

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

sage, Lev. 5: 1—13, which we are convinced, appertains to the sin-offerings, yet as it has been placed by many, and especially by Baehr also, in the rubric of trespass-offerings, we can only consider hereafter.

ARTICLE III.

HEBREW CRITICISMS.

By M. Stuart, lately Prof. of Sacred Literature at Andover.

NO. I. A WORD MORE ON PSALM XXII. 17.

WHAT more can be said, or needs to be said? are questions which may very naturally be asked, by any one who knows that a little library of books has already been written, on the controverted clause of the text in question. And after all, the matter has not, as our cousin-Germans express it, *come into the clear*. Doubt and division of opinion remain; and not only as it regards the readers in general of the original Scriptures, but also among the most learned Hebrew scholars now living.

These grounds of doubt and difficulty cannot be felt, or duly appreciated, by the mere English reader. They rest almost wholly on the *form* of a single Hebrew word, viz. *כַּאֲרֵי*, as now presented in our commonly received Hebrew text. The English reader finds the verse in question apparently very plain. It runs thus: "For dogs have compassed me; the assembly of the wicked have enclosed me; they pierced my hands and my feet." The word *dogs* will, of course, be tropically understood by every intelligent reader; just as it is in the New Testament, when the Apostle says: "Beware of dogs" (Phil. 3: 2), and again, when the Apocalypticist says: "Without are dogs" (Rev. 22: 15). In all these three cases, degraded, vile, ravenous, and shameless men are tropically designated.

The second clause of Ps. 22: 17 (Eng. version, v. 16) employs a more literal diction, instead of this figurative one. Its words are: *The assembly of the wicked*; which is an equivalent of the preceding word *dogs*, such as is common in Hebrew parallelisms. All then appears to be plain. The meaning thus far seems to be simply,

that many base and mischievous persons have surrounded the complainant, and with an intent to injure him.

The last clause only of the verse might suggest some doubts to the mind of a practised reader of the Bible. To speak of *piercing my hands and my feet*, instead of saying *me*, or *my person*, or *my body*, is at least very unusual, and therefore seems somewhat strange. Indeed, the particularity of it is such, as to excite something of wonder, at first view, if not a suspicion that the original text has somehow been disturbed. Yet a little further investigation will serve to allay this feeling, in a good measure, since we shall find other very striking and unusual particulars, disclosed by the language of the sufferer. For example, v. 19th: "They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture;" and again: "They shake the head, saying: He trusted in the Lord, that he would deliver him; let him deliver him, seeing he delighted in him?" vs. 7, 8. This last is uttered in the way of mockery and insult at the sufferer's helplessness. But both passages are peculiar for their *speciality*, and their remoteness from the usual modes of describing persecution. And so with the last clause of v. 17. *The wounding of the hands and the feet* are circumstances not elsewhere to be found, in such descriptions. This may serve to awaken inquiry in respect to the expression as a whole; but the simple meaning of the words by themselves, in English, is entirely plain and obvious to every one. Of course, no one would hesitate about the general meaning of the verse, provided it could be shown that our English version is correct. The difficulty of showing this, is what perplexes the commentators; and not without some reason.

All the real difficulty of the passage is concentrated in the single word פָּתַחַר־יָדַי , which is translated *pierced*. But apparently the very same word elsewhere, in four cases, means, and is on all hands translated: *As a lion*, viz., Is. 38: 13. Num. 23: 24. 24: 9, and Ezek. 22: 25. The only discrepancy in these cases, as to the form of the word, is this, viz., that in the last three cases, it is pointed פָּתַחַר־יָדַי , that is, it has a *Pattah* under the ח , instead of a *Qamets* as in the other two cases. But this is a thing which does not at all affect the real and essential meaning of the word. It is simply *the absence of the article* from the noun, in the last three instances, which occasions its special vowel-point, *Pattah*. But in the first two cases, the article belongs to the noun; and this article being elided by the prefix particle פ , its vowel (*Qamets*) is thrown under the ח , according to general usage. Hence we have פָּתַחַר־יָדַי , instead of פָּתַחַר־יָדַי . Of course every

one sees, that it makes no more difference with the main word itself, in Hebrew, than it does in English, whether we say *as the lion*, or *as a lion*. Both are good, in English and in Hebrew. Both mean, or at least may mean, the same identical thing. All the difference is, that in the first case, the article *the* tacitly distinguishes *the lion* from other beasts; and in the second case, the omission of *the* makes the word mean *a lion*, that is, *any lion*. In other words, a shade of distinctiveness appears in the first case, which is omitted in the second; but without the least change in the essential meaning of the word. In the Hebrew, the בְּ of comparison is perhaps more often followed by the article, expressed or implied; but this usage has almost as many exceptions as examples. Of course, both methods are good usage.

Here, then, is ample vindication of the meaning of כְּאַרְיֵל , if we follow the analogy of the other four cases; for in all four of them there is not a spark of doubt, that the meaning is simply *as the lion*, or *as a lion*. Why not follow this analogy in our text?

The answer is, that 'such a rendering in the clause before us would make no intelligible meaning.' *As a lion, my hands and my feet* — what sense is there in this? Certainly there is, I concede, no tolerable sense, unless the construction is *elliptical*, and we introduce some verb to govern and make significant the last two nouns.

But here we are met with the allegation, that a verb cannot be brought over, in this instance, from the preceding clause; although every one is forced to concede, that in a great number of instances, where a preceding verb is appropriate, it is thus *mentally* carried forward, instead of being again repeated in the text. Indeed, nothing is more common than this, in Hebrew poetry. But while the general principle is conceded, as here laid down — a principle which breviloquence and energy of diction fully justify — yet the allegation in the present case is, that the verb would be wholly *inappropriate*. The Rev. Mr. Landis, in the preceding number of this Review, has fully and even sarcastically exposed the incongruity of supplying the verb סָבַבְתִּי , if translated (as he insists it must be) by our verb *surrounded*. He asks, and not without reason, how we can conceive, imagine, or paint, *a lion as surrounding* the hands and feet of a man. He tells us that such an expression could come only from a "son of the Emerald Isle;" whom in fact he introduces as using it, or at least the like of it. This is all well enough, at any rate plain enough, provided we must translate the Hebrew verb סָבַבְתִּי as he does, viz. *surround*. But what if this same verb may mean *stab, pierce, transfix*?

Why then all is plain enough. *As a lion* [they pierce] *my hands and my feet*, is surely good sense, and has no *Hibernianism* in it. *Hands and feet* are the instruments of defence or of flight, in case of an attack by a lion. The hands are spontaneously stretched out to defend the body; or, in case of flight, the feet are specially employed. To cripple these is the first effort of the lion; and this he does, by seizing them with his teeth, and piercing them through. The victim is then maimed, so as to be incapable of resistance or escape; and so, the comparison is pregnant with meaning. What hinders our interpreting the passage thus?

Not the verb פָּרַץ, in the preceding clause. This may have, and not improbably here has, the meaning required. The verb פָּרַץ, which is the root, originally means *to pierce, strike through, transfix, to fasten with nails*, etc. This meaning of the verb is fully confirmed by both the Chaldee and the Arabic, where this same verb has such a sense. In Kal, the verb is employed but once in the Hebrew Scriptures. But in Piel, it twice appears, and with the meaning above given intensified, e. g., in Is. 10: 34, and in Job 19: 26, with the meaning (in the latter case) a little generalized, being = פָּרַץ, and meaning *to destroy*. But in the text before us we have a *Hiphil* form, which generally has a derived or secondary meaning, viz., *to go round, to encircle, to surround*; as may be seen in the lexicon. But it does not follow from this, that *Hiphil* has, or can have, no other shade of meaning than this secondary one. A great multitude of verbs have, in this passage or in that, a meaning *sui generis* in *Hiphil*; as every one familiar with Hebrew must know. It is the *context*, which must dictate the shade of meaning, not only of verbs, but very often also of nouns. Take for example the very plain and simple word ἐξουσία, and ask whether any of its evident and familiar meanings will apply to 1 Cor. 11: 10, where the apostle says: "For this cause ought the woman to have *power* (ἐξουσία) on her head, because of the angels." What downright nonsense would any of the usual meanings of ἐξουσία make here! We are forced to explain it as meaning *symbol of power*; and probably it was the local and current name of the *veil* worn by *married* women; and, viewed in this light, it was moreover a very significant name. Now why do we depart from the usual meaning of ἐξουσία here? The answer is: Simply because the *context* demands it. We take it for granted, that the author wrote *sense*; and therefore we feel obliged so to interpret his words as to make sense.

Even so, in the case before us. If the verb in question has most

clearly the sense demanded in order to be carried forward with propriety, and this in all cases of its use out of Hiphil in Hebrew, and also has the same meaning in the cognate languages, what violence is done to the common principles of exegesis, by adopting this appropriate meaning in the present case? Surely none. One needs to consult only a few verbs in the Hebrew Lexicon, in order to satisfy himself that the *Hiphil* form often has the same sense as some one of the meanings in Kal or Piel; see Roed. Heb. Grammar, § 52. 2. If then the context invites us here to give the verb such an interpretation as that named above, why are we not at liberty to do so? I know of nothing which forbids it. The fact that the Hiphil of הָקִיף elsewhere means *go round, surround*, etc., is by no means conclusive against the present proposed meaning. Let any one take his lexicon, and search out the Hiphil forms, and he will soon see, that cases enough may be found, where only one single passage exhibits a *sui generis* meaning, while all the other examples of usage differ from it. Specially do Hiphil and Piel often convey the same meaning; e. g. הָאָבֵד , הָאָבֵד , *he destroyed*. This is all we need, in the present case. All the cases of נָקַע in Piel mean *to pierce or wound*; why may not some of the examples in Hiphil preserve and exhibit the same meaning? Most clearly no grammatical or lexical difficulty stands in the way of this, provided the context demands it. It would be easy to show this, by a multitude of examples of the like nature, both as to Kal and Hiphil, and as to Piel and Hiphil; e. g. as to the first class, viz. Kal and Hiph., we have אָמַט , Kal and Hiph. *clausit*; אָרַךְ , Kal. and Hiph., *longum fecit*; בָּוֶה , Kal and Hiph., *sprevit*; בִּיַן , Kal and Hiph., *percepit*, (only in *one* case, Is. 28: 19, while a multitude of other examples in Hiph. are of a different shade); בָּקַע , Kal and Hiph., *aperuit*; and so *sexcenties*, and even more. In regard to Piel and Hiphil, the cases are more numerous still; e. g. בָּיַן , Piel and Hiph., *statuit*; בָּחַד , Piel and Hiph., *occultavit*; בָּעַט , Piel and Hiph., *irritavit*; בָּתַר , Piel and Hiph., *cinxit*; מָלַט , Piel and Hiph., *liberavit*; מָרַר , Piel and Hiph., *acerbum fecit*; and the same in cases without number. The only question that remains therefore is, Whether, in the present case, the verb in Hiph. demands the same meaning which it has in Piel?

If now the last clause of the verse were wanting, we might say with confidence, that הִקִּיפוּ should be rendered *surround*, because the preceding clause has apparently a parallel in סָבְבוּ , *encircle or surround*. In such a case, the two members of the parallelism are simply *synonymous*. The case would indeed, when thus circumstanced,

be too plain to admit of any doubt. But the addition of the third clause of the verse (on the ground that פָּאָרַי means *as the lion*), renders absolutely necessary the supply of some verb; and in a case like this, (which does not exhibit any of the commonly abridged and breviloquent expressions made plain by their frequency), we should of course expect the necessary verb to be supplied by the context. My belief is, that it is supplied in this way, in the present instance. We have seen that no grammatical or lexical principles hinder our giving to the Hiph. form the same meaning which the Piel has. The demand for this indeed is imperious, on the ground that פָּאָרַי is taken as a *noun*. The context must give us a clue to the verb, or else we must *guess* at the ellipsis, and supply it at our own will; a principle which is inadmissible, in respect to any writing designed to be intelligible. And if the context does in the present case supply the ellipsis, then the meaning of *pierced, transfixed*, must be given to הִקְיִסָּנִי , because *surround* would make little short of sheer nonsense.

I venture then on giving to this last verb, the meaning here designated. Piel has it, (*Kal* of this verb is not common in Hebrew use, so far as we know); the kindred dialects exhibit it; usage, in cases without number, permits the employing of a verb in the same sense both in Piel and Hiphil; and the context, (if פָּאָרַי be a *noun*), absolutely demands it.

It is no good answer to this, to aver that the first clause of the verse controls the meaning of the second throughout. There are indeed many cases of strictly synonymous parallelism; but these are fewer than those, in which an *advance* is made in the second clause. *Climactic*, in a measure, are unnumbered cases of parallels; indeed this is almost normal. The second has a stronger verb, or noun, than the first. This is in accordance with the natural taste and feeling of every reader; and examples without end could easily be adduced, but they are unnecessary for any well informed reader, since he may find them on every page of Hebrew poetry.

I have already said, that if the third clause of the verse before us were omitted, then I should take the first two clauses as a clear example of the strict *synonymous* parallelism. But since the third clause is added, if פָּאָרַי has its normal meaning (i. e. *as the lion*), then must we give to הִקְיִסָּנִי a *climactic* sense, (of which indeed, as we have seen, it is altogether capable), and translate it *pierced* or *transfixed*. So then, in this way, we have the idea, in the first clause, that the enemies of the sufferer gather in numbers around him, and with a hostile intention; in the second, that these evil men *assault*

and wound him; and in the third, we have a peculiar specification of the manner of the wounding, viz. the piercing of *the hands and the feet*. Of itself this seems to indicate, that the sufferer in question is *peculiar*, or at all events that he is wounded in a peculiar manner; for in general, such descriptions deal not in minute particulars. If now the holy Redeemer was actually wounded in the way here indicated, (as in fact he was), then here is a description of his sufferings both *unique* and *appropriate*. This tells well for the meaning of the passage; for the Psalm is, at least in my view, clearly *Messianic*, and certainly not applicable to David, the writer, in any appropriate sense.

The assertion by Mr. Landis, that a root תקן must be taken as the ground form of תקן (p. 812), I must regard as not well grounded, and certainly as unnecessary. Gesenius and Fuerst both consider such a root as merely *fictitious*; and although verbs Pe Yodh, of Class III, may in a few cases take such a form in Hiphil, yet there are no vestiges of such a root, either in Hebrew or the kindred languages with such a meaning. Mr. L. calls the derivation of תקן from a verb Pe Nun, a *far fetched* construction (ib.); why, I know not, for surely this is an ordinary form of such verbs Pe Nun in Hiphil; whereas this form, if from תקן , is to be reckoned only among the unfrequent and somewhat rare forms.

Mr. L. has twice asserted (pp. 812, 814), that the Athnach under תקן "shows that it [the verb] has no connection with the following words, and is not to be joined to them." This is a mistake which may be corrected by referring to the first verse of the Hebrew Bible. There the Athnach rests on אֱלֹהֵינוּ ; and if his position be true, then the verb בָּרָא which precedes this, terminates its influence with the first clause, and we are of course obliged to translate thus: "In the beginning, one created God." This conclusion is inevitable on the ground which he assumes. The like would often take place, in all parts of the Bible, in cases almost without number. The simple truth is, that none of the Hebrew accents are safe guides always, in the matter of sense or connection. They often regulate merely the *cantillation* of the Scriptures, and are not always *distinctives* as to the sense; as might easily be shown by a cloud of witnesses.

Dr. Nordheimer says, very justly, in his Hebrew Grammar (II. p. 314), that "very often a verb expressed in the first clause of a poetic parallelism, is left to be understood in the second;" of which he gives plain and striking examples. Now in all, or nearly all, of these cases, the Athnach stands on the last word of the first clause; but

this never hinders the continuance of the power of the verb, and its extension to the second clause. Many other examples he gives of the like merely *mental* transfers of words from the first clause to the second, and some even *vice versa*. This is a matter so obvious in Hebrew poetry, that there is scarcely room for a mistake.

It is in this way, that I arrive at a satisfactory view of the meaning of the contested clause. It is true, I arrive at the same goal as Mr. L., and as Dr. Alexander also, in respect to the substance of his opinion. The clause respects the REDEEMER, and designates his peculiar sufferings on the cross. But I arrive at the goal, by travelling in a road somewhat different from that which either of these gentlemen have travelled — in a way which seems to me plain, facile, and offending neither grammar nor lexicon, nor demanding any change in the Hebrew text. And if I am right in my views of this way, it is surely preferable to one, which demands laceration of the text, or even of its vowels, in order to bring about a desired meaning.

That the ancient versions and most of the later commentators have translated הִקְיִסוּ by *surround*, can be easily accounted for on the ground of the ready parallelism which this makes with the preceding clause. Having thus translated, and seeing that *surround* would be preposterous as applied to *my hands and my feet*, they of course felt constrained to make כַּפַּי וְרַגְלַי into a verb, or into its equivalent, i. e. a participle. But they are not all agreed as to the meaning of the verb, as Mr. L. has himself shown. Had they looked at the third clause, as governed by the second, they would then have been directed to a more easy and obvious solution, than that which they have chosen. But still, no one need be surprised at this. The careful interpreter will often meet with passages, which have come down to us in a traditional garb that does not fit them, and which recent and more exact criticism is obliged to strip off. Nor need we hesitate to do this, when a better and more facile meaning can be brought out in this way. Even the vowel-points are not binding, since they came in nearly a thousand years after the writing of the Old Testament was completed. They are indeed an *elucidation* of the text — one so admirable and appropriate in general, that no one should ever depart from them except for a good and obvious reason. But when such a reason does occur, who can scruple to follow a better sense than they give? Yet this matter is never to be engaged in lightly, or without sober and adequate consideration. But surely it is not every reader, who can judge skilfully, whether the reason for the departure is a good and valid one. It is best here to “make haste slowly.” A

minute knowledge of grammar and idiom are necessary, in order to judge well.

Mr. L. has expressed his wonder at the unwillingness of Dr. A. to adopt the reading of the Qeri here, or rather of the Masora parva on Num. 24: 9; which, instead of the בְּאָרִי in Ps. 22: 17, suggests in remarks on the former passage, that the *text* in the Psalms reads בְּאָרִי . This perhaps is to be read בְּאָרִי ; I say *perhaps*, for we are not certain that the Masorites did read thus. They may have read בְּאָרִי , and thus have made the word a derivative from בָּוֵר , 3 plur. Perf. written with a superfluous א after the first vowel; as it is, in like manner, in a very few other cases, e. g., קָמָה for קָמָה in Hos. 10: 14, רָאִמָּה for רָמָה in Zech. 14: 10; and thus in a few other cases. The א here, in such a case, is merely a *mater lectionis*, a *fulcrum*, or at most is only intended to give emphasis to the preceding vowel. That in fact the Masorites must have so read the word in question (i. e. read it בְּאָרִי), seems quite probable if not certain. As to the word בְּאָרִי , it has no basis. A root בְּאָר is a nullity, so far as I can discover, a real Hebrew *Unding*; and if so, of course we must suppose the Masorites to have read the word as בְּאָרִי from בָּוֵר .

It becomes interesting to inquire here, whether the Masora has given a consistent testimony, in regard to the controverted word בְּאָרִי . So far as it respects the ancient text, the Masora is the only *critical* commentary and guide which we have, in regard to nearly all the ancient various readings of the Hebrew manuscripts. All the ancient translators have dealt more or less freely with the text, in giving, every now and then, paraphrastic versions; so that in a case of nicety as to what was a Hebrew reading, they are rarely to be depended on. The Masora has given us a pretty ample list of various readings, which existed at the time when it was written. We, of course, are entitled to choose between them, and are not at all bound to follow the *Qeri*, which bids us read so and so, in a way different from the received text or Kethibh. But although we have a right to call in question the authority of the *Qeri*, and half the time, or in some books (e. g. Daniel and Coheleth) more than half, feel obliged to follow the Kethibh as the better reading of the two; yet the Masora is a highly important means of ascertaining what the ancient readings of different Codices were, and some of its readings are of high, if not of essential, value.

Is the Masora consistent, now, in the case before us? On Num. 24: 9, it says, as we have seen, that the Kethibh of Ps. 22: 17 is בְּאָרִי , probably read בְּאָרִי . But we must observe, that in the very

same passage of the Masora, the statement is made that כִּאֲרִי occurs twice with Qamets [viz. Ps. 22: 17. Is. 38: 13], and twice with Pattah [Num. 23: 24. Ezek. 22: 25]. I understand this as meaning so many times, in other passages besides the text in Num. 24: 9, because such is the fact. In other words, כִּאֲרִי with a כ before it occurs five times in the whole, twice where כ has Qamets (i. e. the vowel of the article), and three times, if we include (as we must) Num. 24: 9, with a Pattah under the כ, which merely show that the *article* is not here employed. The word and its combinations (with כ) are the same in all these cases, as we have seen above, p. 52. Now these are all the instances, in which a word of this form and combination appears in the Old Testament. And as the Masora includes all these under its remark on כִּאֲרִי in Num. 24: 9; and as these are all the forms of this kind in the Old Testament, in what light can we consider the suggestion of the Masora in this place, that the Kethibh or text has the form of כִּאֲרוֹ? The note is plainly contradictory of itself here; yet from other quarters, much later ones, we know that some Codices have read כִּאֲרוֹ; see Bib. Sac., p. 820, 1851. Indeed, the last remark of the Masora on Num. 24: 9, viz. כִּאֲרוֹ כִּהְרִיב, evidently bears the stamp of being supposititious, or, in other words, of having been subsequently inserted, when כִּאֲרוֹ had crept into some of the Codices.

The *Masora magna* confirms my statement. In the last chapter, which treats of words which are the same as to *form*, but which differ in their *signification*, it enumerates among these כִּאֲרִי, and assigns this form to Ps. 22: 17 and Is. 38: 13. Here then is full proof against כִּאֲרוֹ in the text of Ps. 22: 17. That the *Masora magna* assigns a different *meaning* to the same word as to *form*, in the two cases, doubtless arose from the perplexity in which the writers were about the meaning and connection of the third clause in the verse before us. In the *Masora* textual on Ps. 22: 17, the remark is also made, that the two cases of כִּאֲרִי have a different meaning. Here both the *Masoras* agree, not only in respect to the *same form*, but also in the opinion that the two cases *differ in meaning*. No one ever doubted the meaning *as the lion* in one of them, viz., in Is. 38: 13; and it follows, therefore, that the Masorites made out a different meaning of כִּאֲרִי in Ps. 22: 17. But what that meaning is or was, we have no means of ascertaining. Doubtless the difficulty of the passage which would here result from the translation by the words *as the lion*, pressed them with the seeming necessity of another signification; just as it has led most critics to give another, even down to the

present time. But as the Masorites are not *authoritative*, we are at liberty to depart from their opinion, whenever we can find "a more excellent way."

Taking then the whole of the Masoretic testimony together, it is quite clear that it stands for כָּאָרִי as the reading in our text. The one clause in the Masora on Num. 24: 9, viz. כָּאָרוּ כְּהַיָּב, i. e. *the text has כָּאָרוּ*, is plainly contradictory of all the rest in the Masora, and bears on its face the marks of being a later addition. Hengstenberg (in loc.) says, that only two unsuspected Jewish manuscripts have this reading in the Kethibh.

We have only one other reading, then, which competes with כָּאָרִי. This is כָּרוּ, which would be the 3 pl. either of כָּוַר or of כָּרָה. As to this reading, it is found only in one primary, and in a few copied, Jewish manuscripts. And since all the manuscripts, with the insignificant exceptions above noted, are on the side of the received text, as also the Masora, I should say (with Hengstenberg in loc.): "It would be to abandon everything like certainty in criticism, and along with this, criticism itself, were we to reject this reading" for another.

So much for *text-readings*. Our main question remains: How can the meaning, *they pierced*, be made out from כָּאָרִי?

We have seen above, that this word occurs elsewhere only *four times*, viz. in Is. 38: 13. Num. 23: 24. 24: 9. Ezek. 22: 25. It is agreed, on all hands, that in all these cases it means, with the article, *as the lion*, without it, *as a lion*. This constitutes ground for a strong presumption in respect to the case before us, to say the least. To rebut it, we must have some plain and practicable way of making out such a meaning as *they pierced*, from כָּאָרִי. Plain the way is not. If the root, as is usually alleged, be כָּוַר, then the whole matter at once becomes doubtful. Gesenius well says, this root is "*of dubious authority*:" and Fuerst (Concord.) says, that *it is not used*. Then moreover, there seems to be a pretty strong probability against it, since we have already in Hebrew use, כָּרָה, אָבַר, אָבַר, אָבַר, אָבַר, all of the like signification. But admitting כָּוַר as a root, how then are we to get כָּאָרִי from it? The normal Part. plur. of כָּוַר is כָּרוּם. In all the Hebrew Scriptures, there are only three cases, so far as I have been enabled to discover, where an א is inserted after the first radical of a verb כָּוַר, viz. קָאָם in Hos. 10: 14 (a verb); רָאָמוּ in Prov. 24: 7, and אָאָרִים in Ezek. 28: 14, the last two being *participles*. So Altling, in his best of all books on the anomalies and rare forms of the Hebrew, the *Fundamenta Punctat. Heb. Francof. 1717*. If there be more, they could hardly have escaped such an indefatigable

and discerning investigator as he was. But these cases are all so plain in their form and meaning, as to leave no reason for doubting that the \aleph is here a mere *fulcrum* or *mater lectionis*. They have no other anomalies but this, and no doubtful meaning to perplex the interpreter.

Different is the case before us. Here the intruder \aleph has a *vocal composite* *Sheva* under it; in the other cases there is *no* vowel, because the letter is *otiant* or a mere *fulcrum*. The analogy fails us then, in a very important point; so important, that we may truly say, the Hebrew has no where else an analogous pointing for a participle from a verb עָן. The example before us is a perfect ἀπαξ λεγόμενον.

But this is not all. We are told that כְּאַרְיִים stands for the plural כְּאַרְיִים, by virtue of an old plur. form in אַרְיִים for אַרְיִים. But this plural itself is, to say the least, a doubtful one. Hengstenberg (in loc.) asserts, that "it occurs in only one single well-ascertained instance." Gesenius and Roediger (in Gramm. § 86) say, that the plur. ending "in several places [to which appeal is usually made] is doubted by many." Ewald, in the last edition of his Grammar, says that "there are only two cases in which such a plural has any certainty;" and these are עָמִי in 2 Sam. 32: 44. Ps. 144: 2, and רְמוֹנֵי in Cant. 8: 2. He adds, that "perhaps מְנֵי, in Ps. 45: 9, belongs to this category." He expressly excludes כְּאַרְיִים from it. Altling has wholly omitted any such plural. This is a strong array against extending such a plural, when it cannot be clearly and necessarily made out; which surely is the case in the verse before us. It is only when we are forced to receive it in order to make any tolerable sense, that such a plural is admissible. The usual examples of it that are brought forward, besides those mentioned above, are all capable of another and an easier solution.

But we have not yet done with our difficulties. In order to account for \aleph with a *vowel*, in כְּאַרְיִים, we are obliged to resort to the *Chaldee* mode of pointing the participle, in the cases of a root עָן. Here קָיַם, for example, makes Part. קָיָם, and plur. קָיָמִין. But what other instance, in all the Bible, is there of such a Chaldaism? The other examples with inserted \aleph , as produced above, present no case of such an inserted \aleph with a vowel of its own. Of course, then, they have no analogy. The case before us stands *solus cum solo*.

To recapitulate for a moment; we have the following reasons against making the word before us a plur. participle of כּוֹרֵר: (1) Such a root as כּוֹרֵר is altogether doubtful; the probability is much against it. (2) The insertion of \aleph , in such a case, has only two or

three examples to support it. (3) The punctuation of such an \aleph with a vowel of its own, is without any example in Hebrew; and if referred to Chaldaism, there is nothing like it elsewhere in the whole Hebrew Bible. (4) The plur. ending in ָ is at least highly improbable here, if indeed it is ever admissible; and therefore it should not be admitted without a necessity. Putting now all these things together, and adding to the whole the consideration, that the sense of the last clause may easily and lawfully be made out in another way, without any change of the text, or any violation of the laws of grammar or of the lexicon, and without a change in any word of even a vowel point — the case becomes, at least in my view, all but one of downright and absolute certainty. It is impossible to defend ָ , either as a verb or a participle, on any grounds of considerate regard to the grammar and the structure of the language. On this point I must sympathize with Dr. Alexander; although I feel much more decided in regard to it, than he has expressed himself to be. But his solution of the whole passage I cannot well adopt. He says: "The sense would then be, 'they surround my hands and my feet as they would a lion,' i. e. with the strength and fierceness of a lion." He admits ingenuously, that there is a *strangeness* in this, and doubtless he has some serious difficulty in his own mind, about receiving such an interpretation. I cannot for a moment hesitate to reject it. It is in vain to contend against the certain and established laws of grammar and idiom.

Dr. Alexander, in his Commentary, has given us but partially the views of Dr. Hengstenberg. He has perhaps chosen the most prudent course, since he has not obligated himself to follow that commentator in everything. But since Dr. Hengstenberg's work has been translated and published in England, and since he has acquired so high a reputation among us, it has become important to our religious public, that they should distinctly see where this able and learned writer now stands, as to his theory of exegesis in regard to Ps. xxii., and also in regard to other Messianic Psalms.

In his *Christology*, Dr. H. has warmly defended the personal and individual application of this Psalm to the Messiah, Vol. I. p. 172 seq. In speaking of such an application (p. 175 of *Christol.* in German) he says, that he "decidedly agrees with it." He then proceeds (p. 176) to detail all the specialities of description in the Psalm, and repeatedly asserts that they can be applied to no one but to the suffering and crucified Messiah. His language is very strong, and somewhat stringent, in respect to the opinion of his neological opponents.

Among other things, he adopts unhesitatingly the word כְּאֲרִי as a plural form of the participle from כָּרַר; and he appeals to קָמַח and קָמַיִם (cited above on p. 61), as justifying the redundant א. But he never notices the essential difference between the א *otiant* here, and the א with a vowel in כְּאֲרִי, which is fatal to his solution. Thus much, however, for the tone and tenor of the Christology; and these are such as meet my hearty approbation, and (the grammatical *faux pas* excepted) I could heartily subscribe to all the distinctive and important parts of his original comment on Ps. 22: 17.

In his recent and formal Commentary on the Psalms, Dr. H. has departed far enough from his prior views; and in speaking of them apologetically he says, that he did the best he could at the time; for then "he had as yet advanced but a little way on an independent footing into the depths of the Old Testament," p. 362 Eng. translation. At the present time, he says, that "if we consider the Psalm as referring to the *ideal person of the Righteous One* . . . nothing but ignorance (sic!) can object to this interpretation," p. 364. He says, moreover, that "this character is introduced throughout the Psalms more frequently than any other." It would seem, then, that the *ignorance* in question has scarcely any apology for itself, if such be indeed the case.

It may be so; but after devoting a somewhat long life to the study of the Scriptures, I have never yet been able to form in my mind any definite conception, as to who or what sort of a person this *ideal person of the Righteous One* is, separate from the character and person of Christ. Dr. H. says, that "*every particular righteous man* might appropriate to himself the consolations of this Psalm, . . . so far as he embodied in his own person *the ideal righteous man*," p. 364. Of course, as he argues, every such man may appropriate to himself the sufferings depicted in it. The inference, he says, is clear, that the Messiah, as a righteous person, must be a sufferer. And inasmuch as *suffering* and *righteousness* have a consummation in him, we in this way may come at last to see how it is applicable to the Messiah; (not, as it would seem, to him as a *unum PRO omnibus*, but merely as a *unum INTER omnes*).

On v. 16 (Heb. 17) he says, in reference to a *special* application to Christ, that "the grounds adduced in his introduction [to this chapter], make it evident, that the Psalm has reference to him [Christ] only as embodying the perfect idea of the *righteous man*," p. 386 seq.

The Psalmist, then, has merely drawn a picture of an *ideal good man*, first as suffering, then as rewarded. The description in Psalm

xxii. is true, and applies to the Saviour, only *par excellence*, as being a more distinguished good man; and all the special and peculiar traits of suffering here described become, in his view, only specialities which intensify the light and shade of the general picture. *Quantum mutatus ab illo!*

I shall enter into no defence here of the views diverse from these, entertained by evangelical interpreters; although this were an easy task. I would only say, that such a claro-obscure picture of the predicted Messiah has no point of attraction for me. What could the Jewish people at large understand, about a mythical or philosophical *ideal* or *abstraction* of a good man, such as this is? Some living and real exemplar they might contemplate, and learn to copy. But it required more of transcendental philosophy to realize such a generalization, and to connect it specially with the Messiah, than any Hebrew of that day ever learned.

Doubtless, if Dr. H. is consistent with himself, we shall next hear, that he has applied Is. liii. to the *abstract genus* of righteous sufferers, and not to the Messiah in particular. Knobel himself (Comm. s. 365) is not unwilling to admit such a qualified Messianic exegesis as this; and De Wette would doubtless have acceded to it.

But in truth, the so called *Messianic Psalms* would be of little worth or force to us, when looked at through such a medium. We can easily understand simple predictions, that the righteous will suffer, and will be rewarded. But in what way a *mere ideal* is to suffer and be rewarded, and how all righteous men are made to participate in him, and so far suffer and enjoy as they are parts of this *ideal*, and what special bearing any or all of this can have on the true Messiah, we wot not. We cannot see objects distinctly, when surrounded with such a silver fog. It may be *Dummheit* or *Unkundigkeit* (as Dr. H. suggests), which prevents our seeing. But after all, it does need unusually sharp optics to see palpably a mere abstraction.

With unfeigned regret we make these remarks. Dr. H. has stood long before the world, as the dauntless champion of evangelical views in Germany. Dr. Alexander has (perhaps wisely) forborne to bring these things out in his Commentary. Our views of duty to the church constrain us to give, to our religious public, an account of these matters as they really are. Our young men especially, who are most exposed to be led away by distinguished names, should have the paths laid open before them, in which such visionary exegesis bids us to go.

After so much of this nature, it will cease to create surprise, when we learn, that Dr. H. has given up the definite Messianic interpreta-

tion of the Psalms usually deemed Messianic, nearly throughout the whole book. Ps. viii. belongs to the *ideal man*. So does Ps. xvi, Ps. xxii. (as we have seen), and also Ps. xl. On this last Dr. H. makes a remark worth quoting: "The views given by the author himself [viz. the author of this Comm.], in the beginning of his course, have *lost all significance*, since he has attained to a deeper insight of the way and manner of the New Testament, and specially of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in handling the declarations of the Old Testament," (Introd. to Ps. xl.). Formerly, he had stringently urged the consideration, that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews had made a plain and palpable application of this Psalm to the Messiah, "which is decisive as to all who believe in the divine authority of this Epistle." But now his *deeper insight* into the nature and extent of the *abstract, ideal, good man*, has shown him that there is no weight to be attached to this argument. Ps. ii. and Ps. xlv, however, are so difficult to manage, by way of application to the *ideal man*, (since divinity and supremacy are here assigned to the subject of these Psalms), that he allows them to pass as Messianic; yet with less of strenuousness than formerly.

But to other Psalms, generally deemed by most to be Messianic, he has applied again that universal solvent—the *ideal good man*. Upon the whole he has given us much reason to exclaim, with desponding Mary at the sepulchre: "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him!" John 22: 13. To stop with Ps. ii. and xlv, and represent all the rest as transcendental speculation on the *abstract and ideal good man*, is a stride in exegesis, which I would hope in God our countrymen may never be prepared to make.

All this, by the way, helps to show that it is far from being desirable to be cast on German commentary alone, for the elucidation of the true spirit of the Scriptures. All that pertains to mere philology and criticism of a literary kind, the Germans have done more effectually, in general, than any other writers whatever. But on this point of all points, the real *Christology* of the Bible, it seems to me very unsafe to follow them. Even such learned and excellent men as Drs. Nitzsch, Neander, Tholuck, and Müller, in their new *Deutsche Zeitschrift*, deliberately and designedly call in question the *inspiration* of the Bible, as we hold it. They acknowledge errors of fact, of science, and of other minor things; they admit discrepancy and contradiction among the various writers of the Scriptures, and attribute these last to individual writers, in respect to their own works. If any

one wishes for the proof, let him read Tholuck's Essay on *Inspiration*, in the said *Zeitschrift*, and Dr. Neander's Letter to the translators of his *Leben Jesu*, given in the Preface of the Translators. Is it not time for American theologians to be on the look out for such things? And above all, should we not provide for raising up our own critics and interpreters? Is there not talent enough in our American youth, if duly called out, to equal, yea surpass, the Germans themselves in such matters? I cannot doubt it, for a moment. But alas! how are our churches to be roused up to a proper sense of their present duty and their danger? How are they to be persuaded, that we should not be dependent on foreign countries for our sacred literature? And when will adequate provision be made to secure a corps of life-guards for the church and the Bible, by an arrangement which shall establish and make permanent at least a small body of them, who are competent to meet and repel every invading foe?

No person, who has an adequate and enlightened view of the present state and dangers of the Christian church in this country, when we are becoming flooded with foreign books of all kinds, in respect to sacred philology, doctrinal theology, dogmatic and church history, (not to speak of Rationalism and atheistic philosophy), — I say no one can refrain from the most sincere and ardent wish, that some wealthy and noble-hearted Christians would make themselves immortal in the churches of God, by founding and establishing a Seminary, on an adequate pecuniary basis, the sole object of which should be to teach, to explain, and to defend the Bible. There should be in it at least four Professors, one for the elementary studies in the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic; one for the higher exegesis of the Old Testament on critical grounds; one for Hellenistic Greek, including the Septuagint, the New Testament, the Apocrypha, and the apostolic and early Fathers, with the early New Testament apocryphal writers; and one for New Testament critical exegesis.

An *appendage* of this critical Bible School, (into which last, laymen, if they desire it, as well as theological students should be admitted,) should be another department, with at least two competent teachers to fit youth, male and female, *for the great business of Sabbath Schools*. A residence at this department should be at the election of the pupil as to length of time, beyond a half year's course; but none should be admitted for less time than six months. Both Institutions should be so endowed, and furnished, that a residence there would cost but quite a small sum; and thus they would be thrown open to all ranks, on condition of satisfactory character and attainments.

Such an Institution would interfere with no other in the land. In the higher branches, a *three years' curriculum* should be the normal demand. Then the pupils who choose, can go into the Seminaries where doctrine, church-history, and homiletics are taught, and go through the ordinary course, languages excepted. With such prescriptions, only younger students would be likely to attend the Bible College, and the number who would frequent our already established Seminaries, would not probably be diminished sensibly, in the end, by such an Institution.

Are these *airy* visions? I am afraid they may prove to be so. But how easy it would be for some half a dozen men in Boston or New York, to do all that such a plan requires, even without sensibly diminishing their wealth, and certainly with great augmentation of their happiness. Our Statesmen soon find out how their country can be best and most effectually defended. They provide for manning the militia, when called out, with officers trained up in all military science at West Point. Two wars have effectually demonstrated the cleverness of these tactics. Why should "the children of light" be less wary and wise than Statesmen? *Our all is at stake in the Bible.* As surely as its *inspiration* is set aside, and our people are taught that enlightened views demand them to give it up, so surely is there an end to all evangelical religion among the mass; and all the *authoritative* power of the Bible will cease thenceforth to be recognized. Then we shall be where France is; or (which is not much better in respect to piety among the mass of men) where the Germans are, having, on the Sabbath, some twenty, or it may be thirty, but rarely fifty, persons to attend a brief public worship, in their large towns and villages, and most of that brief time of worship occupied with music. If we are not to come to this, then may God put it into the hearts of wealthy and enlightened men among us to raise up, here and there at least, Bible Colleges, *Sacred West-Points*, where officers will be trained up, who are able and willing to defend, to the last extremity and triumphantly, that holy citadel of Christianity, THE SCRIPTURES GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD.

Having, in a preceding paragraph, ventured to speak plainly concerning the views of some men greatly respected and honored, I must not do myself, or the distinguished writers above named, the injustice of an exposure to be misunderstood. I would say therefore explicitly, that I do not think there is any good reason to doubt the personal piety of any of the gentlemen whom I have thus named, certainly none to doubt their highly distinguished talents and learning. I have,

as I think, very good reason to believe, that each of them regards *the whole soul and essence of Christianity as centering in the person of Christ*, and that without him is neither true religion nor Christian salvation. They receive and regard him as their Saviour, in an appropriate sense. But their education and modes of reasoning have led them to think less of what they would name the costume or non-essentials of the Scriptures, than we are accustomed to do. They separate facts, and incidents, and what they regard as Jewish opinions and views, from what they would name *the moral and spiritual essence of the religion set forth in the Bible*; and while they are in a measure indifferent to the exactness of the truth and consistency of the former, they believe and receive the latter. Their refined education, and their great powers of discrimination, enable them, in some measure, to separate between costume and person; and while they are not solicitous about the first, they seem readily to admit for substance the last. Endowed with such powers and such learning, *they* may, perhaps, do all this, without hazard to their own personal salvation. Who can doubt of the late Neander's personal piety? And so one might speak of Tholuck, of Müller, and of Nitzsch. But while they may make such discriminations as the above, perhaps *salva fide* in a personal sense, could their positions in regard to the Scriptures be received by the indiscriminating multitude of men, both learned and unlearned, without the most absolute hazard of all belief in the Bible as divinely authoritative; of all belief in its doctrines, its precepts, and its facts? Impossible, altogether impossible. The ground once abandoned, which Paul has taken, that ALL SCRIPTURE IS GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD, every man of common attainments will feel at liberty to say whatever his own subjective feelings may dictate; to say: 'This is unimportant, that is unessential; this is a doubtful narration, that is a contradictory one; this is in opposition to science, and that to reason; this may be pruned, and that lopped off, while the tree may still remain as good as ever.' In a word, every one is left, wholly and without any check, to be his own judge in the case, how much of the Bible is consonant with his own reason and subjective feelings, and how much is not; and these feelings are of course the high court of appeal. What now has become of the book of God, true, authoritative, decisive of all duty and all matters of faith? Gone, absolutely gone, irretrievably gone, as to the mass of men who are not philosophizers in casuistry and in the theory of religion. And if any doubt remains, as to the effect of such doctrine, I appeal again to the religious state of the

great German community — to their Sabbaths, to their lonely sanctuaries, to their lack of missionary spirit, and to their general indifference as to revivals of religion, such as produce and foster warm-hearted piety. The *Pietists*, (as in the way of scorn they name all warm-hearted and practical religious men), are merely “a smoke in the nostrils” of their scholars and their statesmen. No man can rebut the force of this appeal; for the truth of it is too palpable. The worst of all is, that the mass of the Germans look, with secret scorn, on a man who claims that a practically godly, prayerful, humble life, is essential to religion. One question sums up the account. Where is the *family altar* for prayer and praise in the German community? Even in the so-called *religious* community? If what I have often heard be true, such altars are not more numerous among them, than were the righteous, whom Abraham was requested to find in a devoted city of old. I do not say there can be no piety, where this is the case. There may be some sevens of thousands, I hope there are, who do not “bow the knee to Baal;” and doubtless the Redeemer has sincere followers and friends there. But that active spirit of piety, which fills the church and the conference-room with humble and anxious inquirers after the way of salvation; which sanctifies the Sabbath; which builds up religious Schools; which sends the Gospel to the destitute in one’s own country, and raises up missionaries and causes them to go forth unto the ends of the earth, that “the dead may hear the voice of the Son of God and live” — such a spirit cannot breathe strongly and freely, where there are no family altars, and no Sabbath.

To the same position or state, or one much like it, must we also come, ere long, unless this tide can be averted from us. But this must be done, if it can be accomplished. On the present generation in our country it rests, to decide the question whether we shall follow in the footsteps of Germany. The spirit of every Christian pastor in the land, and of every private Christian too, ought to be roused up to meet this great exigency; and the churches should at once concert and adopt measures to establish such an Institution as has been described above, or something equivalent to it. NEW TIMES AND NEW DANGERS CALL FOR NEW AND ADEQUATE DEFENCES. We should train our own men; so that they may rush with skill and power into the thickest of the battle, so often as the portentous contest arises. Alas! How will our churches rue the day, (when they have become prostrate in energy and insignificant in numbers), in which they have neglected to furnish a *corps of holy*

officers, who are adequate to guide in every contest and on every occasion!

But I sat out to descant on a short Hebrew text, and have made a long, a very long, excursus; and yet I would hope, not one that will be useless; for I am sure that it is not uncalled for. A few words more, in returning to our text, and I have done.

It is clear from what I have said above, that Dr. Alexander, Mr. Landis, and myself, perfectly agree as to the applicability of that text in Ps. 22: 17, to a *crucified Saviour*. We differ only in the mode of arriving at the conclusion. 'I must confess that I see nothing to take alarm at in Dr. A.'s opinion about it. Mr. L., too, is clearly and entirely orthodox as to principle; and besides all this, he has managed his discussion with much acuteness and ability. If he has made some small slips in regard to the grammatical nature and power of Hebrew forms and accents, he can appeal to a long line of critics who have done the same thing before him, in respect to the passage now in view. He has the consolation at least of being found in very respectable company. He will doubtless do me the justice to say, that I have shown him no disrespect; at least, if I have, I am unconscious of it, and it certainly was not intended. A man who can write as he does, need not anticipate disrespect from any sensible reader.

To conclude; I have not advanced my own solution of the controverted passage in question, with any intended assumption of certainty on my part, or made any efforts to cast on other opinions differing from mine any contumely, or to hold them up to disrespect. I have merely proposed a way of interpreting the controverted verse before us, in a manner simple, normal, without offence to grammatical or lexical usage, and without changing any one either of the letters or of the vowels of the text. I am no stickler for the *Kethibh* or for the *Qeri*, but I adopt either, when the sense seems to me to demand it. And as to the *vowel-points*, since they are notoriously no older than the sixth century of our era, we are clearly not bound by them. Yet no good Hebrew scholar can say, that they are not a masterly, and almost always a true, exposition of the meaning of the Hebrew text. It follows, of course, that when we depart from them, there should be an *exegetical necessity*, or at least an *evident advantage*, in doing so, as to the meaning of the text. That we *may* depart from them, is with me one of the orthodox critical canons; that we *should* depart from them, except for reasons such as have been suggested, I deem little short of downright heresy in criticism.

Since the preceding pages were in type, a copy of Lengerke's recent Commentary on the Psalms has come into my hands. He has made some remarks that are worthy of attention, on the passage which has been before us, and which go far toward showing the possibility of retaining *הִקְיִסוּ* in its usual *Hiphil* sense, with only some little modification.

That the original meaning of *נָקַד* is to *smite, beat, (schlagen)*, both Gesenius and Lengerke assert; and this is fully borne out by the kindred languages. But there is an *accessory* idea attached to it, in most, if not all cases. This is that of *smiting around a thing*, and sometimes so as to *enclose, clamp, clasp, or clinch* it. So in Is. 17: 6. 24: 13, *נָקַד* means *the beating around*, i. e. of a fig-tree, in order to knock off its fruit. From this is easily deduced the secondary and common meaning in *Hiph.*, viz. *to surround, enclose*; as in 1 Kings 7: 24. Is. 15: 8. 2 Kings 6: 14. 11: 8. Ps. 17: 9. 78: 18. It is not confined to *persons*; it may extend to *things*, as in Job 19: 6, "*He has thrown around (הִקְיִסוּ) me his net.*" So tropically, in Lam. 3: 5. The idea is, that the net *grasps or surrounds* him, so that he is helpless. Easily deduced from this shade of meaning, is that of *going round in a continuous circle*; like the revolution of the stated feasts, Is. 29: 1. Job 1: 5.

Yet the verb has clearly another shade of meaning, which attaches itself mostly to the simple idea of *smiting or beating*; e. g., Is. 10: 34 (*Piel*), where it is applied to *smiting down* a forest, viz., with the blows of the axe. So in Job 19: 26; where (in *Piel*) it is used for *smiting* the skin of Job with grievous ulcers so as to *destroy* it; (comp. Job 2: 7, "And Satan . . . smote (*נָקַד*) Job with sore boils," etc.). A *destructive smiting* is implied in both these cases, by the tenor of the sense. On this may be easily grafted the *smiting or wounding of the hands and the feet*; as I have interpreted the passage above. But Lengerke chooses the other shade of sentiment, and renders thus: ["*They have clasped or clinched*], *lion-like, my hands and my feet.*" This he refers to the clinching of the hands and feet by the claws of the lion, who thus prevents his prey from defending himself or escaping. The meaning is, that the claws surround the limbs, so as to constrict them; and thus the victim has no means of escape. Of course, he carries forward *הִקְיִסוּ* of the second clause, to the third, as shown above in the version, and takes *בְּאָרְזֵי* in the same sense as that which I have endeavored to defend.

Certainly this is an ingenious and not unnatural interpretation.

Conceding it, all the absurdity which Mr. Landis and others find in *surround*, as applied to *hands* and *feet*, falls away; and the image seems to be taken from nature. Yet I have a doubt remaining; and this is, whether the lion does not always employ his *teeth* first, in assaulting his victim, and his *claws* merely in holding him fast, and helping to tear him in pieces. If so, then *piercing* or *wounding* is the more probable sense of סָבְרוּ , because the most appropriate. In either way, this verb suits well the last clause, and doubtless ought to be transferred to it.

[NOTE. I add a word, in respect to the *English Translation* of Hengstenberg's Commentary. I have, in reading some of it, not unfrequently found myself obliged to resort to the *original*, in order to be sure of the meaning. For example, we have a version of the Hebrew (II. p. 39 German) by Dr. H., which runs thus: "Sie umgeben mich Löwengleich nach Händen und Füßen;" Eng. Translation: "They beset me, lion-like, on my hands and my feet." If I rightly understand the German, it means: "They surround me, lion-like, as to my hands and my feet," the two latter nouns in Hebrew being the *Acc. of manner*. To beset any one, is plain and good English; but to beset on, sounds strange to us in these western ends of the earth. To set on, is familiar enough; but to beset on, I cannot get at, without going to the German. I would by no means characterize the Translation in general as unfaithful; but it needs revision and more pains-taking in passages of critical nicety.]

NO. II. SUGGESTIONS RESPECTING THE MUCH CONTROVERTED סָבְרוּ OF PSALM VIII. 2.

This word still remains an *offendiculum criticorum*. Hengstenberg insists, that it is the *Inf. const.* form of the verb סָבַר , to give, put, place, etc., although he takes the liberty, in his version of it in the Commentary, to translate it *gekrönt*, [hast] crowned. Hoffmann, in his striking work on *Prophecy and its Fulfilment*, makes it an *Imper.* of סָבַר ; on which no comment is needed. De Wette renders the clause thus: "Who exaltest thy praise to heaven." Ewald (Psalmen) renders thus: "Thou whose glory is exalted above the heavens." All of these translations are rather *metaphrases* of the word סָבְרוּ , than a literal version. The sense which they give is a good one in itself; but our question now is: Whether it is *true* to the original?

Most of the expositors and grammarians have assigned סָבְרוּ , as Hengstenberg does, to the const. Inf. of סָבַר . The latter strenuously maintains, that it can be made nowhere else. My question, and the first one, is: Whether it can, with any probability, be made here?

(1) All analogy in the alleged verb (סָבַר) is against it. Examples of the Inf. forms of this verb are very numerous. Two of them are

normal, like תָּהָן . All the rest, excepting the case before us, are either תָּהָן (a usual Inf. fem. form in verbs תָּהָן), or else a contraction of this form, viz. תָּהָן . The examples of these amount to some 140. As to the Inf. form of תָּהָן , if it is one, it stands alone.

(2) No other verbs Pe Nun form such an Inf. All that are not normal, follow the model of תָּהָן (תָּהָן).

(3) Verbs Pe Yodh, like those Pe Nun, do many of them drop their first radical in the Inf.; e. g. יָלַד , Inf. לָדוּהָ . In a very few cases here, there are forms like לָדוּהָ , i. e. with a *long* vowel on the first syllable; but only one has a *Sheva* under the first letter (like תָּהָן); and this is in Gen. 46: 3. The word in question is בְּרָדוּהָ , which is said to be רָדוּהָ with a בָּ prefix preposition. But this formation I doubt, because there is not another like it in all the fem. Infinitives of verbs Pe Yodh. It is said, that the verb which precedes this word, viz. אִירָא , requires בָּ prep. to follow it. But this is not so always. This verb does indeed admit a בָּ prep. after it; but by far the greater number of nouns which follow it, are in the simple Acc. without the בָּ . Then it is easy to suppose a *noun-form* in בְּרָדוּהָ (*descent*), such as is formed in the second class of verbs Pe Yodh, e. g. such as מִיָּטַב from יָטַב , only that in the case before us, the Yodh *quiescent* is omitted in the writing, which is very common everywhere. The sense of the passage is the same by using the noun, as if we employ the supposed Infinitive.

Where can we find, then, in the hundreds of cases in verbs Pe Nun and Pe Yodh, an established fem. Inf. form, which is like תָּהָן ? Not even one can be found. It is therefore very hard to believe, against such united and universal testimony as all this. It must be the most extreme necessity, which would justify us in admitting תָּהָן under the category of Infinitives.

Is there such a necessity in the present case? Plainly not. In fact the clause $\text{אֲשֶׁר תִּזְכֶּה הַדָּדִךְ עַל-יְהוָה שָׁמַיִם}$, in v. 2, seems to forbid an Inf. here. Dr. H. translates thus, in his Notes: "Thou, in respect to whom the giving thy glory over the heaven." Is there not something strange and seemingly lame in this? אֲשֶׁר is rendered *thou in respect to whom*. Literally the Hebrew runs thus: *Thou in respect to whom to give thy glory, etc.* This is enigmatic enough; and I must believe this to be a connection and position of an Inf. without any parallel.

To me it seems quite probable, almost certain indeed, that the תָּהָן here is either a *verb Praeter* from the root תָּהָן , and should be so pointed; or else (which appears more probable), it is the *Pres. Part.*

of the same verb, and to be pointed תָּתַן . Nothing is easier, in either of these cases, than the grammatical construction. The relative pronoun אֲשֶׁר can be combined in sense with the תָּ in $\text{תָּתַן$, i. e. it can be combined with the second, or even the first pers. of a pronoun; just as we can say: "*He who, thou who, I who*"; Heb. Gramm. § 121. l. n. 1. But the last two combinations are somewhat rare; yet not so much so as to be doubtful. Naturally the pronoun אֲשֶׁר relates more often to the third pers., and to make a different reference without necessity, is undesirable. But if it be taken as the third pers. here, it would disagree with the suffix תָּ .

But what now is the meaning of the proposed construction above? I answer, that the verb תָּתַן is no stranger in Hebrew. It occurs in Hos. 8: 9, 10, in the sense of *distributing* or *diffusing*. Its original meaning is *to extend* or *stretch out*. Abundant pledges of this are given in its correlates. In Greek we have *τείνω*, *to extend, stretch out*. In the Indo-Germanic, *ten* is of the same meaning. In Ethiopic, *tin* = *expansive*. In our English word *ex-tend*, we have the same etymon at the basis. Indeed this sense is quite plain, and well established, in the original root.

Besides this, if there be any meaning in the root תָּתַן , *to give*, which is here necessary, the same is also to be found in $\text{תָּתַן$; for one of its meanings is, *to give, to distribute*, as it evidently stands related to תָּתַן . But clearly the former sense of *diffusing* or *expanding* is altogether appropriate in the verse before us, which speaks of *glory expanded abroad over the whole heavens*. What that *glory* is, the fourth verse has disclosed, viz., *the moon and the stars*, which, as a combined whole, are spread over the entire face of the sky.

We seem, then, to have arrived near our goal. We can now translate: *Thou who diffusest abroad thy glory over the heavens*; thus taking אֲשֶׁר as related to the second person, in connection with the pronoun תָּ . We point the controverted word, in this case, *participially*, viz. תָּתַן . Participles have no distinction of *person*, but only of gender and number; and they may therefore be used, with equal propriety, with either the first, second, or third person. All on this ground is plain, proper, and appropriately significant. We merely supply the appropriate vowel-points; and the liberty to do this, when the exigency of the passage demands it, has already been vindicated in the preceding No. I. That there is an *exigency* here, seems to me plain; for we cannot, against the universal testimony of all verbs Pe Nun and Pe Yodh, make an Inf. form out of תָּתַן from תָּתַן . If it is not a monstrosity, it is at least in opposition to all normal forms of

abridged fem. Infinitives. We obtain as good a sense, even a better one, out of הִתְקַדַּח , than out of תִּתְקַדַּח .

But there is another way of resolving the difficulty, viz., by taking the word וַתְּקַדַּח as a verb in the Praet., and pointing it תִּתְקַדַּח . It would then have הִוָּד for its subject, and we must translate thus: *Thou whose glory extends abroad over the heavens.* This is favored by Ewald; and for substance it gives the same sense as the other method of pointing, although the structure is not so facile, when we point it as a verb. The noun הִוָּד is masc. and therefore requires the masc. verb; and such is תִּתְקַדַּח .

Thus we save all the grammatical difficulty of an Inf. form, which is against usage and without a single parallel in the language. Thus too we obtain even a better sense than תִּתְקַדַּח gives. And as the verb, when pointed as above (i. e. either תִּתְקַדַּח or הִתְקַדַּח), is no stranger in the older Hebrew, and has extensive off-shoots in other languages, I can see no valid objection to admitting it here. The objection, that such a verb is not *frequent* in the Hebrew, if urged against any particular word in this passage or in that, would, if admitted, exclude a great many well established words. E. g. רָצַח (*sen*) in Ps. 2: 12, stands quite alone in Hebrew, if we except the three examples of it in the brief composition of Lemuel, contained in Prov. xxxi. But who doubts the reality of the reading? So אִשָּׁה (*wife*) in Ecc. 2: 8, stands entirely alone in all the Bible; yet that is no good reason for rejecting the word. And so of a multitude of other words. It is quite as probable that David should use the verb תִּתְקַדַּח , elsewhere also employed, as that he should use רָצַח in Ps. 2: 12. The only fair question is: Whether the verb is usable and appropriate? We reply by affirming both; and we have given our reasons for such a reply.

My object was merely a special one in the preceding remarks, viz. to investigate the apparently strange form of the word וַתְּקַדַּח , as coming from תִּתְקַדַּח . We have found an easy and obvious solution, in supposing a different root in actual use. In this case, we change only the vowel-points; and if we can thus avoid trespassing the laws of grammar as to the fem. Inf. forms of verbs Pe Nun, and make even a more appropriate sense by adopting another root, I do not see why any serious objection should be made against the view of the subject which has been taken above.

I merely remark, at the close, that in my apprehension, Ps. viii. needs, and ought to receive, a very different exposition from that which Dr. H. has made out. The *abstract ideal man* accomplishes

very little here, in the way of satisfying the demands of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 2: 6—9, and several other passages. It seems to me quite certain, that the author of that epistle verily believed that the Messiah is to be found in Ps. viii. My views of his authority are such, that in my mind this settles the question, whether Christ is to be found there, in the affirmative. But time and space forbid entering on a discussion of the Psalm, although one is much needed.

ARTICLE IV.

THE FOUR GOSPELS AS WE NOW HAVE THEM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, AND THE HEGELIAN ASSAULTS UPON THEM.

By C. E. Stowe, D. D., Professor in Bowdoin College.
[Continued from Vol. VIII. p. 529.]

V. COMPARISON OF THE CANONICAL GOSPELS WITH THE APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS STILL EXTANT.

THE impugnors of the New Testament gospels appeal to the fact, that there are gospels acknowledged to be apocryphal, as a proof of their theory that our recognized gospels are also myths or forgeries. Any one who candidly examines these spurious gospels, and compares them with the New Testament, will find in them, not a refutation of our sacred writers, but a most convincing testimony to their intelligence, honesty and supernatural inspiration. So totally diverse are they from the genuine gospels, in conception, in spirit, in execution, in their whole impression — in all respects so entirely unlike, so immeasurably inferior, that the New Testament only shines the brighter by the contrast. They have scarcely so much resemblance to the genuine gospels, as the monkey has to a man.

An elaborate history and collection of these writings was first published by Fabricius near the beginning of the last century. The first volume of a new and critical edition was issued at Halle by Thilo in 1832. Prof. Norton has given an account of them in the third volume of his work on the Genuineness of the Gospels, but with an incredulity in regard to the testimony of the ancients which amounts