Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis or dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis or dissertation in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis or dissertation. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis or dissertation. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis or dissertation.

Signature:

_____ _____

Alexander P. Thompson Date

Raised from Ignorance to Knowledge:
Recognition and the Resurrection Appearances of Luke 24

By

Alexander P. Thompson
Ph.D.

Graduate Division of Religion
New Testament

_____

Steven J. Kraftchick
Advisor

_____

Niall W. Slater
Committee Member

_____

Walter T. Wilson
Committee Member

Accepted:

_____

Lisa A. Tedesco, Ph.D.
Dean of the James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies

_____

Date

Raised From Ignorance to Knowledge:
Recognition and the Resurrection Appearances of Luke 24

By

Alexander P. Thompson
M.Div. Candler School of Theology
M. Litt., University of St. Andrews,
B.A., University of Evansville

Advisor: Steven J. Kraftchick, Ph.D.

An abstract of
a dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in Graduate Division of Religion
New Testament
2019

Abstract

Raised from Ignorance to Knowledge:
Recognition and the Resurrection Appearances of Luke 24
By Alexander P. Thompson

Luke 24 depicts several resurrection appearances of Jesus to his disciples in and around Jerusalem. This work argues that these appearances should be interpreted as recognition scenes, following the wider literary tradition of recognition described by Aristotle and prevalent in Greek, Roman, and Jewish literature. Chapter 1 offers a history of interpretation of Luke 24, paying particular attention to questions of literary form in order to propose the recognition type-scene as a more appropriate category of interpretation. Chapters 2 and 3 trace the use and development of recognition scenes in Greco-Roman and Jewish literature respectively, focusing on the form of the scenes and their function in the wider narratives. Chapter 4 offers an exegetical analysis of Luke 24 using the elements of the recognition type-scene to demonstrate the form of the appearances as recognition scenes. It also uses the recognition tradition to cast light on a range of interpretive issues in Luke 24 including the density of affective language, the use of evidence, and the focus on scriptural interpretation. Chapter 5 then locates the recognition scenes of Luke 24 as the climax of the gospel, demonstrating how recognition brings the plot, characterization, and themes of the narrative to a powerful closure. Recognition functions as the cognitive, affective, commissive, and hermeneutical climax of the narrative for the characters internal to the narrative and for the readers. Chapter 5 also articulates how recognition was adapted by Luke to support a wider theological vision where the resurrection of Jesus was the fulfillment of God's plan. Overall, the work argues that the use of recognition in Luke 24 represents a conscious use of a widespread literary technique in order to create a fitting and artful climax to the narrative of Luke's Gospel, earning it a lasting place in the Western literary imagination.

Raised from Ignorance to Knowledge:
Recognition and the Resurrection Appearances of Luke 24

By

Alexander P. Thompson
M.Div. Candler School of Theology
M. Litt., University of St. Andrews,
B.A., University of Evansville

Advisor: Steven J. Kraftchick, Ph.D.

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in Graduate Division of Religion
New Testament
2019

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is the result of years of conversation, research, and writing that would not have been possible without the support of several individuals. I am grateful to my advisor, Dr. Steven Kraftchick, for his support and guidance through every stage of the project. The idea for the work first emerged from conversations in his class on resurrection in the New Testament. He has been a great advisor, a lively conversation partner, and a strong supporter of my work. I am also thankful for the support of my other committee members, Dr. Niall Slater and Dr. Walter Wilson, who have offered helpful feedback throughout the process. Many other faculty members of the Emory community have shaped and supported my work, whose names are too numerous to mention. I am also grateful for the wider academic community at Emory's Graduate Division of Religion, especially my colleagues in New Testament, who have provided invaluable encouragement and helpful feedback. Finally, I am grateful to my wife and son without whose support, patience, and encouragement, I would never have finished this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

"Let's assume for the present that [Jesus] foretold his resurrection. Are you ignorant of the multitudes who have invented similar tales to lead simple-minded hearers astray?...Doubtless you will freely admit that these other stories are legends (μύθους), even as they appear to me; but you will go on to say that your resurrection story, this climax to your tragedy, is believable and noble (τὴν καταστροφὴν τοῦ δράματος εὐσχημόνως ἢ πιθανῶς)."
Celsus as cited in Origen, *Against Celsus* 2.55

One of the first published critiques of Christianity was the pagan philosopher Celsus' *True Doctrine*, where the resurrection of Jesus was a favorite target. Celsus challenged the Christian claim that the resurrection of Jesus was a unique and true story since similar tales about the raising of Greek heroes were considered legends. He further suggested that the account of Jesus' death and resurrection was not a believable and noble climax to the Christian story because the supernatural elements that surrounded these events were similar to the artificial interference of a *deus ex machina* in ancient dramas.[1] Ultimately, he objected that Christians failed to situate their own writings in the wider literary milieu. This critique was at once both literary and historical. Was the resurrection narrative a fitting climax to the gospel? And to what extent was this climax similar to and distinct from the wider literary milieu?

Celsus' literary critique invites enagement with Aristotle's *Poetics*, since it was the most important work of literary criticism in antiquity. Aristotle offers a theoretical discussion on the construction of literary works through the analysis of ancient epic and tragedy. Plot (μῦθος) was of primary importance as it provides the natural progression through a narrative and could be called "the soul of tragedy (*Poet.* 1450a39 [Halliwell, LCL])." The plot's climactic moment,

[1] This critique from Celsus is explored in detail in Margaret M. Mitchell, "Origen, Celsus and Lucian on the 'Dénouement of the Drama' of the Gospels," in *Reading Religions in the Ancient World: Essays Presented to Robert McQueen Grant on His 90th Birthday*, ed. David E. Aune and Robin D. Young, NovTSup 125 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 215–236.

called the μετάβασις, brought resolution to the whole narrative (*Poet.* 1442a).[2] In his treatment of ancient tragedies, Aristotle articulated three plot devices for bringing a narrative to its climax: reversal, suffering, and recognition. If we follow Aristotle, the way to assess the force of Celsus' critique of the Christian narrative is to explore the extent to which a gospel utilized these plot techniques to create the climax of its narrative about Jesus.

This work argues that the plot technique of recognition was used in the resurrection appearances of Luke 24 to bring the Gospel to its climax. Aristotle defined recognition (ἀναγνώρισις) as "a change from ignorance to knowledge, leading to friendship or enmity, and involving matters which bear on prosperity or adversity (*Poet.* 1452a21-23[Halliwell, LCL])." Aristotle also illustrated the various means of producing recognition with well-known examples from Homer's *Odyssey* and the fifth century tragedians. However, the popularity of recognition as a climactic literary device extended well beyond Aristotle's treatise as recognition scenes are attested across ancient genres in the Greek literary milieu, the Hebrew Bible, and Hellenistic Jewish texts. The popularity of recognition as a literary technique was supported by many elements in ancient culture including "metaliterary scholarship, rhetorical *paideia*, the constant production, distribution, and reading of texts, as well as oral retelling."[3] Thus, the recognition technique was deeply imbedded in the literary milieu of Luke's Gospel and was readily available to give form to its climax.

Commentaries on Luke 24 have occasionally appealed to the recognition tradition, especially in relation to the recognition in the Emmaus pericope (Luke 24:13-35). C.H. Dodd

---

[2] Later ancient authors like Celsus prefer the term καταστροφή instead of μετάβασις, as referenced in Celsus' critique. Cf. Lucian *Alex.* 60; *Peregr.*, 37. See also Mitchell, 223-6.

[3] Kasper Bro Larsen, *Recognizing the Stranger: Recognition Scenes in the Gospel of John*, BibInt 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 20.

suggested that the center of the Emmaus story "is ἀναγνώρισις–for it seems proper in this case to use the technical term applied by ancient literary critics to the recognition-scene which was so often the crucial point of a Greek drama."[4] Similarly, Karl Kerenyi's work on literary techniques in the Greek and Roman novels was often cited as providing impressive parallels to the recognition in the Emmaus story.[5] Recent commentators have expanded these observations to include the recognition parallels between Jesus' appearances in Luke 24:36-43 with the return of Odysseus and the proof of his identity through his scar.[6] Geoffrey F. Nuttal has even suggested that Luke's work has a strong affinity for recognition such that "the dialectic of men's ignorance and knowledge, of their blindness and the moment of recognition, seems to have fascinated Luke."[7] However, the analysis of recognition in Luke 24 has remained undeveloped, and recognition in Luke 24 as the climax to Luke's Gospel has not received the detailed treatment it deserves.

The following work will correct this lack of scholarship in two significant ways. First, I will locate Luke's use of recognition in the resurrection appearances of Luke 24 against the wider ancient literary milieu to argue that the appearances are *formally* recognition scenes that were crafted to provide a fitting conclusion to the gospel narrative. Second, by contextualizing Luke

---

[4] C. H. Dodd, "The Appearance of the Risen Christ: An Essay in Form-Criticism of the Gospels," in *More New Testament Studies* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), 108.

[5] Kerenyi's work is cited approvingly by Friedrich Hauck, *Das Evangelium des Lukas (Synoptiker II)*, *THAT* 3 (Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchandlung D. Werner Scholl, 1934), 289–91; Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas, THAT* 3 (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961), 442–43.

[6] R. Alan Culpepper, "The Gospel of Luke," in *The New Interpreter's Bible: Volume IX* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1995), 479, claimed "Aristotle would have been pleased with the recognition scene of the Emmaus story." See also Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, SP 3 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2006), 401; François Bovon, *Luke 3: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 19:28-24:53*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 368.

[7] Geoffrey F. Nuttall, *The Moment of Recognition: Luke as Story-Teller* (London: Athlone Press, 1978), 13.

24 in light of the literary conventions of the recognition scene, I will explore how the resurrection appearances of Luke 24 participate in the ancient recognition tradition. I will show that recognition scenes do not have a universal function but are uniquely tailored to fit each narrative context, with the literary conventions supporting a work's larger purposes. Following the tradition, Luke 24 uses recognition to provide a fitting resolution to the key literary and theological themes in Luke's Gospel. Overall, Luke 24 is simultaneously participating in the wider recognition tradition of antiquity even as it uses this tradition to its own unique literary and theological ends.

My argument will unfold in five chapters. Chapter 1 will offer a history of scholarship on Luke 24 that pays particularly attention to debates about the form of the resurrection appearances in that chapter of the Gospel. I will then define the recognition type-scene and propose that it is a more appropriate form for the analysis of Luke 24. Chapters 2 and 3 will illustrate the formal elements and literary conventions of the recognition type-scene as it was used and developed in Greco-Roman and Jewish literature respectively. Chapter 4 will deploy these literary conventions to offer an exegetical analysis of Luke 24. Chapter 5 will then use narrative analysis to demonstrate how the recognition scenes in Luke 24 function as the literary and theological climax of Luke's Gospel.

CHAPTER 1
HISTORY OF SCHOLARSHIP AND METHODOLOGY

"A man who has spent his youth and manhood in the minute study of New Testament texts and of other people's studies of them, whose literary experience of those texts lacks any standard of comparisons such as can only grow from a wide and deep and genial experience of literature in general, is, I should think, very likely to miss the obvious things about them. If he tells me that something in a Gospel is legend or romance, I want to know how many legends and romances he has read, how well his palate is trained in detecting them by the flavour; not how many years he has spent on that Gospel."[8]

1.0: The Emergence of Criticial Scholarship on Luke 24

Luke 24 has occupied a prominent place in the history of biblical interpretation because of its witness to the resurrection of Jesus. The earliest interpreters used Luke 24 as an apologetic text to stress the historicity of the resurrection and the nature of Jesus' risen body to counter the opponents of a blossoming orthodoxy.[9] The apologetic tendency continued through the scholastic debates of the Middle Ages and served as a major point of contention among the English Deists in the 18th century.[10] But under the influence of the Enlightenment, New Testament scholarship

[8] C.S. Lewis, "Fern-Seed and Elephants," in *C.S. Lewis: Essay Collection and Other Short Pieces*, ed. Lesley Walmsley (London: Harper Colllins, 2000), 244.

[9] Cf. the anti-docetic polemic in Ignatius, *Smyrn.* 3.1-3, Origen's response to Celsus in *Cels.* 2.50-60, and Tertullian's use of the passage against Marcion in *Marc.* 4.43.

[10] For a medieval interpretation, see Bonaventure, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke Chapters 17-24*, trans. Robert J. Karris, Bonaventure Texts in Translation Series (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute Publications, 2004), 2226. For its interpretation among Eglish Deists, see the debate between Peter Annet and Thomas Woolston on the nature of the resurrection in Thomas Woolston, *A Sixth Discourse on the Miracles of Our Saviour, in View of the Present Controversy between Infidels and Apostates.* (London, 1729), http://find.galegroup.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=emory&tabID=T001&docId=CW123369305&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE. ; Peter Annet, *The Resurrection of Jesus Considered in Answer to The Tryal of the Witnesses. By a Moral Philosopher*, 2nd ed. (London: 1743), http://find.galegroup.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=emory&tabID=T001&docId=CW120268273&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE.

shifted its focus from the use of Luke 24 in apologetic argument to a consideration of its literary form.

D.F. Strauss was the pioneer of the critical literary shift as he appealed to the category of myth in ancient literature in order to assess the literary forms in the Gospels. Strauss defined myth as "the representative of an event or of any idea in a form which is historical, but, at the same time characterized by the rich pictorial and imaginative mode of thought and expression of the primitive ages."[11] The gospel's mythic form was apparent though its violation of the natural order of cause and effect through divine intervention and its use of ancient Messianic ideas.[12] In a mythic framework, the accounts of the empty tomb and resurrection resisted harmonization in their details so that their discrepancies demonstrated the resurrection appearances were the result of subjective visions of the earliest disciples.[13] In recounting the appearances, the details of the stories were embellished with details derived from Jewish theophany myths.[14] While scholars would challenge many of Strauss' conclusions, his method of analyzing the literary features of Luke 24 through comparison with ancient literature became the dominant arena of scholarly debate.

1.1: History of Religion Scholarship

The use of comparative literature in New Testament scholarship blossomed in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century as numerous scholars shared a concern to study the

---

[11] David Friedrich Strauss, *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*, trans. George Eliot (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973), 53.

[12] Strauss, *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*, 88, 91.

[13] Strauss, *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*, 713, 739-41.

[14] Strauss, *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*, 730, 744.

development of Christianity as part of the wider development of ancient religion in the Meditteranean world.[15] However, history of religion scholarship tended to displace Strauss' concern for literary features by focusing on parallels in religious phenomena. For instance, Hermann Gunkel suggested that the forms of the New Testament resurrection accounts paralleled stories of dying and rising gods from Babylonia, Syria, Greece, and Rome, asserting that the gospel accounts differed little from the wider ancient religious landscape.[16] Gunkel singled out the Emmaus appearance in Luke 24 as an example of an ancient epiphany that paralleled a wider tradition reflected in Genesis about a mysterious divine presence walking among humanity.[17] The religious phenomena of epiphanies emerges as the first major category for comparison with the resurrection appearances.

The comparison with ancient epiphanies also produced the first comments on recognition in the resurrection appearances. Karl Kerenyi's research on the ancient romances forged the connection by arguing that the ancient Greek and Roman novels were indebted to the stories of the death and resurrection of the deities Osiris and Isis so that the recognition of lovers at the climax of these novels was an expression of epiphanic recognition of the risen deities. The literary technique of recognition in the romances was an outgrowth of the religious experience. [18] The overlap of recognition and resurrection in Luke followed this religious-literary pattern. Although Kerenyi's work introduced the literary technique of recognition in the study of Luke

---

[15] On the emergence of the history of religion research, see William Baird, *History of New Testament Research, Volume 2*: *From Jonathan Edwards to Rudolph Bultmann* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 222.

[16] Hermann Gunkel, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903), 76–79.

[17] Gunkel, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments*, 71.

[18] Karl Kerényi, *Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1927).

24, recognition was understood only as part of a larger phenomenon of epiphanies, casting a long shadow over the study of Luke 24, especially among German commentators.[19] Recognition was not assessed on its own terms but entered the conversation as a feature of epiphanies, which I intend to show is an inadequate treatment of the literary technique.

Scholars have since complicated the conclusions of the history of religion school by nuancing the broad category of epiphany. Many have insisted on the differences between the epiphany of a hidden deity and the appearance stories of an individual's return from the dead.[20] Instead, they have proposed a more accurate class of parallels that focus on Hellenistic and Roman heroes like Romulus or Apollonius of Tyana.[21] Many of these comparisons have had a lasting influence on the interpretation of Luke 24.[22] While the lasting contribution of the history of religion school is expanding the ancient parallels to the resurrection appearances with the wider religious landscape of antiquity, the danger is that the preoccupation with *religious* comparison neglects the *literary* form present in the resurrection appearances. This is especially important for the analysis of recognition since it is first and foremost a literary technique in antiquity.

---

[19] Kerenyi's influence can be see in Hauck, *Das Evangelium des Lukas (Synoptiker II)*, 292; Wilfried Eckey, *Das Lukasevangelium: unter Berücksichtigung seiner Parallelen* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004), 982. More recently, Marco Frenschkowski has followed this wider tradition in rejecting recognition and instead using the category of epiphany in his interpretation of the Emmaus story, claiming that recognition scenes are too dependent on complex plots of deception. Such a claim is dependent on a narrow view of recognition derived from the ancient novels alone and does not do justice to the full range of recognition in the ancient world. See Marco Frenschowski, *Offenbarung und Epiphanie*, 2 vols., WUNT 2.79-80 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1995), 228–31.

[20] George Rowland Brunk, "The Concept of the Resurrection According to the Emmaus Account in Luke's Gospel" (Ph.D. diss., Union Theological Seminary, 1975), 394.

[21] Arnold Ehrhardt, "Emmaus: Romulus and Apollonius," in *Mullus: Festschrift Theodor Klauser*, JAC 1 (Münster: Aschendorffsche, 1964), 93–99.

[22] One prominent example is the comparative analysis of Luke 24 in light of ancient figures in Sjef van Tilborg and Patrick Chatelion Counet, *Jesus' Appearances and Disappearances in Luke 24*, BibInt 45 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 129–247.

1.2: Form Criticism

The history of religion school's concern for parallels was subsequently developed in form criticism. Form criticism attempted to articulate the various literary forms (*Gattung*) that made up the New Testament and link them to particular life settings (*Sitz im Leben*). Early form critics followed the tendency to treat the form of the resurrection appearances in Luke 24 as epiphanies. For instance, Martin Dibelius argued that the epiphany tradition was able to hold together the biographic material and the religious meaning of the resurrection appearances in Luke 24.[23] Similarly, Rudolf Bultmann cited Gunkel to support his definition of the Emmaus story as a typical legendary theophany. However, Bultmann moved beyond Gunkel in describing the complexity of Luke 24 as a "self-conscious literary work" that has "to be styled editorial."[24] Bultmann emphasized how Luke 24 was a complex fusion of different functions and motifs, highlighting two in particular: an apologetic defense of the resurrection (Luke 24:13-35; 36-43) and a missionary charge (24:44-48).[25] Dibelius and Bultmann both show a growing awareness of the complex literary features of Luke 24 that eventually led scholars to depart from a reliance on the epiphany category. The complexity in the form of Luke 24 led to three key developments that proved crucial for the understanding of recognition in Luke 24.

First, C.H. Dodd proposed a new taxonomy for the forms of the appearance tradition that emphasized recognition. He rejected the epiphany parallels and instead articulated an appearance

---

[23] Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel* (New York: Scribner, 1965), 297-9. Dibelius considered the account of the story of Emmaus as a cult legend in almost pure form. Inclusion of legends like the Emmaus or the Jerusalem appearances are the result of the missionary growth of the Church and the need to include elements that both resonated with the wider culture and provided an apologetic defense of the faith. A similar analysis of Emmaus as a 'cult legend' with secondary insertions is argued by Hans Dieter Betz, "Origin and Nature of Christian Faith according to the Emmaus Legend," *Int* 23.1 (1969): 32–46.

[24] Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, rev. ed. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1963), 286.

[25] Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 288–89.

form.[26] Dodd described two types of appearances: a simple form that had only recognition and command (Class I), and a more developed form that included various theological expansions (Class II).[27] He followed Bultmann and Dibelius in noting the complexity of Luke 24, defining its appearances as Class II. Thus, the walk to Emmaus was originally a simple appearance of the Lord shaped like ancient tales (*Novellen*), which was subsequently expanded by apologetic motifs. Dodd recognizes the same apologetic development in the appearances in Jerusalem (24:36-42).[28] Importantly, Dodd's articulation of the appearance form placed recognition at the center of even the simplest resurrection accounts, a feature he correlated with the ancient literary technique. As he comments on the Emmaus story,

> "It is however worth noting that here, as elsewhere, the story begins with the disciples feeling the loss of their Lord, that Jesus takes the initiative, and that dramatic centre of the whole incident is ἀναγνώρισις—for it seems proper in this case to use the technical term applied by ancient literary critics to the recognition scene which was so often the crucial point of a Greek drama."[29]

However, Dodd does not support this claim with extensive parallels to ancient recognition scenes since he finds such parallels insignificant in the face of the uniqueness of the Synoptic material.[30] Still, Dodd's acknowledgment of the central place of recognition in the appearance tradition and his link to the wider dramatic tradition marks a major development in the interpretation of Luke 24.

---

[26] Dodd, *More New Testament Studies*, 133.

[27] Dodd, *More New Testament Studies*, 118.

[28] Dodd, *More New Testament Studies*, 112, 127-8.

[29] Dodd, *More New Testament Studies*, 108.

[30] As noted in Brunk, "The Concept of the Resurrection According to the Emmaus Account in Luke's Gospel," 364.

The second major development is found in John E. Alsup's monograph *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition.* [31] His work proceeds in three distinct parts. First, he carefully argues for the distinctiveness of the post-resurrection appearance tradition from the kerygma, empty tomb, and the ascension accounts.[32] The second portion of the monograph offers a meticulous treatment of the appearance tradition in order to articulate an appearance form (*Gattung*). Alsup develops Dodd's work by defining a specific appearance form whose key elements include verbs of seeing/encounter, reactions of recognition, the identity of the appearing one, the response and address of the appearing one, a reaction and rejoinder from those receiving the appearance, and a culminating moment.[33] Alsup follows Dodd by placing the element of recognition at the center of the diverse resurrection appearances.[34]

However, it is the third part of Alsup's work that made the most significant contribution to the study of the resurrection appearances. Alsup sifted through the numerous parallels to the resurrection appearances from the wider history of religion research with greater precision in order to focusing on the Greco-Roman *theios aner* tradition (e.g., Apollonius of Tyana).[35] Finding these parallels largely unconvicing, Alsup instead used the Hebrew Bible tradition of anthropomorphic theophanies as the source of the NT appearance form because they provided stronger comparison to the physical appearance of the risen Lord and a better framework for

---

[31] John E. Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition: A History-of-Tradition Analysis; with Text-Synopsis*, Calwer theologische Monographien 5 (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1975), 54.

[32] Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition*, 61, 106, 145.

[33] These characteristics are laid out in the appended text-analysis in Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition*.

[34] Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition*, 212.

[35] Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition*, 214-39.

words of promise and commission.[36] But the influence of the Hebrew Bible on the appearance tradition of the Gospels occurs only on the conceptual level.[37] While Alsup's work refines the analysis of the form of the resurrection appearances and possible parallels, his conclusions reiterate earlier form critics' preoccupation with the epiphany tradition rather than following Dodd's suggestion to examine the literary technique of recognition. Still, his work remains the most prominent defense of a specific appearance form and a major conversation partner on the background to Luke 24.

The third development in form criticism is Jerome Neyrey's attempt to define the resurrection appearances as a vocation or commissioning form.[38] Key elements in this form are the introduction, confrontation between messenger and those chosen for leadership, a commission mandate, objections, offers of proof and reassurance, and a conclusion with departure. As commission stories, the resurrection stories function to legitimate the authority of important individuals in the group.[39] Neyrey's work provides a competing alternative to form criticism's reliance on theophanies for parallels to the form of the resurrection appearances.[40]

An overview of form critical research provides three possible forms for the interpretation of the resurrection appearances of Luke 24: the epiphany, the appearance form, or the commissioning form. While recognition is often treated as an element that occurs in these

---

[36] Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition*, 271.

[37] Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition*, 270. This conclusion is also supported by Brunk, "The Concept of the Resurrection according to the Emmaus Account in Luke's Gospel," 394-7.

[38] Jerome H. Neyrey, *The Resurrection Stories* (Wilmington, DE.: Glazier, 1988), 26.

[39] Neyrey, *The Resurrection Stories*, 98.

[40] James L. Bailey and Lyle D. Vander Broek, *Literary Forms in the New Testament: A Handbook*, (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992), 145.

various forms, it is never understood as a form in its own right despite the scholarly awareness of its centrality in the resurrection appearances.

1.3: Redaction Criticism

As form criticism wrestled with the form of the resurrection appearances, redaction criticism focused on the editorial changes in Luke 24 in order to identify unifying tendencies between its various narratives. Paul Schubert argued that Luke 24 was deliberately unified into a fitting conclusion to Luke's Gospel through the theme of proof from prophecy, a motif well-attested throughout the Gospel.[41] Richard Dillon argued that Luke had redacted the resurrection accounts to stress the Easter revelation as a pure gift from God rather than the result of human logic.[42] The apologetic motif in the physicality of Luke's resurrection appearances was inherited from a source, which Luke had redacted to emphasize faith apart from sight.[43] Like Dodd before them, Schubert and Dillon note the centrality of recognition in Luke 24 but prefer to highlight other themes as the unifying tendency of the chapter. Many redaction studies followed in the wake of these works and resulted in a lively conversation about Luke's redactional tendencies, but the discussion of recognition was never significantly developed.[44]

---

[41] Paul Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," in *Neutestamentliche Studien Für Rudolf Bultmann* (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1954), 173-77.

[42] Richard J. Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word: Tradition and Composition in Luke 24*, AnBib 82 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978). Dillon argued that the empty tomb generates complete incomprehension among the disciples, who reject the women's Easter message. The recognition at Emmaus is the result of divine disclosure rather than any empirical perception of those on the road or their scriptural understanding.

[43] Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Minister of the Word*, 165–66.

[44] For further redaction critical studies on the appearances, see Reginald H. Fuller, *The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives*. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980); Grant R. Osborne, *The Resurrection Narratives: A Redactional Study* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1984). For shorter works, see Kathy Lorraine Anderson, "Recognizing the Risen Christ: A Study of the Non-Recognition/Recognition Motif in the Post-Resurrection Appearance Narratives (Luke 24:13-35; John 20:11-18; and John 21:1-14)" (M.A. thesis, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 2004); Bennett Uchegbulam Enyioha, *Nonrecognition as a Motif in the Post-Resurrection Appearance*

1.4: Narrative Criticism

Redaction criticism's identification of unifying tendencies in the Gospels eventually led to scholarly investigation of the Gospels as coherent narratives, often with appeal to traditional literary categories derived from Aristotle's *Poetics*, that resulted in significant gains in studies of character and plot techniques in Luke-Acts. [45] Narrative research has contributed to a growing interest in recognition in Luke 24.

Jacques Dupont and Jean-Noël Aletti have each proposed the category of recognition to various ends in their work on Luke's Gospel. Dupont has argued that the Emmaus pericope is best structured as a dramatic story with a final climactic recognition in line with Aristotle's *Poetics*.[46] Although working only on the Emmaus appearance, Dupont attempts to draw out the implications of recognition as a climax of a narrative plot. In his *L'Art de Raconter Jesus Christ*, Aletti devotes a whole chapter to Luke 24 in order to stress how the chapter is both a recapitulation of major themes of Luke's Gospel (e.g., prophecy, sight, Jerusalem) as well as a fitting climax to the story of Israel as a whole.[47] Aletti has stressed the literary artistry in Luke 24

Narratives (PhD. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1985). These works note the place of recognition in Luke 24 but do little to develop it as a theme.

[45]For characterization, see John A. Darr, *On Character Building: The Reader and the Rhetoric of Characterization in Luke-Acts*, Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992). For plot, see Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, 2 vols; FF (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986). For the plot technique of reversal, see Frederick W. Danker, *Luke*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 47–57; John O.York, *The Last Shall Be First*, JSNTSup 46 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991).

[46] Jacques Dupont, "Les Disciples D'Emmaüs," in *Études Sur Les Evangiles Synoptiques*, vol. 2 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985), 1178–81.

[47] Jean-Noël Aletti, *L'art de raconter Jésus Christ: L'écriture narrative de l'évangile de Luc* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1989), 187–97.

and its role as providing closure to whole gospel narrative. Elsewhere Aletti has attempted to demonstrate how recognition was used differently in the conclusions of the Synoptic Gospels.[48]

However, the most complete treatment of Luke 24 as recognition scenes is in a recent article by Craig T. McMahan. Drawing on Culpepper's treatment of *anagnorisis* in John's Gospel, McMahan compares Luke 24 to the recognition scenes in Homer's *Odyssey* with four key elements: testing, deception, foretelling, and recognition. Luke 24 contains three recognition scenes (1-12; 13-35; 36-53) that support the movement from ignorance to knowledge to persuade the original audience about the truth of Jesus.[49] While McMahan's article offers a treatment of the Lukan recognition scenes, his appeal only to the scenes of recognition in the *Odyssey* leads him to neglect the rich tradition of recognition in ancient literature. This results in a lack of nuance in interpreting the purpose of recognition in Luke 24.

Still, the resurgence of research on recognition as an interpretive category for Luke 24 holds promise for more detailed analysis. Furthermore, detailed analysis is needed to correct the shallow references to recognition scenes characteristic of recent commentators. I. Howard Marshall is aware of recognition parallels but rejects their appropriateness in interpreting the Emmaus appearance, explaining "The fact that parallels to features of the story can be cited from pagan legends does not alter this verdict; in reality none of the alleged parallels is sufficiently forceful to suggest that motifs from folklore have played a vital part in the development of the story."[50] In contrast, Luke Timothy Johnson explains the Emmaus story by noting "The

---

[48] Jean-Noël Aletti, *The Birth of the Gospels as Biographies with Analyses of Two Challenging Pericopes*, trans. Peggy Manning Meyer, AnBib 10 (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 2017).

[49] Craig Thomas McMahan, "More than Meets the 'I': Recognition Scenes in The Odyssey and Luke 24," *PR St* 35.1 (2008): 87–107.

[50] I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC 3 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 891.

Hellenistic reader would find nothing strange in this account of appearance and disappearance, for such stories were in circulation about figures such as Romulus."[51] While he notes that the account contains the elements of a "recognition story," his suggestion that Luke is unique from the recognition tradition in his sensitivity to human emotion is easily refuted by an awareness of the wider recognition tradition.[52] François Bovon offers a succinct articulation of the Emmaus story as a recognition scene and notes parallels between Jesus' demonstration of his hands and feet with Eurycleia's recognition of Odysseus through his scar in Homer's *Odyssey*. [53] But his discussion lacks sustained attention to form and parallels. Finally, R. Alan Culpepper's commentary on Luke uses the category of recognition explicitly in its interpretation of the Emmaus account.[54] Despite Culpepper's extensive exploration of recognition scenes in John's Gospel, the treatment of recognition in Luke 24 is constrained by the commentary's form and audience.[55]

[51] Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 398.

[52] Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 401. No reader, ancient or modern, would see Luke 24 as more sensitive to human emotion than the heart-wrenching recognition scenes of Odyssey upon his return to his family in Ithaca or the reunion of Orestes with his sister Electra in the tragedies. The affective function of recognition is inherent in Aristotle's definition of recognition.

[53] Bovon, *Luke 3*, 368, 372.

[54] Culpepper, "The Gospel of Luke," 475–80.

[55] See R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design,* FF (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 88-89. His work has recently been surpassed by the excellent history and literary treatment of recognition in John by Kasper Bro Larsen, *Recognizing the Stranger: Recognition Scenes in the Gospel of John.* Culpepper notes Luke's use of the recognition scene in the story of Emmaus in his commentary on Luke, though he does not explore recognition and the Jerusalem appearance. Work on recognition in John’s Gospel will be discussed below.

1.5: Recognition in Other New Testament Scholarship

While recognition has not received detailed treatment in Lukan scholarship, it has emerged as a prominent interpretive focus in other NT scholarship, especially on the Gospel of John. R. Alan Culpepper used Aristotle to argue that the plot of John's Gospel hinges on the recognition or rejection of Jesus as it is played out in numerous recognition scenes.[56] Culpepper further developed this idea in subsequent work where he notes, "One of John's distinguishing features is its depiction of Jesus as the Revealer and the various responses to him in a narrative that draws the reader to affirm Jesus' identity through a series of episodes that describe attempted, failed, and occasionally successful *anagnorises* (recognition scenes)."[57] Culpepper's thesis was subsequently refined in Bro Kaspar Larsen's *Recognizing the Stranger*. Larson offers a complete treatment of the recognition scenes in John's Gospel with a nuanced methodology that draws on semiotics and a robust understanding of ancient recognition scenes. Larson describes the formal elements of a recognition scene from his survey of ancient literature as consisting of the following elements: meeting, cognitive resistance, display of tokens, recognition, and attendant reactions/reunion.[58] Through the use of recognition scenes, John's Gospel involves the reader in a process of decoding the identity of Jesus in order to lead the reader to belief.[59]

Besides these careful studies of recognition in John, discussions of recognition have cropped up elsewhere in NT scholarship in recent decades. For instance, Dennis MacDonald has

---

[56] R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*, 88–89.

[57] R. Alan Culpepper, "The Plot of John's Story of Jesus," *Int* 49.4 (1995): 353.

[58] These are the characteristics as laid out in Larsen, *Recognizing the Stranger*, 59–70.

[59] Larsen, *Recognizing the Stranger*, 214.

used parallels between Jesus' hidden identity and the return of Odysseus in Homer to challenge Wrede's interpretation of the Messianic secret in Mark's Gospel.[60] While few scholars would follow MacDonald's claim of Mark's literary dependence on Homer, others have nevertheless maintained the category of recognition in interpreting Jesus' transfiguration in Mark.[61] More broadly, Petri Merenlahti has described a poetics of the Gospels with the help of Aristotle's categories of recognition and reversal in order to demonstrate that all of the gospels deploy both a plot of action and a hermeneutic plot of identity to intepret the death of Jesus. The plot of action leads to a reversal in Jesus' fortune while the plot of identity generates recognition.[62]

Of more interest is how recognition in the New Testament has attracted scholars from other academic disciplines. Literary critic Piero Boitani has commented on the nuances of recognition scenes in the Bible with particularly focus on John, noting how biblical writers tend to depart from classical tradition by making space for revelation.[63] Classicist John Taylor has also attempted comparison between ancient recognition scenes and various NT narratives.[64] Finally, Diana Culbertson has attempted to use the idea of recognition as a way to discern the poetics of revelation in religious experience, paying particularly attention to Mark and John in

---

[60] Dennis R. MacDonald, "Secrecy and Recognitions in the Odyssey and Mark: Where Wrede Went Wrong," in *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative*, ed. Ronald F. Hock, J. Bradley Chance, and Judith Perkins, SBLSymS 6 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 151. Of particular importance for MacDonald is the literary dependence of Mark's account of the transfiguration with the recognition scene between Odysseus and Telemachus.

[61] Mary Ann Beavis, *Mark*, Paideia (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011); John T. Carroll, *Jesus and the Gospels: An Introduction*, 1st ed. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2016), 54.

[62] Petri Merenlahti, *Poetics for the Gospels*, SNTW (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2002), 105.

[63] Piero Boitani, *The Bible and Its Rewritings*, trans. Anita Weston (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 145–53.

[64] John Taylor, *Classics and the Bible: Hospitality and Recognition*, Classical Literature and Society (London: Duckworth, 2007), 118–35.

their use of recognition to highlight the subjective apprehension of revelation that can result in transformation.[65] Unfortunately, these scholars have also avoided detailed treatment of Luke 24.

Recent research shows that the discussion of recognition in the interpretation of the New Testament is hardly a novel idea. Yet, it does point out two important issues that frame the thesis of this project. First, there is no detailed study of recognition in Luke 24 or the Gospel of Luke, a gap in scholarship I will seek to rectify. Second, any current study on recognition in the New Testament requires participating in a wider interdisciplinary conversation with classicists and literary scholars. The interdisciplinary conversation will be an important framework for the presentation of my argument.

1.6: The Limits of Previous Scholarship on Recognition in Luke 24

The history of scholarship on recognition in Luke 24 presents an interesting situation where scholars have long noted the category of recognitionin the interpretation of Luke 24, but have failed to develop it in any significant way. This is the result of at least two major oversights. First, scholars have minimized the comparative potential of ancient recognition scenes in the interpretation of Luke 24. Second, scholars have separated recognition in Luke 24 from the wider narrative of Luke's Gospel despite the role of recognition in antiquity as a plot device. Both of these points deserve further development.

First, the comparative analysis between Luke 24 and ancient recognition scenes tends toward reduction or minimization rather than a robust discussion of shared formal and thematic overlap. Scholars tend to downplay the connections between Luke 24 and the ancient recognition tradition in various ways. For example, scholars often limit the recognition parallels to specific

[65] Diana Culbertson, *The Poetics of Revelation: Recognition and the Narrative Tradition*, StABH 4 (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1989), 141–83.

elements such as isolating Jesus' wounds as a parallel to Odysseus' scar. Another form of reduction is focusing on a single parallel text rather the wider tradition. This was seen in McMahan's decision to focus only on Homer's *Odyssey* as a parallel to Luke 24.[66] Finally, reduction often occurs from the perpetuation of a divide between Jewish and Greco-Roman parallels as in Alsup's preference for parallels to Hebrew Bible theophanies alone. These various forms of reduction misrepresent the rich tradition of recognition scenes in the ancient world and the extent to which Jews, Greeks, and Romans all participated in and developed its literary conventions. To cite parallels between Luke 24 and recognition scenes requires a more robust approach to the ancient recognition tradition. To paraphrase C.S. Lewis, NT scholars have shown that they have not read enough recognition scenes to understand Luke 24 as a recognition scene. A robust examination of the ancient recognition tradition is the only corrective to the shallow discussion of recognition in Luke 24.

Second, the scholarly treatment of recognition in Luke 24 has isolated recognition from the wider narrative in a way directly opposed to the use of recognition in antiquity. Interpreters have focused on isolating and dissecting the various forms and tendencies in the chapter rather than locating recognition in light of the wider narrative. Arguably, the dissection of Luke 24 is symptomatic of a desire among most scholars to uncover the "history" behind the appearance tradition just as literary parallels are discussed in terms of historical development or influences rather than as a way to appreciate the artistry of Luke's Gospel. Even narrative critics have treated recognition as an explanation for isolated elements in Luke 24 rather than the climax of

[66] Craig Thomas McMahan, "More than Meets the 'I': Recognition Scenes in The Odyssey and Luke 24," 87–107. A similar example is found in David R. Catchpole, *Resurrection People: Studies in the Resurrection Narratives of the Gospels* (Macon, GA.: Smyth & Helwys, 2002), 70–74, who argues that Luke 24 is deliberately structured to parallel the recognition in the Book of Tobit.

the wider narrative. This can only be corrected by placing the role of recognition in Luke 24 in its wider narrative context.

1.7: The Form of the Resurrection Appearances in Luke 24

The limit of previous research on Luke 24 is nowhere more apparent than the complete neglect of the recognition scene as the form of the appearances in Luke 24. Form critical proposals for Luke 24 have clustered around three possibilities: the epiphany (Gunkel), the appearance form (Alsup), or the commissioning form (Neyrey). While previous scholars have often included recognition as an element in these forms, the recognition scene as a distinct form has never received a comprehensive treatment. The limits of these three forms provide the backdrop for my defense of the resurrection appearances in Luke 24 as recognition scenes.

1.7.1: Epiphany

One of the earliest forms for the resurrection appearances in Luke 24 is the epiphany. In Greek, ἐπιφάνεια can have a range of meanings that include revelatory moments and dreams, though as a technical term it refers to "a visible and frequently sudden manifestation of a hidden divinity, either in the form of personal appearance, or by some deed of power or oracular communication by which its presence is made known."[67] When used in reference to the story of Emmaus, scholars tend to draw comparisons with other stories where the divine is offered hospitality by an unaware person(s).[68]

---

[67] BDAG, 385, s.v. "ἐπιφάνεια." For a discussion of the category in NT scholarship and attempt to chart its development in the NT itself, see Margaret M. Mitchell, "Epiphanic Evolutions in Earliest Christianity," *Illinois Classical Studies* 29 (2004): 183-204.

[68] The most common cited parallel is the story of Philemon and Baucis in Ovid, *Meta.*8.611-724. See Hermann Gunkel, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments*, 76–79. For a more complete

There are several problems with using epiphany to define the literary form of the appearances in Luke 24. First, the resurrection appearances lack many of the characteristic details of epiphanies such as the sense of awe and wonder before the numinous. The risen Jesus does not incite awe by a glorious appearance, but because he has returned from the dead.[69] Furthermore, the identity of the risen Jesus with the crucified Jesus is at the center of Luke 24 rather than questions of divinity. Second, epiphanies are often explicitly joined to a command to start a cultic site. This is clearly lacking in the appearances of Luke 24.[70] Finally, the category of epiphany is too general to be codified as a specific literary form because the term covers a broad range of ancient religious phenomena concerned with human interactions with the divine. Any claim about "epiphanies" requires additional conceptual clarity that could include further subdivisions based on the type of *numen* encountered (e.g., theophanies, angelophanies) or specific shared formal characteristics (e.g., the Dionysian prison-escape scene).[71] The general category of epiphany offers little by way of explanatory potential without significant refinement.[72]

---

study of stories of divine hospitality, see Daniela Flückiger-Guggenheim, *Göttliche Gäste: Die Einkehr von Göttern und Heroen in Der griechisischen Mythologie* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1984).

[69] Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, 1st ed., AB 28-28A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981), 1557. Fitzmyer notes in particular the lack of "apocalyptic stage props" characteristic of revelatory moment including experiences of glory, heavenly mystery, signs in heaven, etc. See also Dodd, *More New Testamnet Studies*, 132-3.

[70] On the importance of the cultic command, see Cora Angier Sowa, *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymns* (Chicago: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1984), 236–80.

[71] John B. Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany: Prison-Escape in Acts of the Apostles.*, BZNW 131 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004), begins with the standard definition of epiphany but eventually concentrates on a specific type of Dionysian epiphany with shared narrative features.

[72] This critique was noted by Alsup which led him to formulate his appearance *Gattung.* See Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition*, 217.

1.7.2: The Appearance *Gattung*

Expanding on the work of Dodd, John Alsup tried to clarify the epiphany form by proposing a more precise appearance *Gattung* built on a subgroup of biblical theophanies he calls *anthropomorphic theophanies*.[73] While Alsup's category is a more tightly bound form for assessing the resurrection appearances, it is also problematic. First, the resurrection appearances of Luke 24 are concerned with an individual returned from the dead while the Hebrew Bible theophanies revolve around the visitation of the divine. Like the comparison with epiphanies, Alsup's form tends to misplace the focus in the narratives from the identity of the returned onto divine manifestation as is central to the biblical parallels.[74] Second, Alsup's form remains a heuristic creation of the scholar rather than an attested ancient category. While this is not a problem if the heuristic category proves helpful, the issue is that the appearance *Gattung* lacks explanatory potential. Alsup acknowledges that the gospels' use of the Hebrew Bible theophanies are purely conceptual and do not impart any specific formal elements or functions to the resurrection appearances.[75] Thus, Alsup's appearance *Gattung* suffers from many of the same limits as the more general epiphany form.

1.7.3: The Commissioning *Gattung*

The third proposed form for the resurrection stories is a common vocation or commissioning form.[76] This form relies heavily on examples of "call narratives" of the Hebrew

---

[73] These characteristics are laid out in the appended text-analysis in Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition*.

[74] A critique cited in Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1557.

[75] Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition*, 270. This conclusion is also supported by Brunk, "The Concept of the Resurrection according to the Emmaus Account in Luke's Gospel," 394-7.

[76] Neyrey, *The Resurrection Stories*, 26.

Bible articulated by Norman Habel.[77] Neyrey argues the New Testament authors utilizing this Old Testament call form in order to highlight the resurrection as grounds for a new missional activity. While the commissioning form does fit the resurrection appearance of Jesus in Matthew 28:16-20 quite well, it is too narrow to be effectively applied to the appearances of Luke 24. It fails to treat specific appearance elements like the issue of identity and its recognition. Furthermore, the focus on commissioning distorts many other key elements in the stories including the proof of Jesus' physicality and the interpretation of Scripture. While Neyrey's work recognizes the formal overlap between the appearance stories and the idea of commissioning that emerges in some aspects of Luke 24 (especially 24:48-49), it lacks comprehensiveness in describing the appearances in Luke 24.

1.8: The Recognition Type-Scene

The inadequacy of these proposed forms grounds my argument that the resurrection appearances in Luke 24 should be interpreted as *recognition scenes*. This category not only best describes the form of the appearances in Luke 24 but also offers insights into the function of these narratives as a plot device. Because the recognition type-scene is well attested in the ancient literary milieu and was treated theoretically as a specific literary technique supporting certain narrative functions, its explanatory potential is both as a *formal* category with clear ancient parallels and as a *functional* category for exploring its purpose.

---

[77] Norman C Habel, "Form and Significance of the Call Narratives," *ZAW* 77.3 (1965): 297–317.

1.8.1: Type-Scene Definition

I have deliberately used *recognition scene* to describe the form of the appearances in Luke 24 to label the form as a type-scene. A type-scene is defined as "a narrative convention which employs a 'repetitive compositional pattern' in that narration of 'certain fixed situations'."[78] While form criticism was developing in nineteenth and twentieth century biblical scholarship, classicists were pioneering a similar study of oral composition in terms of type-scenes. Walter Arend first utilized type-scenes as a way of describing the repetition of fixed situations and motifs in the Homeric epics.[79] An example of the type-scene might not feature all of the individual elements or portray them in the same order, but a formal set of elements provides a starting point for comparing similar scenes.[80] The type-scene served as a formal means of classifying shared narrative sequences as well as a heuristic starting point from which to explore the unique ways each type-scene deploys the conventions to its own larger literary ends.

While the study of type-scenes by classicists and forms by NT scholars have a similar origin in their concern to describe the conventions in oral composition behind written texts, their subsequent use has followed different trajectories. As Robet Alter has explained, type-scene analysis establishes a pattern in order to examine the diverse variations on the pattern; form-

---

[78] As defined in Jonathan Kruschwitz, "The Type-Scene Connection between Genesis 38 and the Joseph Story," *JSOT* 26.4 (2012): 391-2.

[79] Matthew Clark, "Formulas, Metre and Type-Scenes," in *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, ed. Robert Fowler (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 117. Arend's work was similar to the landmark studies of Lord and Parry on the oral composition of the Homeric epics, where certain phrases were identified as fixed tags around which a bard might improvise. See the discussion in Robert Scholes, *The Nature of Narrative* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), 20–27.

[80]Steve Reece, *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene*, Michigan Monographs in Classical Antiquity (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993). He explains, familiarity with a type-scene "is essential in order for an audience to appreciate the nuances and connotations of the formulaic diction; recognize significance sequences and patterns in their various combinations; detect allusions, irony, parody, humor, and foreshadowing; and, in general, distinguish between what is deliberately conventional and generic and what is innovative and unique."

criticism is more about identifying and classifying patterns.[81] This difference in emphasis is also connected to a difference in goal. Form criticism is aimed at classifying units into forms for the sake of uncovering the life-setting. Type-scene analysis focuses on artistic creativity in the deployment of a type-scene.[82] The result is that type-scene analysis tends to stress literary creativity and diversity whereas form-criticism narrows examples down to a generailized life-setting.

My decision to treat the resurrection appearances of Luke 24 under the category type-scene rather than *Gattung* is a deliberate way to stress two aspects of my work. First, the category of type-scene better aligns Luke 24 with the wider literary milieu in which it participates. While form critical categories have often seemed unaware of the way that ancient authors talked about their own writings, the recognition type-scene is an obvious literary convention used, discussed, analyzed, and even mocked in ancient literature. The recognition type-scene is a more historically appropriate category for interpreting Luke 24. Second, the focus on the recognition type-scene attests to a deliberate decision to concentrate on artistic creativity involved in the use of literary conventions. By using the category of the type-scene I am concerned not simply with identifying *that* Luke 24 participates in the narrative pattern of a type-scene. Rather, I want to present a range of type-scene examples in order to examine *how* Luke 24 uses the conventions for its own literary ends. The category of type-scene helps correct previous errors in analyzing the form and function of Luke 24.

---

[81] Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, rev. and updated (New York: Basic Books, 2011), 61.

[82] Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 61.

1.8.2: Aristotle and the Definition of Recognition

Before articulating the recognition type-scene, I want to define what I mean by recognition. While recognition is a widespread literary phenomenon that can be found in literature of all periods, the classic definition of recognition (ἀναγνώρισις) comes from the work of Aristotle.[83] Because his work laid the foundation for the use and development of recognition in the literary milieu around the Gospel of Luke, I take Aristotle's definition as my starting point for the understanding of ancient recognition scenes.

Aristotle defines recognition as "a change from ignorance to knowledge, leading to friendship or enmity, and involving matters which bear on prosperity or adversity (*Poet.* 1452a29-32 [Halliwell, LCL])." Aristotle always subsumes recognition as an element of plot.[84] Plot should provide the beginning, middle, and end of a narrative with each following naturally from the other (*Poet.* 1450b20-30). Recognition, alongside suffering and reversal, is one of the literary techniques for resolving a plot's complications.

Aristotle further develops several key aspects of his definition of recognition. First, Aristotle limits recognition to a change in personal relationships (1452a35). Although one can recognize inanimate objects, Aristotle's view of recognition in plot construction is concerned only with interpersonal recognition. Second, Aristotle closely aligns recognition with his notion

[83] For the widespread occurrence of recognition scenes in folklore, see Vladimir Propp, *Morphology of the Folktale*, ed. Louis A. Wagner, 2nd ed. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1968), 62.

[84] As discussed in Andrew Ford, "The Purpose of Aristotle's *Poetics*," *CP* 110.1 (2015): 4. Although the *Poetics* discusses six elements as crucial to any literary construction (plot, character, diction, thought, spectacle, and melody), Aristotle holds plot (μῦθος) to be of first importance. The other elements can be briefly summarized as follows. Character (ἦθος) consists of the joining of individual action and speech to reveal a person's moral choice. Character is subordinate to the plot because it is through the action of the play that character is expressed (1452a17-19). Character is revealed through thought (διάνοια), a term that does not connote the interiority of a character but how one's moral choice is presented through elements of speech and action. Diction (λέξις) and melody (μελοποιΐα) are concerned with how a work is written, including categories of word choice, ornamentation, metaphor, and poetic meter. Aristotle does not treat spectacle (ὄψις), the visual aspect of literary performance, because he does not consider it central to the art.

of reversal because both produce the shift in the narrative's plot. While recognition can occur apart from reversal, Aristotle states that the most artful tragedies will combine both elements simultaneously (1452a15-20). The most artful examples of tragic recognition use it as the climax of the plot as, for instance, in Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*. Third, Aristotle restricts the use of recognition to a person "not preeminent in virtue and justice, and one who falls into adversity not through evil and depravity, but through some kind of error (*Poet.*1553a12 [Halliwell, LCL])." This limitation stems from Aristotle's own ethical understanding of how plots should operate as an emotional catharsis for the audience. The emotional release of pity or fear for an audience is only possible if recognition reverses characters of a certain ethical value.[85] Thus, an important function of recognition is the change experienced by both characters internal to the narrative and the audience external to it.

Aristotle also creates a taxonomy of the ways that recognition can be constructed in which he categorizes the degrees of satisfaction and artfulness of various recognition scenes in antiquity. The least artistic, but perhaps most common, is recognition through the use of a token (σημεῖον), an object that proves one's identity. Examples of tokens include congenital tokens like birthmarks, acquired bodily tokens like scars, or external items such as a necklace (*Poet.* 1454b25-6).[86] A second inartistic recognition is one contrived by the poet, who introduces an unmotivated demonstration that produces recognition but which is not necessarily required by

[85] In his discussion of the difference between comedy and tragedy, Aristotle recognizes that tragedy is about characters superior to existing humans while comedy represents people inferior to humans (*Poet.* 1448a15-8). These heroic characters are best in the recognition plots of tragedy because of their ability to provoke pity and fear in the audience rather than the revulsion that the prosperity of the wicked or the adversity of the righteous would produce. Comedy tends to focus on less heroic, more banal humans.

[86] The most well-known token in antiquity was the scar of Odysseus, which Homer uses in various ways to prove the identity of Odysseus. See the *Niptra* in Homer, *Ody.* 19.386-475.

the logical sequence of the plot (*Poet.* 1452b4-7).[87] A third type of recognition results from memory (μνήμη) (*Poet*. 1455a3-4).[88] The fourth comes by reasoning, by which Aristotle means the attempt to make inferences from the evidence through the deductive reasoning of the συλλογισμός. He also notes a related type of recognition here that arises from false deduction called παραλογισμός.[89] The most artful recognition is produced by the natural sequence of events in the plot. Because the parts of a plot ought to follow logically from one another, this type of recognition is best because it is not as an artificial intrusion into the plot (*Poet.* 1455a15-20).[90]

While this taxonomy does not exhaust all the possible means of recognition or treat the overlap of the various categories, it does provide two crucial frameworks for the theoretical discussion of recognition. First, Aristotle's view of recognition operates in the realm of proof and argument derived from ancient rhetoric.[91] The required shift from ignorance to knowledge is facilitated by some evidence. Recognitions that rely on evidence that is easily faked (i.e., external tokens like necklaces) are a lower priority than those that emerge from reasoning or

---

[87] Aristotle cites as an example the way that Orestes reveals himself to Iphigenia in Euripides' *Iphigenia Among the Taurians*. While the plot leads Iphigenia to write a letter to her brother and reveal her identity, the brother's response with the proof of his identity is not required by plot but produced by the poet. For the recognition scene, see Euripides *Iph. taur.* 769-826.

[88] Again, Aristotle appeals to Homer's *Odyssey* noting how recognition occurs when Odysseus hears the tale of Alcinous and remembers, leading him to weep. See Homer, *Ody*. 8.521-610.

[89] See also *Poet*. 1460a19-21.

[90] Aristotle's exemplar of a recognition scene is Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*. Because it is probably that Oedipus would want to know who committed the crime, the recognition naturally follows from the plot. Unlike plays that rely on the artificial interference of tokens or the poet in producing recognition, Aristotle's preference for *Oedipus* reveals his own insistence on the centrality of the plot and that it appear reasonable and part of a natural chain of cause and effect.

[91] As argued extensively in Kathy Eden, *Poetic and Legal Fiction in the Aristotelian Tradition* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 7–23. The emergence of tragedy in fifth-century Athens correlates with an increasing rise in studies of rhetoric. On the development of rhetoric in fifth century Athens, see George A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*, 2nd ed. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 27-33.

natural events.[92] Second, the more artful recognitions are those that arise naturally from the plot rather than artistic contrivance, capturing Aristotle's stress on the importance of the reasonable and probable in recognition, as well as its fittingness to a narrative's plot. As Aristotle explains, "Things probable though impossible should be preferred to the possible but implausible. Stories should not comprise irrational components (*Poet*. 1460a25-6 [Halliwell, LCL])." Ancient recognition scenes will thrive on this border between what constitutes a probable recognition and what reflects an impossible recognition created by artistic contrivance. Overall, Aristotle presents recognition as a cohesive literary device with clearly identified elements and an important function in a narrative's plot.

1.8.3: The Recognition Type-Scene

Aristotle's discussion of recognition is the foundation for the recognition type-scene as his taxonomy of types of recognition was subsequently used by scholars to compare examples of recognition.[93] Recent scholarship shows a broad agreement on the elements of the recognition type-scene as illustrated by comparing the following elements of the recognition type-scene defined by three recent scholars.

---

[92] Terence Cave, *Recognitions: A Study in Poetics* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1988), 39.

[93] The modern discussion of a recognition type-scene can be seen already in the early twentieth century by B. Perrin, "Recognition Scenes in Greek Literature," *AJP* 30.4 (1909): 373.

Chart 1: *Anagnorisis* as Type-Scene in Recent Scholarship

Gainsford's Formal Analysis of Recognition in the *Odyssey*[94]	Larsen's Recognition Type Scene[95]	Boulhol's Recognition Scene Elements[96]
Boundary Marker at Start of Scene	The Meeting	*Separation* -separating event -assistants of separation -heavenly comfort
Testing	Cognitive Resistance	*Coming together* -reunion -initial obstacle to recognition
Deception	The Display of Tokens	*Factor of Recognition* -object of recognition -revelatory story
Foretelling	The Recognition	*Production of the Scene* -reversal, pathos, shamelessness
Recognition	Attendant Reactions and Physical (Re-)Union	*Natural Sight and Prerecognition*
Hospitality motifs		*Spatial and Temporal Frames*
Boundary Marker at End of Scene		

The first column shows Peter Gainsford's analysis of recognition scenes in the *Odyssey* 13-24 using modern narratological categories. Gainsford constructs a formal 'grammar' for the recognition scenes which articulates four different moves (testing, deception, foretelling, and recognition) that are subject to various configurations.[97] He also includes certain motifs which

[94] Peter Gainsford, "Formal Analysis of Recognition Scenes in the 'Odyssey,'" *JHS* 123 (2003): 42–44. This is also the type-scene formula followed in McMahan, "More than Meets the 'I': Recognition Scenes in The Odyssey and Luke 24."

[95] Larsen, *Recognizing the Stranger*, 55–71.

[96] Pascal Boulhol, *Αναγνώρισμος: La Scène De Reconnaissance Dans L'Hagiographie Antique Et Médiévale* (Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l'Université de Provence, 1996), 11–50.

[97] Gainsford, "Formal Analysis of Recognition Scenes in the 'Odyssey,'" 52.

are co-extensive with the four moves (e.g., boundary markers; hospitality).[98] A significant limit of Gainsford's analysis, however, is the extent to which his focus on the *Odyssey* distorts his evidence, not least in the formal overlap of hospitality and recognition.[99]

The second column shows Kasper Bro Larsen's description of the recognition type-scene used in his study of the Gospel of John. Larsen's recognition type-scene is derived from a range of ancient examples from Greece, Rome, and the Bible. Larsen's survey of ancient texts is the most comprehensive and, as a result, offers the strongest comparative potential. The constituent elements he notes include the meeting of two parties, the cognitive resistance to recognition, the display of tokens, the recognition proper, and the attendant reactions of the parties.

A third analysis of ancient recognition scenes is found in Pascal Boulhol's recent study of recognition in Christian hagiographies in Late Antiquity and the early Medieval period. He discusses six broad categories that include separation, coming together, production of the scene, natural sight/prerecognition, and spatial temporal frames. He further subdivides these cateogies into more specific elements that parallel Gainsford and Larsen, especially the stress on the meeting, the recognition with its supporting evidence, and the emotional reunion. Several of Boulhol's type-scene elements are peculiar to later Christian literature such as the use of natural sight/prerecognition.[100] Other elements, like the discussion of the types of separation, are best understood as prerequisites to the type-scene rather than a constituent element of the scene itself.

These recent attempts to define the literary conventions of the recognition type-scene highlight several important methodological issues. First, the number and types of texts the

---

[98] Gainsford, "Formal Analysis of Recognition Scenes in the 'Odyssey,'" 44.

[99] A criticism noted in Larsen, *Recognizing the Stranger*, 61.

[100] Boulhol, *Αναγνώρισμος: La Scène De Reconnaissance Dans L'Hagiographie Antique Et Médiévale*, 33–34.

scholar analyzes shapes their discussion of the type-scene. Scholars define the formal elements from the texts in order to classify and compare. While they appeal to the texts to derive these conventions, there remains a subjectivity based on selectivity. The reality, as astutely recognized by Terence Cave, is that the ultimate definition of what constitutes a recognition type-scene is shaped by the particular materials and critical approach of the scholar.[101] Because the purposes of Gainsford, Larsen, and Boulhol are different, it is no surprise that the resulting formal descriptions are themselves different. This does not denigrate the clarity of their methodology, but serves as a reminder that a level of subjectivity penetrates every attempt to delineate literary conventions. Despite these observations, there remains remarkable agreement on what elements constitute a recognition type-scene. For all three authors, recognition scenes require the interaction of two parties, exchanges in which identity is tested and confirmed, and a resulting recognition with its accompanying emotions. However, Larson's type-scene is the most appropriate for our study of the Gospel of Luke as his work emerges from the broadest scope of ancient texts around the New Testament. Thus, I will use his type-scene elements (meeting, cognitive resistance, display of tokens, recognition, and reunion with attendant reactions) throughout my work to identify and compare recognition scenes.

1.8.4. Contemporary Issues in the Study of Recognition

Besides defining the elements of the recognition type-scene, my work will engage recent developments in modern literary critical work on recognition as it has contributed a more robust apparatus for the discussion of major thematic issues intertwined with recognition scenes. Literary scholars have pointed out how Aristotle's definition of recognition "is notoriously full of

[101] Cave, *Recognitions*, 242.

gaps and uncertainties that leave plenty of room for conjecture."[102] These aporia point toward major interpretive questions that must be considered in our analysis of artistic creativity in the deployment of the recognition type-scene.

First, literary critics have questioned what is actually being recognized in the recognition scene. Is it inter-personal (father recognizes son) or intra-personal (hero recognizes his shortcomings)? Aristotle's definition (and the prominent use in the ancient world) was inter-personal recognition, often the recognition between family members or lovers. However, there are some outliers that portray recognition as an internal change concerned with moral illumination.[103] Indeed, the biblical tradition often connects recognition with patterns of repentance.[104] The possibility of depicting self-recognition blossomed in Late Antiquity in Augustine's *Confessions* and laid a foundation for the modern novelist's concern with *anagnorisis* almost exclusively as self-recognition or discovery.[105] Our study of recognition type-scenes will need to be cognizant of the possibility that the literature (especially in the biblical tradition) might use recognition in a way distinct from the Aristotelian definition.

Second, scholars have noted the variety of places in a plot where recognition can take place. While Aristotle insists that recognition is best used as the climax of the narrative's plot, a brief scan of ancient tragedies reveals that recognition scenes can occur at various points in a

---

[102] Cave, *Recognitions*, 27.

[103] As noted in Silvia Montiglio, *Love and Providence: Recognition in the Ancient Novel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 9. A possible example of self-recognition in Greek literature can be found in Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*, an example discussed in chapter 2.

[104] Recognition scenes like Judah and Tamar (Gen 38) or David's recognition and repentance after his affair with Bathsheba (1 Sam 11-12) make self-recognition and repentance explicit. A similar internal recognition is suggested by passages of internal dialogue like Luke 12:17; 15:17-19. See Michal Beth Dinkler, ""The Thoughts of Many Hearts Shall Be Revealed': Listening in on Lukan Interior Monologues," *JBL* 134.2 (2015): 373–99.

[105] Cave, *Recognitions*, 174.

narrative with differing effects. This serves as a reminder that Aristotle's view was not taken as law in antiquity.[106] Exploring the various locations of recognition in a plot expands the possible ways that recognition contributes to its wider narrative context.

Third, literary critics have used Aristotle's definition of recognition to ask further questions about the epistemological and emotional shifts inherent in recognition. Recognition scenes are dominated by two prominent functions, cognitive and affective, as recognition brings a level of intellectual satisfaction and emotional release. As one literary scholar explained, recognition "represents a particularly sensitive conjunction of the formal and the contextual, the one associated with a convention of plot making and the other with issues of human awareness and understanding, in particular issues customarily studied systematically in epistemology and psychology."[107] However, the purpose of the cognitive and affective functions is dependent on the place of recognition in any given narrative. We will need to pay attention to both the means by which this shift from ignorance to knowledge is generated and the nature of the accompanying affective shift.

Finally, modern scholars have analyzed the ways recognition relates to character internal to the narrative and readers external to the narrative. Aristotle was primarily concerned with the shifts occurring between characters in the narrative itself, though he notes the affects of recognition on the audience. However, the term recognition in Greek (ἀναγνώρισις) is derived from ἀναγινώσκω, the Greek word used for reading, suggesting a similarity between the plot

---

[106] As noted in detail by Donald Clive Stuart, "The Function and the Dramatic Value of the Recognition Scene in Greek Tragedy," *AJP* 39.3 (1918): 290.

[107] Barry B. Adams, *Coming-to-Know: Recognition and the Complex Plot in Shakespeare*, Studies in Shakespeare 10 (New York: Lang, 2000), 42.

device and the activity of the audience in making sense of the plot.[108] As Cave explains, "there is plenty of evidence to indicate that *anagnorisis*, once conceptualized as a term of art or a term in poetics, has always contained the germ of equivocation between reading and recognizing."[109] Recognition thus invites a consideration of the hermeneutical function of recognition scenes and its commissive function in calling forth a certain way of living in response. As a recent scholar explained, "If we borrow the *Poetics* as a helpful–though not prescriptive–conceptual tool to consider narrative in general from antiquity to the present, recognition becomes key to the way we make meaning and to the way we read."[110] Our study of recognition thus needs to be aware of interpretation on two levels: the recognition occurring in the narrative and the recognition occurring in the audience's interpretation of the narrative. The cognitive, affective, hermeneutical, and commissive functions might be experienced differently by the characters and the audience/reader.

The plethora of possibilities offered by recognition scenes make recent literary criticism an important conversation partner in our study of recognition in Luke 24. How individual narratives broach these larger thematic issues even as they deploy the literary conventions of the recognition type-scene necessitate an interdisciplinary approach. This work will create a conversation between biblical scholarship, classics, and recent literary criticism around the

[108] One example of the double-meaning of ἀναγινώσκω occurs in Luke 10:26, where the lawyer questions Jesus about the Law and Jesus responds both with a question about how he reads and a parable which invites the act of interpretation and recognition.

[109] Cave, *Recognitions*, 260.

[110] Philip F. Kennedy and Marilyn Lawrence, "Introduction," in *Recognition: The Poetics of Narrative: Interdisciplinary Studies on Anagnorisis*, Studies on Themes and Motifs in Literature 96 (New York: Lang, 2008), 2.

recognition type-scene in order to provide a more comprehensive framework for a study of the ancient conventions of the recognition type-scene in the interpretation Luke 24.

1.9: Summary

The history of scholarship on recognition in Luke's Gospel lacks the comprehensiveness and nuance that the topic invites. Despite the passing references to recognition in the interpretation of Luke 24 in contemporary scholarship, the discussion is confined to shallow comparisons. Overall, past research has failed to analyze the form of the resurrection appearances as recognition scenes, to connect the use of recognition in Luke 24 to the larger plot and themes of Luke's Gospel, and to join this analysis with a robust understanding of the ancient literary conventions of recognition. The judgment of C.S. Lewis is a fitting summary of past tendencies in analyzing recognition in Luke 24. Scholars have noted the similarities with ancient recognition scenes but have not developed their palate from a close study of ancient recognition in order to offer an in-depth study of recognition in Luke 24.

In contrast, I have proposed that the recognition type-scene offers the best category for the interpretation of the resurrection appearance in Luke 24. In the following chapters, I will examine the use of this recognition type-scene in a range ancient literature prior to and contemporary with the Gospel of Luke to help develop a more sophisticated palate for the assessment of recognition in Luke 24. The comparative analysis will simultaneously highlight the prevalence of the type-scene and create a robust understanding of the range of narrative functions and thematic possibilities the type scene offers for the interpretation of Luke 24.

CHAPTER 2
RECOGNITION SCENES IN GREEK AND ROMAN LITERATURE

"In the case of the *Odyssey*, no later author could ever again make a fresh start when shaping a narrative or a visual representation of a voyage, a metamorphosis, a run-in with savages, an encounter with anyone dead, a father-son relationship, *a recognition token*, or a reunion between husband and wife."[111]

2.0: Introduction

The Gospel of Luke participated in the cultural milieu of the first century CE that was heir to a vast Greek literary heritage. A diverse array of classical Greek literature permeated the ancient Mediterranean world in the wake of the Hellenism and the dominance of the Roman Empire. Besides the works themselves, this literary heritage was also transmitted thorough networks of influence, education, and mimesis. The recognition type-scene was part of this dominant literary milieu. Thus, the recognition tradition in Greek and Roman literature provides the most comprehensive starting point for understanding the ancient conventions available to the Gospel of Luke.

2.1: Homer's *Odyssey* as the Foundation of Greek Recognition Scenes

The Homeric epics are the foundation for the Greco-Roman literary milieu, often called the Bible of the ancient Greeks because of the immense influence they wielded in the ancient world.[112] As the first century CE orator Dio Chrysostom noted, "Homer comes first and in the middle and last in that he gives of himself to every boy and adult and old man just as much as each of them can take (*Discourse* 18.8 [Cohoon, LCL])." Or, as Edith Hall has recently shown,

---

[111] Edith Hall, *The Return of Ulysses: A Cultural History of Homer's Odyssey* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2008), 8 (italics are mine).

[112] Lionel D. Barnett, *The Greek Drama* (Folcroft, PA: Folcroft Library Editions, 1972).

"the two Homeric epics formed the basis of the education of everyone in ancient Mediterranean society from at least the seventh century BCE."[113] Homer was the foundation for the Greek literary tradition.

With respect to the recognition scene, Homer's *Odyssey* provides the crucial starting point for the ancient literary conventions. The story of Odysseus' return to his home on Ithaca after the Trojan War was one of many ancient return narratives called *nostoi*, which featured elements of disguise, deception, and recognition.[114] However, the *Odyssey* stands out in the number and length of its recognition scenes. Odysseus' return in disguise in order to test and defeat the suitors results in a number of distinct recognition scenes that are crucial to the structure and thematic content of the work as a whole. [115] As Aristotle explained, the *Odyssey* was "pervaded by recognition" (*Poet.* 1459b.15 [Halliwell, LCL]).[116] The *Odyssey*'s recognition scenes model the formal elements of the type-scene and demonstrate how the conventions of the type-scene were adapted to a work's own ends. I will demonstrate these two points by analyzing several of the recognition scenes and locating them within the wider purpose of Homer's *Odyssey*.

---

[113] Hall, *The Return of Ulysses*, 7.

[114] Albert Bates Lord, *The Singer of Tales*, College ed., Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature 24 (New York: Atheneum, 1976), 121.

[115] As Sheila Murnaghan has argued, "The successive scenes of recognition in which Odysseus' base of support in Ithaca is reconstructed articulate the *Odyssey*'s account of his return in two senses: through their sequence, these scenes provide the structure of the plot; and through their internal form, they express the interdependence of the relationships that make it possible for Odysseus to come back." See Sheila Murnaghan, *Disguise and Recognition in the Odyssey* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 22.

[116] A Byzantine commentator on the *Odyssey* similarly described the recognition scenes as *polytropos*, a word used throughout the text to describe the cunning of Odysseus himself. See Taylor, *Classics and the Bible*, 12.

2.1.1: Odysseus and Telemachus

Odysseus' son Telemachus is the first to recognize the returning hero in a recognition scene that aids the rising action of the plot of Odysseus' vengeance against the suitors that occupies books 12-24 of the *Odyssey*. The scene begins when Telemachus arrives at the house of Eumaeus where the beggar Odysseus is lodging (*Ody.* 16.1-7). When Odysseus *meets* Telemachus, Athena removes Odysseus' disguise as a beggar in order to aid Telemachus' recognition of his father (16.167-180). But Telemachus reacts to the sudden change in Odysseus' appearance with *cognitive resistance* because he believes he is seeing a god. (16.182). Odysseus rebukes Telemachus' explanation with an appeal to his familial relationship to his son in order to prove his identity. He declares, "I am your father, for whose sake with groaning you suffer many a woe, undergoing the violence of men (16.188-9 [Murray, LCL])." But Telemachus continues to question this identity (16.194-200), at which point later examples of the type-scene usually introduces a token to prove identity. However, this scene lacks a display of tokens, with Odysseus instead answering Telemachus' doubts by explaining the role of Athena in his transformation (16.201-212).[117] Telemachus then *recognizes* his father and embraces him in an emotional *reunion* (16.215-6). The reunion concludes with Telemachus' questions about his father's arrival and the problem of the suitors (16.220-235). Telemachus' recognition of his father allows him to become a co-conspirator with Odysseus in orchestrating his successful return to Ithaca.

[117] This lack of tokens remains unique in the recognition scenes of the *Odyssey*, though it can be explained by the development of Telemachus in the narrative. In Book 1, Athena had disguised herself as Mentes and urged Telemachus to seek out information about his father (*Od.* 1.279-283). Telemachus embarks on a voyage that parallels his father's journey in which he learns of his father's greatness and his identity as his father's son. Telemachus is aided by Athena throughout the journey. Thus, Telemachus' earlier experience confirms the providential help of Athena and Odysseus' identity as his father. Telemachus will invoke this new knowledge of his father's greatness and the power of Athena in the dialogue that follows the recognition scene (*Od.* 16.240-243, 263-5).

2.1.2: Odysseus and his Servants

The next set of recognition scenes take place between Odysseus and three of his servants: Eumaeus, Philoteius, and Eurycleia. These three servants are set apart throughout the narrative because of their loyalty to the household and commitment to hospitality.[118] Like Telemachus, they will be instrumental in facilitating Odysseus' defeat of the suitors and their recognition scenes are part of the rising action of the narrative of Odysseus' return. However, these recognition scenes between the servants and Odysseus are subsumed under the wider narrative of his return to his biological family.[119] As a result, "these characters' subordinate, servile status has seemed to be recapitulated in the way in which their allotment of narrative attention is designed to serve the presentation of other, more socially elevated characters."[120] Thus, Eurcyleia's recognition is part of the suspense between Odysseus and Penelope; Philoteius and Eumaeus receive recognition only in order to support Odysseus' defeat of the suitors. While these recognition scenes demonstrate the formal elements of the recognition type-scene, they function primarily to add suspense, dramatic irony, and complexity to the narrative's rising action.

Eurycleia is the first servant to recognize Odysseus in the famous foot-washing scene (*Niptra*).[121] Penelope welcomes the disguised Odysseus into her chamber in order to hear news

---

[118] The swineherd Eumaeus and the cowherd Philoteius swear oaths of support for Odysseus' return (20.235-9). Similarly, the nurse Eurycleia is brought to tears as she reminisces about her master Odysseus (19.360-1). All offer hospitality to Odysseus: Eurycleia washes the stranger's feet (19.386-9), Eumaeus provides food and lodging to the stranger (14.55-81), and Philoteius extends the stranger the right hand of greeting (20.197-8). Their loyalty and hospitality identify them as supporters of Odysseus, worthy of recognition and assistance in the plot of Odysseus' return.

[119] Odysseus first interacts with Eumaeus in Book 14 and Philoteius in Book 20. However, both share a single recognition scene in Book 21 only when their involvement in the attack on the suitors is necessary.

[120] Murnaghan, *Disguise and Recognition in the Odyssey*, 39.

[121] The scene was famous in Antiquity and a common painting on pottery. See discussion in Dennis R.. MacDonald, *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 115–17. It has

of Odysseus' journey (19.104-6). Odysseus responds with a deceitful tale about how he met Odysseus, invoking as evidence a description of Odysseus' cloak and his herald (19.215-240). The clever ruse to hide his identity from his wife contrasts with Eurycleia's accidental recognition when she discovers a token as she washes Odysseus' feet. During the *meeting* between Eurycleia and Odysseus at the washbasin, Eurycleia notes a similarity with Odysseus but *resists* the recognition of his identity (19.380-1). The moment of *recognition* occurs when she uncovers a scar on his leg (19.390-2), generating a narrative "flashback" which recounts how Odysseus received the scar from a boar (19.392-466). This scar is decisive evidence of Odysseus' identity and will become a key token in subsequent scenes (19.467-73).[122] Eurycleia's recognition follows from her discovery, as she declares, "Surely you are Odysseus, dear child, and I did not know you, until I handled all the body of my master (19.474-5 [Murray, LCL])." The subsequent *emotional reaction* includes the drop of the basin, tears, and a mixture of joy and grief (19.467-73). However, Odysseus demands her silence lest she reveal his identity and spoil the plot against the suitors (19.480-490).

The recognition between Odysseus and the other servants, Philoteius and Eumaeus, is similar to Eurycleia's although much briefer. Before enacting his revenge, Odysseus leaves the house and *meets* Eumaeus and Philoteius in disguise (21.186-92). Odysseus questions these servants about their willingness to defend Odysseus if he were to return, leading the servants to vow their allegiance (21.193-99). Odysseus reveals his identity (21.208-220) and pre-empts any

---

also served as an important scene among recent literary critics thanks to the analysis offered in Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, trans. Willard R. Trask, 1st Princeton Classics ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013), 3–23.

[122] As Terence Cave explains, "The scar, then, is more than a sign by which Odysseus is recognized. It composes his identity by calling up retrospectively a fragment of narrative, since only narrative can compose identity as continuity once a severance has occurred, and the scar here may well look like a sign of the wound, the hiatus, the severance constituted by Odysseus' wanderings." See Cave, *Recognitions*, 23.

cognitive resistance by offering them a sure sign of his identity (σῆμα ἀριφραδες; 21.217). The servants carefully examine the *displayed scar* (21.221-2) and, satisfied with the proof, *recognize* Odysseus and *respond* with a tearful embrace (21.223-7).

2.1.3: Odysseus and Penelope

The *Odyssey* depicts two climactic recognition scenes.[123] The first takes place between Odysseus and his wife, Penelope, who has remained loyal to Odysseus throughout the narrative in her declarations and actions (19.150-170). Although there is debate about whether or not Penelope had earlier recognized Odysseus' identity during the foot-washing scene, the formal recognition scene does not occur until Book 23.[124]

After the slaughter of the suitors, Eurycleia runs to Penelope to announce Odysseus' return (23.5-9). Penelope rejects the news as the old woman's foolishness and instead insists that the slaughter is the result of a god's vengeance (23.60-65). Penelope follows Telemachus's response to the arrival of Odysseus by considering it the manifestation of a god. When Penelope *meets* Odysseus, her vision of his identity is not clear. Rather, "she sat long in silence, and amazement came upon her heart; and now with her eyes she would look full upon his face, and now again she would fail to know him with his wretched clothes upon his body (23.90-95 [Murray, LCL])." Penelope does not immediately recognize her husband, leading her son to rebuke her hard-heartedness (23.97-104). Penelope responds by explaining that she will recognize Odysseus when they exchange signs unknown to others (23.105-110).

[123] A case can be made that Odysseus' unveiling of his identity to the suitors also constitutes a recognition scene. However, the scene lacks evidence of Odysseus' identity and the emotional reunion. Furthermore, the form of the recognition is largely subsumed to the wider narrative of the contest over the bow and the ensuing battle. I have thus omitted it as an example of the recognition type-scene.

[124] For a recent example of the on-going debate about Penelope's recognition of her husband, see Kostas Myrsiades, "Introduction: Early Recognition in the Odyssey," *College Literature* 38.2 (2011): ix–xi.

Her *cognitive resistance* leads to a complex testing of Odysseus' identity. First, Odysseus is bathed and, in the process, Athena graces Odyseus with strength and beauty so that he appears "in form like the immortals (23.163 [Murray, LCL])." But this glorious transformation is not enough to convince Penelope, leading Odysseus to repeat Telemachus' complaint about her hard-heartedness (23.166-173). Rather, Penelope tests Odysseus by calling for his bed to be brought out of the bridal chamber so he might sleep (23.174-181). Odysseus is enraged by her request because he had made the bed out of a rooted tree around which the house was built (23.181-204). Knowledge of the bed, like the evidence of his scar, serves as a *token of recognition* because it provides continuity between Odysseus' identity before and after his return. It is also a symbol of the unique relationship of husband and wife, a sign unknown to others. Because Odysseus is not naturally a husband as he is a father or a son, the recognition of the wife requires a token appropriate to his identity in relation to her. Odysseus' knowledge of the bed generates Penelope's *recognition* and *emotional reunion* with her husband (24.205-8). Homer explains, "her heart melted as she recognized the tokens, still unshaken, which Odysseus showed her (24.205-6 [Murray, LCL])."

Unlike the role of the earlier recognitions in the plot's rising action, this scene is deliberately shaped to serve as the narrative climax. The reunion of husband and wife is described through the metaphor of the sailor returning from sea to his homeland (23.231-240). The juxtaposition of Odyssey's reunion with his wife and a sailor returning from a voyage offers a sense of closure to Odyssey's *nostos*. This sense of closure is also expressed in the space allotted for Odysseus and his wife to lie with one another and recount the stories of their struggles (23.300-343). Because the recognition was dependent on the power of the tokens to provide narrative continuity, so Penelope, having recognized her husband, can now properly

understand the narrative of her husband's voyage since she knows its ending. As Sheila Murnaghan explains, "Only when all significant dangers are past and Odysseus is reunited with Penelope can storytelling be associated with open self-revelation, and only then can both storytelling and self-revelation be enjoyable experiences."[125] This climactic recognition scene expresses a hermeneutic function in giving shape and meaning to the whole preceding narrative through its happy resolution.

2.1.4: Odysseus and Laertes

Odysseus' story does not end with his recognition by Penelope but goes on to recount his reunion with his father, Laertes. After the reunion with Penelope, Odysseus goes to Laertes' farm in order to see if Laertes will recognize him (24.205-18). As Odysseus *meets* his father while his father is tending his plants. Odysseus is so overcome by grief that he wishes to reveal himself immediately. But afraid that a sudden recognition would be too shocking for the old man, he decides that it is better to test his father (24.230-34).[126] He first tells his father a story about Odysseus that produces more grief (24.244-320). Odysseus then reveals his identity, exclaiming "That man am I, father, myself, standing here, of whom you ask, come back in the twentieth year to the land of my fathers (24.321-2 [Murray, LCL])." Laertes responds to this revelation with *cognitive resistance* and demands a clear sign of Odysseus' identity (24.329). Odysseus *displays* the scar from the boar (24.350-55) and also offers an additional token only his father would known: his knowledge of the various trees that his father pointed out to him as a child (24.336-

[125] Murnaghan, *Disguise and Recognition in the Odyssey*, 169.

[126] While this might seem a strange tact, it can perhaps be explained by reference to an earlier reunion between Odysseus and his old dog Argos. Argos, upon instantly recognizing Odysseus, immediately dies as if from the shock (17.326). N.J. Richardson concludes that Odysseus' testing of his father "is to prepare the ground for the shock of recognition by (as it were) 'softening up' Laertes to begin with." See N.J. Richardson, "Recognition Scenes in the Odyssey and Ancient Literary Criticism," *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 4 (1984), 228.

344). The knowledge of the trees, like the wedding bed, is a sign well suited to creating narrative continuity in Odysseus' identity and in attesting to their unique relationship. The result is a moment of *recognition* and *attendant emotions* by his father whose "heart melted, as he recognized the tokens which Odysseus showed him without error (24.345-6 [Murray, LCL])."

Laertes' recognition of Odysseus occurs as the narrative approaches its conclusion and gives the scene a climactic importance in the narrative. In the reunion with his father, Odysseus' return has reached its conclusion as he is reunited with his family in his household. However, the news of the slaughter of the suitors had reached the neighboring households and results in a desire for vengeance against Odysseus. This circle of retribution is curtailed by the gods in the final moments of the *Odyssey* when Athena commands a cessation from bloodshed right before a clash between Odysseus and the suitors' supporters (24.531-2). Odysseus' recognition by his father is the last recognition in the narrative, imbuing it (along with the recognition by Penelope) as part of the climax of the whole plot.

2.1.5: The Function of Recognition in the *Odyssey*

The *Odyssey* uses the recognition type-scene in the rising action of the plot of Odysseus' return and in the climactic reunion of Odysseus with his wife and father. They are all part of a wider plot of return that begins in book 13 with Odysseus' arrival at Ithaca, with the scenes drawing on the themes invoked by an initial recognition scene in Book 13 between Odysseus and the goddess Athena. This initial recognition scene establishes the thematic role of *xenia* and *theoxeny* as the interpretative framework for the predominant role of recognition in the narrative. I will briefly examine this scene as a way to illustrate the function of recognition in Homer’s *Odyssey*.

Book 13 begins with Odysseus stranded on his homeland, but unable to recognize the land because the goddess Athena has cast a mist over it (13.187-90). When Odysseus sees the lands, he utters, "Alas, to the land of what mortals have I now come? Are they cruel, and wild, and unjust? Or are they kind to strangers and fear the gods in their thoughts (13.200-202 [Murray, LCL])?" The same question is repeated at several key junctures in the narrative to foreground the issue of *xenia*.[127] *Xenia* is a term used to describe the ritualized hospitality toward strangers in ancient Greece. Throughout the *Odyssey*, the hospitality and inhospitality offered to Odysseus by the strangers he encounters provides the major impetus for his success and struggles on his journey home.[128] As Douglas Stewart noted, "The *Odyssey* could be viewed as little more than an endlessly complex study of the possible ramifications of the guest-host relationship."[129] Hospitality and recognition are linked throughout the *Odyssey* as the ramifications of identity and disguise are explored in the interactions of guest and host.[130] In positive *xenia*, hospitality is offered to a stranger prior to the revealing of a guest's identity. The eventual revelation of the identity of the guest allows the host to receive reciprocal hospitality in

[127] The same question is uttered with Odysseus arrival in Phaecia (6.131-2), when recounting his travels (8.641), and upon landing on the Cyclop's island (9.197). See Reece, *The Stranger's Welcome*, 145.

[128] In the *Odyssey*, "Homeric hospitality is a triangle, whose points are host, guest, and food. When it works properly, benevolent hosts ply welcome guests with wholesome food. When it goes wrong, each element turns into a dark obverse (so for example the guest becomes a prisoner), or the triangle disturbingly rotates: the elements themselves change places and become confused." See Taylor, *Classics and the Bible*, 12. Besides the positive hospitality the disguised Odysseus receives from his faithful household members, other examples of positive hospitality include the reception of Odysseus by the Phaecians (5.388-13.187) and the reception of Telemachus by King Menelaus (4.1-624). Examples of negative hospitality include the treatment received from Polyphemus (9.118-630), the witch Circe (10.145-631), and the suitors who both take advantage of his wife's hospitality and offer poor hospitality to himself disguised as a beggar. For the structural role of hospitality in the narrative as a whole, see Reece, *The Stranger's Welcome*, 205.

[129] Douglas J. Stewart, *The Disguised Guest: Rank, Role, and Identity in the Odyssey* (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 1976), 77.

[130] For instance, Telemachus reveals his identity to King Nestor after receiving hospitality at Pylos (8.82-112).

the future from the guest.[131] However, the revelation of one's identity is also a source of great difficulty in the travels of Odysseus.[132] Odysseus often takes on a disguise or tells lies to protect his identity, leading others to discover his identity.[133] The centrality of *xenia* in the narrative frames the plot of Odysseus' return to Ithaca as a guest seeking hospitality whose identity is in question.

The recognition between Odysseus and Athena invokes the dangers involved in Odysseus' earlier stories of hospitality and identity. [134] When Athena *meets* with Odysseus disguised in shepherd's clothes (13.220-27), she tells Odysseus that he has returned to Ithaca (13.248-9). Odysseus does not immediately rejoice, but lies about his identity, having learned from his journeys the importance of disguise (13.250-285). Athena (herself disguised) delights in his cunning and, transforming herself from a shepherd to a beautiful woman, reveals her divine identity and her role in orchestrating Odysseus' arrival (13.287-310). Yet Odysseus *questions* her identity and demands proof by having her reveal his homeland (13.311-329). Athena offers him this *token* by lifting the mist and allowing Odysseus to *recognize* Ithaca. Odysseus *responds* with great emotion (13.352-55). Importantly, the moment of recognition of his homeland is consciously linked with Odysseus' trust and recognition of the goddess Athena.[135] Odysseus'

---

[131] Reece, *The Stranger's Welcome*, 25.

[132] For instance, the revelation of his identity to Polyphemus made Odysseus subject to Poseidon's wrath (9.555-595). See Stewart, *The Disguised Guest*, 42.

[133] The recognition by a stranger occurs most strikingly when Odysseus is brought to tears from hearing the bard Demodocus' song about the Trojan War, leading his host to urge Odysseus to reveal his identity through telling his story (8.587-655). See Reece, *The Stranger's Welcome*, 27–28.

[134] Technically, this recognition of the goddess could be classified as an epiphany though it bears the marks of the recognition type-scene. It is perhaps better to see epiphanies as a wide-spread religious phenomenon that could be narrated in a number of ways, including through epiphanic recognition scenes. On the blurring of these lines, see section 2.2 below.

[135] Emily Kearns, "The Return of Odysseus: A Homeric Theoxeny," *ClQ* 32.1 (1982): 2–3.

recognition grounds their active partnership that drives the plot of Odysseus' against the suitors.[136]

But Odysseus' recognition of Athena is also unique in the narrative because it is explicitly a *theophany*, an appearance of a god, and thus forges a connection between *xenia* and *theoxeny*. *Theoxeny* refers to the hospitality offered to gods in disguise. The *theoxeny* tradition was common in ancient Greece and was supported by examples of both positive and negative hospitality.[137] These stories were a shared background in the *Odyssey* and are often referenced by characters as grounds for their hospitality to strangers (e.g., 7.201-3).[138] Crucial to the plot of the *Odyssey* is not the mistreatment of a god, but the mistreatment of Athena's favorite Odysseus that results in the judgment of suitors. *Xenia* and *theoxeny* are linked together as Odysseus and Athena are co-conspirators so that *xenia* withheld from Odysseus warrants Odysseus' enactment of the judgment of a *theoxeny*. As Kearns explains, "Like the god in a theoxeny, he punishes the transgressors and sets to rights a moral order which has gone wrong."[139]

---

[136] Athena was already crucial in encouraging Telemachus' journey to uncover information on his father (1.209-351) as well as orchestrating his return to his father (15.10-61). However, she now takes on a more active role when she signals Odysseus to reveal himself to Telemachus (16.160-177) and joins in the battle against the suitors (22.250). She is also responsible for the cessation of violence at the end of the narrative (24.582-602).

[137] Perhaps the most well-known example is the story of Philemon and Baucis in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 8.620-740. For a negative example, see Euripides' *Bacchae.* As Reece, *The Stranger's Welcome*, 182, explains "The denouement of the *Odyssey* takes on the form of a theoxeny, in which a disguised god comes to the homes of mortals in order to test their hospitality...This universal folktale motif is well attested in Greek and Roman myth." For a more complete discussion of stories of divine hospitality, see Flückiger-Guggenheim, *Göttliche Gäste*.

[138] The strongest (and most ironic) example is how the suitors are appalled at Antinous' mistreatment of the disguised Odysseus. They warn, "Antinous, you did not do well to strike the unfortunate wanderer. Doomed man that you are, what if perchance he be some god come down from heaven? And the gods do, in the guise of strangers from afar, put on all manner of shapes, and visit the cities, beholding the violence and the righteousness of men (17.481-87 [LCL, Murray])." This citation of the *theoxeny* tradition is deeply ironic specifically because of the partnership between Odysseus and Athena and the impending judgment on the suitors.

[139] Kearns, "The Return of Odysseus: A Homeric Theoxeny," 7.

The overlap of *xenia* and *theoxeny* provides the literary framework for the function of the recognition scenes in the *Odyssey*. The recognition scenes operate as confirmation of the proper hospitality due to strangers and gods alike. This overlap also explains the relation of recognition scenes with the wider epiphany tradition, especially when Odysseus is often misidentified as a god in the recognition of his son (16.183) and wife (23.60-65). Similarly, his supernatural transformation and awe-inducing presence are elements characteristic of divine epiphanies that have been adapted into mere human recognition scenes.[140] As John Taylor explains, "In the *Odyssey* and in later Greek literature, recognitions of people (and internalised recognitions, moments of self-knowledge and of insight into the workings of the world) are modelled on scenes where a god is recognised and retain something of the atmosphere of those encounters."[141] However, these elements of the numinous in the recognition scenes should not overshadow the stress on the mundane, human elements of Odysseus' identity conveyed by the various personal tokens. A blending of epiphany and recognition has shaped the function of the recognition scenes in the *Odyssey* even as the recognition of the identity of Odysseus remains distinct from the appearance and recognition of the gods.[142]

2.1.6: Summary

The *Odyssey* lays an impressive foundation for the literary conventions of the recognition type-scene for later classical authors. The recognition type-scene in Homer attests to a stable yet

---

[140] Murnaghan, *Disguise and Recognition in the Odyssey*, 185.

[141] Taylor, *Classics and the Bible*, 4.

[142] For instance, the appearance of the gods tends to be embellished with stress on the beauty, size, or light that accompanies their appearance. See Athena's role in the battle in the banquet hall, where she flits in and out as Mentor, misdirects spear throws, and terrifies the suitors with her might. *Od.*22.209-325. Elsewhere, the gods are constantly changing form and disguise in a way distinct from Odysseus' single disguise as a beggar. See *Od.* 13.230, 295.

flexible pattern that includes a consistent use of the formal elements of the type-scene. Furthermore, the *Odyssey* demonstrates the diverse ways in which the type-scene was manipulated. Tokens could be varied based on their evidentiary value to the recognizing party or disregarded altogether in order to produce a deeper sense of trust. The cognitive resistance of the recognizing party could be forestalled by displaying immediate evidence or lengthened into a series of tests with additional proof. In terms of plot, the *Odyssey* uses recognition scenes in the rising action and as the climax where the themes of *xenia* and *theoxeny* shape the function of the recognition scenes by linking the recognition of Odyssues with the positive or negative hospitality given to a stranger. As the foundation of the classical recognition tradition, the *Odyssey* attests to the flexibility and imaginative possibilities offered by the literary technique.

2.2: The Relation of Epiphany and Recognition

Before continuing the analysis of recognition scenes in classical literature, I want to further discuss the overlap of epiphany and recognition highlighted by the *Odyssey*. Epiphany was presented in the first chapter as a term often used to refer to a whole class of ancient phenomena that describe interactions with the divine. Even in the *Odyssey*, epiphanies occur on a spectrum ranging from physical appearances to dreams.[143] Yet, there is a subset of epiphanies that center on the recognition of the deity and thus have strong formal correspondence with recognition scenes, which I will call epiphanic recognitions. Cora Angier Sowa has explored this sub-class of epiphanies in detail, especially with respect to the Homeric Hymns and epics. The formal elements of these epiphanies include a disguised god, the inappropriate treatment of the

[143] Examples of epiphanies in the *Odyssey* include the physical appearance of Athena to Odysseus in Book 13, the appearance of Hermes to Odysseus on the island of Circe (Book 10), the visit of Athena immediately before sleep (15.4-8, 20.30-55), and the messengers sent through dreams (4.796-8).

god, revelation of the god's identity through tokens, fear in response to the god's revelation, the institution of rites for the god, and the construction of a temple.[144] The similarities between the recognition type-scene and the epiphany tradition clusters around the issue of identity and its proof. The gods are notoriously difficult to recognize and often use tokens to prove their identities (*Ody.* 13.312-313; *Hymn to Demeter* 111). These tokens range from supernatural elements such as divine light, great size, or shifting forms (*Hymn to Demeter* 189; *Hymn 7 to Dioysius* 13-15, 34-54) to more mundane things like footprints (*Il.* 13.71-72; *Hymn to Hermes* 218-226). With respect to the latter, Sowa notes, "the epiphany of a god whose identity is unrecognized at first, but is revealed by tokens, is very much like the recognition of a mortal who has been absent for a long time."[145]

While there are some general similarities, such epiphanic recognitions nevertheless display several important formal differences with the recognition type-scene. First, epiphanies are constructed as recognitions of a deity while recognition scenes are generally recognition of humans. While there is some blurring of this distinction in the *Odyssey,* ultimately it is always made explicit that Odysseus is not a god. Indeed, the type-scene deliberately rebukes the charge of divinity from the recognizing party through tokens that stress Odysseus' mortality and kinship.[146] Second, epiphanic recognitions often have an aetiological interest as they revolve around the establishment of cultic rites and temples. This aetiological interest is lacking from the

---

[144] Sowa, *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymns*, 241–42. For instance, in the *Hymn to Demeter,* the goddess travels among humans unrecognized, until she is brought into service by some girls and tends for the child of Metaneira (92-215). When Metaneira catches Demeter attempting to make the child immortal through placing the child in the fire (231-247), Demeter is outraged at her concern (243-49) and reveals her identity through tokens of her glorious appearance (275-280). In response, she demands the building of a temple and the establishment of her rites (293-302, 470-482). A similar pattern can be found in the Homeric hymns to Apollo, Dionysius, and Aphrodite.

[145] Sowa, *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymns*, 249.

[146] Sowa, *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymns*, 267–72.

recognition type-scene.[147] As Greek literature developed, these differences became increasingly obvious as the recognition tradition took center stage in plots of tragedy and comedy and tended to stress human interpersonal recognitions. While there remained some overlap between epiphanic recognitions and recognition scenes in the later tradition, the two remain easily differentiated.

2.3: Recognition in Fifth-Century Tragedy

While Aristotle's *Poetics* celebrated the *Odyssey* for its extensive use of recognition, the majority of his examples of recognition scenes came from the fifth-century tragedies. Tragedy was distinct from the epic tradition as its performance involved actors, a chorus, and stagecraft.[148] All of this contributed to tragedy's power to invoke emotions in its audience.[149] Indeed, the visual element was the truly new addition that tragedy brought to ancient Greece.[150] Greek tragedy flourished in the fifth century BCE, growing out of traditions associated with performed poetry and influenced by the political and religious landscape of Athens.[151] Through festive competions, the three great Athenian tragedians (Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides)

---

[147] Sowa, *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymns*, 241. The importance of cultic foundation in epiphanies is also stressed in Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany: Prison-Escape in Acts of the Apostles*.

[148] On the use of stagecraft, see the landmark work of Oliver Taplin, *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus: The Dramatic Use of Entrances and Exits in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977).

[149] Matthew Wright, "The Joy of Sophocles' Electra," *GR* 52.2 (2005): 174.

[150] John Herington, *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), 144.

[151] On the origins of tragedy in the song culture of ancient Greece, see Herington, *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition*.

won a name for themselves and, through repeat performances of their works after their deaths, earned lasting fame.[152]

The differences between tragedy and epics should not obscure the fact that both borrowed from a common stock of stories and techniques. As John Herington has notes, "the mythic world was a kind of encyclopedia" from which the epic and tragic traditions both simultaneously drew.[153] While the tragedians tended toward subject matter tangential to Homer's epics, they remained indebted to Homer's literary style.[154] The Homeric influence is particularly apparent in the shared form of the recognition type-scene, though the tragedians employed the conventions in new and innovative ways.

2.3.1: The Orestes-Electra Recognition Scene

The recognition between Orestes and Electra presented in ancient tragedy provides an excellent point of comparison with Homer as it emerges from a similar *nostos*.[155] The basic story tells of Agamemnon's return from the Trojan War to be killed by his wife, Clytemnestra. His son

---

[152] On the festival setting of the earliest tragic performances, see Barnett, *The Greek Drama*, 71. On the spread of Athenian tragedy through the ancient world in the centuries to follow, see Mark Griffith, "'Telling the Tale': A Performing Tradition from Homer to Pantomime," in *Cambridge Companion of Greek and Roman Theatre*, ed. Marianne McDonald and J. Michael Walton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 13-35.

[153] Herington, *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition*, 67.

[154] Ruth Scodel, *An Introduction to Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 3–5. The most obvious example of a story tangential to Homer's epic that became central to tragedy was the story of Agamemnon's return. A few of the numerous references to this story in Homer can be seen in *Od.* 1.32-44; 3.215-39; 4.572-605; 23.102-105. For stylistic similarities, see Simon Goldhill, *Reading Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 138. As Simon Goldhill explains, "Aeschylus is said to have claimed his works were 'slices from the banquets of Homer (though whether this means left-overs or choice pieces is less than clear) and, 'Sophocles might have taken for himself the Aeschylean claim.' Euripides, too, is impossible to understand without some sense of the heroic tradition and the place of Homer in more than a literary context."

[155] The story of Agamenon appears several times in Homer's *Odyssey* and serves as an example to Telemachus and as a foil to the narrative of Odysseus' successful return to his faithful wife. See Goldhill, *Reading Greek Tragedy*, 147.

Orestes returns from exile to avenge his father's death by killing his mother Clytemnestra and her new husband Aegisthus with the help of his sister Electra. The audience of the tragedies were likely familiar with the story of Agamemnon and his son Orestes because of references in Homer and the wider culture. Each of the three great fifth century tragedians composed a version of this story and recounted a dramatic recognition between Orestes and Electra. The popularity of their recognition attests to the stability and flexibility of the recognition type-scene in ancient tragedy.

2.3.1.1: Aeschylus' *Libation Bearers*

The first example of Electra's recognition of Orestes is in Aeschylus' *Libation Bearers*, the second play of a trilogy that tells the story of bloodshed in the house of Agamemnon.[156] The *meeting* for the recognition occurs while Electra is praying outside the city near the grave of her father. Orestes had earlier visited the grave and made an offering of a lock of his hair, though he is currently hiding on stage from his sister's approach (*Cho.* 1-20). When Electra finds the lock of hair, she offers *cognitive resistance* and interprets it as a sent gift (168-79). The second token is more convincing as she finds footprints on the ground similar to her own. When she follows these footprints to her hidden brother, Orestes reveals himself and declares his identity (205-211). Yet his sister greets this revelation with *more cognitive resistance*.[157] In response, Orestes produces a piece of weaving as a third token of his identity and explains,

[156] The trilogy moves from Agamemnon's murder by his wife (the key action of the first play), the revenge sought by Agamemnon's son Orestes against his father's murders (covered in the second play), and the trial in Athens which frees Orestes from the curse of shedding the blood of his own mother in seeking revenge (the subject of the third play).

[157] Electra's statement of cognitive resistance is "Look here, sir, are you trying to weave some web of trickery around me (*Cho.* 220 [Sommerstein, LCL])?" The web resonates with the trilogy's use of web/net imagery to describe treachery and deception, not least in Clytemnestra's use of the net to kill Agamemnon. Cf. *Ag.* 1494, 1516; *Cho*. 999.

> "So when you see me in person you're reluctant to recognize me–whereas when you saw this cut lock of mourning, and when you were examining the track of my feet, your heart took wing and you imagined you could see me. Put the lock of hair next to the place it was cut from, and take a look: it's your brother's, and it matched that of your own head. And look at this piece of weaving, the work of your hands, the strokes of the batten and the picture of the beast. (225-233 [Sommerstein, LCL])"

The cumulative weight of the three tokens is convincing because, like Odysseus' scar, they are able to offer narrative continuity between Orestes' presence and his identity before his exile, and prove his relation to his sister. Electra yields to *recognition* and celebrates the *reunion* with great joy (235-245).

Aeschylus' *Libation Bearers* includes all of the elements of the recognition type-scene even as the drama and suspense of the scene is expanded by the gradual discovery of three tokens and their testing. The scene occurs at the beginning of the narrative in the rising action of the plot, providing the means for Electra and Orestes' partnership in the scheme to enact revenge against Clytemnestra. Like the recognition between Telemachus and Odysseus, the recognition scene is not deployed as the climax of the plot but as a point of departure for the proceeding revenge. Functionally, the recognition captures Electra's cognitive and emotional shift, as it moves her from longing for her brother's return to an active participant in her brother's plot of revenge.

2.3.1.2: Sophocles' *Electra*

Sophocles' version dramatically enhances the focus on Electra and her plight under her family as she awaits her brother's return. This is apparent in the space given to the development of the recognition and the conscious delay of the revelation of Orestes' identity.[158] Orestes has

[158] This follows a general tendency in Sophocles' works to explore the conflict between women's loyalties to their family and their social roles, as in *Antigone*. See Ruth Scodel, "Sophoclean Tragedy," in *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*, ed. Justina Gregory (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005), 235.

already returned and left the stage when Electra enters with a tearful plea for her brother's return (*El.* 84-328). At this point in Aesychlus' version, the recognition scene was already completed. However, Sophocles delays the recognition scene and heightens the suspense with a series of narrative devices: an impending threat to Electra's life (329-471), a dream of Orestes' possible return (418-430), and a messenger who arrives with the deceitful news of Orestes' death in a chariot race (660-765). This delay of recognition heightens the suspense around the recognition. While Electra is mourning her brother's apparent death, she is visited by her sister with news that Orestes has returned (878-9). Electra displays significant *cognitive resistance* to this report (882-90), despite her sister's appeal to the evidence of the offering laid at Agamemnon's tomb including a lock of hair, a parallel to the first token in Aeschylus' narrative (891-918). Electra rejects these *tokens*, setting the stage for a more dramatic recognition (932-3). The suspense reaches its zenith when Orestes arrives in disguise bearing an urn supposedly containing his remains (1100-1118). The dramatic tension is palpable as the grieving Electra takes her brother's urn in her hands and prays for her own death (1119-1170). During this *meeting,* Orestes reveals himself and demonstrates his identity by producing the token of his father's signet ring (1171-1224). The family signet ring conveys Orestes' kinship with his dead father and his sister. Reversing her previous doubt, Electra *recognizes* Orestes and they embrace joyously (1225-1235). Orestes then urges Electra's silence so he can enact his plan of revenge (1236-41).[159]

The formal elements of Sophocle's use of the type-scene are easily discerned, although Sophocles has reconfigured them so that an initial display of tokens and cognitive resistance

[159] Orestes' exhortation to silence contrasts with the space given to Electra's speech earlier in the narrative and the emphasis on her uncontrolled tongue (*El.*797, 993). However, Electra will again take center stage during a long speech while the matricide enacted by Orestes occurs off stage (*El.* 1395-1416). This is all part of her heightened role in the narrative as explored in Goldhill, *Reading Greek Tragedy*, 269.

occurs prior to Electra's meeting with Orestes. His elaboration of the suspense prior to the recognition also makes the recognition scene constitute the whole of the rising plot, playing a larger role in the tragedy's overall scope. Functionally, Sophocles also heightens the affective dimension of the recognition by accentuating Electra's *pathos*, especially in her speech over her brother's funeral urn. Yet, Sophocles' unique emphases do not overshadow the cognitive shift produced by the recognition. Indeed, the false tale of Orestes' death heightens the credibility of Electra's cognitive resistance and supports the profound affective and cognitive shift produced by the recognition.

2.3.1.3: Euripides' *Electra*

The final example of the Electra-Orestes recognition comes from Euripides. Euripides found himself in competition with Sophocles and Aeschylus, so he often exploited the traditions upon which tragedy was built, leading him to be accused of corrupting tragedy.[160] The result of Euripides' competition with his contemporaries meant that his tragedies were innovative in many regards.[161] The innovation is readily apparent in his *Electra*, as he places the narrative not around the royal palace, but in the more rustic setting of a rural farmhouse. Euripides also depicts

[160] On innovation in Euripides, see Ann Norris Michelini, *Euripides and the Tragic Tradition*, Wisconsin Studies in Classics (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987), 54–86. Some of the noted tactics of innovation include the exploitation of literary convention and use of irony, the violation of taboo subjects, and the rejection of Sophocles' high mimetic for the introduction of the grotesque. The charges against Euripides' tragedy are seen in the imaginative contest between Aeschylus and Euripides in Aristophanes' *Frogs*. For a discussion, see Oliver Taplin, "Fifth-Century Tragedy and Comedy," in *Oxford Readings in Aristophanes*, ed. Erich Segal (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 25.

[161] Justina Gregory, "Euripidean Tragedy," in *A Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005), 251–52.

Electra, whose name implies being unwed, as married to a farmer whose house serves as the setting for the recognition type-scene.[162]

Euripides' competitive spirit is also apparent in the deliberate mocking of Aeschylus' use of the type-scene.[163] Orestes and Pylades leave various tokens at the tomb and hide before Electra enters. When Electra eventually *meets* them, their conversation is full of dramatic irony in which Orestes neglects to reveal his identity (*El.* 215-296). This opening interaction recalls Aesychlus' *Choephoroi* in which Electra follows the footprints to the hidden Orestes. Yet in place of recognition at the tomb, Euripides delays recognition to a further point in the narrative at the house of the farmer. While at the farm, an old man comes to Electra from Agamemnon's tomb *displaying* the three Aeschylean recognition tokens: the lock of hair, the footprints, and the piece of weaving (520-544). Electra mocks these tokens with intense *cognitive resistance*. She rejects the lock of hair by questioning how a man and woman could have similar hair (528-531). The footprints are rejected as proof because Orestes' feet should have changed size since his exile (534-537). Finally, the piece of weaving is discredited as Electra explains, "Do you not know that when Orestes went into exile, I was still a child? And even if I had been weaving clothes, how could a man who was a child at that time be wearing the same garments unless his clothing were to grow with his body? (541-546 [Kovacs, LCL])?" Euripides has deliberately critiqued the evidentiary value of the Aeschylean tokens by insisting on their failure to provide narrative continuity in Orestes' identity. And yet, Orestes had returned so that the inadequate

[162] Electra is the negated form of λέκτρον, the Greek word for the marriage-bed. For this and other innovations, see Richmond Lattimore introduction to "Electra" in *Euripides II*, Complete Greek Tragedies 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013), 189-90.

[163] While past scholars have sought to reject the echoes of Aeschylus as a later addition, recent scholarship has argued convincingly for its authenticity. For a discussion of the issues underlying the scene and a defense of authenticity, see Godfrey Bond, "Euripides' Parody of Aeschylus," *Herm* 118 (1974): 1–14.

recognition tokens are nevertheless true evidence. As Bond explains, "it is interesting that the clever Electra is wrong and the simple Old Man is right: very likely there is intentional irony here."[164] The result is that Euripides' mocking of Aeschylus' use of recognition is not so much a scathing polemic as a playful parody of an established tradition. The literary conventions of the Electra-Orestes recognition scene are parodied even as they are upheld.

Following the failure of the tokens to convince Electra, Orestes and Pylades join Electra and Orestes' old tutor at the old man's farm (547-49). During this *meeting*, the tutor carefully examines the stranger and recognizes the identity of Orestes (548-565). As the tutor celebrates the recognition of Orestes as that "which god reveals" (565), he exhorts Electra to recognize her brother (566-572). To prove the point, he *produces a new token* to convince Electra which is incidentally also the oldest token in the ancient Greek repertoire. He points toward a scar that Orestes got while a child, a scene playfully invoking the famous recognition of Odysseus' scar by his nurse (573-5).[165] The token produces Electra's *recognition* and results in the siblings' embrace with the *attendant emotion* of great joy (576-582).

Euripides' use of the type-scene is a delightful play on the recognition conventions. It parodies the formal elements (especially the use of tokens) in recognition scenes, but ultimately reinforces them by appeal to the *Odyssey*. As Goldhill explains, "as Euripides forces awareness of the incongruity and arbitrariness of the Aeschylean recognition tokens, he also marks the conventionality involved in the recognition process itself. He displays the recognition of a long-

[164] Bond, "Euripides' Parody of Aeschylus," 3.

[165] For a famous discussion of this scene in *The Odyssey*, see Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, 2-23. Euripides is playfully mocking the scene from the *Odyssey* as the scar received by Orestes came from a fawn while Odysseus' came from a boar. Both scenes are also similar in their domestic setting, with the recognition by the tutor of the younger Orestes bring to mind the recognition by Eurycleia, Odysseus' nurse.

lost relative as a literary, theatrical theme, a game complete with rules and conventions."[166] The playful recognition scene demonstrates both the stability and flexibility of the recognition type-scene. Parody is only successful because the conventions of recognition are well known. This also gives the recognition scene an additional function. Besides its cognitive and affective role, Euripides' use of the recognition type-scene highlights the hermeneutical function of recognition as a reflection on the nature of interpretation.[167] That is, the recognition scene raises the issue of the interpretability of the scene in relation to the wider plot. The conventions of recognition force the audience to answer the question, "how do you read the signs?"[168] The audience becomes a participant in the interpretation of the recognition scene by Euripides' parody of the wider recognition tradition.

2.3.1.4: Summary

The differing treatments of the Orestes-Electra recognition scene demonstrate the consistency of the literary convention of recognition scenes between Homer and the tragedians while also highlighting the type-scene's malleability. In all three examples, the recognition scene carries a cognitive and affective function with Electra being moved from ignorance to knowledge alongside her emotional shift in the reunion with her brother. However, the emphasis on the evidentiary values of tokens, the order of the formal elements, and the amplification of testing and *pathos* show that each tragedian adapted the conventions to various ends. Indeed, Euripides'

[166] Simon Goldhill, *Reading Greek Tragedy*, 249.

[167] Bond, "Euripides' Parody of Aeschylus," 11. As Godfrey Bond has noted, "We know from the *Poetics* that Aristotle's contemporaries liked comparing and dissecting recognition scenes; this interest may reasonably be projected back into the fifth century: it is likely enough that as intrigues became more complex the competing dramatists increasingly criticised each other's plots."

[168] Goldhill, *Reading Greek Tragedy*, 258.

treatment presupposes a broad awareness of the literary conventions of the scene that would be recognizable to the audience. Already in the fifth century, the recognition scene was a "metapoetic commentary that is a self-conscious invitation to reflect on the conventions of dramatic production."[169] The tradition of competition and commentary around the tragic recognition solidied recognition as a prevalent literary technique in antiquity.

2.3.2: Recognition in Other Ancient Tragedies

While the Orestes-Electra recognition scene in fifth-century tragedy demonstrates strong continuity with the type-scene found in Homer, the tragedians also created additional recognition scenes that developed aspects of recognition in ways that had a lasting impact on the classical recognition tradition. While space will not allow a complete treatment of every tragic recognition, I want to highlight briefly four further examples of the type-scene in tragedy that exemplify several major developments in the classical tradition

2.3.2.1: Euripides' *Iphigenia among the Taurians*

The first example comes from *Iphigenia among the Taurians*, one of the more daring works of Euripides. The story concerns the reunion of Orestes and his other sister, Iphigenia, who was supposedly sacrificed in order to get a favorable wind for the invasion of Troy. In Euripides' take on the tradition, Iphigenia was not sacrificed but miraculously transported to become a priestess among the Taurians (*Iph. taur.* 1-41). Orestes considered his sister long dead

[169] Isabelle Torrance, "In the Footprints of Aeschylus: Recognition, Allusion, and Metapoetics in Euripides," *AJP* 132 (2011): 179.

when he is sent to the Taurians by an oracle of Apollo to steal the statue of Artemis (77-93), only to discover that she is alive.

The scene begins when Orestes is caught trying to steal the statue and is brought before his sister (237-244). Orestes and his friend Pylades *meet* with Iphigenia who, in her role as priestess, must decide if she will sacrifice these foreigners as the local custom insists (455-465). During the meeting, brother and sister exchange a long ironic dialogue in which neither recognizes the other (466-570). When Iphigenia learns that they are from her homeland, she frees Pylades in order to send him back to her family with a letter telling of her survival (578-615). But Pylades asks Iphigenia to reveal the contents of the letter in case it is lost at sea (759-765). The letter reveals Iphigenia's identity to her brother, who is stunned by the sudden revelation. Iphigenia is likewise surprised when Pylades gives the message to her brother who is standing right in front of her (790). While Orestes' slight *cognitive resistance* is seen in his surprise at the letter's content (767-777), Iphigenia displays greater *resistance* to the sudden turn of events and demands proof of Orestes' identity (792-810). He *produces tokens* of personal information: a fine piece of cloth his sister once wore, knowledge of a ritual bath she took while young, locks of hair she sent her mother, and the hiding place of the ancient spear of their father (811-826). The tokens produce *recognition* and *the attendant emotions* of joy and amazement between the siblings.

The major development in this recognition scene is that it is a *double recognition* in which neither Orestes nor Iphigenia recognizes the other. In his analysis, Aristotle distinguishes two different types of recognition: recognition by artificial token and plot. Orestes' recognition of his sister arises naturally from the plot because it is logical for Iphigenia to send a letter and explain its contents in case the letter is lost. Aristotle celebrates Orestes' recognition as a

probable development in the the overall narrative (*Poet.* 1455a15-21). In contrast, Iphigenia's recognition of her brother is artificial because it relies on the literary convention of tokens that the author introduces without cause (1454b30-34). Overall, the double recognition shows an increasing complexity in the use of the recognition type-scene. The increasing complexity in Euripides' work captures a general tendency to innovate and develop in the recognition tradition that will continue in the plots of New Comedy and the romances.[170]

2.3.2.2: Euripides' *Helen*

Euripides' *Helen* develops the recognition tradition in a different way. Helen is popularly remembered as the cause of the Trojan War. However, Euripides' play builds on a version of the myth where Helen is not taken to Troy. Rather, the Helen fought for at Troy was a phantom doppelgänger created by the goddess Hera while the real Helen lived in Egypt.[171] In Euripides' tragedy, Menelaus brings his phantom Helen with him to Egypt only to encounter the real Helen, whom he refuses to recognize until his phantom-wife disappears. The issue of identity is foregrounded as the phantom Helen and real Helen vie for Menelaus' recognition.

The recognition scene begins when Helen *meets* her husband Menelaus as she is returning from the tomb where she hides to avoid the Egyptian king (*Hel.* 528-546). Ironically, they both note that each resemble the other's lover (555-65). Helen immediately yields to *recognition*, exclaiming "To recognize your own is also something divine (560 [Kovacs, LCL])!"

[170] Gregory, "Euripidean Tragedy," 265. The influence of this play on later comedy and romances is particularly apparent in the positive, almost comic, ending with the happy reunion of separated families rather than the typical tragic plot. Cf. also the ending of Euripides' *Helen*.

[171] Helen's stay in Egypt is suggested by Herodatus, *Hist.* 2.112-20. This notion of the phantom appears to be an earlier tradition as suggested by references to it in Stesichorus. See David Kovacs, introduction to *Helen.* (LCL 11; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), 2-3.

She immediately attempts to *embrace* Menelaus (565). However, Menelaus resists recognizing the true Helen because he knows he left Helen in a cave after the shipwreck (560-568). The crucial element in his *cognitive resistance* is the inability to distinguish the real Helen and the phantom.[172] Ultimately, there is no proof that can help him decide between the two. Menelaus even insists that his experience fighting for the phantom is more convincing than what his eyes see now in Egypt (594). Euripides has taken the issue of identity to the extreme by making the divinely-created image of Helen and the true Helen sufficiently alike so that no token can tell them apart. Lest this bring the plot to a standstill, Euripides resolves the conflict with the report that the phantom Helen has disappeared from the cave right after declaring she was not the true Helen (605-615). With the disappearance of the phantom, Menelaus *recognizes* his wife in a joyous *reunion* (622-4).

The major development is Euripides' utilization of the recognition type-scene to explore the limits of recognition. No token is able to distinguish the true Helen and the phantom except an act of the gods. This development is only possible in a literary milieu that is aware of the literary conventions of recognition scenes and can delight in Euripides' playfulness. *Helen* carries the role of evidence in recognition *ad absurdum*. As a result, the recognition ultimately relies on a divine intervention for a successful reunion. The recognition thus reverberates with the conclusion of the play which explains, "What heaven sends has many shapes, and many things the gods accomplish against our expectation. What men look for is not brought to pass, but a god finds a way to achieve the unexpected. Such was the outcome of this story (1687-1692 [Kovacs, LCL])." As Euripides suggests, there remains something divine that is able to facilitate the

[172] This conflict is laid out as the cause explicitly in *Hel.* 576-584. The most prominent term for this phantom is εἴδωλον in *Hel.* 34, 582, 684, 1136. Other terms include Helen's double in *Hel.* 74 and a phantom attendant in *Hel.* 570.

recognition despite all evidence to the contrary. The plot highlights the extent to which recognition scenes bear marks of absurdity and contrivance, often relying on providence to reach a resolution. Euripides' imbedded reflection on the limits of recognition (seen also in *Electra*) will become an important way for later recognition scenes to explore their own aritificiality and/or divine intentionality.

2.3.2.3: Euripides' *Ion*

Euripides' *Ion* demonstrates another important development in recognition as it establishes the standard plot of New Comedy with the recognition of a lost child as the climax of the narrative. The story recounts how Creusa was raped in a cave by Apollo and abandons her child with tokens of his identity. Hermes rescues her son Ion and has him raised by the temple priests of Apollo. Creusa later marries Xuthus but they are unable to produce children. This drives the couple to seek an oracle at the temple of Apollo. Apollo uses this to his own ends, promising that Ion will be Xuthus' son. The gods will also orchestrate the recognition of mother and son as foreshadowed in Hermes' prologue (*Ion* 1-236).

Ion's plot is consciously constructed around the recognition of mother and son, with the recognition scene serving as the plot's climax. Yet in order to sustain the suspense until the narrative's end, the plot is full of near recognitions and continuous dramatic irony.[173] The climactic recognition occurs at the altar of Apollo where mother and son *meet* at the narrative's end. A prophetess intervenes in their discussion by providing *the means of recognition*: a basket that contains the swaddling clothes in which Ion was abandoned (1335-1394). When Ion opens

[173] These schemes include ironic exchanges between the mother and son unknown to each other (237-380), the misinterpretation of oracles that leads to a false recognition by Xuthus that Ion is his son (407-565), and Creusa's foiled plot of poisoning Ion (789-1228).

the basket, Creusa immediately *recognizes* it and the clothes it contains as belonging to her abandoned child (1397-1405), yet Ion *resists* her claim and considers it a trick meant to deceive him (1405-1410). To prove her claim, Creusa describes in great detail the three items in the box (clothing, a gold necklace, and an olive wreath), tokens which Ion notes are functioning "like an oracle (1424 [Kovacs, LCL])!" Ion yields to *recognition* and *embraces* his mother (1436-1469). Following this climactic recognition, the narrative concludes with the proper interpretation of Apollo's oracle by the goddess Athena who, in another example of a *deus ex machina*, explains that Ion's parents are Creusa and Apollo. Apollo has given this child as a gift to Xanthus so that he might be established as ruler over Athena's land (1553-1594).

As perhaps the most complicated example of recognition in Euripides' work, *Ion* exerted an important influence on the developing recognition tradition. First, the recognition scene is clearly the climax to the narrative in a way that will become standard for many later works.[174] The entire plot builds to and and is resolved by the recognition. Second, the plot prior to this climax revolves around the array of intrigues, misread signs, and false recognitions that delay the recognition. *Ion* revels in the growing complexity and suspense prior to recognition.[175] Third, *Ion* creates a parallelism between recognition tokens and oracles that thematizes the difficulty of interpreting the signs that lead to recognition. As with *Electra* and *Helen*, the hermeneutic

[174] Stuart, "The Function and the Dramatic Value of the Recognition Scene in Greek Tragedy," 284. As Stuart explains, "In the *Ion* the principal anagnorisis is delayed until the end of the play since the problem presented by the plot is whether Creusa must remain childless. The function of this recognition scene is to serve as the denouement, as it does in New Comedy, for the play is practically over the moment that Creusa recognizes Ion."

[175] Naomi A. Weiss, "Recognition and Identity in Euripides' Ion," in *Recognition and Modes of Knowledge: Anagnorisis from Antiquity to Contemporary Theory*, ed. Teresa G. Russo (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2013), 43–44. She explains, ""The process of recognition undergone by Kreousa and Ion is therefore not just a sudden climax of the recognition scene at the play's end. Instead, it is an extended process lasting almost the entire length of the drama, beginning with the initial meeting of mother and son, and playing a role in the course of "therapy" that they both experience."

function of recognition is placed at the center of the narrative, highlighting the recognition as the *interpretive moment* that brings comprehension and coherence to the whole narrative. In other words, the recognition scene provides the interpretive power necessary to make the preceding plot sensible. As Cave explains, "what the audience is given is not a correct reading of an enigmatic story but a device for rendering plausible a highly implausible sequence of events."[176] Euripides attributes the successful fulfillment of this highly implausible plot to the actions of the gods. As Athena utters at the end of the play, "The gods perhaps move to action late, but in the end they show their strength (1614-5 [Kovacs, LCL])." Euripides has simultaneously placed before the audience a proper conclusion to his play and one that feels artificial and impossible because it relies on divine interference. Again, Euripides has emphasized the important hermeneutical function of recognition in a narrative while simultaneously gesturing toward the artifice of the scene.[177]

2.3.2.4: Self-Recognition in Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*

Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* was celebrated by Aristotle as an example of "the finest recognition (*Poet.* 1452a.32)." However, the recognition scene in *Oedipus Rex* is actually anomalous among the ancient tragedies. Whereas the recognition scenes analyzed so far have involved two parties, in *Oedipus Rex* it is Oedipus who recognizes himself in his proper relationship to others. While the scene still fits clearly within the recognition type-scene, the

[176] Cave, *Recognitions*, 261.

[177] The hermeneutic function of the scene is also reinforced by the fact that Xuthus is never made privy to the true parentage of Ion, excluded from the recognition of the child's true identity despite the recognition experienced by Creusa and the audience. Cf. Athena's speech in the *dea ex machina* of *Ion* 1553-1605.

character of the self-recognition suggests a unique development in the tradition worthy of closer consideration.

The plot of Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* revolves around Oedipus' process of discovery. Oedipus seeks to rid Thebes of a terrible plague by solving the murder of the former king, Laius (*Oed. tyr.* 1-141). Through a complex web of investigations and interpreted oracles, Oedipus eventually *meets* with a shepherd who is able to tell Oedipus of his birth as Laius' son (1119-1181). While there are no new tokens of recognition produced in this scene, this exchange facilitates Oedipus' correlation of the earlier prophecies, the witnesses of Laius' death, and the origin of his name into *convincing proof* of his identity. As the evidence slowly comes together, the exchange is punctuated with *cognitive resistance* as Oedipus presses the shepherd for the truth. The scene culminates in Oedipus' *recognition* that he had murdered his father and married his mother (1182-85). The *emotional response* to the recognition is deeply tragic, leading to the suicide of Oedipus' wife (and mother) Jocasta, Oedipus' uncontrollable mourning, and his self-blinding (1234-1415). The story reverses the fate of one who was once so proud of his powers of discernment by leaving him blinded by the truth (380-403).

Like Euripides' *Ion*, the entire plot of *Oedipus Rex* is constructed around the climactic recognition scene.[178] Evidence slowly trickles in through the rising action until the moment Oedipus recognize the truth of his identity. The scene highlights the recognition as the interpretive moment that unlocks the whole plot, casting all of Oedipus' former interpretation of oracles and his own actions in their proper light. Unlike our previous examples, the climactic recognition in *Oedipus Rex* has tragic consquences as the truth of his identity does not result in a joyous reunion with his family but a spiral of suffering and loss.

[178] Stuart, "The Function and the Dramatic Value of the Recognition Scene in Greek Tragedy," 281.

But the most distinctive element of the recognition scene is that it does not hinge on Oedipus recognizing another person. Rather, it is about rightfully understanding his identity. While this might seem a departure from the standard use of the type-scene, it is actually quite consistent. Recognition is not just about discovering someone's identity, it is also about acknowledging one's proper relation to that person. Recognition scenes "dramatize not just the moment of a sentimental rediscovery of a family member, but also the reaffirmation of the legitimacy or obligations of a particular tie."[179] Oedipus' recognition is constituted by recognition of himself *via* his rightful relationship to his family, a tragic revelation that he has killed his father and married his mother. By the time Oedipus recognizes who he truly is, it is too late to change or recover.[180] While Oedipus' self-recognition became important in later literature and thought as a way to discuss the idea of inward alienation and possible repentance, this emphasis is absent from Sophocles' recognition scene.[181] Rather, *Oedipus Rex* is better seen as a subtle variation on the conventional use of recognition in the classical tradition.

2.3.3: Summary

The fifth-century Athenian tragedies illustrate remarkable continuity with Homer in the use of the type-scene while simultaneously expanding the horizons of recognition. The formal

---

[179] Goldhill, *Reading Greek Tragedy*, 85. This is often seen in the tokens chosen to produce recognition as they highlight the continuity in one's identity and unique relationship to a recognizing party (e.g., Penelope's use of the marriage bed in the *Odyssey*).

[180] Culbertson, *The Poetics of Revelation*, 21.

[181] On the expansion of recognition beyond kinship ties to questions of mental alienation, see Cave, *Recognitions*, 228–31. Perhaps the seed of this idea can be seen here or in the use of a kind of psychological severance in Euripides' *Bacchae* and *Hercules Furens*, leading the protagonists to have a recognition after some trauma. But in all of these stories, the driving force of the recognition remains the protagonist's actions *in relation to kinship*. Connections to repentance seem to arise later due to the influence of the biblical tradition. See Culbertson, *The Poetics of Revelation*, 20-23.

elements of the recognition type-scene are so well established that the tragedians begin to parody many of the conventions and add increasingly complexity and nuance. They also adapted recognition to various plot locations, though they display a general thrust to locate it at the climax of the narrative. Importantly, they consistently use the recognition scene to enact a cognitive, affective, and hermeneutical function. Drawing on the stability and prevalence of recognition in ancient tragedy, Aristotle could thus conclude that recognition was a standard climactic plot technique in ancient literature

2.4: Recognition in Other Genres

Although Aristotle's discussion of recognition centered on the Homeric epics and the fifth century tragedians, other ancient genres made extensive use of the recognition scene.[182] In the following sections, I will demonstrate briefly the use of recognition in other ancient Greek genres. While space will not allow a detailed analysis of every example of the type-scene, the overview will establish its prevalence, its stable formal elements, and the various ways it continued to develop prior to and subsequent with the composition of Luke's Gospel.

2.4.1: Recognition in Ancient Comedy

Recognition scenes were widespread in ancient comedy. Developing from the parody, deceptions, and disguises utilized in Aristophanes, comic recognition became a major element of plot construction and complexity in Menander's New Comedy, whose legacy had a lasting

[182] *Poet.* 49b21-2 suggests that Aristotle was going to offer an additional book that treated comedy. While some have speculated that the later *Tractatus Coislinianus* is a sketch of the contents of this book, most are unconvinced and consider Aristotle's writings on comedy lost. For a discussion of *Tractatus*, see Cave *Recognitions*, 47-54. For an attempt to reconstruct the lost section, see Richard Janko, *Aristotle on Comedy: Toward a Reconstruction of Poetics II* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

impact on ancient literature. Menander's reception and adaptation by the Roman comedians Plautus and Terence put the recognition scene at the center of ancient comedy well into the Roman period. These Greek and Roman comedies demonstrate both a widespread agreement on the form of the recognition scene and reveal a literary culture that delighted in imitating, adapting, and complicating the recognition type-scene.

An early example of a comic recognition scene is found in Aristophanes' *Thesmophorizusae* where a kinsman of Euripides is disguised as a woman in order to infiltrate the Thesmophoria and defend Euripides against charges of unjust depiction of women in his plays. When the kinsman is captured, Euripides adapts several schemes from his tragic works in order to free him.[183] In one of these scenes, Euripides imitates the recognition in *Helen.* Disguised as Menelaus, Euripides *meets* with the kinsman who, already disguised as a woman, plays the part of Helen (*Thesm.* 840-874). The kinsman and Euripides play out the recognition between the two separated lovers, complete with *cognitive resistance* and the *emotions of a reunion* (904-917). As this mock recognition unfolds, the guard Critylla plays the 'straight man' who scorns the joke. She mocks the disguised kinsman's attempt to be a woman (861-3), and the identification of the Thesmophorium as Egypt (879-80). At the moment of recognition between the fake Helen and Menelaus, the guard realizes that the whole scene is Euripides' scheme for trying to retrieve his kinsman (920-4). [184] The juxtaposition turns the actual recognition of

[183] Other echoes of Euripidean scehemes include: the kinsman's mocking of Euripides' *Palamedes* when he tries to send a message to Euripides on wood as Oeax did on oar blades (*Thesm.* 765-84); Euripides' attempt to rescue his kinsman pretending to be Perseus with Echo following him and distracting the guard, as in *Andromeda* (1008- 1134).

[184] This joins to a larger theme of the artificiality of Euripidean tragedy in the face of reality in the play. As Jeffrey Henderson explains, "In the end, Euripidean tragedy is exposed as being just as artificial as the female costumes worn by Agathon, Euripides, and the Kinsman, and just as inadequate in the face of actual women." Jeffrey Henderson, introduction to *Women at the Thesmophoria* by Aristophanes, LCL 179 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), 449. For a discussion of the overlap of Euripides and Aristophanes, see Paul Cartledge, *Aristophanes and His Theatre of the Absurd*, Classical World Series (Bristol: Bristol Classical, 1990), 17–20.

characters in the play into a recognition of the literary artificial of the entire scene. Aristophanes' scene shows an awareness not only of the conventions of the recognition type-scene but also a willingness to parody the artificiality of these conventions. The recognition scene is treated as a trope that is recognizable as a trope! The parodying of the hermeneutical function of recognition is itself in line with Euripides' own use of recognition in *Helen*.[185]

However, it is really New Comedy that places recognition at the center of the comic plot. New Comedy tended to focus on the family and the household with complex plots of lovers and the comedic intervention of low-status persons like slaves.[186] The foremost author of New Comedy was Menander, who was celebrated in antiquity for his carefully constructed plots that often contained a climactic recognition between lovers.[187] As Plutarch noted, "In the theatre, the lecture-room, the dinner-party, his poetry provides reading, study, and entertainment for a wider public than that commanded by any other Greek masterpiece (*Moralia*, 853 [Winterbottom, LCL])." While recognition as a narrative climax is found in some earlier tragedies (e.g., *Ion*), Menander solidifies the role of recognition as the climax of a complex narrative such that Terence Cave has even argues that, "It is possible, in fact, to read Menander's surviving plays as a commentary on the uses and theory of anagnorisis in this period, so strong are the intertextual links."[188]

---

[185] A similar parody of a recognition scene can be found in the opening of Aristophanes' *Frogs*, in which Dionysius has a conversation with Herakles while disguised as Herakles, seeking advice on how to hear a tragedy from Euripiides who recently died. Cf. Aristophanes, *Ran.* 35-163.

[186] Kathryn J. Gutzwiller, *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature*, Blackwell Guides to Classical Literature (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007), 53.

[187] Adele C. Scafuro, "Menander," in *The Oxford Handbook on Greek and Roman Comedy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 221. On the popularity of Menander in antiquity, see Gutzwiller, *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature*, 52. She explains, "He is surpassed only by Homer and Euripides in number of papyri found, and scenes from his comedies were represented in mosaics and paintings throughout the Greco-Roman world."

[188] Cave, *Recognitions*, 50.

To cite only one example, consider the complex plot of *The Arbitration*. A shepherd named Daos found an exposed child and, keeping the tokens found with the child, gave the child to Syros a charcoal-burner. The child is actually the daughter of Pamphilia and her husband Charisios who, before he had wed, had unknowingly raped his future wife. Pamphilia gave birth to the child and sent it away before the husband found out. Eventually, Daos and Syros seek an arbiter to decide who is the rightful owner of the child's tokens. The arbiter ends up being Smirkines, the grandfather of the child, who decides the case unaware that it is about his grandchild. Eventually, the child is reunited to its rightful family in a scene that includes the formal elements of the type-scene (*Epitr.* 853-875). Besdies illustrating the increasingly complexity of recognition, the narrative delights in mocking the established conventions of the recognition tradition. In the arbitration between Daos and Syros over the recognition tokens, Syros demands that such tokens are the child's because it might reveal the child's proper parents (305), citing as evidence the repeated use of tokens to avert disasters in other literary works: "One man avoided marrying his sister through tokens, one man found his mother and saved her, a third his brother! (*Epit.* 341-4 [Arnott, LCL])."[189] *The Arbitration* uses recognition as the climax of its drama even as it mocks the conventional hermeneutic function of the recognition scene. Thus, Menander's works attest to the continuity of the recognition tradition into the Hellenistic period along with a growing importance placed on recognition's climactic and hermeneutic function.[190]

[189] The references are likely to Menander's *Perikeiromene* (marrying a sister), Sophocles' *Tyro* (son saving mother; see also Euripides' *Antiope* and *Hypsipyle*) and Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris* (brother saved by sister). See Menander, *Epitrepontes,* ed. and trans.W. G. Arnott, LCL 132 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979), 423.

[190] For other examples of the use of the type-scene in Menander, see also the false recognition recounted in *Aspis* 1-80 (the actual recognition in the ending is now lost), or the fragmentary recognition in *Perikeiromene* 708-822.

Beyond the Hellenistic period, the two exemplary comedy writers of the Roman Republic, Plautus and Terence, as the heirs to the tradition of New Comedy, provide even more evidence for the continual use of recognition scenes.[191] Roman comedy also attests to the continuing development of trajectories already noted.[192] On the whole, the ancient comedies provide significant evidence for the widespread use of the recognition type-scene in antiquity, demonstrating the stability of the literary conventions involved in the type-scene even as they reveal a willingness to adapt and parody them for the on-going delight of the audience.[193]

Overall, ancient comedy confirms several key themes in the use of the recognition type-scene even as it challenged its conventionality. First, recognition is intricately bound up with the evidence of tokens, though comedy warns that such evidence can often be misleading and generate false leaps of logic. Second, the ancient comedies show that recognition scenes function to provide closure to the narrative by providing the probable logic that makes a situation

---

[191] On the use of Greek originals by the Roman comedians, see Alison Sharrock, *Reading Roman Comedy: Poetics and Playfulness in Plautus and Terence*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 19. Despite the flexibility of the comic plot, Sharrock also notes that of the 26 surviving Roman comedies, 19 of them clearly feature recognition scenes. See Sharrock, *Reading Roman Comedy*, 97–98. For examples, see Plautus, *Amphitruo* 1131-1143; *Captivi* 5-8, 984-993; *Cistellaria* 625-787; *Curculio* 650-660; *Epidicus* 536-640; *Menaechmi* 10, 1160-1125; *Poenulus* 1258-1275; *Rudens* 1138-1180. Examples from Terence include *Andria* 904-956; *Eunuch* 750-55, 921; *Hecyra* 812-841.

[192] The plots of the Roman comedies tend to expand and elaborate the function and thematic use of recognition in ways already illustrated. One of the favorite devices is the use of identical twins, either separated twins as in Plautus' *Menaechmi*, or gods disguised as humans in Plautus' *Amphitruo*. This motif was already seen in Euripides' *Helen*, where the scene required a new type of token, either evidence of the origins of the twins by someone who knew them both or, in the example of the divine, the revelation of the god's true identity. Roman comedies also develop the role of clever slave who, like the playwright himself, is occupied with designing and directing the intrigues of the plot before its final recognition. This is already illustrated by Euripides' role in Aristophanes' *Thesmophorizusae*. All of this results in plots that are often less focused on the resolution through recognition and more concerned with the complications and dramatic irony prior to the resolution, as is the case in *Casina* which has a recognition scene that is referenced (80-85; 1012-1019) but never depicted.

[193] As Sharrock, *Reading Roman Comedy: Poetics and Playfulness in Plautus and Terence*, 201, explains "There is simple pleasure in recognition, and in this regard comedy epitomises and makes a joke of something rich and strange about drama generally, which is the aesthetic pleasure that comes from an artificial repetition of life in literature."

understandable. Yet, this climactic and hermeneutic use of recognition is balanced with references to divine action and artificiality so that recognition is never able to escape a sense of impossibility, artificiality, or implausibility. As Cave explains, "in the everyday world and language of comedy, implausibilities are openly scorned like the *deus ex machina* of tragedy."[194] Finally, the comedies are most influential in consistently locating the recognition scene as the successful climax of the narrative.

2.4.2: Recognition in Ancient Fiction

Recognition scenes were also consistently used in the new *fictive* literature that blossomed in the early Roman Empire.[195] For the sake of presentation, I will discuss the recognition tradition as it occurs in two different sub-sets of this literature. The first is the Greek romance proper, used to describe "the five extant romances" which "form a tight corpus, with recurrent plot structures and thematic repertoires."[196] The second sub-set of fictional narratives is more eclectic and lacks the stereotypical plot of the other romances, though it bears the mark of fictionalized narrative. Like ancient comedy, these works attest to the stability and flexibility of

---

[194] Cave, *Recognitions*, 256.

[195] On the origin of the ancient novel, see Bryan P. Reardon, *The Form of Greek Romance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 128–66. The mark of explicit fictional prose narrative perhaps remains the greatest commonality of this emerging genre as noted in J.R. Morgan, "Make-Believe and Make Believe: The Fictionality of the Greek Novels," in *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*, ed. Christopher Gill and T.P. Wiseman (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1993), 175–229. While this new class of literature is often called simply romances or novels, this term does not do justice to the diversity of the works that includes romantic novels, comic narratives, epistolary novels, and fictional biographies. On the difficulties in terminology and classification of these works, see Niklas Holzberg, "The Genre: Novels Proper and Fringe," in *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. Gareth Schmeling, Mnemosyne 159 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 11–28. On the range of Greek fiction in this period, see J.R. Morgan, "Introduction," in *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*, ed. J.R. Morgan and Richard Stoneman (London: Routledge, 1994), 6–9.

[196] Morgan, "Introduction," 2.

the recognition scene across the breadth and depth of ancient literature. They also correlate and expand many of the developments already noted in the recognition tradition.

2.4.2.1: Greek Romances

The five extant Greek romances date from the first century CE to the fourth century CE and feature remarkably similar adventure plots that follow the separation of young lovers and their eventually reunion usually depicted as a climactic recognition.[197] While the origins of the Greek romance are debated, there is significant overlap with the story of Odysseus and his reunion to his wife Penelope, as well as the standard plot of the New Comedy, creating a strong source of continuity with the established recognition tradition.[198] What is distinct about the Greek romance is that it was written to be read rather than performed, creating a narrative form which was able to develop the themes of love and adventure in greater detail.[199] As Reardon explains, "As a result of the extensive and imaginative treatment entailed by its narrative form, romance can carry a spiritual content similar in dimension to that of tragedy, and more impressive than is achieved normally by comedy."[200] As a result, the ancient romances tend to provide greater depth to the themes and functions of the recognition scene.

---

[197] The shared plot is noted by Niklas Holzberg, "The Genre: Novels Proper and Fringe," in *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. Gareth Schmeling, *Mnemosyne* 159 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 14; Morgan, "Introduction," in *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*, eds. J.R. Morgan and Richard Stoneman (London: Routledge, 1994), 2. While the similarity in plot is enough to cluster the works together, it is important that this similarity does not overshadow the differences between the works. The characterization, setting, and tone of the works are often quite distinct. See Morgan, "Introduction," 2.

[198] As Reardon notes, "The *Odyssey* itself is the fountainhead of Greek romance." See Reardon, *The Form of Greek Romance*, 6. For the relation to New Comedy, see Reardon, *The Form of Greek Romance*, 102.

[199] Reardon, *The Form of Greek Romance*, 71.

[200] Reardon, *The Form of Greek Romance*, 106.

The centrality of the recognition scene in the plot of the romances is apparent from the earliest extant example, Chariton's *Callirhoe*.[201] The narrative recounts the adventures of the couple Chaereas and Callirhoe who fall in love at first sight but are separated because of a scheme of a rival suitor that results in the apparent death of Callirhoe (*Chaer.* 1.1-8). Callirhoe awakes in her tomb only to be kidnapped by pirates (1.9). When Chaereas learns of her kidnapping, he sets out to find his wife. The rising action then depicts a series of delays to their reunion that build complexity and suspense.[202] The climactic recognition and reunion occurs in Book 8 which the narrator explains "will prove the most enjoyable for my readers, as an antidote to the grim events in the preceding ones (8.1.4-5 [Goold, LCL])."

The recognition and reunion occur when Chaereas captures the king's retinue among whom is a veiled Callirhoe. Chaereas enters the room where Callirhoe is staying to persuade her to join him. During this *meeting*, Chaereas' heart is stirred by the way the girl looks, but he is unable to recognize her because of some *cognitive resistance* (8.1.7-8). Once Chaereas addresses Callirhoe, she immediately recognizes his voice as the *token* of his identity and reveals herself. The result is a mutual *recognition* between the two that leads to an *emotional embrace* that deliberately recalls Penelope and Odysseus (8.1.8-9).[203] As B.P. Reardon noted, "Chariton has

---

[201] Bryan P. Reardon, *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 17.

[202] The schemes that delay recognition include Chaereas' discovery of the empty tomb without Callirhoe's body (3.3.4-5), Chareas' discovery of Callirhoe's funeral offerings without her body (3.3.13-16), and the trial of Book 5 where Callirhoe and Chareas recognize each other only to be torn apart again. During this last example, the narrator is clearly aware of the conventions of the type-scene as he declares, "What dramatist ever staged such an extraordinary situation? An observer would have thought himself in a theater filled with every conceivable emotion. All were there at once-tears, joy, astonishment, pity, disbelief, prayer (5.8.2 [Goold, LCL])."

[203] Montiglio, *Love and Providence*, 16–47. Montiglio has noted the deliberate echoes of Euripides' *Alcestis* in this scene as well as an intertextual relationship with the recognition between Odysseus and Penelope. The latter is supported by a direct quotation from the *Odyssey* 23.296 as Callirhoe and Chaereas' embrace leads to a reunion like Odysseus and Penelope as "they gladly came to the ancient rite of the bed (8.1.17 [LCL, Goold])." This climactic recognition scene, like its Homeric forbearer, also leads to further recognition in the denouement as Callirhoe returns with Chaereas to be recognized by her family just as Odysseus returned ultimately to Laertes (8.6-8).

certainly learned his lessons, and is clearly familiar with the whole range of literary equipment and devices by now accumulated in the Greek tradition."[204]

But Chariton's recognition scene develops the tradition in a few important ways. First, Chariton uses the recognition token of Chaereas' voice to generate Callirhoe's recognition. The voice was generally not used as a recognition token in ancient literature because it was seen as unreliable.[205] Second, there is no detailed testing of the tokens. Rather, Callirhoe and Chaereas instantly recognize each other. Use of the voice as a token and the lack of testing produces an instant recognition that captures the couple's love for each other. As Silvia Montiglio explains, "the novelist is not concerned…with prolonging the recognition but with idealizing the force of love."[206] The instant recognition ties the climactic scene to the emphasis throughout the work on love's inevitability, expressed through the prominent role of Aphrodite in bringing the couple together.[207] Chariton imbues the literary conventions with a spiritual meaning as the triumph of the plot of recognition is the works of the goddess of love.[208] Unlike comedy's parody of the

---

[204] B.P. Reardon, "Chariton," in *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. Gareth Schmeling, *Mnemosyne* 159 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 332.

[205] Montiglio, *Love and Providence*, 21.

[206] Montiglio, *Love and Providence*, 29.

[207] The recognition scene recalls the first time the couple met through a similar setting associated with Aphrodite, the casting off of a veil, and an immediate recognition between the lovers. The twists and turns of the plot are attributed to the goddess. As Book 8 explains, Aphrodite had created these problems for the couple out of jealous for Chaereas (8.1.2-3) but she eventually "brought the truth to light and revealed the unsuspecting lovers to each other (8.1.5 [Goold, LCL])." Her divine action orchestration of the plot is supported by her role as protector of the couple, the foreshadowing revealed through dreams, and numerous references to fortune's guiding hand.

[208] Reardon summarizes the narrative's worldview: "Love makes the world go round; beauty begets love, love leads to marriage, and marriage brings happiness. This life-process is traditionally symbolized and engineered by Eros, but Chariton gives the ultimate credit to Aphrodite, as is only proper for a writer from Aphrodite's city." See Reardon, "Chariton," 331.

deus ex machina, the appeal to the divine in this recognition is utterly serious. The hermeneutic role of the recognition scene attests to the conquest of love as the expression of Aphrodite's will.

The other four extant Greek romances are similar enough to be summarized briefly as follows, paying particular attention to their development of certain trajectories in the type-scene. First, all of them feature a climactic recognition scene, though sometimes it is not the recognition of lovers (as in *Odyssey*) but the recognition of a lost identity (as in *Ion* or *The Arbitration*).[209] In all of the recognition scenes, the elements of the type-scene are easily identified despite some artistic variation.[210]

Second, the possibilities offered by the written form of the romance allowed for increasing complexity in the narration of the recognition scenes. Of particular importance is the motif of apparent or faked deaths (*Scheintod*) as the grounds for the cognitive resistance during the recognition scenes. Empty tombs, perceived beheadings, funeral tokens without bodies, and staged sacrifices are strategies that create the doubt necessary for recognition.[211] For instance,

---

[209] For the recognition of lovers, see Xenophon *Ephesian Tale* 5.10-15; Achilles Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon* 3.9-23 and 8.15-16, with both of these recognitions following from plots that had faked Clitophon's death. For the recognition of the lost identity, see Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe* 4.20-40; Heliodorus, *Ethiopian Story* 10.5-40.

[210] For specific elements of the recognition type-scene, consider the cognitive resistance of the servants in Xenophon, *Ephesian Tale* 5.10.10 or Leucippe in Achilles Tatius, *Leuc. Clit.* 3.18.4. For a detailed court-room testing of the tokens, see Heliodorus, *Aeth.* 10.12-14. For an example of variation of the elements, consider the motif of the instantaneous recognition of lovers without the lovers testing tokens reused from *Callirhoe* in Xenophon, *Ephesian Tale* 5.13.3 or the delayed explanation for the recognition of Clitophon by Leucippe after the second staged death until 8.15-16 despite initial recognition and tokens in 5.18-20. For a summary of the type-scene elements and its examples in the romances, see Larsen, *Recognizing the Stranger*, 63–71.

[211] For empty tombs, see Chariton, *Callirhoe* 3.3.4-5; Xenophon, *Ephesian Tale* 3.6-9. For the staged beheading and sacrifice, see Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* 3.15 and 5.7. On the recognition of funeral tokens without the body, see Chariton, *Callirhoe*, 3.3.13-16. For an attempt to read these in line with a growing interest in resurrection perhaps because of Christianity's influence, see G. W. Bowersock, *Fiction as History: Nero to Julian*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 99–119. For a response that sees the emergence of *Scheintod* as part of an attempt to navigate cultural identity in the matrix of early Roman imperialism, see Judith Perkins, "Fictive *Scheintod* and Christian Resurrection," *R & T* 13.3–4 (2006): 396–418. Rather than attribute either a religious or socio-political interpretation to *Scheintod*, it seems most straightforward to see it as part of the growing complexity of the literary tradition around recognition. If there was competition to see who could have the

Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* features two distinct recognition scenes as they emerge from resolution of two faked deaths. In the narrative resolution of these through recognition, the type-scene elements are drawn out across chapters with a number of interrupting plot segments.[212] Similarly, the testing of the tokens in Heliodorus' *Ethiopian Story* shows the most robust testing found in the ancient literary tradition.[213] The pattern of increasingly complexity in these works parallels the development in the recognition scene in ancient comedy and suggests an on-going competitiveness within the tradition to make more elaborate and entertaining recognition scenes.

Finally, the romances amplify the typical functions of the recognition scene. For instance, they heighten the affective dimension by devoting more space to the emotional release of the recognition scene.[214] They are also more robust in their use of the hermeneutical role of the recognition scene. The romances are consciously aware that the recognition scene is meant to offer an interpretive lens for the whole plot, leading them to stress recognition as the result both of divine action and the author's ability. This is especially true of Heliodorus' *Ethiopian Tale,*

---

best, most compelling, recognition, apparent deaths would be an obvious development, as was already seen in the tradition from Euripides, *Iphigenia among the Taurians*.

[212] Silvia Montiglio suggests that Achilles Tatius' work is best described as *iconoclastic* in its willingness to use recognition but in a way that clearly exploits the conventions, often delaying the closure offered by recognition for significant lengths of time. See Montiglio, *Love and Providence*, 80-81.

[213] In what is easily the longest extant Greek romance, *An Ethiopian Tale* devotes abundant space to the development of the recognition type-scene, especially the testing of the tokens. The scene includes no less than three different tokens of identity, extended speeches for and against the value of these tokens, and an elaborate series of emotions in response to the recognition. As Terence Cave explains, "it is obvious that Heliodorus was drawing on a large fund of knowledge, internalized in his readers, of the conventions of such narrative: the technical vocabulary of recognition, belief and unbelief, wonderment and so forth, is used throughout in a way that reminds one of Aristotelian terminology." See Cave, *Recognitions*, 20.

[214] For instance, the two recognition scenes in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*, building on the plot of supposed death, are full of deep *pathos* supported by the use of first-person narration. For a discussion of this style and its indebtedness to tragic motifs, see B.P. Reardon, "Achilles Tatius and Ego-Narrative," in *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*, ed. J.R. Morgan and Richard Stoneman (London: Routledge, 1994), 80–96.

where, on the level of the characters internal to the narrative, the surprising interpretation of events is attributed to divine causality (10.18). However, on the level of the reader of the narrative, the surprise of the plot is the display of the author's brilliance who is able "to resolve a hopeless situation like a *deus ex machina* in the theater (10.12 [Morgan, *Collected*])." The self-referentiality and appeal to the theatre tradition stresses the plot as the work of the author alongside the divine in the narrative world.[215] As the soon-to-be recognized heroine Charikleia summarizes the whole, "great ends can only be achieved by means of equal greatness. A story whose beginnings have been made convoluted cannot be quickly resolved (9.24 [Morgan, *Collected*])." The same is true of the various staged tragic deaths in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* as they simultaneously parody the recognition tradition and use it as the hermeneutical key to the whole plot of the narrative. Overall, the romances correlate the interpretation of the signs of identity in the recognition scene with the reader's interpretation of the narrative. The recognition at the climax of the narrative reflects the reader's own sense of closure in arriving at the narrative's end.

2.4.2.2: Other Fictions

Besides these five extant Greek romances, the first few centuries CE saw a growth of literary production, creativity, and experimentation that drew from a diverse range of Greek literature including history, biography, geography, and even the raunchy satyr comedies, and

[215] Reardon, *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, 350–51. He explains, "at the end we are left with the satisfying feeling that everything has been accomplished under the guidance of Providence. But in a work of fiction Providence is only Plot in disguise. I cannot find any consistency in the attribution of events to nonhuman agencies and am inclined to think the whole divine apparatus a literary device to give the plot a sense of direction, purpose, and eventual closure, rather than a statement of belief intended to instruct its reader in the ways of god."

resulted in new fictive works for a larger consumer public.[216] Recognition scenes can be found sprinkled across these works as part of the inherited literary tradition. Two examples from these works warrant comment as they show continuity with the recognition tradition (*Satyricon*) and the distinction between recognition and epiphany (*Metamorphoses*).

The first example comes from the *Satyricon*, a bawdy and carnivalesque work of Latin fiction written in the mid-first century. [217] The story follows the exploits of the runaway slaves Encolpius and Giton as they navigate a series of misadventures generated by some offense against the god Priapus.[218] Despite its bawdiness, Petronius' fiction bears the marks of significant literary pretension especially in its dependence on Homer's *Odyssey* as reflected in the allusions to Homer in the recognition scene.[219] Encolpius and Giton flee the pursuit of their masters Lichas and Tryphaena by boarding a ship, only to have their masters follow them. Playing the part of Odysseus, Encoplius and Giton disguise themselves as bald and branded slaves (*Satyr.* 100-103). But when Lichas sees their shorn hair, he demands they be beaten for bringing bad luck on the

---

[216] Holzberg, "The Genre: Novels Proper and Fringe," 26; Tim Whitmarsh, *Ancient Greek Literature*, Cultural History of Literature (Malden, MA: Polity Press, 2004), 141. While it is impossible to make any statement of thematic unity among these works, scholars have often pointed toward their situation in an increasingly Roman dominated world where the Greek idea of civic life is replaced with a focus on domestic life, travel, and the individual.

[217] Petronius, *Satyricon*, ed. and trans. Sarah Ruden (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2000), 129-132, 176.

[218] Alongside its explicit subject matter, Petronius has often been praised for his high realism in depicting the language and character of the lower classes. This gives his narrative a singular vividness in the ancient world, as noted in Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis*, 31–33; Gareth Schmeling, "The Satyrica of Petronius," in *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. Gareth Schmeling, *Mnemosyne* 159 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 474–79.

[219] Similarity with the Homeric epic is apparent in the decision for the work to span 24 books. Other parallels include Encolpius' hiding on the underside of the bed just as Ulysses tied himself under a sheep to escape the Cyclops (97), the interactions with a witch named Circe (126-137), and a plot drive by an offended god (Priapus instead of *Odyssey*'s Poseidon). Schmeling, "The Satyrica of Petronius," 481, has even suggested that the *Satyricon* was a deliberate prose parody of the *Odyssey*. For a critique of Schmeling's position, consider Niall W. Slater, *Reading Petronius* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1990), 40-41, 181-3. Regardless of the extent of Petronius' parody, the echoes of Homer are clearly apparent in the recognition scene and show an explicit engagement with the recognition tradition inherited from Homer.

boat (105). During the violent *meeting*, the young Giton cries out in pain and is immediately *recognized* by Tryphanea because of his sweet voice (105). Lichas then turns to the disguised Encolpius and, as *a token* to prove his identity, examines not his hands or face but his genitals (105). Homer is deliberately invoked as the narrator explains, "No one need be surprised that Ulyssses's nurse discovered the scar which revealed his identity after twenty years, when a clever man hit upon the one test of a runaway so brilliantly, though every feature of his face and body was blurred (105 [Heseltine, LCL])." Upon *recognizing* Encolpius, Lichas realizes that the slave marks are merely stage makeup meant to hide his servants' identities (106). The unfortunate *reunion* leads to an elaborate rhetorical trial as the servants and masters are reconciled (much to the chagrin of the servants).

The elements of the recognition type-scene are obvious as is their dependence on the wider tradition. The explicit reference to Homer's *Odyssey* makes the parallel to the recognition scene explicit and shows the lasting influence of Homer's *Odyssey* in the construction of recognition scenes well into the first century.[220] The disguise as slaves is described in terms of stage make-up as if to align Petronius' use of recognition with the wider theatrical recognition tradition.[221] Even Tryphaena's recognition of Giton by his voice recalls the Greek romances. However, the function of the recognition operates largely against the established conventions since Encolpius and Giton are not brought to a happy reunion but are delivered back into the hands of their captors. The *Satyricon* reverses the romantic recognition by displaying a recognition "not of a person who would wish to be recognized by kin or lover and eventually is,

[220] Montiglio, *Love and Providence*, 159–61.

[221] This is reminiscent of the invoking of theatricality in the recognition scene in Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae* and Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*.

but of one who would wish to remain undetected and cannot."[222] This function is heavily dependent on the widespread awareness of the literary conventions of recognition in order to depart from them.

A second example comes from Apuleius' second century novel *Metamorphoses*. Apuleius tells the story of a young man named Lucius who is transformed into an ass.[223] After facing many trials and tribulations, Lucius calls out to the goddess Isis for deliverance, to which Isis responds with instructions for his transformation at a religious festival. Once returned to his human form, Lucius becomes a devotee of the goddess and, by the novel's conclusion, serves as a minor priest in her cult in Rome. Like Petronius' *Satyricon*, many elements of Apuleius' story are more satirical and erotic in tone than the ideal Greek romances.[224] For our purposes, the unique element in the narrative is the extended sequence of religion conversion that marks the climax of the novel's plot.[225] The narration of a religious conversion is quite unique in Greek literature, and is especially suggestive when joined to the climax of a romance.[226] Indeed, the singularity of the narrative has led scholars to significantly disagree on whether it depicts a conversion or merely a mocking of religious initiation.[227] While this debate hinges on a number

---

[222] Montiglio, *Love and Providence*, 159.

[223] On the date of the work, see S.J. Harrison, "Apuleius' Metamorphoses," in *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. Gareth Scmeling, *Mnemosyne* 159 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 505.

[224] Lucius' exploits mock the standard story of love lost and found in the ideal romances by having a donkey that is constantly having sex but never finding true love. The similarities with the Greek romance are likely due to dependence on an earlier Greek novel called *Lucius* or *The Ass.* For discussion, see Harrison, "Apuleius' Metamorphoses," 502.

[225] Harrison, "Apuleius' Metamorphoses," 503.

[226] Montiglio, *Love and Providence*, 9. As she has noted, "moral illumination is not the stuff of ancient Greek novels."

[227] For those who see the work as a conversion or at least a heightened sense of devotion to a single deity, see Nancy Shumate, *Crisis and Conversion in Apuleius' Metamorphoses* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996); Arthur Darby Nock, *Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of*

of factors including the definition of *conversion* and one's assessment of the tone of the whole work, what is important for us is to assess whether the climactic religious moment in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* constitutes a recognition scene. A close examination of the scene reveals it is better understood as an epiphany rather than a recognition scene.

Lucius' moment of revelation and transformation lacks too many of the formal elements to be a recognition scene. The donkey's conversion is rather a depiction of an epiphany whereby Lucius prays to the goddess Isis (*Meta.* 11.2), who shows up in a radiant vision and offers to save Lucius if he will eat a rose carried as part of her priests' ritual procession (11.3-6). In exchange for his deliverance, Isis demands that Lucius must forever devote his life to the service of her in obedience and chastity (11.6). In this sequence of events, the focus is on the epiphany of the deity and the promise of salvation in return for obedience. There is no exchange of tokens, no questioning of identity, and no moment of recognition. Rather, the scene better reflects the wider religious phenomena of epiphanies discussed earlier.[228] Furthermore, this climactic moment differs drastically from the standard functions of the recognition type-scene. Apuleius' story actually lacks a final recognition scene because Lucius is never reunited with his kin. Rather, his conversion to his human form does not represent a return but a commitment to a life of service to Isis. What is recognized is not a recovery of what is lost, but an abandonment of his old life for a new one.[229] Apuleius's *Metamophoses* is important, therefore, not because it depicts a recognition scene but because it shows the continuing distinction between epiphanies and

---

Hippo, Brown Classics in Judaica (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1988), 138–55. For a caution against this view, see Harrison, "Apuleius' Metamorphoses," 509–16.

[228] The marks of the epiphany are explicit in the commands for a life of service to Isis that follows the experience, a parallel closer to the establishment of the *cultus* in epiphanies rather than the emotional reunion of recognition scenes. See the above discussion on epiphanies in 2.2.

[229] Montiglio, *Love and Providence*, 170.

recognition scenes.[230] Unlike the overlap of epiphany and recognition in the *Odyssey*, this work demonstates a more explicit separation of the two forms.

2.4.3: Summary

Ancient fictive literature demonstrates that the recognition scene was not bound to the traditional genres of epic, tragedy, and comedy. The literary conventions of the recognition type-scene were transferred from classical works like Homer's *Odyssey* and New Comedy into a central feature of the plots of the Greek romances and related literature.[231] The formal elements of the type-scene remain easily identified even as the fictions adapt the recognition scene by using new tokens, introducing new complexity though stories of apparent death, and lengthen the scenes to create more suspense.[232] The novelistic literature attests to the continuing role of the cognitive, affective and hermeneutical functions of recognition into the first few centuries CE even as these functions are expanded by the new literary form.

2.5: Recognition in Ancient History and Biography

All of the examples of recognition examined above occur in ancient literary works where the type-scene is clearly a literary device that provides some development or closure to a narrative plot. These examples are not concerned with issues of historicity, however that term is defined. Furthermore, the artificiality of recognition as a plot technique initially would suggest

---

[230] This distinction between religious epiphanies and the climatic recognition scenes resists the reductionistic tendency to see all of the Greek romances as a mere religious narrative of initiation proposed by Karl Kerényi, *Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*, 10-137.

[231] Montiglio, *Love and Providence*, 228.

[232] Montiglio, *Love and Providence*, 232.

that it is unsuitable for historical or biographical works. As Terence Cave has explained, "To tell a story which ends in recognition is to perform one of the most quintessential acts of fictional narration–the recognition scene is, as it were, the mark or signature of a fiction, so that even if something like it occurs in fact, it still sounds like fiction and will probably be retold as such."[233] But the presence (or absence) of recognition scenes in historical or biographical works remains an important question since my argument for the occurrence of recognition scenes in the Gospel of Luke must contend with the well-supported claim that the Gospels are best read in light of the ancient genres of history and/or biography.[234] The generic distinction between fiction and history/biography was the reason Alsup limited the parallels to the resurrection of Jesus with the *theios aner* tradition found in historical and biographical writings. My survey of recognition in the Greco-Roman literary milieu must therefore conclude by providing evidence that the recognition type-scene was also found in works that show a concern for questions of historicity.

But it is important to begin the discussion by noting that this objection is predicated on a clear dichotomy between historical and 'fictional' writing, although such a divide is problematic in numerous ways. First, any act of narration requires selection and presentation that rule out a pure concern for historicity. Second, ancient historiography and biography have clear fictionalizing and literary tendencies. Historiography, as almost all of Greek literature, has its origin in the Homeric epics, which prefigure history's concern to articulate stories in a particular time and place and to explore issues of causation and truthfulness.[235] The tragic tradition also

---

[233] Cave, *Recognitions*, 4.

[234] Richard A. Burridge, *What Are the Gospels?: A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*, SNTSMS 70 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); For the opinion of a classicist on this point, see Tomas Hägg, *The Art of Biography in Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 148–86.

[235] Antonios Rengakos, "Homer and the Historians: The Influence of Epic Narrative Technique on Herodatus and Thucydides," in *La Poesie Epique Grecque: Metamorphoses D'Un Genre Litteraire*, eds. Franco Montanari and Antonios Rengakos (Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 2006), 183.

deeply influenced the historical writing developed in the Hellenistic period with a greater concern for rhetoric and morality.[236] History used elements from the tragic tradition such as stock scenes (the tragic messenger), vocabulary, and *pathos* in what is now called "tragic history."[237] Similar influences can be seen in ancient biographies.[238] As Richard Burridge has explained, Greco-Roman biography "was a flexible genre having strong relationships with history, encomium and rhetoric, moral philosophy and the concern for character."[239] Thus, history and biography were heavily influenced and indebted to the techniques and currents of thought in the wider literary milieu so that it is hardly surpring that the recognition type-scene (prevalent in “fictional” writing) made its ways into works of history and biography. The line between history and fiction is more a product of modern categories than ancient literary tendencies.

Such a blending of the historical and fictional in the use of the recognition type-scene is already apparent in a series of works now called the *Alexander Romance*.[240] The *Alexander Romance* refers not to a single document but a series of texts that tell the story of Alexander the

---

[236] John Marincola, *Greek Historians*, *GR* New Surveys in the Classics 31 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 110.

[237] For a careful discussion of tragic history and its use in recent scholarship, see Richard Rutherford, "Tragedy and History," in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. John Marincola, (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007), 504–14. On tragic history's influence on the New Testament, see DooHee Lee, *Luke-Acts and “Tragic History”: Communicating Gospel with the World*, WUNT 2.346 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013).

[238] For the development of the ancient genre of biography and its various literary influences, see Arnaldo Momigliano, *The Development of Greek Biography: Four Lectures* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), 101.

[239] Burridge, *What Are the Gospels?*, 69.

[240] These stories already existed in the Hellenistic period and likely were written in the third or second century BCE. See Richard Stoneman, "The Alexander Romance: From History to Fiction," in *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*, eds. J.R. Morgan and Richard Stoneman (London: Routledge, 1994), 117–21.

Great from a fictional perspective.[241] The *Alexander Romance* is unique among the ancient romances for situating a historical character in a fictional world and using the literary conventions of the type-scene in a historical situation.[242] For instance, Alexander dons a disguise in order to sneak into the camp of his enemy, King Darius (2.14). Alexander pretends to be the messenger of Alexander, and so King Darius has his enemy in his midst and is completely unaware (2.15). While at the king's banquet, Alexander is recognized by Pasarges who had met him earlier in his life. The *meeting* of Pasarges and Alexander leads to *recognition* based on the *token* of Alexander's voice, borrowing a trope from the Greek romances. Pasarges explains, "This is Philip's son, even if he has changed his appearance: many men can be recognized by their voice, even though they remain in darkness (2.15 [Dowden, *Collected*])." While not an elaborate recognition scene, it is one of many such scenes in the work that follow the formal elements of the type-scene and support wider themes in the narrative.[243] The hybridization of an ancient romance with the wider historiographic and biographic traditions demonstrates not only the blurring of distinctions between history and fiction but also the malleability of the recognition type-scene to be used in a history-like setting.[244]

---

[241] On the textual tradition involving the *Alexander Romance* in its many versions, see Richard Stoneman, "The Metamorphoses of the Alexander Romance," in *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. Gareth Schmeling, *Mnemosyne* 159 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 601–12.

[242] Besides the following example, see also the story of Alexander's tricking of Doros in his disguise as a soldier and his recognition through a portrait by the queen Candace (3.3, 20-22).

[243] Stoneman, "The Alexander Romance: From History to Fiction," 123–27. Stoneman has noted "Alexander's love of disguises certainly belongs to the character of the cunning hero, and cases of mistaken identity are important also in the Greek novels." The adaptation of one's identity aligns Alexander with the cunning Odysseus. As a wider theme, the ability of Alexander to manipulate his identity parallels the overarching theme of the struggle of the hero to conquer throughout the work.

[244] On the genre of the work, see Stoneman, "The Alexander Romance: From History to Fiction," 122–24.

When one sets aside the dichotomy between history and fiction in the use of the type-scene, it is not surprising that the literary conventions of the type-scene are also found in historical and biographical works, especially in several heroic appearances. Consider, for instance, the story of Apollonius of Tyana. An account of Apollonius' life was written by Philostratus in the third century CE, though it drew on early traditions roughly contemporary to the New Testament.[245] Philostratus recounts the recognition of Apollonius by his followers after a miraculous escape from a trial. Apollonius had prophesied to several believers to go wait for his appearance at a grotto (*Vit. Apoll.* 7.41). While his followers Damis and Demetrius are praying in the grotto, Apollonius appears before them to their surprise, having disappeared from his trial (8.10). During this *meeting,* Apollonius *proves* he is really there by instructing Demetrius to touch his body and make sure he is not a ghost (8.11 [Jones, LCL]). The *token* of physical touch dispels their disbelief and results in their *recognition* and *emotional reunion* with Apollonius. Apollonius then accompanies them on the road, recounting how he managed to escape his trial and providing the interpretive key to all of the events that preceded his appearance (8.12). The recognition scene is in line with the wider literary tradition.[246] It is also tightly fused to the plot with its stress on the fulfillment of Apollonius' earlier words and its function as space for recounting Apollonius' escape from the trial. The recognition scene offers a sense of closure to the whole, functioning synonymously as the recognition in the *Odyssey* or

[245] Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition*, 222. Recent scholars have questioned the extent to which Philostratus can be compared with the Gospels, not least because of the possibility that Philostratus used the Gospels, as noted in Larry W. Hurtado, *Destroyer of the Gods: Early Christian Distinctiveness in the Roman World* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016), 123. Still, the work remains the largest biography known from the ancient world and a key to understanding that genre. See Christopher P. Jones, introduction to *Apollonius of Tyana, Volume I: The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, by Philostratus. LCL 16 (Cambridg: Harvard University Press, 2005), 1–3.

[246] For instance, the stress on cognitive resistance to an appearance as a ghost has parallels in Euripides' *Helen* and Luke 24:36-43.

Chaereas and Callirhoe. Both in form and function, the biographical genre did not preclude Philostratus' use of the recognition type-scene but seems to have easily supported its inclusion.

Similarly, in Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* (a biographical work that contrasts important Greek and Roman men), a story is told of the post-death appearances of Romulus. Rather than die, "Romulus disappeared suddenly, with no portion of his body or fragment of his clothing remained to be seen (I.XXVII [Perrin, LCL])." Julius Proculus then meets Romulus while traveling on the road and reports this appearance to the assembly. (I.XXVIII). When recounting the experience, he uses the formal elements of the type-scene. During the *meeting* on the road, he met Romulus and *recognized* Romulus because of his glorious armored appearance (I.XXVIII). While not made explicit, the armor and appearance seem to function as *recognition tokens* revealing Romulus' identity. However, Proculus offers a level of *cognitive resistance* to Romulus' appearance, demanding an explanation for Romulus' departure. Romulus explains his departure as a result of the pleasure of the god. He finishes his short reply by prophesying that Rome will be the greatest empire, exhorting the Romans to practice restraint and valor, and explaining that he is ascending to heaven where he will be their propitious deity (I.XXVIII).[247] The scene concludes without an emotional reunion since the purpose is not a reunion but a confirmation of Romulus' new status and a commission to spread the news. The place where this scene departs from the recognition type-scene derives from the wider epiphany tradition in elements such as the god-like appearance and the institutionalization of a new cult. Still, the function of Proculus' recognition of Romulus offers a sense of closure to speculation about Romulus' disappearance by providing confirmation of Romulus' deification. The recognition

[247] A shorter version of the same story is recounted in Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Roman Antiquities* LXIII. It retains many of the same formal elements of the recognition scene.

functions as a hermeneutic key to understanding the events that followed and provides the cognitive and affective shift necessary to understand Romulus' status shift.

Following the story of Romulus, Plutarch recounts two similar afterlife appearances: Aristeas of Proconnesus and Cleomedes of Astypaleia.[248] Plutarch has clustered these stories together because of their similar shape and content.[249] Plutarch refers to them as μυθολογουμένοις, in line with a dichotomy between *muthos* and *logos/historia* used as early as Thucydides in order to contrast the truthfulness of history with the unbelievable element of myth.[250] Plutarch had a a negative view of these myths, since they "are told by writers who improbably ascribe divinity to the moral features in human nature, as well as to the divine (I.XXVII [Perrin, LCL])." Interestingly, it is the content of the stories (i.e., depicting mortals as immortal) rather than the literary form (i.e., recognition scenes) that grounds Plutarch's assessment of their plausibility. But Plutarch still recounts these stories despite his reservations because of their popularity as oral traditions connected to particular persons and places. Thus, the

[248] The stories are invoked as parallels to Romulus in *Parallel Lives* I.XXVIII. Both of these stories are also recounted elsewhere in the ancient world. Herodotus treats the story of Aristeas in *Persian Wars* IV.14-15. Cleomedes is treated in Pausanias' *Descriptions of Greece* VI.9.5-6.

[249] Aristeas of Proconnesus was a poet who died in a fuller's shop. As news spread of his death, a man from Cyzicus disputed the story by claiming he had seen Aristeas. When the shop was opened, the body was gone, a token of his disappearance. Additional tokens included reports of Aristeas' appearing and writing a poem seven years later in Proconnesus, and an appearance more than 200 years later in Metapontium (IV.15). Ultimately, the appearances are confirmed by the oracle of Delphi who urged that the Metapontines obey Aristeas' command for an altar to Apollo. Similarly, Cleomedes hit a pillar causing a roof to collapse and kill several children. Pursued by an angry crowd, Cleomedes hid in a chest. When men were finally able to open the chest, his body was gone. In response, the crowd consults the oracle of Delphi, who proclaims that Cleomedes had ascended to the gods as the last hero (I.XXVIII). Other examples of disappearance (or "translation" fables) are discussed in Richard C. Miller, *Resurrection and Reception in Early Christianity*, Routledge Studies in Religion 44 (New York: Routledge, 2015), 26-90. While not every example Miller provides is a recognition scene, many of these stories feature elements typical of the recognition type-scene.

[250] The historians essentially invented the idea of the "mythical" as the foil to their work despite using the mythical in their own writings, often in speeches or narrative digressions. On the complex relationship of myth and history, see Suzanne Said, "Myth and Historiography," in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. John Marincola, (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007), 76–88.

use of the recognition type-scene in these popular tales demonstrates its popularity and its adaptability to various settings regardless of historicity.

Phlegon's *Book of Marvels*, a collection of wondrous events compiled in the early second century, provides an excellent case in point.[251] He tells the story of a nurse who saw a girl believed dead with a young man named Machates (1.1-2). The nurse reports the news to the girl's mother, who accuses her of being mad. Still, the mother "peered in and thought she recognized her daughter's clothes and features, but inasmuch as she could not determine the truth of the matter, she decided to do nothing further that night (1.5)." In the morning, the mother questions Machates about this girl. Machates explains that the girl's name is Philinnion and, to prove her identity, opens a chest to reveal *tokens* (1.7-8). The mother recognizes the tokens and reacts with great wailing. She urges Machates to show them the girl if she comes again (1.8-9). When Philinnion comes to Machates the following night, he entertains her with food and drink while he secretly sends for the mother and father (1.10). When her parents arrive, there is a moment of *recognition* and *embrace* between the parties, but Philinnion rebukes her parents and immediately dies in their presence (1.11-12). The city hears of this miraculous event and gathers at the tomb of the girl where she was laid to rest months earlier (1.13-15). Upon opening the tomb, her body was not found. In its place were tokens she had obtained from Machates in her post-death visits. In this elaborate recounting of a local legend, the marks of the recognition scene are obvious, illustrating how deep a mark the recognition tradition left on the ancient world, seeping into popular storytelling that at least claimed to be historical.[252]

---

[251] William Hansen, introduction to *Phlegon's Book of Marvels*, by Phlegon of Tralles (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1996), 1–2. Collections of wondrous events were depicted in an ancient genre known as *paradoxoography* which first developed in the Hellenistic period as a blend of history, local legends, biography, and travelogues. For a discussion of the genre and its emergence, see Hansen, introduction, 9.

[252] There are several *meetings* between the dead girl and her friends and family. The mother displays *significant cognitive resistance* to the report of the nurse and Machates (1.1-5). The girl is recognized by her visits to

The examples presented in this section are neither numerous nor as artfully developed as the recognition scenes in other genres, but they nevertheless demonstrate that the recognition type-scene was flexible enough to be used in works of historiography, biography, and related storytelling.[253] Because of the interdependence of ancient genres, the imitation and reuse of the recognition scene was not limited by questions of historicity. Rather, the widespread prevalence of the recognition type-scene in epic, comedy, tragedy, and romance only made it a popular literary technique available to any work regardless of it claims to historicity or fictionality.

2.6: Conclusion

The brief survey of recognition scenes in classical literature establishes its widespread use in antiquity and its remarkable consistency in the formal elements of meeting, cognitive resistance, display of tokens, recognition, and reunion. But the stability of the type-scene did not restrict innovation and development, as each author tailored recognition to fit the plot and themes of the work as a whole. Amidst the development of the recognition type-scene, however, three functions rose to prominence.

First, the scene often carries both a cognitive and affective function in line with Aristotle's concern for a shift in knowledge and emotions. Questions of proper evidence in

---

Machates by the *tokens* she leaves behind (1.7-8). Similarly, the townspeople resist the story until the tomb is opened. This empty tomb is marked with *tokens* of Philinnion's visit to Machates, providing evidence of her post-death visit and confirming the story (1.15). Even the *recognition* and *reunion* between Philinnion and her parents bears the type-scene marks, as the parents embrace their daughter with weeping and wailing (1.11).

[253] In a recent book on the connection between Luke and ancient biographies, Jean-Noël Aletti contends that a major reason why recognition scenes do not show up more consistently in ancient biographies is because the protagonists of biographies were already recognized as great men of honor and virtue and thus do not require recognition internal to the narrative. Jesus, on the other hand, was not recognized as great by his coreligionists requiring the evidence of a recognition scene in the narrative. However, Aletti interprets recognition solely as the recognition of Jesus' innocenet by authorities in Luke, not his identity as the risen Messiah. See the discussion in Aletti, *The Birth of the Gospels as Biographies with Analyses of Two Challenging Pericopes*, 4–24.

identification and the renewed relationship between the recognizing parties are often foregrounded. The emotional release of the scene, found in the reunion of the characters, was also prominent and subject to elaboration.

Second, recognition scenes often demonstrate a concern for the process of interpretation, as the recognition provided a hermeneutical key to the understanding of a work's wider plot. The recognition scene is treated as a microcosm of the reading process itself, with the move from ignorance to knowledge paralleling the audience's experience in interpreting the literary whole in light of the moment of recognition. Of course, the hermeneutic function in bringing closure to a narrative was subject to a range of treatments. For some, the closure produced by recognition was so unlike reality that recognition was mocked for its artificiality and conventionality. For others, recognition's artificiality expressed the work of the divine in history specifically because of its surprising, supernatural character. Yet an assessment of recognition as the work of divine providence or literary artifice was not an assessment of the scene's historicity as much as a critique grounded in the conventionality of recognition in the literary milieu.

Overall, the classical tradition provides a broad background for understanding the recognition type-scene as a literary technique available to Luke's Gospel in the first century CE. But another significant aspect of the literary milieu of Luke’s Gospel was the Hebrew Bible and Hellenistic Jewish literature of the Second Temple Period. The extent to which the recognition type-scene was used in these works and provided similarities and differences with the broader classical tradition will be the topic of the following chapter.

CHAPTER 3

RECOGNITION IN THE HEBREW BIBLE AND HELLENISTIC JEWISH LITERATURE

"The passage from ignorance to knowledge, one of the great archetypes of literature, is another Hebraic innovation for which the Greeks get all the credit."[254]

3.0: Introduction

While Greek and Roman literature utilized the recognition type-scene as a standard literary technique, the Hebrew Bible was developing its own recognition tradition.[255] This independent development of recognition is an example of a phenomenon well documented by folklore experts of how a literary technique can be found in diverse cultures independent of direct genetic influence.[256] Eventually, the biblical tradition of recognition was brought into conversation with the wider classical tradition following the interactions between Greeks and Jews during the Hellenistic period. The Hellenistic milieu facilitated the adaptation of the biblical recognition tradition into greater agreement with the classical tradition. To insist on a division between the biblical tradition and the wider Greek literary milieu in the assessment of the form of the resurrection appearances is simply misleading because the two traditions were merged by the time of the writing of Luke's Gospel.[257] Thus, the Gospel of Luke was written in a

---

[254] Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, Indiana Literary Biblical Series (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985), 176.

[255] For an attempt to trace the literary relationship of Homer and the ancient Near East, see Bruce Louden, *Homer's Odyssey and the Near East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011). However, Louden, 12 is unable to articulate specific influence preferring instead the vague explanation, "Greek myths should be seen in dialogic relation with Near Eastern myth, with influence running in both directions, during several difference eras." A direct dependence is simply out of the question.

[256] See the folklore work of Propp, *Morphology of the Folktale*. A similar claim is also supported by the work of form criticism research, both biblical and classical, as seen in Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* and Albert Bates Lord, *The Singer of Tales*.

[257] *Conta* Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition*, 265. For the link between Judaism and Hellenism, see Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in*

context where the wider Greek literary tradition and the inherited tradition of the Hebrew Scriptures were intertwined.[258] The challenge of this chapter is to present the recognition tradition in the Hebrew Bible and related Jewish literature in a way that can appreciate its independent development while also acknowledging its eventual incorporation into the classical tradition by the first century CE.[259]

3.1: The Poetics of Recognition in the Hebrew Bible

The starting point for the analysis of recognition in the Hebrew Bible is not as apparent as the Greek tradition since there is no Jewish equivalent of Aristotle's *Poetics*. Rather, recent comparative literary analysis has tried to discern inductively the key differences between the poetics of ancient Greece and Israel. The classic example is *Mimesis*, in which Erich Auerbach argued that there were two distinct streams of literary representation of reality that emerged from Homer and the Hebrew Bible. Homer's style externalizes description, places events in the foreground, and offers few elements of psychological development. In contrast, the Hebrew Bible is terse, lacks detail, and prefers to work through ambiguity, historical development, and psychological depth.[260] Auerbach's work then charts how the interactions, dialogues, and debates between these two traditions resulted in the literary development of the Western world.

Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period, 1st ed., (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974); Erich S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism the Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*, HCS 30 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).

[258] The influence of the Hebrew Scriptures on the Gospel of Luke are too numerous to count and include the numerous citations and allusions to the Hebrew Scriptures, particularly in their Greek translation as the Septuagint, as well as the references to key figures from the Jewish narratives. For more specific details on Luke's use of the Old Testament, see Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016), 191-280.

[259] This is the challenge of comparative literature as a whole as noted in David Palumbo-Liu, "Method and Congruity: The Odious Business of Comparative Literature," in *A Companion to Comparative Literature*, eds. Ali Behdad and Dominic Thomas (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 57.

[260] Auerbach, *Mimesis*, 1–23.

Two recent scholars have used Auerbach's dichotomy between Homer and the Hebrew Bible in order to discuss the recognition scene. Pietro Boitani's *The Bible and Its Rewritings* notes that apart from the passage from ignorance to knowledge, the Hebrew Bible's recognition tradition "has nothing in common with Greek artistic practice nor, consequently, with the philosophy which analyses it."[261] Recognition in the Old Testament tends to be "silent anagnorisis" where there is less concern for the moment of recognition than the divine-human relationship in which the recognitions occurs. Revelation tends to occupy a more prominent place than recognition tokens, since tokens are often the source of misrecognition while God can ultimately guarantee recognition.[262] For the Hebrew Bible, moments of recognition tend to function less as a climactic moment but as part of the continual process that unfolds through narrative development and interpersonal relationship.[263]

Meir Sternberg has also offered a discussion of the biblical recognition tradition in contrast to Homer. The Bible's opposition of divine omniscience and human restriction placed the question of knowledge in a complex tension that allows for the creation of complex plots of recognition.[264] While the Greeks saw the shift in knowledge as causing a shift in external fortune, the Hebrew Bible establish a more complex relationship between reversal of external goods and internal recognition that results in plots where "external and internal plot fuses together into a movement in which history turns on discovery—failures, zigzags, relapses and

---

[261] Boitani, *The Bible and Its Rewritings*, 2.

[262] Boitani, *The Bible and Its Rewritings*, 24.

[263] Boitani, *The Bible and Its Rewritings*, 30–31.

[264] Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 173-76. As Sternberg explains, "With surprisingly few exceptions…in each tale at least one character goes through a drama of discovery, complete with *anagnorisis* if not with a whole series of them, and none ends as unenlightened as he began."

all—and the progress made by an agent emerges by references to both equally developing counterparts and the two status superiors."[265] Recognition functions as a fleeting moment of illumination given by God with its own sense of closure.[266] In Sternberg's opinion, the biblical emphasis on illumination and transformation sets it apart from the Greek tradition and anticipates the turn in modern fiction to the internal development of characters.[267]

Thus, recent comparative literary analysis highlights the distinctiveness of the biblical recognition tradition in contrast to the Greek tradition. In the following analysis of biblical recognition scenes, I will continue to use the formal element of the type-scene in order to identify examples of recognition, but I will also highlight the unique aspects of the biblical recognition tradition. Presenting the unique aspects of the biblical recognition tradition will allow me to explore its subsequent development in Hellenistic Jewish literature where it merged with the classical recognition tradition in the literary milieu of the first century CE.

3.2: Genesis as the Foundation for the Biblical Recognition Tradition

If Homer's *Odyssey* is the foundation for the classical recognition tradition, Genesis holds a similar place in the biblical recognition tradition. Genesis features several recognition scenes as it incorporated these scenes into its wider narrative.[268] Genesis also shows some overlap between

---

[265] Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 176–77.

[266] Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 178.

[267] Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 232.

[268] Modern scholars have long noted that Genesis is not a single united narrative but the result of several sources redacted into a whole. For a recent work on the complexities of the documentary hypothesis, see Joel S. Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis*, AYBRL (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012). Still, several recent commentators have continued to treat the text as a literary whole. I will follow these scholars in treating Genesis as a whole, not least because it was read as such by Jewish and Christian communities in the first century CE. See Walter Brueggemann, *Genesis*, IBC (Atlanta: John Knox, 1982), 6–7; David W. Cotter, *Genesis*, Berit Olam (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003).

recognition and theophanies. Thus, Genesis presents a similar series of issues as Homer's *Odyssey* in determining not only the pattern and function of recognition in the work but also how this type-scene is similar to and distinct from theophanies. I will begin by analyzing several recognition scenes in Genesis before addressing their role in the wider narrative and their relation to epiphany stories.

3.2.1: Judah and Tamar

The most overt recognition scene in the Hebrew Bible occurs in Genesis 38 between Judah and Tamar.[269] While Genesis 38 is part of the Joseph cycle and its thematization of recognition (Gen 37-50), the chapter's distinct plot and characters give it an independent narrative coherence.[270] Genesis 38:1-11 provides the necessary background for the deception and recognition between Judah and Tamar. Judah, seeing the death of his two eldest sons after their marriage to Tamar, refrains from giving away his youngest son to Tamar. Judah's deceptive plot aligns him with the wickedness of Onan as he refuses to obey the levirate law to produce heirs.[271] Judah's deception forces Tamar to act independently to produce children.

---

[269] Dohyung Kim, "The Structure of Genesis 38: A Thematic Reading," *VT* 62 (2015): 551.

[270] The coherence of the chapter has led some scholars to suggest it is an insertion. Gerhard Von Rad, *Genesis: A Commentary*, rev. ed., OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972), 356, notes, "Every attentive reader can see that the story of Judah and Tamar has no connection at all with the strictly organized Joseph story at whose beginning it is now inserted." See also Walter Brueggeman, *Genesis*, 307-8. For the wider narrative connections to the Joseph story, see Kruschwitz, "The Type-Scene Connection between Genesis 38 and the Joseph Story," 390-3; Bruce Waltke and Cathi J. Fredricks, *Genesis: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 507. Despite the connections, this narrative is set apart from what precedes by an explicit time indicator (v.1), a unique cast of characters only one of whom (Judah) shows up in the following chapters, and a clear conclusion with a tribal aetiology around the births of Perez and Zarah (vv.29-30).

[271] Kruschwitz, "The Type-Scene Connection between Genesis 38 and the Joseph Story," 397.

Genesis 38:12-24 describes Tamar's scheme as she dons the disguise of a prostitute in order to seduce Judah during his visit to the sheepshearers after his wife's death.[272] When Judah meets Tamar, he is unaware that she is his daughter-in law (38:16), although the reader knows her true identity, resulting in a sense of dramatic irony. Judah desires to sleep with Tamar and promises to send payment later, but Tamar shrewdly demands Judah's seal, cord, and staff as a pledge until she receives payment (38:18). These tokens are "the instruments of Judah's legal identity and social standing."[273] Judah concedes, hands over the tokens, and has sex with Tamar. Later, the announcement of Tamar's conception from this union will prompt the recognition scene. In the interim, Judah sends his payment to the prostitute, but is unable to find her, leaving him in disgrace without his tokens.[274]

The recognition type-scene occurs in Gen 38:24-26 as the news of Tamar's pregnancy is brought to Judah (38:24). Judah calls for Tamar to be brought out and burned for her infidelity, setting the stage for the *meeting of the two parties*.[275] During the meeting, Tamar declares that she is pregnant by the man to whom the tokens belong. She *displays the tokens* and explains, "Take note, please, whose these are, the signet and the cord and the staff (Gen 38:26 NRSV)."

---

[272] Recent research confirms the connection between sheepshearing and fertility festivals, as seen in 1 Sam 25. See Jeffrey C. Geoghegan, "Israelite Sheepshearing and David's Rise to Power," *Bib* 87 (2006): 55-63; Mark Leuchter, "Genesis 38 in Social and Historical Perspective," *JBL* 132.2 (2013): 220.

[273] Alter, *The Five Books of Moses: A Translation with Commentary*, 1st ed. (New York: Norton, 2004), 217.

[274] When the news of the prostitute's departure is brought to Judah, he demands that the woman can keep his pledge, "lest we be put to shame" (Gen 38:23: פֶּן נִהְיֶה לָּבוּז הִנֵּה). The Hebrew word בוז suggests contempt and disgrace. See BDB, 101, s.v. "בוז"; *DCH* 2:127, s.v."בוז."

[275] Alter, *The Five Books of Moses: A Translation with Commentary*, 218-9. It is unclear whether Tamar's defense is spoken in a meeting with Judah or through a messenger. The text remains ambiguous though the meeting criterion is still fulfilled as the setting notes the recognition occurring through the exchange between Tamar and Judah. See Rachel Adelman, "Ethical Epiphany in the Story of Judah and Tamar," in *Recognition and Modes of Knowledge: Anagnorisis from Antiquity to Contemporary Theory*, ed. Teresa G. Russo (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2008), 60.

Although the NRSV translates the verb used here (נָכַר) as "take note," it can also carry the stronger sense of recognition, especially as it is repeated in Judah's *recognition* in 38:26.[276] However, no direct object is attached to the verb in verse 26 so that Judah's recognition remains ambiguous. As one scholar explains, "Does [Judah] recognize himself, or his items, or what he has done, or Tamar? Tamar's own directive suggests that he first recognize himself, though this initial recognition would presumably prompt him to recognize more clearly both what he has done and the person to whom he has done it."[277] On the surface, the recognition is similar to the cognitive and affective function found in Greco-Roman literature, especially Oedipus' self-recognition *vis-a-vis* his family.

But Judah's recognition also has judicial and moral implications, as captured in his pronouncement that Tamar "is more in the right than I, since I did not give her to my son Shelah (Gen 38:26 NRSV)." Judah is not only recognizing the identity of Tamar, he is also admitting his wrongdoing. As Alter explains "The verb used, *tsadaq*, is a legal term: it is she who has presented the convincing evidence. But in the next clause Judah also concedes that he has behaved unjustly toward Tamar, so that in a sense her taking the law into her own hands, however unconventional the act, is vindicated by his words."[278] Thus, Judah's *attendant reaction*

---

[276] BDB, 648, s.v. "נָכַר." The primary use of this verb in Genesis involves scenes that are either examples of recognition or deliberate deception. The verb appears in Jacob's deception of his father by pretending to be Esau (27:23), in Rachel's deception of both her father and Jacob in stealing an idol (31:32), and several times in the Joseph story (37:32-33; 42:7-8). The use of this verb throughout the Joseph narrative is often a key element in the argument for reading the narrative of Genesis 38 as a microcosm of the recognition that occurs in Gen 37-50. So Leuchter, "Genesis 38 in Social and Historical Perspective," 210-11; Alter, *The Five Books of Moses: A Translation with Commentary*, 217; Waltke and Fredericks, *Genesis: A Commentary*, 507.

[277] Kruschwitz, "The Type-Scene Connection between Genesis 38 and the Joseph Story," 408.

[278] Alter, *The Five Books of Moses: A Translation with Commentary*, 219. *Contra* David A. Lambert, *How Repentance Became Biblical: Judaism, Christianity, and the Interpretation of Scripture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 54, who sees the act only as a legal dismissal without the attendant shift in moral perspective.

is to admit his moral culpability and acknowledge the justice of Tamar's actions.[279] Genesis 38:36 emphases a further shift in Judah's moral character since he does not sleep with Tamar again. Knowing the familial identity of Tamar leads Judah to no longer engage in incestuous activities.[280] The recognition has a clear commissive function as the narrative depicts Judah's transformed moral character. If the cognitive function of the scene is similar to the Greek tradition, the moral transformation marks a significant departure. As Adelman states, "the course of events does not hinge on plot alone; for this scene is not dictated by the necessity of probability (as Aristotle would have it), but by a critical shift in moral consciousness on the part of Judah."[281] The narrative emphasizes the commissive function of recognition in calling forth a change in character. Following the shift in character, the narrative concludes with Tamar's birth of twins, the two new sons of Judah that function as a divine blessing to replace his wicked sons.[282]

To summarize, Genesis 38 uses the standard elements of the recognition type-scene, lacking only the element of cognitive resistance. It is similar to the Greek tradition in its use of evidence, and its focus on the cognitive and emotional shift produced by recognition. But Genesis 38 also illustrates a unique emphasis in the biblical recognition tradition as recognition hinges on the discovery of Judah's moral culpability, giving the recognition scene a commission

---

[279] See also Esther Marie Menn, *Judah and Tamar (Genesis 38) in Ancient Jewish Exegesis: Studies in Literary Form and Hermeneutics*, JSJSup 51 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 45. As Menn explains, "This climatic moment of visual recognition in Genesis 38 stimulates recognition of a more fundamental nature and leads Judah's public admission of responsibility for the crisis that forced Tamar to act in an unorthodox, but effective, manner (Gen 38:25). The fact that Judah accuses himself in Genesis 38 emphasizes his personal progress from irresponsibility and ignorance to self-knowledge and responsibility."

[280] Von Rad, *Genesis: A Commentary*, 361.

[281] Adelman, "Ethical Epiphany in the Story of Judah and Tamar,"59-60.

[282] Kruschwitz, "The Type-Scene Connection between Genesis 38 and the Joseph Story," 408.

function that calls for a change in the actions of the character. The moral focus in the recognition scene creates a commissive function that correlates with the emphasis on character development in the biblical tradition noted by recent comparative scholarship.

3.2.2: Joseph and His Family

Genesis 38 is situated inside the complex story of Joseph's slavery in Egypt, his rise to power, and his reunion with his family. The Joseph Cycle contains two additional recognition scenes and a number of misrecognition scenes. [283] As Boitani explains, "the whole story of Joseph and his brothers constitutes a process of anagnorisis, the passing from ignorance to knowledge (in Aristotle's definition), based on three basic, complementary, and interconnected devices: sign, recognition, and revelation."[284] Like Homer's *Odyssey*, the Joseph Cycle is permeated by a concern for recognition that is expressed in several scenes that deserve careful attention for illustrating the unique aspects of the biblical recognition tradition.

The narrative begins with Jacob's preferential love for his son Joseph (Gen 37:3), which causes strife between Joseph and his brothers and drives the narrative's plot. Joseph's preferential treatment is also joined with two important motifs. First, Jacob gives Joseph a special robe (כְּתֹנֶת פַּסִּים) as a sign of his favor (37:4).[285] Clothing will function throughout the narrative as a

[283] On the genre of the Joseph cycle as a court tale or *novella*, see Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, WBC 2 (Dallas: Word, 1994), 344–45. On the literary skill in the Joseph cycle, consider Nahum M. Sarna, *Genesis: The Traditional Hebrew Text with New JPS Translation*, JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1989), 254. Sarna explains "the Joseph story is set forth by a master storyteller who employs with consummate skill the novelistic technique of character delineation, psychological manipulation, and dramatic suspense."

[284] Boitani, *The Bible and Its Rewritings*, 29.

[285] There is debate about the exact special status of the robe, whether it had long sleeves or, as in the LXX, it was many colored. For discussion, see Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 351.

recognition token subject to manipulation. Second, Joseph has dreams that predict his rise to success over his family (37:5-9), enfusing the narrative with God's providential guidance.[286] While both motifs function as signs of Joseph's chosen status, they also provoke the jealousy of his brothers, who respond by stripping Joseph of his robe and selling him as a slave (37:18-28).

The brothers then fabricate a *misrecognition scene* in order to hide their deed from their father Jacob. They put goat's blood on Joseph's cloak to fake Joseph's death (37:31), *meet* with the father to *display the token* of the coat, and ask him to *recognize* it (37:32) using the same verb for recognition as in Genesis 38. Jacob recognizes the coat (37:33) and interprets it as evidence of Joseph's death, *reacting* with mourning and the tearing of his clothes as he exclaims, "I shall go down to Sheol to my son, mourning (37:34-5 NRSV)." This brief scene follows the pattern of the recognition type-scene, but the result is a misrecognition arising from a manipulation of the tokens. The brothers' deception of Jacob functions to further the drama and *pathos* of the narrative just as the report of Orestes' death propels Sophocles' *Electra.*[287]

The same is true of a second misrecognition scene that happens while Joseph is a slave in Egypt. While working under his master Potiphar, Potiphar's wife attempts to seduce Joseph several times (39:6-9). During one failed seduction, Potiphar's wife takes Joseph's garment as Joseph flees (39:11-13) and uses it as evidence that "this Hebrew servant whom you have

[286] The motif of dreams in the Joseph narrative is important in Genesis 40-41 as Joseph's ability to interpret the dreams of the cupbearer, the baker, and eventually Pharoah will lead him out of prison. As Joseph is interpreting these dreams, however, the stress is placed on God as the interpreter (40:8; 41:16, 25, 38-39). Divine revelation allows Joseph to interpret the truth from these signs and leads to his ascent in the Egyptian court, where he earns a new name for himself with authority and new clothes (41:42-45). God builds a new identity for Joseph in Egypt. Joseph's ability to properly interpet God's actions will intersect with the theme of recognition in the recognition between Joseph and his brothers.

[287]As David Cotter explains, "Joseph, having been stripped of his identity, will have to reclothe himself somehow, have to weave a new persona. The brothers, having taken upon themselves the identity of brother slayers, will have to atone for that and for the grief that they have caused to their father." See Cotter, *Genesis*, 276.

brought among us" had attempted to rape her (39:17-18 NRSV). Potiphar finds this evidence quite convincing and has Joseph thrown in prison.

Both misrecognition scenes create deception through the manipulation of clothing in a way similar to Tamar's deception through veiling in Genesis 38. As John Huddleston explains, "in each case, the deception or concealment hinges upon the initial removal or loss of garments or objects."[288] But the three stories diverge on the evidentiary value of tokens for recognition. While Joseph's brothers and Potiphar's wife use tokens to deceive, the tokens in Genesis 38 produce recognition. Thus, Genesis presents a complex view of recognition tokens since tokens require additional perception in order to function as trustworthy signs. As Boitani explains, "The sign in itself, then, is neutral: this much at least is clear to the reader of Genesis. It can lead equally to ignorance or knowledge, death or life; it only leads to recognition, and thus true knowledge, if accompanied by self-awareness. Aristotle's scientifico-philosophical criterion is here replaced by a moral one, introspection."[289] While the tokens are exploited by jealous brothers and the desires of Potiphar's wife, they become transformative for Judah only when joined with his moral shift. The crucial difference will take center stage in the recognition between Joseph and his brothers as God becomes the guarantor of Joseph's identity by providing the truest sign.

While Joseph's dream interpretation eventually leads him out of prison and into Pharoah's court, a famine forces Jacob to send his remaining sons to Egypt to buy grain (42:1-3). When Joseph's brothers arrive in Egypt, they bow before their brother in an ironic fulfillment of the

[288] John R Huddleston, "Divestiture, Deception, and Demotion: The Garment Motif in Genesis 37-39," *JSOT* 26.4 (2002): 55.

[289] Boitani, *The Bible and Its Rewritings*, 20.

dream in Genesis 37. Crucially, Joseph recognizes his brothers though they do not recognize him (42:7-8). The recognition scene that follows is unilateral, involving only the brothers' recognition of Joseph. As Cotter, explains, "The words "brother" and "recognition" dominate the first episode, the tension being on who recognizes and who fails to recognize."[290] But before the climatic recognition, Joseph extensively tests his brothers in order to assess whether their character has changed (42:18-44:13).[291] The tests reveal the brothers' moral transformation as they acknowledge their guilt for hurting Joseph and show particular care for their youngest brother Benjamin.[292] Joseph's testing brings him to tears on three separate occasions as he observes their moral change. As Bosworth suggests, "the asymmetric weeping emphasizes that these are recognition scenes for Joseph, but not for his brothers."[293] While the tests allow Joseph to see his brothers anew, they also increase the story's *pathos* and drive toward the emotional release of the recognition scene.[294]

The recognition scene proper occurs in Genesis 45:1-15. Joseph orchestrates a secluded *meeting* with his brothers (45:1), in which he *reveals* himself by declaring, "I am Joseph. Is my father still alive?" (Gen 45:3 NRSV). The brothers do not instantly recognize him, but rather are

---

[290] Cotter, *Genesis*, 305. This includes the repeated use of נָכַר

[291] Von Rad, *Genesis: A Commentary*, 378.

[292] Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 425. For the brother's confession, see 42:21-22. After Joseph has Benjamin falsely arrested for stealing his cup, Judah steps up to plead for Benjamin's release, offering himself as a servant instead (44:18-34). Like his moral transformation before Tamar in Genesis 38, Judah's earlier selling of his brother into slavery is transformed into a willingness to become the slave in his brother's stead. Judah's speech ultimately results in Joseph's disclosure of his identity.

[293] David A Bosworth, "Weeping in Recognition Scenes in Genesis and the Odyssey," *CBQ* 77.4 (2015): 626. Joseph cries when he hears his brothers' confess their guilt for selling him into slavery (42:21), during the first meeting his younger brother whom his brothers had delivered to him with such care (43:30), and after hearing Judah's plea for Benjamin (45:1-2).

[294] Sarna, *Genesis: The Traditional Hebrew Text with New JPS Translation*, 308.

dismayed (בָּהַל) by the news, suggesting a kind of *cognitive resistance*.[295] Joseph answers their resistance by explaining, "I am your brother, Joseph, whom you sold into Egypt (45:4 NRSV)." His self-disclosure functions as a *recognition token* in two ways. First, Joseph reveals his name and his relation to his brothers, showing that the recognition is not simply about identity but also the relationships that constitute his identity. Second, Joseph explains his identity as the one "whom you sold into Egypt," providing a narrative fragment known only by Joseph and his brothers. Joseph's selling into slavery "composes his identity by calling up retrospectively a fragment of narrative, since only narrative can compose identity as continuity once a severance has occurred."[296] The result is *recognition* and the *attendant reactions* of weeping, embracing, and further conversation (45:15).[297] The scene captures the cognitive and affective shift in the brothers through their recognition.

But the recognition also functions hermeneutically by connecting recognition to divine action. Joseph notes four separate times that God had worked through his brothers' actions to help preserve them from slavery (Gen 45:5, 7, 8, 9), offering his decisive interpretation of all of the events in the recognition scene by appealing to God's invisible hand.[298] As Wenham explains, "The statements about God's overruling of human affairs are undoubtedly the key to understanding the whole Joseph story."[299] The description of God's role in his story offers the

---

[295] The verb בָּהַל conveys the sense of terror and anxiety reflected in trembling. See Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 432.

[296] Cave, *Recognitions*, 23. The same focus on identity through relationship and the narrative linkage offered by tokens are seen in the recognition scenes of the *Odyssey*.

[297] Interestingly, Joseph's embrace begins first with his youngest brother Benjamin before moving on to his other brothers, paralleling his weeping for his youngest brother in 43:30. The special preference for the younger brother is also seen in the gift of clothes after the recognition scene (Gen 45:22). The prefence for the young brother is a fitting recapitulation of the special favor Joseph himself received from his father Jacob.

[298] Sarna, *Genesis: The Traditional Hebrew Text with New JPS Translation*, 254.

[299] Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 432.

reader the theological framework for making sense of the whole narrative that culminated in the recognition. For the brothers (and the reader), the recognition offers the lens for properly interpreting Joseph's story.

Joseph's final speech also provides instructions for how the narrative will precede and how the family will ultimately be delivered from the famine. Joseph plans to provide housing and food to his father and brothers in Goshen (Gen 45:11-12). In the assessment of Von Rad, "it is not possible to overlook the great theological and programmatic significance of these statements, for through this guidance that family was preserved which was the heir of the promise to the fathers."[300] The focus on the actions that ought to follow from the recognition highlight the scene's commissive function. The brothers' transformed moral character should result in the complete reunion of Joseph with his family and their deliverance from the famine.

Although the recognition between Joseph and his brothers is the climax of the narrative, there is an additional recognition scene between Joseph and his father. Like Odysseus and Laertes, the recognition between father and son in Genesis 46 lacks the detail or suspense of the preceding recognition but participates in the narrative's climax. The brothers return to Jacob and report that Joseph is still alive. Joseph responds with *cognitive resistance* (45:26), to which the brothers respond with the *tokens* Joseph told them as well as display the wagons of goods he provided them (45:27). Jacob decides to investigate for himself (46:28), encouraged by a divine dream that his family will thrive in Egypt with Joseph (46:3-4). Again, recognition is joined with a revelation of God's actions. When Joseph and Jacob finally meet, the *recognition* is instantaneous with *attendant reactions* of weeping (46:29-35).[301] The remainder of the Joseph

[300] Von Rad, *Genesis*, 393.

[301] Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 445.

narrative recounts the death of Jacob in old age and the blessings of his sons. The whole story is summarized, like the conclusion of a Euripidean drama, with a celebration of the god who orchestrated the whole plot, as Joseph reassures his brothers "even though you intended to do harm to me, God intended it for good, in order to preserve a numerous people, as he is doing today (Gen 50:20 NRSV)."[302]

Overall, Genesis 37-50 contains three explicit recognition scenes and two misrecognition scenes that easily correlate with the formal elements of the type-scene and have a similar cognitive, affective, and hermeneutic function as the classical tradition. However, there are three emphases in these scenes that are distinct from the wider Greek tradition. First, recognition in Gen 37-50 revolves around moments of confession of guilt, moral culpability, and decisions to change one's character. The role of character development in recognition is much more central here than in the Greco-Roman examples. Second, the recognition scenes often have an explicit commissive function. Arising from the focus on the moral, these recognition scenes often support or demand a specific response or new form of behavior. Third, these scenes heighten the role of the divine in recognition plots. While the Greek tradition often invokes the divine in recognition, it takes a more central place in the Joseph narrative, both in the focus on dreams and the explicit references to God in orchestrating the whole plot. In the moment of recognition, success is less dependent on tokens of identity than on God's providential care. These three emphases will reappear in other biblical recognition scenes.

[302] Gabriel Josipovici, *The Book of God: A Response to the Bible* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), 78.

3.2.3: Recognition and Deception in Genesis

The recognition scenes in Genesis 37-50 are tightly bound up with the theme of deception, whether in the false tokens produced by Joseph's brothers and Potiphar's wife or in the trickery displayed by Tamar. Genesis, like many ancient narratives, presents recognition and deception as two related phenomena. Recognition scenes are often built on scenes of deception and reverse the deception with a revelation of the truth.[303] Several recent authors have treated the theme of deception in Genesis comprehensively, so I simply want to discuss several scenes of deception in Genesis that support unique aspects of the recognition tradition. [304]

One common pattern of deception in Genesis is the sister-wife tale. At three different points in Genesis (Gen 12:10-20; 20:1-18; 26:6-11), the patriarch pretends that his wife is his sister in order to protect her from those in power. The powerful eventually recognize the deception, rebuke the patriarch, and promise to protect his wife. While the similarity of these stories led earlier scholars to conclude that they were variations on a single tradition, recent scholars have argued that these are three examples of a type-scene. [305] While each story has its unique emphases, all three are concerned with God's promise to Abraham to protect his offspring (Gen 12:1-3). The patriach's attempt to protect his wife through deception is dramatically reversed by the powerful's recognition of the truth.[306]

---

[303] Susan Niditch, *Underdogs and Tricksters: A Prelude to Biblical Folklore*, New Voices in Biblical Studies (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987).

[304] Michael James Williams, *Deception in Genesis: An Investigation into the Morality of a Unique Biblical Phenomenon*, StBibLit 32 (New York: Lang, 2001); Dean Andrew Nicholas, *The Trickster Revisited: Deception as a Motif in the Pentateuch*, StBibLit 117 (New York: Lang, 2009); John Edward Anderson, *Jacob and the Divine Trickster: A Theology of Deception and YHWH's Fidelity to the Ancestral Promise in the Jacob Cycle*, Siphrut 5 (Winona Lake, IN.: Eisenbrauns, 2011).

[305] For an argument in favor of variations on a single tradition, see Von Rad, *Genesis*, 162–63. For a careful analysis of the three stories as separate expressions of a type-scene, see Niditch, *Underdogs and Tricksters*, 23–69.

[306] Anderson, *Jacob and the Divine Trickster*, 40.

The sister-wife tales capture the biblical emphasis on morality and divine action in recognition. In Gen 12:10-20, God's plague on Pharaoh leads him to recognize that he has taken Abram's wife (Gen 12:17-20). In the second tale, God appears to Abimelech in a dream and threatens Abimelech with death if he does not return Abraham's wife (20:3-7). The third sister-wife tale involves Isaac, Abraham's son, pretending that his wife Rebekah is his sister to deceive another king named Abimelech (26:6-7).[307] In this story, God does not interfere to expose the plot. Rather, in a comic twist on the type-scene, Abimelech sees Isaac "playing"with his 'sister' leading him to surmise that this woman is not his sister but his wife (26:8-10 NRSV)! [308] In two of the three deceptions, God is intimately involved in the moment of recognition. The longest sister-wife tale (Gen 20) also connects the moment of recognition with Abimelech's emphasis on his innocence rather than guilt. Genesis 20 aligns the moment of recognition with a moral change in the character. While none of these stories are examples of the recognition type-scene *in toto*, they support the unique biblical emphasis on morality and divine interaction in recognition.

Patterns of deception and recognition are also prominent in the Jacob Cycle of Genesis 25-36. Beginning with the Lord's declaration that "the elder shall serve the younger (Gen 25:23 NRSV)," the Jacob Cycle depicts Jacob's deception of his father, his brother, and his father-in-law as he tries to supplant his older brother.[309] As Jacob plays the deceiving trickster, one learns simultaneously that God acts in surprising and subversive ways to maintain fidelity to the

---

[307] The story is intertextually linked to Abraham's plot in Gen 12:10-20 through mention of a similar famine experience by Abraham (26:1), God's appearance to Isaac to tell him to go to Gerar rather than Egypt as Abraham had done (26:2), and the repetition of God's promise of Abraham (26:3-5; cf. 12:1-1-3).

[308] The Hebrew word for laughter is צָחַק which is itself a play on Isaac's name, יִצְחָק. See Von Rad, *Genesis*, 266.

[309] As Susan Niditch explains, "Themes of rivalry and status at the heart of the entire narrative of Jacob as trickster are textured into the very opening of the hero's life." See Niditch, *Underdogs and Tricksters*, 95.

promise of Abraham.[310] Several of Jacob's deceptions offer insight into the function of recognition in Genesis.

Jacob's deceptions begin when he tricks his brother out of his birthright in exchange for a reddish lentil stew (Gen 25:29-34).[311] Subsequently, Jacob and his mother trick Issac into giving his blessing to Jacob rather than Esau (27:1-40). The latter scene is important because it uses the conventions of recognition in order to generate a plot of misrecognition. Jacob's mother disguises him to look like Esau (27:14-16) so that while Esau is hunting for dinner to give to his father, Jacob *meets* with his father and claims that he is Esau (27:18-19). When Isaac questions the disguised Jacob about his hunt, he invokes God's blessing of his endeavor suggesting God's approval of the ensuing deception. As Isaac embraces his disguised son, he displays *cognitive resistance* for "the voice is Jacob's, but the hands are the hands of Esau (27:22 NRSV)." Issac's resistance is overcome by the *physical token* of the hairy hands and the smell of Esau's clothes on Jacob's body (27:27).[312] The deception is successful as Isaac *misrecognizes* Jacob as Esau and gives him the blessing of the firstborn (27:27-29).[313] The misrecognition resonates with the similar plots of deception in the Joseph Cycle where recognition tokens (especially clothing) are manipulated to dishonest ends, supporting the biblical ambiguity toward recognition tokens as convincing evidence and the need for divine intervention in recognition.[314] The theme continues

---

[310] Anderson, *Jacob and the Divine Trickster*, 174.

[311] Gen 25:30 builds on a wordplay between Edom, Esau's other name, (אֱדֹם) and the reddish soup (אָדֹם) his brother makes. Similar wordplays on red can be seen in 25:25-26. See Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 178.

[312] As Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 209, explains, "the disguise provided by Rebekah is sufficient. Only the voice does not seem to fit. Nevertheless, Isaac is sufficiently persuaded to bless Jacob." Cf. the use of voice as a token in the Greek romances.

[313] The misrecognition is stressed through the use of נָכַר (27:23), the same verb found in other recognition scenes in Genesis.

[314] Niditch, *Underdogs and Tricksters*, 78, suggests that the recurrence of the deception pattern likens the Jacob cycle to the Joseph cycle so that "as Telemachus is to Odysseus, so Joseph is to Jacob.

later in the narrative as Jacob will continue to deceive and be deceived in his interactions with Laban, his father-in-law.[315] But suffice to say that Jacob's deceptions, like the sister-wife tales, support the unique emphases of the recognition scenes in Genesis by highlighting the role of morality and divine action in recognition.

3.2.4: Recognition in Genesis' Anthropomorphic Theophanies

There is another set of recognition scenes in Genesis that deserves special attention because of their overlap with theophanies. While biblical theophanies display a range of forms including appearances in dreams, storms, and in displays of glory (כָּבוֹד), there are two divine appearances in Genesis where the deity is described as appearing as a person (אִישׁ): Genesis 18:1-33 and 32:22-32.[316] These examples are, in the words of Von Rad, "strange and singular in the Old Testament," although they were important evidence for Alsup's creation of an appearance form.[317] These two stories confirm specific aspects of Genesis' use of recognition while also exposing the complex relationship between recognition and theophany in the biblical tradition.

---

[315] Laban is able to deceive Jacob into marrying both of his daughters (29:15-30). Jacob gets his revenge when he swindles Laban out of a large portion of his livestock (30:25-43). Rachel, Jacob's wife, also deceives Laban by stealing his household god and hiding it (31:19-35). These examples of deception are deeply bound up with the story of Jacob and reveal a consistent pattern in the narrative where Jacob is able to achieve success and live into his blessing through his deception. While the role of God in these scenes is often ambiguous, the framing of the story with the divine oracle at least suggests God's approval of the deception. As Wenham explains, "this narrative makes points that were ever relevant to the life of the nation: that God is not frustrated by the cheat, that justice will finally be seen done, and that his promises to his people, here personified in Jacob, of land, protection, and blessing to the nations will, despite all opposition, eventually triumph." See Wenham, *Genesis. 16-50*, 260.

[316] On types of theophanies in the Hebrew Bible, see Esther J. Hamori, *When Gods Were Men: The Embodied God in Biblical and Near Eastern Literature*, BZAW 384 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 1.

[317] Von Rad, *Genesis*, 200. For the use of these stories in analyzing the resurrection appearances, see Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition*, 242–51; Catchpole, *Resurrection People*, 70–71.

The first example is YHWH's appearance to Abraham at the oaks of Mamre in Genesis 18:1-33. The overall form of the story is a *theoxeny* where Abraham's hospitality to his divine guest(s) will be contrasted with the hospitality received in Sodom and Gomorrah.[318] While the opening calls this a visit of God, the three guests are unknown when Abraham receives them and offers a generous display of hospitality (18:1-8).[319] One of the guests promises that Abraham's wife will soon bear a child, leading Sarah to laugh (18:9-12). Yet the guest, now named as YHWH, reaffirms the promise and claims "Is anything too wonderful for the LORD (Gen 18:14 NRSV)?" The verbal revelation seems to lead Abraham to recognize the true identity of the guest as the narrator shifts to the use of LORD to identify the speaker in vv.13-14.[320] Furthermore, it is clear that Abraham's recognition of God has occurred before verse 24 when, after the other two messengers are sent to Sodom, Abraham intercedes for God's mercy for Sodom and Gomorrah (vv.22-33).

The difficulty of this story, however, is that Abraham's recognition of God is never explicitly recounted. Boitani describes it as a silent *anagnorisis* so that "when Abraham's recognition of God is finally explicit, it is presented accidentally, as part of a considerably more important narration of how he speaks to God and bargains with him."[321] The passage's ambiguity

---

[318] Scholars have struggled to make sense out of this strange theophany. Many see in this narrative a fusion between a story of Abraham's hospitality to strangers and a separate account of Abraham's intercession for Sodom and Gomorrah. See Claus Westermann, *Genesis 12-36: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1985), 274. Similarly, Von Rad, *Genesis*, 200. Von Rad also cites the work of Hermann Gunkel, whose study informed much form critical research on Luke 24.

[319] Von Rad, *Genesis*, 201.

[320] Hamori, *When Gods Were Men*, 11–2.

[321] Boitani, *The Bible and Its Rewritings*, 8. As Boitani elaborates, this story "plays with our readerly capacities, offering Sarah's laughter and God's recognition of it as keys, but then confuses us with grammar games of singular, plural, name, and noun, drawing us into the trap behind the slow, silent process of agnition between Abraham and God." See Boitani, *The Bible and Its Rewritings*, 9.

is further heightened by the narrative's unclear demarcation between God's identity among the three messengers. The scene also lacks a display of evidence of identity or cognitive resistance so that the anthropomorphic nature of the theophany does not facilitate the recognition but contrasts with the explicit appeal to divine tokens in Greek theophanies. Rather, the silent recognition between God and Abraham is inferred from God's verbal address rather than any visual cue.[322] The only token is God's promise, which echoes the repeated calls and promises of God to Abraham throughout Genesis, suggesting that the recognition is about trust in God rather than evidence of sight. Overall, the scene resists categorization as a recognition scene.

Similarly, the story of Jacob's wrestling with a visitor in Genesis 32:22-32 is marred in mystery and ambiguity that sets it apart from the recognition type-scene. While Jacob is alone at the river Jabbok, a man appears and wrestles Jacob until day (32:25). Before this man can escape, Jacob is able to demand that the stranger bless him. The stranger renames Jacob as Israel, a name denoting one who strives with God (32:27-9).[323] Jacob in turn renames the place Peniel, claiming "I have seen God face to face, and yet my life is preserved (32:30 NRSV)." The story concludes with an aetiological description linking the stranger's wound to Jacob's hip with the practice of not eating the thigh muscle among Israelites.[324] The stress on Jacob's new name marks an end to Jacob's plots of deception that pave the way for his reunion with his brother, Esau.[325]

---

[322] Hamori, *When Gods Were Men*, 12.

[323] Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 297.

[324] Von Rad, *Genesis*, 319.

[325] Wenham, *Genesis 16-50*, 304.

There are numerous difficulties in interpreting this narrative, not least in its depiction of recognition. Many scholars think that it is not properly a theophany but instead depicts Jacob wrestling with an angel or spiritual force associated with the river Jabbok.[326] The description of the stranger as God only occurs in the interpretive acts of Jacob's re-naming as Israel and in Jacob's naming of the place as Peniel.[327] Thus, Jacob (like Abraham in Gen 18) only recognizes the stranger through speech rather than any visual characteristic. Again, the anthropomorphic element in the theophany is completely minimized without any reliance on physical tokens or cognitive resistance. Like Genesis 18, there is never an explicit moment of recognition. Recognition must be inferred from the shift in the character's speech following the divine encounter. Overall, the story does not conform to the recognition type-scene.

Both anthropomorphic theophanies highlight the distance between the recognition type-scene and theophanies. They lack the formal elements of the type-scene, especially in narrating a moment of recognition and the display of tokens, and are rightfully undertood better as theophanies rather than recognition scenes. But they do confirm a number of observations about the unique stylistic tendencies in biblical recognition scenes. First, they reveal a deep-seated mystery about the role of the divine in recognition. God can aid recognition, but it is often unclear or ambiguous how to discern God's role. Indeed, the explicit acknowledgement of God's role in recognition often comes only after a silent recognition. Second, these theophanies reject physical tokens and support a tendency in recognition scenes to question the value of such evidence. In both theophanies, God is not inferred from physical tokens but from divine address. A similar emphasis on speech rather than physical evidence is seen in the recognition scenes. For

[326] See discussion and rejection of these theories in Hamori, *When Gods Were Men*, 13–18.

[327] Hamori, *When Gods Were Men*, 23–24.

instance, Joseph's revealing of his identity to his brothers is supported primarily by his direct speech and his ability to articulate God's role in his history. If, as Boitani has argued, *anagnorisis* in Genesis hinges on the interplay of signs, recognition, and revelation, these anthropomorphic theophanies stress the mystery of revelation and the limits of signs.[328]

3.2.5: Summary

The preceding sections have surveyed a diverse set of narratives in Genesis that includes recognition scenes, misrecognition scenes, plots of deception, and anthropomorphic theophanies. The broad range of material provides a framework from which we can draw several conclusions about the nature and function of recognition in the book of Genesis. First, the recognition scenes in Genesis are easily identified with the formal elements of the type-scene suggesting a cross-cultural narrative pattern. The recognition type-scene is identified in Genesis with the same markers as used in our study of the Greco-Roman scenes, though a unique identifying marker in Genesis is the Hebrew word נָכַר. The conventions of recognition were also utilized in scenes of misrecognition demonstrating how Genesis creatively used and adapted recognition to create scenes of deception. Furthermore, the anthropomorphic theophanies lacked the key characteristics of the recognition type-scene, suggesting a differentiation between the two forms.

The recognition scenes in Genesis also had a similar set of cognitive, affective, and hermeneutical functions as the Greco-Roman material. But Genesis expanded these functions with two unique emphases. First, recognition in Genesis is often joined to moral transformation in its characters. Recognition operates "less in a state of being than in a process of becoming, by

[328] Boitani, *The Bible and Its Rewritings*, 29.

the trial and error of experience."[329] The result is that recognition scenes often carry an explicit commissive function that calls for the recognizing party to change their behavior either prior to or in response to the recognition. Second, Genesis reveals a general skepticism toward recognition scenes that hinge on tokens alone, as the tokens are continually revealed to be the source of deception (e.g., Joseph's cloak, Jacob's disguise as Esau). While the tokens can function as convincing evidence (i.e., Judah and Tamar), successful recognitions prefer to stress divine intervention or revelation. It is God who provides the most compelling evidence in the recognition scene. While divine action can be found in some Greco-Roman recognition scenes, it is given much more prominence and seriousness in Genesis.

Finally, the role of recognition in Genesis often lacks the climactic force it has in the Greek literature. Genesis recounts not *one recognition* but an on-going movement of recognition and deception in the lives of its protagonists. This is due, in part, to the fact that Genesis is part of a larger story of the chosen people of God rather than the story of a single individual (e.g., Odysseus). [330] Still, moments where the deceptions give way to recognition act as revelatory moments about the characters and the God they serve, allowing a climax in terms of interpersonal relationships (e.g., Joseph and his brothers) even if they are never climactic in the individual's relationship with God. As Meir Sternberg explains, "Instead of marking a reversal of character and often fortune too, as in Greek tragedy or the classical novel, biblical discovery, like Joycean epiphany, comes up as a momentary illumination that may well be followed by a backsliding into darkness."[331]

---

[329] Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 177. See also Josipovici, *The Book of God*, 172.

[330] Scholars have attributed Genesis' dialectic of deception and recognition to Israel's place as a marginal power stuck between various empires which required it to use deception in order to survive. See Niditch, *Underdogs and Tricksters*.

[331] Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 178.

3.3: Other Recognition Scenes in the Hebrew Bible

Although Genesis provides the densest clustering of recognition scenes in the Hebrew Bible, recognition scenes can be found in other books of the Hebrew Bible and often feature the same emphases noted above. The following section discusses several of these examples in order to demonstrate the consistency of the type-scene elements and the unique biblical emphases, providing the broadest foundation for the biblical recognition tradition.

1 Samuel recounts two separate recognition scenes between David and Saul. In 1 Samuel 24, Saul is pursuing David in the wilderness in order to capture him (1 Sam 24:2-4). While David and his men hide in a cave, Saul unknowingly wanders into the same cave where David is able to cut off a corner of Saul's robe undetected (24:4-7). After Saul leaves the cave, David reveals himself to Saul and his men. During this *meeting*, David *displays the token* of Saul's robe to demonstrate his righteousness in not killing Saul (24:9-11).[332] Saul *recognizes* David's identity through his voice and confirms his story by the display of the the corner of the robe. Saul responds with *weeping and a confession* that David is more righteous than he (24:16-17), providing a close parallel to Judah's confession in Genesis 38. This strengthens the overlap of repentance and confession with recognition in the biblical tradition. The scene uses most of the elements of the recognition type-scene (lacking only the *cognitive resistance*) and correlates with the unique biblical emphases showing continuity with the recognition pattern of Genesis.

1 Samuel 26 recounts a similar theft of tokens and recognition between Saul and David. David and a few of his men are able to sneak into Saul's camp while he and his soldiers are

[332] The token of the robe corner reminds the reader of Samuel's early prophetic act of tearing Saul's robe just as the Lord will tear the kingdom from Saul (1 Sam 15:27). See A. Graeme Auld, *I and II Samuel*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012), 275–76.

sleeping (1 Sam 26:1-7) and steal Saul's spear and water jar (26:12). The narrator explains that this was easily done because "a deep sleep from the Lord was upon them (26:12 NRSV)." After David sneaks out of the camp, he calls out to Saul and his soldiers. During this *meeting*, Saul *recognizes* David's voice and David *displays* the stolen spear, leading Saul to bless David again for his mercy (26:21-25). The recognition scene is remarkably similar to the recognition in 1 Samuel 24 in David's display of restraint, the use of two tokens (the voice and a marker of Saul's identity), and in the lack of cognitive resistance. There are only two major differences. First, there is the shift in token to a spear rather than the robe corner.[333] Second, 1 Samuel 26 heightens God's involvement in the recognition. God's role in putting Saul and his men to sleep enables David's theft of the tokens. Thus, the passage amplifies the divine involvement common to the recognition tradition established by Genesis.

The infamous story of David's affair with Bathsheba and his plot to kill her husband in 2 Samuel 11:1-25 also concludes with a recognition scene in 12:1-15. The Lord sends the prophet Nathan to confront David for his acts of adultery and murder (2 Sam 12:1). During his *meeting* with the king, Nathan tells David a parable about a rich man who steals a poor man's ewe in order to entertain a guest (12:1-4).[334] Upon hearing the story, David pronounces judgment upon the rich man and declares that he ought to pay fourfold for the lamb (12:5-6). Nathan then declares, "You are the man (2 Sam 12:7 NRSV)!" symbolically connecting David's actions with the actions of the rich man in the story. Nathan uses the parable as a *recognition token* to comment on David's actions. Nathan explains that as a result of his actions David will face the

[333] Throughout 1 Samuel, Saul's power and identity and are associated with the spear. The spear is used by Saul in his attempts to kill David (18:11; 19:9) and his son Jonathan (20:33). However, Saul will keep his spear until the end of his life when he dies leaning up against it (2 Sam 1:6). See Auld, *I and II Samuel*, 309.

[334] For a more robust treatment of the parable, see Jeremy Schipper, *Parables and Conflict in the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 41–55.

Lord's judgment (12:9-12). David *recognizes* his wrong-doing and *responds* by confessing his sin (12:13). The scene is distinct in its use of a parable to generate a self-recognition rather a token that proves identity, though the emphasis on verbal tokens is similar to the emphasis on divine speech in the anthropomorphic theophanies. David's self-recognition is similar to Oedipus' recognition in Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex,* though David's recognition is the result of his moral failing and gives him the opportunity to confess and change. Thus, David's recognition provides room for characer transformation in a way that contrasts with Oedipus but is in line with the wider biblical tradition. Furthermore, the instigation of the recognition comes from the Lord who sends Nathan to confront David. The passage contains a self-recognition where the unique biblical emphases on repentance and divine involvement given the scene a strong commissive function.

These recognition scenes in the Hebrew Bible agree with the pattern of the recognition type-scene and the unique emphases of recognition in Genesis. The elements of meeting, cognitive resistance, display of tokens, recognition, and reunion with attendant emotions still operate successfully as general markers. However, there is not a slavish dependence on the elements as each scene shapes the type-scene to its own ends. Indeed, many of these examples stress the results of the recognition in moral transformation rather than dwelling on the cognitive resistance to the tokens. Importantly, many of the biblical recognition scenes show up in historical narrative material, demonstrating that recognition was used comfortably in historical narrative just as demonstrated in the wider Greco-Roman milieu.

3.4: Recognition in Other Biblical Anthropmorphic Angelophanies

Besides these recognition scenes, there are at least two other biblical narratives that feature recognition although they occur in angelophanies. The angelic appearances of Judges 6:11-40 and Judges 13 feature elements of the recognition type-scene, though they better align with the pattern of anthropomorphic theophanies found in Gen 18 and 32 and with the call narratives that often accompany theophanies as in Isa 6. The result is a kind of epiphanic recognition similar to the blending encountered in Homer's *Odyssey* and the Homeric hymns.

The first passage is the call and commission of Gideon in Judges 6:11-40.[335] An angel of the Lord appears to Gideon and declares the Lord's presence with Gideon (Judg 6:11-12). During this *meeting*, Gideon demands a sign of its truth, suggesting his *cognitive resistance* to the news of the divine messenger (6:13-18).[336] The angel instructs him to place his offerings on a rock, which the angel then touches with his staff (6:19-20). Fire miraculously consumes the offering and the angel of the Lord then disappears (6:21). These actions are *convincing tokens* for Gideon, who *recognizes* the angel of the Lord and *responds* with a cry for God's help (6:22). After the Lord grants Gideon peace, Gideon responds by building an altar to the Lord (11:23-24).

A similar angelophany occurs in Judges 13, though this story functions not as a commission but as an annunciation of the birth of Samson to his parents.[337] An angel announces the birth of Samson to his mother, whose husband asks for his own visitation when he hears his wife's story (Judg 13:2-8). The recognition contrasts the believing wife and her disbelieving

---

[335] For a formal description of the call narrative, see Habel, "Form and Significance of the Call Narratives," 298–301; Neyrey, *The Resurrection Stories*, 26.

[336] There is an interesting movement in the identity of the messenger from being simply an angel of the Lord (6:11, 21) to the angel as the Lord (6:14). Such ambiguous personage is reminiscenent of Gen 18 and 32. See Susan Niditch, *Judges*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008), 90.

[337] Niditch, *Judges*, 142.

husband. When the angel appears again, the husband questions the messenger and prepares a meal for him (13:15-16). During this *meeting,* Manoah displays *cognitive resistance* to the messenger's identity.[338] Interestingly, "The woman recognizes immediately that the messenger is no mere mortal (v.6), whereas the husband treats him as a holy human being (vv.8, 17)."[339] The angel declares that he will not eat Manoah's food but will make it an offering to the Lord. When Manoah lays his offerings on the altar, they are miraculous consumed by flames as the angel ascends with the flames and disappears from their presence (13:10-20). These miraculous *tokens* generate *recognition* and lead Manoah to *emotions* of fear (13:21). However, his wife (who has all along recognized the angel) argues that God would not have taken the time to announce the birth of their child if God was going to kill them. The recognition "serves to contrast the down-to-earth good sense of the women, who understands the significance of the events, with the timidity and ignorance of the man."[340]

These two angelophanies are remarkably similar in their fusion of an angelic appearance with a testing, recognition through miraculous means, and resulting emotions of fear requiring further reassurance from God. While there is strong continuity with the formal elements of recognition scene, several items set them apart from the recognition tradition and suggest they are formally different. The recognition of an angel leads to distinct shifts in the formal elements that recall other theophanies in the Hebrew Bible including the miraculous fire, the resistance to the call, and the expression of divine favor.[341] Furthermore, the building of an altar and the

---

[338] Niditch, *Judges*, 146. The irony is further heightened after the angel denies to tell Manoah his name because it is "too wonderful (Jud 13:18, NRSV)." The refusal to reveal his name is similar to the theophany on the river Jabbok (Gen 32:29).

[339] Niditch, *Judges*, 145.

[340] Niditch, *Judges*, 146.

[341] Niditch, *Judges*, 90.

offerings suggest the kind of cultic establishment found in ancient epiphanies. The theophanic character of the stories also leads to different emotional responses centered on fear and awe rather than joy. Overall, there are enough distinct differences to describe these stories not as recognition scenes but as forms of theophanies that incorporate an element of recognition. Such epiphanic recognitions were found in the wider Greco-Roman milieu. What is distinct about the two examples, however, is their fusion of recognition with commission and annunciation stories which again highlights unique strands of the biblical recognition tradition.

3.5: Recognition in Hellenistic Jewish Literature

The recognition scenes in the Hebrew Bible were composed and compiled at various times in Israel's history from the 10th century BCE to the Babylonian exile in the sixth century BCE.[342] However, the unique emphases of the biblical recognition tradition continued in the literary milieu of Second Temple Judaism. The Second Temple period covers the construction of the Jerusalem Temple in the fifth century BCE up to its destruction in the Jewish War of 66-70CE.[343] During this period, the effects of Hellenism created a diverse Judaism with various social, religious, and cultural means of joining Greek language and culture to the inherited biblical tradition.[344] The dynamic interaction of Judaism and Hellenism promoted a period of

[342] Many other portions of the Hebrew Bible were written after Israel's return from exile (e.g., the Book of Daniel), though the examples above likely stem from the earlier period. For a brief history of the development of the canon of the Hebrew Bible and its implications, see Shaye J. D. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*, 3rd ed. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2014), 167–204.

[343] On the history of this period and the complexities involved in terminology, see Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*, 1–12.

[344] For the diversity of Judaism in Palestine, see Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*. For a compelling examination of the diversity of Judaism in a specific setting, see John M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE - 117 CE)* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996).

great literary production in which Jews produced new literature including rewritten biblical stories, apocalyptic and testament texts, and historical and philosophical reflections.

During this period, the biblical tradition of recognition was continually used, reworked, and developed in conscious dialogue with the wider Greek literary milieu. An examination of the recognition tradition in Hellenistic Jewish literature cautions against any strong distinction between Jewish and Greek recognition in the first century CE. Rather both traditions had coalesced into a single literary milieu by the writing of Luke's Gospel. Our analysis of the recognition tradition in Second Temple Jewish literature will focus on two categories of recognition scenes: the reuse and retelling of recognition scenes from the Hebrew Bible and new Jewish narratives that included recognition scenes.[345] Both provide evidence of the interaction of the biblical and Greek recognition traditions.

3.5.1: The Reception of Biblical Recognition Scenes in Hellenistic Jewish Literature

The Jewish literature produced during the Second Temple period was heavily indebted to the biblical tradition, which paradoxically served as a source of great freedom and creativity. As Cohen notes, "The emergence of canonized texts allowed the Jews great freedom in interpreting their sacred traditions, a freedom that had earlier been denied them when the traditions circulated in fluid form."[346] The sheer number of retold recognition scenes from the Hebrew Bible demonstrate how widespread the biblical recognition tradition was in this period. To take just one example, the story of Judah and Tamar in Genesis 38 is translated in the LXX, retold by the Hellenistic Jewish philosopher Philo of Alexandria, rewritten in the book of Jubilees, and forms

[345] As noted in Everett Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 433.

[346] Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*, 185.

a major portion of the Testament of Judah.[347] Rather than exhaustively cataloguing every retold biblical recognition scene, I want to highlight the key developments reflected in retelling of the biblical recognition tradition, paying attention to the Greek language used for recognition, the clarification and dramatic amplification of aspects of the recognition scenes, and the continuing emphasis on divine action and repentance.

Many of the biblical recognition scenes in Second Temple Judaism were retold in the Greek language. However, these translations rarely used the semantic domain of ἀναγνώρισις. For instance, the only use of ἀναγνωρίζω in the entire LXX occurs in Gen 45:1 to describe the recognition of Joseph by his brothers.[348] Similarly, the only use of ἀναγνωρίζω in the corpus of Philo shows up in his treatment of Gen 45:1, which he calls "the first recognition" (τὴν πρώτην ἀναγνώρισιν) (*Joseph* 237).[349] The Greek retelling of recognition scenes was dominated instead by two other verbs. The first is ἐπιγινώσκω, which is used consistently to describe the moment of recognition in the LXX recognition scenes.[350] Josephus also uses it to describe the recognition of Saul in 1 Sam 26 (*Ant.* VI.312). The second verb is γνωρίζω, which is the preferred verb for recognition in Philo and Josephus.[351] Importantly, the recognition in the

---

[347] For a thorough treatment of the reception of Genesis 38 in ancient Judaism, see Menn, *Judah and Tamar (Genesis 28) in Ancient Jewish Exegesis*, and Esther Blachman, *The Transformation of Tamar (Genesis 38) in the History of Jewish Interpretation*, CBET 71 (Leuven: Peeters, 2013). On the date and provenance of *Jubilees*, see O.S. Wintermute, "Jubilees: A New Translation and Introduction," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigraph*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, vol. 2 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1983), 44. On the date of the *Testament of Judah*, see H.C. Kee, "Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: A New Translation and Introduction," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, vol. 1 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1983), 777–78.

[348] John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, SCS 35 (Atlanta.: Scholars Press, 1993), 756.

[349] Interestingly, the only time ἀναγνωρίζω appears in the NT is also in a summary of the recognition between Joseph and his brothers in the speech of Stephen (Acts 7:13).

[350] It shows up at key junctures in Gen 37:32-33; 38:25-26; 42:8 and even in 1 Sam 26:16 (LXX I Kings 26:17).

[351] When Philo describes the first meeting of Joseph and his brothers, he explains "He, seeing those who had sold him, immediately recognized them all (ἐγνώρισεν), though none of them recognized him (γνωρισθεὶς)

theophanies and angelophanies do not use either of these terms.[352] While this initially suggests a formal difference between recognition and heavenly appearances, the difference it not as decisive since the theophanies do occasionally use γιγνώσκω which overlaps semantically with ἐπιγινώσκω and γνωρίζω.[353] What remains important, nevertheless, is that biblical recognition scenes are not bound to the language of ἀναγνώρισις. Recognition scenes are not restricted to certain key terms but to the type-scene conventions.

The Greek retelling of biblical recognition scenes also tends to clarify elements left ambiguous in the Hebrew. For instance, there is a variant in the LXX textual tradition of Gen 38:25 that adds ταυτα to specify that Judah recognized the tokens *explicitly*.[354] Similarly, Philo clarifies the moment of recognition in Genesis 18, explaining that Sarah recognized the miraculous nature of her visitors in Gen 18 following their speech about the promised child (*Abraham* 113). Jewish authors also provide greater clarity to the identity of the visitors in the heavenly appearances of Genesis 18 and 32 by distancing God from the anthropomorphic

(*Joseph*, 165 [Colson, LCL])." In Josephus' account of Joseph's recognition by his brothers in Gen 45, he narrates "Joseph makes himself known to the brothers (ποιεῖ γνώριμον αὐτὸν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς) (*Ant.* II.160 [Thackeray, LCL])."'. He also uses this verb for Joseph's earlier recognition of his brothers and their failure to recognize him (*Ant.* II.97) as well as for Saul's recognition of David's voice in 1 Sam 26 (*Ant.* VI.316). However, this term is used in a variety of other ways in both Josephus and Philo so that it is not a technical tem for recognition scenes.

[352] Neither Philo nor Josephus uses the language of γνωρίζω when discussing the appearances to Abraham in Genesis 18. Philo, *Abraham* 113 describes the moment using the verb ἰδέαν. Josephus has the messengers confess their identity to Abraham and Sarah (*Ant.* I.198). In the explicit moments of recognition in the LXX of Judges 6 and Judges 13, there is no use of ἐπιγινώσκω. Rather, Judges 6:22 uses εἶδεν and Judges 13:22 uses γιγνώσκω.[352] Josephus also avoids this recognition language in his accounts of the angelophanies in Judges 6 and 13. Josephus briefly mentions the angel's appearance to Gideon without any recognition language (*Ant.* V.213-4). Similarly, the angel appears (ἐπιφαίνεται) to Manoah and his wife and, after he ascends, they do not recognize but realize that this vision was given them to see God (ὁραθῆναι) (*Ant.* V.276-284).

[353] Rudolf Bultmann, "Γιγνώσκω," *TDNT* 1:689–718.

[354] Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, 265–66; Blachman, *The Transformation of Tamar (Genesis 38) in the History of Jewish Interpretation*, 106. The same clarification occurs in *Jubilees* 41:19. See Blachman, *The Transformation of Tamar (Genesis 38) in the History of Jewish Interpretation*, 122.

realism of these accounts.[355] Josephus refers to the visitors of Genesis 18 and 32 as angels of God (*Ant.* I.198, 333) and, in his comments on Gen 32, calls the messenger an apparition (φάντασμα).[356] Philo also calls the visitors in Genesis 18 angels but heightens their spiritual nature by claiming that they only appeared to consume food and drink (*Abraham* 113, 118). [357]

The retellings also clarify the causes for misrecognition in the biblical recognition scenes. The midrashic text *Genesis Rabba* attributes the inability of Joseph's brother to recognize him as the result of Joseph's beard.[358] Similarly, Josephus attributes the misrecognition to the shift in Joseph's age and his achievement of such an exalted rank (*Ant*. II.97). Philo, however, prefers a more supernatural explanation. He notes, "It was not God's will to reveal the truth as yet, for cogent reasons which were best at the time kept secret, and therefore either He changed and added grandeur to the appearance of the regent or else perverted the understanding of the brothers from properly apprehending what they saw (*Joseph* 165 [Colson, LCL])." Other examples of these clarifications could be cited, but the general tendency is to make explicit the amibiguous elements of the biblical recognition tradition. [359]

---

[355] For a brief history of the criticism of anthropomorphism in depicting the divine in the ancient world, see Hamori, *When Gods Were Men*, 34–38.

[356] Josephus similarly uses both the terms angels and φάντασμα for the visitors in Judges 6 and 13 (*Ant.* V.213, 279-84).

[357] Philo explains, "It is a marvel indeed that though they neither ate nor drank they gave the appearance of both eating and drinking. But that is a secondary matter; the first and greatest wonder is that, though incorporeal, they assumed human form to do kindness to the man of worth (*Abraham* 118 [Colson, LCL])."

[358] Maren Niehoff, *The Figure of Joseph in Post-Biblical Jewish Literature*, AGJU 16 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 97.

[359] For instance, the *Testament of Judah* 12.3 attributes Judah's misrecognition of Tamar to the confusion caused by his drunkenness as well as Tamar's disguise. Philo prefers to spiritualize the misrecognition of Tamar by having her veil her face like Moses so that *she* does not recognize who the father is or whose tokens were left behind (*Names* 134-6). This also allows Philo to offer a daring interpretation inspired by his Platonic way of thinking where the children born to Tamar are of divine origin in their virtuous souls. See discussion in Blachman, *The Transformation of Tamar (Genesis 38) in the History of Jewish Interpretation*, 150–51.

But not all of the elaborations found in the biblical retellings are the result of clarification as many are the result of dramatic amplification. Some scenes expand the number of recognition tokens. For instance, Jubilees 39.10-11 introduces as a second recognition token a door that was broken in Joseph's flight from Potiphar's wife as additional evidence of his guilt.[360] A more interesting example of dramatic amplification is the increased *cognitive resistance* of Judah recounted in the retelling of Genesis 38 in the *Testament of Judah*. In this version of the story, Judah is increasingly incredulous toward the recognition tokens, wondering if Tamar had not received them from some other woman (T.Jud. 12).[361] But the most common dramatic amplification of the biblical recognition scenes involves heightened the *pathos* of the stories. Josephus heightens the emotional reunion in the account of Joseph's recognition, explaining that Joseph's brothers "were plunged in tears and grief for those designs upon him and found no lack of chastisement in this forbearance of their brother. They then resorted to festivity (*Ant.* II.166 [Thackeray, LCL])." While the Gen 45:14-15 recounts Joseph's tears and embrace of his brothers, Josephus recounts the dueling emotions of grief and festivity in the brothers. A similar tendency to heighten the emotional response of the recognition can be seen in other examples from Josephus.[362]

---

[360] Similarly, Josephus has David use both the staff and the water jug as recognition tokens in his retelling of 1 Sam 26 (*Ant.* VI.310-8).

[361] Wendy Doniger, "Narrative Conventions and Rings of Recognition," in *Recognition: A Poetics of Narrative: Interdisciplinary Studies on Anagnorisis*, eds. Philip Kennedy and Marylin Lawrence, Studies on Themes and Motifs in Literature 96 (New York: Lang, 2008), 21.

[362] Josephus heightens the emotions at the recognition of Jacob and Joseph, explaining that the joy of seeing his son revived the dying Jacob (*Ant*. II.184). A similar expansion that creates further suspense is found in Josephus' recounting of Jacob's misrecognition of Joseph's robe from Genesis 37. Josephus recounts how Jacob, having heard the news of Joseph's absence, cherished the hope that his son was just kidnapped. This hope is dashed with the evidence of the robe (*Ant.* II.36-7). For discussion, see Louis H. Feldman, "Josephus' Portrait of Jacob," *JQR.* 79.2/3 (1988): 142.

Importantly, both the clarifications and amplification of the biblical recognition tradition correlate with wider tendencies in the classical recognition tradition. Elements such as the increasing number of tokens, the clarity in causes of misrecognition, the heightened *pathos* and cognitive resistance are all hallmarks of the classical tradition and a departure from the tendency toward ambiguity and reticence in the biblical recognition tradition. The attempts to provide greater clarity and drama to the recognition scenes suggest the Second Temple literature was adapting the biblical recognition tradition to the standards of the classical recognition tradition especially in heightening the focus on evidence and *pathos*.[363]

The influence of the Greek literary milieu might also explain some attempts to minimize the unique emphases in the biblical recognition tradition, even if these elements are never wholly erased. For instance, Josephus deletes the divine induced sleep in 1 Samuel 26 that grounded David's theft of the tokens (*Ant.* VI.310-18). However, he maintains the confession and repentance of Saul in from both recognition scenes (*Ant*. VI.291, 316-8). The retellings of the story of Judah and Tamar try to justify Judah's actions. Jubilees exonerates Judah of the guilt of withholding his son by attributing this action to his wife (Jub. 41.7), though he remains guilty for lying with his daughter-in-law (41.23-24). Thus, Jubilees still insists on Judah's repentance in the recognition scene (41.25). The Testament of Judah follows a similar trajectory in its attempts to downplay Judah's guilt by blaming the influence of alcohol (T.Jud. 12.3; 14.1; 16.1) but there nevertheless remains a strong emphasis on Judah's repentance for his actions.[364] Thus, the

[363] In the case of both Josephus and Philo, it is clear that these authors had been exposed to Greco-Roman literature. Philo shows knowledge of Homer, the three fifth century tragedians, Aristophanes and Menander as noted by Gregory E. Sterling, "From the Thick Marshes of the Nile to the Throne of God: Moses in Ezekiel the Tragedian and Philo of Alexandria," SPhiloA. 26 (2014): 115–16. For sources in Josephus, see Louis H. Feldman, *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*, HCS 27 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).

[364] Blachman, *The Transformation of Tamar (Genesis 38) in the History of Jewish Interpretation*, 112.

influence of the classical recognition tradition did not wholly erase the unique emphases of the biblical recognition tradition.

The retelling of biblical recognition scenes in Hellenistic Jewish literature complicates a clear delineation between the biblical and the Greek literary traditions. Rather, the biblical recognition tradition was changed, reworked, and adapted in line with wider literary tendencies in Greek literature even as it maintained its unique elements. A similar confluence is apparent in new examples of the recognition type-scene in Jewish literature.

3.5.2: New Examples of Recognition in Hellenistic Jewish Literature

Tobit, written in the second century BCE, contains a new Jewish recognition scene.[365] Originally written in Aramaic, Tobit recounts the stories of two families trying to survive during Assyrian captivity, both of whom are delivered simultaneously from their plights by an angel.[366] The recognition scene occurs at the conclusion of the narrative when Tobit and Tobiah learn that the stranger who had traveled with Tobiah on his adventures is the angel Raphael (Tob 12:11-22). The recognition scene reverses Tobiah and Tobit's misrecognition of Raphael as a mere traveling companion.[367] The scene begins when they *meet* with Raphael in order to pay him for his work as a guide (12:1-5). While alone with these men, Raphael offers them a series of

[365] On the date of Tobit, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, CEJL (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 51–52.

[366] Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 18–28.

[367] Raphael heard the prayers of both Sarah and Tobit and was sent to deliver them (3:16-17). When Tobiah first meets the angel, he does not recognize him as an angel (5:4). Rather the angel pretends to be an Israelite kinsman who can lead Tobiah to Media to recover his father's money (5:8-17) During the journey, the hidden angel helps orchestrate the deliverance of Sarah (6:10-18) and the healing of Tobit's blindness (11:7-8). The Greek of Tob 5:4 suggests a direct allusion to LXX Judges 13:16 with both Tobiah and Maonah not recognizing the angel of the Lord. Again, the Greek word used for the misrecognition in both is γιγνώσκω. See Alexander A. Di Lella, "The Book of Tobit and the Book of Judges: An Intertextual Analysis," *Hen* 22 (2000): 199–200.

exhortations on righteous living before God (12:6-10) before revealing his identity (12:11-15).[368] The two men immediately *recognize* and respond with *emotions* of fear and reverence (12:16). Raphael offers them a word of peace before dispelling any lingering doubt about his identity by using the *token* that he only appeared to eat or drink when he was with them (12:17-19).[369] As a final *token* of his identity, Raphael ascends from their presence so that they can see him no more, leading them to express *further emotions* of blessing and praise (12:21-2).

Tobit's narrative of a double plight resulting in a single happy ending aligns it with other ancient romances, especially since its recognition scene occurs at the climax of the narrative.[370] The recognition functions to enact the cognitive and affective shift in the characters as they learn the identity of the angel. But it also gives the scene a hermeneutical force as the entire prior journey is now seen from the perspective of God's providential help. This creates a conclusion where recognition is not merely a plot device but a theological statement that leads the characters (and reader) to praise the God of Israel (12:22). Divine initiative is at the center of the recognition scene as it is in the biblical recognition tradition. The scene also follows the biblical tradition in its commissive function. The recognition of the angel is joined with clear exhortations for moral living (12:6-10). Besides the stress on divine involvement and moral exhortation, stylistically Tobit is heavily dependent on the recognition of the angels in Judges 6 and 13. As Alexander A. di Lella has shown, there are significant allusions to Judges 13 in Tobit

---

[368] The role of instruction is often attributed to angels in Jewish literature of this period as noted in Margaret Barker, "The Archangel Raphael in the Book of Tobit," in *Studies in the Book of Tobit: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, ed. Mark Bredin, LSTS 55 (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 122.

[369] This strange token of apparent eating and drinking appeared also in Philo's account of Genesis 18, and appears to be a fairly common trope in second Temple literature. Cf. T.Ab. 4 (A); Philo, *Abraham* 117. See also Barker, "The Archangel Raphael in the Book of Tobit," 125–26.

[370] On the discussion of Jewish romances, see the treatment in Lawrence M. Wills, *Ancient Jewish Novels: An Anthology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 1–27.

12:11-22 including the emotions of fear, the refusal to eat, the word of peace spoken by the angel, and the angel's disappearance in ascent.[371] But Tobit has repurposed the biblical angelophanies more explicitly into the recognition type-scene that functions to follow the standard plot of a Greek romance. Thus, Tobit demonstrates how a Jewish author "appropriated ideas and themes from the stories of Israel's past in order to exploit and reuse them in composing his own edifying narrative." The new narrative was engaging with both the biblical and Greek recognition traditions.[372]

Another example of a blending of the biblical and classical recognition tradition can be found in the story of Joseph and Aseneth, a Jewish romance written in Greek between the first century BCE and early second century CE.[373] The first part of the work tells how Aseneth fell in love with Joseph and underwent a miraculous conversion before marrying him. The second part is a tale of Aseneth's deliverance from a jealous lover by Joseph's brothers. Like Tobit, Joseph and Aseneth shows strong familiarity with the Hellenistic romances but its subject matter is strongly dependent on the biblical story of Joseph.[374]

---

[371] Di Lella, "The Book of Tobit and the Book of Judges: An Intertextual Analysis," 201–5.

[372] Di Lella, "The Book of Tobit and the Book of Judges: An Intertextual Analysis," 205.

[373] While many of the introductory issues about Joseph and Aseneth are disputed, I follow the majority of scholars who see this is as Jewish text originally written in Greek. For more detailed discussions, see Randall D. Chesnutt, *From Death to Life: Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth*, JSPSup 16 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995), 73–91; Edith McEwan Humphrey, *Joseph and Aseneth*, Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000), 21–46. The translation I cite will be C Burchard, "Joseph and Aseneth: A New Translation and Introduction," in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha,* ed. James H. Charlesworth, vol. 2 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1983), 177–247. I will also refer to the Greek found in Christoph Burchard, Carsten Burfeind, and Uta Barbara Fink, *Joseph und Aseneth*, PVTG 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

[374] For the influence of romances on Joseph and Aseneth, see Richard I. Pervo, "Joseph and Asenath and the Greek Novel," SBLSP (1976): 171–81; Howard C. Kee, "The Socio-Religious Setting and Aims of 'Joseph and Asenath,'" SBLSP (1976): 183. On the centrality of the biblical text rather than Hellenistic romances, see Nina "'Braginskaya, "Joseph and Aseneth in Greek Literary History: The Case of the 'First Novel, in *The Ancient Novel and Early Christian and Jewish Narrative: Fictional Intersections*, eds. Marila P. Futre Pinheiro, Judith Perkins, and Richard Pervo (Havertown: Barkhuis, 2012).

The recognition in Joseph and Aseneth is predicated on Aseneth's conversion after Joseph's first visit to her father's house which ended with Joseph's rejection of Aseneth's advances and his prayer that she would be be converted "from error to the truth and from the death to the life (Jos.Asen. 8.9 [Burchard, *OT Pseudepigrapha*])." His prayer begins a drastic transformation in Aseneth that continues in chapters 9-13 as she destroys her idols, rejects all unclean foods, and confesses her trust in the God of Israel. Her dramatic conversion is confirmed by the visit by a heavenly angel.[375] Upon hearing of Joseph's second arrival, Aseneth calls for a feast to be prepared and sets about preparing herself (18.1-8). During her preparation, she is transformed so that her remarkable beauty is extolled as a sign that "the Lord God of heaven has chosen you as a bride for his firstborn son, Joseph (18.11 [Burchard, *OT Pseudepigrapha*])."

Her transformation, both physical and spiritual, is the impetus for the recognition scene when Joseph and Aseneth *meet* at the entrance of the court (19.4). However, Joseph does not recognize Aseneth but asks, "Who are you? Quickly tell me (19.4 [Burchard, *OT Pseudepigrapha*])."[376] Joseph's offers *cognitive resistance* to her identity because of her transformed beauty, which is a reflection of her inward conversion to the God of Israel. In response to his cognitive resistance, Aseneth offers *tokens* of her new identity through the report of her conversion and heavenly visitation, which, like many tokens in the Hebrew Bible, are primarily verbal. To confirm this report, she also notes that the same angel had visited Joseph with the same news (19.7). Joseph *recognizes* Asenth (19.9) and they have an *emotional reaction* where Joseph and Aseneth "embrace each other for a long time and interlocked their hands like

[375] The angel allows her to partake in a meal of the bread of life, the cup of immortality, and the ointment of incorruptibility (15.7) as well as a strange tasting of a honeycomb (ch. 16). Aseneth's transformation is marked by the angel's bestowal of a new name, "City of Refuge" and promise that she will now marry Joseph (15.6-7), a fulfillment of Aseneth's prayer for this from earlier in the narrative (13.15).

[376] Greek: τίς εἶ σὺ ταχέως ἀνάγγειλόν μοι

bonds (20.1 [Burchard, *OT Pseuepigrapha*])." This concludes the recognition scene and paves the way for the marriage of Joseph and Aseneth.

Joseph and Aseneth uses the recognition scene as the climax of the first part of its narrative, producing the happy ending common to the ancient romance. However, there are several unique features of this recognition scene that reveal the imprint of the biblical recognition tradition. Aseneth is not separated from Joseph physically but socially, religiously, and existentially because of her idolatry.[377] Thus, the cognitive function of the recognition scene (seen in the narrative's use of *ignorance* [ἄγνοια]) is tied to Aseneth's idol worship.[378] The recognition scene is actualized by Aseneth's conversion so that the overlap of conversion and recognition results in a double marriage where Aseneth is married to both God and Joseph.[379]As Edgar Smith explains, "it is this account of Asenath's conversion that distinguishes JA I from most of the Hellenistic novels, for it makes the story openly religious."[380] Similarly, the major tokens required for recognition are not external signs but revelations from the angel. Joseph and Aseneth does not rely on any external tokens for recognition (19.5-9). God becomes the

---

[377] Chesnutt, *From Death to Life*, 108. Randall Chestnutt thus rightly captures the central conflict when he explains, "The very predicament of Aseneth which her conversion story resolves is that she is Gentile and a worshipper of idols, and the emphasis in the narrative of her conversion is therefore not upon ritual formalities but upon her renunciation of idols."

[378] Several times in the narrative, Aseneth locates her separation from God and Joseph as a result of her ignorance, which in turn is connected to her idolatry (12.5; 13.11; 21.15). More importantly, it is Aseneth's recognition of her own ignorance which grounds her conversion. She explains, "Behold now, all the gods whom I once used to worship in ignorance I have now recognized that they were dumb and dead idols (13.11 [Burchard, *OT Pseudepigrapha*])." See Chestnutt, *From Death to Life*, 142.

[379] The marriage to Joseph is embedded within a wider marriage to God. This is reflected in the clear 'twinning' that happens in the narrative when Aseneth's future husband Joseph is described in terms remarkably similar to the angelic visitor who confirms her conversion. More importantly, it is expressed in Aseneth's own concluding hymn in chapter 22 where, after marrying Joseph, she relates how she became God's bride forever (21:21) echoing the promise of the angel that she will be Joseph's bride forever (15.6). See Humphrey, *Joseph and Aseneth*, 88-96.

[380] Edgar Wright Smith, "Joseph and Asenath and Early Christian Literature: A Contribution to the Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti" (Claremont Graduate School, 1974), 22.

guarantee of the recognition and provides the proof of Aseneth's new identity.[381] The stress on conversion, verbal tokens, and divine action is the result of the influence of the biblical recognition tradition. The result is that the recognition scene in Joseph and Aseneth is deeply indebted to the biblical tradition even as it follows the standard role of recognition in the Hellenistic romances and New Comedy. [382]

The Testament of Abraham provides a final example of the blending of Greek and biblical recognition traditions in Hellenistic Jewish literature. Written between the 2nd century BCE and 3rd century CE, it recounts the visit of a heavenly messenger to Abraham to tell him about his approaching death and lead him on an apocalyptic journey. [383] The work draws from a number of different genres to offer a humorous parody of a testament, while also demonstrating strong dependence on the style, narrative, and character of the LXX version of Genesis.[384] The current version of the *Testament of Abraham* exists in two different versions, a longer recension (A) and the shorter recension (B), both of which feature a recognition scene between Abraham and the angel.[385]

The recognition scene occurs in chapter 6 of the Testament of Abraham. The angel Michael is sent to Abraham (T.Abe. 2.1; [A] explains he is disguised as a handsome soldier).

---

[381] A similar recognition scene occurs in the Testament of Job where Job's friends are unable to recognize Job because of the tragedies he has undergone. In response, Job uses the promise of a future divine vindication as the tokens to confirm his identity, much to the consternation of his friends. The recognition is predicated on an awareness of a spiritual transformation that looks beyond the external appearances. See T.Job 28-34.

[382] Montiglio, *Love and Providence*, 15.

[383] On the date of this work, see Dale C. Allison, *Testament of Abraham*, CEJL. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), 34–40; E. P. Sanders, "Testament of Abraham: A New Translation and Introduction," in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, vol. 1 (Peabody, MA.: Hendrickson, 1983), 874–75.

[384] Allison, *Testament of Abraham*, 41–42, 49.

[385] Allison, *Testament of Abraham*, 12–27.

Abraham responds to this visitor with characteristic hospitality (φιλοξενία, 1.2 [A]), a trait that locates this story within the wider world of Greco-Roman *theoxeny*.[386] While entertaining his guest, Abraham washes the stranger's feet and leads both Abraham and Michael to cry (3.1-12 [A]; 3.1-10 [B]). As Michael's tears hit the water, they are turned into precious gems that Abraham gathers (3.11-12 [A]; 3.10 [B]).[387] Both the foot-washing and the mystery of the gems become important for the recognition.

Later in the narrative, Issac and Abraham weep over a dream foretelling Abraham's death, which causes Sarah to enter the room (5.7-13 [A]; 6.1 [B]). During this *meeting*, Sarah tells Abraham that he should not cry in front of the heavenly messenger. (6.1-2 [A];6.7[B]). In Recension A, Sarah has clearly recognized the visitor as a heavenly messenger through the token of his voice (6.1).[388] However, Abraham offers *cognitive resistance* to Sarah's claim and demands to know how she knows the man's identity (6.2 [A]; 6.9 [B]). She explains that he was one of the men who had visited them by the oaks of Mamre (6.4-5 [A]; 6.10[B]). Her recognition recalls the appearance in Genesis 18, an allusion strengthened in numerous ways in the preceding narrative.[389] Abraham concedes to her explanation and, denying his own ignorance, goes on to explain that he had himself *recognized* the stranger earlier while washing his feet (6.6 [A]; 6.12-13 [B]). The recognition of the feet of the stranger recalls the recognition of Odysseus by his

[386] Sanders, "Testament of Abraham: A New Translation and Introduction," 882.

[387] The motif of tears becoming gems is most likely drawing on the Greek literary tradition as noted in Allison, *Testament of Abraham*, 123–24.

[388] This builds on the report of Isaac to his mother earlier in recension A that shows he recognizes the stranger as more than human (3.5-7). Allison, *Testament of Abraham*, 51, notes "it is ironic that Sarah and Isaac, who divine Michael's identity almost instantly, are faster on their feet than their husband and father."

[389] Allison, *Testament of Abraham*, 162–63.

nurse Eurycleia in *Odyssey* 19.[390] While both recensions attribute the recognition to the foot washing, the recognition is only recounted after Sarah reveals the angel's identity.[391] Recension A offers further *tokens of recognition* by having Abraham produce the gems made from the angel's tears, which he *displays* with the assertion, "If you do not believe me, look at them (6.7 [Sanders, *OT Pseudepigrapha*])." As Allison notes, these tokens suggest that "eyes and hands should confirm that something supernatural has happened."[392] Recension A then recounts the *resulting emotions* of the recognition as Sarah embraces of Abraham and gives glory to God for revealing this wonder (6.8 [A]).

The recognition scene occurs as part of the rising action of the plot of the *Testament of Abraham* as it prepares Abraham for his heavenly journey with Michael. But it demonstrates the joining of two streams of the recognition tradition in Hellenistic Jewish literature. The *Testament of Abraham* clearly invokes the recognition tradition of Genesis 18 and the Homeric footwashing of *Odyssey* 19 in order to blend both into a new narrative. The work's willingness to blend the two is part of a wider narrative strategy that "transcends sectarianism and dismisses barriers between Jews dwelling abroad and their pagan neighbors."[393] The *Testament of Abraham* embodies this fusion of the two tradition by the way it joins Greek and biblical recognition tropes into a cohesive scene.

---

[390] Allison, *Testament of Abraham*, 168. For a brief discussion of the reception of the washing of Odysseus' feet, see MacDonald, *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark*, 111–19.

[391] Allison, *Testament of Abraham*, 168.

[392] Allison, *Testament of Abraham*, 169.

[393] Erich S. Gruen, *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), 30.

3.5.3: Summary

The Jewish literature of the Second Temple period drew on the recognition traditions of both the Hebrew Bible and the wider Greek literary tradition in its retelling and creation of recognition scenes. The Hellenistic Jewish writers developed the recognition scenes in ways that parallel the Greco-Roman tradition and, at times, deliberately invoke it. Still, they maintain the unique emphases in the biblical traditions on divine action and moral transformation in moments of recognition. Overall, this literature attests not to two distinct tradition of recognition but the merger of the two into a single recognition tradition. While it is possible to speak of unique biblical emphases in Hellenistic Jewish recognition scenes, it is misleading to insist on a clear divide between the classical and biblical recognition traditions by the first century CE.

3.6: Conclusion

Scholars have often stressed that the Hebrew Bible's tradition of recognition was distinct from the classical tradition because of its stress on ambiguity, divine action, and moral transformation. This chapter used the recognition type-scene as a method for analyzing a number of recognition scenes in Genesis and elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible in order to provide greater clarity to these unique emphases in the biblical recognition tradition while also supporting the strong cross-cultural continuity in the form of the recognition type-scene. The distinctivess of the biblical recognition tradition was subsequently incorporated into the wider classical tradition by the works of Hellenistic Jewish literature. Both in retelling the biblical stories and in composing new recognition scenes, the Hellenistic Jewish authors maintained the unique elements of the biblical recognition tradition even as they reworked their tradition in ways that parallel the growth and development of recognition in the wider Greek literary milieu. Hellenistic Jewish

literature demonstrates how the biblical material was incorporated into the classical tradition, providing the earliest Christian writers a broad tradition of recognition available for literary use, emulation, and inspiration. The Gospel of Luke drew from this fused tradition when it used the recognition type-scene to depict the resurrection appearances of Luke 24.

CHAPTER 4

RECOGNITION IN THE RESURRECTION APPEARANCES OF LUKE 24

"Luke 24 constitutes an extensive recognition scene, a point of illumination for characters who were previously blind."[394]

4.0: Introduction

The evidence from the literary milieu of antiquity demonstrates the widespread use of the recognition type-scene. The following chapter uses this background to analyze the use of the recognition type-scene in Luke 24. It argues that the recognition type-scene is the literary form of the resurrection appearances on the road to Emmaus (Luke 24:13-35) and in Jerusalem (24:26-49). Furthermore, the recognition tradition shapes the account of the empty tomb (24:1-12) and the ascension (24:50-53). Overall, recognition gives Luke 24 its climactic function as the ending of Luke's Gospel. After a few introductory remarks on Luke's Gospel and the structure of Luke 24, I will offer an exegetical analysis of Luke 24 that pays particular attention to its use of the literary conventions of the recognition type-scene. [395]

---

[394] Mikeal C. Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts: The Ascension Narratives in Context*, JSNTSup 21. (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 80.

[395] Generally speaking, my exegetical analysis will follow the eclectic text of Luke's Gospel established in NA28, noting variants only if they are of importance in my interpretation. My eclectic approach will address the places in Luke 24 where the Codex Bezae (D) and other Western texts omit key verses or phrases in Luke 24. First named by Westcott and Hort as *Western non-interpolations* in the late nineteenth century, it was believed that these shorter readings were closer to the original text. However, the discovery of Bodmer Papyrus XIV-XV (P^{75}), because of its early date, has tended to challenge a preference for the D-Text. Although NA28 includes these omissions, the tendency among recent commentators is to assess each variant in turn. For a brief discussion of the history of the debate and a defense of the Western non-interpolations as closer to the original, see Mikeal C. Parsons, "A Christological Tendency in P75," *JBL* 105.3 (1986): 463–79. For an eclectic approach to the variants, see Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 884; John T. Carroll, *Luke: A Commentary*, 1st ed., NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012), 477–78.

4.1: Introductory Matters

The Gospel of Luke was likely composed between 75-125CE with most scholars preferring a date near the end of the first century CE.[396] This date assumes Luke's Gospel was dependent upon Mark's Gospel, though scholarship remains divided on whether Luke used additional sources such as Q, Matthew's Gospel, or special L material (written or oral). [397] The source question is largely immaterial for the interpretation of Luke 24 since, with the exception of the account of the empty tomb (Luke 24:1-12), it is without direct parallel in the Synoptic Gospels. My treatment of this pericope will assume that Luke had access to Mark.

The genre of Luke's Gospel is typically classified as either a biography or historiography, with one's preference often dependent on one's view on the relationship between Luke's Gospel and Acts.[398] While I presume that Luke and Acts are best understood as a literary unity, I find

---

[396] This range is established by the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple to which Luke refers (13:34-35; 21:20-24) and by the use of the Gospel in the work of Marcion and Justin Martyr, This is the range noted in Carroll, *Luke*, 4. I follow most scholars who prefer a range in the late first century between 75-95 C.E. See Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 2–3; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 53–57; I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 33–35; Michael Wolter, *The Gospel According to Luke*, trans. Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig, 2 vols. (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016), 1:11–12. For an argument for a later date, see John T. Townsend, "The Date of Luke-Acts," in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*, ed. Charles H. Talbert (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 47–62. The later date of canonical Luke is predicated on assuming some Marcionite interaction, as in Joseph B. Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006). This thesis has been challenged in Leland Edward Wilshire, "Was Canonical Luke Written in the Second Century?—A Continuing Discussion," *NTS* 20.3 (1974): 246–53. For a recent treatment on the early reception of Luke and Acts, see Andrew F. Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century*, WUNT 2.169 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003).

[397] For a brief presentation of the overwhelming evidence for Luke's use of Mark, see Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 66–71. For the use of Mark, Q, and L material see Carroll, *Luke*, 7–9. For a clear two-source opinion, see Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 6; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 63–65; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 30–31. Still, others reject the use of Q and prefer to see Luke as using both Mark and Matthew as in Mark S. Goodacre, *The Case against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and Synoptic Problem* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001). The case for special L-material, especially in the birth and resurrection accounts, has been noted recently in Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts*.

[398] For the classic defense of the Gospel of Luke as a biography, see Burridge, *What Are the Gospels?* For those who argue for reading it in light of ancient historiography, see Gregory E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts, and Apologetic Historiography*, NovTSup 64 (Leiden: Brill, 1992); Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 7–10. On the types of historical writing, see David Edward Aune, *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*, 1st ed., LEC 8 (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987), 77–111.

that the genre debate is unhelpful and owes more to modern categories than ancient literary distinctions.[399] For my purposes, it is sufficient to note that the Gospel of Luke was shaped by a range of Greco-Roman literary traditions, Mark's Gospel, and the Old Testament (especially in the LXX).[400] Like other Hellenistic Jewish literature of this period, the Gospel of Luke was indebted to both biblical and wider Greco-Roman literary conventions. Thus, the Gospel of Luke had access to a recognition tradition where the biblical recognition scenes were already merged with the wider Greco-Roman recognition tradition.

4.1.1: The Structure of Luke 24

The plot of Luke's Gospel follows the birth, life, and death of Jesus before culminating in his resurrection.[401] Luke 24 offers the surprising climactic reversal of Jesus' death with the account of his resurrection appearances.[402] Structurally, Luke 24 consists of four scenes: the empty tomb (vv.1-12), the Emmaus appearance (vv.13-35), the Jerusalem appearance (vv.36-49),

---

[399] Recently Mikeal C. Parsons and Richard I. Pervo, *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), challenged the issue of unity in terms of genre, narrative, and canon. Responding scholars have offered strong support for the authorial and literary unity of Luke-Acts, while canonical unity is still debated. For a full recent discussion, see Andrew F. Gregory and C. Kavin Rowe, eds. *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2010). For the classic work on the literary unity of Luke and Acts, see Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*. For a brief defense of the literary unity of Luke-Acts, see William S. Kurz, *Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993), 17-36. One attempt to link a biography to a history is found in Charles H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*, SBLMS 20 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1975).

[400] The LXX provided not only the source for direct citations but also a wider influence in emulated literary themes, characters, techniques, and vocabulary. Luke's Gospel was deliberately constructed in continuity with the story of Israel, albeit with God's promises for Israel now working through Jesus, the Messiah. See Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 12–13; Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 191–280; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 113.

[401] For a more detailed treatment of the plot of Luke's Gospel, see chapter 5.

[402] The link between the death of Jesus and the appearances is apparent in the repetition of the women who witness Jesus' death (23:49) and burial place (24:55-56) as the major actors in the first scene of Luke 24, the deliberate time indicators that create a chronology of Jesus' death and resurrection (23:54, 56; 24:1), and the use of a μέν-δέ construction that connects 23:56 and 24:1.

and the ascension (vv.50-53).[403] In my analysis, I will use these four scenes as the basis for my discussion. However, these divisions are largely heuristic as there is ample evidence that the four scenes function as a cohesive whole. Apart from the narrative of the empty tomb in 24:1-12, the Lukan material is not clearly dependent on prior sources.[404] Rather, there are an impressive number of connections made between the various scenes that suggest a sophisticated literary artistry in the composition of the chapter.[405] The unity is found in the temporal, geographical, rhetorical, informational, and thematic links between the various scenes. These are worth noting as they support the centrality I give to recognition in Luke 24 as a literary whole.

The four scenes are unified chronologically and geographically, creating a careful temporal sequence of events occurring on a single day around Jerusalem.[406] Although the final scene (24:50-53) is ambiguously connected to this temporal sequence, one can infer that it occurs

---

[403] Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24." Osborne, *The Resurrection Narratives*, 99–146; Bovon, *Luke 3*, 343–45. Some scholars prefer to speak of a triptych (tomb, Emmaus, Jerusalem) with the ascension forming the final movement of the third scene in Jerusalem. See Catchpole, *Resurrection People*, 65; Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 389–406.

[404] Indeed, the material in Luke 24 is the largest block of uniquely Lukan material outside of Luke 1-2. It has been suggested that it derives as a whole from a prior version of Luke often called proto-Luke. See Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts*, 101. The unique character of Luke 24 has led many scholars to attempt to identify earlier sources in the material. The most popular candidate for material drawn from another source has been the story of Emmaus (24:13-35). See Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition*, 193; Reginald H Fuller, *The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives*, 106. See the rejection of this theory in Jacques Dupont, "Les Pèlerins D'Emmaüs (Lc 24,13-35)," in *Études Sur Les Evangiles Synoptiques*, vol. 2 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985), 1128–52.

[405]As Alsup notes, "The compositional sophistication of the whole is really quite striking." See Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition*, 150. For further discussion, see Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 832–35; Carroll, *Luke*, 474–75; Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 226; Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 390–91.

[406] The women arrive at the tomb early on the third day (24:1, ὄρθρου βαθέος), Jesus appears to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus on the same day (24:13, ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ) and stays with them until early evening (24:29). When Jesus disappears from before the Emmaus disciples, they return to the other disciples in Jerusalem at the same hour (24:33, αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ). Jesus then appears to all of the disciples in Jerusalem following the report of the Emmaus disciples (24:36). The present participle in the genitive absolute (Ταῦτα δὲ αὐτῶν λαλούντων) states that the appearance of Jesus is simultaneous with the report of the disciples. So Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 901; Carroll, *Luke*, 490.

on the same day.[407] The result is a coherent narrative sequence between the disparate scenes that invites the reader to read them as a narrative progression. Another unifying factor is the central place of Jerusalem. Events happen in and around Jerusalem, with the characters moving back and forth from this city, demonstrating a literary centripedal force from Jerusalem.[408] The focus on Jerusalem is an editorial change from Mark's Gospel suggesting Luke used Jerusalem to provide unity to the resurrection appearances.[409]

Luke 24 also creates unity through the careful control of information as the initial small group encounters transfer the experience and information to the larger group who receives the final appearance in 24:36-49. The sequence of scenes establishes a growing body of witnesses to the resurrection of Jesus, beginning with the women's report and ending with a large group of disciples in Jerusalem.[410] Repeated information links the passages together, creating a growth of information that demonstrates how "in the sharing and combination, individual experience becomes community experience, creating a new sense of identity."[411] The control of knowledge

---

[407] Scholars often note the conflict between the ascension occurring on the same day as the resurrection as suggested in Luke 24 with the reference to the ascension after 40 days in Acts1:3. However, the ambiguity in Luke 24 allows Luke to maintain the temporal unity of the whole without actually subscribing to an explicit external timeframe. This literary solution is noted in Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts*, 194–95; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 835; Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word*, 181.

[408] The women visit the tomb of Jesus in Jerusalem, the Emmaus disciples return to Jerusalem to report the appearance of Jesus (24:33). After the ascension, the disciples return to Jerusalem (24:52).

[409] On Jerusalem as an editorial tendency, Fuller explains, "Luke's changes are clearly motivated by his editorial requirements. He is going to give us a series of appearances in or around *Jerusalem*. Therefore he cannot, as Mark does, point forward to appearances in *Galilee*." See Reginald H Fuller, *The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives*, 97.

[410] Osborne, *The Resurrection Narratives*, 128.

[411] Brendan Byrne, *The Hospitality of God: A Reading of Luke's Gospel* (Collegeville, MN.: Liturgical Press, 2000), 203. The repetition of key events in reported discourse supports Luke's control of information. For instance, the women report the angelic message to the disciples (24:10-11), a point that is emphasized again in the Emmaus disciples' recounting of the events in Jerusalem to the veiled Jesus (24:23). Similarly, the Emmaus disciples seem to repeat the information of an apostolic visit to the empty tomb (24:24; cf. 24:12).

also unifies the chapter's rhetoric as the credibility of the witnesses is reinforced by their use of rhetorical questions to further the unfolding of the resurrection appearances.[412] The rhetorical shape grounds the centrality of recognition, since ancient recognition scenes functioned explicitly in rhetorical situations of testing witnesses and evidence.[413] The overlap of rhetoric and recognition is especially apparent in the stress in Luke 24 on evidence of Jesus' resurrection.

But perhaps the strongest and most commonly noted aspects of unity in these accounts are the shared themes. Of first importance is the thematic use of "proof-from-prophecy" seen in the repeated references to fulfillment of the Scriptures and predictions of Jesus' fate (24:5-8, 25-27, 44-48). Schubert concluded that this theme "is the structural and material element which produces the literary and the theological unity and climax of the gospel."[414] But the emphasis on prophetic fulfillment should not overshadow other unifying themes. For instance, both the Emmaus and Jerusalem appearances feature an element of eating.[415] Similarly, there is emphasis on the *pathos* of these scenes.[416] I will also contend that recognition provides thematic unity to the four scenes.

---

[412] Deborah Prince has noted the central place of rhetorical questions in each of the three narratives: the angels ask the women why they seek the living among the dead (24:5), Jesus asks the Emmaus disciples about the events in Jerusalem (24:19), and questions the disciples in Jerusalem about their doubts regarding his bodily appearance (24:38). Prince sees these as a form of forensic rhetoric seeking to offer assurance to the reader. See Deborah Thompson Prince, "'Why Do You Seek the Living among the Dead?': Rhetorical Questions in the Lukan Resurrection Narrative," *JBL* 135.1 (2016): 123–39. Prince has further studied the rhetorical shape of Luke 24 in other writings. See Deborah Prince, "Resurrecting Certainty in the Gospel of Luke," *Leaven* 20.1 (2012): 25–30; Deborah Thompson Prince, "Visions of the Risen Jesus: The Rhetoric of Certainty in Luke 24 and Acts 1" (PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 2005). See also William S Kurz, "Hellenistic Rhetoric in the Christological Proof of Luke-Acts," *CBQ* 42.2 (1980): 171–95.

[413] On the relation of recognition and ancient rhetoric, see Eden, *Poetic and Legal Fiction in the Aristotelian Tradition*, 4–23.

[414] Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," 176.

[415] For a study of the theme of meals in Luke-Acts, see John Paul Heil, *The Meal Scenes in Luke-Acts: An Audience-Oriented Approach*, SBLMS 52 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999), 226.

[416] Strong affective language includes the women's transition from perplexity to amazement (24:4, 12), the Emmaus' disciples sadness giving way to burning hearts (24:17, 32) and finally the Jerusalem disciples' fear and

While some of these unifying elements are likely the result of Lukan editorial activity on traditional material, one cannot help but be struck by the literary sophistication of the chapter as whole. Although my exegetical analysis will proceed by looking at the individual scenes, the larger literary coherence remains in the background and guides my interpretation of the climactic role of recognition in Luke 24. My goal is not only to demonstrate that the scenes found in Luke 24:13-35 and 24:36-49 are recognition type-scenes, but that the recognition type-scene has impacted the literary construction of the whole chapter. On the whole, the literary conventions of recognition provide a rich interpretive grid for the entire chapter.

4.2: The Empty Tomb (24:1-12)

Luke 24:1-12 recounts the women's visit to the tomb, the angelic message, and their subsequent report to the apostles.[417] Its literary form joins the discovery of the empty tomb with an angelophany that occurs at the tomb. The angelophany follows the biblical tradition with the surprising appearance of the messengers, their dazzling brilliance, and the heavenly announcement. However, this angelophany is secondary to the discovery of the empty tomb as the angelophany's purpose is to interpret the empty tomb.[418] The discovery of the empty tomb parallels stories of empty tombs in antiquity such as that found in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe* 1.8-9. Recently, Daniel Smith argued that such narratives functioned to generate religious belief in the ascension of the deceased hero. However, a more precise understanding of

---

doubt moving to unbelieving joy and amazement and eventually blossoming in great praise (24:37-8, 41, 52). The affective element in Luke 24 is especially noted in Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 834.

[417] The account of the empty tomb is attested in all four canonical gospels, although Luke and Matthew's version show use of Mark. For a recent discussion of the empty tomb tradition, see Daniel Alan Smith, *Revisiting the Empty Tomb: The Early History of Easter* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2010).

[418] Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 287–90.

the empty tomb in antiquity is as an inherently ambiguous recognition token that could generate any number of possible interpretations.[419] For instance, *Chaereas and Callirhoe* actually exploits the ambiguity of the empty tomb to generate misrecognition, rejecting Chaereas' belief in Callirhoe's ascension with the story of her kidnapping by pirates.[420] As a literary trope, empty tombs were used to suggest a range of possible interpretations, with the discovery of the empty tomb in Luke 24:1-12 building on this ambiguity in order to invite further interpretation.[421] The empty tomb establishes the dilemma for the recognition scenes that follow. While the women are able to interpret the empty tomb via the angelic message, the other disciples will require additional evidence and interpretation in the recognition scenes.

4.2.1: The Discovery (vv.1-4a)

The scene opens with the women going early on the first day of the week with their prepared spices (24:1).[422] When the women arrive at the tomb, they make a twofold discovery: the stone has been moved from the tomb but the body of the Lord Jesus is gone (24:2).[423] Luke is more explicit than Mark or Matthew with his emphasis on the women finding the absence of a

---

[419] For other examples, consider how the empty tomb in Phlegon of Tralles' story of Philinnion confirms the story of appearances rather than supports ascension. Similarly, the disappearance of Aristeas' corpse from a locked house leads to further appearances in nearby cities rather than an ascension (Herodotus, *Persian Wars* IV.14-15). Thus, the ascension or assumption to heaven was only one among many possible interpretations of an empty tomb. This is apparent in the charges of a stolen or moved body noted in Mt 28:11-15; John 20:2, 13. See also the discussion in Tilborg, *Jesus' Appearances and Disappearances in Luke 24*, 193–231.

[420] As itself is noted by Smith, *Revisiting the Empty Tomb*, 53.

[421] The ambiguity of the empty tomb is more explicit in Matt 28:11-15, which introduces the chief priests' opposite interpretation of the open tomb and absent body as the result of the disciples' theft.

[422] The D-text and a few other manuscripts omit the reference to the spices, though their appearance is easily seen as Luke's use of Mark 16:1.

[423] The passage stresses their two-fold discovery in the repeated use of εὑρίσκω. Cf. Matt 28:2 where the women do not find an empty tomb, but see the tomb opened by the angel accompanied by an earthquake.

body (τὸ σῶμα), placing the issue of Jesus' bodily location in question.[424] The women's discovery results in their confusion (24:4-ἀπορεῖσθαι).[425] While Matthew and Mark lack any emotional reaction to the empty tomb and skip straight to the emotions of the angelophany, Luke keeps the emotional confusion of the empty tomb separate from the emotions generated by the angelic visitation by explaining that the confusion arose περὶ τούτου. The emotional reaction to the absence of Jesus' body in the tomb is not the religious ecstasy of a possible ascension (as in *Chaer*. 1.8-9). Rather, the women express confusion about what has happened. As Dillon explains, "The *fact* of the empty tomb begets *perplexity* and requires the *interpreting word* of the angels."[426] The ambiguous tokens of the empty tomb and absent body are a problem that requires further interpretation before recognition occurs.

4.2.2: The Angelophany and Interpretation (vv.4b-7)

The angelophany provides the requisite interpretation of the tokens. Luke 24:4b describes the appearance of two men (δύο ἄνδρες) whose angelic status is captured by their radiant clothes (ἐν ἐσθῆτι ἀστραπτούσῃ) and sudden appearance (ἐφίστημι).[427] The women respond to the

---

[424] For use of the term τὸ σῶμα for a corpse, see Luke 23:52, Acts 9:40. The absence of the body is noted by the women prior to the angelic message unlike the accounts of Mark and Matthew where the absence of the body is told by the angel (Mark 16:6; Matt 28:5-6). While the D-text lacks identification of the body with Lord Jesus, the title κύριος has been applied to Jesus elsewhere in the narrative so that the longer reading has strong internal agreement with the gospel as well as significant external attestation. For the use of Lord for Jesus, see Luke 1:43; 2:11; 10:1; 17:5; 19:8. See also the uses of the phrase 'Lord Jesus' in Acts 1:21; 4:33; 8:16 For the longer reading, see Carroll, *Luke*, 476; Bovon, *Luke 3*, 349; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 837; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 884.

[425] Luke uses ἀπορέω throughout his narrative to convey a sense of perplexity as in Luke 21:25; Acts 25:20. Some manuscripts prefer the more common διαπορέω, a term also used for puzzled emotions in the face of miraculous activity as discussed in Frank Dicken, *Herod as a Composite Character in Luke-Acts*, WUNT 2.375 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 96. The difference between the two verbs is rather insignificant as noted in Bovon, *Luke 3*, 349.

[426] Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word*, 19.

[427] While Mark 16:5 has one young man (νεανίσκος) and Matthew 28:2 depicts one messenger (ἄγγελος), Luke describes two men, though scholars tend to agree that these men should be understood as angels. Indeed, the report in Luke 24:23 describes this as a vision of angels (ὀπτασίαν ἀγγέλων). There is a clear association of lighting

angelophany with fear and reverence before the angels offer their message (24:5). All of this follows the standard features of biblical angelophanies.[428]

The angelic interpretation of the empty tomb begins with the rhetorical question, "Why do you seek the living among the dead (24:5)?," which names the issue at stake (Jesus' presence among the dead) but also implies an answer (Jesus is living).[429] This is made explicit in the proceeding statement that Jesus has been raised and is not here (24:6).[430] While Mark 16:6 states "he is not here, he has been raised," Luke has reversed the order and added the stronger contrast with ἀλλὰ which, along with the rhetorical question, seems to add a critical tone to the angelic speech. As Bovon notes, "Luke keeps Mark's affirmation and simply changes the wording in order to reach a climax."[431] The angelic interpretation of the empty tomb and the absent body is the claim that Jesus has been raised with the verb ἠγέρθη, a divine passive, denoting God's action in raising Jesus from the dead. Luke's use of this verb elsewhere connotes bodily resurrection

(ἀστραπή) with theophanies, in Ex 19:16, Ez 1:13; Rev 4:5. The use of similar language for angels is found in Luke 10:38. Matthew and Mark also contain similar dazzling dress (Matt 28:3, Mark 16:5). For the use of ἐφίστημι in angelic appearances, see Luke 2:9; Acts 12:7; 23:11. The use of two angelic messengers parallels the transfiguration (Luke 9:30) and amplifies the validity of the angelic testimony with two witnesses. See Bovon, *Luke 3*, 349; Carroll, *Luke*, 476–77; Osborne, *The Resurrection Narratives*, 128; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 885.

[428] While expressions of awe and reverence are used in a range of instances in the LXX, the unique pairing of fear and bowing in this passage are seen especially in the angelophanies of Judg 13:20 and Tob 12:16. Appearances of angels are often accompanying by a message as seen in the angelic instruction on Samson's lifestyle in Judg 13:1-5 or earlier in Luke's angelophany to Zechariah (Luke 2:13-17).

[429] Prince, "'Why Do You Seek the Living among the Dead?': Rhetorical Questions in the Lukan Resurrection Narrative," 134.

[430] This clause is omitted by the D-text, with some scholars seeing its inclusion as a result of harmonization with Matt 28:6 or Mark 16:6. However, the inclusion of the ἀλλὰ suggests originality and should be included. So Bruce Manning Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1994), 183–84.

[431] Bovon, *Luke 3*, 350.

rather than heavenly ascension.[432] The empty tomb and absent body are interpreted as the result of Jesus' bodily resurrection.

The angels' message also includes a call to remember (24:6-μνήσθητε) that prompts the women to recognition through memory.[433] As Aristotle noted, a common way of producing recognition is through memory (μνήμης; *Poet*. 1454b37). The object of memory and the token of their recognition is the word Jesus spoke while in Galilee when he prophesied the necessity of the Son of Man's betrayal, death, and resurrection (24:6-7).[434] This is the first example of the stress on prophetic fulfillment in Luke 24, though here it is the fulfillment of Jesus' own words rather than the biblical prophets.[435] When the women remember the words of Jesus (24:8-ἐμνήσθησαν τῶν ῥημάτων αὐτοῦ), it implies their recognition.[436] However, the women do not recognize *Jesus* (as he is absent) but the *proper interpretation* of the empty tomb so that their recognition is purely hermeneutical as they come to understand Jesus' words and the events

---

[432] Cf. Luke 7:22; 8:54; 9:7; 9:22; 11:31; 20:37.

[433] The use of memory as a ground for recognition is also seen in the story of Peter's denial of the Lord, where he similarly remembers the words of Jesus and thus recognizes something new about himself. So Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 838. For the use of memory in other recognition scenes, see Sophocles, *Oed. tyr*. 1057, 1130-1140; Euripides, *Iph. Taur.*, 814-21; *Ion* 250, 284.

[434] Rather than pointing toward a future appearance in Galilee as in Mark 16:7 and Matt 28:7, the angels point to back in time to Jesus' own words while in Galilee. The angelic reminder in 24:7 recalls elements from the passion and resurrection predictions expressed by Jesus in Luke 9:22, 33, and 18:31-33 without being a *verbatim* repetition of any one statement. All three passages mention the son of man, 9:44 and 18:32 use the verb παραδίδωμι, and 9:22 and18:33 mention resurrection on the third day. New expansions include the death of Jesus as crucifixion [earlier accounts simply mention rejection (9:22) and death (18:33)] and attributing it to the hands of sinful man [earlier accounts mention just simply men (9:44), the Gentiles (18:31), and the chief priests /scribes (9:22)]. See Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 838.So Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 387. On the identification of the specific passion and resurrection predictions during Jesus' Galilean ministry, see Maria-Luisa Rigato, "'Remember...Then They Remembered': Luke 24:6-8," in *Luke and Acts*, eds. Gerald O'Collins and Gilberto Marconi, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (New York: Paulinist, 1993), 93–102.

[435] The particular stress on fulfillment comes through in the use of δεῖ, a verb used throughout Luke's narrative for divine necessity. Cf. Luke 17:25, 22:37, 24:26, 44, 46. For a discussion Luke-Acts understanding of divine fulfillment in history, see John T. Squires, *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*, SNTSMS 76 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

[436] The αὐτοῦ refers Jesus' speech, referenced by the angels in 24:6 as the thing to be remembered. So Carroll, *Luke*, 478; Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 388.

properly. Luke's account then diverges from the other Synoptics by lacking a commission of the women to report this angelic message to the other disciples.[437] The displacement of commission places the stress on the women's recognition rather than their role as mediating a message from the angels to the disciples.[438] However, some scholars have rejected the women as recognizing Jesus, insisting instead that belief arises only at the end of Luke 24.[439] I will show how this reading is untenable in light of the narration of the women's report to the disciples in verses 9-11.

4.2.3: The Women's Report (vv.9-11)

The women's recognition of the significance of the empty tomb and the words of Jesus result in their return to the apostles to announce (ἀπαγγέλλω) what they have learned (Luke 24:9), emphasized by the repetition of language about their proclamation.[440] Luke lists the women who made the announcement as Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Mary the mother of James, and other women with them, several of whom are named elsewhere in Luke as eyewitnesses to Jesus' ministry, death, and burial.[441] Interestingly, Luke has placed the list at the end of the

---

[437] Cf. Mark 16:7; Matt 28:7-8

[438] Cf. Luke 2:8-18 where the shepherds also receive an angelic message without a commission, though they go on to seek out the baby Jesus of their own volition.

[439] This is the opinion of Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word*, 58; Gerhard Lohfink, *Die Himmelfahrt Jesu: Untersuchungen zu den Himmelfahrts- und Erhöhungstexten bei Lukas.*, SANT 26 (Munich: Kosel, 1971); Joseph Plevnik, "The Eyewitnesses of the Risen Jesus in Luke 24," *CBQ* 49.1 (1987): 90–103.

[440] The language of announcement (ἀπαγγέλλω) is used throughout Luke, often as a form of proclamation in response to the miraculous action of God through Jesus. Cf. Luke 7:22; 8:34, 36, 47. See also the announcement of the women in John 20:18. Luke 24:10 uses the imperfect ἔλεγον, which conveys a sense of repeated or on-going sharing of the good news. So Bovon, *Luke 3*, 352; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 888. *Contra* Shelly Matthews, "Fleshly Resurrection, Authority Claims, and the Scriptural Practices of Lukan Christianity," *JBL* 136.1 (2017): 170. However, it should be noted that Luke does not have a wholly positive or wholly negative depiction of women in Luke-Acts. See Turid Karlsen Seim, *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke-Acts*, SNTW (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994).

[441] Cf. Luke 8:1-3, 23:49, 23:55. The list shows a strong connection to Mark's list of women in 16:1, though there are a few differences. For a discussion of the differences as well as the variants in involved, see Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 887–88.

empty tomb account rather than Mark's more natural place at the beginning, perhaps to stress their role as resurrection witnesses, warranting support for their remembrance as an attestation to their recognition.[442]

Their belief is more apparent in the contrast with the disciples to whom they speak.[443] Luke 24:11 explains that the other disciples regard the message as nonsense (λῆρος) and do not believe the women (καὶ ἠπίστουν αὐταῖς). The use of λῆρος for the women's speech is a *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament, but it has an extensive use in Greco-Roman literature to characterize speech that is untrue and unworthy of being taken seriously.[444] The situation suggests that it is both the message itself and the female witnesses that are unworthy of belief.[445] And yet, the narrative will confirm the women's message about the resurrection of Jesus, creating an ironic twist to the male disciples' accusation of λῆρος that aligns it with the term's predominant use in ancient comedy by "straight men" who fail to get a joke.[446] The men fail to understand and need further evidence in contrast to the women's recognition and pronouncement. The contrast of men and women is also supported by literary parallels in the angelophanies of the Hebrew Bible and Luke's Gospel. For example, in Judges 13, the wife of Manoah receives the angelic message but her husband is slow to belief, requiring an additional angelic visit. Similarly,

---

[442] So Bovon, *Luke 3*, 352; Plevnik, "The Eyewitnesses of the Risen Jesus in Luke 24," 92.

[443] Luke describes these disciples first as the Eleven and all those with them (24:9) and later as the apostles (v.10). For use of the Eleven as a designation elsewhere in Luke-Acts, see Luke 24:33, Acts 1:26; 2:14. This designation implies that Luke knows of the death of Judas, though he does not mention it until Acts 1:15-22. For the category of apostles, see Luke 6:13, 9:10; 17:5; 22:14. Bovon, *Luke 3*, 352.

[444] For a detailed discussion of the term, see Stephen E. Kidd, *Nonsense and Meaning in Ancient Greek Comedy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

[445] For a brief discussion of the reception history of this passage where both aspects have been highlighted, see Bovon, *Luke 3*, 355–60.

[446] So Kidd, *Nonsense and Meaning in Ancient Greek Comedy*, 161–86. Cf. Aristophanes, *Thesmo*. 618-20; *Plut.* 500-19. This term shows up nowhere else in the NT and only once in the LXX (4 Macc 5:11), suggesting it derives from the wider Greek literary milieu.

the Testament of Abraham 6 recounts Sarah's announcement of the angelic identity prior to Abraham's own admission of recognition.[447] Luke's Gospel uses the pattern of male disbelief and female belief of angelic messengers in Luke 1 with the contrast of Zechariah and Mary.[448] Thus, even if an explicit statement of the women's belief is lacking in the text, the contrast with the men, the insistence on the women's reporting, and the notion of recognition through memory support a positive evaluation of the women's belief. What the women recognized through memory, the male disciples have failed to grasp and will require additional evidence in the following appearances.

4.2.4: Peter's Visit to the Tomb (v.12)

The male disciples' rejection of the message is reiterated by Peter's investigation of the tomb in verse 12. This short verse, which is omitted in the D-text and a few Latin manuscripts, is the most significant of the Western non-interpolations.[449] Scholars who omit it stress its similarity with a visit by Peter to the tomb in John 20:3-10 and its stylistic features uncharacteristic of Luke.[450] I will follow the scholars who support its inclusion because of the strong external support (including the third century P^{75}), aspects of the passage that conform to

[447] This is true in both Recension A and B.

[448] As Juel explains, "It is appropriate that women, low on the social scale, should be the first evangelists-as appropriate as that Mary, an ordinary girl, should give birth to the Savior of the world and serve as a model of piety. Reversals occur to the very end." See Donald Juel, *Luke-Acts: The Promise of History* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1983), 54. For a wider discussion of Luke's use of reversal, see York, *The Last Shall Be First.*

[449] As Neirynck notes, "There can be few, if any, variant readings in the apparatus of the Greek New Testament that enjoyed such massive support from the tradition, but such little favour with the critics as the twelfth verse of Luke xxiv." As cited in John Muddiman, "Note on Reading Luke 24:12," *ETL* 48.3–4 (1972): 542.

[450] Among the supporters of its omission, see Carroll, *Luke*, 479–80.

Luke's style and vocabulary, and the clear differences with John 20:3-10.[451] It is also significant that verse 12 correlates with the brief mention of an appearance to Peter in v.34 which is not a disputed variant. Combined, these two brief references to Peter depict a shift from doubt to recognition that is characteristic of the whole chapter.

After hearing the report of the women, Peter arises and runs to the tomb as introduced with the participle ἀναστὰς, a typical Lukan expression.[452] When Peter stoops to look (βλέπει) into the tomb, he only sees the grave clothes (τὰ ὀθόνια μόνα). [453] Grave clothes (τὰ ὀθόνια) refer to the linen cloth wrapped around a corpse in preparation for burial.[454] The grave clothes function as a token of Jesus' absence for Peter that is open to various interpretations. Thus, Peter's resulting emotions are similar to the women's perplexity in verse 4.[455] In the face of the ambiguity, Peter fails to understand and is left without an adequate interpretation, a successful recognition, or a message to share.

---

[451] For a strong defense of the originality of Luke 24:12, see Frans Neirynck, "Once More Luke 24,12," *ETL* 70.4 (1994): 319–40; Muddiman, "Note on Reading Luke 24:12." Scholars who support its originality include Bovon, *Luke 3*, 353–55; Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 388–89; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 888–89; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 840. There are numerous inexact matches between Luke and John in vocabulary here. While they both have them running to the tomb (ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον), Luke uses the aorist ἔδραμεν while John uses the imperfect (v.3: ἔτρεχον) and the compound aorist (v.3: προέδραμεν).

[452]On Luke's distinctive use of ἀναστὰς, see Muddiman, "Note on Reading Luke 24:12," 545. Of the 112 uses of the term, more than 70 show up in Luke-Acts. Cf. Luke 1:39; 5:25; 10:25; 15:20; 23:1.

[453] The use of the historical present is rare in Luke, though it does show up when taken over from Mark in 8:49, in Luke's parable of Lazarus and the rich man, and twice in Acts. See Muddiman, "Note on Reading Luke 24:12," 544. Some manuscripts add the participle κείμενα to describe the grave clothes, though this is a harmonization with John 20:5.

[454] Cf. John 19:40; 20:5-7, though John also refers to a face-cloth (σουδάριον). Luke earlier notes that Jesus was wrapped in linen (23:53-σινδών).

[455] Peter departs in amazement at what has happened (θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός). The verb θαυμάζω is used in Luke to characterize a response to the supernatural, but it does not equal faith or even necessary foreshadow future faith Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 840. Cf. Luke 1:21; 1:63; 2:18; 2:33; 4:22; 8:25; 11:14. Of particularly importance is the link between disbelief and amazement that will be seen in Luke 24:41.

4.2.5: Summary

Luke 24:1-12 provides the necessary framework for understanding the proceeding recognition scenes as the visits to Jesus' burial place result in the discovery of an empty tomb and a missing body. These tokens generate great confusion and require further interpretation. The women's confusion is overcome by the angelic appeal to memory of Jesus' words, which allows the women to recognize God's action in Jesus' ministry, death, and resurrection. Their recognition has a hermeneutical function as the death and resurrection of Jesus are seen as prophetic fulfillment.

While not formally a recognition scene, Luke 24:1-11 introduces the reader to the theme of recognition that will occupy the entire chapter. It also highlights the importance of divine action in guaranteeing recognition, a trope inherited (along with the pattern of angelophany) from the recognition tradition in the Hebrew Bible. The spontaneous response of the women to share the message also parallels the commissive function of biblical recognition scenes.

In contrast to the women, the other disciples fail to recognize. Their unbelief is reiterated by Peter's visit to the tomb who, despite seeing the grave clothes, does not come to knowledge but is left marveling at what has happened. The disciples' disbelief will be addressed more fully in the final recognition appearance (24:36-49). Before that, however, Luke recounts the recognition of the risen Jesus on the road to Emmaus.

4.3: The Emmaus Recognition Scene (24:13-35)

The appearance of Jesus on the road to Emmaus in Luke 24:13-35 is often hailed as the height of Luke's literary creativity with its use of suspense, dramatic irony, and a climactic

recognition.[456] The space given to the story in Luke 24 (22 of 53 verses) has led many to claim that it is the conclusion of Luke's narrative as supported by the concentric or chiastic structure seen in its repeated language (e.g., vv.16/31: closed and opened eyes).[457] More recently, Dupont has argued that the passage's plot with its climactic recognition provides the structure to the whole.[458] The strength of his observation is that it does not force the verses into an inexact parallelism but appreciates the narrative's development while also capturing the central place of recognition as the narrative's climax.

Of course, scholars have long acknowledged the importance of ἀναγνώρισις in this story.[459] For instance, Joel Green has noted "the Emmaus account is structured in such a way as to call particular attention to the progression from lack of recognition to full recognition and to the means by which insight is gained."[460] However, the formal characteristics of the recognition type-scene have not been used as the grid upon which to read and interpret the whole passage.[461]

---

[456] R. Alan Culpepper, "The Gospel of Luke," 475.

[457] For example, Arthur A. Just, *The Ongoing Feast: Table Fellowship and Eschatology at Emmaus* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1993), 1–2. Similarly, Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," 168. For a chiastic or concentric structure, see Bovon, *Luke 3*, 367–68; Carroll, *Luke*, 482; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 842.

[458] Dupont, "Les Disciples D'Emmaüs."

[459] This begins explicitly with C. H Dodd, *More New Testament Studies*, 108. Since then, the claim has become a hallmark of scholarship on the passage. See Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word*, 104; Dupont, "Les Disciples D'Emmaüs," 1178; Brunk, "The Concept of the Resurrection According to the Emmaus Account in Luke's Gospel," 400; Octavian D. Baban, *On the Road Encounters in Luke-Acts: Hellenistic Mimesis and Luke's Theology of the Way*, Paternoster Biblical Monographs (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006), 274; Richard Bolling Vinson, *Luke*, SHBC 21 (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2008), 744–45; Carroll, *Luke*, 483; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 842; Culpepper, "The Gospel of Luke," 479.

[460] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 842.

[461] Past attempts to articulate the form of this story apart from the recognition type-scene have been inexact. For instance, Neyrey (the proponent of resurrection appearances as commissioning stories,), notes Luke 24:13-25 "is not cast in the form of a vocation commissioning." See Neyrey, *The Resurrection Stories*, 39. While there are some similarities with epiphanies with an appearance to individuals on the road (i.e, Romulus) or the entertainment of a divine visitor in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Gen 18), these formal parallels often fail to expand major aspects of 24:13-35. For instance, the appearance of Jesus in this story, apart from his disappearance in v.31, lacks

My exegetical analysis will argue that Luke 24:13-35 is best understood as using the recognition type-scene with its meeting (vv.13-16), cognitive resistance (vv.17-27), display of tokens and recognition (vv.28-31), and attendant reactions (vv.32-35). I will also note the ways that the recognition conventions are used to anticipate the climactic appearance in Jerusalem.

4.3.1: The Meeting (vv.13-16)

Luke 24:13-35 establishes a new scene with the meeting between Jesus and the journeying disciples. The common LXX expression (Καὶ ἰδού) transitions from the preceding scene, as the two disciples on the road are described as journeying to Emmaus from Jerusalem after receving the women's message (ἐξ αὐτῶν) that same day (ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ).[462] The movement out of Jerusalem and back again functions as a kind of *inclusio* for the whole scene, bracketing the disciples' recognition.[463] The traveling disciples are discussing (ὡμίλουν) everything that has recently happened in Jerusalem.[464] Their discussion is further emphasized in v.15 with the repetition of ὁμιλέω and its juxtaposition with συζητέω, suggesting their conversation includes the struggle to properly interpret the recent events.[465] But before the

---

any of the supernatural stage props common to epiphany stories. The difference of this story from the epiphanies is clearly seen in contrast to the angelophany of Lule 24:1-12. So Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1557.

[462] For the use of Καὶ ἰδού in the LXX, see Gen 15:17; 31:2. A similar use can be seen in Luke 1:36; 2:25; 5:12; 7:12. Much scholarly ink has been spilt over the location of Emmaus, with the distance of 60 stadia (and the textual variant of 160 stadia) only further complicating the matter. See Rainer Riesner, "Wo Lag Das Neutestamentliche Emmaus (Lukas 24, 13)?," *ZAC* 11.2 (2007): 201–20; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 892–93. For the textual variant discussion, see Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 184–85.

[463] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 844.

[464] The verb ὡμίλουν is in the imperfect, suggesting an ongoing conversation, the content of which are "all these things that have happened (v.14)." The perfect participle συμβεβηκότων, which conveys a sense of things that have happened in the past but continue to have force in the present, is also used in Acts 3:10.

[465] Carroll, *Luke*, 483; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 844. The verb συζητέω is often used for questioning (Luke 22:23) and debating (Acts 6:9; 9:29), especially the scriptural debates between Jesus and his opponents (Matt 12:28; Mark 9:14).

content of their conversation is revealed, Jesus *meets* with the disciples, becoming their fellow traveler.[466] Verse 15 places added emphasis on Jesus' identity through the use of his personal name with αὐτὸς so that there can be no doubt for the readers that Jesus is present with the disciples.[467]

However, the two disciples lack this insight as Luke 24:16 explains they "were prevented from recognizing him (ἐκρατοῦντοτοῦ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι αὐτόν)." While some scholars have proposed natural explanations for their failure to recognize Jesus, it is better to see the form of κρατέω as a divine passive that attributes their blindess to God's intervention.[468] There is a suggestive parallel in Philo's discussion of the recognition scene of Joseph and his brothers where Philo explicitly attributes the brothers' initial inability to recognize Joseph to divine action (*Joseph* 165-6). The divine concealment of the disiples' eyes plays into the metaphor of blindness in Luke's Gospel where seeing is correlated with proper spiritual perception.[469] The use of ἐπιγινώσκω to characterize the disciples' inability to recognize Jesus also locates this story in the

[466] Despite the mystical suggestiveness of his 'drawing near' (ἐγγίζω), the verb is used throughout Luke in a mundane sense. See Luke 7:12; 15:25; 18:35; 19:37, 41; 22:47; 24:28. Jesus becomes the fellow journeyman with these two disciples highlighted by the use of συνεπορεύετο. The motif of journeying has been particularly important to the story of Jesus in Luke's Gospel, particularly in the so-called travel narrative (9:51-19:48). Jesus' journeying with his disciples after his death is an extensive of this theme. See Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 843.

[467] Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 893; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 845.

[468] For the history of interpretation on the cause of misrecognition, see Anderson, "Recognizing the Risen Christ: A Study of the Non-Recognition/Recognition Motif in the Post-Resurrection Appearance Narratives (Luke 24:13-35; John 20:11-18; and John 21:1-14)." In defense of the divine passive, see Vinson, *Luke*, 746; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 893; Carroll, *Luke*, 483; Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition*, 196–97; Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word*, 146. *Contra* Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 845; Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*, 282.

[469] Cf. sight and blindness in Luke 2:30; 4:18; 6:39; 7:21-22; 18:35-43. For more detailed treatments of this theme, see Dennis Hamm, "Sight to the Blind: Vision as Metaphor in Luke," *Bib* 67.4 (1986): 457–77; Chad Hartsock, *Sight and Blindness in Luke-Acts: The Use of Physical Features in Characterization*, BibInt 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2008). Similar motifs of the disciples' inability to understand are found in Luke 9:45 and 18:34.

biblical recognition tradition as this term is used throughout the LXX in recognition scenes.[470] It also occurs elsewhere in Luke-Acts to describe the process of discerning identity through specific markers.[471] The blindness of the disciples contrasts with the reader's knowledge of the identity of the stranger (v.15). These different levels of knowledge provide the conditions for the dramatic irony of the whole narrative. As the disciples fail to recognize Jesus, the reader is held in suspense about how the recognition will be accomplished.

4.3.2: Dialogue of Cognitive Resistance (vv.17-27)

Verses 17-27 depict an extensive dialogue that expresses the disciples' cognitive resistance to Jesus and the news of his resurrection. Jesus' question about what the disciples were discussing picks up the narrative of vv.14-15, with an emphasis on the very words (οἱ λόγοι οὗτοι) previously discussed (24:17).[472] The disciples' response reveals the deep emotional content of their discourse as verse 17 explains "they stopped saddened (καὶ ἐστάθησαν

[470] Cf. LXX Gen 37:32-33; 38:25-26; 42:8; 1 Kings 26:17. On the use of ἐπιγινώσκω, see Bultmann, TDNT 1:689-719.

[471] The crowd recognizes that Zechariah has seen a vision when he emerges speechless from the temple (Luke 1:22) and Pilates recognizes that Jesus is from Galilee in response to his question (23:7). In Acts, a crowd recognizes that the healed man once begged for alms (Acts 3:10), the Jerusalem leaders recognize that Peter and John had been with Jesus (Acts 4:13), and Rhoda recognizes Peter at her door through his voice (Acts 12:14).

[472] Jesus notes the liveliness of their conversation through the use of ἀντιβάλλετε, a word that stresses the back and forth exchange of a conversation. The use of ἀντιβάλλω is a *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament, though it is use elsewhere in Greek literature for verbal exchanges. See BDAG, 88, s.v. "ἀντιβάλλω." Cf. 2 Macc 11:13. For some scholars, the rare use of this term suggests that Luke is working with a special source. So Bovon, *Luke 3*, 372.

σκυθρωποί)."[473] The word σκυθρωπός conveys a gloominess and darkened countenance.[474] This term is used in Gen 40:7 where Joseph encounters the saddened faces of the jailed baker and cupbearer who ask for an interpretation of their dreams. While the echo of two individuals in need of proper interpretation has a surprising resonance with this passage, the term is also a stock emotion used in Greek novels.[475] As Johnson notes, this term "is one of many "novelistic" touches in the story which give it vividness and psychological plausibility."[476] The *pathos* of the disciples will be reversed by the affective function of their recognition.

Luke explains that one of the travelers who responds to Jesus is named Cleopas, a character unknown elsewhere in Luke's Gospel.[477] There is a tradition in the early Church that Cleopas is an alternative form of Clopas and could be the uncle of Jesus, the husband of Mary the mother of James and Joses.[478] If true, this familial relationship would only further heighten the irony of the recognition scene as Jesus' own extended family failed to recognize him.[479]

---

[473] The verb ἐστάθησαν is passive but with an active sense of stopping. See also Luke 8:44. So Bovon, *Luke 3*, 372; Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 393. There are a series of variants on this phrase. Some manuscripts replace the verb with ἐστέ, simply pointing to the sadness alone. The D-text omits the verb altogether, so that sadness is attached to Jesus' speech describing their countenance as they walk. However, the textual support for 'and they stopped' is strong, including P^{75}, Sinaticus, Alexandrinus and Vaticanus.

[474] BDAG, 933, s.v."σκυθρωπός." While the term is rare in the NT (only appearing here and in Matt 6:1), it does occur three times in the LXX as a way of expressing sorrow (Gen 40:7; Neh 2:1; Sir 25:23).

[475] Cf. Chariton, *Chaer*. 1.12.6; 3.10.1; 7.6.10; Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe* 1.17.2. See also Menander, *Sikyonioi*, 124; *Dis Exapaton*, 104.

[476] Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 393.

[477] Many suggest the name is inherited from the tradition, as in Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 1563–64.

[478] See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl* iii.32 as discussed by Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 894; Just, *The Ongoing Feast*, 72–74.

[479] That Luke would contain a negative assessment of Jesus' family would agree with Jesus' words elsewhere that replace his familial relationships with the call to discipleship. See Luke 8:21; Matt 12:46-50; Mark 3:31-35.

Alternatively, Carroll has suggested that the name Cleopas is a nomastic word-play with the *kleo-* stem resonating with the language of breaking (κλάω) and shutting (κλείω).[480] Both the centrality of kinship and nomastic wordplay are found in other recognition scenes in Greek literature.[481] While both are interesting possibilities opened up by the recognition tradition, there is not enough evidence to confirm either interpretation. There is even less evidence for trying to identify Cleopas' unnamed companion.[482]

As Cleopas responds to Jesus' question, the audience is finally given the details of the lively conversation. He asks Jesus if he is a stranger to Jerusalem since he does not know the things that had recently happened. The language of stranger (παροικέω) suggests that Cleopas and his companion see him as a pilgrim to Jerusalem for the Passover.[483] The dramatic irony is that Jesus knows all too well what happened in Jerusalem as it happened to him! The dialogue continues in v.19, when Jesus succinctly asks, "What things (ποῖα)?," which leads Cleopas to recount the events he and his companion had been discussing. He introduces his subject under the heading of "the things concerning Jesus of Nazareth (24:19: τὰ περὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ).[484] The use of the personal name reminds the reader of the earlier use of the name in

---

[480] Carroll, *Luke*, 484. Such nomastic wordplay is found elsewhere in Luke-Acts, as with Eutychus in Acts 20:7-12.

[481] Familial connection is crucial to the recognition scenes of *Odyssey* and the Electra-Orestes story. Wordplay in recognition, while less common, is used at least in Euripides' *Electra* where he subverts the tradition by marrying the one who is to be unmarried. Electra is the negated form of λέκτρον, the Greek word for the marriage-bed. For nomastic wordplay in ancient comedy, see Nikoletta Kanavou, *Aristophanes' Comedy of Names: A Study of Speaking Names in Aristophanes*, Sozomena 8 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011).

[482] For the identity of the other companion as an omitted female disciple, see Matthews, "Fleshly Resurrection, Authority Claims, and the Scriptural Practices of Lukan Christianity," 172. A similar thesis was entertained earlier by Pierre Benoit, *The Passion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, trans. Benet Weatherhead (New York: Herder and Herder, 1969), 275. Ultimately, one must acknowledge that these proposals are merely conjectures.

[483] Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 894. Cf. Heb 11:9.

[484] The use of the article with a preposition as in "τὰ περὶ" is Lukan, as seen in similar constructions in Luke 2:39, 8:15, 24:27, 25. The phrase "τὰ περὶ" is used again at the conclusion of v.26, framing the dialogue

v.15. However, the irony of the situation is heightened since it is Jesus himself who is with these travelers and yet remains unrecognized by them.

Verses 19b-24 consist of an analepsis as Cleopas recounts his interpretation of the life and death of Jesus as well as the previous events of the morning. As Bovon notes, "there is also an intentional imbalance between the slow conversation and the sudden, concluding revelation (vv.30-32)."[485] Cleopas describes Jesus as a man and prophet mighty in word and deed before God and the people, recalling Luke's stress on the prophetic identity of Jesus in the narrative.[486] Cleopas then recounts how "our" chief priests and rulers handed Jesus over to the judgment of death by crucifixion.[487] The language recalls both the events narrated by Luke earlier and, like the message of the angels in v.7, Jesus' own words.[488] But Cleopas' interpretation of these events is one of disappointment as he explains "but we were hoping that he is the one coming to redeem (λυτροῦσθαι) Israel (24:21a)."[489] With the death of Jesus, the travelers' hopes have been dashed to pieces. There are strong similarities between Cleopas' speech and the cognitive resistance

---

between Cleopas' interpretation and Jesus' subsequent rebuke and proper interpretation. Some manuscripts replace the less common Ναζαρηνοῦ with the alternative spelling Ναζωραῖος. So, Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 185.

[485] Bovon, *Luke 3*, 373.

[486] On the title prophet used of Jesus, see Luke 4:24; 7:16, 39; 13:33. This presentation recalls traditions of Jesus as a prophet like Moses, as in Acts 7:22. So Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 894–95. For other prophetic similarities, see Acts 1:16; 2:29, 37; 7:2.

[487] Cf. Luke 19:47-8; 22:2; 23:35. The passage also echoes the juxtaposition between the people who receive Jesus and the leaders who reject him. So Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 847.

[488] Cf. παραδίδωμι in Luke 9:44; 18:32; 22:4, 6, 21-2, 48; 23:5. Also, σταυρόω in Luke 23:21, 23, 33. Interesting, this verse names the Jewish leaders as the agents of Jesus death, although the Romans were also involved. See the contrast with Luke 18:32; Acts 4:27 and the ambiguous Luke 24:7.

[489] Cleopas' interpretation of Jesus' mission suggests a hope for the deliverance from Israel from her enemies, as in Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 846. Cf. Acts 7:22. The use of λυτρόω recalls the task of Moses in the story of the Exodus, see LXX Ex 6:6; 15:13, 16. A related term (λύτρωσις) appears twice in the speech of Jews who are eagerly anticipating deliverance with the birth of the messiah (Luke 1:68; 2:38).

displayed in other recognition scenes. Throughout the *Odyssey*, Homer often has characters confess their loss of hope for Odysseus' return to a hidden Odysseus (*Ody.* 14.141-171). Similarly, Sophocles' expanded recognition scene between Electra and Orestes depicts Electra's mourning over an urn of her supposedly dead brother (*El.* 1100-1170). The dramatic irony of Cleopas' speech is a hallmark of the ancient recognition tradition as his loss of hope in Jesus provides a radical misinterpretation of the situation that the recognition will reverse.

Cleopas' speech takes a sudden turn in verse 21b (marked by the conjunctions ἀλλά γε καὶ) as he remarks that is it now the third day since this has happened (v.22b). The reference to the third day recalls Jesus' prophetic words about his resurrection, which, while apparent to the audience, lacks explanatory power for the companions on the road.[490] In a dash of irony, these disciples have considered Jesus a prophet yet they have not taken his predictions seriously. Cleopas then offers a condensed report of the events that had transpired earlier that day, reiterating the women's discovery of an empty tomb and absent body, the angelophany, and their report that Jesus lives (vv.22-23.).[491] Cleopas even notes how several of the men went to the tomb only to find it empty.[492] The introduction of the empty tomb, the absent body, and the report of the women further highlights the Emmaus disciples' cognitive resistance. Although

[490] Some manuscripts suggestively add the word σήμερον in v.21b. Though it is lacking in several key manuscripts including Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and P^{75}, the term is quite prevalent at key points in Luke's narrative as a technical term for the messianic salvation already present in the world. Cf. Luke 2:11; 4:21; 5:26; 19:9; 23:43. See Alexey Somov, *Representations of the Afterlife in Luke-Acts*, LNTS (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), 62. While likely unoriginal, the addition would add further ironic force to Cleopas' speech as he fails to see the salvation present *today*.

[491] Like the account of the empty tomb in vv.2-3, this repetition places stress on the lack of Jesus' body in the tomb. Cleopas also recounts how the women saw a vision of angels (ὀπτασίαν ἀγγέλων) who told them that Jesus is alive (24:23). As Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 395, explains "For the labeling of angelophanies as a vision by those who did not experience it, see also Luke 1:22."

[492] The passage correlates with the account of Peter's visit in v.12 (suggesting it is not an interpolation), although Luke here has noted that more than one person (τινες τῶν σὺν ἡμῖν) visited the empty tomb. Cf. John 20:3-10.

their eyes are veiled, this divine concealment is juxtaposed with their own misinterpretation of the recent events. Recognition will only be possible when both their eyes are opened and the proper interpretation is received.

Jesus responds to Cleopas' interpretation with a swift denunciation: "Oh foolish and slow of heart to believe all which the prophets spoke (Luke 24:25)" The disciples are dull witted (ἀνόητος) and slow of heart (βραδεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ), affective language reminiscent of other ancient recognition scenes.[493] The rebuke also draws from prophetic denunciation especially since the disciples have failed to believe the prophets and now require a proper hermeneutic for interpreting the recent events in line with God's plan.[494] The lack of a proper interpretation is emphasized by Jesus' rhetorical question in verse 26, as he explains "Ought not the Christ to suffer these things and to enter into his glory?."[495] The question stresses the importance of God's guidance through the events (expressed by the δεῖ) and recalls Jesus' own prophetic predictions, especially as the identity of the Messiah must be marked by his suffering prior to entering his glory.[496] The disciples had failed to see how Jesus' death could redeem Israel, and have now been confronted with an alterative explanation that challenges their cognitive resistance.

---

[493] BDAG, 84, s.v."ἀνόητος." While only used here in Luke-Acts, the term is found also in Rom 1:14, Gal 3:1, 3; 1 Tim 6:9; Tit 3:3. The heart is used here in the LXX sense as the inner dispositions of a person that determine one's life. For a similar use in Luke, see 1:17, 51, 66; 2:19; 5:22; 6:45. Besides showing up often in the rhetorical situations of denunciation (e.g., 4 Macc 5:9-10), it also shows up in the ancient recognition scenes. Telemachus rebukes his mother when she refuses to recognize the revealed Odysseus, declaring "My mother, cruel mother, whose heart is unyielding, why do you thus hold aloof from my father…No other woman would harden her heart as you do, and stand aloof from her husband…but your heart is always harder than stone (*Ody*. 23.96-104 [Murray, LCL])." See also Chariton, *Chae.* 1.12.2; 2.10.4; 5.7.3.

[494] As noted extensively in Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24." For the use of πιστεύειν with ἐπὶ elsewhere in Luke-Acts, see Acts 9:42; 11:17; 16:31. So Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 395.

[495] Cf. the rhetorical question in 24:5. See discussion in Prince, "'Why Do You Seek the Living among the Dead?': Rhetorical Questions in the Lukan Resurrection Narrative," 135.

[496] P^{75} replaces Jesus entering his glory with the expression entering into his *kingdom*. Lacking additional textual support, I will have followed NA28 in reading *glory*.

Jesus aligns his interpretation with the fulfillment of Scripture as verse 27 explains, "beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the writings the things concerning himself."[497] The main verb (διερμήνευσεν) describes acts of translation and interpretation, stressing Jesus' scriptural interpretation in suppose of the Messiah's suffering, death, and resurrection.[498] Jesus' biblical defense is built on the prophets and Moses, both of whom are fitting echoes of Cleopas' early description of Jesus as a prophet like Moses.[499] But this alternative interpretation is not enough to produce recognition. Indeed, one should use the category of "proof-from-prophecy" carefully since the prophetic proof does not help the travelers recognize Jesus.[500] Despite Jesus' own scripturally supported alternative interpretation of the recent events, the travelers still do not recognize him. Their eyes remain veiled and they require more than scriptural proof.

Thus, verses 17-27 leave the reader with two competing interpretations of the evidence of Jesus' death and resurrection, itself a convention of the cognitive resistance of recognition scenes. For instance, Electra offers an alternative interpretation of the evidence of her brother's return when faced with the proper interpretation of the old man (Euripides, *Electra* 513-546). Both Oedipus and the disguised Odysseus engage in the spinning of alternative explanations before the climactic moment of recognition. Even the story of Joseph is marked by false explanations of recognition tokens such as the deception of Joseph's brothers of Jacob with the

---

[497] For a parallel to the phrase ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν, see Acts 8:35.

[498] BDAG, 244, s.v. "διερμηνεύω." For uses of the term for translation, see Acts 9:26; LXX 2 Macc 1:36. For uses that focus on interpretation, see Paul's discussion of glossolalia in 1 Cor 14:5-27. Some manuscripts prefer the aorist to the imperfect form of the verb.

[499] Cf. the two parts (Moses and propherts) as in Luke 16:29; Acts 26:22; 28:23. In contrast, see Luke 24:44 for the tripartite canonical division of Law, prophets, and writings.

[500] *Contra* Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," 173.

blood-stained cloak (Gen 37:31-34). Recognitions scenes thrive on interpretive ambiguity. The competing interpretations build suspense and prompt more detailed displays of evidence before recognition happens. As Jesus' interpretation from Scripture fails to overcome the blindness of the travelers, the reader anticipates some further display of evidence.

4.3.3: Hospitality, Tokens, and Recognition (vv.28-31)

While the dialogue has a slow pace that relishes in the dramatic irony of the disciples' cognitive resistance, the display of tokens and moment of recognition occur rapidly in a mere two verses. As the travelers draw near to their destination (ἤγγισαν εἰς τὴν κώμην), Jesus desires (προσεποιεῖτο) to continue along the way.[501] The suspense created by the possibility of Jesus' departure before his recognition is quickly overcome by the travelers' offer of hospitality. The disciples compel him to stay (παρεβιάσαντο) saying, "Remain with us because it is near evening and the day has already set (Luke 24:29)." Their request has striking verbal parallels with Lot's offer of hospitality to an angel in Genesis 19.[502] Jesus accepts their offer of hospitality and remains with them, establishing a "hospitality dynamic, as it gives [the disciples] an opportunity

[501] The use of ἐγγίζω and κώμη in this verse recalls the same terms used in 24:13-15. The use of προσποιέω can mean "pretend" or "make as to" and suggests a kind of intentionality on the part of Jesus. See BDAG, 884, s.v."προσποιέω." The term is rare in the NT, but is used in LXX of 1 Sam 21:13-14 when David pretends to be mad. This gives a liveliness to the story as it allows the disciples to welcome Jesus as noted in Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 897.

[502]The use of παραβιάζομαι recalls Gen 19:3 when Lot compels the disguised angels to stay with him as a guest. See Andrew E. Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels: Early Christian Hospitality in Its Mediterranean Setting*, New Testament Monographs 8 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2005), 146–47. Similar language can be be found in other hospitality scenes. In Gen 24:55 (LXX), her family asks if Rebekah can remain with them (μεινάτω ἡ παρθένος μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν). Similarly, version A of Judges 9:9 LXX requests that a certain Levi and his concubine accept hospitality because "ἰδοὺ δὴ εἰς ἑσπέραν κέκλικεν ἡ ἡμέρα."

to invite their fellow traveler to a meal that will transform their traveling fellowship into table fellowship." [503]

Hospitality provides the setting whereby the recognition occurs. Luke's Gospel has already established the connections between hospitality, meals, and the reception of God.[504] For instance, the disciples are instructed to bring peace to houses that show them hospitality but to offer judgment on those who fail to provide hospitality (10:8-12). Similarly, Zacchaeus' offer of hospitality results in salvation coming to his house (19:1-10). The passage exploits the connection between hospitality and divine reception in Luke's Gospel to create a setting for the recognition. This overlap of recognition and hospitality has significantly literary precursors in the biblical and wider Greco-Roman tradition beginning with Odysseus and Abraham. The prevalence of this motif in the literary milieu cautions against using it as the most important fact in determining this pericope's literary form.[505] Rather, one needs to understand how Luke is deploying hospitality in his recognition scene.

The disciples' hospitality creates a setting for Jesus to prove his identity and generate recognition. Verse 30 begins with Jesus reclining at the table (κατακλιθῆναι) with the disciples.[506] But Jesus moves from the role of guest to host as he takes the bread (λαβὼν τὸν

---

[503] Heil, *The Meal Scenes in Luke-Acts*, 206. This verse repeats the verb μένω used in the traveler's plea. The language of remaining (μένω) further bolsters the connections to Jesus' teaching on hospitality as it is used in his discourse to the 12 (9:4), the 72 (10:7), and in the hospitality scene with Zacchaeus (19:5).

[504] On the importance of meals and hospitality in Luke-Acts, see Heil, *The Meal Scenes in Luke-Acts*; Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 135–81; Byrne, *The Hospitality of God*, 8–18.

[505] The limit of recognition and hospitality to specific precursors is largely responsible for Alsup's focus on anthropomorphic theophanies from the Hebrew Bible alone. This focus is inherited from Hermann Gunkel, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments*, 76–77.

[506]The verb κατακλίνω can mean to recline, but is often used specifically in meal setting for reclining at the table BDAG, 511, s.v."κατακλίνω." The term is used throughout Luke for sitting during meals as in Luke 9:14; 14:8. For comparison, see Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, XII.96. The infinite is joined to the introductory expression καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ just as in 24:15.

ἄρτον), blesses it (εὐλόγησεν), breaks it (κλάσας) and gives it (ἐπεδίδου) to Cleopas and his companion.[507] The verbal sequence recalls the feeding of the 5,000 (Luke 9:16) and the Last Supper (Luke 22:19), two other crucial meal scenes in Luke's Gospel.[508] These actions result in the disciples' recognition in verse 31a when, in a reverse of the expression in v.16, their eyes are opened (διηνοίχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ) and they recognize Jesus (ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν). The first clause uses a divine passive to describe the overcoming of the disciples' blindness in an expression which recalls the opening of Adam and Eve's eyes in Gen 3:7 and Elijah's opening of his servant's eyes to see the divine army in 2 Kings 6:17. [509] While these are suggestive allusions, they are imprecise since they rely primarily on the occurrence of διανοίγω and ὀφθαλμός, terms that are frequently paired in biblical passages.[510] More importantly, διανοίγω forges a strong connection between the opened eyes and the opening of the Scriptures in v.32.[511] The second clause explains that the disciples' opened eyes lead them to recognize Jesus (ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν). The use of ἐπιγινώσκω reverses the lack of recognition expressed by the same term in v.16 and

---

[507]Jesus' reversal of the role of guest and host in hospitality scenes is common to Luke's Gospel. Cf. Luke 5:29-39; 10:38-42; 11:27-28; 14:1-24; 19:1-27. So Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 849.

[508] The parallels have long been noted by scholars. See John Gillman, "The Emmaus Story in Luke-Acts Revisited," in *Resurrection in the New Testament: Festschrift J. Lambrecht*, ed. R. Bieringer, V. Koperski, and B. Lataire, BETL 165 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 168–69; Just, *The Ongoing Feast*, 160; Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 396.

[509] The term is used elsewhere in Luke-Acts for the Lord's opening of a heart (Acts 16:14). Cf. similar passive uses in Mark 7:35. The LXX of Gen 3:7 reads, "καὶ διηνοίχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῶν δύο καὶ ἔγνωσαν ὅτι γυμνοὶ ἦσαν." Cf. Gen 3:5. For fuller discussion, see Dane C. Ortlund, "'And Their Eyes Were Opened, and They Knew': An Inter-Canonical Note on Luke 24:31," *JETS* 53.4 (2010): 717–28; Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 396–97. The LXX of 2 Kings 6:17 reads "καὶ προσεύξατο Ελισαιε καὶ εἶπεν κύριε διάνοιξον τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ παιδαρίου καὶ ἰδέτω καὶ διήνοιξεν κύριος τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶδεν καὶ ἰδοὺ τὸ ὄρος πλῆρες ἵππων καὶ ἅρμα πυρὸς περικύκλῳ Ελισαιε." See Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 241–43.

[510] Cf. LXX Job 27:19; Prov 20:13; Zech 12:4.

[511] Such a use of terms is called amphibology and has been noted in Daniel Marguerat, *The First Christian Historian: Writing the "Acts of the Apostles,"* trans. Ken McKinney, Gregory J. Laughery, and Richard Bauckham, SNTSMS 121 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 75. An obvious example of this technique would be Luke's use of 'raising up a prophet' in Acts 3:22; 7:37.

again aligns the passage with the biblical recognition tradition. The disciples have moved from ignorance about the stranger's identity to the knowledge that it is the risen Lord, a recognition that provides the dramatic center to the whole scene.[512]

But what are the recognition tokens that prompt this shift? Jesus' actions at the table are the obvious candidate and are named as such when the disciples later recount the experience in verse 35.[513] There are two possible reasons why these tokens are sufficient for recognition. First, they recall Jesus' ministry of table fellowship throughout the Gospel, especially the feeding of the 5,000 (9:16) and the last Supper (22:19). Second, they reflect the early church's continuing practice of the Lord's Supper.[514] These two possible solutions are not mutual exclusive since Luke-Acts creates continuity between Jesus' meal scenes and the practices of the early chuch.[515] However, the first explanation seems more appropriate since the actions of Jesus at the table recall for the disciples' the memory of Jesus' unique actions at other meals. These actions function as a recognition token by which the disciples see the stranger for who he is: the same Jesus who broke bread with them before his death. That the celebration of the meal by Jesus

[512] As noted in C. H Dodd, *More New Testament Studies*, 108; Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," 171.

[513] In Luke 24:35 they cite the breaking of the bread as revealing his presence. The verb κλάω is used with ἄρτος in Luke 22:19; Acts 2:49; 20:7; 20:11; 27:35. Cf. τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου in Acts 2:42

[514] Bovon, *Luke 3*, 375; Carroll, *Luke*, 487; Just, *The Ongoing Feast*, 160; Heil, *The Meal Scenes in Luke-Acts*, 209. This has led many interpreters to interpret the use of the Lord's Supper in the story of Emmaus as an institution or justification of Christian practice, often in the same vein as Greco-Roman theophanies result in the institution of cultic practices. See Hans Dieter Betz, "Origin and Nature of Christian Faith According to the Emmaus Legend," 37. See also Neyrey, *The Resurrection Stories*, 43. However, at no point in the scene does Jesus institute the supper again as in Luke 22. While the cultic resonances are possible, they are not probable.

[515] For the connections, see Heil, *The Meal Scenes in Luke-Acts*; Just, *The Ongoing Feast*.

would recall the memory is supported by the same use of memory in the story of the women at the tomb.[516]

But the emphasis on the meal as a recognition token needs to be balanced with the clear stress on divine action in the recognition. The unveiling of the eyes implies the importance of divine action, rather than mere human memory, in the recognition of Jesus. Such a mixture of divine and human actions in recognition is common to the biblical recognition tradition in such ambiguous moments as Abraham's conversation with his visitors in Genesis 18 or Jacob's wrestling with God in Genesis 32. The moment of recognition in Luke 24:30-31a seems indebted to the complicated overlap of human and divine actions in the biblical recognition tradition.[517]

Immediately following the moment of recognition, verse 31b explains that Jesus vanished from before the disciples.[518] The sudden disappearance expressed by the term ἄφαντος recalls a number of literary parallels including the disappearances of heroes after post-death appearances and the disappearance of angels and divine visitors in the Hebrew Bible. [519] Importantly,

---

[516] It is further significant that Jesus' instructions on the Lord's Supper in Luke 22:19 emphasize the act be done as a rememberance (ἀνάμνησις), a phrae unique among the Gospels. Cf. 1 Cor 11:24, 28.

[517] *Contra* Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word*, 155. Of course, the overlap of the divine and human in recognition is not isolated to the Bible alone. Euripides' *Helen*, for instance, can insist that there is something divine in recognition (560). However, the ambiguity and terseness of the references to the divine in Luke is more characteristic of the biblical style, not least in the understated divine passives.

[518] The ability of the risen Jesus to disappear demonstrates dissimilarity between Jesus' earthly presence and his risen state, reminiscent of a tension found elsewhere in the New Testament. Cf. 1 Cor 15; John 21. However, this should not be amplified to the neglect of Luke's insistence on the continuity in Jesus' identity which the recognition scenes stress. Cf. Luke 5:29-39; 10:38-42; 11:27-28; 14:1-24; 19:1-27. So Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 849.

[519] Arnold Ehrhardt, "Emmaus: Romulus and Apollonius," 93–99; Tilborg, *Jesus' Appearances and Disappearances in Luke 24*, 193–231. While it is likely that some in the Greco-Roman world might associate Jesus with these figures, the disappearance in these stories is often associated with assumption, about making the hero somehow larger through his disappearance. So Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition*, 238. In this narrative, however, Jesus is not assumed but will reappear briefly. For the disappearance of divine angels, see 2 Macc 3:34. This parallel is cited in Brunk, "The Concept of the Resurrection According to the Emmaus Account in Luke's Gospel," 307; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 898. For similar divine disappearances In Greek literature expressed through ἄφαντος, see Apollonius, *Argo*. 3.275; Pindar, *Ol.* I.46

Euripides uses this term for the disappearance of the false Helen after Menelaus confronts the real Helen as an end to the moment of recognition (*Hel*. 606).[520] In a similar way, the disappearance of Jesus brings closure to the recognition. Once he has been recognized, his disappearance closes off the possibility of further cognitive resistance or displays of tokens. As van Tilborg and Counet explain, "The unrecognised appearance becomes a recognised disappearance."[521]

Overall, verses 28-31 offer a climactic recognition that resolves the suspense caused by the cognitive resistance on the road. The disciples' hospitality creates the setting in which Jesus can reveal his identity through breaking the bread. Jesus' actions are dramatically linked to the disciples' recognition, reversing the ignorance and blindness noted in v.16 through a blend of divine revelation and human remembrance. After Jesus is recognized, he disappears without any commission or cultic instruction. Rather, the moment of recognition is the climactic point of the story. What remains is the disciples' response to the recognition.

4.3.4: Attendant Reactions and Proclamation (vv.32-35)

The Emmaus pericope concludes by recounting the inner emotional reaction of the disciples (v.32) and their spontaneous announcement to the disciples gathered in Jerusalem (vv.33-35).[522] Their response begins in verse 32 as they explain, "Was not our heart burning in us as he was speaking to us on the road, as he opened the Scriptures to us?" This metaphor has

---

[520] Cf. also Eurpides' *Orestes* where it is used of the disappearance of Hermione explained ambiguously as the result "either because of drugs or magicians' contrivance or stolen away by the gods (1495-8 [Kovacs, LCL])

[521] Tilborg, *Jesus' Appearances and Disappearances in Luke 24*, 84.

[522] This attendant response follows the pattern established by the women who report after the remembering even without a specific command to do so. The spontaneous response of proclamation sits at odds with the commissioning form suggested by Neyrey, *The Resurrection Stories*, 39.

precursors in the Hebrew Bible, as in Jeremiah 20:9 when the prophet's attempt to keep from speaking the word of God feels like a fire in his bones. [523] Similar expressions show up in scenes of *pathos* in the Greek novels.[524] The burning heart expresses the affective transformation from the disciples' earlier gloominess (v.17) and slowness of heart (v.25) that is produced by the recognition.[525]

Their change of heart is attributed to two separate clauses beginning with ὡς: it happened "as he was speaking to us on the road" and "as he opened to us the Scriptures." The focus is not on what has transpired at the table, but what took place on the journey (ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ), so that the moment of recognition enables the disciples to properly understand their conversation with Jesus.[526] The connection between the journey dialogue and the recognition at table is now made explicit as the proper interpretation is joined with the moment of recognition. As Marshall explains, "The reality of the risen Jesus was already making itself known to the disciples as he spoke to them, struggling to put itself into conscious form, and only being recognized for what it was after the visual revelation of Jesus."[527] The use of διανοίγω for the opening of the Scripture as this term was used earlier for the opening of their eyes (v.31).[528] While Jesus' interpretation of

---

[523] The use of the singular heart with a plural genitive, called a distributive singular, is found elsewhere in the New Testament. Cf. 2 Cor 6:11; 1 John 3:20-21. The rarity of the expression is what has generated the range of variants that replace the burning with expressions like veiled, blinded, hardened, and heavy. For discussion of variants, see Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 185–86; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 898. Jer 20:9 (LXX) reads "ὡς πῦρ καιόμενον φλέγον ἐν τοῖς ὀστέοις μου." A similar expression is found in Ps 39:3 (LXX 38:4) (ἐθερμάνθη ἡ καρδία μου). See Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 397.

[524] Chariton, *Chaer*. 4.2.5 refers to "the hot piercing wound in his heart (Goold, LCL)" and 6.4.5 describes a heart set on fire. Achilles Tatius, *Anthia.* I.6 describes a heart set ablaze. These are similar metaphors but inexact verbal parallels.

[525] Brunk, "The Concept of the Resurrection According to the Emmaus Account in Luke's Gospel," 313.

[526] The reference to the way is loaded with significance in Luke-Acts, as noted in Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 842–43.

[527] Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 899.

[528] There is also the use of γραφή to link v.27 and the opening in v.32

Scripture has preceded the recognition of Jesus in person, the disciples only understand the scriptural interpretation after the moment of recognition. If Luke accents the crucial role of scriptural interpretation in recognition, he nevertheless explains that it is not sufficient on its own.[529] Rather it is the intersection of proper interpretation with experience that produces the recognition. Like the memory of Jesus' words joined with the evidence of the empty tomb in the recognition of the women, the Emmaus disciples recognize Jesus in their midst by his actions at the table alongside his earlier explanation from Scripture. In both cases, the ambiguity of the interpretation is met with additional recognition tokens. By locating the interpretation of Scripture in the recognition scenes, Luke creates a recognition with an explicit hermeneutic function. The resurrection appearances are the interpretive key to unlocking Jesus' role in the plan of God found in Scripture.

The Emmaus disciples' recognition leads them to proclain their experience to the disciples at the same hour (αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ) by returning to Jerusalem. Verse 33 creates geographic and temporal continuity with the earlier scenes.[530] Like the women leaving the tomb, these two disciples return and find the Eleven and those with them gathered together.[531] But before the Emmaus disciples can report what has happened, they are confronted with the news that the Lord has risen and appeared to Simon (v.34)! The interruption of Peter in the Emmaus disciples' report

[529] As argued in Richard B. Hays, "Reading Scripture in Light of the Resurrection," in *The Art of Reading Scripture*, ed. Ellen F. Davis and Richard B. Hays (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 231.

[530] Although the disciples' description as 'arising' uses the common Lukan participle ἀναστάντες, one can hear in its use a kind of playfulness as their recognition has 'raised' them to proper insight into the resurrection of the Lord.

[531] The parallel with the women is made explicit through the repetition of the verb ὑποστρέφω (v.9) and the naming of the group as the Eleven and those with them (v.33- τοὺς ἕνδεκα καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς; v. 9- τοῖς ἕνδεκα καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς λοιποῖς). The previous gathering of this group is implied by the perfect passive participle (ἠθροισμένους). This term is used only in Luke-Acts in the NT. Cf. Acts 12:12; 19:25.

parallels Peter's similar intrusion into the women's story of the empty tomb in 24:12.[532] The brief mention of an un-narrated appearance to Peter in v.34 allows Luke to rehabilitate the Peter who denied Christ in Luke 22:55-62 into a witness of the resurrection and a leader in the community.[533]

When the Emmaus disciples finally describe their experience in verse 35, they recount (ἐξηγοῦντο) the things that happened on the road (τὰ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ).[534] The verb ἐξηγέομαι is used throughout Acts for the report of surprising acts of God and suggests a proclamation.[535] They assert that their recognition happened through the token of the broken bread, as Jesus is "made known," with the verb ἐγνώσθη following the use of passive verbs to capture the divine intervention in the moment of recognition in Luke 24.[536] This verb is used elsewhere in Luke-

---

[532] Bovon, *Luke 3*, 376. The report of Jesus' appearance to Peter has often been treated with doubt or scorn by commentators, much in the way as Peter's visit to the tomb, often as somehow secondary to the narrative. For instance, Betz, "Origin and Nature of Christian Faith According to the Emmaus Legend," 34. The major difference in this case, however, is there is no textual evidence to support the claim of an insertion. The only major variant in v.34 is a shift from the accusative λέγοντας (referring to the Eleven) to the nominative λεγοντες (referring to the Emmaus disciples). But this change makes little sense (i.e., the Emmaus disciples did not know of the appearance to Peter) and is easily explained as a transcriptional error. See Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 186. For a rejection of attempts to explain this material away as secondary, see the discussion in Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 899. The language in v.24 seems to correlate with material elsewhere in the chapter. The Eleven's first claim that "the Lord has been raised" (ἠγέρθη ὁ κύριος) recalls a similar proclamation in the narrative of the empty tomb. In Luke 24:6, the angels state that he has been raised using the same verb form (ἠγέρθη). Similar, the ascription of κύριος to Jesus occurs earlier in 24:3. The reference to Peter as Simon could point toward a tradition, though the various names of Peter are known in Luke 22:31-34.

[533] As noted in Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 851; Carroll, *Luke*, 488. On the importance of an appearance first to Peter in the tradition, see 1 Cor 15:5; Mark 16:7.

[534] The verb ἐξηγέομαι suggests a lengthy reporting, primarily in narrative, whose on-going nature is stressed through the use of the imperfect. See BDAG, 349, s.v."ἐξηγέομαι." In Acts 10:8, it is used for Peter's report of his angelic vision. In Acts 15:12, 14, it is used for the reports of Barnabas, Paul, and Peter for their experience of God in their recent mission work. In Acts 21:19, it is used again for Paul's recounting of his work among the Gentiles to James. See Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 397; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 851. Cf. Luke 8:39; 9:10; Acts 8:33; 9:27; 12:17.

[535] In Acts 10:8, it is used for Peter's report of his angelic vision. In Acts 15:12, 14, it is used for the reports of Barnabas, Paul, and Peter for their experience of God in their recent mission work. In Acts 21:19, it is used again for Paul's recounting of his work among the Gentiles to James. So Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 397; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 851. Cf. Luke 8:39; 9:10; Acts 8:33; 9:27; 12:17.

[536] Cf. similar use of divine passive verbs in 24:16, 31. See Bovon, *Luke 3*, 376.

Acts and in Greco-Roman literature to convey the sense of recognition, correlating with the use of ἐπιγινώσκω in vv.16, 31.[537] The second clause also makes explicit that the breaking of the bread is the recognition token that helps the disciples see Jesus' identity.[538] Their two-fold summary joins the interpretation gained on the road with the recognition at the table in a succinct summary of the experience. The report highlights the cognitive and affective transformation caused by their recognition, while their decision to report suggests an implicit commission to share the news with the other disciples. Like the women's spontaneous proclamation, the Emmaus disciples share their experience without a commission so that the recognition itself generates the proclamation.

4.3.5: Summary

The Emmaus pericope is a clear example of the recognition type-scene. The passage depicts the *meeting* of the two parties (24:1-11) before recounting a dialogue of *cognitive resistance* between the hidden Christ and the Emmaus disciples about the proper interpretation of Jesus' death and empty tomb (24:12-27). The scene of hospitality overturns the disciples' doubt when Jesus offers a *recognition token* through his actions at the table that produce *recognition* (24:28-31). The passage concludes by recounting the disciples' *attendant reactions* of affective transformation and proclamation (24:32-35). Formally, the passage easily correlates with the recognition type-scene. It also uses other conventions of the recognition tradition including key

[537] For use in recognition, consider Acts 9:24 when Saul recognizes a plot against him (ἐγνώσθη δὲ τῷ Σαύλῳ ἡ ἐπιβουλὴ αὐτῶν). For a more exact verbal parallel, see Euripides, *Electra* 852, where Orestes is recognized by his servants (ἐγνώσθη δ᾽ ὑπὸγέροντος ἐν δόμοισιν ἀρχαίου τινός)

[538] Although this phrase can function as a metonymy for the whole meal, it is associated in Luke-Acts with the Eucharist. Cf. use of the phrase in Luke 22:19; 24:30; Acts 2:46; 20:7, 11 ; 27:35. So Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 851; Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 397.

terminology (e.g, ἐπιγινώσκω), rhetoric techniques (e.g., *pathos*, suspense), and wider literary themes (i.e., hospitality, conflicting interpretations, disappearance).

Still, there remain several distinctive elements in Luke 24:13-25 that show how Luke creatively developed the recognition tradition to his own ends. First, there is remarkable reservation in the emotional reaction of the disciples. Unlike the standard weeping and tears, the emotional reaction is more a reflection on the recognition process. The emotional reservation suggests that this scene is not the emotional climax of the whole chapter as will be made explicit in Luke 24:50-53. Second, the tokens of Jesus' recognition are not identifiable physical characteristics or artificial tokens but actions that recall his former life and ministry.[539] Understanding the recognition token requires the preceding narrative to link the token of table-fellowship to the unique identity of Jesus. The scene, like the story of the empty tomb, places memory at the center of recognition for the characters and the readers.[540] It also supports the story's role in the climax of the wider narrative as the preceding narrative scenes are necessary for a successful recognition. Third, the Emmaus recognition is explicitly joined to the question of the proper interpretation of Scripture with respect to Jesus' identity. While the overlap of recognition of persons and recognition as proper interpretation is common, Luke gives prominence to this theme with its specific focus on Jesus' fulfillment of the Scriptures.[541] Finally,

---

[539] Using the categories of Aristotle, this recognition would be classified both as a recognition from memory (since the former table ministry is necessary to understand the recognition power of this token) as well as a recognition contrived by the poet since, although hospitality often naturally entailed a meal, Jesus' role is shifted from guest to host without any probable cause. Just because Jesus has earlier performed this guest-host role reversal does not make the scene any less of a contrivance. Rather, it suggests a consistent literary (and likely theological) strategy. *Contra* Culpepper, "The Gospel of Luke," 479." Aristotle would clearly see some poetic contrivance in this recognition scene.

[540] John Koenig, *New Testament Hospitality: Partnership with Strangers as Promise and Mission* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2001), 90–91.

[541] On the link between recognition of persons and recognition as interpretation, see Cave, *Recognitions*, 251.

the role of God in the Emmaus recognition scene is ambiguous and remains largely hidden.[542] Luke is remarkably reserved in describing the involvement of God in the recognition scene so that the logic of the recognition scene maintains an aura of mystery and incomprehensibility found in the biblical recognition tradition rather than the more evidence driven classical recognition scenes.

4.4: The Jerusalem Recognition Scene (24:36-49) and Ascension (24:50-53)

Luke 24:36-52 offers the climactic moment of recognition in Luke's Gospel and, as such, develops and resolves several lingering questions.[543] As Bryne explains, "while repeating the pattern of the Emmaus episode in this way, it takes a significant step beyond it."[544] This includes numerous expansions to the pattern of Emmaus including more witnesses, more proofs of Jesus' resurrection, and the only explicit commission of the disciples in Luke 24. The final scene unites all of the characters in Luke 24 to the final appearance of Jesus in a resounding moment of recognition. Yet, it does sit at odds with the earlier appearance narratives where the women (24:8), Peter (24:34) and the Emmaus disciples (24:31) have already recognized the risen Christ.[545] It seems that Luke has reinserted a lack of recognition for all of the disciples in order to create a comprehensive group recognition scene. The Jerusalem appearance consists of the formal elements of the recognition type-scene: the meeting (v.36), the cognitive resistance

[542] Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word*, 155; Enyioha, "Nonrecognition as a Motif in the Post-Resurrection Appearance Narratives," 184.

[543] Just, *The Ongoing Feast*, 2.

[544] Byrne, *The Hospitality of God*, 210.

[545] The earlier scenes serve as individual examples of recognition and perhaps are given pride of place because of Luke's awareness of certain traditions (e.g., an appearance to Peter) which he has incorporated into a cohesive whole.

(v.37), two separate displays of tokens (vv.38-43), and commissioning (vv.44-49). The ascension of Jesus (24:50-53) functions as the conclusion of the Jerusalem appearance and depicts the recognition and attendant reactions.

4.4.1: The Meeting (v.36)

The Jerusalem appearance follows on the heels of the report of the Emmaus disciples to the disciples in Jerusalem as reflected in the genitive absolute (Ταῦτα δὲ αὐτῶν λαλούντων). While the disciples are speaking, Jesus stands in their midst (ἔστη ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν) and greets them with peace (λέγει αὐτοῖς· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν) (v.36).[546] Luke often has Jesus utter words of peace in connection with salvation, echoing the Semitic greeting of *shalom*, in a sequence also found in the angelophanies of Luke-Acts and the LXX.[547] As Green notes, "Here at the outset, Luke's account might pass for that of an angelophany."[548] However, the incompatability of the category of angelophany will soon become apparent as the presence of Jesus with his disciples will initiate a recognition scene that stresses Jesus' physical resurrection.

---

[546] Both expressions are found in a similar appearance to a group in John 20:19, leading some scholars to suggest Johannnine influence. D and it omit λέγει αὐτοῖς· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν, another so-called Western non-interpolation. Again, the evidence for inclusion hinges on the strong diversity of textual support from the other fourth century uncials and P^{75}. The similarities between John and Luke at this point are not easily reduced to one tradition using the other, but are easier to explain as a retelling of the same tradition as noted in Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 87–89. *Contra* John Amédée Bailey, *The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John.*, NovTSup 7 (Leiden: Brill, 1963), 81–101; Barbara Shellard, *New Light on Luke: Its Purpose, Sources and Literary Context*, JSNTSup 215 (New York: Continuum, 2002), 259. However, the influence of John on this passage is apparent in the manuscripts which add "it is I, don't be afraid" from John 6:20. See Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 186–87.

[547] Cf. Jesus' offer of peace in Luke 7:50; 8:48. Jesus' arrival is also associated with peace in Luke 1:79; 2:14; 19:38; 19:42. Both Zechariah's and Mary's visit by the angel Gabriel feature similar features, as does Peter's visit by an angel in Acts. Cf. Luke 1:11-12; 1:28-29; Acts 12:7-8; 27:23 lacks the greeting but does use a form of ἵστημι. For the phrase "peace to you" in an angelophany, see LXX Judges 6:23. For a form of ἵστημι in an angelophany, see LXX Num 22:24.

[548] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 854.

4.4.2: Cognitive Resistance (v.37)

The disciples' reaction to the risen Christ is *cognitive resistance*, with verse 37 explaining that they are terrified (πτοηθέντες) and frightened (ἔμφοβοι γενόμενοι). The first participle (πτοέω) is associated with fear and terror.[549] The second expression (γίνομαι + ἔμφοβος) is found in Luke 24:5 describing the women's fear at the angelic visit.[550] This combination has precedence in the LXX as in 2 Chron 20:15-17 (LXX) when the prophet Jahaziel twice utters a command to the people of Judah not to fear or be terrified because the Lord was about to win the battle for them.[551] In these biblical precursors, fear is viewed negatively as preventing the people from properly obeying God. Likewise, the reaction of the disciples must be viewed in a negative light as their reaction prevents them from properly understanding the presence of Jesus.

The disciples' fear is attributed to their misinterpretation of Jesus as a spirit (ἐδόκουν πνεῦμα θεωρεῖν), with the passage stressing the evidence of the disciples' sight through the use of θεωρέω. Like the earlier pericopes' emphasis on seeing the empty tomb and graveclothes and the opening of the Emmaus disciples' eyes, their cognitive resistance is primarily visual. However, the use of δοκέω ironically signals the falsehood of the claim since the audience, unlike the disciples, knows that Jesus has been bodily raised. A similar irony was used in Luke 24:11 when the disciples wrongly consider the women's story of the empty tomb as nonsense.

---

[549] BDAG, 895, s.v. "πτοέω." The verb is rare in the NT, used only here and in Luke 21:9 as a command against fear. Several manuscripts actually replace it with the participles derived from related terms for fear. The reading of P^{75}, B, and 1241 uses θορυβέω. This verb shows up as a variant in Acts 20:10 and as a variant in Acts 17:5. It is also used in Matt 9:23; Mark 5:39. Sinaiticus and W use φοβέω though this is likely a scribal error derived from the proceeding use of ἔμφοβοι γενόμενοι, a more common expression in Luke-Acts Cf. Luke 1:13; 1:30; 1:50; 2:10; 5:10. The preferred reading with πτοέω is more difficult and also has the strongest manuscript support.

[550] The combination also shows up in angelophany of Acts 10:4 and the christophany of Acts 22:9. For other uses, see Acts 24:25; Rev 11:13.

[551] See also LXX 1 Chron 22:13; 28:20.

The disciples exemplify cognitive resistance to recognition even as the reader sees through their misinterpretation.

The misinterpretation of Jesus as a πνεῦμα has been the source of much scholarly debate. The use of the term for a ghostly appearance is practically unheard of in Greek literature, despite recent commentators.[552] Many scholars have thus sought alternative explanations for Luke's use of πνεῦμα as an apology aimed at a particular enemy. The candidates for Luke's polemic have included an early form of Gnosticism or docetism,[553] a reaction to necromancy practices,[554] a rebuttal of Marcion,[555] or a response to Paul's depiction of a spiritual resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15.[556] As ingenious as these explanations are, they fail to consider carefully how

---

[552] For a reading of the term as a "ghost," see Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 902; Tannehill, *Luke*, 359; Kevin L Anderson, *"But God Raised Him from the Dead": The Theology of Jesus' Resurrection in Luke-Acts*, Paternoster Biblical Monographs (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006), 188; Juel, *Luke-Acts*, 55; Somov, *Representations of the Afterlife in Luke-Acts*, 137. For the terminology of ghosts in antiquity, see D. Felton, *Haunted Greece and Rome: Ghost Stories from Classical Antiquity*, 1st ed. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1999), 23–28. The range of vocabulary included φάσμα, φάντασμα, δαίμων, ψυχή, εἴδωλον, and σκιὰ. The replacement of πνεῦμα with φάντασμα offered by D is a much more appropriate term if the meaning of the passage is the disciples' fear of Jesus as a ghost. The variant seems to offer greater clarity, as noted in Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 854; Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 401.

[553] Charles H. Talbert, *Luke and the Gnostics: An Examination of Lucan Purpose* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), 14; Alsup, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition*, 172.

[554] Hans Dieter Betz, "Zum Problem Der Auferstehung Jesu in Lichte Der Grieschen Magischen Papyri," in *Gesammelte Aufsatze I: Hellenismus Und Urchristentum* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990), 230–61. His argument is grounded on the use of πνεῦμα as a replacement for the δαίμων of a dead person in magical papyri. However, his linguistic evidence has been challenged as significantly later than Luke 24. See Terence Paige, "Who Believes in 'Spirit'?: Πνεῦμα in Pagan Usage and Implications for the Gentile Christian Mission," *HTR* 95.4 (2002): 433. For a more complete refutation, see Daniel A Smith, "Seeing a Pneuma(Tic Body): The Apologetic Interests of Luke 24:36-43," *CBQ* 72.4 (2010): 757–59.

[555] Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts*, 79–120. However, there is significant debate about whether Marcion's version of Luke 24 read πνεῦμα or perhaps followed D in reading φάντασμα. For the complications in understanding Marcion's view of Jesus' physical substance, see Judith Lieu, *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 374–76. On the difficulties in determining Marcion's text of Luke 24, see Timothy Leonard Carter, "Marcion's Christology and Its Possible Influence on Codex Bezae," *JTS* 61.2 (2010): 550–82.

[556] This is the argument proposed by Smith, "Seeing a Pneuma(Tic Body): The Apologetic Interests of Luke 24:36-43," 765–72. Smith read Luke's rejection of Jesus as a πνεῦμα and the insistence on his flesh and bones (24:39) as a refutation of 1 Cor 15:45's discussion of Jesus as the second Adam, a living giving spirit (πνεῦμα ζῳοποιοῦν), who enables to inherit the kingdom of God not as flesh and blood (15:50) but by putting on the incorruptible. Smith sees this tactic as part of a larger strategy of downplaying Paul's role as resurrection witness and

Luke uses πνεῦμα elsewhere. Several passages in Luke's Gospel demonstrate that πνεῦμα was used to refer to an aspect of the person to survive death. The raising of Jairus' daughter in Luke 8:55 describes how "her spirit returned (ἐπέστρεψεν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς)." The use of πνεῦμα here corresponds with the Greek idea of the ψυχή as a kind of soul or spirit that survives death after being separated from the body.[557] A similar overlap of ψυχή and πνεῦμα is seen in the parallelism of Luke 1:46-7 when Mary sings that her soul (ψυχή) magnifies the Lord and her spirit (πνεῦμά) rejoices in God.[558] Both terms are essentially a poetic way of saying 'I.' Still, their occurrence together demonstrates a semantic overlap in Luke's literary milieu.[559] The use of πνεῦμα in tandem with ψυχή also suggests that Luke's terms for the soul and spirit were inherited from the LXX and were not operating as technical philosophical categories.[560] The third passage is Luke 23:46, where Jesus' final words (likely echoing Ps 31:6) are to commit his spirit (πνεῦμα) to God before he expires (ἐξέπνευσεν). As Hans-Joachim Eckstein has argued, Luke is here operating with a dichotomous anthropology where Jesus' spirit (πνεῦμα, roughly equivalent to ψυχή) is returning to the Father to be in Paradise even as his body (σῶμα) dies.[561] Eckstein

---

Luke's desire to delineate a clear period of resurrection appearance from later visions of the risen Lord. Smith's idea is not new, but was proposed earlier in Kirsopp Lake, "The Command Not to Leave Jerusalem and the 'Galilee Tradition,'" *BegC*, vol. 5: Additional Notes to the Commentary, eds. Kirsopp Lake and F.J. Foakes Jackson, (London: Macmillan, 1933), 8. However, the argument hinges on Luke knowing Paul's letters (a highly debated topic) and a tenuous overlap of a few terms.

[557] Cf. the use of ψυχή in Acts 20:10, which like Luke 8:55 draws on LXX 3 Kings 17:21. There is also the vision of Ezek 37 where bones and flesh are enlivened by the breath or spirit of God, described in the LXX of 37:5 as πνεῦμα ζωῆς.

[558] Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 366. A similar parallelism is found in LXX Ps 76:3-4, the likely source of Luke's usage.

[559] Luke also uses ψυχή to describe characters having internal conversations with themselves. Cf. Luke 12:19.

[560] The Jewish milieu seems to be the source of Luke's spirit language here as elsewhere, as a number of passages in the literature of Second Temple Judaism attest to the overlap of πνεῦμα and ψυχή. See 1 En. 22.3-12; 103.4-5; Dan 3:86; Wis 15:11; 16:14. Other examples could be cited from Jewish sources though they are less helpful here. Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* I.34; III.260.

interprets the disciples' misunderstanding of Jesus' presence in Luke 24:37 in similar terms as a disembodied soul or spirit without a body. These examples gives adequate warrant to reading πνεῦμα as a kind of shadowy existence after death, roughly equivalent to the Greek idea of a shade or ghost often described with the term ψυχή.[562] Luke's use of πνεῦμα is likely the result of an on-going dialogue with the diversity of afterlife beliefs found in ancient Judaism.[563] While "Luke is scarcely using technical philosophical language," the charge of "spirit" is clearly meant to convey an alternative interpretation of Jesus as less than bodily resurrected.[564] No explicit opponent need be identified.

Of course, the purpose of the disciples' charge is to express the cognitive resistance of the disciples to the belief in Jesus' physical resurrection. While the term is distinctive, such misinterpretations are a common feature in ancient recognition scenes. Greek literature often exploited the popular tales of ghostly visits as a rival interpretation to recognition.[565] For instance, upon hearing news that Leucippe is alive through a letter, Clitophon asks if the letter was sent from Hades, the region of the dead (Achilles, *Leu.* 5.19). He will later express concern

---

[561] Hans-Joachim Eckstein, "Bodily Resurrection in Luke," in *Resurrection: Theological and Scientific Assessments*, eds. Ted Peters, Robert John Russell, and Michael Welker (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 120–22. This assessment of the evidence solves the complicated issue of how Jesus can enter Paradise immediately after his death (Luke 23:43) before his resurrection in the third day. Eckstein's reading includes a kind of intermediate state as soul or spirit after death, a state suggested in Luke 8:55 and in the parable of Lazarus and the rich man in Luke 16:19-31.

[562] This solution is the one convincing to most modern interpreters, though often without the extensive treatment of the issues. See Carroll, *Luke*, 490–91; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 854; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 902.

[563] The diversity of afterlife views in Luke is explored comprehensively in Somov, *Representations of the Afterlife in Luke-Acts*.

[564] Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 401.

[565] Another example was noted earlier in the story of Philinnion in Phlegon's *Book of Marvels* 1.1-18. For a comparison with other apparition tales, see Deborah Thompason Prince, "The 'Ghost' of Jesus: Luke 24 in Light of Ancient Narratives of Post-Mortem Apparitions," *JSNT* 29.3 (2007): 291–92.

that the supposedly dead Leucippe and Thersander have been sent as haunting spirits called νεκροί (5.26). The doubt will remain until an explanation is given for how they are alive. Likewise, the disciples' initial reaction is a competing interpretation of the appearance of Jesus as some sort of afterlife existence rather than as the resurrected Lord. For recognition to occur, their misinterpretation must be overcome with proof to the contrary.

4.4.3: First Set of Tokens (vv.38-40)

Jesus responds to the incredulous disciples by acknowledging their emotional state: "Why are you disturbed and why do doubts arise in your heart (Luke 24:38)?" He notices how they are shaken or disturbed (ταράσσω), a term used only one other time in Luke to describe the fearful reaction of Zechariah to his angelic visit (1:21).[566] However, the term is commonly used throughout the LXX in recognition scenes.[567] The second element of Jesus' question aims at the disciples' doubts (διαλογισμοὶ), a term Luke uses to characterize individual failure to understand Jesus and his message.[568] The rising of doubts in their heart (ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν) emphasizing the interiority of their doubt in an expression that recalls the earlier transformation of the heart of the Emmaus disciples from its slowness to burning (Luke 24:25, 32). Both the doubts and the

[566] The verb ταράσσω, used here as a passive periphrastic, can mean a physical shaking or the internal sensation of being disturbed or confused. See BDAG, 990-1, s.v. "ταράσσω." In Acts, it is often used to describe situations where communities are disturbed (15:24; 17:8; 13; Cf. Gal1:7; 5:10).

[567] As a feature of recognition scenes, it is used to describe the emotional disturbance of the brothers after Joseph reveals his identity (Gen 45:3), in the initial response of Boaz to the sudden appearance of Ruth on the threshing floor (Ruth 3:8), and in reaction of Tobit and Tobias to the recognition of the angel (Tob 12:16). For more generic uses in the LXX, see Gen 40:6; 41:8; 42:28.

[568] The term is used to refer to reasonings or disputes. See BDAG, 232-3, s.v. "διαλογισμός." While occasionally these inner workings are viewed positively (Luke 1:29; 3:15), more often they are used to describe the inner thoughts of Jesus' opponents (as in Luke 5:22; 6:8). Jesus' exposure of these negative thoughts is part of a literary fulfillment of Luke 2:35. Cf. Luke 9:47. See Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 854.

shaking emphasize the cognitive and affective resistance of the disciples to recognition of the risen Jesus.

But Jesus addresses two commands to assuage the disciples' doubts. The first establishes Jesus' unique personal identity as he exhorts his disciples to observe his hands and feet as evidence that he is himself. The imperative (ἴδετε) locates the initial proof on the evidence of sight. Jesus asserts that the observation of his hands and feet reveals his unique identity and demonstrate ἐγώ εἰμι αὐτός.[569] This phrase emphasizes the continuity between the Jesus they formerly knew and the Jesus now present before them.[570] If Jesus' hands and feet are to be convincing evidence that he is truly himself, they must be distinctive tokens of his identity, suggesting that Jesus is displaying the marks of the crucifixion. While Luke never makes explicit that Jesus was nailed to the cross, the appeal to these wounds is the best explanation for the hands and feet as recognition tokens.[571] It also aligns Luke with a similar use of the wounds in Jesus' hands and side as recognition tokens in John 20, and with the classic trope of the scar as a recognition token beginning with Homer.[572]

Jesus' second command expands the presentation of his wounds for visual inspection into a call to physical touch. Verse 39b explains, "Handle me and see, that a spirit does not have flesh and blood just as you all see me having." The command to handle (ψηλαφάω) is often used in the

[569] The use of ἐγώ εἰμι is often used in Luke-Acts when followed by a personal name as is the case with Gabriel in Luke 1:19; Jesus in Acts 9:5; or as a person's self designation, as with Zechariah as an old man in Luke 1:18 or Paul as a Jewish man in Acts 22:3. This use of the phrase is unique to Luke, though its meaning with the reflexive αὐτός surely is meant to convey recognition of the unique person represented by the spoken I.

[570] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 854–55.

[571] A point supported by Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 902; Carroll, *Luke*, 441; Bovon, *Luke 3*, 391.

[572] Bovon, *Luke 3*, 391.

LXX in situations where eyesight is limited and requires additional support.[573] The evidence of touch is also common in recognition scenes as when Eurycleia, upon uncovering the identity of Odysseus, declares "I did not know you, until I had handled all the body of my master (Homer, *Od*. 19.474-5 [Murrary, LCL])." The evidence of touch confirms for the disciples that the recognized was not a ghost.[574] This second command similarly insists that Jesus is not a spirit because he has flesh and bones. Crucial here is the phrase "flesh and bones" (σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα), an expression found throughout the LXX as a poetic way of referring to kinship ties, as a synecdoche for the physical body, and as a description of the material composition of bodies.[575] A similar expression can be found in Homer when Odysseus is told in his consultation with the dead that when one dies "the sinews no longer hold the flesh and the bones together (οὐ γὰρ ἔτι σάρκας τε καὶ ὀστέα ἶνες ἔχουσιν), but the strong force of blazing fire destroys these, as soon as the spirit leaves the white bones, and the ghost (ψυχὴ), like a dream, flutters off and is gone (Homer, *Ody*. 11.219-24 [LCL, Murray])."[576] In line with this usage, Jesus' display of his body as flesh and bones is evidence that overturns the disciples' initial interpretation that he is a disembodied spirit.[577]

---

[573] This term is used in Jacob's deception of Esau in Gen 27, as the disguised Jacob is able to fool his father's touch by wearing goat hair (27:12, 21, 22). Similarly, it is used in the recently blinded Samson's request to touch the pillars (Jud 16:26) and for the groping of a blinded people (Deut 28:29; Isa 59:10). This groping while blind is the force of the term in its only other use in Luke-Acts in Acts 17:27 where it describes the Gentiles' search for God. The closest parallel sequence to the use here in the NT comes in 1 John 1:1 in the claim that some have seen and touched the Word of life.

[574] Heracles compels Admetus to touch his wife after Heracles has rescued her from the dead as proof that she is really present in Euripides' *Alcetis* 1115-1125.

[575] For poetic uses, see LXX Gen 2:23; 29:14; 2 Kingdms 5:1; 19:2. For the stress on the material of bodies, see Ezekiel's vision of dry bones consists of bones joining together with flesh and sinews in 37:1-8. See also the decomposition of bodies in Josephus, *Ant.* 12.4.9 (211).

[576] See also Homer, *Ody*. 14.133-5.

Jesus then displays his hands and feet as proof so that "what the double imperative had demanded is realized in v. 40."[578] The key verb in this passage is δείκνυμι, a word meaning to show or display, but which is often used in the sense of giving evidence or proof.[579] Forms of δείκνυμι often show up in recognition scenes as they draw on legal settings that require evidence.[580] The display of Jesus' feet and hands as evidence for the disciples' inspection establishes their role as recognition tokens. Importantly, these hands and feet both function as evidence that he is physical and not a disembodied spirit (the second command) and reveal his unique identity through the marks of his death (the first command). Following Aristotle's categories, the use of scars as recognition tokens is usually seen as inartistic, though the situation in which the hands are presented (as physical proof of a body) actually emerges from a probable sequence of the events themselves as the disciples need to know that Jesus is not a ghost. The result is a sophisticated recognition scene driven by the logical sequence of the plot.

4.4.4: Further Cognitive Resistance and a Second Set of Tokens (vv.41-43)

Yet the display of tokens in verse 40 does not result in recognition but an additional display of cognitive resistance and further tokens that increases the suspense of the narrative.[581]

---

[578] Bovon, *Luke 3*, 392.

[579] BDAG, 214-5, s.v. "δείκνυμι." Some manuscripts (A, K, W among others) read ἐπέδειξεν, a compound form of δείκνυμι that means "to show openly." Both terms are used in Luke in situations where evidence is given as, for instance, when evidence of Jesus' healing is presented to the priest (Luke 4:5; 17:14). I prefer to read δείκνυμι with NA 28 as it has more textual support. The differences in meaning are rather insignificant. See Bovon, *Luke 3*, 392.

[580] On the influence of legal procedure on ancient recognition scenes, see Eden, *Poetic and Legal Fiction in the Aristotelian Tradition*, 7–23. To cite one parallel, in Menander's *Arbitration*, there is the call to show the recognition token (δεικνύ[οι] τεκμήριον) (456). Cf. *Ody* 21.215-220.

[581] The *locus classicus* for the expansion of cognitive resistance and additional token is in Euripides' *Electra* which deliberate critiques the tokens of Aeschylus through their display and rejection, before resolving the recognition through the use of a scar.

Verse 41a recounts the disciples' initial reaction to the tokens as one of joyful disbelief and amazement that falls short of belief. The participle ἀπιστούντων reminds the audience of the disbelief expressed by the disciples upon hearing the report of the women in Luke 24:11.[582] However, the disbelief is attributed to the disciples' joy (χαρά), a term used positively throughout Luke-Acts to describe the response to God's miraculous work.[583] The disciples' disbelieving joy is only a partial improvement that will soon give way to great joy in the final attendant emotions of the recognition in Luke 24:52. The second genitive absolute (θαυμαζόντων) also highlights the lack of recognition as it is a common Lucan expression for the sense of marvel or wonder in the face of the miraculous, used earlier in Luke 24:12 to describe Peter's amazement (but not belief) upon finding the empty tomb.[584] The disciples' response thus echoes the earlier failure of the disciples to believe that Jesus is truly raised while nevertheless hinting at a development in their inward disposition. Such depictions of divided emotions were taught in rhetorical handbooks and are well attested in ancient recognition scenes.[585] The disciples are slowly changing, but have not yet believed the good news. Luke delays the

[582] The only other use of the term in Luke-Acts occurs in Acts 28:24 to create a contrast between those who believe Paul's message and those who do not.

[583] Cf. χαρά in Luke 1:14; 2:10; 10:17; Acts 8:8; 13:52; 15:3. See the discussion in Paul J Bernadicou, "Lucan Theology of Joy," *ScEs* 25.1 (1973): 75–98. The use of ἀπό is causative here as it connects the disbelief to joy. See Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 855.

[584] Cf. Luke 1:63; 2:18, 33; 8:25; 11:14, 38; 20:26.

[585] Claire Clivaz, "'Incroyants de Joie' (Lc 24,41): Point de Vue, Histoire et Poetique," in *Regards Croises Sur La Bible: Etudes Sur Le Point de Vue. Actes Du III Colloque International Du Reseau de Recherche En Narrativite Biblique, Paris 8-10 Juin 2006*, LD (Paris: Cerf, 2007), 184–95. The divided emotions are common in recognition scenes. For instance, Chaereas "was astonished at the sight and seized by a fearful bewilderment" in the face of arriving at Callirhoe's tomb to find it empty (Chariton, *Callir.* 3.3.2 [Goold, LCL]). Similarly, Penelope's initial reaction to the report that the beggar is her husband is one of silence and amazement as her eyes flash back and forth from perceiving her husband to seeing only a beggar (*Ody.* 90-95).

recognition by depicting the disciples' divided emotions in order to set the stage for further proofs.

Jesus reacts to the disciples' continuing doubt in v.41b by asking the disciples if they have anything to eat. Luke 24:42-3 details how the disciples provide him a piece of cooked fish (ἰχθύος ὀπτοῦ μέρος), which Jesus eats in front of them (ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν).[586] The eating of the fish provides further evidence of Jesus' bodily presence and recalls Jesus' table fellowship, resonating with the table scene in Luke 24:30 and the multiplication of the loaves and fish in Luke 9:10-17.[587] But Jesus only plays the role of guest here, with the phrase ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν stressing the role of the disciples as eyewitnesses rather than fellow consumers.[588]

The second token serves as additional support for Jesus' physicality in response to the charge of spirit. In Greek literature, there is debate about whether ghostly apparitions are able to eat and drink.[589] There is a similar dispute in Hellenistic Jewish literature about whether angelic

[586] Two separate variants in v.42 add that Jesus also ate honeycomb (καὶ ἀπὸ μελισσίου κηρίου or καὶ ἀπὸ μελισσίου κηρίον). The inclusion of the honeycomb is a suggestive parallel with Joseph and Aseneth 16-17 where the angel can eat the honeycomb as it is the food of immortality (a variant that suggests a possible overlap with the apologetic against Jesus as an angel). In early Christianity, honeycombs and fish were often placed on the Eucharist table and occasionally honeycomb was given to the baptized as the food of paradise. While the variants are not likely original, they do have a significant impact of later Christian authors. See Bovon, *Luke 3*, 392–93; Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 187–88.

[587] See also Gerald O'Collins, *Interpreting the Resurrection: Examining the Major Problems in the Stories of Jesus' Resurrection* (New York: Paulist, 1988), 40–51. A similar tradition of Jesus' eating bread and fish before the disciples is found in John 21:13.

[588] Although Bovon notes that in the LXX ἐνώπιον can be used in the sense of σύν, he rightly notes that the focus here seems to be on the role of the disciples' as witnesses rather than participants in the meal. See Bovon, *Luke 3*, 393. This is also noted in Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 855. However, in Acts 1:4; 10:40-41, the disciples are said to have ate and drank with Jesus after his resurrection. A number of manuscripts added a clause that states that Jesus shares the food with the disciples, probably to correlate this passage with Acts. For a discussion of the variants, see Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 903.

[589] Prince, "The 'Ghost' of Jesus: Luke 24 in Light of Ancient Narratives of Post-Mortem Apparitions," 290–91. While they usually are unable to eat or drink, there are some exceptions as in the story of Phinnion in Phlegon's *Book of Marvels*.

beings can eat or drink.[590] Although the mysterious visitors to Abraham and Lot in Genesis 18:8 and 19:3 eat and drink, later interpreters were at pains to show that these angelic visitors did not eat, perhaps influenced by the lack of refusal to eat in the angelic appearances to Gideon and Manoah in Judges. The same concern is found in Tob 12:19 where the angel reveals that he only appeared to eat. The most prominent outlier to this tradition, however, is found in Joseph and Aseneth 16-17, where the angel miraculously eats a honeycomb with Aseneth. But even in this story, the food eaten by the angel is somehow miraculous and not normal human food.[591] The angelic tradition is particularly important for understanding the shape of Luke 24:36-43. Jesus was called a πνεῦμα and responded by showing his body and eating in front of the disciples. In light of the possibly misinterpretations, eating does not necessarily challenge a ghostly interpretation of Jesus but it does help demonstrate that Jesus is not an angel.[592] Elsewhere in Luke-Acts, there is a similar overlap in discussions of angels, the resurrection, and the spirit, often in settings of intra-Jewish debate, suggesting Luke is navigating the ambiguous categories of Jewish afterlife existence rather than responding to a particular opponent.[593] Luke is arguing that Jesus is not a disembodied spirit or angel (perhaps in some intermediate afterlife existence) but is bodily raised.

---

[590] Cf. Philo, *Abraham* 118; Josephus, *Ant.* 197. For a complete discussion, see David Goodman, "Do Angels Eat?," *JJS* 37.2 (1986): 160–75.

[591] This story is connected to the tradition that the honeycomb is manna, the bread of angels, described in LXX Ps 78:35. See a more complete discussion in Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*, WUNT 2.94 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 66–67; Goodman, "Do Angels Eat?," 160–62.

[592] A point noted in Goodman, "Do Angels Eat?," 168.

[593] Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 70–71. For the overlap of angels and the resurrection, see Luke 20:36; Acts 12:51. For the overlap of all three terms, see Acts 23:8. For recent interpretations of Acts 23:8, see David Daube, "On Acts 23: Sadducees and Angels," *JBL* 109.3 (1990): 493–97; Benedict Viviano, "Sadducees, Angels, and Resurrection (Acts 23:8-9)," *JBL*. 111.3 (1992): 496–98.

4.4.5: Interpretation and Commission (vv.44-49)

Following this extended testing and display of tokens, Luke does not immediately recount the recognition of the disciples but inserts a rather lengthy speech. While some think Luke simply forgot the moment of recognition and attendant emotions, these will be made explicit after the disappearance of Jesus in his ascension.[594] Before this, Jesus' speech in 24:44-49 offers the proper interpretation from Scripture in support of the provided evidence. Interpretation must join evidence just as in the stories of the empty tomb and Emmaus. This final interpretation is also enhanced by the explicit commissioning of the disciples as witnesses. While a commission is a common feature of the resurrection appearance tradition used by the Gospels and has strong similarities with similar stories in the Old Testament, Luke 24 has incorporated the commission into the recognition scene.[595] Luke has elsewhere fused commissioning with other literary forms, so it is not unique that Luke would subordinate Jesus' commission of the disciples in verse 44-49 to a different literary form.[596]

Verse 44 begins Jesus' interpretation of the past events, explaining, "These are my words that I spoke to you while I was still with you, that is it necessary to fulfill all the things having been written in the law of Moses and the prophets and the psalms concerning me." As the opening salvo, it reiterates the key interpretive themes noted in the account of the empty tomb

[594] For a forgotten recognition, see Bovon, *Luke 3*, 393. However, recounting the recognition and attendant emotions after Jesus' disappearance parallels the pattern established in the story of Emmaus.

[595]Cf. Matt 28:16-20; John 20:21-23. See the brief discussion in Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 903–4. For parallels with the Old Testament commissioning form, see Neyrey, *The Resurrection Stories*, 98; Benjamin Jerome Hubbard, "The Matthean Redaction of a Primitive Apostolic Commissioning: An Exegesis of Matthew 28:16-20" (PhD diss., University of Iowa, 1973), 99–104. Even Neyrey admits that, apart from Luke 24:44-49, the other sections of Luke 24 are not formally vocation commissioning scenes. So Neyrey, *The Resurrection Stories*, 39.

[596] The commissioning of the first disciples in Luke 5:1-11 is uniquely crafted in Luke so that the commissioning occurs as part of a miracle story. See Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 560–62.

(vv.6-7) and the discussion on the Emmaus road (vv.25-27): the importance of Jesus' words (οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι μου), the stress on the divine plan through the use of δεῖ, and the fulfillment of Scripture through his death and resurrection.[597] Simply put, the proper interpretation of Jesus' risen identity is established by his words, the Scriptures, and the divine plan, further establishing continuity in Jesus' identity by linking his words spoke prior to his death with his new risen status as the fulfillment of God's work.[598] Verse 45 then recounts how Jesus opened the disciples mind to understand the Scriptures, recalling the conclusion of the Emmaus story in vv.31-32 with the repetition of διανοίγω and τὰς γραφάς. The opening of the Scriptures suggests the affective and cognitive transformation of the disciples necessary for their proper understanding.[599] The disciples' shift in understanding is conveyed nicely through the use of συνίημι, a term used earlier in the Gospel only in situations where there is a lack of understanding.[600] The final revelatory moment reverses this lack and, along with the physical evidence of Jesus, will culminate in their recognition and response.

Verse 46-7 offers greater specificity about the scriptural fulfillment of these events, beginning with the repetition of the common sequence of events regarding the Messiah's

---

[597] Cf. Luke 24:7, 26. The reference to the law of Moses, the prophets, and the psalms is Luke's most robust description of the biblical writings. The inclusion of the psalms is interesting here, as the psalms seem to shape Luke's passion account and will become crucial for the missionary speeches in Acts. Some scholars see this threefold type of Scripture as suggestive of earlier canonical divisions. See Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 905.

[598] This link between the past and present is also emphasized by his stress on the words he spoke "while I was still with you." The oddness of the phrase "while I was still with you" shows how the narrator is struggling to articulate how Jesus is still with them while also not with them in the same way he was prior to the resurrection. For discussion, see Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 904.

[599] In his recent article, Matthew Bates proposes an alternative translation of the passage where the sense of the scripture is revealed rather than the disciples' minds are opened. See Matthew W. Bates, "Closed-Minded Hermeneutics?: A Proposed Alternative Translation for Luke 24:45," *JBL* 129.3 (2010): 537–57. While this interpretation is possible, it neglects the clear elements of inward transformation found throughout Luke 24.

[600] Cf. Luke 2:50; 8:10; 18:34.

suffering and resurrection on the third day. [601] Similar summaries are seen in the interpretations at the empty tomb and on the road to Emmaus. However, the interpretation takes a new turn when Jesus points toward the future ministry of the Christian community as a herald of repentance and forgiveness of sins to the nations. While the preaching of repentance and forgiveness of sins was launched in the ministry of John and Jesus, the move toward the Gentiles (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) will be fulfilled later in the ministry of the church in Acts.[602] This future mission will begin in Jerusalem, again highlighting Jerusalem's centrality in Luke 24 and establishing it as the starting point for the Christian proclamation in Acts 1-2. [603]

The mention of the future proclamation generates the commissioning of the disciples in verse 48 into their new role as witnesses (μάρτυρες). The category of witness occurs only here in Luke's Gospel but features prominently in Acts to describe those who were eyewitnesses of the ministry, death, and resurrection of Jesus.[604] Their unique knowledge as witnesses is expressed here through the expression "these things" (τούτων) referring to the events listed in vv. 46-47. For Luke, these witnesses are the eyewitnesses and ministers (αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται) that

---

[601] These three infinitives express the specific content of what has been written (γέγραπται). Some manuscripts insert οὕτως ἔδει, again playing up the divine necessity of these events. However, the shorter reading is preferred due to the date of the manuscripts supporting it. It is also easy to how this phrase would have been harmonized with the use of δεῖ in the similar expressions of 24:6, 26, 44. The term παθεῖν is used a shorthand to refer to all of the events of Jesus' passion. Cf. Luke 22:15; 24:26; Acts 1:3. The stress on the suffering of the Messiah is also noted as a major stumbling block to understanding of Jesus' identity in 24:7 and 24:26. See Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 856–57. For the resurrection on the third day, see Luke 9:22; 18:33; 24:7; Acts 3:15; 4:10; 10:40.

[602] Cf. the use of μετάνοια, see Luke 3:3; 5:32. For the ἄφεσις, see Luke 1:77; 3:3; 4:18. On the prophetic prediction of Gentile inclusion, see Luke 2:32. For its fulfillments, see Acts 13:46-48.

[603] The participle (ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλὴ) has caused some disagreement as certain manuscripts read the participle in the accusative singular or genitive plural. This causes difficulties as the participle can be see as attached to the preceding (preaching forgiveness from Jerusalem) or to the following (witnesses from Jerusalem), though in both cases the participle is rather loosely connected and no easy reading is apparent. See discussion in Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 188. I follow the majority of recent commentators who connect the participle to the preaching of repentance. So Carroll, *Luke*, 493; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 857; Bovon, *Luke 3*, 396. *Contra* Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 403.

[604]Cf. Acts 1:8, 22; 2:32; 3:15; 5:32; 10:39, 41; 13:31.

ground the gospel's certainty in knowledge.[605] In the ancient world, the category of witness (μάρτυς) is primarily a legal category with strong connections to the recognition tradition.[606] Like the recognition tokens, witnesses are used as evidence to create convincing recognition scenes. The commission of the disciples as witnesses will provide testimony to the identity of the risen Lord, since they will be the foundation for continual recognition of the risen Lord.

The disciples' new role is joined in v.49 with the promise of additional power from God.[607] Like the proclamation beginning in Jerusalem, the promise calls for the disciples to remain in the city (ἐν τῇ πόλει) until they receive the power of the Spirit.[608] The Spirit has been connected to Jesus' ministry throughout Luke's Gospel and it is now shifted to the disciples.[609] Like the disciples' witness, the Spirit functions as a bridge between the two volumes and supports the continuation of God's plan through the witnesses.[610] However, the language of the promise is vague here, adding a note of suspense and expectation to the conclusion of Luke's Gospel. The disciples and the reader must wait for greater clarity.[611]

---

[605] Cf. Luke 1:1-4. So Carroll, *Luke*, 494.

[606] BDAG, 619-20, s.v. "μάρτυς." For the place of witness in recognition scenes, consider Sophocles, *El.* 1224 where Orestes witnesses to his identity (συμμαρτυρῶ); Achilles, *Leu.* 3.6 where Leucippe is told to reveal herself as a witness that she lives.

[607] P^{75} and D attest to a shorter reading that omits ἰδού, while a large majority of other manuscripts keep it. NA28 keeps the verb in brackets, noting the difficulty of any clear decision on its inclusion or exclusion. I have decided to include it here, though it adds little to the overall force of the verse. For a discussion, see Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 188–89; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 906–7.

[608] Some manuscripts make the name of the city explicit by inserting Jerusalem.

[609] Cf. Luke 1:35; 4:14; 9:1. This promise will be reiterated in Acts 1:1-11 where it prepares the reader for Pentecost and Acts' narration of the spread of the gospel. For instance, the language of power (δύναμις) in Acts 1:8; the promise of the father (τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς) in Acts 1:4; the call to stay in Jerusalem in Acts 1:4.

[610] Cf. Luke 21:15. Although Luke avoids calling this gift the Holy Spirit in 24:49 or in 21:12, it is made explicit in Acts 1:8. The gift of the Spirit for mission is also found in the appearance of John 20:19-23. See Bovon, *Luke 3*, 397–98.

[611] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 859.

Overall, Luke 24:44-49 subordinates the commissioning of the disciples to the issues of Jesus' identity. The explicit commissioning of vv.48-49 confers a new status on the disciples and prepares them to receive the additional power for their ministry.[612] However, this is predicated on verses 44-47 where the disciples are given the proper interpretation of Jesus' identity via his words and Scripture. The disciples only become witnesses of these things when their minds are opened to the Scriptures and they properly understand Jesus' identity. Recognition of Jesus' identity remains the central framework under which the commissioning occurs. Luke's decision to interrupt the moment of recognition with the proper understanding of the events has parallels with the wider recognition tradition.[613] For instance, immediately following Joseph's revealing of his identity to his brothers in Gen 45:3, he launches into a lengthy speech where he unpacks how he is still alive through the providence of God (Gen 45:4-13). Similarly, Jesus' stress on the fulfillment of Scripture correlates with the use of prophecy in Greek literature to show how the events leading to the recognition have been divinely ordained.[614] Overall, Jesus' speech is more an elaboration of a possibility in the recognition tradition than a wholly unique element. The moment of recognition and its attendant reactions, delayed in Luke 24:44-49, are saved for the final moment of the Gospel.[615]

---

[612] Neyrey, *The Resurrection Stories*, 98.

[613] For a discussion of this, see Boulhol, *Αναγνώρισμος: La Scène De Reconnaissance Dans L'Hagiographie Antique Et Médiévale*, 23.

[614] This is true of the oracle of Apollo which gives shape to the whole of Xenophon's *Ephesian Tale* as well as the misunderstood oracles in Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* or Euripides' *Ion*. For a discussion of *Ephesian Tale* and prophecy, see J. Bradley Chance, "Divine Prognostications and the Movement of Story: An Intertextual Exploration of Xenophon's Ephesian Tale and the Acts of the Apostles," in *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative*, eds. Ronald F. Hock, J. Bradley Chance, and Judith Perkins, SBLSymS 6 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 219–34.

[615] The delay of the recognition by the insertion of Jesus' speech actually follows the pattern established by the story of Emmaus where Jesus speaks with the disciples prior to the recognition (Luke 24:25-27). As Dillon explains "Once again, by prolonging the pathos of the appearance-story's stage of *non*-recognition, Luke has given conclusive weight to the words uttered by the mysterious cenacle guest." See Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word*, 203.

4.4.6: The Ascension (vv.50-53)

After Jesus concludes the commissioning, he leads his disciples to Bethany where he blesses them before being taken up to heaven (vv.50-51). In response, the disciples worship him and return in joy to Jerusalem praising God (vv.52-53). Since the landmark work of Lohfink, this short section (and its parallel in Acts 1) has been compared with translation/ascension/rapture stories found in the Hebrew Bible and Greco-Roman religious milieu.[616] However, a number of significant scholarly voices have resisted this attempt to designate the form of Luke 24:50-53 independent of the context of the appearance stories. As one scholar explains, "the reaction of the disciples in Luke 24:52-53, coming as it does at the end of an appearance, makes it at least as likely that Luke was thinking in terms of an ascension at the end of an appearance at least in the Gospel account."[617] More recently, Mikeal Parsons has noted that Luke 24:50-53 draws on the pattern of biblical farewell addresses for this gospel's conclusion, especially as a way to link appearances and ascension.[618] Parsons' work has been important for recent commentators who follow him in seeking to join the ascension to the preceding appearance narratives.[619]

---

[616] See Lohfink, *Die Himmelfahrt Jesu*. For a brief list of parallels, see Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 909. For a more complete discussion of Greco-Roman parallels, see James Buchanan Wallace, "Benefactor and Paradigm," in *Ascent into Heaven in Luke-Acts*: *New Explorations of Luke's Narrative Hinge*, eds. David K. Bryan and David W. Pao (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2016), 83–108. Perhaps the most illuminating (as it draws on Luke's preference for depicting Jesus as a prophet) is the parallel with Elijah's ascent to heaven in a fiery chariot in 2 Kings 2. [616] As noted in Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 406. This is explored more fully in Steve Walton, "Jesus's Ascension through Old Testament Narrative Traditions," in *Ascent into Heaven in Luke-Acts*: *New Explorations of Luke's Narrative Hinge*, eds. David K. Bryan and David W. Pao (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2016), 29–40.

[617] John F. Maile, "The Ascension in Luke-Acts," *TynBul* 37 (1986): 42.

[618] Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts*, 58.

[619] Carroll, *Luke*, 495–97; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 860–63.

Space will not allow me to explore all of the intricacies of the ascension accounts in Luke 24, its relation to Acts 1, or its role in the development of earliest Christianity.[620] Rather, I will concentrate on how Luke 24:50-53 depicts the recognition and attendant reactions that conclude the Jerusalem appearance and thus offers the climax to Luke 24 as a whole. My analysis of Luke 24:50-53 concentrates on the remaining formal elements of the Jerusalem recognition appearance including the departure of Jesus (vv.50-51) and the disciples' recognition and attendant reactions (vv.52-53).

4.4.6.1: The Departure of Jesus (vv.50-51)

Verse 50 begins with the shift in location from Jerusalem to Bethany, the place used as the stopping point of Jesus and his disciples before the triumphal entry.[621] The use of ἐξάγω is reminiscent of the conversation prior to this entrance into Jerusalem where Jesus discusses his exodus and departure.[622] Besides the shift in location, there is also an inherent ambiguity in the chronology of this passage. Although Luke 24 located all of the prior events prior on a single day, verse 50 does not contain a temporal marker but only the conjunction δέ, giving the

[620] For a recent detailed treatment of the intricacies of these passages, see Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts*. For a brief summary of key debates today, see Arie W. Zwiep, "Ascension Scholarship," in *Ascent into Heaven in Luke-Acts*: *New Explorations of Luke's Narrative Hinge*, eds. David K. Bryan and David W. Pao (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2016), 7–26.

[621] Cf. Luke 19:29.

[622] Cf. Luke 19:31, 51. See Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 860. There are several manuscripts that have variants around the occurrence of ἕξω ἕως in this verse. While NA28 includes both (with ἕξω in brackets), it is easy to explain that ἕξω could have been dropped because of redundancy with the verb ἐξάγω, while the similarity of ἕξω and ἕως caused some of the variant confusion. See Bovon, *Luke 3*, 409.

impression that the ascension happened on the same day as the appearances. However, the temporal marker is ambiguous enough to allow Luke to revise the chronology in Acts 1:3.[623]

At Bethany, Jesus blesses the disciples by raising his hands in a gesture of blessing. While some scholars associate this gesture with the high priest's blessing, there is a wider tradition where patriarchs offered a blessing as part of their farewell address suggesting Luke need not be invoking a specific priestly motif. [624] More importantly, the Gospel of Luke has already depicted Jesus as blessing on multiple occasions so that this act provides continuity between his pre- and post-resurrected existence.[625] Since the blessing at the meal in Luke 24:30 was an identity token, the blessing here might serve a similar role, a token that would be enhanced by the raising of the same wounded hands displayed in 24:40. Although not explicit, the evidentiary value of these two actions is a narrative possibility and links this final act with the appearances in Emmaus and Jerusalem. Jesus' blessing signals his final departure and creates a lingering suspense about whether the disciples will recognize Jesus before he leaves.[626]

Verse 51 recounts the disappearance of Jesus with NA28 reading "And it happened as he was blessing them that he withdrew (διέστη) from them and was carried up into heaven (καὶ

---

[623] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 860. Of course, alternative explanations of this ambiguity are possible including that Luke encountered new information before Acts 1 leading him to revise his earlier position. For brief discussion, see Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 907–8.

[624] Cf. Num 9:22; Sir 50:20. However, most commentators resist seeing a connection between Jesus and the high priest as there is little else in the Gospel to support this view, as noted in Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 860; Carroll, *Luke*, 495. As a motif, blessing is commong throughout Scripture. Isaac blesses Jacob on his death bed (Gen 27), Jacob blesses his sons (Gen 48-49), and Moses blesses the people before his death (Deut 33).See Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 861; Andrews George Mekkattukunnel, *The Priestly Blessing of the Risen Christ: An Exegetico-Theological Analysis of Luke 24, 50-53* (New York: Lang, 2001), 158.

[625] Cf. the blessings in Luke 9:16; 24:30. Similar blessing-like pronouncements at the end of the appearances are also seen in Matt 28:16-20; John 20:21-23, 29. So Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 909.

[626] Cf. Luke 24:28 where Jesus intention to leave the Emmaus disciples creates narrative suspense as they have not yet recognized him.

ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν)." This verse has several important textual variants. First, the D-text replaces the διέστη with the reading ἀπέστη. There is little difference in meaning as both terms carry the sense of separation from, though the D text likely prefixed the preposition ἀπό to agree with the phrase that follows (ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν).[627] The most interesting and complicated variant involves the exclusion of the phrase καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν from a few manuscripts including D and the first-hand reading of Sinaiticus. Some scholars have decided to follow the shorter reading of the D-text.[628] In defense of the longer reading, scholars have pointed toward the evidence of P^{75} and other witnesses that include the reading.[629] Furthermore, Eldon Epp has shown that the Western text's omissions in the ascension accounts have a consistent tendency to eliminate the visible and material nature of the event.[630] I follow the majority of recent scholars who prefer the longer reading here.[631]

The verse begins with the repetition of εὐλογέω, forging the connection with the actions in verse 50. Jesus withdraws (διέστη) from the disciples and is then taken up (ἀνεφέρετο) into heaven, representing both separation from the disciples and movement upward to heaven.[632] Although in Acts 1 the ascension is described using the term ἀναλαμβάνω, a verb with clear parallels in the story of Elijah, Luke 24 uses the passive form of ἀναφέρω which is more

---

[627] Bovon, *Luke 3*, 409.

[628] In defense of the shorter reading, see Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts*, 36–52. The shorter reading is followed by Carroll, *Luke*, 496–97.

[629] Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 189.

[630] Eldon Jay Epp, "The Ascension in the Textual Tradition of Luke-Acts," in *New Testament Textual Criticism; Its Significance for Exegesis: Essays in Honor of Bruce M Metzger*, eds. Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee (Oxford: Clarendon, 1981), 131–45.

[631] The longer reading is followed by Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 909; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 859–63; Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 404; Bovon, *Luke 3*, 409–10.

suggestive of Greco-Roman ascension stories.[633] Such ascension stories often result in a divine status conferred on the ascended one who can then offer divine benefaction.[634] Similar miraculous departures can be found in the conclusion of recognition scenes, especially when the recognized party is associated with the divinity and the divinity is required to resolve a complicated plot. In Euripides' *Helen*, the disappearance of the divinely created phantom allows Menelaus to recognize his true wife (*Hel.* 605-624). Similarly, the plot of Plautus' *Amphitruo* is only resolved when Jupiter ascends to heaven and allows recognition of the true Amphitruo (*Amph.* 1131-1141). In these cases, ascension is a divine solution to a divine deception. The ascension in Luke lacks any divine deception but does produce a divine confirmation of Jesus' mission and identity. In a sense, the ascension is the ultimate recognition token that confirms Jesus' identity as God's appointed Christ who conquered through his death and resurrection.[635] As Green explains, the disciples "are thus provided with incontrovertible evidence that Jesus' humility and humiliation on the cross, far from disqualifying divine sanction of his mission, are actually embraced by God."[636] Jesus' departure is the final confirmation of Jesus' identity and results in the most complete recognition and emotional response in Luke 24.

---

[633] Cf. Acts 1:2, 9 with 2 Kings 2:11. So Walton, "Jesus's Ascension through Old Testament Narrative Traditions," 121. On the parallels here, see Bovon, *Luke 3*, 412. Bovon is drawing on the work of Lohfink in his parallels, many of which are inexact. For instance, Livy, *Roman History* 1.16.1-3 does not give us the Greek terms because the text is in Latin. Similarly, Plutarch, *Numa* 2.3 describes Romulus as becoming invisible. Still, the wider tradition of Greco-Roman ascension tales is clearly operative in the background here as shown in Wallace, "Benefactor and Paradigm." This is specifically true in the phrase 'into heaven' which does show up in a number of ancient accounts. See Dio Cassius, *Roman History* 56.42.2; Antonius Liberalis, *Metam.* 25.

[634] Wallace, "Benefactor and Paradigm," 105–7.

[635] McMahan, "More than Meets the 'I': Recognition Scenes in The Odyssey and Luke 24," 106; Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts*, 58.

[636] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 862.

4.4.6.2: Recognition and Attendant Reactions (vv.52-53)

Luke 24 comes to its climactic conclusion with the moment of recognition and attendant reactions of the disciples in verses 52-3. Although these verses do not use explicit language of recognition (*vis a vis* ἀναγνώρισις and related terms), they do narrate the disciples' worship of Jesus for the first time, which demonstrates that they have moved from a position of ignorance to knowledge in understanding the identity of Jesus. From the recognition, the disciples' subsequently express their new understanding in verse 53 with the emotions of great joy and blessing of God, which is also the most complete emotional transformation in Luke 24, once again showing the affective change of the disciples. The cognitive and affective shift provided by verses 52-53 gives the Gospel of Luke its climactic moment of recognition.

Verses 52-53 read "And after worshipping him (προσκυνήσαντες αὐτὸν), they returned to Jerusalem with great joy (μετὰ χαρᾶς μεγάλης) and were continually in the temple blessing (εὐλογοῦντες) God."[637] The verb προσκυνέω can refer to the action of kneeling or prostration, but is expanded in the LXX to include the attitude and actions of worship.[638] Throughout Luke's Gospel, humans have avoided worshipping Jesus until this final moment.[639] Rather, the usual human response to Jesus' words and deeds is praise to God. [640] Luke 24:52 retains the latter while

[637] The omission of the phrase προσκυνήσαντες αὐτὸν in D and other manuscripts is another one of the Western non-interpolations. The shorter text is preferred by Carroll, *Luke*, 497. The evidence of P^{75} and the other manuscripts is convincing external support for its inclusion. So Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 190. A number of scholars prefer the longer text, as in Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 862; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 910; Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 404; Bovon, *Luke 3*, 412–13.

[638] BDAG, 882-3, s.v. "προσκυνέω." See use in LXX Ex 20:5; 23:24; Ps 28:2.

[639] The only other uses of the term occur in Jesus' denial of worship to Satan in Luke 4:7-8. See Bovon, *Luke 3*, 412. Cf. the use of προσκυνέω in Matthew, where the term is used freely before Jesus' resurrection to describe worship of Jesus, as in Matt 2:11; 8:2; 9:18; 14:33; 18:26.

[640] See Luke 2:20; 7:16; 19:37. Occasionally, people rejoice or marvel at his actions, as in Luke 8:39, 56; 13:17.

also introducing the former. The disciples' reaction in Luke 24:52 is thus without precedent in Luke's Gospel and gives the moment the weight of a decisive transformation in their knowledge of Jesus. As Green explains, "Their worship of Jesus signifies that the disciples have, at last, recognized Jesus for who he is."[641] Furthermore, the worship of Jesus suggests not just a shift in their cognitive perspective but also a reorientation of their religious obligations as Jesus is now worthy of the worship that is due to God alone. Despite the numerous tokens offered in verses 36-43, and the opening of the Scriptures in verses 44-49, the moment of recognition only occurs after God acts by taking Jesus to heaven. The disappearance of Jesus in v.51 through the divine action (reflected in the divine passive ἀνεφέρετο) generates the disciples' recognition in v. 52. This follows the narrative pattern established by the Emmaus story where it is only after the disappearance of Jesus and the divine action of eye-opening that recognition occurs (v.31). [642]

The disciples' recognition is accompanied by the strongest attendant emotions in Luke 24 in a brief verse that recalls the opening chapters of Luke's Gospel. The climactic emotional and thematic verse functions as an *inclusio* that brings completion to the work as a whole.[643] First, the disciples return to Jerusalem where Jesus has told them to wait (24:49), showing that they are obedient to the commission of Jesus. Their recognition leads to a specific change of action as is typical in the biblical recognition tradition. Second, they exude a reaction of great joy (χαρᾶς μεγάλης). While they had responded to the display of Jesus' wounds with disbelieving joy

---

[641] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 862.

[642] In a similar sense, the pattern is also reflected in the account of the empty tomb as the women see the absence of Jesus' body and, with the divinely sent angelic messengers, remember and recognize Jesus (v.8). In contrast, the visit of Peter lacks recognition because the absence of Jesus in the tomb is lacking the divine action (v.12).

[643] The centrality of the temple recalls the Gospel's opening scene with Zechariah in the temple (1:9) and the presentation of Jesus in the temple (2:22), the response of great joy recalls the angel's message to the shepherds (2:10) and the blessing of God parallels the words of Zechariah (1:64) and Simeon (2:28). See Bovon, *Luke 3*, 413.

(24:41), now they react with great joy in the strongest emotional response to the risen Jesus in Luke 24 that demonstrates the chapter's affective climax.[644] Third, they bless God (ἦσαν εὐλογοῦντες τὸν θεόν) continually in the temple.[645] As the first time the praise of God shows up in Luke 24, this suggests that the disciples have finally correlated the recognition of Jesus with the worship of God, revealing that Luke 24 is not just about the recognition of Jesus but also understanding the God who has been at work in Jesus. God had worked mysteriously behind the scenes of Luke 24 through raising Jesus from the grave, sending angelic messengers, opening eyes and the Scriptures, and ultimately snatching Jesus to heaven. The climatic recognition of Jesus ultimately functions hermeneutically to give the disciples insight into the role of God through the whole narrative as God is finally recognized and glorified by the disciples through their recognition and worship of Jesus.

4.4.7: Summary

The Jerusalem appearance and ascension uses all the formal elements of the recognition type-scene and parallels the recognition tradition in various details including the emphasis on Jesus' hands and feet as recognition tokens, the commission as witnesses, and the strong affective language. Overall, Luke 24:36-53 reveals a carefully crafted recognition scene that participates in the wider recognition tradition.

However, what is most often overlooked about the Jerusalem appearance and the ascension is how it is crafted in various ways to be the climactic recognition scene in Luke 24.

---

[644] For parallels in the recognition tradition where the attendant reaction is joy, see Aeschylus, *Choe.* 233-5; Euripides, *Hel.* 652-5; Chaereas, *Callir.* 5.8.3; 8.6.8

[645] Some manuscripts replace εὐλογοῦντες with αἰνοῦντες; some manuscripts include both terms. I follow NA28 here by keeping εὐλογοῦντες only. For a discussion of the variants, see Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 100–101; Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 910. The blessing follows the pattern of blessing God established by the crowds earlier in the gospel. For the use of εὐλογέω in praise of God, see Luke 1:64; 2:28.

First, the recognition scene involves the greatest number of witnesses and the greatest number of recognition tokens. While Emmaus is a literary masterpiece in its own right, the two Emmaus disciples return to Jerusalem for the final scene in which Jesus presents the most explicit proofs of his identity, giving the Jerusalem appearance a collective force. Second, the Jerusalem appearance is the only scene to feature an explicit commission. While the women at the tomb and the Emmaus disciples all report their experiences, it is only in the Jerusalem appearance that the disciples are commissioned as witnesses of the resurrection. Third, the ascension of Jesus results in the complete cognitive and affective transformation of the disciples. They not only recognize Jesus, but they *worship* him with great joy. Finally, the Jerusalem appearance results in the disciples' praise of God. The climax is a recognition not only of Jesus but also the God who orchestrated Jesus' resurrection. Overall, a careful reading of Luke 24 shows how the Jerusalem appearance and ascension provide the climax to the entire chapter.

4.5: Conclusion

Chapter 4 has argued that the recognition type-scene is the best formal category for the analysis of the resurrection appearances of Luke 24. The resurrection appearances at Emmaus (24:13-35) and the appearance in Jerusalem with subsequent ascension (24:36-53) use the recognition type-scene with its elements of meeting, cognitive resistance, display of tokens, recognition, and attendant reactions. The recognition type-scene also explains innumerable details in these stories including the stress on physical proof, the conflict of interpretations, the heightened suspense, and the pervasive emotional language.

The recognition tradition has also shaped other aspects of Luke 24 besides the formal recognition scenes. Beginning with the empty tomb, Luke 24 places a strong significance on

physical and visual evidence in a way similar to ancient recognition scenes and even includes an element of recognition in the empty tomb scene when the women remember the words of Jesus, creating a contrast between the women's recognition by memory and the male disciples' need for additional physical proof of the risen Jesus. The conflict of interpretation created by the empty tomb frames the appearances as an answer to the male disciples' doubts by providing extensive proofs of Jesus' resurrection and its proper interpretation through Scripture. The rhetoric of proof characteristic of recognition scenes also shapes the commissioning element in 24:48 where the disciples are commissioned as witnesses. The recognition tradition has deeply shaped Luke 24, demonstrating the conscious use of the recognition tradition to unify the scenes into a cohesive whole.

Nowhere is this more apparent than how Luke 24 uses the four prominent functions of recognition scene. First, Luke 24 depicts a cognitive shift from ignorance to knowledge. The disciples move from belief that Jesus is dead to knowledge of his resurrection. Their intellectual recognition is also joined with the interpretation of Scripture so that the disciples correlate the death and resurrection of the Messiah with the plan of God, which provides them with the intellectual framework necessary to move from a lack of understanding Jesus' identity into proper awareness of both Jesus and God. Second, the recognition causes an affective transformation as the characters move from fear, sadness and disbelief to heart-burning, eye-opening joy. The climax of this cognitive and emotional transformation culminates in the account of the ascension, resulting in the worship of Jesus and the praise of God with great joy.

Beyond Aristotle's definition, but a part of the Jewish recognition tradition, this cognitive and emotional shift includes a third function: the commission to witness. To show this, Luke 24 draws on the ethical function of recognition scenes in the Bible where recognition supports a call

to action. The disciples are not simply moved cognitively and emotionally, they are called to respond by obedient witness. While proclamation occurs freely in the stories of the empty tomb and Emmaus disciples, it is mandated in the climactic final appearance in Jerusalem where Jesus establishes the community as witness.

Last but not least, the recognition of Luke 24 demonstrates a clear hermeneutical function. Luke 24's use of recognition invites reflection on *how to recognize Jesus* rather than simply *that he is recognized* as is especially apparent in the stress on the overlap of divine action, the interpretation of Scripture, and the display of various physical proofs. The disciples work through the proper interpretation of Jesus' death and resurrection, while the audience is invited to see not just how the recognition unfolds but also how it is in line with God's plan from the beginning. The hermeneutic function is part of the ancient recognition tradition upon which Luke draws, but it is specifically shaped by Luke’s positioning of the risen Jesus at the center of the interpretation of Scripture.

These four functions (cognitive, affective, commissive, and hermeneutical) will be subject to greater analysis in the following chapter as they offer a climax to the wider themes and plot of Luke-Acts. Still, the exegetical analysis of Luke 24 demonstrates how central the recognition type-scene is to the interpretation of the chapter. From the form of the appearances to their wider functions, Luke 24 is deeply dependent on the recognition tradition.

CHAPTER 5

RECOGNITION IN LUKE 24 AND THE WIDER NARRATIVE OF LUKE-ACTS

> "The dialectic of men's ignorance and knowledge, of their blindness and the moment of recognition, seems to have fascinated Luke…Proclamation, revelation, epiphany: homiletics, epistemology, the language of worship: from the question 'Who is he?' to the moment of recognition the routes are various, but the apologetic is unchanging."[646]

5.0: Introduction

Chapter 4 demonstrated how the recognition tradition shaped the form and content of Luke 24. However, the exegetical analysis of Luke 24 is not sufficient for a complete interpretation of the chapter because the recognition of Luke 24 functions as the climax for overall narrative. As demonstrated in Chapters 2 and 3, a narrative's wider plot and themes shaped an author's use of the recognition type-scene. Although recognition was not always a narrative's climax, it did consistently produce a "shift" in the plot, which could have cognitive, affective, commissive, and hermeneutic functions both for the characters internal to the narrative and the audience experiencing the narrative. Recognition scenes relied on the wider narrative in constructing this decisive shift. Chapter 5 presupposes the interrelationship of recognition scenes and the wider narrative as the foundation for examining how the recognition scenes in Luke 24 function as a climax to the Gospel of Luke.

The chapter will analyze three narrative aspects of the recognition scenes of Luke 24. The first section will demonstrate how Luke 24 functions as the climax to the plot and characterization in Luke's Gospel through the four common functions of the recognition scene. The second section will then address the relationship between the climactic role of Luke 24 and

---

[646] Nuttall, *The Moment of Recognition: Luke as Story-Teller*, 13.

the start of Luke's second volume by examining the extent to which the climactic role of Luke 24 remains open to further narration in the Acts of the Apostles. The third section will examine the ways that the recognition scenes of Luke 24 correlate with wider themes in Luke-Acts, concluding with a brief summary of how Luke's use of recognition supports the narrative's theological purposes.

5.1: Narrative Analysis of Luke 24's Role in Luke's Gospel

The Gospels were long treated as a mere string of episodes with little to no developed plot or characterization.[647] Literary analysis challenged this assumption by demonstrating that plot is crucial to any narrative as it is the operation of the reader in making sense of the whole.[648] Even in episodic narratives, plot and characterization are created and sustained through the reader's participation.[649] Building on this insight, New Testament scholars began interpreting the Gospels as cohesive narratives with an increased focus on their unique plots and characterization.[650] The following analysis will offer a brief summary of the wider plot and

[647]As Dibelius summarized, "The literary understanding of the Synoptics begins with the recognition that they are collections of material. The composers are only to the smallest extent authors." See Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, 3. In the history of interpretation, form criticism was quickly supplemented by redaction criticism and, more recently, narrative criticism. The pioneering work of redaction criticism on Luke is Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. Goeffrey Buswell (London: Faber and Faber, 1960). A great example of narrative analysis is Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*.

[648] Peter Brooks, *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative* (New York: Knopf, 1984).

[649] See the excellent argument in Whitney Shiner, "Creating Plot in Episodic Narratives: The Life of Aesop and the Gospel of Mark," in *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative*, eds. Ronald F. Hock, J. Bradley Chance, and Judith Perkins, SBLSymS 6 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 155–76. Another great summary of this discussion is found in Michal Beth Dinkler, *Silent Statements: Narrative Representations of Speech and Silence in the Gospel of Luke*, BZNW 191 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013), 22–37.

[650] The landmark work of such narrative analysis is David M. Rhoads, *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999). For the study of plot in the Gospels, see Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, 84–97; Jack Dean Kingsbury, "The Plot of Luke's Story of Jesus," *Int* 48.4 (1994): 369–78. For a study of characters, see John A. Darr, *On Character Building: The Reader and the Rhetoric of Characterization in Luke-Acts*; David M. Rhoads and Kari Syreeni, *Characterization in the Gospels: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*, JSNTSup 184 (Sheffield.: Sheffield Academic, 1999).

characterization of Luke's Gospel in order to explore how the recognition scenes in Luke 24 presuppose, develop, and resolve it.

5.1.1: Plot and Characterization in Luke's Gospel

Aristotle explained that the most basic plot consists of a beginning, middle, and end (*Poet.* 1450b25-26). Luke's Gospel generally reflects this tripartite division: the beginning birth narratives (Luke 1-2), the middle's account of the ministry of Jesus (Luke 3-19:26), and the end consisting of his arrest in Jerusalem, death, and resurrection (Luke 19:27-24:52). In this plot, Petri Merenlathi has demonstrated how Luke follows the other canonical Gospels in presenting two parallel plot lines. The first is the *plot of action* that recounts the events leading up to the death of Jesus. The second is the *plot of discovery* that supplements the plot of action with a wider hemerneutical concern to demonstrate that Jesus is the Messiah despite his suffering and death.[651] Each of the Gospels is unique in presenting these two plots and the various characters which participate in them.

In Luke's Gospel, the plot of action and discovery are expressed as God's plan to bring salvation to world. Luke joins God's visitation to the people (plot of action) with a concern for how one is to recognize the visitation (the plot of discovery).[652] Jesus is placed at the center of both plot lines beginning with his birth in Luke 1-2. The opening chapters emphasize Jesus' identity as the Messiah who will fulfill God's plan for the world.[653] The beginning also

---

[651] Petri Merenlahti, *Poetics for the Gospels*, SNTW (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2002), 105.

[652] Mark Coleridge, *The Birth of the Lukan Narrative: Narrative as Christology in Luke 1-2*, JSNTSup 88 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 23. Coleridge, however, prefers to refer to these two plot lines in terms of theology and epistemology.

[653] For instance, the angel tells Mary that her child is the Son of the Most High (Luke 1:32) who will reign forever on the throne of David (1:34). Similarly, the angels who appear to the shepherds celebrate the birth of Jesus as the birth of God's Messiah, a savior (2:11).

foreshadows the conflict and misrecognition that pervades the plots of action and discovery. While some characters properly recognize God's visitation in Jesus and respond with praise and worship (2:20, 38), God's visitation in Jesus also results in division and conflict among the people.[654] As the prophet Simeon declares, Jesus will result in the rising and falling of many in Israel (2:34). This conflict is seen, for instance, in Jesus' visit to the temple as it results in the confounding (ἐξίστημι) of the religious leaders (2:46), who will become the primary opponents of Jesus throughout the narrative. [655] Yet even among more positive characters like Joseph and Mary, there is similar confusion about Jesus' identity and teaching (2:49-50). The beginning creates a framework whereby the audience learns that the action of God in the birth of Jesus ought to result in recognition of Jesus as the Messiah to the praise of God; and yet, Jesus tends to cause confusion and division among the people.

The middle of Luke's Gospel (3:1-19:27) depicts the ministry of Jesus before his entry into Jerusalem and focuses on the actions of Jesus and the response of the people to him.[656] The plots of action and discovery are intertwined as Jesus' actions foreground the issue of his identity. For the reader, Jesus' identity as the Son of God is reaffirmed at his baptism (3:22) and his genealogy (3:38). Similarly, the testing of Jesus develops his identity by connecting it to his

---

[654] Mary responds to the news of the child with a hymn praising God's power to reverse the world order (Luke 1:52) and Zechariah praises the birth of John the Baptist by declaring he will prepare the way for the Messiah's work of bringing light to those in darkness (1:79). Other exuberant recognizers of God's plan include the shepherds (2:20) and Simeon and Anna in the Temple (2:25-38). See Coleridge, *The Birth of the Lukan Narrative*, 214.

[655] The verb used for the religious leaders' reaction (ἐξίστημι) is ambiguous and can suggest amazement as well as confusion. See BDAG, 150, s.v. "ἐξίστημι." Cf. Luke 8:56; 24:22; Acts 2:12; 8:9. The religious authorities function as a character group that opposes Jesus throughout the Gospel as argued extensively by Mark Allan Powell, "The Religious Leaders in Luke: A Literary-Critical Study," *JBL* 109.1 (1990): 93–110; Kingsbury, "The Plot of Luke's Story of Jesus." It is important to recognize that this character group encompasses a range of persons including scribes, rulers, teachers, Pharisees, and Sadduccees.

[656] Coleridge, *The Birth of the Lukan Narrative*, 231–32.

impending suffering as the devil attempts to coerce Jesus to throw himself off the temple in Jerusalem so that God will deliver him as the Son of God (4:9-11).[657] The devil's challenges locate the dispute about Jesus' identity in the context of the proper interpretation of Scripture, while also showing the Scriptures are ambiguous and (like the empty tomb) require proper interpretation.[658] Jesus' ability to outflank the devil leads to the devil's retreat to the background of the middle of Luke's Gospel. But as the start of Jesus' ministry, these stories give the readers insight into Jesus' identity and the conflict over its interpretation.[659]

The conflict is subsequently developed for the narrative characters through the depiction of Jesus' ministry and reception among the people of Israel. Jesus' teaching and rejection in Nazareth offers the programmatic start of his ministry and expounds several of the narrative's key themes.[660] On one hand, Luke 4:16-30 is a succinct summary of the teaching and actions that Jesus will perform in the following narrative.[661] After reading from Isaiah, Jesus stresses his fulfillment of God's promises through the prophets.[662] The stress on fulfillment (πληρόω) and the

---

[657] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 195–96.

[658] Joel B. Green, *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*, New Testament Theology (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 26. Green explains, "Questions of *identity*-specifically the nature of Jesus' identity as *Son of God*-are at the fore in Luke 4:1-13, where the Scriptures are also cited. In this case, though, it is interesting that both Jesus and the devil cite the Scriptures, and to different ends. This emphasis has special importance because it shows (1) Luke's fondness for the use of *echoes* of Scripture in addition to his interest in citing biblical texts, and (2) the degree to which *Scripture alone* cannot serve for Luke as testimony to God's purpose."

[659] Susan R. Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 59. Garrett also offers a complete analysis of this conflict as it is developed throughout Luke-Acts which space will not allow me to discuss more fully.

[660] Luke is likely drawing on Mark 6:1-6, though there are major developments both of the fulfillment and rejection theme. For a discussion, see Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 526–29.

[661]As Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 81, explains, "the passage is made into a programmatic prophecy which guides the reader's understanding of the subsequent narrative."

[662] The bulk of the citation comes from Isa 61:1-2, though the release of the oppressed is likely drawn from Isa 58:6. So Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 209–10. This programmatic prophecy is reflected in Jesus' ministry as he frees captives from demons (4:31-37) and the chains of death (7:11-17), heals the blind and alleviates suffering from ailments (4:38-39; 5:12-26; 18:35-43), and preaches the good news among the poor and rejected (5:27-32; 7:36-50

presence of salvation today (σήμερον) aligns Jesus' actions with God's visitation to the people, emphasizing Jesus' identity as the one sent from God to fulfill the people's Messianic hopes.[663] On the other hand, the question of identity raised by Luke 4:16-30 highlights the division that Jesus causes as the crowd displays difficulty in interpreting Jesus as anything more than Joseph's son (4:22), although their initial amazement (ἐθαύμαζον) suggests openness to alternative explanations.[664] But when Jesus further aligns his work with the prophets sent to the Gentiles, the people respond in outrage and anger, foreshadowing how Jesus' ministry and identity will ultimately lead to his rejection and death.[665]

Thus, Luke 4:16-30 establishes the basic conflict which the various episodes in the middle of Luke's narrative develop. Rather than detailing each episode, I will trace the characteristic responses of the crowds, the disciples, and the religious leaders to Jesus' ministry as this captures the characterization of Luke's Gospel. The responses of these characters also guide the unfolding plot of action and discovery.[666]

The crowds are an ambiguous character in the Gospel as they are open to the message of Jesus and rejoice at his deeds, but ultimately fail to recognize Jesus' identity and commit to

---

[663] Both the fulfillment language and the eschatological loaded nature of 'today' are particular Lukan emphases. See Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 213–15.

[664] Some scholars have often seen this initial positive reaction sitting at odds with the rejection to follow in vv.28-29, suggesting instead a reading of the amazement in v.22 as a negative reaction. I follow recent commentators who see the crowd's initial response in a positive light. So Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 214–15; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 535.

[665] Jesus cites the examples of Elijah and Elisha from 1 Kings 17:8-24 and 2 Kings 5:1-19 as prophets sent to perform miracles for Gentiles rather than to the people of Israel (4:25-27).

[666] Patrick E. Spencer, *Rhetorical Texture and Narrative Trajectories of the Lukan Galilean Ministry Speeches: Hermeneutical Appropriation by Authorial Readers of Luke-Acts*, LNTS 341 (London: T & T Clark, 2007), 39.

discipleship.[667] They repeatedly come to Jesus for healing and rejoice in the miracles, but lack insight into Jesus' identity.[668] The ambiguity of the crowds will eventually turn toward rejection as their fickleness, already foreshadowed in Luke 4:16-30, will lead them to support the religious leaders' plot against Jesus.

In contrast to the ambivalent crowds, the disciples respond positively to Jesus' ministry. They emerge in Luke 5:1-11 but remain largely passive during Jesus' itinerary around Galilee.[669] As the middle of the plot shifts from Jesus' Galilean ministry to his journey to Jerusalem, the disciples come more to the fore in their commitment to Jesus as they are sent to carry on Jesus' mission (9:1-6) and play an active role in his feeding of the five thousand (9:10-17). Still, they struggle to understand the identity of Jesus (8:22-25). Peter's initial confession of Jesus as the Messiah only produces deeper confusion as Jesus explains his impending suffering and death (9:21-27). As the disciples are repeatedly told of Jesus' future suffering and death, the narrative stresses their lack of comprehension and silence.[670] But their lack of understanding is different than the crowds who remain indecisive in their commitment to Jesus, especially since the disciples' ignorance about Jesus' identity is juxtaposed with a divine veiling of Jesus' identity.[671] As Green explains, "For Jesus' disciples, the struggle is not so much to discern *who* Jesus is, but

---

[667] For an analysis of the crowds in Luke-Acts in light of ancient novels, see Richard S Ascough, "Narrative Technique and Generic Designation: Crowd Scenes in Luke-Acts and in Chariton," *CBQ* 58.1 (1996): 69–81. Specifically in this comparison, one can note the way the crowd functions as audience, indicates popularity, and support the movement of the narrative.

[668] Cf. Luke 4:42-44; 5:25; 6:17-19; 7:16-17; 13:17; 14:25-33.

[669] Green, *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*, 102.

[670] Cf. Luke 9:43-45; 18:31-34.

[671] Luke juxtaposes the ignorance of the disciples about Jesus' future suffering alongside a kind of divine action in keeping the meaning hidden from them in the passive forms of παρακαλύπτω in Luke 9:24 and κρύπτω in Luke 18:34. See Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 390. Similarly, Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*, 227.

how he can fulfill his role. Their own views of the world remain conventional throughout most of the Gospel; hence, almost to the end of the Gospel, they lack the capacity to correlate Jesus' exalted status as God's Messiah with the prospect and experience of heinous suffering."[672] The disciples support Jesus even as they fail to penetrate the depth of his identity, aiding the on-going plot of discovery. Their support culminates in the celebration around Jesus' entry into Jerusalem (19:37-38).[673] Overall, the disciples represent a positive response to Jesus but lack a clear comprehension of his identity.

The religious authorities stand in sharp relief to both the crowds and the disciples in their opposition to Jesus. From the string of controversy stories at the start Jesus' ministry, the religious leaders are hostile to Jesus (5:17-6:11).[674] When Jesus exposes their hostility (5:22; 6:8), their response is greater fury and scheming (6:11). Throughout the middle of Luke's Gospel, the religious leaders consistently oppose Jesus' actions and are used by Jesus as negative examples of discipleship.[675] Their rejection of Jesus is attributed to their lack of knowledge of Jesus' identity. Despite having the Scriptures, they reject God's messenger and align themselves with those who reject and kill the prophets (11:49-52).[676] They will orchestrate Jesus' arrest, trial, and death in the final portion of the narrative because they have rejected his identity. The

---

[672] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 23. For the positive characterization, see Luke 10:1-20 where the 70 are sent out with good results and the specific teachings for the disciples in 11:1-11 and 12:22-48.

[673] Luke recounts explicitly how a great multitude of disciples welcome Jesus into Jerusalem, as noted in Dinkler, *Silent Statements*, 141.

[674] This point is discussed in greater detail in Kingsbury, "The Plot of Luke's Story of Jesus," 371–73. The religious leaders accuse Jesus of speaking blasphemies in offering forgiveness (5:21), scorn his eating with sinners (5:30), and challenge Jesus' treatment of fasting and the Sabbath (5:33; 6:2; 6:7).

[675] For opposition to Jesus, see Luke 7:39; 13:10-17; 14:1-6; 15:1-2. As negative examples, see Luke 11:42-44; 16:14-18; 18:9-14

[676] Powell, "The Religious Leaders in Luke: A Literary-Critical Study," 98.

religious leaders represent the negative side of the division caused by Jesus' ministry and the major opponent to the actions of Jesus.

These three groups embody different reactions to the ministry of Jesus in the middle of Luke's Gospel. The on-going interaction between Jesus and these groups drives the plot of action and continually raises the issue of identity. But despite their different responses, the three groups are similar in their inability to wholly grasp Jesus' identity. There remains a general aura of mystery in the plot of discovery about Jesus' identity and impending suffering. The final portion of the plot will expose the widespread misunderstanding of Jesus' identity as the plot of action builds toward its conclusion.

The end of the plot begins in Luke 19:28 when Jesus enters Jerusalem to his disciples' shouts of acclamation (19:37) and the religious leaders' call for silence.[677] Jesus' cleansing of the Temple further exasperates the religious leaders' hatred and lead them to plot his death (19:47).[678] However, the crowd's captivation (ἐξεκρέματο) with Jesus forces the religious leaders to delay their plot (19:48).[679] Luke 20 reverberates with the growing tension between Jesus and

[677] Luke is unique among the Synoptics in explaining that it is the multitude of the disciples (τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν) who celebrate the arrival of the king. Matthew 21:8 has "a great multitude" (ὁ πλεῖστος ὄχλος) and Mark 11:8 has the unspecified "many" (πολλοὶ). The emphasis in Luke on the multitude of the disciples gives the impression of significant growth from the mission of the 12 and the 70 to the great multitude now gathered. So, Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 297. The debate over Jesus' identity seems to be an important dividing point between the disciples and the religious leaders. This is in contrast to Powell, who prefers to see the opposition in terms of salvation history. Drawing on Luke 5:39, he reads the religious leaders as preferring the "old wine" than the "new wine." So Powell, "The Religious Leaders in Luke: A Literary-Critical Study," 101–9. However, the salvation-historical divide of the ages is intricately connected to the identity of Jesus as God's representative so that the distinction is perhaps unwarranted.

[678] Verse 47 provides an excellent example of how Luke joins various opponents together against Jesus, warranting my use of "religious leaders."

[679] The verb ἐκκρέμαμαι in the middle carries the sense of paying close attention, or hanging on to someone's words. So BDAG, 305, s.v. "ἐκκρέμαμαι." For the role of crowds in preventing violence in ancient narratives, see Ascough, "Narrative Technique and Generic Designation: Crowd Scenes in Luke-Acts and in Chariton," 77–78.

the religious leaders through a series of debates reminiscent of Luke 5:17-6:11.[680] Jesus again silences his opponents and speaks against them, while the ambivalent crowds remain around Jesus and manage to delay the religious leaders' plot (21:38).[681]

The religious leaders are able to enact their plot against Jesus with the help of Jesus' disciple Judas (22:1-6). Satan enters Judas to orchestrate Jesus' demise (22:3), reintroducing the conflict from Luke 4:13.[682] As the day of Passover comes, Jesus reminds his disciples of the necessity of his death by describing the cup and bread as his body and blood given for them (22:14-23).[683] Despite the positive characterization of the disciples to this point, these final chapters emphasize their repeated failure to follow Jesus in the final hours: they fail to grasp his identity (22:35-38), sleep in the garden while Jesus prays (22:44-55), and Simon Peter will be sifted by Satan and deny Jesus three times (22:31-34). [684] At the trial and death of Jesus, the disciples will only watch from a distance (23:49). The disciples fail to recognize the link between

[680] The religious leaders question Jesus' authority (20:1-2), try to entrap him in a question about paying taxes to Caesar (20:20-22), and mock his view of the resurrection (20:27-33). Jesus' replies, however, silence the religious leaders (20:7, 40). See Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*, 191.

[681] Cf. Luke 20:7, 19, 40, 45-47

[682] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 753. See also Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings*, 132.

[683] The overlap of language of the Last Supper in Luke 22:14-23 with the feeding of the 5,000 in 9:10-22 is strengthed by the connection between the feeding and the focus on Messianic suffering (9:21-23) and the resulting debate about greatness (9:46-48). So Heil, *The Meal Scenes in Luke-Acts*, 196–97.

[684] Jesus' speech in Luke 22:37 is redundant in use of fulfillment language (δεῖ, τελέω, τέλος). Jesus is also clearly referencing Isa 53:12. The suffering servant will become an important intertextual allusion to justify a suffering Messiah as is seen in Acts 8:26-40. As Satan entered Judas in Luke 22:3, Satan will now sift Peter (22:31), highlighting the failure of those closest to Jesus to follow him in his suffering. So Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 772. Interestingly, Luke recounts that Peter's denial is met by seeing Jesus, remembering his words, and fleeing in tears. This suggests the beginning of the repentance that will blossom in Peter's place in Luke 24.

Jesus' identity and suffering even at his death.[685] Jesus faces the conflict with the religious leaders abandoned by his disciples, despite the promise of their future faithfulness (22:32).

With the disciples out of the picture, the narrative concentrates on the conflict between Jesus, the religious leaders, and the crowds. Throughout the final chapters, the crowds become aligned with the religious leaders in their rejection of Jesus.[686] The religious leaders' plot is finally enacted when Judas arrives at the Mount of Olives to arrest Jesus with a crowd, beginning an increasingly negative depiction of the ambivalent crowds (22:47-39). The question of Jesus' identity is the main issue addressed at the trials as the religious leaders demand to know if Jesus is the Messiah and the Son of God. Jesus responds, "you say I am" (Ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι) (22:70), in an answer full of dramatic irony as Jesus, who has been declared Son of God since the beginning of the narrative for the reader, turns the words of those who deny his identity into their confession of it (22:70).[687] While the trials highlight Jesus' innocence, the partnership of the religious leaders and the crowds insist on his death.[688] As Tannehill notes, "The narrative in 23:13-25 places strong emphasis on the responsibility of both the leaders and the people for Jesus' death."[689] While the religious leaders have rejected Jesus and his identity throughout the

---

[685] Luke does not recount the flight of the disciples as in Mark 14:50, though the disciples lack a role in the events that follow apart from being witnesses (perhaps connecting to stress on witnessing all things in Luke 1:2; 24:48; and Acts 1:22-23). So Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 823; Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 776; Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 347.

[686] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 783; Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*, 164.

[687] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 796; Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 360. Some scholars see this response as more ambiguous. So Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 851.

[688] Although Pilate finds Jesus innocent, he hears the leaders complain that Jesus is stirring up the people and sees the crowd that has arrived to support the religious leaders (23:1-5). Herod's trial of Jesus similarly includes the accusations of the religious leaders and the mockery of soldiers (23:6-12). Luke alone has a trial before Herod which is part of a larger inclusion of the Herodians in Luke-Acts. See Dicken, *Herod as a Composite Character in Luke-Acts*.

[689] Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*, 164.

narrative, the crowd's sudden shift in supporting the death of Jesus is a mystery left unexplained.[690] Perhaps their ambivalent decision about Jesus' identity is ultimately itself a rejection.

Jesus' death concludes his conflict with the religious leaders and the crowd, revealing. their tragic failure to understand his identity. Just as the curtains are split at Jesus' death, the crucifixion highlights the division of the people. [691] The religious leaders continue to mock Jesus' identity, demanding him to save himself as the Messiah of God (22:36). While one thief joins the religious leaders in mocking Jesus, the other thief declares Jesus' innocence and asks to be remembered when Jesus enters the kingdom (23:42-3).[692] Similarly, a centurion declares Jesus' innocence and praises God (23:47). But on the whole, the crowds are returned to an ambivalent role as they observe Jesus' death but respond only with mourning (23:48).[693] Finally, the narrative reintroduces the disciples who are watching from far off, a group that includes the women who will be witnesses to Jesus' death, burial, and the discovery of the empty tomb in 24:1. But they still lack an understanding of these events and Jesus' identity. As Green notes, "their comportment vis-à-vis the cross of Christ creates a renewed sense of narrative tension that begs to be resolved: how will [the disciples] respond to Jesus' death? What will be the future of

---

[690] Carroll, *Luke*, 460. This mystery can be seen as a theological move to associate the death of Jesus with all the people, as preached in Acts 2:23, 36. It can also be explained by the fickleness of crowds in ancient narratives, as noted in Ascough, "Narrative Technique and Generic Designation: Crowd Scenes in Luke-Acts and in Chariton," 78–79.

[691] The darkness and torn curtains are symbols evocative of God's judgment as well as suggestive of a new opening of God's presence to all people. So Carroll, *Luke*, 469–70.

[692] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 822–23. Jesus' words to the repentant thief recall the preaching in Capernaum with its emphasis on the eschatological today (4:21) just as the whole scene recalls the division Jesus generates in Capernaum.

[693] The parallels between the centurion and the crowds are well noted and developed in Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 826–28. The tears of the crowd in Luke 23:26-31 and 23:48 suggest a hope for repentance of the people just as Peter's tears suggest a hope for the disciples in 22:62. So Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*, 165.

God's purpose now that Jesus has died?"[694] At the end of Luke 23, the plot of Luke's Gospel remains incomplete. While Luke 23 returns the characterization of the religious leaders and the crowds to their *status quo*, the characterization of the disciples remains unfulfilled as the reader anticipates their restoration to a positive characterization.[695]

5.1.2: Luke 24 as the Conclusion of the Plot and Characterization of Luke's Gospel

Luke 24 is consciously constructed as the conclusion of the plot and characterization of Luke's Gospel. The accounts of the empty tomb, the resurrection appearances, and the ascension in Luke 24 are the end of the *plot of action* as they are the last events recounted in the narrative. Furthermore, the various predictions of Jesus' resurrection throughout the narrative claim that the resurrection is the proper conclusion to the story of his betrayal, arrest, and death.[696] While these predictions do not necessarily demand that the plot of action include appearances or ascension, they make clear that the end of Jesus' story is the resurrection. However, Luke 24 deliberately aligns the resurrection appearances with the fulfillment of the expectation by the repeated appeal to these predictions. The angels at the empty tomb explicitly remind the women of Jesus' prediction of his death and resurrection (24:7). Similarly, Jesus explains to the Emmaus disciples that it was necessary for the Messiah to suffer and enter into his glory (24:26).[697] Finally, the

---

[694] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 828.

[695] Their restoration is prophesied by Jesus in his appointment of them as representatives of the Kingdom that will judge the 12 tribes (22:29-30) and his call for Peter to strengthen the brothers after his sifting by Satan (22:32).

[696] In Luke, the predictions occur in 9:21-22 (death and resurrection); 9:44 (betrayal only); 18:31-33 (death and resurrection). However, scholars often label these sections solely as passion predictions overlooking the role of the resurrection in some of the predictions. For instance, Robert C. Tannehill, *Luke*, 157.

[697] I take the phrase 'εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ' as a reference to the whole complex of resurrection, ascension, and exaltation. So Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 896–97; Carroll, *Luke*, 485.

risen Jesus invokes his own words in the Jerusalem appearance to remind the disciples about the necessity of the Messiah's suffering and resurrection from the dead (24:46). Through these verbal allusions, the resurrection appearances in Luke 24 are consciously designed as the conclusion of the plot of action.

The same is true of *the plot of discovery* with its stress on the proper interpretation of Jesus' identity. Luke's Gospel presents an ongoing concern over the identity of Jesus as the characters are unable to understand him as a suffering Messiah. Luke 23 captures the misunderstanding of the crowds and religious leaders at the death of Jesus by returning them to their negative and ambivalent characterization respectively. However, the disciples remain mere onlookers at the end of chapter 23, still unable to correlate Jesus' identity as Messiah with his suffering. Rather, their rehabilitation is saved for Luke 24 where they alone resolve the plot of discovery in line with their positive characterization throughout the narrative.

Through Luke 24, the disciples resolve the question of Jesus' identity by recognizing the risen Jesus in light of God's plan. The culmination of the plot of discovery begins with the women who are eyewitnesses of Jesus' death, burial, and the empty tomb. They are the first to recognize that the same Jesus who died is now raised in line with God's plan by remembering his words about the fate of the Son of Man and connecting the events to a proper understanding of Jesus' identity (24:6-7). The plot of discovery is even more apparent in the Emmaus and Jerusalem recognition scenes. The Emmaus disciples recognize the risen Lord (24:31) and connect his identity as Messiah with the necessity of his suffering (24:26-7). In the Jerusalem appearance, the risen Jesus physically presents his body to the disciples for inspection to prove that he is indeed himself (24:39). The display of Jesus' hands and feet with the passion wounds connects his risen identity with his suffering. His physical demonstration is joined with a verbal

articulation of the necessity of the death and resurrection of Messiah (24:44-46). The Gospel concludes with a positive characterization of the disciples as finally understanding the identity of the one whom they have followed throughout the narrative.

Thus, the plot of Luke's Gospel is incomplete without Luke 24. This is apparent not only in how Luke 24 is structured to recall the plots of action and discovery from the preceding narrative, but also how the preceding narrative anticipates and prepares the reader for the resolution offered in Luke 24. The positive characterization of the disciples throughout the narrative anticipates their recognition of Jesus by the end of the narrative. Luke 24 is constructed to provide the conclusive end of the narrative. But how do the recognition scenes in Luke 24 support this climactic conclusion? Using the cognitive, affective, commissive, and hermeneutical functions of the recognition scene, I will examine the climactic role of recogntion in Luke's Gospel as it is experienced on two levels: the level of the characters internal to the narrative and at the level of the reader of the narrative.

5.1.3: The Cognitive Function

The recognition scenes of Luke 24 provide a cognitive shift at the narrative conclusion that reflects Aristotle's stress on the recognition scene's function to enact "a change from ignorance to knowledge (*Poet.* 1452a29-32 [Halliwell, LCL])." The first disciples to experience this cognitive shift are the women as they encounter the evidence of the empty tomb.[698] This ambiguous token is joined to the angelic reminder of the words of Jesus concerning the necessity of his death and resurrection. Token and interpretation provide sufficient grounds for the recognition of Jesus' identity through memory. The passage's stress on the women's

[698] Carroll, *Luke*, 478.

rememberance and their report of the news to the other disciples makes clear that a cognitive change has occurred. But the women are unique in their ability to link the empty tomb with the memory of Jesus' words in order to come to the truth of the resurrection because their cognitive shift occurs without a physical appearance of Jesus.

Second, the Emmaus disciples are cognitively transformed through their interaction with Jesus on the road. Initially, they are ignorant both of the identity of the stranger (24:14-15) and the connection between their hopes about Jesus and his tragic death (24:19-21). Their failure to see is the result of both their own ignorance and the divine action that keeps them from recognizing.[699] When Jesus breaks the bread, their eyes are miraculously opened and they see the risen Lord. They are then able to grasp the interpretation of the risen Christ experienced on the road. The combination of appearance and interpretation allows them to understand the identity of Jesus (24:26, 32), although the interpretation is only understood retrospectively after the moment of recognition. Thus, it is recognition through Jesus' breaking of bread that produces the shift from ignorance to knowledge in two separate cognitive movements. First, there is recognition of the identity of the risen Jesus as the stranger in their midst. This leads to a secondary recognition about the identity of Jesus in line with the interpretation of Scripture. Overcoming the first ignorance (an event described as eye-opening) is what grounds the overcoming of the second ignorance (the heart-burning scriptural interpretation).

The final and most comprehensive recognition scene involves the large group of disciples in Jerusalem (24:33), a group that recalls the unspecified group of disciples who watched the death of Jesus from a distance (23:49).[700] The ignorance overcome in this scene is slightly

---

[699] Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*, 283–84.

[700] Cf. Luke 23:49

different than the preceding two. The disciples, when confronted with the appearance of Jesus, refuse to believe he is physically raised. Jesus overcomes their ignorance through various recognition tokens that convince the disciples. Like the empty tomb or the breaking of bread, the first cognitive change is to recognize the Jesus is risen and present with them. But the cognitive shift then moves to address a second ignorance about Jesus' identity as the suffering Messiah in line with God's plan, which requires the scriptural interpretation offered by Jesus himself (24:44-49). The culimination of the cognitive shift is the recognition of Jesus as worthy of worship in the ascension. The disciples, once unable to correlate Jesus' identity with his tragic death, finally grasp the connection and response in worship. The Jerusalem appearance and ascension completes the plot of discovery with the complete cognitive transformation of the largest group of disciples.

Luke 24 uses the disciples' recognition of the risen Jesus to capture the cognitive shift that culminates the plot of discovery. Functionally, the cognitive element of the recognition scenes rehabilitates the disciples from their ignorance into understanding. In a certain sense, the recognition scenes *raise* the disciples from ignorance to knowledge about the identity of the risen Jesus and his role in God's plan. Thus, the cognitive function of the recognition scenes in Luke 24 resolve the plot and characterization of Luke's Gospel.

But there is also a cognitive shift produced by the recognition scenes for the reader of Luke's Gospel foreshadowed in the prologue's stress that the purpose of the gospel is to provide the reader assurance (ἀσφάλεια) about things previously taught (περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων) (Luke 1:1-4). [701] The use of κατηχέω in the aorist points toward an instruction that Theophilus,

[701] Luke is the only gospel that sets forth a purpose in a prologue in a stylistically impressive Greek reminiscent of ancient historiography. As a result of its uniqueness, it has been the subject of intense scrutiny and research by scholars. For a brief summary of the issues of generic correspondence and her location of the preface in Greek scientific prologues, see Loveday Alexander, "Luke's Preface in the Context of Greek Preface-Writing,"

whether an actual person or some kind of ideal reader, has already received.[702] The original readers of Luke's Gospel were apparently Christians since the prologue assumes they are seeking assurance about what they already know about Jesus.[703] However, a neglected aspect of the prologue is its close ties to the process of recognition in the closing scenes of chapter 24. Specifically, Luke 1:4 claims that the work's purpose is to produce recognition in the reader (ἵνα ἐπιγνῷς). As Du Plessis has shown, this word in Luke "indicates the perception or recognition of something by means of visual perception, investigation, or deduction."[704] It is also a common term in recognition scenes in the LXX and shows up explicitly in the recognition of the Emmaus disciples. As the purpose of the work, the call to recognition in Luke's prologue claims that Luke's Gospel ought to produce a recognition for the reader.

But what does an audience recognize in a story they already know? If they do not receive the new knowledge of the risen Jesus like the disciples, what is their cognitive shift? C.S. Lewis has helpfully described how the surprise of a narrative changes when it is re-read. Lewis distinguishes between an initial reading of a text where the surprise is truly a shift from

---

NovT 28.1 (1986): 48–74. Her complete argument can be found in Loveday Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1-4 & Acts 1.1*, SNTSMS 78 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993). Her argument is a challenge to the predominant opinion of reading Luke 1:1-14 in light of ancient history, as established by Henry J. Cadbury, "Commentary on the Preface of Luke: Appendix C," in *BegC*, vol. 1 (London: Macmillan, 1922), 489–510. A recent article in support of Cadbury *contra* Alexander is Armin Daniel Baum, "Lk 1,1-4 Zwischen Antiker Historiografie Und Fachprosa: Zum Literaturgeschichtlichen Kontext Des Lukanischen Prologs," *ZNW* 101.1 (2010): 33–54. On the interpretation of ἀσφάλεια as stressing certainty, assurance, and reliability of the facts, see Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 28; François Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 23–24; Carroll, *Luke*, 22. *Contra* Rick Strelan, "A Note on Ασφάλεια (Luke 1:4)," *JSNT* 30.2 (2007): 163–71.

[702] While the term should not be read as a technical term implying the later understanding of catechesis, a similar use of κατηχέω in Acts 18:25, 21:21, and 21:24 does stress the reception of information and knowledge. So I. I. Du Plessis, "Once More: The Purpose of Luke's Prologue (Lk 1:1-4)," *NovT* 16.4 (1974): 269.

[703] A point agreed on by a range of recent scholars. See Carroll, *Luke*, 3–4; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 57–59; Tannehill, *Luke*, 24; Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 3.

[704] Du Plessis, "Once More: The Purpose of Luke's Prologue (Lk 1:1-4)," 270. It is used also in Luke 1:22, 5:22; 7:37; 23:7 and in Acts 3:10; 4:13; 9:30; 12:14; 22:24; 22:29; 24:8; 25:10; 27:39; and 28:1.

ignorance to knowledge and a re-reading which produces a holistic appreciation of a narrative's intrinsic suprisingness.[705] As he explains, " Knowing that the 'surprise' is coming we can now fully relish the fact that this path through the shrubbery doesn't *look* as if it were suddenly going to bring us out on the edge of the cliff."[706] For the reader, the initial surprise of the resurrection of Jesus after his rejection and death is replaced by a greater attentiveness to the overall shape of the narrative's plot. The reader does not learn the *fact* of the resurrection but learns to appreciate how God had worked mysteriously through the whole of Jesus' story to the surprising recognition of his resurrection. As Richard Dillon explains, "His reader's "certainty" would derive from a demonstrated bond of connection between the sacred history of promise and fulfillment, on the one hand, and the present situation of Christian belief…through the service of well-schooled followers whom the Easter Christ had made into "witnesses," just as he even now makes listeners into believers."[707] Indeed, this purpose is remarkably similar to the secondary ignorance overcome by the disciples in Luke 24. After recognizing Jesus, the disciples are forced to recognize his identity in relation to God's plan. If the reader has been attentive throughout the narrative, they ought to recognition how God was at work in the plot to bring it to a climax in Jesus' resurrection. The reader's recognition is a cognitive shift from ignorance to a reassurance and security in the deeper knowledge of the God's plan.

[705] C.S. Lewis, "On Stories," in *Essay Collection and Other Short Pieces*, ed. Lesley Walmsley (London: Harper Colllins, 2000), 502. For a more detailed study on the nature of re-reading, see Matei Călinescu, *Rereading* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993).

[706] Lewis, "On Stories," 502.

[707] Richard J. Dillon, "Previewing Luke's Project from His Prologue (Luke 1:1-4)," *CBQ*. 43.2 (1981): 227.

5.1.4: The Affective Function

The recognition scenes in Luke 24 also provide an affective climax to the narrative. Aristotle describes the affective function of recognition scenes as leading to either friendship or enmity (εἰς φιλίαν ἢ ἔχθραν) (*Poet.* 1452a29-32 [Halliwell, LCL]) as these characterize the relationship and affect between the recognizing parties. Recognition scenes either produce friendship as parties are reunited (e.g., Electra and Orestes) or enmity as recognition produces hostility (e.g., Oedipus). Throughout the ancient examples, the emotional release of recognition scenes made them a potent dramatic device for concluding a narrative. The affection function was usually depicted as a change to the characters in a narrative, but was also a catharsis for the audience or reader. Luke 24 contains a strong affective function both in the restoration of the disciples to Jesus and in a catharsis offered the reader.

Luke 24 restores the positive relationship between Jesus and his disciples severed by his death. Although Jesus only once addresses his disciples as friends (12:4), the positive characterization of the disciples' relationship to Jesus is distinct from Jesus' relationship to other groups.[708] Their friendship is especially palpable in Luke 22-23 where the *pathos* of Jesus' final hours is felt through the disciples' abandonment.[709] Jesus' arrest and crucifixion shifts the

[708] Only in John and here in Luke does Jesus address his followers as friends, though in both Gospels the address is quite rare. Cf. John 15:14-15. For the disciples' role as followers and recipients of Jesus' teaching, see Luke 5:1-11; 8:9-10; 9:1-2; 9:18-27; 9:43-48; 10:1.

[709] Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK, 1968), 236. As Henry Cadbury has noted, "There are two traits of Luke's style that may be mentioned by way of illustration-the sense of suspense and the quality of pathos. In both of these Mark's gospel was also notable, and Luke has doubtless merely preserved a primitive aspect of the tradition."

disciples from intimacy and celebration to abandonment and grief, as their ties of friendship are severed as they watch Jesus die from a distance (23:49).[710]

But Luke 24 enacts an emotional reversal as the recognition scenes move the disciples from grief to joy in a restored relationship with Jesus. The affective language of the chapter is particularly dense as it expresses this shift. The women at the tomb are perplexed (διαπορέω) and fearful (ἔμφοβος) at the empty tomb before they remember and proclaim the resurrection (24:1-9). The *pathos* of the Emmaus disciples begins with their grief (σκυθρωπός), as Jesus' death had dashed their hopes (24:17, 20-21). But their recognition of Jesus allows them to feel that their hearts were burning on the road (24:32). Finally, the appearance of Jesus in Jerusalem is met with initial fear and doubt (24:37-8), which recalls the disciples' rejection of the women's message (24:11). Even after Jesus' display of evidence of his identity, the disciples still display a mixed response of disbelief as a result of joy and wonder (24:41). Although their emotions have shifted, the disciples' most complete emotional reversal is saved for the final verses of Luke 24.

In the final recognition scene, the ascension culminates with the worship of Jesus. At this point, the disciples exhibit great joy (μέγας χαρά) that overflows into the praise of God (24:52-3). Because the disciples from the earlier scenes (the women and the Emmaus disciples) had returned to Jerusalem and are still present for the final moment, this resolves completely the emotional transformation of all of the disciples. It is also the only time Luke describes an emotional response of "great joy," saving it for the climactic reunion of Jesus with his disciples.[711] The recognition scenes of Luke 24 provide a satisfactory emotional reversal of the

[710] The emotional language of Luke 22-23 is especially apparent in descriptions of the disciples. Luke alone recounts that the disciples' sleep at the Mount of Olives out of grief (22:45). There is also the bitter weeping of Peter after his denial (22:54-62).

[711] Earlier moments in the narrative have produced joy at God's work in Jesus (e.g., the birth of Luke 1:14; 2:10; the return of the mission of the 40 in Luke 10:17). But it is only in this climactic that moment that "great joy"

disciples' grief into joyful worship of Jesus and praise of God. The disciples' friendship with Jesus is restored through the recognition scenes even as a new dimension of the relationship is opened by their worship.

But how does this climactic affective function impact the reader? One possibility is that the reader is pulled into the same joy through the recognition scenes of Luke 24 because they share in the community founded by these witnesses. Joy is prominent in Luke's Gospel particularly as it captures the communal and eschatological response to God's purpose in Christ and is used as a major characteristic of the church in Acts.[712] In both Luke and Acts, joy also accompanies the repentance and conversion of individuals.[713] Thus, Luke-Acts creates an image of the believer and community as living in joy in response to God, leading one recent scholar to conclude that the stress on joy and praise "lends an epideictic tone to the narrative, which suggests that Luke-Acts is not a tragedy" but rather a narrative that generates joy.[714] The narrative's connection of joy with Christian conversion and communal life encourages the reader (likely a Christian, as noted in the prologue) to identify and participate in the joy experienced by

---

is expressed, giving Luke 24 a conclusive emotional force. Kindalee Pfremmer De Long, *Surprised by God: Praise Responses in the Narrative of Luke-Acts*, BZNW 166 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 245.

[712] Paul J Bernadicou, "Lukan Theology of Joy Revisited," *ScEs* 30.1 (1978): 57. See also Bernadicou, "Lucan Theology of Joy," 78. Graham Twelftree notes that one of the key characteristics of the church in Acts is joy as seen in the cluster of words: εὐφραίνω is used in Luke 12:19; 15:23-32; 16:19; Acts 2:26; 7:41; ἀγαλλιάω occurs in Luke 1:47; 10:21; Acts 2:26; 16:34; ἀγαλλίασις appears in Luke 1:14, 44; Acts 2:46. See Graham C. Twelftree, *People of the Spirit: Exploring Luke's View of the Church* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009), 109.

[713] For a brief summary of Luke-Acts' unique stress on repentance and conversion in Luke-Acts, see Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 237–41. For more detailed studies, see Beverly Roberts Gaventa, *From Darkness to Light: Aspects of Conversion in the New Testament*, OBT 20 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986); Fernando Méndez-Moratalla, *The Paradigm of Conversion in Luke*, JSNTSup 252 (London: T & T Clark, 2004); Joel B. Green, *Conversion in Luke-Acts: Divine Action, Human Cognition, and the People of God* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015).

[714] De Long, *Surprised by God*, 279–80.

the disciples in Luke 24. The climactic joy produced by the recognition of the risen Lord invites the reader into a joyful assurance in the the good news Theophilus received.

Of course, another possibility is that the reader is invited to identify with the grief and misunderstanding of the disciples prior to the recognition's joyous catharsis. Because joy is eschatological and grounded in the resurrection of Jesus, the reader can identify with the grief, abandonment, and failure of the disciples prior to the resurrection as they themselves still anticipate a future resurrection. Readers can delay the affective transformation by focusing on their present separation from the fulfilled hope through their own failures of understanding or the difficulties of cruciform discipleship (14:27). Delaying the affective transformation places the joy of resurrection recognition still ahead for the reader. Thus, whether in the present catharsis of joy or the hope for a future catharsis, the reader is invited to be emotionally invested in the affective function of Luke 24.

5.1.5: The Commissive Function

There is an obvious element of commissioning in Jesus' speech in Luke 24:44-49.[715] While I have argued that commissioning is not the form of the appearances of Luke 24, its inclusion nevertheless provides an important function in the recognition scenes of Luke 24. A commission often showed up in the biblical recognition tradition as a result of the stress on moral responsibility and transformation, and Luke 24 depicts the same commissive shift in the disciples, both implicitly and explicitly, in response to the recognition of the risen Jesus.

---

[715] See Hubbard, "The Matthean Redaction of a Primitive Apostolic Commissioning"; Neyrey, *The Resurrection Stories*. As Francis Schüssler Fiorenza, *Foundational Theology: Jesus and the Church* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 38 explains "The combination of the motifs of commissioning and identity show that the basic goal of the appearance stories is not to prove the resurrection of Jesus but to show the link between the Church's mission and the historical Jesus."

The only explicit commissioning in Luke 24 occurs in the final recognition scene in Jerusalem among all of the gathered disciples (v.36). Just as all of the characters from Luke 24 are gathered together to receive the fullest affective transformation in the ascension, Jesus' commission is extended to all the disciples, whom Jesus redefines as witnesses (μάρτυρες) in the only use of this term in Luke's Gospel. Their new commissioned status arises from the recognition of the risen Jesus. Witness is a common category in recognition scenes as a witness provides testimony of recognition, suggesting that the disciples are called to attest to the recent events involving Jesus (μάρτυρες τούτων) (Luke 24:46). The referent of "these things" is the Messiah's death, resurrection, and the necessity of preaching repentance and forgiveness in his name to the nations. The disciples are commissioned both to witness to the past actions about the Messiah (his death and resurrection) and continue his mission into the future.[716] The commission offers a key transition between the conclusion of Luke's Gospel and the beginning of the Book of Acts as the baton is passed from Jesus to his followers, neatly capturing the climatic change the recognition produces in the relationship between Jesus and his disciples.[717] Just as the disciples are cognitive and affectively transformed by the recognition, they are commissioned to a new task arising from their recognition.

[716] Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*, 294. As Tannehill explains, "Jesus both reviews the past and previews the future. In speaking of the future, he is giving his followers a commission which will guide their actions."

[717] Although the only use of witness in Luke's Gospel occurs in 24:48, the category of witnesses (μάρτυρες) is applied often in Acts and includes more than just the Eleven. Cf. Acts 1:8; 1:22; 2:32; 3:15; 5:32. Of course, there are other ways that the commission foreshadows and connects to the plot of Acts. The disciples are commissioned as witnesses beginning in Jerusalem, the city whose inhabitants have yet to recognized the Messiah. The commission in Jerusalem leaves open the possibility that Jerusalem might recognize through the witness of the disciples. See Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*, 295. Similarly, the preaching of the nations develops several subtle allusions in Luke's Gospel about the coming universal appeal of the message. Cf. Luke 2:32.

For the reader, the commissive function points back to the prologue in order to confirm the truth of the gospel which Theophilus received (Luke 1:1-4). The prologue stresses the chain of transmission from Jesus to the eyewitnesses and servants of the word (1:2). Although the prologue does not use the language of witnesses (μάρτυρες), it is deeply concerned to note the passing on of the gospel into its present form from those who were, in good historiographic fashion, eyewitnesses from the beginning. The author of Luke-Acts does not claim to be an eyewitness, but instead invokes the eyewitnesses as assurance of the gospel.[718] For the reader, Luke's narration of the disciples' recognition and commission serves as the first link in a chain of proclamation that ends with the Gospel of Luke. This chain of transmission emerges from Jesus himself who commissioned the disciples as witnesses and establishes the trustworthiness of their message. For the reader, the commission of the disciples ought to bring assurance of the truthfulness of the message already known.

Providing assurance is the primary force of the commissive element in Luke 24 for the reader. But there are also hints that the commission of the disciples might also function as a commission for the reader to carry on the disciples' proclamation. Throughout Luke's Gospel, Jesus' teaching and instruction on discipleship speaks both to the disciples as characters and the reader who is invited to be a disciple.[719] Insofar as Jesus' words to the disciples are paradigmatic for the discipleship offered to all Christians, the commission to the disciples invites the reader to take up the task of proclamation as witnesses. However, this function of the commission for the

[718] Du Plessis, "Once More: The Purpose of Luke's Prologue (Lk 1:1-4)," 265.

[719] For instance, Jesus' teaching about prayer (11:1-13), worry (12:22-34), or the exhortation to fearless confession (12:4-12) surely extends beyond the disciples as narrative characters to the reader. The same could be said for the paradigmatic function of many of the narratives as well. See the discussion in Kari Syreeni, "The Gospel in Paradigms: A Study in the Hermeneutical Space of Luke-Acts," in *Luke-Acts: Scandinavian Perspectives*, ed. Petri Luomanen, Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 54 (Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 1991), 36–57.

reader is muted in Luke 24:45-49 because of the stress on the unique role of the disciples at the start of the mission.

5.1.6: The Hermeneutic Function

The final function of recognition scene in Luke 24 is hermeneutic. Climactic recognition scenes are often framed as interpretive devices that untangle and resolve a narrative. As Terence Cave explains, recognition scenes give an audience "a device for rendering plausible a highly implausible sequence of events."[720] It offers the interpretive stance from which the whole plot can be properly understood, both for the characters internal to the narrative and the reader.[721] The hermeneutic function of recognition in Luke's Gospel connects Jesus' fate to the outworking of God's plan as revealed in the Scriptures, establishing the recognition of the risen Lord in Luke 24 as the interpretive key to Luke's Gospel and the Hebrew Scriptures.

Luke 24 captures the hermeneutic function through its emphasis on scriptural fulfillment. The risen Jesus repeatedly helps his disciples interpret Scripture properly in light of his resurrection so that recognition and proper interpretation are bound together, just as the Greek terms for reading (ἀναγινώσκω) and recognition (ἀναγνώρισις) are related.[722] This relies heavily on Luke 24's stress on prophetic fulfillment as each narrative contains explicit refernces to the ways that Jesus' resurrection is the fulfillment of prophecy.[723] The women at the tomb are instructed to remember that Jesus' resurrection was predicted by Jesus (24:6), Jesus interprets the

---

[720] Cave, *Recognitions*, 261.

[721] Cave, *Recognitions*, 256–60. Our analysis of ancient recognition scenes noted several ways this hermeneutic function was expressed. Often the voice of a narrative character (e.g., Odysseus or Joseph) provides the proper explanation that renders the recognition's climactic role possible. Another means was the invocation of divinity as the force that moves the plot to its fitting conclusion.

[722] Cave, *Recognitions*, 260.

Scriptures to the Emmaus disciples in order to demonstrate that the Messiah must suffer and enter glory (24:26-7), and finally, in his Jerusalem appearance, Jesus explains to the disciples everything written in Scripture (24:44-47). As Paul Schubert concluded, "Luke's proof-from-prophecy theology is the heart of his concern in chapter 24. It is the structural and material element which produces the literary and the theological unity and climax of the gospel."[724]

However, what Schubert neglects is how proof-from-prophecy is dependent on recognition in order to give Jesus' resurrection its hermeneutic force. Recognition and interpretation are the twin threads that guide the whole chapter as neither is possible without the other. The hermeneutic function of the recognition scenes claim that it is Jesus' resurrection that makes the interpretation of the Scriptures possible. That is, the recognition of the risen Messiah is the hermeneutical key which allows the disciples to interpret God's purpose in Jesus. Luke 24 is shot through with retrospective summaries of the narrative events of Jesus' life and death (24:4-6, 14; 18-21; 44) that are properly interpreted by the disciples only after they recognize the risen Lord.[725] Furthermore, the Emmaus and the Jerusalem appearances stress that it is the risen Lord himself who is responsible for opening the Scriptures so the disciples can properly interpret them (24:32; 44-45). With the exception of the references to upcoming events in Acts (Luke 24:47-49), there is no new information conveyed in this chapter's focus on proper interpretation. Rather, the recognition scenes primarily offer the decisive interpretation of the preceding narrative. Thus, it is only from the perspective of recognition of the risen Lord that one can interpret the whole of the Gospel. And to this end, the entire plot of Luke's Gospel is properly understood only after the climactic recognition scenes of Luke 24. As Richard Dillon

---

[724] Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," 176.

[725] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 833.

summarizes, "It was clear the facts did not speak for themselves, any more than Jesus' miracles automatically generated faith in him among the onlookers. Only when wondrous fact and interpreting word coincided in the conclusive self-disclosure of the Easter Christ did the messianic enigma dissipate and the messianic salvation become accessible."[726] For the characters internal to the narrative, the recognition of the risen Lord offers the hermeneutical key to the interpretation of the whole.

The hermeneutic function of Luke 24 is similar for the reader. Just as ancient recognition scenes resolve the plot into a coherent whole, so the recognition of the risen Lord and its invocation of Scripture provide the reader the proper stance from which to read the whole Gospel. But the joining of recognition and fulfillment is presented not merely as a literary device but as a claim about the divine action at work behind Jesus' ministry from the beginning. Rather than a mocking of the artificiality of recognition scenes as implausible, Luke treats the climactic recognition as the work of God in history. This is why the Gospel concludes not just with the worship of Jesus, but also the praise of God. Recognition of the risen Lord reveals to both characters and readers the culmination of God's plan. The interpretive power offered by recognition is itself a fitting expression of Luke's theology of history. As Richard Hays explains, "The story has a *plot* scripted by its divine author, and it leads to a triumphant, joyous ending. This is the ground for the *asphaleia* that Luke promises to Theophilus. Readers of this Gospel are meant to come to the final page with a secure sense of the utter reliability of God's plan for Israel and the world." [727]

---

[726] Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word*, 270.

[727] Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, 277.

Of course, the reader can always reject Luke's explanation of the hermeneutical power of the recognition scenes on the grounds of artificiality and implausibility because the story is simply too good to be true. That is the danger of a recognition scene. As Terence Cave explains, "to tell a story which ends in recognition is to perform one of the most quintessential acts of fictional narration…even if something like it occurs in fact, it still sounds like fiction and will probably be retold as such."[728] The Gospel of Luke presents the recognition of the risen Jesus as of such hermeneutical importance that it forces the reader at this crucial point to decide either for or against the whole narrative. The scandal of belief produced by the appearance narratives is foisted onto the Gospel as a whole. To recognize Jesus, one must recognize his place in God's wider plan.

The hermeneutic function of recognition is perhaps the best explanation for why Luke decided to shape the resurrection appearance in this literary form. The recognition scene allowed him to express two truths simultaneously. Recognition captures the surprising, unexpected character of Jesus' resurrection while also granting explanatory potential for the entire plot of his Gospel. The ending of Euripides' *Alcestis* expresses this hermeneutical function of recognition in Luke's Gospel: "many things the gods accomplish against our expectations. What men look for is not brought to pass, but a god finds a way to achieve the unexpected. Such was the outcome of this story (*Alc.* 1159-1162 [Kovacs, LCL])." Or, to draw from a recognition scene known to Luke, "Even though you intended to do harm to me, God intended it for good, in order to preserve a numerous people, even as he is doing today (Gen 50:20 NRSV)."

[728] Cave, *Recognitions*, 4.

5.1.7: Summary

Recognition in Luke 24 provides a comprehensive way for Luke to bring his Gospel to a fitting, climactic conclusion for the characters in the narrative and the audience reading the narrative. Recognition offers a cognitive, affective, commissive, and hermeneutic function at the end of Luke's Gospel that generates the narrative climax to Luke's Gospel. It creates a coherent resolution of the narrative's plot and characterization and invites the reader to participate in the resolution.

5.2: Luke 24 and the Acts of the Apostles

The preceding section argued that recognition provides a fitting climax and conclusion to Luke's Gospel. Yet this seems to sit uneasily with the growing scholarly consensus that the Gospel of Luke continues its narrative in the Acts of the Apostles. How can recognition conclude a narrative that will continue in a second part? In the following section, I will demonstrate that the climactic role of Luke 24 does not exclude the possibility of further narration. Rather, the narrative of Acts seems to presuppose the climactic recognition of Jesus in Luke 24 as the beginning of a new stage of the narrative. Thus, Luke 24 resolves a narrative plot while also serving as the foundation for further narration, a possibility supported by the wider recognition tradition.

First, it is obvious that Luke 24 contains several unresolved narrative threads. This is most explicit in the reference to the future gift of the Spirit and the preaching of repentance to the world (vv.44-49). Both themes will be picked up in Acts and generate a narrative suspense as the disciples return to Jerusalem at the end of Luke's Gospel (v.52).[729] Despite the climactic role of

[729] For the development of these themes in Acts, consider the promise of the Spirit in Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 859.On the preaching to the nations, see Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts*, 87.

Luke 24, these promises remain unresolved until the second volume.[730] Nevertheless, the Acts of the Apostles does insist on the conclusive nature of the recognition in the appearances of Luke 24. Thus, the first chapter of Acts rehearses the decisiveness of much of Luke 24 including the proof of Jesus' resurrection though his appearances (Acts 1:3), the promise of the coming Spirit (Acts 1:4-5), the commission to witness to the nations (Acts 1:8), Jesus' ascension (Acts 1:9), and the disciples' waiting in Jerusalem (Acts 1:12).[731] The retelling stresses that the resurrection appearances that culminated in the ascension conclude the period of Jesus' ministry. Acts 1 presupposes that the narrative trajectory involving the plot of action and identiy around Jesus is resolved as the new narrative is taken up. As Parsons summarizes, Luke 24 "is the necessary climax of the one and the starting point of the other. This fact is hardly new, and it creates little problem for the reader of Luke-Acts."[732]

Acts also deliberately invokes the evidentiary nature of the resurrection appearances of Luke 24 to ground the disciples' proclamation after their recognition. For instance, Acts 1:3 describes Jesus as presenting many convincing proofs (ἐν πολλοῖς τεκμηρίοις) of his resurrection to the disciples. The use of τεκμήριον recalls the use of tokens as evidence of one's identity in the recognition tradition.[733] There are also additional references to the proof of Jesus' resurrection in

---

[730] Carroll, *Jesus and the Gospels*, 497.

[731] Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts*, 172.

[732] Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts*, 193-5. There are a number of minor dissimilarities between Luke 24 and Acts 1 that have tended to frustrate scholars and led some to insist on the disjunction between Luke and Acts. This includes the more apocalyptic account of Jesus' ascension (Acts 1:9) and the stress on the gap of forty days between Jesus' resurrection and ascension (Acts 1:3). But these discrepancies can be explained. On the shift to 40 days in Acts 1, one explanation is to describe the difference as arising on literary grounds as a way to connect Jesus' ascension closer to Pentecost and align him with OT heroes. It is also important that Luke's Gospel gives the impression of the resurrection appearances and ascension occurring on a single day, though there is no date assigned explicitly to the ascension. So Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 860. Another explanation is to see the difference between Luke 24 and Acts 1 as a contrast of the doxological ending with a more pragmatic and realist look to the future, perhaps influenced by the delay of the Parousia, as in S. G. Wilson, "Ascension: A Critique and an Interpretation," *ZNW* 59.3–4 (1968): 275.

the speeches of Acts.[734] Acts presents the appearances of Luke 24 as the convincing and climactic recognition scenes that are foundational for the witnesses in Acts, presupposing the disciples' climactic recognition of the risen Lord as the conclusion to Luke's Gospel. Acts starts from the new beginning created by Luke 24.

There are several parallels in the wider recognition tradition that help us understand how Luke 24 can offer a conclusion to a narrative while also maintaining openness to further narration. The recognition scenes of ancient tragedies often offer closure to a single tragedy while remaining open toward a wider tragic plot that spans across narrative works. The depiction of the recognition between Electra and Orestes in Aeschylus' *Libation Bearers* occurs in the second work of a trilogy. While their recognition leads to the resolution of the plot of revenge, it spawns further issues dealt with in the following tragedy.[735] Similarly, the tragic recognition of Oedipus at the climax of Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* is presupposed in the plot of Sophocles' later work *Oedipus at Colonus*. In Jewish literature, the narrative of Joseph and Aseneth consists of two loosely joined narratives that hinge on a recognition scene. The first culminates in the recognition and marriage of Aseneth and Joseph, while the second presupposes this as it recounts how the Pharoah's son kidnaps Aseneth from her husband. A similar division is found in The Testament of Abraham where the recognition of the angel concludes the first part of the narrative and initiates Abraham's heavenly journey with the angel in the remaining portion. Throughout

[733] Eden, *Poetic and Legal Fiction in the Aristotelian Tradition*, 1–23.

[734] Peter cites eating and drinking with the risen Lord in his speech to the Gentiles (Acts 10:41). Peter also cites the evidence of Jesus' empty tomb in contrast to David's body still in the tomb (Acts 2:25-32). Both Peter and Paul cite the disciples as witnesses of these events (Acts 3:32; Acts 13:31)

[735] Stuart, "The Function and the Dramatic Value of the Recognition Scene in Greek Tragedy," 290.

the ancient recognition tradition, the climactic role of a recognition scene did not preclude the possible continuation of the narratives.

Thus, the continuation of Luke's Gospel into a second volume does not invalidate the conclusive function of the recognition scenes in Luke 24. Although Luke 24 leaves several narrative threads open to resolution in a second volume, the evidence of Acts itself stresses that the recognition scenes of Luke 24 are the conclusion of the gospel narrative and the foundation for a new beginning.

5.3: The Coherence Between Recognition and Other Lukan Themes

As Luke 24 brings closure to one narrative while opening up new avenues for the sequel, it creates a bridging effect that is apparent in the way that the recognition scenes in Luke 24 intersect with the wider themes of Luke-Acts. While the narrative themes contextualize the recognition scenes, the recognition scenes conversely provide a lens for interpreting the wider themes. This is particularly supported by the hermeneutic function of Luke 24 as the recognition of the risen Jesus provides the interpretive key for the whole of the narrative. The connection between Luke 24 and its wider themes aids the climactic importance of the chapter for the interpretation of the Luke-Acts. I will briefly examine how several themes are transformed by the bridging effect of Luke 24.

5.3.1: Sight and Blindness

One narrative theme incorporated into the recognition scenes of Luke 24 is the motif of sight and blindness. Sight and blindness are used literally and metaphorically in Luke's Gospel to

characterize the dynamics of faithful response to Jesus.[736] Jesus' ability to transform blindness into sight is foreshadowed in the birth narrative (2:29-32; 3:6) and reflected in Jesus' own interperetation of Isaiah (4:16-18). [737] However, there is only a single sight miracle in Luke's Gospel (18:35-43), which occurs in immediate contrast with the disciples' inability to understand Jesus' last passion and resurrection prediction (18:31-34).[738] The connection of these two passages promotes the metaphorical importance of blindness and sight to describe the conflict over the proper interpretation of Jesus' identity. While the religious leaders fail to see, the disciples' earlier blindness is transformed to sight in Luke 24.[739] The Emmaus story depicts the disciples' recognition through a shift from blindness to sight (24:16, 31). Their sight is joined to the opening of the Scriptures to unpack the metaphorical significance (24:31-32).[740] However, the stress on sight is found elsewhere in Luke 24. The chapter relies heavily on visual evidence: the lack of a body in an empty tomb, the sight of graveclothes, and the visual inspection of Jesus' hands and feet. Even the description of the disciples as witnesses, which the prologue stresses as eyewitnesses (αὐτόπται), places an emphasis on the evidence of sight. The visual shift of the recognition scenes resonates with the reader for whom the recognition scenes bring cognitive and

[736] Green, *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*, 79. "Recovery of sight is in the Lukan narrative clearly an issue of the physical (cf. 18:35-43; Acts 9:18-19), but it is also presented as a metaphor for receiving revelation and experiencing salvation and inclusion in God's family (cf., e.g., 1:78-79; 2:9, 29-32; 3:6; 6:39-42; 8:35-43; 10:23-24; 11:29-36; 19:1-10; 24:31; *et al.*)." Of course, the metaphor of sight is used in all the Gospels in this way, but in Luke it has a particular prominence. See Hamm, "Sight to the Blind: Vision as Metaphor in Luke," 457.

[737] Hamm, "Sight to the Blind: Vision as Metaphor in Luke," 461.

[738] Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 661–62. See also Byrne, *The Hospitality of God*, 164.

[739] Hamm, "Sight to the Blind: Vision as Metaphor in Luke," 465–66. While the disciples are praised at moment for their sight (Luke 10:24), the lack the proper complete sight as see in their responses to Jesus' prediction in Luke 9:43-45 or 18:34.

[740] As discussed in Hartsock, *Sight and Blindness in Luke-Acts: The Use of Physical Features in Characterization*, 178–79.

hermeutical clarity to the narrative's plot and identity of Jesus. As Hamm notes, "both the readers of the Gospel and those who encounter Jesus in its narrative are led through an itinerary of deepening visions regarding the true identity of Jesus."[741] The recognition scenes provide the climactic reversal of the metaphor of sight and blindess in Luke's Gospel as one comes to see Jesus' true identity as the risen Messiah.

While Luke's metaphorical use of blindness and sight is likely derived from the biblical prophets (especially Isaiah) and Mark's Gospel, the overlap of sight and recognition in Luke 24 resonates with the wider recognition tradition.[742] Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex* uses the theme when the blind seer Tiresias tells Oedipus about his crimes. Ironically, Oedipus accuses the seer of his inability to see the truth even though it is the blind man who perceives properly (*Oed. tyr.* 345-403). Oedipus' ultimate recognition of the oracle results in Oedipus' own self-induced blindness. A similar thematic overlap is made in Tobit as the healing of Tobit's blindness is followed by the family's recognition of the true identity of the messenger Raphael (Tob 11-12). Like these examples, Luke 24 makes the final recognition the decisive change from blindness to sight and transforms the literary theme around the moment of recognition.

The use of the metaphor in Luke 24 allows one to contextualize the theme both forwards and backwards from the climactic recognition scenes. Earlier references to the movement from blindness to sight foreshadow the climatic recognition. For instance, predictions about Jesus' healing of blindness become pointers to the new sight enabled by his resurrection (4:18; 7:22). Similarly, later stories of miraculous healing of vision (such as the use of sight and blindness in Paul's encounter with the risen Jesus in Acts) are reframed by the proper grasping of Jesus'

---

[741] Hamm, "Sight to the Blind: Vision as Metaphor in Luke," 475.

[742] Hartsock, *Sight and Blindness in Luke-Acts: The Use of Physical Features in Characterization*, 122.

identity through his resurrection. The major difference being that those who have recognized (the disciples) now become the facilitators of bringing sight out of blindness in Acts. For instance, Ananias is sent by the Lord to heal Saul's blindness (Acts 9:18).[743] The use of sight and blindness in the recognition scenes of Luke 24 invite a deeper reading of the whole narrative in light of the resurrection appearances.

5.3.2: Hospitality and Table Fellowship

Another thematic overlap between the recognition scenes of Luke 24 and Luke's wider narrative is the role of hospitality. Hospitality was a well-established convention in the ancient Mediterranean that including providing shelter and food to strangers. Among the New Testament writings, "Luke provides us with perhaps the most complete pictures of early Christian hospitality."[744] The hospitality of the meal scenes provides a major setting for much of Jesus' ministry.[745] Hospitality is also tied to the characterization of the narrative, so that, for example, the inhospitality offered to Jesus by Jerusalem will lead to judgment (19:41-44), while the hospitality of Zaachaeus results in his salvation (19:9).[746] In the hospitality theme, Jesus

[743] A similar effect results from the Lukan emphasis on the interpretation of Scripture in the recognition scenes of Luke 24. In the narrative of Luke's Gospel, Jesus is the decisive interpreter of Scripture, much to the confusion of the crowds, religious leaders, and disciples alike (Luke 4:16-30; 7:18-35; 20:41-44). In the recognition scenes of Luke 24, Jesus opens the Scriptures to the disciples and subsequently passes off the proper interpretation of the Scriptures to his followers (Luke 24:27; 44-9). The task of the proper interpretation of Scripture is then taken up by the disciples who properly interpret the texts for others in Acts (Acts 2:14-36; 4:23-31; 8:26-40; 13:13-51).

[744] Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*, 152.

[745] Heil, *The Meal Scenes in Luke-Acts*. Cf. the banquet at Levi's house (5:27-32); the dinner at a Pharisees house (7:36-50); hospitality at Mary and Martha's house (10:38-42); another dinner at a Pharisee's house (11:37-52); hospitality at Zaccheus' house (19:1-10).

[746] Byrne, *The Hospitality of God*, 8–10.

functions not only as the guest who needs to be received but also as the host in whom God's hospitality is offered to the world.[747]

Luke 24 invokes the hospitality theme by linking it to the successful recognition of the resurrected Christ. In the Emmaus recognition scene, the two disciples do not recognize the risen Lord until they offer him hospitality (24:28-31). The moment of recognition happens at the breaking of bread so that the recognition of Jesus is linked to the practice of table fellowship (24:30-31, 35). The hospitality of the disciples and the dual role of Jesus as guest and host in the narrative lets the whole scene function as a kind of climactic exploration of the hospitality theme.[748] There is also an element of hospitality in the Jerusalem appearance where the disciples offer fish to the risen Jesus. Although the stress is on eating as proof, the use of a meal resonates with the wider table fellowship theme.[749] In both scenes, the disciples come to recognize Jesus because they are willing to offer him hospitality. The disciples' willingness to show hospitality to the risen Jesus is part of their positive characterization and supports their recognition and commission as witnesses. Furthermore, the disciples' table fellowship with the risen Jesus is used in Acts as a major proof of their message (Acts 1:4; 10:41).

Hospitality and recognition are deeply connected in the wider recognition tradition, beginning in both Homer and Genesis. The link was also supported by wider traditions of

[747] This ambiguity of Jesus as guest and host is especially present in moments where Jesus is hosted at another's house but seems to take the lead in offering teaching about the hospitality of God to all. Cf. Luke 5:27-32; 14:7-24.

[748] Heil, *The Meal Scenes in Luke-Acts*, 216–17; Arthur A. Just, *The Ongoing Feast*.

[749] Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word*, 200–201; Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts*, 291–93. However, Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 855. However, eating in front of someone (as in Luke 42:43, "ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν") is sometimes used in the LXX for shared meals, as in 2 Sam 11:13; 1 Kings 1:25.

hospitality offered to the divine in human guise (the so-called *theoxenies*).[750] At the most basic level, hospitality informed recognition because recognition requires a level of receptivity by the recognizing party in meeting which often happened as a result of a willingness to extend hospitality.[751] Luke is hardly unique in joining recognition and hospitality in light of the ancient recognition tradition.

But Luke 24 brings culmination to the theme of hospitality in the Gospel while also opening up the overlap of recognition and hospitality to new creative expression in Acts. As Paul Minear explains, "The table becomes a place where human need meets divine grace, where the presence of Jesus transforms the sad remembrance of things past into the glorious promise of things to come."[752] On one hand, all earlier moments of hospitality in Luke's Gospel foreshadow the climactic moment of hospitality and recognition in Luke 24, as is apparent in the echoes of the feeding of the 5,000 and the Lord's Supper in the Emmaus story. These preceding narratives of table fellowship are the necessary link for the recognition of Jesus in the breaking of the bread (24:30-31, 35). On the other hand, all experiences of hospitality after the resurrection reverberate with the climactic recognition of Jesus. Hospitality and recognition are joined in Acts in diverse forms including the celebration of the Eucharist as a community table fellowship in response to

[750] For a recent study of ancient hospitality in conversation with the New Testament, see Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*.

[751] Perhaps the most insightful discussion on the overlap is found in Murnaghan, *Disguise and Recognition in the Odyssey*, 22–55. Luke 24's correlation of hospitality and recognition, especially in the Emmaus story, has been a continual source of reflection by recent philosophers on the reception of the 'other'. See Jean-Luc Marion, *Prolegomena to Charity*, trans. Stephen E. Lewis, 1st ed., Perspectives in Continental Philosophy 24 (New York: Fordham University Press, 2002); Jean-Luc Marion, "They Recognized Him; And He Became Invisible To Them," trans. Stephen E. Lewis, *Modern Theology* 18.2 (2002): 145–52; John D. Caputo, *What Would Jesus Deconstruct?: The Good News of Postmodernity for the Church*, Church and Postmodern Culture (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 60–76.

[752] Paul Sevier Minear, "Some Glimpses of Luke's Sacramental Theology," *Worship* 44.6 (1970): 325.

Jesus' resurrection (Acts 2:46) or the welcome of the Gentiles in Acts 10-15.[753] The thematic use of hospitality in the recognition scenes of Luke 24 reorientes the centrality of hospitality in Luke-Acts around the recognition of the risen Jesus.

5.3.3: Recognition, Reversal, and Repentance

A final theme joined to the recognition scenes of Luke 24 is the pattern of reversal and repentance in Luke's Gospel. Reversals constitute a major theme in Luke's Gospel where "the reversal of two opposites or contraries is presented as a series of related divine principles, describing God's action towards humanity through the inauguration of the Kingdom in the presence of his son, Jesus."[754] It is apparent in Mary's song about God's coming in terms of a reversal of the *status quo* (Luke 1:52-3). Divine reversal is also present throughout the narrative in Jesus' contrast of blessings and woes (6:20-26) and in parables where characters' futures are reversed (e.g., 16:19-31; 18:9-14). Reversal is often expressed through the narrative's use of repentance as a way to characterize dramatic shifts in a character's life. In interactions with Jesus, a character often repents prior to the reversal of their fortunes.[755] For instance, Zacchaeus' repentance and sharing of his possessions with the poor reverses his status from sinner to having salvation in his home (19:1-10). Similarly, Levi's abandonment of his tax booth to follow Jesus and hold a great banquet suggests a clear joining of repentance with reversal (5:27-32). The

---

[753] Geoffrey Wainwright, *Eucharist and Eschatology.* (London: Epworth, 1971), 38; Betz, "Origin and Nature of Christian Faith According to the Emmaus Legend," 41. Rather than interpreting Emmaus as the founding of the cultic practice of the Eucharist, it is more helpful to see it as reorienting the practice in light of the resurrection.

[754] York, *The Last Shall Be First*, 93.

[755] On recent studies of repentance and conversion, see Gaventa, *From Darkness to Light*; Méndez-Moratalla, *The Paradigm of Conversion in Luke*; Green, *Conversion in Luke-Acts*. The stress on repentance is particular prominent in Luke when compared to the other Gospels.

positive characterization of repentance is contrasted with those who are resistant to Jesus' reversing ministry (5:30; 19:5). The joining of reversal and repentance expresses a value system whereby God acts in surprising ways with respect to the existing order, allowing the audience of Luke's Gospel to be radically challenged (if on the side of fortune) or radically encouraged (if on the side of suffering) by the promise and hope of a new order.[756]

With the focus on reversal and repentance, Luke 24 functions decisively as the climactic reversal of Luke's narrative. While the language of conversion and repentance is not explicit, the recognition of the risen Jesus in Luke 24 is the decisive change for the disciples that produces the cognitive, affective, commissive, and hermeneutical change that launches their preaching of repentance to the nations. Furthermore, Luke 24 is the pivotal moment where the reversal of the fate of God's Messiah from crucified to risen is recognized by the narrative characters. As the climactic recognition of the Messiah, it imbues all of the previous reversals with the powerful paradigmatic example of Jesus so that all reversals are now interpreted under the central reversing of Christ's death by his resurrection.[757]

Of course, the link between reversal and recognition is itself prominent in the ancient literary tradition. Aristotle's *Poetics* situates recognition alongside reversal (περιπέτεια) as the two most decisive plot techniques. The most artful narratives are able to incorporate both into the narrative's climax.[758] While I have avoiding using the terminology of reversal in my description

---

[756] York, *The Last Shall Be First,* 173–84. York also notes that the bi-polar reversal sets this apart from the reversal of Greek and Roman literature which tends to feature only a unilateral reversal. In comedy, it is movement from the negative to the positive. In tragedy, it is the movement from the positive to the negative. Luke's Gospel attempts to hold both types of reversal simultaneously. No doubt this is the result of his dependence on the Hebrew Bible and ancient Judaism. This contrast is well noted in Northrop Frye, *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature*, 1st ed. (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982), 114–17.

[757] Josipovici, *The Book of God*, 260.

[758] Cave, *Recognitions*, 33–34.

of the various functions of recognition in Luke 24 in order to focus on recognition, the depicted transformation in Luke 24 could easily be defined with the Aristotelian terminology.

But the on-going recognition of the risen Jesus is also a major element in Acts' depiction of repentance and conversion, as the proclamation of the risen Messiah requires characters to respond. Alongside the accounts of many people receiving the good news following their repentance to join the community of the faithful (Acts 2:37-42; 13:48-49), Acts also recounts a number of individual conversion moments that resonate with the recognition of Luke 24. For instance, the conversion of Paul includes a cognitive shift in his knowledge of Jesus alongside his repentance and reversed fortune (Acts 9:1-19). Similarly, the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch involves repentance and baptism in tandem with the recognition of the risen Lord in the Scriptures (Acts 8:26-39).[759] Just as the recognition of the risen Christ in Luke 24 reorients the themes of sight and hospitality, so it shapes all later conversion stories. Thus, the recognition of the risen Lord in Luke 24 establishes a pattern utilized by the conversion stories in Acts. It is as if the recognition type-scene in Luke 24 gives rise to its own type-scene: the Christian conversion narrative.

5.3.4: Summary

The selective treatment of several key narrative themes in Luke 24 further exemplifies the climactic role that the recognition scenes of Luke 24 play in the wider narrative of Luke-Acts. The use of recognition in Luke 24 creates a narrative world where the recognition of the risen Jesus is the interpretive center. Key themes that are used before and after this moment are given greater meaning because of their place in Luke 24. As Josipovici explains, "Once you

[759] John Taylor, *Classics and the Bible: Hospitality and Recognition*, 135.

claim, as Jesus does to the disciples on the way to Emmaus, that in one person (himself) all that was written is fulfilled, you perform a major act of colonization. Those elements which do not fit disappear into the darkness, and only those which do seem to fit remain."[760] Of course, this is a natural outgrowth of the hermeneutical function of the recognition scene. Luke 24 not only offers the interpretive grid for the plot and characterization of Luke-Acts, but also for many of its wider literary themes, further establishing the recognition type as a powerful technique for expressing the climactic role of Luke 24 in Luke-Acts.

5.4: Recognition in the Theology of Luke-Acts

This chapter has integrated the recognition scenes in Luke 24 into the plot, characterization, and themes of Luke-Acts in order to demonstrate how recognition operates as the climax of the entire work. Luke 24 participates in the wider recognition tradition in using recognition as a plot technique and not merely as a literary form. However, I want to conclude with a brief sketch of the role of recognition in Luke-Acts' theology. The literary features of the New Testament are inextricably bound to the theological vision they narrate. As Petri Merelahti explains, "the plot of each gospel can be viewed, not only as a literary but also, simultaneously, as a theological feature."[761] Thus, the decision to use the recognition type-scene as the conclusion of the gospel is as much a theological as a literary decision. An analysis of Luke 24 that neglects the theological element fails to grasp how Luke's recognition scenes speak about the actions of God in the resurrection of Jesus. The recognition scenes in Luke 24 are not only the literary climax, but also a theological pivot around which the whole narrative revolves.

---

[760] Josipovici, *The Book of God*, 274.

[761] Merenlahti, *Poetics for the Gospels*, 100.

Ultimately, Luke 24 is about the action of God in raising Jesus from the dead. As Daniel Marguerat notes, "from Luke's point of view, the greatest intervention of God in history is surely the resurrection of Jesus."[762] The same God who raised Jesus is also responsible for producing recognition of the risen Jesus among the disciples so that the recognition is, for Luke, not a literary artifice but a way to depict a God who orchestrates a plot to its surprising conclusion. And yet, God is largely hidden in Luke 24 behind passive verbs: the Messiah is raised and eyes are opened. At the moment when God has acted most decisively, God is seemingly absent from the narrative until the end when God is worshipped (24:53). Prior to that, the recognition scenes present only Jesus, the risen Messiah, who is recognized and joined to God in the climactic worship of the disciples. As Hans Frei has noted, "in the resurrection, where the initiative of God is finally and decisively climaxed and [God] alone is and can be active, the sole identity to mark the presence of that activity is Jesus."[763] The recognition scenes claim that one recognizes the activity and identity of God through the risen Jesus so that the use of recognition in Luke 24 locates Luke's *theology* in and through his *Christology*.

But recognition of the risen Messiah arises from the complete incomprehension on the part of the human observers. The disciples' ignorance is not merely a lack of information but an inability to perceive God's plan with the given information. As Green explains, "*What* God purposes may be known. *That* what God purposes will be actualized may be assured. But *how* and *by whom* God's purpose will be realized is not at all clear."[764] The recognition scenes hinge on the surprising nature of God's action in Jesus that generates a new hermeneutic. Luke 24

---

[762] Marguerat, *The First Christian Historian*, 88. See also Danker, *Luke*, 57.

[763] Hans W. Frei, *The Identity of Jesus Christ: The Hermeneutical Bases of Dogmatic Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 121.

[764] Green, *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*, 32.

stresses that the facts themselves (the empty tomb, the grave clothes, the physical presence of Jesus) require additional interpretation granted by God. The angelic messengers, the opening of eyes, and the unveiling of Scripture demonstrate that divine assistance joins the material facts to generate recognition. The dynamic intersection of evidence, interpretation, and divine action result in a framework for the recognition of Jesus' identity and the understanding of Scripture. Although the human observers play a role in this process, it is only when accompanied by God's action that recognition is possible. Furthermore, the path to recognition is many-branched. Each appearance in Luke 24 has a unique configuration of evidence, interpretation, and divine action so that there is no formula for the recognition of the risen Jesus but a range of possibilities. The diversity of Luke 24 entertains a remarkable openness to God's surprising freedom without sacrificing the centrality of the recognition itself. The avenues to the recognition of the risen Christ are various, but the importance of the recognition remains central. The delightful diversity of recognition is also depicted in the range of functions and metaphors invoked by Luke 24.

But the diverse accounts all support the resurrection of Jesus as the decisive turning point for the disciples and the narrative of Luke-Acts. The recognition of the risen Messiah is the culmination of the plot and themes of the Gospel, while the witnesses to the resurrection are the foundation of the church in Acts.[765] The resurrection appearances are the seminal moment in the unfolding of God's action. Perhaps this is why Luke is explicit in delineating a period of resurrection appearances. The narrative wants to mark off the disciples as a unique group that witnesses to God’s plan and offers assurance to the reader. Because recognition of the risen Jesus is the decisive turning point, it must remain a point rather than an on-going phenomenon.

[765] Anderson, "Recognizing the Risen Christ: A Study of the Non-Recognition/Recognition Motif in the Post-Resurrection Appearance Narratives (Luke 24:13-35; John 20:11-18; and John 21:1-14)," 34.

And yet, the recognition scenes of Luke 24 easily transcend the defined period of appearances to capture a basic reality about the life of faith and the encounter with the divine. Recognition captures the suddenness of religious experience, the power of a revelatory moment to simultaneously scatter old ways of seeing and create a new point of view. The religious possibility in recognition is itself a prominent feature of the wider recognition tradition.[766] Luke's recognition scenes capitalize on the overlap of recognition with this broader religious experience and reframe the epiphanic moment around the resurrection of Jesus. The result is that the distinctive nature of Luke 24 gives shape to other forms of religious experience in Luke-Acts in two specific ways.

First, Luke 24 becomes a theological paradigm for the depiction of religious experiences in Acts as they embody a moment of recognition. It is reflected in the surprising reception of the Spirit (Acts 2), the conversion of Paul through blinding by the risen Christ (Acts 9:1-19), the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch by hospitality toward stranger on the road to explain the Scriptures (Acts 8:26-40), and Peter's recognition that God is including the Gentiles in the good news (Acts 10:1-48). Acts depends on the transformation from ignorance to knowledge offered by the witnesses of Jesus' death and resurrection and replays this moment in the on-going life of the Church, albeit with new characters and settings. Thus, recognition in conversion is deeply dependent on the recognition pattern established by Luke 24.[767] It is not that Acts depicts new

[766] On the overlap of recognition scenes with the religious experience in literature, see Culbertson, *The Poetics of Revelation*.

[767] This is especially stressed in Luke-Acts use of conversion to overturn error, making the shift from ignorance to knowledge (in recognition) a soteriological act. As Marguerat, *The First Christian Historian*, 103, explains *agnoia* "is a soteriological category in Luke, characterizing both the Jewish error on the subject of the Messiah and the bewilderment of the Hellenistic religios quest, and therefore is applicable to all." For a more complete discussion, see Jens W. Tager, *Der Mensch und sein Heil*: *Studien zum Bild des Menschen und zur Sicht der Bekehrung bei Lukas*, SNT 14(Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus G. Mohn, 1982).

recognition scenes of the risen Jesus as much as it uses Luke 24 as a paradigm for depicting further religious experiences.

Second, the recognition scenes of Luke 24 generate a similar framework for the religious experiences of the Christian life. The expansion of recognition into the religious experiences of Acts is only a further reinforcement of this central point. Luke 24 prepares the reader for further recognition and offers clues about how and where this recognition can occur, as the recognition scenes also provide cognitive, affective, commissive, and hermeneutical shifts for the reader. The scenes reverberate with Christian experiences of revelation by interweaving several key themes: the encounter with the divine in the stranger, in the Scriptures with their interpreted word, in the breaking of the bread, or in the sudden "opening" of one's eyes. All are ways that the Church continues to experience revelation and recognize Jesus. The recognition scenes become paradigmatic, transcending their historical and literary limits.[768] Luke 24 nurtures a reader into a recognition of how God might still be at work in the world.

Thus, the use of the recognition type-scene in the resurrection appearances of Luke 24 is a theologically generative narrrative technique whereby the decisive action of God in the story of Jesus opens up new possibilities for the on-going narration of God's action in the Church. Luke's attempt to limit the resurrection appearances to a specific period rather than limiting the possibilities opened up by his fusion of the type-scene with the story of Jesus only further expanded its power. As the period of the resurrection appearances ended, the possibilities for recognition of God's work in Christ continued to take new and different forms informed by the recognition scenes. The welcome of the Gentiles, the reception of the Spirit, the dreams and visions of Jesus, and the conversion of individuals share a familial resemblance to the

[768] Merenlahti, *Poetics for the Gospels*, 111.

recognition scenes of Luke 24 because of the central narrative and theological importance of the chapter. Luke's joining of the recognition type-scene with the resurrection of Jesus in Luke 24 opened up a range of new theological possibilities that would have a lasting impact on Christian literature for centuries to come.

5.5: Conclusion

My narrative analysis of Luke 24 has taken seriously the role of recognition scenes as a plot device deeply dependent on its wider narrative in order to show that Luke 24 offers the climax to the plot, characterization, and themes developed throughout the narrative of Luke's Gospel. The climactic role of Luke 24 was expressed in the cognitive, affective, commissive, and hermeneutical functions of the recognition scenes, while also maintaining an openness that makes the sequel of the Acts of the Apostles possible. The role of recognition in Luke 24 was further situated in its narrative context by an examination of the various ways it incorporates and develops themes from Luke and Acts. The chapter concluded by examining the role of recognition in Luke's wider theology, highlighting the resurrection appearances as both a specific period of witness formation while simultaneously creating a paradigm for the Christian experience that explodes the particular with new possibilities for the on-going recognition of Jesus in the Christian life. Overall, the recognition scenes of Luke 24 offer a fitting conclusion to Luke's Gospel, create a foundation for the Acts of the Apostles, and provide a generative narrative technique for further theological reflection.

CONCLUSION

"there is a whole world of biblical recognition—I mean both in the Hebrew and the Christian Bible—that critics have not really tackled…The Bible does not theorize on anagnorisis, but exhibits quite a few recognition scenes, especially in Genesis and in the New Testament."[769]

This work has sketched the use of recognition scenes in antiquity as a framework for the interpretation of the resurrection appearances in Luke 24. While the focus has been on the role of recognition in Luke 24, the wider framework required addressing both the ancient Greek and biblical recognition traditions, resulting in an interdisciplinary conversation about recognition that included literary theory, the Hebrew Bible, classics, and the New Testament. While there are obvious limits to such interdisciplinary approaches, I hope that these limits have not detracted from the new vistas opened up by the conversation. To conclude this work, I want to summarize briefly my argument and note several possibilities for further research on recognition in the New Testament.

Chapter 1 laid out the scope of the project and the history of research on the interpretation of Luke 24. It emphasized how recent scholarship has proposed a number of possible forms of the resurrection appearances in Luke 24. Although scholars referenced the category of *anagnorisis*, it was never explored in a detailed way as a formal category for the interpretation of Luke 24. In contrast, classical scholarship had a well-established tradition of discussing the recognition type-scene in ancient narratives rooted in Aristotle's *Poetics*. Recently, recognition has gained traction in scholarship on the Gospel of John. Recognition as a type-scene consisted of the formal elements of meeting, cognitive resistance, display of tokens, recognition, and

[769] Piero Boitani, "Something Divine in Recognition," in *Recognition and Modes of Knowledge*, ed. Teresa G. Russo (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2013), 12.

reunion with attendant reactions. These formal elements served as the foundation for my comparison and discussion of recognition scenes in the ancient literary milieu. Chapter 1 also noted the importance of recent studies in literary theory in analyzing recognition scenes as an integral part of a narrative. Recognition scenes often have a number of functions for both internal characters and external readers of the narrative that include the cognitive, affective, hermeneutical, and commissive. I proposed that ancient recognition scenes must be assessed both on the formal level and with respect to their wider narrative role, arguing for a comparative analysis of recognition scenes in the literary milieu around Luke's Gospel in order to to contextualize Luke 24 in light of the ancient recognition tradition.

Chapter 2 assesed the recognition type-scene as it was developed in a wide range of Greco-Roman literature. The fount of the long-standing recognition tradition is Homer's *Odyssey*, which grounded a tradition of recognition scenes that continued through ancient tragedies, comedies, the romance novels, and even writings like histories, geographies, and paradoxography. This chapter highlighted the wide-ranging influence of the recognition type-scene in ancient literature and demonstrated broad agreement on the formal elements of the recognition type-scene. The comparative analysis also noted the various ways that authors manipulated the type-scene to function in their literary constructions, often to produce a cognitive, affective, and hermeneutical tranformation.

Chapter 3 charted the role of recognition scenes in the Hebrew Bible and Hellenistic Jewish literature, with Genesis serving as the foundation for the biblical recognition tradition. Other recognition scenes were also identified in the narrative material in the Hebrew Bible. Despite its separation from the classical recognition type-scene, there remained widespread agreement on the form and possibilities of the recognition scene noted in chapter 2. The most

significant differences in the biblical recognition scenes included deeper concern for moral transformation and divine action in the recognition scene, highlighting the possible commissive function of the recognition scene. Chapter 3 also discussed examples of recognition in Hellenistic Jewish literature that joined both the biblical recognition tradition with the wider classical literary tradition. Hellenistic Jewish literature established the confluence of the biblical and classical recognition tradition into a single literary milieu that served as the backdrop for Luke's use of the recognition tradition.

Chapter 4 offered an exegetical analysis of the recognition tradition in Luke 24 by examining four scenes: the visit to the empty tomb (vv.1-12), the Emmaus appearance (vv.13-35), the Jerusalem appearance (vv.36-49), and the ascension (vv.50-53). I argued that both the Emmaus and Jerusalem appearances are examples of the recognition type-scene that include all of the formal elements of the recognition scene. The accounts of the empty tomb and the ascension support the central recognition scenes of Luke 24 as the empty tomb provides the absence which the resurrection appearances overcome through recognition of the risen Lord and the ascension functions as the climactic conclusion of the recognition scenes in Luke 24 with the disciples' final recognition and emotional response of worship. Throughout my exegetical discussion, I noted how the recognition type-scene provided an interpretive grid for a number of key elements of the chapter such as the stress on evidence of Jesus' resurrection, the density of emotional language, and the commission of the disciples as witnesses. In both form and content, Luke 24 was demonstrated to participate in the recognition tradition.

Chapter 5 explored the ways that recognition in Luke 24 functions within the overall narrative of Luke-Acts. I argued that the recognition scenes of Luke 24 offered a climax to the plot and characterization of the Gospel of Luke through the cognitive, affective, commissive, and

hermeneutic function of recognition on both the level of the characters internal to the narrative and in the experience of the reader. While Luke 24 brings Luke's Gospel to its powerful climax, I also noted how the recognition scenes provided an openness to further narration in Acts. The role of the recognition scenes in Luke 24 in concluding the Gospel and grounding Acts was also demonstrated by the incorporation of wider literary themes from Luke-Acts into Luke 24. Chapter 5 concluded with a reflection on the role of recognition in the wider theological vision of Luke-Acts, showing that the recognition scenes capture the unique surprise of the resurrection of Jesus for the disciples while also providing a literary technique capable of describing on-going religious experience.

On the whole, it is clear that the recognition type-scene is an important interpretive framework for the resurrection appearances in Luke 24 and for Luke-Acts as a whole. The use of the recognition tradition also suggests clear literary aspirations for the author of Luke-Acts. The literary technique not only locates Luke-Acts solidly within the literary milieu of the first centuries CE, but also suggests, in the words of Frances Young, a kind of culture take-over bid in which the best of the biblical and classical traditions are reworked around the risen Messiah in service of the message of God's Kingdom.[770] Luke is not a slave to the recognition conventions, but is a creative reworker whose theological vision has shaped the literary technique and, in the process, laid the foundation for the technique's appropriation by later Christian writings. In this regard, the analysis of Luke 24 in the wider ancient literary tradition of recognition has opened up new avenues for further interdisciplinary research.

First, my work invites several possibilities for further New Testament research. The attempt to situate the form of the resurrection appearance in a clearly defined ancient literary

[770] Frances M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 286–88.

category joins a growing conversation to provide a more historically situated assessment of the literary strategies and techniques used by Luke-Acts.[771] The exploration of the overlap of recognition in Luke 24 with the emphasis on the role of Scripture and hospitality also seems ripe for further exploration.[772] Most importantly, I hope my study of the role of recognition in Luke 24 will be included in the conversation about recognition in the New Testament already underway among Johannine scholars.[773] My concentration on Luke can serve as a point of comparison with recognition in John's Gospel and begin a conversation about the different ways that the recognition type-scene was used in the New Testament.

Second, this work invites further research on the role of recognition in Luke as part of the wider Greco-Roman literary milieu. Recent works have continued to highlight the differences between the New Testament and the classical tradition, not least with respect to its literary styles and sophistication. However, my work suggests a deeper appreciation for the literary achievement of Luke-Acts as both similar and distinct from the classical tradition. It invites a more nuanced assessment of the role of the New Testament in its wider classical literary mileu.[774] While the New Testament may lack the stylistic and literary sophistication of much classical literature, it would be interesting to explore what, if any, unique literary features or

---

[771] Good examples of reading Luke-Acts in light of ancient literary traditions include York, *The Last Shall Be First*; Weaver, *Plots of Epiphany*; Joshua W. Jipp, *Divine Visitations and Hospitality to Strangers in Luke-Acts: An Interpretation of the Malta Episode in Acts 28:1-10*, NovTSup (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

[772] On the growing importance of hospitality in the study of Luke-Acts, see Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels*; Byrne, *The Hospitality of God*; Joshua W. Jipp, *Saved by Faith and Hospitality* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017).

[773] See the role of recognition scenes in Johannine scholarship by Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*; Larsen, *Recognizing the Stranger*.

[774] Taylor, *Classics and the Bible*.

developments the New Testament introduced into the literary milieu of Late Antiquity.[775] Luke 24's awareness of the wider recognition tradition also invites further research into the reading habits and literary pretensions of the earliest Christians.[776]

Third, this work invites further research on recognition in the biblical material in reception history and literary theory. The landmark works on recognition as a literary technique by Piero Boitani and Terence Cave both note, in various ways, the unique contribution of the biblical tradition.[777] However, their assessment leaves undeveloped the on-going importance of the Bible for shaping the recognition tradition in the literary canon of the Western world.[778] For instance, the recognition scenes in Luke 24 are invoked in both Dante's *Inferno* and T.S. Eliot's *Wasteland*.[779] There is still more to be said about the influence of the Bible (and perhaps the Gospel of Luke in particular) in the on-going recognition tradition in the West.

There are numerous opportunities for further research generated by this study. If this work has been successful, it has hopefully produced its own *anagnorisis* in the reader, moving them from ignorance of the possibilities to a new horizon of knowledge. In this sense, the interpretation of recognition in Luke 24 has raised the readers with the risen Lord beyond the limits of previous scholarship into a new knowledge that warrants further reflection.

---

[775] One thinks in particularly about the unique emphasis placed on conversion in the biblical and Christian literary tradition which, despite parallels in Greco-Roman philosophy, nevertheless results in a range of unique literary accomplishments including St. Augustine's *Confessions.*

[776] Consider the work on patristic exegesis against the backdrop of ancient literary theory in Frances M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). See also the work of Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).

[777] See Boitani, *The Bible and Its Rewritings*. The biblical use of recognition is largely bracketed by Cave, *Recognitions*. However, for much of the Western literary tradition Aristotle stood side by side and was often second only to the importance of the Bible for shaping the literary imagination.

[778] For some possible direction for this research, consider Frye, *The Great Code*; Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis.*

[779] Boitani, "Something Divine in Recognition," 20.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Barry B. *Coming-to-Know: Recognition and the Complex Plot in Shakespeare*. Studies in Shakespeare 10. New York: Lang, 2000.

Adelman, Rachel. "Ethical Epiphany in the Story of Judah and Tamar." Pages 51-76 in *Recognition and Modes of Knowledge: Anagnorisis from Antiquity to Contemporary Theory*. Edited by Teresa G. Russo. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2008.

Aletti, Jean-Noël. *L'art de raconter Jésus Christ: L'écriture narrative de l'évangile de Luc*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1989.

———. *The Birth of the Gospels as Biographies with Analyses of Two Challenging Pericopes*. Translated by Peggy Manning Meyer. AnBib 10. Rome: Gregorian and Biblical Press, 2017.

Alexander, Loveday. "Luke's Preface in the Context of Greek Preface-Writing." *NovT* 28.1 (1986): 48–74.

———. *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1-4 & Acts 1.1*. SNTSMS 78. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Allison, Dale C. *Testament of Abraham*. CEJL. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003.

Alsup, John E. *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition: A History-of-Tradition Analysis; with Text-Synopsis*. Calwer Theologische Monographien 5. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1975.

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. Rev. and updated. New York: Basic Books, 2011.

———. *The Five Books of Moses: A Translation with Commentary*. 1st ed. New York: Norton, 2004.

Anderson, John Edward. *Jacob and the Divine Trickster: A Theology of Deception and YHWH's Fidelity to the Ancestral Promise in the Jacob Cycle*. Siphrut 5. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011.

Anderson, Kathy Lorraine. "Recognizing the Risen Christ: A Study of the Non-Recognition/Recognition Motif in the Post-Resurrection Appearance Narratives (Luke 24:13-35; John 20:11-18; and John 21:1-14)." M.A. thesis, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 2004.

Anderson, Kevin L. *"But God Raised Him from the Dead": The Theology of Jesus' Resurrection in Luke-Acts*. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006.

Annet, Peter. *The Resurrection of Jesus Considered in Answer to The Tryal of the Witnesses. By a Moral Philosopher*, 2nd ed. (London: 1743). http://find.galegroup.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=emory&tabID=T001&docId=CW120268273&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE.

Arterbury, Andrew E. *Entertaining Angels: Early Christian Hospitality in Its Mediterranean Setting*. New Testament Monographs 8. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2005.

Ascough, Richard S. "Narrative Technique and Generic Designation: Crowd Scenes in Luke-Acts and in Chariton." *CBQ* 58.1 (1996): 69–81.

Auerbach, Erich.*Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Translated by Willard R. Trask. 1st Princeton Classics ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013.

Auld, A. Graeme. *I and II Samuel*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012.

Aune, David Edward. *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*. 1st ed. LEC 8. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987.

Baban, Octavian D. *On the Road Encounters in Luke-Acts: Hellenistic Mimesis and Luke's Theology of the Way*. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006.

Baden, Joel S. *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis*. AYBRL. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.

Baird, William. *History of New Testament Research, Volume 2: From Jonathan Edwards to Rudolph Bultmann*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.

Bailey, James L., and Lyle D. Vander Broek. *Literary Forms in the New Testament: A Handbook*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992.

Bailey, John Amédée. *The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John.* NovTSup 7. Leiden: Brill, 1963.

Barclay, John M. G. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE - 117 CE)*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Barker, Margaret. "The Archangel Raphael in the Book of Tobit." Pages 118–28 in *Studies in the Book of Tobit: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Edited by Mark Bredin. LSTS 55. London: T&T Clark, 2006.

Barnett, Lionel D. *The Greek Drama.* Folcroft, PA: Folcroft Library Editions, 1972.

Bates, Matthew W. "Closed-Minded Hermeneutics?: A Proposed Alternative Translation for Luke 24:45." *JBL* 129.3 (2010): 537–57.

Baum, Armin Daniel. "Lk 1,1-4 Zwischen Antiker Historiografie Und Fachprosa: Zum Literaturgeschichtlichen Kontext Des Lukanischen Prologs." *ZNW* 101.1 (2010): 33–54.

Beavis, Mary Ann. *Mark*. Paideia. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011

Benoit, Pierre. *The Passion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ.* Translated by Benet Weatherhead. New York: Herder and Herder, 1969.

Bernadicou, Paul J. "Lucan Theology of Joy." *ScEs* 25.1 (1973): 75–98.

———. "Lukan Theology of Joy Revisited." *ScEs* 30.1 (1978): 57–80.

Betz, Hans Dieter. "Origin and Nature of Christian Faith According to the Emmaus Legend." *Int* 23.1 (1969): 32–46.

———. "Zum Problem Der Auferstehung Jesu in Lichte Der Grieschen Magischen Papyri." Pages 230–61 in *Gesammelte Aufsatze I: Hellenismus Und Urchristentum*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990.

Blachman, Esther. *The Transformation of Tamar (Genesis 38) in the History of Jewish Interpretation*. CBET 71. Leuven: Peeters, 2013.

Boitani, Piero. "Something Divine in Recognition." Pages 1–32 in *Recognition and Modes of Knowledge*. Edited by Teresa G. Russo. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2013.

———. *The Bible and Its Rewritings*. Translated by Anita Weston. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Bonaventure. *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke Chapters 17-24*. Translated by Robert J. Karris. Bonaventure Texts in Translation Series. St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute Publications, 2004.

Bond, Godfrey. "Euripides' Parody of Aeschylus." *Herm* 118 (1974): 1–14.

Bosworth, David A. "Weeping in Recognition Scenes in Genesis and the Odyssey." *CBQ* 77.4 (2015): 619–39.

Boulhol, Pascal. *Αναγνώρισμος: La Scène De Reconnaissance Dans L'Hagiographie Antique Et Médiévale*. Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l'Université de Provence, 1996.

Bovon, François. *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002.
———. *Luke 3: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 19:28-24:53*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.
Bowersock, G. W. *Fiction as History: Nero to Julian*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
Braginskaya, Nina. "Joseph and Aseneth in Greek Literary History: The Case of the 'First Novel.'" *The Ancient Novel and Early Christian and Jewish Narrative: Fictional Intersections*. Edited by Marila P. Futre Pinheiro, Judith Perkins, and Richard Pervo. Havertown: Barkhuis, 2012.
Brooks, Peter. *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative*. New York: Knopf, 1984.
Brown, Francis, S.R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010.
Brueggemann, Walter. *Genesis*. IBC. Atlanta: John Knox, 1982.
Brunk, George Rowland. "The Concept of the Resurrection According to the Emmaus Account in Luke's Gospel." Ph.D. Dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, 1975.
Bultmann, Rudolf. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Rev. ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1963.
Burchard, Christoph, Carsten Burfeind, and Uta Barbara Fink. *Joseph und Aseneth*. PVTG 5. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
Burchard, C. "Joseph and Aseneth: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 177–247 in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Vol. 2. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1983.
Burridge, Richard A. *What Are the Gospels?: A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*. SNTSMS 70. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
Byrne, Brendan. *The Hospitality of God: A Reading of Luke's Gospel*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000.
Cadbury, Henry J. "Commentary on the Preface of Luke: Appendix C." Pages 489-510 in *BegC* vol.1. London: Macmillan, 1922.
———. *The Making of Luke-Acts*. London: SPCK, 1968.
Călinescu, Matei. *Rereading*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.
Caputo, John D. *What Would Jesus Deconstruct?: The Good News of Postmodernity for the Church*. Church and Postmodern Culture. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
Carroll, John T. *Jesus and the Gospels: An Introduction*. 1st ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2016.
———. *Luke: A Commentary*. 1st ed. NTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2012.
Carter, Timothy Leonard. "Marcion's Christology and Its Possible Influence on Codex Bezae." *JTS* 61.2 (2010): 550–82.
Cartledge, Paul. *Aristophanes and His Theatre of the Absurd*. Classical World Series. Bristol: Bristol Classical, 1990.
Catchpole, David R. *Resurrection People: Studies in the Resurrection Narratives of the Gospels*. Macon, GA.: Smyth & Helwys, 2002.
Cave, Terence. *Recognitions: A Study in Poetics*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1988.
Chance, J. Bradley. "Divine Prognostications and the Movement of Story: An Intertextual Exploration of Xenophon's Ephesian Tale and the Acts of the Apostles." Pages 219–34 in

Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative. Edited by Ronald F. Hock, J. Bradley Chance, and Judith Perkins. SBLSymS 6. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
Chesnutt, Randall D. *From Death to Life: Conversion in Joseph and Aseneth*. JSPSup 16. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.
Clark, Matthew. "Formulas, Metre and Type-Scenes." Pages 117–38 in *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. Edited by Robert Fowler. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
Clines, David J.A., ed. *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. 9 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.
Clivaz, Claire. "'Incroyants de Joie' (Lc 24,41): Point de Vue, Histoire et Poetique." Pages 184–95 in *Regards Croises Sur La Bible: Etudes Sur Le Point de Vue. Actes Du III Colloque International Du Reseau de Recherche En Narrativite Biblique. Paris 8-10 Juin 2006.* LD. Paris: Cerf, 2007.
Cohen, Shaye J. D. *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*. 3rd ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2014.
Coleridge, Mark. *The Birth of the Lukan Narrative: Narrative as Christology in Luke 1-2*. JSNTSup 88. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St. Luke*. Translaed by Geoffrey Buswell. London: Faber and Faber, 1960.
Cotter, David W. *Genesis*. Berit Olam. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003.
Culbertson, Diana. *The Poetics of Revelation: Recognition and the Narrative Tradition*. StABH 4. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1989.
Culpepper, R. Alan. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. FF. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
———. "The Gospel of Luke." *The New Interpreter's Bible. Volume IX*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1995.
———. "The Plot of John's Story of Jesus." *Int* 49.4 (1995): 347–58.
Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
Danker, Frederick W. *Luke*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
Darr, John A. *On Character Building: The Reader and the Rhetoric of Characterization in Luke-Acts*. Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992.
Daube, David. "On Acts 23: Sadducees and Angels." *JBL* 109.3 (1990): 493–97.
De Long, Kindalee Pfremmer. *Surprised by God: Praise Responses in the Narrative of Luke-Acts*. BZNW 166. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
Dibelius, Martin. *From Tradition to Gospel*. New York: Scribner, 1965.
Dicken, Frank. *Herod as a Composite Character in Luke-Acts*. WUNT 2.375. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
Di Lella, Alexander A. "The Book of Tobit and the Book of Judges: An Intertextual Analysis." *Hen* 22 (2000): 197–205.
Dillon, Richard J. *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word: Tradition and Composition in Luke 24*. AnBib 82. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978.
———. "Previewing Luke's Project from His Prologue (Luke 1:1-4)." *CBQ* 43.2 (1981): 205–27.

Dinkler, Michal Beth. *Silent Statements: Narrative Representations of Speech and Silence in the Gospel of Luke*. BZNW 191. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013.
———. "'The Thoughts of Many Hearts Shall Be Revealed': Listening in on Lukan Interior Monologues." *JBL* 134.2 (2015): 373–99.
Dodd, C.H. "The Appearance of the Risen Christ: An Essay in Form-Criticism of the Gospels." Pages 102-133 in *More New Testament Studies*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.
Doniger, Wendy. "Narrative Conventions and Rings of Recognition." Pages 13–25 in *Recognition: A Poetics of Narrative: Interdisciplinary Studies on Anagnorisis*. Edited by Philip Kennedy and Marylin Lawrence. Studies on Themes and Motifs in Literature 96. New York: Lang, 2008.
Du Plessis, I. I. "Once More: The Purpose of Luke's Prologue (Lk 1:1-4)." *NovT* 16.4 (1974): 259–71.
Dupont, Jacques. "Les Disciples D'Emmaüs." Pages 1153–81 in *Études Sur Les Evangiles Synoptiques*. Vol.2. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985.
———. "Les Pèlerins D'Emmaüs (Lc 24,13-35)." Pages 1128–52 in *Études Sur Les Evangiles Synoptiques*. Vol. 2. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1985.
Eckey, Wilfried. *Das Lukasevangelium: unter Berücksichtigung seiner Parallelen*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004.
Eckstein, Hans-Joachim. "Bodily Resurrection in Luke." Pages 115–23 in *Resurrection: Theological and Scientific Assessments*. Edited by Ted Peters, Robert John Russell, and Michael Welker. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
Eden, Kathy. *Poetic and Legal Fiction in the Aristotelian Tradition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.
Ehrhardt, Arnold. "Emmaus: Romulus and Apollonius." Pages 93–99 in *Mullus: Festschrift Theodor Klauser*. JAC 1. Munster: Aschendorffsche, 1964.
Enyioha, Bennett Uchegbulam. "Nonrecognition as a Motif in the Post-Resurrection Appearance Narratives." Ph.D. Thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1985.
Epp, Eldon Jay. "The Ascension in the Textual Tradition of Luke-Acts." Pages 131–45 in *New Testament Textual Criticism; Its Significance for Exegesis: Essays in Honor of Bruce M Metzger*. Edited by Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee. Oxford: Clarendon, 1981.
Feldman, Louis H. "Josephus' Portrait of Jacob." *JQR* 79.2/3 (1988): 101–51.
———. *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*. HCS 27. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
Felton, D. *Haunted Greece and Rome: Ghost Stories from Classical Antiquity*. 1st ed. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1999.
Ferguson, Everett. *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
Fiorenza, Francis Schüssler. *Foundational Theology: Jesus and the Church*. New York: Crossroad, 1984.
Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. 1st ed. AB 28-28A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981
———. *Tobit*. CEJL. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003.
Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*. WUNT 2.94. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
Flückiger-Guggenheim, Daniela. *Göttliche Gäste: Die Einkehr von Göttern und Heroen in Der griechisischen Mythologie*. Bern: Peter Lang, 1984.
Ford, Andrew. "The Purpose of Aristotle's *Poetics*." *CP* 110.1 (2015): 1-21.

Frei, Hans W. *The Identity of Jesus Christ: The Hermeneutical Bases of Dogmatic Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
Frenschowski, Marco. *Offenbarung und Epiphanie*. 2 vols. WUNT 2.79–80. Tübingen: Mohr, 1995.
Frye, Northrop. *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature*. 1st ed. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1982.
Fuller, Reginald H. *The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.
Gainsford, Peter. "Formal Analysis of Recognition Scenes in the 'Odyssey.'" *JHS* 123 (2003): 41–59.
Gamble, Harry Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. *From Darkness to Light: Aspects of Conversion in the New Testament*. OBT 20. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
Garrett, Susan R. *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
Geoghegan, Jeffrey C. "Israelite Sheepshearing and David's Rise to Power." *Bib* 87 (2006): 55-63.
Gillman, John. "The Emmaus Story in Luke-Acts Revisited." Pages 165–88 in *Resurrection in the New Testament: Festschrift J. Lambrecht*. Edited by R. Bieringer, V. Koperski, and B. Lataire. BETL 165. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002.
Goldhill, Simon. *Reading Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
Goodacre, Mark S. *The Case against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and Synoptic Problem*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001.
Goodman, David. "Do Angels Eat?" *JJS* 37.2 (1986): 160–75.
Green, Joel B. *Conversion in Luke-Acts: Divine Action, Human Cognition, and the People of God*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.
———. *The Gospel of Luke*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
———. *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke*. New Testament Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
Gregory, Andrew F. and C. Kavin Rowe, eds. *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2010.
Gregory, Andrew F. *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century*. WUNT 2.169. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
Gregory, Justina. "Euripidean Tragedy." Pages 251–70 in *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005.
Griffith, Mark. "'Telling the Tale': A Performing Tradition from Homer to Pantomime." Pages 13-35 in *Cambridge Companion of Greek and Roman Theatre*. Edited by Marianne McDonald and J. Michael Walton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
Gruen, Erich S. *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.
———. *Heritage and Hellenism the Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. HCS 30. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
Grundmann, Walter. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. *THAT* 3. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961.
Gunkel, Hermann. *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903.

Gutzwiller, Kathryn J. *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature*. Blackwell Guides to Classical Literature. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007.
Habel, Norman C. "Form and Significance of the Call Narratives." *ZAW* 77.3 (1965): 297–323.
Hägg, Tomas. *The Art of Biography in Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
Hall, Edith. *The Return of Ulysses: A Cultural History of Homer's Odyssey*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2008.
Hamm, Dennis. "Sight to the Blind: Vision as Metaphor in Luke." *Bib* 67.4 (1986): 457–77.
Hamori, Esther J. *When Gods Were Men: The Embodied God in Biblical and Near Eastern Literature*. BZAW 384. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
Hansen, William. Introduction to *Phlegon's Book of Marvels*, by Phlegon of Tralles. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1996.
Harrison, S.J. "Apuleius' Metamorphoses." Pages 491-516 in *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Edited by Gareth Schmeling. *Mnemosyne* 159. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
Hartsock, Chad. *Sight and Blindness in Luke-Acts: The Use of Physical Features in Characterization*. BibInt 94. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
Hauck, Friedrich. *Das Evangelium des Lukas (Synoptiker II)*. *THAT* 3. Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchandlung D. Werner Scholl, 1934.
Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016.
———. "Reading Scripture in Light of the Resurrection." Pages 216–38 in *The Art of Reading Scripture*. Edited by Ellen F. Davis and Richard B. Hays. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
Heil, John Paul. *The Meal Scenes in Luke-Acts: An Audience-Oriented Approach*. SBLMS 52. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999.
Henderson, Jeffrey. Introduction to *Women at the Thesmophoria* by Aristophanes. LCL 179. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.
Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. 1st ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
Herington, John. *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.
Holzberg, Niklas. "The Genre: Novels Proper and Fringe." Pages 11–28 in *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Edited by Gareth Schmeling. *Mnemosyne* 159. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
Hubbard, Benjamin Jerome. "The Matthean Redaction of a Primitive Apostolic Commissioning: An Exegesis of Matthew 28:16-20." PhD diss., University of Iowa, 1973.
Huddlestun, John R. "Divestiture, Deception, and Demotion: The Garment Motif in Genesis 37-39." *JSOT*. 26.4 (2002): 47–62.
Humphrey, Edith McEwan. *Joseph and Aseneth*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.
Hurtado, Larry W. *Destroyer of the Gods: Early Christian Distinctiveness in the Roman World*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016.
Janko, Richard. *Aristotle on Comedy: Toward a Reconstruction of Poetics II*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
Jipp, Joshua W. *Divine Visitations and Hospitality to Strangers in Luke-Acts: An Interpretation of the Malta Episode in Acts 28:1-10*. NovTSup. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
———. *Saved by Faith and Hospitality*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017.
Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Gospel of Luke*. SP 3. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2006.
Jones, Christopher P. Introduction to *Apollonius of Tyana, Volume I: The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, by Philostratus. LCL 16. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Josipovici, Gabriel. *The Book of God: A Response to the Bible*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.
Juel, Donald. *Luke-Acts: The Promise of History*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1983.
Just, Arthur A. *The Ongoing Feast: Table Fellowship and Eschatology at Emmaus*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1993.
Kanavou, Nikoletta. *Aristophanes' Comedy of Names: A Study of Speaking Names in Aristophanes*. Sozomena 8. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.
Kearns, Emily. "The Return of Odysseus: A Homeric Theoxeny." *ClQ* 32.1 (1982): 2–8.
Kee, H.C. "Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 775–828 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Vol. 1. Peabody, MA.: Hendrickson, 1983.
———. "The Socio-Religious Setting and Aims of 'Joseph and Asenath.'" SBLSP (1976): 183–92.
Kennedy, George A. *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*, 2nd ed. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.
Kennedy, Philip F., and Marilyn Lawrence. "Introduction." Pages 1–12 in *Recognition: The Poetics of Narrative: Interdisciplinary Studies on Anagnorisis*. Studies on Themes and Motifs in Literature 96. New York: Lang, 2008.
Kerényi, Karl. *Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1927.
Kidd, Stephen E. *Nonsense and Meaning in Ancient Greek Comedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
Kim, Dohyung. "The Structure of Genesis 38: A Thematic Reading." *VT* 62 (2015): 550-60.
Kingsbury, Jack Dean. "The Plot of Luke's Story of Jesus." *Int* 48.4 (1994): 369–78.
Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1976.
Koenig, John. *New Testament Hospitality: Partnership with Strangers as Promise and Mission*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2001.
Kovacs, David. Introduction to *Helen*. LCL 11. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002.
Kruschwitz, Jonathan. "The Type-Scene Connection between Genesis 38 and the Joseph Story." *JSOT* 26.4 (2012): 383-410.
Kurz, William S. Kurz, William S. "Hellenistic Rhetoric in the Christological Proof of Luke-Acts." *CBQ* 42.2 (1980): 171–95.
———. *Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993.
Lake, Kirsopp. "The Command Not to Leave Jerusalem and the 'Galilee Tradition.'" *BegC*. Vol. 5L Additional Notes to the Commentary. Edited by Kirsopp Lake and F.J. Foakes Jackson. London: Macmillan, 1933.
Lambert, David A. *How Repentance Became Biblical: Judaism, Christianity, and the Interpretation of Scripture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
Larsen, Kasper Bro. *Recognizing the Stranger: Recognition Scenes in the Gospel of John*. BibInt 93. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
Lattimore, Richmond. Introduction to "Electra" in *Euripides II*. Complete Greek Tragedies 3rd ed. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2013.
Lee, DooHee. *Luke-Acts and "Tragic History": Communicating Gospel with the World*. WUNT 2.346. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Leuchter, Mark. "Genesis 38 in Social and Historical Perspective." *JBL* 132.2 (2013): 209–27.
Lewis, C.S. "Fern-Seed and Elephants." Pages 242–54 in *C.S. Lewis: Essay Collection and Other Short Pieces*. Edited by Lesley Walmsley. London: Harper Colllins, 2000.
———. "On Stories." Pages 491–504 in *Essay Collection and Other Short Pieces*. Edited by Lesley Walmsley. London: Harper Colllins, 2000.
Lieu, Judith. *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
Lohfink, Gerhard. *Die Himmelfahrt Jesu: Untersuchungen zu den Himmelfahrts- und Erhöhungstexten bei Lukas.* SANT 26. Munich: Kosel, 1971.
Lord, Albert Bates. *The Singer of Tales*. College ed. Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature 24. New York: Atheneum, 1976.
Louden, Bruce. *Homer's Odyssey and the Near East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
MacDonald, Dennis R. "Secrecy and Recognitions in the Odyssey and Mark: Where Wrede Went Wrong." Pages 139–53 in *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative*. Edited by Ronald F. Hock, J. Bradley Chance, and Judith Perkins. SBLSymS 6. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
———. *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
Maile, John F. "The Ascension in Luke-Acts." *TynBul* 37 (1986): 29–59.
Marguerat, Daniel. *The First Christian Historian: Writing the "Acts of the Apostles."* Translated by Ken McKinney, Gregory J. Laughery, and Richard Bauckham. SNTSMS 121. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002
Marincola, John. *Greek Historians*. *GR* New Surveys in the Classics 31. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
Marion, Jean-Luc. *Prolegomena to Charity*. Translated by Stephen E. Lewis. 1st ed. Perspectives in Continental Philosophy 24. New York: Fordham University Press, 2002.
———. "They Recognized Him; And He Became Invisible To Them." Translated by Stephen E. Lewis. *Modern Theology* 18.2 (2002): 145–52.
Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC 3. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
Matthews, Shelly. "Fleshly Resurrection, Authority Claims, and the Scriptural Practices of Lukan Christianity." *JBL* 136.1 (2017): 163–83.
McMahan, Craig Thomas. "More than Meets the 'I': Recognition Scenes in The Odyssey and Luke 24." *PRSt.* 35.1 (2008): 87–107.
Mekkattukunnel, Andrews George. *The Priestly Blessing of the Risen Christ: An Exegetico-Theological Analysis of Luke 24, 50-53*. New York: Lang, 2001.
Menander. *Epitrepontes*. Edited and translated by W. G. Arnott. LCL 132. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.
Méndez-Moratalla, Fernando. *The Paradigm of Conversion in Luke*. JSNTSup 252. London: T & T Clark, 2004.
Menn, Esther Marie. *Judah and Tamar (Genesis 38) in Ancient Jewish Exegesis: Studies in Literary Form and Hermeneutics*. JSJSup 51. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
Merenlahti, Petri. *Poetics for the Gospels*. SNTW. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2002.
Metzger, Bruce Manning. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1994.

Michelini, Ann Norris. *Euripides and the Tragic Tradition*. Wisconsin Studies in Classics. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987.
Miller, Richard C. *Resurrection and Reception in Early Christianity*. Routledge Studies in Religion 44. New York: Routledge, 2015
Minear, Paul Sevier. "Some Glimpses of Luke's Sacramental Theology." *Worship* 44.6 (1970): 322–31.
Mitchell, Margaret M. "Epiphanic Evolutions in Earliest Christianity," *Illinois Classical Studies* 29 (2004): 183-204.
———. "Origen, Celsus and Lucian on the 'Dénouement of the Drama' of the Gospels." Pages 215–236 in *Reading Religions in the Ancient World: Essays Presented to Robert McQueen Grant on His 90th Birthday*. Edited by David E. Aune and Robin D. Young. NovTSup 125. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
Momigliano, Arnaldo. *The Development of Greek Biography: Four Lectures.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.
Montiglio, Silvia. *Love and Providence: Recognition in the Ancient Novel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
Morgan, J.R. "Introduction." Pages 1–14 in *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*. Edited by J.R. Morgan and Richard Stoneman. London: Routledge, 1994.
———. "Make-Believe and Make Believe: The Fictionality of the Greek Novels." Pages 175-229 in *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*. Edited by Christopher Gill and T.P. Wiseman. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1993.
Muddiman, John. "Note on Reading Luke 24:12." *ETL* 48.3–4 (1972): 542–48.
Murnaghan, Sheila. *Disguise and Recognition in the Odyssey*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.
Myrsiades, Kostas. "Introduction: Early Recognition in the Odyssey." *College Literature* 38.2 (2011): ix–xi.
Neirynck, Frans. "Once More Luke 24,12." *ETL* 70.4 (1994): 319–40.
Neyrey, Jerome H. *The Resurrection Stories*. Wilmington, DE.: Glazier, 1988.
Nicholas, Dean Andrew. *The Trickster Revisited: Deception as a Motif in the Pentateuch*. StBibLit 117. New York: Lang, 2009.
Niditch, Susan. *Judges*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008.
———. *Underdogs and Tricksters: A Prelude to Biblical Folklore.* New Voices in Biblical Studies. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.
Niehoff, Maren. *The Figure of Joseph in Post-Biblical Jewish Literature*. AGJU 16. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
Nock, Arthur Darby. *Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo*. Brown Classics in Judaica. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1988.
Nuttall, Geoffrey F. *The Moment of Recognition: Luke as Story-Teller*. London: Athlone Press, 1978.
O'Collins, Gerald. *Interpreting the Resurrection: Examining the Major Problems in the Stories of Jesus' Resurrection*. New York: Paulist, 1988.
Ortlund, Dane C. "'And Their Eyes Were Opened, and They Knew': An Inter-Canonical Note on Luke 24:31." *JETS* 53.4 (2010): 717–28.
Osborne, Grant R. *The Resurrection Narratives: A Redactional Study*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1984.

Paige, Terence. "Who Believes in 'Spirit'?: Πνεῦμα in Pagan Usage and Implications for the Gentile Christian Mission." *HTR.* 95.4 (2002): 417–36.
Palumbo-Liu, David. "Method and Congruity: The Odious Business of Comparative Literature." Pages 46–59 in *A Companion to Comparative Literature*. Edited by Ali Behdad and Dominic Thomas. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.
Parsons, Mikeal C. and Richard I. Pervo. *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
Parsons, Mikeal C. "A Christological Tendency in P75." *JBL* 105.3 (1986): 463–79.
———. *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts: The Ascension Narratives in Context*. JSNTSup 21. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
Perkins, Judith. "Fictive *Scheintod* and Christian Resurrection." *R & T* 13.3–4 (2006): 396–418.
Perrin, B. "Recognition Scenes in Greek Literature." *AJP* 30.4 (1909): 371–404.
Pervo, Richard I. "Joseph and Asenath and the Greek Novel." *SBLSP* (1976): 171–81.
Petronius. *Satyricon.* Edited and translated by Sarah Ruden. Indianapolis: Hackett, 2000.
Plevnik, Joseph. "The Eyewitnesses of the Risen Jesus in Luke 24." *CBQ* 49.1 (1987): 90–103.
Powell, Mark Allan. "The Religious Leaders in Luke: A Literary-Critical Study." *JBL* 109.1 (1990): 93–110.
Prince, Deborah Thompson. "Resurrecting Certainty in the Gospel of Luke." *Leaven* 20.1 (2012): 25–30.
———. "The 'Ghost' of Jesus: Luke 24 in Light of Ancient Narratives of Post-Mortem Apparitions." *JSNT* 29.3 (2007): 287–301.
———. "'Why Do You Seek the Living among the Dead?': Rhetorical Questions in the Lukan Resurrection Narrative." *JBL* 135.1 (2016): 123–39.
———. "Visions of the Risen Jesus: The Rhetoric of Certainty in Luke 24 and Acts 1." PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 2005.
Propp, Vladimir. *Morphology of the Folktale*. Edited by Louis A. Wagner. 2nd ed. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1968.
Reardon, Bryan P. "Achilles Tatius and Ego-Narrative." Pages 80-96 in *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*. Edited by J.R. Morgan and Richard Stoneman: London: Routledge, 1994.
———. "Chariton." Pages 309–35 in *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Edited by Gareth Schmeling. *Mnemosyne* 159. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
———. *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
———. *The Form of Greek Romance*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1991.
Reece, Steve. *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene*. Michigan Monographs in Classical Antiquity. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993.
Rengakos, Antonios. "Homer and the Historians: The Influence of Epic Narrative Technique on Herodatus and Thucydides." Pages 183-214 in *La Poesie Epique Grecque: Metamorphoses D'Un Genre Litteraire.* Edited by Franco Montanari and Antonios Rengakos. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 2006.
Rhoads, David M. *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.
Rhoads, David M., and Kari Syreeni. *Characterization in the Gospels: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*. JSNTSup 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.

Richardson, N.J. "Recognition Scenes in the Odyssey and Ancient Literary Criticism." *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 4 (1984): 219-36.
Riesner, Rainer. "Wo Lag Das Neutestamentliche Emmaus (Lukas 24, 13)?" *ZAC* 11.2 (2007): 201–20.
Rigato, Maria-Luisa. ""Remember...Then They Remembered': Luke 24:6-8." Pages 93–102 in *Luke and Acts*. Edited by Gerald O'Collins and Gilberto Marconi. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell. New York: Paulinist, 1993.
Rutherford, Richard. "Tragedy and History." Pages 504–14 in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*. Edited by John Marincola. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007.
Said, Suzanne. "Myth and Historiography." Pages 76–88 in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*. Edited by John Marincola. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2007.
Sanders, E. P. "Testament of Abraham: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 871–902 in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth.Vol. 1 Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1983.
Sarna, Nahum M. *Genesis: The Traditional Hebrew Text with New JPS Translation*. JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1989.
Scafuro, Adele C. "Menander." Pages 218–38 in *The Oxford Handbook on Greek and Roman Comedy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
Schipper, Jeremy. *Parables and Conflict in the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
Schmeling, Gareth. "The Satyrica of Petronius." Pages 457-490 in *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Edited by Gareth Schmeling. *Mnemosyne* 159. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
Scholes, Robert. *The Nature of Narrative*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.
Schubert, Paul. "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24." Pages 165–86 in *Neutestamentliche Studien Für Rudolf Bultmann*. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1954.
Scodel, Ruth. *An Introduction to Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
———. "Sophoclean Tragedy." Pages 233–50 in *A Companion to Greek Tragedy*. Edited by Justina Gregory. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005.
Seim, Turid Karlsen. *The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke-Acts*. SNTW. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
Sharrock, Alison. *Reading Roman Comedy: Poetics and Playfulness in Plautus and Terence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
Shellard, Barbara. *New Light on Luke: Its Purpose, Sources and Literary Context*. JSNTSup 215. New York: Continuum, 2002.
Shiner, Whitney. "Creating Plot in Episodic Narratives: The Life of Aesop and the Gospel of Mark." Pages 155–76 in *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative*. Edited by Ronald F. Hock, J. Bradley Chance, and Judith Perkins. SBLSymS 6. Atlanta.: Scholars Press, 1998.
Shumate, Nancy. *Crisis and Conversion in Apuleius' Metamorphoses*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996.
Slater, Niall W. *Reading Petronius*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1990.
Smith, Daniel Alan. *Revisiting the Empty Tomb: The Early History of Easter*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2010.
———. "Seeing a Pneuma(Tic Body): The Apologetic Interests of Luke 24:36-43." *CBQ* 72.4 (2010): 752–72.

Smith, Edgar Wright. "Joseph and Asenath and Early Christian Literature: A Contribution to the Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti." Claremont Graduate School, 1974.
Somov, Alexey. *Representations of the Afterlife in Luke-Acts*. LNTS. London: Bloomsbury, 2017.
Sowa, Cora Angier. *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymns*. Chicago: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1984.
Spencer, Patrick E. *Rhetorical Texture and Narrative Trajectories of the Lukan Galilean Ministry Speeches: Hermeneutical Appropriation by Authorial Readers of Luke-Acts*. LNTS 341. London: T & T Clark, 2007.
Squires, John T. *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*.SNTSMS 76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
Sterling, Gregory E. "From the Thick Marshes of the Nile to the Throne of God: Moses in Ezekiel the Tragedian and Philo of Alexandria." SPhiloA 26 (2014): 115–33.
———. *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts, and Apologetic Historiography*. NovTSup64. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*. Indiana Literary Biblical Series. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.
Stewart, Douglas J. *The Disguised Guest: Rank, Role, and Identity in the Odyssey*. Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 1976.
Stoneman, Richard. "The Alexander Romance: From History to Fiction." Pages 117–29 in *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*. Edited by J.R. Morgan and Richard Stoneman. London: Routledge, 1994.
———. "The Metamorphoses of the Alexander Romance." Pages 601–12 in *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Edited by Gareth Schmeling. *Mnemosyne* 159. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
Strauss, David Friedrich. *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*. Translated by George Eliot. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973.
Strelan, Rick. "A Note on Ασφάλεια (Luke 1:4)." *JSNT* 30.2 (2007): 163–71.
Stuart, Donald Clive. "The Function and the Dramatic Value of the Recognition Scene in Greek Tragedy." *AJP* 39.3 (1918): 268–90.
Syreeni, Kari. "The Gospel in Paradigms: A Study in the Hermeneutical Space of Luke-Acts." Pages 36–57 in *Luke-Acts: Scandinavian Perspectives*. Edited by Petri Luomanen. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 54. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 1991.
Tager, Jens W. *Der Mensch und sein Heil*: *Studien zum Bild des Menschen und zur Sicht der Bekehrung bei Lukas*. SNT 14. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus G. Mohn, 1982.
Talbert, Charles H. *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*. SBLMS 20. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1975.
———. *Luke and the Gnostics: An Examination of Lucan Purpose*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1966.
———. *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
Tannehill, Robert C. *Luke*. ANTC. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.
———. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. 2 vols. FF. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
Taplin, Oliver. "Fifth-Century Tragedy and Comedy." Pages 9–28 in *Oxford Readings in Aristophanes*. Edited by Erich Segal. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

———. *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus: The Dramatic Use of Entrances and Exits in Greek Tragedy*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1977.
Taylor, John. *Classics and the Bible: Hospitality and Recognition*. Classical Literature and Society. London: Duckworth, 2007
Tilborg, Sjef van and Patrick Chatelion Counet. *Jesus' Appearances and Disappearances in Luke 24*. BibInt 45. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
Torrance, Isabelle. "In the Footprints of Aeschylus: Recognition, Allusion, and Metapoetics in Euripides." *AJP* 132 (2011): 177–204.
Townsend, John T. "The Date of Luke-Acts." Pages 47–62 in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. Edited by Charles H. Talbert. New York: Crossroad, 1984.
Twelftree, Graham C. *People of the Spirit: Exploring Luke's View of the Church* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009.
Tyson, Joseph B. *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006.
Vinson, Richard Bolling. *Luke*. SHBC 21. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2008.
Viviano, Benedict. "Sadducees, Angels, and Resurrection (Acts 23:8-9)." *JBL* 111.3 (1992): 496–98.
Von Rad, Gerhard. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Rev. ed. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972.
Wainwright, Geoffrey. *Eucharist and Eschatology.* London: Epworth, 1971.
Wallace, James Buchanan. "Benefactor and Paradigm." Pages 83–108 in *Ascent into Heaven in Luke-Acts*: *New Explorations of Luke's Narrative Hinge*. Edited by David K. Bryan and David W. Pao. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2016.
Waltke, Bruce, and Cathi J. Fredericks. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001.
Walton, Steve. "Jesus's Ascension through Old Testament Narrative Traditions." Pages 29–40 in *Ascent into Heaven in Luke-Acts*: *New Explorations of Luke's Narrative Hinge*. Edited by David K. Bryan and David W. Pao. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2016.
Weaver, John B. *Plots of Epiphany: Prison-Escape in Acts of the Apostles.* BZNW 131. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004.
Weiss, Naomi A. "Recognition and Identity in Euripides' Ion." Pages 33–50 in *Recognition and Modes of Knowledge: Anagnorisis from Antiquity to Contemporary Theory*. Edited by Teresa G. Russo. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2013.
Wenham, Gordon J. *Genesis 16-50*. WBC 2. Dallas: Word, 1994.
Westermann, Claus. *Genesis 12-36: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1985.
Wevers, John William. *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*. SCS 35. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
Whitmarsh, Tim. *Ancient Greek Literature*. Cultural History of Literature. Malden, MA: Polity Press, 2004.
Wilshire, Leland Edward. "Was Canonical Luke Written in the Second Century? —A Continuing Discussion." *NTS* 20.3 (1974): 246–53.
Williams, Michael James. *Deception in Genesis: An Investigation into the Morality of a Unique Biblical Phenomenon*. StBibLit 32. New York: Lang, 2001.
Wills, Lawrence M. *Ancient Jewish Novels: An Anthology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
Wilson, S. G. "Ascension: A Critique and an Interpretation." *ZNW* 59.3–4 (1968): 269–81.

Wintermute, O.S. "Jubilees: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 35–142 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigraph*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Vol. 2. Peabody, MA.: Hendrickson, 1983.

Wolter, Michael. *The Gospel According to Luke*. Translated by Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig. 2 vols. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016.

Woolston, Thomas. *A Sixth Discourse on the Miracles of Our Saviour, in View of the Present Controversy between Infidels and Apostates.* London, 1729. http://find.galegroup.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=emory&tabID=T001&docId=CW123369305&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE.

Wright, Matthew. "The Joy of Sophocles' Electra." *GR* 52.2 (2005): 172–94.

York, John O. *The Last Shall Be First: The Rhetoric of Reversal in Luke*. JSNTSup 46. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

Young, Frances M. *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Zwiep, Arie W. "Ascension Scholarship." Pages 7–26 in *Ascent into Heaven in Luke-Acts*: *New Explorations of Luke's Narrative Hinge*. Edited by David K. Bryan and David W. Pao. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2016.