
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE VII.

THE TRUE IMPORT OF כָּאֲרִי יָדַי וְרַגְלָי IN PS. 22: 17, COMMONLY TRANSLATED, "THEY PIERCED MY HANDS AND MY FEET."

By Rev. Robert W. Landis, Hillsdale, N. Y.[1]

THE question as to the true import of this passage, has for a thousand years past furnished a theme for contention between the Synagogue and the Christian Church; the former insisting that כָּאֲרִי is compounded of the prefix כ and אֲרִי *a lion;* and that the phrase simply means "*as a lion my hands and my feet;*" while the latter maintains that the word should be read not as a noun but as a verb; and that the phrase should be rendered, "*They pierced* my hands and my feet." A popular and excellent expositor, has lately in his work on the Psalms, afforded some countenance to the Jewish interpretation; and as the importance of the theme will be readily conceded, we have concluded to devote a few pages to a review of the question.

The expositor to whom we refer, it is almost needless to say, is the Rev. Joseph Addison Alexander, to whom the sacred literature of our country owes obligations which are neither trivial nor few. In common with many we feel gratefully indebted to this gentleman for the exegetical works with which he has already favored the Christian world; and though we decidedly dissent from his conclusions in relation to the passage before us, it is not without diffidence that we venture thus to call them in question; being assured of the scrupulous care with which his conclusions generally in this his favorite department of theological science, are considered and reviewed before being submitted to the public. We are, however, fully convinced that the exposition of the passage referred to is erroneous, and that it is calculated to do serious injury in more ways than one to the cause of truth; and so thinking and feeling, we shall endeavor with all the frankness which Dr. Alexander himself would observe in a similar case, to state the reasons which appear to us to justify this conviction.

That the matter may, however, be fully understood by all our readers, we shall here extract from the work of Dr. Alexander, the passage to which we refer. After translating the whole verse in

[1] The following Article was prepared for the Biblical Repository, and should have been inserted at an earlier day. — EDS.

consistency with the common version of it by evangelical Christians, he proceeds as follows in relation to the clause referred to:

"The last clause, as above translated, contains a striking reference to our Saviour's crucifixion, which some have striven to expunge by denying that the ancients nailed the feet as well as the hands to the cross. But although there is a singular absence of explicit declaration on the subject, both in the classical and sacred writers, the old opinion that the feet were pierced may be considered as completely verified by modern investigation and discussion. So far, therefore, as the question of usage is concerned, we can have no difficulty in referring the clause to our Saviour's crucifixion, and regarding it as one of those remarkable coincidences, some of which have been already noticed, all designed and actually tending to identify our Lord as the most prominent subject of prophecy. It is very remarkable, however, that no citation or application of the clause occurs in any of the Gospels. It is also worthy of remark that the clause, thus explained, although highly appropriate to one part of our Saviour's passion, is, unlike the rest of the description, hardly applicable, even in a figurative sense, to the case of any other sufferer. Even supposing the essential idea to be merely that of wounds inflicted on the body, it seems strange that it should be expressed in the specific and unusual form of piercing the hands and the feet. On further inspection it appears that, in order to obtain this meaning, we must either change the text (כָּאֲרִי or כָּאֲרִי for כָּאֲרוּ), or assume a plural form so rare that some grammarians deny its existence altogether (כָּאֲרַי for כָּאֲרִים), and an equally rare form of the participle (כָּרִים for כָּאֲרִים), and a meaning of the verb itself which nowhere else occurs, but must be borrowed from a cognate root (כָּרָה for כוּר); an accumulation of grammatical and lexicographical anomalies, which cannot be assumed without the strongest exegetical necessity, and this can exist only if the words admit of no other explanation more in accordance with analogy and usage. Now the very same form in Ps. 38: 13, is unquestionably used to mean *like the lion*, and a slight modification of the same in Numb. 24: 9. Ezek. 22: 25, *like a lion*. This idea would be here the more appropriate because the Psalm abounds in such allusions, and because the lion is expressly mentioned both before and afterwards. See above, v. 14 (13), and below, v. 22 (21). The sense would then be 'they surround my hands and my feet, as they would a lion,' or, 'as a lion would,' i. e. with the strength and fierceness of a lion. The hands and feet may be mentioned as the parts used in defence and flight. That the mention of these parts after all, in connection with the lion is not altogether natural, cannot fairly be denied, and this objection should have all the weight to which it is entitled. But whether it can outweigh the grammatical difficulties that attend the other construction, is a serious question, which ought not to be embarrassed by any supposed conflict with New Testament authority, since no citation of the clause occurs there. It may even be possible to reconcile the two interpretations by supplying a verb and giving כָּאֲרִי

its usual meaning. 'Like a lion (they have wounded) my hands and my feet.' The point of comparison would then be the infliction of sharp wounds in those parts of the body, an idea common to the habits of the lion and to the usages of crucifixion." See in loco, pp. 184, 185.

Such are Dr. Alexander's annotations touching the clause referred to. But, before entering upon the discussion of the main question, we shall here offer a remark or two upon several topics raised in this exposition, but which have not an immediate connection with the point mainly at issue.

That there is in the sacred writers an absence of explicit declaration on the subject of the piercing of the feet in crucifixion, may, perhaps, be admitted; but by no means can it be admitted that there is a "*singular* absence" of such allusions; for this would imply that there existed a demand for such "explicit declaration" in the New Testament, which is by no means the fact. Whatever the custom in crucifying might have been, it was universally known in the time of Christ, and for centuries afterwards. Nor is it easy to imagine what occasion could exist, under such circumstances, that should require of the sacred writers, the "explicit declaration" referred to. The fact, however, that he was thus pierced, is sufficiently referred to and implied. For example, in Matt. 27: 35, 36, we have precisely the occurrences which are mentioned in Ps. 22: 17–19, "They *crucified* him," (that is, agreeably to the usages of crucifixion as then universally known, they pierced his hands and feet by nailing them to the cross,) "and parted his garments," etc. Then in Luke 24: 39, 40, the same idea is most forcibly implied in Christ's words to his disciples, "Behold my hands and my feet that it is I myself:" *ἴδετε τὰς χεῖρας μου καὶ τοὺς πόδας μου, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐγώ εἰμι.* It was by the marks which were visible in his hands and feet, therefore, that the disciples were to learn that he who then stood before them, was he who had been crucified.

As to the absence of such declaration in the classics, nothing need be here said, (though the reader, if disposed, may consult Plautus. Mostell. Act. II. 1, 13). The expressions on the subject, in both the Greek and Latin fathers, (while crucifixion was yet practised) can leave no room for doubt on the subject. Justin Martyr says, "As they therefore did crucify Him, they pierced through his hands and feet, by driving nails through them." Tertullian (Adv. Marc. III. 19,) expressly affirms also that the nailing of the feet as well as the hands, belonged to the peculiar severity of this mode of punishment: *quae propria est atrocia crucis.* He makes this remark in his ex-

planation of Ps. 22: 17, which he has just quoted. So too say all the fathers when they have occasion to refer to the matter. And can it be conceived that such an expression as that of Justin, or this of Tertullian would have ever been made thus openly, at the very time when this mode of executing was still practised, and yet the declaration be false, and remain uncontradicted? It is needless, however, to dwell upon this matter. No one will doubt that the recent, thorough investigations of this subject, have settled the question that the feet as well as the hands were pierced in crucifixion; and if so, every mention in the N. Testament of the fact that Christ was crucified, (and how frequently is it mentioned!) is a declaration of the fact that his hands and feet were pierced. And how Dr. A. could suppose that there need be, under such circumstances any more *explicit* declaration on the subject, is unaccountable. Nor should we have devoted so much space to this point, were it not for the strong and repeated efforts made by Dr. A. to employ this alleged absence of "explicit declaration," to sustain his criticism.

Dr. Alexander also considers it *very remarkable* that no citation or application of the clause occurs in any of the Gospels. But admitting it to be even so, what is there peculiarly remarkable herein? Is it not equally remarkable that Gen. 49: 10, and Dan. 9: 27, and other passages are not quoted and applied? There can be no doubt that all such passages were adduced by the apostles in their disputes with the Jews, and that they were among those with which Apollos "mightily convinced" them, and by which they were "confounded" by Paul; but why they should have been formally quoted and applied in the New Testament does not appear.

A third point raised in the foregoing exposition by Dr. A., and obviously for the purpose of preparing the reader's mind to abandon the commonly received view of the passage, is, that "Even supposing the essential idea to be merely that of wounds inflicted on the body, it seems strange that it should be expressed in the specific and unusual form of piercing the hands and feet." But wherein is this asserted *strangeness*? If the psalm be indeed Messianic, (Dr. A. strenuously maintains that it is,) the sufferings which it narrates are of course to be referred to the Messiah. Now, were not the hands and feet of Christ pierced? and is not the clause in question (as commonly explained,) a prophetic statement of the fact? If the wounds which he received were mentioned at all, why should they not be correctly mentioned? The *strangeness* appears to be on the other side, and in supposing that they could have been mentioned in some

other way.[1] But Dr. A. completely sets aside the force of this presumption, by conceding at the close of his exposition (as quoted above,) that "It may be even possible to reconcile the two interpretations by supplying a verb and giving כָּאֲרִי its usual meaning. 'Like the lion (they have wounded) my hands and my feet.'" As to the *possibility* here referred to, it is somewhat problematical, to say the least; but the reader will perceive from this passage that it may not after all, therefore, be very "*strange that it should be expressed in the specific and unusual form of piercing the hands and the feet.*" But let us proceed to the main question.

Dr. Alexander remarks, "That in order to obtain this meaning, ('they pierced my hands and my feet,') we must either change the text, (כַּאֲרִי or כְּאָרֵי for כַּאֲרוּ), or assume a plural form so rare, that some grammarians deny its existence altogether, (כָּאֲרִי for כָּרִים), and an equally rare form of the participle (כָּאֲרִים for כָּרִים), and a meaning of the verb itself which no where else occurs, but must be borrowed from a cognate root (כּוּר for כָּרָה): an accumulation of grammatical and lexicographical anomalies which cannot be assumed without," etc. This representation presents the full strength of the position assumed by Dr. A. The remarks which follow in his exposition, and which are designed to show that the version for which he thus contends, is susceptible of being justified on other than exegetical grounds, will be noticed hereafter.

And *first*, As to the change of the text. This consideration is placed by Dr. A., in the front of his array of argument, with much skill; for if it be even so that the words of the Holy Spirit must be *changed*, before we can obtain the version of the passage which is commonly given, Dr. A. may well expect to carry with him the piety and intelligence of at least the American public, in favor of the version which he proposes. The idea of rudely changing the sacred text, in order to sustain a theory, or a statement, is not to be tolerated for a moment by the evangelical churches in this land. And it is easy to imagine how the ideas of Unitarian and Rationalistic rashness and hardihood, must rise up and flit before the mental vision of his readers, awakening, too, the corresponding ideas of indignation at the audacity which would venture for any reason whatever to mutilate the inspired record of the Holy Spirit. But should it turn out

[1] It has been said of J. S. Semler that he was not content with knowing what other people knew, but that *he must know it in a different way* from what they did. This might be easily accomplished, if the supposition mentioned above could be realized.

that there now is, and has been for a thousand years past, (founded, too, on the best of reasons), a dispute as to what *the text* really is, (that is, whether it be בְּאֵרִי or בְּאֵרוּ), and that there are strong, if not invincible, reasons for believing that what is now called *the text*, (or *Kethibh*), is really and properly not the text, as originally written; and should it appear, moreover, that in other instances Dr. A. does not at all hesitate to change the Kethibh for the Keri, (or the textual reading for that which is in the margin), and that he has made such *changes* in other places, without a tithe of the reasons which imperiously demand it here; we may be permitted to indulge our surprise that he should lay such stress upon a matter of so little consequence.

Let us be fairly understood here. We are gratified with the expression of that high regard which Dr. A. undoubtedly feels for the received text. That it ought never to be departed from, unless when the best and most conclusive reasons require and justify such a procedure, is too evident to need illustration; and Lowth and others have done serious injury to the cause of truth and righteousness, by their rash and conjectural emendations. Our objection is not therefore to Dr. Alexander's high regard for the Kethibh itself, but to his implied intimation, that there is no sufficient reason here for the substitution of בְּאֵרוּ for בְּאֵרִי, and also to his want of consistency in not allowing this avowed reverence for the *Kethibh* to operate uniformly. For why should he with such apparent zeal require a strict adherence to the text, in an instance where its accuracy is, to say the least, extremely doubtful; and yet in many places where there is comparatively nothing of importance to the Christian church involved in the matter, depart from that very text without even an expression of regret or of doubt as to the correctness of the procedure? And not only so, but he repeatedly avers that the *Kethibh* should be corrected from the Masora and ancient versions, and in cases, too, where there appears not to be a tithe of the sufficient reasons for such a procedure, which are found to exist in behalf of the *change* referred to in Ps. 22: 17. See for example, Dr. Alexander's Exposition of Isaiah 9: 2, where, without the least hesitation, he omits the negative particle in his translation of the passage, and in his notes, justifies the omission. He renders the passage, "Thou hast increased its joy," expunging from the *Kethibh* the particle לֹא, and substituting in lieu thereof, לוֹ, and then coolly remarking that it is best so "to read it with the Masora, several ancient versions, Gesenius, De Wette, and Knobel;" and also that "the same emendation is *required by the con-*

text in several other places, e. g. ch. 49: 5. 63: 5." See, *in loco*, p. 156. Now, all we ask of Dr. A., or of any other critic, is that these considerations should be permitted to operate also in the case under discussion. The import of Psalm 22: 17, would never thereafter be questioned by them.

We have likewise another instance of the kind in Dr. Alexander's Annotations on Ps. 16: 10, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption." The *Kethibh* here is חֲסִידֶיךָ, *holy ones*, and the *Keri*, חֲסִידְךָ, *holy one;* and yet he hesitates not to reject or "*change*" the text for the marginal reading,[1] and that, too, against the decision of Rosenmüller, De Wette, Gesenius, Bruns, Stange, Fischer, etc.

Now we again say that these principles of criticism ought not to be objected to; for the Keri is in these places doubtless the true reading. But we do object to the refusal of Dr. A. to apply the same principles to the case before us. We do object to his varying his ground as he does in relation to Ps. 22: 17; and so giving the authority of his distinguished and well-earned reputation to justify the cavils of Jews and Rationalists, in a matter of the highest interest to the church. For the distinguishing views of these gentlemen Dr. A. has obviously not much sympathy. But we regret that he should have departed from the principles upon which he expounded Is. 9: 2, just where they applied more strongly than to that passage itself; and just where a question of the utmost importance was in dispute between the church of Christ, and the Jewish and Rationalistic schools.

[1] In relation to this subject, Hengstenberg remarks that "the plural here must have been extremely welcome to the Jews, because it furnished them with the best means of refuting the Messianic interpretation of the Psalm." But Dr. Alexander remarks, that "the essential difference between the two (readings,) is less than it may appear at first sight, since even the singular is collective, and includes the whole class of God's chosen and favored ones, of whom Christ is the head and representative," p. 118. This observation appears to be peculiarly unfortunate; and, if we understand it, contains a concession of more than is just to the Jews and Rationalists. But is it a fact that God does not suffer his "*holy ones*," (i. e. "his chosen and favored ones,") to see corruption? It is true in no sense of the terms as here employed, and Dr. A. ought not to have conceded that the question as to which reading is here adopted, is therefore a question of less importance than evangelical Christians have supposed. Even Fischer (Proluss. de Vit. lexic. N. T. p. 184, seq.) and Stange, (anticrit. in Psalm. p. 101), who contend for the Kethibh here, yet admit that it is a *pluralis intensivus*, or plural of intensity, *having reference* ONLY *to Jesus Christ*. Could this criticism be established, it would of course lessen the importance of the question referred to; but how different is the ground of such a procedure as here presented from that which is above presented by Dr. Alexander!

To return to the point therefore. What is the amount of this accusation of *changing the text*, which has been put forth with such an air of rebuke and seriousness? If it were an attempt to sustain even an unsupported conjecture, Dr. A.'s unqualified statement could not be stronger than it is. The *change* is not even necessary in order to support the common version of the passage, as we shall see; but even if it were, why hold it up to view as something of sufficient weight and importance to counterbalance all the absurdities involved in the other rendering which has been proposed? That the word has always, until modern times, been read as a verb, we shall prove; and if in order to read it so now it were even necessary to change בָּאֲרִי into בָּאֲרִו where would be the harm of doing it, supported as we should be by the Masora, and all the ancient versions, the Latin and Greek fathers, to say nothing of other authorities which we shall adduce? Has a ו never been mistaken for a י by the transcribers of the sacred text? Have no errors ever been committed, and do none confessedly now exist therein? The letters referred to are so alike in MSS. that even an attentive and careful reader does not always distinguish between them. As instances in point take Ezra 10: 44, where the text reads נָשׂאוּ while the margin has נָשׂאוּ *which is the true text.* But as in the case before us both readings have been preserved by the Jews, while the anomalous reading is now in the text itself and the true reading placed in the margin. See also Gen. 8: 17, and 14: 2, 8, and Ps. 9: 13. And who can doubt that the original reading in Hos. 13: 14, was not אֲהִי as it is now, but אַיֵּה as it was obviously read by the Apostle, 1 Cor. 15: 55? Or that גַּה in Ezek. 47: 13, has been mistaken for זָה, which is supported by the LXX, the Chaldee, 14 Ms. and our English version; or that יָדָ in the text of 1 Sam. 4: 13, should be exchanged for the Keri יָד? These things and many others in relation to the Heb. text are known to every one, and why must not their influence be permitted to operate in the instance before us?

The remaining anomalies suggested by Dr. A. as standing in the way of the common interpretation of this passage, relate merely to the question as to the plural termination, the adscititious א in בָּאֲרִי, and the derivation of that word from its proper root; all of which shall be fully considered hereafter.

The attempt of Dr. Alexander to justify his preference for reading בָּאֲרִי as a noun next claims to be noticed. The remark that the very same form in Is. 38: 13 is unquestionably used to mean *like the lion*, and a slight modification of the same in Numb. 24: 9, etc., strikes us,

however, as an instance of something like arbitrary criticism, or of special pleading, aiming as it does to lead the reader to a definite and important conclusion, without making him fully acquainted with the premises. If the most weighty authorities, authorities too which are elsewhere often relied on by Dr. A. himself, are of no importance in settling a question of Scripture criticism, then may the critic thus arbitrarily state his premises, and demand our assent to his conclusion; but if they are of weight and importance in such a matter, on what principle is it that they are thus to be kept back from the view of the reader, even where his assent is asked to a conclusion of so much importance as the one before us? It *is* true that the same word is used in Is. 38: 13, and that there it unquestionably means *as a lion*. But *it is likewise true* that the Masora most decidedly declares that in this place it is used in a sense entirely different from that attached to it in Ps. 22: 17; and it is true, moreover, that all ancient and modern versions (with exceptions not worth naming) sustain the declaration of the Masora. Had the reader no right to know these facts in determining a question like the present? The difference between the two words is as great as it would be if the reading in Ps. xxii., was "He that *forbears* to contend is wise;" and that in Is. xxxviii., "*For bears* to contend is agreeable to their nature."

The next consideration by which Dr. A. would justify the reading of the word in question as a noun, is thus presented: "This idea (i. e. *as a lion* my hands and my feet,) would be here the more appropriate because the Psalm abounds in such allusions, and because the lion is expressly mentioned both before and afterwards." This, however, is so far from being certain, that it is impossible to imagine what connection there is between such a conclusion and the premises. How can the mere fact, that the lion is mentioned in other passages which in no way resemble this in their construction, evince that the same idea is more appropriate here? Is not the fair and legitimate inference deducible from the facts, (even as stated by Dr. A. himself,) *that the lion is not here referred to*, because the comparison of a lion is employed by the sacred writer, just before, and just after, the text? (See v. 14, 22.) And is not the supposition, therefore, that the same comparison is here again instituted, harsh and unwarrantable, and not to be entertained without the strongest reason? The reader will decide which presumption is the more natural. And we may, moreover, safely challenge the advocates of this interpretation, to point out an instance in any classic, where such a comparison is three several times formally instituted and repeated in the course of some eight or ten lines.

Dr. Alexander continues as follows: "The sense would then be: 'they surround my hands and my feet as they would a lion,' or 'as a lion would,' i. e. with the strength and fierceness of a lion. The hands and feet may be mentioned as the parts used in defence and flight." He admits, however, that "the mention of these parts, after all, in connection with the lion, is not altogether natural:" a just and proper admission, as we shall see. But I would here ask, whether the *change* in the text contemplated by this construction, can possibly be regarded by Dr. A., as doing less violence to it, than the substitution of כְּאַרְיֵה for כָּאֲרִי, or than the regarding of א as epenthetical, or the plural as terminating in י, or than deriving the meaning of the word from a cognate root? It were idle to say that no change or modification is contemplated in the exposition proposed by Dr. A., for the simple phrase, "as a lion, my hands and my feet," expresses no idea; and before anything more can be got *out of* the phrase, I apprehend that something more must be supposed to be connected with it. This is practically conceded by Dr. A., and he *supposes* the phrase to be elliptical: "*They surround* my hands and my feet as *they would surround* a lion": or, "as a lion *would*." But for what reason are we to resort to the supposition of an ellipsis? Simply on account of the "accumulation of grammatical and lexicographical anomalies" aforesaid; the force of which reasons, we shall consider presently.

If, then, the phrase under consideration is to be regarded as an ellipsis, (as the construction proposed by Dr. A., takes for granted), how is the ellipsis to be supplied, or filled out? This is a question of some importance, certainly, and we surely have the right to expect a direct and satisfactory answer to it, from those who assume that there is an ellipsis. Two methods have already been proposed by Dr. A., to wit: "*They surround* my hands and my feet as *they would surround* a lion;" and "*they surround* my hands and my feet as a lion *would surround them.*" Now there is a prodigious difference between these proposed constructions of the passage, as much as there would be between the surrounding of a lion by men, and the surrounding of a man by a lion. Neither of these, however, seem satisfactory to Dr. A., and therefore near the conclusion of his annotation, he, (after Rabbi Coecus of the Chaldee Paraphrase,) proposes a third, to wit: "Like the lion (they have wounded) my hands and my feet;" and adds, "the point of comparison would then be the infliction of sharp wounds in those parts of the body." Here there are no less than three different methods of supplying this imaginary

ellipsis: and all, of course, taking for granted that the previous word, וַיַּקִּיפוּנִי, (*they surround me,*) is to be understood in the clause referred to; an idea which conflicts with the fact that the Masorites have placed the *Athnach* under this verb to show that it has no connection with the following words, and is not to be joined to them.

But, let us examine these three methods *seriatim*. We commence with the last. If we mistake not, וַיַּקִּיפוּנִי is the preterite in *Hiphil*, from the root נָקַף; *Hiphil*, וַיַּקֵּף, *to go around, to enclose;* and it is evident from its parallelism with סָבְבוּנִי, in the beginning of the verse, that this verb can only mean, to surround. To get from the term the sense of *piercing*, therefore, it must be derived from נָקַף (agreeing in signification with נָקַב), which in *Hiph.* would likewise give וַיַּקֵּף, and with the affix, וַיַּקִּיפוּנִי. If this be so, therefore, it can afford Dr. A. but little assistance to suppose that this verb is to be understood in the phrase referred to. Its import is simply, *they surround me.* And the sense of *perforarunt* cannot be fairly obtained from its proper root, יָקַף, but only by a far-fetched J. D. Michaelis-construction from נָקַף: a procedure which would be rather remarkable, after the objection against borrowing a meaning from a cognate root as above stated. Another construction of the passage by Dr. A., is, "they surround my hands and my feet as they would a lion:" making כַּאֲרִי the accusative. But a fatal objection to this, (to say nothing of the repetition of the metaphor referred to above), is, that it makes the sufferer, who in v. 7, under a deep sense of misery, compares himself to a *worm*, in the same connection, and under the same sense of misery, compare himself to a lion: an incongruity not to be supposed on any account. But, distinct from this consideration, what can be pleaded in favor of the foregoing construction? It is doubtful whether a parallel to such an expression, employed under such or similar circumstances by a sufferer, is to be found in the whole compass of human language. That a sufferer should say, "they surround *me* as they do a lion," may be perfectly natural; but that he should specify his *hands* and *feet* as being *surrounded* by his persecutors, is as incredible as it is impossible that his hands and feet (while forming a part of his body) could be surrounded, without himself having been surrounded at the same time.

Dr. Alexander evidently felt the force of these and other considerations which might be mentioned, and has therefore given to the reader his choice between this exposition, and the following: "they surround my hands and my feet as a lion would surround them." This alternative of ellipsis reminds us very forcibly of the eels mea-

tioned by Æsop, who, finding themselves rather uncomfortable in a certain cooking utensil, concluded to crawl out of it, but in doing so, made their debût upon a bed of burning coals, — for, how *a lion* could *surround* one's hands and feet, is certainly a mystery. Can Dr. A. seriously intend to propound this solution with (to say the very least) the incongruities and impossibilities with which it is clogged, as preferable to the common one? A lion *surround* a man's hands and feet! Can the imagination conceive such an idea? Can it be represented in painting? Can it be realized in any way whatever? If not, can it be proper to assert such a thing as a fact, in an exposition of the word of God? Nothing could be more ludicrous than to attempt in any way the development of such an idea. The nearest approach to its realization, with which we are acquainted, is contained in the following statement, which we remember having often heard in childhood, and which we hope may without offence, be introduced in this connection. When General Washington was encamped at White Marsh, above the city of Philadelphia, he was informed on a certain occasion that a soldier of his army had, single-handed, captured three of the enemy. The General being delighted with such an exhibition of courage, immediatety sent for the soldier, (a gallant son of Erin), intending, for the encouragement of enterprise in the army, to reward him in some signal manner. Pat immediately appeared in the presence of the General, who addressed him as follows: "You have, sir, succeeded in capturing three of the enemy, as I am informed; and I should be pleased to hear how you effected it. That a man should capture one, or even two, is not so remarkable; but that one man should make three armed men his prisoners, depriving them of their arms, and marching them safely into camp, is somewhat surprising. Tell me, therefore, the particulars of the adventure." Pat hereupon bowed very politely, and then said, "Indeed and I had no difficulty in the matter at all, sir; for, may it please your honor, *I surrounded them.*" Now, could we only learn how he surrounded them, we should perhaps be able to form some idea of how a lion could surround a man's hands and feet. We have never learned that any artist has made Pat's adventure the subject of a painting; but one thing is certain, that if Pat could surround three men, a lion assuredly could surround one. But surely it is unnecessary to dwell upon this subject.

The phrase, therefore, as it stands, taking כַּאֲרִי as a noun, is confessedly destitute of meaning; for what does it signify to say, "as a lion my hands and my feet?" And a sense must consequently be

obtained by supplying something. We have seen how Dr. Alexander has succeeded in the effort; and as the Jews likewise contend that the word is a noun, it may be proper before we pass on, to notice briefly how they have succeeded herein. They admit that the phrase as it stands does not make complete sense; though they have not yet agreed on the question as to what ought to be supplied, or how the phrase should be explained. Rabbi Joseph Coecus (as he is called,) author of the Chaldee Paraphrase of the Psalms supplies the word נָכְתִין *biting*, and connects the phrase with the preceding thus: "The congregation of the malignant surround me; biting my hands and feet as lions." Rabbi Solomon Jarchi thus explains it: "As a lion the hands of me and the feet of me, that is, as if they were broken by the mouth of a lion;" the sheer absurdity of which need not be here dwelt upon. Kimchi, and Aben Ezra, that they may avoid these incongruities, *formally* supply nothing, but merely connect the phrase with the preceding: "the congregation of the malignant surround for me, as a lion my hands and my feet;" an interpretation which does violence to the text; for David does not say הִקִּיפוּ לִי *they surround for me*, but הִקִּיפוּנִי *they surround me;* and it is certainly absurd to say "they surround *for me* my hands and my feet." And this exposition moreover as above remarked, is at war with the fact, that the Athnach, which is under the verb, makes a pause, and announces that the verb itself is not to be connected with what follows. It is scarcely necessary to dwell upon the preposterous fable of Kimchi, who to render his exposition probable, says that a lion describes a circle with his tail around his prey before he devours it; a *fact* for the existence of which he drew upon his most fertile imagination. It may be found in the margin.[1] Such then are the efforts of our Jewish brethren in this same department; and certainly Dr. Alexander has made no improvement upon their labors.

Having thus therefore, as we conceive, evinced the inconclusiveness of the reasons urged by Dr. Alexander in justification of his departure from the ordinary interpretation of this passage, we shall next proceed to consider the grounds on which this interpretation may be justified.

---

[1] Whether this famous Rabbi ever wrote a *natural history* we do not know; but the following is his account of the lion; "Leo in sylva cauda sua circulum describit, quem ferae cum vident, ex eo non audent excedere prae leonis timore et metu, et manus, et pedes colligunt, (that is, the fore feet and hind feet remain fixed to the spot,) et in medio circuli praedam suam invenit leo." This, we presume may be called an *ex post facto* history, designed for the benefit of Ps. 22:17.

The simple point of inquiry is, whether the word in question is here to be regarded as a verb or a noun? That it is *not* a noun, may be fairly concluded, from the abortive attempts which have been made to construe it as such: for no ingenuity has ever succeeded on this supposition to make any tolerable sense of the passage.

Several methods of determining the question, have been proposed, either of which may be maintained without a resort to anything like the extremities of solution which are demanded by the presumption that the word is a noun. We shall briefly glance at them; but let not the idea embarrass the reader's mind, that we are compelled to settle the claims of either of these proposed methods, before we can avail ourselves of the legitimate inference which they all unite to sustain; for we are not required to do so by any principle of fair reasoning; and before our opponents demand it of us, let them first settle the question in respect to the filling out of the ellipsis aforesaid. We repeat it, therefore, that the simple question in dispute is, whether the word be a verb or a noun.

The idea of Gesner and others, that the word ought to be pointed, כָּאֲרִי, is not sustained by any very great authority, and seems at variance with the rules of punctuation. It need not therefore be here examined. The supposition also that כָּאֲרִי is a compound word from כַּאֲר and אֲרִי, (which would connect the two significations, "*as a lion they pierced,*") is a mere unsupported conjecture. There are composite forms in the Hebrew, though seldom occurring; but this proposed compounding of the two words would make כ both a servile and a radical, at one and the same time: a procedure which would certainly be at war with precedent.

There are, however, weighty reasons for concluding that כָּאֲרִי was the original reading of the text; and the ease with which a ו may be mistaken for a י, and the fact that in transcribing the Scriptures, they have frequently been mistaken one for the other, (as above illustrated), favors the argument. This word is simply the *scriptio plena* of the verb כָּוַר, and the objection of Dr. Alexander to what he pronounces the anomalous א, is scarcely worth dwelling upon; that letter being epenthetical, (as is asserted by Rabbies Jacob ben Chaïm, and Moses Haddarsan), as when it is added after the Qametz, for protracting the sound of a long vowel. See instances of such epenthesis, in Hosea 10: 14, וקאם, and in Zech. 14: 10, ויראמו, and in Prov. 24: 7, ראמות, and also in Is. 10: 13, Ezek. 9: 8, Joel 2: 6, 2 Sam. 19: 4, etc., and thus we have צוּאר for צוּר, and מלאכים for

מלכים, etc. There can be no solid objection, therefore, against this reading, on such ground.[1]

Then, further: In the Masora textual in Numb. 24: 9, we have the following most decided testimony, to wit: כאריה ידי ורגלי כארי כתיב, that is, "*As a lion my hands and my feet;* for '*as a lion,*' which is the reading of *the margin*, the *text* has it, '*they pierced.*'" Hence, when the Masora was written, some ten or twelve centuries ago, the word in the text was כָּאֲרִי, and כָּאֲרֵי was only in the margin. So, too, Rabbi Jacob ben Chaïm, in his Masora Magna says: "In *many copies* of the Scriptures, written with the most scrupulous care, I have found כארי in the text, and כארי only in the margin, — when, according to the tradition of our Rabbies, the reverse ought to have been the fact." Many other eminent men, as we shall have occasion to note presently, testify to the same thing in substance.

Further: כָּאֲרִי may be the original reading, as many of the ablest grammarians think, who notwithstanding regard it not as a noun but verb. The Masora parva gives countenance to the supposition, when it states on Numb. 24: 9, that "כארי occurs four times; twice with Qamets on the first syllable, (Ps. 22: 17. Is. 38: 13,) and twice with Pattah," (Numb. 23: 24, and 24: 9); which statement taken in connection with that of the textual Masora above cited, evinces that both the readings existed when the Masoras were written. The reader will indulge us with a single remark here, before we pass on. We ask, therefore, what is the fair inference from the fact that the readings כָּאֲרִי (כָּרִי) and כָּאֲרֵי are found still in MSS. and editions of the Heb. text, and confessedly existed in the codices many centuries ago? Let it be granted that כָּאֲרִי is the true reading, and how, we ask, shall we ever explain the fact of these diverse readings if that word is to be construed as a noun? Does not the fact that they exist evince that the word in that connection was always regarded as a verb? It seems utterly inconceivable how these readings could have originated on any other supposition. This is a point, however,

---

[1] It is not improbable that the reading כארי, may have originated from this adscititious א. Some incompetent scribe, regarding the letter as a radical, and consequently not knowing what to make of the word thus spelled, might have (in order to make some sense of the clause in his view) spelled it with a י instead of a ו; or, as above-remarked, the ו may have been mistaken for a י. At all events, the two readings early existed in the MSS.; and, considering the hostility of the Jews to the Gospel, it is not to be wondered that in later times they should have given the preference to that which might most easily neutralise the argument for Christ's Messiahship, which is founded upon this passage.

upon which (unless we err) Paulus and Ewald and their followers have not thought proper as yet to display their ingenuity; and we doubt whether Dr. Alexander has given to it the consideration which it deserves. But to return.

Pococke, Gesenius, De Wette, Winer, Hengstenberg in the Christology, and most of the earlier critics do not hesitate to adopt כָּאֲרֵי as the true reading; regarding it as the irregular plural for כָּאֲרִים, the participle of כּוּר (which is synonymous with כָּרָה) a word which, though it does not again occur in Hebrew, is clearly ascertained by a reference to the cognate dialects to mean *to bore through, to pierce.* The א is inserted by epenthesis as above remarked. Professor Ewald, (whose representations have obviously considerable influence on the mind of Dr. Alexander,) has objected that this irregular plural form is only an arbitrary supposition; to which Gesenius well replies that the single example of מְנֵי in Ps. 45: 9 is sufficient to justify the assumption of this form. With all deference to Verbrügge and Ewald, however, it is sheer folly to deny that the Hebrew language admits of the plural form ending in י, (the final ם being cut off by apocope,) or that such forms occur not unfrequently in the Old Testament. The celebrated Rabbi, David Kimchi (who flourished about A. D. 1190, and whose grammar of the Hebrew language Gesenius pronounces to be classical,) speaking of the plural masculine in ים, declares that "there are plurals which are used with *Hhireq* alone, as there are also, with ם superadded;" of which instances in the following verses are given as examples: 2 Sam. 23: 8. Ezek. 32: 30. Gen. 14: 16. Pococke also cites Gen. 40: 16. 2 Kings, 11: 4. Lam. 3: 14. See also 1 Sam. 20: 38, and 24: 14. Is. 38: 12, and Cant. 8: 2. These instances and others that could be named are more than sufficient to justify the reception of כָּאֲרֵי as a noun.

It is not, however, we again remark, of much importance which of these readings is regarded as the true one; nor is it at all necessary that this question should be determined by those who reject the view presented by Dr. Alexander. The great and sole point in dispute is, whether the word referred to be a verb or a noun. That it may properly be regarded as a verb, is, we think, fully apparent from the foregoing remarks. Let us then proceed to the further consideration of the evidence which bears upon the question.

Gesenius candidly observes that "all the ancient interpreters have taken כארי as a verb; and this is certainly possible if we regard כָּאֲרֵי as the participle in Kal formed in the Chaldee manner, and in the plural number for כָּאֲרִים." And he refers to two MSS. to prove

that "*it was commonly held to be a verb.*" And in confirmation of this Vatablus declares that the ancient reading was twofold כָּאֲרִי and כָּרוּ; while according to the testimony of Genebrard, the Jews continued to write כָּאֲרִי in the margin and כָּאֲרוּ in the text until the six hundredth year of the Christian era, and then began to insert the marginal reading into the text itself; and finally to omit כָּאֲרִי altogether.

It is scarcely possible to overestimate the weight and importance of the evidence furnished by the versions in favor of our position that the word in question is a verb. The limits allotted to this review are not sufficient to permit us to go thoroughly into this branch of the argument; and we can therefore do but little more than glance at it. We begin with the Septuagint, the most ancient of all versions, it having been made probably in the third century before the Christian era, and by Jews who unquestionably understood their own language. Now these interpreters rendered the clause in question by ὤρυξαν χεῖράς μου καὶ πόδας, *they pierced my hands and feet.* If therefore the word in dispute was then regarded as a noun, how is this rendering to be accounted for? Can any one suppose that such a rendering would have been given in defiance of MSS., common sense, common honesty, and directly in the face of the knowledge of every one who could read Hebrew? and also without any assignable inducement whatever? If it was not done in defiance of these things, we apprehend that there is but one other alternative — *it was done in accordance with the MSS., common sense and honesty.* Add to this the fact that the Greek fathers all translate the word in a similar manner. Justin, in his dialogue with the shrewd and learned Jew Trypho, so translates it; so does the author of the Questions to Antiochus, Quest. 136, and Athanasius in his Dialogue on the Trinity and in his work on the Incarnation. Apollinaris, in his Paraphrase, thus renders it:

Ἡμιτέρους ὤρυξαν ὠμοῦ χεῖράς τε, πόδας τε.

The Latin interpreters, likewise, uniformly render it as a verb. So Tertullian, in innumerable places. Cyprian, also, in his second book of Testimonies *against the Jews*, renders it by *effoderunt.* In the old Latin version of the Psalms made by Jerome from the Hebrew with the utmost care, the word is translated also as a verb: "*Fixerunt* manus meas, et pedes meas." Now to this version there is a preface addressed to Sophronius by Jerome in which he most confidently declares that he has not departed from the strict sense of the Hebrew in a single word; and he calls upon the Jews to show,

if they were able, one instance of such departure.[1] Now let the reader ask himself whether Jerome (or any other man of sense or integrity) could have thus challenged such a scrutiny, and in a case where so glaring an error would, to his shame and mortification, have been at once detected by his bitter opposers, the Jews, if in such a well-known instance as the one before us he had been conscious of having corrupted the text? The supposition is out of all question. Jerome knew that the Jews had *fastened* Jesus to the cross, and the Jews knew also that they had thus fastened him by piercing his hands and feet; and they likewise knew that all Christians applied this passage to that transaction. And yet under such circumstances Jerome thus challenges their scrutiny, and defies them to come forward and show that he had mistranslated a single word! The conclusion seems irresistible, that כָּאֲרִי was either the reading of the then approved text, or כַּאֲרִי in Ps. xxii. was universally regarded as a verb.

To all this may be added the strong fact that Aquila the Jew (a man of great industry and thoroughly acquainted with Hebrew) who in the second century of the Christian era translated the Old Testament into Greek, renders the word not as a noun but verb; not indeed by ὤρυξαν, but by ἤσχυναν, a word whose import in this connection (though Hengstenberg has strangely questioned it) involves the signification of *pierced*. At all events he translates it as a verb, for this is the point before us. Here, then, was a most learned and eminent Jew thus translating from the approved text, or Kethibh of the Jews. What, then, must the reading of the Kethibh have been? Will any one say that it was כַּאֲרִי, and that this word is a noun?

Further: The old Syriac version, which every intelligent man admits was made directly from the Hebrew text, translates the word in question by one whose signification is *perforarunt* or *transfixerunt*. Now this version was probably made during the latter part of the first century; and of course its authors either found כָּאֲרִי in the text, or regarded כַּאֲרִי as a verb.

The old Arabic version, likewise, renders it by *perforarunt;* and the Aethiopic by *perforarunt mihi* pedes, etc. The Latin Vulgate by *foderunt;* and if we come down to the later versions we find them equally harmonious here; Junius and Tremellius render the word *foderunt;* Castalio, *perfoderunt;* Luther by *durchgraben;* the Belgic

[1] His words are "Certè confidenter dicam, et multos hujus operis testes citabo, me nihil duntaxat sententiae Hebraica veritate mutâsse;" and, a little further on, he adds "Interroga quemlibet Hebraeorum."

by *doorgraven*. So also Munster, Pagnini, Piscator, Genebrard, Muis, etc.

It may be added, also, that כָּאֲרִי is the reading of the Kethibh of the Complutensian Bible, published in 1520 by the patronage of Ximenes and with the privilege of Leo X. Genebrard, also, as above remarked, has proved by the testimony of the most learned Jews that this was the reading of the best and most ancient copies of the Hebrew text. Capito (Inst. Heb. lib. I. cap. 13) testifies that in a very ancient copy of the Hebrew Scriptures he found this reading in the Keri. Others equally eminent, sustain the statement of Genebrard; as, for example, Pagninus, Vatablus, and Müller *in loco*. Galatinus, also, (De Arcanis Catholicae Veritatis, lib. 8, c. 17,) and John Isaac (lib. 2, cont. Lindanum), together with Andradius (Defens. Conc. Trident. lib. 4). These all aver that they had seen copies of the Hebrew Scriptures of the same character with the above. These copies have not come down to us, but no one will question that they once existed. And what is the only correct and legitimate inference from these facts, added to the consideration that all the versions, as above shown, translate the word referred to as a verb?

Not less conclusive is the Jewish testimony, of which a part has already been cited. The *Masora parva* at this place observes that "כָּאֲרִי occurs twice with Qamets, although the words themselves differ in their signification." Now the only other place in which it so occurs is Is. 38: 13, where it indisputably means "as a lion;" of course, therefore, such cannot be its meaning here according to this authority. So, too, in the *Masora Magna*. The last chapter of this work treats of words that are but twice employed in the Bible, though with different significations. The catalogue of these numbers 98. For example, אֲמִיר, occurs in Is. 17: 6, where it signifies *a high branch* of a tree; and also in Hos. 4: 7, where *it is a verb*, and signifies, *I will change* — (an instance of usage strikingly analogous to that of the word כאריי). So, too, אֲבִרִים occurs in Exod. 1: 15, and Jer. 18: 4, with different significations. שִׁמְשׁוֹת also occurs in Gen. 26: 21, and Ezra 4: 6, in the same manner. Now, amongst the words thus enumerated, is כָּאֲרִי; which in page 2, column 2, the authors of this work mention as occurring in Ps. 22: 17, and Is. 38: 13; and as no one will question that in the last of these places, it means *as a lion*, and as the Jews uniformly thus explain it, the conclusion is irresistible that the Masorites did not attach to it this signification in Ps. 22: 17. The argument could still be strengthened by other testimony

of the same kind, but it is needless, and we must hasten to draw these remarks to a close.

There is one more consideration which certainly is of weight, and ought not to be overlooked in this connection. We refer to the following: In this same Psalm, everything else which our adorable Redeemer suffered while enduring the death of the cross, is mentioned, and why then should not the piercing of his hands and feet be referred to? When in the deepest agony on the cross, he repeated at least the first verse of the Psalm.[1] In vs. 8 and 9, he is represented as saying, "All who see me, laugh me to scorn; they shoot out the lip, they shake the head, saying, He trusted in the Lord that he would deliver him," etc. In v. 14, "They gaped upon me with their mouths as a raging lion." In v. 16, he complains of thirst, and in v. 19, says, "They part my garments among them, and cast lots for my vesture." Is it credible, then, that no reference should have been made to the excruciating agony which he endured from the piercing of his hands and feet? If Dr. Alexander's exposition of the word in question be the true one, *then there is no direct reference to this matter in the whole Psalm.* Can this be believed?

Not less forcible than touchingly beautiful, are the following words of Luther: "To us who believe in Christ, and who hold by the authority of the Gospel, that this whole Psalm was spoken concerning him, it is easy to perceive that the proper reading of the passage is, '*they have pierced* my hands and my feet,' instead of '*as a lion* my hands and my feet.' For we would not endeavor by means of the mysteries of the Scriptures, to explain the things which are known to have occurred; but on the contrary would clear up the mystery, by a reference to such things; that is, we would illustrate the Old Testament by the New, (and not the New by the Old,) and would determine what is the sense of the former, by the obvious import of the latter: thus making them both to look towards Christ, as the two cherubim looked towards the mercy-seat. For God said by the prophet, (Jer. 23: 30,) '*In the last days*, ye shall understand my counsel;' but to Moses he said, 'Ye shall discern only my hinder parts.' Since, therefore, we are assured that Christ's hands and feet were pierced, and are equally certain also, that this whole Psalm ap-

[1] Osiander (Dr. Lucas) and others of ancient times, believed that Christ repeated *the whole psalm* while hanging on the cross; "creditur Christus hunc Psalmum totum in cruce recitasse," says he, — an idea which Coleridge and others in modern times have adopted.

plies to him; and since the sense of the passage not only strikingly accords herewith, but absolutely demands that the word be read, '*they pierced*,' (especially since no rule of grammar forbids it); we may, without violence, and with perfect propriety, adopt this as its proper signification." *Comment. in Ps.* xxii.

ARTICLE VIII.

NEANDER'S SERVICES AS A CHURCH HISTORIAN.[1]

Translated by Prof. H. B. Smith.

[The following Article was originally delivered by Dr. Hagenbach as an Academical Address before the University of Basle, apparently at the opening of his course of lectures, Nov. 4, 1850. It speaks of Neander exclusively as a Church Historian. The author is amply qualified to do this by his own proficiency in the department, as shown in his lectures on the Reformation, and on the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. His name was also prominent as a successor to the chair of Neander. In the translation the introductory paragraph was omitted. He then states that in order to get a clear view of Neander's services it is necessary to give a somewhat long sketch of what his predecessors, especially the German church historians, had accomplished. Long as this sketch is, comprising rather more than half of the Article, it is written with so much animation that it can hardly fail to be of interest to any who take an interest in Church History, or in Neander as a Church Historian.]

Church History, like all history, has come to be a science only by a gradual growth. The collection of the materials preceded the sifting of them; and this sifting again in all its separate parts went before the organic combination into a whole, and the spiritual mastery and artistic shaping of the masses of materials. Three centuries of the Christian era had already run their course when Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, was called to write the first Christian Church History, not only by his external position at the court of Constantine the Great,

[1] By K. R. Hagenbach, Professor in Basle. Translated from the Studien und Kritiken, 1851 drittes Heft, by Henry B. Smith, Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary of New York.