

THE BREAKING OF BREAD IN LUKE 24

Paul B Decock

University of Natal / St. Joseph's Theological Institute

ABSTRACT

This paper considers the meaning of breaking bread in Emmaus in Luke 24 in the light of other occasions in Luke-Acts when bread is broken. Five aspects of the significance of this event are identified and discussed: (1) Breaking the bread as prayer; (2) as an occasion of illumination; (3) particularly concerning the death and resurrection of Jesus; (4) as a means of sustenance through suffering to salvation; (5) as anticipation of the eschatological banquet.

1. *Introduction*¹

The breaking of the bread is mentioned twice in Luke 24 (vv. 30 and 35). In verse 30 the narrator tells the readers: Jesus "took bread, blessed and broke it and gave it to them; their eyes were opened and they recognized him. . . ." In verse 35 the two disciples report to the eleven and their companions that he was made known to them in the breaking of the bread. The breaking of the bread seems to be the decisive turning point at which the communion between Jesus and the disciples is restored. We will explore in what way the breaking of the bread can be seen to bring about such a decisive disclosure and communion.

We will begin by considering briefly the surface and narrative structures of Luke 24 before focusing on the place and function of the breaking of the bread in the chapter. There are a number of other Lukan passages where the breaking of the bread appears: Luke 9:16; 22:19; Acts 2:42,46; 20:7,11; 27:35; we will consider these in order to see how they contribute to our understanding of Luke 24:30 and 35. In the last section we will bring together the different aspects of the breaking of the bread in Luke 24.

2. *The structure of Luke 24*

A number of scholars have in recent years drawn our attention to the concentric construction of the text of Luke 24.² There is a basic agreement that the Emmaus story forms the center piece of a triptych. There is no agreement on the exact demarcation of the three units, but I prefer the following: verses 1-11; 12-35; 36-53.³ There has been much concern to determine

1 For an overview of the literature on Luke 24, see Wanke (1973b), Dillon 1978, Dupont 1982, de Haas 1996; the last two are particularly useful for the literature dealing with structural analysis.

2 See Dupont 1982, Dussaut 1985, Nolland 1993, de Haas 1996, 49-94 for a more complete overview of this discussion.

3 Patte (1999, 188-189) argues for this division; on the other hand, Meynet (1988, 236-237), Dussaut (1987), and several authors before them demarcate the units differently: vv. 1-12, 13-33a, 33b-53. It may be better to let the second panel conclude with v. 35; the third one would then start with v. 36 (see also Boismard 1972, Sr Jeanne D'Arc 1977, Dupont 1982, 183 n. 62, Fitzmyer 1985, 1553). In this case the three panels each conclude with a return and a description of the response of the disciples to the message of the resurrection and the risen Jesus. In this way, there is a gradual progress between the conclusions of the three panels.

the central affirmation in the concentric construction of each unit. Scholars like Léon-Dufour (1971), Meynet (1978, 1988), Dussaut (1987) and Nolland (1993, 1177), for instance, consider verse 23b (οἱ λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ζῆν) as the center of the Emmaus story, and therefore also of the whole of Luke 24. This phrase is surrounded by the parallel statements of verses 22-23a and verse 24. The common words between these are: γυναῖκες, τινες, μνημεῖον, εὐροῦσαι – εὐρον, ἤλαθον – ἀπῆλθον, λέγουσιν – εἶπον, ἑωρακέναι – εἶδον. The γυναῖκες form a nearly perfect inclusion (Dussaut 1987, 174). The central section of the first panel is made up by the first part of the words of the heavenly men: verse 5 (Meynet 1988, 225). The center of the third panel, again according to Meynet (1988, 231), would be verse 45. The first two narratives are centered therefore on the message of the resurrection, while the third one focuses on Jesus opening the minds of the disciples to understand the scriptures (about Jesus' death and resurrection).

From a narrative point of view, the events described are not Jesus' rising from the dead but how the disciples came to recognize him as being alive. In Luke 24 we have a threefold story of transition from ignorance to understanding, from the inability to recognize the risen Jesus to recognition, from unbelief to faith. Each of the narratives in the triptych ends with a return (vv. 9, 33, 52) and a report on the response of the disciples (vv. 11, 31-35, 52).⁴

In each of the panels of the triptych the appearing figures enable the disciples to move towards faith and recognition.⁵ In the first panel, the heavenly men point out to the women that they are looking in the wrong place for the wrong object. It makes no sense to look for the body in the tomb; Jesus is no longer among the dead, he is risen and they invite them to remember his own prophetic words (vv. 5b-7). The effect is that the women do remember and that they announce to the eleven and their companions what they have experienced.⁶ The response of the eleven and those with them was negative (vv. 8-11).

In the second panel, the narrative starts with Peter's rush to the tomb and ends with the enthusiastic report that Jesus has appeared to Simon. The central section of this panel focuses on the two disciples; someone joins them on the road to Emmaus; the readers are told that it is Jesus, but the eyes of the disciples are prevented from recognizing him. After listening to their view on the situation, he challenges their ignorance and their slowness of heart to believe the words of the prophets; he then shows them, beginning from Moses and all the prophets, the things that relate to him (vv. 25-27). No effect is reported, but as evening approaches they reach Emmaus and the two disciples insist on offering hospitality to the

About the beginning of the first unit de Haas (1996, 99-103) defends a starting point in 23:49; in fact 24:1 refers to the women simply as "they"; they appear on the scene in 23:49, where on the first day they are witnesses to the death and burial of Jesus and they prepare everything to take care of the body on the third day. De Haas also defends v. 12 as the beginning of the second panel: after the message of the women Peter responds in one way; the two disciples in another; by the end of the unit these three have returned and witness to their experience of the risen Jesus.

4 The turning point in the lives of the two is therefore embedded in the turning point for Jesus' followers as a whole, with Peter as their representative.

5 Dussaut (1978, 177-189) has shown the symmetries between the three panels.

6 Remembering is repeated twice and seems important here. It is the basis for understanding. Dillon (1978, 51-52), while recognizing remembrance as a step towards faith, holds that the women are reminded of the riddle of Jesus' saying without the veil being lifted, without understanding. Nolland (1993, 1190, 1193) gives more weight to the remembrance; the women are assured of the reality of the resurrection and therefore they are able to announce it to the eleven. The literary pattern also favors a more positive understanding of the women's remembering. First of all, in each of the three panels the persons who have experienced an appearance are said to return (vv. 9, 33, 52) after they have come to a new insight.

stranger. He then reaches out to them a second time through the breaking of the bread, at which their eyes are opened and they recognize him. As they share with each other they also recognize that while on the road their hearts (which were slow to understand the Scriptures) were already burning (coming to life) when he opened the Scriptures to them.⁷ If we accept that verse 23c, “who say that he is alive”, is the center of the concentric construction of the central panel, it is equally important to note that the concluding phrase, “him they did not see” of verse 24 stands in striking contrast with this central statement. The phrase sounds ironical as the readers know that the disciples are speaking to Jesus himself; what they say about the women, “him they did not see,” also applies to themselves. The narrative begins by stating that their eyes were prevented from recognizing him (v. 16) and reaches a resolution when it is said that their eyes are opened and they recognize Jesus (v. 30). They return to Jerusalem and there find the community gathered and the eleven and Peter also fundamentally changed (cf. v. 11 with v. 34).

As the second narrative ends on a positive note we would not expect any further need for instruction. However, at the beginning of the third panel of the triptych the disciples are terrified at the sight of Jesus because they think they are seeing a spirit.⁸ The first response of Jesus is to convince them that it is he (v. 39), that he is risen. He invites them to observe him carefully and even touch him.⁹ Jesus *shows* them his hands and his feet and as they are still confused,¹⁰ he asks for some fish and eats it before their eyes.¹¹

The center piece of the third panel is found in verses 44-47 and the core of the chiasmic structure is verse 45: “he opened their minds to understand the Scriptures.”¹² Compared to the first and second panel,¹³ we have here a new element in the content of the Scriptures: this

7 It is important to see how in the concentric construction of this panel the dialogue of v. 32 corresponds to the one of v. 14. The panel opens with the statement, “that same day” two disciples left “Jerusalem” (v. 13) followed by a dialogue, “to each other” (v. 14). The panel then concludes with dialogue, “to each other” (v. 32), and a statement that “that same hour they returned to Jerusalem” (v. 34). The *a b b' a'* pattern is obvious (Meynet 1988, 235; Dussaut 1978, 170-171).

8 While the women had been looking for a corpse (vv. 1-3), now the disciples fear they are facing the spirit of the dead man Jesus; cf. 1 Sam 28:3-19; Isa 8:19; 19:3; 29:4 (see Nolland 1993, 1213). Van Tilborg and Chatelion Counet (2000, 187) remind us of πνεῦμα in Luke 23:46; Luke’s understanding would be that the spirit of Jesus went to God, while his body remained a day or two in Hades. “Initially, the eleven and those with them believed that they were dealing with an ordinary πνεῦμα. Jesus corrected this misunderstanding” (2000, 191). It has nothing to do, therefore, with anti-gnostic polemic.

9 On the concentric construction in vv. 36-43, see Meynet 1988, 227. The use of the verbs of observation in vv. 37-40 is striking: θεωπεῖν – ἴδετε – ψηλαφήσατε – ἴδετε – θεωπεῖτε; they form an impressive concentric pattern.

10 ἀπιστούντων (v. 41) reminds us of the reaction of the disciples to the words of the women in v. 11; θαυμαζόντων (v. 41) evokes the reaction of Peter in v. 12. The mention of joy (v. 41) contrasts with the terror and fear of v. 37 and indicates some progress in the disciples’ response to Jesus (cf. “great joy” in v. 52).

11 Nolland (1993, 1214-1216) does not see the eating as a further proof that he is not a spirit; it is a meal which reminds the disciples of the feeding miracle of Luke 9:10-17; he sees the “fish” as “a counterpart of the ‘bread’ ” in v. 30 and so together they correspond to the bread and fish of 9:13, 16 (1993, 1214). “Jesus is made known for what he is in the meal setting. . . . Through it Luke expresses a eucharistic theology” (1993, 1215). I would see the eating as a further sign, in order to conquer their unbelief that he is risen, in other words that they are not merely seeing the spirit of Jesus but the risen Jesus.

12 Meynet (1988, 231) highlights the words *paroles* and *écritures* (v. 44) and *écrit* (v. 46) and *proclamées* (v. 47) to support a chiasmic interpretation of this unit.

13 V. 44 reminds us of the words of the heavenly men to the women (vv. 6-8): the necessity of the death and resurrection which Jesus had foretold. V. 44 also evokes vv. 25-27, where this necessity is linked to the

time the understanding of the Scriptures does not only concern the death and resurrection of the Christ, but also involves the proclamation of conversion for the forgiveness of sins to all nations (vv. 46-47). To all these things the disciples will be witnesses beginning in Jerusalem (v. 48). For this task they are to await in Jerusalem the power from on high which Jesus will send from the Father (v. 49). So far, we have not been told of any positive effect of all this on the disciples, except for the ambiguous "joy" in verse 41. As in the second panel the positive response will come at the end.¹⁴ In this case it is at the experience of Jesus' ascension that they recognize Jesus as God's Christ. In response they worship him.¹⁵ They then return to Jerusalem with great joy and in the temple they await the promise in response to Jesus' command.

At the end of this third panel it has become clear that Jesus has been assumed into heaven. The original confusion caused by the missing body and the emphasis on Jesus becoming invisible after he has been recognized all fit in with the Hellenistic model of the assumption, a model which was most helpful for Luke's Hellenistic readers.¹⁶

3. *The breaking of the bread: Links with Luke 22:19 and Luke 9:16*

Our focus in this study is on the function of the breaking of the bread in these stories of transition from unbelief to faith, from blindness to sight, from despondency to great joy and openness for the task entrusted to them by Jesus.

The breaking of the bread appears at the climax of the second panel: during this ritual the eyes of the disciples are opened and they recognize him (vv. 30-31). It is mentioned a second time, in verse 35, in a context of mutual witnessing to experiences of the risen Jesus in contrast with the earlier puzzlement of Peter (v. 12), the sadness and disappointment of the

words of the prophets, to Moses and all the prophets, to the Scriptures. V. 45 recalls v. 27. Meynet (1988, 233) also points out how v. 26, "was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer and so enter into his glory," is the center of the chiasmic structure in vv. 25-27. The center deals with the Christ event, while the surrounding verses focus on the issue of the understanding of the disciples. In the chiasmic unit of vv. 44-47 we have the opposite: here the center is occupied by the issue of the understanding of the Scriptures by the disciples, while the surrounding verses deal with the content of the Scriptures (v. 44: everything that is written about Jesus must be fulfilled; vv. 46-47: the "everything" is now specified into three items: suffering, rising, proclamation).

14 Besides the fact that the endings of the second and third panel both show how the disciples recognize Jesus or respond appropriately, there are several other points of contact between the endings of these two panels: Jesus and the disciples journey outside of Jerusalem (Emmaus/Bethany); in both cases the disciples return to Jerusalem; in both scenes Jesus blesses; in both scenes we have the formula καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ + infinitive, which introduces the decisive gesture of Jesus and which leads to recognition, upon which Jesus becomes invisible, leaves them. Dussaut (1987, 181) has pointed out how this formula appears four times in Luke 24: in the first two instances they introduce appearances (vv. 4, 15), while in the last two they introduce disappearances. We could also say, however, that in the first two instances they are connected with confusion, while in the last two passages they are connected with enlightenment.

15 See Dillon 1978, 220, 223-224; Nolland 1993, 1215. The verb was not used with Jesus as the object of the worship until this point in the story. According to Lohfink (1971, 173 quoted by van Tilborg and Chatelion Counet 2000, 247), in the Hellenistic world assumption into heaven identifies a person as divine and the appropriate response is worship. On the connection in Hellenistic texts between the disappearance of the body and the conclusion that the person must be assumed into heaven, and therefore be divine, see also van Tilborg and Chatelion Counet (2000, 195ff.). The emphasis in Luke on the divine birth would fit in with this concern (van Tilborg and Chatelion Counet 2000, 236ff.).

16 See van Tilborg and Chatelion Counet 2000, 194-235.

two (vv. 17, 21), and the unbelief of the disciples as a whole (v. 11). About Peter it is said simply that the Lord had appeared to him, while the two disciples repeat that he was made known to them in the breaking of the bread.

One lead we should explore is the one indicated by Nolland (1993, 1178). There may also be significance in the way that the failure to find the body is mentioned and then reiterated in the first half of the chiasm (vv. 5, 23), while in the second half (vv. 30, 35), the mention of the bread is mentioned and then reiterated (the equation of body and bread in 22:19 and the fact that Jesus is made known in the breaking of the bread in 24:30-31 and verse 35 suggest that the similarity is more than fortuitous). Indeed, Luke 24:30 evokes the words of Jesus in Luke 22:19:¹⁷

Luke 22:19: καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν . . .

Luke 24:30: λαβὼν τὸν ἄρτον εὐλόγησεν καὶ κλάσας ἐπέδιδου . . .

In Luke 22:19 Jesus interprets the broken bread as his body given for the disciples.¹⁸ He adds, “do this in remembrance of me.” Remembrance is an important word right from the beginning of Luke 24: the women are asked to remember Jesus’ words about his death and resurrection and they do remember (vv. 6-8). The theme of remembrance of Jesus’ words (and deeds) is evoked again in the third panel with a formula which recalls verse 6 (ἔτι ὧν . . .). It would not be surprising then if the theme of remembrance would also appear in the second panel, precisely in the gesture of the breaking of the bread. The ritual by which Jesus symbolized the meaning of his imminent death and resurrection now after the events takes on a fuller meaning. We can see, therefore, a parallelism between the breaking of the bread and the two instances where Jesus’ words are recalled (vv. 6-8 and 44).¹⁹ In order to appreciate the relationship between Jesus’ body and the breaking of the bread in Luke 24, we pay attention to the importance of the body in the chapter: the absence of the body from the tomb is repeatedly mentioned (or implied): verse 3: the body of the Lord Jesus; verse 12: only the burial clothes; verses 23-24: not finding the body . . . while him they did not see; in verses 36-44 Jesus demonstrates that they do not merely see a spirit, but that they see him in the body risen from the tomb. On the other hand, the presence in the body is elusive (vv. 31, 51). In verses 31-32, by contrast with the dead body which they could not find, by contrast also with the risen body which escapes them, they meet his body given for them in the breaking of the bread. In a context in which remembering Jesus’ words and deeds is so important, it is quite natural to remember Jesus’ gesture and words at the Last Supper: “this is my body given for you.” The emphasis in the text is on God’s gift of sight: their eyes were opened (by

17 Roloff (1970, 257-258, 263-264), and some others before him, did not recognize any eucharistic association in the story of the multiplication of the loaves or in the Emmaus story. For Roloff, the meals of the risen Jesus with his disciples express renewal (and fulfillment) of the communion which was experienced through the meals during Jesus’ earthly life.

18 The parallelism between διδόμενον and ἐκχυννόμενον, the body given for you, the blood poured out for you, highlights Jesus’ life giving gift of self in his death; the twofold “for you” expresses the vicarious character of this gift of self. The death is very much in focus in this passage (v. 15). Here the blood is connected with the new covenant. We should recall here also Acts 20:28, where the blood is connected with the acquisition of the Church of God. We could think here of the blood of the Passover lamb, which played a special role in the acquisition of Israel as God’s people. This Passover lamb typology occurs in 1 Cor 5:7; in John’s presentation of the death of Jesus at the time the Passover lambs were slaughtered and in John 19:36. With the other synoptists Luke clearly presents the Last Supper as a Passover meal and he speaks about the imminent “fulfillment” of the Passover lamb in the kingdom of God.

19 See Pate 1999, 192: “. . . they have already expressed that they remembered his deeds and words (24:19).

God) so that they might recognize him with the eyes of faith.²⁰ The opening takes place through the interaction with Jesus who places the disturbing and puzzling events (vv. 19-24) in the context of his own words and deeds, and in the context of the Scriptures. In doing so he facilitates a disclosure experience for the disciples.²¹ The fact that Jesus immediately became invisible is important (as in v. 51); they know him to be with them although they do not see him.²² Luke tells the story with the Christian community in mind: Jesus is with them and this is expressed and celebrated in the breaking of the bread (Fitzmyer 1985, 1559).

The breaking of the bread in Luke 24 also evokes the multiplication of the loaves and the fishes (Luke 9:10-17).²³ There is a similar indication of time in both Luke 24:29 and 9:12 (κλίνειν, ἡμέρα). Κατακλίνειν appears in Luke 24:30 and in 9:14, 15 (and elsewhere in Luke only in 7:36 and 14:8). The four verbs, λαβών, εὐλόγησεν, κλάσας, ἐπέδιδου²⁴ in Luke 24:30 correspond closely to 9:16: λαβών, εὐλόγησεν, κατέκλασεν, ἐδίδου. This shared vocabulary is an indication that the feeding miracle was already at a pre-Lukan stage associated with the eucharistic tradition.²⁵ As part of this tendency we can see how in Matthew and Luke, compared to Mark, the role of the fish is played down in favour of the bread.²⁶ However, the theme of the fish re-appears in Luke 24:42. Dussaut (1987, 210-211) has drawn our attention to the relationship between the two meals: verse 30: λαβών . . . ἐπέδιδου; verses 42-43: ἐπέδωκαν . . . λαβών. The concentric relationship between the two can further be seen in the fact that the interpretation of Scripture precedes the Emmaus meal (vv. 25-27), while it follows the Jerusalem meal (44-47). Nolland (1993, 1206, 1214-1216) therefore holds that the two meals together evoke the miracle of the multiplication of the loaves and the fishes. The eucharistic practice of the church evoked particularly the Last Supper and the multiplication of the loaves; these meals revealed the mystery of Jesus and of his way.

20 See Fitzmyer 1985, 1568, who refers to 1 Kgs 6:17.

21 On disclosure, see Schillebeeckx (1974, 601); de Haas (1996, 114), referring to the work of Wojcik (1989, 8, 23), draws attention to Aristotle's idea of parataxis: "a series of independent statements that a speaker joins together without connecting words . . ." establishing correspondences without making the links explicit.

22 Note the emphasis on "being with" the disciples: v. 29: "remain with us . . . went in to stay with them"; v. 30: "as he was reclining at table with them. . . ." "Avant, Jésus se fait voir sans se laisser reconnaître, maintenant il se fait reconnaître, sans plus se laisser voir" (Perrot 1982, 164). Cf. Luke 24:5-6 and Acts 1:11; in both cases we find a message from two heavenly men challenging their apparent fixation with a location. The women are challenged to let go of the tomb; the disciples are challenged to break their fixation with heaven. The Lord is indeed alive in heaven, invisible until the Parousia, but he is nevertheless with them for their mission. The disciples of Emmaus experience him in a similar way: as soon as they recognize him, he becomes invisible (Luke 24:31). According to v. 29, the narrator says that Jesus entered in order to stay with them; the travelers will realize that indeed he is with them although invisible; see van Tilborg and Chatelion Counet (2000, 67-87): both the women and the two disciples return with invisible proof; "this makes it possible to see the story of Jesus' disappearance in Emmaus as metaphor of the empty tomb" (2000, 69).

23 Wanke 1973a, 38-39; Dillon 1978, 149-150.

24 This verb is also used in Luke 24:42.

25 These are the verbs found in Mark 14:22; 6:41. They are firmly rooted in the tradition of the Last Supper and at least already in Mark they had started to affect the traditions of the miraculous feeding (Wanke 1973a, 38-39; Dillon 1978, 149-150).

26 Dillon (1978, 149 n. 228) refers to Patsch, who pointed out how in Matthew and Luke the fish is not mentioned in the distribution and the gathering of the remnants. In Matt 14:19 the object of the breaking and the distribution is clearly only the loaves, while Luke does not further specify the object; see already Schürmann 1969, 517-518.

In order to appreciate the revelatory function of the meal in Luke 9, it is important to note that this narrative is framed by material raising the question of Jesus' identity.²⁷ In Luke 9:7-8 we read about Herod finding himself in a quandary, because people thought that Jesus was John the Baptist raised from the dead, or one of the prophets risen again. Like the disciples in Luke 24:11, Herod is sceptical about rumours of a resurrection.²⁸ In Luke 9:18-22 Jesus himself picks up the question of these rumours. In the process Peter confesses Jesus as the Christ while Jesus completes the picture by means of the first announcement of his death and resurrection. In this context we can see how the breaking of the bread (and the fishes?) in Luke 9:16 has a revelatory function; it reveals Jesus as the Christ, who brings the abundance of God's blessings, but a Christ who will be put to death and will be raised on the third day.²⁹ It is precisely the issue of the death and resurrection which the disciples have not understood and which emerges again in Luke 24, particularly with the disciples of Emmaus.³⁰ The breaking of the bread (and the fish) in Luke 24 can be understood as a revelatory ritual which evokes also the revelatory sign of the multiplication; this time the revelation is understood. In conjunction with Jesus' instruction about the Scriptures (vv. 25-27) the breaking of the bread reveals Jesus as the Christ, a Christ however who had to pass through death and be raised on the third day.³¹

27 The revelatory character of the meal is enhanced compared with the Markan (and Matthaean) text: as a result of several omissions from the Markan source, Mark 6:14-16 and the great omission, Mark 6:45-8:26, the pericope about Herod's opinion about Jesus and the pericope of the confession of Peter frame the miracle of the multiplication (Luke 9:10-17); see Schürmann 1969, 519, 525-527.

28 Herod wanted to see Jesus; likewise Peter wanted to see the situation at the tomb for himself and came away wondering (Luke 24:12).

29 The OT echoes (Exod 16, Num 11, 2 Kgs 4:42-44) are important, especially in view of the fact that later on in the Transfiguration scene (9:30, 33) Moses and Elijah appear. Moses, Elijah and Elisha share the same traditions: Elijah can be seen as a new Moses, and Elisha as the new Elijah. Jesus is seen here in this tradition, as the one who brings the abundance of God's gifts for the messianic time. Schürmann (1969, 421) is careful to emphasize that it is not simply a question of showing that Jesus is greater than Moses or Elijah, but to show how God's blessings of the past come to a climax with Jesus.

30 The disciples of Emmaus tell their companion on the road about Jesus in a way which reminds us of the passion predictions (vv. 20-21: παρέδωκεν, ἀρχιερεῖς, [θανάτου], τρίτην . . . ἡμέραν: cf. Luke 9:22; 9:44; 18:32-33). All this was presented by Jesus as the fulfillment of "all the things written by the prophets" (Luke 18:31). However, just as they are unable to recognize Jesus, they are unable to see the link between their experiences of these last few days on the one hand, and the words of Jesus and the Scriptures on the other. In that sense they are unable to understand the Scriptures. They mention how Jesus was handed over and was crucified (v. 20); they also mention that this is now already the third day (v. 21) and that the women could not find the body in the tomb but told them about a vision of angels in which they were assured that Jesus was risen (vv. 22-23). They do not refer to Jesus' announcements of his death and resurrection. All the elements were there, but they could not make sense of it. As Dillon comments: "the *totality of the facts* is developed in ironic counterpoint to the *total incomprehension* by those who experience and recount them. Rescue from this *aporia* will come only *sola gratia* with the resurrected Lord's instruction, and that is the climax towards which Luke's composition builds" (1978, 111). The prophet like Moses (Acts 3:22-23), raised from the dead, is the one who interprets the Scriptures; to him all must listen (Dillon 1978, 137-138). It is noteworthy that the two disciples do not mention how the two men reminded the women about Jesus' prediction of the necessity of his death and resurrection. They did not remember these words of Jesus nor did they understand the Scriptures. Jesus will therefore start from this necessity as it was expressed in the Scriptures (vv. 25-27).

31 Co (1990, 199-200, n. 139) has drawn our attention to the similarities between Mark 8:14-26 and the Emmaus story. Although this Markan text is part of the great omission, this does not mean that it was not available to Luke (see Schürmann 1969, 525-6). Co lists as common elements: the breaking of the bread, the

Luke's stories of the Last Supper and the multiplication of loaves are linked with texts asserting that the way to the kingdom passes through the cross. In Luke 22:14-20 the eucharist is associated with the nearness of the kingdom: verses 16 and 18. We can understand these to mean that Jesus' kingship will be fulfilled in his death, resurrection and ascension (Luke 19:38; 22:15; 23:2-3, 37-38; and especially 23:42-43).³² The theme of the kingdom occurs again a few verses later in 22:28-30. Here, as in Luke 9:23-27, the point is that the way to the kingdom requires remaining with Jesus in his trials (for the disciples), taking up one's cross daily and following Jesus (addressed to all; cf. Acts 14:22). Jesus' response to an enthusiastic listener who exclaims: "Happy whoever eats bread in the kingdom of God" (Luke 14:15), follows the same trend: what is required is radical availability (vv. 16-24; cf. 12:31), "hating one's own father . . ." (vv. 25-26), carrying one's cross (v. 27), parting with all one's possessions (vv. 28-33). "Breaking bread" does evoke images of the messianic banquet, but Luke is particularly interested in the "way" to the banquet.³³ The coming of the kingdom in its fullness is connected with the return of Christ; his coming is certain (Acts 1:11) but "between Christ's exaltation and his parousia is the time for the testimony of his followers, the period of the Church under Stress" (Fitzmyer 1998, 211 on Acts 1:11).³⁴ Breaking bread and remembering Jesus means therefore also remembering our future.³⁵

4. *Tradition- and redaction-critical considerations*

Looking at the genesis of the texts may open new perspectives on the role of the breaking of the bread in Luke 24. In particular, we want to consider the two crucial actions of Jesus with regard to the disciples, the interpretation of the scriptures and the breaking of the bread. Dillon is one of those authors who has tried to show that the theme of the meal (breaking of the bread) was traditionally linked to the resurrection appearances and that Lukan redaction was responsible for introducing the passion instructions into the meal.³⁶ Luke had a particular

theme of understanding/not understanding, and the opening of the eyes. We should also note "do you not remember?" (Mark 8:18) in view of the presence of this theme in Luke 24:6, 8. The Markan text could have inspired Luke to develop the revelatory potential of the miracle. For Dillon, "the 'breaking of the bread' is the sacramental signature of Jesus' bequest of his own life's mission and destiny to his followers. As such, the rite is the normal and necessary accompaniment of the passion instruction, so that the two are really a *single act*, not two separate moments of the recognition process in our story" (1978, 154).

32 This kingdom was operative from the beginning of Jesus' ministry (Luke 4:43) but will be realized fully only after the testimony to Jesus has reached the ends of the earth: "... the kingdom awaits the testimony that must be borne about it 'to the ends of the earth' ... Mark 13:32; Matt 24:36; 1 Thess 5:2. . ." (Fitzmyer 1998, 205 on Acts 1:7).

33 Pokorný (1998, 98) points out how the parable which follows upon v. 15 presents the feast as ready right now: v. 17. The kingdom is present in Jesus as a challenge here and now.

34 See also Acts 1:6-7. Note how the kingdom of God is mentioned at the beginning and in the very last verse of Acts, as an inclusion.

35 According to Pokorný, "Den Weg durch die Geschichte bis zum Ende dieser Welt und der Erfüllung der prophetischen Verheissungen in der Endzeit schildert Lukas nicht [against the position of Conzelmann], denn das theologisch Entscheidende, das was für die Orientierung auf dem Wege notwendig ist, ist mit Jesus verbunden. Die Endzeit war in Jesus antizipiert (Luke 17, 20f.)" (1998, 100). Pokorný speaks about the "Christologisierung der Eschatologie bei Lukas" (1998, 101).

36 "In any case the hypothesis is quite plausible that Luke's Emmaus *tradition* was the account of the risen Christ encountered as a *wayfaring stranger entertained as a houseguest* . . . and, while reclining at table with his host, reenacting the miraculous feeding of bread and fish, whereupon his astonished hosts-turned-guests recognized his identity" (Dillon 1978, 152-153). Such a tradition can be found, for instance, in John 21:4, 9,

interest in the link between these two themes, as can be seen not only in Luke 24:35, but also in Luke 9:10-27 and in Luke 22:14-38. Feeding and self-revelation are intimately linked: "In Luke's mind, *the Master breaking bread with his followers is the Master sharing his mission and destiny with them!*" (Dillon 1978, 107).³⁷

5. *The meaning of the breaking of the bread in the stories of Acts 20:7-12 and 27:1-28:16*

5.1 Acts 20:7-12: The raising of Eutychus

Recently, J Taylor (1996; 1999) has argued that the breaking of the bread cannot be seen as a eucharist, having as its point of reference the Last Supper, but must have its origin in a Jewish ritual of blessing in which only bread was broken, a ritual which was open to various interpretations. Taylor finds in *Did.* 9:4 an indication of how the ritual was understood in that community; there it symbolized being scattered (broken and spread over the table)³⁸ and then gathered, before being distributed. This Taylor understands in the light of Ezek 34:5-14, 23 (LXX), about the scattering of God's sheep and their gathering by David, God's servant. The ritual therefore had a negative moment followed by a positive moment and it was applied in a particular way in the narrative of Acts 20:7-12, where we find the death and resurrection of Eutychus, together with the movement from night to dawn, symbolized in the scattering and the gathering of the broken bread. Taylor's reading is stimulating, but his interpretation of *Did.* 9:4 as well as his effort to keep the breaking of the bread distinct (and in origin independent) from the eucharist are not really convincing. He is certainly right to point to the importance of the two moments in the story, midnight and dawn, which correspond to the death and resurrection of Eutychus. However, the fact that Jesus is not mentioned does not mean that the symbolism of death and life was connected with night and dawn and independent of the death and resurrection of Jesus (1999, 293). The theme of the resurrection of Jesus is evoked right from the beginning by means of "the first day of the week," which in Luke and the NT in general is connected with the day of resurrection: Mark 16:2; Matt 28:1; Luke 24:1; John 20:1, 19.³⁹ It is more likely, therefore, that the transition from darkness to light symbolizes first of all the death and resurrection of Jesus,⁴⁰ but this transition also

12. 13; the miraculous catch was originally a separate entity (Dillon 1978, 150). Roloff (1970, 260) points to the links with John 6: the presence of the rare ὀψάριον; no reference to the breaking of the bread; the distribution of the fish expressed in a very similar way (6:11; 21:13).

37 According to Dillon (1978, 153-154) the milieu in which these traditions about the meal appearances were transmitted and shaped could be that of the itinerant missionaries for whom hospitality and table-fellowship were important issues. Extending hospitality to the missionaries was a duty for Christians, an issue to which Luke was particularly attentive, as can be seen in Luke 10:1-12 (Dillon 1978, 105-108, 187-190, 238-240).

38 He follows the variant in St. Athanasius, *De virginitate*, which refers to the table instead of to the mountains; the more commonly accepted interpretation is the one found already in Cyprian, *Eph.* 63.13, where it is said that the *grain* (not the broken bread) was scattered over the hills (1999, 287-288).

39 The expression also occurs in 1 Cor 16:2, where this day is especially marked out, but the text does not explicitly mention a eucharistic celebration (Taylor 1996, 86-87). On the origin of the Sunday celebration, see Schneider 1982, 285-286 nn. 17, 18. In Acts 20:7 it is not clear from the text whether the vigil takes place during the night of Saturday to Sunday or Sunday to Monday; the first alternative is the more probable (Fitzmyer 1998, 668-669); Rordorf (2000) favours the latter.

40 In Luke 1:78 the coming of the Lord is compared to ἀντολή which will enlighten those in darkness and the shadow of death; see Schürmann 1969, 91-92; on the association of Jesus and the sun in early Christianity, see Domagalski 2000.

affects the lives of Christians as they follow Jesus on the way through death to life. The text marks "midnight" as the moment Eutychus fell and died, while only in verse 12 the evidence of his return to life is seen and experienced by the community as consolation. This is situated "at dawn" after the breaking of the bread.⁴¹ The breaking of the bread, the celebration of Jesus' way from death to life, brings consolation in the experiences of trial.⁴²

5.2 Acts 27:1-28:16: Paul's journey from Caesarea to Rome⁴³

Although a prisoner, Paul is the key actor in this section. In verse 10 he denounces the ὄντες of the men who decide to sail although it was a dangerous season and he points to the risk involved for the ship and the men. Paul's words come true and from verse 14 onwards we are told how a violent storm threatens the ship. By verses 20-21 the situation reaches its nadir: no sun or stars for many days; no more hope for salvation; no more courage to eat. At this point Paul intervenes again, now with a message of hope from God on whose promise he relies: because of Paul all will be saved (vv. 21b-26). The narrative reaches a critical point in verses 27-37.⁴⁴ Paul again takes the initiative and encourages all to eat: he himself takes bread, he thanks God in the presence of all, he breaks the bread and eats (v. 35). This changes the mood of the men: they take courage and eat (v. 36, cf. Acts 20:12). From then onwards the narrative moves quickly towards a positive resolution of the crisis.⁴⁵ As in the Emmaus narrative and in the raising of Eutychus, the breaking of the bread brings about a positive turn. It is significant that Paul thanks God before all the people. In the act of thanking or blessing God in the biblical tradition people remember all God's blessings of the past. Paul remembers here all God's great acts of the past, he expresses his trust in God's words of promise (v. 25) and translates these promises into a prophecy of salvation (v. 34). The thanksgiving (or "the breaking of the bread") has its effect on all (v. 36).

There is an argument among scholars whether Paul was celebrating a Christian eucharist.⁴⁶ That it has "nothing to do with the eucharist" (Jervell 1998, 609) is definitely incorrect. The language evokes Luke 22:19; 24:30; 9:16; even though Paul does not "give" to those present, they do eat.⁴⁷ As Schneider (1982, 397) remarks, to put the question in terms of the alternative, eucharist or ordinary meal is not helpful.⁴⁸ "Die Mahlzeit hat eine ähnliche

41 Commentators have observed the awkward order at the end, with v. 11 interrupting the more natural flow from v. 10 to v. 12 (Fitzmyer 1998, 668).

42 According to Wanke, "Die 'Tröstung' bezieht sich nun sowohl auf das Geschehen um den Knaben wie auf die ganze nächtliche Abschiedsszene, deren Höhepunkt das 'Brotbrechen' ist. Damit ist das Geschick des Knaben erzählerisch dem grösseren Anliegen untergeordnet: Die zum Mahl versammelte Gemeinde ist geborgen unter dem Schutz des Herrn" (1973a, 23).

43 We will not enter into the discussions on the origin of this passage. It is the last of the "we-passages".

44 Note the indications of time: midnight (v. 27); longing for daylight (v. 29); as it was about dawn (v. 33); it was day (v. 39).

45 Before reaching land there is still another crisis (v. 42) and another one after they have landed (vv. 3-6), but these are quickly resolved.

46 See Barrett 1998, 1208-1209.

47 Acts 27:36, 38 recall Luke 9:17; and the mention at this point in the text of the number of people who were nourished in Acts 27:37 recalls Luke 9:14.

48 As Barrett (1987, 61-63; also 1998, 1210) points out, in earliest times the eucharist could not that easily be distinguished from all other meals. What did Jesus do at Emmaus? Every Jewish meal was a religious occasion. That is also why there is a dispute among scholars over the interpretation of *Did.* 9-10: it is not obvious to everyone that we have here a eucharist (see Draper 2000, 142-143; van Cangh 1999, 267-268).

Transparenz auf die Eucharistie hin, wie das Stichwort σωτηρία in V. 34b auf die Bedeutung 'Heil' hin offen ist" (1982, 397).⁴⁹

This is all the more significant when we bear in mind the correspondence between the presentation of Jesus in Luke and of Paul in Acts, particularly between Luke 22-24 and Acts 27-28 (Aletti 1996; Pokorný 1998, 83-85). Faced with extreme danger they entrust themselves to God and are vindicated. Both are saved: Jesus is saved, not in the way the opponents challenged him (by saving himself: Luke 23:35-39), but by entrusting himself into God's hands (23:46) and so entering his kingdom (23:42-43); Paul is saved⁵⁰ from the shipwreck (and the sword and the viper). Both are recognized as innocent: Jesus in Luke 23:47-48 and Paul in Acts 28:4-7. Both perform the blessing ritual which brings about a transformation in their companions and leads to salvation. In fact, Jesus performs it twice: the first time it does not lead to transformation for the disciples,⁵¹ the second time it does.

6. The meaning of the ritual of the breaking of the bread in Luke 24

6.1 The breaking of the bread as prayer

In order to understand the "breaking of the bread," we should first of all remember that it is a form of prayer, a prayer of thanksgiving, blessing and petition, which is also at the heart of the ritual. *Did.* 9-10 has left us many substantial traces of the shape of the "breaking of the bread" at its earliest stage.⁵² According to Mazza (1995, 13-41), in chapter 9 we have the eucharistic rite before the meal, which must have its roots in the Jewish Kiddush: first a thanksgiving over the cup, next a thanksgiving over the bread, concluded by a prayer of petition. Chapter 10 is the eucharistic rite after the meal, which corresponds to the Jewish Birkat ha-mazon.⁵³ In 10:2 we have a thanksgiving for the work of Jesus, God's παῖς, who

maintains that *Did.* 9-10 refer to the ἀγάπη meal which precedes the eucharist). It would seem that the eucharist in earliest times did not necessarily include the "words of consecration" (see Draper 2000, 142, who refers to Mazza and Kilmartin; see also studies of Ligier in the bibliography of Mazza 1995). They did what Jesus had done: they took bread, gave thanks or blessed, broke the bread, and distributed. Jesus was the climax of all God's works for which they thanked and blessed God, but in different traditions and at different occasions different aspects of this work in Jesus were remembered.

49 See Wanke: "Nicht ohne Hintergründlichkeit wird nun von dieser Mahlzeit so erzählt dass der Leser an die Eucharistie erinnert werden konnte. Den Sinn der Mahlzeit damals und der Eucharistie für jede Zeit will V. 34b herausstellen: τοῦτο γὰρ πρὸς τῆς ὑμετέρας σωτηρίας ὑπάρχει" (1973a, 29).

50 Schneider points to the "Häufung von Vokabeln des Stammes σώζω . . . σώζω 27.20.31; διασώζω 27.43.44; 28.1.4; σωτηρία 27.34."

51 One disciple betrays Jesus (Luke 22:21-23, 47-48; another denies him (Luke 22:31-34, 54-62); none of them understand his stance (Luke 22:24, 45-46).

52 There is no agreement on the question whether these two chapters are about a eucharist or about an agape leading up to a eucharistic rite which is not described. The latter view is defended by Rordorf and Tuilier, who also give an overview of the literature on the issue (1998, 224-226). Mazza (1995, 36-40), who accepts these chapters as a eucharist, assigns a very early date to these two chapters, a date before the Council of Jerusalem, because the Davidic imagery would be strange and incomprehensible after the controversy with the Judaizers; the primitive character of the παῖς christology is another argument; furthermore (1995, 66-97), he holds that *Did.* 9-10 must be earlier than 1 Cor 10:16-22. In any case, for the *Didache* as a whole a date before the end of the first century or soon after is widely accepted; for a survey of the arguments, see Draper 1996, 1-42.

53 See also Draper 2000, 138-139; Draper cautions: "Most recent attempts to analyze the eucharistic prayers in the *Didache* have been overly influenced by consideration of Rabbinic rules. . . . In view of this fluidity and

made God's name dwell in our hearts, and who revealed knowledge, faith and immortality. In 10:3 we find a twofold "account of institution" leading to a further thanksgiving (10:4).⁵⁴ In 10:5 we have a prayer of petition, followed by an acclamation, an exclusion of sinners, and comment about the freedom of the prophets. Draper (2000, 129-130, 139-143) has shown how "the prayers before and after the meal form a coherent and complementary whole" (2000, 139), which is complete in itself without any further need for the "words of institution" (2000, 153). This order of the eucharist is still reflected in Luke's account of the Last Supper (22:17-20), with the twofold thanksgiving before the meal, first over the cup and then over the bread, and with another thanksgiving over the cup after the meal. A further indication of common traditions between the *Didache* and Luke-Acts can be found in the Davidic imagery and the *παῖς* christology.⁵⁵ Attention to the "breaking of the bread" as prayer enables us to situate it in Luke's particular approach to prayer in Luke-Acts. In Luke 1-2 the ideal Israel is presented as a praying people: it has often been pointed out that the Gospel begins in the temple with Zechariah and ends in the temple with the disciples; we have the prayers of Mary, Zechariah and Symeon; Mary, Joseph and Jesus visit the temple on two occasions; Anna spends day and night in the temple fasting and praying (2:37) and Jesus at the age of twelve stays behind in the temple as he considers that he has to be ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου (2:49). During his ministry Jesus is often presented in prayer: 3:21; 5:16; 6:11; 9:18; 9:28-29; 22:40-46; 23:46. It is striking, however, that during his ministry Jesus prays alone and the disciples seem to be incapable to share with him (as they are incapable to understand particularly the teaching about the death and resurrection of the Son of Man).⁵⁶ This appears clearly in a few decisive scenes: 9:32; 22:45-46; their response to the ritual of the last supper shows once more that they are incapable of entering into the perspective of Jesus: one betrays Jesus (22:21-23, 47-48); another denies him (22:34, 54-62); they all argue with one another reflecting an attitude totally alien to that of Jesus (22:24-27). However, when Jesus repeats the "breaking of the bread" at Emmaus we reach a turning point; the two disciples become alert and understand that Jesus is risen; their dull and slow hearts had begun to burn as he explained the Scriptures (24:32). Their eyes are now opened (24:31) not simply to recognize Jesus physically but to recognize what God had done in Jesus, particularly in his death and resurrection. After the ascension we find them therefore constantly in the temple blessing God (24:53, cf. 2:37). From now onwards the disciples are regularly presented, like Jesus, in prayer: Acts 1:14, 24-25 (cf. Luke 6:12-16); 2:4; 2:42-47;⁵⁷ 4:24-31; 5:12. Joy now characterizes their worship and life: Luke 24:52 (cf. Luke 1:14; 2:10); Acts 2:46 (cf. Luke 1:14, 44, 47).⁵⁸

uncertainty concerning the existence of any 'original' Jewish form, the wisest procedure in analyzing the eucharistic prayers in the *Didache* would seem to be to examine its internal logic and not seek immediately to relate it to external 'rules', which probably never existed" (2000, 138-139).

54 Mazza (1995, 16, 24-26) points out that the first "account of institution" (10:3a), like the Jewish *Birkat ha-mazon*, refers back to and quotes Deut 8:10; but in 10:3b we find a further "account of institution" justifying the thanksgiving for Christians, as distinct from non-Christian Jews.

55 On the Davidic and *παῖς* traditions in Luke-Acts, see Decock 2001, 39-55.

56 In Luke 19:37 we seem to have an anticipation of the praise in 24:52-53.

57 Note how in v. 42 the breaking of the bread and the prayers are mentioned together; in v. 46 the breaking of the bread (participle) occurs in parallelism with προσκαρτεροῦντες in the temple and in v. 47 with αἰνοῦντες τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἔχοντες. . . .

58 Another point of contact between *Did.* 9-10 and Luke-Acts may be found in the theme of the gathering of the faithful (*Did.* 9:4; 10:5). Although there are no exact verbal links, the themes of God's gathering of those to be saved and of unity among them are prominent in the summaries of Acts. In Acts 2:41b, 5:14 and 11:24b

6.2 The breaking of the bread and the gift of knowledge

We have seen how the theme of recognition of Jesus is a key concept in the Emmaus story (vv. 16, 31, 35). This recognition is the result of God's gift as is suggested by "emphatic passive verb-forms" in verses 16, 31, and 35 (Dillon 1978, 103-108).⁵⁹ In verse 31 the gift of recognition is connected with the breaking of the bread, while verse 35 repeats this connection⁶⁰ but also evokes the dialogue while on the road.⁶¹

Didache 9-10 may also help us to understand how the "breaking of the bread" could "cause" the opening of the eyes of the disciples (Luke 24:31) and how he could be made known to them in it (v. 35). In *Did.* 9:3, the prayer over the bread thanks God ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ γνώσεως, which God has made known through Jesus his servant; the prayer after the meal thanks God ὑπὲρ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ πίστεως καὶ ἀθανασίας, which God has made known through Jesus his servant (10:2).⁶² The food and drink which Christians, as distinct from people in general, receive is qualified as πνευματικὴν τροφὴν καὶ ποτὸν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον (10:3b).⁶³ The knowledge and faith (10:2) are about God's deeds for the believers in Jesus his servant, which enables a new quality of life: ἀθανασία, ζωὴ αἰώνιος. Through it God's "name dwells in our hearts" (10:2).⁶⁴ The kind of knowledge involved in Luke 24 is of the same

the passive form of προστίθημι is used in referring to the increase of the number of converts to the Christian faith (Co 1990, 152); in Acts 2:47 the subject is "the Lord". The gathering "from the four corners of the earth" (*Did.* 10:5) may be evoked by the great diversity of languages in Acts 2:5-11; ἀπὸ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς (*Did.* 9:4) evokes the mission of the disciples in Acts 1:8: ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς. The theme of gathering can also be seen in the Emmaus story in v. 33 (a passive perfect participle). The theme of unity is prominent in the summaries of Acts: κοινωνία: 2:42; ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό: 2:44, 47 (also 1:15; 2:1); ὁμοθυμαδόν: 2:46; 5:12 (also 1:14; 4:24; 15:25); we could also add καρδιά καὶ ψυχὴ μία (4:32) and the theme of common property (2:44-45; 4:32-35) (also 4:36-37; 5:1-11).

59 "The messianic *krypsis* was a matter of time precisely ordained and delimited by the divine will . . . which arranged all of sacred history with the Easter Christ as its focal point." (Dillon 1978, 105). "The essence of the mystery which has covered the story since that point is that *God's messiah* had to *suffer* (9:22). Between these two terms of the mystery lies interposed the *krypsis*: μηδενὶ λέγειν τοῦτο (9:21), indicating that Jesus could not be known as *messiah* until his path *through suffering to glory* was complete" (Dillon 1978, 146). Nolland (1993, 1201, 1206), on the other hand, sees here Satanic blinding. Fitzmyer's view (1985, 1558), that the inability to recognize Jesus should be seen as mere human incredulity without the active involvement of either God or Satan, is probably more correct.

60 Wanke (1973a, 40-41, n. 129) agrees with Jeremias that ἐν should be understood in a temporal sense: they recognized him as (while) he was breaking the bread (cf. Luke 14:14; 20:33; Acts 7:13).

61 Dillon points to several texts where instruction about the mystery of the person of Jesus is associated with a meal: Luke 9:10-27; 22:14-38; probably also Acts 1:43-4 and 10:41; see also Acts 2:42; see also the discussion of Co (1990, 191-204).

62 Draper (2000, 140) points to the chiasmic parallelism between the two ὑπὲρ passages: "The addition of a further element 'and faith' intensifies the formula in a way common in oral/liturgical composition, and is consistent with the greater emphasis on the 'spiritual' in the thanksgiving prayers after the meal (in the same way life is further spiritualized as 'immortality'), but the parallel remains."

63 In *Jos. Asen.* 8:5 we do not have the contrast between people in general and Christians, but the irreconcilable opposition between one who blesses the living God and one who blesses idols. The one who blesses the living God eats the blessed bread of life, drinks the blessed cup of immortality and is anointed with the blessed oil of incorruptibility. Later on (8:11) Joseph prays that Aseneth may eat the bread of life and drink the cup of blessing. Knowledge and life are closely associated as can be seen in 8:10: "Lord . . . who calls from darkness to light, from error to truth, from death to life."

64 Mazza (1995, 21) associates the image of "the name dwelling in our hearts" (10:2) with Gal 4:6 (and Rom 8:15), with the Spirit calling out in our hearts.

kind. It is not merely factual knowledge in the sense that they realize that their unknown companion is Jesus. It involves the understanding of Jesus' words, of the Scriptures, and ultimately of God's wonderful works in Jesus.⁶⁵ It is this new knowledge which is given to them as they share with Jesus in the breaking of the bread and henceforth they are able to bless God (Luke 24:53). For this reason the breaking of the bread has been associated with the Jewish traditions about Wisdom inviting people to a banquet: Prov 9:1-6 (Mazza 1995, 96); Isa 55:1-5 (Draper 2000, 152);⁶⁶ Sir 15:3; 24:19-22 in John 6:26ff. (Taylor 1999, 291). The wine and the bread symbolize God's gracious gift of wisdom (Draper 2000, 152).⁶⁷

6.3 The breaking of the bread and the death and resurrection of Jesus

The knowledge which is communicated in the breaking of the bread is especially the way of Jesus through death to life. The inability of the disciples to recognize Jesus (Luke 24:16) must be understood in the light of their inability to understand Jesus' teaching about his future death and resurrection: 9:45;⁶⁸ 18:34. Each of the three panels of the triptych of Luke 24 touches on the necessity of moving through suffering to glory (vv. 7, 26, 44). This is clearly the central issue in the process of recognition. To understand this is the true wisdom: it is the way of Jesus and it is also the way of the disciple (Acts 14:22).⁶⁹ It may be significant therefore that the last verse of the Gospel lets the disciples repeat the journey into Jerusalem of Luke 19:29-48; the first time they marched in ignorant joy (19:37), this time in lasting joy; this time they make the temple into a place of prayer (cf. Luke 19:46); from now on they will make known to the whole of Israel (Acts 2:36) what remained hidden to murderous Jerusalem during the first journey (Luke 19:42).⁷⁰

Compared with *Did.* 9-10, the content of faith and knowledge in Luke 24 is clearly marked by the historical experience of Jesus, through the cross to the resurrection. *Didache* 9-10 does

65 In Acts 3:10, as well, the recognition is not merely the cold realization that the man they now see walking and singing God's praises is the one they knew before as a lame beggar; it involves an awareness of the broader meaning of what happened: ἐπλήσθησαν θάμβους καὶ ἐκστάσεως. It is the aim of Luke's work to lead the readers to such kind of knowledge (Luke 1:4).

66 "Bread is common cultural symbol of knowledge/wisdom in Jewish culture, often in connection with wine . . ." (Draper 2000, 152).

67 Wisdom, praise of God, faith, are all tied up with each other in the Jewish tradition and are gifts of God, the work of God's Spirit: Wis 8:21; Gal 4:6; 1 Cor 12:3.

68 Luke 9:1-50 has a special connection with Luke 24 and Acts 1; the ignorance of the disciples about the way of Jesus, through death to life, is transformed in Luke 24 into "recognition". In Luke 9:1-50, as we have seen, we have a revelatory meal (vv. 12-17) preceded and followed by a discussion about the identity of Jesus (vv. 7-9; 18-22), which ends in Jesus' first announcement of his death and resurrection. This is followed in vv. 28-36 by the transfiguration, where "two men" speak with Jesus "in his glory" (see also 24:4 and Acts 1:10) about his ἐξοδος which he was about to fulfil in Jerusalem. The inability of the disciples and their lack of faith feature regularly in ch. 9: vv. 13, 32-33, 40-41, 45, 46, 50.

69 Luke 9:23-27, on taking up one's cross daily, follows upon Jesus' first announcement of his own way through death to the resurrection. These can be seen as the mysteries of God (divine δει); cf. with Wis 2:21-24, where the godless/the fools do not understand the mysteries of God.

70 Combet-Galland and Smyth-Florentin (1993, 331-332) draw attention to "les retours, le retournement." There is indeed an interesting pattern of repetitions: first of all, Jesus announces his suffering and resurrection several times: 9:22; 9:44 and 17:25 (without resurrection); 18:31-33. In Luke 24 he recalls and explains these predictions three times. The meal of Luke 9:12-17 and the appearance of the "two men" in Luke 9:30 do not have their revelatory effect and are repeated, in reverse order, in Luke 24: at the tomb and at Emmaus.

not mention suffering or death; there is only mention of immortality and eternal life (10:2-3), which may be a more Hellenistic way of speaking about God's gift of life for the righteous.⁷¹ Luke, on the other hand, gives full weight to suffering and the cross, but usually closely linked to the resurrection.⁷² Luke knows about the saving power of Jesus' death (Luke 22:14-20; Acts 20:28), but he prefers to see suffering and death not in isolation but together with the resurrection as the way to life which Jesus himself had to walk according to the mysterious design (δεῖ) of God.⁷³

6.4 The breaking of the bread sustains people on the way through suffering to salvation

Luke is particularly interested in the way of Jesus as the way for Christians.⁷⁴ The way to life is one of taking up one's cross every day and following Jesus (Luke 9:23). In the eyes of Jesus the disciples have persevered with Jesus in his trials (Luke 22:28-30), although without understanding. The cross will be a severe test for their faith, but Jesus prayed for Peter so that his faith may stand firm and that he in his turn may strengthen his companions (22:31-32). While in Luke 22:28-30 Jesus says to his disciples that they have "*remained with him* in his trials" and promises that "*they will eat and drink at his table in his kingdom . . .*", the disciples in 24:29-30 ask Jesus to stay *with them*; he enters to stay *with them* and lies down at table *with them*. There are thus subtle links between these two passages and it is clear that in the course of Luke 24 the disciples begin to understand the truth of Luke 22:28-30.

In Luke 24 Jesus draws attention to God's promises in the Scriptures and as he blesses God, the disciples recognize him and they understand that he is risen as the two men had announced to the women (vv. 6-7, also vv. 9-10, 23). The blessing evokes in them a similar attitude of blessing: their sadness (v. 17), their disappointed hope (v. 21), their blindness (v. 16), their foolishness and slowness of heart (v. 25), all these are affected by the blessing: they are converted to share the vision and attitude of Jesus and their faith in God, who made all

71 Draper (2000, 153) notices the fact that the *Didache* placed no emphasis on the death and resurrection of Jesus and he compares this to Q, with its wisdom christology and the absence of a Passion narrative. "Here, indeed, we may have the eucharistic prayers of the 'Q' community in their simplicity and coherence." However, while it is clear that the cross is not mentioned, the resurrection may be present in ἀθανασία and in ζωὴ αἰώνιος (10:2-3). In other Jewish texts, like Wisdom of Solomon, which was highly appreciated in certain sections of the early church, we find the language of immortality rather than resurrection (see also Ign. Eph. 20:2; 1 Clem. 35:2); however this is not the innate immortality of Greek philosophy, but a gift from God (2:21-24). The righteous are in God's hand even after death (3:1-12), but the day of judgment remains important (3:7; 4:20-5:23, see Puech 1993, 92-98; according to Puech, the resurrection is not totally foreign to Wisdom and its eschatology does not differ fundamentally from that of Jewish apocalyptic; however, all attention goes to the reward and punishment on the day of God's visit, and not so much to the previous stage). *Did.* 16:6 also knows of a day of judgment (truth) of which the resurrection of the dead is the third sign.

72 As we have seen, tradition- and redaction criticism show how the interpretation of Scripture and the passion predictions were introduced into the apparition narratives at the level of the Lukan redaction.

73 "Die Rettung geschieht aber nicht durch eine einzelne Tat Jesu, sondern durch alle Phasen seines Lebens und Werken" (Jervell 1998, 104). Jervell (1998, 104, n. 345) lists the most important authors who in the past denied the saving value of Jesus' death for Luke; he also lists more recent authors who support the view that Luke knows this view and does not reject it.

74 Luke is particularly interested in the exemplary aspect of Jesus' life: "Hier [Luke 9:23-27] – wie in der ganzen Evangelienchrift – werden zwar die Christusereignisse erzählt, aber doch immer nur so, dass das pro me – als Zusage und Anspruch – deutlich wird" (Schürmann 1969, 539).

this known beforehand, is re-established.⁷⁵ Their conversion is only complete, however, at the end of the chapter, when they too are able to bless God (v. 53).

In Luke 24 the breaking of the bread is at the center of the transition from ignorance to faith, from sadness to great joy, from being lost to being centered on God in prayer, from getting scattered to being brought together. In the two narratives from Acts (20:7-12 and 27:1-28:16), the breaking of the bread is the crucial turning point in the movement from death to life, from danger to rescue and safety. In each of the three narratives the breaking of the bread sustains the process from darkness to light, through suffering to life. The memory of Jesus' way and the trusting and joyful blessing of God, provides encouragement (Acts 27:36) and consolation (Acts 20:12) for Jesus' followers on their way "through many trials to the kingdom of God" (Acts 14:22).

6.5 The breaking of the bread and the eschatological banquet

Luke has not abandoned the eschatological perspective; it has become concrete in the person of Jesus, who suffered and died, rose and is now assumed into heaven, and who will return at the time appointed by the Father. This gives perspective and direction to everything Christians do.⁷⁶ They are on the way to the kingdom, but Luke is concerned to spell out in a concrete way the demands of this way here and now: freedom for the kingdom, witness to the kingdom, radical denial of self, taking up one's cross (see above, p. 46). While it is true that the Emmaus narrative on its own does not articulate an eschatological outlook (Wanke 1973a, 44), it would be incorrect to deny its importance for Luke's understanding of the breaking of the bread. Eating and drinking was for Luke also an image of the fullness of the kingdom, as we can see from Luke 13:29; 14:15 and 22:30a (Nolland 1993, 1066). First Corinthians 11:26, "proclaiming the death of Jesus until he comes," also expresses Luke's view: death in its many forms is a real challenge which Christians face all the time, but they face it in hope, hope in Jesus. Although the kingdom is already among them,⁷⁷ the time of trials remains for the present, but Jesus' followers can look forward to the great reversal in the future (Luke 6:21,25; Acts 3:21).⁷⁸ Yet, even now, even in the midst of trials, they have reason to rejoice: "Happy are you when people hate you . . . χάριτε ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ σικιρῆσατε, ἰδοὺ γὰρ ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ."⁷⁹

Luke 24 describes the transformation from unbelief (v. 11) and sadness (v. 17) to great joy (v. 53). The breaking of the bread played a crucial role in this transformation; through it Jesus

75 It was towards evening and the daylight had waned (v. 29), but their eyes were opened (v. 31).

76 See Pokorný 1998, 97-109. "[D]ie universalgeschichtliche Wiederherstellung im Sinne von Acts 3, 21 wird zwar vorausgesetzt und bildet ein festes Datum als das Dass des Gerichts und radikalen Wiederherstellung der Welt, aber es wird nicht näher expliziert" (1998, 101). Luke also shows special interest in salvation after death, which should however be understood as a preliminary stage before the Last Judgment (1998, 102).

77 The fruits were already visible in Jesus ministry (Luke 11:20), and in the community of the believers: in the joy, the prayer, the unity, the sharing of possessions (Acts 2:42-47; 3:26; 4:32-35; 5:12-16).

78 Luke can also speak about this reversal in very Jewish terms: Luke 2:25, 38; Acts 1:6.

79 The great reward in heaven (Luke 6:35) or the treasure in heaven (Luke 12:33; 18:22) are images of a secure future, a future kept safe in God's hand, where nothing or no one can interfere with it. Jesus himself is already there. The spatial imagery is more important for Luke than the temporal.

initiated his followers to bless God for the great works in Jesus, those past and the decisive one still to come.⁸⁰

I dedicate this study to Professor John Suggit on the occasion of his 80th birthday. He has had a keen eye for the fruitful interaction between the interpretation of Scripture and the liturgy. Luke 24 depicts this complex concurrence of the interpretation of Scripture and the meals with Jesus in the process of transformation of the disciples, a transformation which reached its culmination as they blessed God constantly in the temple.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aletti, J-N 1996. Le naufrage d'Actes 27: Mort symbolique de Paul? Pages 374-392 in *L'Évangile exploré: Mélanges offerts à Simon Légasse*. Edited by A Marchadour. LD 166. Paris: Cerf.
- Audet, J-P 1958. *La Didaché: Instructions des apôtres*. EBib. Paris: Gabalda.
- Barrett, C K 1987. Paul Shipwrecked. Pages 51-64 in *Scripture: Meaning and Method. FS A T Hanson*. Edited by B P Thompson. Hull: Hull University Press.
- Barrett, C K 1998. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. Vol. 2. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Boismard, M-E 1972. *Synopse des quatre évangiles*. 2 vols. Paris: Cerf.
- Co, M A 1990. The Composite Summaries in Acts 2-5: A Study of Luke's Use of Summaries as a Narrative Technique. Doctoral dissertation Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.
- Combet-Galland, C and F Smyth-Florentin 1993. Le pain qui fait lever les écritures: Lc 24:13-35. *ETR* 68: 323-332.
- D'Arc, Soeur Jeanne 1977. Un grand jeu d'inclusions dans 'les pèlerins d'Emmaüs. *NRTh* 99:62-76.
- Decock, P B 2001. *Isaiah in Luke-Acts*. Cedara.
- De Haas, V D M 1996. *De opgebroken straat: Een intertekstuele analyse van "De komst van Joachim Stiller" in het licht van Lukas 24*. Diss. Theologische Faculteit Tilburg. Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum.
- Dillon, R J 1978. *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word: Tradition and Composition in Luke 24*. AnBib 82. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
- Domagalski, B 2000. Sonne: historisch-theologisch. *LTK*.
- Draper, J A ed. 1996. *The Didache in Modern Research*. AGAJU 37. Leiden: Brill.
- Draper, J A 2000. Ritual Process and Ritual Symbol in *Didache* 7-10. *VC* 54:121-158.
- Dupont, J 1982. Les disciples d'Emmaüs (Lc 24,13-35). Pages 166-195 in *La Pâque du Christ mystère de salut: Mélanges en l'honneur du P Durrwell*. Edited by M Benzerath, A Schmid and J Guillet. LD 112. Paris: Cerf.
- Dussaut, L 1987. La triptyque des apparitions en Luc 24 (Analyse structurelle). *RB* 94:161-213.
- Fitzmyer, J A 1985. *The Gospel according to Luke (X-XXIV): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. AB. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Fitzmyer, J A 1998. *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB. New York: Doubleday.
- Jervell, J 1998. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. KEK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Léon-Dufour, X 1971. *Résurrection de Jésus et message pascal*. Parole de Dieu 7. Paris: Seuil.
- Mazza, E 1995. The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.
- Meynet, R 1988. *L'évangile selon Saint Luc: Analyse rhétorique*. Vol 1. Paris: Cerf.
- Nolland, J 1993. *Luke 18:35-24:53*. WBC 35C. Dallas: Word Books.
- Patte, D 1999. Structural Criticism. Pages 183-200 in *To Each its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and Their Application*. Revised and expanded ed. Edited by S L McKenzie and S R Haynes. Westminster: John Knox.

80 It is therefore quite natural for them to ask when this great future deed can be expected (Acts 1:6), to which Jesus, in terms characteristic for Luke, answers by pointing to the tasks of the present (Acts 1:7-8); genuine hope for the kingdom expresses itself in radical commitment in the present (Luke 14:15-34).

- Perrot, C 1982. Emmaüs ou la rencontre du Seigneur. Pages 159-166 in *La Pâque du Christ mystère de salut: Mélanges en l'honneur du P Durrwell*. Edited by M Benzerath, A Schmid and J Guillet. LD 112. Paris: Cerf.
- Pokorný, P 1998. *Theologie der lukanischen Schriften*. FRLANT 174. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Puech, É 1993. *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le Judaïsme ancien*. EBib 21-22. Paris: Gabalda.
- Roloff, J 1970. *Der Kerygma und der irdische Jesus: Historische Motive in den Jesus-Erzählungen der Evangelien*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Rordorf, W 2000. Sonntag: historisch-theologisch. LTK.
- Rordorf, W and A Tuilier 1998. *La doctrine des douze apôtres (Didache)*. SC 248bis. Paris: Cerf.
- Schillebeeckx, E 1974. *Jezus: Het verhaal van een levende*. Brugge: Emmaüs.
- Schneider, G 1980. *Die Apostelgeschichte I*. HTKNT. Freiburg: Herder.
- Schneider, G 1982. *Die Apostelgeschichte II*. HTKNT. Freiburg: Herder.
- Schürmann, H 1969. *Das Lukasevangelium I: Kommentar zu Kap 1,1-9:50*. HTKNT. Freiburg: Herder.
- Taylor, J 1996. *Les actes des deux apôtres*. Vol 6: *Commentaire historique (Act 18:23-28:31)*. EBib. Paris: Gabalda.
- Taylor, J 1999. La fraction du pain en Luc-Actes, in *The unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by J Verheyden. BETL. Leuven: University Press.
- Van Cangh, J-M 1999. L'évolution de la tradition de la cène (Mc 14,22-26 et par). Pages 257-285 in *Lectures et relectures de la Bible. FS P-M Bogaert*. Edited by J-M Auwers and A Wénin. BETL 144. Leuven: University Press.
- Van Tilborg, S and P Chatelion Counet 2000. *Jesus' Appearances and Disappearances in Luke 24*. Biblical Interpretation Series 45. Leiden: Brill.
- Wanke, J 1973a. *Beobachtungen zur Eucharistieverständnis des Lukas auf Grund der lukanischen Mahlberichte*. Erfurter theologische Schriften 8. Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag.
- Wanke, J 1973b. *Die Emmauserzählung: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lk 24,13-35*. ETS 31. Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag.
- Wanke, J 1974. "Wie sie ihm beim Brotbrechen erkannten": Zur Auslegung der Emmauserzählung Lk 24,13-35. *BZ* 18:180-192.

Professor Paul B Decock, St Joseph's Theological Institute, Cedara
e-mail: decock@eject.co.za



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.