

Easter III: Luke 24:13-35: Jesus Appears to Two People on Their Way to Emmaus.
Cf. Mk. 16:12-13

1. This is Luke's first narrative of Jesus appearing to anyone. Ylvisaker says that these two had been in Jerusalem and had witnessed Jesus' trial and knew all about His death and burial. That makes sense. One is named Cleopas, vs. 18. Whether that is the Clopas (note spelling) of Jn. 19:25 is much debated. The other has been identified with Luke, but that is ruled out by Lk. 1:1-4. Others have identified the second man with Simon Peter (since the days of Origen) but that is ruled out by the correct reading of vs. 34. In a word, we cannot identify these two beyond what the text says. Bengel says: "The godly are mentioned not for their own sake, but for the sake of others." Right. It's what we learn from this account that is important. One other thing: Morris makes the astounding observation that it cannot be proved conclusively from the Greek that both were men. Cleopas, of course, is a man. But the second person may have been his wife. It is clear that they were not of the Twelve. Neither are they called μαθηταί, "disciples". They were well acquainted with the Twelve and were disciples in the wider sense. What Morris says is worth pondering. In the final analysis, it makes little difference. We have been conditioned by tradition and art to consider both men, males.
2. Emmaus cannot now be identified. All our translations read the text of Nestle, sixty stades from Jerusalem. A στάδιον is six hundred feet. Therefore, eight of our translations read: "about seven miles". That's a walk of 2 1/2 to 3 hours.
3. Vs. 13: καὶ ἰδοὺ attracts our attention to something noteworthy. It applies to the whole account, vss. 13-35, a remarkable account, so very human but so very enlightening. δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν, as Morris points out does not necessarily mean that both were males. The antecedent of αὐτῶν is the disciples. Cf. vs. 33. They knew the disciples. ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, "on that very day", Easter Sunday. Note the periphrastic construction which indicates a slow walk.
4. Vs. 14: ὁμιλοῦν, impf. of continued action, a word denoting ordinary conversation. περὶ πάντων etc. denotes the trial, crucifixion, the Sabbath, the report of the women, and the fear and misgivings of the disciples.
5. Vs. 15: καὶ ἐγένετο, it really happened. "While they were conversing and debating." The second καὶ is idiomatic and is not translated. It introduces the main clause. αὐτοῦς is emphatic, "Jesus Himself". The text indicates that He approached them from behind and unobtrusively joined them. Likely they considered Him another traveller and continued their discussion unabated. δὲ is plainly "but". ἐκκρατοῦντο is impf. of continued action. It lasts till end of vs. 30. It is a passive verb. God is the agent. It's the antithesis to the verb in vs. 31. God "held" their eyes. God "opened" their eyes. We are reminded of Lk. 10:22. All synergism is gone. No man recognizes Jesus unless He causes and wills it. μὴ ἐπιγινῶναι denotes result. By the way, this implies that they had seen Him before. You can't recognize someone unless you've seen Him before.
6. Vs. 17: From what is said in this vs., it is clear that Jesus quietly listened for a while. His question shows that they were having an animated discussion. Cf. the reading of AV and NKJV with that of all the others. The former make the whole sentence a question, the latter two sentences. ἐστῆσαν means "they stopped (walking)." It also means they stopped conversing. σκυθρωπός "sullen, sad" denotes their sadness and their incredulity over Jesus' question.
7. Vs. 18: ἀποκριθεὶς means "in response". Σὺ is emphatic. μόνος, in thought, goes with both verbs. παροικεῖς denotes continued action, ἔγνωσ αorist ingressive action. It's an exclamatory question.

AAT: "Are you the only stranger living in Jerusalem who doesn't know what happened there these days?" παροικέω is used of an alien resident. τὰ γενόμενα denotes the things mentioned at end of vs. 14. It is a very human touch. It amounts to: "Man, where have you been the last few days?" This question implies that what happened to Jesus in Jerusalem caused such a stir that absolutely no one could be unaware of it.

8. Vs. 19: Ποῦα has the same meaning as interrogative τίνα, meaning simply "what things?" How human! The resurrection did not make Jesus less human. He is not pretending. He wants them to state their problem so He can help them. He is causing them to state their need. He is causing them to pray. "The things concerning Jesus of Nazareth" is explained in vss. 20-24. The relative clause from δε to λαοῦ identifies Jesus clearly. Cleopas explains carefully for, evidently, he considers Jesus totally ignorant of these affairs. ἐγένετο is either "was" or "proved to be", not "become". ἀνὴρ προφήτης is idiomatic for "a man who was a prophet." Now a problem. TEV: "This man was a prophet, and was considered by God and by all the people to be mighty in words and deeds." But JB: "Who proved he was a great prophet by the things he said and did in the sight of God and of the whole people." Does it denote approval of God and the whole people or where He spoke and worked? We prefer the former. And do they mean "prophet" in the sense of Deut. 18:15 (Lenski) or as Morris says: "Their perception of His Person was limited. Yet, in their hope for redemption (vs. 21) they must have seen Him as more. At any rate they had been impressed both by His deeds and His words and they characterized them alike as MIGHTY. They had seen the power of God in Jesus." In any case, they were confused.
9. Vs. 20: Here the "things concerning Jesus of Nazareth" are explained. ὅπως "how" introduces a noun clause. The blame for Jesus' betrayal and crucifixion is put squarely on the Jewish authorities. θανάτου is adjectival genitive, indicating the kind of judgment. The last καὶ is resultative.
10. Vs. 21: δὲ is "but". ἡμεῖς is emphatic. They dissociate themselves from the Jewish authorities. ἐλπίζομεν, impf. of continued action, a hope for them which is leading to despair. ὅτι introduces an indirect statement. Therefore ἐστίν is present tense. We would say "was". αὐτός "the very one". λυτροῦσθαι has caused much discussion. Does it mean "redeem" (RSV, TEV, NIV, NKJV, NASB); "liberate" (NEB); or "free" (JB and AAT)? "Redeem" implies that they had true Messianic hopes. "Liberate" or "free" might indicate that they shared false Messianic hopes, deliverance from Rome. Arndt remarks: "The two disciples admit that they had entertained the hope Jesus would show Himself as the Messiah; this hope they imply was an illusion." ἀλλά γε καὶ gives additional information. Our translations make ἔγει impersonal. But others (including BDF) make it personal: "He (Christ) now passes the third day since etc." ταῦτα denotes the trial, suffering and death.
11. Vs. 22: These two are on the verge of giving up entirely. ἀλλά καὶ gives a further reason for their attitude. Note the animated speech indicated by the word order. They speak of the women who had gone early to the tomb. ἐξέστησαν means "astonished" "amazed" or "astounded". That's all they did, they say. The women didn't convince them. ἡμεῖς proves that these two were there when the report was brought.
12. Vs. 23: In this vs. we have the inf. with subject accusative twice, a report by the women and a report by the angels. ὁπτασάν means "a disclosure of the unseen world." ἀγγέλων is adjectival, telling what kind of disclosure. The whole point of this vs. is the skepticism of the two.
13. Vs. 24: This vs. clearly describes the visit of Peter and John to the tomb, Jn. 20:3-10. οὕτως καθὼς "the situation exactly as". The situation is limited to the empty tomb as is clear from the final words.

αὐτὸν is emphatic by position: "But HIM they did not see." By the way, note the prepositional phrases ἐξ αὐτῶν, 13, ἐξ ἡμῶν, 22, σὺν ἡμῖν, 24. The disciples of Jesus and the larger group were a close-knit group. Vss. 20-24 clearly show that these two were holding on only by their finger nails. They were really skeptical about the report of the women because Peter and John did not actually see Jesus. How do we analyze the condition of these two? That begins in the next verse.

14. Vs. 25: αὐτὸς is likely emphatic "He Himself". He had listened to their whole problem. Now He takes over. It reminds one of the lengthy speeches in the book of Job. But finally the Lord Himself speaks. The rest of this verse is an exclamation. There are four synonyms, translated "foolish" in AV, in the NT. ἀνόητος (cf. Gal. 3:1.3); ἄσοφος (cf. Eph. 5:15); ἄφρων (cf. Lk. 11:40; 12:20) and μωρός (cf. Mt. 5:22; 23:17). The latter two are much stronger than the first two. Here ἀνόητος means that the intellect was misled because faith in the ENTIRE OT lacked. τῇ καρδίᾳ is dative of respect. τοῦ πιστεύειν is exegetical. It explains their folly and slowness. ἐπὶ means "on the basis of". Note importance of πᾶσιν. They did not deny the OT per se, but were oblivious to its most important content. οἷς is dative by attraction. οἱ προφῆται here and in vs. 27 means "the inspired writers".
15. Vs. 26: οὐχὶ introduces a question which demands an affirmative answer. ταῦτα, the things done to Jesus by Jews, Romans and all mankind. ἔδει, the necessity caused by the plan of God and its recorded nature in the Scriptures of the OT. παθεῖν, explains itself. τὸν Χριστὸν, the subject of both infinitives. καὶ "and so" (JB and AAT). Jesus entered glory through suffering. That was the God-ordained necessity, spelled out in the OT. Jesus had repeatedly told His disciples that resurrection would be preceded by betrayal, suffering and death. That was necessary. Like the disciples, these two on the way to Emmaus hoped in the deliverance and the glory but were oblivious to the suffering.
16. Vs. 27: καὶ "and then". The second καὶ "as well as". ἀρχόμενος is used absolutely, without an infinitive. He started with the Pentateuch but continued from there through the entire account of all the inspired writers. Note that forms of "all" are used twice in this verse. διερμήνευσεν αὐτοῖς "He explained for them." He must have spoken of specific prophecies, very likely also Gen. 3:15, types, symbols, etc., from the whole OT. What is the OT except the story of man's sin and the account of God's love, which centers in Christ Jesus? Cf. Jn. 5:39; Acts 3:18; Acts 8:35. τὰ περὶ ἐαυτοῦ: Christ is everywhere in the OT. Very likely Jesus spoke to these two for about two hours. What an exposition that must have been! And that's the way Christ expects His preachers to expound the OT.
17. Vs. 28: Note that Nestle 25th ed. makes a subparagraph here. The 26th ed. makes a major paragraph. Note forms of πορεύομαι, 13, 15, 28, all imperfects. First they're alone, next He joins them, here they're together. καὶ perhaps "and then". Note frequency of forms of αὐτός, Jesus, in this account, vss. 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, in some cases twice in the verse. Our attention is riveted on Jesus the Savior. προσποιήσατο does not mean that Jesus was play-acting. If they had not asked Him, likely He would have gone on. He forces Himself on no one. By the way, the whole context clearly indicates that these two lived in Emmaus.
18. Vs. 29: παρεβιάσαντο is the effective aorist. They strongly urged Him to stay and He did. λέγοντες is circumstantial, denoting means. They urged Him by what they said. NIV, JB, NEB and NASB read: "It is nearly evening and the day is almost over." Night time was not a good time to travel in these days. This was a prayer proceeding from faith. From this text comes the hymn: "Abide with me, fast falls the even tide." τοῦ μένειν is the inf. of purpose. By the way, did He stay with them? Yes. Where there is faith in Jesus and His Word, there is Jesus. He removed His visible presence later, but He stayed with them.

19. Vs. 30: καὶ ἐγένετο so frequent in Luke. ἐν introduces a temporal adverbial clause and means "while". At this point guest becomes host and there is no objection. Note two circumstantial participles, each followed by a verb, the first aorist, the second the impf. of ingressive action: "He began giving it to them." That is important because His action was interrupted. Augustine and Theophylact thought that this was the Eucharist. Rome, in its teaching of the Eucharist under one kind only, picked up this idea. And as Ylvisaker points out, unfortunately Melanchthon granted Rome too much. We read in *Apology*, Art. XXII, Two Kinds, Tappert 237: "They (Rome) quote passages that mention bread, like Lk. 24:35, which says that the disciples recognized Christ in the breaking of the bread. We do not seriously object if someone take these passages as referring to the sacrament. Still it does not follow that only one part was given; for by the ordinary usage of language, naming one part also signifies the other." Melanchthon is implying that wine was offered in this case. But Arndt, Lenski, Morris and Plummer argue against this view. Wine is not mentioned. And would Jesus have interrupted the Lord's Supper? It is unthinkable. The context calls for an evening meal after a walk of 2-3 hours.
20. Vs. 31: Note prominent position of αὐτῶν. διηνοήθησαν, antithetical to ἐκρατοῦντο, 16, is metaphorical for recognition. Note that it also is passive but this time aorist, effective aorist. καὶ "and as a result". They did not recognize Jesus by commitment or a decision. No synergism here. God Himself was the agent. Both this vs. and 16 clearly indicate that they had seen Jesus before. Read Mk. 16:12.13 at this point. There it is said that "He appeared in a different form," a form which they did not recognize. The second καὶ is "and then". ἀφαντος appears only here in NT. He became invisible. We think of the genus majesticum. In the glorified state Jesus' human nature fully uses the qualities of the divine nature, a great mystery to us. At first when He was with them visibly they were sullen, sad, skeptical. But now when He removes His visible presence, faith supports them and they are glad. What made the difference? The Word. They now believed Rom. 4:25. It's as simple as that.
21. Vs. 32: In vss. 14 and 17 πρὸς ἀλλήλους denoted reciprocal anxiety and gloom but here it denotes reciprocal joy. Οὐχὶ expects an affirmative answer. Cf. καρδιά here and in vs. 25. From a heavy, unbelieving heart to a burning one. Note the periphrastic, denoting continued action. For the metaphor cf. Ps. 39:3 and Jer. 20:9. The two ὡς which follow mean either "as" or "while". Note that both verbs are impf. of continued action. The second explains the first. Clearly the burning in their heart was caused by His exegesis of the OT. A model for all preachers.
22. Vs. 33: Nestle 25th makes this a subparagraph. The 26th makes it a major paragraph. ἀναστάντες denotes immediate action, as often. Therefore, αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ must mean "at once" (TEV, NIV) or "without a moment's delay" (NEB). NASB literally reads: "that very hour" which gives the same sense. They returned to Jerusalem, a remarkable thing to do after dark in those days. They went right back to the disciples whom they had left earlier in the day. ἠθροισμένους is the perfect participle of existing state. The eleven and those with them gathered together for the reason given in vs. 34. By the way, this must be the same gathering mentioned at Jn. 20:19-23. Thomas was not present but don't let the word "eleven" here bother you. This vs. uses "eleven" as I Cor. 15:5 uses "twelve".
23. Vs. 34: λέγοντας modifies the object in vs. 33. On the basis of the inferior reading, λέγοντες, some have assumed that Simon Peter was the second of the two disciples going to Emmaus. ὅτι introduces direct discourse. The second clause explains the first. Their proof of Jesus' resurrection was based on the fact that Jesus had appeared to Peter. Paul mentions this as one of the proofs of Jesus's resurrection at I Cor. 15:5. It must have happened after the two Emmaus disciples left Jerusalem in the afternoon.

24. Vs. 35: αὐτοὶ means the Emmaus disciples. ἐξηγοῦντο is impf. tense, "were explaining". This is the word from which "exegesis" is derived. Their report involved two matters: a) What happened on the way, and b) How He became known to them when they sat down to eat. Note that it's a form of γινώσκω, not οἶδα. The former generally means "to know from an outside source." God caused the recognition, not they. Synergism is eliminated. ἐν is variously translated "in, as, when, at" by the translations. But none take it as "by means of". That is important. There are those who claim that they celebrated the Lord's Supper and that they recognized Him "by means of" this. No. It is simply temporal. τοῦ ἄρτου is objective genitive.
25. Luther is quoted in F.C., S.D., Art. VIII, Person of Christ, par. 39-40, Tappert 598: "Zwingli calls that an alloeosis when something is said about the deity of Christ which after all belongs to the humanity, or vice versa--for example 'Was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer these things and enter into his glory?' Lk. 24:26. Here Zwingli performs a sleight-of-hand trick and substitutes the human nature for Christ. Beware, beware, of this alloeosis, for it is the devil's mask since it will finally construct a kind of Christ after whom I would not want to be called a Christian, that is, a Christ who is and does no more in his passion and death than any other ordinary saint. But if I believe that only the human nature suffered for me, then Christ would be a poor Saviour for me, in fact, he himself would need a Saviour. In short, it is indescribable what the devil attempts with this alloeosis."