‘when he was yet with you.’

**9.**] See note on Mark ver. 8.

**10.**] It seems as if the testimony of one of the disciples  
who went to Emmaus had been the ground  
of the whole former part—perhaps of the  
whole—of this chapter. We find consequently this account exactly agreeing with his report afterwards, vv. 23, 24.

Joanna was the wife of Chuza, Herod’s steward, ch. viii. 2.

**12.**] This verse cannot well have been interpolated from  
John xx., for the only reason for the insertion would be, to tally with ver. 24, and in that case it certainly *would not men-  
tion Peter alone.* That Cleopas bak  
ver. 24, **certain of them that were with us went,** &c. must not be pressed too  
much, although it does certainly look as  
if he knew of more than one (see note  
there). The similarity in diction to John  
xx. 5, 10—(*“ stooping down he beheld the  
linen clothes laid by themselves,”* and  
*“went away home,”* being common to the  
two passages) indicates a common origin,  
and, if I mistake not, one distinct from the  
rest of the narrative in this chapter.

**13—35.**] Jesus APPEARS TO TWO OF THE DISCIPLES AT EMMAUS. Peculiar to  
Luke:—the incident (but from another  
source) is alluded to in the fragmentary addition to Mark xvi. (ver. 12.)

**13.**] **of them,** not of the *Apostles*—the last  
mentioned were *“the eleven, and all the  
rest,”* ver.9: see also ver. 22, *“of us”* (*“of our company”*). One of them  
ver. 18, was walled kleopas (equivalent  
to Kleopatros, probably a different name  
from Clopas, John xix. 25: see note  
on Matt. x. 3). Who the other was,  
is idle to conjecture. Origen, in several places, calls him Simon; apparently from having understood *“saying”* in ver.  
34 to refer to the two from Emmaus, and  
referring *“hath appeared unto Simon”* to  
the present appearance. Epiphanius says  
it was Nathanael; Theophylact, St. Luke  
himself. This may shew what such reports are worth. Wieseler believes the two to have been, James the son of Alphæus or  
Clopas or Cleopas (but see above) journeying *with his father,* and the appearance on the road to Emmaus to be the same as *“was seen of James,”* 1 Cor. xv.7. Our narrative seems to have been from the report of Cleopas.

**Emmaus**] Josephus also mentions this Emmaus as sixty furlongs  
from Jerusalem. There were two other places of the same name: (1) a town afterwards called Nicopolis, twenty-two Roman  
miles from Jerusalem, where Judas Maccabeus defeated the Syrian general Gorgias: see 1 Macc. iii. 40—57. (2) Another  
Emmaus is mentioned by Josephus as being  
*in front of the sea of Tiberias:* and he  
adds, that Emmaus means, that there were  
warm springs there. This was the case  
also with the other places of the name.  
Our Emmaus is now called Cubeibi (?).

**15.**] **Jesus himself,** of whom they had  
been speaking, drew near to them. But  
this expression forbids the supposition that  
He was here, *strictly speaking, in another  
form,* as we find it less precisely expressed  
in Mark xvi. 12. The reason why they