

VU Research Portal

Against All Authorities

Kamphuis, B.L.F.

2017

document version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

citation for published version (APA)

Kamphuis, B. L. F. (2017). *Against All Authorities: The New Testament Conjectural Criticism of Jan Hendrik Holwerda (1805-1886)*. [PhD-Thesis - Research and graduation internal, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam].

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

E-mail address:

vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl

CONTENTS

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 1 | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 | 13 December 1886..... | 1 |
| 1.2 | The Amsterdam research project and its historical approach..... | 2 |
| 1.3 | The Dutch Movement of Conjectural Criticism..... | 4 |
| 1.4 | Holwerda as father of the Dutch Movement..... | 8 |
| 1.5 | The Dutch Movement of Conjectural Criticism and Dutch Radical Criticism..... | 10 |
| 1.6 | The relevance of Holwerda..... | 12 |
| 1.7 | Holwerda and nineteenth-century New Testament conjectural criticism in scholarship..... | 14 |
| 1.8 | Research aims..... | 16 |
| 1.9 | Research questions, outline, methods..... | 17 |
| 1.10 | Miscellaneous..... | 19 |
| 2 | THE <i>SITZ IM LEBEN</i> OF HOLWERDA'S NEW TESTAMENT CONJECTURAL CRITICISM | 23 |
| 2.1 | Introduction..... | 23 |
| 2.2 | Early years (1805–1830)..... | 24 |
| 2.3 | Ministry (1831–1872)..... | 27 |
| 2.4 | <i>Emendationum Flavianarum specimen</i> (1847) and the Leiden Radical School..... | 29 |
| 2.4.1 | <i>Emendationum Flavianarum specimen</i> | 29 |
| 2.4.2 | Rise of the Leiden Radical School..... | 31 |
| 2.4.3 | Characteristics of the Leiden Radical School..... | 33 |
| 2.4.4 | The apogee of the Leiden Radical School: Cobet..... | 36 |
| 2.5 | In contact with Cobet (from 1847 onwards)..... | 38 |
| 2.6 | Rejected by van Hengel (1849–1851)..... | 41 |
| 2.6.1 | Hamaker's observation..... | 41 |
| 2.6.2 | Holwerda's essay..... | 41 |
| 2.6.3 | Interpretation..... | 45 |
| 2.7 | Van Hengel's <i>Proeve</i> (1852)..... | 47 |
| 2.8 | <i>Betrekking</i> (1853): A programmed New Testament 'debut' | 49 |
| 2.8.1 | The title | 49 |
| 2.8.2 | Criticism of New Testament scholarship..... | 52 |
| 2.8.3 | The New Testament passages in <i>Betrekking</i> and <i>Proeve</i> | 56 |

Contents

| | | |
|--------|--|-----|
| 2.8.4 | <i>Betrekking</i> as the outcome of a long process | 58 |
| 2.8.5 | Criticism of <i>Betrekking</i> | 60 |
| 2.9 | Praise and friendship (from 1853 onwards)..... | 63 |
| 2.10 | <i>Aanteekeningen</i> (1853) and “Opmerkingen” (1854) | 67 |
| 2.11 | <i>Bijdragen</i> (1855)..... | 68 |
| 2.12 | Discredited in <i>Godgeleerde bijdragen</i> (1855)..... | 71 |
| 2.12.1 | Holwerda popular among conservatives | 71 |
| 2.12.2 | The review in <i>Godgeleerde bijdragen</i> | 73 |
| 2.12.3 | Antipathy towards New Testament conjectural emendation?..... | 77 |
| 2.12.4 | Holwerda’s response | 80 |
| 2.13 | Polemic with Peerkamp (1855–1856) | 81 |
| 2.13.1 | <i>Opmerkingen</i> | 81 |
| 2.13.2 | Holwerda’s first response..... | 83 |
| 2.13.3 | Babel-like confusion | 84 |
| 2.13.4 | A pleasant discussion | 87 |
| 2.13.5 | Holwerda’s reputation..... | 90 |
| 2.14 | Romans 9:5 (1858–1859)..... | 92 |
| 2.15 | Review of Tischendorf’s <i>Septima</i> (1860)..... | 94 |
| 2.16 | Troubles with Cobet (rift in 1862) | 95 |
| 2.16.1 | Cobet thwarting Holwerda | 95 |
| 2.16.2 | Holwerda annoyed | 98 |
| 2.16.3 | The rift..... | 99 |
| 2.16.4 | Interpretation | 102 |
| 2.17 | The last two decades (1866–1886)..... | 104 |
| 2.18 | Conclusion | 108 |
| 3 | THEORETICAL ASPECTS OF HOLWERDA’S NEW TESTAMENT CONJECTURAL CRITICISM..... | 113 |
| 3.1 | Introduction..... | 113 |
| 3.2 | Background | 114 |
| 3.2.1 | Introduction | 114 |
| 3.2.2 | Griesbach | 115 |
| 3.2.3 | Lachmann | 115 |
| 3.2.4 | Tischendorf..... | 118 |
| 3.3 | General text-critical method..... | 121 |
| 3.4 | The role of exegesis in textual criticism (contra Tischendorf) | 125 |
| 3.5 | Best manuscripts..... | 129 |
| 3.5.1 | Bekker’s short cut and the luxury problem of New Testament manuscripts..... | 129 |
| 3.5.2 | Holwerda’s ‘diplomatic’ investigation..... | 133 |

Contents

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----|
| 3.5.3 | Holwerda's mirror image: Tregelles | 139 |
| 3.6 | Conjectural emendation | 143 |
| 3.6.1 | Argumentation in <i>Betrekking</i> | 143 |
| 3.6.2 | Argumentation in <i>Bijdragen</i> and "Tischendorf"..... | 147 |
| 3.6.3 | No relation to earlier New Testament conjectural criticism..... | 151 |
| 3.7 | Conclusion | 154 |
| 4 | QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF HOLWERDA'S NEW TESTAMENT CONJECTURES..... | 159 |
| 4.1 | Introduction..... | 159 |
| 4.2 | Quantitative analysis..... | 159 |
| 4.2.1 | Introduction | 159 |
| 4.2.2 | Holwerda's conjectures as distributed over his writings and over the biblical books..... | 159 |
| 4.2.3 | Holwerda's conjectures classified according to problems, causes and operations..... | 164 |
| 4.2.3.1 | The classification | 164 |
| 4.2.3.2 | Holwerda's conjectures classified | 168 |
| 4.3 | Qualitative analysis | 178 |
| 4.3.1 | Introduction | 178 |
| 4.3.2 | Passage-related (content) problems | 179 |
| 4.3.2.1 | Introduction | 179 |
| 4.3.2.2 | Addition as solution | 179 |
| 4.3.2.3 | Omission as solution | 184 |
| 4.3.2.4 | Substitution as solution 1: form change..... | 186 |
| 4.3.2.5 | Substitution as solution 2: similar word..... | 190 |
| 4.3.2.6 | Two-track solutions | 197 |
| 4.3.3 | Philological problems..... | 200 |
| 4.3.3.1 | Introduction | 200 |
| 4.3.3.2 | Confusion of εἰς and ἐν..... | 200 |
| 4.3.3.2.1 | Problematic εἰς..... | 200 |
| 4.3.3.2.2 | Problematic ἐν..... | 203 |
| 4.3.3.2.3 | Interpretation..... | 205 |
| 4.3.3.3 | Confusion of indicative and subjunctive..... | 206 |
| 4.3.3.3.1 | Problematic indicatives | 206 |
| 4.3.3.3.2 | Problematic subjunctives..... | 211 |
| 4.3.3.3.3 | Interpretation..... | 212 |
| 4.3.3.4 | Ἐμὲ expected, με transmitted | 213 |
| 4.3.3.5 | Καί for καί | 215 |
| 4.3.3.6 | Lexical problems..... | 216 |

Contents

| | | |
|---------|---|-----|
| 4.3.3.7 | Syntactical problems | 217 |
| 4.3.3.8 | Other philological problems | 218 |
| 4.3.4 | Other problems | 219 |
| 4.3.4.1 | Passage-related (style) problems | 219 |
| 4.3.4.2 | Stemmatic problems..... | 220 |
| 4.3.4.3 | An author-related (content) and an extraneous problem: Mark 1:1–3 | 222 |
| 4.3.5 | A cause group of conjectures: omission of supposed glosses | 225 |
| 4.3.5.1 | General | 225 |
| 4.3.5.2 | Holwerda’s conjecture on 2 Cor 3:3 in the history of scholarship | 233 |
| 4.3.6 | Semi-conjectures..... | 239 |
| 4.3.7 | A special case: Holwerda anticipating the <i>ECM</i> conjecture on 2 Pet 3:10..... | 242 |
| 4.4 | Conclusion | 253 |
| 5 | CONCLUSION | 259 |
| 5.1 | Three paradoxes | 259 |
| 5.2 | Future research | 262 |
| 5.3 | Epilogue..... | 264 |
| | APPENDIX 1. OVERVIEW OF HOLWERDA’S CONJECTURES..... | 267 |
| | APPENDIX 2. CODEX EPHRAEMI RESCRIPTUS: AN UNDERESTIMATED UNCIAL | 281 |
| | BIBLIOGRAPHY..... | 287 |
| | 1. Holwerda’s publications | 289 |
| | 2. Holwerda’s correspondence..... | 292 |
| | 3. New Testament editions and Bible translations | 294 |
| | 4. Editions and translations of other ancient works | 303 |
| | 5. Other sources | 305 |
| | SUMMARY..... | 343 |
| | SAMENVATTING | 347 |