

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

The Implications in Luke's Preface.

BY PROFESSOR A. T. ROBERTSON, LITT.D., LOUISVILLE.

THE article of Professor H. J. Cadbury, in the *Expositor* of December 1922, on 'The Knowledge claimed in Luke's Preface,' interested me very much. It is certainly wholly to the good to have a fresh and full presentation of the facts concerning the connotations of παρακολουθέω. Such a careful study has been much needed. Dr. Cadbury has done it with more than his usual care, and it supplements well his *Commentary on the Preface of Luke* in part i. of vol. ii. of *The Beginnings of Christianity*. There is not much save one point in either the *Commentary* or the *Expositor* article to which one can object. It is nearly all to the good. He rightly shows that παρακολουθέω etymologically and literally means *to follow at one's side*. Some early writers took it in this literal sense and understood πᾶσιν as referring to persons (masculine, not neuter). That in itself is, of course, possible. Only the actual context can determine whether the literal or the figurative meaning of a verb is meant by the writer.

In the figurative sense, which is rightly found here by Dr. Cadbury, he suggests three possible uses and gives examples of each. One is following what is read as in a preface (by the reader, not the writer). A second is keeping in touch with things done, with a course of events. Dr. Cadbury adds: 'This broad meaning is probably to be accepted here.' He further says: 'It may include reliance upon written information, as is well shown by cases where a letter is said to be written in order that the recipient may keep in touch with events.' The third use is 'actual presence or participation in the events.' On this point Dr. Cadbury makes a real contribution of freshness and force. If the word is capable of this sense, then the author of the Gospel of Luke and of the Acts claims to be, in part at least, a participant in, or contemporary of, the events. We know that this is true of the second part of Acts (the 'we' sections), and there is no reason, so far as we know, why it may not be true of the life of Jesus, unless Luke (or the author) was born near the middle of the first century instead of near the beginning of it.

Dr. Cadbury rightly sees that, if there is truth in this meaning, then the author wrote both books

fairly early and had himself personal knowledge of some (or many) of the things of which he writes. Dr. Cadbury thinks this 'new consideration' the most convincing argument for the Lucan authorship, which has not hitherto impressed him very greatly.

But it is the denial by Dr. Cadbury of any research on the part of Luke that calls for protest on my part. 'There appears to be no warrant for assigning to the word the sense of deliberate investigation, although Luke's apologists love thus to modernize it. The writer's information had (notice the perfect tense) come to him as the events took place; it was not the result of special reading and study. His acquaintance with the subject, whatever its degree of intimacy, was something already in his possession. The perfect tense is often thus used of this verb, and this is its meaning.'

It is this paragraph that challenges one's scepticism on several important points. One is Dr. Cadbury's interpretation of the perfect active participle παρακολουθηκότι. The perfect tense here does mean that 'his acquaintance with the subject, whatever its degree of intimacy, was something already in his possession' *before he began to write the book*. It does not mean that 'the writer's information had (notice the perfect tense) come to him as the events took place.' The very structure of the sentence places παρακολουθηκότι (whatever it means) as a state of completion before γράψαι. It is wholly gratuitous, and I think misleading, to say that the perfect tense conveys here the idea that Luke's information came to him 'as the events took place.' That special idea is not what the perfect active participle means. It means simply that the process involved (παρακολουθηκότι) was at an end before Luke proceeded to write (γράψαι). There is absolutely nothing in the perfect tense itself to suggest any notion of 'as the events took place.' The perfect tense with some verbs may have the resultant sense of 'broken continuity,' 'a series of links rather than a line' (Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, p. 896; Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 144). But this idea is due to the special meaning of the verb, not to the meaning of the perfect tense.

The meaning of the verb affects the perfect tense in such instances. But one cannot turn it round and urge that the perfect tense calls for such a meaning in the verb. The special use of παρακολουθέω may or may not suggest the idea of broken continuity, but that idea does not come out of the perfect tense. Luke does mean to say with all positiveness that he was prepared to write before he began to write.

Dr. Cadbury puts, I think, too narrow a meaning on the words 'investigation' and 'research.' He denies 'deliberate investigation' on Luke's part. 'It was not the result of special reading or study.' Now, I submit that there is nothing in the meaning of παρακολουθέω (whatever meaning one accepts) or in the context of Luke's Preface to justify these words. It is putting the negative side beyond the warrant of the known facts. It is not clear precisely what Dr. Cadbury means by 'research.' His last words in the *Expositor* (p. 420) are: 'At any rate he says nothing of research.' In the *Commentary* (p. 501) he says: 'It may include reliance upon written information.' If the sense of reading be involved, Dr. Cadbury says: 'If this interpretation is adopted here, Luke is claiming to have read the διηγήσεις which the preceding writers had composed.' He certainly makes that claim. He introduces the Preface with ἐπειδήπερ, which gives the reason that prompted him to write (ἔδειξε κάμους γράψαι). I see no escape from this interpretation of Luke's sentence. He does not say that he incidentally glanced at a few feeble attempts in writing, but relied chiefly on his own personal knowledge obtained otherwise. He says that he was stirred to his task of writing by what others had written (see my *Luke the Historian in the Light of Research*, p. 44) by these previous efforts. We know that he made constant use of two of them (the *Logia* or Q and *Mark's Gospel*). If this is not 'research,' 'deliberate investigation,' 'special reading and study,' one is at a loss to know what it is. Every one is entitled to his own opinion, of course, but it seems to me that Luke's known and verifiable use of Q and Mark forbids our saying that 'he says nothing of research.' To me the natural inference is quite the other way. His careful use of Q and Mark argues that he made like use of the other written sources known to him.

It is not necessary to know precisely what particular shading of meaning we are to give to παρακολουθεῖν in Luke's Preface. In point of fact

Dr. Cadbury is by no means clear in his own views on that point. 'Perhaps personal presence is more than the verb παρακολουθηκóτι actually claims. Possibly it was just the kind of verb that included both presence and indirect though contemporary information, and could be used by one who wished, to suggest the utmost knowledge without defining too specifically how intimate that knowledge was.' I see nothing in this statement that goes too far except the use of 'indirect.' Dr. Cadbury here admits that Luke may wish 'to suggest the utmost knowledge without defining how intimate that knowledge was.' Well, then, why insist on the adjective 'indirect'? Some of it may have been 'indirect,' but certainly the use of Q and Mark was not 'indirect.' There is nothing in the word παρακολουθηκóτι or the context inconsistent with the use of 'direct' information also.

I sincerely concur in the conclusion of Dr. Cadbury that 'the possibility must be left open that the author is claiming in the very beginning of his work to have been long in such close contact with the series of events which he unfolds as to be possessed of first-hand contemporary knowledge about them, and that perhaps he means to claim the knowledge of an actual eye-witness.' I am bound to demur to the closing sentence: 'At any rate he says nothing of research,' as if that failure proves that 'it was not the result of special reading and study.' Nothing that Dr. Cadbury has produced warrants so positive a denial. Dr. Cadbury admits that 'the verb is used in so many senses that absolute certainty is impossible.' And yet he pointedly denies one of the possible uses of the verb.

Dr. Cadbury draws a distinction between careful reading and philosophic reflexion and research that is not clear to me. 'At most it would mean only the intelligent and attentive understanding of what is read or told, not deliberate inquiry.' We know the use that Luke made of Q and Mark. Was that 'deliberate research' or merely 'the intelligent and attentive understanding of what is read'? And what is the difference? Is one to say that Luke merely copied Q and Mark without reflexion? The facts in Luke's Gospel refute that idea.

Dr. Cadbury makes the point that when παρακολουθέω occurs in Hellenistic writers 'it invariably applies not to the writer but to the reader.' If Luke employs the word in that sense in his Preface, he likewise refers to the works of others that he has read, not to his own work. He would have in mind

διηγήσεις of previous writers which he had read, as Dr. Cadbury properly observes.

It will be seen that at almost every point I find myself in agreement with Dr. Cadbury's fresh and illuminating discussions of Luke's Preface save in his denial of research by the author. It is quite likely that some writers have insisted too strongly that παρακολουθεῖν can mean nothing else but to make research. Dr. Cadbury has done a good

service in showing the variety of uses of this interesting verb. But he has, I think, gone too far in urging that the author's information 'was not the result of special reading and study.' Dr. Cadbury offers no real proof for that denial. The very context in Luke's Preface disproves it.

The use of ἀνωθεν with παρεκλογηκότι falls in also with the idea of careful preparation before writing.

In the Study.

Virginitus Puerisque.

Found Out.¹

'There is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; neither hid, that shall not be known.'—Lk 12².

OF course you have heard of Tutankhamen. 'Rather,' you say: 'our cat's called Tut.' I know, and there are two more in your street, and three others in the road round the corner. But I'm talking of the man after whom they are all named, the poor old king of Egypt who took such pains that he should never be disturbed after his burial, who had himself built in, with all his chariots and carvings and treasures and wonders, behind door after door after door, so that he has lain there for three thousand years, and all down the centuries no greedy robber ever found him yonder in the hush and quiet of the desert. And now that they have broken in on him they stand, hardly able to believe their eyes, staring at all the lovely things that they have stumbled on. How ever did they do it, these men of so very long ago, who had no cunning machines to help them as we have now.

And so folk started talking, telling us these were the times when people really worked, and didn't shirk or scamp things as they do to-day; kept wagging their heads, as father does when he begins to tell you about when he was a boy, and things were all so different and funny. For then, it seems, every boy loved to get up on the coldest and the darkest morning and just sprang out of bed: and all children liked their lessons better even than the most exciting story. It seems so very strange to you. Do you think father could have forgotten just a teenie-weenie little bit? Well, I don't know: I wouldn't like to say. Dad is very

¹ By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

wise. But things do slip from one's memory sometimes; and I'm bound to say that in my day I remember one small boy who never found it very easy to get up, and had to drag himself to lessons very often. But, anyway, people were speaking just like that. These were the days when people really worked, and put their heart and their back and their skill into things. And then they came on something, upon something horrid, and their talking died away: came on a heap of shavings where no shavings should be, and on a splendid bit of carving not fitted carefully into its place but jammed down anyhow. And that proved that long, long ago there were men who scamped work even then, and didn't do their best or really stick in as men should. It was a great shame, wasn't it? All the others had done so perfectly, and here at the very end there came along two or three idle fellows and let down that old world. It's like as if one coward spoiled the fame of a whole battalion that had been won by years of splendid heroism by thousands of men; or like a fellow in your team who won't get down to the ball, and lets the other side score, and so you lost, though all the rest did gallantly; or like some silly ass who gets you all a hundred lines, and what he was doing wasn't even funny!

It was too bad of those fellows long ago. Yet I think I know how it all came about. Perhaps the architect, who was a glorious architect, had said to his wife that he would go visiting with her at three o'clock. But things at the very last had taken a bit longer than he had expected and now it was four. And so he said to the men, 'Well, you're just finished, clean things up and tell the man who is to lock up when you're ready'; and away he went, for he knew his wife would be fussing. And the carpenter man