

شواهد النصوص لسودين

Holy_bible_1

شواهد النصوص اي ما هي الشواهد التي تشهد لكل نص وانواع النصوص شرحته باختصار في جزء تقسيم النصوص

وهذا التقسيم يتم كما شرحت سابقا في اول جزء من مقدمة النقد النصي وهي تاسيس شجرة العائلة وهو القسيم الذي قدمته الان

ولتحديد مخطوطة تنتمي الي اي عائلة هو يقارن القراءات الموجوده فيها ويحسبوا نسب القراءات بمعني مخطوطة بها 70% بيزنطي و 25% اسكندري و 5% غربي مثلا فهي تنتمي الي العائلة البيزنطية

وهذا التقسيم اصبح يطبق علي الاسفار فقسم العهد الجديد الي اناجيل واعمال والبولس والكاثوليكون والرويا

فاصبح كل جزء من مخطوطة بمعني الاناجيل في المخطوطة يدرس نصوصها وتطبق عليها الانتساب الي العائلة في كل قسم فقد تكون مخطوطة بيظنطية كلها وقد تكون بيزنطية في الاناجيل وغربية في الاعمال وهكذا

ولازال الابحاث تجدري علي المخطوطات وايضا علي الترجمات وايضا الالباء

فتنتسب كل ترجمه الي عائلة وايضا ينتسب كل اب الي عائلة كما قدمت سابقا وايضا قد نجد اب بيزنطي في الاناجيل وغربي في البولس وهكذا

فون سودين

وهو يسمي هرمان فيرهير فون سودين

Hermann Freiherr von Soden

16 August 1852-15 January 1914

وهو الماني ويعتبر من اعظم باحثي النقد النصي في زمانه وهو يقال انه راجع كل مخطوطات الكتاب المتوفره في عصره وتقريبا هو الوحيد الذي استطاع ان يفعل ذلك

وهو قسم النصوص الي ثلاث انواع

كويني وهو يرمز له بحرف كبا وهو يقابل النص التقليدي المتسلم او البيزنطي

Koine = K

وهيسيخي ويرمز له بحرف ايتا وهو يقابل الاسكندري

Hesychian = H

واورشليمي ورمز له بحرف يوتا وهو يقابل النص الغربي

Jerusalem = I

وهو قام بالتقسيم الاتي

The Gospels

- H -- ⌘ B C L (W) Z Δ Ψ 33 579 892 1241

Comment: With the exception of Δ, which is Alexandrian only in Mark, all of these manuscripts are indeed at least mixed Alexandrian. Nor has more recent research added significantly to the list; Wisse lists several additional manuscripts, but all of these are either partially mixed or otherwise textually complicated.

- I --

- I^α -- D (W) Θ 079 (067) 21 28 372 (399) 544 565 700 (1342?) 1542 1654 (Old Latin) (Old Syriac)

Comment: This group consists of every true "Western" witness plus almost all the leading "Cæsarean" witnesses (the only exceptions being the next two groups), with a handful of Byzantine witnesses such as 21. Therefore most critics have split up this type into other groups. Most of the remainder of the I type has, at best, a very weak kinship with the members of these first three groups; all the I groups except the first three are more Byzantine than anything else, while the members of I^α, I^η, and I^ι are (for the most part) clearly non-Byzantine.

- I^η --
 - I^{ηa} -- 1 1582 (2193)
 - I^{ηb} -- 22 118 (131) (205) 209 (872)

Comment: This is, of course, Family 1 (the Lake Group). The existence of Von Soden's subgroups is questionable, and Wisse believes 22 to belong to a separate type.

- I¹ --
 - I^{1a} -- 983 1689
 - I^{1b} -- 13 69 (124) 174 788
 - I^{1c} -- 230 346 543 826 828

Comment: This is Family 13 (the Ferrar Group). Wisse does not break the type into subgroups, but Soden's subdivisions have been accepted by others such as Colwell.

- I^φ --
 - I^{φa} -- 349 517 954 (1188) 1424 1675
Comment: This is Streeter's Family 1424, which (with some modifications) became Wisse's Cluster 1675. It would appear (based on the work of the Alands) that it has some non-Byzantine readings in Mark but very few elsewhere.
 - I^{φb} -- 7 115 179 (185) 267 659 827 (1082) (1391) (1402) (1606)

Comment: Although Wisse identified a Cluster 7, only two of the manuscripts listed here belong to the type. This subgroup, therefore, probably is not real. The members are basically Byzantine.

- I^{φc} -- 945 990 1010 (1207) 1223 1293
Comment: Wisse's K^x Cluster 160 consists of three of these manuscripts (160, 1010, 1293; Wisse did not profile 990). Nonetheless this group cannot be

considered verified. In any case it is strongly Byzantine.

- $I^{\phi r}$ -- M (27) 71 (692) 1194

Comment: Von Soden considered this type to be the most distinct of the I^{ϕ} groups. Wisse confirms the existence of the type (he calls it the M type), but regards it as a rather complex entity. It is, nonetheless, clearly Byzantine.

- I^{β} --

- $I^{\beta a}$ -- 348 477 1279
- $I^{\beta b}$ -- 16 1216 1579 (1588)

Comment: This group was confirmed but redivided by Wisse. The manuscripts most distinct from K^x he called Group 1216 (this group was earlier confirmed by Colwell). Others he classified as Group 16 and as K^x Cluster 17. Even Group 1216 is basically Byzantine.

- I° -- U X 213 443 1071 (1321) 1574 2145

Comment: Several of the members of this group (most notably X and 1071) are listed by Wisse as mixed, but he finds no kinship among them. While some of the manuscripts are important, they probably do not form a group.

- I^{π} -- N O Σ Φ

Comment: There is general agreement that these four "purple uncials" are closely akin; indeed, some have

thought that N O Σ are actually copies of the same ancestor (though this seems unlikely). Streeter thought that these manuscripts were weak witnesses to the "Cæsarean" text -- but Streeter put everything not otherwise firmly spoken for in the "Cæsarean" text (just as von Soden put all these witnesses in the I groups). In fact the purple uncials are very strongly Byzantine; there are some earlier readings, but not enough to really classify the type. (The problem is not helped by the fact that only N contains any portions whatsoever of Luke and John, and those fragmentary.)

- I^σ -- 157 (235) 245 291 713 1012

Comment: Wisse's data reveals absolutely no kinship among these manuscripts, although 157 at least is valuable.

- I' -- P Q R Γ 047 064 074 (079) 090 0106 0116 0130 0131
013 4 162 251 273 440 472 485 (495) 660 (716) 998
(1038) 1047 1093 (1170) (1229) (1242) 1295 1355 1396
(1515) 1604 2430

Comment: This collection is less a group than a sampling of leftovers in which von Soden thought (often falsely) that he perceived a non-Byzantine element. Individual manuscripts within the type have been found by Wisse to show kinship, but overall this is not any sort of group.

- I^κ --

- I^{κa} -- A K Y Π 265 489 1219 1346

- I^{kb} -- 270 726 1200 1375
- I^{kc} -- 229 280 473 482 1354

Comment: The existence of I^k (which von Soden also called K^a, and which is now usually and properly referred to as Family Π) has been repeatedly confirmed, most recently by Wisse (who however redivides the subgroups). Whether von Soden is correct in considering it not purely Byzantine is, however, open to question; it certainly is primarily Byzantine, and its early strength implies that it might be one of the primary early branches of the Byzantine text-type.

- I^l -- Λ 262 (545) 1187 1555 1573

Comment: This is Wisse's Group Λ. Von Soden himself considered it to be overwhelmingly influenced by the Byzantine type. In fact it seems clearly Byzantine, and Wisse notes that it is often difficult to distinguish from K^x.

- **K --**

- K¹ -- S V Ω (399) 461 476 655 661

Comment: Wisse regards K¹ (and Kⁱ) as portions of K^x; K¹ becomes Wisse's K^x Cluster Ω. But one must keep in mind Wisse's small sample size (three chapters of Luke) and the ages of the manuscripts involved. Based on age alone, it appears that K¹ and Kⁱ are independent of K^x, though perhaps not of each other.

- Kⁱ -- E F G H

Comment: For the relationship of this group to K^x, see the notes on K¹ above. Although these four uncials are often treated as a block, they do not really go together; although all are similar to the K^x type, G seems slightly less Byzantine than the rest, and E seems closer to the basic form of the Byzantine text.

- K^x -- 2^e 3 8 14 45 47 49 51 54 56 58 59 60 61 73 75 76 78 84 89 96 99 etc.

*This is **the** basic group of the Byzantine text in terms of numbers, although in terms of definition it is weak (both von Soden and Wisse define it negatively -- in Von Soden's case, as Byzantine manuscripts which are neither K¹, Kⁱ, nor K^r). Nonetheless it is the dominant manuscript type, constituting nearly half of all manuscripts known. (For further information, see the section on [Byzantine subgroups](#) above.)*

- K^r -- 18 35 55 66 83 128 141 167 etc.

Comment: This is the one Byzantine group which is clearly recensional, and consists of both a text and an apparatus of lectionary and other information. It was probably compiled in the late eleventh or early twelfth century, and became increasingly common in the centuries which followed. Although widespread, its late text makes it of very little importance for criticism, except as it influenced manuscripts not of its type.

- K^a -- Alternate name for I^k (Family Π), which see.

Acts

For an overall view of Von Soden's system in the Acts, Paul, and the Catholic Epistles, see the [Summary](#) following the section on the Catholic Epistles.

- H -- P⁸ ⚭A B C Ψ 048 076 095 096 0165 0175 33 81 104 326 1175

Comment: This is by no means the entire Alexandrian text in the Acts, and 326 and perhaps some of the others are heavily Byzantine.

- I --
 - I^a --
 - I^{a1} -- D E 36 88 181 307 431 453 610 915 917 1829 1874 1898
 - I^{a2} -- 5 467 489 623 927 1827 1838 1873 2143
 - I^{a3} -- 1 38 69 209 218 226 241 256 337 436 460 547 642 794 808 919 920 1311 1319 1522 1525 1835 1837 1845

Comment: This group simply cannot be treated as a unity. D, of course, is "Western," but E has both Byzantine and Alexandrian elements; its "Western" readings are probably derived from the Latin. Many of the other witnesses are also Byzantine, or Byzantine/Alexandrian mixes. There are valuable manuscripts in this section, but they do not form a text-type, and need to be investigated individually.

- I^b --
 - I^{b1} -- 206 242 429 491 522 536 1758 1831 1891
 - I^{b2} -- 066? 323 440 216 1739 2298

This group is Family 1739, which unquestionably exists and includes the majority, perhaps all, of these witnesses (206 323 429 522 1739 1891, for instance, have been confirmed by Geer). There is, however, no basis for Von Soden's subgroups, and even less reason to think that the type is "Western." Available evidence indicates that Family 1739 is either Alexandrian, an Alexandrian/Western mix, or a distinct type.

- I^c --
 - I^{c1} -- 1108 1245 1518 1611 2138
 - I^{c2} -- 255 257 378 383 614 913 1765 2147

Comment: This is the entity variously called Family 614, Family 1611, or Family 2138. Its existence cannot be questioned (though not all of the witnesses listed here have been verified as members of the family). Von Soden's subgroups are, however, questionable (they are demonstrably wrong in Paul and the Catholic Epistles). It is also questionable whether this type is, in fact, "Western"; while it has certain of the D-type readings, it does not agree consistently with D, and does not agree with D F G of Paul or the Old Latin fragments in the Catholics.

- **K --**

Comment: In the Acts and Epistles, Von Soden generally does not break down the Byzantine types. Thus the major Byzantine uncials -- H L P 049 -- are simply listed as "K" with some influence. However, von Soden does distinguish two Byzantine subgroups:

- K^c -- 42 51 57 223 234 479 483 etc.

Comment: K^c has not been examined extensively, but the type does seem to be real. It is clearly Byzantine, but has enough characteristic readings that it can easily be told from the Byzantine mass.

- K^r -- 18 141 201 204 328 363 386 394 444 480 etc.

Comment: K^r in the Acts and Epistles is generally similar in form to the recension of the same name in the Gospels. It has been verified since von Soden's time. Textually, however, it is of very little interest, being almost indistinguishable from the main run of Byzantine witnesses (the group which, in the Gospels, von Soden called K^x, but here does not distinguish with a title).

Paul

For an overall view of Von Soden's system in the Acts, Paul, and the Catholic Epistles, see the [Summary](#) following the section on the Catholic Epistles.

- **H --** P¹³ P¹⁵ P¹⁶ Ⲁ A B C H I P Ψ 0121a+b 048 062 081 082 088
6 33 81 104 326 424^c 1175 1739 (1852) 1908

Comment: All of these witnesses are traditionally listed as Alexandrian, and most of them are certainly witnesses of that type (e.g. ⲘA C I 33 81 1175). Ψ, however, is strongly Byzantine, while P¹³ and B probably go in their own type -- or at least their own subtype -- with P⁴⁶, and the group 0121 1739 6424^c also deserved to be treated as a separate group.

- I --

- I^a --

- I^{a1} -- D (D^{abs1}) (F) (G) 88 181 915 917 1836 1898 1912

Comment: The kindest thing we can say about this group is, "not established." The uncials D F G clearly do form a type, and this type is old -- but their only clear minuscule ally is the diglot 629 (which derives its "Western" readings largely from the Latin). The minuscules listed here are generally interesting, but they are not necessarily "Western"; several seem to contain the Euthalian recension, and have a text which seems to be Alexandrian if anything.

- I^{a2} -- 5 467 489 623 927 1827 1838 1873 2143

The link between 5 and 623 has been fairly well verified (though they seem to be rather weaker in Paul than the Acts and Catholic Epistles). Several of the other manuscripts are of interest, though some appear to be Byzantine. The group, however, has

not been established. The manuscripts do not appear particularly "Western."

- I^{a3} -- 1 38 69 177 218 226 241 255 256 263 319 321
330 337 436 460 462 547 642 794 919 920 999
1311 1319 1738 1835 1837 1845 2127

This is the largest group von Soden recognizes in Paul, and it is certainly true that some of the manuscripts are akin (e.g. 256 1319 2127 and probably 263 are all part of Family 2127). The manuscripts of Family 2127 also appear to show some kinship, at a greater distance, with other members of the group such as 330 and 436. But as usual with von Soden's classifications, the group contains certain Byzantine witnesses (e.g. 1, 177, 226, 319, 337). And even if the non-Byzantine witnesses form a group (which remains to be proved), it is not a "Western" group; the text of Family 2127 (which is probably the least Byzantine of all the witnesses listed here) consists mostly of Alexandrian and Byzantine readings, with very few that are characteristically "Western." If there is a "Cæsarean" text of Paul, this may be it; Family 2127 appears to be the closest Greek witness to the Armenian version.

○ I^b --

- I^{b1} -- 2 206 242 429 522 635 941 1099 1758 1831
1891

- I^{b2} -- 35 43 216 323 336 440 491 823 1149 1872
2298

Comment: This group contains many members which belong with Family 1739 in Acts (e.g. 206, 323, 429, 522, 1891, 2298). Some of these (323, 2298) are also members of Family 1739 in the Catholics; others (206, 429, 522) shift to Family 2138. All of these witnesses, however, lose their value in Paul, and there is no reason to believe any of the other I^b witnesses are any better. Although this group has some meaning in the Acts, and rather less in the Catholics, in Paul it can be completely ignored. The manuscripts are, almost without exception, Byzantine in this corpus.

- I^c --

- I^{c1} -- 1108 1245 1518 1611 2005 2138

Comment: The members of this group are generally members of Family 2138 in the Acts and Catholic Epistles. In Paul, however, this group is simultaneously much smaller and noticeably more Byzantine. 2138, for instance, seems to depart it; indeed, of the above witnesses, only 1611 and probably the lost 1518 clearly belong to this type (other known witnesses include 1505 and 2495). The type is legitimate, but von Soden's list of witnesses is unreliable.

- I^{c2} -- 203 221 257 378 383 385 506 639 876 913
1610 1867 2147

Comment: This group, like the preceding, contains some witnesses which, in the Acts and Catholic Epistles, are members of Family 2138 (Soden's I^{c1}). Almost all of these witnesses, however, become Byzantine in Paul, and there is no reason to believe they belong together or form a textual grouping.

- **K --**

Comment: As in the Acts and Catholic Epistles, Von Soden generally does not break down the Byzantine text in Paul. One major Byzantine uncial, L^{ap}, is listed as K with I influence; most of the others are not listed (e.g. 049) or simply listed as commentary manuscripts (e.g. K^{ap}, 056, 0142). However, as in the Acts, von Soden does distinguish two Byzantine subgroups:

- K^c -- 42 51 57 223 234 479 483 etc.

Comment: K^c has not been examined extensively, but the type does seem to be real. It is clearly Byzantine, but has enough characteristic readings that it can easily be told from the Byzantine mass.

- K^r -- 18 141 201 204 328 363 386 394 444 480 etc.

Comment: K^r in the Acts and Epistles is generally similar in form to the recension of the same name in the Gospels. It has been verified since von Soden's time. Textually, however, it is of very little interest, being almost indistinguishable from the main run of Byzantine

witnesses (the group which, in the Gospels, von Soden called K^x , but here does not distinguish with a title).

Catholic Epistles

For an overall view of Von Soden's system in the Acts, Paul, and the Catholic Epistles, see the [Summary](#) following the section on the Catholic Epistles.

- **H** -- P^{20} \aleph A B C P Ψ 048 (056) (0142) 33 81 104 323 326 424^c
1175 1739 2298

Comment: With the exception of 056 0142 (which von Soden does not list as H manuscripts, but theoretically cites with the H group), the manuscripts in this group are commonly listed as Alexandrian. This is, however, much too simple. Many of the manuscripts are indeed Alexandrian (e.g. A Ψ 33 81). 1175, however, is Byzantine at least in the Catholic Epistles, \aleph and B are rather more distant from the A-33 group, and a large subset of this type -- C 323 1739 2298 -- belong to a different though perhaps related type. In addition, a number of witnesses to this type, such as 436, are listed by von Soden as I rather than H.

- **I** --
 - **I^a** --
 - **I^{a1}** -- 36 88 181 307 431 453 610 915 917 1829
1836 1874 1898
 - **I^{a2}** -- 5 467 489 623 927 1827 1838 1873 2143

- I^{a3} -- 1 38 69 209 218 226 241 256 321 337 384 436
460 547 642 794 808 919 920 1311 1319 1522
1525 1738 1835 1837 1845

Comment: I^a, in the Acts and Paul, contains the uncials which are the core of the "Western" text. In the Catholic Epistles, however, there are no "Western" uncials -- indeed, there is no absolute proof that there ever was a "Western" text of these writings. Deprived of the uncials, the I^a group becomes a collection of not-necessarily-related minuscules (some, such as 436, are Alexandrian; many others are Byzantine and listed here based primarily on their texts in the Acts or Paul).

- I^b --
 - I^{b1} -- 206 216 242 429 440 522 1758 1831 1891
 - I^{b2} -- 35 216 440 491 823 1149 1872

Comment: This group corresponds roughly to Family 1739 in the Acts. In the Catholics, however, von Soden withdrew all the Family 1739 witnesses (323 1739 2298) and listed them with the H text. This leaves the I^b group very weak; many of the members are Byzantine, and the handful which are not (206 429 522) here belong with Family 2138 -- i.e. in the I^c group. The I^b groups do not appear to have any meaning in the Catholics.

- I^c --

- I^{c1} -- 1108 1245 1518 1611 1852 2138

Comment: These manuscripts are part of the core of Family 2138, but Wachtel considers 1852 merely a relative, not a member, of this type, and does not include 1109 and 1245. Thus, while the I^c group is real, it is falsely subdivided.

- I^{c2} -- 255 378 383 614 913 1765 2147

Comment: At least one of these witnesses (614) belongs with the group 2138-1611-1518. Several of the others, however, are mostly Byzantine. This group should be dissolved, with the better members joining Family 2138 and the rest ignored.

- **K** --

Comment: As in the Acts and Paul, Von Soden generally does not break down the Byzantine text in the Catholic Epistles. One major Byzantine uncial, L^{ap}, is listed as K with I influence; another, 049, is listed as Byzantine; others are simply listed as commentary manuscripts (e.g. K^{ap}, 056, 0142). However, as elsewhere, von Soden does distinguish two Byzantine subgroups:

- K^c -- 42 51 57 223 234 479 483 etc.

Comment: K^c has not been examined extensively, but the type does seem to be real. It is clearly Byzantine, but has enough characteristic readings that it can easily be told from the Byzantine mass.

- K^r -- 18 141 201 204 328 363 386 394 444 480 etc.

Comment: K^r in the Acts and Epistles is generally similar

in form to the recension of the same name in the Gospels. It has been verified since von Soden's time -- in the Catholics specifically by Wachtel. Textually, however, it is of very little interest, being almost indistinguishable from the main run of Byzantine witnesses (the group which, in the Gospels, von Soden called K^x, but here does not distinguish with a title).

Summary of Von Soden's work on the Acts, Paul, Catholic Epistles

It has become customary to ignore Von Soden's groupings outside the Gospels, and with good reason; many of the manuscripts he classified simply do not show the features he attributes to them, and manuscripts shift groups more than his system allows. And yet, if we look at the overall results for the Acts and Epistles, von Soden's results bear a striking resemblance to the results outlined in this document. The "H" group is the Alexandrian text (von Soden cannot be faulted for failing to realize the existence of the P⁴⁶/B type in Paul; a text-type can only be recognized when two witnesses exist, and von Soden did not know P⁴⁶). I^a is the "Western" text. I^b is Family [1739](#). I^c is Family [2138](#). And the "K" text is the Byzantine text. If von Soden is to be faulted, it is for not clearly identifying the boundaries of the types. In other words, though Von Soden did not realize it, he too was struggling with the definition of a text-type, just as we have done. In addition, von Soden included many irrelevant witnesses in his groups (often, it appears, by assuming that a manuscript had the same type

in all three sections unless it was known to undergo a shift). This, combined with the rather sloppy way witnesses were cited, makes it hard to perceive the broad accuracy of its groupings (e.g. it's hard to realize that I^b is Family 1739 in Paul when von Soden places 1739 and all its kin in H!).

Apocalypse

Von Soden's textual theory in the Apocalypse has received even less attention than his work in other areas, having been completely eclipsed by the work of Schmid.^[12] The outline which follows is, therefore, less detailed than those which preceded. *Note that the following list does **not** agree, even approximately, with the citation order in Merk or Bover!* Von Soden in these books has a bad habit of putting manuscripts in multiple categories -- e.g. 051 is listed as an Andreas manuscript (A_v²) with a text-type of H. The information here is as interpreted in the *Kurzgefasste Liste*. Note that not all the manuscripts listed under the Andreas type actually have Andreas's commentary; the manuscripts listed here are listed by von Soden as having the Andreas-type text, but some (e.g. 1611) have no commentary at all.

- H -- xA C (P) (051) (052) 0169
- I --
 - I^a --
 - I^{a1} -- 598 2026 2060 2065 2081 2286
 - I^{a2} -- 1 181 296 1894 2059
 - I^{a3} -- 35 209 2031 2056

- I^{a4} -- 1876 2014 2015 2036 2043
- I^{a5} -- 2028 2029 2033 2054 29068 2069
- I^{a6} -- 743 2055 2074 2067
- I^{a7} -- 60 432 2023 2061
- I^b --
 - I^{b1} -- 1778 2080
 - I^{b2} -- 104 459 628 922
- I^o --
 - I^{o1} -- 172 250 424 1828 1862
 - I^{o2} -- 42 325 468 517
- I' -- 69 (2016) 2020 2057 2329 2351
- **K** -- 046 1841 2030
 - K^c -- 920 1859 1872 2027
 - K^o -- 91 175 242 256 314 617 1934 (2016) 2017
- Av (Andreas) -- 94 241 (469) 1611 1678 1854 2019 (2040)
2042 2050 2070 2071 2073 2091 2254 2302
- **O** (Oecumenius) -- 2053 2062

والمجد لله دائما