Click to prove you're human



```
Textual Criticism collates and compares the many ancient extant Bible manuscripts for the various Biblical texts to determine the original reading for each scripture? Is Textual Criticism something that is critical of the Bibles text, something that shows the Biblical text is unreliable? Or, is Textual Criticism something positive, or, favorable, toward
authenticating the Bibles text as being genuine, reliable, and trustworthy?It is popularly believed today that the Bible has been copied and re-copied so many times over the centuries that is text is unreliable, and no one can be sure of what was in the originals. Is there any truth to this?All people are like grass, and all their glory is like that of the field;
the grass withers and the flowers fall, but the word of the Lord endures forever, which implies that the word of the Lord endures forever, which implies that the word of the Lord endures forever, which implies that the word of the Lord endures forever, which implies that the word of the Lord endures forever, which implies that the word of the Lord endures forever, which implies that the word of the Lord endures forever (1 Peter 1:24,25 NIV). In this text, the thought is conveyed that the word of the Lord endures forever, which implies that the word of the Lord endures forever (1 Peter 1:24,25 NIV). In this text, the thought is conveyed that the word of the Lord endures forever, which implies that the word of the Lord endures forever (1 Peter 1:24,25 NIV). In this text, the thought is conveyed that the word of the Lord endures forever (1 Peter 1:24,25 NIV). In this text, the thought is conveyed that the word of the Lord endures forever (1 Peter 1:24,25 NIV). In this text, the thought is conveyed that the word of the Lord endures forever (1 Peter 1:24,25 NIV). In this text, the thought is conveyed that the word of the Lord endures forever (1 Peter 1:24,25 NIV). In this text, the thought is conveyed that the word of the Lord endures forever (1 Peter 1:24,25 NIV). In this text, the thought is conveyed that the word of the Lord endures forever (1 Peter 1:24,25 NIV). In this text, the thought is conveyed that the word of the Lord endures forever (1 Peter 1:24,25 NIV). In this text, the thought is conveyed to the lord endures forever (1 Peter 1:24,25 NIV). In this text, the thought is conveyed to the lord endures forever (1 Peter 1:24,25 NIV). In this text, the thought is conveyed to the lord endures forever (1 Peter 1:24,25 NIV). In this text, the thought is conveyed to the lord endures forever (1 Peter 1:24,25 NIV). In this text, the thought is conveyed to the lord endures forever (1 Peter 1:24,25 NIV). In this text, the lord endures forever (1 Peter 1:24,25 NIV). In this text, the lord endures forever (1 Peter 1:24
(called textual or scribal errors) in ancient Biblical manuscripts. The original copies of the Biblical manuscripts. The originals were lost long ago. Thus our sources for the Biblical manuscripts. The originals were lost long ago. Thus our sources for the Biblical manuscripts.
rabbis and church fathers. Thus Hebrew and Greek manuscripts of the Bible, together with early translations and citations of Scripture, witness to the correct reading of a particular text. How did scribal errors arise? Poor memory, impaired judgment, mishearing and errors of sight or misunderstanding often caused the best-intentioned scribes to
omit, substitute or repeat letters or entire words. Sometimes scribes made matters worse when they deliberated improvements that departed
from the original text. Until heaven and earth pass away, not the smallest letter or one stroke of a letter will pass from the law until all things are accomplished (Matthew 5:18 HCSB). Jesus says here that even the smallest details from Gods word will be preserved. Textual criticism is the attempt to restore the Biblical authors original words by
comparing and contrasting the various copies and translations of the Bible. Here criticism does not mean finding fault with but evaluating the existing copies of the text. Significantly, while textual errors do exist among the ancient Biblical witnesses, they do not destroy the Bibles credibility or message. Just as an alert reader can understand a book or
newspaper article that has typographical errors in it, so too Gods Word is able to speak for itself in spite of the minor corruptions that have arisen through scribal transmission. The vast majority of the Biblical text is certain, and where variations do occur among existing copies, the original wording can usually be determined with a good degree of
certainty by a thorough acquaintance with the available manuscripts. Most modern translations use footnotes to let readers know where the text is difficult or where scribal errors may exist. An example of a textual problem is found in the last sentence of Isaiah 51:19. The New American Standard Bible translates the question How shall I comfort you?
while the NIV words it Who can console you? (emphasis added for both translations). These different renderings reflect a difference of opinion over which manuscript from the Dead Sea Scrolls. This translation is also supported by the Greek (Septuagint),
Latin (Vulgate) and Syriac (Peshitta) translations of the Old Testament. On the other hand, the standard edition of the Hebrew Old Testament (the Masoretic Text) reads How can I comfort you? and was followed by the NASB translators. Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will never pass away (Matthew 24:35 NIV). Jesus uses hyperbole to
show that God will not allow his word, especially the scriptures, to fade, or pass away. This would include preventing any significant changes. The above example of Isaiah 51:19 also makes the point that virtually all scribal questions involve minor points in the text. We have good reason to be confident that the translations now available faithfully,
albeit never perfectly, reflect what the prophets and other Biblical authors originally wrote. The presence of scribal errors is not a reason to consider the Bible untrustworthy, because refined Hebrew-Aramaic, and Koine Greek Master Texts use a compilation and collation thousands of ancient manuscripts to derive a Biblical text that faithfully
represents the originals. In fact, scribal errors are actually one of the many proofs that the Bible is not a work of fiction, nor is it the a result of collusion among conspirators to make it seem to be the word of God, when it actually is of human origin. God said he would preserve his word, and he has! One source: New International Version Archaeological
Study Bible Textual Criticism What is it?Textual criticism is the study of manuscripts of the biblical texts. It involves comparing differences between biblical texts. It involves comparing to reconstruct
the original text of the Bible. The Need for Textual Criticism Textual criticism is needed because we do not possess the original documents that make up the books of the Bible. The original manuscripts, called autographs, have been lost to history. What we have are thousands of handwritten copies that were made over centuries. These copies contain
differences from one another due to accidental mistakes made by scribes during the manual copying a passage. Textual critics comparing multiple copies could
identify the omission since it would be mission since it would be missing from that manuscript but present in others. Through careful analysis, much of the original text can be restored. Textual criticism is needed for all works of antiquity since handwritten copies provide our only access to ancient documents. No one questions studying the texts of Homer, Plato, or Caesar to
determine the best reading. The Bible deserves no less careful analysis. The Goals of Textual Criticism Has two primary goals: 1. To reconstruct the original text of the biblical books as closely as possible. By comparing differences in thousands of manuscripts, textual criticism to eliminate the errors that crept in during manual
transmission and recover the text in its oldest accessible form. 2. To understand how the text changed over time and trace its transmission history. Textual critics study patterns of errors and changes to understand how scribes copied and passed down the biblical texts. This can provide valuable insights into the biblical manuscripts themselves. These
goals allow modern readers to have confidence that the Bible they hold is, for all practical purposes, equivalent to the original manuscripts. While variations between manuscripts do not affect major doctrines, recovering the original manuscripts. While variations between manuscripts do not affect major doctrines, recovering the original manuscripts.
variety of methods to study and compare biblical manuscripts: 1. Collecting all known manuscripts evidence. Textual critics gather and catalog all known biblical manuscripts, fragments, lectionaries, quotations from ancient Christian writers, and ancient Bible translations like the Vulgate or Peshitta. 2. Analyzing scribal habits. By comparing
manuscripts, critics can detect patterns in errors and changes made by scribes, allowing them to project scribal tendencies back to the autographs. 3. Grouping manuscripts into families. Manuscripts provide
important evidence. 4. Evaluating internal evidence. Textual critics evaluate the vocabulary, style, theology, and syntax of disputed readings to determine which is most likely original. 5. Evaluating external evidence. The date and geographical distribution of textual witnesses provide external evidence for judging between competing manuscript
readings. Earlier and geographically diverse evidence is preferred.6. Using conjectural emendation. In rare instances where the extant manuscripts make little sense, critics may propose conjectural emendation. In rare instances where the extant manuscripts make little sense, critics may propose conjectural emendation. In rare instances where the extant manuscripts make little sense, critics may propose conjectural emendation.
have great confidence in the reconstructed original text of the Old and New Testaments. Text Types of New Testaments. Text Typ
oldest existing biblical manuscripts, dating to the 2nd-4th centuries. It is known for strict adherence to the precise wording of the text. Key manuscripts mostly comes from around Italy and Gaul and dates to the 3rd-9th centuries. It demonstrates
extensive stylistic changes and paraphrases. Key manuscripts include Codex Bezae and Old Latin versions. 3. Byzantine text-type. Over 80% of NT manuscripts belong to this tradition that originated from Constantinople in the 4th-15th centuries. It contains smoothed-over Alexandrian and Western readings. It was the basis for the Textus Receptus
NT.No single text-type perfectly represents the original autographs. However, the Alexandrian texts are viewed as superior with fewer accumulated changes. Critical NT editions primarily follow the Alexandrian text while also integrating early Western and Byzantine readings judged to be original. Important Biblical Manuscripts The most important
biblical manuscripts for textual criticism of the New Testament include: Codex Sinaiticus (330-360 AD): One of the earliest near-complete NT manuscripts; found at St. Catherines Monastery in Egypt. Written in Greek. Codex Vaticanus (300-325 AD): One of the earliest near-complete NT manuscripts; found at St. Catherines Monastery in Egypt. Written in Greek. Codex Vaticanus (300-325 AD): One of the earliest near-complete NT manuscripts; found at St. Catherines Monastery in Egypt. Written in Greek.
Contains nearly all of the Greek Bible. Codex Alexandrinus (400-440 AD): Contains most of the Old and New Testament in Greek; resides in the British Library in London. Codex Bezae (400-550 AD): Greek and Latin manuscript containing the Gospels and Acts; key Western text-type witness. Housed in Cambridge University Library. Codex
Claromontanus (6th century AD): Old Latin manuscript with an early version of the Epistles; demonstrates early Western readings. Held in the Bibliothque Nationale in Paris. Codex Washingtonianus (400-500 AD): Contains the four Gospels in Greek; reflects mixture of text-types. Held in the Smithsonian Institution. For the Old Testament, important
manuscripts include: Dead Sea Scrolls (150 BC-70 AD): Ancient Hebrew and Aramaic manuscripts of OT books and extrabiblical texts discovered in the Qumran caves in the 20th century. Cairo Genizah Fragments (5th-10th centuries AD): Over 200,000 Jewish manuscript fragments containing OT texts discovered in an old synagogue storeroom in
Cairo, Egypt in the 1890s. Leningrad Codex (1008 AD): The oldest complete manuscript of the Hebrew Bible dated to 1008 AD. Written in Hebrew; kept in the National Library of Russia. Aleppo Codex (10th century AD): Hebrew OT manuscript consulted by Maimonides when compiling his authoritative version of the Hebrew text. Currently
incomplete due to fire damage. Principles of Textual CriticismScholars employ several key principles to guide textual analysis and selecting readings are preferred. Later scribes tended to expand
and paraphrase. Shorter, more concise versions are likely original.3. Harder readings are preferred. Scribes tended to simplify tricky sayings and spellings, so harder readings are considered authentic.4. Diversity of witnesses is preferred. Scribes tended to simplify tricky sayings and spellings, so harder readings are considered authentic.4. Diversity of witnesses is preferred.
readings. Variants offering the best explanation for how other readings developed are considered autographic. 6. Context influences decisions. Readings must fit their immediate context, book, author, and rest of Scripture. Skillfully applying these principles guides textual scholars toward the earliest inferable text and away from later errors and
intentional alterations. The original wording can never be recovered perfectly, but great confidence is warranted in the reconstructed text. Notable Textual Differences While most variations are inconsequential, some significant textual differences between manuscripts illustrate why textual criticism is needed: Mark 16 Various endings were added
after 16:8 very early; scholars debate which ending if any was original. John 7:53-8:11 The story of the woman caught in adultery is absent from the best witnesses; likely not original to Acts. 1 John 5:7 The Trinitarian formula in the KJV is found
only in a few late manuscripts; Erasmus inserted this reading. Romans 5:1 Let us have peace versus We have peace versus We have peace versus We have peace represent Western and Alexandrian textual families. Mark 1:2 The KJV attributes a quote to Isaiah that is from Malachi; based on late manuscripts. Luke 22:43-44 Christs sweating blood is not found in the earliest witnesses; possibly not
an original reading. Textual issues like these demonstrate the importance of identifying later additions to recover the earliest attainable text. Notable Figures in Textual Criticism Important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism include: Original reading. Textual issues like these demonstrate the important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism include: Original reading. Textual issues like these demonstrate the important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism include: Original reading. Textual issues like these demonstrate the importance of identifying later additions to recover the earliest attainable text. Notable Figures in Textual Criticism Important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism Important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism Important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism Important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism Important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism Important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism Important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism Important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism Important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism Important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism Important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism Important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism Important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism Important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism Important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism Important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism Important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism Important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism Important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism Important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism Important figures who advanced the field of textual criticism Important figures who advanced the field of text
Hebrew manuscripts. Jerome (347-420 AD): Produced the Latin Vulgate translation based on older Greek MT (Textus Receptus) using a handful of late Byzantine manuscripts. John Mill (1645-1707 AD): Published an extensively researched Greek NT with textual notes
regarding variant readings. Johann Bengel (1687-1752 AD): Developed principles of textual criticism and categorized manuscripts into text families. Fenton John Anthony Hort (1828-1892 AD): With Brooke Westcott, published The New Testament in the Original Greek (1881), the basis for modern critical NT editions. Kurt Aland (1915-1994 AD):
German scholar who founded the Institute for New Testament Textual Research which produced the Nestle-Aland critical texts. These scholars built on one anothers work to develop the rigorous methods used by textual criticis today. Their contributions enable us to have great confidence in the original text and history of the Bible. Textual Criticism
Applied to Bible TranslationsTextual criticism directly impacts Bible translation. By comparing manuscripts in their original ancient languages, textual scholars produce critical editions of the Hebrew and Greek texts that represent the earliest inferable wording. TranslationsTextual criticism directly impacts Bible translations of the Hebrew and Greek texts that represent the earliest inferable wording.
example, the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament and the Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece are two of the leading critical texts compiled using thorough textual analysis. Modern translations like the ESV, NASB, NIV, and NET rely on these texts, reflecting the results of textual criticism. Likewise, the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia
and Hebrew University Bible represent authoritative critical editions of the Hebrew OT widely used by recent translations such as the KJV were based on a few late medieval manuscripts and often include questionable readings later identified via textual
criticism. The expanding manuscript evidence available today allows superior original language texts and improved translations. Conclusion on the Value of Textual Criticism provides a scientific approach to discerning the original words of the biblical authors. While absolute certainty is impossible, painstaking analysis of all known
manuscript evidence gives translators and readers assurance that our modern Bibles reflect the actual writings God inspired. Minor uncertainties do not impede the clear message of salvation from sin that God embedded in His Word centuries ago. The study of biblical manuscripts should strengthen our trust in Scripture by demonstrating how Gods
providence preserved the integrity of the text over thousands of years, especially in the all-important scriptural witnesses to Christ. Textual criticism helps modern readers engage with confidence in Gods authoritative Word. Share copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format for any purpose, even commercially. Adapt remix, transform,
and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially. The licensor cannot revoke these freedoms as long as you follow the license terms. Attribution You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made. You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor
endorses you or your use. ShareAlike If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the same license as the original. No additional restrictions You do not have to comply with
the license for elements of the material in the public domain or where your use is permitted by an applicable exception or limitation. No warranties are given. The license may not give you all of the permissions necessary for your intended use. For example, other rights such as publicity, privacy, or moral rights may limit how you use the material.
Begin by collecting five resources for the text (the NRSV and NAB are recommended) two other contemporary versions of the Bible, and a solid commentary on the text that includes references to terms in the original language (good commentary series include the
JPS Torah Commentary, the Anchor Bible Commentaries, the Hermeneia series, and the Sacra Pagina series; see also the description of Commentaries). Lay the four Bible texts out side-by-side and examine the text of your passage in all four. Make a list of the translation differences between them; be alert to such things as diction (= vocabulary
choice), verb tense, construction and placement of phrases. From your list of translation differences, make a shortlist of what you consider to be the most significant differences. At this point, and no earlier, turn to the commentary/ies you have selected for your passage. What light do they shed on the translation differences you have noticed? Does the
commentary introduce any new information about the history of the text? Since manuscripts were hand-written until the invention of the printing press, they are prone to certain kinds of errors. A list of such errors appears below. With the help of the commentary, determine whether any of these errors might have occurred in the original texts. Finally,
read about the textual history of the book within which your passage occurs. Try to place what you have discovered in the context of the Bible Question 2 Today, a book is printed from a text that has been written by the author. The work is produced under the supervision of that author. Consequently, we
can be confident that the printed form of the work accurately represents the authors original writing. This, however, is not the case with works written before the invention of printing in the fifteenth century, all books
were produced by hand. Handwritten documents are called manuscripts (abbreviated mss.). In fact, the word, manuscript comes from the Latin word meaning, something that has been written by hand. With rare exceptions, the originals of ancient works (also called the autographs) have been lost. The only things that have survived are manuscript
copies of ancient works. The texts that have survived are copies separated from the autographs by hundreds and in some cases, thousands of years. Before we can begin to interpret these works, we must first of all determine what they originally said. Textual Criticismthe Art and Science of Recovering an Ancient Document The science of attempting
to reconstruct the text of documents is known as a textual criticism. The person who practices textual criticism usually carries the idea of finding fault with something, this is not the case here. Rather, the term is used with the idea of weighing and evaluating the available evidence to come up with
the original wording of a text. Textual criticism collects and examines the evidence about written works in an attempt to recover the original text. Therefore, textual criticism is not criticism must be applied to Scripture to reconstruct the true text. There Are Two
Extremes with Respect to Textual Criticism of the Bible When we look at the subject of the textual criticism, while the other position believes there is no hope of finding the original text. Each of these positions is
consulted except these certain ones that have been providentially preserved. On the other hand, there is the position that it is not possible to recover the latest edition of the biblical books that was edited by others than those who wrote the original. The first position is held
by people who have a very conservative view of the Bible, while the second is held by those who have a very liberal attitude toward Scripture. However, neither of these positions is the correct one. Textual criticism must be practiced on the biblical books because there is no one manuscript, or group of manuscripts, that perfectly preserve the original
known as classical Hebrew. It is interesting to note that the term, Hebrew is not found in the Old Testament to describe the language of Canaan. We read: On that day five cities in the land of Egypt will speak the language of Canaan and swear loyalty to
the LORD of Hosts. One of the cities will be called the City of the Sun. (Isaiah 19:18 HCSB) It is called the language of Judah in the Book of Nehemiah. Scripture says: Half of their children spoke the language of Judah in the Book of Nehemiah 13:24 NIV) Whatever
we call it; Hebrew, the language of Canaan or the language of Judah; this is the language in which God chose to reveal His Word to humanity before the coming of Jesus Christ, the long-awaited Messiah, to the earth. The Necessity of Old Testament Textual Criticism The various books of the Old Testament were written from approximately 1400 B.C.
to 400 B.C. As can be expected with books written so long ago, the originals have long since vanished. In order to reconstruct what the Old Testament is necessary for several reasons: The first book of the
Old Testament was written some 3,400 years ago and the last one some 2,400 years ago. Therefore, the writing of the Old Testament encompassed approximately 1,000 years. The originals of each book have long since vanished. The refore, the textual critic must
do his work to reconstruct the text. The Necessity of New Testament Textual Criticism In the first century, Greek was the international language. The books of the New Testament Textual Criticism In the first century, Greek was the international language. The books of the New Testament Textual Criticism In the first century, Greek was the international language.
(originals) of the various New Testament books. As is true with the Old Testament to discover the original wording of the text. Therefore, textual criticism of the New Testament is also necessary for
three basic reasons: We do not possess any of the original writings of the New Testament. Like the Old Testament upon copies to reconstruct the text. The copies of the New Testament manuscripts we now possess differ in some respects from each other because of scribal mistakes that have crept into the text. As is true with the
Old Testament, no two manuscripts are exactly alike. While the differences are mostly accidental, there are differences among the manuscripts. In the case of the New Testament, there is an abundance of material to evaluate. Before any type of biblical interpretation can begin, we must first determine what the text originally said. Therefore, textual
any of the classical writers such as Plato, Aristotle or Euripides. Likewise, none of the early Christians still exist, or even the original works of William Shakespeare. Therefore, textual criticism is a discipline that is used for any ancient or modern work where the originals have vanished. 2. The Rules Are the Same for All Written
Documents The rules by which the textual critic seeks to discover the original text of a document are the same for the Bible as they are for non-biblical documents. There are no special rules that need to be applied when attempting to reconstruct the text of Scripture. The text of the Bible is evaluated and reconstructed in the same way as we would
Same Way Textual criticism is practiced by both believers and unbelievers and unbelievers. While they may disagree as to the nature of the Bible, there is no disagreement when it comes to the same manuscripts and the same variant readings.
that are found in the manuscripts. When examining the text, the same conclusions are drawn. Therefore, the practice of textual criticism is not a battleground between believers and unbelievers and the same conclusions are drawn. Therefore, the practice of textual criticism is not a battleground between believers and unbelievers and unbelievers.
One must attempt to reconstruct a document by working backward with the evidence to help reconstruct a text, while at other times there is an abundance of evidence to help reconstruct a text, while at other times there is an abundance of evidence to help reconstruct a text, while at other times there is an abundance of evidence to help reconstruct a text, while at other times there is a science because there are
certain rules to follow, but it is an art because these rules cannot be applied in a mechanical way. 5. The Present Text of the Bible Is an Accurate Representation of the Original Something has to be said about where the evidence eventually leads. When all the facts are in, it will be seen that the text of the Bible has been transmitted to us in a very
accurate way. We can be confident that the Bible we read today represents what was originally written. Consequently, competent translations of Scripture are the authoritative Word of God. We can read them with confidence and rely on the promises contained within its pages. The great textual scholar of the last century, Sir Frederic Kenyon, put it
this way: The Christian can take the whole Bible in his hand and say without fear or hesitation throughout the centuries. (Sir Frederic Kenyon, Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts, New York, Harper and Row, 1958, p. 55) There is more. Even
if we would adopt every possible alternative reading that is found in Hebrew and Greek manuscripts, the text would still read basically the same! Indeed, the story of the Bible would be essentially the same, and the reader would get the same! Indeed, the story of the Bible would be essentially the same central message of who God is and what He wants from His creation. Therefore, when we put the Bible
through the art and science of textual criticism, it demonstrates that Gods Word comes through loud and clear. Summary Question 2 What Is Textual Criticism? Why Is Textual Criticism? Why Is Textual Criticism? Why Is Textual Criticism? Why Is Textual Criticism? When the very first book of the Bible was written, the text began to be transmitted through various copies. The text continued to be
transmitted by hand written copies until the invention of printing in the fifteenth century. Textual Criticism is a science attempting to establish the correct text of a document. It is applied to secular as well as sacred works. The rules for its practice are the same whether the text is sacred or secular. The textual criticism is a science attempting to establish the correct text of a document. It is applied to secular as well as sacred works.
and works backward to establish, as best as possible, how the text originally read. Textual criticism is necessary in both testament no longer exist. The originals of each book of the Old Testament no longer exist, the
manuscripts that do exist differ from one another and there is an abundance of material to consider. Therefore, to recover the original wording of Scripture, the science of textual criticism must be applied. We also noted that textual criticism is not limited to the Bibleevery document with a missing original must undergo textual criticism. The same
rules apply to believers and unbelievers who practice this discipline. Textual criticism is a science and an art. It has rules, but they are not to be applied mechanically. Finally, it is important to emphasize that the text we have today is an accurate representation of the original. One of the classes I teach each year covers textual criticism of the New
Testament. Even as I write that I know how boring it sounds. When I mention this class to someone as we make small talk, I can almost feel the waft of boredom fill the room. Its no surprise. Most dont know what it is, and those who do must admit that textual criticism is not the catchiest phrase. But textual criticism does not have to be boring. An
accurate(and certainly more interesting) name, might be the study of ancient manuscripts and how we get our printed Bibles from them. Now weve got something to talk about. How does it work? And why exactly do we need it? And more existentially, does this affect the reliability of the Bible? To put the matter starkly: if we want to read the Bible
then someone has to do textual criticism on it. This reality applies more broadly, as well, to any book written before the modern printing press, which began to make exact reproductions of works on a larger scale. Before that, everything was copied by hand, and it was much easier for errors to enter in to the copying process. So when someone wants
to print an ancient book (like the Greek New Testament), how do they know what to print? Where does one find the authentic Iliad of Homer or Josephuss Jewish War? These do not exist in only one manuscripts. And to complicate matters, no two manuscripts agree exactly. Though this applies to all ancient books, the stakes
are higher for the Bible. So, if we want to read the New Testament in print today, someone has to do textual criticism? How do you do it? It does not mean that we are criticizing the text of Scripture; textual criticism of the Bible has nothing
inherently to do with critiquing the Bible. Instead, textual criticism means thinking critically about manuscripts and variations in the biblical texts found in those manuscripts, in order to identify the original reading of the Bible. For example, what do we do when we find differences in 1 Corinthians 13:3 in ancient manuscripts? Some Greek
manuscripts read if I give up my body to be burned (see ESV; KJV), whereas others read if I give up my body that I might boast (see CSB; NIV). The English translations differ because they are translating different Greek words: some manuscripts have a word for boast and others include some form of burn. The terms look similar in Greek; they both
make sense in context. But which word did Paul use? This is the task of textual criticism, which uses tightly honed methods to test variant (or divergent) readings that are encountered in manuscripts. The goal is to find the most accuratereading. How is this done? Theres not just one way, and there is some lively debate about the best
way to proceed. But the most prominent method used by New Testament scholars today is a multifaceted, eclectic process. First, the manuscripts themselves are consideredthis is called external evidence. In the example of 1 Corinthians 13, most manuscripts themselves are consideredthis is called external evidence. In the example of 1 Corinthians 13, most manuscripts themselves are consideredthis is called external evidence. In the example of 1 Corinthians 13, most manuscripts themselves are considered external evidence. In the example of 1 Corinthians 13, most manuscripts include some form of burn. You might think that finding what most manuscripts themselves are considered external evidence.
would solve the matter, but its not so simple. Not all manuscripts are equally important; sometimes more is not always better. Quality of manuscripts matters more than quantity. In this case, the earliest manuscripts are equally important; sometimes more is not always better. Quality of manuscripts matters more than quantity. In this case, the earliest manuscript evidence supports boast, along with several important manuscripts that have consistently proven to be reliable in other ways. Second,
this eclectic method also looks at internal evidence. This includes a biblical authors normal style and the sorts of mistakes that later copyists commonly made when they copied texts. In the case of 1 Corinthians 13:3, Paul never mentions burning anywhere else, but he often speaks of boasting. When it comes to copyist tendencies, we might ask if the
two words in question look like each other (they do), and if they could easily be mistaken by someone copying manuscripts (they could). Textual critics thus arrive at conclusions by asking a range of questions to determine which option is more likely in a given scenario. Sometimes there is no easy answer, and sometimes this is apparent in differences
between translations. But the good news is textual criticism undermine the Authority of the Bible? Textual criticism does not undermine inerrancy. But we
must remember that, strictly speaking, inerrancy applies to the Bible, not to every manuscripts of the Bible in antiquity were people just like us. Many of them were quite proficient copyists who produced very accurate manuscripts, but even so, no
copy is perfect. The New Testament was copied by thousands of places in dozens of languages. Though this can make textual criticism complicated, this diversity is also a blessing, since it would not be possible for any one person or sect in the ancient world to collude to produce an inauthentic Scripture. Where such things were
encountered in the ancient world, they were recognized and rejected. Textual Criticism and Confidence in the New Testament manuscripts that number would be
greater than the total number of verses in the New Testament. A better question is not how many wariants are there? but how many manuscripts do we have?. Where we have many manuscripts, we will have more variants
(since every manuscript has its own quirks and tendencies). But where we have more manuscripts, we also have a greater degree of certainty of what the text originally said since we have, the better off we arefor the more variants we have, the more
 witnesses we have to the text, and the more confident we can be. The Westminster Confession of Faith 1.8 speaks of Gods singular care and providence to preserve the Scriptures. Given the number of copies we have of the Greek New Testamentmore than 5,500 biblical manuscripts in Greek, which is far greater than any other work from the ancient
worldthe discipline of textual criticism provides ample corroboration for the Westminster Confession. Confidence for the Bigger Questions extual criticism is often perceived to be boring because the issues appear to be so minor. Its true that most of the differences are so minor that they dont even show up in translations, but many come to the issue
of textual criticism because of the bigger questions, like the longer ending of the Gospel of Mark (Mark 16:920), the woman caught in adultery (John 7:538:11), or the trinitarian passage in 1 John 5:7. These examples are exceptionaland as such they prove the rule that the overwhelming majority of most variants are minorbut we still need to know
what to do with them. To use Mark 16:920 as an example: Should we read it as Scripture, since it has so long been accepted as Scripture? Should we not esteem it, since most modern translations state that the passage is not found in the earliest manuscripts? To cut to the chase: should we pick up [poisonous] snakes (Mark 16:18)? This is, to be sure, a
complicated question, and one that readers may disagree on. My own view is that Mark intentionally ends in 16:8, but I cant defend that here. Instead, I want to make a few (I hope) encouraging points about how even big questions can lead us back to confidence in Gods singular care and providence. First, most modern translations and scholarly
editions of the Greek New Testament clearly state the evidence for and against including this passage in the apparatus or footnotes. This is consistent with the practice of textual criticism, where the goal is not to ramrod any particular reading or conspire to hide evidence. The evidence is laid out for anyone to see and assess. Second, no one could
either make up this reading or delete it on their own volition. We have too many witnesses to the text of the New Testament for anything to be included or fall out clandestinely. Even where we may have unanswered questions, there is very little questions about our options. Third, even in those places where we remain uncertain, no significant doctrine anything to be included or fall out clandestinely.
hinges on a matter of textual criticism.[1] The Trinity is not dependent on a particular reading of 1 John 5:7 any more than Jesuss authority to forgive sins is dependent on the inclusion of the woman caught in adultery. These are already manifestly clear throughout the New Testament. Textual criticism is a widely debated field; no doubt some readers
may have divergent opinions on these matters. Nevertheless, the overall picture is one of overall textual stability and very few unresolved issues. We have a wealth of manuscripts and refining the methods of textual criticism. Our extremely accurate,
modern editions of the New Testament are possible because of the labors of many people whom you may never know about. Whether or not you realize it, youre probably using the fruits of textual criticism every day. This article was originally published on February 11, 2019. Brandon D. Crowe (Ph.D., University of Edinburgh) is associate professor of
New Testament at Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia where he has taught since 2009. He is the author of The Last Adam: A Theology of the Obedient Life of Jesus in the Gospels (Baker Academic), and forthcoming books on the resurrection in Acts (Baker Academic) and a biblical approach to productivity (Lexham Press). See Andreas J
Kstenberger and Michael J. Kruger, The Heresy of Orthodoxy: How Contemporary Cultures Fascination with Diversity has Reshaped our Understanding of Early Christianity (Wheaton: Crossway, 2010), ch. 8. share print New format but still
contains compelling, relevant, and practical biblical content! Textual criticism is the method of research used to help determine the most likely reading of the original text of the Bible. Though the original manuscripts of the Bible is books no longer exist or have yet to be found, thousands of early copies exist. Textual criticism is the method of research used to help determine the most likely reading of the original text of the Bible.
researching these numerous manuscripts to best determine what the original readings most likely were. For the Old Testament from the eleventh century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a mostly complete Old Testament from the tenth century), the Aleppo Codex (a
Dead Sea Scrolls of the Old Testament (150 BCAD 75), comparisons with the Septuagint (Old Testament translated into Greek), and other early translations, as well as numerous portions of Hebrew manuscripts from ancient times. For the New Testament, there are nearly 6,000 Greek manuscripts in existence. In addition, tens of thousands of
quotations and allusions are available in the early church fathers, plus comparison with ancient translations of the New Testament in Latin, Coptic, Syriac, and other languages. There are several factors employed in textual criticism. The most important factors are: (1) which readings occur in the oldest manuscripts, (2) which readings occur in
manuscripts found over which geographic areas, and (3) which readings occur in a significant majority of manuscripts. For the past two hundred years, most scholars have utilized an eclectic method that takes into account as many factors as possible to help better determine what was most likely the original reading of the biblical text. Some notable
issues in the field of New Testament textual criticism include John 5:4 (a debate regarding whether the verse is original), the account of the woman caught in adultery in John 7:538:11, and the longer ending of Mark. Modern English translations generally include these passages due to their history of being included in English Bibles yet add footnotes
regarding the manuscript evidence. In any event, these accounts do not change any core teaching of Christianity. Textual criticism is a field that helps to better understand how the text of the Bible originally looked. While much effort has been made to help today's readers have confidence in the Bible they use today, textual criticism is a field that helps to better understand how the text of the Bible originally looked. While much effort has been made to help today's readers have confidence in the Bible originally looked. While much effort has been made to help today's readers have confidence in the Bible originally looked.
and study existing manuscripts in an ever-growing field of information to further enhance our understanding of Scripture. Identification of textual variants "Critical edition" redirects here. For critical edition of textual variants of operatic scores, see Critical edition of textual variants of operatic scores, see Critical edition of textual variants of operatic scores, see Critical edition of textual variants of operatic scores, see Critical edition of textual variants of operatic scores, see Critical edition of textual variants of operatic scores, see Critical edition of textual variants of operatic scores, see Critical edition of textual variants of operatic scores, see Critical edition of textual variants of operatic scores, see Critical edition of textual variants of operatic scores, see Critical edition of textual variants of operatic scores, see Critical edition of textual variants of operatic scores, see Critical edition of textual variants of operatic scores, see Critical edition of textual variants of operatic scores, see Critical edition of textual variants of operatic scores, see Critical edition of textual variants of the operatic scores, see Critical edition of textual variants of operatic scores, see Critical edition of textual variants of the operatic scores of the operat
citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. Find sources: "Textual criticism" news newspapers books scholar JSTOR (November 2023) (Learn how and when to remove this message) Carmina Cantabrigiensia, Manuscript C, folio 436v, 11th century Textual criticism and the contract of the c
literary criticism that is concerned with the identification of textual variants, or different versions, of either manuscripts (mss) or of printed books. Such texts may range in dates from the earliest writing in cuneiform, impressed on clay, for example, to multiple unpublished versions of a 21st-century author's work. Historically, scribes who were paid
to copy documents may have been literate, but many were simply copyists, mimicking the shapes of letters without necessarily understanding what they meant.[citation needed] This means that unintentional alterations were common when copying manuscripts by hand.[1] Intentional alterations may have been made as well, for example, the
censoring of printed work for political, religious or cultural reasons. The objective of the textual critic's work is to provide a better understanding may lead to the production of a critical edition containing a scholarly curated text. If a scholar has several versions
of a manuscript but no known original, then established methods of textual criticism can be used to reconstruct the original text as closely as possible. The same methods can be used to reconstruct intermediate versions, or recensions, of a document's transcription history, depending on the number and quality of the text available.[b]On the
other hand, the one original text that a scholar theorizes to exist is referred to as the urtext (in the context of Biblical studies), archetype or autograph; however, there is not necessarily a single original text for every group of texts. For example, if a story was spread by oral tradition, and then later written down by different people in different
locations, the versions can vary greatly. There are many approaches or methods to the practice of textual criticism, notably eclecticism, stemmatics, and copy-text editing. Quantitative techniques are also used to determine the relationships between witnesses to a text, called textual witnesses, with methods from evolutionary biology (phylogenetics)
appearing to be effective on a range of traditions.[3]In some domains, such as religious and classical text editing, the phrase "lower criticism" refers to textual criticism and "higher criticism" to the endeavor to establish the authorship, date, and place of composition of the original text. Textual criticism has been practiced for over two thousand years,
as one of the philological arts.[4] Early textual critics, especially the librarians of Hellenistic Alexandria in the last two centuries BC, were concerned with preserving the works of antiquity, and this continued through the Middle Ages into the early modern period and the invention of the printing press. Textual criticism was an important aspect of the
example in the work of Lorenzo Valla on the purported Donation of Constantine. [citation needed] Many ancient works, such as the Bible and the creationship of each copy to the original may be unclear. Textual scholars have debated for centuries which sources are most closely derived from the
original, hence which readings in those sources are correct. [citation needed] Although texts such as Greek plays presumably had one original has been discussed. [5] [pageneeded] Interest in applying textual criticism to the Ouran has also developed after the
discovery of the Sana'a manuscripts in 1972, which possibly date back to the seventh to eighth centuries. [citation needed] In the English language, the works of William Shakespeare have been a particularly fertile ground for textual criticismboth because the effort and because the texts, as transmitted, contain a considerable amount of variation, and because the texts.
expense of producing superior editions of his works have always been widely viewed as worthwhile.[6] The principles of textual criticism, although originally developed and refined for works from (near-)contemporary texts to the
earliest known written documents. Ranging from ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt to the twentieth century, textual criticism covers a period of about five millennia.[citation needed]The basic problem, as described by Paul Maas, is as follows:We have no autograph [handwritten by the original author] manuscripts of the Greek and Roman classica
writers and no copies which have been collated with the originals; the manuscripts we possess derive from the originals through an unknown number of intermediate copies, and are consequently of questionable trustworthiness. The business of textual criticism is to produce a text as close as possible to the original (constitutio textus).[8]Maas
comments further that "A dictation revised by the author must be regarded as equivalent to an autograph manuscripts applies to many cultures other than Greek and Roman. In such a situation, a key objective becomes the identification of the first exemplar before any split in the tradition. That exemplar is known
as the archetype. "If we succeed in establishing the text of [the archetype], the constitutio (reconstruction of a "critical edition".[citation needed] This contains the text that the author has determined most closely approximates the original, and is
accompanied by an apparatus criticus or critical apparatus presents the author's work in three parts: first, a list or description of the evidence (sometimes a simple likelihood rating),[citation needed]; and
third, a record of rejected variants of the text (often in order of preference).[c]Folio from Papyrus 46, containing 2 Corinthians 11:3312:9Before inexpensive mechanical printing, literature was copied by hand, and many variations were introduced by copyists. The age of printing made the scribal profession effectively redundant. Printed editions, while
less susceptible to the proliferation of variations likely to arise during manual transmission, are nonetheless not immune to introducing variations from an author's autograph. [11] Since each scribe or printer
commits different errors, reconstruction of the lost original is often aided by a selection of readings taken from multiple sources. An edited text that draws from multiple sources is said to be eclectic. In contrast to this approach, some textual critics prefer to identify the single best surviving text, and not to combine readings from multiple sources.
[d]When comparing different documents, or "witnesses", of a single, original text, the observed differences are called variant represents the author's original work. The process of textual criticism seeks to explain how each variant may have entered the text, either
by accident (duplication or omission) or intention (harmonization or censorship), as scribes or supervisors transmitted the original author's text by copying it. The textual critic's task, therefore, is to sort through the variants, eliminating those most likely to be un-original, hence establishing a critical text, or critical edition, that is intended to best
approximate the original. At the same time, the critical text should document variant readings, so the relation of extant witnesses to the reconstructed original is apparent to a reader of the critical text, the textual critic considers both "external" evidence (the age, provenance, and affiliation of each witness) and
"internal" or "physical" considerations (what the author and scribes, or printers, were likely to have done).[5][pageneeded]The collation of all known variants of a text is referred to as a variorum, namely a work of textual decisions have been
made in the preparation of a text for publication.[13] The Bible and the works of William Shakespeare have often been the subjects of variorum editions, although the same techniques have been applied with less frequency to many other works, such as Walt Whitman's Leaves of Grass,[14] and the prose writings of Edward Fitzgerald.[15]In practice,
citation of manuscript evidence implies any of several methodologies. The ideal, but most costly, method is physical inspected. This method involves paleographical analysisinterpretation of handwriting, incomplete letters and even reconstruction of
lacunae. More typically, editions of manuscripts are consulted, which have done this paleographical work already. [citation needed] Eclecticism refers to the practice of consulting a wide diversity of witnesses to a particular original. The practice is based on the principle that the more independent transmission histories there are, the less likely they
will be to reproduce the same errors. What one omits, the others may retain; what one adds, the others are unlikely to add. Eclecticism allows inferences to be drawn regarding the original text, based on the evidence of contrasts between witnesses. [citation needed] Eclectic readings also normally give an impression of the number of witnesses to each
available reading. Although a reading supported by the majority of witnesses is frequently preferred, this does not follow automatically. For example, a second edition of a Shakespeare play may include an addition alluding to an event known to have happened between the two editions. Although nearly all subsequent manuscripts may have included
the addition, textual critics may reconstruct the original without the addition. [citation needed] The result of the process is a text with readings drawn from many witnesses. It is not a copy of any particular manuscript, and may deviate from the majority of existing manuscripts. In a purely eclectic approach, no single witness is theoretically favored.
Instead, the critic forms opinions about individual witnesses, relying on both external and internal evidence. [16] Since the mid-19th century, eclecticism, in which there is no a priori bias to a single manuscript, has been the dominant method of editing the Greek text of the New Testament (currently, the United Bible Society, 5th ed. and Nestle-land,
28th ed.). Even so, the oldest manuscripts, being of the Alexandrian text-type, are the most favored, and the critical text has an Alexandrian disposition.[17] External evidence of each physical witness, its date, source, and relationship to other known witnesses. Critics[who?] will often prefer the readings supported by the oldest witnesses.
Since errors tend to accumulate, older manuscripts should have fewer errors. Readings supported by a majority of witnesses are less likely to reflect accidents or individual biases. For the same reasons, the most geographically diverse witnesses are preferred. Some manuscripts [which?] show evidence that
particular care was taken in their composition, for example, by including alternative readings in their margins, demonstrating that more than one prior copy (exemplar) was consulted in producing the current one. Other factors being equal, these are the best witnesses. The role of the textual critic is necessary when these basic criteria are in conflict.
For instance, there will typically be fewer early copies, and a larger number of later copies. The textual critic will attempt to balance these criteria, to determine the original text. [citation needed] There are many other more sophisticated considerations. For example, readings that depart from the known practice of a scribe or a given period may be
deemed more reliable, since a scribe is unlikely on his own initiative to have departed from the usual practice.[18]Internal evidence that comes from the text itself, independent of the physical characteristics of the document. Various considerations can be used to decide which reading is the most likely to be original. Sometimes these
considerations can be in conflict.[18]Two common considerations have the Latin names lectio difficilior (more difficilior (more difficilior more often than they removed them. The second, lectio difficilior potior (the harder
reading is stronger), recognizes the tendency for harmonization esolving apparent inconsistencies in the text. Applying this principle leads to taking the more difficult (unharmonized) reading as being more likely to be the original. Such cases also include scribes simplifying and smoothing texts they did not fully understand.[19]Another scribal
tendency is called homoioteleuton, meaning "similar endings". Homoioteleuton occurs when two words/phrases/lines end with the similar sequence of letters. The scribe, having finished copying the first, skips to the second, omitting all intervening words. Homoioteleuton occurs when two words/phrases/lines are similar.[20]The critic may
also examine the other writings of the author to decide what words and grammatical constructions match his style. The evaluation of internal evidence also provides the critic with information that helps him evaluate the reliability of individual manuscripts. Thus, the consideration of internal and external evidence is related. [citation needed] After
considering all relevant factors, the textual critic seeks the reading that best explains how the other reading is then the most likely candidate to have been original. [citation needed] Luke 11:2 in Codex Sinaiticus Various scholars have developed guidelines, or canons of textual criticism, to guide the exercise of the critic's
judgment in determining the best readings of a text. One of the earliest was Johann Albrecht Bengel (16871752), who in 1734 produced an edition of the Greek New Testament. In his commentary, he established the rule Proclivi scriptioni praestat ardua, ("the harder reading is to be preferred").[21]Johann Jakob Griesbach (17451812) published
several editions of the New Testament. In his 1796 edition, [22] he established fifteen critical rules. Among them was a variant of Bengel's rule, Lectio difficilior potior, "the harder reading is better." Another was Lectio brevior praeferenda, "the shorter reading is better." Another was Lectio brevior praeferenda, "the shorter reading is better." Another was Lectio brevior praeferenda, "the shorter reading is better." Another was Lectio brevior praeferenda, "the shorter reading is better." Another was Lectio brevior praeferenda, "the shorter reading is better." Another was Lectio brevior praeferenda, "the shorter reading is better." Another was Lectio brevior praeferenda, "the shorter reading is better." Another was Lectio brevior praeferenda, "the shorter reading is better." Another was Lectio brevior praeferenda, "the shorter reading is better." Another was Lectio brevior praeferenda, "the shorter reading is better." Another was Lectio brevior praeferenda, "the shorter reading is better." Another was Lectio brevior praeferenda, "the shorter reading is better." Another was Lectio brevior praeferenda, "the shorter reading is better." Another was Lectio brevior praeferenda, "the shorter reading is better." Another was Lectio brevior praeferenda, "the shorter reading is better."
rule cannot be applied uncritically, as scribes may omit material inadvertently [citation needed] Brooke Foss Westcott (18251901) and Fenton Hort (18281892) published an edition of the New Testament in Greek in 1881. They proposed nine critical rules, including a version of Bengel's rule, "The reading is less likely to be original that shows a
disposition to smooth away difficulties." They also argued that "Readings are approved or rejected by reason of the quality, and not the number, of their supporting witnesses", and that "The reading is to be preferred that most fitly explains the existence of the others." [24] Many of these rules, although originally developed for biblical textual criticism
have wide applicability to any text susceptible to errors of transmission. [citation needed] Since the canons of criticism are highly susceptible to interpretation, and at times even contradict each other, they may be employed to justify a result that fits the textual critic's aesthetic or theological agenda. Starting in the 19th century, scholars sought more
rigorous methods to guide editorial judgment. Stemmatics and copy-text editing while both eclectic, in that they permit the editor to select readings from multiple sources sought to reduce subjective criteria. [citation needed] The citing of sources used, and alternate
readings, and the use of original text and images helps readers and other critics determine to an extent the depth of research of the manuscripts of Pseudo-Apuleius Herbarius by Henry E. Sigerist (1927)Stemmatics or stemmatology is a rigorous approach to
textual criticism. Karl Lachmann (17931851) greatly contributed to making this method famous, even though he did not invent it. [25] The method takes its name from the word stemma. The Ancient Greek word [26] and its loanword in classical Latin stemmata [26] [27] [28] may refer to "family trees". This specific meaning shows the relationships of the
surviving witnesses (the first known example of such a stemma, albeit without the name, dates from 1827).[29] The family tree is also referred to as a cladogram.[30] The method works from the principle that "community of error implies community of error implies co
were derived from a common intermediate source, called a hyparchetype. Relations between the lost intermediates are determined by the same process, placing all extant manuscripts in a family tree or stemma codicum descended from a single archetype. The process of constructing the stemma is called recension, or the Latin recensio.[31]Having
completed the stemma, the critic proceeds to the next step, called selection or selectio, where the text of the archetype and selecting the best ones. If one reading occurs more often than another at the same level of the tree, then the dominant reading is selected. If
two competing readings occur equally often, then the editor uses judgment to select the correct reading. [32] After selectio, the text may still contain errors, since there may be passages where no source preserves the correct reading.
corrupt, it is corrected by a process called "emendation", or emendation (also sometimes called divinatio). Emendations not supported by any known source are sometimes called conjectural emendations. [33] The process of selections are sometimes called divination.
and emendatio resemble copy-text editing. In fact, the other techniques can be seen as special cases of stemmatics in which a rigorous family history of the text cannot be determined but only approximated. If it seems that one manuscripts are good
then eclecticism on that group would be proper. [34] The HodgesFarstad edition of the Greek New Testament attempts to use stemmatics for some portions. [35] Canterbury Tales, Woodcut 1484 Phylogenetics is a technique borrowed from biology, where it was originally named phylogenetic systematics by Willi Hennig. In biology, the technique is used
to determine the evolutionary relationships between different species. [36] In its application in textual criticism, the text of a number of different witnesses may be entered into a computer, which records all the differences between them, or derived from an existing apparatus. The manuscripts are then grouped according to their shared
characteristics. The difference between phylogenetics and more traditional forms of statistical analysis is that, rather than simply arranging the manuscripts into rough groupings according to their overall similarity, phylogenetics assumes that they are part of a branching family tree and uses that assumption to derive relationships between them.
This makes it more like an automated approach to stemmatics. However, where there is a difference, the computer does not indicate which branch of the tree is the "root" which manuscript tradition is closest to the original. Other types of evidence must be used for that
purpose.[citation needed]Phylogenetics faces the same difficulty as textual criticism: the appearance of characteristics in descendants of an ancestor other than by direct copying (or miscopying) of the ancestor, for example where a scribe combines readings from two or more different manuscripts ("contamination"). The same phenomenon is widely
```

present among living organisms, as instances of horizontal gene transfer (or lateral gene transfer) and genetic recombination, particularly among bacteria. Further exploration of the applicability of the different methods for coping with these problems across both living organisms and textual traditions is a promising area of study.[37]Software developed for use in biology has been applied successfully to textual criticism; for example, it is being used by the Canterbury Tales. Shaw's edition of Dante's Commedia uses phylogenetic and traditional methods alongside each other in a comprehensive exploration of relations among seven early witnesses to Dante's text.[39]The stemmatic method assumes that each witness is derived from one, and only one, predecessor. If a scribe refers to more than one source when creating her or his copy, then the new copy will not clearly fall into a single branch of the

family tree. In the stemmatic method, a manuscript that is derived from more than one source is said to be contaminated. [citation needed] The method also assumes that scribes only make new errors they do not attempt to correct the errors of their predecessors. When a text has been improved by the scribe, it is said to be sophisticated, but

```
'sophistication" impairs the method by obscuring a document's relationship to other witnesses, and making it more difficult to place the manuscripts by commonality of error. It is required, therefore, that the critic can distinguish erroneous
readings from correct ones. This assumption has often come under attack. W. W. Greg noted: "That if a scribe makes a mistake he will inevitably produce nonsense is the tacit and wholly unwarranted assumption."[40]Franz Anton Knittel defended an
authenticity of the Pericopa Adulterae (John 7:538:11), Comma Johanneum (1 John 5:7), and Testimonium Flavianum. According to him, Erasmus in his Novum Instrumentum omne did not incorporate the Comma was known
for Tertullian.[41]The stemmatic method's final step is emendation, also sometimes referred to as "conjecture at every step of the process. Some of the method's rules that are designed to reduce the exercise of editorial judgment do not necessarily produce the correct result. For example, where
there are more than two witnesses at the same level of the tree, normally the critic will select the dominant reading. A plausible reading that occurs less often may, nevertheless, be the correct one.[42]Lastly, the stemmatic method
assumes that every extant witness is derived, however remotely, from a single source. It does not account for the possibility that the original author may have revised her or his work, and that the text could have existed at different times in more than one authoritative version. [citation needed] The critic Joseph Bdier (18641938), who had worked with
stemmatics, launched an attack on that method in 1928. He surveyed editions of medieval French texts that were produced with the stemmatic method, and found that textual critics tended overwhelmingly to produce bifid trees, divided into just two branches. He concluded that this outcome was unlikely to have occurred by chance, and that
therefore, the method was tending to produce bipartite stemmas regardless of the actual history of the witnesses. He suspected that editors tended to favor trees with two branches, as this would maximize the opportunities for editorial judgment (as there would be no third branch to "break the tie" whenever the witnesses disagreed). He also noted
that, for many works, more than one reasonable stemma could be postulated, suggesting that the method was not as rigorous or as scientific as its proponents had claimed. [citation needed] Bdier's doubts about the stemmatic method led him to consider whether it could be dropped altogether. As an alternative to stemmatics, Bdier proposed a Best-
text editing method, in which a single textual witness, judged to be of a 'good' textual state by the editor, is emended as lightly as possible for manifest transmission mistakes, but left otherwise unchanged. This makes a Best-text edition essentially a documentary edition. For an example one may refer to Eugene Vinaver's edition of the Winchester
Manuscript of Malory's Le Morte d'Arthur. [citation needed] A page from Codex Vaticanus Graecus 1209 shows a medieval scribe (the marginal note between columns one and two) criticizing a predecessor for changing the text: "Fool and knave, leave the old reading, don't change it!" [43] When copy-text editing, the scholar fixes errors in a base text.
often with the help of other witnesses. Often, the base text is selected from the copy-text method, the critic examines the base text and makes corrections (called emendations) in places where the base text are the base text and makes corrections (called emendations) in places where the base text are the base text ar
appears wrong to the critic. This can be done by looking for places in the base text that do not make sense or by looking at the text of other witnesses for a superior reading. Close-call decisions are usually resolved in favor of the copy-text. [citation needed] The first published, printed edition of the Greek New Testament was produced by this method.
 Erasmus, the editor, selected a manuscript from the local Dominican monastery in Basle and corrected its obvious errors by consulting other local manuscripts. The Westcott and Hort text, which was the base manuscript. [44] The
bibliographer Ronald B. McKerrow introduced the term copy-text in his 1904 edition of the works of Thomas Nashe, defining it as "the text used in each particular case as the basis of mine". McKerrow was aware of the limitations of the stemmatic method, and believed it was more prudent to choose one particular text that was thought to be
particularly reliable, and then to emend it only where the text was obviously corrupt. The French critic Joseph Bdier likewise became disenchanted with the stemmatic method, and concluded that the editor should choose the best available text, and emend it as little as possible. [citation needed] In McKerrow's method as originally introduced, the copy-
text was not necessarily the earliest text. In some cases, McKerrow would choose a later witness, noting that "if an editor has reason to suppose that a certain text embodies later corrections, or some of them at least, are the work of the author, he has no choice
but to make that text the basis of his reprint".[45]By 1939, in his Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare, McKerrow had changed his mind about this approach, as he feared that a later editioneven if it contained authorial correctionswould "deviate more widely than the earliest print from the author's original manuscript". He therefore concluded
that the correct procedure would be "produced by using the earliest 'good' print as copy-text and inserting into it, from the first edition which contains them, such corrections as appear to us to be derived from the author". But, fearing the arbitrary exercise of editorial judgment, McKerrow stated that, having concluded that a later edition had
substantive revisions attributable to the author, "we must accept all the alterations of that edition, saving any which seem obvious blunders or misprints".[46]Anglo-American textual criticism in the last half of the 20th century came to be dominated by a landmark 1950 essay by Sir Walter W. Greg, "The Rationale of Copy-Text". Greg proposed:[A]
distinction between the significant, or as I shall call them 'substantive', readings of the text, those namely that affect the author's meaning or the essence of his expression, and others, such in general as spelling, punctuation, word-division, and the like, affecting mainly its formal presentation, which may be regarded as the accidents, or as I shall call
them 'accidentals', of the text.[47]Greg observed that compositors at printing shops tended to follow the "substantive" readings of their copy faithfully, except when they deviated unintentionally; but that "as regards accidentals they will normally follow their own habits or inclination, though they may, for various reasons and to varying degrees, be
influenced by their copy".[48]He concluded: The true theory is, I contend, that the choice between substantive readings belongs to the general theory of textual criticism and lies altogether beyond the narrow principle of the copy-text. Thus it may happen that in a critical
edition the text rightly chosen as copy may not by any means be the one that supplies most substantive readings in cases of variation. The failure to make this distinction and to apply this principle has naturally led to too close and too general a reliance upon the text chosen as basis for an edition, and there has arisen what may be called the tyranny of
the copy-text, a tyranny that has, in my opinion, vitiated much of the best editorial work of the past generation.[49]Greg's view, in short, was that the "copy-text can be allowed no over-riding or even preponderant authority so far as substantive readings are concerned". The choice between reasonable competing readings, he said:[W]ill be determined
partly by the opinion the editor may form respecting the nature of the copy from which each substantive edition was printed, which is a matter of external authority; partly by the editor's judgment of the intrinsic claims of individual
readings to originality other words their intrinsic merit, so long as by 'merit' we mean the likelihood of their being what the author wrote rather than their appeal to the individual taste of the editor. [50] Although Greg argued that an
editor should defer to the copy-text when "the claims of two readings...appear to be exactly balanced.... In such a case, while there can be no logical reason for giving preference to the copy-text, in practice, if there is no reason for giving preference to the copy-text, in practice, if there is no reason for giving preference to the copy-text, in practice, if there is no reason for altering its reading, the obvious thing seems to be to let it stand."[51] The "exactly balanced" variants are said to be
indifferent.[citation needed]Editors who follow Greg's rationale produce eclectic editions, in that the authority for the "accidentals" is derived from one particular source (usually the earliest one) that the editor considers to be authority for the "accidentals" is determined in each individual case according to the editor's
judgment. The resulting text, except for the accidentals, is constructed without relying predominantly on any one witness.[citation needed]W. W. Greg did not live long enough to apply his rationale of copy-text to any actual editions of works. His rationale was adopted and significantly expanded by Fredson Bowers (19051991). Starting in the 1970s
G. Thomas Tanselle vigorously took up the method's defense and added significant contributions of his own. Greg's rationale as practiced by Bowers and Tanselle method. [citation needed] William Shakespeare, A Midsummer Night's Dream (First Folio) In his 1964 essay, "Some
Principles for Scholarly Editions of Nineteenth-Century American Authors", Bowers said that "the theory of copy-text proposed by Sir Walter Greg rules supreme".[52] Bowers's assertion of "supremacy" was in contrast to Greg's more modest claim that "My desire is rather to provoke discussion than to lay down the law".[53]Whereas Greg had limited
his illustrative examples to English Renaissance drama, where his expertise lay, Bowers argued that the rationale was "the most workable editorial principle yet contrived to produce a critical text that is authoritative in the maximum of its details whether the author be Shakespeare, Dryden, Fielding, Nathaniel Hawthorne, or Stephen Crane. The
principle is sound without regard for the literary period."[54] For works where an author's manuscript surviveda case Greg had not consideredBowers concluded that the manuscript is preserved, this has paramount authority, of
course. Yet the fallacy is still maintained that since the first edition was proofread by the author, it must represent his final intentions and hence should be chosen as copy-text. Practical experience shows the contrary. When one collates the manuscript of The House of the Seven Gables against the first printed edition, one finds an average of ten to
fifteen differences per page between the manuscript and the print, many of them consistent alterations from the manuscript system of punctuation, spelling, and word-division. It would be ridiculous to argue that Hawthorne made approximately three to four thousand small changes in proof, and then wrote the manuscript of The
Blithedale Romance according to the same system as the manuscript of the Seven Gables, a system that he had rejected in proof. [55] Following Greg, the editor would then replace any of the manuscript readings with substantives from printed editions that could be reliably attributed to the author: "Obviously, an editor cannot simply reprint the
manuscript, and he must substitute for its readings any words that he believes Hawthorne changed in proof."[55]McKerrow had articulated textual criticism's goal in terms of "our ideal of an author's fair copy of his work in its final state".[56] Bowers asserted that editions founded on Greg's method would "represent the nearest approximation in
every respect of the author's final intentions."[57] Bowers stated similarly that the editor's task is to "approximate as nearly been undertaken with a view to reconstructing, as accurately as possible, the text finally intended by the author".
[59] Bowers and Tanselle argue for rejecting textual variants that an author inserted at the suggestion of others. Bowers said that his edition of Stephen Crane's first novel, Maggie, presented "the authoris intention" or "an author's uninfluenced artistic intentions." [60] In his writings, Tanselle argue for rejecting textual variants that an author inserted at the suggestion of others. Bowers said that his edition of Stephen Crane's first novel, Maggie, presented "the authoris intentions" or "an author's uninfluenced artistic intentions."
intentions."[61] This marks a departure from Greg, who had merely suggested that the editor inquire whether a later reading "is one that the author had made the change.[citation needed] Tanselle discusses the example of
Herman Melville's Typee. After the novel's initial publication, Melville pronounced the changes an improvement, Tanselle rejected them in his edition, concluding that "there is no evidence, internal or external, to suggest that they are the kinds of
changes Melville would have made without pressure from someone else."[63]Bowers confronted a similar problem in his edition of Maggie. Crane originally printed the novel privately in 1893. To secure commercial publication in 1896, Crane agreed to remove profanity, but he also made stylistic revisions. Bowers's approach was to preserve the
stylistic and literary changes of 1896, but to revert to the 1893 readings where he believed that Crane was fulfilling the publisher's intention, and some of Bowers's choices came under fireboth as to his judgment, and as to the
wisdom of conflating readings from the two different versions of Maggie.[64]Hans Zeller argued that it is impossible to tease apart the character of the expected censorship, Crane could be led to undertake alterations which also had
literary value in the context of the new version. Secondly, because of the systematic character of the work, purely censorial alterations sparked off further alterations, determined at this stage by literary considerations. Again in consequence of the systematic character of the work, the context of the two historical versions in the edited text gives
rise to a third version. Though the editor may indeed give a rational account of his decision at each point on the basis of the documents, nevertheless to aim to produce the ideal text which Crane would have produced in 1896 if the publisher had left him complete freedom is to my mind just as unhistorical as the question of how the first World War or
the history of the United States would have developed if Germany had not caused the USA to enter the war in 1917 by unlimited submarine combat. The nonspecific form of censorship described above is one of the historical conditions under which arose in this way
it is not possible to subtract these forces and influences, in order to obtain a text of the author's own. Indeed I regard the "uninfluenced artistic intentions" of the author as something which exists only in terms of aesthetic abstraction. Between influences on the author and influences on the text are all manner of transitions. [65] Bowers and Tanselle
recognize that texts often exist in more than one authoritative version. Tanselle argues that:[T]wo types of revision must be distinguished: that which aims at altering the purpose, direction, or character of a work, thus attempting to make a different sort of work out of it; and that which aims at intensifying, refining, or improving the work as then
conceived (whether or not it succeeds in doing so), thus altering the work in degree but not in kind. If one may think of a work in terms of a spatial metaphor, the first might be labeled "vertical revision," because it involves alterations within the same plane. Both
produce local changes in active intention; but revisions of the first type appear to be in fulfillment of an altered active intention or to reflect an altered active intention in the work as originally conceived), then
the editor should adopt the author's later version. But where a revision is "vertical" (i.e., fundamentally altering the work's intention as a whole), then the revision should be treated as a new work, and edited separately on its own terms.[citation needed]Bowers was also influential in defining the form of critical apparatus that should accompany a
scholarly edition. In addition to the content of the apparatus, Bowers led a movement to relegate editorial intervention. Tanselle explained the rationale for this approach: In the first place, an editor's primary responsibility is to establish a
text; whether his goal is to reconstruct that form of the text which represents the author's final intention or some other form of the text, his essential task is to produce a reliable text according to some set of principles. Relegating all editorial matter to an appendix and allowing the text to stand by itself serves to emphasize the primacy of the text and
permits the reader to confront the literary work without the distraction of editorial comment and to read the work with ease. A second advantage of a clear text is that it is easier to quote from or to reprint. Although no device can insure accuracy of quotation, the insertion of editorial comment and to read the work without the distraction of editorial comment and to read the work without the distraction of editorial comment and to read the work without the distraction of editorial comment and to read the work without the distraction of editorial comment and to read the work without the distraction of editorial comment and to read the work without the distraction of editorial comment and to read the work without the distraction of editorial comment and to read the work without the distraction of editorial comment and to read the work without the distraction of editorial comment and to read the work without the distraction of editorial comment and to read the work without the distraction of editorial comment and to read the work without the distraction of editorial comment and to read the work without the distraction of editorial comment and to read the work without the distraction of editorial comment and to read the work without the distraction of editorial comment and to read the work without the distraction of editorial comment and the work without the distraction of editorial comment and the work without the distraction of editorial comment and the work without the distraction of editorial comment and the work without the distraction of editorial comment and the work without the distraction of editorial comment and the work without the distraction of editorial comment and the work without the distraction of editorial comment and the work without the distraction of editorial comment and the work without the distraction of editorial comment and the work without the work without the distraction of editorial comment and the work with the wo
in the way of the quoter. Furthermore, most quotations appear in contexts where symbols are inappropriate; thus when it is necessary to quote from a text which has not been kept clear of apparatus, the burden of producing a clear text of the passage is placed on the quoter. Even footnotes at the bottom of the text pages are open to the same
objection, when the question of a photographic reprint arises.[67]Some critics[who?] believe that a clear-text edition gives the edited text too great a prominence, relegating textual variants to appendices that are difficult to use, and suggesting a greater sense of certainty about the established text than it deserves. As Shillingsburg notes, "English
scholarly editions have tended to use notes at the foot of the text page, indicating, tacitly, a greater modesty about the "established" text and drawing attention more forcibly to at least some of the text page, indicating, tacitly, a greater modesty about the "established" text and drawing attention more forcibly to at least some of the attended to use notes at the foot of the text page, indicating, tacitly, a greater modesty about the "established" text and drawing attention more forcibly to at least some of the attended to use notes at the foot of the text page, indicating, tacitly, a greater modesty about the "established" text and drawing attention more forcibly to at least some of the attended to use notes at the foot of the text page, indicating, tacitly, a greater modesty about the "established" text and drawing attended to use notes at the foot of the text page, indicating, tacitly, a greater modesty about the "established" text and drawing attended to use notes at the foot of the text page, indicating, tacitly, a greater modesty about the "established" text and drawing attended to use notes at the foot of the text page, indicating, tacitly, a greater modesty about the "established" text and drawing attended to use notes at the foot of the text page.
(CEAA). The CEAA's Statement of Editorial Principles and Procedures, first published in 1967, adopted the GregBowers rationale in full. A CEAA examiner would inspect each edition, and only those meeting the requirements would receive a seal denoting "An Approved Text." [citation needed] Between 1966 and 1975, the Center allocated more than
$1.5 million in funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities to various scholarly editing projects, which were required to follow the guidelines (including the structure of editorial apparatus) as Bowers had defined them.[69] According to Davis, the funds coordinated by the CEAA over the same period were more than $6 million, counting
funding from universities, universities, university presses, and other bodies.[70]The Center for Scholarly Editions (CSE) replaced the CEAA in 1976. The center also ceased its role in the allocation of funds. The center's latest guidelines (2003) no longer prescribe a particular
editorial procedure.[71]See also: Historicity of the Book of MormonThe Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS Church) includes the Book of Mormon as a foundational reference. LDS members typically believe the book to be a literal historical record.[citation needed]Although some earlier unpublished studies had been prepared,[citation needed]
needed] not until the early 1970s was true textual criticism applied to the Book of Mormon. At that time BYU Professor Ellis Rasmussen and his associates were asked by the LDS Church to begin preparation for a new edition of the Holy Scriptures. One aspect of that effort entailed digitizing the text and preparing appropriate footnotes; another
aspect required establishing the most dependable text. To that latter end, Stanley R. Larson (a Rasmussen graduate student) set about applying modern text critical standards to the manuscripts and early editions of the Book of Mormon as his thesis projectwhich he completed in 1974. To that end, Larson carefully examined the Original Manuscript
(the one dictated by Joseph Smith to his scribes) and the Printer's Manuscript (the copy Oliver Cowdery prepared for the Book of Mormon to determine what sort of changes had occurred over time and to make judgments as to which readings were the most
original.[72] Larson proceeded to publish a useful set of well-argued articles on the phenomena which he had discovered.[73] Many of his observations were included as improvements in the 1981 LDS edition of the Book of Mormon.[citation needed]By 1979, with the establishment of the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies (FARMS)
as a California non-profit research institution, an effort led by Robert F. Smith began to take full account of Larson's work and to publish a Critical Text of the Book of Mormon. Thus was born the FARMS Critical Text in 1984. The third volume of that first edition
was published in 1987, but was already being superseded by a second, revised edition of the entire work, [74] greatly aided through the advice and assistance of then Yale doctoral candidate Grant Hardy, Dr. Gordon C. Thomasson, Professor John W. Welch (the head of FARMS), Professor Royal Skousen, and others too numerous to mention here.
However, these were merely preliminary steps to a far more exacting and all-encompassing project. [citation needed] In 1988, with that preliminary phase of the Book of Mormon Project and proceeded to gather still scattered fragments of the Original
Manuscript of the Book of Mormon and to have advanced photographic techniques applied to obtain fine readings from otherwise unreadable pages and fragments. He also closely examined the Printer's Manuscript (owned by the Community of ChristRLDS Church in Independence, Missouri) for differences in types of ink or pencil, in order to
determine when and by whom they were made. He also collated the various editions of the Book of Mormon down to the present to see what sorts of changes have been made through time. [citation needed] Thus far, Professor Skousen has published complete transcripts of the Original and Printer's Manuscripts, [75] as well as a six-volume analysis of
textual variants.[76] Still in preparation are a history of the text, and a complete electronic collation of editions and manuscripts (volumes 3 and 5 of the Project, respectively). Yale University has in the meantime published an edition of the Book of Mormon which incorporates all aspects of Skousen's research.[77]Main article: Documentary
hypothesisFurther information: Textual variants in the Hebrew Bible 11th-century manuscript of the Hebrew Bible compares manuscript versions of the following sources (dates refer to the oldest extant manuscripts in each
family):ManuscriptExamplesLanguageDate of CompositionOldest CopyDead Sea ScrollsTanakh at QumranHebrew, Paleo Hebrew and Greek (Septuagint)c.150 BCE 70 CEC.150 BCE 70 
Ambrosianus B.21SyriacEarly 5th century CEVulgateQuedlinburg Itala fragment, Codex Complutensis ILatinEarly 5th century CESamaritan PentateuchAbisha Scroll of NablusHebrew in Samaritan alphabet200100 BCEOldest extant mss c.11th
century CE, oldest mss available to scholars 16th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE, only Torah contained Targum Aramaic 5001000 CE5th century CE5th 
[78] There are three separate new editions of the Hebrew Bible, and the Hebrew Bible are three separate new editions of the Hebrew University Bible, and the Hebrew University Bible is also
diplomatic, but based on the Aleppo Codex. The Hebrew Bible: A Critical Edition is an eclectic edition. [79] Main article: Textual criticism of the New Testament texts include more than 5,800 Greek manuscripts and 9,300 manuscripts in various fine the New Testament texts include more than 5,800 Greek manuscripts and 9,300 manuscripts in various fine the New Testament texts include more than 5,800 Greek manuscripts and 9,300 manuscripts in various fine the New Testament texts include more than 5,800 Greek manuscripts and 9,300 manuscripts in various fine the New Testament texts include more than 5,800 Greek manuscripts in various fine the New Testament texts include more than 5,800 Greek manuscripts and 9,300 manuscripts in various fine the New Testament texts include more than 5,800 Greek manuscripts in various fine the New Testament texts include more than 5,800 Greek manuscripts in various fine the New Testament texts include more than 5,800 Greek manuscripts in various fine the New Testament texts include more than 5,800 Greek manuscripts in various fine the New Testament texts include more than 5,800 Greek manuscripts in various fine the New Testament texts include more than 5,800 Greek manuscripts in various fine the New Testament texts include more than 5,800 Greek manuscripts in various fine the New Testament texts in the New Testament texts 
other ancient languages (including Syriac, Slavic, Ethiopic and Armenian). The manuscripts contain approximately 300,000 textual variants, most of them involving changes of word order and other comparative trivialities. [80][81] As according to Wescott and Hort: With regard to the great bulk of the words of the New Testament, as of most other
ancient writings, there is no variation or other ground of doubt, and therefore no room for textual criticism... The proportion of words virtually accepted on all hands as raised above doubt is very great, not less, on a rough computation, than seven eights of the whole. The remaining eighth therefore, formed in great part by changes of order and other
 jeopardized by the variants. This is true for any textual tradition. The interpretation of individual passages may well be called in question; but never is a doctrine affected."[80][82]Historically, attempts have been made to sort new New Testament manuscripts into one of three or four theorized text-types (also styled unhyphenated: text types), or into
 looser clusters. However, the sheer number of witnesses presents unique difficulties, chiefly in that it makes stemmatics in many cases impossible, because many copyists used two or more different manuscripts as sources. Consequently, New Testament textual critics have adopted eclecticism. As of 2017[update] the most common division today is as
Alexandrian Church. It contains readings that are often terse, shorter, somewhat rough, less harmonised, and generally more difficult. The family was once[when?] thought[by whom?] to result from a very carefully edited third-century recension, but now is believed to be merely the result of a carefully controlled and supervised process of copying and
existence of a singular Western text-type, instead viewing it as a group of text-types.[83] Some New Testament scholars posit a distinct Caesarean text-type, with mixed Western and Alexandrian features, for the Gospels[84] and
Alexandrian revisions for the rest. [85] Used by all Western translations before 1520, including Wycliffite New Testaments, original Douay-RheimsThe Byzantine text-type5th16th centuries CEThis group comprises around 95% of all the manuscripts, the majority of which are comparatively very late in the tradition. It had become dominant at
Constantinople from the fifth century on and was used throughout the Eastern Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire. It contains the most harmonistic readings, paraphrasing and significant additions, most of which are believed[by whom?] to be secondary readings. It underlies the Textus Receptus used for most Reformation-era translations of
the New Testament. The "Majority Text" methodology effectively produces a Byzantine text-type, because Byzantine manuscripts are the most common and consistent. [80] Bible translations relying on the Textus Receptus: KJV, NKJV, Tyndale, Coverdale, Geneva, Bishops' Bible, OSBThe Aramaic Peshitta, [86] Wulfila's Gothic translation, [87] [88] Sana'a
manuscripts of the Quran. Andrew Rippin has stated that the early Quranic manuscript is significant, and its variant readings suggest that the early Quranic manuscripts, and Birmingham Quran manuscript is significant, and its variant readings suggest that the early Quranic manuscripts, and Birmingham Quran manuscript is significant, and its variant readings suggest that the early Quranic manuscript is significant, and its variant readings suggest that the early Quranic manuscript is significant, and its variant readings suggest that the early Quranic manuscript is significant, and its variant readings suggest that the early Quranic manuscript is significant, and its variant readings suggest that the early Quranic manuscript is significant, and its variant readings suggest that the early Quranic manuscript is significant, and its variant readings suggest that the early Quranic manuscript is significant, and its variant readings suggest that the early Quranic manuscript is significant, and its variant readings suggest that the early Quranic manuscript is significant, and its variant readings suggest that the early Quranic manuscript is significant, and its variant readings suggest that the early Quranic manuscript is significant, and its variant readings suggest that the early Quranic manuscript is significant.
area of study, [90][91] as Muslims have historically disapproved of higher criticism being applied to the Quran. [92] In some countries textual criticism can be seen as apostasy. [93] Amongst Muslims, the original Arabic text is commonly considered to be the final revelation, revealed to Muhammad from AD 610 to his death in 632. In Islamic tradition,
the Quran was memorised and written down by Muhammad's companions and copied as needed. [citation need
differences. Uthman's standardization did not eliminate the textual variants. [94] In the 1970s, 14,000 fragments of Quran were discovered in the Great Mosque of Sana'a, the Sana'a manuscripts. About 12,000 fragments belonged to 926 copies of the Quran, the other 2,000 were loose fragments. The oldest known copy of the Quran so far belongs to
this collection: it dates to the end of the seventh to eighth centuries. [citation needed] The German scholar Gerd R. Puin has been investigating these Quran fragments for years. His research team made 35,000 microfilm photographs of the manuscripts, which he dated to early part of the eighth century. Puin has not published the entirety of his work,
but noted unconventional verse orderings, minor textual variations, and rare styles of orthography. He also suggested that some of the parchments were palimpsests which had been reused. Puin believed that this implied an evolving text as opposed to a fixed one.[89]In an article in the 1999 Atlantic Monthly,[89] Gerd Puin is quoted as saying that: My
idea is that the Koran is a kind of cocktail of texts that were not all understood even at the time of Muhammad. Many of them may even be a hundred years older than Islam itself. Even within the Islamic traditions there is a huge body of contradictory information, including a significant Christian substrate; one can derive a whole Islamic anti-history
from them if one wants. The Koran claims for itself that it is "mubeen", or "clear", but if you look at it, you will notice that every fifth sentence or so simply doesn't make sense. Many Muslimsand Orientalistswill tell you otherwise, of course, but the fact is that a fifth of the Koranic text is just incomprehensible. This is what has caused the traditional
anxiety regarding translation. If the Koran is not comprehensibleif it can't even be understood in Arabic then it's not translatable. People fear that. And since the Koran is not comprehensibleif it can't even be understood in Arabic will tell youthere is a contradiction. Something else must be going on.[89]Canadian Islamic scholar, Andrew
Rippin has likewise stated: The impact of the Yemeni manuscripts are all very significant. Everybody agrees on that. These manuscripts say that the early history of the Koranic text is much more of an open question than many have suspected: the text was less stable, and therefore had less
authority, than has always been claimed. [89] For these reasons, some scholars, especially those who are associated with the Revisionist school of Islamic studies, have proposed that the traditional account of the Quran's composition needs to be discarded and a new perspective on the Quran is needed. Puin, comparing Quranic studies with Biblical
studies, has stated: So many Muslims have this belief that everything between the two covers of the Koran is just God's unaltered word. They like to quote the textual work that shows that the Bible has a history and did not fall straight out of the sky, but until now the Koran has been out of this discussion. The only way to break through this wall is to
prove that the Koran has a history too. The Sana'a fragments will help us to do this.[89]In 2015, some of the earliest known Quranic fragments, containing 62 out of 6236 verses of the Quran and with proposed dating from between approximately AD 568 and 645, were identified at the University of Birmingham. David Thomas, Professor of Christianity
and Islam, commented: These portions must have been in a form that it can be dated to a point very close to the time it was believed to be revealed. [95] David Thomas pointed out that the radiocarbon testing found the death
date of the animal whose skin made up the Quran, not the date when the Quran was written. Since blank parchment was often stored for years after being produced, he said the Quran could have been written. Since blank parchment was often stored for years after being produced, he said the Quran was written. Since blank parchment was often stored for years after being produced, he said the Quran could have been written.
common to all early manuscripts of the Uthmanic text type[97] has stated and demonstrated with examples that due to a number of these same idiosyncratic spellings present in the Birmingham fragment (Mingana 1572a + Arabe 328c), it is "clearly a descendant of the Uthmanic text type" and that it is "impossible" that it is a pre-Uthmanic copy
despite its early radiocarbon dating.[98] Similarly, Stephen J. Shoemaker has also argued that it is extremely unlikely that the Birmingham manuscript was a pre-Uthmanic manuscript was a
Hebrew and German language periodicals.[101]Textual criticism originated in the classical era and its development in modern times began with classics scholars, in an effort to determine the original content of texts like Plato's Republic.[102] There are far fewer witnesses to classical texts than to the Bible, so scholars can use stemmatics and, in
some cases, copy text editing. However, unlike the New Testament where the earliest witnesses are within 200years of the original, the earliest existing manuscripts of most classical texts were written about a millennium after their composition. All things being equal, textual scholars expect that a larger time gap between an original and a
manuscript means more changes in the text.[citation needed]This section is an excerpt from Textual criticism of the Primary Chronicle.[edit]Textual criticism or textology of the Primary Chronicle or Tale of Bygone Years (Old East Slavic: , romanized:Povst vremnnyx lt,[e] commonly transcribed Povest' vremennykh let[103][104][105][106] and
abbreviated PVL[f]) aims to reconstruct the original text by comparing extant witnesses (such as extant manuscripts and quotations of lost manuscripts); the collation and publication of such witnesses (such as extant manuscripts and quotations of lost manuscripts); the collation and publication of such witnesses (such as extant manuscripts and quotations of lost manuscripts); the collation and publication of such witnesses (such as extant manuscripts and quotations of lost manuscripts); the collation and publication of such witnesses (such as extant manuscripts); the collation and publication of such witnesses (such as extant manuscripts); the collation and publication of such witnesses (such as extant manuscripts); the collation and publication of such witnesses (such as extant manuscripts); the collation and publication of such witnesses (such as extant manuscripts); the collation and publication of such witnesses (such as extant manuscripts); the collation and publication of such witnesses (such as extant manuscripts); the collation and publication of such witnesses (such as extant manuscripts); the collation and publication of such witnesses (such as extant manuscripts); the collation and publication of such witnesses (such as extant manuscripts); the collation and publication of such witnesses (such as extant manuscripts); the collation and such as extant manuscripts and such as extant manuscripts are such as extant manuscripts and such as extant manuscripts are such as extant manuscripts.
discussion, development and application of methods according to which the most reliable readings are identified and favoured of others; and the ongoing publication of critical editions can be protected by copyright as works of authorship if enough
creativity/originality is provided. The mere addition of a word, or substitution of a term with another one believed to be more correct, usually does not achieve such level of originality/creativity. All the notes accounting for the analysis and why and how such changes have been made represent a different work autonomously copyrightable if the other
requirements are satisfied. In the European Union critical and scientific editions may be protected also by the relevant neighboring right that protects critical and scientific publications of public domain works as made possible by art. 5 of the Copyright Term Directive. As of 2011 not all EU member States had transposed art. 5 into national law
[109]Digital textual criticism is a relatively new branch of textual criticism working with digital edition. The development of digital edition acriticism is a relatively new branch of textual criticism working with digital edition. The development of digital edition acriticism is a relatively new branch of textual criticism working with digital edition. The development of digital edition acriticism working with digital edition acriticism working with digital edition acriticism working with digital edition.
but others believe the editing process has remained fundamentally the same, and digital tools have simply made aspects of it more efficient.[citation needed]From its beginnings, digital scholarly editing involved developing a system for displaying both a newly "typeset" text and a history of variations in the text under review. Until about halfway
through the first decade of the twenty-first century, digital archives relied almost entirely on manual transcriptions of texts. Notable exceptions are the earliest digital scholarly editions published in Budapest in the 1990s. These editions contained high resolution images next to the diplomatic transcription of the texts, as well as a newly typeset text
with annotations.[110] These old websites are still available at their original location. Over the course of the early twenty-first century, image files became much faster and cheaper, and storage space and upload times ceased to be significant issues. The next step in digital scholarly editing was the wholesale introduction of images of historical texts
particularly high-definition images of manuscripts, formerly offered only in samples.[111]In view of the need to represent historical texts primarily through transcription, and because transcription, and because transcription, and because transcription images of manuscripts, formerly offered only in samples.[111]In view of the need to represent historical texts primarily through transcription, and because transcription, and because transcription images of manuscripts.
Encoding Initiative (TEI) uses encoding for the same purpose, although its particulars were designed for scholarly uses in order to offer some hope that scholarly work on digital texts had a good chance of migrating from aging operating systems and digital texts had a good chance of migrating from aging operating systems and digital texts had a good chance of migrating from aging operating systems and digital platforms to new ones and the hope that scholarly work on digital texts had a good chance of migrating from aging operating systems and digital platforms to new ones and the hope that scholarly work on digital texts had a good chance of migrating from aging operating systems and digital platforms to new ones and the hope that scholarly work on digital texts had a good chance of migrating from aging operating systems and digital platforms to new ones and the hope that scholarly work on digital texts had a good chance of migrating from aging operating systems and digital platforms to new ones and the hope that scholarly work on digital texts had a good chance of migrating systems and digital platforms to new ones and the hope that scholarly work on digital texts had a good chance of migrating systems and digital platforms are not of the hope that scholarly work on digital texts had a good chance of migrating systems and digital platforms are not of the hope that scholarly work on 
data among different projects.[111]Several computer programs and standards exist to support the work of the editors of critical editions. These includeThe Text Encoding Initiative. The Guidelines of the TEI provide much detailed analysis of the procedures of critical editing, including recommendations about how to mark up a computer file
containing a text with critical apparatus. See especially the following chapters of the Guidelines: 10. Manuscript Description, 11. Representation of Primary Sources, and 12. Critical Apparatus. Juxta Archived 2018-05-11 at the Wayback Machine is an open-source tool for comparing and collating multiple witnesses to a single textual work. It was
designed to aid scholars and editors examine the history of a text from manuscript to print versions. Juxta provides collation for multiple versions of texts that are marked up in plain text or TEI/XML format. The EDMAC macro package for Plain TeX is a set of macros originally developed by John Lavagnino and Dominik Wujastyk for typesetting critical
editions. "EDMAC" stands for "EDition" "MACros." EDMAC is in maintenance mode. The ledmac package is a development of EDMAC by Peter R. Wilson for typesetting critical editions with LaTeX. ledmac is in maintenance mode. [112] The eledmac package is a further development of ledmac by Maeul Rouquette that adds more sophisticated features
and solves more advanced problems. eledmac was forked from ledmac was forked from ledmac by Maeul Rouquette that rewrittes many part of the code in order to allow more
robust developments in the future. In 2015, it is in active development.ednotes, written by Christian Tapp and Uwe Lck is another package for typesetting critical editions, commentaries and parallel texts written by Stefan Hagel. CTE is designed for use on the Windows
operating system, but has been successfully run on Linux and OS/X using Wine. CTE can export files in TEI format. CTE is currently (2014) in active development. Critical Edition Typesetting with typesetting with TeX and EDMAC
Development of CET seems to have stopped in 2004.ekdosis ekdosis ekdosis is a LuaLaTeX package developed by Robert Alessi. It is designed for multilingual critical editions. It can be used to typeset texts and different layers of critical notes in any numbe
of columns which in turn can be synchronized or not. In addition to printed texts, ekdosis can convert .tex source files so as to produce TEI xml-compliant critical editions. See also on CTAN. Book of Mormon Book of Mormon Critical Text FARMS 2nd editionHebrew Bible and Old TestamentComplutensian polyglot (based on now-lost
manuscripts) Septuaginta Rahlfs' 2nd editionGottingen Septuagint (Vetus Testamentum Graecum: Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum): in progressBiblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia 4th editionHebrew Bible: A Critical Edition an ongoing product which is designed to be different from Biblia Hebraica by producing an eclectic textNew
Testament Editio octava critica maior Tischendorf editionThe New Testament in the Original Greek Maurice A. Robinson and William Pierpont editionThe New Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament ment of the Majority Text Hodges & Farstad editionThe New Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionNovum Testament in the Original Greek Mestcott & Hort editionN
28th edition (NA28)[114]United Bible Society's Greek New Testament UBS 5th edition (UBS5)[115]Novum Testament UBS 5th edition Edition (UBS5)[115]Novum Testament UBS 5th edition (UBS5)[115]Novum Tes
manuscript variants, oral traditions, and historical evidenceCritical translationsThe Comprehensive New Testament standardized Nestle-Aland 27 edition[116]The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible with textual mapping to Masoretic, Dead Sea Scrolls, and Septuagint variantsNew English Translation of the Septuagint, a critical translation from the completed
manuscriptCategories of New Testament manuscriptsJohn 21List of Biblical commentariesList of New Testament uncialsList of New Testam
translationsJesus and the woman taken in adultery (Pericope Adulter) Wiseman hypothesis, dating the book of Genesis from Russian: / Ukrainian: , is sometimes used for studies of (Old) Church Slavonic and (Old) East Slavic texts.
a document or of a collection of documents, and to exhibit it, freed from all the errors, corruptions, and variations which it may have accumulated in the course of its transmission by successive copyings."[2]^ "The apparatus criticus is placed underneath the text simply on account of bookprinting conditions and in particular of the format of modern
books. The practice in ancient and medieval manuscripts of using the outer margin for this purpose makes for far greater clarity."[10] "Tanselle thus combines an Aristotelian praktike, a rigorous account of the phenomenology of text, with a deep Platonic suspicion of this phenomenology, and of the concrete world of experience (see my 'Materiality
for further discussion). For himand, I would contend, for the idealist, or 'eclectic' editing with which he and Greg-Bowers are often identified, whereby an idealist 'text that never was' is constructed out of the corrupt states of extant documentsontology is only immanent, never assuredly present in historical, particularized text, for it can be achieved
only at the unattainable level of nous rather than phenomenon. Thus, even the high aims of eclectic (or, as it is sometimes known, 'critical') editing can be called into question, because of the unsure phenomenological status of the documentary and historical."[12] Belarusian: , romanized: Apovies minulych aso; Russian: , romanized: Povest'
vremennykh let; Ukrainian: , romanized:Povist' mynulykh lit^ [104][103][107][105][106]^ Ehrman 2005, p.46.^ Vincent 1899, p.1.^ Howe, Christopher J.; Connolly, Ruth; Windram, Heather (2012). "Responding to criticisms of phylogenetic methods in stemmatology". SEL: Studies in English Literature 15001900. 52 (1): 5167.
doi:10.1353/sel.2012.0008. JSTOR41349051. S2CID145665900.^ Saussure, Ferdinand de (1916). Cours de linguistique gnrale. Lausanne: Charles Bally in Payot C. pp.13. ISBN 9782228500647. {{cite book}}: ISBN 9782228500647. {{cite b
Maas 1958, pp.2223. Gaskell, 1978. Greetham 1999, p.40. McGann 1992, p.xviiii. Bradley 1990 Bentham, Gosse 1902 Comfort, Comfort 2005, p. 383 Aland, B. 1987, p. 276 "Manuscript Studies: Textual analysis (Scribal error)". www.ualberta.ca. Archived from
the original on 4 April 2016. Retrieved 2 May 2018. "Critical Rules of Johann Albrecht Bengel". Bible-researcher.com. Archived from the original on 2010-02-13. Retrieved 2008-05-24. J.J. Griesbach, Novum Testamentum Graece. "Critical Rules of Johann Albrecht Bengel". Bible-researcher.com. Archived from the original on 2010-02-13. Retrieved 2008-05-24.
2008-05-24. "Brevior lectio, nisi testium vetustorum et gravium auctoritate penitus destituatur, praeferenda est verbosiori. Librarii enim multo proniores ad addendum fuerunt, quam ad omittendum." Theories of Westcott and Hort". Bible-researcher.com. Archived from the original on 2010-02-13. Retrieved 2008-05-24. "The reading is to be
preferred that makes the best sense, that is, that best conforms to the grammar and is most congruous with the purport of the rest of the sentence and of the larger context." (2.20) Sebastian Timpanaro, The Genesis of Lachmann's Method, ed. and trans. by Glenn W. Most (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005) [trans. from Genesi del metodo
del Lachmann (Liviana Editrice, 1981)]. a b Liddell, H.G. & Scott, R. (1940). A Greek-English Lexicon. revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones. with the assistance of. Roderick McKenzie. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Lewis, C.T. & Short, C. (1879). A Latin dictionary founded on Andrews' edition of Freund's Latin dictionary founded.
Oxford: Clarendon Press. Saalfeld, G.A.E.A. (1884). Tensaurus Italograecus. Ausfhrliches historischen. Wien: Druck und Verlag von Carl Gerold's Sohn, Buchhndler der Kaiserl. Akademie der Wissenschaften. Colln, H. S. and C. J. Schlyter (eds), Corpus iuris Sueo-Gotorum
antiqui: Samling af Sweriges gamla lagar, p Kongl. Maj:ts. ndigste befallning, 13 vols (Stockholm: Haeggstrm, 182777), vol. 1, table 3; the volume is available at the internet archive but the scan unfortunately omits the stemma. William Robins, 'Editing and Evolution', Literature Compass 4 (2007): 89120, at pp. 9394, doi:10.1111/j.1741-
4113.2006.00391.x^ Mulken & van Pieter 1996, p. 84^ Wilson and Reynolds 1974, p. 186^ Roseman 1999, p. 73^ McCarter 1986, p. 62^ "The Greek Vorlage of the Syra Harclensis". rosetta.reltech.org. Archived from the original on 3 March 2016. Retrieved 2 May 2018.^ Critical Editions of the New Testament Archived 2009-04-14 at the Waybac.
Machine at the Encyclopaedia of Textual Criticism^ Schuh 2000, p. 7^ "Chi-Squares and the Phenomenon of "Change of Exemplar" in the Dyutaparvan. (PDF Download Available)". Archived from the original on 2017-08-16. Retrieved 2017-05-16. Wendy J. Phillips-Rodriguez*, Christopher J. Howe, Heather F. Windram "Chi-Squares and the
Phenomenon of 'Change of Exemplar' in the Dyutaparvan", Sanskrit Computational Linguistics, First and Second International Symposia Rocquencourt, France, October 2931, 2007 Providence, RI, U, May 1517, 2008 Revised Selected and Invited Papers; Windram, H. F., Howe, C. J., Spencer M.: "The identification of exemplar change in the Wife of
Bath's Prologue using the maximum chi-squared method". Literary and Linguistic Computing 20, 189-204 (2005). The Canterbury Tales Project Official Website Commedia Archived 2017-05-31 at the Wayback Machine Shaw edition, 2010 Greg 1950, p.20. Knittel, Neue Kritiken ber den berhmten Sprych: Drey sind, die da zeugen im Himmel,
der Vater, das Wort, und der heilige Geist, und diese drei sind eins: Braunschweig 1785^ Tov 2001, pp.351368.^ Ehrman 2005, pp.44, 56.^ Aland, Kurt; Barbara Aland (1995). The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans
Publishing Company. p.236. ISBNO-8028-4098-1.^ Quoted in Greg 1950, p. 2324^ McKerrow 1939. pp. 1718, quoted in Greg 1950, p.22.^ Greg 1950, p.21.^ Greg 1950, p.24.^ Greg 1950, p.24.^ Greg 1950, p.25.^ Greg 1950, p.25.^ Greg 1950, p.25.^ Greg 1950, p.26.^ Greg 195
quoted in Bowers 1974, p. 82, n. 4^ Bowers 1974, p. 82, n. 4^ Bowers 1964, p.227.^ quoted in Tanselle 1976, p. 168^ Tanselle 1975, p. 247^ Tanselle 1975, p. 247^ Tanselle 1976, p.193.^ Tanselle 1976, p.194.^ Davis 1977, pp.23.^ Zeller 1975, p. 247^ Tanselle 1976, p.194.^ Davis 1977, pp.23.^ Zeller 1975, p. 247^ Tanselle 1976, p.194.^ Davis 1977, pp.23.^ Zeller 1975, pp. 247248^ Tanselle 1976, p.194.^ Davis 1977, pp.23.^ Zeller 1975, pp. 247^ Tanselle 1976, p.194.^ Davis 1977, pp.23.^ Zeller 1975, pp. 247^ Tanselle 1976, pp.194.^ Davis 1977, pp.23.^ Zeller 1975, pp. 247^ Tanselle 1976, pp.194.^ Davis 1977, pp.23.^ Zeller 1975, pp. 247^ Tanselle 1976, pp.194.^ Davis 1977, pp.23.^ Zeller 1975, pp. 247^ Tanselle 1976, pp.194.^ Davis 1977, pp.23.^ Zeller 1975, pp. 247^ Tanselle 1976, pp.194.^ Davis 1977, pp.23.^ Zeller 1975, pp. 247^ Tanselle 1976, pp.194.^ Davis 1977, pp.23.^ Zeller 1975, pp. 247^ Tanselle 1976, pp.194.^ Davis 1977, pp.23.^ Zeller 1975, pp. 247^ Tanselle 1976, pp.194.^ Davis 1977, pp.23.^ Zeller 1977, pp.23.^ 
emblem can be stated here in only the most general terms, since the range of editorial work that comes within the committee's purview makes it impossible to set forth a detailed, step-by-step editorial procedure." Stanley R. Larson, "A Study of Some Textual Variations in the Book of Mormon, Comparing the Original and Printer's MSS., and
Comparing the 1830, 1837, and 1840 Editions," unpublished master's thesis (Provo: BYU, 1974). Stanley Larson, "Early Book of Mormon Texts: Textual Changes to the Book of Mormon Texts: Textual Changes t
(Autumn 1977), 830 [FARMS Reprint LAR-77]; Larson, "Conjectural Emendation and the Text of the Book of Mormon," BYU Studies, 18 (Summer 1978), 563569 [FARMS Reprint LAR-77]; Larson, "Conjectural Emendation and the Text of the Book of Mormon (Provo: FARMS Reprint LAR-78]. A color of Mormon, "BYU Studies, 18 (Summer 1978), 563569 [FARMS Reprint LAR-78]. The Original Manuscript of the Book of Mormon (Provo: FARMS Reprint LAR-78].
2001); The Printer's Manuscript of the Book of Mormon, 2 vols. (FARMS, 2001). Nov 2001, p.9. Hendel, R., "The Oxford Hebrew Bible: Prologue to a New Critical Edition", Vetus
 restamentum, vol. 58, no. 3 (2008), pp.325326 a b c Wallace, Daniel. "The Majority Text and the Original Text: Are They Identical?". Archived from the New Testament in The Original Greek: Introduction Appendix, Macmillan, p.2. Retrieved 23 November 2013. "A b Westcott and Hort (1896). The New Testament in The Original Greek: Introduction Appendix, Macmillan, p.2. Retrieved 23 November 2013. "A chief the Original O
November 2013. The New Testament in the Original Greek. Beacham, Roy E.; Bauder, Kevin T. (2001). One Bible Only?: Examining Exclusive Claims for the King James Bible. Kregel Publications. ISBN 9780825497032. Ehrman, Bart D.; Holmes, Michael W. (2012-11-09). The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the
Status Quaestionis. Second Edition. BRILL. pp.190191. ISBN 978-90-04-23604-2.^ Chapman, John (1922). "St Jerome and the Vulgate New Testament (III)". The Journal of Theological Studies. o.s. 24 (93): 3351. doi:10.1093/jts/os-XXIV.93.33. ISSN 0022-5185. Chapman, John (1923). "St Jerome and the Vulgate New Testament (III)". The Journal of Theological Studies. o.s. 24 (93): 3351. doi:10.1093/jts/os-XXIV.93.33. ISSN 0022-5185. Chapman, John (1923). "St Jerome and the Vulgate New Testament (III)". The Journal of Theological Studies. o.s. 24 (93): 3351. doi:10.1093/jts/os-XXIV.93.33. ISSN 0022-5185. Chapman, John (1923). "St Jerome and the Vulgate New Testament (III)". The Journal of Theological Studies. o.s. 24 (93): 3351. doi:10.1093/jts/os-XXIV.93.33. ISSN 0022-5185. Chapman, John (1923). "St Jerome and the Vulgate New Testament (III)". The Journal of Theological Studies. o.s. 24 (93): 3351. doi:10.1093/jts/os-XXIV.93.33. ISSN 0022-5185. Chapman, John (1923). "St Jerome and the Vulgate New Testament (III)". The Journal of Theological Studies. o.s. 24 (93): 3351. doi:10.1093/jts/os-XXIV.93.33. ISSN 0022-5185. Chapman, John (1923). "St Jerome and the Vulgate New Testament (III)". The Journal of Theological Studies. o.s. 24 (93): 3351. doi:10.1093/jts/os-XXIV.93.33. ISSN 0022-5185. Chapman, John (1923). "St Jerome and the Vulgate New Testament (III)". The Journal of Theological Studies. O.s. 24 (93): 3351. doi:10.1093/jts/os-XXIV.93.33. ISSN 0022-5185. Chapman, John (1923). "St Jerome and Theological Studies."
Theological Studies. o.s. 24 (95): 282299. doi:10.1093/jts/os-XXIV.95.282. ISSN0022-5185. Scherbenske, Eric W. (2013). Canonizing Paul: Ancient Editorial Practice and the Corpus Paulinum. Oxford University Press. p.183. Pickering, Wilbur N. (2012). Identity of the New Testament Text III. Wipf & Stock Publishers. ISBN978-1-4982-6349-8.
Ratkus, Artras (6 April 2017). "The Greek Sources of the Gothic Bible Translation". Vertimo Studijos. 2 (2): 37. doi:10.15388/VertStud.2009.2.10602.^ Bennett, William, 1980, An Introduction to the Gothic Language, pp. 24-25.^ a b c d e f Lester, Toby (January 1999). "What Is the Koran?". The Atlantic. Retrieved 10 April 2019.^ Christian-Muslim
relations: yesterday, today, tomorrow Munawar Ahmad Anees, Ziauddin Sardar, Syed Z. Abedin 1991 For instance, a Christian critic engaging in textual criticism of the Quran from a biblical perspective will surely miss the essence of the quranic message. Just one example would clarify this point. Studies on Islam Merlin L. Swartz 1981 One will find
a more complete bibliographical review of the recent studies of the textual criticism of the Quran in the valuable article by Jeffery, "The Present Status of Qur'anic Studies," Report on Current Research on the Middle East^ Religions of the world Lewis M. Hopfe 1979 "Some Muslims have suggested and practiced textual criticism of the Quran in a
manner similar to that practiced by Christians and Jews on their bibles. No one has yet suggested the higher criticism of the Quran. "^ Egypt's culture wars: politics and practice Page 278 Samia Mehrez 2008 Middle East report: Issues 218222; Issues 224225 Middle East Research & Information Project, JSTOR (Organization) 2001 Shahine filed to
divorce Abu Zavd from his wife, on the grounds that Abu Zavd's textual criticism of the Quran made him an apostate, and hence unfit to marry a Muslim. Abu Zavd and his wife eventually relocated to the Netherlands Sadeghi, Behnam (23 July 2015). "The origins of the Koran". BBC News. Coughlan, Sean (22 July 2015). "Oldest' Koran fragments
found in Birmingham University". BBC News. Retrieved 4 February 2016. Retri
Oriental and African Studies. 82 (2): 271288. doi:10.1017/S0041977X19000338. hdl:1887/79373. S2CID231795084.^ van Putten, Marijn (January 24, 2020). "Apparently some are still under the impression that the Birmingham Fragment (Mingana 1572a + Arabe 328c) is pre-Uthmanic copy of the Quran". Twitter.com. Twitter. Retrieved August 24,
2021. Shoemaker, Stephen I. "Creating The Ouran: A Historical Criticism of the Talmud is as old as the Talmud itself. In modern times, however, it
became a separate scholarly concern, where scientific method is applied to correct corrupt and incomprehensible passages." The treatise Ta'anit of the Babylonian Talmud: Henry Malter 1978 It goes without saying that the writings of modern authors dealing with textual criticism of the Talmud, many of which are scattered in Hebrew and German
periodicals, are likewise to be utilized for the purpose. Habib 2005, p. 239 a b Dimnik 2004, p.255. a b Ostrowski 2018, p.342. Ostrowski 2003, p.XIX. Margoni, Thomas; Mark Perry (2011). "Scientific and Critical Editions of Public Domain Works: An Example of
European Copyright Law (Dis) Harmonization". Canadian Intellectual Property Review. 27 (1): 157170. SSRN1961535.^ Balassi, Blint. Horvth, Ivn (ed.). "Balassi Blint sszes verse, hlzati kritikai kiads (c) 1998". magyar-irodalom.elte.hu. Retrieved 2022-10-19.^ a b Shillingsburg, Peter, "Literary Documents, Texts, and Works Represented Digitally"
(2013). Center for Textual Studies and Digital Humanities Publications. 3. Shillingsburg, Peter (January 2013). "Literary Documents, Texts, and Works Represented Digitally". Center for Textual Studies and Digital Humanities Publications. Archived from the original on 2017-08-16. Retrieved 2017-05-16. See further the useful guidelines offered by
Dekker, D-I. "Typesetting Critical Editions with LaTeX: ledmac, ledgar and ledarab", Archived from the Original Greek, 2018, Novum Testament in the Original
Academic-bible.com". Archived from the original on 2013-11-02. Retrieved 2013-10-31.^ "Review of Biblical Literature" (PDF). Archived from the original on 2013-11-02. Retrieved 2013-10-31.^ "Review of Biblical Literature" (PDF). Archived from the original on 2013-11-02. Retrieved 2013-10-31.^ "Review of Biblical Literature" (PDF). Archived from the original on 2013-11-02. Retrieved 2013-10-31.^ "Review of Biblical Literature" (PDF). Archived from the original on 2013-11-02. Retrieved 2013-10-31.^ "Review of Biblical Literature" (PDF). Archived from the original on 2013-11-02. Retrieved 2013-10-31.^ "Review of Biblical Literature" (PDF). Archived from the original on 2013-11-02. Retrieved 2013-10-31.^ "Review of Biblical Literature" (PDF). Archived from the original on 2013-11-02. Retrieved 2013-11-02. R
2010-02-08.Aland, Kurt, Aland, Barbara (1987). The Text of the New Testament. Brill. ISBN90-04-08367-7. {{cite book}}: CS1 maint: multiple names: authors list (link)Aland, Barbara (1987). The Text of the New Testament. Brill. ISBN90-04-08367-7. {{cite book}}: CS1 maint: multiple names: authors list (link)Aland, Barbara (1987). The Text of the New Testament. Brill. ISBN90-04-08367-7. {{cite book}}: CS1 maint: multiple names: authors list (link)Aland, Barbara (1987). The Text of the New Testament. Brill. ISBN90-04-08367-7. {{cite book}}: CS1 maint: multiple names: authors list (link)Aland, Barbara (1987). The Text of the New Testament. Brill. ISBN90-04-08367-7. {{cite book}}: CS1 maint: multiple names: authors list (link)Aland, Barbara (1987). The Text of the New Testament. Brill. ISBN90-04-08367-7. {{cite book}}: CS1 maint: multiple names: authors list (link)Aland, Barbara (1987). The Text of the New Testament. Brill. ISBN90-04-08367-7. {{cite book}}: CS1 maint: multiple names: authors list (link)Aland, Barbara (1987). The Text of the New Testament. Brill. ISBN90-04-08367-7. {{cite book}}: CS1 maint: multiple names: authors list (link)Aland, Barbara (1987). The Text of the New Testament. Brill. ISBN90-04-08367-7. {{cite book}}: CS1 maint: multiple names: authors list (link)Aland, Barbara (1987). The Text of the New Testament. Brill. ISBN90-04-08367-7. {{cite book}}: CS1 maint: multiple names: authors list (link)Aland, Barbara (1987). The Text of the New Testament. Brill. Brill
Definitive Edition of the Poetical and Prose Writings of Edward Fitzgerald, (1902), Doubleday, Page and Co.Bowers, Fredson (1964). "Some Principles for Scholarly Editions of Nineteenth-Century American Authors". Studies in Bibliography. 17: 223228. Retrieved 2006-04. Bowers, Fredson (1972). "Multiple Authority: New Problems and Concepts
of Copy-Text". Library. Fifth Series. XXVII (2): 81115. doi:10.1093/library/s5-XXVII.2.81.Bradley, Sculley, Leaves of Grass: A Textual Variorum of the Printed Poems, (1980), NYU Press, ISBN0-8147-9444-0Comfort, Philip Wesley (2005). Encountering the Manuscripts: An Introduction to New Testament Paleography & Textual Criticism. B&H
Publishing Group. ISBN0-8054-3145-4.Davis, Tom (1977). "The CEAA and Modern Textual Editing". Library. Fifth Series. XXXII (32): 6174. doi:10.1484/J.MS.2.306512. Retrieved 27 February 2023.Ehrman, Bart
818171-X.Gippius, Alexey A. (2014). "Reconstructing the original of the Poves vremennyx let: a contribution to the debate". Russian Linguistics. 38 (3). Springer: 341366. doi:10.1007/s11185-014-9137-y. [STOR43945126. S2CID255017212. Retrieved 17 May 2023. Greetham, D. C. (1999). Theories of the text. Oxford [Oxfordshire]: Oxford University
Press. ISBN0-19-811993-3.Greg, W. W. (1950). "The Rationale of Copy-Text". Studies in Bibliography. 3: 1936. Retrieved 2006-06-04. Habib, Rafey (2005). A history of literary criticism: from Plato to the present. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Pub. ISBN0-631-23200-1. Hartin, Patrick J., Petzer J. H., Manning, Bruce. Text and Interpretation: New
Approaches in the Criticism of the New Testament. (1991), BRILL, ISBN 90-04-09401-6Isoaho, Mari (2018). "Shakhmatov's Legacy and the Chronicles of Kievan Rus'". Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History. 19 (3). Slavica Publishers: 637648. doi:10.1353/kri.2018.0033. S2CID 159688925. Retrieved 25 September 2022. Jarvis, Simon
Scholars and Gentlemen: Shakespearian Textual Criticism and Representations of Scholarly Labour, 17251765, Oxford University Press, 1995, ISBN0-19-818295-3Klijn, Albertus Frederik Johannes, An Introduction to the New Testament (1980), p.14, BRILL, ISBN90-04-06263-7Maas, Paul (1958). Textual Criticism. Oxford University Press. ISBN0-19-818295-3Klijn, Albertus Frederik Johannes, An Introduction to the New Testament (1980), p.14, BRILL, ISBN90-04-06263-7Maas, Paul (1958). Textual Criticism. Oxford University Press. ISBN0-19-818295-3Klijn, Albertus Frederik Johannes, An Introduction to the New Testament (1980), p.14, BRILL, ISBN90-04-06263-7Maas, Paul (1958). Textual Criticism. Oxford University Press. ISBN9-19-818295-3Klijn, Albertus Frederik Johannes, An Introduction to the New Testament (1980), p.14, BRILL, ISBN90-04-06263-7Maas, Paul (1958). Textual Criticism.
814318-4. {{cite book}}: ISBN / Date incompatibility (help)McCarter, Peter Kyle Jr (1986). Textual criticism: recovering the text of the Hebrew Bible. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press of Virginia. ISBN0-8139-1418-3.McKerrow, R. B.
(1939). Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare. Oxford: Clarendon Press, Montgomery, William; Wells, Stanley W.; Taylor, Gary; Jowett, John (1997). William Shakespeare: A Textual Companion. New York: W. W. Norton & Company. ISBN 0-393-31667-X.Ostrowski, Donald, ed. (2003). The Povest' vremennykh let: An Interlinear Collation and
Paradosis. 3 volumes (in Russian and English). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Archived from the original on 2005-03-23. Ostrowski, Donald (2018). "Was There a Riurikid Dynasty in Early Rus'?". Canadian-American Slavic Studies. 52 (1): 3049. doi:10.1163/22102396-05201009. Parker, D.C. (2008). An Introduction to
the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-71989-6.von Reenen, Pieter; Margot van Mulken, eds. (1996). Studies in Stemmatology. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.Roelli, Philipp (2020). Handbook of Stemmatology. History, Methodology, Digital Approaches. Berlin: De
Gruyter. p.694. ISBN 9783110684391.Rosemann, Philipp (1999). Understanding scholastic thought with Foucault. New York: St. Martin's Press. p.73. ISBN 9783110684391.Rosemann, Philipp (1999). Understanding scholastic thought with Foucault. New York: St. Martin's Press. p.73. ISBN 9783110684391.Rosemann, Philipp (1999). Understanding scholastic thought with Foucault. New York: St. Martin's Press. p.73. ISBN 9783110684391.Rosemann, Philipp (1999). Understanding scholastic thought with Foucault. New York: St. Martin's Press. p.73. ISBN 9783110684391.Rosemann, Philipp (1999). Understanding scholastic thought with Foucault. New York: St. Martin's Press. p.73. ISBN 9783110684391.Rosemann, Philipp (1999). Understanding scholastic thought with Foucault. New York: St. Martin's Press. p.73. ISBN 9783110684391.Rosemann, Philipp (1999). Understanding scholastic thought with Foucault. New York: St. Martin's Press. p.73. ISBN 9783110684391.Rosemann, Philipp (1999). Understanding scholastic thought with Foucault. New York: St. Martin's Press. p.73. ISBN 9783110684391.Rosemann, Philipp (1999). Understanding scholastic thought with Foucault. New York: St. Martin's Press. p.73. ISBN 9783110684391.Rosemann, Philipp (1999). Understanding scholastic thought with Foucault. New York: St. Martin's Press. p.73. ISBN 9783110684391.Rosemann, Philipp (1999). Understanding scholastic thought with Foucault. New York: St. Martin's Press. p.73. ISBN 9783110684391.Rosemann, Philipp (1999). Understanding scholastic thought with Foucault. New York: St. Martin's Press. p.73. ISBN 9783110684391.Rosemann, Philipp (1999). Understanding scholastic thought with Foucault. New York: St. Martin's Press. p.73. ISBN 9783110684391.Rosemann, Philipp (1999). Understanding scholastic thought with Foucault. New York: St. Martin's Philipp (1999). Understanding scholastic thought with Foucault. New York: St. Martin's Philipp (1999). Understanding scholastic thought with Foucault. New York: St. Martin's Philipp (1999). Understanding scholastic thought with Foucault.
the Social Status of Texts and Modes of Textual Criticism". Studies in Bibliography. 42: 5578. Archived from the original on 2013-09-12. Retrieved 2006-06-04. Tanselle, G. Thomas (1975). "Greg's Theory of Copy-Text and the
Editing of American Literature". Studies in Bibliography. 28: 167230. Retrieved 2006-06-04. Tanselle, G. Thomas (1976). "The Editorial Problem of Final Authorial Intention". Studies in Bibliography. 29: 167211. Retrieved 2006-06-04. Tanselle, G. Thomas (1981). "Recent Editorial Discussion and the Central Questions of Editing". Studies in Bibliography. 29: 167211. Retrieved 2006-06-04. Tanselle, G. Thomas (1981). "Recent Editorial Discussion and the Central Questions of Editing".
Bibliography. 34: 2365. Retrieved 2007-09-07. Tanselle, G. Thomas (1986). "Historicism and Critical Editing". Studies in Bibliography. 39: 146. Retrieved 2024-06-28. Tanselle, G. Thomas (1992). A Rationale of Textual Criticism. University of Pennsylvania Press. p. 104. ISBN 9780812214093. (originally published 1989; first paperback printing
1992) Tanselle, G. Thomas (1995). "The Varieties of Scholarly Editing". In D. C. Greetham (ed.). Scholarly Editing: A Guide to Research. New York: The Modern Language Association of America. Tenney, Merrill C. (1985). Dunnett, Walter M. (ed.). New Testament survey. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co. ISBN 0-8028-3611-9. Tov, Emanuel
(2001). Textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress. ISBN90-232-3715-3. Van Mulken, Margot; Van Reenen, Pieter Th van. (1996). Studies in Stemmatology. John Benjamins Publishing Co. ISBN90-272-2153-7. {{cite book}}: CS1 maint: multiple names: authors list (link) Vincent, Marvin Richardson (1899). A History of the Textual
Criticism of the New Testament. Macmillan. Original from Harvard University. ISBN 0-8370-5641-1. {{cite book}}: ISBN 0-83
Greek and Latin literature. Oxford: Clarendon Press. p.186. ISBN0-19-814371-0.Zeller, Hans (1975). "A New Approach to the Critical Constitution of Literary Texts". Studies in Bibliography. 28: 231264. Archived from the original on 2013-09-12. Retrieved 2006-06-07.Epp, Eldon J., The Eclectic Method in New Testament Textual Criticism: Solution or
Symptom?, The Harvard Theological Review, Vol. 69, No. 3/4 (JulyOctober 1976), pp.211257Housman, A. E. (1922). "The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism". Proceedings of the Classical Association. 18: 6784. Retrieved 2008-03-08.Love, Harvard Theological Review, Vol. 69, No. 3/4 (JulyOctober 1976), pp.211257Housman, A. E. (1922). "The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism".
Press. ISBN0-19-811219-X.Ostrowski, Donald (March 1981). "Textual Criticism and the Povest' vremennykh let: Some Theoretical Considerations". Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute: 1131. JSTOR41035890.Robinson, Peter M. W. (1989). "The Collation and Textual Criticism of Icelandic Manuscripts (2): Textual
Criticism". Literary and Linguistic Computing. 4 (3). Oxford University Press: 174181. doi:10.1093/llc/4.3.174. Retrieved 19 May 2023. Soulen, Richard N. and Soulen, R. Kendall, Handbook of Biblical Criticism; Westminster John Knox Press; 3 edition (October 2001), ISBN 0-664-22314-1Wikimedia Commons has media related to Textual criticism. An
example of cladistics applied to textual criticismStemma and Stemmatics and Information TheoryComputer-assisted stemmatology challenge & benchmark data-setsSearching for the Better Text: How errors crept into the Bible and what can be done to correct them Archived 2012-03-14 at the Wayback Machine Biblical Archaeology
ReviewThe European Society for Textual Scholarship. Society for Textual Scholarship. Society for Textual Scholarship. Walter Burley, Commentarium in Aristotelis De Anima L.III Critical Edition by Mario Tonelotto: an example of critical edition from 4 different manuscripts (transcription from medieval paleography). Parvum lexicon stemmatologicum - A brief lexicon of
stemmatologyManuscript Comparator allows two or more New Testament manuscript editions to be compared in side by side and unified views (similar to diff output)A detailed discussion of the textual variants in the Gospels (covering about 1200 variants on 2000 pages)A complete list of all New Testament Papyri with link to imagesAn Electronic
Edition Archived 2010-11-29 at the Wayback Machine of The Gospel According to John in the Byzantine TraditionNew Testament Manuscripts (listing of the manuscript evidence for more than 11,000 variants in the New Testament).
Testament - transcription of more than 60 ancient manuscripts of the New Testament with a textual commentary and an exhaustive criticism. Catholic Encyclopedia. New York: Robert Appleton Company. Retrieved from "2Book of the New Testament Corinthians 11:3312:9 on Papyrus 46
(recto; c.AD 200)[1]Part of a series onBooks of the New Testament Papyrus 46, one of the oldest New Testament papyri, showing 2Cor11:3312:9Gospels and ActsFour EvangelistsMatthewMarkLukeJohnLukan ActsActs of the ApostlesEpistles and ApocalypsePauline epistlesRomans1 Corinthians2 Corinthians2 CorinthiansEphesiansPhilippiansColossians1
Thessalonians2 Thessalonians1 Timothy2 TimothyTitusPhilemonHebrewsCatholic epistlesJames1 Peter2 Peter1 John2 John3 JohnJudeApocalypseBook of RevelationAuthorshipLuke-ActsJohannine worksPauline epistlesHebrewsPetrine epistlesRelated topicsNew Testament canonNew Testament manuscriptsSynoptic GospelsJohannine literature
(epistles)Pastoral epistles Bible portal Christianity portalvtePart of a series of articles onPaul in the BiblePauline literature(Authorship)Romans1 TimothyTitusPhilemonRelated literatureLost epistlesApocalypse of PaulCoptic Apocalypse of PaulCop
PaulActs of PaulPaul and TheclaPeter and PaulPrayer of PaulSee alsoPaul the ApostleApostles in the New Testament of the Christian Bible. The epistle is attributed to Paul the
Apostle and a co-author named Timothy, and is addressed to the church in Corinth and Christians in the surrounding province of Achaea, in modern-day Greece.[4] According to Jerome, Titus was the amanuensis of this epistle. [5] While there is little doubt among scholars that Paul is the author, there is discussion over whether the Epistle was
```

originally one letter or composed from two or more of Paul's letters. [6] Although the New Testament contains only two letters to the Corinthian church, the evidence from the letters themselves is that he wrote at least four and the church replied at least once: 1 Corinthians 5:9 ("I wrote unto you in an epistle not to company with fornicators", KJV refers to an early letter, sometimes called the "warning letter." 1 Corinthians 2:34 and 7:8. 1 Corinthians does not match that description, so this "letter of tears" may have been written between 1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians. 2 Corinthians 2:34 and 7:8. 1 Corinthians does not match that description, so this "letter of tears" in 2 Corinthians 2:34 and 7:8. 1 Corinthians and 2 Corinthians 2:34 and 7:8. 1 Corinthians Corinthians 7:1 states that Paul was replying to certain questions written and sent to him by the church in Corinth. The abrupt change of tone from being previously harmonious to bitterly reproachful in 2 Corinthians 1013 has led many to infer that chapters 1013 form part of the "letter of tears" which were in some way appended to Paul's main letter [8] Those who disagree with this assessment usually say that the "letter of tears" is no longer extant. [9] Others argue that although the letter of tears is no longer extant, chapters 89 leads some scholars to conclude that chapters 89 were originally a separate letter, and some even consider the two chapters to have originally been distinct themselves. Other scholars dispute this claim, however.[11]Some scholars also find fragments of the "warning letter", or of other letters, in chapters 19,[12] for instance that part of the "warning letter" is preserved in 2 Cor 6:147:1,[13] but these hypotheses are less popular.[14]There is evidence that Paul wrote 2 Corinthians from Macedonia in 55 or 56 AD, roughly a year after writing 1 Corinthians from a 1486 Latin Bible (Bodleian Library). The book is usually divided as follows:[9]1:111 Greeting1:12 7:16 Paul defends his actions and apostleship, affirming his affection for the Corinthians.8:1 9:15 Instructions for the collection for the poor in the Jerusalem church can be reconstructed as follows:[9]Paul visits Corinth for the first time, spending about 18 months there (Acts 18:11). He then leaves Corinth and spends about 3 years in Ephesus (Acts 19:8, 19:10, 20:31). (Roughly from AD 53 to 57, see 1 Corinthians from his second year at Ephesus.Paul visits the Corinthian church a second time, as he indicated he would in 1 Corinthians 16:6. Probably during his last year in Ephesus. 2 Corinthians the "letter of tears". Paul writes the "letter of tears". Paul writes 2 Corinthians 2:1 calls this a "painful visit". Paul writes 2 Corinthians, indicated where he is writing from, but it is usually dated after Paul left Ephesus for Macedonia (Acts 20), from either Philippi or Thessalonica in Macedonia (Acts 20), from either Philippi or Thessalonica (Acts 20), from eit principal members of the church to the Romans.[17]Paul refers to himself in the letter as an apostle of Christ Jesus by the will not have another painful visit, but what he has to say is not to cause pain but to reassure them of the love he has for them. The letter is shorter than the first one and can be confusing if the reader is unaware of the social, religious, and economic situation of the community. Paul felt the situation in Corinth was still complicated and felt attacked. Some challenged his authority as an apostle, and he compares the level of difficulty to other cities he has visited who had embraced it, like the Galatians. He is criticized for the way he speaks and writes and finds it just to defend himself with some of his importance of forgiving others, and God's new agreement that comes from the Spirit of the living God (2 Cor. 3:3), and the importance of being a person of Christ and giving generously to God's people in Jerusalem, and ends with his own experience of how God changed his life (Sandmel, 1979). According to Easton's Bible Dictionary, This epistle, it has been well said, shows the individuality of the apostle more than any other. "Human weakness, spiritual strength, the deepest tenderness of affection, wounded feeling, sternness, irony, rebuke, impassioned selfvindication, humility, a just self-respect, zeal for the welfare of the welfare of the spiritual advancement of its members, are all displayed in turn in the course of his appeal." Lias, Second Corinthians.[17]2 Corinthians 11:19Authorship of the Pauline EpistlesCome-outerFirst Epistle to the CorinthiansThe Spirit of Detroit, 1958 sculptureTextual variants in the Second Letter of Paul to the Corinthians, or simply 2 Corinthians. [2] It is most commonly abbreviated as "2 Cor." [3] Aland, Kurt; Aland, Barbara (1995). The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism. Translated by Rhodes, Erroll F. (2nded.). Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. p.159. ISBN 978-0-8028-4098-1. Archived from the original on October 5, 2023. ESV Pew Bible. Wheaton, IL: Crossway. 2018. p.964. ISBN 978-0-8028-4098-1. 1-4335-6343-0. Archived from the original on June 3, 2021. *Bible Book Abbreviations". Logos Bible Software. Archived from the original on April 21, 2022. Retrieved April 21, 2022. *Retrieved April 21, 2022. *R J. (2005). The Second Epistle to the Corinthians. The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. p.8. ISBN978-0-8028-7126-8.^ 1 Cor. 5:9^ Adolph Hausrath, Der Vier-Capitel-Brief des Paulus an die Korinther (Heidelberg: Bassermann, 1870); similarly, James Houghton Kennedy, "Are There Two Epistles in 2 Corinthians?" The Expositor 6 (1897); reprinted in idem, The Second and Third Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians (London: Methuen, 1900). More recently see L. L. Welborn, The Identification of 2 Corinthians (1995): 138153. a b c 2 Corinthians: Introduction, Argument, and Outline, by Daniel B. Wallace at bible.org^ B. J. Oropeza, Exploring Second Corinthians: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture. The New American Commentary. Nashville, TN: B&H Publishing Group. ISBN 978-0805401295.^ New Testament Letter Structure, from Catholic Resources by Felix Just, S.J.^ THE SECOND LETTER TO THE CORINTHIANS, from "An Introduction to the Bible", by John Drane (Lion, 1990), p. 654^ Acts 20:23^ "Introduction to the Book of 2 Corinthians". ESV Study Bible. Crossway. 2008. ISBN 978-1433502415.^ a b c Corinthians 1:1English Wikisource has original text related to this article:2 CorinthiansWikiquote has quotations related to Second Epistle to the Corinthians. "Corinthians. "Corinthians bible at GospelHall.org Archived 14 September 2020; site "under maintenance for 2 days" since 2021. 2 Corinthians public domain audiobook at LibriVox Various versions Commentary articles by J. P. Meyer on Second Corinthians, by chapter: 12, 3, 4:16:10,6:117:16,89, 1013Second Epistle Frecededby First Corinthians New Testament Evistle Frecededby First Corinthians 11 Corinthians 12024 on Uncial 081 or Codex Tischendorfianus II, written in 6th century. BookSecond Epistle to the Corinthians Category Pauline epistles Christian Bible partNew TestamentOrder in the MediterraneanThe city of Corinthians 1, written in 6th century. BookSecond Epistle to the Corinthians 1 Corinthians 2 Corinthians 1 Corinthians 2 Corinthians 2 Corinthians 2 Corinthians 2 Corinthians 2 Corinthians 3 Cor is the first chapter of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians in the New Testament of the Corinthians 1:1) to the Corinthians on the Corinthians of the Corinthians 1:1) to the Corinthians of the Corinthians of the Corinthians 1:1) to the Corinthians of the Cor chapter are: Papyrus 46 (~AD 200)Codex Vaticanus (325350)Codex Freerianus (~450; extant verses 324)Codex Freerianu church of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints who are in all Achaia:[3]Timothy's name is also associated with Paul's name in the Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, both of those written to the Thessalonians, and in that to Philemon.[4]Protestant commentator Heinrich Meyer argues that "the saints who were in all Achaia" lived around the wider region but attached themselves to the Corinthian church, the "sole seat" of a church in the region. Hugo Grotius had
argued in his Annotationes in Novum Testamentum ("Commentaries on the New Testament", 164150) that the letter was intended to be sent on to "the churches in Achaia". Meyer argues that Paul would have said "to the churches" rather than "to the saints" if that had been the case.[5]Themes of "affliction" and "comfort" are dominant in these verses.[6]Paul's introduction to his letter begins in 2 Corinthians 1:3 with a thanksgiving to God the "father of mercies" (Ancient Greek: , ho pater tov oiktirmon), a Jewish term frequently used in prayer.[7] The plural ('mercies') generates a strong sense of God's many mercies alongside God's merciful nature; James uses a similar expression, the father of lights (Ancient Greek: , ho pater tov photon), in James 1:17.[4]Paul outlines his aborted plans to travel to Corinth on his way to Macedonia, return to Corinth and then travel to Judea.[8] The letter does not indicate where he is writing from, or would have been travelling from. Easton's Bible Dictionary suggests "it was probably written at Philippi, or, as some think, Thessalonica".[9] Margaret MacDonald suggests that chapters 1-9 were composed in Macedonia.[1]For all the promises of God in Him are Yes, and in Him Amen, to the glory of God through us.[10]"All the promises of God in Him are Yes" ("yea" in King James Version): the first 5 words may be rendered, "as many promises are "in Him [are] yea".[11]"And in Him Amen": that is, like Christ himself, who is "the amen, the true and faithful witness the same today, yesterday, and for ever."[11]"The glory of God through us": When the promises are received "by us", the believers in Christ, the more glory is given to God. The Syriac version has the "Amen" in the last clause, reading: "therefore by him we give Amen to the glory of God through us": When the promises are received "by us", the believers in Christ, the more glory is given to God. The Syriac version has the "Amen" in the last clause, reading: "therefore by him we give Amen to the glory of God through us": When the promises are received "by us", the believers in Christ, the more glory is given to God. The Syriac version has the "Amen" in the last clause, reading: "therefore by him we give Amen to the glory of God through us": When the promises are received "by us", the believers in Christ, the more glory is given to God. The Syriac version has the "Amen" in the last clause, reading: "the promises are received "by us", the believers in Christ, the more glory is given to God. The Syriac version has the "Amen" in the last clause, reading: "the promises are received "by us", the believers in Christ, the more glory is given to God. The Syriac version has the "Amen" in the last clause, reading: "the promises are received "by us", the believers in Christ, the more glory is given to God. The Syriac version has the "the promises are received "by us", the believers in Christ, the more glory is given to God. The Syriac version has the "the promises are received by us", the believers in Christ, the more glory is given to God. The Syriac version has the "the promises are received by us", the believers in Christ, the more glory is given to God. The Syriac version has the "the promises are received by us", the believers in Christ, the more glory is given to God. The Syriac version has the "the promises are received by us", the believers in Christ, the more glory is given to God. The Syriac version has the "the promises are received by us", the promises are received by us and the glory is given to God. The Syriac v and who anoints us is God, [12] who also has sealed us and given us the Spirit in our hearts as a guarantee. [13] Cross reference: Ephesians 1:13 Moreover I call God as witness against my soul, that to spare you I came no more to Corinth. [14] This verse is highlighted in the section heading which the New King James Version applies to verses 15-24. [15] Achaia Jesus Christ Judea Macedonia Paul of Tarsus Silvanus Timothy Other related Bible parts: 1 Corinthians 1, Revelation 3^ a b MacDonald 2007, p.1134. Aland, Kurt; Aland, Barbara (1995). The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism. Erroll F. Rhodes (trans.). Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. pp.107, 109. ISBN 978-0-8028-4098-1. 2 Corinthians 1:1: NKJV a b Lias, J. J. (1897), Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges on 2 Corinthians 1:1: NKJV a b Lias, J. J. (1897), Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges on 2 Corinthians 1:1: NKJV a b Lias, J. J. (1897), Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges on 2 Corinthians 1:1: NKJV a b Lias, J. J. (1897), Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges on 2 Corinthians 1:1: NKJV a b Lias, J. J. (1897), Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges on 2 Corinthians 1:1: NKJV a b Lias, J. J. (1897), Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges on 2 Corinthians 1:1: NKJV a b Lias, J. J. (1897), Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges on 2 Corinthians 1:1: NKJV a b Lias, J. J. (1897), Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges on 2 Corinthians 1:1: NKJV a b Lias, J. J. (1897), Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges on 2 Corinthians 1:1: NKJV a b Lias, J. J. (1897), Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges on 2 Corinthians 1:1: NKJV a b Lias, J. J. (1897), Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges on 2 Corinthians 1:1: NKJV a b Lias, J. (1897), Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges on 2 Corinthians 1:1: NKJV a b Lias, J. (1897), Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges on 2 Corinthians 1:1: NKJV a b Lias, J. (1897), Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges on 2 Corinthians 1:1: NKJV a b Lias, J. (1897), Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges on 2 Corinthians 1:1: NKJV a b Lias, J. (1897), Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges on 2 Corinthians 1:1: NKJV a b Lias, J. (1897), Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges on 2 Corinthians 1:1: NKJV a b Lias, J. (1897), Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges on 2 Corinthians 1:1: NKJV a b Lias, J. (1897), Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges on 2 Corinthians 1:1: NKJV a b Lias, J. (1897), Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges on 2 Corinthians 1:1: NKJV a b Lias, J. (1897), Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges on 2 Corinthians 1:1: NKJV a b Lias, J. (1897) German sixth edition, accessed on 28 May 2025^ MacDonald 2007, p.1142.^ Gill, J., Gill's Exposition of the Entire Bible on 2 Corinthians 1:16^ Easton, M. G., Second Epistle to the Corinthians 1:16^ Easton, M. G., Second Epistle to the Corinthians 1:16^ Easton, M. G., Second Epistle to the Corinthians 1:20: New King James Version^ a b c John Gill's Exposition of the Entire Bible on 2 Corinthians 1:16^ Easton, M. G., Second Epistle to the Corinthian the Entire Bible, 2 Corinthians 1:20^ 2 Corinthians 1:21: Lexham English Bible 2 Corinthians 1:22: NKJV 2 Corinthians 1:23: NKJV 2 Corinthians 1:23: NKJV 2 Corinthians 1:23: NKJV 2 Corinthians 1:24: Lexham English Bible 2 Corinthians 1:25: NKJV 2 Corinthians 1:26. Description 1:26: NKJV 2 Corinthians 1:26: NKJV 2 Corinthians 1:26: NKJV 2 Corinthians 1:26: NKJV 2 Corinthians 1:27: NKJV 2 Corint ISBN978-0199277186. Retrieved February 6, 2019.2 Corinthians 1 King James Bible - WikisourceEnglish Translation with Parallel Latin Vulgate Archived June 17, 2019, at the Wayback MachineOnline Bible dateway (NKJV, NIV NRSV etc.)Retrieved from " 4Chapter of the New Testament2 Corinthians 11:3312:9. This manuscript contains almost complete parts of the whole Pauline epistles. BookSecond Epistle to the Corinthians 11:3312:9. This manuscript contains almost complete part of the whole Pauline epistles. BookSecond Epistle to the Corinthians 11:3312:9. This manuscript contains almost complete part New Testament (11) and the corinthians (12) and the corinthians (13) and the corinthians (1 TestamentOrder in the Christian part82 Corinthians 10 is the tenth chapter of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians 1:1) in Macedonia in 5556 CE.[1] According to theologian Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, chapters 1013 "contain the third chief section of the Epistle, the apostle's polemic vindication of his apostolic dignity and efficiency, and then the conclusion".[2] According to Margaret MacDonald, they "set the stage" for Paul's forthcoming visit to Corinth. The whole of this third section is based upon the conviction that "the apostle's authority is rooted
in the fact that his personal strength/weakness echoes the strength/weakness of the crucified/resurrected Christ".[3] The original text was written in Koine Greek. This chapter are:Papyrus 46 (~AD 200)Codex Vaticanus (325350)Codex Sinaiticus (330360)Codex Alexandrinus (400440)Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus (~450; extant verses 1,810,1718)Codex Freerianus (~550). Corinthians 10:17: Jeremiah 9:242 Corinthians 10:17: Jeremiah 9:2 are "not carnal", (Biblical Greek:, ou sarkika). He does not rely on human power and authority or on learning or eloquence.[5]Paul knows that he is criticised for being bold and direct in his writings but treated as weak and unassertive when he is present: he has made the same point in verse 1,I who am humble when face to face with you, but bold toward you when I am away.[6]Biblical commentator Edward Plumptre notes also considered to be "a proof that he was shirking [an] encounter".[7]But "he who glories, let him glory in the Lord."[8]Believers should not glory in themselves or in the outward circumstances of their lives, or their "inward endowments of mind", but rather "in the Lord Jesus Christ, as the author and donor of all gifts, natural and spiritual".[9]MacedoniaTitusRelated Bible parts: Psalm 34, Psalm 44, Jeremiah 9, 1 Corinthians 1, 2 Corinthians 11^ MacDonald 2007, p.1134.^ Meyer, H. W. W. (1880), Meyer's NT Commentary on 2 Corinthians 10, accessed September 8, 2017 Accessed September 8, 2017 MacDonald 2007, p.1145. 2 Corinthians 10:4: New Revised Standard Version Plumptre, E., Ellicott's Commentary for English Readers on 2 Corinthians 10, accessed September 9, 2017 2 Corinthians 10:17: New King James Version Gill, J., John Gill's Exposition of the Entire Bible, 2 Corinthians 10:17, accessed on 26 June 2025MacDonald, Margaret (2007). "66. 2 Corinthians 10:17, accessed on 26 June 2025MacDonald, Margaret (2007). "67. Corinthians 10:17 (2007). "68. 2 Corinthians 10:18 (2007). "68. 2 University Press. pp.11341151. ISBN 978-0199277186. Retrieved February 6, 2019.2 Corinthians 10 King James Bible - Wikisource English Translation with Parallel Latin Vulgate Archived June 17, 2019, at the Wayback Machine Online Bible at Gospel Hall.org (ESV, KJV, Darby, American Standard Version, Bible in Basic English) Multiple bible versions at Bible Gateway (NKJV, NIV, NRSV etc.)Retrieved from "5The following pages link to 2 Corinthians 10 External tools(link counttransclusion countsorted list) See help page for transcluding these entriesShowing 25 items. View (previous 50 | next 50) (20 | 50 | 100 | 250 | 500) Second Epistle to the Corinthians (links | edit)Thorn in the flesh (links edit)The Spirit of Detroit (links | edit)Eerkeley Divinity School at Yale (links | edit)2 Corinthians 1 (links | edit)2 Corinthians 3 (links | edit)2 Corinthians 3 (links | edit)2 Corinthians 4 (links | edit)2 Corinthians 6 (links | edit)2 Corinthians 6 (links | edit)2 Corinthians 1 (links | edit)2 Corinthians 6 (links | edit)2 Corint Corinthians 7 (links | edit)2 Corinthians 8 (links | edit)2 Corinthians 12 (links | edit)2 Corinthians 13 (links | edit)2 Corinthians 10 (transclusion) (links | edit) Wikipedia: Contributor copyright investigations/20221029 (links | edit) Template: Second Epistle to the Corinthians (links | edit) What is textual criticism? Definition and Purpose Textual criticism is the disciplined study of ancient documents to determine, as accurately as possible, their original wording. When applied to the Bible, this process examines the surviving Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek manuscripts-along with various translations and citations-to ensure that the text we read reflects what the original authors wrote. The field addresses discrepancies (or variants) among the multiple copies and manuscript families and aims to resolve them so that readers can be confident in the reliability of Scripture. As it has been said, All Scripture is God-breathed and is useful for instruction, for conviction, for c flourish with the abundance of classical texts in the eras following the invention of the printing press (mid-15th century). Scholars recognized the need to compare available copies of ancient works to detect scribal errors or intentional modifications. In the realm of biblical studies, this work gained special importance because of the unique significance of Scripture within communities of faith. Early Jewish scribes, including those of the Masoretic tradition, meticulously counted letters and words to preserve the Hebrew text. By examining manuscripts from different time periods-from the earliest Hebrew text. By examining manuscripts from different time periods from different time periods from the earliest Hebrew scrolls (such as those found among the Dead Sea Scrolls in Qumran, which date as early as the third century BC) to Greek papyri and later codices-textual critics trace the transmission of the biblical text through successive generations. This ongoing process has borne a wealth of evidence that supports the faithful preservation of Scripture throughout history. Primary Goals and Methods 1. Reconstructing the Original Text: Textual critics study differences in manuscript copies to work backward toward the earliest possible text. This includes analyzing word choices, comparing grammatical forms, and noting peculiar readings that might reveal a scribe's mistake or a deliberate marginal note. 2. Evaluating External and Internal Evidence: - *External Evidence* looks at the age of the manuscript, its geographical distribution, and its relationship to other copies. The Dead Sea Scrolls are a prime example of external evidence* considers how likely a variation is, based on the authors style, vocabulary, context, and the scribes common habits of misspelling or harmonizing a reading with a known parallel passage.3. Weighing Families (Alexandrian, Byzantine, Western, etc.). Each family displays certain characteristic tendencies, often traced to specific regions or historical situations. 4. Resolving Variants and Forming a Critical Text: After analyzing the evidence, specialists propose the critical text. This critical text is not the final word but a living scholarly effort, revised as new manuscripts or discoveries come to light. Key Manuscript Witnesses1. Old Testament Witnesses1. *Masoretic Text (MT):* Carefully preserved by Jewish scribes known as the Masoretes between the 6th and 10th centuries AD. They developed vowel-pointing systems to ensure proper pronunciation and precision of the Hebrew text. - *Dead Sea Scrolls:* Discovered in 1947 near the Qumran settlement, these scrolls include portions of almost every book of the Old Testament, offering critical insight into the textual tradition centuries before the MT. Many passages show remarkable consistency with the MT, giving further evidence of reliable transmission. New Testament, some fragments date as early as the second century AD (e.g., P52, often linked to the Gospel of John). - *Codices:* Famous codices such as Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and Alexandrinus (4th and 5th centuries AD) contain most or all of the New Testament and are foundational for modern editions of the Greek text. - *Lectionaries and Quotes:* Quotations from early church leaders (e.g., Ignatius, Polycarp, Irenaeus) and the widespread church lectionaries help confirm established readings in various regions. Examples of Textual Variants 1. Mark 16:9-20: Some manuscripts end Mark at verse 8, while others include verses 9-20. Textual variants 1. Mark 16:9-20: Some manuscripts end Mark at verse 8, while others include verses 9-20. Textual variants 1. Mark 16:9-20: Some manuscripts end Mark at verse 8, while others include verses 9-20. Textual variants 1. Mark 16:9-20: Some manuscripts end Mark at verse 8, while others include verses 9-20. Textual variants 1. Mark 16:9-20: Some manuscripts end Mark at verse 8, while others include verses 9-20. Textual variants 1. Mark 16:9-20: Some manuscripts end Mark at verse 8, while others include verses 9-20. Textual variants 1. Mark 16:9-20: Some manuscripts end Mark at verse 8, while others include verses 9-20. Textual variants 1. Mark 16:9-20: Some manuscripts end Mark 16:9-20: early manuscript support and the style of writing. 2. John 7:53-8:11: The story of the woman caught in adultery appears in many later manuscripts. Some early Greek manuscripts omit this section or place it in different locations (e.g., at the end of the Gospel of John or in the Gospel of Luke). Scholars look at the evidence to determine whether it was part of the original text or a subsequent addition. Despite these well-known variants, no major doctrine hinges on them. Even where variants exist, the overall message of Scripture remains fully intact. Archaeological and Historical study often confirm the context and reliability of the events described in Scripture. For example: The Dead Sea Scrolls not only validated the faithfulness of the Hebrew text through century BC) references the House of David, providing extrabiblical mention of the biblical monarch. The Pool of Bethesda in Jerusalem, featured in John 5:2-9, was once questioned. Later excavations revealed a pool with five porticoes, consistent with Johns description. Such finds illustrate that references within Scripture align with known geographic and historical realities. In the broader sphere of biblical origins, geological and historical arguments have been presented for a worldwide Flood event, consistent with the narrative in Genesis (Genesis 6-9). Geological features, such as large fossil graveyards and sedimentary strata laid down over massive areas of various continents, have been cited by some researchers as consistent with rapid burial scenarios. These considerations intersect with the textual transmission of the Genesis narrative, which has been preserved in the same manner as other biblical texts. Consistency and Reliability of Scripture From a textual criticism standpoint, the evidence for the integrity of the
Bible is unparalleled. The New Testament, for instance, is preserved in thousands of Greek manuscripts, as well as thousands more in Latin, Coptic, Syriac, and other ancient translations. Quotations used by early Christian writers-even if all actual manuscripts were lost-would reconstruct nearly the entire New Testament, the demonstrated alignment between the Masoretic Text and the Dead Sea Scrolls underscores its stability across centuries. These findings corroborate that, The grass withers and the flowers fall, but the word of our God stands forever. (Isaiah 40:8) Additionally, the genealogies of Christ (Matthew 1; Luke 3), reveal a coherent storyline that resonates with a purposeful narrative. Textual critics testify that the manuscripts preserving these accounts have consistent witness across multiple sources, addressing concerns about authenticity. Relevance to Modern Faith and Practice 1. Confidence in Scriptures Witness: Because textual criticism shows how carefully Scripture has been preserved, readers can be confident in their Bibles faithfulness to the original. This becomes paramount when studying foundational beliefs, including the resurrected Christ as the central tenet of the Christian faith. Heaven and earth will pass away, but My words will never pass away. (Matthew 24:35)2. Guarding Against Misunderstanding: By examining where minor textual variants exist, pastors, teachers, and everyday readers can better understand biblical passages in their historical, cultural, and linguistic contexts. This process enriches rather than undermines the believers engagement with Scripture.3. Unity Amid Diversity: Even if certain manuscripts contain variations, biblical textual criticism confirms the cohesive message throughout Scripture. Manuscript families or variations never change the essential teaching regarding Gods redemptive plan, culminating in Christs death, burial, and resurrection. Conclusion Textual criticism is a rigorous field quotations from church leaders-demonstrate a remarkable level of consistency that upholds the trustworthiness of Scripture. Archaeological discoveries-from the ancient pool of Bethesda to mentions of King David on the Tel Dan Stele-correspond with the biblical record and bolster evidence for events recorded in the text. Even where questions of chronology and the earths history arise, the manuscript evidence for Scripture remains robust, pointing to a deliberate design and superintendence throughout the ages. These convergent lines of evidence assure students of the Bible that the words available today are rooted in the authoritative Scriptures that have withstood the test of time. Textual criticism, therefore, is not just an academic pursuit but a vital undertaking for all who value the message and reliability of Gods revealed Word. Textual Criticism is the science ofstudying ancient manuscripts to determine the authentic text of the Bible. It is sometimes called Lower Criticism. It is necessary because we no longerpossess the original manuscripts of Moses, Paul and others. Textual Criticismdeals with Hebrew and Greek, not English translations. Because of the many other languages involved, it is oneof the many other languages involved. OLD TESTAMENT 1. Manuscripts, A. There are about 1,000 Hebrew manuscripts, plus thousands of mere scraps. The Pentateuchis contained in more of them than any other part of the Hebrew Bible. Hand-copying by scribes virtually ceased with the introduction of the printing press in the 15th century. Hebrew Bibles were among the first printed Someancient manuscripts had been destroyed during anti-Jewish persecutions, such asthe Crusades. There are far fewer Hebrew manuscripts for the O.T. than Greekmanuscripts for the O.T. than Greekmanuscripts for the Porsecutions, such asthe Crusades. There are, however, proportionately fewer variations in the Hebrew than in the Greek. Hebrew scribes were more accurate, mainly for religious reasons but also because they copied in their native languages whereas many Greek manuscripts agree even tend to disagree even tend variations in manuscripts were made in order to counterChristianity, but most were mere slips of the pen or other unintentionalerrors. E. Manymanuscripts have Qere and Ketib. That is, a word is written in themargin indicating the true reading or pronunciation of the text. F. The Dead Sea Scrolls are the oldest manuscripts - 1,000 years older than any others, except a few scraps. They date from before AD 70 and probably much older. Yetthere is a remarkable agreement between these and the later manuscripts. G. The Massoretes were Jewish scribes around the 8th and 9th centuries. Since ancient Hebrewused only consonants, problems arose over the pronunciations. The Massoretes added vowels. They also devised an elaborate system of statistics of wordfrequency, number of sentences, number of sente century) is the oldest manuscript from the old Massoretictradition known as the Ben Asher text. It was partially destroyed in a fire inIsrael in 1948, but photographs remain. It is said to be the officialmanuscript of Maimonides, the leading medieval Jewish rabbi. I. Codex Leningradiensis (10th-11th century) contains the whole O.T., but contains atext from a minority Massoretic tradition. It was made in Babylon. J. The Cairo Geniza was an ancient storeroom of thousands of Hebrew manuscripts, but most are mere scraps. It is probably the largest such collection. 2. Versions include the Septuagint (c. 150 BC), and those by Aquila (c. 130 AD), Symmachus (c. 170 AD), Theodotian (c.180 AD) and others. Origen's Hexapla (3rd cent.) contained a Hebrew OT, a Greektransliteration, the Septuagint, Aguila, Symmachus and Theodotian in parallel columns, but most of it is lost. B. The Samaritan Pentateuch (about 400 BC) is in a language and script similar to Hebrew. Variations are minor, but someof them are for specific theological reasons - the Samaritans thought they, notthe Jews, were heirs of the Covenant. C. The Aramaic Targums were paraphrasedtranslations of the Hebrew O.T. Most were written about 200 AD, but some may bepre-Christian and others much later. D. Other versions: Latin (Old Latin 150 AD, Vulgate 400 AD), Syriac (2nd to 5th centuries AD), Ethiopic, Coptic, Arabic, Armenian, Georgian, etc. 3. Families. Manuscripts and Versionstend to show similar patterns in their variations. A. Strict Massoretic era, such as inthe Dead Sea Scrolls and some of the versions and non-Massoretic Hebrewmanuscripts. C. Proto-Septuagint family consists of variants discovered when the Samaritan family occurs when the Samaritan is translated back into Hebrew and contains variations from the Massoretc tradition. 4. same is true with the New Testament Apocrypha, the Nag Hamadi writings and the like. The early Christian Church Fathers usuallywrote in Greek or Latin, and often quoted the O.T. C. The Dead Sea Scrolls include ancient writings which often quoted the O.T. C. The Dead Sea Scrolls include ancient writings which often quoted the O.T. C. The Dead Sea Scrolls include ancient writings which often quote or paraphrase the Hebrew O.T. These usually, but not always, match the Dead Sea O.T. manuscripts. Dead Sea O.T. and often quoted the O.T. C. The Dead Sea O.T. and often quote or paraphrase the Hebrew O.T. and often quoted the O.T. and often qu Ancient Jewish non-Christian writings are full of quotations from the O.T., such as Josephus, Philo, the Mishnah, the Talmuds, the Tosefta, and to on. And lastly there are some brief quotations on coins, pottery, amulets, and the like. 5. Principles. A. Some variations are obvious and unintentional - word order, misspellings, duplication, etc. Variations of a more serious order add, subtract, substitute or rephrase the text. Still, no more than about 1 to 2% is seriously debated. B. Manuscripts and making a list of the variants, and then cataloging the variations from all the manuscripts. C. Thescholars then consult the manuscripts and collations, plus the versions, quotations and Massoretic notes. Comparing editions of the Hebrew Bible is alsodone. It is a painstaking effort. Scholars, like scribes, can make mistakes. D. Using theancient versions is tricky. They all precede the era of the Massoretes. However, some are not literal translations. Moreover, translating back into Hebrew is not always exact - in the massoretes. translation loses something, then doubletranslation also loses something. It is questionable to rely on a versionalretranslation if there are no Hebrew manuscripts with that reading to context or the editor's theology (usually liberal). Some HebrewBibles contain such guesses without support from Hebrew or even the versions. F. Scriptureforbids adding to or subtracting from the Bible (Rev. 22:18-19). But it also promises that God has and will providentially protect His Word through the course of history (Matt. 24:15). THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT 1. Manuscripts. About 5,366 of all kinds, excluding those incategory E. A. Papyri arethe oldest. There are about 100 of them, many mere scraps. Most date frombefore 300 AD. Most belong to the Alexandrian family, being from Egypt. B. Majusculeswere usually written on sheepskin parchment in capital letters called uncials. Most are from before the 9th century. There are some 274 majuscules and about 80% of them are from the Byzantine family, 10% from the Alexandrian and therest from the Western and Caesarean families. The most important ones: Codex Sinaiticus (discovered near Mt. Sinai), Codex Vaticanus, Codex Vatica study we can read the original writing. C. Miniscules were written in cursive handwriting in small letters, some on paper. They usually date from after the 9th century and are by far thelargest number of manuscripts (2,795). About 90% are from the Byzantine family. D. Lectionaries collections of the N.T. for public reading in Church services, usuallynumbered sections of the Gospels. Of the 2,209, some 245 are uncial majusculesand
1,964 are in cursive miniscule script. Most are Byzantine. E. Miscellanousportions have been found among ancient inscriptions on the walls of the Catacombs, or on ostraca (some 1,624 small scraps of pottery) or amulets. 2. History. A. Many ancient manuscripts were destroyed by Roman persecution. Others were intentionally buried or destroyed once a copy was made, lest the first one fall into sacrilegious disrepair. Younger manuscripts were obviously copied from older manuscripts, most of which no longer exist. B. Not allscribes knew Greek well, especially after 500 AD. Some manuscripts were copiedone by one, others in tandem as a scribe dictated from one manuscript toseveral scribes at once. Later scribes often corrected a manuscript. Somevariations are known to exist. A massive and exhaustive effort is beingmade to collate and catalog them all. Most variants are minor: misspellings, word order, duplication, etc. More significant ones add, subtract, substituteor rephrase. Even so, only about 2-5% of the entire text is seriously debated. The largest sections in debate are Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:59-8:11. D. Only a few manuscripts contain the whole N.T. Many contain mere scraps or individual books(the Gospels are most represented). Acts contains the most variants, whileRevelation has fewest manuscripts but proportionately the entury. Thelargest collections of manuscripts are in the Vatican, the British Museum and the Greek Orthodox monastery on Mt. Athos in Greece. 3. Families. The variations in manuscripts andvariations, plus some of the ancient versions. Moreover, those in this familyare almost entirely identical and uniform. Most are from the EasternMediterranean. A. Alexandrianmanuscripts and readings tend to subtract (or conversely, say some, theByzantine tends to add to the Alexandrian). 5-10% of the manuscripts are inthis family. Even though they do not agree withthemselves as a few and to the Alexandrian and to the Alexandrian and the Al much as the Byzantine manuscripts do. B. Westernmanuscripts come from the Western Mediterranean and make up about 5% ofmanuscripts, plus some versions and Fathers. Also not uniform, they tend toadd. C. Caesareanmanuscripts contain mixed readings from other families. Some scholars deny that this is even a family as such. These supposedly came from Casarea. They numberless than 5% of the total 4. Versions. A. Latin: The first translated the N.T. was probably into the Old Latin (c.150AD). Jerome later translated the N.T. into the Latin Vulgate, whichbecame the standard in the Catholic Church (thus, there are over 8,000 Vulgatemanuscripts). The Old Latin tends to be Western, the Vulgate tends to beByzantine. B. Syriac: The Old Syriac is found in only 2 or 3 manuscripts from the 3rd-5th century. Plus minorones. C. Coptic: There were two major translations into a Grecianized form of Egyptian. Thefirst was the Sahidic (3rd cent), then the Bohairic (4th cent), plus minorones. D. Other versions: Gothic, Ethiopic, Georgian, Armenian, Arabic, Slavonic, Anglo-Saxon, etc. 5. Church Fathers only made allusions. B. Theirpatterns vary like the versions: some Byzantine, others Alexandrian, someWestern. C. Fathersfrom whom most quotations are being made, but a definite pattern hasemerged. All variations, versions and Fathers must be considered. Readings mustbeen must be considered. Readings must be considered must be considered must be considered must be considered. Readings must be considered must b judged by age, locality spread, number, and how they explain the othervariants. B. Conjectural Emendation is questionable, but accepted by many even when manuscript evidenceis non-existent. C. The Majority Witness school says that the Byzantine family basically contains the truetext. This text is the one underlying the KJV and NKJV.Only a minority ofscholars accept this view; most who do are usually Fundamentalists or GreekOrthodox. This view says the otherfamilies are defective; older manuscripts survived because they were defective and therefore not used or copied. This text has basically been printed in mostGreek editions before 1830 (Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, Elzivir, etc) andrecently in The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text. D. The Neutral Text school basically upheld the superiority and virtual infallibility fthe Alexandrian family. It was popularized by Westcott and Hort. When thepapyri and majuscules agree, that is the authentic text. E. The Eclectic School is the predominant view today. It says that no one family shouldpredominate, though the Alexandrian is the best. But a reading accepted by 2 or 3 of the other families against the Alexandrian would outweigh it. This school sometimes accepted by 2 or 3 of the other families, each of which contain distinctivetraits of the original. This view usually says the Alexandrian or the Westernis the oldest, the Byzantine the youngest and least reliable. This text is that which underlies the NASB, NIV, ASV, etc. F. Finally, Providential Preservation (Matt. 24:15) applies to the N.T. Let us neither add nor subtract from the Bible (Rev. 22:18-19) True textual criticism must be scholarly and reverent. As difficult as it is toscholars, and bewildering to non-scholars, it is an important field of researchbeing conducted around the world. BIBLIOGRAPHY.Geisler, Norman; and Nix, Gary; A General Introduction to the Bible (Chicago: Moody Press). Wurthwein, Ernst; The Text of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans). Metzger, Bruce; The Text of the New Testament NY and Oxford: Oxford UniversityPress) [Eclectic]. Pickering, WilburN.; The Identity of the New Testament Text (Nashville: Nelson) [MajorityWitness]. the vernacular translations of the Reformation Period. It was a printed text, not a hand-copied manuscript, created in the 15th century to fill the need for a textually accurate Greek New Testament. As the Christian message was carried abroad, the books of the New Testament were not only taken along, but also translated into the languages of the people to whom the message was given. In the transmission of the text, copies were made, mostly by Christians who were not trained in the art of the topies. As the number of copies in the different languages proliferated, it became apparent that many differences and discrepancies were found in the various versions. Eventually, it became obvious that there was a need for someone to bring textual criticism into play. Needless to say, the invention of the printing press with movable type in the mid-fifteenth century revolutionized the world of literature. The first Bible to be printed in 1456 was the Latin Vulgate. This was also known as the Gutenberg Bible. Bible scholars at that time were little concerned about the Greek languageunknown for hundreds of yearswas recovered in the West, the geographical area of the Latin Church. With the rediscovery of Greek and its inception as the language of the people, the Latin Vulgate translation was subjected to a critical examination in comparison with the Greek original. Scholars discovered numerous mistranslations or outright errors in the Vulgate. This provided a reason for printing the New Testament in its original language, Greek. Erasmus, a 15thcentury Dutch theologian, working at great speed in order to beat to press another Greek New Testament being prepared in Spain, gathered together what hand-copied Greek manuscripts he could locate. He found five or six, the majority of which were dated in the twelfth century. Working with all the speed he could, Erasmus did not even transcribe the manuscripts; he merely made notes on the manuscripts themselves and sent them to the printers. The entire New Testament was printed in about six to eight months and published in 1516. It became a best seller, despite its errors, and the first printing was soon gone. A second edition was published in 1519 with some of the errors having been corrected. Erasmus published two other editions in 1527 and 1535. Stung by criticism that his work contained numerous textual errors, he incorporated readings from the Greek New Testament published in Spain in later editions of his work. his death in 1536. In 1633, another edition was published. In the publishers preface, in Latin, we find these words: Textum ergo habes, nunc ab omnibus receptum, which can be translated as the [reader] now has the text that is received by all. From that publishers notation have come the words Received Text. The Textus Receptus became the dominant Greek text of the New Testament for the following two hundred and fifty years. It was not until the publication of the Westcott and Hort Greek New Testament in 1881 that the Textus Receptus lost its prominent position as a basis of biblical textual interpretation due to the inception of textual criticism Influential scholars paved the way for the acceptus and the establishment of the Textus Receptus is not a bad or misleading text, either theologically or practically. Technically, however, it is far from the original text. Yet three centuries were to pass before scholars had won the struggle to replace this hastily assembled text with a text which gave evidence to being closer to the New Testament Autographs. Many consider the King James Version of the seventeenth century, the Greek text used in preparing the KJV was the Textus Receptus. Both Luther and Tyndale translated the Scriptures into their vernacular languages using the same basic Greek text. Luther used the second edition of the Erasmus New Testament, and Tyndale utilized the third edition. Regardless of ones position on the Textus Receptus, it is evident that it had great influence on preserving Gods inspired Word through many centuries. Textual criticism of the Scriptures is so evidently important that all scholars and students of the Word of God need to utilize its principles in order to fulfill the biblical mandate, Study to show yourselves approved unto God, a workman that needs not to
be ashamed, rightly dividing the Word of truth (2 Timothy 2:15). Return to:Questions about the Bible are either lost, hidden, or no longer in existence. What we do have is tens of thousands of copies of the original manuscripts dating from the 1st to the 15th century A.D. (for the New Testament) and dating from the 4th century B.C. to the 15th century B.C. to the 15 attempt to determine what the original reading actually was. There are three primary methods to textual criticism. The first is the Textus Receptus was a manuscript of the Bible that was compiled by a man named Erasmus in the 1500s A.D. He took the limited number of manuscripts he had access to and compiled them into what eventually became known as the Textus Receptus. The Textus Receptus is the textual basis behind the King James Version and New King James Version. which reading occurs the most. For example, if 748 manuscripts read "he said" and 1,429 manuscripts read "they said" the Majority Text will go with "they said" the Majority Text. The third method is known as the critical or eclectic method. The eclectic method method is known as the critical or eclectic method. The eclectic method is known as the critical or eclectic method is known as the critical or eclectic method. involves considering external and internal evidences for determining the most likely original text. External evidence manuscripts found? Internal evidence prompts these questions: what are the dates for these manuscripts found? Internal evidence prompts these questions: what could have caused these varying readings? Which readings? The New International Version, New American Standard, New Living Translations use the Eclectic Text. Which method is most accurate? That is where the debate begins. When the methods are first described to someone, the person typically picks the Majority Text as the method that should be used. It is essentially the "majority rules" and the "democratic" method. However, there is a regional issue to consider here. In the first few century A.D. Latin began to become the most common language, especially in the church. Starting with the Latin Vulgate, the New Testament began to be cominant language of the church for over 1,000 more years. As a result, the vast majority of Greek manuscripts are from the eastern / Byzantine region. These Byzantine manuscripts are all very similar to each other, the Byzantine manuscripts have numerous differences with the manuscripts found in the western and central regions of the church So, it essentially boils down to this: if you started with three manuscripts, one was copied 5,000 times, and the third group is no more likely to have the original reading than the first or second group. It only has more copies. The critical / eclectic method of textual criticism gives equal "weight" to the manuscripts from different regions, despite the manuscripts from the East having the overwhelming majority. How does the critical / eclectic method work in practice? If you compare John 5:1-9 in the King James Version (Textus Receptus) and the New International Version (Critical Text), you will notice that verse 4 is missing from the NIV. In the KJV, John 5:4 reads, "For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whoseever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had." Why is this verse missing from the NIV. (and the other Bible translations which use the Critical Text)? The eclectic method works as follows: (1) The text of John 5:4 occurs in all of the Byzantine manuscripts, but not many of the non-eastern manuscripts. (2) It is more likely that a scribe would add an explanation than Eclectic Text does not include John 5:4. No matter what method of textual criticism you believe is correct, this is an issue that should be discussed with grace, respect, and kindness. Christians can and do disagree on this issue. We all have the same goalto determine the most likely original wording of the Bible. Some simply have different methods to achieve that goal. Return to:Questions about the Bible Textual criticism - what is it?Disclaimer: The views and opinions expressed in this article belong to the author and do not necessarily match my own. - Dr. Bart D. EhrmanIn the world of biblical studies and the study of ancient texts, textual criticism plays a crucial role in piecing together the past. This scholarly discipline is dedicated to determining the most accurate version of a text. In this article, Ill explain some of the core principles of textual criticism, explore various resources available for scholars, and present concrete examples of textual variants found within the Bible. By understanding the methods and challenges involved, we can get a clearer perspective on how textual criticism? Textual criticism is a vital part of the discipline of biblical studies as well as the study of ancient writing (called an autograph), textual critics look at the various manuscripts of that writing, noting differences between them and trying to get at what the original probably said. As Bart Ehrman puts it, textual criticism is the discipline that tries to establish what the original words were or at least tries to decide which words to print if there are a variety of options. As is the case with many ancient documents, we dont have a single autograph of any biblical text. What we have are manuscripts, which are copies of copies of copies, usually made years after the original was written and often differing in multiple ways. For a text such as the Bible, this presents a problem for those who believe it is inerrant: which version is free from error? For many, this question demonstrates that there is a lot at stake in the study of textual criticism. Before the printing press was invented, people could only write and copy books by hand. This left a lot of room for copyist errors. In his book Misquoting Jesus: The Story Behind Who Changed the Bible and Why. Bart Ehrman notes that (Affiliate Disclaimer: We may earn commissions on products you purchase through this page at no additional cost to you. Thank you for supporting our site!) none of these copies is completely accurate, since the scribes who produced them inadvertently and/or intentionally changed them in places. All scribes did this. So rather than actually having the inspired words of the autographs. For ancient writings such as those in the Bible for which we have no originals, textual critics examine the oldest manuscripts, noting differences called variants in the writing. In his book A Rationale of Textual criticism, G. Thomas Tanselle writes that the job of the textual criticism, G. Thomas Tanselle writes that are probably not original. The resulting text is called a critical text, the textual critics best estimate of what the original said. Examples of Variants in Biblical TextsBroadly speaking, textual variants can be put into two categories: unintentional changes and intentional changes and intentional changes and intentional changes. distracted, or sleepy, or ignorant while intentional changed it, or didnt like what it said and changed it, or thought he had a better way of putting it and changed it. Unintentional VariantsIn A Student's Guide to Textual Criticism of the Bible: Its History, Methods and Results, Paul Wegner notes a number of examples of unintentional biblical variants. One type often found is a misreading, and thus miscopying, of individual letters (these are called majuscule or uncial), the Greek word C (who) is misinterpreted as C (God). This can be seen in some manuscripts of 1 Timothy 3:16, which says either Who was revealed in flesh. Wegner further explains two other types of unintentional scribal errors called fusion and fission. Fusion is when two words which should be separated are read together. Conversely, fission occurs when two words should be joined together into one but are mistakenly separated. Both of these errors happened a lot in ancient manuscripts. Imagine, for example, reading this:One copyists would undoubtedly read this as God is now here, while another might read it as God is nowhere. Scribes had to make decisions about how to correctly read and interpret words like this all the time. In the New Testament, there are many examples of fusion. One can be found in Mark 10:40. Textual critics have decided, based on manuscript evidence, that the original likely said this:but to sit at my right hand or at my left is not mine to appoint, but it is for those for whom it has been prepared. The Greek words meaning but for whom are all hois but some manuscripts write it as allhois, one word which would mean for others. In the first example, Jesus merely admits that he doesnt decide who will sit at his right and left hands. In the second, he tells the disciples it will be others, not them, who sit at his side. You can imagine that while some of these changes make very little difference to the overall meaning of a phrase, others can make a big difference to the overall meaning of a phrase, others can make a big difference. We find an example of fission in some manuscripts of Romans 7. In some variants, the Greek word oidamen (we know) is split into oida men (On the one hand I know). The difference in meaning here is not that significant, but it is a difference which forces textual critics to decide which version is original to the text. Intentional VariantsSometimes, scribes deliberately changed something in a biblical text because they thought the text was incorrect in some way. This could mean fixing grammar or spelling, changing details to make a story more cohesive, or even making theological alterations so the text would fit with dogma. Lets look at some examples of this. In older manuscripts, scribes changed the name to Asa, which was the name of a king of Judah found in 1 Kings 15. While it may be that the scribe was trying to insert more royalty into Jesus genealogy,
it may also be that he was unfamiliar with the Hebrew name Asaph and thought he was correcting the spelling. Or both, since its often difficult to discern the intentions behind scribal changes. In other cases, scribes appear to have changed or added words to clarify what they believed was the intended meaning of the text. An example of this passage attribute a Hebrew Bible quote to Isaiah the prophet. However, the quotation is actually a composite of quotes from Malachi 3:1 and Isaiah 40:3. Apparently realizing this, later scribes attribute the quote more generally to the prophets in their manuscripts. Additionally, sometimes scribes attempted to harmonize texts, changing them so that they agreed with other texts. In John 19:20, for example, it says that the inscription over Jesus head on the cross was written in Hebrew, Latin, and Greek. Lukes Gospel doesnt say anything about the languages in a different order, apparently to harmonize it with Johns Gospel account. Did Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John Actually Write the Gospels? The New Testament Gospels are anonymous. So why did early Christians say they were written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John? And what's the evidence that they actually did? How Do Textual Critics Decide Which Variants Are the Originals? In The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration, textual critic Bruce Metzger, one of Bart Ehrmans main teachers in the field, outlines some of the criteria textual critics use to make key decisions about which manuscript evidence is likely original. Ehrman himself recommends this book for anyone interested in the field, beginners included. Among many other things, the book includes a primer on some of the basic things a textual critic has to know to do this work, including the following:- How were books made in antiquity?- How were they published or made available for reading?- What are the surviving manuscripts of the text in question?- Into what ancient languages was the New Testament translated?- How was the New Testament original New Testament said?- How was the New Testament changed by scribes over the centuries?- What verses are most disputed among scholars today? And what is probably the right answer about how those verses were originally worded? All of this knowledge helps text critics come to decisions on what was likely in the autograph of a given biblical text. The process might go like this: Lets say were text critics working on the first step is to gather as many ancient manuscripts as possible sometimes called witnesses of John 3. Having done this, we scrutinize them to find any differences between manuscripts as possible sometimes called witnesses of John 3. Having done this, we scrutinize them to find any differences between manuscripts as possible sometimes called witnesses of John 3. Having done this, we scrutinize them to find any differences between manuscripts as possible sometimes called witnesses of John 3. Having done this, we scrutinize them to find any differences between manuscripts as possible sometimes called witnesses of John 3. Having done this, we scrutinize them to find any differences between manuscripts as possible sometimes called witnesses of John 3. Having done this, we scrutinize them to find any differences between manuscripts as possible sometimes called witnesses of John 3. Having done this, we scrutinize them to find any differences between manuscripts as possible sometimes called witnesses of John 3. Having done this, we scrutinize them to find any differences between manuscripts as possible sometimes called witnesses of John 3. Having done this, we scrutinize them to find any differences between manuscripts are proportionally as the first things to be a scrutinized by the first things the first thing understanding variants is external evidence. First, older manuscripts are preferred for obvious reasons: the older it is, the closer it was to the time the original was written so it may have fewer scribal errors. In addition, critics look in the margins of these manuscripts. If the scribe added alternative readings of a phrase or passage there, it likely means that he used more than one manuscript source for his copy. Knowing this, we could then look to see which manuscripts agree with the main and marginal texts. Then we have internal evidence. Kurt and Barbara Aland outline some of this in their book The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism. Two criteria they mention go by the Latin names lectio brevior (shorter reading) and lectio difficilior is the principle that scribes tended to try to harmonize texts to get rid of inconsistencies. This means the text that is unharmonized, meaning a bit more obscure and harder to understand in the context of the passage, is likely to be the original reading. As you can imagine, there are many, many more criteria used by textual critics, so many, in fact, that it would be impossible to cover them all in this article. Im sure you can see, though, that textual criticism requires meticulous attention to detail as well as an impressive amount of perseverance. Conclusion Textual criticism is the discipline in which scholars examine multiple manuscripts of biblical texts, attempting to reconstruct the original form of each one. This is important for the Bible since we dont have a single original copy of texts from either the Hebrew Bible or the New Testament. Manuscripts in ancient times were copied by hand, leaving them open to both intentional and unintentional errors. Sometimes, a scribe was just exhausted as he copied a text and thus made a mistake. Other times, the scribe attempted to help the text along, changing words or phrases to make them harmonize with other texts or with certain doctrines he found important. The process by which textual critics decide which readings are the originals is difficult and painstaking. It involves looking at external evidence, such as the age of the manuscript and any scribal writing in the margins, and internal evidence, including the notion that shorter and more difficult readings are more likely to be original. Despite the difficulties inherent in such an endeavor, Bart Ehrman notes that there are good reasons for thinking that most of the time we can get back to a fair approximation of what ancient authors wrote. By the way, if youre interested in learning more about textual criticism, check out Bart Ehrmans online course The Scribal Corruption of Scripture. TEST YOUR KNOWLEDGE of the Historical Jesus! Think you know the Jesus of the Bible? Uncover the historical figure behind the texts!

What is textual criticism and how is it used in the study of the bible. What is textual criticism. What is textual criticism and why is it important in biblical studies. Textual criticism of the new testament. Textual criticism of the old testament.

do peonies need plant food
macmillan education students books answers class 6 english
windows xp arabic language pack download sp3 iso