blessed Saviour pretended that He would  
pass forth beyond Emmaus; but if He intended not to do it, yet He did no injury to the two disciples, for whose good it was  
that He intended to make this offer: and  
neither did He prevaricate the strictness of  
simplicity and sincerity, because they were  
persons with whom He had made no contracts ; to whom He had passed no obligation; and in the nature of the thing, it  
is proper and natural, by an offer, to give  
an occasion to another to do a good action:  
and in case it succeeds not, then to do  
what we intended not; and so the offer  
was conditional.” Jer. Taylor, Sermon on  
Christian Simplicity. Works (Heber), vi. 156.

**with us** does not imply ‘that  
they lived at Emmaus; merely **in the  
same quarters with us.**

**30.**] **I** believe that there was something in the  
manner of His breaking the bread, and  
helping and giving it to them, which was  
his own appointed means of opening their  
eyes to the recognition of Him. But we  
must not suppose any reference to, much  
less any celebration of, the Sacrament of  
the Lord’s Supper, *Neither of these disciples was present at its institution* (but see Wieseler’s conjecture, which is at all  
events worth consideration, in note on  
ver. 13); and certainly it had never been  
celebrated since. With this simple consideration will fall to the ground all that Romanists have built on this incident,  
even to making it a defence of administration in one kind only. The analogy of such a breaking and giving with His institution of that holy ordinance becomes lost, when we force the incident into an  
example of the ordinance itself. The Lord  
at their meal takes on Him the office of the *master of the house* (which alone would shew that it was not *their house,*  
but an inn), perhaps on account of the  
superior place which His discourse had  
won for Him in their estimation :—and as  
the Jewish rule **was,** that “three eating  
together were bound to give thanks,”  
He fulfils this duty. In doing so, perhaps  
the well-known manner of His taking  
bread, &c., perhaps the marks of the nails  
in His hands, then first noticed, or these  
together, as *secondary* means,—but certainly *His own will and permission to be seen by them,* opened their eyes to know  
Him.

**31.**] **he vanished** **out of their  
sight** does not imply His Body to have  
remained, though *invisible to them:* but  
plainly indicates in the original, besides  
the supernatural disappearance, a real objective *removal from them.*

**32.**] ‘Was there not something heart-kindling in His  
discourse by the way, which would have  
led us to suppose that it was none but the  
Lord Himself?’ not that they *did* suppose it,—but the words are a sort of selfreproach for not having done so. Compare Matt. vii. 29.

**he spoke to us,** not merely, *‘with us,’* as A.V.: it **was** not  
so much a talking with them, as a discourse delivered *to them.*

**33.**] “They have now no fear of the journey at night,  
from which they before dissuaded their unknown companion.” Bengel. The *whole eleven* were not there—Thomas was not  
present. Some have derived an argument  
from this incompleteness in their number,  
for the second of the travellers being also  
an Apostle ; see above on ver. 13.

Who **them that were with them** are, we  
learn from Acts i, 14,

**34.**] This *appearance to Simon* (i. e. Peter—the