BRILL

NOVUM TESTAMENTUM 57 (2015) 72-90

Novum Testamentum
An International Quarterly for New Testament and Related Studies

brill.com/nt

Sleepy Scribes and Clever Critics

A Classification of Conjectures on the Text of the New Testament

Bart L.F. Kamphuis, Jan L.H. Krans, Silvia Castelli, and Bert Jan Lietaert Peerbolte

Amsterdam[1]

Abstract

This article presents a classification of conjectures on the text of the New Testament. It focusses on the types of arguments used by conjectural critics. The argumentation for a conjecture basically comprises (1) the perception of a problem (or problems) in the transmitted text and (2) the suggestion of a cause (or causes) for the supposed scribal change. Type (or types) of perceived problems and of supposed causes are classified, and illustrated with a range of important conjectures.

Keywords

New Testament; textual criticism; conjectural emendation; conjecture; classification; typology

1 Introduction

The times are changing for New Testament conjectural emendation. This textual procedure, largely considered outdated in the second half of the twentieth

1 This contribution is part of the ongoing research project "New Testament Conjectural Emendation: A Comprehensive Enquiry" at VU University, Amsterdam, financed by NWO (Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research), directed by Bert Jan Lietaert Peerbolte (who is also research fellow at the University of Pretoria). First author Bart L.F. Kamphuis is the originator of the classification proposed in this article. We thank our colleague Martinus C. de Boer for correcting and polishing the English text. We take of course full responsibility for any errors that may remain.

 | DOI 10.1163/15685365-12341462

century,[2] has been tentatively rehabilitated by some leading scholars in recent years.[3] Even more importantly, a new appreciation has been brought about by the "historical turn" in NT textual criticism; a growing number of scholars is focussing less on the "original text," and more on the historical process of transmission and textual change as such.[4] Applied to conjectures, this turn brings their historical context to the fore, instead of limiting their importance to their text-critical quality. Hence a whole field of research opens up: from Origen until today literally thousands of conjectures have been made, and nearly all great textual critics and many renowned exegetes were involved in conjectural criticism. The first extensive exploration of a part of this field was done by Jan L.H. Krans in his research on Erasmus and Beza,[5] and currently an investigation of the entire history of NT conjectural emendation is underway.[6]

---

2 See e.g. B.M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption and Restoration* (3rd ed.; New York: Oxford University Press, 1992) 185.

3 See e.g. J.K. Elliott, *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles; Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation* (NovTSup 137; Leiden: Brill, 2010) 8; M.W. Holmes, "Text and Transmission in the Second Century," in R.B. Stewart (ed.), *The Reliability of the New Testament: Bart D. Ehrman and Daniel B. Wallace in Dialogue* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011) 61-79 (67-68); U. Schmid, "Scribes and Variants: Sociology and Typology," in *Textual Variation: Theological and Social Tendencies? Papers from the Fifth Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticicm of the New Testament* (eds. H.A.G. Houghton and D.C. Parker; TS third series 6; Piscataway: Gorgias, 2008) 1-23 (23). See also R. Wettlaufer, "Unseen Variants: Conjectural Emendation and the New Testament," in *Editing the Bible: Assessing the Task Past and Present* (eds. J.S. Kloppenborg and J.H. Newman; SBLRBS 69; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012) 171-193, and *No Longer Written: The Use of Conjectural Emendation in the Restoration of the Text of the New Testament, the Epistle of James as a Case Study* (NTTSD 44; Leiden: Brill, 2013). Seemlingly at odds with this trend, the latest edition of the Nestle text has obliterated all modern conjectures from its apparatus. However, its text contains a fresh conjecture at 2 Pet 3:10, besides the one already present at Acts 16:12. Moreover, the decision to omit the conjectures was a technical one (see NA[28] Introduction, 49*); the Amsterdam project (see n. 1) will provide the digital NA[28] with a full listing of all conjectures ever mentioned in previous Nestle editions.

4 See e.g. several essays in B.D. Ehrman and M.W. Holmes (eds.), *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis* (2nd ed.; NTTSD 42; Leiden: Brill, 2013), notably K. Haines-Eitzen, "The Social History of Early Christian Scribes" (479-495); M.W. Holmes, "From 'Original Text' to 'Initial Text': The Traditional Goal of New Testament Textual Criticism in Contemporary Discussion" (637-688); B.D. Ehrman, "The Text as Window: New Testament Manuscripts and the Social History of Early Christianity" (803-830).

5 J.L.H. Krans, *Beyond What is Written: Erasmus and Beza as Conjectural Critics of the New Testament* (NTTS 35; Leiden: Brill, 2006).

6 See n. 1.

Different scholars make different conjectures. Whereas Erasmus limited himself mainly to philological conjectures,[7] Beza made many conjectures aimed at removing obvious errors or at harmonizing contradictory passages from different biblical writings as well.[8] In later centuries still other types of conjectures emerged, such as the conjecture presented as the missing ancestor for a known set of readings (see § 3.2). The wide variety in kinds of conjectures shows the need for a systematic classification of conjectures, that is, *a system of clearly defined categories which are mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive*.[9] Such a classification will indeed be useful for all types of textual studies in which conjectural emendation plays a role. As an important tool for the analysis of the history of NT conjectural emendation, it aims to ensure that different scholars investigating different periods mean the same thing when using a certain characterization. It will also render the analysis of conjectural criticism as practised by specific critics or in specific periods more exact and verifiable.

The classification presented here results from an analysis of hundreds of conjectures from all periods of NT textual criticism, including the Church Fathers. After a short section on definition and method (§ 2), the classification itself is described (§ 3), and two more elaborated examples of classified conjectures are provided (§ 4). The concluding remarks demonstrate some possible applications (§ 5).

2 Definition and Method

What is meant by the term "(textual) conjecture"? According to which aspects can conjectures be classified, and which form of classification is needed?

We take conjectural emendation to mean *the process by which a textual critic emends an allegedly corrupt text by advancing the supposedly original wording, which the critic presumes to be unattested, or, in any case, not uninterruptedly transmitted*.[10] Whereas "conjectural emendation" thus refers to the procedure

7 *Beyond What is Written*, 186.

8 *Beyond What is Written*, 327, 330-331.

9 For this common definition of "classification," see e.g. P. Butchvarov, "Categories," in *A Companion to Metaphysics* (2nd ed.; eds. J. Kim, E. Sosa and G.S. Rosenkrantz; Blackwell Companions to Philosophy 7; Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009) 171-174 (171).

10 Cf. F.W. Hall, *A Companion to Classical Texts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913) 150-198; P. Maas, *Textual Criticism* (transl. B. Flower; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958) 5, 10-13; E.J. Kenney, "Textual Criticism," in *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online, n.p.* [consulted

(specific or general, the latter also referred to by the term "conjectural criticism"), the term "conjecture" is reserved for the aspect of textuality, that is, the actual wording that is intended as an emendation of the text.[11]

As a first step, conjectures can be classified according to the proposed textual operation as such. This step is rather straightforward: a conjecture can be an addition, omission, substitution, transposition or a combination of two or more of these operations. This step possibly discloses a critic's preference for one of these operations, or the relative frequency of each of the operations within the corpus of NT conjectures, which could subsequently be compared with the relative frequency of types of scribal changes in early manuscripts.[12]

For the sake of understanding the history of NT conjectural criticism, a second step is more important, namely the argumentation provided by a scholar in defense of the textual operation. The argumentation should even count as an essential part of the conjecture. More often than not, it reveals specific ideas about the text and the nature of the transmission. These ideas differ from scholar to scholar and from one era to the next, and the classification provides the tools to map out such differences and developments.

The classification is, technically speaking, a typology. Each element is not positioned within a hierarchical structure, as in a taxonomy, but characterised according to variables—in this case, the use or non-use of specific textual operations as well as arguments—that are considered in parallel, instead of in sequence.[13]

---

16 October 2013; http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/589489/textual-criticism/58836/Emendation]; B.A. Van Groningen, *Traité d'histoire et de critique des textes grecs* (Verhandelingen Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, section Letterkunde, second series 70; Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1963) 81-117; R. Renehan, *Greek Textual Criticism: A Reader* (Loeb Classical Monographs; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969) 2.

11 In the literature on definition, the term "(conjectural) emendation" sometimes refers to the result as well, whereas 'conjecture' can be used for the procedure. Another term that can refer to both procedure and result is "divinatio." Deliberate scribal changes, though sometimes also considered as conjectures, fall outside the scope of our research, as they do not occur in an explicitly text-critical context. In all cases, it remains to be proven that their aim is to restore the original text form.

12 See e.g. the major study of J.R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (NTTSD 36; Leiden: Brill, 2008), who from his analysis of singular readings in $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{47}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$, $\mathfrak{P}^{72}$, and $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ concludes that early scribes tended to omit rather than to add. From a statistical point of view, this would imply for conjectural criticism that a proposed addition is more plausible than a proposed omission.

13 See A. Maradi, "Classification, Typology, Taxonomy," in *Quality and Quantity* 24 (1990) 129-157.

3 The Classification

3.1 *The Two Dimensions in the Argumentation: Problem and Cause*

As already mentioned, the more significant part of the classification are the categories that have been induced from the argumentation for specific conjectures. The key to this part of the classification is the observation that the argumentation for a conjecture contains two major dimensions: on the one hand, critics perceive different kinds of *problems* in the transmitted reading; on the other hand, they imagine different kinds of *causes* of the supposed scribal change (in their view: corruption).

Erasmus' famous conjecture on Jas 4:2 nicely exemplifies these two dimensions of problem and cause. Jas 4:2[a] runs as follows: ἐπιθυμεῖτε καὶ οὐκ ἔχετε, *φονεύετε* καὶ ζηλοῦτε καὶ οὐ δύνασθε ἐπιτυχεῖν ("You want something and do not have it; *so you commit murder*. And you covet something and cannot obtain it").[14] Erasmus conjectures φθονεῖτε ("you are jealous") for φονεύετε, and writes in his *Annotationes*:

> φονεύετε καί ζηλοῦτε. I do not see how this word "you kill" makes sense here. Perhaps there was written φθονεῖτε and ζηλοῦτε, that is, "you are jealous and you seek, and you cannot obtain," and so [I conclude that] a sleepy scribe wrote φονεύετε instead of φθονεῖτε; especially since there follows "the spirit desires jealousy" [see vs. 5].[15]

This conjecture clearly shows both dimensions. For Erasmus, the *problem* is the implausibility of the writer accusing his readers of killing each other in a passage that merely deals with conflicts and disputes among Christians. Therefore, he supposes φονεύετε to have been substituted for the original word φθονεῖτε, which seems to fit the context much better and therefore solves the perceived problem. For this scribal change, a *cause* is indicated as well: a scribe lost his concentration for a moment and unintentionally made a mistake.

Not every critic explicitly mentions both the perceived problem and the cause of the supposed change; especially the latter is regularly omitted. Sometimes scholars do not argue for their conjecture at all. In most of these

14 All translations of biblical passages are taken from the NRSV, unless otherwise mentioned.

15 Our translation. For Erasmus' Latin, see *Novum Instrumentum omne, diligenter ab Erasmo Roterodamo recognitum et emendatum* . . . (Basle: Froben, 1516), vol. 2, 604. Erasmus' conjecture has had an impressive reception history (see Krans, *Beyond What is Written*, 126-127 n. 119).

cases the conjecture itself already reveals the argumentation,[16] but it does happen that the cause is not evident from the conjecture itself.[17] Still, the fact remains that the dimensions of problem and cause both determine the type of conjecture. Indeed, the very classification enables us to pinpoint incomplete conjectures, for which no scenario of textual change is provided. This possibility shows one of the ways in which the distinction between problem and cause in the *classification* of conjectures can be useful for their *evaluation*.[18]

3.2 *The First Dimension of Argumentation: Categories of Problems*

This subsection describes the several categories of problems critics can perceive in the transmitted text,[19] with examples of mostly well-known conjectures in the footnotes.

1. *Text-critical* problems—the variety of readings calls for a conjectured reading at the top of the local stemma.[20]
2. *Philological* problems—the transmitted reading is grammatically or lexically incompatible with the Greek language (classical or Koine), or with the specific philological background of the NT authors (Septuagint).[21]

---

16 E.g. Markland does not explicitly argue for his conjecture on 1 John 2:1 (n. 21 below), but problem as well as cause are evident.

17 Because of their incomplete argumentation, such conjectures can be regarded as weak. Cf. R.J. Tarrant, "Classical Latin Literature," in *Scholarly Editing: A Guide to Research* (ed. D.C. Greetham; New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1995) 95-148 (120).

18 The "solution" part of the argumentation may contain an additional element. Critics sometimes provide examples of the same or cognate words either in the writing concerned (as Erasmus does in the example above, by referring to Jas 4:5), or in other writings of the same author, or sometimes in writings of contemporary authors, as a way of showing that the proposed reading is plausible for the author concerned. However, as such 'fitness' arguments do not contribute to the differentiation of conjectures, they are not strictly needed for the present classification.

19 Some of these categories were tentatively introduced by Krans in his discussion of the conjectural criticism of Beza, although he used slightly different terms there. The footnotes below relate the present categories to these "Bezan" ones.

20 Probably the first NT conjecture in history based on a text-critical problem was made by Bengel. At Matt 10:29, he found the variant παγίδα ("trap") for γῆν ("ground") in some Fathers, and conjectured the reading πάγην (also meaning "trap"), which could then explain the rise of both variants (J.A. Bengel, *Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη: Novum Testamentum Graecum ita adornatum* . . . [Tübingen: Cotta, 1734] 472).

21 Krans distinguished "philological" and "grammatical" conjectures, the former relating to the spelling and use of words, the latter to syntax (*Beyond What is Written*, 249-260). In the

3. *Passage-related* problems—the transmitted reading does not fit its immediate literary context, that is, the sentence or passage concerned.
   3.1. *Style*—the transmitted reading disrupts the stylistic characteristics of the passage.[22]
   3.2. *Content*—the transmitted reading creates nonsense or is implausible on the basis of the content it produces.[23]
4. *Author-related* problems
   4.1. *Style*—the transmitted reading does not fit the style of the author.[24]
   4.2. *Content*—the transmitted text is irreconcilable with what the author writes elsewhere in the same writing or in other writings.[25]
5. *Extraneous* problems—the transmitted text contradicts information the critic derives from other sources, which can be classified as follows:
   5.1. *Old Testament*—reference can be made to the Old Testament in general, or more specifically to the Hebrew Bible or the Septuagint.[26]

---

present classification, the one category "philological" includes both kinds of problems. An example is J. Markland's conjecture on 1 John 2:1, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν *τὸν* δίκαιον for Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δίκαιον (*Conjectures on the New Testament* . . . [ed. W. Bowyer; 2nd ed.; London: Bowyer & Nichols, 1772] 334; there signed with the letter 'R.', which, as the 3rd edition [London: Nichols, 1782, 470] shows, stands for Markland); the conjecture is mentioned in the Nestle editions (N[13]-NA[27]).

22 In Krans, *Beyond What is Written*, 261-265, conjectures based on these problems are called "stylistic." A far-reaching conjecture based on a passage-related (style) problem is Blass' conjecture on Matt 23:8-10. In order to reach a perfectly parallel structure, Blass omits vs. 10, and makes several changes in vss. 8 and 9: ὑμεῖς δὲ μὴ *καλέσητε διδάσκαλον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς·* εἷς γάρ ἐστιν ὑμῶν ὁ διδάσκαλος *ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς·* πάντες δὲ ὑμεῖς *μαθηταί* ἐστε. (9) καὶ πατέρα μὴ καλέσητε ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· εἷς γάρ ἐστιν ὑμῶν ὁ πατὴρ ὁ οὐράνιος· *πάντες δὲ ὑμεῖς ἀδελφοί ἐστε* (conjectured words in italics; καλέσητε in vs. 8 is attested by Θ; F. Blass, *Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Matthäus* [BFCT 4.4; Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1900] 41-43). Blass' conjecture was reported only partially in the Nestle editions (N[13]-NA[25]).

23 E.g. Erasmus on Jas 4:2 (see above, § 3.1). Krans speaks of "logical and contextual" conjectures (*Beyond What is Written*, 267-281).

24 E.g. Straatman on 1 Cor 14:33[b]-35 (see § 4.1 below).

25 E.g. Straatman on 1 Cor 14:33[b]-35 (see § 4.1 below).

26 Krans labelled such conjectures as "harmonising" (*Beyond What is Written*, 283-297). A typical example is the conjecture on Matt 27:9 made by Origen. Here the words quoted are ascribed to Jeremiah, whereas they can only be found (albeit with some differences) in Zech 11:13—leading Origen to conjecture Ζαχαρίου for Ἰερεμίου; in *Commentarium series in evangelium Matthaei* 117 (E. Klostermann and E. Benz [eds.], *Origenes Matthäuserklärung*, vol. 2: *Die Lateinische Übersetzung der Commentariorum Series* [GCS 38; Origenes 11; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1933] 249, ll. 20-22). The scarce attestation of Ζαχαρίου (see e.g. NA[28]) most probably depends on Origen's conjecture.

5.2. *New Testament*—that is, a book from the New Testament not written by the author of the text to be emended.[27]

5.3. *Extra-biblical sources*—literary or non-literary, such as another primary source,[28] a secondary source,[29] oral tradition, or one's own observation.[30]

5.4. *Higher critical theory*—in this special case, the transmitted text is at odds with a certain theory the critic upholds on the authorship, origin or composition of the writing concerned.[31]

This list first of all makes clear that the scope of conjectural emendation is as wide as the scope of exegesis. The various categories can even be related to the several steps involved in the process of exegesis, in which a part of the text is 1) mapped text-critically; 2) analysed with the help of grammar and lexicon; 3) interpreted in its direct literary context; 4) interpreted in relation to what

27 Beza made several such "harmonising" conjectures (Krans, *Beyond What is Written*, 297-305). For example, he suggests that τοῖς δώδεκα ("to the twelve") in 1 Cor 15:5 should be changed into τοῖς δέκα ("to the ten") to make the appearance of the risen Christ referred to by Paul correspond to the one narrated in John 20:19-23 (*Testamentum Novum, sive Novum Foedus Iesu Christi* . . . [4th ed.; Geneva: Henricus Stephanus, 1588], vol. 2, 158).

28 E.g. Bowyer's reference to Livius in defense of Clericus' conjecture on Acts 16:12 (see next note), in *Conjectures* (2nd ed., 1772), 160-161.

29 A famous example is Clericus' proposal to read πρώτης for πρώτη τῆς in Acts 16:12, making Philippi a city of the first district of Macedonia (in line with what Clericus found in Ezechiel Spanheim's numismatic study *Dissertationes de praestantia et usu numismatum antiquorum* [Rome: Deuersin & Cesarettus, 1664]) instead of a capital of the district of Macedonia (Philippi in ancient times not being a capital, nor Macedonia a district); see H. Hammond and J. Le Clerc, *Novum Testamentum Domini nostri Jesu Christi* . . . (2nd ed.; Frankfurt: Fritsch, 1714) vol. 1, 559. Unknown to Clericus, there is some versional attestation to an equivalent of his conjecture (GNT[4]: it[c] vg[mss] slav; NA[28]: vg[mss]). Clericus' conjecture was the only one to be adopted as text in GNT[3] and NA[26].

30 Both oral tradition and his own observation are found in Origen's conjecture on John 1:28, Βηθαβαρᾷ for Βηθανίᾳ (the manuscript evidence for this reading should be taken as depending on Origen). He argues as follows, among other things: "We have been at the places to enquire after the footsteps of Jesus and his disciples, and of the prophets. . . . they say that τὰ Βηθαβαρᾶ is shown at the banks of the Jordan, and that they record that John baptized there" (*Commentarii in evangelium Joannis* 6.40.204-205 [our translation]; see for the Greek C. Blanc [ed.], *Origène, Commentaire sur Saint Jean* vol. 2: *Livres VI et X; Texte Grec, avant-propos, traduction et notes* [SC 157; Paris: Cerf, 1970] 286, ll. 5-7, 12-15).

31 E.g. Turner on Matt 26:68 (see § 4.2). Beza made a conjecture on Heb 2:3 to "save" the Pauline authorship of this letter; in *Beyond What is Written*, this conjecture was called "theological" by Krans (305-307).

the writer says elsewhere; 5) interpreted in relation to other sources and higher critical theory. At all these points, problems may emerge that seem insoluble at the respective exegetical level: the known readings cannot be brought into a satisfactory local stemma, or the passage shows a grammatical construction unparalleled in all old Greek literature, or an awkward combination of words makes it impossible to reach a plausible interpretation, etc. This alignment of the classification of problems with the structure of exegesis dovetails with Joël Delobel's observation that conjectural criticism takes place on the border between textual criticism and exegesis, and as such exemplifies how the latter two are "Siamese twins."[32]

The argumentation for a conjecture can, and often does, point to more than one type of problem (see the examples of Straatman and Turner in section 4). Depending on the strength of the argumentation, such a "multiple-problems conjecture" can receive approval exactly because the transmitted text seems to be defective on different levels. Here again the classification can be used as an evaluation tool.

3.3 *The Second Dimension of Argumentation: Categories of Causes*

The second dimension of the argumentation for a conjecture is the *cause* of the supposed textual change. In contrast to the classification of problems, the classification of causes builds on a long scholarly tradition: the manifold attempts by classical and biblical scholars to classify scribal changes according to the different causes at work in these changes.[33] Almost all of the categories of the causes of *supposed* scribal change listed below are also found in the literature

32 J. Delobel, "Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Siamese Twins?," in *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis and Early Church History: A Discussion of Methods* (eds. B. Aland and J. Delobel; CBET 7; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994) 98-117 (111-116).

33 Instead of "change," the terms "error" or "corruption" are also used. The former, however, is not well suited to refer to intentional changes, while the latter too strongly implies a value judgment, at odds with the "historical turn." The most detailed classification for classical literature is Louis Havet's *Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes Latins* (Paris: Hachette, 1911); Hall (*Companion*, 150-198) is less extensive, but treats both Latin and Greek texts. For the NT, the most substantial publication is J.W. Burgon and E. Miller, *The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels: Being the Sequel to "The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels"* (London: Bell, 1896). Modern classifications include L.D. Reynolds and N.G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* (3rd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991) 222-239; Metzger, *Text*, 186-206; K. Aland and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (transl. E.F. Rhodes; 2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989) 282-297.

on *actually observed* scribal change.[34] This is not surprising: the several scribal changes manifest in the manuscripts, are, as it were, the toolbox conjectural critics carry with them to "fix" passages that seem to be corrupt.

As the categories of causes listed below have all been induced from the argumentation observed in NT conjectures known to us thus far, it cannot be excluded with absolute certainty that ongoing research might lead to the addition of yet some other (sub)category. The list below generally reflects what is found in the literature, but the specific definitions of categories and the arrangement in groups of categories presented here results from the attempt to develop a classification that is as systematically structured as possible.

1. *Unintentional*—all scribal errors, which fall into different forms of misperception, misunderstanding and confusion.
   - 1.1. *Misperception*.
     - 1.1.1. *Dittography* ("writing the same")—instead of proceeding from "where she was," the eye of a scribe went back a letter, a few letters or a few words, resulting in a double copy of this portion of the text.[35]
     - 1.1.2. *Haplography* ("writing once")—the reverse of dittography; a letter or a sequence of letters was repeated in the exemplar; a scribe copied the first occurrence, looked back at the exemplar and proceeded to copy the text after the second occurrence, which was thus left uncopied.[36]

34 The only three categories not parallelled in the sources referred to in the preceding note are 1.3.6 "language error" and 1.3.7.4/5 "transposition of columns/folios" (Havet mentions a transposition of folios in the archetype of the extant MSS of the *Panegyrici Latini*, but there he is involved, of course, in conjectural emendation [*Manuel*, 134]). Although absence in secondary literature cannot be equated with absence in the manuscripts, conjectures built on these scenarios stand little chance of winning approval.

35 E.g. Clericus on Acts 16:12, πρώτης for πρώτη τῆς (see n. 29).

36 E.g. Markland on 1 John 2:1, Χριστὸν τόν for Χριστόν (see n. 21). In an extended form of this mistake (which can be nicely referred to as *saut du même au même*—"leap from the same to the same") there would have been text in between the repeated letters/sequences, which was thus left uncopied as well. If the two letters or sequences of letters both constituted the beginning of a word, the scribal change can be referred to as "homoioarcton" (e.g. Michelsen on Mark 1:16, ἀμφίβληστρον ἀμφιβάλλοντας for ἀμφιβάλλοντας; J.H.A. Michelsen, *Het evangelie van Markus* vol. 1 [Amsterdam: Funke, 1867] 10); if the two letters or sequences of letters both constituted the ending of a word, as 'homoeoteleuton' (e.g. van der Beke Callenfels on Mark 6:36, τί φάγωσιν οὐ γὰρ ἔχουσιν for τί φάγωσιν; W. van der Beke Callenfels, *Beoordeeling van de conjecturen op den tekst der*

1.1.3. *Similarity*—a letter or a sequence of letters (mostly a word) was replaced by another letter or sequence of letters merely because of similarity in image and/or sound. The subcategories are:

1.1.3.1. *General*—the nature of the similarity is neither made explicit by the critic nor evident from the conjecture.[37]

1.1.3.2. *Image* (palaeography)—in typical cases, the argumentation presents the transmitted reading and the conjecture in uncial script, in order to show how similar they look.[38]

1.1.3.3. *Sound* (phonetics)—the mishearing of vowels/diphtongs ("itacism") and consonants.[39]

1.2. *Misunderstanding*—a scribe misunderstood a:

1.2.1. *Numeral*.[40]

1.2.2. *Nomen sacrum*.[41]

1.2.3. *Correction*.[42]

---

evangeliën van Markus en Lukas [Utrecht: Kemink, 1885] 47). The way in which the terms "haplography," *saut du même au même*, "homoioarcton" and "homoeoteleuton" are related to each other here is based on the use of these terms by Reynolds and Wilson (*Scribes and Scholars*, 226).

37 E.g. Erasmus on Jas 4:2 (see § 3.1).

38 E.g. the famous suggestion by 'S.' (anonymous) in Bowyer's collection of conjectures, who wants to read ενωχ for ενω (ἐν ᾧ) in 1 Pet 3:19 (*Conjectures* [2nd ed. 1772] 324); the conjecture is mentioned in the Nestle editions, though incorrectly under the names of either Schulz (N^{11-20}) or Bowyer (N^{21}-NA^{27}).

39 E.g. Fritzsche on 1 Cor 14:38, ἀγνοεῖτε for ἀγνοεῖται (C.F. Fritzsche, *De conformatione Novi Testamenti critica, quam Car. Lachmannus edidit, commentatio* vol. 1: *Qua* . . . [Giessen: Heyer, 1841] 21-22), a conjecture mentioned in only two Nestle editions (N^{11-12}).

40 For his conjecture on 1 Cor 15:5 (see n. 27) Beza probably had in mind such a misunderstanding.

41 E.g. Bentley on Jas 5:6, ὁ Κύριος (οκς) ἀντιτάσσεται for οὐκ (ογκ) ἀντιτάσσεται (Phileleutherus Lipsiensis [pseudonym of Richard Bentley], *Remarks Upon a Late Discourse of Free-Thinking: In a Letter to F.H. D.D.* [London: Morphew, 1713] 73-74).

42 A famous example is Bornemann's conjecture on 1 Cor 4:6. According to Bornemann, the awkward phrase τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται, which still puzzles exegetes, was originally a marginal note, pointing out to the reader that "the [word] μή is written above [the letter] α" in ἵνα. In other words, it drew attention to an interlinear correction of an unintentional omission. In a next copy, however, the scribe not only adopted μή into the text, but the marginal note as well, the result of which seems to be utter nonsense (F.A. Bornemann,

1.3. *Confusion*.

1.3.1. *"Lipography"* (from λείπω, "to leave behind")[43]—any omission that is neither regarded as intentional, nor can be explained by the repetition of text as in haplography, nor by any other type of cause.[44]

1.3.2. *"Contagion"*—a change caused by adaptation to words recently copied or just about to be copied.[45]

1.3.3. *Synonym*—any replacement of a word by a synonym (which may be more familiar than the original word).[46]

1.3.4. *Unfamiliarity*—any substitution caused by the unfamiliarity of the original word.[47]

1.3.5. *Proper name*—any unintentional change of a proper name.[48]

1.3.6. *Language error*—any change that can only be explained by assuming that a scribe committed a language error.[49]

"De memorabili glossemate, quod locum I Corinth. 4,6 insedisse videtur," *Biblische Studien von Geistlichen des Königreichs Sachsen* 2 (1843) 37-44).

43 The term "lipography" is used by Hall, who provides several examples of this phenomenon in the manuscripts (*Companion*, 190-191).

44 E.g. Musculus on 2 Cor 1:17, ἵνα μή for ἵνα (W. Musculus, *In ambas Apostoli Pauli ad Corinthios Epistolas, commentarii* [Basle: Hervagius, 1559], "Commentarii . . . in posteriorem epistolam . . ." cc. 47-48), mentioned in the Nestle editions (N[13]-NA[27]), though only under the name of the twentieth-century classical scholar Theodor Nissen.

45 E.g. van de Sande Bakhuyzen proposes to omit καλῶς in Mark 9:7, arguing that the word καλῶς from vs. 6 may have been copied accidently into vs. 7 as well (W.H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen, *Over de toepassing van de conjecturaal-kritiek op den tekst des Nieuwen Testaments* [Verhandelingen, rakende den natuurlijken en geopenbaarden godsdienst, n.s. 9.1; Haarlem: Bohn, 1880] 252).

46 Aland and Aland (*Text*, 291) regard the replacement by a synonym as "chiefly intentional." However, in this classification Metzger is followed, for whom this textual change belongs to the unintentional "errors of the mind" (*Text*, 193). An example is the change of πάγην into παγίδα (indeed the more familiar word) in Matt 10:29 assumed by Bengel (see n. 20).

47 Bengel's conjecture on Matt 10:29 (see n. 20) can serve as an example here as well, but now for the other change he assumes: πάγην into γῆν.

48 E.g. Beza on 2 Tim 4:20, Μελίθῃ for Μιλήτῳ (*Iesu Christi D.N. Novum Testamentum, sive Novum foedus* . . . [3rd ed.; Geneva: Henricus Stephanus, 1582] vol. 2, 325), mentioned in the Nestle editions (N[13]-NA[27]). Royse shows many examples of spelling mistakes in proper names in the singular readings of early papyri (*Scribal Habits*, 181-185, 332-335, 393, 534-535, 602, 687-690).

49 Cf. n. 34 above. Example: Piscator on 3 John 2, πρό for περί (J. Piscator, *Analysis logica septem epistolarum Apostolicarum* . . . [Herborn: Rab, 1593] 323), mentioned in the Nestle editions (anonymously in N[3-12]; under Piscator's name in N[13]-NA[27]).

1.3.7. *Transposition*—any change merely caused by a process of transposition (the term "transposition" thus can refer to either the textual operation as such or the confusion behind this operation). Subcategories are *Transposition of*:

1.3.7.1. *Letters.*[50]

1.3.7.2. *Words.*[51]

1.3.7.3. *Lines.*[52]

1.3.7.4. *Columns.*[53]

1.3.7.5. *Folios.*[54]

2. *Intentional*—all causes involving purposeful scribal activity. Critics can assume either that a scribe simply changed the text,[55] or that first a note was written in the margin of the copy, which was subsequently—on purpose or by accident—inserted into the text by a later scribe.[56] As a conse-

---

50 E.g. Naber on Acts 27:38, ἱστόν for σῖτον (S.A. Naber, "Τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι," *Mnemosyne* second series 9 [1881] 273-302 [293-294]), mentioned in the Nestle editions (N[8]-NA[27]). The transposition of letters within a word could also be regarded as a case of "similarity," but is mentioned here for easy reference.

51 E.g. Hort on Jude 1, θεῷ . . . ἐν Ἰησοῦ for ἐν θεῷ . . . Ἰησοῦ (in B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek* [vol. 2]: *Introduction, Appendix* [Cambridge: Macmillan, 1882] 106 in "Appendix"), mentioned in the Nestle editions (N[1]-NA[25]).

52 E.g. Luther on John 18:13-24, who (inspired by Cyril and Erasmus; see Krans, *Beyond What is Written*, 158-160, 176-179) in the 1541 edition of his Bible translation proposed to place vs. 24 after vs. 14 in order to harmonise with the synoptic Gospels (*D. Martin Luthers Deutsche Bibel 1522-1546* (*Luthers Drucktexte*) vol. 6.1: *Das Neue Testament, Evangelien und Apostelgeschichte* [D. Martin Luthers Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe; Weimar: Böhlau, 1929] 399), a conjecture that as a matter of course became widely known; it is referred to in the Nestle editions (N[17]-NA[25]).

53 See the next note; see also n. 34 above.

54 Cf. n. 34 above. A far-reaching example of the supposed transposition of columns and folios is the combination of conjectures made by Jan Gerhardus Ottema. This nineteenth-century Dutch classicist, who could not know yet that early NT papyri generally contain only one column per page, wanted to make the chronologies of Matthew and Mark run parallel. Although the title of his article suggests that only "one simple transposition" is needed ("De overeenstemming der evangeliën van Mattheüs en Marcus door middel van ééne eenvoudige omzetting hersteld: Eene kritische bijdrage," *Jaarboeken voor wetenschappelijke theologie* 6 [1848] 662-693), Ottema ended up conjecturing no less than seven transpositions in Mark and two in Matthew, among which two transpositions of lines, four of columns, and three of folios.

55 E.g. Straatman on 1 Cor 14:33[b]-35 (see § 4.1).

56 Bentley has such a scenario in mind for Gal 4:25[a] ("Richardi Bentleii epistola ad Cl. V. Joannem Millium S.T.P. . . . ," in *Joannis Antiocheni, cognomento Malalae, Historia chronica . . .* [eds. E. Chilmead and J. Mill; Oxford: Sheldonianus, 1691] 96-98 [96-97]); in

quence, all categories below are to be specified as "with margin" (in case the critic assumes a marginal note as the origin of the textual changes) or "without margin" (in case the critic assumes the change to have occurred without such a note).[57]

2.1. *Conflation*—a scribe combined the original reading with a "corrupted" one into a new reading.[58]

2.2. *Repair*—a scribe repaired a text "damaged" by a supposed earlier "corruption," or by words having become unreadable.[59]

2.3. *Improvement*—a scribe improved language, style or logic/plausibility of the passage.[60]

2.4. *Explanation*—a scribe explained a certain element in the text.[61]

2.5. *Harmonization*—a scribe changed the text in order to harmonize with a passage in another biblical writing.[62]

NA$^{24\text{-}27}$, though Bentley is mentioned at Gal 4:25, the form of the conjecture reported there was not proposed by Bentley, but by Schott [H.A. Schott, *Epistolae Pauli ad Thessalonicenses et Galatas*... [Leipzig: Barth, 1834] 532-533), as correctly indicated in N^{13}-NA^{23} (see further n. 59 below).

57 If an author does not explicitly refer to a marginal note, for instance by using the word "gloss," we suppose the cause is to be tagged as "without margin."

58 E.g. Naber on Rom 1:29, φθόνου for φθόνου φόνου (S.A. Naber, "Ὑπέρ τὰ ἐσκαμμένα," *Mnemosyne* second series 6 [1878] 85-104 [101]); in "Τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι," 286-288, Naber makes no fewer than 22 conjectures on the basis of such supposed conflations, in most cases, however, leaving it up to the reader to decide which of the two conflated parts is original.

59 In Gal 4:25, Bentley assumes scribal adaptation ("repair") was applied after the insertion of a gloss. His conjecture τῇ δὲ Ἁγὰρ συστοιχεῖ ἡ νῦν Ἰερουσαλήμ, δουλεύει γὰρ μετὰ [τῶν] τέκνων αὐτῆς in Gal 4:25 ("Ad Joannem Millium," 96-98; cf. n. 56) not only involves the omission of the gloss Σινᾶ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ, but also several minor changes to the transmitted *τὸ* δὲ Ἁγὰρ συστοιχεῖ *δὲ τῇ* νῦν Ἰερουσαλήμ (words in italics are regarded as unauthentic), in order to arrive at a grammatically and logically satisfying text. It may be noted in passing that by undoing the "repair" once needed because of the "damage" inflicted by the gloss, Bentley himself is in a way also "repairing" a text "damaged" by his own *detection* of the gloss.

60 E.g. Peerlkamp on Luke 16:21; τὰ ἕλκη αὐτοῦ was supposedly added by a scribe in order to make explicit the object left unsaid by the author; the author, however, would have had a completely different object in mind, namely τὰ ψιχία. Leaving out τὰ ἕλκη αὐτοῦ would solve certain passage-related and philological problems observed by Peerlkamp (*Opmerkingen betreffende de Staten-overzetting van de Evangeliën en de Handelingen der Apostelen* [published anonymously, but commonly attributed to the Dutch classicist P.H. Peerlkamp; Amsterdam: Van Kampen, 1855] 77-79).

61 E.g. Bentley on Gal 4:25 (see nn. 56 and 59).

62 E.g. Turner on Matt 26:68 (see § 4.2).

2.6. *Contextualization*[63]—any change of the text that reflects the historical context (liturgy, ethics, dogmatics, etc.) of the scribe concerned.[64]

Some NT conjectures appeal to two of the above types of causes for one conjecture,[65] suggesting that two steps were involved in the textual change, often with the cause "repair" as a second step. Interestingly, the argumentative power of multiple *problems* (which function in parallel) on the one hand and multiple *causes* (which function in sequence) on the other are inversely proportional. As already mentioned, the case for a conjecture can be strengthened by each additional problem detected in the transmitted text, but it is weakened by each additional cause needed to bridge the gap between the conjecture and the transmitted reading or readings.[66] Therefore it does not come as a surprise that in all the conjectures on the NT, multiple problems are much more common than multiple causes.

3.4 *The Categories of Textual Operations*

Quintilian already knew that there are four ways in which one can make an error in writing: through addition, omission, substitution, or transposition.[67] In textual criticism, this classification has been used to distinguish at a basic level the different ways in which scribes can alter their exemplar at a certain point. In the same way, the four categories can be applied to textual conjectures, to describe the proposed textual operation as such, apart from the underlying argumentation. Each conjecture involves an addition, omission, substitution

63 This term was coined for the present classification, as a suitable general term could not be found in the existing descriptions of scribal changes in NT manuscripts.

64 An example of a conjecture that touches on both liturgy and dogmatics is van de Sande Bakhuyzen's omission of the baptismal formula in Matt 28:19 ("De stand der evangeliënkwestie" [part 2], *Godgeleerde Bijdragen* 39 (1865) 449-492 [482]). Straatman's conjecture on 1 Cor 14:33^{b}-35 (see § 4.1) concerns church order.

65 In very rare cases even more than two causes are assumed. For his extensive conjecture on Matt 23:8-10 (see n. 22), Blass assumes a combination of the causes "contagion," "repair" and "contextualization"; for the interpolation of vs. 10 Blass does not even provide a cause (*Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Matthäus*, 41-43).

66 This is not to say that the assumption of multiple causes is absurd; the phenomenon is abundantly attested in the manuscripts. Havet (*Manuel*, 381-390) even shows many examples of readings that evolved from the original one in more than two steps.

67 "adiectione, detractione, inmutatione, transmutatione"; see *Institutio oratoria* 1.5.6 (M. Winterbottom [ed.], *M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutiones oratoriae libri duodecim* [OCT; Oxford: University Press, 1970] 29).

or transposition of a part of the transmitted text (in the case of multiple readings, of the reading considered closest to the conjectured original reading), or a combination of two or more of these categories.

4 Two elaborated examples

The many conjectures mentioned thus far were only briefly referred to in order to illustrate specific problems or causes. As a fuller illustration of the classification, it is worthwhile to describe two conjectures more extensively. Both well-known conjectures discussed below involve more than one problem: Straatman's conjecture on 1 Cor 14:33^{b}-35 and Turner's conjecture on Matt 26:68.

4.1 *Straatman on 1 Cor 14:33^{b}-35*

One of the best-known NT conjectures is the one on the so-called *mulier taceat* ("a woman should be silent") passage in 1 Cor 14. Although the conjecture became popular in the second half of the twentieth century,[68] it was already made in 1863 by the Dutch scholar Jan Willem Straatman.[69] The passage runs as follows:

> As in all the churches of the saints, (34) women should be silent in the churches. For they are not permitted to speak, but should be subordinate, as the law also says. (35) If there is anything they desire to know, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is shameful for a woman to speak in church.[70]

Straatman considers this passage as highly problematic for several reasons. First, he points at the non-Pauline use of the word ἐκκλησία in vss. 34 and 35.[71]

68 On the *status quaestionis* of the conjecture, see E.J. Epp, "Text-critical, Exegetical, and Socio-cultural Factors Affecting the Junia/Junias Variation in Romans 16,7," in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel* (ed. Adelbert Denaux; BETL 161; Leuven: University Press, 2002) 237-242.

69 J.W. Straatman, *Kritische studiën over den 1^{en} Brief van Paulus aan de Korinthiërs. 1^{e} stuk. Hoofdstuk XI-XIV. Met een naschrift* … (Groningen: Van Giffen, 1863) 134-138.

70 Ὡς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῶν ἁγίων (34) αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις σιγάτωσαν· οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτρέπεται αὐταῖς λαλεῖν, ἀλλὰ ὑποτασσέσθωσαν, καθὼς καὶ ὁ νόμος λέγει. (35) εἰ δέ τι μαθεῖν θέλουσιν, ἐν οἴκῳ τοὺς ἰδίους ἄνδρας ἐπερωτάτωσαν· αἰσχρὸν γάρ ἐστιν γυναικὶ λαλεῖν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ (NA^{28}).

71 *Kritische studiën* 1, 135.

According to him, Paul never has a church meeting in mind when he uses this word. For Paul, ἡ ἐκκλησία is the (spiritual) union of the believers.[72] This problem can be classified as "author-related (style)."

Second, Straatman detects a passage-related (content) problem as well. Vss. 33^{b}-35 interrupt Paul's argument about prophecy, which starts in vs. 29. Without any transition, he switches to the "silent women" in vs. 33b, and then, again without any transition, back to prophecy in vs. 36. The *mulier taceat* verses can neither be accounted for by the larger context of the chapter, which, next to prophesying, deals with speaking in tongues. At stake are the πνευματικά; commanding women to be silent is completely out of place here.[73]

Third, however, and most importantly to Straatman, 1 Cor 14:33^{b}-35 violates Paul's own principles (problem: author-related [content]). The same Paul who fights for freedom from the law in Christ (cf. Galatians), could never argue for something on the basis of that same law (as he does here in vs. 34). For Paul, moreover, there was no difference between male and female in Christ (Gal 3:28). Therefore, he would never instruct women to be silent; indeed, he instructs women to pray and prophesy with their heads veiled in 11:2-16 in the same letter.

Straatman concludes that vss. 33^{b}-35 are a Jewish-Christian second-century interpolation, that reflects the "catholic" church's pursuit of unity and order (Baur's thesis). This means that the cause dimension of his conjecture is to be categorized as "contextualization," specified as "without margin," since Straatman does not assume a scenario in which the words were first written in the margin. The textual operation proposed is, of course, the omission of the disputed passage.

Straatman's conjecture found wide approval, though mostly in the form first proposed by Wilhelm Bousset, according to whom only vss. 34 and 35 (so without 33^{b}) are a later interpolation.[74]

---

72 *Kritische studiën* 1, 27.

73 *Kritische studiën* 1, 135.

74 W. Bousset, "Der erste Brief an die Korinther," in *Die Briefe. Die johanneischen Schriften* (vol. 2 of *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments neu überlegt und für die Gegenwart erklärt . . .* ; ed. J. Weiß; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1907) 123-124. In the Nestle editions (N^{13}-NA^{27}) the conjecture is mentioned in this form, though incorrectly under Straatman's name. Bousset leaves out vs. 33^{b} from the conjecture, because only vss. 34 and 35 are located after vs. 40 in the "Western Text" (information not used by Straatman). In Bousset's version, the conjecture solves a fourth problem, this one being text-critical. As he assumes the suspicious words were first written down in the margin, and subsequently inserted into other copies at different locations, the cause now becomes "contextualization (*with margin*)."

4.2 *Turner on Matt 26:68*

One of the best-known "minor agreements" between Matthew and Luke (those passages in which Matthew and Luke diverge from their source Mark in the same way) is found in the words τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε—"who is it that struck you?" (Matt 26:68; Luke 22:64). If original in both gospels, these words raise a serious difficulty for the Two-Source Hypothesis (2SH), according to which Luke and Matthew did not use one another as a source. This problem can be classified as "extraneous (higher critical theory)": the two passages together are incompatible with a specific higher critical theory, which functions as a "source" of information, parallel to the biblical and extra-biblical sources of the first three subcategories of the category "extraneous."

Spurred on by the extraneous problem, Cuthbert H. Turner noticed, on closer inspection, a passage-related (content) problem in Matthew's text as well.[75] Whereas in Luke the words τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε come naturally, given the fact that Jesus has just been blindfolded, in Matthew's text it seems strange that the soldiers ask Jesus who has hit him if he has not only just felt the blow, but has also seen the person hitting him. The combination of problems led Turner to regard the words in Matthew as spurious: "I prefer to conjecture that it is an undetected insertion by scribes, of the type of dozens of others that we can detect, into the text of Matthew from the text of Luke."[76] The cause assumed here is "harmonization (without margin)." In its reception history, Turner's conjecture has become a cornerstone for the validity of the 2SH.[77]

5 Concluding remarks

The classification is intended, in the first place, to facilitate the analysis of the history of NT conjectural emendation. But it appears to be useful in two other respects as well. First, in classifying a conjecture, one is forced to study very carefully the arguments brought forward in favour of it. Thus the classification, developed as a tool for macro analysis, serves equally well on a micro level.

75 C.H. Turner, *The Study of the New Testament, 1883 and 1920: An Inaugural Lecture Delivered Before the University of Oxford on October 22 and 29, 1920* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1920) 46-47.

76 Turner, *Study*, 47.

77 The conjecture was e.g. accepted by Streeter, Neirynck, and (carefully) Tuckett, but also contested by Goulder and others. For an overview of the reception history, see S.D. Black, "One Really Striking Minor Agreement: Τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε in Matthew 26:68 and Luke 22:64," *NovT* 52 (2010) 313-333.

Second, it also backs up the evaluation of conjectures, in at least three ways: (1) The dimensions of problem and cause can be used to "check" whether the argumentation is complete. (2) The greater the number of serious problems indicated, the more urgent the need for conjectural emendation. (3) The greater the number of causes assumed, the less plausible the conjecture.

Other possibilities for evaluation lie in the frequency of certain causes as observed in the manuscripts. On a micro level, if a certain cause appears to have been operating very rarely in the manuscripts, an appeal to it in conjectural emendation is risky, let alone if no example at all can be found in the manuscripts. On a macro level, it would be interesting to compare the relative frequency of causes in *supposed* scribal changes on the one hand, and *actually observed* scribal changes in early manuscripts on the other hand (though for the latter, of course, much research has still to be done).

With regard to the main use of the classification, the historical analysis, no firm conclusions can yet be drawn. Nevertheless, the classification can be expected to be of great help in testing working hypotheses such as the following.

When critics propose conjectures on the text of the NT:

1. Passage-related (content) problems are the most commonly perceived ones.
2. Extraneous problems are relatively more often perceived in pre-modern than in modern biblical scholarship.
3. Intentional causes of textual change are relatively more often assumed in modern than in pre-modern textual criticism.
4. Substitutions and additions are relatively more often proposed by critics with a background in classical studies than by those with a theological background.

Hypotheses such as these can be tested when the corpus of NT conjectures is analyzed by means of the classification—which quite possibly will still need slight adjustments in ongoing research. Scholars in other fields of textual studies can adopt this classification and adapt it to their own needs, thus refining the study of conjectural emendation even further and contributing to the "historical turn."