

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/robbadshaw>

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

the Princes' outspoken dislike of the Indo-Chinese opium trade, and Disestablishment, which we frequently meet with. We have, moreover, confined ourselves strictly to those parts of the work contributed by the Princes themselves, and can merely refer to the numerous excursus with which Canon Dalton has illustrated it. These, nevertheless, are most ably written, full of power and accuracy, and often of rare interest. We may mention especially that on the West Indies (vol. i., p. 116), that on imperial federation (vol. i., p. 538), that on China (vol. ii., p. 239), and those on the Eastern question (vol. ii., pp. 735, 748). Altogether, Canon Dalton's editing deserves the highest praise. There are very few misprints; and the only faults of the book are the lack of an index and the portentous bulk, which we fear will effectually preclude its being so well known as it ought to be. Volumes such as these, too big to hold in the hand, or to read except at a table, and too costly to be generally purchased, will never nowadays gain the place to which their merits entitle them. We hope that before long we may see them published in some cheaper and handier form, like the "Life of the Prince Consort" (of which, by the way, we are frequently reminded in the sentiments expressed by the Princes). The book is far too good to be merely tasted through the medium of reviews.

EDWARD CONYBEARE.



ART. V.—“THE RESULTANT GREEK TESTAMENT.”

The Resultant Greek Testament. By RICHARD FRANCIS WEYMOUTH, D.Lit., Fellow of University College, London. Elliot Stock: 62, Paternoster Row.

THIS is a very useful work. It exhibits in a compact form the results of modern critical research as applied to the text of the Greek Testament. Dr. Weymouth does not profess to give us a text based on an independent collation of MSS., Versions, and Patristic citations. His aim has been far less ambitious and more modest; it has been simply to produce a text which shall represent as far as possible the consensus of the principal editors—"that in which (roughly speaking) the majority of them agree." But at the same time he is careful to inform us that he has not merely counted names, but has weighed the reasons which may have influenced an editor in adopting a particular reading. Thus, for instance, "since Lachmann's time and since the earlier portion of Tregelles's Greek Testament appeared, fresh MS. evidence has come to

light, some of the most valuable uncials (the Codex Vaticanus and others) having been more carefully collated, and some hitherto unknown (notably the Codex Sinaiticus) having been discovered ;" and it is but reasonable to suppose that the judgment of these critics would have been modified in some instances by the new material thus supplied, had they had it before them.

Every reader can judge for himself with what success Dr. Weymouth has accomplished his task ; for the evidence is put clearly before him. " In the upper inner corner of each page all the authorities for that portion of the text are named ;" while on the other hand, " The footnotes contain the readings which have won less numerous or less weighty suffrages." Instead of having to consult half a dozen different editions, the student can now tell at a glance what is the reading of Lachmann, or Tischendorf, or Tregelles, or Westcott and Hort, and how far their agreement extends.

The idea, indeed, is not altogether new. Dr. Scrivener had already furnished the groundwork of such a comparison in his Cambridge Greek Testament, but he did not attempt to construct a text ; he merely issued a careful reprint of Stephens's third edition of 1550, contenting himself with placing at the foot of the page the various readings of Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles.

An attempt to produce a resultant text had also been made in the Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges. There, however, the basis of the text is narrower ; it rests upon the consent of Tischendorf and Tregelles. When these two editors are at variance, a determining voice is allowed to the text of Stephens, where it agrees with either of their readings ; and to Lachmann only where the text of Stephens differs from both. This is the general principle followed, provision, however, being made for the due recognition in the Gospels of the Sinai MS. (N) which was discovered too late to be used by Tregelles except in the last chapter of St. John's Gospel and the following books.¹

Dr. Weymouth's critical authorities are more numerous. He has not only availed himself of the labours of the editors already mentioned, the great masters in this field of criticism, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort, but he has also made use of Alford's Greek Testament ; of the Bâle edition of 1880, by Dr. Stockmeyer, and Professor Riggénbach ; the readings (so far as they can be ascertained) adopted by the New Testament Revision Company ; Bishop Lightfoot's and

¹ The text of Westcott and Hort had not been published when the earlier volumes of the Cambridge Greek Testament were issued.

Bishop Ellicott's edition of St. Paul's Epistles ; and Dr. Bernhard Weiss's text of St. Matthew's Gospel, published in 1876.

On these authorities, Dr. Weymouth constructs his text, but he has further given, for the sake of comparison, all the readings of Stephens's third edition (folio, 1550); in many places, and chiefly where it agrees with his text, the readings of the Complutensian Polyglot ; those of the *Editio Princeps* of Erasmus, 1516 ; and the most important in Stephens's margin. He has also noticed the few instances in which the readings presumed to underlie the English Authorized Version as well as those in which the Elzevir edition of 1633 (the so-called “Textus Receptus”) differed from that of Stephens; and he draws attention to the fact that in many hundreds of passages “either Erasmus or Stunica adopted, or Stephens himself inclined towards, those very readings in favour of which, with fuller knowledge of the evidence, the consensus of modern editors has decided.”

It will be seen, therefore, that the basis of Dr. Weymouth's comparison is wider than that of those who have preceded him in the same field. At the same time the selection of his authorities strikes one as somewhat arbitrary ; and without laying stress on the objection that has been urged, that “some of the editions above enumerated can hardly claim to be admitted as authorities,” and whilst admitting the force of Dr. Weymouth's reply that he fails to see “that only those scholars who have devoted a large part of their lives to the study of manuscripts can form a judgment of any value on the results of such study,” I venture to think that critics like Meyer, for instance, and Delitzsch (on the Epistle to the Hebrews) were not less worthy of notice than some of those to whom Dr. Weymouth appeals.

It may be interesting to compare this “Resultant Text” in a few crucial instances with two other “Resultant Texts”—that of the Cambridge Bible for Schools, so far as portions of it have appeared, and the text which, in the instances I am about to give, it is quite certain had the support of the Revisers.

Matt. i. 25.—All have “a son” instead of “her first-born son.”

Matt. v. 13.—All omit the doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer ; and in verse 44, all omit the words “bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you,” and the words “that despitefully use you.”

Matt. vi. 1—All have “righteousness” instead of “alms.”

xviii. 11.—Omitted by all.

In Luke ii. 14, the reading of all alike is $\epsilon\nu\delta o\kappa i\alpha\varsigma$, not $\epsilon\nu\delta o\kappa i\varsigma$, “peace among men in whom He is well pleased,” as the Revised

Version expresses it. This has always been the reading of the Western Church, and is found in a passage of Origen.

Luke vi. 1.—All omit διεπεξωπύρω.

Luke xi. 2-4.—The Lord's Prayer: all three are alike, and all give the shorter form.

In John v. 3, 4, the words "waiting for the moving of the water . . . whatsoever disease he had" are omitted by all.

Acts ii. 30.—All omit the words "that He would raise up the Christ according to the flesh."

viii. 37.—The words of Philip to the eunuch, "If thou believest," etc., together with the eunuch's reply; and in ix. 5, 6, the words "It is hard for thee . . . and the Lord said unto him" are omitted by all.

xx. 28.—The Cambridge text agrees with Dr. Weymouth in having Κυρίου, whilst the Revised retains Θεοῦ as in the Authorized Version.

In Romans v. 1, Dr. Weymouth has ἐχωμεν, in this agreeing with the text of the Revised Version. The Cambridge Greek text of this Epistle has not yet been published, but the editor, the Rev. H. C. G. Moule, in his Notes on the English Version of the Epistle, has declared himself in favour of the Received reading, ἐχουμεν.

In the celebrated passage 1 Tim. iii. 15, which has been the subject of so much controversy, Dr. Weymouth has ο; with the Revisers, and with every modern editor of note. The Revisers' margin, "The word *God* in place of *He* who rests on no sufficient ancient evidence," is an unquestionable fact, and the reading ο; admits of the amplest justification, as has been shown by Dr. Vaughan in his "Authorized or Revised?"

In Hebrews iv. 2, Dr. Weymouth has συνεκερασμένους with the Revised Version. Tischendorf, however, has here συνεκερασμένος, and this has been defended by Delitzsch, and is, it appears to me, on every ground the preferable reading.

In 1 John iii. 1, all alike insert καὶ ἰσπέν.

It is needless to remark that the notorious interpolation in verse 7 is rejected by all.

Dr. Weymouth's work has been done with the most conscientious care, and, so far as my observation has extended, with remarkable accuracy. His book may be confidently recommended to readers who wish to see at a glance what the present state of the text of the Greek Testament is, as determined by the consensus of the most competent editors.

J. J. STEWART PEROWNE.

