

THE Union Seminary Magazine.

Vol. XIII.

OCTOBER—NOVEMBER, 1901.

No. 1.

I. Literary.

WILLIAM WALLACE SPENCE.

By PROF. W. W. MOORE, D. D., LL. D.

NOTWITHSTANDING all that has been said about our age as an era of young men, it is undeniable that much of the world's best work is still done by men who are well advanced in years. The adage, "Old men for counsel, young men for war," while true in general, cannot be taken literally, as many of our most useful men of action are old men. Longfellow, in his *Morituri Salutamur*, recognized this fact in his catalogue of literary achievements by the elderly:

"Cato learned Greek at eighty; Sophocles
Wrote his grand *Œdipus*, and Simonides
Bore off the prize of verse from his compeers,
When each had numbered more than fourscore years,
And Theophrastus, at fourscore and ten,
Had but begun his *Characters of Men*;
Chaucer, at Woodstock with the nightingales,
At sixty wrote the *Canterbury Tales*;
Goethe at Weimar, toiling to the last,
Completed *Faust* when eighty years were past."

Von Moltke, Bismarck, Gladstone, Hannibal Hamlin, Justin Morrill, John Hall, Moses Hoge, William Henry Green, John I. Blair, of New Jersey, and Charles Reid, of Norfolk, are examples of immensely active old age from the recent past, while we still have with us such leaders in public life as Lord Salisbury, such preëminent soldiers as Lord Roberts, such teachers as Pro-

TEXTUAL EMENDATION AND HIGHER CRITICISM.

BY REV. F. P. RAMSAY.

THE science of interpretation undertakes to determine the meaning of a writing, given the writing itself, together with the author, the time and place, and the occasion. The science of higher criticism undertakes to determine the author, the time and place, and the occasion, given the writing itself. The science of lower criticism undertakes to determine the writing itself. The science of lower criticism gives the writing to higher criticism; and higher criticism receives it and gives it and the conditions of its origin to interpretation.

Lower criticism has three tasks to accomplish. The first is to collect the readings of the manuscripts, versions and quotations, that is to provide the critical apparatus. The second is to discriminate between the various readings, determining in each case which is the correct or more probable, that is to ascertain the written text. The third is to correct the written text, supplying omissions, removing additions and curing corruptions. In performing the second of these tasks use is made of internal evidence as well as of external; and in performing the third, use is made of conjecture, as well as of what is strictly evidence.

Distinction here is necessary. The readings actually found in manuscripts, versions and quotations are the external evidence. Phenomena found in a writing other than these readings are internal evidence. If, for instance, we were to read in Matthew xxvii. 9, *Jeremiah* in some manuscripts, versions and quotations, but *Zechariah* in others, here would be external evidence for each reading, and the weight of external evidence for the one reading rather than for the other might be sufficient to put the one reading beyond doubt. If doubt remained after all the external evidence was considered, then the internal would remain to be examined. If we found Matthew elsewhere ascribing the same quotation to Jeremiah, or to Zechariah, this would be internal evidence for the reading *Jeremiah* or *Zechariah*, as the case

might be. Or if an examination of all Matthew's ascribed quotations shows him to have been correct in his ascription in every other case, this is internal evidence for *Zechariah* here, or at least against *Jeremiah*, since that quotation actually comes from Zech. xi. 12, 13; but if Matthew were found to be often inaccurate in his ascriptions, such internal evidence would be wanting. Internal evidence is properly used in determining between various readings of the written text.

When these two tasks, of collecting the various readings of manuscripts, versions and quotations, and of sifting them, have been done, and the written text is thus determined, we are ready for *emendation*. Emendation is often used of substituting one written reading for another written reading, but we are here using it of changes away from the written text. In emendation in this sense, use may be made of both evidence and conjecture. To recur to our passage in Matthew xxvii. 9, Matthew's unvarying correctness elsewhere is evidence favorable to his correctness here; but the written reading is undoubtedly *Jeremiah*, *Zechariah* occurring nowhere. There are four possibilities. Two, that the quotation is really from the book of Jeremiah, and that Jeremiah actually wrote that part of the book of Zechariah from which the quotation is taken, are shut out by the facts. Two other conjectures remain, that Matthew wrote either *Zechariah* or nothing, and that he wrote *Jeremiah* by mistake. This is favored by the external evidence supporting the written text; but the other, by the correctness of Matthew elsewhere. Between the written reading *Jeremiah*, and the conjectural reading *Zechariah* or nothing, one must judge. To strike out *Jeremiah* with or without insertion of *Zechariah* will be to emend the written text by internal evidence.

We see the difference between internal evidence and conjecture. Internal evidence may be strong enough to bring the written text into doubt, or even to disprove it; but it can hardly determine any reading in place of the written reading. Conjecture can prove nothing. It may be used in directing the application of evidence; but, unless in rare and extreme cases, no evidence can establish a conjectural reading against a written reading. The written text, as determined without the admission of any conjectural reading, should be put down as the written text; and all emendations should be marked as such. For it should be

borne in mind that all readings substituted for the written text are necessarily conjectural, and that, even when the written text is disproved by internal evidence, the conjectural text is not established thereby. Conjecture is only a detective in search of evidence.

So much of the written text given by the science of lower criticism is established as the internal evidence does not bring into doubt or disprove, plus what little of the conjectural text, if any, the internal evidence establishes beyond doubt. The text given by lower criticism is doubtful so far as not established by external and internal evidence. So much of the written text as is disproved by the internal evidence, and whatever of conjecture is not supported by internal evidence, is not given at all by lower criticism.

The text that higher criticism must use is not a text of its own creation, but the text received by it from lower criticism; and this text is scientifically determined only in so far as it is traditional. For internal evidence is traditional as certainly as is external evidence. The internal is traditional evidence drawn from a wide field, and the external is traditional evidence concerning the particular passage. The only evidence for the text is traditional in its nature, and the only text available for use by higher criticism or interpretation is the text determined by traditional evidence.

If, then, higher criticism must do its work before interpretation has material to work on, and this right is conceded to the science of higher criticism, lower criticism is also a science, to which must be conceded the right of determining the text on which higher criticism shall work.

There are two tendencies in higher criticism, as in other branches of Biblical science. The one is the new and the other is the old. The one prefers new views and the other prefers old views. Those in whom the love of the new predominates may be called the new school; and those in whom the love of the old predominates, the old school. Those of us who believe that the Bible has already been understood in the main, belong to the old school; and those who believe that the Bible has been misunderstood in the main, belong to the new school. Consequently the old school believes that the traditional text is in the main correct, while the new school lean more to textual change. Thus it

happens that the new school are more ready than the old to doubt and reject the traditional text, and to favor conjectural emendations; for the traditional text favors the old views, and the new views require a conjecturally emended text.

We will illustrate. In Zechariah i. 7, the text given by lower criticism adds to the number of the month its name, *that is the month Shebat*. This addition is said by Nowack (*Handkommentar zum Alten Testament: Die Kleinen Propheten*) to be "probably not original," and adds as a reason that "first in later times does the custom meet us of adding the names to the numbers. This is a conjectural emendation without evidence. On the same principle he strikes out *Chisleu* in vii. 1, supporting the one conjectural emendation by the other. The fact is that the name of the month is added to its number only in 1 Kings vi. 1; Zech. i. 7; vii. 1; Est. ii. 16; iii. 7 t., 13; viii. 9, 12; ix. 1. The number is added to the name in 1 Kings vi. 38; viii. 2. By removing this phenomenon from Zechariah, foundation is laid for an argument (?) that Kings was compiled at a very late date. That is, by accepting the given text in 1 Kings and Esther, and rejecting it in Zechariah, texts are obtained favorable to a certain hypothesis. Conjecture is supported by conjecture.

In Zech. ii. 2 (English i. 19) the given text reads, "These are the horns which have scattered Judah, Israel and Jerusalem." And in viii. 13 the given text reads, "O house of Judah, and house of Israel." The second part of Zechariah, which the new school says was not written by Zechariah, couples Israel and Judah (xi. 14), and otherwise mentions Israel (ix. 1 and xii. 1). By eliminating *Israel* from the first part of Zechariah, a difference will be created between the two parts, and then this difference can be used in favor of difference of authorship. Accordingly Nowack so emends the text by conjecture.

In iii. 4, 8, 9 the given text reads, "And he answered and said to those standing before him, saying, Strip off the filthy garments from him; and he said to him, See, I have caused thy guilt to pass from thee, and have clothed thee with festal robes.—Hear now, Joshua, the high priest, thou and thy companions that sit before thee (for they are men of typical significance); for, behold, I am going to bring in my servant, BRANCH. For, behold, the stone which I have put before Joshua, seven eyes upon one stone,—behold, I am going to engrave its engraving,

is the oracle of Jehovah, and I will remove the guilt of that land in one day." Here it is taught that the Messiah will as the high priest, of whom Joshua is but the type, effect the real removal of guilt. But the new school needs to find in Zechariah the doctrine of a real removal of guilt by the ritual. For, if Zechariah is found teaching that the ritual cannot effect atonement, one of the strongest arguments for the post-exilic origin of the Levitical ritual will be gone. Moreover, if Zechariah is allowed to teach that the Messiah is going to be the priest as well as king of the nation, the new school conception of the early post-exilic times is destroyed. Accordingly, either the removal of guilt in v. 4 or the bringing in of the BRANCH in v. 8 is eliminated. This is conjectural emendation to support a reconstruction of the whole history.

We give one more example. Zech. vi. 11-13, according to the text given by lower criticism reads thus: "And take silver and gold, and make a crown (*or* crowns), and put on the head of Joshua, son of Jehozadak, the high priest, and say to him, saying, Thus saith Jehovah of hosts, saying, Behold a man, whose name is BRANCH and he shall spring up in his place, and shall build the temple of Jehovah. Even he it is that shall build the temple of Jehovah, and he that shall bear glory, and sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be priest upon his throne, and the counsel of peace shall be between the two" (the temple and the throne). As Zechariah had already said that Zerubbabel should build the temple (iv. 9), this symbolic crowning of Joshua as type of the Messiah who should build the temple would certainly signify that Joshua and the existing temple and ritual were but typical; that the Messiah would unite in himself the offices of king and priest, and that he would build the real temple and make the real atonement, as well as establish the real kingdom. But to admit that Zechariah taught all this, would be to give up a conception of Zechariah's time fundamental to the whole new school theory. Accordingly, the text must be emended. It has been conjectured that to v. 11 was added *and on the head of Zerubbabel*, so that a crown was put on the head of Joshua and Zerubbabel each; that *Zerubbabel* was originally written in place of *Joshua*; that the last clause of v. 11 should be omitted altogether; and that the last clause of v. 12, *and he shall build the temple of Jehovah*, should be omitted. By one or more of these

conjectural changes, and any other change thus made necessary, Zechariah is prevented from teaching antagonistically to the new views.

These specimens are sufficient. It is safe to say that the new views in higher criticism cannot be defended without frequent emendation, by mere conjecture, of the text given by lower criticism, emendation changing the sense of many most important passages. This dependence of the new views upon mere conjecture makes impossible their stability.

We plead, then, for the rights of lower criticism. The only scientific basis for the work of higher criticism is the work of lower criticism.

It may be objected that lower criticism cannot give a sure text of the Old Testament, the available evidences being insufficient. Three answers are at hand. If lower criticism, whose office it is to give the text, cannot do it, much less can higher criticism, whose office it is not; for if the facts do not yield certainty, conjecture never can. Again, it is unscientific to build upon a conjecturally emended text. Finally, the new school is forced to resort to conjectural emendation of the text of the New Testament, a text as certainly established as any ancient text.

There is an indissoluble connection between the text given by the science of lower criticism and the old views. In the name of science we must insist that the new views in higher criticism are incapable of proof unless first a new text be established by scientific methods.