"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


---

* 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 Hylen, 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


\textsuperscript{35} C. Marvin Pate, \textit{Luke} (Chicago: Moody, 1995) 474.
\textsuperscript{40} Trent C. Butler, \textit{Luke} (Holman NT Commentary; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2000) 418.

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, Guthrie, Hübner, Strecker, Esler, Matera, and Schnelle. But the same omission occurs in the NT theology projects of Schlatter, Goppelt, Ladd, Morris, Wilckens, Marshall, Thielman, Schreiner, and Scott. 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

---

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.
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 re-
garding any connection between Genesis 3 and Luke 24.\footnote{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 pur-
port 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,\footnote{72} Dietrich Rusam’s 2003 Das Alte Testament bei Lukas,\footnote{73}
and Kenneth Litwak’s even more recent Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts.\footnote{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 Commen-
tary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament, despite this volume’s
aim to identify allusions as well as quotations.\footnote{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, mono-
graphs on Luke-Acts, broader works of NT theology, and studies specifically

II. IDENTIFICATION OF THE ALLUSION

This brings us to three writers who do make a connection between Gen 3:7
trio comprises the tiny minority that identifies the allusion we are proposing,

\footnote{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 Testa-
ment 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
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 Bib-
lical Theology (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2008).

\footnote{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).

\footnote{73}{BZNW 112; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.

\footnote{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).

\footnote{75}{D. A. Carson and G. K. Beale, eds., Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Tes-
tament (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 narratival 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 narratival 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


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 ὀφθαλμοί τῶν δύο καὶ ἐγνώσαν [“and the eyes of both were opened and they knew”]. The corresponding phrase of Luke 24:31 reads αὐτῶν δὲ διηνοίχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτῶν [“and their eyes were opened and they knew”]. Most English translations render Luke’s use of ἐπιγνῶσκο 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 ἐπιγνῶσκο in Luke 24 and γνῶσκο 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). 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 ἄνοιγω 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 συνετιθήμαα (see ibid. 40 n. 17). In the text of Luke 24:31, ἄνοιγω 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, διάνοια γω 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 (δεινοπενθέν) to see the hills full of fiery chariots.

In light of the parallel wording, the relative infrequency with which διάνοια γω is used (compared with ανοιγμός, 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. Narratival. 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 adding 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 Delamarer’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 διάνοια γω (rather συνίσχιμον) 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. Scheuring, and Valarie 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.


\(^ {85}\) 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).

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. 35) 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. 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 climaxing 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

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.\(^80\)

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.\(^81\) 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.\(^82\) 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.


and opening of eyes in Luke 24.\textsuperscript{93} A new creation dimension to the Edenic allusion in Luke 24:31 might be further supported by the twelfth narratival 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, narratival, 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 rejected 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.