

**Chapter 1 : Virgil in Late Antiquity, the Middle Ages, and the Renaissance: An Online Bibliography**

*www.nxgvision.com* Reading an apparatus criticus is hard enough for a human to do; for a computer, it's impossible—at least if the apparatus hasn't been encoded. Critical editions in print are heavily encoded, but in a way that only humans with special training and lots of experience can decode.

There is more to it than simply choosing the readings of the oldest available manuscripts. Here are three historically important sets of rules published by some influential scholars of textual criticism: Bengel, Griesbach, and Hort. Critical Rules of Johann Albrecht Bengel In his essay *Prodromus Novi Testamenti recte cauteque ordinandi* [Forerunner of a New Testament to be settled rightly and carefully], Denkendorf, Johann Albrecht Bengel, a Lutheran schoolmaster, published a prospectus for an edition of the Greek Testament which he had already begun to prepare published in . In it he outlines his text-critical principles, which included a novel classification of manuscripts into two primitive groups: The first group he supposed to be of Byzantine origin, and to it belonged the majority of modern manuscripts and the Syriac version; the second, of Egyptian provenance, was represented by Codex Alexandrinus and the manuscripts of the early Latin and Coptic versions. In this work Bengel also set forth a very influential rule of criticism: This rule he expressed in four pregnant words: By far the more numerous portions of the Sacred Text thanks be to God labour under no variety of reading deserving notice. These portions contain the whole scheme of salvation, and establish every particular of it by every test of truth. Every various reading ought and may be referred to these portions, and decided by them as by a normal standard. The text and various readings of the New Testament are found in manuscripts and in books printed from manuscripts, whether Greek, Latin, Graeco-Latin, Syriac, etc. We include all these under the title of Codices, which has sometimes as comprehensive a signification. These codices, however, have been diffused through churches of all ages and countries, and approach so near to the original autographs, that, when taken together, in all the multitude of their varieties, they exhibit the genuine text. No conjecture is ever on any consideration to be listened to. It is safer to bracket any portion of the text, which may haply to appear to labour under inextricable difficulties. All the codices taken together, should form the normal standard, by which to decide in the case of each taken separately. The Greek codices, which possess an antiquity so high, that it surpasses even the very variety of reading, are very few in number: Although versions and fathers are of little authority where they differ from the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, yet, where the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament differ from each other, those have the greatest authority, with which versions and fathers agree. The text of the Latin Vulgate, where it is supported by the consent of the Latin fathers, or even of other competent witnesses, deserves the utmost consideration, on account of its singular antiquity. The number of witnesses who support each reading of every passage ought to be carefully examined: And so, in fine, more witnesses are to be preferred to fewer; and, which is more important, witnesses who differ in country, age, and language, are to be preferred to those who are closely connected with each other; and, which is most important of all, ancient witnesses are to be preferred to modern ones. For, since the original autographs and they were written in Greek can alone claim to be the well-spring, the amount of authority due to codices drawn from primitive sources, Latin, Greek, etc. A Reading, which does not allure by too great facility, but shines with its own native dignity of truth, is always to be preferred to those which may fairly be supposed to owe their origin to either the carelessness or the injudicious care of copyists. Thus, a corrupted text is often betrayed by alliteration, parallelism, or the convenience of an Ecclesiastical Lection, especially at the beginning or conclusion of it; from the occurrence of the same words, we are led to suspect an omission; from too great facility, a gloss. Where the passage labours under a manifold variety of readings, the middle reading is the best. There are, therefore, five principal criteria, by which to determine a disputed text. The antiquity of the witnesses, the diversity of their extraction, and their multitude; the apparent origin of the corrupt reading, and the native colour of the genuine one. When these criteria all concur, no doubt can exist, except in the mind of a sceptic. When, however, it happens that some of these criteria may be adduced in favour of one reading, and some in favour of another, the critic may be drawn sometimes in this, sometimes in that direction; or, even should he decide, others may be less ready to

submit to his decision. When one man excels another in powers of vision, whether bodily or mental, discussion is vain. In such a case, one man can neither obtrude on another his own conviction, nor destroy the conviction of another; unless, indeed, the original autograph Scriptures should ever come to light. Moody reprint, page The shorter reading, if not wholly lacking the support of old and weighty witnesses, is to be preferred over the more verbose. For scribes were much more prone to add than to omit. They hardly ever leave out anything on purpose, but they added much. It is true indeed that some things fell out by accident; but likewise not a few things, allowed in by the scribes through errors of the eye, ear, memory, imagination, and judgment, have been added to the text. The shorter reading, even if by the support of the witnesses it may be second best, is especially preferable-- a if at the same time it is harder, more obscure, ambiguous, involves an ellipsis, reflects Hebrew idiom, or is ungrammatical; b if the same thing is read expressed with different phrases in different manuscripts; c if the order of words is inconsistent and unstable; d at the beginning of a section; e if the fuller reading gives the impression of incorporating a definition or interpretation, or verbally conforms to parallel passages, or seems to have come in from lectionaries. But on the contrary we should set the fuller reading before the shorter unless the latter is seen in many notable witnesses -- a if a "similarity of ending" might have provided an opportunity for an omission; b if that which was omitted could to the scribe have seemed obscure, harsh, superfluous, unusual, paradoxical, offensive to pious ears, erroneous, or opposed to parallel passages; c if that which is absent could be absent without harm to the sense or structure of the words, as for example prepositions which may be called incidental, especially brief ones, and so forth, the lack of which would not easily be noticed by a scribe in reading again what he had written; d if the shorter reading is by nature less characteristic of the style or outlook of the author; e if it wholly lacks sense; f if it is probable that it has crept in from parallel passages or from the lectionaries. The more difficult and more obscure reading is preferable to that in which everything is so plain and free of problems that every scribe is easily able to understand it. Because of their obscurity and difficulty chiefly unlearned scribes were vexed by those readings-- a the sense of which cannot be easily perceived without a thorough acquaintance with Greek idiom, Hebraisms, history, archeology, and so forth; b in which the thought is obstructed by various kinds of difficulties entering in, e. The harsher reading is preferable to that which instead flows pleasantly and smoothly in style. A harsher reading is one that involves an ellipsis, reflects Hebrew idiom, is ungrammatical, repugnant to customary Greek usage, or offensive to the ears. The more unusual reading is preferable to that which constitutes nothing unusual. Therefore rare words, or those at least in meaning, rare usages, phrases and verbal constructions less in use than the trite ones, should be preferred over the more common. Surely the scribes seized eagerly on the more customary instead of the more exquisite, and for the latter they were accustomed to substitute definitions and explanations especially if such were already provided in the margin or in parallel passages. Expressions less emphatic, unless the context and goal of the author demand emphasis, approach closer to the genuine text than discrepant readings in which there is, or appears to be, a greater vigor. For polished scribes, like commentators, love and seek out emphases. The reading that, in comparison with others, produces a sense fitted to the support of piety especially monastic is suspect. Preferable to others is the reading for which the meaning is apparently quite false, but which in fact, after thorough examination, is discovered to be true. Among many readings in one place, that reading is rightly considered suspect that manifestly gives the dogmas of the orthodox better than the others. When even today many unreasonable books, I would not say all, are scratched out by monks and other men devoted to the Catholic party, it is not credible that any convenient readings of the manuscripts from which everyone copied would be neglected which seemed either to confirm splendidly some Catholic dogma or forcefully to destroy a heresy. For we know that nearly all readings, even those manifestly false, were defended on the condition that they were agreeable to the orthodox, and then from the beginning of the third century these were tenaciously protected and diligently propagated, while other readings in the same place, which gave no protection to ecclesiastical dogmas, were rashly attributed to treacherous heretics. With scribes there may be a tendency to repeat words and sentences in different places having identical terminations, either repeating what they had lately written or anticipating what was soon to be written, the eyes running ahead of the pen. Readings arising from such easily explained tricks of symmetry are of no value. Others to be led into error by similar enticements are those

scribes who, before they begin to write a sentence had already read the whole, or who while writing look with a flitting eye into the original set before them, and often wrongly take a syllable or word from the preceding or following writing, thus producing new readings. If it happens that two neighbouring words begin with the same syllable or letter, an occurrence by no means rare, then it may be that the first is simply omitted or the second is accidentally passed over, of which the former is especially likely. One can scarcely avoid mental errors such as these, any little book of few words to be copied giving trouble, unless one applies the whole mind to the business; but few scribes seem to have done it. Readings therefore which have flowed from this source of errors, even though ancient and so afterwards spread among very many manuscripts, are rightly rejected, especially if manuscripts otherwise related are found to be pure of these contagious blemishes. Among many in the same place, that reading is preferable which falls midway between the others, that is, the one which in a manner of speaking holds together the threads so that, if this one is admitted as the primitive one, it easily appears on what account, or rather, by what descent of errors, all the other readings have sprung forth from it. Readings may be rejected which appear to incorporate a definition or an interpretation, alterations of which kind the discriminating critical sense will detect with no trouble. Readings brought into the text from commentaries of the Fathers or ancient marginal annotations are to be rejected, when the great majority of critics explain them thus. We reject readings appearing first in lectionaries, which were added most often to the beginning of the portions to be read in the church service, or sometimes at the end or even in the middle for the sake of contextual clarity, and which were to be added in a public reading of the series, [the portions of which were] so divided or transposed that, separated from that which precedes or follows, there seemed hardly enough for them to be rightly understood. Readings brought into the Greek manuscripts from the Latin versions are condemned. *Brevior lectio, nisi testium vetustorum et gravium auctoritate penitus destituatur, praeferenda est verbosiori. Librarii enim multo proniores ad addendum fuerunt, quam ad omittendum. Consulto vix unquam praetermiserunt quicquam, addiderunt quam plurima: In primis vero brevior lectio, etiamsi testium auctoritate inferior sit altera, praeferenda est-- a si simul durior, obscurior, ambigua, elliptica, hebraizans aut soloeca est, b si eadem res variis phrasibus in diversis codicibus expressa legitur; c si vocabulorum ordo inconstans est et instabilis; d in pericoparum initiis; e si plenior lectio glossam seu interpretamentum sapit, vel parallelis locis ad verbum consonat, vel e lectionariis immigrasse videtur. Contra vero plenior lectio breviori nisi hanc multi et insignes tueantur testes anteposuerunt-- a si omissioni occasionem praebere potuerit homoeoteleuton; b si id quod omissum est, librariis videri potuit obscurum, durum, superfluum, insolens, paradoxum, pias aures offendens, erroneum, aut locis parallelis repugnans; c si ea quae absunt, salvo sensu salvaque verborum structura abesse poterant, e quo genere sunt propositiones, quod vocant, incidentes, praesertim breviores, et alia, quorum defectum librarius relegens quae scripserat haud facile animadvertibat; d si brevior lectio ingenio, stylo aut scopo auctoris minus conveniens est. Difficilior et obscurior lectio anteposenda est ei, in qua omnia tam plana sunt et extricata, ut librarius quisque facile intelligere ea potuerit. Durior lectio praeferatur ei, qua posita, oratio suaviter leniterque fluit. Durior autem est lectio elliptica, hebraizans, soloeca, a loquendi usu graecis consueto adhorrens aut verborum sono aures offendens. Insolentior lectio potior est ea, qua nil insoliti continetur. Vocabula ergo rariora, aut hac saltem significatione, quae eo de quo quaeritur loco admittenda esset, rarius usurpata, phrasesque ac verborum constructiones usu minus tritae, praeferantur vulgatoribus. Pro exquisitoribus enim librarii usitatiora cupide arripere, et in illorum locum glossemata et interpretamenta praesertim si margo aut loca parallela talia suppeditarent substituere soliti sunt. Locutiones minus emphaticae, nisi contextus et auctoris scopus emphasin postulent, propius ad genuinam scripturam accedunt, quam discrepantes ab ipsis lectiones quibus major vis inest aut inesse videtur. Erudituli enim librarii, ut commentatores, emphases amabant ac captabant. Lectio, prae aliis sensum pietati praesertim monasticae alendae aptum fundens, suspecta est. Praeferatur aliis lectio cui sensus subest apparenter quidem falsus, qui vero re penitus examinata verus esse deprehenditur. Inter plures unius loci lectiones ea pro suspecta merito habetur, quae orthodoxorum dogmatibus manifeste prae caeteris faciet. Cum enim codices hodie superstites plerique, ne dicam omnes, exarati sint a monachis aliisque hominibus catholicorum partibus addictis, credibile non est, hos lectionem in codice, quem quisque exscriberet, obviam neglexisse ullam, qua catholicorum dogma aliquod luculenter confirmari aut haeresis*

fortiter jugulari posse videretur. Scimus enim, lectiones quascunque, etiam manifesto falsas, dummodo orthodoxorum placitis patrocinarentur, inde a tertii saeculi initiis mordicus defensas seduloque propagatas, caeteras autem ejusdem loci lectiones, quae dogmati ecclesiastico nil praesidii afferrent haereticorum perfidae attributas temere fuisse. Cum scribae proclives sint ad iterandas alieno loco vocabulorum et sententiarum terminationes easdem, quas modo scripsissent aut mox scribendas esse, praecurrentibus calamum oculis, praeviderent, lectiones ex ejusmodi rhythmici fallacia facillime explicandae, nullius sunt pretii. Hisce ad peccandum illecebris similes sunt aliae. Librarii, qui sententiam, antequam scribere eam inciperent, totam jam perlegissent, vel dum scriberent fugitivo oculo exemplum sibi propositum inspicerent, saepe ex antecedentibus vel consequentibus literam, syllabam aut vocabulum perperam arripuerunt, novasque sic lectiones procuderunt. Ejusmodi hallucinationes vix vitabit, qui libello paullo verbosiori exscribendo operam dat, nisi toto animo in hoc negotium incumbat: Lectiones ergo, quae ex hoc errorum fonte promanarunt, quantumvis vetustae ac consequenter in complures libros transfusae sint, recte rejiciuntur, praesertim si codices caeteroqui cognati ab hujus labis contagio puri deprehendantur. E pluribus ejusdem loci lectionibus ea praestat, quae velut media inter caeteras interjacet; hoc est ea, quae reliquarum omnium quasi stamina ita continet, ut, hac tanquam primitiva admissa, facile appareat, quanam ratione, seu potius quonam erroris genere, ex ipsa caeterae omnes propullularint. Repudiantur lectiones glossam seu interpretamentum redolentes, cujus generis interpolationes nullo negotio emunctioris naris criticus subolfaciet. Rejiciendas esse lectiones, e Patrum commentariis aut scholiis vetustis in textum invectas, magno consensu critici docent Respuimus lectiones ortas primum in lectionariis, quae saepissime in anagnosmatum initiis ac interdum in clausulis etiam atque in medio contextu claritatis causa addunt, quod ex orationis serie supplendum esset, resecantque vel immutant, quod, se junctum ab antecedentibus aut consequentibus, vix satis recte intelligi posse videretur. Damnandae sunt lectiones e latina versione in graecos libros invectae Hort, published a very influential edition of the Greek Testament: Hort, and in it he set forth the arguments and general theories upon which the text was reconstructed, and provided explanations for many specific textual decisions. Westcott and Hort brought the main tendency of nineteenth century textual criticism—the exaltation of the oldest Greek copies—to its culmination. They firmly set aside the Latin witnesses along with the later Greek manuscripts; but the oldest known Greek copies, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus, they elevated to a pristine class called "Neutral," and very nearly identified them with the original manuscripts. It cannot be said, however, that Westcott and Hort were simply following a tendency here, for they realized that if such weight were to be given to only two manuscripts, a theory must be offered to explain how the text given in them had so early disappeared from the manuscript tradition. And so Hort offered in the Introduction of their text a theoretical history of the manuscript tradition that met the needs of the case, or at least so it seemed to many scholars. They theorized that the "Neutral" text was the most primitive type, carefully copied for use in the worship services of the churches.

*Textual Criticism, Varro, Latin textual criticism, Helvius Cinna Collectio canonum Sanblasiana: Manuscripts, Contents, Tradition This paper reviews the seven manuscript witnesses for the Collectio canonum Sanblasiana, a large and ancient collection of Latin canons dating to about the year*

If you are or were an English or Literature major, then you already know what I am talking about. Here I am talking specifically about textual criticism applied to the Bible. Textual criticism is essentially a scientific approach to determining the origin of any piece of literature, and also determining any errors that may exist from the transmission of documents by hand we all know that the Bible was originally orally transmitted, then hand-written for many centuries in various languages before our modern Bible translations were printed. A fairly good description is given here. First, God communicated all the words of Scripture clearly and without contradiction. For example, the long ending in Mark is an example hotly debated for many years. It seems contradictory to hold a high view of Scripture as noted above and yet question the authenticity of many verses of Scripture. This research is prompted by this tension. Does textual criticism provide accuracy without devaluing the authority of Scripture? The inerrancy of Scripture presupposes that the original text is known. Textual criticism can be defined as follows: Tregelles notes the same tension “namely that a textual critic questions the authenticity of certain verses of Scripture and therefore questioning inspiration of the material itself. Tregelles desires to retain Mark Burgon criticizes Tregelles here, though Burgon himself argues for the retention of There are many Greek New Testaments. One can choose from a collection of Byzantine based manuscripts: Or a person can opt for an Alexandrian based Greek New Testament as typified by a Wescott-Hort version, and more recently with one of four Nestle-Aland editions. This list is by no means exhaustive. It simply expresses the variety. In contrast to the amount of manuscripts found in the New Testament one need look no further in antiquity than the classical Greek writers whose works have been preserved since antiquity. The Greek Anthology and the Annals of Tacitus are known to have direct descent from earlier material. A greater amount of manuscript evidence ensures a greater accuracy in the reconstruction of the original text. If only a handful of manuscripts are present, confidence in the accuracy could certainly be diminished. Further, the earliest extant New Testament manuscripts MSS were written much closer to the original writing than almost any other piece of ancient literature. Harold Greenlee notes the relationship between the manuscript evidence and inspiration, But it is important to see that the inspired, authoritative New Testament has come down through the centuries in a great multitude of ancient manuscripts that differ from one another in various details, that almost all of these manuscripts give us the Word of God, and that the exact wording of the original text can be determined only by studying the variants and applying sound principles to decide among them. The great multitude of manuscripts is a convincing proof for the inspiration of Scripture, nevertheless it is not satisfactory for all. It is often argued that the great number of variant readings among the New Testament manuscripts plays against the inspiration of Scripture. A second objection is that most of the variants do not affect the meaning of the text. The methods of textual criticism offered by Kirsopp Lake follow this general pattern. Mistakes and corruptions fall under two classes: Homoioteleuton is the omission of a letter, word or phrase. Itacism describes a copyist mistake of spelling or grammar. A modified view of B. Incidentally, it is important to note that the most significant contribution Streeter made is the principle of weighing MSS evidence rather than counting. The discussion that ensues will regard g as a separate family and d as a separate family. Hort viewed genealogy as important and elevated b by arguing that some readings of b, particularly Vaticanus and its intimate kin, are superior. Therefore all MSS of b were superior. Third, one must recognize that there is a process in the development of the text-type resulting in gradual distinctiveness and uniformity. Sixth, study the text-types book by book or section by section. Seventh, give priority to text-types that are frequently quoted. Eighth, begin with the earliest sources and work forward to the later sources. Ninth, recognize different values in different groupings. Borland briefly defines the rules of internal evidence as follows, 1 Prefer the reading that best explains the rise of other variants; 2 prefer the shorter reading; 3 prefer the more difficult reading; 4 prefer the reading most characteristic of the

author. Borland questions whether b is so infallible. Borland asks that textual criticism be altered to maintain a high view of Scripture. Only one may be discussed for the sake of space. Borland believes that this is one of the textual problems where scholars denigrate the inerrancy of Scripture. The first is Matthew 1: On the side of Asaph are the following MSS: On the other hand hundreds of Greek witnesses exist for Asa. Further, Washingtonensis and Regius L are often agreeable with codex Vaticanus. In addition, there are hundreds of cursives that exhibit independence from the Byzantine text-type and other minuscules stating at the ninth century, which 33 of them align themselves constantly with X and B. Only a preconceived idea could favor the dozen Alexandrian texts above the hundreds of Greek witness covering a vast geographical region and dating from fifth century OL 4th on up. Again, viewing Asa as the overwhelming favorite eliminates an inerrancy dilemma. Further, it vindicates Matthew as unconfused in his Jewish genealogy by faulting the scribal tradition for an error in some of the MSS but maintaining the correct rendering in most. There is a dividing line between those who hold to the Byzantine textform or an eclectic textform usually favoring the Alexandrian textform. The issue, Robinson and Pierpont believe, is Byzantine priority wherein a division in Byzantine-era manuscripts necessitated consultation of all other ancient manuscripts under the standard textual critical methods. The following is not intended to be exhaustive nor is intended to be revisionist. What is included here is that which leads up to the tension between eclecticists and Byzantine prioritists. In the fifteenth century Biblical scholars were more concerned with the Latin Vulgate. The first Latin edition was printed in Guttenburg Bible. In through , the Elzevir brothers of Holland dominated the scene with seven editions. The second edition became the standard text for the continental United States. Johannes Albert Bengel published a text in deserting the Textus Receptus when other preferable readings were already in print. Bengel began a classification system calling them African or Asiatic. John Jacob Wetstein published the Textus Receptus with the true readings in the apparatus designating uncials by capital letters and minuscules by Arabic numbers. Samuel Prideaux Tregelles also collated MSS, published his own critical text with a critical apparatus and explanation of textual critical principles. Tischendorf included citations of Greek MSS, versions, and patristic evidence. Perhaps the two most important textual critical scholars, Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Antony Hort, coupled together and published a twenty eight year work in two volumes under the title The New Testament in the Original Greek Intrinsic probability relates to internal evidence e. External evidence related to the testimony of MSS, versions, patristic citations, etc. Westcott and Hort divided MSS witnesses into four groups: Scrivener, and by J. Burgon coupled with Edward Miller. Burgon and Miller argued a threefold defense: Robinson and William G. It took twenty-eight years to finish the New Testament but it did ultimately dethrone the Textus Receptus. With equal chance at authenticity it had to be determined what families represented a more original reading. Westcott and Hort are now criticized for not providing evidence or the application of the method on the New Testament. Klijn doubts whether grouping MSS in families i. Burgon has questioned most of the eight. Out of all that, Pickering states that only a few cases of Syrian conflation[iv] may be culled. Finally, Lake questioned whether in a triple variant the longer reading could be assumed a conflation of two shorter readings apart from Patristic evidence. Origen also had no settled text; he sided with the Textus Receptus times and the Neutral text with Western combined totaled times. Irenaeus sided with the Textus Receptus 63 times and the Western plus Neutral 41 times. Hippolytus cited two long passages 1 Thess. P46 agrees with a number of previously discarded Byzantine readings. Thirteen percent of Byzantine readings considered late have been proved by Papyrus Bodmer II to be early readings. Sturz conservatively estimated distinctive Byzantine readings supported by Papyri. Colwell even places Byzantine readings in this early second century: Hort postulated that the church Father Lucian worked with copyists and created a recension of which the Syrian text is made. Burgon scoffs since there is simply not a trace of historical evidence. Pickering reconstructs the historical textual transmission first acknowledging that from the time of Irenaeus there is no doubt that the New Testament writings are considered Scripture. Rome held Mark and Romans. Matthew and James were held by Asia Minor or Palestine. Jude was possibly held by Asia Minor. There was free travel and exchange between the churches, which practiced weekly Scripture readings. Any questions of accuracy could still be checked against faithful copies of the autographs if they had perished AD. It would take cataclysmic circumstances to overthrow such

statistical probability.

**Chapter 3 : Textual Criticism | Digital Latin Library**

*Textual criticism is a branch of textual scholarship, philology, and literary criticism that is concerned with the identification of textual variants in either manuscripts or printed books.*

Because publishers prefer not to sacrifice much real estate on a page to printing information that they think only some readers will use, textual scholars have developed a way of compressing the information into the allotted space using abbreviations and symbols. Consider all of the types of information that appear in the entries on a single page: Editors of print editions rely on readers to decode the various visual cues provided by symbols e. Without access to a clear legend at the beginning of a printed edition, a reader can become confused, especially since different publishers use typographical conventions differently. In a digital edition, however, editors can encode meaning directly. Instead of relying on a reader to understand that roman type denotes a variant reading and italic type indicates editorial remarks, the editor can use Extensible Markup Language XML to make those distinctions explicit, so that readers do not have to divine what is meant by a typographical convention. In other words, digital editions give editors more control over communicating what they think is important and meaningful information. How that information is displayed depends on the needs of a particular reader or group of readers. Content, not Display In the world of print publication, the content of an edition is literally bound together with its presentation. That has an effect on the usability of the edition as a whole, since the size of the page limits the amount of information it can hold. We can design a layout that resembles a traditional printed edition, which is useful if someone wants to have a hard copy. But we can also offer online users the ability to change the amount of information available to them at any given time. Or maybe you want to see the text with variants from a certain manuscript in place. Someone might want to have access to images of manuscripts and diplomatic transcriptions of them. Whatever the case may be, all of these things have to do with the presentation of a digital edition, not its content. Our goal is to provide authoritative, reliable, critical editions that are valuable in and of themselves as works of scholarship, but that can also be presented in a variety of formats for a variety of uses—from hard copies bound by a print-on-demand service to an eBook format for use on computers and mobile devices to tokenized data for use in sophisticated information visualization applications. The same is true for LDLT editions. Instead of being constrained by any one format, we can use XML to separate information from its visual presentation, all the while making the information easier to understand. How that information is presented will depend in large part on the way the user wants to interact with it. Since most users just want to see the text and any editorial annotations associated with it, the LDLT reading room provides a clean view of the text with links to annotations about variant readings or other information the editor has deemed important. For users who want to delve into the data, the LDLT also has a downloadable desktop application with sophisticated tools for visual data analysis. Chris Weaver and his assistants have developed a number of sophisticated text visualization tools that will help users see critical editions in new ways—from pixel-based visualization of variants to storyboard visualizations of witness groupings. The important thing to remember is that the presentation of that data is separate from the data itself. In other words, what matters is the scholarship that goes into making the edition authoritative and reliable, not the way it looks after it goes to a professional typesetter and publisher. Markup as Scholarship All of this means that semantic markup with XML must be considered part of the original, scholarly contribution of a digital critical edition, which in turn means that there must be a way of evaluating markup as scholarship. Accordingly, the DLL project is developing a rubric for assessing the quality of scholarly markup in editions submitted for publication in the Library of Digital Latin Texts. This rubric takes several standards into consideration, including not only adherence to the long-standing best practices of textual criticism, but also the guidelines established by the Text Encoding Initiative for using XML in scholarly editions.

**Chapter 4 : Rules of Textual Criticism**

*Texts, Editors, and Readers: Methods and Problems in Latin Textual Criticism (Roman Literature and its Contexts)*  
[Professor Richard Tarrant] on [www.nxgvision.com](http://www.nxgvision.com) \*FREE\* shipping on qualifying offers.

Sigerist Stemmatics or stemmatology is a rigorous approach to textual criticism. Karl Lachmann "greatly contributed to making this method famous, even though he did not invent it. This specific meaning shows the relationships of the surviving witnesses the first known example of such a stemma, albeit with the name, dates from 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. 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. The step of examination, or examinatio is applied to find corruptions. Where the editor concludes that the text is corrupt, it is corrected by a process called "emendation", or emendatio also sometimes called divinatio. Emendations not supported by any known source are sometimes called conjectural emendations. The steps of examinatio 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 manuscript is by far the best text, then copy text editing is appropriate, and if it seems that a group of manuscripts are good, then eclecticism on that group would be proper. In biology, the technique is used to determine the evolutionary relationships between different species. 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 attempt to decide which reading is closer to the original text, and so 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. Phylogenetics faces the same difficulty as textual criticism: 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. If a scribe refers to more than one source when creating 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. The method also assumes that scribes only make new errors they do not attempt to correct the errors of their predecessors. The stemmatic method requires the textual critic to group 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. Greg noted, "That if a scribe makes a mistake he will inevitably produce nonsense is the tacit and wholly unwarranted assumption. He defended an authenticity of the Pericopa Adulterae John 7: According to him Erasmus in his *Novum Instrumentum omne* did not incorporate the Comma from Codex Montfortianus , because of grammar differences, but used Complutensian Polyglotta. According to him the Comma was known for Tertullian. But in fact, the critic employs conjecture at every step of the process. For example, where there are more than two witnesses at the same level of the tree, normally the critic will select the dominant reading. However, it may be no more than fortuitous that more witnesses have survived that present a particular reading. A plausible reading that occurs less often may, nevertheless, be the correct one. It does not account for the possibility that the original author may have revised his work, and that the text could have existed at different times in more than one authoritative version. 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. This makes a Best-text edition essentially a documentary edition. Often, the base text is selected from the oldest manuscript of the text, but in the early days of printing, the copy text was often a manuscript that was at hand. Using the copy-text method, the critic examines the base text and makes corrections called emendations in places where the base text 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. 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 basis for the Revised Version of the English bible, also used the copy-text method, using the Codex Vaticanus as the base manuscript. McKerrow introduced the term copy-text in his edition of the works of Thomas Nashe, defining it as "the text used in each particular case as the basis of mine. 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 than any other, and at the same time has no ground for disbelieving that these 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. Greg, "The Rationale of Copy-Text". The true theory is, I contend, that the copy-text should govern generally in the matter of accidentals, but 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. 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 altering its reading, the obvious thing seems to be to let it stand. The resulting text, except for the accidentals, is constructed without relying predominantly on any one witness. Greg's Bowers's Tanselle[edit] 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. Starting in the s, G. The principle is sound without regard for the literary period. Citing the example of Nathaniel Hawthorne, he noted: 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, capitalization, 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. Although 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. Crane originally printed the novel privately in To secure commercial publication in , Crane agreed to remove profanity, but he also made stylistic revisions. Firstly, in anticipation of 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 systemic character of the work, the contamination 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 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 by unlimited submarine combat. The nonspecific form of censorship described above is one of the historical conditions under which Crane wrote the second version of *Maggie* and made it function. 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. If one may think of a work in terms of a spatial metaphor, the first might be labeled "vertical revision," because it moves the work to a different plane, and the second "horizontal 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 programmatic intention or to reflect an altered active intention in the work as a whole, whereas those of the second do not. But where a revision is "vertical" i. Format for apparatus[ edit ] 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 matter to appendices, leaving the critically established text "in the clear", that is, free of any signs of editorial intervention. Tanselle explained the rationale for this approach: 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 symbols or even footnote numbers into a text places additional difficulties 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. 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 alternative forms of the text". The change of name indicated the shift to a broader agenda than just American authors. The Center also ceased its role in the allocation of funds. Believers in sacred texts and scriptures sometimes are reluctant to accept any form of challenge to what they believe to be divine revelation. Some opponents and polemicists may look for any way to find fault with a particular religious text. Legitimate textual criticism may be resisted by both believers and skeptics. LDS members typically believe the book to be a literal historical record. Although some earlier unpublished studies had been prepared, not until the early s was true textual criticism applied to the Book of Mormon. 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 projectâ€”which he completed in

**Chapter 5 : Latin textual criticism in antiquity ( edition) | Open Library**

*The method of textual criticism which has been generally practised by editors of classical Greek and Latin texts involves two main processes, recension and emendation. Recension is the selection, after examination of all available material, of the most trustworthy evidence on which to base a text.*

History of textual criticism From antiquity to the Renaissance Until the 20th century the development of textual criticism was inevitably dominated by classical and biblical studies. The systematic study and practice of the subject originated in the 3rd century bce with the Greek scholars of Alexandria. Literary culture had before that time been predominantly oral, though books were in common use by the 5th century, and many texts had suffered damage because the idea of precise textual accuracy and reproduction was unfamiliar. The aim of the librarians of Alexandria was to collect and catalogue every extant Greek book and to produce critical editions of the most important together with textual and interpretative commentaries. Many such editions and commentaries did in fact appear. Alexandrian editing was distinguished above all by respect for the tradition; the text was constituted from the oldest and best copies available, and conjectural emendation was rigidly confined to the commentary, which was contained in a separate volume. An elaborate battery of critical signs was used to refer from text to commentary. These techniques were applied, though on a less ambitious scale, by Roman scholars to Latin texts. Fidelity to tradition was the chief legacy of ancient textual scholarship to later ages; the copyist was expected to reproduce his exemplar as exactly as he could, and correction was based on comparison with other copies, not on the unaided conjectural sagacity of the scribe. From about , however, a change in attitude is evident, particularly in the West. What is often called the revival of learning was in reality a practical movement to enlist the heritage of classical antiquity in the service of the new Christian humanism. In order to make them usable i. At its best, as seen in the activities of a scholar like Demetrius Triclinius , later medieval and early Renaissance criticism verges on scientific scholarship, but such cases are exceptional. For the most part the correction of texts was a purely subjective display of taste, sometimes right but much more often wrong, and resting as a rule on nothing more solid than a superficial sense of elegance. In consequence, by the s, when the first printed editions editiones principes of classical texts began to appear, most Greek and Latin authors were circulating in a textually debased condition, and it was manuscripts of this character that almost always served as copy for the early printers. Very little editing in any real sense of the word was done; the scholars who saw the editiones principes through the press generally confined themselves to superficial improvements. From Politian to Cobet This state of affairs entailed that down to the 19th century most critics were engaged not in establishing and emending texts on scientific principles but in correcting, in a necessarily unsystematic fashion, a vulgate or received text lectio recepta that was itself the product of an almost entirely haphazard process of variation and conjecture. The situation was aggravated by the fact that the manuscripts themselves, the basic materials of the investigation, were largely inaccessible to scholars. The Italian poet and scholar Politian , unlike most of his contemporaries, was aware that only through the identification and comparison of the best manuscripts could texts be improved; his notes and collations show that he understood the problem correctly as essentially one of control of the sources. Many manuscripts were still privately owned, their very existence unknown to scholars; public libraries were few and published catalogues fewer; travel was difficult, expensive, and often dangerous. It was not until the twin disciplines of diplomatic and paleography were founded by the great Benedictine monks Mabillon and Montfaucon , and developed by their successors, that a critical use of the evidence became possible; and much of the evidence itself did not become available until after the Napoleonic Wars , when most of the private stock of manuscripts passed finally into public collections. Some advances were taking place, slowly and unsystematically, in both the theory and practice of textual criticism. The history of critical method in this period is most profitably studied in the best editions of the best editors. The accepted method was to correct the text i. Divination was subordinated to authority, and any reading found in a manuscript or printed text was accounted superior to any conjecture, whatever its intrinsic merits. The first important departure from this pattern is seen in the edition of Catullus by J. Scaliger , in which the possibilities of the genealogical method,

already understood in principle by Politian and other Renaissance scholars, were exemplified by the demonstration that all the extant copies derived from a lost manuscript, whose orthography and provenance Scaliger was prepared to reconstruct. Heinsius were informed by Bentleian principles. Under his influence there grew up what may be called an Anglo-Dutch school of criticism, the two most typical representatives of which were Richard Porson and C. Its strength lay in sound judgment and good taste rooted in minute linguistic and metrical study; its weaknesses were an excessive reliance on analogical criteria and an indifference to German science and method. Its influence may still be seen in the empiricism that characterizes much critical work by English scholars. From Bentley to Lachmann The decisive influence on the editing of secular texts came from the New Testament critics of the 18th century. The printed text of the Greek New Testament in common use was still essentially that established in by Desiderius Erasmus. For his edition, produced in great haste, he had used such manuscripts, neither ancient nor good, as chanced to be accessible to him. So that there shall not be twenty words, nor even particles, difference. On the Continent, meanwhile, New Testament criticism was being developed on scientific and historical lines by a succession of distinguished scholars, notably J. They shaped the genealogical method that was later refined by editors of classical texts. Wettstein also deserves commemoration as the first New Testament critic to use sigla systematically. This was important, since some at least of the deficiencies of classical editions at this time are attributable to the lack of suitable conventions for the presentation of critical information, together with a conservative and belletristic attitude to technical jargon by publishers, scholars, and users of books in general. Though sigla occur sporadically in editions as early as the 16th century and were used by S. Haverkamp in his Lucretius in something like the modern style, they did not become normal until the second half of the 19th century. The genealogical, or stemmatic, method of recension has already been described. It is usually associated with the name of the German Karl Lachmann , but it had its origins in the work of J. Nevertheless Lachmann occupies a central position in the development of textual criticism because of the unusual power and penetration of his scholarship, the range of textual material on which he worked, and his immense contemporary and posthumous influence. His edition of the Greek New Testament ; 2nd ed. Similarly his famous edition of Lucretius is important as an exemplification of the method in action, since the tradition of Lucretius is peculiarly suitable for the purpose. The demonstration fell short of completeness, for Lachmann had not fully grasped the problem and so failed to exploit the method fully. The Lachmannian model of recension derived added authority from seemingly analogous models in other fields, especially that of comparative philology. As propagated by disciples , notably Moritz Haupt, it dominated textual studies for half a century. Related developments in the late 19th century Possibly the most important technical advance in the latter part of the 19th century was the perfection of photography. Instead of travelling in search of his material, the paleographer or critic could now assemble and study it at relatively little expense and without leaving his desk. During the last quarter of the 19th century the tempo of archaeological discovery in classical and biblical lands was vastly increased, and many new texts were unearthed. Some of these were in previously unknown languages, setting new problems of decipherment. Specifically relevant to textual studies are the many Greek papyri recovered from Egypt. These have thrown much light on the history and techniques of ancient book production and scholarship and hence, indirectly, on critical problems. Where the texts they contain are already known, their evidence has tended to emphasize our ignorance of the textual history of classical literature in antiquity itself. Papyrus discoveries have been of particular moment for the text of the New Testament. Editors of printed texts , having invariably received a classical education no other being available , had naturally followed, with minor modifications, the methods of classical editing. They would reprint the text of the last edition with such improvements as editorial taste and learning suggested but with no attempt to investigate the sources of the text. Much of the work of modern Shakespearean editors has consisted of undoing the damage inflicted by their predecessors. Its object was to devise a style of recension appropriate to the special circumstances under which early printed texts were produced and propagated, and its methods were those of analytical bibliography. These developments are of direct importance for the criticism and editing of a large range of texts of the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries, particularly those of the Elizabethan and Jacobean dramatists. They have also engendered a discussion of general methodological interest on the

role of bibliographical as opposed to historical and literary criteria in the editorial process. Critics and editors of medieval texts had also inevitably been influenced by developments in the classical field. Before Lachmann it had been usual to choose a single manuscript as the main basis for an edition. Because of the circumstances in which much medieval literature was composed and transmitted this was not necessarily unscientific, and the surviving bulk of texts was so large as to dictate that approach in many cases if they were to be edited at all. This had been the style of editing followed by the Belgian Jesuits known as Bollandists, the French Benedictines called Maurists, and the Italian scholar L. At its best it is seen in the editions of medieval Latin chronicles by the 18th-century Oxford antiquary Thomas Hearne, some of which are still standard works. A more scientific approach was adopted in the publications of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, the later volumes of which from about were produced by editors trained in the school of Lachmann. Similarly, editors of vernacular texts followed the lead that Lachmann had given in his editions of such early German poems as the *Nibelunge Not* and the *Iwein*. An important development in the application of the method was due to the medievalists G. Paris, who first emphasized the significance of common errors. But in the general uncritical enthusiasm for scientific method, the genealogical approach was too often used without regard for the special conditions under which medieval literature has been handed down. Reaction against the genealogical method Haupt had proclaimed in his lectures that his main object was to teach method. But confidence in method led to its misuse. The Lachmannian formula of recension was applied to texts, classical as well as medieval, for which it was unsuitable, often with grotesque results. This was the type of editing satirized by A. Housman in the brilliant prefaces to his editions of *Manilius* and *Juvenal* and in many reviews and articles. It flourished chiefly between and, but the dangers of excessive methodological rigidity had already been foreseen. Sauppe in his *Epistola Critica ad G. Hermannum* had emphasized the diversity of transmissional situations and the difficulty or actual impossibility of classifying the manuscripts in all cases. Jahn, in his edition of *Persius*, had repudiated the strict application of the genealogical method as unsuitable to the tradition of that poet. The most extreme position was taken by E. The limitations of the stemmatic method have subsequently been stressed in a more temperate fashion by other writers. The modern tendency is to acknowledge the validity of the method in principle while recommending a cautious empiricism in its application. For the editor of a contaminated tradition and most traditions are probably contaminated the lesson of recent research is that authoritative evidence may survive even in late and generally corrupt or interpolated sources. More radical criticism of the method has come from medievalists. In and again in the French scholar J. The point taken by H. Quentin has already been mentioned: This objection, more cogent in theory than in practice, applies with greater force to medieval than to classical texts. The linguistic and stylistic canons of classical Greek and Latin are relatively strict and well defined, whereas the vocabulary, grammar, and usage of many medieval authors especially when an oral prehistory is in question is often not certain enough to allow reliable discrimination between variant and error. Classical texts, moreover, have passed through a series of bottlenecks in their history, which have simplified editorial problems by eliminating a high proportion of the evidence cf. With a few exceptions, such as the commentary of *Servius*, only one version of each text remains to be reconstructed, whereas many medieval texts are extant in several redactions that cannot be winnowed by the stemmatic method so as to leave only one. It is immensely laborious and does not in practice possess the objectivity that its inventor claimed for it. Mechanical methods Quentin also gave a lead to later investigators in calling attention to the possibility of basing recension on the variants themselves, and the more sophisticated methods of Greg, Archibald Hill, Vinton Dearing, and J. Froger may be seen as a continuation of his work. It has already been suggested that methods of this type, so far as recension is concerned, have been of primarily theoretical interest. But the use of mechanical and computing techniques in this field is in its infancy, and assessment must be provisional.

*Rules of Textual Criticism. The text of the Latin Vulgate, where it is supported by the consent of the Latin fathers, or even of other competent witnesses.*

It is sometimes called Lower Criticism. It is necessary because we no longer possess the original manuscripts of Moses, Paul and others. Textual Criticism deals with Hebrew and Greek, not English translations. Because of the wealth of materials and the difficulties of the many other languages involved, it is one of the most difficult sciences in Bible study. The following is a brief outline of the basic facts and principles. There are about 1, Hebrew manuscripts, plus thousands of mere scraps. Hand-copying by scribes virtually ceased with the introduction of the printing press in the 15th century. Hebrew Bibles were among the first printed books. Some ancient manuscripts had been destroyed during anti-Jewish persecutions, such as the Crusades. There are far fewer Hebrew manuscripts for the O. 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 were copied by those who knew only a little or no Greek. Those that disagree even tend to disagree with themselves. Jeremiah has more manuscript variations than any other book. Some variations in manuscripts were made in order to counter Christianity, but most were mere slips of the pen or other unintentional errors. Many manuscripts have Qere and Ketib. That is, a word is written in the margin indicating the true reading or pronunciation of the text. The Dead Sea Scrolls are the oldest manuscripts - 1, years older than any others, except a few scraps. They date from before AD 70 and probably much older. Yet there is a remarkable agreement between these and the later manuscripts. The Massoretes were Jewish scribes around the 8th and 9th centuries. Since ancient Hebrew used only consonants, problems arose over the pronunciations. The Massoretes added vowels. They also devised an elaborate system of statistics of word frequency, number of sentences, number of letters in a book, and so on. They also used numerology and gematria. All this insured more careful copying. The Aleppo Codex 10thth century is the oldest manuscript from the old Massoretic tradition known as the Ben Asher text. It was partially destroyed in a fire in Israel in , but photographs remain. It is said to be the official manuscript of Maimonides, the leading medieval Jewish rabbi. Codex Leningradiensis 10thth century contains the whole O. It was made in Babylon. The Cairo Geniza was an ancient storeroom of thousands of Hebrew manuscripts, but most are mere scraps. It is probably the largest such collection. Greek versions include the Septuagint c. Variations are minor, but some of them are for specific theological reasons - the Samaritans thought they, not the Jews, were heirs of the Covenant. The Aramaic Targums were paraphrased translations of the Hebrew O. Most were written about AD, but some may be pre-Christian and others much later. Manuscripts and Versions tend to show similar patterns in their variations. Proto-Massoretic contains patterns of variants from before the Massoretic era, such as in the Dead Sea Scrolls and some of the versions and non-Massoretic Hebrew manuscripts. Proto-Septuagint family consists of variants discovered when the Septuagint is translated back into Hebrew and where these variants differ from the Massoretes. Proto-Samaritan family occurs when the Samaritan is translated back into Hebrew and contains variations from the Massoretic tradition. Most of the Hebrew O. The New Testament quotes sometimes from the Hebrew, sometimes from the Septuagint where it differs from the Hebrew, and sometimes makes original quotations. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha contain numerous quotations, usually translated into Greek. These usually, but not always, match the Dead Sea O. Ancient Jewish non-Christian writings 5. Some variations are obvious and unintentional - word order, misspellings, duplication, etc. Variations of a more serious order add, subtract, substitute or rephrase the text. Manuscripts must be collated - comparing manuscripts and making a list of the variants, and then cataloging the variations from all the manuscripts. The scholars then consult the manuscripts and collations, plus the versions, quotations and Massoretic notes. Comparing editions of the Hebrew Bible is also done. It is a painstaking effort. Scholars, like scribes, can make mistakes. Using the ancient 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 - if translation loses something, then double translation also loses something. It is questionable to

rely on a versional retranslation if there are no Hebrew manuscripts with that reading. Some Hebrew Bibles contain such guesses without support from Hebrew or even the versions. Scripture forbids adding to or subtracting from the Bible Rev. But it also promises that God has and will providentially protect His Word through the course of history Matt. About 5, of all kinds, excluding those in category E. Papyri are the oldest. There are about of them, many mere scraps. Most date from before AD. Most belong to the Alexandrian family, being from Egypt. Majuscules were usually written on sheepskin parchment in capital letters called uncials. Most are from before the 9th century. The most important ones: Codex Sinaiticus discovered near Mt. Some are palimpsests - a parchment was erased by scraping and then written over, but by careful study we can read the original writing. Miniscules were written in cursive handwriting in small letters, some on parchment but most on paper. They usually date from after the 9th century and are by far the largest number of manuscripts 2, Lectionaries are collections of the N. Of the 2,, some are uncial majuscules and 1, are in cursive miniscule script. Miscellaneous portions have been found among ancient inscriptions on the walls of the Catacombs, or on ostraca some 1, small scraps of pottery or amulets. 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. Not all scribes knew Greek well, especially after AD. Some manuscripts were copied one by one, others in tandem as a scribe dictated from one manuscript to several scribes at once. Later scribes often corrected a manuscript. Some variations are due to alteration by known heretics to suit their nefarious purposes. Over , variants are known to exist. A massive and exhaustive effort is being made to collate and catalog them all. Most variants are minor: More significant ones add, subtract, substitute or rephrase. The largest sections in debate are Mark Only a few manuscripts contain the whole N. Many contain mere scraps or individual books the Gospels are most represented. Acts contains the most variants, while Revelation has fewest manuscripts but proportionately the most variants in number and kind. Copying by hand virtually ceased after the invention of printing in the 15th century. The variations in manuscripts tend to fall down into 4 categories or families. Moreover, those in this family are almost entirely identical and uniform. Most are from the Eastern Mediterranean. Alexandrian manuscripts and readings mainly come from Egypt. Even though they tend to be older, they do not agree with themselves as much as the Byzantine manuscripts do. Also not uniform, they tend to add. Caesarean manuscripts contain mixed readings from other families.

**Chapter 7 : Textual criticism - Wikipedia**

*Texts, Editors, and Readers: Methods and Problems in Latin Textual Criticism (Roman Literature and its Contexts) - Kindle edition by Richard Tarrant. Download it once and read it on your Kindle device, PC, phones or tablets.*

It contains, moreover, many items that I have not handled in person. As a result, there are some entries that are incomplete lacking, for instance, the name of a series or publisher. There are also, in all likelihood, some simple errors of transcription. If you find errors or lacunae, please send them to david.virgil. In print, see the excellent bibliographies by Suerbaum et al. Some of these last are also online. Textual Criticism Courtney, E. Testo virgiliano e tradizione indiretta: Summary in Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 80 Raccolta di saggi su Virgilio e gli studi virgiliani. Lettere Economia Diritto, A Survey of the Latin Classics. Prolegomena critica ad P. Vergili Maronis opera maiora. Per la storia della filologia virgiliana antica. Quaderni di Filologia e critica 6. Virgilianisti antichi e tradizione indiretta. Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity. Monographs in Classical Studies. Scriptores graeci et latini. Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen. Peter Knox and Clive Foss. Foca, Vita di Virgilio: Testi e studi di cultura classica 1. Brugnoli, Giorgio, and Fabio Stok. Die Vitae vergilianae und ihre antiken Quellen. Studi sul commento a Virgilio dello Pseudo-Probo. Cornell Studies in Classical Philology Eugenio and Myriam Billanovich. Studier fra sprogog oldtidsforskning Prolegomeni a una nuova edizione della Vita Vergilii di Svetonio-Donato. Bollettino dei classici, supplement no. Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, Una nuova vita virgiliana. Prints text of 9C vita, comparing it with other vitae vergilianae. Includes stemma of vitae deriving from Suetonius on p. Summary in Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 51 Rivista di storia antica, Kallendorf, Virgil and the Myth of Venice 42 n. The First Fifteen Hundred Years. Reconstructed by Alfred Thomsin. Virgilio, vates ignarus nella Continentia Vergiliana. A History of Roman literature: Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava, Supplementum Leiden and New York: Barabino, Iosepha, Antonio and Scivoletto Nazzaro, eds. Gli Scolii Veronesi a Virgilio: Introduzione, edizione critica e indici. Co Baxter, Robert T. Atti del convegno, Mantova, ottobre Accademia nazionale virgiliana di scienze lettere e arti 6. Zur Wertung paganer Autoren bei Laktanz. Echos virgiliens du bas-empire. Artisan du livre, Jerome and on St. The Charles Oldham Essay, Black Hole or Eminence Grise? Except for his preliminary remarks on Ecl. Interpretationes Vergilianae, adiectae sunt Vitae Vergilianae. Henricus Georgii and Iacobus Brummer. La presenza di Virgilio nei graffiti pompeiani. Dynastic Epic in the Renaissance. Includes biographical information on Servius. Tullio Agozzino and Ferruccio Zanlucchi. Ohio State UP, De Fabio Planciade Fulgentio, Virgilii interprete. Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism: Publications in Medieval Studies U of Notre Dame, The Descriptio orbis terrae of Avienus. Milan, Aprile Pizzolato and Marco Rizzi. Tiberio Claudio Donato di fronte a Didone. Studi sul commento a Virgilio dello psuedo-Probo. La Nuova Italia, The Georgics in Antiquity. U of Ottawa, National Library of Canada, Its Date, Purpose and Reception. Recherches sur sa vie et ses oeuvres. Scholia Bernensia ad Vergili Bucolica atque Georgica. Augustine and the Latin Classics. Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag, The Latin Fathers and the Classics: Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia 6. Vergil in the Historia Augusta. Libreria Hahniana and London: Brief notes in Latin on the Virgil commentaries that are known to have existed in antiquity. Centre national de la recherche scientifique, The Pipes of Pan: U of Michigan P, Storia e letteratura Edizioni di storia e letteratura, The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, Valerii Probi Berytii commentariis vergilianis. Universitas Friderica Guilelma Berolinensis,

**Chapter 8 : He Knew Nothing of Real Textual Criticism Â« SENTENTIAE ANTIQUAE**

*Textual criticism is the study of these manuscripts in an attempt to determine what the original reading actually was. There are three primary methods to textual criticism. The first is the Textus Receptus.*

Transposition of two letters across an intervening space: In such instances, the principle of *lectio difficilior* is not necessarily going to apply. Below is a case where haplography see the Appendix has caused a word or phrase to drop out, and the demands of meter have led to another word or phrase being inserted into the lacuna. First the original text: Housman expends much energy in chastising those who are too timid to depart from the manuscript tradition when circumstances call for such action: Lucretius *De Rerum Natura* VI 107-108 "Whether nature of herself brings to us an infected sky or something we are not accustomed to experience In addition, since documents were written without word division, instances of mis-segmentation such as this were frequent. Witness the case of a New Testament papyrus, P46, where the scribe has very carelessly copied an exemplar of high quality: Textual evidence is generally divided into two categories: The textual critic is always having to weigh these two types of evidence, and, as often as not, either consciously or otherwise, will usually tend to emphasize one more than the other when making decisions about variants. Internal evidence can be further subdivided into a transcriptional and b intrinsic types. Intrinsic evidence is what causes the editor to ask which of the available readings is most likely to be what the author wrote, based on considerations of style, vocabulary, thought patterns, and the like. When we consider the various ways of approaching textual criticism, we find that there exists a wide range of methodologies. At one end of the spectrum, an editor might decide to follow one manuscript or family of manuscripts exclusively, departing from it only in cases of obvious corruption, and otherwise virtually ignoring all other evidence; this is the methodology of the *codex optimus*. To a large degree the earliest editors of classical and biblical texts tended to follow one or at most a small number of manuscripts, while ignoring the bulk of the evidence, which often contained better readings. Part of their justification was the fact that access to widely scattered documents was not yet convenient enough to allow full exploitation of all relevant textual evidence; as such access opened up, with improvements in modes of travel, as well as the use of photography, scholars began to use the full range of available documentation. Wolf himself condemns scholars and editors who depend excessively and slavishly upon one exemplar, as well as those who use variant readings only when an obvious textual problem appears. In practice editors often tend to tilt more to the external or the internal evidence: In many cases, though, one is able to create a stemma which displays the dependence of later manuscripts on earlier ones in the form of a family tree. This third manuscript typically has its own distinctive characteristics, i. In this way there arises a horizontal relationship between the second and third manuscriptsâ€™i. The foregoing assumes, of course, that the scribe actually does change his text to make it conform with the third manuscript; in some cases scribes do make such corrections, in other cases they leave their new copy as it is; they may even do a combination of the two, i. Example of a stemma *codicum*, or family tree of manuscripts. The fact of contamination might not at first seem to be a problem; after all if scribes check their work against other manuscripts surely their final product will be of a higher quality. However, when one is weighing one variant reading against another, such a weighing must take into account the weights of the individual manuscripts as discussed above ; independent manuscripts or branches of the stemma carry more weight than those which show some dependence on each other. Pasquali [ 65 ] and M. West [ 66 ] have given it more appropriate treatment. Reynolds and Wilson caution us against extremesâ€™particularly that of assuming that contamination is so rampant in textual traditions that the stemmatic method is of no use. At this point it would be well to step back and think more about the actual benefits of textual criticism, and to look at some examples. Firstly, and most obviously, textual criticism aims to allow us to determine with a more or less reasonable degree of certainty what precisely the author wrote. Details regarding economic situations or military events could even be obscured by confusion between letters, since letters of the alphabet were employed to represent numerals in both Greek and Latin. An example of this latter type of confusion occurs in Thucydides III Without being certain as to which reading is genuine, one can easily see how one might have

arisen from the other: Thus we can say that this particular error most likely originated sometime between about the third and eighth centuries CE, before uncial manuscripts were superseded by minuscules. However my claim will be that only some of the surviving variant readings in our text of Homer can be explained by invoking this sort of scribal error, and that in fact a significant number cannot be explained in this way; rather, the variants in question contain divergences so substantial and so early [ 73 ] that they lead one to conclude that there was no archetype in the usual sense. In 69â€”70 the soul, chest, and heart are being described; in 70Aâ€”B the following four variant readings occur, along with a scholarly conjecture: This could explain a conscious change of the text. Or, treating it as an unconscious error, it could be explained as a case of haplography accidentally writing one letter for two â€”helped by the fact that the resultant word was indeed familiar. Alternatively, the reading could be due to the fact that in early uncial writing geminate consonants were as a rule written once only. However, when all is said and done, this reading gives an untranslatable clause. Renehan points out that Galen quotes this passage with this reading three times, indicating that the textual corruption is very early. This reading, characterized as a Renaissance conjecture it is found only in some later mss. This is a modern conjecture: However its meaning seems inappropriate in this passage. This much relates to internal evidence, and in this case both transcriptional and intrinsic types come into play. Our knowledge of his personal sensitivities may depend heavily upon the care with which we weigh and decide between different readings. This can enrich our knowledge of the language itself, as well as of the relationships between authors of the same and related genres. Not infrequently there will be cases when none of the extant manuscripts gives a reading that can be considered original. Either there is one sole surviving reading which is patently incorrect, or two or more variants which are all faulty; or there may be a gap in the text lacuna which must be filled in order for the passage to make clear and coherent sense. This is sometimes accompanied by the theological belief that Providence would have preserved the sacred text without allowing a single original reading to be lost. A further New Testament example occurs in 2 Peter 3. Clearly something is not quite right here, although this reading has the best ancient external evidence in its favor. In addition scholars have conjectured the following: Tanselle stresses that the process of recensio is just as conjectural as that of emendatio he appears to include examinatio as a part of recensio â€”both procedures are based completely on human judgment. An enlightening and humorous account of how one scholar has made conjectures in Latin literature is provided by Robin Nisbet. Such reasons include the following: I will also suggest that the Alexandrian scholars, far from exercising the kind of capricious subjectivity alleged by van der Valk, instead used manuscript evidence and an intelligent and educated sense of judgment in much the same way that a modern editor does. The question to be considered there will be: Footnotes [ back ] 1. West further uses nineteen medieval minuscule manuscripts, some of which contain complete texts of the Iliad. Allen had listed a total of about medieval manuscripts, and in his editio maior of he attempts to cite each for every variant reading, leading to a critical apparatus often taking up more space than the text itself. For a helpful account, which is written to describe the textual criticism of Latin texts but applies equally well to Greek, see Tarrant See also Reynolds and Wilson For these and other Latin terms, see Appendix B. Bengel , Admonition 12 in his preface. For a modern and more nuanced defense, see Robinson

**Chapter 9 : Textual Criticism as Applied to Biblical and Classical Texts**

*Roman Literature and its Contexts: Texts, Editors, and Readers: Methods and Problems in Latin Textual Criticism* by Richard Tarrant, , available at Book Depository with free delivery worldwide.

Textual criticism - what is it? Simply stated, textual criticism is a method used to determine what the original manuscripts of the Bible said. The original manuscripts of 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 centuries A. In these manuscripts, there are many minor and a few significant differences. Textual criticism is the study of these manuscripts in an attempt to determine what the original reading actually was. There are three primary methods to textual criticism. The first is the Textus Receptus. The Textus Receptus was a manuscript of the Bible that was compiled by a man named Erasmus in the 16th century A. He took the limited number of manuscripts he had access to and compiled them into what eventually became known as the Textus Receptus. A second method is known as the Majority Text. The Majority Text takes all of the manuscripts that are available today, compares the differences, and chooses the most likely correct reading based on which reading occurs the most. For example, if manuscripts read "he said" and manuscripts read "they said" - the Majority Text will go with "they said" as the most likely original reading. There are no major Bible translations that are based on the Majority Text. The third method is known as the critical or eclectic method. The eclectic method involves considering external and internal evidences for determining the most likely original text. External evidence makes us ask these questions: Internal evidence prompts these questions: 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 centuries of the church, the vast majority of Christians spoke and wrote in Greek. Starting in the 4th century A. However, in the eastern Christian world, Greek continued to be the dominant language of the church for over more years. These Byzantine manuscripts are all very similar to each other. They likely all originated in the same few Greek manuscripts. While being 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: The third group, of course. However, the third group is no more likely to have the original reading than the first or second group. It only has more copies. If you compare John 5: In the KJV, John 5: The eclectic method works as follows: Why would a scribe remove this verse? That does not make sense. It does make sense for that the tradition of why the crippled man wanted to get into the pool would be added. 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 can debate the methods, but we should not attack the motivations and character of those with whom we disagree on this issue. We all have the same goal—to determine the most likely original wording of the Bible. Some simply have different methods to achieve that goal.