

Psalm 22 and Genesis 22

This article will suggest new perspectives for Psalm 22 and also attempt historical contextualization as well as resolving some difficult textual problems. Psalm 22 is incredibly important in the NT, Patterson summarises: “Pride of place for the use of Psalm 22 belongs to the writers of the NT. Direct citations of this psalm occur fourteen times (cf. v. 1 with Matt 27:46; Mark 15:34; v. 5 with Rom 3:5; v. 7 with Matt 27:39; Mark 15:29; v. 8 with Matt 27:43; Luke 23:35; v. 18 with Matt 27:35; Mark 15:24; Luke 23:34; John 19:24; v. 22 with Heb 2:12; v. 23 with Rev 19:5; v. 31 with John 19:30). In addition, J. H. Reumann suggests that allusions to the whole psalm are reflected in the NT (e.g. Mark 9:12; 14:21; Luke 24:27; Acts 13:29; 1 Pet 1:11), as well as several of the psalms individual verses (cf. v. 13 with 1 Pet 5:8; v. 15 with John 19:28; v. 21 with 2 Tim 4:17; v. 24 with Heb 5:7; v. 28 with Rev 11:15; 19:16; v. 29 with Matt 27:42; Mark 15:31)”.¹

Of course, the importance of Psalm 22 is magnified because not only was it (at the very least) partially recited by Jesus during the crucifixion, it was also (actively but unconsciously) fulfilled by the various protagonists/participants. A perceptive study is provided by HAW in *Studies in the Gospels*.² Our first step towards achieving a new perspective on Psalm 22 was provoked by the insight provided by GB and HAW into the citation in Matthew 27: 46 (*Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani?*) adapted from Psalm 22:1, in which they suggest links with Genesis 22:13.³

The phrase “Why hast thou forsaken me?” is linked by both HAW and GB with Gen 22:13 through the NT use of *sabachthani*. However, the Hebrew for “thicket” in Genesis is *Cebak* (צֶבַק) and the problem is further complicated by the fact that the English translations of the Greek texts of Matthew and Mark do not indicate that Matthew and Mark **have very different words written** - *transliterations* (what the audience heard) of the words Jesus spoke. This device is probably used to reflect the audiences’ confusion over hearing (understanding) Eli/Eloi/Elijah and reflects that the original citation (as heard) may have been in a mixture of Hebrew and/or Aramaic. Nevertheless, Matthew (found it necessary) and makes it explicit (by adding the caveat....“*that is to say*”) that it is a quote from Psalm 22:1. In itself this indicates that something unusual is going on.....as if Matthew is saying.....pay attention!!

¹ Summary taken from: Richard D. Patterson, Psalm 22: From trial to triumph, JETS47/2 (June 2004) 213–33pg.228 (Also see there for intertestamental period) Patterson adds the following footnote: Reumann also feels that the description of the psalmist’s enemies as dogs (vv. 16, 20) was influential in Paul’s warning for the Philippian believer’s to “watch out for those dogs” (Phil 3:2). Reumann, “Psalm 22 at the Cross” 41–42.

² Harry A. Whittaker (HAW), *Studies in the Gospels* (Biblia, 1993), Available online [cited Jan 2016]: Study 232; “Why Hast Thou Forsaken Me?” (Matt. 27:46-49; Mark 15:34-36) and Study 234; “It is finished” (Matt. 27:50; Mark 15:37; Luke 23:46; John 19:28-30) <http://christadelphianbooks.org/haw/sitg/index.html>

³ The Genesis link will be investigated anon. See, Harry A. Whittaker (HAW) in *Studies in the Gospels* (*Ibid* , Study 232) and George Booker (GB) in *Psalms Studies Vol 1* (which I believe was a cooperative project); available online [cited Jan 2016] <http://christadelphianbooks.org/booker/psalms1/psabka30.html>

Psalm 22 (KJV)	Genesis 22 (KJV)
<p>v.1) Why hast thou forsaken me?</p> <p>Matt. 27:46) <i>Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani?</i> that is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?</p>	<p>v.13) behold behind <i>him</i> a ram caught in a thicket by his horns</p> <p>LXE v.13) And Abraam lifted up his eyes and beheld, and lo! a ram caught by his horns in a <u>plant of Sabec</u></p>
<p>v.1) ...<i>why art thou so far</i> (רַחֵק) from helping me...(literally; <i>far from salvation of me</i>)</p> <p>v.11) Be <u>not far</u> (same word) from me; for trouble <i>is</i> near; for <i>there is</i> none to help.</p> <p>v.19) But be <u>not thou far</u> (same word) from me, O LORD : O my strength, haste thee to help me.</p>	<p>v.4) Abraham lifted up his eyes, and saw the place <u>afar off</u> (רַחֵק) distant...far off....afar)</p>
<p>v.4) Our fathers trusted in thee: they trusted.....</p>	<p>Gen.15:6) And he believed in the LORD; and he counted it to him for righteousness.</p>
<p>v.4) and thou didst deliver them</p>	<p>v.8) My son, <u>God will provide</u> himself a lamb</p>
<p>v.20) Deliver my soul from the sword; <u>my darling</u> from the power of the dog.</p> <p>JPS v.20 (22-21) Deliver my soul from the sword; <u>mine only one</u> from the power of the dog.</p>	<p>v.12) seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, <u>thine only son</u> from me.</p>
<p>v.30) <u>A seed</u> shall serve him; it shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation.</p>	<p>v.17) I will multiply <u>thy seed</u>.... <u>thy seed</u> shall possess the gate of his enemies</p>
<p>v.27) and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee.</p>	<p>v.18) And in <u>thy seed</u> shall all the nations of the earth be blessed</p>

E. A. Knapp comments; “If Matthew’s first two words of the quote are Hebrew and Mark’s are Aramaic then the obvious question is what language are the remaining two words, “lama sabachthani” (λεμα σαβαχθαυ)? In an interesting coincidence these words are used in *both* Aramaic and Mishnaic Hebrew (the Hebrew used at the time of Yeshua)”.....and, “Where the Psalm has “azavthani” the gospels record Yeshua saying “sabachthani,” which is a word used in both Aramaic and in Mishnaic Hebrew. Logically Matthew wouldn’t have changed “Eloi” to “Eli” to make it match the words of Psalm 22 and then *not* change “sabachthani” to “azavthani” as well, in order to make the quotation of the Psalm match precisely. It is almost completely unrecognized and unappreciated that Yeshua’s use of “sabachthani” in place of “azavthani” is actually a well known rabbinic technique. Rabbis used this technique of replacing a word with a synonym to point the discerning reader to a midrash (rabbinic interpretation/teaching) about another related verse.”⁴ The Septuagint (LXX) employs σαβεκ in Gen 22:13 which is a transliteration rendered by the English Septuagint translation (LXE) as “a plant of Sabec”, similar to the Aramaic

⁴ E. A. Knapp, Did the Messiah Speak Aramaic or Hebrew? (part 2) [cited Jan 2016]
<http://www.torahclass.com/archived-articles/412-did-the-messiah-speak-aramaic-or-hebrew-part-1-by-eaknapp>

sabachthani and rendered as a Greek transliteration (σαβαχθανι) in Matt.27:46. The suffix “thani” means: *you do this to me*. The Greek transliteration of *Sabach* is also similar to the well-known Hebrew word *Zabach*, which is used for sacrifice, however, the solution proposed by HAW/GB (although conveying a similar concept as sacrifice) is preferable.....**My God, My God why have you have entangled me?** (Like a ram, i.e. like a sacrifice [Zabach], trapped in a thicket....in a bush of entanglement [Sabec]). Clearly, we are dealing with *multiple associations* and *word-plays* all leading back to the sacrifice that God provided in Genesis 22.

This is further supported by the Psalmists emphasis on the word “far” or “afar”⁵ used multiple times to express a feeling of abandonment (God is distant) a deliberate contrast with Abraham’s faithful view into the distant (same word) future; “*Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad*” (John 8:56). The word “rejoice”, acting as a play on the meaning of Isaac’s name (laughter). The contrast is between the “eye of faith”, that sees the distant future clearly (afar off),⁶ with *loss of hope* that accuses God himself of being distant (afar off) and disinterested in human salvation. However, this understandable human feeling of divine abandonment is reversed in the second half of the Psalm. GB/HAW comment on Ps 22:1 as follows;

Why art thou so far from helping me? Contrast Psa. 35:3; 62:1, 6, 7. This *so far* is almost literal, for Golgotha was “without the camp”, remote from the Holy of Holies and on the north side of the temple area: Lev. 1:11.⁷

We might add that the taunt in v.8 “He trusted on the Lord” is literally “he rolled himself” Patterson notes; “The Hebrew verbal form (גל, gal) could be understood as a perfect, “he trusts/trusted,” paralleling the previous perfect, “he delights,” rather than the imperative of the MT. The basic meaning of the root is “be round, roll.” Used figuratively the verb takes on special spiritual significance. The Psalmist advises the believer “to roll himself upon the Lord in total commitment to God” (Ps 37:5).⁸ In a footnote Patterson adds the following; “In a crucial moment of Israel’s redemptive experience Joshua pronounced God’s declaration, “This day have I rolled away (galal) the reproach of Egypt from off you” (Josh 5:9). Accordingly, that place was named Gilgal. Interestingly, the root was also used to form the word for skull—gulgolet. The Aramaic form of the word was to be forever remembered in the Greek NT as the place of our Savior’s crucifixion—Golgotha”. The Gilgal link is important because it supports the Abrahamic theme (the Abrahamic covenant was renewed at Gilgal). Golgotha (the “far place” outside the

⁵ N. H. Ridderbos understands “far” as a structural key that divides verses 1-21, what he calls the “lament song” section of the psalm, into three parts (1-10, 11-18, 19- 21). This approach has the appeal of having a simple structural key and a good fit with Westermann’s typical individual lament structure. However, “far” does not mark off the obvious break between verse 21 and 22 and so is better seen as functioning as a catchword that links just the first two major sections. N. H. Ridderbos, (*Die Psalme* [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1972 v.1, pp. 185-89; cf. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry*, p. 288).

⁶ Add to this that **Yahweh-Jireh** (Gen.22:14) literally means *Yah will be seen* and we understand that Abraham “saw my day (afar off)” in John 8:56.

⁷ *Ibid*, GB, Psalm Studies (Vol 1).

⁸ *Ibid*, 221

camp) became a place of covenant renewal and rolling away (gal) of reproach - - a circumcision of the “heart” (cf. Jer. 4:4) for the faithful children of Abraham. The reference to the “fathers” trusting in God is a self-evident reference to the patriarchs faith and particularly to that of the eponymous forefather Abraham which is used by Paul as the NT exemplar of *justification by faith* (although faith also requires “works” but not self-justifying “works of law”). What immense faith did it require for Abraham to be prepared to kill his son? Particularly in an era where the “gods” often demanded human sacrifice. Truly, Abraham must have seen “afar off” and trusted the revelation of God. (Abraham believed in the steadfast mercy of Yah; in the promise of an heir; rather than believing that Yah was capricious like the foreign “gods”).

The Psalmist appeals for the rescue of his “darling” (KJV), or, “only one” (JPS, Jewish Publication Society) this directly links to the “thine only” (KJV) in Genesis 22:12. Note the word *son* is placed in italics in the KJV as it is not present in the original Hebrew. The Psalmist has **only one** life and it is dear to him and Abraham has only *one son.....only one child of promise*. In that sense Isaac is the firstborn (not Ishmael) and becomes **“thine only”** (*son*) in Genesis 22 and this dovetails with Zech.12:10; “they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth **for his only son**, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for *his* firstborn”. Note literally; mourning **for only** (this is the only one whom they previously *pierced*). GB/HAW comment on Ps 22:20, **Deliver....my darling** as follows; “This highly unusual expression means ‘my very special one’ (Gen. 22:2, 12, 16; Psa. 35:17; 68:6 (solitary); Prov. 4:3; Jer. 6:26; Amos 8:10; Zech. 12:10). LXX reads “my firstborn”.⁹

Rivka Ulmer¹⁰ notes that Rabbinic hermeneutics situate Psalm 22:21 in the context **of sacrificing a son**; “The interpretation of the verse Save my soul from the sword, yehidati [my only one] from the power of the dog (Ps. 22:21) does not only focus upon the lemma “dog,” but also upon “my only one.” Genesis Rabbah 46:7 (see Sifre Deuteronomy 313) contains an interpretation relating this Psalm to the Aqedah, the sacrifice of Isaac. Rabbinic hermeneutics situate Psalm 22:21 in the context of sacrificing a son. Your only son (Gen. 22:12) is implied and juxtaposed to my only one (Ps. 22:21); the text states God said to Abraham: “I give merit to you, as if I had asked you to sacrifice yourself and you did not refuse it.” My only one in this case would indicate that God recognized Abraham’s willingness to sacrifice his son. In another midrash, Numbers Rabbah 17:2, a lemma from Genesis Your only son, referring to Isaac, is changed to “your soul,” proof-text is Psalm 22:21. The ram sacrificed saves not only Isaac, but also Abraham. These passages show a nexus between Psalm 22:21 and Isaac, the “only son” of Abraham. The problematic passage in Genesis which ignores Abraham’s other son, Ishmael, is clarified through this

⁹ *Ibid*, GB, Psalm Studies (Vol 1).

¹⁰ Rivka Ulmer, “Psalm 22 in Pesiqta Rabbati: The Suffering of the Jewish Messiah and Jesus.” *The Jewish Jesus: Revelation, Reflection, Reclamation* (2011): 106-128, p. 110

interpretation of Psalm 22:21. The second part of the verse containing the dog motif is implied. The dog motif could refer to the biblical Moloch who required child sacrifice”.¹¹

The reference to “seed” is also self evidently an Abrahamic theme employed by Paul in the NT to express the singular seed Christ but also all those who are “in him” (i.e. his descendants or offspring) and true inheritors of the covenant promises. Psalm 22 concludes with the same “seed” theme as Genesis 22. The interim conclusion is that Psalm 22 (and therefore implicitly the crucifixion event in the Gospels) draw powerful parallels with the **sacrifice of Isaac in Genesis 22**.

The living God

Whether or not a critical or a conservative stance is adopted, Psalm 22 is at least 2,500 years or, arguably, nearer 3,000 years old and therefore composed anywhere between 1,000 to 500 years before the crucifixion event. The antiquity of the Psalm should (but often does not) influence the way the Psalm is interpreted. Psalm 22 clearly reflects **cultic elements** that are often missed and therefore lead to interpretive errors. Cultic ritual, referencing either the tabernacle (at Shiloh or the temporary set up by David at Jerusalem), or the first temple (built by Solomon and established until BC 586) are abundant (and often ignored) in this Psalm. Yahweh dwells between the “cherubim” (or “living creatures”)¹² as the mercy-seat *represents* his earthly throne. Numerous references are made to the “faces” of the cherubim (פָּנִים *paniyim*: Hebrew plural but always expressed as singular).

Psalm 22	Notes
v.3) But thou <i>art</i> <u>holy</u> , O <i>thou</i> that inhabitest the praises of Israel	Isaiah 6:1-3) I saw also the Lord <u>sitting upon a throne</u> , high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple. ² Above it stood the seraphims: each one had six wings; with twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly. ³ And one cried unto another, and said, <u>Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD</u> of hosts: the whole earth <i>is</i> full of his glory.
v.21) thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorns	RV, RSV, and NIV read <i>wild oxen</i> . This is a reference to the <u>ox-faced cherubim</u> NKJ Ezekiel 1:10) As for the likeness of their faces, <i>each</i> had the face of a man; each of the four had the face of a lion on the right side, each of the four had the face of an ox on the left side, and each of the four had the face of an eagle.
v.24) neither hath he hid <u>his face</u> from him	Isaiah 59:2) But your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have <u>hid his face</u> from you, that he will not hear.
v.27) all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee.	Literally: and <i>they-shall-worship</i> to <u>faces-of you</u> all-of <i>families-of</i> nations

¹¹ See 2 Kings 3:21-27; 2 Kings 16:1-4; 2 Kings 21:1-8; 23:4-11

¹² Hence “the living God” i.e., the God of the living creatures (cherubim)..... **Matthew 22:32** not the God of the dead, but of the living

Yahweh is “enthroned” on the “divine chariot”, think here of the “fiery chariot” that snatched away Elijah in a whirlwind.¹³ Of course, this is idiomatic language representing the cherubim and the mercy-seat. However, the ancients did not understand the glory of Yahweh as permanently dwelling on the ark – it was a mere symbol (the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee). Moreover, the face(s) of the cherubim praise Yahweh (Holy, Holy, Holy) and Yah “inhabits” (or is enthroned) in the midst of these praises.¹⁴

Therefore the face(s) do not represent Yahweh himself, but rather elements of his redeemed creation and worshipping towards the face(s) means joining in with the praises of the redeemed (the cherubim). The face(s) are therefore understood as an integral part of Yah’s “glory” (no doubt the faces shining with reflected glory) and uttering praises. They (the faces) are not Yah, but rather they reflect the fullness of his work and therefore they also represent Yah in his redemptive, salvic aspect.

If our analysis is correct, then perhaps other verses should be interpreted in this light (i.e. in the light of cultic worship);

“My strength is dried up like a potsherd; and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws; and thou hast brought me into the dust of death” (Ps.22:15).

A literal rendition of the Hebrew¹⁵ reads thus:

(ibish) he- is- dried- up (k·chrsh) as ^{the} earthenware (kch·t) vigour-of me (u·lshun·i) and tongue-of me (mdbaq) being – clung (mlquch·i) jaws-of me (u·l·ophr) and to soil-of (-muth) death (thshpht·ni) **you-are-setting-on-the-hearth-stones me**

All of the versions treat the enigmatic חֶפֶץ (*thshpbh*) formally (even JPS and LXX) as “brought/lay/set” rather than supplying the ellipses, i.e., “set [on the fire/on the hearth]” as in “Set (same word) on the great pot, and seethe pottage for the sons of the prophets” (2 Kgs.4:38) and “Set on a pot, set *it* on, and also pour water into it” (Ezek 24:3). In the last instance Ezekiel enacts a parable where the city of Jerusalem is likened to a pot and the people (bones and meat) are stewed dry and burnt on the fire. The suggestion is that Ps 22:15 describes an earthenware pot (not a potsherd) being roasted dry on the hearth stones of the altar of burnt offering.¹⁶

“He has dried up my strength and my tongue cleaves to my mouth; like earthenware he brought me to the soil of death and set me on the hearth stones [of the altar]”.

¹³ Appro to the spectators believing that Jesus was appealing to Elijah to save him from the cross by coming down with the divine cherubim-chariot.

¹⁴ A. F. Kirkpatrick believes that “inhabiting the praises” (Ps 22:3) is a figurative adaptation of the idea of God being enthroned between the cherubim on the ark of the covenant (Exod. 25:22), as directly expressed in Psalms 80:1 and 99:1 (The Book of Psalms [1902; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1982], p. 116).

¹⁵ *Interlinear Scripture Analyzer* (ISA) free version available from : <http://www.scripture4all.org/>

¹⁶ Some sacrifice portions were cooked/seethed/roasted in a pot or cauldron – see the sons of Eli abusing the practice by using fleshhooks to steal choice portions of the offering for themselves (1 Sam 2:12-15).

The imagery reflects a neglected earthenware vessel left to burn dry on Yahweh's altar.....nothing left but ash (soil of death).

Perhaps we can also reconfigure v.21;

“Save me from the lion's mouth: for thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorns”
(Psalm 22:21).

We already noted (above table) that “unicorns” denotes the “wild-oxen” face of the cherubim but what of the lion? The only translation (that I know of) that resolves the problem is ISA. It understands the first part of the verse as an exclamatory appeal:

Save me!

And the second part as the response:

From mouth of the lion and from the horns of the wild-oxen you answered me.

The original Hebrew has no punctuation. This reading makes much more sense. The victim appeals for help and the immediate response comes from the lion-ox faces of the cherubim (symbolizing Judah/Israel). In other words, Yahweh, who inhabits the redeemed of Judah-Israel responds from the mercy-seat in the temple/tabernacle. However, we must look beyond the tabernacle/temple with its' cherubim iconography (otherwise they become mere idols), beyond the visionary cherubim of Ezekiel (otherwise they become mere mythology), even beyond the heaven of heavens (otherwise they become a mere physical containment and the creator is greater than his creation), for Yah chooses to manifest himself in the metaphysical, in the character and Spirit of beings conformed to his image.....Jesus Christ and his saints.

Animal Imagery

One of the most debated (and intractable problems between Jews and Christians) is the translation of Psalm 22:16;

“For dogs have compassed me: the assembly of the wicked have inclosed me: **they pierced** my hands and my feet” (Psalm 22:16 KJV).

The JPS version (which follows the Masoretic Text) has the following:

“For dogs have encompassed me; a company of evil-doers have inclosed me; **like a lion,** they are at my hands and my feet”.

We will discuss the textual differences in depth anon. For now we simply note that the Masoretic text does not make sense at this point. It literally reads;

“that they surround me dogs crowd-of ones-doing-evil they encompass me as the lion hands of me and feet of me” (ISA).

A lion does not “encompass/encircle” hands and feet. It doesn’t even bite or snap at them (like a dog/jackal might) it stalks, crouches, leaps and kills by grabbing the victim’s neck. Moreover, the solution that we have proposed (the lion cherubim face) would be destroyed by this contrary symbolism. The **Lion is portrayed as a royal beast denoting strength or courage** whereas the dog was a wild pack animal (not the domesticated pet of today) used to denote idolatry (male cult prostitutes are called “dogs”).¹⁷

The following chiasm can be constructed:

A1 STRONG BULLS
(surrounding) v.12

A2 MOUTH OF LION
(gaping comparison) v.13

A3 DOGS CIRCLING
(wicked assembly) v.16a

B3 POWER OF DOG
(deliverance from) v.20

B2 MOUTH OF LION
(answer from) v.21a

B1 HORNS WILD-OX
(answer from)v.21 b

¹⁷ See, Ellen White, No, No, Bad Dog: Dogs in the Bible, Israelite attitudes toward dogs (Biblical Archaeological Society 01/26/2015) <http://www.biblicalarchaeology.org/daily/biblical-topics/hebrew-bible/dogs-in-the-bible/>

If the MT text is correct (Like a Lion at my hands and feet), it would form the centre of the chiasm (placing A3 and B3 on either side of the MT). This is a possibility and would balance the reverse parallelism by placing lion (MT) at the centre:

Bull-Lion-Dog-**Lion(MT)**-Dog-Lion-Ox

However, as we have noted, the MT of 22:16 does not make sense, particularly with regards to Genesis 22 typology. In fact, neither does the word “pierced” as we would expect hands and feet to be “bound” if the sacrifice of Isaac is typed. We will examine the debate on this verse in more depth anon, for now we note the balance of the reverse parallelism. **A1** and **B1** are coupled by the idea of strength (the horn being a symbol of power), **A2** and **B2** are coupled by the theme of the mouth.

In **A2** the mouth of the “Bulls” (strong enemies) is compared to that of a hungry Lion. The enemies are *not* Lions, but they have the appetite of a hungry Lion (a desire for usurping royalty?).

B2 depicts the response (for deliverance) coming from the Lion’s mouth. This is obviously intended as a contrast – The enemies might well be strong “Bulls” with mouths *like* (compared to) a hungry “Lion” but the voice of deliverance comes from the cherubim, i.e., from the actual royal “Lion-mouth” (and from the Ox-horn). We can speak of *peripeteia* (a reversal of fortune) and this is emphasised by reversing the chiasmic structure.

The “Dogs/Dog” in both **A3** and **B3** is unambiguously the enemy, intent on harassing and killing the victim –which is why it is strange that MT should add Lion at this point?? Again, note that “Power” is a Dog attribute, providing each animal with a unique form of control: Bull (Strength)-Dog (Power)-Ox (Horn). Also note that the theme of surrounding/encompassing/encircling is a very important theme to the poem.

Textual Problems in Psalm 22:16

Are the evil doers at the victim’s hands and feet like a lion (MT) or did they pierce his hands and feet (KJV), or perhaps something else? This textual problem is given a comprehensive treatment by Glenn Miller.¹⁸ Miller concludes **that the two best readings are “pierced” and “tied” with the first reading to be preferred.**

A tabular synopsis (with extra resources in the footnotes) is included below:

¹⁸ Glenn Miller, The Christian Think Tank (CTC) online @ <http://christianthinktank.com/ps22cheat.html> [cited Jan 2016]

Version of Ps22:16	Date	Heb./Gk	Translit	Interpretation
LXX (Septuagint) ¹⁹	300 - 100 BC	ὀρούσσω	<i>orussō</i>	dig/pierce
Nachal Hever Scroll (5/6Hev - Col. XI, frag. 9) ²⁰	50-100 AD	כָּאָרוּ	<i>ka'aru</i>	they dug/pierced?
MT (Masoretic Text) ²¹	1000 AD	כָּאָרִי	<i>ka'ari</i>	as a Lion

¹⁹ The critical view is that the LXX was translated between 300 BC (the Pentateuch first) and completed circa 100BC. That the LXX version of the Psalms had already been translated by Qumran times can be seen from the manuscripts from Cave 11. Vanderkam points out: “The scrolls now appear to have preserved two versions of the Psalter. One version, attested in most of the copies, belongs in the tradition that would culminate in the Masoretic Text. That is, in this version the psalms appear in the order and form that they have in the traditional Hebrew text and consequently in all the modern translations made from it. But the familiar form seems not to have been the only shape the Psalter took in antiquity. I have already noted that in the Septuagint the book has 151 psalms, not 150 as in the traditional Hebrew text. Psalm 151 has now been found among the scrolls--in Hebrew...In that scroll the psalm occurs in the last position, just as it does in the Greek Psalter.” James VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, (Eerdmans: 1994), 135. Additionally; “But there is can be [sic] no doubt that in the Minor Prophets Scroll we have conclusive evidence of Jewish Septuagintal revision of the [sic] in pre-Christian era.” *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (vol 1). Peter Flint and James Vanderkam (eds.), Brill:1998,104-106

²⁰ The DSS scrolls pre-date (historically) the Massoretic Text by centuries (even the latest DSS). Psalm 22.17 occurs in one of these scrolls from Nahal Hever (XHev/Se4, f.11, line 4), and the collection is dated to 50-100 AD (*The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms*, Peter W. Flint, Brill: 1997, p.43)--again, centuries before the MT witness. The form in this earliest copy of the Psalm in existence is *ka'ru*, with the *waw* ending *y* indicating a 3 personal plural verb form (“they”). This is decisive evidence against “like a lion” (although it will not necessarily help us decide between the other competing variants). The *ka'ru* variant also showed up in the later MT variants. [Data on the DSS manuscript can be found in *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms*, Peter W. Flint, Brill:1997, p.83]. For detailed summary (including an image of the fragment) see Tim Hegg, Psalm 22:16[cited Jan 2016] @ <http://www.torahresource.com/EnglishArticles/Ps22.16.pdf>

²¹ The MT is a **text-family** consisting of different manuscripts of varying quality and they are not as homogenous as some would suggest, with no two manuscripts agreeing in all details. Although the text was finalized (the pointing) around 1000 BC it has a consistent transmission history from earlier texts. Tov, in the standard work on OT/Taanach, tries to get this across to his readers: “It has become clear from the preceding paragraphs that one of the postulates of biblical research is that the text preserved in the various representatives (manuscripts, editions) of what is commonly called the Masoretic Text, does not reflect the “original text” of the biblical books in many details. Even though the concept of an “original text” necessarily remains vague, it will always be legitimate to recognize the differences between the Masoretic Text and earlier or different stages of the biblical text. Moreover, even were we to surmise that MT reflects the “original” form of the Bible, we would still have to decide *which* Masoretic Text reflects this “original text,” since the Masoretic Text is not a uniform textual unit, but is itself represented by many witnesses... Similar problems arise when one compares MT with the other textual witnesses, such as the Qumran scrolls and the putative Hebrew source of the individual ancient translations **{PW: This includes the LXX}**. We do not know which of all these texts reflects the biblical text faithfully. Thus, it should not be postulated in advance that MT reflects the original text of the biblical books better than the other texts.” Even some of the MT versions amend the noun “Lion” into a verb! *ka'ru* (“a few mss”, Kennicott gives seven), a 3 personal plural verb form from the biblical Hebrew root *ka'ra(b)*, meaning “they dug/pierced” *karu* (“2 mss”; Kennicott adds “in the margin of three”), also a verb form. [Actually, this is the same word as *ka'ru*, less the *aleph* which has ‘intruded’. See Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, (Fortress:1992),11 and Benjamin Kennicott, *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum Variis Lectionibus* (1776 & 1780[in Latin cited Jan 2016]) <https://books.logos.com/books/3788#content=/books/3788> Downloadable PDF @Post Reformation Digital Library http://www.prill.org/author_view.php?a_id=3348[cited Jan 2016]. Perowne comments; “In only two genuine Jewish MSS. do we find כָּאָרוּ **{PW: ka'aru=they dug}**. But in one of these (Kenn. 39) it would seem that the י **{PW: yod}** has been altered by a later hand into ו **{PW: vav}**, and the other (Rossi, 337) has כָּאָרִי , a union of both readings. Jacob Ben Chayim, however, in the Masora finalis, says that he found כָּאָרוּ **{PW: ka'aru = they dug}** as the K'thibh, and כָּאָרִי **{PW: ka'ari=lion}** as the K'ri in good MSS., and this is supported by the Masora Magna on Numb.xxiv.9”. J.J. Stewart Perowne, *The Book of Psalms* (Bell & Daldy: London, 1870), 236 online <https://archive.org/details/bookofpsalmsnew00perouoft> {footnotes compiled with the help of Miller, CTC}

The original setting of the Psalm

All prophetic texts have a short term first (typical) context and a longer term actualization (fulfilment). Psalm 22 is no exception to this rule, and although it may not be possible to recover a plausible original context, at the very least an attempt should be made. It is not sufficient to label the Psalm as “Messianic” and simply ignore the original setting²² by stating that the Psalmist was only vaguely aware of the meaning of his own writings. The Psalms express heart-felt personal emotions and are obviously based on very real situations. Those experiences are employed to inspire (divine inspiration) great literary art and Messianic Prophecy, but that does not detract from the original context. This is (according to the superscription) a Davidic Psalm but that does not necessarily mean that it was written by David.²³ It may have been completely composed or perhaps partially composed by him, but the title (Hebrew) “*for David*” can mean “*pertaining to David*”, or “*for the Davidide*” (i.e., a Davidic King) or, perhaps it is generic, denoting a certain Davidic style. A brief survey of scholarship follows;

Scholar	Author	Event	Bib. Ref.	Scholar ref.
Delitzsch	David	Desert of Maon	1 Sam 23:25–26	Delitzsch, Psalms 1.305.
Moll	David	disillusioned old age		Moll, Psalms 138, 168
Alexander & Dahood and others	Unknown			Alexander, Psalms106; Dahood, Psalms1.138
Anderson & Tostengard	Unknown	sickness		Anderson, Psalms 1.185; Tostengard, “Psalm 22” 167; Frost (“Psalm 22” 102)
Rabbinic (Kimchi)	Esther period	Haman’s plot		Midrash?
Hitzig & Holladay	Jeremiah prison			see Delitzsch, Psalms1.304; see also Holladay, “Background” 153–64
Craigie	generic	any sick Israelite		Craigie, Psalms 1–50, 198.
Buttenwieser & C. Stuhlmueller & Olshausen	Maccabean Era			See Buttenwieser, Psalms, 588–606; C. Stuhlmueller, Psalm 22, BTB12 (1982) 86–90; Olshausen ²⁴
Patterson	David		2 Sam 22:4–7, 17–20, 49–50	Patterson, <i>Ibid</i> 214-215
Booker	David	Absalom rebellion & Saul persecution	2 Sam 15–17, 1 Sam 20;21:1–15	G. Booker, <i>Ibid</i>
Thirtle Ps 22:1-21	David	Ziklag	1 Sam.30.1-6	Thirtle, OT Problems,315
Thirtle Ps 22:22-31	Hezekiah	Suffering servant	Isa 53 etc	Thirtle, OT Problems,315

²²So Booker, “The apostle Peter offers the inspired commentary (on other of David’s psalms) that “David, being a prophet and knowing....he seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ” (Acts 2:30,31). And, again, “David speaketh concerning *him*...” (2:25). So perhaps Psalm 22 should be considered as in a relatively special category, of prophetic vision by David, having little if anything to do with his own experiences”. G. Booker, *Ibid*, Psalm Studies, Vol 1

²³ A great many expositors place no confidence in the attribution of the psalm to David in the psalm’s title. Although one need not hold the titles of the psalms to be inspired, they do represent very ancient opinion, being attested even in the LXX. For a consideration of the place and value of psalm titles, see T. Longman III, *How to Read the Psalms*(Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1988) 38–42; D. W. Music, “The Superscriptions of the Psalms,” *Biblical Illustrator* 15 (1989) 49–53

²⁴ Perowne, *The Book of Psalms*, p. 236 cites Olshausen as endorsing a Maccabean date.

Only authorship by David and/or Hezekiah holds any linguistic, stylistic and intertextual merit. Later attributions can be ruled out on these grounds alone, and “unknown” and “generic” settings are contrary to everything we understand about messianic/prophetic scriptures. The suggestion of dual authorship made by Thirtle²⁵ is the strongest, although a simple delineation into two distinct “halves” is unlikely and contrary the unifying chiasmic structure.

That this Psalm uses earlier “Davidic material” and “Davidic Styling” is undeniable. We propose that the Psalmist is using Davidic phrases etc that correspond with his own situation. Thus he would start the Psalm with a rough chiasmic structure and an idea of how the Psalm commences (forsaken) and how it ends (victorious). Then he would employ terminology from Davidic Psalms that are relevant to his situation (of suffering/abandonment) and other prophetic writings (some of them contemporary).

Thus Davidic Psalm(s) were “recycled” or rather *used as a resource* to describe similar situations. This would explain both the continuity *and the* differences (with earlier material) and negates the necessity to posit abrupt transitions from earlier to later material. The chiasmic structure and poetic nature of the Psalm and multiple intertextual connections demonstrates that the Psalm was carefully (and ingeniously) crafted as a **unified work** – and by using multiple scrolls (other OT books) that were (at that time) available to him, the author achieves continuity with the past and contemporary relevance to his situation.

But that is not the complete picture as the Psalm is also Messianic. So it has a **future aspect that the author cannot know** despite his best efforts at continuity and modernization. Although the Psalmist labours to create a work of great literary art and profound sacred expression using all the tools and knowledge available to him it is only through **divine inspiration** that the whole becomes greater than the parts by taking on a messianic/prophetic dimension.

We must move away from the idea that the Psalm was somehow “dictated” from heaven in its final form and realise that we are dealing with a joint project between God and man. The Psalmist is not an instrument (like a pen) but the subject of the Psalm. His emotions and experiences and literary genius are inextricably woven into the mysterious guiding inspiration that allows the Psalm to become Messianic. The outcome of this ingenious process is that the Psalm speaks of past suffering and victory (David) current suffering and victory (Hezekiah) and future suffering and victory (Christ).

²⁵ This psalm is in two parts –*vv.*1-21 by David; the remainder dating from the time of Hezekiah. The situation of the former may be found in the spoiling of Ziklag by the Amalekites (1 Sam.30.1-6); though the words go beyond the experiences of the king, and provide expressions which would describe a greater persecution and deeper woe to which his promised seed would be subjected (*vv.*16-18). Coming into use in the time of Hezekiah, the Psalm was extended in remarkable terms, and possibly adapted in other ways. On *v.*24, cp Isa.53.3; and on *v.*30, cp. Isa.53.8, 10. The experiences of the subject of this hymn shall be celebrated in the great congregation *vv.*22, 25; cp. Ps.35.18; 144.9, and on his account men shall turn unto the Lord in penitent devotion (*v.*27.) such as he brings to subjection shall bow before him, although he was not able to keep his own soul alive a seed shall serve him: it shall be accounted by the Lord for a generation or declared successor to the throne; cp Isa.38.12; 53.8. Men shall come and talk of his righteousness to a people yet to be born – because this hath been done (*vv.*29-31). The story is that of the servant of the Lord; the Psalter and prophetic writings alike being concerned with Hezekiah as the great messianic type. J. W. Thirtle, *Old Testament Problems* (London: Morgan and Scott, 1916),315

Connections to David

Psalm 22 has many similarities with Psalm 18, which occurs also in its historical setting in **2 Samuel 22** **where it is repeated** (note that 2 Sam. chaps. 20-24 form a miscellaneous collection of records not in chronological order). Certain small differences in text are discernible between the two versions (Ps18/2 Sam.22). Therefore Psalm 18 is **definitely** from the time of David and **it contains multiple thematic links with Psalm 22:**

Ps18:17: “He delivered me from my strong enemy, and from them which hated me: for they were too strong for me”. cf. strong (different word) Bulls in Ps 22: 12.

Ps 18:6: “In my distress I called upon the LORD, and cried unto my God: he heard my voice out of his temple, and my cry came before him, *even* into his ears”. Note that Yahweh rides a cherub in Ps. 18:10.

Ps.18:41: “They cried, but *there was* none to save *them: even* unto the LORD, but he answered them not”., contrast Psalm 22 in which the victim (initially) receives no answer (forsaken) – in Psalm 18 the enemies are forsaken.

Psalm 18:19 (cf. 2 Samuel 22:20): “...he delivered me, because he delighted in me” and Ps 22:8; “He trusted on the LORD *that* he would deliver him: let him deliver him, seeing he delighted (same Heb. word) in him”.

There are numerous intertextual links with other Davidic Psalms, suffice to say that stylistically this Psalm can be described as “for David” or Davidic.....but not necessarily composed by David.

Connections to Hezekiah

The connections to Hezekiah are prolific and not just in the first half of the Psalm (contra Thirtle).

Isaiah 41	Ps 22
v.11. (enemy) ashamed and confounded	v.5. (faithful) were not confounded
v.14. worm Jacob	v.6. But I <i>am</i> a worm , and no man
v.17. their tongue faileth for thirst	v.15. dried up....my tongue cleaveth to my jaws;
v.17. will not forsake them	v.1. my God, why hast thou forsaken me?
v.20 the LORD hath done this	v.31 he hath done this

The same word for worm (*tonla`* as in “scarlet worm”) is used in both passages (Ps.22:6/Isa.41:14) and also in the same sense in other eighth century era writings (Isa.66:4, Job 25:6).

Psalm 22:7-8: ⁷All they that see me laugh me to scorn: they shoot out the lip, they shake the head, *saying*,⁸ He trusted on the LORD *that* he would deliver him: let him deliver him, seeing he delighted in him.

This is not the first time Hezekiah was scorned:

2 Chronicles 30:10: So the posts passed from city to city through the country of Ephraim and Manasseh even unto Zebulun: but they laughed them to scorn, and mocked them.

His attempt at reformation compliments the typology of Isaac (which permeates Psalm 22):

Genesis 21:9: And Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian, which she had born unto Abraham, mocking.

The legitimate heir to the covenant being mocked! In particular, Hezekiah's emissaries were scorned by the Northern tribe of Manasseh:

Psalm 22:12 Many bulls have compassed me: strong *bulls of Bashan* have beset me round.

Bashan is a district east of the Jordan known for its fertility which was given to the half-tribe of Manasseh. Hezekiah, Yahweh, and the Jerusalem temple were also mocked by Sennacherib;

2 Kings 19 ²¹ This *is* the word that the LORD hath spoken concerning him; The virgin the daughter of Zion hath despised thee, *and laughed thee to scorn*; the daughter of Jerusalem hath shaken her head at thee. ²² Whom hast thou reproached and blasphemed? and against whom hast thou exalted *thy* voice, and lifted up thine eyes on high? *even* against the Holy *One* of Israel

In **Psalm 22: 9-10** images of the psalmist's mother abound, but no mention is made of the father. Why? Because Yahweh had promised that he would be a Father to a son of David. (**2 Samuel 7:14**: "I will be his father, and he shall be my son").

Psalm 22: 9-10 ⁹ But thou *art* he that took me out of the womb: thou didst make me hope *when I was* upon my mother's breasts. ¹⁰ I was cast upon thee from the womb: thou *art* my God from my mother's belly.

Ps.22 *vv.*9-10 echoes the **Immanuel prophecy!** The prophecy is applicable to Hezekiah in the first instance. Hezekiah's mother has a name that means "Yah is my Father" (Abijah, 2 Chron.29:1).

Isaiah 7:14 Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.

Hezekiah's wife is called "Hephzibah" (2 Kgs 21:1) which means my "delight is in her" and Jerusalem is symbolically named "Hephzibah" by Yahweh.....**the same word used** in Psalm 22:8 and a reversal of the theme of being forsaken (Ps.22:1).

Isaiah 62:4-5 ⁴ Thou shalt **no more be termed Forsaken**; neither shall thy land any more be termed Desolate: but thou shalt be called Hephzibah, and thy land Beulah: for the LORD **delighteth in thee**, and thy land shall be married. ⁵ For *as* a young man marryeth a virgin, *so* shall thy sons marry thee: and *as* the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, *so* shall thy God rejoice over thee.

Hezekiah's illness:

Isaiah 53:5 But he *was* wounded (Hebrew: **pierced** cf. Ps. 22:16) for our transgressions, *he was* bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace *was* upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.

Isaiah 38:13 I reckoned till morning, *that, as a lion*, so will he break all my bones: from day *even* to night wilt thou make an end of me.

Interestingly, Isa 38:13 would complement the MT reading of Ps.22:16, however, there is recognition even in the rabbinics, that the form in Ps 22:16 does NOT mean the same as the “as a lion” form in the Isaiah 38 passage!²⁶ So, no matter if the deficient MT reading or the alternative LXX reading is chosen, they both point to Isaiah 53 (either v.5 “pierced” or v.13 “as a lion”) connecting the suffering servant with Psalm 22.

More Isaac typology:

Isaiah 53:10....when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin...

Hezekiah victorious:

Isaiah 53:11 He shall see of the travail of his soul, *and* shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities.

Psalms 22:26 The meek shall eat and be satisfied: they shall praise the LORD that seek him: your heart shall live for ever.

Isaiah 38:20 The LORD *was ready* to save me: therefore we will sing my songs (i.e., Ps.22) to the stringed instruments all the days of our life in the house of the LORD.

Psalms 22:16 A seed shall serve him; it shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation.

Hezekiah would not die childless, he would have “a seed” (the travail of his soul). Christ was that seed.....who would live forever. Christ did not die childless. We are his seed.

Interesting Speculations

A point of interest is **Isaiah 29:1**, where Jerusalem is called “**the lion of God**” or Ariel. Ariel is an ominous name applied to Jerusalem (Isa.29:1, 2, 7). The same word occurs 3x in Ezekiel 43:15, 16, first as *har' el* (mountain of God) and in the other two instances as *'ari' el* - each of these three examples is preceded by the definite article. The Targum defines this word in both Isaiah and Ezekiel as altar, and

²⁶ Keil and Delitzsch bring this data to light in their discussion of this passage: “Perceiving this [difficulty of the translation ‘like a lion’ in the context], the Masora on Isa xxxviii. 13 observes, that *k'ari* in the two passages in which it occurs (Ps. xxii. 17, Isa. xxxviii. 13), occurs in **two different meanings**, just as **the Midrash** then also understands *k'ri* in the Psalm **as a verb** used of marking with conjuring, magic characters” Let's restate this for clarity: 1. Since the Isaiah passage clearly means “like a lion” and since the Masora says the Psalm passage has a “different meaning”, then it cannot mean “like a lion”. 2. The Midrash understands the form in the psalm as (a) a verb [instead of ‘like a lion’] and (b) meaning “marking hands and feet with symbols”. {Miller, CTC}

from the context in Isaiah this seems to be the preferable explanation of the word as applied to the city. The R.V. translates the word in Ezekiel as altar or hearth.

NIDOTTE comments: “The 5x in Isa 29:1-2, 7 seem to involve a wordplay where, at least in one instance (29:2b, “Yet I will besiege Ariel; she will mourn and lament, she will be to me like an altar hearth”, NIV), the translation “altar hearth” once again seems appropriate in the context. Some suggest that this rendering is appropriate in all five of its occurrences in Isa 29 because of the festival context (v.1b; see Oswalt,526, the rendering of the term *’r ’l* as the “altar” in line 12 of the Mesha Inscription according to *KAI* 2:169,175, and other references in Dijkstra, 29 n.28).²⁷

HAW envisages several possibilities for Ariel in Isaiah 29 with the first being a reference to the altar, the second to destruction by fire (hearth of God cf. Ezek 11:3; Jer. 1:13) or, thirdly “lion of God” in a negative (hostile) sense. His fourth proposal is interesting (reproduced fully);

“Ariel can also mean “I will provide a ram”, as happened at the intended sacrifice of Isaac (Gen.22:14). The implied idea is, then, one of rescue when all seems hopeless. Compare also David’s provision of sacrifice at the same place, staving off disaster in Jerusalem when the angel of destruction went forth” (2 Sam. 24:16, 25).²⁸

In this HAW is incorrect, although *’ārī ’ēl*, does work as a word-play on *ayil*, the Hebrew for ram. While it is true that the *’ārī ’ēl* of Isa.29 is not the same as the *ka’ari* of MT Ps.22:16 a thematic connection can be found with the word “encompass/around/circle etc” (*naqaph*):

Ps 22:16 MT	Isa 29:1
<i>ka’ari</i> (like a lion)	<i>’ārī ’ēl</i> (Lion of God/ Altar /Hearth)
victim	Sacrifice
Dogs circling/surrounding (<i>naqaph</i>):	Feasts circling /cycling (<i>naqaph</i>)

In Isa.29 the people are ironically encouraged to fulfil the sacrificial feast cycle (round and round, year after year) ignorant of the fact that the “Lion of God”(Jerusalem) will actually become **an altar** (the hearth of God) with themselves as the sacrificial victims (while the enemy goes “round and round” besieging them like a pack of wild dogs). One wonders if there was some kind of cross-fertilization (at the least thematically) between the lion themes of Ps 22:16 and Isa 29:1?

Finally, my preferred reading for 22:16 is “tied or bound” rather than “pierced” because even though pierced has a distribution advantage (Miller); “tied or bound” does better justice to the underlying Isaac typology. The LXX translators obviously had very early Hebrew texts in front of them which they believed (interpreted) as “pierced”. Aquila of Sinope, a 2nd-century AD Greek convert to Christianity and later to Judaism, undertook two translations of the Psalms from Hebrew to Greek. In the first, he renders the verse “they disfigured my hands and feet”; in the second he revised this to “they have bound my hands and feet”. Both his interpretations were obviously biased by his religious beliefs (first Christian then Jewish). In the last instance, it doesn’t really matter. Whether directly or indirectly **all translational**

²⁷ *NIDOTTE* (ed. VanGemeren, Paternoster,1997) Vol 2.pg 898

²⁸ HAW, Isaiah, (Biblia, 1988,reprint 2000),pg 295

choices of the disputed word in Ps.22:16 point to Christ either directly or indirectly (through typology). So, God is able to preserve his word against the malignant tendentiousness of men, for *the foolishness of God is greater than the wisdom of men.*

Conclusions

Psalm 22 is a Messianic Psalm recited by Jesus on the cross. It is replete with Isaac typology because it is based on the offering of Isaac in Genesis 22. It is also couched in Davidic language appropriated from the Psalms of David, but ultimately Ps.22 tells the story of the suffering servant of Isaiah. We would classify it as a Hezekiah Psalm made “for David” or done “in the style of David”. Interestingly, Isaac also acts as a type for Hezekiah²⁹ (who in turn types Christ). Therefore the Psalm is *polyvalent*, complex and extremely poignant. It tells the story not only of David’s distress at rebellion and persecution, but also of the betrayal and Passover deliverance of King Hezekiah and as such is the perfect Messianic Psalm, with Abraham, Isaac, David and Hezekiah pointing in a direct line of promise (concentrating in the Davidic line) to the fulfilment of the covenants in Christ.

²⁹ On this see, P. Wyns, “Sister-wife” article in The Christadelphian eJournal of Biblical Interpretation, (eds, A. Perry, T. Gaston, P. Wyns, Vol. 6 No. 2 Apr 2012; pp. 10-14 online [cited Jan 2016] <http://www.christadelphian-ejbi.org/PA/eJournal12q2.pdf>