

مقدمه في النقد النصي الجزء الثامن

قواعد التحليل الداخلي

Holy_bible_1

قواعد التحليل الداخلي او ما تسمى بالادله الداخليه

Internal evidence (Internal Critical Rules)

والبعض يقسمه نوعين الدليل النسخي الذي يعتمد علي صفات الناسخ والدليل الجوهرى الذي يعتمد علي النص نفسه وسياقه

والبعض قدم سبعة تقسيمات مثل جيلسون والبعض قدم 11 قاعده مثل فليب كامفورت والبعض قدم 12 قاعده ودائرة المعارف النقديه قدمت تقسيمه تفصيليه من 27 قاعده وهي

The shorter reading is best

القراءه الاقصر هي الافضل او هي

Lectio brevior praeferenda

وهي قاعده تقريبا قالها معظم باحثي النقد النصي ولكن ليس الكل لان البعض يري ان القراءات الطويله هي الافضل وايضا لا تطبق في كل الاحوال وهي يجب ان كما قال الكثيرين مثل جريسباخ

ان تطبق بحذر شديد جدا لانه قد تفود لاططاء كثيره

وهي باختصار تعتمد علي ان بعض النساخ يميل الي اضافات تفسيريه ولهذا القراءه الاقصر اصح ولهذا هذه القاعده صحيحه لو طبقت علي مخطوطه مشهوره بالاضافات التفسيريه ولكن لا تصلح ان تطبق علي اخطاء النساخ الذين يميلون في الاخطاء الي الحذف مثل قاعدة

haplography

لان اخطاء النساخ الصغيره تميل دائما الي الحذف بالخطأ وليس الاضافه فهم بدون قصد يحذفون الكلمات القصيره التي لا تؤثر في الظاهر علي المعني (وهي صفة مميزه لبعض نساخ السينائية) ولكن هناك نوع مختلف يسمى الاختصار الحر مميزه جدا لناسخ بعض المخطوطات (ويظهر بقوه في البرديه 45)

وهذه القاعده لايجب ان تستخدم لوحدها لان استخدامها لوحدها سيقود الي الخطأ (وهذا هو الخطأ الذي وقع فيه كثيرا بويسمارد كما قالت الموسوعه) , وتطبق ايضا علي القراءات عندما لا يوجد اي دليل علي وجود خطأ نسخي مثل بيزا او في الاعداد التي يوجد بها صلوات

The hardest reading is best

القراءه الاصعب هي الافضل

Difficilior lectio potior or Proclivi scriptioni praestat ardua

(ومن تكلم عليها هو بنجيل (وبالنسبه له هي كانت القاعده الاساسيه)

وهي تعتمد ان النساخ يميلوا الي جعل النص ابسط وليس اصعب ولكن يجب ان تطبق ايضا بحرص شديد لان في كثير من الاحيان ينتج عن خطأ النساخ قراءه اصعب ولو طبقه هذه القاعده سنثبت القراءه الخطأ الاصعب ونترك القراءه الصحيحه البسيطة (ومثال الي اخطاء النساخ التي ينتج عنها قراءات اصعب هي برديه 66) ولهذا يجب ان تؤخذ القراءه الاصعب لو تم التأكد تماما من ان لا يوجد هناك خطأ نسخي

The reading most in accord with the author's style (and vocabulary) is best.

القراءة التي تتماشى مع أسلوب الكاتب هي الأفضل

وهي قاعده مهمة ولكن تحتاج خبره لانه يحتاج دقه في تمييز أسلوب كاتب السفر فعلي سبيل المثال أسلوب يوحنا دائما يقول الحق الحق اقول لكم فعندما نجد اختلاف في قراءة عدد ادهم به الحق اقول لكم والآخر الحق الحق اقول لكم يكون الذي يتماشى مع أسلوب الكاتب هو الصحيح وهو الحق الحق اقول لكم

ولكن يجب ان تطبق بحزر وتقارن بالتقليد

وهي مهمة ومفيدة جدا ايضا في اختيار الافعال الصحيحة لان الكتاب لهم أسلوب مميز في تصريفات الافعال ولكن يجب ان يكون أسلوب الكاتب مدروس جيدا

The middle reading is best.

القراءة الوسطي هي الأفضل

وهي قاعده قلما يتكلم عنها باحثي النقد النصي وهو تستخدم فقط في وجود ثلاث قراءات او اكثر لان لو وجد ثلاث قراءات قصيره ومتوسطه وطويله ودائما التغيير سيميل من المتوسطه الي القصيره ومن المتوسطه الي الطويله ولكن صعب ان يكون من الطويله الي القصيره او العكس مباشره . وهي تطبق فقط لو كانت الادله متساويه في التاريخ والقدم ولكن لو كانت ادهم حديثه جدا فلا تدخل في المقارنة

The reading which could most easily have given rise to the other readings is best.

القراءة التي هي بوضوح السبب في بقية القراءات هي الأفضل

وهذه القاعده هي من انتاج تشندورف وهي القراءه الافضل هي التي تفسر بقية القراءات

وكثيرين يعتبرون هذه القاعده هي الاساسيه في التحليل الداخلي وتسمى ايضا

Corollary

وهي قد اتى اليها في قواعد الحسابات في النقد النصي

Mathematics

ويجب ملاحظة ان هذه القاعده لا يجب ان تطبق لو كان الخطأ واضح ولكن لو تاكدنا ان لا يوجد

خطأ نسخي اذا القراءه الصحيحه هي التي تفسر بقية القراءات

The reading which could not have arisen from lectionary use is best.

القراءه التي لم تبرز بسبب استخدام الفصول الكتابيه هي الافضل

وتعني ان القراءه التي لم تنتج بسبب تقسيم الفصول هي الاصح لان النساخ عاده يفضلوا اضافة

مقدمات وهذه المقدمات قد يزحف بعضها الي النص

(يخطئ البعض في تطبيقها بصوره عامه ويقول قراءه كانت في هامش النص واضيفت ولكن هذه

القاعده عن المقدمات وليس التعليقات)

The reading which is counter to ecclesiastical usage is best.

القراءه التي تخالف الاستخدام الكنسي هي الافضل

وهي قاعده وضعها ابرهارد نستل وتطبق علي ايضا الفصول . وهناك خلاف علي تطبيقها علي

كلمة امين التي في نهاية الرسائل باستثناء يعقوب

The disharmonious reading is best.

القراءة التي اقل في توفيق الكلام هي الافضل

وهذه القاعده تطبق غالبا علي الاناجيل الاربعه فقط لانه كثير من النساخ يميلوا لجعل الاربع اناجيل متوافقه معا . ولهذا لو وجد قراءتين الاولى تتوافق مع قراءة انجيل اخر والثانيه تختلف يكون التي تختلف او مميزه هي الاقرب الي الصحة . وقال سودين ان غالبا النساخ يميلوا لجعل الاناجيل تشبه انجيل متي ولهذا القراءة التي لا توافق انجيل متي هي الافضل .

وهي ايضا قاعده جيده ولكن يجب ان تطبق بحرص كما قال كولويل لانه قد يخطي الناسخ ويقرب النص الي شئ مشهور مثل ترنيمة او شئ نسخه الناسخ قريبا ولهذا فهو قال ان القاعده يجب ان تعدل الي

The less familiar reading is best.

اي القراءة الاقل اعتياد هي الافضل . اي القراءة التي تتوقع ان يكتبها الناسخ هي الخطأ والتي لا تتوقع ان يكتبها الناسخ هي الصحيحه . وقد سماها هورت

Transcriptional Probability

وهي احتماليات النسخ . والمشكله مع هذه القاعده هي تخمين ماذا يدور بذهن الناسخ اثناء النسخ

The reading which best fits the context or the author's theology(and ideology) is best.

القراءة التي تناسب الفكر اللاهوتي للكاتب هي الافضل

وهذه القاعده ممتازة لو نعرف بطريقه قطعيه فكر كاتب الوحي اللاهوتي فهي يجيدها من يدرس انواع علوم اللاهوت وبخاصه الذين يتخصصون في لاهوت الكتبه مثل اللاهوت البولسي واللاهوت اليوحنوي (وهي تتماشى مع قاعدة اسلوب كاتب الوحي)

The reading which has the truest sense is best.

القراءة التي لها الحس المصدق هي الأفضل .

وقال هورت كلام مختلف قليلا فيها " القراءة التي من الظاهر لا تعطي معني هي الأفضل ولكن التي تبدو انها اكثر معقوليه هي الابدع عن الصحة

The reading which avoids Atticism is best.

القراءة التي تتحاشي الاساليب الاغريقية هي الأفضل

لان اليوناني الاغريقي او اليوناني الاتيكي وهي لغة اثينية وهي اهملت ثم استخدمت فيما بعد ولكن المهم في هذه القاعده هو معرفة الباحث القويه بالفرق بين اليوناني الاثيني واليوناني الكويني (زمن التلاميذ)

The reading which is characteristic of Hellenistic usage is best.

القراءة المميزه باستخدام الهلنستية هي الأفضل

لان اليوناني الكويني يستخدم عادة اشكال غير تقليديه وغير مالوفه في وقت لاحق من الكتابه التعليميه الكلاسيكيه وقد يميل البعض من النساخ الي محاولة تصحيح هذا وغالبا النقاد يميلوا الي تاكيد النص الكويني

The reading which resembles Semitic usage is best.

القراءة التي تشابه الاستخدامات الساميه (للغات) هي الأفضل

لان كتاب العهد الجديد هم ناطقين بالاراميه ويكتبوا اليونانية فالقراءه التي تميل الي استخدام كلمات ساميه (عبريه و ارامية) مخالفه لليوناني هذا هو تعبيرهم ولكن النساخ هم يونانيين فقط في معظم الاحوال فقد يميلوا الي تصحيح ذلك بمعنى لو وجد قراءه تكتب كلمه قريب نطقها الي الارامي او العبري وقراءه اخري بيونانيه سليمه فغالبا الاولي هي الاقرب الي الصحه ولكن هناك خلاف بين باحثي النقد النصي في هذه النقطة بسبب السبعينية لان بعض النساخ يميلوا الي اسلوب السبعينيه وساتي الي ذلك في القاعده التاليه

The reading which is less like the Septuagint is best.

القراءه الاقل تشابه مع السبعينيه هي الافضل

وهي قاعده قد تخدع احيانا رغم انها مهمه لان بالفعل بعض النساخ يميلون الي كتابت النص المماثل للسبعينية او بلغة السبعينية. ولكن يجب ان يلاحظ ايضا ان نساخ السبعينيه بعد الميلاد هم مسيحيين وليسوا يهود وقد يكون يفعل النساخ بدون قصد العكس اي ينسخوا السبعينيه بما يشبه العهد الجديد فيكون الخطأ في السبعينية وليس في نص العهد الجديد

That reading which seems to preserve an ungrammatical form is best.

القراءه التي تحفظ نص غير نحوي هي الافضل

ولكن معظم تطبيقات هذه القاعده هي غير مهمه ولكنها تستخدم اكثر في الكشف عن طبيعة النساخ الذي انتج المخطوطه (بمعنى يمكن تمييز ناسخ من خطأ نحوي متكرر)

وايضا يجب ان يلاحظ في تطبيق هذه القاعده انه قد يحدث العكس بمعنى قد يخطئ الناسخ بحذف كلمه او اضافته بدون قصد فينتج خطأ نحوي بسبب الحذف او الاضافه فيجب ان يتأكد من ان الخطأ لغوي نحوي وليس خطأ حذف او اضافته

If one reading appears to be an intentional correction, the reading which invited such a correction is best.

لو قراءه تبدو مصححه , تكون القراءه التي دعت الي ذلك التصحيح هي الافضل
ولها تسميه اخري

That reading which is most likely to have suffered change by copyists is best.

اي القراءه التي عانت من تصحيح النساخ هي الافضل (قبل التصحيح) وهي اقترحها تشندورف
مثل تفضيله للقراءه الحاده . وهي تعني لو كان هناك قراءه تدعوا الي التصحيح بالطبع قد يندفع
ناسخ ويصححها

The reading which could have given rise to the others accidentally is best.

القراءه التي تكون السبب في اخطاء اخري هي الافضل
وهي قالها كيلى مكارتر بطريقه

Look first for the unconscious error

تبحث اولا عن الخطأ اللارادي . وهي قاعده مهمه جدا في العهد القديم حيث الشهود قلانل)
والاخطاء ايضا شبه معدومه الا من هذا النوع (ولكن تطبيقاتها في العهد الجديد قليله حيث اخطاء
الاطفاء الاملائييه الي حد ما متكرره ولا تعطي اختلاف في المعني . ولكن تستخدم مع قاعده
القراءه السبب في الاخري ولكن بطريقه الخطأ (مثل حذف حرفين من كلمه بطريقه غير مقصوده
او كلمه قصيره او مقطع نطقي (اي ثلاث حروف)) هي الافضل

The reading which is susceptible to a heterodox interpretation is best.

القراءة التي عرضه لتاويل الهرطقة هي الأفضل

وهذه القاعدة لا تطبق كثيرا ولكن عندما يتم ذلك فمن المهم ان نفهم ان القراءة التي تقلل من كرامة المسيح هي الأفضل . ولكن يجب ان تطبق هذه القاعدة بحذر ومع دراسة خلفية المدرسه المسؤله عن هذه القراءة وبخاصه في زمن اوريجانوس او في زمن يوسابيوس او الناتجه عن منطق سيطر عليها هرطقة

وكما قالت الوسوعه هذه شبهة الي حد ما صاحبت اوريجانوس لبعض الاشياء التي لم يستريح اليها

The reading which contains unfamiliar words is best.

القراءة التي تحتوي علي كلمات غير معتاده هي الأفضل

وهي قدمها بروس مترجر وجريسباخ وهي مشهوره في النسخ الاملائي ولكن ايضا عليها تحفظات بمعنى ان الناسخ قد يبدل كلمة يعرفها لكن لو كلمة لا يعرف معناها جيدا فكيف لها ان يبدلها بكلمه اخري . فافضل تطبيق للقاعدة هذه هي علي المخطوطات المعروف عنها عادات معينه

If, in a variant reading, one reading is subject to different meanings depending on word division, that reading is best.

لو كان هناك قراءات مختلفه تكون القراءة التي لها اكثر من معني اعتمادا علي تاويل الكلمه هي القراءة الأفضل

هي قاعده نادرة الاستخدام وتستخدم في القراءات التي قد تكون كلمه واحده تصلح ان تكون كلمتين تكون هي الاصح (لان اليوناني كان يكتب بدون فواصل بين الحروف والكلمات)

If a reading is a conflation of two shorter readings, the shorter readings are best (though the correct reading must be decided on other grounds).

لو كان هناك عدة قراءات واحدهم طويله مكونه من عدة قراءات قصيره مجمعه معا ومنهم بعض القراءات القصيره يكون القراءات القصيره غالبا احدها هو الصحيح وتستخدم بقيه القواعد في تحديد اي القراءات القصيره هي الافضل

واستخدمت هذه القاعده بواسطه هورت لكي يصاد بها النص المسلم الذي يكون دائما القراءه السليمه الطويله والفاثيكانيه قراءه قصيره وبها اختلاف فوضع هذه القاعده واشهر مثال علي استخدامه لها لان قراءه لوقا 24: 53 (يسبحون ويباركون الله) فالسينائية والفاثيكانيه كتبوا بياكون الله وبيزا كتبت يسبحون الله ولكن تقريبا كل الادله من بقيه المخطوطات وهي بالالاف قديمه وحديثه تؤكد النص المسلم بطريقه قاطعه فاستخدم هورت هذه القاعده لينحي النص المسلم عن النقاش ويبقي الخلاف فقط بين النص الاسكندري والغربي فهي قاعده لها استخداماتها النادره لو لم يكن هناك ادله اخري

The true reading is best.

القراءه الحقيقيه هي الافضل

وهذه القاعده قدمها وردورث ووايت الذي قال ان القراءه الصحيحه هي التي ستفوز في الاخر وستنتشر رغم كل الظروف وهو قدم ادله كثيره علي ذلك ولكن يرفض هذه القاعده النقيدين لانها تؤكد ان النص التقليدي المسلم هو الصحيح

والان تتطبع عن طريق تقديم كل القراءات وترك القارئ يختار

The reading which is contrary to the habits of the scribe is best.

القراءه التي تتعارض مع عادات الناسخ هي الافضل

وتطبق هذه القاعدة علي المخطوطات المفردة وفي هذه الحالة هي ليست بقاعده نقديه ولكن اسلوب مناسب لدراسة اسلوب نساخ فرديين

فمثلا اتهمت المخطوطه دي بانها معادية لليهود ومعاديه للنساء فلو وجد بها قراءه جيده لليهود او النساء في دي تكون قراءه صحيحه لانها ضد عادة الناسخ

That reading which violates the prejudice of scribes is best.

القراءه التي تخالف توقعات النساخ هي الافضل

وهي تبدو مشابهة للماضيه ولكن هي لا تنطبق تماما ولكنها ايضا تنطبق علي مخطوطات بطريقه فرديه . وهي مقدمه بايرمان فمثلا يوحنا 4: 22 التي تقول الخلاص هو من اليهود ولكن البعض كتبها اليهودية وهي تعتبر ضد اليهود فمتوقع من الناسخ الذي ضد اليهود ان يفضل اليهوديه فلو كتب اليهود تكون صحيحه

Where the same variant occurs in parallel passages, each variant is original somewhere.

لو كان هناك اختلاف في اعداد متوازيه فكل اختلاف يكون هو الاصلي الي حد ما

بمعني عدددين في انجيلين وكل منهما مختلف في قراءته بين قراءتين فغالبا القراءتين الاثنتين صحيحتين واحده منهم لانجيل والاخري المختلفه للانجيل الثاني مثل الجديين والجرجسيين فيكون الجرجسيين في متي صحيحه والجديين في لوقا صحيحه

If a similar variants occur in several places, the reading more strongly attested in the later points of variation is best.

لو كان هناك متغيرات متشابهة في عدة أماكن تكون القراءة التي لها شواهد أكثر في نقاط لاحقة هي القراءة الأفضل

وصاغها روبرتسون بأسلوب آخر وهي

لو نوع من الجمل تكرر عدة مرات في نفس الإصحاح بطريقة أكثر من الطبيعي المستخدمه بواسطة الكاتب يلجأ الناسخ الي ان يصحح القراءة بطريقة واحدة في الأعداد الأولى وليس في الأخيره ويترك الأخيره بدون تصحيح

مثل موضوع دودهم لا يموت والنار لا تطفى مرقس 9: 44 و 46 وجاءت بدون خلاف في 48 فتكون قراءة دودهم لا يموت والنار لا تطفى هي الصحيحة والتي حذفت العددين الأوليين خطأ بناء على هذه القاعدة

ونري هذا أحيانا في أسلوب القديس جيروم في ترجمته وليس في أسلوب نسخته

If you can imagine an error, a scribe has probably made it.

لو تخيلت هناك خطأ غالبا الناسخ فعل ذلك

وهذا قانون مورفي

ويقال بطريقة أخرى

Never underestimate the sleepiness of scribes.

لا تقلل من قيمة أجهاد النساخ

لان النساخ عملوا وقت طويل جدا واعبوا من التعب فغالبا في نهاية كل يوم تكون أخطاؤهم أكثر من بداية اليوم ونري بعض هذه في البرديه 46 فيبدا بدقه ثم في نهاية اليوم يكثر الأخطاء ثم يعود الي الدقه مره ثانيه وهذا غالبا بداية يوم جديد ثم يكثر الأخطاء في النهاية وهكذا

INTERNAL EVIDENCE

THE principal causes which have given rise to various readings have been enumerated in the preceding chapter. The observations made upon that subject will lend us aid in estimating the comparative probability of the genuineness of various readings, from internal evidence. In this inquiry we proceed upon a general principle, which is both obvious and just:—*viz.* that when there are various modes of exhibiting the same passage, all those readings which can be accounted for by the operation of known causes of error are to be suspected; and, if there be any one which cannot be so accounted for, there is *primâ facie*, a probability in its favour. It is not meant that a reading is to be regarded, in all cases, as genuine, on the ground of internal probability alone, in opposition to any mass of authority, however weighty; but merely that, in such instances as those now alluded to, there is often such an inherent likelihood in favour of a reading, as adds greatly to the force of those authorities by which it is supported; and, in some particular cases, this internal testimony may be conceived as so strong, that it would outweigh any assignable amount of external authority. The general principle is so reasonable, that it is unnecessary to advance any argument in its support. Assuming its justice, and applying it to the cases considered in the preceding chapter, it will lead us to the following *Rules of Internal Evidence*:—

1. A reading is to be suspected which can readily be supposed to have arisen from the mistake of a letter, syllable, or word, from one of similar form.

This rule is not of much practical use, since, if one reading resembles another in appearance, the other must equally resemble *it*; and the rule affords no test for determining which is genuine. It is obvious, that in

employing this principle we must have respect, not merely to the present manner of printing and writing, but to those modes which prevailed at all periods, since the composition of the books, the text of which we are investigating. There are indeed many textual variations which can only be explained by reference to the most ancient kind of writing.*

2. A reading is to be suspected which appears to have arisen from the mistake of a letter, syllable, or word, for one of similar sound.

There is reason to believe that many existing MSS. were either written from dictation, or copied from others which were written in that manner: hence similarity of sound between different words might be a frequent cause of error. This rule, however, like the former, is ambiguous in itself; and it farther resembles its predecessor in requiring an acquaintance with the usages of times long since passed away. Of the primitive mode of pronouncing the Hebrew and Chaldee languages, in which the Old Testament is composed, we can scarcely be said to know anything, and of the Greek very little. It is probable that the Greek pronunciation varied considerably at different periods, perhaps in different countries at the same period; and it is certain that it never bore any resemblance to the mode which now prevails in England and Ireland. The whole subject is one of difficulty, and can be best studied by comparing together those *errata* of different MSS. which seem to have arisen from this cause.†

3. A various reading is to be suspected, which apparently owes its origin to the omission of some syllable, word, phrase, or sentence, in consequence of a ὁμοιοτελευτόν.

This cause is the most frequent occasion of omissions: indeed it requires care to avoid mistakes of this kind, even in copying our own composition,

especially if it be of considerable length. The student who will take the trouble of examining the notes to any critical edition of the Scriptures, or of any other ancient work, will discover innumerable examples of this species of mistake: it is probably the most frequent cause of errors of omission, and affords the most obvious and decisive evidence of the fact.

4. A passage is suspicious which is omitted by some good authorities, and which has the appearance of having been introduced into those copies in which it is found, from a parallel place or from a marginal note.

Additions of this kind are, in general, easily detected, and, of course, deserve but little weight. Such a reading becomes still more suspicious if it be found actually written as a gloss or scholium on the margin of some MSS.; especially if those in which it is so written be more ancient than those which contain it in the text; in this case, we may have the means of tracing the history of the introduction of a gloss, in chronological order.

5. A less elegant phrase is more likely to be genuine than another reading of the same passage in which there is nothing that might offend the eye or the ear.

This rule is founded on the fondness of the transcribers for such readings as conformed to their own standard of taste. They were, in almost all instances, studious of grammatical correctness, as well as of force and purity of language; and when they met with anything that violated their canons of elegance, they were apt to change it for another phrase taken from a parallel passage, from the margin, from the comment of some standard writer, or from their own invention, in which the impropriety was avoided or removed. Hence the harsh, obscure, ambiguous, elliptical, ungrammatical, unusual, foreign, or unemphatical reading, is preferable to one in which no harshness or difficulty occurs; because, had the latter been found in the original, no

transcriber would have sought to alter it: but, if the incorrect or inelegant reading were the more ancient, successive transcribers would readily catch at any means of curing what they would naturally consider a defect in their exemplar. The rule given above is of especial use in those passages in which the *lectio difficilior et obscurior* conveys a good and apt sense, but one which, without a minute acquaintance with languages, antiquities, &c. would either appear to be unintelligible, or would seem to be heretical, profane, or immoral. It is this rule which chiefly distinguishes the criticism of the present age from that of the earlier school, and which has given to the moderns a great part of whatever superiority they possess above their predecessors, in the science.

6. A reading is to be suspected which seems well calculated to favour the observances of ascetic devotion, or which may have been introduced from a desire to avoid something that would have sounded offensive in pious ears.

There can be little doubt that the men who devoted themselves to the laborious task of preparing copies of the Sacred Scriptures were devout, according to their own idea of devotion; many of them were Jewish Rabbis or Christian monks; some of the latter were anachorets or hermits; almost all of them were addicted to asceticism. Such men might very naturally introduce, on slight authority, a reading which accorded well with their own devotional feelings and habits; but it is not probable that they would have rejected such a reading on insufficient grounds. It is this consideration which lends the strongest support to the passage respecting the Woman taken in Adultery, John 5:1–11. Copyists who regarded chastity as the first of human virtues, and voluntary celibacy as highly meritorious, might readily omit what they would consider calculated to lead men to regard adultery as a venial offence. This circumstance throws a shade of suspicion upon those

authorities which omit the narrative: but, if the story were of a different nature, it would probably have been condemned as spurious, on the mere comparison of authorities.*

7. Readings which favour the opinions of the transcriber, or of the sect to which he belonged, or which seem calculated to advance the honour of his party and to confound its adversaries, are suspicious.

Copyists would not readily depart from their exemplar for the purpose of introducing what was hostile to their own views of truth, or to the credit or interest of their order or their sect; but they might, and probably would, have been easily persuaded to look with partiality on such readings as promised to favour objects so dear to their hearts. Hence, in the MSS. of the Old Testament, which have come down to us through the hands of Jewish copyists, readings which seem to countenance Jewish predilections, or which might appear unfavourable to Christianity, are to be regarded with suspicion; and, in those of the New Testament, which have descended through an orthodox channel, readings which seem made, as it were, on purpose to put down heresy, are to be suspected. Of course, in the application of this, as of all the other rules for internal evidence, it is assumed that there is conflicting testimony, and that some respectable authorities are to be found on each side.

It may be useful to illustrate this rule at somewhat greater length than has been necessary in the case of those which precede, and the simplest mode of doing so will be by a few examples. Thus, in Judges 18:30, the Jews have, from a very early period, altered, in most of their copies, the word מֹשֶׁה, *Moses*, into מְנַשֶּׁה, *Manasseh*, which, however, is usually found written with the suspended מִשֶּׁה (מִשֶּׁח), or enlarged (מְנַשֶּׁח). We are at no difficulty to divine

the motive of this alteration; it was considered as discreditable to the Hebrew nation and to their religion to have it recorded that the grandson of their great lawgiver exercised, together with his sons, the priesthood of an idol in the city of Dan; and, therefore, the name of Moses was changed into that of Manasseh, to avoid the scandal. This corruption is very ancient, for *Μανάσση* is found in the most ancient copies of the Septuagint; but it is easily detected by the diversity which prevails in writing the word; by the confession of the Talmudists, who affirm that the name was that of Moses, but that it was written with the *נ*, on account of the disgraceful conduct of his descendant; and from the marginal note found in almost all the Hebrew MSS. which directs that the *נ* shall not be inserted in the text, but suspended over it. Had the Jewish copyists found *מנשה* simply, they would not have hesitated to retain it without adding any extraordinary marks to excite suspicion. This error appears in the English version, but not in the Vulgate nor in any of the translations derived from it.

It was, at one time, a very common opinion, that the Jews had wilfully corrupted the text of their sacred books in many places, in order to deprive Christians of the advantage which they might derive from the arguments drawn from ancient prophecy; but recent authors have almost entirely abandoned this charge. It is, indeed, not to be denied that many of the passages formerly relied on as proofs of the accusation are found, when minutely examined, to lend it no support, the readings objected to as spurious being, in some cases, manifestly and undoubtedly authentic; in others, well supported; and in many not less favourable to the Christian doctrine than those for which they were supposed to have been fraudulently substituted. The charge of *general* corruption, therefore, must fall to the

ground: but there are yet manifest proofs that particular passages have, in some MSS. been tampered with; or at least that, in them, readings have been systematically preferred which seemed unfavourable to Christianity. Of this, Psalm 22:17 (Heb.) affords an example. There is no doubt, from the testimony of the ancient versions, as well as from the sense of the passage, that the true reading of the last clause of this verse is כָּרְוּ יָדַי וּרְגְלַי; which is rendered in our English version, “*they pierced* (i. e. tore or wounded,) *my hands and my feet*,” this reading is found in some MSS. as above given, and in several others with a slight change in the first word, which is written כָּאָרוּ, by the insertion of one of the *matres lectionis*. The vast majority, however, of the Jewish MSS. and editions read, instead of כָּאָרוּ or כָּרְוּ “*they pierced*,” כָּאָרִי “*as a lion*,” which makes nonsense of the clause, and even contradicts the *Masorah*, the rule by which they profess to be guided; for that document directs, that in this place כָּאָרוּ shall be inserted in the text; כָּאָרִי in the margin. It is impossible to avoid the suspicion that party zeal may have influenced these copyists. They must have known that the Christians—whether correctly or not is nothing to the present question—regarded this clause as prophetically descriptive of the suffering Messiah; and, no doubt, they were prone to adopt any various reading by which the force of their opponents’ argument could be effectually turned aside. In this instance, therefore, we prefer the reading כָּאָרוּ or כָּרְוּ, “*they pierced*,” because it is supported by some respectable authorities, and because it is least favourable to the party to which the transcribers of the Hebrew MSS. belonged.

Nor need we hesitate to apply the same rule to some readings which are found in particular copies of the New Testament Scriptures. Thus, in John

8:44, where the true reading undoubtedly is, ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστέ, “*ye are of your [lit. the] father, the devil:*” a few MSS. read, ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστέ, *ye are of the devil;*” leaving out τοῦ πατρὸς, “*the father,*” a mistake which may have arisen from the ὁμοιοτελευτόν, occasioned by the repetition of the article τοῦ, but which, more probably, was owing to the desire of the copyists to deprive certain Gnostics of the argument which they might build upon this text in support of their fundamental position, that the God of the Jews, the Creator of the world and of the human race, was an Evil Being. Had the external evidence in favour of this reading been much more weighty than it is, we should have rejected it without scruple, because it apparently owes its origin to the sectarian zeal of the copyists.

For another example we may refer to Matt. 1:25; ἕως οὗ ἔτεκε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον “*until she brought forth her first-born son;*” but here four MSS. with two ancient versions and a few copies of the old Latin version, read simply τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς, “*her son,*” leaving out τὸν πρωτότοκον, “*the first-born.*” These words were, doubtless, omitted because they seemed to call in question the perpetual virginity of the mother of Christ, which it was considered both heresy and blasphemy to impugn. We therefore prefer the common reading; and we should have preferred it though not merely four but forty MSS. had opposed it; because we can account for their opposition from the doctrinal views of the transcribers.

We may here refer to John 3:6, which ends with the words, “*that which is born of the spirit is spirit:*” to this some Latin MSS. and Fathers add, “*quia*

Deus Spiritus est.” and three Latin MSS. still further improve the cogency of the passage by reading: “*quia Deus Spiritus est, et de (vel ex) Deo natus est.*” i.e. “*because the Spirit is God and is born of God.*” Who can doubt that these readings are interpolations, probably originating in a marginal scholium, but which found a ready reception with the copyists of these documents, from their appearing well calculated to refute the doctrines of the Arians and Macedonians, respecting the Spirit of God? Readings which can be traced to such feelings are of no authority whatever.

This rule has been applied by Wetstein, Griesbach, and other critics, to a number of passages in which the Received Text as commonly printed is favourable to the orthodox doctrine: but in which several of the most valuable authorities exhibit a reading that has no direct bearing upon controversy: such as Acts 20:28; 1 Cor. 10:9; 1 Tim. 3:16; 1 John 5:7; Jude, ver. 4; Rev. 1:8; Rev. 1:11, &c.; but as these texts will receive a separate examination hereafter, it is unnecessary and would be out of place to go into them minutely at present. The examples already given are such as will probably occasion no dispute: and they are amply sufficient to explain and justify the rule.

8. In general a shorter reading is to be preferred to a more copious one.

Transcribers were desirous of making their copies as complete as possible: it is probable that they never left out, on purpose, anything which they found in their exemplar, except in cases where their peculiar prejudices were concerned: and several MSS. exhibit blank spaces in particular parts; showing that when the copyists had heard of the existence of passages, though not in their own exemplar, nor in any to which they had access, they nevertheless wished to insert them, whenever an opportunity might occur for doing so, and left room for the purpose. This rule, of course, does not apply

to places in which either the ὁμοιοτελευτόν or some other known cause, might occasion an omission.

9. *Cæteris paribus* a reading is to be preferred which best accords with the usage of the writer in whose works it is found.

Every author has his own peculiarities of style and phrase, from which he does not frequently deviate: we ought not therefore, without strong evidence, to attribute to him a reading which is opposed to his usual mode of expression. This rule shews that no one can be a sound critic who is not also a good scholar, and especially versed in the writings upon which he proposes to exercise his critical sagacity.

10. There is a strong probability in favour of any reading, which, if assumed to have been the original one, will readily enable us to account for all the other readings by the operation of some of the known causes of error.

This rule, though occasionally referred to by preceding writers, has been brought prominently into notice by Griesbach, who has very happily applied it to the elucidation of several difficult passages. Its justice will not be disputed; for we are in no case to suppose more, or more important changes, than are necessary to account for observed facts.

Griesbach, after enumerating the principles of internal evidence, very nearly to the same effect with the rules which are given above, adds, that “it is unnecessary to repeat again and again that those readings which, viewed in themselves, we judge to be preferable, are not to be actually adopted as the true text, unless they are recommended by the testimony of some ancient authorities. Those which are supported by no adequate testimony, but rely exclusively on trivial and modern authorities, are not to be taken into account. But the more conspicuous any reading is for its internal marks of

excellence, the fewer authorities are necessary to support it. And thus it may occasionally happen, that a reading may display so many and so clear indications of authenticity, as to be sufficiently supported by two authorities, provided they belong to different classes or families, or even by one.”—

Proleg. in N. T. Sec. iii. p. 59, n.

To decide upon trivial and modern authorities, exclusively, is nearly the same as to decide without any authority whatever, or upon mere conjecture; and although this is a practice which is freely admitted in the case of the ancient classics, and must occasionally be tolerated, from necessity, in the Old Testament, and although some specious arguments might be advanced for permitting it to be employed in the New,—still it seems safest and best to adhere in the criticism of the sacred text,—always in the New Testament,—and in the Old, whenever it is possible,—to the maxim laid down by Griesbach, and according to which he has constructed his valuable edition,—“*Nil mutetur e conjecturâ.*” The reasons for tolerating Critical Conjecture as a source of emendation in a few passages of the Old Testament, will come before us in the sequel. It must, however, be allowed that it is a dangerous remedy in any hands but the most judicious and experienced: and its arbitrary use ought certainly to be discouraged.

i

والمجد لله دائما

* Some observations on the most ancient forms of writing the languages of Scripture will be introduced hereafter, in the sketches of the History of the Text of the Old and New Testament.

† The English pronunciation of Greek being completely out of the question, two others remain to be considered, the *Erasmian* and the *Reuchlinian*. The former, which is followed in Scotland, France, and parts of Germany, agrees very well with some classical allusions; but the *Reuchlinian*, which was the mode adopted by the Greeks, who taught their native language in the West at the period of the revival of letters, and which still prevails in modern Greece, seems to be of great antiquity. The *itacism*, or confusion of the sounds of η, ι, υ, and ει; and of ε, αι, and οι, which is a peculiarity of Reuchlin's system, has given rise to mistakes in some of the oldest Greek MSS. extant.

* The authorities for the omission and insertion of this passage will be stated in the Third Book of this work.

ⁱPorter, J. S. (1848). *Principles of Textual Criticism* (32). London: Simms and M'intyre.