

Blinded by Invisible Light Revisiting the Emmaus Story (Luke 24,13-35)¹

Bogdan G. BUCUR

Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, PA

“It is universally agreed that the Emmaus story is a gem of literary art. To submit it to tradition-historical analysis seems irreverent, for any analysis will fail to capture its true spirit. Nevertheless ... we must dare to lay the impious hands of criticism even upon this beautiful story”. Reginald Fuller once wrote these words, pointing out that, despite being subjected to intense scholarly scrutiny, Luke’s Emmaus story retains a certain aura of mysterious incomprehensibility². Why do the disciples not recognize

1. I would like to express my gratitude to the friends and colleagues who have offered their valuable feedback at various stages of this project: Dale Allison (Princeton Theological Seminary), Claire Clivaz (University of Lausanne), Edith Humphrey (Pittsburgh Theological Seminary), Arthur Just (Concordia Theological Seminary), Andrei Orlov (Marquette University).

2. R.H. FULLER, *The Formation of the Resurrection Narratives*, London, SPCK, 1972, p. 104. For relevant scholarship see, among others, N. HUFFMAN, *Emmaus among the Resurrection Narratives*, in *JBL* 64 (1945) 205-226; C.H. DODD, *The Appearance of the Risen Christ: An Essay in the Form Criticism of the Gospels*, in D.E. NINEHAM (ed.), *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1955, 9-35; P. WINTER, *The Treatment of His Sources by the Third Evangelist in Luke XXI–XXIV*, in *Studia Theologica* 8 (1955) 138-172; Id., *On Luke and Lucan Sources*, in *ZNW* 47 (1956) 217-242; O. CULLMANN, *The Breaking of Bread and the Resurrection Appearances*, in F.J. LEENHARDT – O. CULLMANN (eds.), *Essays in the Lord’s Supper*, London, Lutterworth, 1958, 8-16; R. ORLETT, *An Influence of the Liturgy upon the Emmaus Account*, in *CBQ* 21 (1959) 212-219; A. EHRHARDT, *The Disciples of Emmaus*, in *NTS* 10 (1963-64) 187-201; H. ANDERSON, *The Easter Witness of the Evangelists*, in *The New Testament in Historical and Contemporary Perspective: Essays in Memory of G.H.C. MacGregor*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1965, 35-55, esp. pp. 47-48; J. WANKE, *Wie sie ihn beim Brotbrechen erkannten: Zur Auslegung der Emmauserzählung*, in *BZ* 16 (1974) 180-192; J.E. ALSUP, *The Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories of the Gospel Tradition: A History-of-Tradition Analysis*, London, SPCK, 1975, esp. pp. 190-199, 214-265; R.J. DILLON, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word: Tradition and Composition in Luke 24*, Rome, Biblical Institute Press, 1978, esp. pp. 69-155; J. HUG, *La finale de l’Évangile de Marc (Mc 16:9-20)*, Paris, Gabalda, 1978; A. FEUILLET, *L’apparition du Christ à Marie-Madeleine (Jean 20,11-18): Comparaison avec l’apparition aux disciples d’Emmaüs (Luc 24,13-35)*, in *Esprit et Vie* 88 (1978) 14, 210-223; C. PERROT, *Emmaüs ou la rencontre du Seigneur (Luc 24,13-35)*, in *La Pâque du Christ, mystère de salut: FS F.-X. Durrwell* (Lectio divina, 112), Paris, Cerf, 1982, 159-166; J. DUPONT, *Les disciples d’Emmaüs*, in *La Pâque du Christ*, 167-195; É. CHARPENTIER, *L’officier éthiopien et les disciples d’Emmaüs (Luc 24,13-35)*, in *La Pâque du Christ*, 197-201; B.P. ROBINSON, *The Place of the Emmaus Story in Luke-Acts*, in *NTS* 30 (1984) 481-497;

Christ during their extensive conversation on the road? Why do they then suddenly recognize him at the breaking of the bread? And, once they have recognized him, why does he vanish?

In what follows I argue that some insight into the theological assumptions and intentions of the Emmaus story can be gained by reading Luke 24 in light of Second Temple traditions, present in the Lukan Transfiguration account, Mark's "Longer Ending", and the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (LAB), about the "glory" – expressed as luminous appearance – of the protoplast, of Moses, and of other elect individuals. Briefly put, Luke stated that the risen Christ had "entered glory", and very likely understood this as a permanent recovery of the luminous state of Adam in Eden, a state experienced only ephemerally by elect individuals. In a manner reminiscent of similar traditions about Moses and King David, the lack of recognition on the part of Jesus' two disciples is caused by the fundamental incompatibility between the "already" glorified state of the risen Christ and the "not yet" glorified state of the two disciples.

A. DELZANT, *Les disciples d'Emmaüs* (Luc 24,13-35), in *Revue des sciences religieuses* 73 (1985) 177-186; P. FIEDLER, *Die Gegenwart als österliche Zeit – erfahrbar im Gottesdienst: Die Emmausgeschichte Lk 24,13-35*, in I. BOER et al. (eds.), *Auferstehung Jesu – Auferstehung der Christen: Deutungen des Osterglaubens* (Questiones Disputatae, 105), Freiburg, Herder, 1986, 124-145; J. PLEVNIK, *The Eyewitnesses of the Risen Jesus in Luke 24*, in *CBQ* 49 (1987) 90-103; L. DUSSAUT, *Le triptyque des apparitions en Luc 24 (analyse structurelle)*, in *RB* 94 (1987) 161-213; E.H. SCHEFFLER, *Emmaus: A Historical Perspective*, in *Neotestamentica* 23 (1989) 251-267; F. SCHNIDER – W. STENGER, *Beobachtungen zur Struktur der Emmausperikope [Lk 24,13-35]*, in *Strukturelle Beobachtungen zum Neuen Testament* (NTTS, 12), Leiden, Brill, 1990, 72-92; H.-D. BETZ, *Ursprung und Wesen christlichen Glaubens nach der Emmauslegende (Lk 24,13-32)*, in *Synoptische Studien: Gesammelte Aufsätze II*, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1992, 35-49; A.A. JUST, *The Ongoing Feast: Table Fellowship and Eschatology at Emmaus*, Collegeville, MN, Liturgical Press, 1993; C. COMBET-GALLAND – F. SMYTH-FLORENTIN, *Le pain qui fait lever les Écritures: Emmaüs, Luc 24,13-35*, in *Études Théologiques et Religieuses* 68 (1993) 323-332; L.-M. CHAUVET, *Symbol and Sacrament: A Sacramental Reinterpretation of Christian Existence*, Collegeville, MN, Liturgical Press, 1995 [French ed. 1987], esp. pp. 161-170 ("The Structuring of Faith According to the Story of Emmaus"); W. ZWICKEL, *Emmaus: Ein neuer Versuch*, in *Biblische Notizen* 74 (1994) 33-36; J.D.M. DERRETT, *The Walk to Emmaus (Lk 24,13-35): The Lost Dimension*, in *Estudios Bíblicos* 54 (1996) 183-193; J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *Where Is Emmaus?*, in D.J. TAYLOR (ed.), *The Early Text of the Gospels and Acts*, Birmingham, Birmingham University Press, 1998, 229-244; S. VAN TILBORG – P. CHATELION COUNET, *Jesus' Appearances and Disappearances in Luke 24* (BIS, 45), Leiden, Brill, 2000, pp. 53-87; J.A. KELHOFFER, *Miracle and Mission: The Authentication of Missionaries and Their Message in the Longer Ending of Mark* (WUNT, 2.112), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2000; D.R. CATCHPOLE, *A Tale of Two Travelers: The Angelic Jesus of Luke*, in *Resurrection People: Studies in the Resurrection Narratives of the Gospels*, Macon, GA, Smyth & Helwys, 2002, 64-102; J. READ-HEIMERDINGER – J. RIUS-CAMPS, *Emmaous or Oulammaous? Luke's Use of the Jewish Scriptures in the Text of Luke 24 in Codex Bezae*, in *Revista Catalana de Teologia* 27 (2002) 23-42; A. DENAUX, *Studies in the Gospel of Luke: Structure, Language and Theology*, Berlin, Lit Verlag, 2010, pp. 285-296; I. RAMELLI, *The Emmaus Disciples and the Kerygma of the Resurrection (Lk 24,34): A Greek Variant and the Old Syriac, Coptic, and Latin Traditions*, in *ZNW* 105 (2014) 1-19.

I. THE INTERPRETIVE FRAMEWORK: JESUS AS PEDAGOGUE AND HEALER

Why were the disciples unable to recognize the risen Christ? “Their eyes *were held*” says Luke, with a passive hinting at divine intervention³. Why God keeps them in the dark about the mysterious stranger is perhaps best explained as a matter of divine pedagogy. When Jesus meets them, the two disciples are grieving. Still in a state of shock, trying to cope with their loss, they are again and again poring over “all these things that have happened” (Luke 24,14), “the things that have taken place there in these days ... the things about Jesus of Nazareth” (Luke 24,18-19). They seem unclear about whether Jesus of Nazareth was “a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people” (24,19) or a false Messiah (24,21: “we had hoped that he was the one to redeem Israel”).

It is significant, of course, that Jesus is called “a prophet” and “mighty in deed and word”⁴; it is no less significant, however, that Luke places these statements on the lips of a disciple whose spiritual understanding is severely impaired (cf. Luke 24,25, ἀνόητοι καὶ βραδεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ)⁵. This indicates, in my judgment, that the narrator deems Cleopas’ statement inadequate, incomplete, unsatisfactory. As Dillon observes, even though Cleopas’ characterization of Jesus as prophet amounts to a specifically Lukan Mosaic-prophet typology,

the disciples’ prophet-christology may not *adequately* express Luke’s understanding of Christ. But neither is the designation “prophet” to be considered false or misleading just because it is preliminary. Luke is not arguing dialectically when he applies the title to Christ; he is building positively towards a fuller portrait of him⁶.

3. Most commentators highlight the use of the *passivum divinum* at Luke 24,16 (“their eyes *were held*”). In fact, the passive is present at crucial junctures of the story: οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν ἐκρατοῦντο (24,16); αὐτῶν διηνοίχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί (24,31); ἐγνώσθη αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου (24,35). DILLON writes (*Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word* [n. 2], pp. 104, 133): “[T]he emphatic *passive* verb-forms of the narrative [...] express the exclusively *divine action* which brought about the sequence of blindness and recognition”; on the road to Emmaus we have “a *purposeful schedule of concealment and disclosure, divinely appointed*”. If the disciples’ inability to recognize the Risen One is a matter of divine action, the latter does not, however, exclude human responsibility: their eyes are “held” – by God – because their limited and distorted understanding (cf. Luke 24,25, ἀνόητοι καὶ βραδεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ) renders them unable or, in biblical parlance, “unworthy”, of a greater manifestation of the risen Christ.

4. ἀνὴρ προφήτης δυνατὸς ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ: cf. Acts 7,22 on Moses; ἀνὴρ προφήτης: cf. Judg 6,8 on Moses; ἐναντίον ... παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ: cf. Exod 34,12, ἔναντι παντὸς Ἰσραὴλ.

5. K.D. LITWAK, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God’s People Intertextually*, London, T&T Clark, 2005, 119: “In Luke 24.25, Jesus refers to the disciples as ἀνόητοι, ‘without understanding’, or ‘foolish’, contrasted often with being ‘wise’, e.g. Deut 32,31; Prov 15,21. This term refers not to someone who lacks mental capacities but to someone whose thinking needs correction”.

6. DILLON, *Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word* (n. 2), pp. 132, 122, 118. Similarly, JUST (*Ongoing Feast* [n. 2], p. 106) discerns “not a flawed Christology, but one looking for

Since it is the dull νοῦς and hardened heart that prevent the two from recognizing the very Jesus walking with them (Luke 24,15, ἀπὸ τὸς Ἰησοῦς), Jesus undertakes to cure his disciples precisely by opening their νοῦς (Luke 24,45) and melting their heart (Luke 24,32). The two disciples are moving from arrogance to humility⁷, from sadness and despair to abundant joy, from blindness to vision, from hosting a stranger to becoming guests at the Messiah's table. Their former understanding of τὰ περὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ (Luke 24,19) vanishes and gives way to the Messiah's own proclamation of τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ (Luke 24,27), which shapes their new identity as believers⁸. Overall, the Emmaus story documents a gradual process of conversion⁹, which ultimately reverses the course of the disciples' journey, leading them back to Jerusalem and reintegrating them into the community of disciples¹⁰. This radical change of perspective

completion. The Emmaus disciples were unable of incorporating into their Christology a confession of the scandal of the crucifixion". I agree with WANKE (*Zur Auslegung der Emmausgeschichte* [n. 2], p. 189) and, more recently, C.K. ROWE (*Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke*, Grand Rapids, MI, Baker Academic, 2006, pp. 187n. 97, 119n. 123) against many commentators who think that the traveler's dialogue is governed by Luke's "Mosaic prophet Christology": e.g., DILLON, *Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word*, pp. 117-132, 144; L.T. JOHNSON, *The Gospel of Luke*, Collegeville, MN, Liturgical Press, 1991, p. 394; K. ANDERSON, "But God Raised Him from the Dead": *The Theology of Jesus' Resurrection in Luke-Acts*, Milton Keynes, Paternoster, 2006, pp. 169, 172; J.B. GREEN, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT), Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 1997, p. 846; JUST, *Ongoing Feast*, p. 7.

7. Note that the *disciples* are instructing their *master* and are describing him, condescendingly, as "the only stranger" who does not "know" about "the things concerning Jesus of Nazareth", while it is they, in fact, who do not "know" him. The irony of the situation is unmistakable. Cf. GREEN, *Luke* (n. 6), p. 845; VAN TILBORG – CHATELION COUNET, *Jesus' Appearances and Disappearances* (n. 2), pp. 75-76; G.J. GOLDBERG, *The Coincidences of the Emmaus Narrative of Luke and the Testimonium of Josephus*, in *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 13 (1995) 59-77, p. 61.

8. BETZ, *Ursprung und Wesen* (n. 2), p. 48. The Emmaus legend sets forth, narratively, the birth and specificity of the Christian faith (pp. 41, 49). Cf. CHAUVET, *Symbol and Sacrament* (n. 2), p. 165: "the recognition of the resurrection of Jesus cannot truthfully take place without provoking the re-surrection of the disciples into witnesses".

9. This slow and gradual process is perhaps more clearly expressed in the Codex Bezae. READ-HEIMERDINGER – RIUS-CAMPS (*Emmaus or Oulammaous?* [n. 2], pp. 29-31) find it noteworthy that, at crucial junctures in the Emmaus pericope, the Codex Bezae uses simple verbs instead of verbs with the perfective compound: ἦν [...] ἐρμηνεύειν for διερμήνευσεν (24,27); ἠνοίγησαν for διηνοίχθησαν (24,31); ἦνοιγεν for διήνοιγεν (24,32). The point is, apparently, to emphasize that "[t]he task is started but not completed" (p. 29).

10. DILLON (*Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word* [n. 2], p. 93) points to the "real conceptual connection of *recognition* and *return*". The travelers left Jerusalem in confusion and disappointment; they now return there aglow with the revelation of the risen Lord". I must disagree here with the over-interpretation proposed by READ-HEIMERDINGER – RIUS-CAMPS (*Emmaus or Oulammaous?* [n. 2], p. 23): "like Jacob who was running away from his brother after tricking him, so the disciples can be seen to be fleeing after the betrayal of Jesus by members of their group. They need to escape from the sphere of the Jewish law, represented by Jerusalem, because the Messiah has been betrayed by his own people".

and direction bears witness to the efficacy of Christ's work as pedagogue and healer of infirmities¹¹.

II. EXITING AND ENTERING: THE GLORIFIED MESSIAH IN LUKE AND MARK'S "LONGER ENDING"

1. *Biblical Theophanies and the Apparition of the Glorified Messiah*

Jesus' sudden disappearance (Luke 24,31, ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν) indicates that his appearance, the dialogue with the two disciples, the opening of the Scriptures, the table fellowship at Emmaus, and the mysterious lack of recognition, have all been part of an extraordinary event, which, regardless of the unprecedented theological claim – an appearance of the Risen One – seems closely related to older theophanic texts. Scholarship has discussed at length the possible connections with Gen 18–19, Judg 6 and 13, Tobit 5–12¹², Gen 28 (supported by the reading Οὐλαμμοῦς for Ἐμμαοῦς in the Codex Bezae)¹³, Gen 21,19 (“And God opened her

11. It is well-known that, “in Luke's Gospel, Jesus is surrounded by an aura of healing and reconciliation that affects all who come into contact with him. [...] The main christological perspective in Luke is that Jesus is the one who brings *shalom*, that is, peace, healing, reconciliation, forgiveness, and wholeness” (JOHNSON, *Luke* [n. 6], p. 9).

12. For an exhaustive analysis of Jesus' appearance and disappearance in Luke 24 in relation to both Hellenistic epiphany myths and biblical and extra-canonical “anthropomorphic theophanies”, see ALSUP, *Post-Resurrection Appearance Stories* (n. 2), pp. 215-263, and HUG, *La finale* (n. 2), pp. 65-66. M.D. GOULDER (*The Evangelists' Calendar: A Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture*, London, SPCK, 1978, p. 81), followed by ROBINSON (*Place of the Emmaus Story* [n. 2], pp. 484-485) and C. FLETCHER-LOUIS (*Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* [WUNT, 2.94], Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1997, p. 63) connects Luke 24 with Gen 18–19 (Abraham entertains angels unawares, as the Emmaus disciples do with Jesus; the two men/angels in Gen 19 are constrained by Lot to enter his house, as Jesus is by the disciples (Gen 19,3LXX; Luke 24,29); the theme of new life (life from the dead womb of Sarah, and Jesus' Resurrection from the tomb) occurs in both narratives; Robinson adds further correspondences that would “confirm the influence of Gen 18–22 on Luke 24”: the action in both cases takes place at evening time, and during the Passover season (for Gen 18–19 during Passover season, see *Genesis Rabbah* and RASHI *ad loc.*); in Gen 19,11, the eyes of the Sodomites are supernaturally blinded by angelic power. For an analysis of the Emmaus story in relation to Tobit 5–12, see CATCHPOLE, *A Tale of Two Travelers* (n. 2), pp. 70-74.

13. J.A. FITZMYER (*The Gospel According to Luke* [2 vols, Anchor Bible, 28], Garden City, NY, Doubleday, 1985, vol. 2, p. 1561) thinks Οὐλαμμοῦς is “well-nigh inexplicable, unless it is a corruption of the ancient name of Bethel in LXX Gen 29:19”. However, READ-HEIMERDINGER – RIUS-CAMPS note (*Emmaous or Oulammaous?* [n. 2], p. 23 n.2) that some LXX minuscules read Οὐλαμμοῦς, and discover a rich weave of parallels between Luke 24 and Gen 28. For example, “their eyes were held” (Luke 24,16) corresponds to Jacob's sleep (Gen 28,11), while the opening of the eyes and recognition of Christ (Luke 24,31) to Jacob's awakening and realization that the Lord was in that place (Gen 28,16). Indeed, “the role of Jacob in the Genesis story is re-enacted by the disciples. They are initially heading for the place where God revealed himself in a dream to Jacob. On their way, they meet and talk with the resurrected Jesus [...] and realize who Jesus is as they eat with him at

[i.e., Hagar's] eyes"), 2 Kings 6,17 (at the prayer of Elisha, the eyes of the servant are opened, so that he may see the angelic armies invisibly present on the side of Israel)¹⁴, or the *Animal Apocalypse* (1 En 85–90), where "their eyes were opened"/"their eyes were darkened" refers to Israel's faithfulness to or apostasy from God¹⁵. Possible connections with writings of the New Testament have also been proposed: some scholars think that Luke intends his readers to connect the Emmaus story with the two narratives at Acts 8,26-40 (Philip and the eunuch)¹⁶, others suggest that Jesus' ability to disappear at will evokes the earlier episode of Luke 4,30 ("They ... led him to the brow of the hill on which their town was built, so that they might hurl him off the cliff. But he passed through the midst of them and went on his way")¹⁷.

These proposals are not without difficulty: the two disciples' misperception of Jesus is fundamentally different from the physical blindness of the Sodomites; Philip does not disappear from sight, but is removed *and relocated* by the Spirit; and the text at Luke 4 is so unclear that it can, at best, furnish only supporting evidence. At any rate, as Fletcher-Louis insists, Luke "has consciously chosen to challenge the identification of Jesus as an angel, as a weak and inadequate Christology"¹⁸. For my part, I suggest that the "logic" of the recognition-motif in Luke 24 should be sought in relation to the language of light and glory.

2. Luke on Resurrection as Entry into Glory

Luke seems to imply a link between the disciples' inability to recognize Jesus and the glorified state of the risen Messiah. It is clear, from the juxtaposition of Luke 24,26 ("Was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer ... and enter into his glory?") and 24,46 ("it is written that the

Bethel, where Jacob talked with God [...] Jesus, in revealing himself through his act of sharing the bread, signals to the disciples a change in the mode of God's dwelling on earth: he dwells no longer in a building of stone but in fellowship among the brethren" (*Emmaous or Oulammaous?* [n. 2], p. 33). Curiously, READ-HEIMERDINGER – RIUS-CAMPS do not draw the conclusion that Jesus is somehow equated with "the Lord" of the Genesis narrative.

14. EPHREM OF NISIBIS, *Par* 15.4.

15. See J. VANDERKAM, *Open and Closed Eyes in the Animal Apocalypse* (1 Enoch 85–90), in H. NAJMAN – J.H. NEWMAN (eds.), *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James Kugel* (JSJ.S, 83), Leiden, Brill, 2004, 279-292. VanderKam argues that the second-century BCE apocryphon (similarly to Philo) "transfers the etymology of the patriarch 'who sees God' from the individual Jacob/Israel to the nation Israel, and uses it to define its unique status" (p. 292) as the people of the covenant, the people that has seen God.

16. ROBINSON, *Place of the Emmaus Story* (n. 2), p. 483; DILLON, *Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word* (n. 2), p. 112; CHARPENTIER, *L'officier éthiopien et les disciples d'Emmaüs* (n. 2); CHAUVET, *Symbol and Sacrament* (n. 2), p. 162.

17. FLETCHER-LOUIS, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (n. 12), p. 70. I find Luke 4,30 too unclear to be of much help for the clarification of Luke 24.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 63 and *passim*.

Messiah is to *suffer and to rise from the dead*”) that Luke identifies Jesus’ resurrection with his “entry into glory”. The statement about “entering into glory” (Luke 24,26) harkens back to the angelic annunciation to the shepherds – when the latter find themselves immersed into the luminous glory of the Lord (Luke 2,9: δόξα κυρίου περιέλαμψεν αὐτούς), a state that “suddenly” (ἐξαίφνης) allows them to perceive “a large company of the heavenly armies”, πλῆθος στρατιᾶς οὐρανόυ (Luke 2,13) – and to the Transfiguration account, where the disciples “saw his glory” (Luke 9,32) and the two prophets “in [the same] glory” (Luke 9,31). Moreover, prior to his appearance “in glory” at the Transfiguration (Luke 9,31), Jesus declares that he “must undergo great suffering ... and on the third day be raised” (Luke 9,22)¹⁹.

It appears, then, as many have said before, that “glory” language offers the common element linking Transfiguration and Resurrection²⁰. Since the Messiah on the road to Emmaus has completed the predicted journey through suffering and death into glory, a fundamental incompatibility obtains between his state and that of his interlocutors. It is the same incompatibility first observed at the Transfiguration: the Master is “in glory” (Luke 9,31 and 24,26), while the disciples are not²¹.

3. *The Longer Ending of Mark: “In Glory” Means “In Another Form”*

The causal link between the glorified state of the risen Messiah and the inability of the disciples to recognize him, and the fact that this link is anticipated in the Transfiguration account seem also confirmed by the Longer Ending of Mark (LE): “After this he appeared in another form (ἐν ἑτέρῳ μορφῇ) to two of them, as they were walking into the country” (Mark 16,12). This verse is of particular relevance, because it constitutes

19. For a detailed discussion of the parallels between Luke 24 and Luke 9, see the excellent analysis in JUST, *Ongoing Feast* (n. 2), pp. 16-24, esp. pp. 20-23. According to DILLON (*Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word* [n. 2], p. 143), Jesus’ “exit” from this world, discussed with Moses and Elijah, corresponds to his announced “entry” into glory at the resurrection.

20. See FITZMYER, *Luke* (n. 13), vol. 2, p. 1566 and esp. vol. 1, p. 794: “[I]t is hard to think that Luke did not intend some connection between the episode [*i.e.*, the Transfiguration] and the risen status of Jesus. In fact he uses ‘glory’ explicitly of that status in 24:26”. Cf. F. BOVON, *Luke: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis, MN, Fortress, 2002, vol. 1, p. 377: “Jesus alone, *through his resurrection*, has entered into his δόξα, that is, into the glory of God that is now promised to him (24:26). [...] With the exception of the transfiguration, he will assume it only after his suffering”. Similarly, JOHNSON, *Luke* (n. 6), p. 396.

21. A variant reading in the Codex Bezae may also be of relevance here, because it signals, at the very least, a second-century interest in reading the Emmaus story in light of the biblical theme of glory. Luke 24,32 (Οὐχὶ ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν καιομένη ἦν [ἐν ἡμῖν] ὡς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὁδοῦ;) is rendered with a significant difference: Οὐχὶ ἡ καρδία ἦν ἡμῶν κεκαλυμμένη ὡς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὁδοῦ; The reference to the “veiled heart” evokes Exod 34,33-35 (cf. 2 Cor 4,3-6) and places the Emmaus story in a larger theological framework defined by the concern with the divine glory and its interaction with humans.

the earliest commentary of the Emmaus story: a gloss on Luke 24, shaped, perhaps, by a missionary agenda, or intended as a theological corrective of sorts²².

The expression ἐφανερώθη ἐν ἑτέρῳ μορφῇ is ambiguous: it could refer to an unusual physical appearance of Jesus, different from that previously known to his disciples; it could refer to an appearance different from the one previously reported (namely to Mary Magdalene, Mark 16,9-11); it could also be that the statement δυσὶν ... ἐφανερώθη ἐν ἑτέρῳ μορφῇ indicates a change in the disciples' perception rather than in Jesus himself. At any rate, it bears fruitful comparison with Jewish traditions about the changed appearance of the resurrected, such as in 2 Bar 49–51²³. How best to exploit this comparison remains, however, a debated issue²⁴.

22. DILLON, *Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word* (n. 2), p. 148: “a later generation’s conclusion concerning the otherwise inexplicable lack of recognition by the Lord’s followers as reported by the canonical account being excerpted”. The thesis that LE had no literary connection to the NT Gospels, advocated by HUG, *La finale* (n. 2), was convincingly refuted by M. Hengel and Kelhoffer. For a detailed articulation of these two options, together with an ample presentation of the history of interpretation, see KELHOFFER, *Miracle and Mission* (n. 2), pp. 84-90, 113, 130-145 and, respectively, HUG, *La finale*, pp. 61-67, 166-167, 221. M. Hengel first characterized Hug’s denial of any literary dependency of LE on NT Gospels as improbable (“unwahrscheinlich”) in view of LE’s heavy-handed editorial manipulation of the canonical Gospels (“die gewaltsam harmonisierende und stark verkürzende Verwendung der Berichte aus den anderen Evangelien ist unübersehbar”). Hengel concluded that LE, together with the *Epistula Apostolorum*, should count as the oldest Christian writing that presupposes all four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. See M. HENGEL, *Die Evangelienüberschriften*, in ID., *Jesus und die Evangelien: Kleine Schriften V*, ed. C.J. THORNTON (WUNT, 211), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2007, 526-567, at pp. 539-540 and n. 47. Kelhoffer’s dense study is generally acknowledged as having imposed these points in the scholarly community.

23. 2 Bar 49,2–51,10 (translation by M. HENZE, in M.E. STONE – M. HENZE, *4 Ezra and 2 Baruch: Translations, Introductions, and Notes*, Minneapolis, MN, Fortress, 2013, pp. 115-117): “[49.2] Indeed, in what shape will those live who live in your day? Or how will the splendor of those persist who [will be] after that? [49.3] Will they indeed then take this form of the present, and will they put on these members of chains [...] Or will you perhaps change these, those that are in the world, as also the world [or: age] itself? [...] [51.1] [...] the pride of those who are guilty will be changed and also the glory of those who are righteous [51.2] For the shape of those who now act wickedly will become worse than it is, as they will endure torment. [51.3] Also, as for the glory of those who are now righteous in my Torah [...] their splendor will be glorified through transformations: the shape of their faces will be turned into the light of their beauty, so that they will be able to acquire and receive the world [or: age] that does not die, which was then promised to them. [...] [51.8] For they will see that world [or: age] which is now invisible to them, and they will see a time which is now hidden from them. [51.9] And time will no longer make them older [...] [51.10] [...] they will be like the angels, and they will be deemed equal to the stars. They will change themselves into any shape they wish, from comeliness into beauty and from light into glorious splendor”. For an analysis of this passage, see M. HENZE, *Jewish Apocalypticism in Late First Century Israel: Reading Second Baruch in Context* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism, 142), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2011, pp. 312-317; L.I. LIED, *Recognizing the Righteous Remnant? Resurrection, Recognition and Eschatological Reversals in 2 Baruch 47–52*, in T.K. SEIM – J. ØKLAND (eds.), *Metamorphoses: Resurrection, Body and Transformative*

But ἐφανερώθη ἐν ἑτέρῃ μορφῇ also echoes Luke's Transfiguration account, the only one among the Synoptics to say that "the appearance of his countenance became different, ἐγένετο τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἕτερον" (Luke 9,29). In my judgment, the second-century writer who composed Mark's Longer Ending understood the state of the risen Messiah as an existence ἐν ἑτέρῃ μορφῇ similar, in some fashion, to the ἕτερον εἶδος manifested at the Transfiguration (Luke 9,29)²⁵. Implied here is that, just as at the Transfiguration, the disciples in the Emmaus story were confronted by a vision of Jesus' celestial glory (cf. Luke 9,32, "they saw his glory"); that the glory was manifested visually as exceeding luminosity (cf. Luke 9,29, "dazzling white"); and that it caused the disciples to enter a borderline state of intense confusion (cf. Luke 9,32-33, "weighed down with sleep ... not knowing what he said"). As on the mountain, the manifestation of glory (although now invisible) has very concrete effects: it affects the disciples' perception of Jesus – "their eyes were held from recognizing him" – so that the disciples misperceive him as an ignorant stranger.

This view, however, presents us with a difficulty. If the Messiah has, through resurrection, come to be "in glory" (Luke 24,26), and if (as Luke himself and Mark 16,12 seem to hint at) this is the same "glory" that the disciples saw at the Transfiguration (Luke 9,31-32), it is nevertheless true

Practices in Early Christianity (Ekstasis, 1), Berlin, de Gruyter, 2009, 311-335. Scholars have often noted the possible points of convergence between this passage and various Pauline texts, especially 1 Corinthians 15. See, e.g., R.H. CHARLES, *II Baruch*, in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1912, vol. 2, p. 508; G.W.E. NICKELSBURG, *A New Testament Reader's Guide to 2 Baruch: Or a New Testament Reader's Guide to 2 Baruch*, in M. HENZE – G. BOCCACCINI – J.M. ZURAWSKI (eds.), *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall* (JSJS, 164), Leiden, Brill, 2013, 271-293, at pp. 283-284; E.J. PENTIUC, *The Nature of the Resurrected Bodies: 2 Baruch and the New Testament*, in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch*, 309-334, esp. 332-333; HENZE, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, pp. 324-339.

24. HUG (*La finale* [n. 2], pp. 64-66) offers the comparison between 2 Bar 49-51 and Luke 24 as a more credible alternative to that between Luke 24 and Mark 16. Yet, as Kelhoffer notes (*Miracle and Mission* [n. 2], p. 56), although 2 Baruch, composed in the early decades of the second century, probably in Palestine, offers insight into what "another form" might have meant to the author of the Longer Ending, "LE's dependence on Luke and the influence of passages like *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch* 49-51 are not necessarily mutually exclusive possibilities". The occurrence of the recognition motif in both Luke 24 and 2 Baruch is often only mentioned in passing, without any elaboration. See, e.g., LIED, *Recognizing the Righteous Remnant?* (n. 23), p. 312; PENTIUC, *Nature of the Resurrected Bodies* (n. 23), p. 324.

25. Cf. BOVON's observations on Luke 9,29 (*Luke*, vol. 1 [n. 20], p. 375, emphasis mine): "What becomes 'different' is not the identity, which is envisaged in τὸ πρόσωπον, but its appearance, which is expressed by τὸ εἶδος ('form'). The word ἕτερον ('other' of two) expresses a change not in essence but in the relationship of Jesus to the others, and of the others to him. According to Luke, Jesus does not become different from what he was before, but for a moment his appearance becomes a divine sign to humanity, the sign of his true identity".

that the risen Jesus lacks the dazzling, overwhelming effulgence of the transfigured Jesus²⁶. Briefly stated, the problem is that the “glory” of the risen Messiah on the road to Emmaus is not luminous.

The explanation I propose is twofold. First, as long as the disciples conceive of Jesus as of a prophet who disappointed Israel’s messianic expectations, they remain unable to bear the brilliance of his glory. Therefore, until the required growth and transformation has taken place, the effect of the glory is, paradoxically, the disciples’ dim and partial perception of their interlocutor. Second, Luke’s account about the light of divine glory being present and active, yet invisible to the beholder, finds parallels among his contemporaries. It is to such stories about biblical figures like Moses and David that we must turn for insight²⁷.

III. EMMAUS AND SINAI

When Moses descends from Sinai, after having spent forty days gazing on the glory of God, the Israelites are at first afraid to approach him, because, unbeknownst to him, his face has been “made glorious” (δεδόξασται) – or, as NETS renders it, “charged with glory”.

As he was descending from the mountain, Moyses did not know that the appearance of the skin of his face was charged with glory (δεδόξασται), while he [God] was speaking to him. And Aaron and all the elders of Israel saw Moyses, and the appearance of the skin of his face was charged with glory (δεδοξασμένη), and they were afraid (ἐφοβήθησαν) to come near to him. And Moyses called them, and Aaron and all the leaders of the congregation turned to him, and Moyses spoke to them²⁸.

Fletcher-Louis views the motif of Moses’ luminosity as “an element of the theophanic constellation ... transferred to the Jewish divine man tradition”²⁹. Such traditions about Moses grew in constant interaction with similar traditions about the luminous face, garment, and crown of the protoplast³⁰.

26. Compared to the description of the risen body in 2 *Baruch*, there is also no change in shape (*dmwt'*), form (*cwrt'*), glory (*tšbwh't'*), splendor (*zyw'*). See the excerpt from 2 *Baruch* quoted in an earlier note. For the Syriac text, see D. GURTNER, *Second Baruch. A Critical Edition of the Syriac Text: With Greek and Latin Fragments, English Translation, Introduction, and Concordance*, London, T&T Clark, 2009.

27. For biblical background, see D.P. MOESSNER, *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative*, Minneapolis, MN, Fortress, 1989; M.L. STRAUSS, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and Its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (JSNT.SS, 110), Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

28. Exodus 34,29-31 (NETS).

29. C. FLETCHER-LOUIS, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 42), Leiden, Brill, 2002, p. 139. I will return to the term “liturgical anthropology” later in this article.

30. See A.L. OPPENHEIM, *Akkadian pul(u)h(t)u and melammu*, in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 63 (1943) 31-34; E. CASSIN, *La splendeur divine: Introduction à l'étude*

We have some knowledge about how some of Luke's contemporaries understood this episode, because we are fortunate to possess the fascinating *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, a work very likely originating in Palestine (possibly Galilee) in the second half of the first or the early second century CE³¹. Despite the lack of a direct literary link between the Gospel of Luke and *LAB*, both documents echo theological speculations that enjoyed popularity among Jews of the first century. *LAB* offers the following re-writing of Exod 34,29-31 – or, more accurately, of Exod 32 (Moses descending from Sinai and finding the golden calf) in light of Exod 34,29-30 (Moses descending from Sinai with the second set of tablets):

Moses came down. Having been bathed with light that could not be gazed upon (*perfusus esset lumine invisibili*), he had gone down to the place where the light of the sun and the moon are. The light of his face surpassed the splendor of the sun and the moon, but he was unaware of this (*hoc nesciebat ipse*).

de la mentalité mésopotamienne, Paris, Mouton, 1968; A. ANNUS, *The Mesopotamian Precursors of Adam's Garment of Glory and Moses' Shining Face*, in T.R. KÄMMERER (ed.), *Identities and Societies in the Ancient East-Mediterranean Regions: Comparative Approaches. Henning Graf Reventlow Memorial Volume* (Acta antiqua mediterranea et orientalia, 1), Münster, Ugarit, 2011, 1-17; A. ORLOV, *Vested with Adam's Glory: Moses as the Luminous Counterpart of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Macarian Homilies*, in *Christian Orient* 4 (2006) 498-513; FLETCHER-LOUIS, *All the Glory of Adam* (n. 29); A. GOLITZIN, *Recovering the "Glory of Adam": "Divine Light" Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Ascetical Literature of Fourth-Century Syro-Mesopotamia*, in J.R. DAVILA (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St Andrews in 2001* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 46), Leiden, Brill, 2003, 275-308.

31. In 1969, D. Harrington noted: "[i]t is odd that Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, which is approximately as long as the four Gospels taken together and was presumably composed near the time in which the New Testament was being written, has not received more attention" (D. HARRINGTON, *Text and Biblical Text in Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, Ph.D. diss., Harvard, 1969, p. 1). Twenty-five years later, REINMUTH (*Studien zum Liber*, p. 1) could only confirm that *LAB* continues to be an under-researched text: "Im ganzen gilt diese Feststellung noch immer". Today, following a series of important studies and commentaries in the 1990s, the situation seems much improved: "After centuries of obscurity, neglect, and false attribution, Pseudo-Philo's time has finally come [...] the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* is finally attracting the attention it deserves" (FISK, *Do You Not Remember?*, p. 13). The scholarly consensus is that *LAB* was written between 50 and 150 CE, with most scholars favoring a pre-70 date, and the most recent commentary on *LAB* arguing for an early second-century date (H. JACOBSON, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum with Latin Text and English Translation* [AGJU, 31], 2 vols., Leiden, Brill, 1996, pp. 199-209, at p. 209; for the tentative suggestion of *LAB*'s Galilean provenance, see p. 211). E. REINMUTH (*Pseudo-Philo und Lukas: Studien zum Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum und seiner Bedeutung für die Interpretation des lukanischen Doppelwerks* [WUNT, 74], Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1994, pp. 24-25) and B.N. FISK (*Do You Not Remember? Scripture, Story, and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of Pseudo-Philo* [JSP.SS, 37], Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 2001, p. 40) provide a sober assessment: on the basis of internal evidence (the only evidence available for *LAB*), it is impossible to determine the precise date (whether before or after the destruction of the Temple), the precise location in Palestine, and the precise socio-political and theological milieu of the writing.

When he came down to the children of Israel, upon seeing him they did not recognize him (*videntes non cognoscebant eum*). But when he had spoken, then they recognized him (*tunc cognoverunt eum*). This was similar to the event in Egypt, when Joseph recognized his brothers; they however did not recognize him. Afterwards, when Moses realized that his face had become glorious (*gloriosissima facta fuerat facies eius*), he made himself a veil with which to cover his face³².

As has been noted, the Moses-Joseph parallel, which *LAB* introduces in order to assign the worshipers of the golden calf to the same negative category as Joseph's brothers: "only works because Pseudo-Philo has already introduced the non-recognition motif into his version of the Moses story"³³. Whether a shrewd exegetical sleight of hand or a theological assumption for which we do not seem to have textual witnesses, it is precisely the puzzling non-recognition of Moses that is relevant to my argument. Scholars usually explain it as an effect of the Israelites' idolatry, that is, of their non-recognition of the Law that the prophet brings to them³⁴. Although this is undoubtedly true, more can be said on the subject. Since, in *LAB*, the Law is intimately associated with the light of the divine realm, the non-recognition motif is, at a deeper level, also to be understood in relation to the themes of light and glory.

If the super-luminous Moses is said to have *descended* to the special realm "where the light of the sun and the moon are" (cf. *I En* 41,5), he has presumably spent the forty days in the heavenly light of some heavenly abode³⁵. Indeed, for *LAB*, the manner of worship revealed on Sinai was meant to establish among the Israelites "the tent of my glory, *tabernaculum gloriae meae*" (11,15); the ten commandments, also, given by God "who is all light" (12,9. *tu es qui omne lumen es*) were meant as a "light" for Israel, so that the Israelites be "glorified" (11,2, *glorificabo populum meum ... eis erunt in lumine*). After the forty days on Sinai contemplating the heavenly

32. *LAB* 12.1 (JACOBSON, *Commentary* [n. 31], vol. 1, pp. 18/110).

33. FISK, *Do You Not Remember?* (n. 31), p. 139. Moreover, the Moses-Joseph comparison ignores the fact that "Joseph's identity remained hidden long after he first spoke to his brothers" (p. 139).

34. *Ibid.*, pp. 30, 140, 137-138; REINMUTH, *Studien zum Liber* (n. 31), pp. 101-102; 177; cf. the older article by M. PHILONENKO, *Essénisme et gnose chez le Pseudo-Philon: Le symbolisme de la lumière dans Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, in *Le origini dello Gnosticismo: Colloquio di Messina, 13-18 aprile 1966* (Studies in the History of Religions, 12), Leiden, Brill, 1967, 401-409: "Dans les *Antiquités* l'illuminateur et l'illuminé par excellence, c'est Moïse, puisqu'il apporte la Loi-Lumière" (p. 407). Philonenko provides a useful grouping of the references to light under the headings of "light of the Law", "God as light", "the illumined and luminous prophets", and "the illumination of the heart".

35. L. GINZBERG, *Legends of the Jews*, Philadelphia, PA, Jewish Publication Society of America, 1968, vol. 6, p. 50 n. 260: "of course, the place of the Shekinah". Cf. *LAB* 19,10: "he [God] showed him [Moses] the place from which the manna rained upon the people, even unto the paths of paradise"; *LAB* 19,12: "the immortal dwelling place that is not subject to time"; *LAB* 19,13: "the place of sanctification that I showed you".

abode, Moses' face is *gloriosissima*; similarly, after the heavenly visions shortly prior to his death, "his appearance became glorious, and he died in glory" (19,16, *mutata est effigies eius in gloria et mortuus est in gloria*). The process of "glorification" makes Moses similar to God – simultaneously luminous and inaccessible³⁶ – but it also introduces a certain incompatibility between Moses and the people: he is "charged with glory", while they are not, he is bathed in *lumen invisibile*, while they are not.

"I have no idea what 'invisible light' (so James, Harrington, SC) could mean here", writes Jacobson³⁷; he thinks nevertheless that *lumen invisibile* probably refers to "light that one is unable to gaze upon" – ἀθέατον φῶς. Even if we accept Harrington's possible parallel with 2 Cor 3,7, the difference between the biblical texts and *LAB* is quite significant. In the first case, the glory on Moses' face is perceived as a fearsome and blinding light, so intense that the Israelites "could not gaze at Moses' face" and were afraid; there is no doubt that everyone recognizes the prophet. By contrast, in *LAB*, the light of glory (which extends to Moses' *entire body*) is not perceived as light by anyone – it is "invisible" – but instead effects a *complete* lack of recognition³⁸. In fact, *LAB* gives a similar account of David:

God sent Zeruel, the angel in charge of power. ... David put a stone in the sling and struck the Philistine on his forehead. He ran toward him and unsheathed his sword. ... David said to him, "Before you die, open your eyes and see your slayer who has killed you". The Philistine looked and saw the angel and said, "Not you alone killed me, but also he who was present with you, whose appearance is not like the appearance of a man" (*cuius species non est sicut species hominis*). Then David cut his head. The angel of the Lord changed David's appearance, and no one recognized him (*erexit faciem David et nemo agnoscebat eum*). When Saul saw David, he asked him who he was, and there was no one who recognized him (*non erat qui cognosceret eum*)³⁹.

Note that the lack of recognition is here also explained as the result of some otherworldly intervention – specified as an angel – and further explained as a *change in appearance*: "The angel of the Lord changed David's appearance, and no one recognized him". David's change in

36. Psalm 104/103,2: "wrapped in light as with a garment" (cf. 1 Tim 6,16, *dwells in light inapproachable*); 1 Kings 8,12 / 3 Reigns 8,3: "The LORD has said that he would dwell in thick darkness" (LXX: ἐν γνόφῳ); 2 Sam 22,12 = Psalm 18/17,11: "He made darkness his covering around him"; LXX: ἔθετο σκότος ἀποκρυφῆν αὐτοῦ).

37. JACOBSON, *Commentary* (n. 31), vol. 1, p. 482.

38. One has to wonder if the same phenomenon is assumed to occur at the death of Moses. Although he is buried in a tomb (19,16) "in the light of all the world" (19,16), Moses, whose "appearance became glorious", so that "he died in glory" (*LAB* 19,16), remains invisible to both angels and humans.

39. *LAB* 61,5-9 (JACOBSON, *Commentary* [n. 31], vol. 1, pp. 83, 189).

appearance, which renders him unrecognizable, is effected (presumably, according to the author of this rewritten history) by the same invisible light that rendered Moses unrecognizable. Moreover, even though *nobody* was able to recognize David, at the command “open your eyes”, and presumably by divine intervention, Goliath is given a glimpse at the truth.

Both episodes from the *LAB* find their closest parallel in three NT accounts in which the disciples fail to recognize the risen Jesus: John 20,14-16 (Mary Magdalene sees him but thinks he is a gardener), John 21,1-4 (he appears to the disciples at the Sea of Tiberias, but they “did not know that it was Jesus”), and, finally, the Emmaus story, especially as interpreted by LE’s theory of glorification as change in appearance.

I submit that Luke and his contemporaries assumed that when one is wrapped in divine light (the glory of Sinai, of the Transfiguration, or of the Resurrection), one becomes unrecognizable to people who are not open to the same presence of God⁴⁰. Luke would add that in such circumstances, one’s eyes are actually “held” from a vision that might be unbearable.

IV. EMMAUS AND EDEN

The depiction of the risen Christ in Luke 24 not only evokes comparable depictions of Moses, but should also be read as an allusion to Eden⁴¹. The structure of the Emmaus story is similar to that of Genesis 3: a certain inability or insufficiency in the protagonists, followed by the “opening of the eyes”, which indicates that the subject has come to “know” something previously unknown. The verbal parallels should also be noted:

40. Keeping in mind my earlier reference to traditions of celestial radiance surrounding gods and select human heroes, it is interesting to note that the exceeding luminosity of Ancient Near Eastern divinities may also render them invisible or unrecognizable to humans. See M.B. HUNDLEY, *Keeping Heaven on Earth: Safeguarding the Divine Presence in the Priestly Tabernacle*, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2011, p. 42 and p. 42 n. 23: “Another notable aspect of the *melammu* is that its pulsating light can render its wearer unrecognizable. [...] Thus, in Mesopotamia, and potentially in Egypt and elsewhere, when gods appear on earth, they are resplendent in fiery and brilliant attire, which at times is so luminous that it obscures their true identities [...] the *melammu* does indeed mask its bearer by surrounding him with pulsating light”.

41. This avenue is seldom pursued in scholarship. The only notable exceptions were, until very recently, X. THÉVENOT, *Emmaüs, une nouvelle Genèse? Une lecture psychanalytique de Genèse 2–3 et de Luc 24,13-35*, in *Mélanges de science religieuse* 37 (1980) 3-18, and the unfounded speculations of J. MAGNE, *From Christianity to Gnosis and from Gnosis to Christianity: An Itinerary Through the Texts To and From the Tree of Paradise*, Atlanta, GA, Scholars, 1993. See the detailed history of research in the opening pages of the extremely well researched and compellingly argued article by D.C. ORTLUND, “*And Their Eyes Were Opened, And They Knew*”: An Inter-Canonical Note on Luke 24:31, in *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 53 (2010) 717-728.

1. “their eyes were opened” and “they came to know” occurs both in Luke and Genesis⁴².

Luke 24,31 αὐτῶν δὲ διηνοιχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν
(cf. Luke 24,45 διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν)

Gen 3,7 καὶ διηνοιχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῶν δύο καὶ ἔγνωσαν ὅτι γυμνοὶ ἦσαν

2. The meal – taking and sharing:

Luke 24,30 λαβὼν τὸν ἄρτον εὐλόγησεν καὶ κλάσας ἐπέδιδου αὐτοῖς

Gen 3,6 λαβοῦσα τοῦ καρποῦ αὐτοῦ ... ἔδωκεν καὶ τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς⁴³.

It is more difficult, at least at first sight, to find a correspondence between the “initial state” of the disciples (their eyes prevented from perceiving Christ) and the initial state of Adam and Eve (their nakedness and lack of shame)⁴⁴. The problem disappears, however, if one reads, with Luke and his contemporaries, “naked but not ashamed” as “[physically] naked but clothed [with the light of glory]”. Indeed, in both early Judaism and early Christianity, it is a commonplace to state that Adam was clothed in a luminous garment of glory, and that this protological luminescence, lost through disobedience, is recaptured by Moses’ luminosity on Sinai, and, in

42. Noted by JOHNSON, *Luke* (n. 6), p. 397.

43. ORTLUND (“*And Their Eyes Were Opened, And They Knew*” [n. 41], p. 725) proposes a more ambitious parallelism: (1) two human beings are involved / addressed (Gen 3,6; Luke 24,13); (2) the human pair is offered food (Gen 3,1-5; Luke 24,30); (3) the one offering the food is a supernatural being (note Rev 12,9 and 20,2 in light of Gen 3,1-15; Luke 24,52); (4) the food is offered in an unexpected way: in Gen 3 it was not the serpent’s prerogative to play the “host” by subversively mediating the fruit to Adam and Eve, and in Luke 24,30 Jesus assumes the role of “host” despite clearly being, up till that point, the guest (note v. 29); (5) the food is accepted (Gen 3,6; Luke 24,30b-31a); (6) the human pair does not recognize the one offering food for who they really are (Gen 3,1-7; Luke 24,16); (7) the eating of the food results in a profound new perception of spiritual reality (Gen 3,7-10; Luke 24,32); (8) this new understanding is described with the phrase “and their eyes were opened, and they knew” (Gen 3,7; Luke 24,31; see above); (9) the human pair now understands retrospectively something God had already told them: Adam and Eve now truly understand what God meant when he said that they would know good and evil, and Cleopas and his companion now truly understand what Jesus meant when he had opened the Scriptures to them on the road (Gen 3,7b; Luke 24,32); (10) the human pair is physically separated from God in the immediate wake of taking the offered food: in Genesis 3, Adam and Eve try to hide from God (v. 8); in Luke 24, Jesus promptly “vanished from their sight” (v. 32); (11) God comes and is present among his people in the wake of the eyeopening, frightens them, and asks a series of questions (Gen 3,9-13; Luke 24,36-41); (12) the human pair immediately physically relocates, Adam and Eve *leaving* the place of God’s special residence (Eden), Cleopas and companion *returning to* the place of God’s special residence (Jerusalem; Gen 3,23; Luke 24,33).

44. Luke 24,16: οἱ δὲ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν ἐκρατοῦντο τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι αὐτόν; Gen 2,25: καὶ ἦσαν οἱ δύο γυμνοὶ ... καὶ οὐκ ἤσχύνοντο.

Christianity, by the radiant Jesus on the mountain of the Transfiguration⁴⁵. Within this theological framework, when their eyes were opened, Adam and Eve recognized not *that they had been naked all along*, but rather that *they had just become naked* of the luminous garment of glory.

Considered in this light, the Emmaus episode seems to construct an antithetical parallel between Genesis and Emmaus, aimed, in typical Christian (and Lukan) fashion, at establishing the resurrection of Jesus as the un-doing of what went wrong in Eden. Rather than painting with a broad theological brush⁴⁶, I prefer to keep the focus on the Second Temple tradition about the luminous garment of the protoplasts. If Adam and Eve are initially endowed with the garment of glory⁴⁷, and find themselves

45. Already in the Book of Ezekiel, the citizen of Eden wears a glittering robe of precious stones (Ezek 28,13). The homophony between עור (“skins”) and אור (“light”) was exploited, from the Targums to the Zohar, to speculate about Adam’s garment of light. See the texts and discussion in FLETCHER-LOUIS, *All the Glory of Adam* (n. 29); L. GINZBERG, *Legends of the Jews*, Philadelphia, PA, Jewish Publication Society of America, 1987, vol. 5, p. 97 n. 69, pp. 103-104 n. 93; D.A. GIULEA, *Pre-Nicene Christology in Paschal Contexts: The Case of the Noetic Divine Anthropos* (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae, 123), Leiden, Brill, 2013, pp. 51-55 (“The Luminous Adam of Second Temple Literature”); G. QUISPPEL, *Makarius, das Thomasevangelium, und das Lied von der Perle* (NT.S, 15), Leiden, Brill, 1967; S. BROCK, *Jewish Tradition in Syriac Sources*, in *Journal of Theological Studies* 30 (1979) 212-232; ID., *Clothing Metaphors as a Means of Theological Expression in Syriac Tradition*, in M. SCHMIDT – C.F. GEYER (eds.), *Typus, Symbol, Allegorie bei den östlichen Vätern und ihren Parallelen im Mittelalter* (Eichstätter Beiträge, 4), Regensburg, Pustet, 1982, 11-38; A. DECONICK – J. FOSSUM, *Stripped Before God: A New Interpretation of Logion 37 in the Gospel of Thomas*, in *Vigiliae Christianae* 45 (1991) 123-150; GOLITZIN, *Recovering the “Glory of Adam”* (n. 30).

46. Cf. ORTLUND, “*And Their Eyes Were Opened, And They Knew*” (n. 41), pp. 726-727: “an Edenic link in Luke 24 fits naturally with the flow of the entire biblical narrative. The allusion is one more small puzzle piece helping us put the whole Bible together as a coherent unfolding drama of God’s mighty deeds in history to undo the disaster of Eden and, by a climactic act of grace wrought in his Son, restore creation to Eden and better-than-Eden. [...] an Edenic allusion in Luke 24 undergirds the Bible as a coherent narrative stretching from creation to fall to new creation to consummation. Specifically, Luke 24,31 gives us one angle from which to view the transition from the second of these pillars to the third, from fall to new creation, for this text shows Jesus reversing the curse of the fall”.

47. Cf. the reference to the re-clothing of the prodigal son with his former robe: ἐξενέγκατε στολήν τὴν πρώτην καὶ ἐνδύσατε αὐτόν (Luke 15,22). F.W. FARRAR, *The Gospel according to St. Luke, with Maps, Notes and Introduction*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1891, p. 260: “some have explained it of the robe he used to wear at home – the former robe”; J. NOLLAND, *Luke 9:21–18:34* (Word Biblical Commentary, 35), Dallas, TX, Word Books, 2002, p. 785: “στολήν τὴν πρώτην may be ‘the best robe’, and thus perhaps the best of the father’s own wardrobe (cf. Esth 6,8), or just possibly ‘the former robe’, and thus the clothing that marked the son’s place in the family before his departure”; K.H. RENGSTORF, *Die Re-Investitur des verlorenen Sohnes in der Gleichniserzählung Jesu: Luk. 15,11–33*, Köln – Opladen, Westdeutscher Verlag, 1967, pp. 40-45; R.A. CULPEPPER, *Luke-John*, in *The New Interpreters’s Bible*, vol. 9, Nashville, TN, Abingdon, 1995, pp. 302-303: “[the father] calls for a robe – the first one, the best one, or possibly the one the son had worn originally”; F. BOVON (*L’Évangile selon Saint Luc [15,1–19,27]* [CNT, 3C], Geneva, Labor et Fides, 2001, pp. 47-48) accepts both meanings (“best” and “first”).

“in” Paradise, Cleopas and his unnamed companion – whether Luke himself, or Simon Peter, or, as Codex Bezae implies, another Simon different from Simon Peter⁴⁸, or perhaps even Cleopas’ wife⁴⁹ – are initially “outside”

48. The variant readings of Luke 24,33-34 have direct implications of the identity of the second disciple. The Greek manuscript tradition, in its majority, reads *καὶ εὗρον ἡθροισμένους τοὺς ἕνδεκα καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς, λέγοντας ὅτι ὄντως ἠγέρθη ὁ κύριος καὶ ὤφθη Σίμωνι*. The Codex Bezae, however, has *λέγοντες* instead of *λέγοντας* thus placing the announcement “the Lord appeared to Simon” on the lips of the two Emmaus disciples, and implying that “Simon” is one of them. See READ-HEIMERDINGER – RIUS-CAMPS, *Emmaous or Oulammaous?* (n. 2), p. 39. Moreover, Ilaria Ramelli’s detailed study of Luke 24,34 shows that the reading of the Greek column of Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis is also found “in the Syriac tradition, especially Codex Sinaiticus, and a part of the Coptic tradition”, that it made an impact upon Amphilochius of Iconium and, possibly, other Cappadocians, and that “the other Syriac and Coptic versions and all Latin versions leave both possibilities open: the announcement could have been given either by the Emmaus Disciples or by the Eleven” (RAMELLI, *The Emmaus Disciples and the Kerygma of the Resurrection* [n. 2], pp. 4, 7-9, 14). READ-HEIMERDINGER – RIUS-CAMPS (*Emmaous or Oulammaous?*, pp. 37-39) propose that the “Simon” in cause was Simon Peter. By contrast, RAMELLI (*The Emmaus Disciples and the Kerygma of the Resurrection*, p. 10) notes: “The fact that he [scil. the Evangelist] does not qualify this Simon as Peter or Cephas here, while he does qualify him as Peter in his Gospel when he mentions a Simon whom he identifies with Peter, further suggests that Luke was not at all sure that this Simon at 24,34 was Peter, or even knew that he was not”. The identification between the “Simon” in Luke 24,34 and Simon Peter, popular in the early Church (e.g. Eusebius of Caesarea, Ambrose of Milan, Ambrosiaster, Augustine, and Bede – see details in RAMELLI, *The Emmaus Disciples and the Kerygma of the Resurrection*, pp. 13-19) was due to the harmonization of the Emmaus story with 1 Cor 15,5. Some early Christian writers refer to the anonymous companion as Simon, the son of Cleopas (e.g., Hegesippus, apud Eusebius, *HE* 3.11.1). Origen refers several times to Simon and Cleopas, but does so “without ever adding ‘Peter / Cephas’ to Simon. The fact that he is careful to avoid this identification suggests that he deemed it unlikely” (RAMELLI, *The Emmaus Disciples and the Kerygma of the Resurrection*, p. 13).

49. Some scholars find it plausible that Cleopas’ unnamed companion, who seems to share the house where the meal will take place, was none other than his spouse. Indeed, “[n]othing in Luke’s account is inconsistent with this suggestion, whereas if the other disciple were known to Luke to be such a well-known early Christian leader [...] it is incredible that he should not have named him” (R. BAUCKHAM, *Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels*, Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 2002, p. 112 n. 45). See also R. BAUCKHAM, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*, Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 2006, p. 47; I.H. MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC), Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 1978, p. 894; C.P. THIEDE – M. D’ANCONA, *The Emmaus Mystery: Discovering Evidence for the Risen Christ*, London, Continuum, 2005, pp. 93-98, esp. p. 94; CATCHPOLE, *A Tale of Two Travelers* (n. 2), pp. 76-77. If Luke’s Κλεοπάς is the Κλωπάς of John 19,25 – as argued by T. ZAHN (*Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur VI*, Leipzig, Andreas Deichert, 1900, pp. 343-344, 350), J.E. ADAMS (*The Emmaus Story, Lk xxiv.13-25: A Suggestion*, in *Expository Times* 17 [1906] 333-335), and BAUCKHAM (*Gospel Women*, p. 211; *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, p. 47), and accepted tentatively (“one might guess”) by D.C. ALLISON (*Resurrecting Jesus: The Earliest Christian Tradition and Its Interpretation*, New York, T&T Clark, 2005, p. 253 n. 229) – the two disciples are Cleopas and “Mary of Clopas”. It is well known that Κλεοπάς and Κλωπάς are actually derivations of different names: Κλεοπάς is the abbreviated version of the Greek name Κλεόπατρος, while Κλωπάς is the Greek transliteration of a Semitic name. Nevertheless,

the reality of the risen Christ (who is “in his glory”, while they are still lacking the garment of glory). Unlike Adam and Eve, who tasted the fruit of knowledge in the wrong way, at the wrong time, and from the wrong provider, the disciples receive it from the very hand of Lord. Their eyes are opened – not to recognize the loss of glory, but to recognize the glorified Christ. The disciples are, in other words, made again “compatible” with God – albeit not yet completely: the vision cannot be sustained for more than an instant, and the risen Jesus, although present, becomes invisible to them⁵⁰.

V. “LITURGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY”

Positing the Eucharist as an inversion of the disordered and disobedient partaking of the fruit before the appointed time is, obviously, a Christian element. Yet it is a “twist” given to a larger discussion, which has much older roots and many branches in Second Temple Judaism. The Jerusalem Temple is described in a manner that evokes Paradise; the Eden narrative itself is shaped by the Temple experience. The reinstatement of Eden, whether projected eschatologically or anticipated here and now, is the very core of Jewish Temple theology (most likely as early as the First Temple)⁵¹, and no less crucial to the ideology of the various Jewish apocalyptic groups in the Second Temple era. Picking up the suggestion of Levitical duties ascribed to Adam and Eve in Eden (Gen 2,15-16; cf. Num 3,7-8; 8,26)⁵², *Jubilees* states explicitly that the Garden of Eden was a temple

BAUCKHAM argued (*Gospel Women*, p. 211; cf. ZAHN, *Forschungen*, p. 343 n.3) that Κλωπᾶς “could easily have been used as its Greek equivalent. Jews of this period often adopted Greek names that sounded similar to their Semitic names [...] even in Greek, both the transliterated form of the Semitic name and the genuinely Greek name that was regarded as its equivalent could be used of the same person. [...] Thus, it is entirely possible that [...] Κλωπᾶς was known both by his Semitic name and by a Greek equivalent, Κλεωπᾶς]. A perfect example would be Simon/ Symeon; Simon Peter is called “Symeon” at Acts 15,14.

50. See DENAUX, *Studies in the Gospel of Luke* (n. 2), p. 295 n. 60: “The Greek word ἄφαντος literally means ‘invisible’. Because of the prepositional expression ἀπ’ αὐτῶν some people translate ‘he left them’. But given the fact that Jesus only ‘disappears’ at his ascension in 24,51, it appears to me that in Luke 24:31, the emphasis is on Jesus’ ‘invisibility’ even though he remains present”.

51. J.D. LEVENSON, *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible*, San Francisco, CA, HarperOne, 1987, pp. 128-135, 142-145; J. BLENKINSOPP, *Structure of P*, in *CBQ* 38 (1976) 275-292; P.J. KEARNEY, *Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Ex 25–40*, in *ZAW* 89 (1977) 375-387; M. WEINFELD, *Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement of the Lord: The Problem of the Sitz im Leben of Genesis 1:1–2:3*, in A. CAQUOT – M. DELCOR (eds.), *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l’honneur de M. Henri Cazelles*, Kevelaer, Butzon & Bercker, 1981, 501-512; FLETCHER-LOUIS, *All the Glory of Adam* (n. 29), pp. 63-64.

52. G. WENHAM, *Genesis 1–15* (Word Biblical Commentary, 1-2), Dallas, TX, Word Books, 2002, 67: “man’s job in the garden is ‘to till it and guard it’. עבד, ‘to serve, till’ is a very common verb and is often used of cultivating the soil (Gen 2,5; 3,23; 4,2, 12, etc.).

(*Jub* 8,19), where access was governed by Levitical laws concerning sexuality, pregnancy, and birth (*Jub* 3,8-14; cf. Leviticus 12), and where Adam offered up of incense, one of the priestly duties and privileges (*Jub* 3,27; cf. Exod 30,7-8, 34-38; Num 17,4-5; 2 Chron 26,16-20)⁵³.

This liturgical framework connecting Sinai, Zion, and Eden gives even more weight to the theme of glory. Indeed, for the sectarians at Qumran and the apocalyptic groups behind the so-called Enoch literature, as well as for Jesus-followers, the abiding interest is that of recovering, in their own words, “all the glory of Adam”⁵⁴. Fletcher-Louis’ phrase “liturgical anthropology”, used in reference to the *Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice* and the *War Scroll*⁵⁵ – the notion that humanity is defined, in its origin and

The word is commonly used in a religious sense of serving God (e.g., Deut 4,19), and in priestly texts, especially of the tabernacle duties of the Levites (Num 3,7-8; 4,23-24, 26, etc.). Similarly, שָׁמַר, ‘to guard, to keep’, has the simple profane sense of ‘guard’ (Gen 4,9; 30,31), but it is even more commonly used in legal texts of observing religious commands and duties (Gen 17,9; Lev 18,5) and particularly of the Levitical responsibility for guarding the tabernacle from intruders (Num 1,53; 3,7-8). It is striking that here and in the priestly law these two terms are juxtaposed (Num 3,7-8; 8,26; 18,5-6), another pointer to the interplay of tabernacle and Eden [...]”.

53. J.T.A.G.M. VAN RUITEN, *Eden and the Temple: The Rewriting of Genesis 2:4–3:24 in the Book of Jubilees*, in G.P. LUTTIKHUIZEN (ed.), *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity* (Themes in Biblical Narrative. Jewish and Christian Traditions, 2), Leiden, Brill, 1999, 63-81, esp. pp. 75-79; Id., *Primaevial History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1–11 in the Book of Jubilees* (JSJ.S, 66), Leiden, Brill, 2000, pp. 85-89.

54. “Those who remain steadfast in it will acquire eternal life, and *all the glory of Adam* is for them” (CD 3.20); “Among the saints none is naked, for they have put on glory [...] they have found, through our Lord, the robe that belongs to Adam and Eve; [...] those who had lost their garments [...] have now been renewed and whitened” (EPHREM, *Par.* 6.9). Although a fourth-century work, Ephrem’s *Hymns on Paradise* are judged to incorporate much older Jewish traditions (see N. SÉD, *Les hymnes sur le paradis de Saint Ephrem et les traditions juives*, in *Le Muséon* 81 [1968] 455-501). On the intriguing presence of Jewish apocalyptic elements in Syriac Christian literature, see GOLITZIN, *Recovering the “Glory of Adam”* (n. 30).

55. FLETCHER-LOUIS, *All the Glory of Adam* (n. 29), and *Further Reflections on a Divine and Angelic Humanity in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, in E. CHAZON et al. (eds.), *New Perspectives on Old Texts: Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 88), Leiden, Brill, 2010, 185-198. For Fletcher-Louis, “liturgical anthropology” designates the view that humans are created as the cultic statue of God, that “Israel, reconstituted through proper worship, is to do what God does and be what he is”, and that “[t]he purpose of entry into the pristine world of the temple – of access to the heavenly world that the inner sanctuary offers – is transformation” (*Further Reflections*, p. 188). Some critics have seized on Fletcher-Louis’ rejection of the scholarly theory that liturgical hymns such as the *Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice* would posit a dualism between the angelic congregation and that of the Qumran covenants, in which the former constitute the heavenly pattern for worship and transformation to be reproduced by the covenants on earth, in favor of an identification of the covenants themselves as *elim* and *Elohim* (see, for instance, P. ALEXANDER, *The Mystical Texts: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Related Manuscripts* [The Library of Second Temple Studies, 61], London, T&T Clark,

destiny, by participation in divine worship, alongside, in imitation of, or even *as* angelic worshipers, and that the community's cultic life, understood in this manner, effects a transformation towards angelic or simi-angelic status – applies not only to the Qumran covenants, but also to early Christians⁵⁶. As a matter of fact, some scholars of Early Christianity have reprised it as “liturgical soteriology”⁵⁷. It is, I believe, reflected in the paradigmatic encounter of Jesus with the disciples on the road to Emmaus: whether the meal at Emmaus is associated with the Last Supper, with the many feeding miracles, or with both, the restoration of the Edenic ability to see God in his glory occurs in a *ritual* context: breaking bread with the Messiah. Neither Eden nor the eschatological state can be grasped conceptually. Therefore, to speak of “paradise” or “resurrection” is only possible from the vantage-point of liturgical experience – ritual and its interiorization.

2006, pp. 44-47). Nevertheless, in *Further Reflections on a Divine and Angelic Humanity*, Fletcher-Louis provides the necessary nuances by stating that “*much of* (though not all of) what has been taken to refer to *supra*human angels, actually refers to the human worshippers, especially the priests *in their heavenly, angelic or divine mode* that they acquire in the liturgical space and time of the true temple” and that, even though “[t]here are *dualities* in the *Sabbath Songs*”, such as between humanity in its state of mortality and the state of exaltation experienced in liturgy, “there are not the hard *dualisms* that older commentators have imagined” (p. 189). Ultimately, “liturgical anthropology” remains useful as a term pointing to the view that humanity is, ontologically and functionally, the true statue of God, and that liturgical worship is the context for divine-human interaction and human transformation.

56. See P. ALEXANDER, *Qumran and the Genealogy of Western Mysticism*, in CHAZON *et al.* (eds.), *New Perspectives on Old Texts* (n. 55), 215-235, esp. p. 218 n. 12 and p. 232. Cf. J. COLLINS, *The Angelic Life*, in SEIM – ØKLAND (eds.), *Metamorphoses* (n. 23), 291-310, whose discussion of the theme in the Dead Sea Scrolls ends with the following observation: “There is an obvious analogy between the transformed life as we find it in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian monasticism” (p. 309), and FLETCHER-LOUIS, *Further Reflections* (n. 55), p. 188: “The liturgical anthropology of the temple tradition is essentially a matter of *deification*. This way of thinking has largely been lost in the Christian west; it is fundamental to Eastern theology, and, at least in the mystical tradition, was, I think, basic to Jewish theology in antiquity”. See also N. RICKLEFS, *An Angelic Community: The Significance of Beliefs about Angels in the First Four Centuries of Christianity*, Ph.D. dissertation, Macquarie University, Sydney, 2002; D.E. LINGE, *Leading the Life of Angels: Ascetic Practice and Reflection in the Writings of Evagrius of Pontus*, in *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 68 (2000) 537-568.

57. GIULEA (*Pre-Nicene Christology in Paschal Contexts* [n. 45], pp. 118-125) discusses the “liturgical soteriology” in the Jerusalem Temple and in Second Temple and Rabbinic texts, in order to reach the following conclusion: “Christian paschal devotion inherited a particular liturgical aspect from the Temple in Jerusalem [...] This tradition envisions the liturgical practice [...] as an attempt at imitating the angelic liturgy and participating in this heavenly celebration in front on God's glory” (p. 124) “the eschatological Adam is not only partaking in the heavenly liturgy, but also recovering his prelapsarian glorious condition of *imago Dei*” (p. 125).

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Luke understands the resurrected state as a definitive “exodus” from the corruptible state and an “entry” into divine glory⁵⁸. The non-recognition motif in Luke 24 is tied to this glorified state of the Messiah, which Luke assumes to be a state of intense luminosity, similar to that at the Transfiguration⁵⁹. The link between Jesus’ glory glimpsed at the Transfiguration and his resurrected state is further confirmed and emphasized by the earliest commentary on the Emmaus event: LE adds the details about “form”, which reinforces the link with Luke’s glory-language of Transfiguration; the Codex Bezae speaks of the disciples’ “veiled hearts” at Luke 24:32, evoking Moses’ shining face and the veil he puts on to shield the Israelites from the radiance (Exod 34,33-35; cf. 2 Cor 4,3-6) and places the Emmaus story in a larger theological framework defined by the concern with the divine glory and its interaction with humans.

The glory of the resurrected Jesus is invisible, but effective: it is not perceived as dazzling light surrounding Jesus (as had been the case at the Transfiguration) or mistaken for a ghost bearing the traits of Jesus (as later in Luke 24,37), but it does effect a certain confusion, which results in the misidentification of the risen Jesus. In this, Luke’s treatment of the risen Jesus is very similar to *LAB*’s treatment of the glorified Moses and David.

Why were the disciples unable to recognize Christ? Is their temporary blindness caused by a certain defect on their part (faulty Christology, “hardness of heart”, etc.) or is it brought about by God’s intervention⁶⁰? Choosing *either* divine action *or* human inability does not honor Luke’s narrative and theological sophistication. I would argue that the relationship between the manifestation of the divine glory and its human reception should be placed, as the opening of the Emmaus story suggests, in a dynamic, synergistic, and pedagogical framework⁶¹.

58. On the convergence of meanings in the Lukan “exodus” (euphemism for death; transit to the Father via passion, death, resurrection, and ascension; counterpart to the εἴσοδος of Acts 13,24; “new Exodus”), see JOHNSON, *Luke* (n. 6), p. 153; BOVON, *Luke*, vol. 1 (n. 20), pp. 376, 380; FITZMYER, *Luke*, vol. 1 (n. 13), p. 167; STRAUSS, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts* (n. 27), pp. 271-272; M. RAMSEY, *The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ*, London, Longmans, 1949, p. 123.

59. Cf. DERRETT, *The Walk to Emmaus* (n. 2), p. 192: “His glory (Lk 9, 26,32; 21, 27; 24, 26) remained to be inferred”.

60. For a convenient survey of the various scholarly opinions – blindness caused by God, by Satan, or attributable to the disciples themselves – see LITWAK, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (n. 5), pp. 138-145. Litwak himself rejects any suggestion of “supernatural” causation and argues that “the issue is a hermeneutical one”, namely that “it is the disciples’ false eschatological hopes that prevent them from understanding Jesus’ words about the need for him to suffer” (p. 139).

61. On divine pedagogy as general framework, see the first section of this paper. For divine-human synergism in Jewish, Christian, and pagan literature of the first three centuries CE, see D. BRADSHAW, *Aristotle East and West: Metaphysics and the Division of Christendom*,

The locus of recognition is the community's liturgical fellowship, the only circumstance in which a moment of "attuning" between the human recipient and the risen Messiah in his glorified state is achieved. This recognition is transformative for the disciples: it institutes a state of faith and ecstatic joy (cf. Acts 2,46, ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει καὶ ἀφελότητι καρδίας), establishes a fraternal community of disciples, and offers a new way of approaching the Scriptures.

Although the *principle* of a charismatic exegesis of Scripture⁶² is strongly affirmed – a simultaneous biblical exegesis and self-exegesis ascribed to Christ, which effects an "opening of the Scriptures" coextensive with an "opening of the eyes" (Luke 24,31) or an "opening of the νοῦς" (Luke 24,45) – the Emmaus story leaves no "solid" exegetical results for Luke's readers⁶³. The point is not *which* texts are christological, but *that* Scripture speaks of Christ, and that *all* of it does: "all that the prophets have declared" (24,25); "Moses and *all* the prophets ... in *all* the scriptures" (24,27)⁶⁴.

The thrust of this story is not apologetic or polemical, but *testimonial*: the "burning hearts" reported by two disciples (Luke 24,32) – the trace, as it were, of the encounter – cannot be objectified and instrumentalized. The readers of the Emmaus story receive immediate access to the identity of the traveler, and have at their disposal a full account of the christological opening of the eyes, the νοῦς, and the Scriptures – but they are not thereby initiated into the twinned experiences of the Risen Christ and

Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2004, esp. pp. 153-186 ("Gods, Demons, and Theurgy"); *The Divine Energies in the New Testament*, in Saint Vladimir's Theological Quarterly 50 (2006) 189-224.

62. I have borrowed the term "charismatic exegesis" from D. AUNE, *Charismatic Exegesis in Early Judaism and Early Christianity*, in J.H. CHARLESWORTH – C.A. EVANS (eds.), *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (JSP.SS, 14), Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1996, 126-150..

63. Contra A. PLUMMER (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke* [ICC], Edinburgh, Clark, 1901, p. 555) who thinks that Luke 24,27 implies "[s]uch prophecies as Gen. 3,15, 22,18; Num. 24,17; Deut. 18,15, and such types as the scape-goat, the manna, the brazen serpent, and the sacrifices, are specially meant. Comp. Acts 8,35".

64. See GREEN, *Luke* (n. 6), p. 857; similarly, LITWAK, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (n. 5), pp. 119-125: "Jesus' words should not be understood to mean that he showed the disciples the predictive nature of a handful of texts (p. 120) ... Since Luke cites no specific scriptural text nor even echoes a scriptural tradition ... one cannot argue that Luke is using the Scriptures of Israel here for proof-from-prophecy (p. 122) ... The notion of proof-from-prophecy suggests an apologetic use of the Scriptures of Israel to demonstrate some facet of Jesus' person or words as valid or reliable or true or of divine origin, but no clear evidence for such a motif can be found here (p. 123) ... Rather than Jesus saying, 'If you read such-and-such a text differently, you would see that it predicted a crucified-and-risen Messiah', Jesus enables the disciples to interpret the Scriptures by reading them through the lens of his experience (p. 137)".

the “burning heart”. Luke most likely intends for his readers to gain confirmation of the apostolic testimony to the Risen One in their own breaking of the bread.

Duquesne University
Department of Theology
600 Forbes Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15282
USA

Bogdan G. BUCUR

ABSTRACT. — Some insight into the theological assumptions and intentions of the Emmaus story can be gained by reading Luke 24 in light of Second Temple traditions about the “glory” of the protoplast, of Moses, and of other elect individuals. This article reads the Emmaus story in conjunction with the Lukan Transfiguration account, Mark’s “Longer Ending”, *2 Baruch*, and the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, and argues that the protological and eschatological garment of glory, perceived sometimes as blinding luminosity, is at other times invisible but rendering its bearer unrecognizable. The lack of recognition on the part of Jesus’ two disciples is caused by the fundamental incompatibility between the “already” glorified state of the risen Christ, who has regained the luminous state of Adam in Eden, and the “not yet” glorified state of the two disciples.