word means *fulfilled*. But the A. V. has  
the more likely rendering. Meyer would  
render it, *‘which have found their completion* among *us,’* i.e. ‘us of the apostolic  
times;’ meaning *‘Theophilus and himself,’* &c.

**among us,** i.e. **us Christians**, you and me, and all members of the  
Church of Christ so also the **unto us**  
in ver. 2.

**2.]** The Apostles, delivered these matters *orally* to the Churches  
in their teaching (see below on ver. 4), and  
others drew up accounts from that catechetical instruction. It appears from this,  
that St. Luke *was not aware of any*  
**narration** *drawn up by an eye-witness or  
minister of the word.* *Their* account of  
these matters was a *tradition, from which*the *narrations* were drawn up. *He cannot therefore have seen* (or, having seen,  
not recognized as such, which is highly  
improbable) *the Gospel of St. Matthew.* Compare 1 John i. 1—3.

**from the beginning]** Not, *‘from the very beginning,’* i.e. the birth of the Lord, &c., but  
from the *official beginning*: see Acts i.21 f. It differs from **from the very first**  
below.

**eyewitnesses** most probably  
stands alone: but it may well be taken  
with **of the word** (see below).

**ministers,** i.e. **ministering servants**—but in  
connection with **from the beginning.**

**of the word**—not, *‘the personal word’*  
(i.e. Christ: so Orig., Athanasius, Cyril,  
Euthym.) which would be altogether alien  
from St. Luke’s usage (see on Heb. iv. 12):  
but, **the word,** *‘the word preached:’—*  
we have the expression *“the ministry* (but  
there *diaconia*) *of the word”* in Acts  
vi. 4.

**3. it seemed good to me also]** St. Luke by this classes himself with these  
*many*, and shews that he intended no disparagement nor blame to them, and was  
going to construct his own history from  
similar sources. The words which follow  
imply however a conscious superiority of  
his own qualification for the work. There  
is here no *expressed claim* to inspiration,  
but at the same time no *disclaimer* of it.

**having traced down]** by research,  
and so become accurately acquainted with.

**from the very first**—i.e. as in  
ver. 5;—as distinguished from those who  
only wrote of the *official* life of the Lord,  
or only fragments perhaps of that.  
**in order]** i. e. **consecutively**. By this  
word we must not understand St. Luke to  
lay claim to any *especial chronological  
accuracy* in *writing;*—which indeed is not  
found in his Gospel. He *traced* the events  
in order as they happened: but he may  
*have arranged* them as other considerations led him.

**most excellent Theophilus]** It is wholly unknown who this  
person was. The name was a very common one. The conjectures about him are  
endless, and entirely without value. It  
appears by the title given him, that he  
was a person of dignity, and of course,  
from ver. 4, he was a convert to Christianity.

The idea of the name being  
not a proper, but a *feigned one*, designating ‘those who loved God’ (found as  
early as Epiphanius, and adopted again  
recently), is far-fetched and improbable.

**4. instructed]** Theophilus had then  
been orally instructed in the narratives  
which form the subject of this Gospel:  
and St. Luke’s intention in writing it is,  
that he might have a *more accurate knowledge of these histories.* The word means literally, **catechized,** *‘catechetically taught.’*

**those sayings]** not as in A. V., to  
be *rendered* ‘things:’ *neither the Greek  
nor the corresponding Hebrew word ever  
has this meaning*, as is commonly but  
erroneously supposed. In all the commonly-cited examples of this, *‘things expressed in words’* are meant: here **the  
histories,—accounts.**

**5—25.]** ANNOUNCEMENT BY GABRIEL  
OF THE BIRTH OF JOHN. Peculiar to  
Luke. The style in the original now  
totally alters and becomes Hebraistic, signifying that the following is translated or  
compiled an Aramaic oral narration,  
or perhaps (from the very distinct character