



# Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)  
**Simon or back to Emmaus**

**Welcome, [neilgodfrey](#).**

You last visited: Today at 12:22 PM

Search

## Notices

### FRDB is Closed

**FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.**

### The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 1 of 9 [1](#) [2](#) [3](#) [>](#) [Last >>](#)

Thread Tools Search this Thread

11-14-2007, 05:42 AM

#1

[spin](#)

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2002

Location: nowhere

Posts: 15,747

**Simon or back to Emmaus**

When Jesus makes his first appearance after his resurrection at Emmaus, the two who had the meeting run back to the eleven and one of them says, "The Lord has risen indeed, and he appeared to Simon!"

The two were not a part of the eleven, yet one of them is called Simon and needed no further clarification.


Leaving aside what we are generally told in the gospels (which helps us find smoothing explanations), are we dealing with a fragment which comes from a different tradition, one which does see Simon, who is frequently called Peter, as separate from the disciples? Is this Simon not the normal Simon? Is this a sign of multiple authorship? What is one to make of this Simon?

spin

11-14-2007, 05:48 AM #2

**neilgodfrey**  
Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005  
Location: Darwin, Australia  
Posts: 874



---

Quote:


Originally Posted by **spin** 

*The two were not a part of the eleven, yet one of them is called Simon and needed no further clarification.*

**spin**

Okay I'll bite. Where in the text do we see that one of them was called Simon? (If the reference is not a clumsy insertion it nevertheless sets Simon apart from the 11 surviving apostles.)


Neil

 Edit

11-14-2007, 06:02 AM #3

**spin**  
Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2002  
Location: nowhere  
Posts: 15,747



---


Lk 24:33-34. After they had their experience with the risen Jesus, they returned to Jerusalem and found the eleven. That's when one said that Jesus had appeared to Simon.

**spin**

11-14-2007, 06:09 AM #4

**Ben C Smith**  
Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005  
Location: Midwest  
Posts: 4,787



---

If one of the two travellers was named Simon, and Jesus had appeared to both of them, why would the other one (Cleopas; see verse 18) say that he appeared *to Simon*? Why not *to us*?

But such questions are unnecessary. It is not one of the two travellers who says this; it is **the eleven**. Luke 24.33-34:

**Και ανασταντες αυτη τη ωρα υπεστρεψαν εις Ιερουσαλημ, και ευρον ηθροισμενους τους ενδεκα και τους συν αυτοις, λεγοντας οτι οντως ηγερθη ο κυριος και ωφθη Σιμωνι.**

Ben.

11-14-2007, 06:36 AM #5



## Toto

Contributor

Join Date: Jun 2000

Location: Los Angeles area

Posts: 40,549

Just before the two meet Jesus, there is **12 Peter, however, got up and ran to the tomb. Bending over, he saw the strips of linen lying by themselves, and he went away, wondering to himself what had happened.**

So **Peter** did not see Jesus at that point. And apparently Jesus appears to Simon Peter off stage, and he then tells the other disciples about it, who are so shocked that they forget that Jesus renamed him to Peter?

But 1 Corinthians 15 has Jesus appearing to Cephas and then to the 12, and then some other people. . . and then the apostles.

It all makes sense, of course.



11-14-2007, 06:47 AM

#6

## Ben C Smith

Veteran Member


Join Date: May 2005

Location: Midwest

Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Toto**   
*Just before the two meet Jesus, there is **12 Peter, however, got up and ran to the tomb. Bending over, he saw the strips of linen lying by themselves, and he went away, wondering to himself what had happened.***

*So **Peter** did not see Jesus at that point.*

Agreed, so far as the text as it stands goes. But 24.12 is not absolutely secure, textually speaking. It is one of the so-called western noninterpolations.

Quote:

And apparently Jesus appears to Simon Peter off stage, and he then tells the other disciples about it, who are so shocked that they forget that Jesus renamed him to Peter?

Jesus himself calls him Simon again in 22.31.

Quote:

But 1 Corinthians 15 has Jesus appearing to Cephas and then to the 12, and then some other people. . . and then the apostles.

It all makes sense, of course.

My suspicion is that Luke knew the Pauline tradition that Jesus had appeared to Cephas first (of all the male disciples, at any rate), and knew (or at least thought he knew) that Cephas was (Simon) Peter, but did not find an actual narration of this appearance in the tradition

available to him. So he inserted it as a summary.

Ben.



11-14-2007, 07:08 AM

#7

## spin

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2002  
Location: nowhere  
Posts: 15,747



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

*If one of the two travellers was named Simon, and Jesus had appeared to both of them, why would the other one (Cleopas; see verse 18) say that he appeared to Simon? Why not to us?*

*But such questions are unnecessary. It is not one of the two travellers who says this; it is **the eleven**. Luke 24.33-34:*

***Και ανασταντες αυτη τη ωρα  
υπεστρεψαν εις Ιερουσαλημ, και  
ευρον ηθροισμενους τους ενδεκα  
και τους συν αυτοις, λεγοντας οτι  
οντως ηγερθη ο κυριος και ωφθη  
σιμωνι.***

You don't mention that the subject of the discourse is plural, but change to the object without any discourse justification. Faux pas. Ben C. The normal progress is subject followed by subject, or else some indicator of a change of focus to a different subject. However, the discourse seems to go smoothly from the verb forms in v33 on to λεγοντας. There is no reason to believe that there has been a change in focus. In fact, the discourse continues with an explanation of what had happened on the road to Emmaus.

What you propose, Ben C., is a total change of topic at the end of the Emmaus story without any signal.

spin



11-14-2007, 07:24 AM

#8

## JoeWallack

Veteran Member

Join Date: Mar 2003  
Location: Nazareth  
Posts: 2,357



**Luukee! Ya Got Sum Splainin Ta Do.**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

*If one of the two travellers was named Simon, and Jesus had appeared to both of them, why would the other one (Cleopas; see verse 18) say that he appeared to*

*Simon? Why not to us?*

*But such questions are unnecessary. It is not one of the two travellers who says this; it is **the eleven**. Luke 24.33-34:*

***Και ανασταντες αυτη τη ωρα  
υπεστρεψαν εις  
Ιερουσαλημ, και ευρον  
ηθροισμενους τους ενδεκα  
και τους συν αυτοις,  
λεγοντας οτι οντως ηγερθη  
ο κυριος και ωφθη Σιμωνι.***

*You don't mention that the subject of the discourse is plural, but change to the object without any discourse justification. Faux pas. Ben C. The normal progress is subject followed by subject, or else some indicator of a change of focus to a different subject. However, the discourse seems to go smoothly from the verb forms in v33 on to λεγοντας. There is no reason to believe that there has been a change in focus. In fact, the discourse continues with an explanation of what had happened on the road to Emmaus.*

*What you propose, Ben C., is a total change of topic at the end of the Emmaus story without any signal.*

**spin**

JW:

Psst, spin:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=001...OR-enlargePage>

Joseph

[http://www.errancywiki.com/index.php/Main\\_Page](http://www.errancywiki.com/index.php/Main_Page)



11-14-2007, 07:36 AM

#9

**spin**

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2002

Location: nowhere

Posts: 15,747



Quote:

Originally Posted by **JoeWallack**

*Psst, spin:*

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=001...OR-enlargePage>

What exactly interests us from that article? (Blank smilie)

Hey, I did get something. Codex Bezae has λεγοντες, which cleans up any grammatical loose ends.

**spin**

11-14-2007, 07:53 AM

#10

## JoeWallack

Veteran Member


Join Date: Mar 2003  
Location: Nazareth  
Posts: 2,357

### Luukee! Ya Got Sum Splainin Ta Do.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin** 

Quote:

Originally Posted by **JoeWallack** 

*Psst, spin:*

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=001...OR-enlargePage>

*What exactly interests us from that article?* 

**spin**

**JW:**

Quote:

If that text is right, Luke is referring in this incredibly casual manner to the first appearance of Jesus, of which he gives absolutely no description. There is therefore not a little to be said in favor of the other reading of λεγοντες for λεγοντας, found in Codex Bezae and implied by Origen, which must mean that Simon was one of the two who went to Emmaus and

Trust your instincts spin, use "The Verse".

**Joseph**

[http://www.errancywiki.com/index.php/Main\\_Page](http://www.errancywiki.com/index.php/Main_Page)

Page 1 of 9 **1** [2](#) [3](#) [>](#) [Last >>](#)

<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

#### Thread Tools

 [Show Printable Version](#)

Search this Thread

Search this Thread:

[Advanced Search](#)

#### Forum Jump

Forums Home



All times are GMT +11. The time now is [01:30 PM](#).

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2  
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.



# Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)  
**Simon or back to Emmaus**

**Welcome, [neilgodfrey](#).**

You last visited: Today at 12:22 PM

Search

## Notices

### FRDB is Closed

**FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.**

### The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 2 of 9 [≤](#) [1](#) **[2](#)** [3](#) [4](#) [≥](#) [Last](#) [»](#)

Thread Tools Search this Thread

11-14-2007, 08:49 AM

#11

**spin**

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2002  
 Location: nowhere  
 Posts: 15,747



Quote:

Originally Posted by **JoeWallack**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**   
*What exactly interests us from that article?*

Quote:

If that text is right, Luke is referring in this incredibly casual manner to the first appearance of Jesus, of which he gives absolutely no description. There is therefore not a little to be said in favor of the other reading of λεγοντες for λεγοντας, found in Codex Bezae and implied by Origen, which must mean that



Simon was one of the two who went to Emmaus and

*Trust your instincts spin, use "The Verse".*

I think you sat too long with the edit box open before responding. 😊

**spin**



11-14-2007, 08:53 AM

#12

## mountainman

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2006  
Location: Falls Creek, Oz.  
Posts: 11,192



Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**

*When Jesus makes his first appearance after his resurrection at Emmaus*

Why did the event occur at Emmaus?  
Anything special about this town?

Best wishes,

Pete Brown



11-14-2007, 09:09 AM

#13

## Toto

Contributor

Join Date: Jun 2000  
Location: Los Angeles area  
Posts: 40,549



Quote:

Originally Posted by **mountainman**

*Why did the event occur at Emmaus?  
Anything special about this town?*

*Best wishes,*

*Pete Brown*

A bit off topic, but [W Emmaus](#)

Quote:

Around 166 BC Judas Maccabeus fought against the Seleucids in the region of Emmaus, and was victorious at the Battle of Emmaus (1 Maccabees 3:55-4:22). Later, it was fortified by Bacchides, a Seleucid general (1 Macc 9:50). When Rome took over the land it became a head of toparchy, and was burnt by order of Varus just after the death of Herod in 4 BC. During the First Jewish Revolt, before the siege of Jerusalem, Vespasian's 5th

legion was placed there while the 10th legion was in Jericho.

### New Advent

Quote:

Emmaus

A titular see in Palæstina Prima, suffragan of Cæsarea. It is mentioned for the first time in 166-165 B.C., when Judas Machabeus defeated there the army of Gorgias (1 Maccabees 3:40, 4:25). A little later the Syrian general Bacchides fortified and garrisoned it (Josephus, Ant. Jud., XIII, i, 3). In A.D. 4, during the rebellion of Athrongius against the Romans, the inhabitants left their city, which was, nevertheless, destroyed by Varus (Joseph us, "Ant. Jud." XVII, x, 7 9; Idem, "Bel. Jud.", II, iv, 3). It soon rose again, for Josephus (Bel. Jud., III, iii, 5) and Pliny (Hist. nat., V, xiv) rank it amongst the "toparchies" of the country. Vespasian took it at the beginning of his campaign against the Jews, stationed a legion in the neighbourhood, and named it Nicopolis (Sozomen, Hist. eccl., V, xxi). According to Eusebius and St. Jerome, this name was given to it only in 223, by Julius Africanus, its governor and most illustrious son, and this is the name commonly used by Christian writers. Here a spring in which Christ is said to have washed His feet, and which was reputed to cure all diseases, was closed up by order of Julian the Apostate (Sozomen, Hist. eccl., V, xxi).

Make of that what you will.



11-14-2007, 10:20 AM

#14

[neilgodfrey](#)

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005

Location: Darwin, Australia

Posts: 874



Quote:

Originally Posted by **mountainman**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**

*When Jesus makes his first appearance after his resurrection at Emmaus*

*Why did the event occur at Emmaus?  
Anything special about this town?*

*Best wishes,*

*Pete Brown*

Emmaous or oulammaous? Luke's use of the Jewish

Scriptures in the text of Luke 24 in Codex Bezae =  
Emmaous ou oulammaous ? L'utilisation lucanienne de la  
littérature juive en Luc 24 dans le Codex de Bèze

<http://cat.inist.fr/?aModele=afficheN&cpsidt=14424111>

#### Résumé / Abstract

There is a well-known difficulty in locating Emmaus, mentioned in Lk 24.13 as the village to which two disciples were walking when they met Jesus in a post-resurrection appearance. This article suggests that the solution to the problem lies in the reading of «Oulammaous» found in Codex Bezae. The name is that given in the LXX text of Genesis 28.19 to the place where God appeared to Jacob in his dream of the ladder reaching to heaven and the author of the Bezan text draws on traditional Jewish exegesis of the Genesis story to establish parallels between the two scenes. There are further clues in Codex Bezae that the disciple called Cleopas is none other than Simon Peter («Cephas» according to Jn 1.42). The text read by the other manuscripts of Luke 24 tend to tone down the theological message by eliminating some of the Jewish allusions and subtleties of character portrayal to give a more factual and literal account.

Neil Godfrey



11-14-2007, 10:31 AM

#15

[neilgodfrey](#)

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005  
Location: Darwin, Australia  
Posts: 874



Quote:

Originally Posted by [spin](#)

*Lk 24:33-34. After they had their experience with the risen Jesus, they returned to Jerusalem and found the eleven. That's when one said that Jesus had appeared to Simon.*

[spin](#)

Seems there is just as much grounds to infer that Jesus told them he had appeared to a Simon as to infer that one of the two is named Simon. At least the former inference raises fewer questions than the strange way the unnamed person is supposed to be have been identified. If I had been part of a duo who had just talked to a ghost or whatever I'd tell others WE or I had seen him.

(But what if Cleophas is a word game with Cephas?)

Neil



11-14-2007, 08:02 PM

#16

**ph2ter**

Regular Member

Join Date: Jul 2007

Location: Europe

Posts: 219



Quote:

Neil wrote:

Seems there is just as much grounds to infer that Jesus told them he had appeared to a Simon as to infer that one of the two is named Simon. At least the former inference raises fewer questions than the strange way the unnamed person is supposed to be have been identified. If I had been part of a duo who had just talked to a ghost or whatever I'd tell others WE or I had seen him.

(But what if Cleophas is a word game with Cephas?)

But if only one of the two is the member of the twelve, and the other is not, then becomes understandable why the testimony of that person is more important than the testimony of its companion.

The text appears to suggest that Cleopas and Simon are the same person - Simon Cleopas, and that is not very far from Simon Cephas. Paul also in Corinthians has Jesus firstly appearing to Cephas and then to the 12. So first appearance could be to Cephas (on the way to Emmaus), and afterwards to the twelve (including Cephas when returning) in Jerusalem.

Discrepancies between Luke and Paul emerges if we try to exclude Judas Iscariot from the group of 12 at that point. (If we believe to John, we must exclude Thomas also)



11-15-2007, 01:02 AM

#17

**JoeWallack**

Veteran Member

Join Date: Mar 2003

Location: Nazareth

Posts: 2,357

**Simon Didn't Saay**

JW:

In Marshall's TNIGTC he indicates the following support for ΛΕΓΟΝΤΕΣ:

- 1) Bezae
- 2) Origen
- 3) Latin and Syriac are "ambiguous"

Neither Metzger (Ehrman needs to rewrite the whole thing) or Zhul! even list 24:34 as Textual Variation. Here's Origen:

<http://www.earlychristianwritings.co...gen-john1.html>

Quote:

Simon and Cleopas too, when talking to each other about all that had happened to Jesus Christ Himself, then risen, though they did not know that He had risen, from the dead, speak thus, "Dost thou sojourn alone in Jerusalem, and knowest not the things which have taken place there in these

days? And when he said what things? they answered, The things concerning Jesus of Nazareth, which was a prophet, mighty in deed and in word before God and all the people, and how the chief priests and our rulers delivered Him up to be sentenced to death and crucified Him. But we hoped that it was He which should redeem Israel." Again, Andrew the brother of Simon Peter found his own brother Simon and said to him, "We have found the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, Christ."

Presumably Origen had superior texts to what is now extant and it was clear to him that a Simon was one of the two, but not Simon Peter.

Joseph

[http://www.errancywiki.com/index.php/Main\\_Page](http://www.errancywiki.com/index.php/Main_Page)



11-15-2007, 02:49 AM

#18

## Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005  
Location: Midwest  
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

*If one of the two travellers was named Simon, and Jesus had appeared to both of them, why would the other one (Cleopas; see verse 18) say that he appeared to Simon? Why not to us?*

*But such questions are unnecessary. It is not one of the two travellers who says this; it is **the eleven**. Luke 24.33-34:*

***Και ανασταντες αυτη τη ωρα  
υπεστρεψαν εις  
Ιερουσαλημ, και ευρον  
ηθροισμενους τους ενδεκα  
και τους συν αυτοις,  
λεγοντας οτι οντως ηγερθη  
ο κυριος και ωφθη Σιμωνι.***

*You don't mention that the subject of the discourse is plural, but change to the object without any discourse justification.*

????

All that matters is that the participle is in the accusative

case, agreeing with the direct object (not the subject). This is grammar at its most basic.

**If** the original reading was **λεγοντες**, as in Bezae, then it is the two disciples speaking, since **λεγοντες** is in the nominative case, agreeing with the subject (the two). But, if the original reading was **λεγοντας**, as in the other major manuscripts, then it is the eleven (and those with them) who are speaking.

Quote:

The normal progress is subject followed by subject, or else some indicator of a change of focus to a different subject.

This makes no sense, and has no bearing on Greek grammar, where a participle can agree with either the subject or the object without confusion.

See Matthew 21.15 for a similar case, in which the participle **λεγοντας** agrees, not with the nominative subject of the sentence, but with the accusative direct object. See also Jeremiah 11.21 LXX; Acts 6.11, 13; Revelation 5.13.

Ben.



11-15-2007, 05:14 AM

#19

**spin**

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2002

Location: nowhere

Posts: 15,747



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**

*You don't mention that the subject of the discourse is plural, but change to the object without any discourse justification.*

????

*All that matters is that the participle is in the accusative case, agreeing with the direct object (not the subject). This is grammar at its most basic.*

It is not discourse at its most basic. To argue as you do is to make the comment a non sequitur.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

**If** the original reading was **λεγοντες**, as in Bezae, then it is the two disciples speaking, since **λεγοντες** is in the nominative case, agreeing with

*the subject (the two). But, if the original reading was **λεγοντας**, as in the other major manuscripts, then it is the eleven (and those with them) who are speaking.*

That's why I later said:

Quote:

Codex Bezae has λεγοντες, which cleans up any grammatical loose ends.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 

Quote:

The normal progress is subject followed by subject, or else some indicator of a change of focus to a different subject.

*This makes no sense, and has no bearing on Greek grammar, where a participle can agree with either the subject or the object without confusion.*

*See Matthew 21.15 for a similar case, in which the participle **λεγοντας** agrees, not with the nominative subject of the sentence, but with the accusative direct object. See also Jeremiah 11.21 LXX; Acts 6.11, 13; Revelation 5.13.*

As I said, it's a matter of narrative discourse. Tell me how the 24:34 fits into the narrative which it is in, ie the two who return from the Emmaus experience (the verses before 24:34) and the description of the experience after 24:34. Codex Bezae with λεγοντες cleans up any grammatical loose ends.





 11-15-2007, 06:10 AM

#20

[neilgodfrey](#)

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005  
Location: Darwin, Australia  
Posts: 874



Quote:

Originally Posted by **ph2ter** 

Quote:

Neil wrote:  
Seems there is just as much grounds to infer that Jesus told them he had appeared to a Simon as to infer that one of the two is named Simon. At least the former inference raises fewer questions than the strange way the unnamed person is supposed to be have been identified. If I had been part of a duo who had just talked to a ghost or whatever I'd tell others WE

or I had seen him.  
(But what if Cleophas is a word game with Cephass?)

*But if only one of the two is the member of the twelve, and the other is not, then becomes understandable why the testimony of that person is more important than the testimony of its companion.*

*The text appears to suggest that Cleopas and Simon are the same person - Simon Cleopas, and that is not very far from Simon Cephass. Paul also in Corinthians has Jesus firstly appearing to Cephass and then to the 12. So first appearance could be to Cephass (on the way to Emmaus), and afterwards to the twelve (including Cephass when returning) in Jerusalem.*

*Discrepancies between Luke and Paul emerges if we try to exclude Judas Iscariot from the group of 12 at that point.*

*(If we believe to John, we must exclude Thomas also)*

Your explanation would be more persuasive if Simon, being the more important one, were named from the outset in place of Cleopas who gatecrashes the gospel here. Your argument rests on the assumption that the author names people on the grounds of their importance. That would mean we could have expected him to write that "Simon and another [nondescript] disciple were walking along the road to Emmaus one day . . . "

What the two say simply does not coherently follow from the preceding narrative. Jesus appeared to two people, and they both are said to report the others that Jesus had appeared to a single named person known to them all.

Like you I'm also going with the assumption that the author and his audience only knew the Corinthian correspondence as the basis of the story of the resurrected Jesus appearing first to Cephass. If there was no traditional story-scene of this event, then it explains why the author here had a hard time inserting the bald fact into his gospel.

If we also accept (with Tyson) that:

1. the gospel as we have it has come to us through the final redaction of the author of Acts,
2. and that it was composed to counter Marcionism,

then this strange reference to Simon may take on a bit more coherence.

The author of Acts/editor of Luke wants to put in the priority of Peter as a counterweight to Marcion but there is only the bare fact of the appearance known to him, no



elaborated story. So he has to have it told second hand in the narrative.

Further, the fact that there are 2 disciples here joining up with the eleven (which tells us that Peter was not one of the two) -- makes Jesus first resurrection appearance to a wider circle than the apostles.

This is a vital narrative component that is a perfect match for the narrative themes to follow in Acts. There was a wider pool of witnesses to the resurrection that could qualify to apply to replace Judas.

And the Twelve, although the leaders, are not the exclusive spreaders or witnesses of the gospel. There is Steven, Philip, all the other persecuted and scattered ones. And the Pentecost event fell upon 120, not just the twelve.

This explains the reason the author arranges for a couple of others to be witnesses of the resurrection along with (even before) the apostles -- but at the same time reminding readers with the awkwardly inserted mention that behind the stories he could create or adapt, it was Simon who still had the priority.

But what does Simon have to do with Cephas in 1 Cor 15? Is there any evidence that counts against the idea that the author of Mark's gospel was the one who changed the name of Cephas to its Greek equivalent for his Greek audience to make more obvious to them his little play on the meaning of Rock? I wrote up this idea more fully some time back [here](#).

Is it possible that Mark invented not just the first gospel, but also was the source of the confusion over the Peter and Cephas relationship?

Neil



Page 2 of 9 < 1 **2** 3 4 > [Last](#) »

<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

#### Thread Tools



[Show Printable Version](#)

[Search this Thread](#)

**Search this Thread:**



[Advanced Search](#)

#### Forum Jump

Forums Home



Go

All times are GMT +11. The time now is 01:31 PM.

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2  
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.



# Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)  
**Simon or back to Emmaus**

**Welcome, [neilgodfrey](#).**

You last visited: Today at 12:22 PM

Search

## Notices

### FRDB is Closed

**FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.**

### The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 3 of 9 [≤](#) [1](#) [2](#) **3** [4](#) [5](#) [≥](#) [Last](#) »

Thread Tools Search this Thread

11-15-2007, 06:18 AM

#21

## Cheerful Charlie

Veteran Member

Join Date: Nov 2005  
 Location: Texas  
 Posts: 3,884



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Toto**

*Just before the two meet Jesus, there is **12 Peter, however, got up and ran to the tomb. Bending over, he saw the strips of linen lying by themselves, and he went away, wondering to himself what had happened.***

*So **Peter** did not see Jesus at that point. And apparently Jesus appears to Simon Peter off stage, and he then tells the other disciples about it, who are so shocked that they forget that Jesus renamed him to Peter?*

*But 1 Corinthians 15 has Jesus appearing to Cephas and then to the 12, and then some other people. . . and then the apostles.*

*It all makes sense, of course.*

This particular verse does not appear in most early manuscripts and is a late addition. Apparently an attempt to make Luke harmonize with John 20 somewhat.

CC



11-15-2007, 06:28 AM

#22

[neilgodfrey](#)

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005  
Location: Darwin, Australia  
Posts: 874



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Cheerful Charlie**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Toto**

*Just before the two meet Jesus, there is **12 Peter, however, got up and ran to the tomb. Bending over, he saw the strips of linen lying by themselves, and he went away, wondering to himself what had happened.***

*So **Peter** did not see Jesus at that point. And apparently Jesus appears to Simon Peter off stage, and he then tells the other disciples about it, who are so shocked that they forget that Jesus renamed him to Peter?*

*But 1 Corinthians 15 has Jesus appearing to Cephas and then to the 12, and then some other people. . . and then the apostles.*

*It all makes sense, of course.*

*This particular verse does not appear in most early manuscripts and is a late addition. Apparently an attempt to make Luke harmonize with John 20 somewhat.*

CC

If Luke did not basically copy it from John then this verse has been inserted into Luke from someone who had a clear memory of it from John. Luke speaks of the apostles in verse 10 and then "two of them" (presumably more than 12 apostles in the final Luke) with the Emmaus story. This Peter scene breaks the narrative flow. It also adds narrative coherence complications. We have enough on our plate with the questions raised in my/our previous posts that come out of the Emmaus episode.



11-15-2007, 06:35 AM

**Ben C Smith**

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005  
 Location: Midwest  
 Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**

*It is not discourse at its most basic.*

Correct. It is discourse introduced by an accusative participle.

But it **is** grammar at its most basic; I gave you relevant examples.

Quote:

To argue as you do is to make the comment a non sequitur.

I have no idea why the comment would be a *non sequitur*.

Quote:

That's why I later said: Codex Bezae has λεγοντες, which cleans up any grammatical loose ends.

There are no grammatical loose ends to tie up. None. The accusative participle agrees with the accusative direct object.

Quote:

As I said, it's a matter of narrative discourse. Tell me how the 24:34 fits into the narrative which it is in, ie the two who return from the Emmaus experience (the verses before 24:34) and the description of the experience after 24:34.

What is there to tell? The two return to Jerusalem and find the eleven gathered. The eleven tell them: The Lord really [**οὕτως**] *has* risen, and has appeared to Simon (Peter). What is omitted, but easy to understand, is the initial report of the two to the eleven. That is what the *really* is doing there: The two report that Jesus has risen, and the eleven reply that indeed, he really has. Then the two elaborate on their presumed initial report. A bit condensed? Sure. Ungrammatical or illogical? Not at all.

What would be strange is if the **two** reported that Jesus had appeared to Simon; I ask again, why not to *both* of them?

Ben.



11-15-2007, 06:37 AM

#24



**Ben C Smith**


Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005

Location: Midwest

Posts: 4,787

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Cheerful Charlie**   
*This particular verse does not appear in most early manuscripts and is a late addition.*

This is incorrect. Most early manuscripts include this verse. Only Bezae and a few Old Latin manuscripts omit it.

Ben.



11-15-2007, 06:58 AM

#25

**neilgodfrey**

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005

Location: Darwin, Australia

Posts: 874



The debate about whether it was the 2 who reported the resurrection appearance to Simon or the eleven who reported it to the two becomes irrelevant if the author had only the the letter to the Corinthians as his source and no narrative source to rely on. The fact that the author relies on a "report" to tell readers that Simon had the priority in this, and no narrative, is the real point.

There was no story to tell. Simon was neither with the 2 nor with the 11. He was only in the author's mindfulness of what he read in the first letter to the Corinthians and what people were saying about that.

That would also explain why the grammatical differences arose in the first place. Different editors each trying his own way to make better sense of the clumsily inserted report.

It was becoming a doctrinal necessity to bring in the claim that Peter had the first appearance.

Neil



11-15-2007, 07:15 AM

#26

**Ben C Smith**

Veteran Member


Join Date: May 2005

Location: Midwest

Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey**   
*That would also explain why the grammatical differences arose in the first place. Different editors each trying his own way to make better sense of the clumsily inserted report.*

I doubt the author had Simon in mind as one of the two. That makes the report naming only one of them seem weird.

But I agree that the Bezae reading could easily have arisen because of the awkwardness of the report.

Ben.

11-15-2007, 07:40 AM

#27

**spin**

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2002  
 Location: nowhere  
 Posts: 15,747



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin** *It is not discourse at its most basic.**Correct. It is discourse introduced by an accusative participle.**But it **is** grammar at its most basic; I gave you relevant examples.**I have no idea why the comment would be a non sequitur.*

If we assume your analysis of what happened, why did the eleven say to the two "The Lord has indeed risen", when the information is irrelevant to them, having seen first hand? The new information in the eyes of the two is that Jesus had risen because they had seen him. Hence they are giving the information. Besides, there is nothing in the narrative anywhere to justify the unprecedented claim that the risen Jesus appeared to Simon.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** *There are no grammatical loose ends to tie up. None. The accusative participle agrees with the accusative direct object.*

You continue to say this, while apparently not interacting with the narrative, as I see it.

A simple change of vowel changes the significance of the verse.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

Quote:


As I said, it's a matter of narrative discourse. Tell me how the 24:34 fits into the narrative which it is in, ie the two who return from the Emmaus experience (the verses before 24:34) and the description of the experience after 24:34.

*What is there to tell? The two return to Jerusalem*

*and find the eleven gathered. The eleven tell them: The Lord really [οὐτως] has risen, and has appeared to Simon (Peter). What is omitted, but easy to understand, is the initial report of the two to the eleven.*

And what makes you think that Jesus appeared to Peter? From the indications we have he didn't.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*That is what the really is doing there: The two report that Jesus has risen, and the eleven reply that indeed, he really has. Then the two elaborate on their presumed initial report. A bit condensed? Sure. Ungrammatical or illogical? Not at all.*

*What would be strange is if the **two** reported that Jesus had appeared to Simon; I ask again, why not to both of them?*

Not if it is Simon who has prestige. When Jesus was before Pilate, he was also before other Roman officers, but the writer wasn't interested. It is only Pilate who was of importance. You'll find a similar approach with Jesus.

spin



 11-15-2007, 10:02 AM


#28

**neilgodfrey** 

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005  
 Location: Darwin, Australia  
 Posts: 874

Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey** 

Quote:

Originally Posted by **mountainman** 

*Why did the event occur at Emmaus?  
 Anything special about this town?*

*Best wishes,*

*Pete Brown*

*Emmaous or oulammaous? Luke's use of the Jewish Scriptures in the text of Luke 24 in Codex Bezae = Emmaous ou oulammaous ? L'utilisation lucanienne de la littérature juive en Luc 24 dans le Codex de Bèze*

<http://cat.inist.fr/?aModele=afficheN&cpsidt=14424111>

Résumé / Abstract

*There is a well-known difficulty in locating Emmaus, mentioned in Lk 24.13 as the village to which two disciples were walking when they met Jesus in a post-resurrection appearance. This article suggests that the solution to the problem lies in the reading of «Oulammaous» found in Codex Bezae. The name is that given in the LXX text of Genesis 28.19 to the place where God appeared to Jacob in his dream of the ladder reaching to heaven and the author of the Bezan text draws on traditional Jewish exegesis of the Genesis story to establish parallels between the two scenes. There are further clues in Codex Bezae that the disciple called Cleopas is none other than Simon Peter («Cephas» according to Jn 1.42). The text read by the other manuscripts of Luke 24 tend to tone down the theological message by eliminating some of the Jewish allusions and subtleties of character portrayal to give a more factual and literal account.*

Neil Godfrey

Hold the debate. There's much more to the texts. I have found the above French article online in English and it gives some very interesting reasons for reading Cleopas as a pseudonym for Simon Peter. If I weren't busy at work I'd give a bit more detail to justify the link, but check it for yourselves:

<http://www.raco.cat/index.php/RevistaTeologia/article/view/71224/93983>

It has caused me to go back to square one and find an alternative explanation to the one I have been arguing till now.

Neil



11-15-2007, 11:05 AM

#29


## Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005  
Location: Midwest  
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**   
*If we assume your analysis of what happened, why did the eleven say to the two "The Lord has indeed risen", when the information is irrelevant to them, having seen first hand?*

Confirmation.

The two (presumed): The Lord has risen!  
The eleven: He has indeed [**οὐτως**]! In fact, he appeared to Simon!

Quote:

Besides, there is nothing in the narrative anywhere to justify the unprecedented claim that the risen Jesus appeared to Simon.

Quite agreed that nothing **in Luke** justifies this claim. But for those of us with access to 1 Corinthians 15, there is no



mystery at all....

Quote:

You continue to say this, while apparently not interacting with the narrative, as I see it.

You keep saying there are **grammatical** loose ends; but there are not. You keep justifying your *grammatical* loose ends with *narrative* concerns. The two are not the same, and your persistence in treating them as if they were is making me wonder if you know the difference between narrative logic and grammatical agreement.

Quote:

A simple change of vowel changes the significance of the verse.


Yes, it does.

Quote:

And what makes you think that Jesus appeared to Peter? From the indications we have he didn't.

What I myself think about Jesus appearing to Peter is irrelevant. I think that **Luke** is aware of something like 1 Corinthians 15.5 and, like so many others, presumes (whether correctly or incorrectly) that Cephas is Simon Peter.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*Not if it is Simon who has prestige. When Jesus was before Pilate, he was also before other Roman officers, but the writer wasn't interested. It is only Pilate who was of importance. You'll find a similar approach with Jesus.*

If Cleopas has enough prestige to be named in 24.18, why not in 24.34? How is this situation analogous to completely unnamed Roman officers at the trial?

And what is the **οὐτως** doing in 24.34 on *your* reading?

Please note: This discussion has slowly turned into a discussion of which variant in 24.34 is original, and I am not actually all that interested in that topic right now. I jumped in because your first post did not seem to show any awareness that the participle in virtually the entire textual tradition (even the Byzantine and its offshoots) had to agree with the object, not the subject. You seem to agree (now?) that, **if** the majority participle is original, the Simon cannot be the companion on the road; that was my original point.

Ben.



11-15-2007, 11:59 AM

#30

### Amaleq13

Veteran Member

Join Date: Nov 2003  
Location: Eagle River, Alaska  
Posts: 7,816



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*That is what the really is doing there: The two report that Jesus has risen, and the eleven reply that indeed, he really has. Then the two elaborate on their presumed initial report. A bit condensed? Sure. Ungrammatical or illogical? Not at all.*

I don't think you are necessarily correct with this reconstruction. It seems to me, taking into account the clarification on who is offering the information about Simon, that the passage reads as though the two walked in on an ongoing discussion about the appearance to Simon and, after being given the "bottom line" (ie the Lord appeared to Simon), they shared their personal story of an appearance.

Whadayathinkathat? 😊



<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

#### Thread Tools



[Show Printable Version](#)

Search this Thread

Search this Thread:

Go

[Advanced Search](#)

#### Forum Jump

Forums Home



Go

All times are GMT +11. The time now is 01:31 PM.

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2  
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.



# Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)  
**Simon or back to Emmaus**

**Welcome, [neilgodfrey](#).**

You last visited: Today at 12:22 PM

Search

## Notices

### FRDB is Closed

**FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.**

### The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 4 of 9 [« First](#) [≤](#) [2](#) [3](#) **4** [5](#) [6](#) [≥](#) [Last »](#)

Thread Tools Search this Thread

11-15-2007, 12:18 PM

#31

## [Ben C Smith](#)

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005  
 Location: Midwest  
 Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Amaleq13**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*That is what the really is doing there: The two report that Jesus has risen, and the eleven reply that indeed, he really has. Then the two elaborate on their presumed initial report. A bit condensed? Sure. Ungrammatical or illogical? Not at all.*

*I don't think you are necessarily correct with this reconstruction. It seems to me, taking into account the clarification on who is offering the information about Simon, that the passage reads as though the two walked in on an ongoing discussion about the appearance to Simon and, after being given the*

*"bottom line" (ie the Lord appeared to Simon), they shared their personal story of an appearance.*

*Whadayathinkathat? 😊*

Do you mean to say that the presumed prior discussion was amongst the eleven (not between the two and the eleven) and that the eleven were now saying amongst themselves that the Lord had *really* risen?

(Man, was that unclear. I hope you can sort it out. 😊)

Ben.



11-15-2007, 12:56 PM

#32

**spin**

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2002  
Location: nowhere  
Posts: 15,747



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** >

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin** >  
*If we assume your analysis of what happened, why did the eleven say to the two "The Lord has indeed risen", when the information is irrelevant to them, having seen first hand?*

*Confirmation.*

*The two (presumed): The Lord has risen!  
The eleven: He has indeed [**οὐτως**!] In fact, he appeared to Simon!*

You're inventing a lacuna then filling it as you like. That's convenient but unconvincing.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** >  
*Quite agreed that nothing **in Luke** justifies this claim. But for those of us with access to 1 Corinthians 15, there is no mystery at all....*

You might look at any other text, but you need to show the relevance based on the Lucan evidence, not your ability to reconstruct a plausible interpretation based on some other text whose relevance you cannot show.


Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** >  
*You keep saying there are **grammatical** loose ends; but there are not. You keep justifying your grammatical loose ends with narrative concerns. The two are not the same, and your persistence in*

*treating them as if they were is making me wonder if you know the difference between narrative logic and grammatical agreement.*

My interest was originally discourse analysis. IF you don't want to talk about it, I can appreciate that. You're happy to be inventive to make the narrative discourse work.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*What I myself think about Jesus appearing to Peter is irrelevant. I think that **Luke** is aware of something like 1 Corinthians 15.5 and, like so many others, presumes (whether correctly or incorrectly) that Cephas is Simon Peter.*

Read the Lucan text and stop trying to change the subject. If for a moment we accept 24:12 as original, it doesn't provide any hope for Peter having seen Jesus. Without it, there is no narrative justification at all for your reading.


Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 

Quote:

Not if it is Simon who has prestige. When Jesus was before Pilate, he was also before other Roman officers, but the writer wasn't interested. It is only Pilate who was of importance. You'll find a similar approach with Jesus.

*If Cleopas has enough prestige to be named in 24.18, why not in 24.34? How is this situation analogous to completely unnamed Roman officers at the trial?*

 Sorry, you lost me. Who was talking about Cleopas?

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*And what is the **οὐτως** doing in 24.34 on your reading?*

The tomb was found empty. Hence the confirming **οὐτως** from the two.

ETA: The inclusion of 24:12 does seem to disrupt the wider narrative discourse. Remember that the women who found the tomb empty were discounted by the apostles as having made up a tale and they weren't believed. It is in this wider context that we should understand the **οὐτως**.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 

*Please note: This discussion has slowly turned into a discussion of which variant in 24.34 is original, and I am not actually all that interested in that topic right now. I jumped in because your first post did not seem to show any awareness that the participle in virtually the entire textual tradition (even the Byzantine and its offshoots) had to agree with the object, not the subject. You seem to agree (now?) that, **if** the majority participle is original, the Simon cannot be the companion on the road; that was my original point.*

The discussion as I thought when I started the thread was about understanding the discourse cohesion, how the passage hangs together. You have been trying to make it work by breaking the discourse and inserting things that a reader couldn't get from Luke. You need to deal with the text as it is written, not as you want it. From there you have to resolve the problems it poses. The variant **ΛΕΓΟΝΤΕΣ** with a simple vowel change resolves the discourse problems as I see it.

spin

11-15-2007, 01:35 PM

#33

## Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005  
Location: Midwest  
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**

*You might look at any other text, but you need to show the relevance based on the Lucan evidence, not your ability to reconstruct a plausible interpretation based on some other text whose relevance you cannot show.*

This appears to be a way of saying that source analysis is taboo. I do not share that sentiment, and therefore feel quite free to look around for potential sources of the appearance to Simon.

The relevance of a Pauline text to Luke, BTW, is hardly a leap:

1. A Pauline text has an appearance to Cephas.
2. A Lucan text has an appearance to Simon; Simon, for Luke, means Peter.
3. The equation of Peter and Cephas is natural linguistically (even if mistaken) and quite common.
4. Luke knows of and admires Paul.

That Luke might know such a Pauline tradition, therefore, should not surprise anybody.

Quote:

My interest was originally discourse analysis.

Perhaps, but you kept calling it *grammar*.

Quote:

Sorry, you lost me. Who was talking about Cleopas?

No one. That was the problem, and why I brought him up. *You* should have talked about the naming of Cleopas in verse 18 if you were going to suggest that only Simon is named in verse 34 because he was the more prominent of the two.

(You even brought up Roman officers next to Pilate; yet none of those officers is named, right? How can that be analogous to Cleopas and Simon on your reading?)

So I ask again, why is Cleopas not prominent enough to be named alongside Simon (or at least included in a plural pronoun) in verse 34 if he is prominent enough to have been named in verse 18?

Quote:

The tomb was found empty. Hence the confirming **ΟΝΤΩΣ** from the two.

You favorably modify this in your edit, but I just want to state that this reason, on its own and by itself, does not work. The empty tomb elicits talk of womanly nonsense in verse 11, which is diametrically the opposite of the hearty confirmation implied by that adverb.

Quote:

ETA: The inclusion of 24:12 does seem to disrupt the wider narrative discourse. Remember that the women who found the tomb empty were discounted by the apostles as having made up a tale and they weren't believed. It is in this wider context that we should understand the **ΟΝΤΩΣ**.

Actually, in juxtaposition to what Doug suggested, I really [**ΟΝΤΩΣ**] like this explanation.

Quote:

The discussion as I thought when I started the thread was about understanding the discourse cohesion....

(Apparently under the supersecret codename *grammar*, which I still am striving, vainly so far, to understand.)

Quote:

...how the passage hangs together. You have been trying to make it work by breaking the discourse

and inserting things that a reader couldn't get from Luke. You need to deal with the text as it is written, not as you want it.

I agree, and I retract my proposed announcement of the two to the eleven before the dialogue in question. I think Doug has a point with the discussion that the eleven seem to be having at the time, and that you have a point with the prior disbelief of the disciples.

Quote:

The variant **ΛΕΥΟΝΤΕΣ** with a simple vowel change resolves the discourse problems as I see it.

Doug has, I think, solved the discourse problem nicely. The participle is in the present tense, which can easily have a progressive sense and generally indicates contemporaneous time: *When* the two found the eleven, the eleven *were saying* that the Lord had really risen, so the two added their own story to the mix (verse 35).

Now there is no unmentioned but understood dialogue between the two and the eleven, and the *really* follows both (either?) the ongoing conversation (along the lines of: He arose; he really arose) and (or?) the fact that the disciples had previously rejected the same basic story from the women (which is little more than simply pushing the ongoing conversation back a ways).

Your take, on the other hand, creates new problems:

1. We already know whom Luke is thinking of when he writes of *Simon* elsewhere (5.4, 5, 10; 6.14; 22.31). Why does Luke mean somebody different here?
2. Why specify that Jesus appeared only to one of the travellers? Throughout the entire episode the two hang together.
3. Why name only Simon? It cannot be that Cleopas was not prominent enough (compared to Simon) to name, since Luke does in fact name him.

Ben.



11-15-2007, 02:48 PM

#34

**spin**

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2002  
Location: nowhere  
Posts: 15,747



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**   
*You might look at any other text, but you need to show the relevance based on the Lucan evidence, not your ability to reconstruct a plausible interpretation based on some other text whose relevance*




*you cannot show.*

*This appears to be a way of saying that source analysis is taboo...*

(??? You're doing source analysis? Funny, I'd never have guessed.)

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*...I do not share that sentiment, and therefore feel quite free to look around for potential sources of the appearance to Simon.*

*The relevance of a Pauline text to Luke, BTW, is hardly a leap:*

- 1.** *A Pauline text has an appearance to Cephas.*
- 2.** *A Lucan text has an appearance to Simon; Simon, for Luke, means Peter.*
- 3.** *The equation of Peter and Cephas is natural linguistically (even if mistaken) and quite common.*
- 4.** *Luke knows of and admires Paul.*

*That Luke might know such a Pauline tradition, therefore, should not surprise anybody.*


And you can't see that that is such an excursion, who knows whether and where you stopped to do your fishing? You can't expect anyone to take that as showing relevance, Ben C.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*Perhaps, but you kept calling it grammar.*

Sorry, are you reading the same thread as I am? I thought the only time I spoke of "grammar" was when I talked about cleaning up grammatical loose ends.

Quote:


Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*No one. That was the problem, and why I brought him up. You should have talked about the naming of Cleopas in verse 18 if you were going to suggest that only Simon is named in verse 34 because he was the more prominent of the two.*

*(You even brought up Roman officers next to Pilate; yet none of those officers is named, right? How can that be analogous to Cleopas and Simon on your reading?)*

You seem to be confusing the narrator with someone who


was present. The narrator mentions Cleopas, while someone present mentioned Simon.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*You favorably modify this in your edit, but I just want to state that this reason, on its own and by itself, does not work. The empty tomb elicits talk of womanly nonsense in verse 11, which is diametrically the opposite of the hearty confirmation implied by that adverb.*


This doesn't seem to relate to the logic of the women's apparent tale which is confirmed by the two. You didn't believe it them, but he has indeed risen.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*(Apparently under the supersecret codename grammar, which I still am striving, vainly so far, to understand.)*


I think you have a fixation on grammar. You used it so much in this thread that you've projected its use onto others.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*I agree, and I retract my proposed announcement of the two to the eleven before the dialogue in question. I think Doug has a point with the discussion that the eleven seem to be having at the time, and that you have a point with the prior disbelief of the disciples.*

I don't see how it works. The high point in the pericope is the announcement that Jesus has risen. That is the purpose of the Emmaus story. Such an interpretation seems to trivialize the Emmaus story as a mere confirmation of what happened offstage. And it doesn't deal with the **οὐτως**.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 

Quote:

The variant **λεγοντες** with a simple vowel change resolves the discourse problems as I see it.


*Doug has, I think, solved the discourse problem nicely. The participle is in the present tense, which can easily have a progressive sense and generally indicates contemporaneous time: When the two found the eleven, the eleven were saying that the Lord had really risen, so the two added their own*

*story to the mix (verse 35).*

*Now there is no unmentioned but understood dialogue between the two and the eleven, and the really follows both (either?) the ongoing conversation (along the lines of: He arose; he really arose) and (or?) the fact that the disciples had previously rejected the same basic story from the women (which is little more than simply pushing the ongoing conversation back a ways).*

Hopefully I've explained that your currently supported interpretation doesn't deal with the issues.


Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*Your take, on the other hand, creates new problems:*

**1.** *We already know whom Luke is thinking of when he writes of Simon elsewhere (5.4, 5, 10; 6.14; 22.31). Why does Luke mean somebody different here?*


You didn't read my original post.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
**2.** *Why specify that Jesus appeared only to one of the travellers? Throughout the entire episode the two hang together.*

Already explained.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
**3.** *Why name only Simon? It cannot be that Cleopas was not prominent enough (compared to Simon) to name, since Luke does in fact name him.*

You get here through confusion between narrator and one of the figures in the narration.





 11-15-2007, 04:14 PM

#35

**Ben C Smith**

Veteran Member


Join Date: May 2005

Location: Midwest

Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**   
*You're doing source analysis?*

Correct, and thanks for noticing. I hypothesized that (something like) 1 Corinthians 15.5 was the source of Luke 24.34.

I wrote:

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben**  
*The relevance of a Pauline text to Luke, BTW, is hardly a leap:*

- 1.** *A Pauline text has an appearance to Cephas.*
- 2.** *A Lucan text has an appearance to Simon; Simon, for Luke, means Peter.*
- 3.** *The equation of Peter and Cephas is natural linguistically (even if mistaken) and quite common.*
- 4.** *Luke knows of and admires Paul.*

*That Luke might know such a Pauline tradition, therefore, should not surprise anybody.*

You replied:

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**  
*And you can't see that that is such an excursion, who knows whether and where you stopped to do your fishing? You can't expect anyone to take that as showing relevance, Ben C.*

The first sentence I do not understand (not even **grammatically**). The second appears to be a vigorous argument by denial.

If or whenever you feel like actually addressing the points I made, you know where to find me.

Quote:

I thought the only time I spoke of "grammar" was when I talked about cleaning up grammatical loose ends.

Correct. Those grammatical loose ends that *do not exist*.

Quote:

I think you have a fixation on grammar. You used it so much in this thread that you've projected its use onto others.

Let me clear this up for you. In [post #1](#) you wrote:

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**  
*When Jesus makes his first appearance after his*

*resurrection at Emmaus, the two who had the meeting run back to the eleven and one of them says, "The Lord has risen indeed, and he appeared to Simon!"*

*The two were not a part of the eleven, yet one of them is called Simon and needed no further clarification.*

This statement is feasible only if the two are the ones talking in 24.34, and that is *grammatically* incorrect if one accepts the majority reading of **λεγοντας** in Luke 24.34. *Grammatically*, if one accepts the majority reading, it cannot be the two who are calling anybody Simon.

Ah, but perhaps *you* were thinking of the minority reading of **λεγοντες** in Luke 24.34 (though I should think you might have very well have mentioned that you were accepting Bezae over the other manuscripts in this case). Alas, however, I think not, for in post #9 you wrote:

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**  
*Hey, I did get something [from the article that Joe linked to]. Codex Bezae has λεγοντες, which cleans up any grammatical loose ends.*

This appears to be your first awareness that this reading even existed. (It was certainly *my* first awareness of this fact.)

Which means that, in your OP, you were using the standard text of Luke 24.34, in which it *grammatically has* to be the eleven, not the two, who are speaking of an appearance to Simon, no matter what your sense of the narrative and discourse logic may or may not be.

It seems quite clear (A) that you were either reading that verse only in translation or misreading the Greek *grammar*; (B) I caught the *grammatical* mistake; and (C) your dialogue with me in the rest of this thread has consisted at least partly of avoiding having to admit your simple error.

Hopefully this explains my emphasis on the grammar. Your first post was, without the Bezae reading, a grammatical mistake.

Quote:

I don't see how it works.

That is not surprising somehow, given the absolute crystal clarity with which Doug expressed it.

Quote:

You didn't read my original post.

In your original post you suggested (*via* leading questions) that the appearance to Simon was a fragment from a different tradition. You offered no external evidence for this different tradition; it was, AFAICT, speculation.

In another post I **also** suggested that the appearance to Simon was a fragment from a different tradition. I offered 1 Corinthians 15.5 as evidence for a tradition that Cephas (which both means the same thing as and is often identified with Peter, AKA Simon). Your reaction was to dismiss this connection out of hand (no relevance, something about a fishing excursion, *et cetera*).

So, apparently, you *are* allowed to hypothesize a tradition for which you offer *no* externally confirming evidence, while I am *not* allowed to hypothesize a tradition for which we *do* have externally confirming evidence.

Ben.



11-15-2007, 05:00 PM

#36

**spin**

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2002  
Location: nowhere  
Posts: 15,747



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**

*You're doing source analysis?*

*Correct, and thanks for noticing.*

If I was asking a question, it is probable that there was no substance to what you were hanging your idea of my noticing on.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

*I hypothesized that (something like) 1 Corinthians 15.5 was the source of Luke 24.34.*

That's not analysis. That's guesswork! and you'll never be able to confirm it, given that it is an ad hoc analysis and not part of a systematic one that gives the hope of verification or at least falsification.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

*I wrote:*

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

*The relevance of a Pauline text to Luke, BTW, is hardly a leap:*

1. A Pauline text has an appearance to Cephias.
2. A Lucan text has an appearance to Simon; Simon, for Luke, means Peter.
3. The equation of Peter and Cephias is natural linguistically (even if mistaken) and quite common.
4. Luke knows of and admires Paul.

*That Luke might know such a Pauline tradition, therefore, should not surprise anybody.*

You replied:

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**  
*And you can't see that that is such an excursion, who knows whether and where you stopped to do your fishing? You can't expect anyone to take that as showing relevance, Ben C.*

*The first sentence I do not understand (not even **grammatically**). The second appears to be a vigorous argument by denial.*

The first comma should have been an em-dash. The second "that", ie "that **that**", refers to your numbered trip of four stopovers. Someone along the trip there is enough room for you to have caught any sort of wrong turn -- big whopper. The result of your long contorted trip was questionable, as is the import of my second sentence.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** [▶](#)  
*If or whenever you feel like actually addressing the points I made, you know where to find me.*

You missed it. You were too busy trying to keep a straight face while going on the Mack Sennett scenic route.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** [▶](#)  
*Correct. Those grammatical loose ends that do not exist.*

So the fuss about grammar has been swept under the carpet and you'll plead that there is nothing wrong with the narrative flow.

Quote:


Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** [▶](#)  
*Let me clear this up for you. In post #1 you wrote:*

*This statement is feasible only if the two are the ones talking in 24.34, and that is grammatically incorrect if one accepts the majority reading of **Λεγοντας** in Luke 24.34. Grammatically, if one accepts the majority reading, it cannot be the two who are calling anybody Simon.*

*Ah, but perhaps you were thinking of the minority reading of **Λεγοντες** in Luke 24.34 (though I should think you might have very well have mentioned that you were accepting Bezae over the other manuscripts in this case). Alas, however, I think not, for in post #9 you wrote:*


You've basically got the events correct. And you have reflected the errors of my thinking aloud, but I don't mind being wrong in the process. The basic issue as I see it is still unresolved despite your various smoothing attempts.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*This appears to be your first awareness that this reading even existed. (It was certainly my first awareness of this fact.)*


I'll let you into a little secret: I had the Kirslopp Lake note (3 pages) on my computer when Joe mentioned it. I just wondered why he was mentioning it. Hence my comment.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*It seems quite clear (A) that you were either reading that verse only in translation or misreading the Greek grammar; (B) I caught the grammatical mistake; and (C) your dialogue with me in the rest of this thread has consisted at least partly of avoiding having to admit your simple error.*


Or I was thinking about other things.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*Hopefully this explains my emphasis on the grammar.*

Not my lack of mentioning it.


Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*Your first post was, without the Bezae reading, a grammatical mistake.*

You could be right.



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*That is not surprising somehow, given the absolute crystal clarity with which Doug expressed it.*

Just because you like it, doesn't make it right. You liked something else before that came along.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 


Quote:

You didn't read my original post.

*In your original post you suggested (via leading questions) that the appearance to Simon was a fragment from a different tradition. You offered no external evidence for this different tradition; it was, AFAICT, speculation.*

You're sort of correct, but I think irrelevant, to the thought in the OP. You might claim the logic was wrong, but you haven't acknowledged it yet.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*In another post I **also** suggested that the appearance to Simon was a fragment from a different tradition.*

Not from evidence within Luke, which is where you need to start.

**spin**



 11-15-2007, 11:41 PM

#37

## Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005  
 Location: Midwest  
 Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**   
*Not from evidence within Luke, which is where you need to start.*

When I gave evidence from within Luke that Luke himself thinks of Simon as Simon Peter, you answered:

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**  
*You didn't read my original post.*

The only part of your original post that I find relevant is

the part in which you suggest multiple authorship.

But, if that is your suggestion, why are you now asking for evidence from within Luke? What good would that do, if you can simply refer back to the notion of multiple authorship again?

Ben.



11-16-2007, 02:52 AM

#38


## Amaleq13

Veteran Member

Join Date: Nov 2003  
Location: Eagle River, Alaska  
Posts: 7,816



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*Do you mean to say that the presumed prior discussion was amongst the eleven (not between the two and the eleven) and that the eleven were now saying amongst themselves that the Lord had really risen?*

Almost.

"And they rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them,

Saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon.

And they told what things were done in the way, and how he was known of them in breaking of bread." (Lk 24:33-35, KJV)

I'm saying:

And the two travelers returned to Jerusalem and found the eleven and others talking about the appearance to Simon. One of them turns to the new arrivals and says "It is true! The Lord appeared to Simon!" And the travelers responded by telling them what had happened on the road.



11-16-2007, 03:51 AM

#39


## Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005  
Location: Midwest  
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Amaleq13**   
*I'm saying:*

*And the two travelers returned to Jerusalem and found the eleven and others talking about the appearance to Simon. One of them turns to the new arrivals and says "It is true! The Lord appeared to Simon!" And the travelers responded by telling them what had happened on the road.*

:thumbs:

I think this scenario is measurably better than my original reconstruction.

Now, if you can explain it to spin, even more progress will be have been made. 😊

Ben.

11-16-2007, 05:04 AM

#40

## Amaleq13

Veteran Member

Join Date: Nov 2003  
Location: Eagle River, Alaska  
Posts: 7,816



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

*I think this scenario is measurably better than my original reconstruction.*

Thanks. I guess I can stop trying to learn ancient Greek now. 🇬🇷

Then again, I might be able to answer this next question on my own if I don't.

"It was Mary Magdalene and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and other women that were with them, which told these things unto the apostles. And their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not. Then arose Peter, and ran unto the sepulchre; and stooping down, he beheld the linen clothes laid by themselves, and departed, wondering in himself at that which was come to pass. And, behold, two of **them** went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem about threescore furlongs." (24:10-13, emphasis mine)

Who is "them" here? Two of the *apostles* or two of the *women*? Is Cleopas an exclusively male name?

Page 4 of 9 [« First](#) [≤ 2](#) [3](#) **4** [5](#) [6](#) [≥](#) [Last »](#)

« [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) »

### Thread Tools



[Show Printable Version](#)

Search this Thread

Search this Thread:

[Advanced Search](#)

### Forum Jump

Forums Home



Go

All times are GMT +11. The time now is 01:32 PM.

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2  
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.



# Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)  
**Simon or back to Emmaus**

**Welcome, [neilgodfrey](#).**

You last visited: Today at 12:22 PM

Search

## Notices

### FRDB is Closed

**FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.**

### The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 5 of 9 [« First](#) [≤ 3](#) [4](#) **5** [6](#) [7](#) [≥ Last »](#)

Thread Tools Search this Thread

11-16-2007, 05:54 AM

#41

## Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005

Location: Midwest

Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Amaleq13**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

*I think this scenario is measurably better than my original reconstruction.*

*Thanks. I guess I can stop trying to learn ancient Greek now.*

Yes, that was my message: The ancient languages are superfluous.

Quote:

"It was Mary Magdalene and Joanna, and Mary the

mother of James, and other women that were with them, which told these things unto the apostles. And their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not. Then arose Peter, and ran unto the sepulchre; and stooping down, he beheld the linen clothes laid by themselves, and departed, wondering in himself at that which was come to pass. And, behold, two of **them** went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem about threescore furlongs." (24:10-13, emphasis mine)

Who is "them" here? Two of the *apostles* or two of the *women*? Is Cleopas an exclusively male name?

I honestly do not know if Cleopas can be a female name. But in this case (at least) I think it has to be male (see number 4 below).

Let me set out how I perceive the issue:

- 1.** Antecedents in Greek work much the same as they do in English; that is, the antecedent is *usually*, but *not always*, the most recent relevant noun.
- 2.** In this case, the most recent pertinent noun is the apostles (verse 10); before that we have the women (same verse); before that we have the eleven and the rest (verse 9).
- 3.** Trying the apostles first, and assuming that they are contiguous with the eleven, I think we hit a dead end for the simple fact that Cleopas is not one of the eleven, *unless* his name is an otherwise unattested second name or something, or *unless*, as spin seems to be implying, we are dealing with multiple layers of authorship. We might, then, try assuming that the apostles are a bit bigger group than the eleven; assuming that Acts comes from the same author, Acts 14.14 lends support to that idea, and in Luke 10 Jesus sends out seventy *others*. These are not explicitly called apostles, but the term *others* seems to be bouncing off the sending of the twelve in Luke 9, where the twelve are called apostles (see verse 10); so the sense may be that Jesus sent other apostles (and perhaps Cleopas was one of these seventy). So it seems possible that the two on the road to Emmaus are considered apostles, but not from the twelve (or eleven).
- 4.** The genitive case of the plural pronoun in verse 13 is ambiguous as to gender; it could be masculine, feminine, or neuter. *However*, these two are consistently referred to with the masculine plural pronoun in those cases (such as the dative) in which we *can* tell a difference. So at least one of them must be male (a mixed group, male and female, would also be referred to with the masculine pronoun). This seems to rule out the antecedent being the women; and Cleopas himself must be male, since the word for *one* in the phrase *one, named Cleopas* in verse 18 is masculine, not feminine.

**5.** Seeing the antecedent as the eleven and the others in verse 9 works in all ways except in having to skip back over other potentially viable antecedents along the way to get there. If, however, the apostles and women in verse 10 prove to be impossible antecedents, the eleven and the rest in verse 9 would be about all that is left. It is also possible, of course, that the author simply stuck the *of them* on without thinking much about it, and it really refers back to nothing, but I would not favor this option unless all the other streams dried up. (All of this, of course, presumes some unity of authorship; if this is a literal fragment just stuck in from somewhere, the antecedents may be illusory.)

That is the Greek end of things as I see them. It is pretty complicated, I know, for such a basic inquiry, but I think I probably favor the group of apostles being a larger group than the eleven alone. Unless you can come up with another, better scenario, of course. 😊

Ben.



11-16-2007, 06:08 AM

#42

## Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005

Location: Midwest

Posts: 4,787



BTW, there is perhaps another hint that Luke thinks of the 70 precisely as apostles. In Luke 22.14 Jesus reclines with *the apostles* at the last supper. During the course of the meal, he reminds his followers of when he sent them out without purse, bag, or sandals (22.35). Now, the bag may recall 9.3, when the 12 were sent out, but the purse, bag, and sandals (all three) recall 10.4, when the 70 were sent out. This would seem to indicate that the 70 were apostles.

I suppose, of course, that this could also be a degree of carelessness on the part of Luke.

Ben.



11-16-2007, 07:29 AM

#43

## Pataphysician

Junior Member

Join Date: Mar 2007

Location: Chicago

Posts: 38



Wouldn't a good explanation be that the two men were, Clopas and his son Symeon. Cleopas being miswritten(or vice versa). Eusebius says

"all with one consent pronounced Symeon, the son of Clopas, of whom the Gospel also makes mention; to be worthy of the episcopal throne of that parish. He was a cousin, as they say, of the Saviour. For Hegesippus records that Clopas was a brother of Joseph."

So isn't it possible that originally, the nice Emmaus story was added to Luke to give some credentials to Symeon as personally witnessing Jesus, and that a bit later editing someone decided to make it unclear if this line was talking

about Clopas and Symeon seeing Jesus, or really Simon Peter seeing Jesus.

Also the text is clear that the speakers of the line ""The Lord has really risen and has appeared to Simon." have to be the two men on the trip to Emmaus, because in the next paragraph Jesus says "Why are you troubled, and why do doubts arise in your hearts?", if it was the apostles or the eleven that said the line above, then it would be weird for Jesus to think they still had doubts. But they did not say this, and were still doubting.



11-16-2007, 07:57 AM

#44


## Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005  
Location: Midwest  
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Pataphysician**   
*Wouldn't a good explanation be that the two men were, Clopas and his son Symeon. Cleopas being miswritten(or vice versa). Eusebius says....*

This is possible (I think), and I believe I have read someone suggesting this very scenario, though I forget who it was.

Quote:

Also the text is clear that the speakers of the line ""The Lord has really risen and has appeared to Simon." have to be the two men on the trip to Emmaus....

This is not true unless you adopt the variant in D. If you accept the majority text, there is no doubt that it is the eleven who are saying this.

Quote:

...because in the next paragraph Jesus says "Why are you troubled, and why do doubts arise in your hearts?", if it was the apostles or the eleven that said the line above, then it would be weird for Jesus to think they still had doubts. But they did not say this, and were still doubting.

**1.** The doubting is a stock element; in Matthew 28.17 the *some doubted* comes out of nowhere, too. John fleshes out this stock theme with the doubting Thomas story.

**2.** The doubting in Luke happens to follow cogently upon (some of?) the disciples thinking that Jesus was a phantom. Jesus goes on to assure them that it is really he, and that he is really made of restored human flesh and bone.


Ben.




11-16-2007, 08:27 AM #45

**spin**  
Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2002  
Location: nowhere  
Posts: 15,747

 Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 

*Now, if you can explain it to spin, even more progress will be have been made.*


You know that Luke doesn't have Simon or Peter seeing the risen Jesus, if it is not one of the two who met him on the road to Emmaus. Luke specifically indicated that Peter only saw the remains in the empty tomb. Both your attempts are unprecedented. Dong! Fail.

**spin**

11-16-2007, 08:31 AM #46

**spin**  
Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2002  
Location: nowhere  
Posts: 15,747

 Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C**

*Why does Luke mean somebody different here?*

*You didn't read my original post.*

*The only part of your original post that I find relevant is the part in which you suggest multiple authorship.*


Did I claim that "Luke mean[t] somebody different here" in the OP? Ummm, no.

**spin**

11-16-2007, 08:47 AM #47


**Pataphysician**  
Junior Member

Join Date: Mar 2007  
Location: Chicago  
Posts: 38

 Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Pataphysician**   
*Wouldn't a good explanation be that the two men were, Clopas and his son Symeon. Cleopas being miswritten(or vice versa). Eusebius says....*

*This is possible (I think), and I believe I have read someone suggesting this very scenario, though I forget who it was.*

*This is not true unless you adopt the variant in D. If you accept the majority text, there is no doubt that it is the eleven who are saying this.*

Quote:

...because in the next paragraph Jesus says "Why are you troubled, and why do doubts arise in your hearts?", if it was the apostles or the eleven that said the line above, then it would be weird for Jesus to think they still had doubts. But they did not say this, and were still doubting.

**1.** *The doubting is a stock element; in Matthew 28.17 the some doubted comes out of nowhere, too. John fleshes out this stock theme with the doubting Thomas story.*

**2.** *The doubting in Luke happens to follow cogently upon (some of?) the disciples thinking that Jesus was a phantom. Jesus goes on to assure them that it is really he, and that he is really made of restored human flesh and bone.*

*Ben.*

It reads wrong to me, if the eleven really said "the Lord has really risen" they wouldn't have perceived Jesus as a ghost and not flesh a few sentences later, either that, or the writer is extremely terrible.

Also, my feeling is that originally the text went from Luke 24:11 to Luke 24:36, with the Emmaus story added in to give a priority to Symeon, and then later edited again with 24:12 and possibly editing the line in 24:33 to create a Simon Peter priority.



 11-16-2007, 08:54 AM

#48

**Ben C Smith**

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005  
 Location: Midwest  
 Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**   
*Did I claim that "Luke mean[t] somebody different*

*here" in the OP? Ummm, no.*

Think of it this way (I am having to scattershoot here a bit since you are not being very clear on your view). Let us imagine that the author of the rest of Luke **did** write verse 34 (whether he got it from tradition or his own imagination or whatever). In that case, Luke has a summary of an appearance to somebody named Simon; so who did **Luke** think this Simon was? The evidence from the rest of the book indicates that, when Luke writes Simon without qualification, Luke means Simon Peter.

But, if **Luke** wrote verse 34 and **Luke** thought that this was Simon Peter, there is virtually no way he placed this saying on the lips of the 2 from Emmaus; this means that the Bezae variant, on the presumption that Luke himself penned this verse, is not original.

You have been arguing that the Bezae variant **is** original, so I presume you *cannot* be thinking that the author of the rest of Luke was responsible for 24.34.

But, if the author of the rest of Luke is not responsible for 24.34, you have no business asking me for evidence within Luke for who the Simon in this fragment is; if it is an interpolation, any evidence from the rest of Luke is a moot point.

IOW, you cannot logically argue on the one hand that Luke was not responsible for verse 34 and then ask for evidence on the other hand for who the Simon in verse 34 is from the rest of Luke.

Quote:

You know that Luke doesn't have Simon or Peter seeing the risen Jesus, if it is not one of the two who met him on the road to Emmaus.

If you mean that he does not narrate the event, agreed.

Quote:

Luke specifically indicated that Peter only saw the remains in the empty tomb.

You seem to be accepting the reading of Bezae in verse 34 but rejecting the reading in Bezae and several Old Latin texts for verse 12. What is your basis for doing this?

Ben.



11-16-2007, 08:56 AM

#49

**Ben C Smith**

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Pataphysician** >

Location: Midwest  
Posts: 4,787

*It reads wrong to me, if the eleven really said "the Lord has really risen" they wouldn't have perceived Jesus as a ghost and not flesh a few sentences later, either that, or the writer is extremely terrible.*

Or the writer is just taking care to include all the stock elements, even if they do not mesh as perfectly as you would like them to.

Quote:

Also, my feeling is that originally the text went from Luke 24:11 to Luke 24:36, with the Emmaus story added in to give a priority to Symeon, and then later edited again with 24:12 and possibly editing the line in 24:33 to create a Simon Peter priority.

I do not feel compelled, agree or disagree, to argue against your feeling. 😊

Ben.



11-16-2007, 09:46 AM

#50

**spin**

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2002  
Location: nowhere  
Posts: 15,747



Ben C, I gather from your continual use of "Luke" wrote, "Luke" thought, you are referring to the unknown writer(s) of the gospel.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

Quote:


Originally Posted by **spin**   
*Did I claim that "Luke mean[t] somebody different here" in the OP? Ummm, no.*

*Think of it this way (I am having to scattershoot here a bit since you are not being very clear on your view). Let us imagine that the author of the rest of Luke **did** write verse 34 (whether he got it from tradition or his own imagination or whatever). In that case, Luke has a summary of an appearance to somebody named Simon; so who did **Luke** think this Simon was? The evidence from the rest of the book indicates that, when Luke writes Simon without qualification, Luke means Simon Peter.*

OK.

One day it might be interesting to know exactly in which contexts the writer(s) used "Peter" and used "Simon".


Quote:


Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*But, if **Luke** wrote verse 34 and **Luke** thought that this was Simon Peter, there is virtually no way he placed this saying on the lips of the 2 from Emmaus; this means that the Bezae variant, on the presumption that Luke himself penned this verse, is not original.*

*You have been arguing that the Bezae variant **is** original, so I presume you cannot be thinking that the author of the rest of Luke was responsible for 24.34.*


I'd prefer to get to an understanding of what is to be extracted from the evidence, so I don't particularly have a solid idea, but I will put sticks in the wheels of those who go for the easy solution.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*But, if the author of the rest of Luke is not responsible for 24.34, you have no business asking me for evidence within Luke for who the Simon in this fragment is; if it is an interpolation, any evidence from the rest of Luke is a moot point.*

 "[N]o business"?


Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*IOW, you cannot logically argue on the one hand that Luke was not responsible for verse 34 and then ask for evidence on the other hand for who the Simon in verse 34 is from the rest of Luke.*

In trying to get at what indications the text provides I can do whatever works. But you do seem to be misrepresenting me. I stated some of the problems as I saw the text in the OP.


(And do stop this "Luke was" this or that stuff. I don't use "Luke" in any other way than to refer to the text. It is unhelpful to use it to refer two distinct things. You might believe in the notion that the writer(s) was named Luke, but for me and many others it is an unjustifiable position, when you know from christian antiquity that texts tended to pass through multiple hands. In using Luke as a presupposition of single so named author, you make communication difficult, because you make argumentative statements which include your presupposition.)

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*If you mean that he does not narrate the event, agreed.*

OK. Then we enter into the discourse problem again. There is no narrative justification for the eleven saying "indeed", etc. A reader of the text cannot extract just from the text what you and Amaleq13 try to. No narrative groundwork exists in the text to back it up.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 

Quote:

Luke specifically indicated that Peter only saw the remains in the empty tomb.

*You seem to be accepting the reading of Bezae in verse 34 but rejecting the reading in Bezae and several Old Latin texts for verse 12. What is your basis for doing this?*

It's hard to claim that any one text tradition got things totally right, so you don't have much reason for this observation.

**spin**



Page 5 of 9 [« First](#) [≤ 3](#) [4](#) **5** [6](#) [7](#) [≥](#) [Last »](#)

[« Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread »](#)

#### Thread Tools



[Show Printable Version](#)

Search this Thread

Search this Thread:

Go

[Advanced Search](#)

#### Forum Jump

Forums Home



Go

All times are GMT +11. The time now is 01:32 PM.

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2  
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.



# Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)  
**Simon or back to Emmaus**

**Welcome, [neilgodfrey](#).**

You last visited: Today at 12:22 PM

Search

## Notices

### FRDB is Closed

**FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.**

### The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 6 of 9 [« First](#) [≤ 4](#) [5](#) **6** [7](#) [8](#) [≥ Last](#) »

Thread Tools Search this Thread

11-16-2007, 09:49 AM

#51

## Amaleq13

Veteran Member

Join Date: Nov 2003  
 Location: Eagle River, Alaska  
 Posts: 7,816



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

**2.** *In this case, the most recent pertinent noun is the apostles (verse 10); before that we have the women (same verse); before that we have the eleven and the rest (verse 9).*

That was my first impression but, then, I noticed that there was a second "them".

Quote:

**3.** Trying the apostles first, and assuming that they are contiguous with the eleven, I think we hit a dead end for the simple fact that Cleopas is not one of the eleven, *unless* his name is an otherwise unattested second name or something, or *unless*, as spin seems to be implying, we are dealing with

multiple layers of authorship. We might, then, try assuming that the apostles are a bit bigger group than the eleven;

I would think that is suggested by "the eleven gathered together, **and them that were with them**".

ETA: Thanks for the Greek tips!! 😊



11-16-2007, 07:19 PM

#52

[neilgodfrey](#)

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005

Location: Darwin, Australia

Posts: 874



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Pataphysician** [▶](#)

*It reads wrong to me, if the eleven really said "the Lord has really risen" they wouldn't have perceived Jesus as a ghost and not flesh a few sentences later, either that, or the writer is extremely terrible.*

*Also, my feeling is that originally the text went from Luke 24:11 to Luke 24:36, with the Emmaus story added in to give a priority to Symeon, and then later edited again with 24:12 and possibly editing the line in 24:33 to create a Simon Peter priority.*

There are so many things that "read wrong" in this chapter, Codex Bezae, other manuscript or Textus Receptus. Either something has been lost from early days (words or esoteric understanding of what we see) or we need a totally new model to explain everything. Till then I can argue several positions with equal conviction and drop any and all of them like a tart the moment I see something I like better.

I like your way of simply cutting out all the problems by saying none was original. Who knows, maybe you are right. But it is also worth noting that some very strong arguments (my opinion, but I'm not an expert in NT Greek) such as from Matson et al, that the author of Luke (even of Luke-Acts) in fact knew the Gospel of John. If that were indeed the case, then the whole idea that Luke 24:12 (Peter visiting the tomb) is a later editorial addition by a scribe hearing voices from the Gospel of John, is a complete nonsense. Luke simply lifted it from John himself.

And add to that that he was also the final evangelist (cum catholicizer) to try to bring everyone together into one "happy" family.

But whatever the outcome of any of the above questions, the chapter as we have it now is a classic sequential narrative of a well-known-in-the-fictional-literature set of graduating recognition scenes. Fiction from around the



time of the gospels often ended with a series of scenes in which the main protagonists would establish their credentials to those "who needed to know" with a series of step by step phases of final recognition. As we have it now, Luke 24 in its entirety works brilliantly to this end.

First are the women who find the tomb empty and only see a couple of angels; second is the scene where two road-travellers meet the man in question but fail to recognize him till after he's gone; third is the moment when he pops into the middle of them all and proves his existence by eating dinner before flying up to heaven.

That is classic fiction. Bit-by-bit recognition. First you hear I am alive - then you think you see me alive but too late to prove it - and now (since you saw me eat and fly away) you can't deny it.

I'm happy to jettison this three-fold recognition scene however the moment I hear a better explanation for the raw data we're trying to figure out.

Till then, whether it's the 2 telling the 11 or the 11 telling the 2 that Simon saw Jesus, I suspend all judgment. Bring on an explanation that explains the whole damn lot without leaving a host of questions in its train, and then I'll begin to think we've got the reading right.

Neil Godfrey



11-17-2007, 01:08 AM

#53


## Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005  
Location: Midwest  
Posts: 4,787




Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**   
*Ben C, I gather from your continual use of "Luke" wrote, "Luke" thought, you are referring to the unknown writer(s) of the gospel.*

Yes. I sometimes expand this as *the author of Luke* or such, but that gets cumbersome. By *Luke* I am not presuming the traditional view, even if I find merit in it.

Quote:

 "[N]o business"?

I did not particularly like the phrase either after I wrote it and submitted the post. Sorry about that.

Quote:

And do stop this "Luke was" this or that stuff. I don't use "Luke" in any other way than to refer to the text. It is unhelpful to use it to refer two distinct things.

I (think I) use it to refer either to the text or to the author, depending on context, but without (necessarily) presuming that the author was really, truly named Luke.

Quote:


OK. Then we enter into the discourse problem again. There is no narrative justification for the eleven saying "indeed", etc. A reader of the text cannot extract just from the text what you and Amaleq13 try to.

I have already stated that I think the insertion of this summary statement is awkward; and of course this is not the only thing awkward about the gospel of Luke. But some account must be made of the *really*, and I think that what Doug suggested makes the most sense of any idea so far. I also noted, if you recall, that I liked your contrast of present belief with past doubt; but I do not see one option as necessarily excluding the other.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*You seem to be accepting the reading of Bezae in verse 34 but rejecting the reading in Bezae and several Old Latin texts for verse 12. What is your basis for doing this?*

*It's hard to claim that any one text tradition got things totally right, so you don't have much reason for this observation.*

Sure I do. There are two Bezae readings in view here; so mathematically there are four options:

1. Both are original.
2. The first is original; the second is not.
3. The second is original; the first is not.
4. Neither is original.

Your analysis depends on the third option being correct. Now, you have at least given reasons (insufficient ones, IMHO) for accepting the second Bezae reading, so this limits us to options 1 and 3. But how did you eliminate option 1?

I am not *at all* against accepting one reading in a manuscript and rejecting another; I am a supporter of an eclectic text. But I always want to know *why* the variants are accepted and rejected, and AFAICT you simply assumed that verse 12 belonged to the Lucan text without argument.

And this brings me to a broader point about the argumentation in general. You are quick to point out

hidden assumptions in arguments made by others; why so slow, then, to acknowledge this unargued assumption of yours that verse 12 belongs to the text?

Ben.



11-17-2007, 01:53 AM

#54

## JoeWallack

Veteran Member

Join Date: Mar 2003  
Location: Nazareth  
Posts: 2,357



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

*Sure I do. There are two Bezae readings in view here; so mathematically there are four options:*

- 1.** *Both are original.*
- 2.** *The first is original; the second is not.*
- 3.** *The second is original; the first is not.*
- 4.** *Neither is original.*

**JW:**

Origen is exponentially better evidence here than D. What pray tell is your reason for ignoring it.

Joseph



11-17-2007, 02:13 AM

#55

## Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005  
Location: Midwest  
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **JoeWallack**

*Origen is exponentially better evidence here than D. What pray tell is your reason for ignoring it.*

Joe, I have asked you a number of informational questions in the not-so-distant past which you have ignored. For a while I even thought that perhaps you had placed me on ignore, and one of your comments to me sounded like you were at least thinking of doing so.

This one is a very good question, and it deserves a good answer, but I am going to ignore it just like you have been ignoring my very good questions.

Ben.



11-17-2007, 02:45 AM

#56

## JoeWallack

Veteran Member

Join Date: Mar 2003




Quote:

Location: Nazareth  
Posts: 2,357

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 

Quote:

Originally Posted by **JoeWallack**   
*Origen is exponentially better evidence here than D. What pray tell is your reason for ignoring it.*

*Joe, I have asked you a number of informational questions in the not-so-distant past which you have ignored. For a while I even thought that perhaps you had placed me on ignore, and one of your comments to me sounded like you were at least thinking of doing so.*

*This one is a very good question, and it deserves a good answer, but I am going to ignore it just like you have been ignoring my very good questions.*

*Ben.*

**JW:**

Actually it's more like don't have the time for everyone here than just ignoring you (just ask everyone else) but hey, no problem. What's important here, as always, is that you are ignoring Origen, not that you are ignoring me.

While we're on the subject though, yes, I do have an attitude towards you. You possess the skills that your fellow Christians here lack but you've turned into another Christian scholar who's first priority is to support Christian Assertians when it should be to support Objectivity. It's disappointing.

**Joseph**

[http://www.errancywiki.com/index.php/Main\\_Page](http://www.errancywiki.com/index.php/Main_Page)



 11-17-2007, 03:24 AM

#57


**Ben C Smith**

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005  
Location: Midwest  
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **JoeWallack**   
*While we're on the subject though, yes, I do have an attitude towards you. You possess the skills that your fellow Christians here lack but you've turned into another Christian scholar who's first priority is to support Christian Assertians when it should be to support Objectivity. It's disappointing.*

Sorry to disappoint you, of course, but (1) I have asked you before what parts of the Bible (it was the Jewish Bible in context) you thought I was warping, and that was one of the questions that went unanswered, and (2) I think

perhaps you would see my arguments in a slightly different light if I were on a different board and had to answer far-right hypotheses on a regular basis instead of far-left hypotheses. Also, I think that on a couple of occasions you have simply misunderstood my position, mistaking it for a more conservative one that I actually do not hold simply because I was also disagreeing with your own.

Do you realize that I am attracted to the minimal HJ model that Robert Price seems to espouse, and that even on my best days I have trouble accepting very much more of the HJ than his baptism and death? How supporting of Christian assertions is *that*?

Finally, right from the start on this board you sounded as if you were trying to take me under your wing or something (some of your comments were actually pretty condescending), as a Grand Skeptical Master who would soon convert me to the position that the main purpose of the gospel of Mark is to criticize Peter (you called it the Dark Side of the Force, IIRC). I have always suspected that, once it became clear I was probably not going to embrace that position (though I certainly agree there is some critiquing of Peter going on there), you lost your grip on civility with me.

For the record, unless the positions that (A) the Bible is not inerrant, (B) the gospels are full of Jesus legends, (C) the apostle Matthew had nothing to do with the gospel of Matthew, (D) oral tradition is inherently unreliable, and (E) countless other nontraditional positions are to be labelled distinctively *Christian*, my first priority is hardly to support Christian assertions. I strive to support the most accurate and least problematic reconstructions available, and where I fail to do so I hope you will politely point my failure out, rather than sporting *an attitude* toward me.

The irony is that *you*, Joe, are absolutely a missionary for a certain skeptical position; your comments on the text are explicitly and openly bound up with tearing into Christianity. Example:

Quote:

Originally Posted by **JoeWallack**  
*I have Faith that public communication to Christians of just how Negative "Mark" was towards "Peter" will be the biggest problem for Christianity since the acceptance of Markan priority.*

If *anybody* is selecting his arguments based on their usefulness either for or against Christianity....

Ben.



**spin**

Contributor


Join Date: Mar 2002

Location: nowhere

Posts: 15,747




Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*I (think I) use ["Luke"] to refer either to the text or to the author, depending on context, but without (necessarily) presuming that the author was really, truly named Luke.*


Besides the fact that you'll never know who wrote the text, you confuse the shit out of me having two separate references to the one term which you flit between, so could you please use say gLuke and aLuke, if typing is a concern, to distinguish the two so I don't get into any necessary mind reading? That would be kind.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*I have already stated that I think the insertion of this summary statement is awkward; and of course this is not the only thing awkward about the gospel of Luke. But some account must be made of the really, and I think that what Doug suggested makes the most sense of any idea so far. I also noted, if you recall, that I liked your contrast of present belief with past doubt; but I do not see one option as necessarily excluding the other.*

You're not getting into it far enough here, if you assume as you do that 24:34 isn't part of the Emmaus pericope, in that it doesn't refer to the Emmaus material. There is no prefiguring for the comment. You are asking that the momentous first sighting of the risen Jesus, that which you suppose is by Peter before the Emmaus event, doesn't rate a mention. That is *ludicrous*. It also misunderstands the importance of the Emmaus event in the narrative as the first view of the risen Jesus, with its withholding of the facts so that the identity of the stranger is only revealed late in the pericope, so that it would have its greatest impact on the listening audience. A casual by the way Peter saw Jesus first simply pulls the carpet out from under the Emmaus event.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**  
*It's hard to claim that any one text tradition got things totally right, so you don't have much reason for this observation.*

*Sure I do. There are two Bezae readings in view here; so mathematically there are four options:*

**1.** *Both are original.*


2. *The first is original; the second is not.*
3. *The second is original; the first is not.*
4. *Neither is original.*

*Your analysis depends on the third option being correct. Now, you have at least given reasons (insufficient ones, IMHO) for accepting the second Bezae reading, so this limits us to options 1 and 3. But how did you eliminate option 1?*

How would you deal with the K tradition of Galatians? While Aleph has Cephas through Galatians except for 2:7-8, K has Peter everywhere except for 2:9. Would you argue that if one follows K's evidence elsewhere that one has to follow it in 2:9 as well?

I can happily do without the mention of Peter at the tomb. My argument would still be functionally the same. The purpose of the Emmaus event was to give us the risen Jesus and any claimed prior sighting would detract from that purpose.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*And this brings me to a broader point about the argumentation in general. You are quick to point out hidden assumptions in arguments made by others; why so slow, then, to acknowledge this unargued assumption of yours that verse 12 belongs to the text?*

If it was there it reinforces my point, if it wasn't, then the argument survives anyway. It's that simple. The incoherence of your attempt to deal with 24:34 only seems to strengthen the contrary case. I'm not the only one hanging on one letter.

**spin**



11-17-2007, 06:44 AM

#59

**Ben C Smith**

Veteran Member


Join Date: May 2005

Location: Midwest

Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **JoeWallack**   
*What's important here, as always, is that you are ignoring Origen, not that you are ignoring me.*

Olive branch.

I agree that I probably should not have ignored Origen here. However, the thrust of my question to spin was not actually to question his acceptance of the Bezae reading at 24.34, since he *had* given something of an argument (from internal evidence, not from external evidence such as

Origen) for that reading, but rather to question his acceptance of the majority text at verse 12, against the shorter western reading; he made no argument in that regard.

As for Origen, I have reason to think that Origen had read Hegesippus, and this is what Hegesippus writes about (someone named) Clopas/Cleopas (a pretty uncommon name):

**Και ὁ ἀπο μίας γνώμης τοὺς πάντας  
Συμεῶνα τὸν τοῦ Κλωπα, οὐ καὶ ἡ τοῦ  
εὐαγγελίου μνημονεύει γραφῆ,  
...δοκιμασαί.**

And they all with one opinion pronounced Symeon, the son of Clopas, of whom the gospel also makes mention.

While I personally think Hegesippus is saying that the gospel mentions Cleopas, it would not be very difficult to read him at a glance or on memory as saying that the gospel mentions Symeon-son-of-Cleopas.

So... did Origen get the name Simon (which was the Greek name that was employed to correspond to the Hebrew Symeon) from Hegesippus, or did he get it from reading something like what we find in Bezae?

Personally, I like the idea that Origen had a reading like Bezae to hand; but I also like the idea that he was connecting dots from Hegesippus. Perhaps you might help me decide which way to go. 😊

(Also, BTW, I believe P75, roughly contemporaneous with Origen, has the majority text at 24.34; if I am correct, and I have only NA27 to go by here, that certainly bears mentioning, too.)

Ben.



11-17-2007, 06:56 AM

#60

## Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005  
Location: Midwest  
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**

*Besides the fact that you'll never know who wrote the text, you confuse the shit out of me having two separate references to the one term which you flit between....*

Sorry about that. I will try to write less confusingly.

Quote:

You are asking that the momentous first sighting of the risen Jesus, that which you suppose is by Peter before the Emmaus event, doesn't rate a



mention.

This is exactly what I am **not** doing. I think the appearance **did** get mentioned... in verse 34.

Quote:

A casual by the way Peter saw Jesus first simply pulls the carpet out from under the Emmaus event.

Yes, it certainly does! That is how important that mention was to the author of the gospel of Luke.

(You brushed it all aside without argument, but the presence in a Pauline text of the Cephas appearance and the fact that the author of Luke and Acts is an admirer of Paul renders it completely unsurprising that the author of Luke should know about this appearance; if he circulated in Pauline circles, he should be picking up Pauline traditions. If the author of Luke knew of the Cephas appearance but did not have an actual narrative of it, Luke 24.34 is one way of mentioning this appearance.)

Quote:

I can happily do without the mention of Peter at the tomb.

Okay, but it sure seemed more of a fixture than that when you wrote:

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**  
*You know that Luke doesn't have Simon or Peter seeing the risen Jesus, if it is not one of the two who met him on the road to Emmaus. Luke specifically indicated that Peter only saw the remains in the empty tomb.*

Ben.

**ETA:** You also asked:

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**  
*How would you deal with the K tradition of Galatians? While Aleph has Cephas through Galatians except for 2:7-8, K has Peter everywhere except for 2:9. Would you argue that if one follows K's evidence elsewhere that one has to follow it in 2:9 as well?*

But I already answered this kind of question:

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben**

*I am not at all against accepting one reading in a manuscript and rejecting another; I am a supporter of an eclectic text. But I always want to know why the variants are accepted and rejected, and AFAICT you simply assumed that verse 12 belonged to the Lucan text without argument.*



<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

**Thread Tools**



[Show Printable Version](#)

**Search this Thread**

**Search this Thread:**

[Advanced Search](#)

**Forum Jump**

Forums Home

All times are GMT +11. The time now is 01:32 PM.

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2  
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.



# Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)

[Simon or back to Emmaus](#)

**Welcome, [neilgodfrey](#).**

You last visited: Today at 12:22 PM

Search

## Notices

### FRDB is Closed

**FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.**

### The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 7 of 9 [« First](#) [≤](#) [5](#) [6](#) **7** [8](#) [9](#) [≥](#)

Thread Tools Search this Thread

11-17-2007, 07:39 AM

#61

spin

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2002

Location: nowhere

Posts: 15,747



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**

*You are asking that the momentous first sighting of the risen Jesus, that which you suppose is by Peter before the Emmaus event, doesn't rate a mention.*

*This is exactly what I am **not** doing. I think the appearance **did** get mentioned... in verse 34.*

You are quibbling on "mention". I meant *showing* of your supposed first appearance of the risen Jesus. It's not there. You have it making a surreptitious intrusion into the Emmaus story. The event itself is simply not there.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 

Quote:

A casual by the way Peter saw Jesus first simply pulls the carpet out from under the Emmaus event.

*Yes, it certainly does! That is how important that mention was to the author of the gospel of Luke.*

You can happily invalidate the impact of the Emmaus story with an undercutting aside. Well done.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 

*(You brushed it all aside without argument, but the presence in a Pauline text of the Cephas appearance and the fact that the author of Luke and Acts is an admirer of Paul renders it completely unsurprising that the author of Luke should know about this appearance; if he circulated in Pauline circles, he should be picking up Pauline traditions. If the author of Luke knew of the Cephas appearance but did not have an actual narrative of it, Luke 24.34 is one way of mentioning this appearance.)*

You are unable to explain why Cephas is seen as separate from the twelve, so you are still in the same quagmire as when I started the thread to try to work out what was going on in 24:33-34.




11-17-2007, 07:48 AM

#62

## Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005  
Location: Midwest  
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin** 

*You are quibbling on "mention". I meant showing of your supposed first appearance of the risen Jesus. It's not there. You have it making a surreptitious intrusion into the Emmaus story. The event itself is simply not there.*

Nobody is quibbling about anything. You said what you said, and I am not responsible for your wording.

I agree that a narration of the event is not there. I also gave a plausible reason why it is not. That you do not accept it is fine; but returning over and over again to

points already made (*it is simply not there!*) is not going to help much... is it?

Quote:

... Well done.

Thank you. 😊

Quote:

You are unable to explain why Cephas is seen as separate from the twelve, so you are still in the same quagmire as when I started the thread to try to work out what was going on in 24:33-34.

I do not have to explain this for the connections to work. In fact, Cephas and Simon Peter do not even have to be the same person for the connections to work. All that is necessary is for the author of Luke to have *thought* they were the same person, whether correctly or incorrectly.

(This makes me wonder what other things you may be assuming my argument depends upon that it really does not.)

Ben.



11-17-2007, 11:30 AM

#63

**spin**

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2002

Location: nowhere

Posts: 15,747



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** >

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin** >  
*You are quibbling on "mention". I meant showing of your supposed first appearance of the risen Jesus. It's not there. You have it making a surreptitious intrusion into the Emmaus story. The event itself is simply not there.*

*Nobody is quibbling about anything. You said what you said, and I am not responsible for your wording.*

If you weren't just quibbling, then you're not being a good ambassador for your thinking abilities.


Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** >  
*I agree that a narration of the event is not there. I also gave a plausible reason why it is not. That you do not accept it is fine; but returning over and*

*over again to points already made (it is simply not there!) is not going to help much... is it?*


Your plausible reason is "look at this Emmaus story, and by the way it's not the first event 'cos Peter's already seen him, but I'm too out of it to include the first (because writing is not my speciality)."

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 


Quote:

You can happily invalidate the impact of the Emmaus story with an undercutting aside. Well done.

Thank you. 

And I'm amused that you took this opportunity!

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 

Quote:

You are unable to explain why Cephas is seen as separate from the twelve, so you are still in the same quagmire as when I started the thread to try to work out what was going on in 24:33-34.

*I do not have to explain this for the connections to work. In fact, Cephas and Simon Peter do not even have to be the same person for the connections to work. All that is necessary is for the author of Luke to have thought they were the same person, whether correctly or incorrectly.*

*(This makes me wonder what other things you may be assuming my argument depends upon that it really does not.)*

It gets worse when you can't see the quagmire you're in. I'm sure that's why many people are still religious.

You've invented another appearance for Jesus when the text itself expressly says that those who went to the tomb didn't see Jesus (24:24). That appearance you imagine, according to the chronology available to us, happened between the time that the two went off to Emmaus to talk with Jesus and when they returned. This is yet another miracle I guess, because you would have Jesus in two places at the same time.

There is plainly more to this textual problem than you are willing to look at. As it is, your reading simply doesn't make sense. You're dangling on a vowel.

**spin**

11-18-2007, 03:17 AM

#64

## Amaleq13

Veteran Member

Join Date: Nov 2003  
Location: Eagle River, Alaska  
Posts: 7,816



Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin** [▶](#)  
*As it is, your reading simply doesn't make sense.*

It only fails to make sense if one insists that the author *had* to explicitly depict the appearance to Simon but there does not appear to be any good reason for that requirement. The author claims to be relying on others for his information so why isn't it possible that he simply did not describe a scene for which he had no information beyond the bare fact of an initial appearance to Simon?

11-18-2007, 05:21 AM

#65

## spin

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2002  
Location: nowhere  
Posts: 15,747



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Amaleq13** [▶](#)

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin** [▶](#)  
*As it is, your reading simply doesn't make sense.*

*It only fails to make sense if one insists that the author had to explicitly depict the appearance to Simon but there does not appear to be any good reason for that requirement. The author claims to be relying on others for his information so why isn't it possible that he simply did not describe a scene for which he had no information beyond the bare fact of an initial appearance to Simon?*

When could it have happened on the author's timeline when a tomb sighting was specifically excluded in Lk 24:24?

**spin**

11-18-2007, 07:16 AM

#66

## Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005



Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin** [▶](#)

Location: Midwest  
Posts: 4,787

*When could it have happened on the author's timeline when a tomb sighting was specifically excluded in Lk 24:24?*

How much time does the text say has elapsed between the dawn events of verses 1-12 and the trip to Emmaus?

Ben.



11-18-2007, 07:35 AM

#67

**spin**

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2002  
Location: nowhere  
Posts: 15,747



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**   
*When could it have happened on the author's timeline when a tomb sighting was specifically excluded in Lk 24:24?*

*How much time does the text say has elapsed between the dawn events of verses 1-12 and the trip to Emmaus?*

It doesn't say. But I can see you are now looking for wiggle room at the cost of the writer's narrative abilities. We might make an apologist out of you yet.

**spin**



11-18-2007, 08:34 AM

#68

**neilgodfrey**

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005  
Location: Darwin, Australia  
Posts: 874

**interpreting the Emmaus story through the techniques of popular fiction**

The online article I cited earlier prompted me to rethink the ending of Luke and the Emmaus story in particular. I ended up taking a fresh look at that episode through the sorts of endings and resolutions commonly found in ancient popular fiction. The result is that I've completely backflipped on my original position about the point of the Emmaus narrative, at least in theory (for now).

My working out of the where it fits in relation to popular novelist devices took me about 7 pages ([posted here](#)), but I summarized the conclusions here.

The problems we see in the text may be the consequence of losing sight of the wider literary context of the gospel. Perhaps it was not long after it was written that serious minded clerics in their quest for theological facts and dogma also lost sight of the original playfulness the Emmaus episode. It has been this far too serious approach



that has raised the interpretative and textual problems. Those problems largely disappear when the ending is read as being constructed with the tools of ancient popular fiction, maybe.

In my earlier 7 page long post I argue that the author of our canonical Luke-Acts knew how to please an audience and hold them in suspense. Acts in particular is one long series of adventures and narrow escapes. The conclusion of Luke demonstrates a mastery of popular technique resolving the narrative plot with a suspenseful graduated series of recognition scenes. The author has primed his audience to anticipate a resolution that involves not only the resurrection of Jesus but in particular a resolution with Simon Peter.

This is a plot development that is new and original to this gospel. His audience knew of the earlier gospel stories where the hoped for meeting between the resurrected Jesus and Peter either never happened or was blurred out by his being included unnamed in the ranks of the rest of the apostles. The author of Luke-Acts also wanted to wrap narrative flesh around the doctrinal "fact" that the very first appearance of the resurrected Jesus was to Peter (1 Cor.15:5).

Yet simply fabricating a dramatic scene at this point of the Christian community's growth, one that no-one had ever heard before, would scarcely win easy acceptance. The story had to be low key enough to explain why it had not been common public knowledge before. At the same time it had to be rich enough in associations and meaning to be worthy of a genuine appearance to the leader of the Twelve. Embedding in the narrative the motifs of travel, evening hospitality towards unrecognized divine messengers, and the place identified as where Jacob was visited by God, achieved this. (Jewish legends further added elaborated the significance of the rock Jacob used for his pillow, possibly further playing with word associations and their relation to the names of Cephas and Peter.)

The author found the solution to both problems by turning one part of the classic recognition scenes into a double dialogue with his audience: at the same time he was taking them through the suspense of how the characters came to recognize the resurrected Jesus, he was playing with them to give them a chance to recognize for themselves how Simon Peter became the first to see the resurrected Jesus. He repeated his known trick of saving the key identity of the character until the critical point in the narrative.

The final resolution of the status of Simon Peter, as well as that of the mystery of the anonymity and strange new name in the Emmaus road narrative, comes when the pair announce to the audience even more than to the eleven that Jesus has just appeared to Simon!

The nature of this revelation, as mysterious and ephemeral but nonetheless as real as the recognition

scene in the story of how Manoah and his wife belatedly recognized the heavenly nature of their guest, and it's immediate overshadowing by Jesus' dramatic open appearance in the midst of them all, complete with his proofs that he was real, facilitated the noncontroversial introduction of the new narrative of how Jesus appeared first to Peter.

Unfortunately for later more literal minded audiences and for subsequent ecclesiastical mythmakers who began to create a genealogy and entirely new identity for Cleophas, an understanding of the playfulness and novelistic art of the author was lost, along with the true meaning of the narrative.

Neil

<http://vridar.wordpress.com>



11-19-2007, 01:56 AM

#69

## Pataphysician

Junior Member

Join Date: Mar 2007  
Location: Chicago  
Posts: 38



Neil, I find that theory intriguing, the name Cleopas then might be used, more of a play on words as it means "Glory of his father", as another way of describing the resurrected "Son of Man". Which would be a hint to 9:26 of Luke, which the angel and the women in chapter 24 had also just referenced chapter 9:22.



11-19-2007, 07:46 AM

#70

## neilgodfrey

Senior Member

Join Date: Mar 2005  
Location: Darwin, Australia  
Posts: 874



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Pataphysician**

*Neil, I find that theory intriguing, the name Cleopas then might be used, more of a play on words as it means "Glory of his father", as another way of describing the resurrected "Son of Man". Which would be a hint to 9:26 of Luke, which the angel and the women in chapter 24 had also just referenced chapter 9:22.*

Woke up this morning with another clue on my mind (I know, I really do have to get more of a life!) and dashed off [another blog post](#) to discuss it at some length -- but in summary here it is:

Some scholars do find support in textual analysis that Luke knew and used John. -- And others do find reasons to believe that our canonical Luke-Acts was written late and after the other gospels.

If we go along with that for a moment, and look at John again, then the possibility that Luke was in fact in dialogue with John over the first resurrection appearance emerges

fairly strongly, I think.

John's gospel has Simon Peter and an unnamed disciple running to the tomb, finding it as they had been told, and then said to be walking off to their homes.

So John has Simon Peter + an unnamed disciple walking off to their homes.

Now thinking how an original audience would be reacting as they heard Luke's Emmaus story. When Luke introduces 2 disciples walking along the road, presumably to their home(s) -- and we learn in the course of the story that they definitely were going to the home of at least one of them -- and when they hear that one of them is left unnamed, but that the name of the other is suspiciously a bit like Cephas, -- Would not they be thinking, "Hey, what's going on? Where is this leading us? We know about Simon Peter and the unnamed disciple traveling along home . . ." (I discuss in more detail this literary audience-grabbing trick that the author of Luke uses when he retells the Markan story of the anointing of Jesus. It's the same game he's playing with his audience -- and coincidentally he saves the Simon identity till the critical moment of the story.)

The author of the Emmaus story is grabbing his audience by picking up where John left Simon and his unnamed companion traveling back to their home. He's playing with them. Like an entertainer having a little tease before finally relieving the tension and declaring unambiguously, yup, this is how Jesus appeared to Simon!

The problem we have with this explanation, I suggest, is that we are reading Luke for historical reconstruction, for traditions, for sources, --- way too seriously in other words. If we read it like a novel, like a good story, then I suggest many of our problems fade away.

Neil Godfrey

<http://vridar.wordpress.com>

P.S. If there is this dialogue thing happening, it would also explain why Cleophas speaks of events that are not found in Luke at all, but only in John's gospel -- that is, the running of the two disciples to the tomb to find it empty.



<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

#### Thread Tools



[Show Printable Version](#)

Search this Thread

Search this Thread:

Go

[Advanced Search](#)

#### Forum Jump

Forums Home



Go

All times are GMT +11. The time now is [01:33 PM](#).

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2  
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.



# Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)  
**Simon or back to Emmaus**

**Welcome, [neilgodfrey](#).**

You last visited: Today at 12:22 PM

Search

## Notices

### FRDB is Closed

**FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.**

### The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 8 of 9 [« First](#) [≤](#) [6](#) [7](#) **8** [9](#) [≥](#)

Thread Tools Search this Thread

11-19-2007, 09:52 AM

#71

## the cave

Veteran Member

Join Date: Feb 2003

Location: Earth

Posts: 1,443



Thank you Neil--I was about to post the following, after which I'll respond to some of your comments:

We must remember that Luke (ALuke, that is) is merging different sources into a single tale. [For spin: the evidence for this is in the prologue to Luke (GLuke, that is--which ALuke wrote!).] He is probably doing whatever it takes to make all the sources tell the same story. If he uses a name like "Cleopas", it could be for any reason--maybe it was a patronym in one source, or maybe it was the name of one of the travelers, or maybe he just used it because it was there (for example, he may have shared a source with John [for spin: GJohn, that is--which AJohn wrote!]-- see Jn 19:25.)

However, here is a grammatical question: is Luke (both ALuke and GLuke, that is) really saying that *the eleven* make the claim about the resurrection and appearance to

Simon? Why couldn't it be "those that were with them"? Remember that back in 24:10, the women are also joined by others who proclaim the resurrection. These others do not accompany the women to the tomb, but there they are on the way back--more evidence that Luke is trying to merge at least two sources. And then they seem to make another appearance in 24:34, saying just what they said in 24:10, but with more elaboration. They don't make the claim about Simon in 24:10, but what if they did in the original source--and so Luke is trying valiantly to explain why they would say so? (By making space in the narrative for it to happen.)

This doesn't answer the question of whether one of the two travelers was Simon or not, though I should point out that it would be odd for Luke to deliberately leave out an appearance to Simon. And if Emmaus *is* the appearance to Simon, then it would be odd for Luke to leave out his name! Is GLuke overtly anti-Petrine? ALuke is doing something funny here, but it's unclear what.

Finally, we can't leave out the possibility that one name or other has been overwritten by a later scribe in an attempt at harmonization--perhaps it was "Simon" with "Cleopas", or it was "Cleopas" with "Simon".

To which I'll add:

Quote:

Some scholars do find support in textual analysis that Luke knew and used John. -- And others do find reasons to believe that our canonical Luke-Acts was written late and after the other gospels.

Yes, though I find it much more likely that Luke and John were sharing a source, rather than ALuke was using canonical GJohn.

Quote:

If we go along with that for a moment, and look at John again, then the possibility that Luke was in fact in dialogue with John over the first resurrection appearance emerges fairly strongly, I think.

Quite right--in fact *all* of the resurrection appearances are cross-linked with one another--analyzing them is a good way to understand which documents the authors were combining and rewriting. There were probably two or three original resurrection appearance stories, and there may have been more, since we need to think about the appearance to James in the Gospel of the Hebrews--note that one also involved a bread-breaking, like the appearance at Emmaus! I don't have the time to explain all the links right now, but maybe I'll do so at some point.

(The Freer Logion is also of some help in this.)

Quote:

John's gospel has Simon Peter and an unnamed disciple running to the tomb, finding it as they had been told, and then said to be walking off to their homes.

So John has Simon Peter + an unnamed disciple walking off to their homes.

Yes, I noticed this myself some months ago...it's good to see I'm not alone. I actually hadn't thought of it for a while now, so thanks for reminding me.



11-20-2007, 12:38 AM

#72

## Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005  
Location: Midwest  
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin** >

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** >  
*How much time does the text say has elapsed between the dawn events of verses 1-12 and the trip to Emmaus?*

*It doesn't say. But I can see you are now looking for wiggle room at the cost of the writer's narrative abilities.*

There is no need to *find* wriggle room. The initial discovery of the tomb takes place at dawn, and the trip to Emmaus (7 miles walking distance from Jerusalem, I believe) culminates at evening. There is an entire morning and possibly even early afternoon left unaccounted for.

Ben.



11-20-2007, 12:52 AM

#73

## Ben C Smith

Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005  
Location: Midwest  
Posts: 4,787



Quote:

Originally Posted by **neilgodfrey** >  
*Some scholars do find support in textual analysis that Luke knew and used John. -- And others do find reasons to believe that our canonical Luke-Acts was written late and after the other gospels.*

*If we go along with that for a moment, and look at John again, then the possibility that Luke was in fact in dialogue with John over the first*

*resurrection appearance emerges fairly strongly, I think.*

I think you run into a bit of a problem here, or at least something that bears explaining. If the author of Luke knew the gospel of John, then the appearance of Clopas in John 19.25 and Cleopas in Luke 24.18 can hardly be coincidental.

Do you think John thought Clopas was Peter too? Or that Luke mistook him to be saying so? Or that Luke artificially turned Clopas into Cleopas = Peter?

Ben.



11-20-2007, 07:14 AM

#74

**spin**

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2002

Location: nowhere

Posts: 15,747



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** >

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin** >

*It doesn't say. But I can see you are now looking for wiggle room at the cost of the writer's narrative abilities.*

*There is no need to find wiggle room. The initial discovery of the tomb takes place at dawn, and the trip to Emmaus (7 miles walking distance from Jerusalem, I believe) culminates at evening. There is an entire morning and possibly even early afternoon left unaccounted for.*

Wriggle, wriggle, wriggle. 😊 And you notice how the narrative is dealt with in 24:13-14. It shifts the reader's focus away from the tomb, *idou* ("behold" -- what's the purpose of that?), onto Emmaus narrative "that same day" in which the two participants take up and talk about the events that had just happened. Then they indicate clearly that no-one *had* seen Jesus at the tomb, though they went to check the women's report. The narrative has the clear aim of filling in the temporal gap, so that they two could confirm that Jesus had indeed risen.

Now of course you can wriggle against the narrative intent, but that would seem wanton.

**spin**



11-20-2007, 07:22 AM

#75

**Ben C Smith**






Veteran Member

Join Date: May 2005  
Location: Midwest  
Posts: 4,787

Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**   
*Wriggle, wriggle, wriggle.* 😊

....

*Now of course you can wriggle against the narrative intent, but that would seem wanton.*

My views only rarely are given the opportunity to be described as *wanton*, so I think I will just let this one stand as it is. 😊

One general observation, though: It seems possible to me that, once **I** am through with a text, it might contain *more* examples of unevenness or fatigue than the original author included, while, once **you** are through with it, it might contain *fewer* such examples than the original author included.

Ben.



11-20-2007, 07:37 AM

#76


**spin**

Contributor


Join Date: Mar 2002  
Location: nowhere  
Posts: 15,747



Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith** 


Quote:

Originally Posted by **spin**   
*Wriggle, wriggle, wriggle.* 😊 .... *Now of course you can wriggle against the narrative intent, but that would seem wanton.*

*My views only rarely are given the opportunity to be described as wanton, so I think I will just let this one stand as it is.* 😊

:Cheeky:

Quote:

Originally Posted by **Ben C Smith**   
*One general observation, though: It seems possible to me that, once **I** am through with a text, it might contain more examples of unevenness or fatigue than the original author included, while, once **you** are through with it, it might contain fewer such examples than the original author included.*

This doesn't seem to deal with the basic problem of the intent of the passage which contains all the elements we are considering. Any fatigue reflects how the passage in a

wider context. It is only the wider context that allows you to consider any fatigue.

spin

11-20-2007, 01:12 PM

#77

## the cave

Veteran Member

Join Date: Feb 2003  
Location: Earth  
Posts: 1,443



Quote:

I think you run into a bit of a problem here, or at least something that bears explaining. If the author of Luke knew the gospel of John, then the appearance of Clopas in John 19.25 and Cleopas in Luke 24.18 can hardly be coincidental.

Do you think John thought Clopas was Peter too? Or that Luke mistook him to be saying so? Or that Luke artificially turned Clopas into Cleopas = Peter?

Of course it's not coincidental. I don't think there is any conflation of Peter and Clopas going on. The name was somewhere near these passages in the shared source--my guess is that John's reading is closer to the source. Luke was just also using a version of either Mark or Matthew, and decided that Mary was more reliably the mother of James, leaving Cl(e)opas out of it. But then he reused the name later.

Luke for some reason doesn't want to give Peter (or even a "Simon"! ) the theophany at Emmaus. I suspect this means that originally (in the theophany in the original source) there was either no Simon involved at all, or there was, but Luke knew it wasn't Simon Peter. (Note that in John, it's Mary who gets the theophany!) Luke (like most if not all the canonical gospel writers) is trying to clean things up.

This does not quite clear up the question of who said that Jesus had appeared to Simon. But that is a separate issue from the question of Clopas.

11-20-2007, 01:18 PM

#78

## the cave

Veteran Member

Join Date: Feb 2003  
Location: Earth  
Posts: 1,443



Quote:

And you notice how the narrative is dealt with in 24:13-14. It shifts the reader's focus away from the tomb, *idou* ("behold" -- what's the purpose of that?)...The narrative has the clear aim of filling in the temporal gap, so that they two could confirm that Jesus had indeed risen.

Yes, Luke is proving that Jesus really did rise. But that doesn't necessarily mean he is ignoring the priority of a "Simon." Now, it could be that Luke thinks one of the two travelers was named Simon. But then your proposal has its own problems--why wouldn't Luke name Simon, instead of Clopas? If Simon was the other traveler, why did Luke leave him unnamed until the announcement to the other disciples? Why would Simon's name take priority over that of Cleopas?

Remember also--in favor of the canonical reading--that Luke is trying to synthesize sources. He might have had a source in which two disciples encounter Jesus, *and* he might have known that Jesus appeared first to a "Simon" (perhaps Cephas, perhaps Peter), without having a specific story about it. He didn't want to eliminate either claim, so he just engineered them both into the same narrative. The appearance to Simon happens off-stage, because...Luke didn't have an actual story for it! He just knew about it. (Of course, this also assumes Luke knows that Simon is also either Cephas or Peter...which may not be true.)

You could try to argue that there was an original in which one of the travelers was identified as Simon, but...where is the textual support for this?

Or (and this is an interesting idea IMO) did Luke know, or assume his readers knew...that Clopas was Simon?

(BTW I'm not sure that Origen's testimony is of any value here--it just means there was at least one version in which the two travelers announce that Jesus appeared to Simon--but we knew that already, from Bezae. It doesn't tell us which version has priority.)



11-20-2007, 01:31 PM

#79

spin

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2002

Location: nowhere

Posts: 15,747



Quote:

Originally Posted by **the\_cave**

Quote:


And you notice how the narrative is dealt with in 24:13-14. It shifts the reader's focus away from the tomb, *idou* ("behold" -- what's the purpose of that?)...The narrative has the clear aim of filling in the temporal gap, so that they two could confirm that Jesus had indeed risen.

*Yes, Luke is proving that Jesus really did rise. But that doesn't necessarily mean he is ignoring the priority of a "Simon." Now, it could be that Luke thinks one of the two travelers was named Simon. But then your proposal has its own problems--why wouldn't Luke name Simon, instead of Clopas? If Simon was the other traveler, why did Luke leave him unnamed until the announcement to the other*

*disciples? Why would Simon's name take priority over that of Cleopas?*


As I have already pointed out in this thread, that there seems to be a confusion between the narrator (who refers to Clephas in 24:18) and the speaker who refers to Simon in 24:34.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **the\_cave**   
*Remember also--in favor of the canonical reading--that Luke is trying to synthesize sources. He might have had a source in which two disciples encounter Jesus, and he might have known that Jesus appeared first to a "Simon" (perhaps Cephas, perhaps Peter), without having a specific story about it. He didn't want to eliminate either claim, so he just engineered them both into the same narrative. The appearance to Simon happens off-stage, because...Luke didn't have an actual story for it! He just knew about it. (Of course, this also assumes Luke knows that Simon is also either Cephas or Peter...which may not be true.)*


This is merely you trying to guess what the writer is doing to suit an a priori analysis. I started off trying to understand how the narrative worked. The best that has been suggested is that it doesn't, because it doesn't include the first sighting of the risen Jesus, but never mind.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **the\_cave**   
*You could try to argue that there was an original in which one of the travelers was identified as Simon, but...were is the textual support for this?*


Working from Codex Bezae, 24:34.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **the\_cave**   
*Or (and this is an interesting idea IMO) did Luke know, or assume his readers knew...that Clopas was Simon?*

I have no direct interest in Cleopas. It seems to me that those who have are merely indulging in the already mentioned confusion.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **the\_cave**   
*(BTW I'm not sure that Origen's testimony is of any value here--it just means there was at least one version in which the two travelers announce that Jesus appeared to Simon--but we knew that*

*already, from Bezae. It doesn't tell us which version has priority.)*

And I didn't mention Origen either.

spin



11-20-2007, 02:23 PM

#80

## the cave

Veteran Member

Join Date: Feb 2003

Location: Earth

Posts: 1,443



Quote:

As I have already pointed out in this thread, that there seems to be a confusion between the narrator (who refers to Clephas in 24:18) and the speaker who refers to Simon in 24:34.

Are you suggesting Luke (aka "the author of the gospel") is recording verbatim a story he got from elsewhere? Even if he is, why would the two from Emmaus make the claim that Jesus appeared to Simon? The larger question is, whoever first wrote the story of Emmaus down, why didn't they identify Simon if it culminated in an announcement that Jesus had appeared to Simon?

Quote:

This is merely you trying to guess what the writer is doing to suit an a priori analysis.

No, I am doing the same thing you are doing. There is an a priori question: is the canonical reading better, or the Bezae reading? But that question can't be answered a priori (probably), so we need to compare the evidence for both, by comparing the two different readings and seeing which are more logical. The canonical reading has the problem that Jesus appears to Simon off-stage. But my answer to that is that Luke knew about the priority of a Simon appearance (if we assume that Simon is either Cephas or Peter or both) but had no story about it (which we don't, besides 1 Corinthians--but at least we have that!). The Bezae reading has the problem that if Cl(e)op(h)as and his companion claim that Jesus appeared to Simon, then that is a non-sequitur. You seem to have no answer to that, but I could be wrong.

Quote:

Working from Codex Bezae, 24:34.

No, Codex Bezae identifies neither of them as Simon. There is an implied suggestion that one of them was Simon--because otherwise, it is a non-sequitur--but if one of them really was Simon, then why doesn't Bezae identify him directly?

Quote:

I have no direct interest in Cleopas. It seems to me that those who have are merely indulging in the already mentioned confusion.

Yes, that comment was really directed at Ben, but I should point out that if Simon is Clopas, then that solves *your* problem--that Simon is not identified directly.

Quote:

And I didn't mention Origen either.

Yes, that was just an aside. Not directed at you.



<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

**Thread Tools**



[Show Printable Version](#)

**Search this Thread**

**Search this Thread:**

Go

[Advanced Search](#)

**Forum Jump**

Forums Home



Go

All times are GMT +11. The time now is 01:33 PM.

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2  
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.



# Freethought & Rationalism Archive

The archives are read only.

[FRDB Archives](#) > [Archives](#) > [Religion \(Closed\)](#) > [Biblical Criticism & History](#)  
**Simon or back to Emmaus**

**Welcome, [neilgodfrey](#).**

You last visited: Today at 12:22 PM

Search

## Notices

### FRDB is Closed

**FRDB is now an archive. If you are a current member of FRDB, you can auto create your account on Talk Freethought here: [FRDB to Talk Freethought](#). FRDB user names are protected from registrations on [Talk Freethought](#) until further notice.**

### The FRDB Archive

Greetings neilgodfrey,

The conversion of the existing archive is not scheduled as of yet. I am looking into a few open source options for the conversion ([phpBB](#), [myBB](#), and [FluxBB](#)). Until that is completed, the current archive will remain available to members.

[The FRDB Archive](#)

You are seeing this notice because you are logged in.

Page 9 of 9 [« First](#) [≤](#) [7](#) [8](#) **9**

Thread Tools Search this Thread

11-20-2007, 04:45 PM

#81

**spin**

Contributor

Join Date: Mar 2002  
 Location: nowhere  
 Posts: 15,747



Quote:

Originally Posted by **the\_cave**


Quote:

As I have already pointed out in this thread, that there seems to be a confusion between the narrator (who refers to Clephas in 24:18) and the speaker who refers to Simon in 24:34.

*Are you suggesting Luke (aka "the author of the gospel")...*


(Wouldn't "aLuke" or similar be simpler and less time consuming?)

Quote:

Originally Posted by **the\_cave**   
*...is recording verbatim a story he got from elsewhere? Even if he is, why would the two from Emmaus make the claim that Jesus appeared to Simon? The larger question is, whoever first wrote the story of Emmaus down, why didn't they identify Simon if it culminated in an announcement that Jesus had appeared to Simon?*


I'm suggesting that people shouldn't confuse the writer with a speaker in a narrative.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **the\_cave**   
*No, I am doing the same thing you are doing. There is an a priori question: is the canonical reading better, or the Bezae reading? But that question can't be answered a priori (probably), so we need to compare the evidence for both, by comparing the two different readings and seeing which are more logical. The canonical reading has the problem that Jesus appears to Simon off-stage. But my answer to that is that Luke knew about the priority of a Simon appearance (if we assume that Simon is either Cephas or Peter or both) but had no story about it (which we don't, besides 1 Corinthians--but at least we have that!).*


1 Cor 15 doesn't seem trustworthy for reasons I've already mentioned.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **the\_cave**   
*The Bezae reading has the problem that if Cl(e)op(h)as and his companion claim that Jesus appeared to Simon, then that is a non-sequitur. You seem to have no answer to that, but I could be wrong.*

This is mainly a problem, as I continue to point out, for those who want to confuse the writer with one of the speakers in the text.

Quote:

Originally Posted by **the\_cave**   
*No, Codex Bezae identifies neither of them as Simon. There is an implied suggestion that one of them was Simon--because otherwise, it is a non-sequitur--but if one of them really was Simon, then why doesn't Bezae identify him directly?*

*Yes, that comment was really directed at Ben, but I should point out that if Simon is Clopas, then that solves your problem--that Simon is not identified directly.*



I'm not interested in the Cleopas is Simon theory. Why would the writer pull such a confusing switch of names? While I can imagine that Cleopas might talk of Simon and not himself, that requires no extra assumptions. Your attempt to create confusion regarding 24:34 doesn't work for me.

spin



11-21-2007, 04:10 AM

#82

## the\_cave

Veteran Member

Join Date: Feb 2003  
Location: Earth  
Posts: 1,443



Quote:

(Wouldn't "aLuke" or similar be simpler and less time consuming?)

Sure, we can use "aLuke".

Quote:

I'm suggesting that people shouldn't confuse the writer with a speaker in a narrative.

That still doesn't explain why aLuke (the author of the *pericope* in which someone says "...and has appeared to Simon") doesn't mention that one of the two travelers is named Simon. Why would this be tacit knowledge? In the case of the Eleven, it makes sense--because the reader would know that Simon Peter was one of the Eleven. But in the case of the traveler, we have no such knowledge. You need to explain why it would make sense for aLuke to leave in the statement "and has appeared to Simon" (whether Luke invented that statement or not), but *not* to explain that one of the travelers was Simon.

I myself have come up with several reasons why, but instead of listing them all in detail, I want to know *your* explanation.

Quote:

1 Cor 15 doesn't seem trustworthy for reasons I've already mentioned.

I agree it is unsatisfactory, but at least it's *something*--whereas your position requires all this guesswork about why aLuke would leave Simon unnamed.

Quote:

I'm not interested in the Cleopas is Simon theory. Why would the writer pull such a confusing switch of names? While I can imagine that Cleopas might talk of Simon and not himself

But why would Cleopas talk of Simon and not himself? From the Emmaus story, it's clear Jesus is revealed to both of them. And why would a Luke leave Simon unnamed?



<< [Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#) >>

**Thread Tools**



[Show Printable Version](#)

**Search this Thread**

**Search this Thread:**

Go

[Advanced Search](#)

**Forum Jump**

Forums Home



Go

All times are GMT +11. The time now is 01:33 PM.

[Top](#)

This custom BB emulates vBulletin® Version 3.8.2  
Copyright ©2000 - 2015, Jelsoft Enterprises Ltd.