

**THE ACTS OF THE
APOSTLES, BEING THE
GREEK TEXT AS REVISED BY
DRS. WESTCOTT AND HORT**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649078387

The acts of the Apostles, being the Greek text as revised by Drs. Westcott and Hort by Thomas Ethelbert Page

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

THOMAS ETHELBERT PAGE

**THE ACTS OF THE
APOSTLES, BEING THE
GREEK TEXT AS REVISED BY
DRS. WESTCOTT AND HORT**

Bible - N. I., N. G. I., N. G. I., N. G. I.,
11.

THE
ACTS OF THE APOSTLES,

BEING

THE GREEK TEXT

AS REVISED BY

DRS WESTCOTT AND HORT,

WITH EXPLANATORY NOTES

BY

THOMAS ETHELBERT PAGE, M.A.

ASSISTANT MASTER AT CHARTERHOUSE, AND FORMERLY
FELLOW OF ST JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ Ἰερουσαλὴμ.

London:
MACMILLAN AND CO.
AND NEW YORK.
1886

[The Right of Translation is reserved.]

B52621
1886

Λουκᾶς ὁ ἰατρός ὁ ἀγαπητός.

Col. iv. 14.

Λουκᾶς ἐστὶν μένος μετ' ἐμοῦ.

2 Tim. iv. 11.

Μάρκος, Ἀρίσταρχος, Δημῆς, Λουκᾶς, οἱ συντροφοί μου.

Phil. 24.

Greek
Basilio
THE COLLECT FOR ST LUKE'S DAY.

Almighty God, who calledst Luke the Physician, whose praise is in the Gospel, to be an Evangelist, and Physician of the soul; May it please thee, that, by the wholesome medicines of the doctrine delivered by him, all the diseases of our souls may be healed; through the merits of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

PREFACE.

THIS edition is intended chiefly for use in Schools, at the same time I am not without hope that in some points it may be of service to other students. Certainly, after a careful examination of the Revised Version, I am justified in saying that there are some passages in the Acts the meaning of which is not generally understood even by scholars. It may suffice to refer to the unintelligible renderings given of such important passages as i. 16—22 and x. 34—39, to the less obvious but clear errors pointed out in the note on *μὲν οὖν* ii. 41, and to the direct violation of the laws of language in the translation of xix. 2 and xxvii. 12.

That there is room for a useful School edition of the Acts, and indeed of any portion of the New Testament, few with any experience in teaching will deny. Schoolboys are for the most part grievously ignorant of the subject. For this two main reasons may be assigned.

(1) Being conversant with the English version they are able to translate the Greek with fatal facility, and fall into the common error of supposing that they understand the meaning of words, the sound of which has been familiar to them from infancy.

(2) Most commentaries are quite unadapted for practical work with boys. Their fault is this. The editors do not confine themselves chiefly to explanation of the text, which is the first and strictly the only duty of a commentator, but encumber their notes with doctrinal discussions and moral reflections. Such additions are at best out of place, even where the doctrinal arguments are not wholly one-sided and the moral disquisitions not trite and mediocre: in a scholar they usually create irritation; schoolboys soon cease to read the notes altogether.

In the present edition the notes with some few exceptions—which will I hope justify themselves—are confined to explanation and illustration of the text. By thus limiting myself I have been enabled to make the notes comparatively short and at the same time fairly thorough. I have moreover carefully studied brevity: it would have taken me half the time to write twice as much. In one point too much space has been saved. Passages of the Bible referred to are rarely quoted. This is done deliberately. I know that as a rule boys will not look up references. This is only natural where the references are to a variety of books, and in such cases passages referred to should usually be quoted; but to read the Greek Testament without a Bible at hand is useless, and it is most important that boys should become accustomed to working with it and examining passages referred to in it.

Allusion has been made not unfrequently to the views of other commentators. The limits however of my work preclude any but a brief examination of

conflicting opinions except in important cases. Perhaps it is well that this is so. The number of commentators is immense, and there is no possible or impossible view of even simple passages which has not found advocates. To have overloaded the notes throughout with a discussion of the views, which seemed to me plainly erroneous, would have made them useless for their purpose. Indeed even now, after cutting out all that seemed possible, I much doubt whether they are as simple as they should be. Certainly some of them can be of little use to any but advanced boys, but I trust that this may be due rather to the complexity of the subject than to a lack of clearness or brevity on my part; at any rate I do not hold that even in a school-book difficult passages should be slurred over, exactly because they are difficult.

I have not written an 'Introduction'. It would be fairly easy to compile one similar to those which are to be found in many English editions. The problems however presented by the Acts are so many and so complex, that an Introduction worthy of the name would require a separate volume and a capacity immeasurably exceeding mine.

It is right however that I should refer to my personal opinions on one or two points. One is that I consider that on critical grounds the writer of the Acts is to be identified with the writer of the third Gospel, and that I see no reason whatever why he should not be St Luke. Another point is that I regard the writer as an *honest* writer, and my notes are written on that supposition: they are an endeavour

to make clear the meaning of a writer, who is, I consider, endeavouring honestly to lay before his readers certain facts which he himself believes. This declaration is, I think, required from me in this preface, for it is clear that the whole character of my notes would be altered if I started from the supposition that the writer either wilfully misrepresented facts or was influenced by such a strong bias or tendency as to render his narrative continually open to suspicion. Beyond this, however, I do not think it necessary for a commentator to go in expressing his personal opinions: if he does, he passes from exegesis into criticism, and these two subjects should, where possible, be kept entirely apart. I will endeavour to illustrate my meaning by two instances.

(1) It does not seem to me that it lies within my province to discuss the exact details and evidence of the miracles related in the Acts. That miracles are impossible or, under certain circumstances, improbable, cannot logically be asserted except from the premises of pure materialism; *a priori* they are exactly as possible as any act of human volition. Moreover they form an integral part of Christianity; the claims of Christianity as a religion essentially rest on the miraculous. It is obvious however that the miracles related in the Acts stand on a different footing to those ascribed to Christ: it would be perfectly reasonable to fully accept the latter and at the same time hold that some of the former are related on insufficient evidence or are based on exaggerated reports. The examination, however, of such questions is entirely without the range of my duty as a commentator: my

duty is only clearly to point out that the writer is describing a miracle, when I judge from his words that he is doing so.

(2) In dealing with the argument of certain speeches I have endeavoured to bring out the meaning of the text. In doing so I have at times spoken of the argument as 'clear' or 'telling', but this does not imply or require that I should hold any special views as to the method of Messianic interpretation of the Old Testament which is employed, but only that, the legitimacy of that method being presupposed, the argument founded on it appears to me valid.

Moreover, all questions about the exact nature of inspiration seem to lie outside my work. I have commented on the Acts as on a work written by a man for men, that is to say, produced in accordance with the laws of human thought and to be examined and understood by human intelligence. Nor indeed is there any clear ground of reason or authority for any other supposition. That the preservation of an adequate record of the life of Jesus and the foundation of the Christian Church would be ensured by God, may be safely maintained by any believer, and that record is justly regarded with a reverence such as can attach to no other human writings; on the other hand the assertion of higher claims serves no necessary end and involves many difficulties.

Lastly I may add that I have not attempted in any way to use my notes to support any particular form of dogmatic teaching. Legitimate exegesis has no concern with the opinions which may be founded on the results at which it arrives. It is the duty of a