107 n. 8; such terms were used also for the robustly embodied revenants (ibid., 26). For the lexical range, see also Ogden, *Greek and Roman Necromancy*, 219. LSJ also notes πέμφιξ (ad loc.).

in connection with ψυχή, most typically for the animating principle of human life, the absence of which means death. In early Greek usage it could be said that the soul was πνεῦμα, either metaphorically (for its fleetingness) or by virtue of its constituent essence.¹⁷ Eventually, and by extension, πνεῦμα came to be used (evidently almost exclusively in Jewish Greek) for that part of the human person that survives death (e.g., *1 Enoch* 103:4; Heb 12:23; 1 Pet 3:19), a usage that arguably occurs in Luke 23:46 and Acts 7:59.¹⁸ More commonly in Luke-Acts, however, πνεῦμα indicates (1) the divine Spirit, (2) an aspect of human personality, or (3) an evil or unclean spirit, synonymous with δαιμόνιον (“demon”).¹⁹

Frequently ψυχή was used by extension for an apparition of a dead person, but an analogous usage is not found for πνεῦμα. This makes the presumed use of πνεῦμα for “ghost” in Luke 24:37, 39 a lexical singularity, which proves to be a critical weakness for the view that Luke was combating the “ghostly” interpretations of the resurrection appearances. In fact, as Terence Paige has shown, “not a single Gentile, non-Christian writer prior to the late second century ever used πνεῦμα to signify a ‘demon,’ ‘ghost,’ or ‘spirit’ of any sort. When Plutarch or Lucian (or Theophrastus before them) refer to such things, the terms used are always δαίμονες, δαιμόνια, or φάσματα—*never* πνεύματα.”²⁰ Moreover, no source in Jewish or Christian Greek before Luke uses πνεῦμα for “ghost,” that is, for the apparition of a dead person’s spirit.²¹ Some early readings of Luke 24:37, 39, however, apparently took πνεῦμα in the narrative context as meaning “ghost” and adjusted the terminology along more conventional lines.²² Nevertheless, the rhetor-

¹⁷ Ernest DeWitt Burton, *Spirit, Soul, and Flesh: The Usage of Pneuma, Psyche, and Sarx in Greek Writings and Translated Works from the Earliest Period to 180 A.D.* (Historical and Linguistic Studies in Literature Related to the New Testament, 2nd series 3; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1918) 18-24, 80-81, 143-45; Terence Paige, “Who Believes in ‘Spirit’? Πνεῦμα in Pagan Usage and Implications for the Gentile Christian Mission,” *HTR* 95 (2002) 417-36, here 420.

¹⁸ Burton, *Spirit, Soul, and Flesh*, 181; see also Luke 8:55, where πνεῦμα probably means “principle of life” or simply “breath.”

¹⁹ The third meaning given here seems exclusive to Jewish and Christian Greek; Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Ant. rom.* 1.31.1 might be an exception (Burton, *Spirit, Soul, and Flesh*, 81). See also Josephus *B.J.* 7.6.3 §185, which defines demons able to possess the living as the spirits (πνεύματα) of dead evil persons.

²⁰ Paige, “Who Believes in ‘Spirit’?” 433 (emphasis original).

²¹ Lexicographers of the NT have not supplied any parallel to this proposed meaning of πνεῦμα: Burton, *Spirit, Soul, and Flesh*, 181; Eduard Schweizer, “πνεῦμα, πνευματικός, κτλ, E, The New Testament,” *TDNT* 6:396-455, here 415; BDAG, ad loc. Plummer (*Luke*, 559) adduced 1 Pet 3:19 as a parallel, but this is questionable (those spirits do not appear). LSJ does not list “ghost” as a possibility for πνεῦμα, but “spiritual or immaterial being, angel” (ad loc.).

²² Codex Bezae reads φάντασμα, not πνεῦμα, in Luke 24:37 (Lat.: *fantasma*), an alteration perhaps influenced by Mark 6:45-52/Matt 14:22-33: so Frans Neirynck, “Lc 24, 36-43: un récit lucanien,” in *À cause de l’Évangile: Études sur les Synoptiques et les Actes. Offertes au P. Jacques Dupont, O.S.B., à l’occasion de son 70e anniversaire* (LD 123; Paris: Cerf, 1985) 655-80, here 671.

ical aim of excluding a “ghostly” interpretation of the resurrection appearances would have been better served had the author used one of the customary terms for “ghost,” such as φάντασμα, σκιά, or even ψυχή (Wis 17:14; Mark 6:49; Matt 14:26 [φάντασμα]).

II. Luke 24:36-43 and Ancient Necromancy

In 1990, Hans Dieter Betz observed that πνεῦμα is used in the Greek magical papyri as a synonym for the δαίμων (daimon) of a dead person potentially useful to the practitioner—as in the following spell, which was to be uttered over the skull of a person who died violently.²³

I call upon you, lord Helios, and your holy angels on this day, in this very hour: Preserve me, NN . . . I beg you, lord Helios, hear me NN and grant me power over the spirit of this man who died a violent death [τούτου τοῦ βιοθανάτου πνεύματος], from whose tent I hold [this], so that I may keep him with me, [NN], as helper and avenger for whatever business I crave from him. (PGM IV.1932-55, excerpted)²⁴

According to the Greek magical papyri, practitioners would sometimes attempt to acquire an assistant (πάρεδρος), which could be a divine, celestial, or spiritual entity, even a material item.²⁵ In these texts, “the πάρεδροι are frequently identified as δαίμονες, generally the δαίμονες of dead people.”²⁶ A necromancer would enlist the aid of a god of the underworld or some other deity (such as Helios, as above) to control the dead person’s daimon. The “restless dead,” that is, those who died untimely or violently, or who were left unburied, were considered particularly sus-

Ignatius Smyrn. 3.2 reads δαιμόνιον ἄσώματον, not πνεῦμα, in a line very similar to Luke 24:39; the verbal agreement (ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι + οὐκ) suggests literary dependence, as argued by Neiryck, “Récit lucanien,” 674-75; cf. William R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985) 227. *Epistula Apostolorum* 11 also gives a “ghostly” interpretation to πνεῦμα in Luke 24:37, 39.

²³ Hans Dieter Betz, “Zum Problem der Auferstehung Jesu im Lichte der griechischen magischen Papyri,” in idem, *Gesammelte Aufsätze I: Hellenismus und Urchristentum* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990) 230-61. The term δαίμων has a remarkably broad range of meanings, including “god/goddess,” “divine power,” “fortune/genius” (of an individual), and “soul” (of an individual from the “golden age,” serving as tutelary deity): so LSJ ad loc. In the Greek magical papyri it can mean the “soul” or “spirit” of a dead person. Herein the term is simply transliterated.

²⁴ Ibid., 243; translations of the Greek magical papyri are from Hans Dieter Betz, ed., *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation, Including the Demotic Spells* (2 vols.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986); Greek text from Karl Preisendanz and Albert Henrichs, eds., *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri* (2nd ed.; 2 vols.; Stuttgart: Teubner, 1973, 1974).

²⁵ Leda Jean Ciraolo, “Supernatural Assistants in the Greek Magical Papyri,” in *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power* (ed. Marvin Meyer and Paul Mirecki; Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 129; Leiden: Brill, 1995) 279-95.

²⁶ Ibid., 284.

ceptible to necromantic exploitation.²⁷ In the magical papyri, such entities are called εἰδῶλα νεκρῶν (“phantoms of the dead”), νεκυδαίμονες (“daimons of the dead”), ψυχαί (“souls”), or πνεύματα (“spirits”).²⁸

In Betz’s opinion, the evangelists were aware of possible necromantic connotations of the resurrection appearances. Someone executed as a criminal would have been viewed as a powerful assistant to the magician who could control his daimon. According to Susan R. Garrett, the story of the sons of Sceva (Acts 19:11-20) shows that Luke knew that Paul’s healing practices could have been interpreted as involving the magical invocation of the daimon of someone who died violently.²⁹ Understood as an assistant daimon, the postmortem Jesus would be viewed as subordinate to underworld deities, open to manipulation by magicians, and malevolent and dangerous if not controlled. In Betz’s view, Luke has Jesus show “daß er kein πνεῦμα (v. 39), d.h. kein Totendämon ist,” because of the damaging consequences of such a view for early Christian proclamation.³⁰

For Betz, the demonstration in Luke 24:39 that the risen Jesus has flesh and bones and is not a “spirit” thus shows that the author was attempting to exclude magical-daimonic interpretations of the resurrection appearances. Although a ghost summoned by a necromancer would be individually recognizable (as in vv. 39-40), one would expect such an apparition to be intangible or to occur in a dream.³¹ “Der massive Materialismus . . . hat theologisch den wohlüberlegten Zweck, die konkurrierenden magisch-dämonologischen Deutungen zu verdrängen.”³² Additionally, Betz argues that Luke’s terminology was meant specifically to counter the necromantic understanding of the daimon of a dead person as a spirit (πνεῦμα).³³ To this point we may add two more features of Luke 24:36-43 that Betz mentions but does not stress. First, Luke (following Mark) does not narrate a resurrection appear-

²⁷ Ogden, *Greek and Roman Necromancy*, 225, citing Tertullian *An.* 56. See also Johnston, *Restless Dead*, 127-28; Zeller, “Erscheinungen Verstorbenen,” 4-10; and Betz, “Zum Problem,” 242-43, 247, who notes an interest in executed criminals in some of the magical papyri.

²⁸ Betz, “Zum Problem,” 247; Paige, “Who Believes in ‘Spirit’?” 432-33. Stephen J. Patterson (*The God of Jesus: The Historical Jesus and the Search for Meaning* [Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1998] 229) seems to overstate Betz’s case, describing πνεῦμα as “the same word ancients use to refer to disembodied spirits who wander the earth.”

²⁹ Susan R. Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke’s Writings* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989) 92; see also David E. Aune, “Magic in Early Christianity,” *ANRW* 2.23.1 (1980) 1507-57, here 1545. Betz also mentions later Christian magical papyri that invoke Jesus in a similar way (“Zum Problem,” 245).

³⁰ Betz, “Zum Problem,” 247-48.

³¹ On incubation in necromancy, see Ogden, *Greek and Roman Necromancy*, 163-64.

³² Betz, “Zum Problem,” 250.

³³ *Ibid.*, 249; additionally, the ascension (as a bodily assumption, not an assumption of the soul) signifies that Jesus has been installed at the right hand of God as an exalted human being and not as a *Totengeist* (*ibid.*, 250).

ance at the tomb, where necromantic apparitions would occur.³⁴ Second, the appearance of Jesus in Luke 24:36 is a direct (αὐτοπτος) encounter: Jesus is not conjured up.³⁵ Necromantic technologies for summoning and controlling daimons were complex, involving sacrifices, invocations, and various rituals, including the manipulation of a body part or skull (*PGM* IV.1928-2005).³⁶

There are obvious differences between necromantic apparitions of ghosts and the appearances of Jesus in Luke 24, in which there is no necromancer, no rituals or invocation of a higher power, no apparition at the tomb, no forced reanimation of Jesus' corpse, and no manipulation of his body.³⁷ But Luke's silence is not necessarily antimagical by design; thus Betz's case rests on the word πνεῦμα. According to Paige, "the magical papyri clearly do use πνεῦμα in the sense of a god or δαίμων, but this is a new, non-native Greek use which postdates the rise and expansion of Christianity into Egypt."³⁸ Betz's linguistic evidence is therefore too late to explain the usage of πνεῦμα in Luke 24.

III. Luke 24:36-43 and Docetism

Luke 24:36-43 is also sometimes thought to be antidocetic.³⁹ A recent proponent of this view is Gerd Lüdemann: "Such blunt realism must be seen as an attack on docetism, a challenge to those who disavow the bodily reality of Jesus both as a human being and as the 'Risen One.'"⁴⁰ Although other NT writings could possibly be called antidocetic (see esp. 1 John 4:2-3; 2 John 7-8), the letters of Ignatius are of particular importance for assessing a purported antidocetic interest in Luke 24 because of the parallel between Luke 24:39 and Ign. *Smyrn.* 3.1-3.

³⁴ Betz is surprised that Matthew and John are not reluctant to depict the risen Jesus at the tomb ("Zum Problem," 246).

³⁵ Ibid., 248 n. 61: the magical papyri use αὐτοπτος for "direct" visions, probably in contrast to apparitions experienced in dreams or through incubation.

³⁶ Ogden, *Greek and Roman Necromancy*, 163-90.

³⁷ On corpse reanimation in literary sources and on the manipulation of skulls in necromancy, see Ogden, *Greek and Roman Necromancy*, 202-16; see also *PGM* XIII.278-82, a spell invoking a spirit (πνεῦμα) to reanimate a corpse.

³⁸ Paige ("Who Believes in 'Spirit'?" 433) concludes that this use of πνεῦμα in the Greek magical papyri was influenced by Jewish and/or Christian usage. Josephus *B.J.* 7.6.3 §185 (n. 19 above) equates πνεῦμα and δαίμων but focuses on possession, not apparition or necromancy.

³⁹ E.g., Grundmann, *Evangelium nach Lukas*, 449; Frederick W. Danker, *Jesus and the New Age: A Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel* (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988) 396; C. F. Evans, *Resurrection and the New Testament* (SBT 2/12; London: SCM, 1970) 109; cf. I. H. Marshall, *Luke*, 900; Wright, *Resurrection*, 659.

⁴⁰ Gerd Lüdemann, *The Resurrection of Christ: A Historical Inquiry* (2nd ed.; Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 2004) 109. But he also says that Luke wishes to avoid "a possible magical-demonic interpretation" (ibid., 109-10, citing Betz, "Zum Problem," 249-50).

According to Ignatius, “certain unbelievers” held that Jesus suffered in appearance only (τὸ δοκεῖν [*Smyrn.* 2.1; also *Trall.* 10]); against these “unbelievers” Ignatius insists that physical events in Jesus’ life “truly” happened (*Smyrn.* 1–2; also *Trall.* 9). Ignatius also reports that the risen Jesus said to members of the Petrine circle, “Take, handle me, and see that I am not a bodiless demon” (οὐκ εἰμι δαιμόνιον ἄσώματον [*Smyrn.* 3.2]).⁴¹ For Ignatius, as in Luke 24, this is coupled with an affirmation that Jesus is still “fleshly” after the resurrection (*Smyrn.* 3.1, 3; 5.2). The pertinent questions are, first, whether Ignatius’s opponents can rightly be labeled “docetic,” and, second, whether it is correct to draw an analogy between Ignatius and Luke 24 on the basis of their shared language.

With regard to the first question, there is the problem of definition: “docetism,” in conventional usage, covers a diverse range of views that may share little theologically or genealogically besides the common idea that “the human appearance of Christ is mere illusion and has no objective reality.”⁴² Docetism was less a system or sect than a “theological option which shows up in a wide variety of early Christian texts.”⁴³ Concerning its origins and focal points, there is no consensus, although proposals tend to concentrate either on concerns about divine involvement with matter or about the suffering and death of Jesus, or both.⁴⁴ As John W. Marshall notes—τὸ δοκεῖν (*Smyrn.* 2.1; *Trall.* 10) notwithstanding—there is a problem in applying the christological label “docetic” to the position of Ignatius’s opponents. According to Marshall, this “reifies” his (polemical) description of their view about Jesus into a christology, implying connections with later, more systematic christological positions that may have involved significantly different reasons for questioning Christ’s existence “in the flesh.”⁴⁵ With these cautions in mind, it nevertheless seems appropriate to characterize Ignatius’s opponents as

⁴¹ On the possible literary relationship between Ign. *Smyrn.* 3.2 and Luke 24:39, see n. 22 above.

⁴² M. Slusser, “Docetism: A Historical Definition,” *Second Century* 1 (1981) 163–72, here 172, citing Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Die christliche Gnosis, oder die christliche Religions-Philosophie in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1835; repr., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967) 258. See also N. Brox, “‘Doketismus’—eine Problem-anzeige,” *ZKG* 95 (1984) 301–14; J. G. Davies, “The Origins of Docetism,” *Studia Patristica* 6 (1962) 13–35.

⁴³ Guy G. Stroumsa, “Christ’s Laughter: Docetic Origins Reconsidered,” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 12 (2004) 267–88, here 269.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 268–69, with bibliography; see Ronnie Goldstein and Guy G. Stroumsa, “The Greek and Jewish Origins of Docetism: A New Proposal,” *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 10 (2007) 423–41.

⁴⁵ John W. Marshall, “The Objects of Ignatius’ Wrath and Jewish Angelic Mediators,” *JEH* 56 (2005) 1–23, here 5.

docetists, in that they evidently questioned the reality of Jesus' physical existence in general, but particularly his suffering (*Smyrn.* 1-3).⁴⁶

Does the same apologetic agenda inform both *Smyrn.* 3.2 and Luke 24:39? Ignatius is concerned to stress the fleshly (ἐν σαρκί, σαρκικός, σαρκοφόρος) character of Jesus throughout his life, though particularly in his suffering, death, and resurrection (*Magn.* 11; *Smyrn.* 1-3; *Trall.* 9-10; etc.; see also 1 John 4:2-3; 2 John 7; *Pol. Phil.* 7.1). Ignatius *Smyrn.* 3.1 is especially important: "for I know and believe that he was in the flesh after the resurrection as well" (καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκί). The adjunctive καί should not be missed. The emphasis on postresurrection tangibility is meant not to establish the nature of the resurrection appearances but to support the reality of Jesus' suffering, on the basis of the continuity Ignatius presumes between Jesus' pre- and postresurrection states.⁴⁷ In Luke, on the other hand, one does not find a discernible emphasis on the physical (fleshly) character of the pre-Easter Jesus; such an emphasis arises only in relation to the resurrection appearance narrated in 24:36-43. Furthermore, in contrast to Luke, Ignatius does not appear reticent to use πνεῦμα for the risen Jesus: in his view, Jesus before and after his death and resurrection is both fleshly and spiritual (*Eph.* 7.2; *Magn.* 1.2; *Smyrn.* 3.2).⁴⁸

In the end, since docetic christologies tend to call into question the reality of either the suffering and death of Jesus or his real bodily existence, and since Luke's concern seems to be specifically the nature of the postresurrection appearances, it does not seem appropriate to call Luke 24:36-43 antidocetic. This is not to say that this passage would not be useful in antidocetic polemic: Irenaeus, for instance, used Luke 24:36-43 in precisely this way, but by avoiding entirely the postresurrection context of 24:39 and concentrating on the whole career of Jesus (*Haer.* 5.2.3).

IV. Luke 24:36-43 and Marcion

Although the traditional view holds that Marcion used an edited version of canonical Luke, Joseph B. Tyson has recently taken up the proposal of John Knox that canonical Luke is the result of an anti-Marcionite revision of a "pre-Marcionite

⁴⁶ J. Marshall's suggestion ("Objects of Ignatius' Wrath," 12-20) that angelomorphic christology lies behind this is compelling.

⁴⁷ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 226. There is for Ignatius an essential identity but a qualitative distinction between Jesus' pre- and postresurrection states: formerly he was παθητός, capable of suffering, but he became ἀπαθής, incapable of suffering (*Eph.* 7.2; also *Pol.* 3.2). After the resurrection Jesus remained tangible (ψηλαφῆσατέ με), bodily (οὐκ εἰμι δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον), and fleshly (σαρκικός), even though spiritually (πνευματικῶς) united with the Father (*Smyrn.* 3.2-3).

⁴⁸ Admittedly, this may be due to Ignatius's incipient two-natures christology.

gospel,” and that Marcion’s Gospel was an edited form not of canonical Luke but of this Proto-Luke.⁴⁹ Tyson’s work, together with that of Matthias Klinghardt,⁵⁰ marks a recent interest in reassessing the significance of Marcion’s Gospel for the composition of the canonical Gospels.⁵¹ Tyson argues that the pre-Marcionite Gospel was a Proto-Luke based on Mark and Q and containing Luke 3–23, plus a short resurrection story perhaps similar to Mark 16:1–8.⁵² An anti-Marcionite editor produced canonical Luke-Acts by adding substantial material to Proto-Luke, including the preface, infancy narratives, other *Sondergut*, and postresurrection material, as well as the second volume.⁵³ Tyson identifies potentially anti-Marcionite themes in Luke 24 (namely, proof from prophecy, the centrality of Jerusalem, the apostles as witnesses, the physicality of Jesus’ resurrection) and suggests that “an anti-Marcionite author, perhaps drawing on earlier oral or written material, composed the greater part of the chapter.”⁵⁴ Tyson also admits that “it is not difficult to read Marcion’s gospel as a reaction to Luke 24,” but he proposes that his reading of Luke 24 stands together with his analyses of the prologue and infancy narratives as cumulative evidence that Luke-Acts was an anti-Marcionite project.⁵⁵ Tyson’s overall thesis cannot be evaluated here, but we can assess whether there is sufficient basis for calling the apologetic of Luke 24:36–43 “anti-Marcionite.”

⁴⁹ Joseph B. Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006) 79–120; John Knox, *Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942) 77–139. For a survey of scholarship on the relationship between Marcion’s Gospel and Luke, see Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts*, 83–86; for Marcion as editor of canonical Luke, see Irenaeus *Haer.* 1.27.2; Tertullian *Marc.* 4.2.4; Epiphanius *Pan.* 9.1–2; Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion: The Gospel of the Alien God* (1921; trans. John E. Steely and Lyle D. Bierma; Durham, NC: Labyrinth, 1990) 28–30, 36–45.

⁵⁰ Matthias Klinghardt, “Markion vs. Lukas: Plädoyer für die Wiederaufnahme eines alten Falles,” *NTS* 52 (2006) 484–513; idem, “The Marcionite Gospel and the Synoptic Problem: A New Suggestion,” *NovT* 50 (2008) 1–27. Klinghardt hypothesizes Marcion’s Gospel as a mediating link between Mark and Luke, with canonical Luke being a revision of Marcion’s Gospel. He calls the Lucan redaction “anti-Marcionite” (e.g., “Markion vs. Lukas,” 484), concentrating mainly on Luke 1:1–4 and 4:16–30.

⁵¹ For an assessment, see Dieter T. Roth, “Marcion’s Gospel and Luke: The History of Research in Current Debate,” *JBL* 127 (2008) 513–27.

⁵² Yet the presence of material closely similar to Luke 24:6–7, 25, 38–39 in Marcion’s Gospel indicates that there would have been substantially more resurrection material in Tyson’s Proto-Luke. See David S. Williams, “Reconsidering Marcion’s Gospel,” *JBL* 108 (1989) 477–96, here 483–96.

⁵³ Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts*, 119–20. Tyson identifies, cautiously, only Luke 5:39 and 16:17 as possible anti-Marcionite *Sondergut* added to the body of Luke by the redactor (*ibid.*, 118–19). He also thinks that “the challenge of Marcion and Marcionite Christianity forms a remarkably meaningful and probable context for Acts,” which he dates to around 120 (*ibid.*, 78). See also Richard I. Pervo, *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists* (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge, 2006) 346, who dates Acts to around 115.

⁵⁴ Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts*, 100–109, here 108.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 109.

Tertullian and Epiphanius both attest that something similar to Luke 24:37-39 was in Marcion's Gospel, as this table shows.⁵⁶

Luke 24:37-39	Ignatius <i>Smyrn.</i> 3.2	Tertullian <i>Marc.</i> 4.43.6	Epiphanius <i>Pan.</i> 42.11, <i>schol.</i> 78
<p>πτοθέντες δὲ καὶ ἔμφοβοι γενόμενοι ἐδόκουν πνεῦμα θεωρεῖν. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τί τεταραγμένοι ἐστέ καὶ διὰ τί διαλογισμοὶ ἀνα- βαίνουσιν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν; ἴδετε τὰς χεῖράς μου καὶ τοὺς πόδας μου ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμὶ αὐτός· ψηλαφή- σατέ με καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι πνεῦμα σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα οὐκ ἔχει καθὼς ἐμὲ θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα.</p>	<p>καὶ ὅτε πρὸς τοὺς περὶ Πέτρον ἦλθεν ἔφη αὐτοῖς, λάβετε, ψηλαφή- σατέ με καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμό- νιον ἀσώματον.</p>	<p>Cum haesitantibus eis ne phantasma⁵⁷ esset, immo phantas- ma credentibus, Quid turbati estis? inquit, et quid cogi- tationes subeunt in corda vestra? Videte manus meas et pedes, quia ego ipse sum, quoniam spiritus ossa non habet sicut me videtis habere.</p>	<p>τί τεταραγμένοι ἐστέ; ἴδετε τὰς χεῖράς μου καὶ τοὺς πόδας μου ὅτι πνεῦμα ὀστέα οὐκ ἔχει καθὼς ἐμὲ θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα.</p>

Further details about the story as it appeared in Marcion's Gospel cannot be determined, except that it may have included a saying similar to Luke 24:25.⁵⁸ Tyson thinks that elements potentially unfriendly to Marcion's theology—references to the Eleven and to the appearance to Simon, as well as vv. 42-43, which describe the risen Jesus requesting food and eating grilled fish—were not part of the original

⁵⁶ Table adapted from Williams, "Reconsidering Marcion's Gospel," 491-92; the partial paraphrase of Luke 24:37 from Tertullian *Marc.* 4.43.6 and the parallel from Ignatius are added (with exact parallels in boldface).

⁵⁷ Marcion's Gospel may have read φάντασμα in 24:37 (so Harnack, *Marcion*, 43; and NA²⁷), although Tertullian *Marc.* 4.43.6, which appears to be the basis for this variant reading in NA²⁷, does not cite *Gos. Marcion* 24:37 directly. Markus Vinzent ("Christ's Resurrection: The Pauline Basis of Marcion's Teaching," *Studia Patristica* 31 [1997] 225-33, here 232 n. 21) suggests that φάντασμα in *Marc.* 4.43.6 is Tertullian's word, not Marcion's; it is the characteristic word that Tertullian uses to describe Marcion's view of Jesus' body (e.g., Tertullian *Marc.* 4.42.6-7; cf. Epiphanius [*Pan.* 42.11, *elench.* 4, 10, 16, etc.], who uses δόκησις and φαντασία).

⁵⁸ Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts*, 46; Harnack, *Marcion*, 43; for text, see Williams, "Reconsidering Marcion's Gospel," 494. Neither Tertullian nor Epiphanius reports any intervening material between the two sayings.

context but were added by the final redactor of Luke 24.⁵⁹ This, however, is impossible to prove or disprove, especially since Tyson allows that Marcion could have edited Proto-Luke.

In general, following Tyson's theory, one should expect redactional traits consistent with Luke 3–23 to be present where Marcion's Gospel and Luke 24:36–43 agree, and redactional traits consistent with Luke 1–2 and Acts where they disagree. In Tyson's view, Proto-Luke (comprising Luke 3–23, plus some core elements in Luke 24) was edited by the same hand that was responsible for canonical Luke 1–2 and Acts. Thus, if we provisionally grant that Luke 24:36, 40–43 was not in Marcion's Gospel, we should find these verses to be consistent with the style of Luke 1–2 and Acts (and not with Luke 3–23).⁶⁰ These verses contain several Lucanisms (two genitive absolutes, ἐνθάδε, ἐπιδίδωμι, ἐνώπιον), but also two *hapax legomena* (βρώσιμος, ὁπτός).⁶¹ As Frans Neirynck notes, the demonstrations after the saying correspond formally to the angelophanies in Luke 1:13–20, 30–37, but the genitive absolute with ἔτι is consistent with the style of Luke 3–23 (Luke 8:49; 9:42; 14:32; 15:20; 22:47; 22:60; also Acts 10:44).⁶²

Luke and Marcion's Gospel agree closely in vv. 38–39, so these common elements cannot derive from an anti-Marcionite redactional program, even though they presuppose a nonspiritual, (flesh-and-) bones view of the postresurrection appearances. *Gospel of Marcion* 24:38–39, according to Tertullian, disagrees with canonical Luke at two significant points: Jesus' invitation to touch him (ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε); and the words σάρκα καὶ. The latter could be interpreted either as Marcion's excision (from the Proto-Lucan core saying) or as an anti-Marcionite addition.⁶³ In Marcion's view, Christ had a body composed not of flesh but of spirit.⁶⁴ According to Markus Vinzent, Luke 24:37–39 provided "a central reference for Marcion's differentiation between the pneumatic corporeality which Christ possesses and which is the soul of the believers, and the material body which comes from the Demiurge and is therefore doomed."⁶⁵ As for ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ

⁵⁹ Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts*, 47, 101. But do vv. 42–43 make sense as anti-Marcionite? For Marcion, Christ's body was "in the likeness of human flesh" (Rom 8:3) but akin to the angels described in Genesis as embodied, tangible, eating food, and so on (Tertullian *Marc.* 3.9; cf. Tob 12:18–19): Vinzent, "Christ's Resurrection," 231–32.

⁶⁰ Luke 24:36b, 40 are included here despite their absence from D it.

⁶¹ Following Fitzmyer's list of Lucanisms (*Luke*, 1:110–13).

⁶² Neirynck, "Récit lucanien," 678–79.

⁶³ Tertullian says that Marcion took the saying to mean that Jesus has no bones, as a spirit does not (*Marc.* 4.43.7); this evasive reading could have worked equally had *Gos. Marcion* 24:39 read "flesh and bones." Epiphanius does not refer to such a reading, but does note Marcion's failure to excise this verse (*Pan.* 42.1.11, *elench.* 78).

⁶⁴ Harnack, *Marcion*, 68, 83–84; Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts*, 34.

⁶⁵ Markus Vinzent, "Der Schluß des Lukasevangeliums bei Marcion," in *Marcion und seine kirchengeschichtliche Wirkung = Marcion and His Impact on Church History* (ed. Gerhard May

ἴδετε, this is understandable as an excision on the theory that Marcion redacted canonical Luke. Although the heresiologists maintained that Marcion thought that Jesus' body was intangible (e.g., Tertullian *Marc.* 4.8; Epiphanius *Pan.* 42.11, *elench.* 14), Harnack and Vinzent have demonstrated that this was not the case; thus for Marcion, handling Jesus' body would not demonstrate with certainty its true essence as "pneumatic corporeality," since it would seem as tangible as a normal human body.⁶⁶ On Tyson's theory of Lucan addition, this could have been added in the final redaction of Luke 24 by an editor familiar with Ignatius.

The evidence is equally ambivalent where the two sayings agree: διαλογισμός with καρδιά (v. 38) is consistent with the style of Luke 3–23. Neirynck describes ἐγὼ εἰμὶ αὐτός (v. 39a) as Lucan: while there is no exact parallel in Luke-Acts, similar formulae are found in Luke 1–2 and Acts (Luke 1:19; Acts 9:5; 10:21; 22:3; 26:15). More important, Neirynck has also demonstrated that the structure of vv. 36–38 is redactional, since it is paralleled in Luke 1:28–30. Both contain a greeting, a fearful response, and a consoling word; parallel vocabulary includes (δια)ταράσσω, ξυφοβος/φοβέω, διαλογισμός/διαλογίζομαι.⁶⁷ On the basis of Neirynck's analysis, it is difficult to see Luke 24:38—which is present in Marcion's Gospel—as deriving from a redactional program different from the one that also created the infancy narratives. The present evaluation is necessarily tentative, owing to the sparse textual data. Neither the contents of *Gos. Marcion* 24:36–43 nor the extent to which Marcion edited his source text (whether canonical Luke or Tyson's Proto-Luke) can be determined. Thus, although certain elements of Luke 24:36–43 would be problematic for Marcion's theology, it cannot be ascertained whether these were deleted by Marcion from his source text or were added in an anti-Marcionite redaction.

V. Luke 24:36–43 and Paul on Resurrection

An increasing number of scholars in the last several decades have found it probable that the author of Luke-Acts knew Paul's letters.⁶⁸ Generally, this view

and Katharina Greschat; *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 150; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2002) 79–94, here 86 (translation from Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts*, 35).

⁶⁶ For Marcion, Christ's body was tangible but only apparently fleshly (for the importance of Phil 2:7, see Tertullian *Marc.* 5.20.3). See Harnack, *Marcion*, 83–84; Vinzent, "Christ's Resurrection," 232.

⁶⁷ Neirynck, "Récit lucanien," 667–68.

⁶⁸ E.g., Peder Borgen, "From Paul to Luke: Observations Toward Clarification of the Theology of Luke-Acts," *CBQ* 31 (1969) 168–82; Morton S. Enslin, "Once Again, Luke and Paul," *ZNW* 61 (1970) 253–71; William O. Walker, Jr., "Acts and the Pauline Corpus Reconsidered," *JSNT* 24 (1985) 3–23; Wolfgang Schenk, "Luke as Reader of Paul: Observations on His Reception," in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel* (ed. Sipke Draisma; Kampen: Kok, 1989)

finds support in (1) a strong a priori probability that Luke knew the letters more than simply by reputation, (2) information about Paul's career shared by Acts and the letters, and (3) verbal echoes of the letters in Luke and Acts.⁶⁹ Regarding Luke 24, Wolfgang Schenk shows not only that Luke 24:34 is directly dependent on 1 Cor 15:4-5 but also that Luke 24:9-10, in which figure "the Eleven," "James," and "the apostles," alludes to Gal 1:17-19 and 1 Cor 15:5, 7.⁷⁰ If Luke used 1 Corinthians 15, the apologetic of Luke 24:36-43 may be evaluated in light of Paul's teachings about resurrection.

Luke 24:37-39 contains similar (but opposing) language to 1 Cor 15:35-50: whereas the risen Jesus in Luke says, "A spirit does not have flesh and bones [πνεῦμα σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα οὐκ ἔχει] as you see that I have," Paul, in comparison, describes bodies in "the resurrection of the dead" as "spiritual" (πνευματικός [1 Cor 15:44, 46]). Paul also writes that "the last Adam [became] a life-giving spirit [εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν]" (15:45), and that "flesh and blood [σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα] cannot inherit the reign of God, nor does that which is perishable inherit imperishability" (15:50). The similar language makes Paul a more likely candidate for the object of Luke's apologetic than the other options evaluated above. Many resist the possibility that Luke 24:36-43 reacts narratively to Paul's (or a Pauline) theology of the resurrection,⁷¹ but others (notably Reginald H. Fuller, James M. Robinson, James D. G. Dunn, and Alan F. Segal) have found fundamental disagreement between Luke and Paul.⁷² Although Fuller attributed Luke's emphasis

127-39; David Wenham, "Acts and the Pauline Corpus II: The Evidence of Parallels," in *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting* (ed. Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke; Book of Acts in Its First-Century Setting 1; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993) 215-58; William O. Walker, Jr., "Acts and the Pauline Corpus Revisited: Peter's Speech at the Jerusalem Conference," in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson* (ed. Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998) 77-86; Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 51-147; Mikeal C. Parsons, *Luke: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007) 123-39.

⁶⁹ On the first point, see Morton S. Enslin, "'Luke' and Paul," *JAOS* 58 (1938) 81-91; on the second, see Wenham, "Acts and the Pauline Corpus II"; and on the third, see the comprehensive study in Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 51-147.

⁷⁰ Schenk, "Luke as Reader of Paul," 136-37; Pervo agrees (*Dating Acts*, 70) and notes thirteen other points of significant contact between Luke-Acts and 1 Corinthians (*ibid.*, 139 for summary table).

⁷¹ E.g., I. H. Marshall, *Luke*, 900-901; Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel* (New York: Crossroad, 1984) 228-29; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2:1576; Gerald O'Collins, *Jesus Risen: An Historical, Fundamental, and Systematic Examination of Christ's Resurrection* (New York: Paulist, 1987) 215; Wright, *Resurrection*, 657-58.

⁷² Fuller, *Formation*, 115; James M. Robinson, "Jesus—From Easter to Valentinus (or to the Apostles' Creed)," *JBL* 101 (1982) 5-37, here 11-13; James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered* (Christianity in the Making 1; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003) 870-72; Alan F. Segal, *Life after Death: A History of the Afterlife in the Religions of the West* (Anchor Bible Reference Library; New York: Doubleday, 2004) 441-42, 458-59.

to the narrative needs of appearance stories—the resurrection appearances had to be described in terms of the earthly Jesus in order to be understandable—there seems to be more at stake for Luke.⁷³ The following discussion explores points of theological difference between Paul and Luke and examines relevant narrative strategies in Luke 24 and Acts.

Paul and Luke agreed on resurrection as embodied. Luke's interest in this is obvious, and Paul of course insists on the term σῶμα in 1 Corinthians 15. François Bovon points out that an implication of this for both Paul and Luke is "die Kontinuität der Person." Paul expresses this in his description of the σῶμα πνευματικόν; Luke's risen Jesus demonstrates this by showing his hands and feet and declaring, "It is I myself."⁷⁴ It is difficult, however, to avoid the inference that they disagree as to the constitution of such a body. For Paul it is πνευματικός, while for Luke it is not πνεῦμα but σὰρξ καὶ ὀστέα. Paul's description of resurrection bodies (1 Cor 15:35-57) distinguishes between the σῶμα ψυχικόν (the natural body, animated by the human ψυχή) and σῶμα πνευματικόν (the transformed resurrection body, enlivened by the divine πνεῦμα). Paul uses paired opposites (vv. 42-44) to compare "what is sown" (perishable, sown in dishonor and weakness, ψυχικός) with "what is raised" (imperishable, raised in glory and power, πνευματικός). As Dale B. Martin and Jeffrey R. Asher have argued, Paul's careful distinction between terrestrial and celestial bodies (vv. 39-41) indicates that the problem for the Corinthians may have been whether "the resurrection of the dead" implied that the natural body was innately suitable to the celestial realm.⁷⁵ Paul agrees that it is not, explaining that the body (not the soul) is still destined for the celestial realm, but only after its transformation (vv. 50-57); the resurrection of Christ is the paradigm according to which this transformation will take place (vv. 45-49). The Corinthians would think it fitting that a body transformed for the celestial realm be defined essentially by πνεῦμα, and not by σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα, for according to popular philosophy human/terrestrial and divine/celestial beings shared πνεῦμα in common.⁷⁶ Yet for Paul it is not the inherent suitability of human πνεῦμα to the divine realm that constitutes the basis for the resurrection of the dead, but God's eschatological transformation of the human person in Christ, flesh and blood (and soul?) into spirit in the continuity of an embodied existence.

⁷³ Fuller, *Formation*, 115.

⁷⁴ Bovon, *Evangelium nach Lukas*, 4:585-86.

⁷⁵ Dale B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995) 104-36; Jeffrey R. Asher, *Polarity and Change in 1 Corinthians 15: A Study of Metaphysics, Rhetoric, and Resurrection* (HUT 42; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000) 146-205. Martin (p. 128) discerns in Paul's anthropology a "hierarchy of essences," according to which the heavier materials (σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα and ψυχή) are not appropriate to the divine realm; Asher (pp. 91-117) argues along a similar line but sees the problem in light of the idea of cosmological polarity (between terrestrial and celestial realms).

⁷⁶ Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 119-20, 123-29.

Paul's metaphor of the seed that dies and decays when planted (1 Cor 15:36-38) might suggest that he thinks that the flesh remains behind, decomposed or decomposing, while the spirit is raised. More probably, as Segal argues, Paul has in mind a divine transformation of flesh and blood into πνεῦμα (1 Cor 15:50; Phil 3:20-21), presumably with no remainder.⁷⁷ There is a Greco-Roman analogy to this idea in ancient texts describing apotheoses: whereas older Greek writings tended to connect apotheosis with disappearance or assumption (the bodily removal of a human person by the gods into the divine realm), newer versions of old stories, deferring to Plato, conceived of the apotheosis of figures such as Herakles and Romulus as the dissolution of the mortal body and the elevation of the soul.⁷⁸ A closer analogy may be found in Philo, who describes Moses' apotheosis as a transformation of the twofold nature of body and soul into mind, εἰς νοῦν (*Mos.* 2.288; similarly also *QG* 1.86),⁷⁹ although for Paul the analogous transformation does not eliminate the body.⁸⁰ The resurrection transformation of the believer involves the corruptible and mortal body putting on incorruptibility and immortality (1 Cor 15:53-54), that is, Spirit: the body is retained, but not in its mortal and corruptible aspects/components ("flesh and blood" [v. 50]).⁸¹ But the resurrection transformation of Jesus' body is different for Luke. Where Paul visualizes continuity in corporeality but discontinuity in essence, Luke visualizes continuity in both aspects. This is evident in Luke 24:36-43, but also in kerygmatic and exegetical expressions in Acts (esp. Acts 2:31).⁸² Although the risen Jesus appears to the disciples in a flesh-and-bones body, Luke does not view the resurrection as mere resuscitation; but neither does Luke 24 narrate what Paul means by "spiritual

⁷⁷ Segal, *Life after Death*, 430-34; Allison, *Resurrecting Jesus*, 315-16; cf. Willi Marxsen, *The Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970) 70; Martin (*Corinthian Body*, 128, 132) thinks that the transformation involves shedding the baser elements.

⁷⁸ Ovid *Metam.* 9.266-71; 14.816-28; see Plutarch *Rom.* 28.8. For the connection between bodily assumption and apotheosis, see Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 46-49.

⁷⁹ Wendy Cotter, "Greco-Roman Apotheosis Traditions and the Resurrection Appearances in Matthew," in *The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study: Studies in Memory of William G. Thompson, S.J.* (ed. David E. Aune; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001) 127-53, here 147.

⁸⁰ See Daniel Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Contraversions 1; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994) 59-61, for Philo and Paul on the body.

⁸¹ This takes v. 50a to be synonymous with v. 50b, referring to the bodily constitution of human beings living or dead, and not (as Joachim Jeremias and others have argued) contrasting living human beings with the dead. See John Gillman, "Transformation in 1 Cor 15,50-53," *ETL* 58 (1982) 309-33; Asher, *Polarity and Change*, 151-55; cf. Joachim Jeremias, "Flesh and Blood Cannot Inherit the Kingdom of God (1 Cor. XV.50)," *NTS* 2 (1955-56) 151-59; Andy Johnson, "On Removing a Trump Card: Flesh and Blood and the Reign of God," *Bulletin for Bible Research* 13 (2003) 175-92.

⁸² In Acts 2:31 Luke transposes σὰρξ from Ps 15:9 LXX into v. 10 so that it reads "nor did his flesh see corruption," even though the context in Acts 2:29-36 has to do with the messianic character of the resurrection, not the (de)composition of Jesus' body.

body" (the risen Jesus can be recognizable or incognito, suddenly appear or disappear).⁸³

The disagreement may result partly from different understandings of the components of the human person, in particular, different valuations of "flesh" and "spirit." Paul's conviction that "flesh and blood" must be transformed in order to have a share in God's kingdom is related to his mainly positive affirmation of "body" in contrast with his overwhelmingly negative appraisal of "flesh."⁸⁴ An important text for illuminating this implication of 1 Cor 15:50 is Gal 5:19-21: following a table of the "deeds of the flesh," Paul writes that "those who do such things will not inherit God's kingdom" (v. 21b). According to Dunn, "the negative factor was not . . . bodily existence itself but the ephemeral character of human existence as existence in desiring, decaying flesh which, as it is focused on and clung to, subverts that existence as existence before and for God."⁸⁵ For Paul, σάρξ can signify that which is weak and corruptible about human existence: it is by means of the flesh that sin exercises its dominion over human persons (Rom 7:5, 25; cf. 6:12), and flesh represents that component of the human person that is opposed to the work of God (Rom 8:6-7; Gal 5:16-26). Paul speaks of an embodied life in which the believer experiences, albeit partially and incompletely, the indwelling and empowerment of the divine Spirit as the positive side of a transformation that negatively involves the crucifixion of the flesh through the believer's identification with Christ (Gal 5:24-25; cf. Rom 6:1-14). This embodied life is the beginning of God's re-creative work in the human person, a work that is completed in the resurrection of the dead, when Spirit overtakes flesh and blood entirely, just as "the last Adam became a life-giving Spirit" (1 Cor 15:45) in the first and paradigmatic instance of resurrection. In contrast, there is no evidence that Luke would have shared Paul's negative and dualistic assessment of σάρξ (see Luke 3:6 = Isa 40:5 LXX; Acts 2:17 = Joel 3:1 LXX; also Acts 2:31, for resurrection as pertaining to flesh).⁸⁶ Evidently Luke did not distinguish, as Paul did, between "body" (as a neutral term, necessary to human existence on any plane) and "flesh" (as a negative term for what is subject to moral and physiological corruption).⁸⁷ For Luke, as for later commentators, "resurrection of the body" makes no sense without "resurrection of the flesh" (and bones).⁸⁸

⁸³ Wedderburn, *Beyond Resurrection*, 29-32.

⁸⁴ See Boyarin, *Radical Jew*, 57-85; James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 62-73.

⁸⁵ Dunn, *Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 72.

⁸⁶ Wright (*Resurrection*, 658) notes that "Luke is not wedded to the special Pauline terminology in which 'flesh' (*sarx*) always designates that which is corruptible, and often that which is rebellious," but considers this grounds for *not* thinking that Luke's "flesh and bones" reveals a disagreement with Paul.

⁸⁷ Dunn, *Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 70-73.

⁸⁸ E.g., Tertullian *Marc.* 5.10.4, which identifies "carnal" with "corporeal."

Equally problematic for Luke would be the apocalyptic language Paul uses for his primary experience of Christ (e.g., Gal 1:15), or the vagueness of his language in relation to other "visions and revelations of the Lord" (e.g., 2 Cor 12:1-4): the resurrection appearance Paul claims could be understood as a revelatory experience, that is, a vision.⁸⁹ Paul's correlation of his experience with those of other apostolic figures (1 Cor 15:5-8) would also jeopardize, from Luke's perspective, the "reality" of their experiences (that is, their unquestionably nonvisionary nature).⁹⁰ Such experiences would therefore be unverifiable but also open-ended and susceptible to deployment in heterodox claims to legitimacy. Thus, Robinson, Dunn, and Segal see Luke 24:36-43 as a reaction against Paul's arguably "spiritualized" or "visionary" presentation of the resurrection appearances.⁹¹ Luke narrowly defines the resurrection appearances as to their chronology (during the forty days), their character (Jesus eating and drinking with his followers), and the persons involved (the male apostles, that is, the Twelve, who accordingly legitimate all offshoots of the Jerusalem-based movement). At the conclusion of these appearances, the risen Jesus ascends so that he can dispense ("pour out") the promised Holy Spirit (Acts 2:33). In light of this, Paul's tendency to see the risen Christ active as Spirit in and among believers (e.g., Rom 8:9-11; 1 Cor 15:45; 2 Cor 3:17-18), or indeed as indwelling believers (e.g., Rom 8:9; 2 Cor 13:5; Gal 2:19-20), probably would have seemed problematic to Luke.⁹²

In light of this discussion, several of the narrative devices employed in Luke 24 and Acts also supply evidence that Luke's concern was with Pauline views. These may be listed briefly. (1) As Robinson notes, Luke consistently demotes Paul as a resurrection witness, not only by placing his experience outside the limits of the apostolic resurrection appearances (contrast Acts 9:1-8 with Acts 1:3; 10:40-41), but even by having Paul refer to others, not including himself, as resurrection witnesses (contrast 1 Cor 9:1; 15:8 with Acts 13:30-32). Paul therefore is not counted by Luke as among the "apostles" (Acts 1:21-22, 26; 15:2; contrast Gal 1:1; 1 Cor 15:8-11) and is never called by that term in Acts, except as "delegate" of the church at Antioch (Acts 14:4, 14).⁹³ Paul's career is still the narrative

⁸⁹ Numerous scholars have noted the openness of ὡφθη, "he appeared" (1 Cor 15:5-8; Luke 24:34) to different connotations: see, e.g., Henk J. de Jonge, "Visionary Experience and the Historical Origins of Christianity," in *Resurrection in the New Testament* (ed. Bieringer et al.), 35-53, here 43-47.

⁹⁰ On Luke's redactional tendency to materialize spiritual experiences, see, e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:484 on Luke 3:22.

⁹¹ Robinson, "Jesus—From Easter," 11-13; Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 871; idem, *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1975) 121-22; Segal, *Life after Death*, 442, 459.

⁹² Robinson, "Jesus—From Easter," 13.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 8.

focus of much of Acts, but in Luke's presentation he is not a witness to the resurrection. (2) Related to this demotion of Paul is the promotion of Peter as the primary resurrection witness. According to Luke 24:34, which probably depends on 1 Cor 15:5, Peter is the first to whom the risen Jesus appeared, and he is also spokesman for the resurrection proclamation and hermeneutic in a variety of settings (Acts 1:15-26; 2:22-36; 3:11-16; 4:1-4, 5-12; 5:27-32; 10:34-43; cf. Luke 22:31-32). (3) In what is probably a Lucan creation, Peter corroborates the message about the empty tomb by visiting it himself (Luke 24:10-12).⁹⁴ In light of Luke 24:37-39, it appears that Luke intended not only to resolve the problem of the women's testimony but also to secure the character of the appearances: the primary resurrection witness determines that Jesus appears to his followers only in a manner that involves his flesh-and-bones body, absent from the tomb. (4) Where Paul can use πνεῦμα to describe the presence of the risen and exalted Christ, Luke's chronology forges a clear narrative distinction between the risen Jesus and the Spirit. For Luke, the risen Jesus is concretely present only in the resurrection appearances, and after the ascension is manifest only in visionary experiences (Acts 7:55-56; 9:1-8, etc.; 18:9-10). The Holy Spirit descends at Pentecost, poured out by the ascended and exalted Christ, who has received the Father's promise (Acts 2:32-34).

Two issues remain. First, it is unclear whether the contrasts between Paul and Luke on resurrection bodies should be understood as evidence that the author of Luke disagreed with Paul's argument in 1 Corinthians 15 as it stands, or as it was being interpreted in his day. Vincent has argued convincingly for the influence of Paul's resurrection experiences on Marcion, and one can see the potential usefulness of Paul's "spiritual body" to Marcion's conception of Christ's "pneumatic corporeality," as Vincent has termed it.⁹⁵ Thus, Luke could have been taking issue

⁹⁴ See further Daniel A. Smith, *Revisiting the Empty Tomb: The Early History of Easter* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2010) 103-6. Luke 24:12 is one of the so-called Western non-interpolations, being absent from Western witnesses (D it); it displays some parallels with John 20:3-10. Some see it as a scribal addition to Luke: see esp. Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) 221, 223-27; Michael Wade Martin, "Defending the 'Western Non-Interpolations': The Case for an Anti-Separationist *Tendenz* in the Longer Alexandrian Readings," *JBL* 124 (2005) 269-94, here 280-85. Neirynck, however, argues compellingly for the verse as a Lucan redactional creation. See Frans Neirynck, "Once More Luke 24,12," *ETL* 70 (1994) 319-40; idem, "Luke 24,12: An Anti-Docetic Interpolation?" in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel* (ed. A. Denaux; BETL 161; Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 2002) 145-58. Neirynck ("Anti-Docetic Interpolation?" 148-52) details significant Lucanisms (including the pleonastic ἀναστὰς and the combination of θαυμάζω with τὸ γεγονός) and argues that John 20:3-10 depends on Luke 24:12 (*ibid.*, 152-56).

⁹⁵ Vincent, "Christ's Resurrection," 230-33; idem, "Schluß des Lukasevangeliums," 81-86. Tertullian does not say that Marcion used 1 Cor 15:42-49 along these lines, but he does connect 1 Cor 15:50 and Rom 8:3 with Marcion's view that Christ was a "phantasm" (*Marc.* 5.14).

with an interpretation of the resurrection appearances that lay somewhere on a trajectory between Paul and Marcion. Luke's approach, however, seems to have been to negate Paul's language, rather than to delimit its interpretive possibilities.

Second, there remains a question of narrative logic: if Luke's negation of πνεῦμα and affirmation of σὰρξ καὶ ὀστέα is anti-Pauline, what can it mean for the disciples to think that they were "seeing a spirit" (Luke 24:37)? Robinson may have been correct that "this identification of the . . . resurrected Christ as the Spirit is then in substance what Luke rejects as the false assumption that they had seen a ghost."⁹⁶ That is, one way to make narrative sense of "seeing a pneuma(tic body)" is to approximate it to a cultural commonplace, that of seeing a ghost, although this interpretation apparently did not motivate the apologetic negation of πνεῦμα in Luke 24:37, 39. The motif of fear (v. 37) and the language of doubt (v. 38) could hint at Luke's concerns about Paul's resurrection anthropology. Since for Luke, as for later Christian authors, bodily resurrection must be fleshly resurrection, Paul's view of a "spiritual body" (1 Cor 15:44-46) becomes in Luke's story the "[disembodied] spirit" that the disciples think they see and that the author's risen Jesus expressly refutes.

⁹⁶ Robinson, "Jesus—From Easter," 13.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.