

“AND THEIR EYES WERE OPENED, AND THEY KNEW”:
AN INTER-CANONICAL NOTE ON LUKE 24:31

DANE C. ORTLUND*

The purpose of this article is to suggest that Luke 24:31 alludes to Genesis 3:7 in the shared statement “and their eyes were opened, and they knew.”¹ When Adam and Eve were offered food by the serpent and ate, their eyes were opened and they knew good and evil. When the two disciples on the Emmaus road were offered food by the risen Jesus and ate, their eyes, too, were opened and they knew who their traveling companion was, that he had been raised, and that he was the focal point of all the Scriptures.

This essay proceeds in three basic steps. We first note the scarcity in the relevant literature of those who raise the possibility of this inter-canonical connection. Second, we identify three scholars who do link Luke 24:31 back to Genesis 3, though each only briefly. Third, we provide four factors that cumulatively suggest an allusion to Gen 3:7 in Luke 24:31.

I. NEGLECT OF THE ALLUSION

It is striking to note the paucity of scholars who entertain the possibility of an allusion to Eden in Luke 24:31.² While many detect a kind of miniature Eucharist celebration in the breaking of bread in Luke 24 (cf. 22:19), and some connect Luke 24 with the bread distribution to five thousand in Luke 9, scholars almost universally fail to link Luke 24:30–31 with Genesis. Let us consider a representative sampling from four main areas of Lukan scholarship: commentaries, books and monographs on Luke, broader NT theology projects, and studies of Luke’s use of the OT.

* Dane Ortlund is senior editor in the Bible division at Crossway Books, 1300 Crescent St., Wheaton, IL 60187.

¹ All Scripture quotations are the author’s translation unless otherwise noted.

² For our purposes, we use the term “allusion” to refer to a conscious though veiled literary connection with a previous text. This “consciousness” on the part of the author distinguishes an allusion from an echo, which is generally made unconsciously, while the “veiling” distinguishes the allusion from a quotation, which is generally made explicit—e.g. with an introductory formula of some kind. On “echoes” (in Paul) see Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989). While we are labeling Luke 24:31 an allusion to, not an echo of, Gen 3:7, our criteria for identifying this allusion largely overlap with Hays’s seven criteria for detecting echoes (ibid. 29–32). Cf. Benjamin Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998) 10–13; and Susan Hulen, *Allusion and Meaning in John 6* (BZNW 137; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005) 44–46, both of whom emphasize the way an alluding text is illuminated and even altered semantically in light of the text to which it alludes.

First, just about every noteworthy commentary on Luke bypasses any mention of a possible connection between Luke 24:31 and Gen 3:7. This goes for commentaries by Calvin,³ Henry,⁴ Bruce,⁵ Klostermann,⁶ Ragg,⁷ Easton,⁸ Manson,⁹ Rose,¹⁰ Lenski,¹¹ Godet,¹² Geldenhuys,¹³ Browning,¹⁴ Caird,¹⁵ Creed,¹⁶ Tinsley,¹⁷ Leaney,¹⁸ Summers,¹⁹ Thompson,²⁰ Hendriksen,²¹ Marshall,²² LaVerdiere,²³ Ellis,²⁴ Grundmann,²⁵ Schweizer,²⁶ Fitzmyer,²⁷ Gooding,²⁸ Danker,²⁹ Tiede,³⁰ Craddock,³¹ Evans,³² Stein,³³ Nolland,³⁴ Pate,³⁵ Black,³⁶ Bock,³⁷ Tannehill,³⁸ Green,³⁹ Butler,⁴⁰ Grün,⁴¹ and Talbert.⁴²

³ John Calvin, *Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists Matthew, Mark, and Luke* (trans. William Pringle; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003; repr.) 364.

⁴ Leslie F. Church, ed., *Matthew Henry's Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1961) 1502.

⁵ A. B. Bruce, "The Gospels according to Matthew, Mark and Luke," in *The Expositor's Greek Testament* (ed. W. Robertson Nicoll; London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1912) 648.

⁶ Erich Klostermann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1919) 607.

⁷ Lonsdale Ragg, *St. Luke: With Introduction and Notes* (London: Methuen, 1922) 316.

⁸ Burton S. Easton, *The Gospel according to St. Luke: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary* (New York: Scribner's, 1926) 361–62.

⁹ William Manson, *The Gospel of Luke* (MNTC; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930) 267–68.

¹⁰ Vincent Rose, *The Holy Gospel according to Saint Luke* (trans. Newton Thompson; Baltimore: Murphy, 1931) 212–13.

¹¹ R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Luke's Gospel* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1946) 1191–93.

¹² F. Godet, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke* (trans. M. D. Cusin; 2 vols.; 5th ed.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1957) 2:355.

¹³ Norval Geldenhuys, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951) 634–35.

¹⁴ W. R. F. Browning, *The Gospel according to Saint Luke* (New York: Macmillan, 1960) 169–70.

¹⁵ G. B. Caird, *The Gospel of St. Luke* (Baltimore: Penguin, 1963) 258.

¹⁶ John M. Creed, *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (London: Macmillan, 1965) 297.

¹⁷ E. J. Tinsley, *The Gospel according to Luke* (CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965) 205–6.

¹⁸ A. R. C. Leaney, *The Gospel according to Luke* (2d ed.; BNTC; London: Black's, 1966) 293.

¹⁹ Ray Summers, *Commentary on Luke: Jesus, the Universal Savior* (Waco, TX: Word, 1972) 327–28.

²⁰ G. H. P. Thompson, *The Gospel according to Luke* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972) 279.

²¹ William Hendriksen, *Exposition of the Gospel according to Luke* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1978) 1066, 1071.

²² I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 898.

²³ Eugene LaVerdiere, *Luke* (New Testament Message 5; Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1980) 287–88.

²⁴ E. Earle Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981) 277; idem, *The Gospel of Luke* (London: Thomas Nelson, 1966) 277.

²⁵ Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (7th ed.; THKNT 3; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1974) 447.

²⁶ Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News according to Luke* (trans. David E. Green; Atlanta: John Knox, 1984) 371–72.

²⁷ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (2 vols.; AB 28; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981, 1985) 2:1568.

²⁸ David Gooding, *According to Luke: A New Exposition of the Third Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) 352–54.

²⁹ Frederick W. Danker, *Jesus and the New Age: A Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel* (red. ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988) 394.

³⁰ David L. Tiede, *Luke* (ACNT; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988) 437. Tiede makes a connection between the opening of eyes in Luke 24:31 and the opening of the young man's eyes in 2 Kgs 6:17, but ignores Gen 3:7.

The same lack of any mention of Gen 3:7 in Luke 24:31 occurs in books and monographs devoted to Luke or Luke-Acts. While we cannot be exhaustive, the consistent trend among Lukan studies is the omission of any discussion of the inter-canonical allusion suggested in this essay. This includes Chance's and Nielsen's studies of fulfilled eschatology in Luke-Acts,⁴³ introductions to Luke by Marshall and Parsons,⁴⁴ Evans and Sanders's co-authored *Luke and Scripture*;⁴⁵ Korn's study on the meaning and significance of Jesus to Luke-Acts;⁴⁶ Ravens's *Luke and the Restoration of Israel*;⁴⁷ Denova's monograph on prophetic fulfillment in Luke-Acts;⁴⁸ the collection of essays edited by David Moessner, *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel*, which explores Luke's portrayal of Jesus as Israel's true inheritance;⁴⁹ Franklin's and McComiskey's respective monographs on Lukan theology;⁵⁰ the multi-edited, hermeneutically oriented 2005 volume *Reading Luke*;⁵¹ Anderson's study of Christ's

³¹ Fred B. Craddock, *Luke* (Int; Louisville: John Knox, 1990) 284–87; similarly the 2009 edition, pp. 284–87.

³² Craig A. Evans, *Luke* (NIBCNT; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1990) 351; idem, *The Bible Knowledge Background Commentary: Matthew–Luke* (Colorado Springs: Victor, 2003) 525.

³³ Robert H. Stein, *Luke* (NAC 24; Nashville: Broadman, 1992) 613.

³⁴ John Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53* (WBC 35C; Dallas: Word, 1993) 1205–8. Nolland speaks of Jesus addressing in Luke 24 “the blinding effect of Satan,” but does not refer to Genesis at any point (p. 1207).

³⁵ C. Marvin Pate, *Luke* (Chicago: Moody, 1995) 474.

³⁶ Mark C. Black, *Luke* (College Press NIV Commentary; Joplin, MO: College Press, 1996) 390.

³⁷ Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996) 963–64.

³⁸ Robert C. Tannehill, *Luke* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996) 357–58.

³⁹ Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997) 849–50.

⁴⁰ Trent C. Butler, *Luke* (Holman NT Commentary; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2000) 418.

⁴¹ Anselm Grün, *Jesus: The Image of Humanity: Luke's Account* (trans. John Bowden; New York: Continuum, 2001) 109–10. Grün's work is not technically a commentary, but his theologically-oriented treatment of the account of the Emmaus road events in Luke 24 could easily have incorporated the allusion proposed in this essay.

⁴² Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel* (rev. ed.; Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2002) 257–64.

⁴³ J. Bradley Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988); Anders E. Nielsen, *Until it Is Fulfilled: Lukan Eschatology according to Luke 22 and Acts 20* (WUNT 2/126; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).

⁴⁴ I. Howard Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (3d ed.; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1988); Mikael C. Parsons, *Luke: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007).

⁴⁵ Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993).

⁴⁶ Manfred Korn, *Die Geschichte Jesu in veränderter Zeit: Studien zur bleibenden Bedeutung Jesu im lukanischen Doppelwerk* (WUNT 2/51; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993).

⁴⁷ David Ravens, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel* (JSNTSup 119; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

⁴⁸ Rebecca I. Denova, *The Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts* (JSNTSup 141; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).

⁴⁹ David P. Moessner, ed., *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1999).

⁵⁰ Eric Franklin, *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975); Douglas S. McComiskey, *Lukan Theology in the Light of the Gospel's Literary Structure* (PBM; Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2004).

⁵¹ Craig G. Bartholomew, Joel B. Green, and Anthony C. Thiselton, eds., *Reading Luke: Interpretation, Reflection, Formation* (Scripture and Hermeneutics 6; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005).

resurrection in Luke-Acts;⁵² Bovon's massive and updated *Luke the Theologian*;⁵³ and Mittmann-Richert's research into the use of Isaiah 53 in Luke's Gospel.⁵⁴

Not only commentaries and monographs but also broader works of NT theology, even those of a more biblical-theological or redemptive-historical bent, pass over consideration of an allusion to Genesis 3 in Luke 24:31. One might not be overly surprised to find this true of the NT theologies of Jeremias,⁵⁵ Guthrie,⁵⁶ Hübner,⁵⁷ Strecker,⁵⁸ Esler,⁵⁹ Matera,⁶⁰ and Schnelle.⁶¹ But the same omission occurs in the NT theology projects of Schlatter,⁶² Goppelt,⁶³ Ladd,⁶⁴ Morris,⁶⁵ Wilckens,⁶⁶ Marshall,⁶⁷ Thielman,⁶⁸ Schreiner,⁶⁹ and Scott.⁷⁰ To be sure, these are wide-ranging treatments of the theology of the entire NT, and it would be unfair to chide these authors too sharply for passing over a minor allusion in Luke 24. Yet the omission across such

⁵² Kevin L. Anderson, *"But God Raised Him from the Dead": The Theology of Jesus's Resurrection in Luke-Acts* (PBM; Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2006).

⁵³ François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-five Years of Research (1950–2005)* (trans. Ken McKim; 2d ed.; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006).

⁵⁴ Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, *Der Sühnetod des Gottesknechts: Jesaja 53 im Lukasevangelium* (WUNT 220; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008). While it may be unfair to include here a study that explicitly focuses on Luke's use of a text from Isaiah (not Genesis), Mittmann-Richert deals with Luke 24:31 at several points (pp. 212, 223, 227, 247, 256, 269), yet, despite being otherwise sensitive to the presence of OT influence in Luke, does not mention Genesis 3 at any point.

⁵⁵ Joachim Jeremias, *New Testament Theology: The Proclamation of Jesus* (trans. John Bowden; New York: Scribner's, 1971).

⁵⁶ Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Theology* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1981).

⁵⁷ Hans Hübner, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (3 vols.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990–1995).

⁵⁸ Georg Strecker, *Theology of the New Testament* (trans. M. Eugene Boring; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000).

⁵⁹ Philip F. Esler, *New Testament Theology: Communion and Community* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2005). In light of Esler's minimal interaction with the text, his omission of the allusion in Luke 24:31 is particularly unsurprising.

⁶⁰ Frank J. Matera, *New Testament Theology: Exploring Diversity and Unity* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007).

⁶¹ Udo Schnelle, *Theology of the New Testament* (trans. M. Eugene Boring; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2009).

⁶² Adolf Schlatter, *The History of the Christ: The Foundation for New Testament Theology* (trans. Andreas J. Köstenberger; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997).

⁶³ Leonhard Goppelt, *Theology of the New Testament, Volume 2: The Variety and Unity of the Apostolic Witness to Christ* (trans. John Alsup; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982).

⁶⁴ George Eldon Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament* (rev. ed.; ed. Donald A. Hagner; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993).

⁶⁵ Leon Morris, *New Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986).

⁶⁶ Ulrich Wilckens, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (4 vols.; Neukirchene-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2002–2005). It should be noted that Wilckens's project is not yet complete.

⁶⁷ I. Howard Marshall, *New Testament Theology: Many Witnesses, One Gospel* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004).

⁶⁸ Frank Thielman, *Theology of the New Testament: A Canonical and Synthetic Approach* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005).

⁶⁹ Thomas R. Schreiner, *New Testament Theology: Magnifying God in Christ* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008).

⁷⁰ J. Julius Scott, *New Testament Theology: A New Study of the Thematic Structure of the New Testament* (Fearn, Ross-shire: Christian Focus, 2008).

a panoramic range of scholarship, taken cumulatively, is striking, and its neglect, while explicable, renders consideration of the allusion all the more pertinent. One could add that a sampling of works in the domain of biblical theology more broadly conceived than just the NT is similarly fruitless regarding any connection between Genesis 3 and Luke 24.⁷¹

While a failure to explore the use of Genesis 3 in Luke 24 is somewhat understandable in broader Lukan studies as well as more comprehensive NT theology projects such as we have just been discussing, even works that purport to address explicitly Luke's use of the OT omit any consideration of the allusion. This includes Charles Kimball's study of Jesus' appropriation of the OT in Luke,⁷² Dietrich Rusam's 2003 *Das Alte Testament bei Lukas*,⁷³ and Kenneth Litwak's even more recent *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts*.⁷⁴ Particularly notable is the lack of any mention of the allusion in David Pao and Eckhard Schnabel's treatment of Luke in the remarkable new *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, despite this volume's aim to identify allusions as well as quotations.⁷⁵

Consideration of an Edenic allusion in Luke 24:31 is, then, widely ignored. This is not to say the possibility of such an allusion is raised, considered, and rejected; it is not even raised. This goes for commentaries on Luke, monographs on Luke-Acts, broader works of NT theology, and studies specifically of the OT in Luke.

II. IDENTIFICATION OF THE ALLUSION

This brings us to three writers who do make a connection between Gen 3:7 and Luke 24:31: Luke Timothy Johnson, N. T. Wright, and Arthur Just. This trio comprises the tiny minority that identifies the allusion we are proposing,

⁷¹ E.g. Geerhardus Vos, *Biblical Theology: Old and New Testaments* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1975); O. Palmer Robertson, *The Christ of the Covenants* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1980); Leonhard Goppelt, *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (trans. Donald H. Madvig; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982); Edmund P. Clowney, *The Unfolding Mystery: Discovering Christ in the Old Testament* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1988); R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission* (Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 1998; repr.); G. K. Beale, ed., *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994); Graeme Goldsworthy, *According to Plan: The Unfolding Revelation of God in the Bible* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1991); Dennis E. Johnson, *Him We Proclaim: Preaching Christ from All the Scriptures* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed, 2007); T. Desmond Alexander, *The Servant King: The Bible's Portrait of the Messiah* (Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 1998); idem, *From Eden to the New Jerusalem: An Introduction to Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2008).

⁷² Charles A. Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel* (JSNTSup 94; Sheffield: JSOT, 1994). Kimball includes extensive appendices both of OT quotations as well as OT allusions in Luke, yet the latter appendix mentions Luke 24:31 only in connection with 2 Kgs 6:17 (212).

⁷³ BZNW 112; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.

⁷⁴ Kenneth Duncan Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually* (JSNTSup 282; London: T & T Clark, 2005).

⁷⁵ D. A. Carson and G. K. Beale, eds., *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007) xxiii, xxiv, xxviii.

and in light of biblical injunctions concerning the testimony of two or three witnesses we shall gladly hear them. Even they, however, make the connection in a brief and not altogether satisfying way, calling for supplementation and fuller defense.⁷⁶

First, Johnson's 1991 commentary on Luke recognizes an Edenic connection in Luke 24:31. Commenting on the phrase "and their eyes were opened, and they recognized him," he writes: "The phrase echoes the biblical language used of Adam and Eve in Gen 3:7, 'the eyes of the two were opened and they recognized that they were naked.'"⁷⁷ Johnson takes us a notable step beyond what we have observed thus far. This, however, is the extent of Johnson's comment. He mentions the allusion to Gen 3:7 only in passing—making no observation, for example, about the significance of the timing of the eye-opening in the narrational flow of Luke 24 (on which more below).

Our remaining two scholars draw out the inter-canonical connection a bit more roundly than does Johnson. An Edenic allusion in Luke 24:31 is identified by N. T. Wright in a 1998 article, a popular-level commentary on Luke, and his massive *The Resurrection of the Son of God*.⁷⁸ In each case he suggests that while Genesis 3 describes the Bible's first meal, a meal that subjects the creation to bondage and decay, Luke 24 is the first meal of the new creation. This is illuminating and a significant step beyond anything we have yet seen. In our own comments below we would like to receive and build upon this. Yet the frequency with which Wright has made this connection is mitigated by the passing nature of his discussion in each case: none of these three treatments defends or explores the allusion beyond a paragraph or two. In each instance, moreover, there is little dealing with the text itself; the connection drawn is primarily thematic. While Wright points in promising and intriguing directions, the lack of exegetical reflection and parallel narrational comparison between Genesis 3 and Luke 24 invites more sustained reflection.

Finally, Arthur Just makes explicit the connection to Genesis 3 in Luke 24:31. In a suggestion similar to that of Wright, Just speaks of the meal of Luke 24 as "the first expression of the new creation that now sees the image restored in the new Adam, the crucified and risen Christ."⁷⁹ Just provides the most intriguing comments on this text of any scholar we have considered, helpfully employing the category of new creation and speaking of Jesus in

⁷⁶ We exclude here the references to Gen 3:7 in discussing Luke 24:31 in two commentaries from a century ago: H. A. W. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the Gospels of Mark and Luke* (Winona Lake, IN: Alpha Greek Library, 1979) 580 n. 3 (originally published in 1883 by T & T Clark) and Alfred Plummer, *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (5th ed.; ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1922) 557. Both Meyer and Plummer merely cite Gen 3:7 without offering any explanation.

⁷⁷ Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (SP 3; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1991) 397.

⁷⁸ N. T. Wright, "The Resurrection and the Postmodern Dilemma," *STRev* 41 (1998) 150–51; idem, *Luke for Everyone* (London: SPCK, 2001) 296; idem, *The Resurrection of the Son of God* (Christian Origins and the Question of God 3; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003) 652. Wright does not deal with Luke 24:30–31 in his other tome on Jesus, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Christian Origins and the Question of God 2; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996).

⁷⁹ Arthur A. Just, *The Ongoing Feast: Table Fellowship and Eschatology at Emmaus* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1993) 66–67.

Luke 24 as the second Adam. Yet Just, too, spends less than a page on the allusion, failing to provide a robust defense or exegetical substantiation of the allusion. Our purpose here is not to minimize the important contribution of Just or our other two scholars on Luke 24:31. They have served us well. Their specific treatment of the allusion in this text does, however, call for more sustained reflection and defense.

III. REASONS FOR THE ALLUSION

This essay builds upon the suggestive comments of Johnson, Wright, and Just by affirming what they have written while clarifying and developing the link between Genesis 3 and Luke 24. At this point, then, we turn to four observations—linguistic, narratival, interpretive, and redemptive-historical—that cumulatively suggest an inter-canonical allusion to Gen 3:7 in Luke 24:31.

1. *Linguistic.* First, the similar wording between the two texts is striking. Gen 3:7 LXX reads, καὶ διηνοίχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῶν δύο καὶ ἔγνωσαν [“and the eyes of both were opened and they knew”]. The corresponding phrase of Luke 24:31 reads αὐτῶν δὲ διηνοίχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν [“and their eyes were opened and they knew him”].⁸⁰ Most English translations render Luke’s use of ἐπιγινώσκω here as “recognize,” obscuring the parallel with Gen 3:7. While this is an appropriate translation of Luke in context, readers of Greek ought not to let this sensible English rendering blind them to the semantic overlap between ἐπιγινώσκω in Luke 24 and γινώσκω in Genesis 3.

Even more striking is the shared use of διανοίγω, to “open” or “explain,” used just eight times in the NT, all but one of them by Luke and three of them here in Luke 24 (Mark 7:34; Luke 2:23; 24:31, 32, 45; Acts 7:56; 16:14; 17:3). Each NT use holds (or is closely connected with) some kind of heightened spiritual or metaphorical significance beyond “opening” in its most basic sense (cf. ἀνοίγω):⁸¹ διανοίγω is used to describe the opening of the womb by the birth of the first son who is thus holy to the Lord (Luke 2:23), the opening of healed ears (Mark 7:34), the opening of the Scriptures (Luke 24:32, 45; Acts 17:3), the opening of the heavens (Acts 7:56), and the opening of Lydia’s

⁸⁰ In both Gen 3:7 LXX and Luke 24:31, a minor manuscript tradition reads ἀνοίγω rather than διανοίγω. On the LXX side, this is true of a single late cursive witness—see A. E. Brooke and N. McLean, eds., *The Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1906); cf. Alfred Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (rev. ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006); John W. Wevers, ed., *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, Vol. 1: *Genesis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974); note also idem, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (SBLSCS 35; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993) 40. Theodotion appears to take interpretive liberty with the text, rendering “opened” with συνετίσθησαν (see *ibid.* 40 n. 17). In the text of Luke 24:31, ἀνοίγω replaces διανοίγω only in the Western text (D), probably a scribal error of accidentally substituting a more common word for a rarer one. Outside of these fairly straightforward textual decisions, there are no text-critical issues to resolve in Gen 3:7a LXX or Luke 24:31a.

⁸¹ Cf. BDAG 234.

heart to receive the gospel (Acts 16:14). The verb has about four times the number of occurrences in the LXX that it has in the NT, and the LXX use is more diverse. Most frequently, it refers to the opening of the womb (Exod 13:2, 12, 13, 15; 34:19; Num 3:12; 8:16; 18:15; Ezek 20:26). Elsewhere, it depicts the opening of the mouth (Prov 31:26; Isa 5:14; Lam 2:16; 3:46; Ezek 3:2; 21:27; 24:27) or the opening of eyes in a more physical sense than is meant in both Genesis 3 and Luke 24 (Job 27:19; Prov 20:13). One also finds a smattering of more idiosyncratic usages (Job 29:19; 38:32; Hos 2:17; Zech 11:1; 13:1; Ode 4:14). Occasionally, the verb is used in a more “spiritual” sense, as in the reference to the opening of the heart to keep God’s commandments in 2 Macc 1:4 (cf. Wis 2:21). In Zech 12:4, *διανοίγω* is even used of the opening of *God’s* eyes (cf. Bar 2:17). The most striking parallel to Luke 24:31 in the LXX outside of Gen 3:7 which many note in commenting on Luke 24:31 is 2 Kgs 6:17, in which the eyes of Elisha’s fearful servant are opened (*διήνοιξεν*) to see the hills full of fiery chariots.

In light of the parallel wording, the relative infrequency with which *διανοίγω* is used (compared with *ἀνοίγω*, which occurs 77 times in the NT and 171 in the LXX [including Apocrypha]), and the heightened spiritual sense with which both Genesis 3 and Luke 24 employ this verb, the linguistic evidence points in the direction of an allusion to Gen 3:7 in Luke 24:31.⁸²

2. *Narrative*. Here we note broader parallels in the events of the narratives of both Genesis 3 and Luke 24, beyond the specific overlapping phrase just discussed. In both narratives:

⁸² The use of Gen 3:7 in Second Temple Judaism, of which Luke ostensibly would have been aware, is not particularly illuminating for the present study. 1 Enoch 32:6 reproduces Gen 3:7 with little alteration. *Jubilees* 3:20–21 recounts the eating the forbidden tree but, while describing only Adam as having his eyes opened (Eve appears to have simply eaten of the tree and promptly made fig leaves, then given some to Adam), there is little pertinent interpretation of the Genesis account (unlike other pivotal junctures in *Jubilees* where one discovers striking additions to, subtracting from, and editing of the biblical account as *Jubilees* retells Genesis 1 to Exodus 20). The only other place in the OT Pseudepigrapha where Gen 3:7 is notably present is *Life of Adam and Eve* 20:1–5, though here, while there is more alteration to the Genesis account (the text is recounted from the perspective of Eve in the first person) than in *Jubilees* 3, there is no reference to Adam’s eyes being opened (one should also bear in mind that this text is one to three centuries later than when Luke likely wrote). Note also the absence of any citations to Gen 3:7, outside the *Life of Adam and Eve* citations, in Delamarter’s Scripture index to Charlesworth’s edition of the OT Pseudepigrapha (Steve Delamarter, *A Scripture Index to Charlesworth’s The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* [London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002]). The OT Apocrypha has no references to the eye-opening of Gen 3:7. The Dead Sea Scrolls are similarly disappointing: in the continuous biblical text synthetically compiled from Qumran documents by Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, the text at 3:7 is missing from the relevant texts of Genesis from Cave 4 (there is a gap from 3:2 to 3:11—see Martin Abegg, Jr., Peter Flint, and Eugene Ulrich, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English* [San Francisco: Harper, 1999] 7). Josephus recounts the Edenic fall in his *Antiquities*, but neither uses *διανοίγω* (rather *συνίημι*) nor specifically mentions the opening of eyes (*Ant.* 1:44). A rabbinic commentary on Gen 3:7 focuses on the subsequent effects of the Edenic transgression (*Midrash Rabbah* [trans. H. Freedman and Maurice Simon; 10 vols.; London: Soncino, 1939] 1:152). Helpful in all this is Kristen E. Kvam, Linda S. Schearing, and Valerie H. Ziegler, eds., *Eve and Adam: Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Readings on Genesis and Gender* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1999); see esp. pp. 48, 53, 61–62, 137, 145.

- (1) two human beings are involved/addressed (Gen 3:6; Luke 24:13);⁸³
- (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);⁸⁴
- (4) the food is offered in an unexpected way: in Genesis 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,⁸⁵ 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 eye-opening, 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);⁸⁶ Gen 3:23; Luke 24:33).

⁸³ Wright believes the two disciples on the road to Emmaus were Cleopas and his wife (*Luke for Everyone* 296). If he is right, we have the added parallel that both pairs of human are a husband and wife.

⁸⁴ In this regard, Richard Bauckham notes the significance of Jesus being the object of the verb προσκυνέω in Luke 24:52 and elsewhere in the Gospels (*Jesus and the God of Israel: God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament's Christology of Divine Identity* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008] 130–31); similarly, Larry Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003) 345.

⁸⁵ On this knowledge, Derek Kidner wisely comments that Adam and Eve's "new consciousness of good and evil was both like and unlike the divine knowledge (3:22), differing from it and from innocence as a sick man's aching awareness of his body differs both from the insight of the physician and the unconcern of the man in health" (*Genesis: An Introduction and Commentary* [TOTC; Leicester: InterVarsity, 1967] 69).

⁸⁶ On the significance of which see K. Coyle, "The Road to Emmaus (Luke 24:13–35)," *East Asian Pastoral Review* 43 (2006) 393–96.

I conclude that the events of the broader narrative provide several subtle parallels which cumulatively affirm an allusion to Eden in Luke 24.

3. *Interpretive.* A third reason for suspecting an inter-canonical allusion in Luke 24:31 is the explanatory power it provides to the flow of Luke 24 as a whole. The delay in the two disciples' seeing that it was Jesus with whom they had been conversing on the road to Emmaus is puzzling. Why did it take them so long to comprehend who it was? In verse 27, we are told that, on the road, "beginning with Moses and all the Prophets, [Jesus] interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself" (ESV). One would expect *this* to be the moment of critical insight for the disciples. Why was it later that evening, at supper, that their eyes were opened (v. 31; reiterated in v. 35⁸⁷) instead of during the lesson in Christocentric biblical theology given by Christ himself that afternoon?

If an allusion to Genesis 3 is present in Luke 24, we are helped in understanding the epistemic delay on the part of the two disciples. For just as the meal of Genesis 3 was the critical moment of eye-opening for Adam and Eve, so the meal of Luke 24 was the critical moment of eye-opening for Cleopas and his companion. The events of Luke 24 have taken place, and Luke has accordingly recorded them, to reinforce a parallel between the Garden of Eden and the road to Emmaus.

4. *Redemptive-historical.* This could just as easily be labeled "salvation-historical" or "biblical-theological" or even "eschatological" if by eschatology we do not mean the doctrine of last things (concerning the future) but the inauguration (in the present) of all the ancient hopes and promises that snowball throughout the OT.⁸⁸ The point, whatever label we choose, is that 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. Three factors point us toward seeing redemptive-historical support for the allusion.

First, we remember that Luke is as concerned as any NT writer in placing his writing in the flow of the history of salvation orchestrated by God and climaxed in Christ. Hence, reading a Lukan text with an eye toward broader redemptive history fits with what is already broadly agreed upon concerning Luke more generally.⁸⁹

⁸⁷ On the importance of this reiteration see P. B. Decock, "The Breaking of Bread in Luke 24," *Neot* 36 (2002) 39–56.

⁸⁸ We are not, then, sharply distinguishing "salvation history" from "eschatology" in Luke in the way that H. Douglas Buckwalter does (*The Character and Purpose of Luke's Christology* [SNTSMS 89; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996] 226).

⁸⁹ See the extensive bibliography (which goes through 2005) on salvation history in Luke in Bovon, *Luke the Theologian* 1–10; V. George Shillington, *An Introduction to the Study of Luke-Acts* (London: T & T Clark, 2007) 22–28. Cf. several of the essays in I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson, eds., *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

Second, there are indications within the context of Luke 24 that Luke has broadly redemptive-historical or biblical-theological concerns in mind. A few verses before the breaking of bread we are told that “beginning with Moses and all the Prophets, [Jesus] interpreted to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself” (v. 27). Later that evening Jesus reiterates, this time to a larger group of disciples, that “‘everything written about me in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms must be fulfilled.’ Then he opened their minds to understand the Scriptures, and said to them, ‘Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and on the third day rise from the dead’” (vv. 44–46). In the immediate context of chapter 24, then, both before and after verse 31, Luke is transparently concerned to communicate that the whole story of Scripture is a unified narrative, diverse but not disparate, testifying to and culminating in Christ.⁹⁰

Third, more broadly, 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.⁹¹ The catastrophic “eye-opening” of Genesis 3 (which is, ironically, a “blinding”: cf. Isa 42:18; 2 Cor 4:4; 1 John 2:11) has been decisively overturned by Jesus, who now restores sight to his followers. This ought not to surprise us, for such eye-opening is exactly what he himself said he had come to do: earlier in Luke Jesus read from the opening verses of Isaiah 61 in the synagogue and announced that he had come, among other things, to proclaim “recovering of sight to the blind” (Luke 4:18 [ESV]; cf. 7:22; Matt 11:5). Indeed, the motif of spiritual blindness/vision is pervasive throughout both OT and New (e.g. Ps 146:8; Isa 6:9–10; 29:18; 35:5; 42:7, 18–19; Zeph 1:17; Matt 15:14; 23:16, 17, 19, 24, 26; Luke 6:39; 9:39–41; 12:40; 2 Cor 4:4; 2 Pet 1:9; 1 John 2:11; Rev 3:17). Particularly corroborative here is G. K. Beale’s proposal that the theme of new creation is the fundamental theological motif within which the whole of the NT can be subsumed.⁹² Such a thesis would prove amenable to the Edenic allusion defended in the present essay, which suggests reading Luke 24:31 in new creation categories in light of its link back to the fracturing of creation in Genesis 3 and Jesus’ restoration of creation in his resurrection

⁹⁰ Cf. Graeme Goldsworthy, *Gospel-Centered Hermeneutics: Foundations and Principles of Evangelical Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2007) 81–82; cf. 248–50, 253–56.

⁹¹ Andy Johnson helpfully explores the eschatological reversals wrought in Luke 24, especially in Jesus’ resurrection, but does not make any connections with Genesis 3 (“Our God Reigns: The Body of the Risen Lord in Luke 24,” *WW* 22 [2002] 133–43; cf. idem, “Ripples of the Resurrection in the Triune Life of God: Reading Luke 24 with Eschatological and Trinitarian Eyes,” *HBT* 24 [2002] 92 n. 21). Jonathan Knight detects an allusion to Gen 3:15 in Luke 10:19, but bypasses any consideration of another Edenic allusion in Luke 24 (*Luke’s Gospel* [New Testament Readings; London: Routledge, 1998] 106).

⁹² G. K. Beale, “The Eschatological Conception of New Testament Theology,” in *The Reader Must Understand: Eschatology in Bible and Theology* (ed. K. E. Brower and M. W. Elliott; Leicester: InterVarsity, 1997) 11–52.

and opening of eyes in Luke 24.⁹³ A new creation dimension to the Edenic allusion in Luke 24:31 might be further supported by the twelfth narrational parallel noted above, which contrasts the human pair leaving Eden in Genesis 3 with another human pair returning to Jerusalem in Luke 24.

IV. CONCLUSION

Scholarship has largely neglected it, but for linguistic, narrational, interpretive, and redemptive-historical reasons, an Edenic allusion in Luke 24:31 ought to be recognized. When Luke tells us in his Gospel that upon two dejected disciples receiving food from the risen Jesus, “their eyes were opened, and they knew [him],” he is deliberately drawing the reader back to the ancient account in which another pair of humans receive food and, concomitantly, new sight. The first eye-opening with its attendant knowledge ushered humanity into a new moral universe of darkness, exile, sin, and death. The second eye-opening with its attendant knowledge pulled back the eschatological curtain to allow Jesus’ distraught disciples to perceive that he himself had inaugurated the long-awaited new world of hope, resurrection, restoration, and new creation.

⁹³ Cf. Just, *Ongoing Feast* 66–67.