

THE TEXT OF HABAKKUK EXAMINED IN THE LIGHT
OF MODERN RESEARCH AND DISCOVERY

THE TEXT OF HABAKKUK EXAMINED IN THE LIGHT
OF MODERN RESEARCH AND DISCOVERY

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Theology

by
Roy Lee Honeycutt, Jr.
November 1957

TO
JUNE

THESES
Th. D.
H757t

192971

027

PREFACE

4.4:

21 38

PREFACE

The writer's personal interest in the problems inherent in the transmission of the text of the Old Testament was initiated during the study of second year Hebrew under the guidance of Dr. John Joseph Owens and continued to grow with the passage of time and as advanced courses in both Greek and Hebrew were taken. Upon entering the Old Testament department of the graduate school further discussions relative to text transmission were carried out with the result that prior to the completion of the preliminary examinations I had tentatively decided to do my dissertation in this area of study.

In view of the appearance of the Qumran scroll of Habakkuk it was suggested that a textual study such as I had contemplated might be carried out, utilizing the Habakkuk commentary as illustrative material. This resulted in the present study in which the text of Habakkuk is examined in the light of modern research and discovery.

The over-all plan for the dissertation shall be to consider the formation of the text, its transmission, the contribution of recent discoveries to the text, a versicular examination of the text of Habakkuk in the

light cast by the results of the first three areas of investigation and a final chapter that shall consist of a translation of Habakkuk embodying the results of modern research and discovery.

It is assumed that anyone interested in this study will be familiar with Hebrew to the extent that it will be unnecessary to use the pointed text. Consequently, unpointed Hebrew will be utilized except in those instances wherein the vowels are of particular significance for the understanding of the text. In addition to this, neither the Hebrew nor the Greek has been translated in every passage, the only complete translation being that which appears as a conclusion to the entire study.

To those members of the Old Testament field committee under whose guidance I have been privileged to study, Drs. Clyde T. Francisco, Thomas O. Hall, William H. Morton and Professor Eric C. Rust, are due my very sincere appreciation not only for their kindness expressed in supervising this study but more especially for the personal contribution that each has made to my own life.

To Dr. John Joseph Owens who served as my guiding professor I would express my very real sense of indebtedness for his suggestive comments and for his patience in counseling with me during the course of this study. For lengthy letters of guidance written while abroad on

Sabbatical leave and for time so freely given from a quite busy schedule I am truly appreciative.

Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Leo T. Crismon, Librarian, and the entire library staff of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary for their many kindnesses both in the use of the facilities of the library and in the procurement of publications from other institutions.

Roy Lee Honeycutt, Jr.

Louisville, Kentucky

November, 1957

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE.	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.	viii
ABBREVIATIONS.	xxi
CHAPTER	
I. THE FORMATION OF THE TEXT OF HABAKKUK	1
The Type Of Literature To Which Habakkuk Belongs	3
Habakkuk is a book or pamphlet.	3
The two-oracle theory	4
The fragmentary or composite theory	5
The reconstructive theory	5
The redactional theory.	5
The interpretative theory	6
Habakkuk is a drama	7
Habakkuk is a liturgy for temple usage.	9
Herman Gunkel	9
Sigmund Mowinckel	11
E. A. Leslie.	13
Paul Humbert.	13
Conclusion.	15
Evidence opposed to a liturgical interpretation.	16
Unbroken tradition.	16

CHAPTER	PAGE
Attitude of prophet toward liturgy.	16
Disunity of Habakkuk.	16
Format of the book.	17
Nature of prophetic utterances.	17
Subjective nature of argument	18
Evidence favoring a liturgical	
interpretation of Habakkuk.	18
Literary structure of the book.	18
Unity of Habakkuk	20
Relationship of prophet and cult.	20
Connection of the name "habakkuk"	
with liturgical groups in Israel.	21
Difference of attitude between	
Jeremiah and Habakkuk	21
Absence of specific historical	
orientation	22
Reference to Habakkuk as a "nabi' ".	22
Concluding synthesis.	22
The Place Of Habakkuk In The Cultic Life	
Of Israel	23
The cultic life of Israel	24
Definition of terminology	24
Necessity of the cult	26
The fact of the cult.	29

CHAPTER	PAGE
	xi
The relationship of Habakkuk to the cult.	29
Habakkuk was a cultic prophet associated with the temple	30
Membership not limited to "false" prophets.	31
Identification of Habakkuk as a Levite	32
The name "habakkuk" characteristic for members of a musical guild.	33
The use of the phrase מְשֹׁמְרֵי	34
The use of the term "nabi'"	39
Type of literature produced by Habakkuk.	39
Habakkuk was not a cultic prophet associated with the temple.	40
Possibility of association must not be equated with association with the temple.	40
Denial of the Levitical tradition	40
Multiple usage of מְשֹׁמְרֵי	41
Use of "nabi'" does not establish cultic associations	41
Liturgical nature of Habakkuk has not been positively demonstrated.	41
Conclusion.	42

	xii
CHAPTER	PAGE
Summary	43
II. THE TRANSMISSION OF THE TEXT OF HABAKKUK. . .	44
The Sopherimic Era Of The Text.	47
The Sopherim.	48
Meaning of the term	48
Date of the sopherimic era.	51
<u>Terminus a quo</u>	52
Archaeological discoveries.	52
Highly developed office of scribe	
in the time of Sirach	52
Status traditionally ascribed to	
Ezra.	53
Disciples associated with the	
prophets.	54
<u>Terminus ad quem</u>	55
The center of sopherimic activity . . .	59
The work of the Sopherim.	62
Transmitters of the text.	63
Textual critics of the day.	70
Examination of questionable passages	71
Indicated variant readings.	72
Emendation of the text.	74
Omissions from the text	76
Additions to the text	80

CHAPTER

PAGE

Regulators of the outward form of	
the text.	83
Divisions within the text	83
The shape of the consonants	87
<u>Matres lectiones</u>	92
Theologians and teachers.	95
Conclusion.	99
The Massoretic Era Of The Text.	99
The Massorettes.	99
The massorah.	101
The meaning of the term	102
Content of the massorah	103
The form of the massorah.	105
Uniformity of the massorah.	107
Massoretic text transmission.	109
The purpose of the Massorettes	110
Unintentional errors.	112
Errors of the eye	113
Errors of the ear	116
Errors of memory.	116
Errors of judgment.	117
Errors of the pen	119
Errors of speech.	120
Intentional errors.	121

CHAPTER	PAGE
Conclusion.	xiv
Summary	123
III. THE CONTRIBUTION OF MODERN DISCOVERY TO THE	
TEXT OF HABAKKUK.	126
The Cairo Geniza.	128
Nature and purpose of the geniza in	
Jewish life	129
Meaning of the term "geniza".	129
Purpose of the geniza	130
Discovery of the Cairo Geniza	131
Location of the Geniza.	131
Discovery of the Geniza	132
Documents acquired from the Geniza.	136
Interpretation of the discovery	137
Theory of the archetype	138
Vocalization of the text.	142
Palestinian vocalization.	145
Babylonian vocalization	146
Tiberian vocalization	147
The ben Asher text.	149
Conclusion.	153
The Ugaritic Literature	156
Discovery and source of the literature.	158
Discovery	158

CHAPTER	PAGE
Source of the literature.	161
The city of Ugarit.	161
The nature of the literature.	162
The rise of the literature.	163
Relationship of Ugaritic and Hebrew . . .	164
Linguistic relationships.	164
Philological relationships.	166
Lexicographical relationships	167
Structural relationships.	168
Conclusion.	170
Contribution to Old Testament textual criticism	170
Significance of the Ugaritic literature for the text of Habakkuk.	173
The Palestinian Scrolls	174
The discovery of the scrolls.	176
Qumran.	176
Murabba'at.	179
Khirbet Mird.	181
An unknown source	182
Significance of the scrolls	183
Higher criticism.	184
Lower criticism	187
Ancient manuscripts	188

	xvi
CHAPTER	PAGE
Families of manuscripts	189
Text transmission	195
Other areas of significance	197
Historical grammar.	198
Paleography	200
Judeo-Christian backgrounds	202
The contribution of the scrolls to the textual study of Habakkuk	205
Summary	208
IV. THE TEXT OF HABAKKUK EXAMINED IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN RESEARCH AND DISCOVERY.	210
Principles of Investigation	213
Cultic associations of the text	213
Effect of transmission upon the text.	214
Vocalization of the text.	215
Significance of parallel literature	215
Contribution of the Qumran commentary	216
The evidence of the versions.	216
The ben Asher text form	217
Variants Between lQH and MT	218
Additions to the text	219
Addition of a word.	219
Addition of the definite article.	220
Addition of the preposition	220

CHAPTER

PAGE

Addition of the conjunction	221
Addition of the pronominal suffix	221
Deletions from the text	222
Deletion of a word.	222
Deletion of the interrogative	223
Deletion of the conjunction	223
Deletion of the pronominal suffix	223
Substitutions between 1QH and MT.	224
Substitution of a word.	224
Substitution of verbal forms.	226
Substitution of an alternate form	227
Substitutions of the pronominal suffix	229
Substitution in the number of the substantive	230
Substitution of word order.	230
Linguistic peculiarities.	231
Insertion of λ'	231
Full and defective pointing	233
Use of <u>matres lectiones</u>	236
Errors attributable to the copyist.	237
Conclusion.	238
Variants Between LXX And MT	240
Additions to the text	241
Addition of words	241

CHAPTER	PAGE
Addition of the article	242
Addition of the preposition	242
Addition of the conjunction	243
Addition of the personal pronoun.	243
Deletions from the text	244
Deletion of words from the text	244
Deletion of the definite article.	245
Deletion of the conjunction	245
Deletion of the preposition	245
Deletion of the personal pronoun.	246
Substitutions between texts	247
Substitution of words	247
Substitution of syntax.	248
Substitution of the pronominal suffix	250
Substitution of the prepositions.	250
Substitution of verbal forms.	251
Substitution of number.	251
Substitution of particles	252
Conclusion.	252
The Text Of Habakkuk Examined In The Light Of Modern Research And Discovery.	254
Habakkuk I.	255
2	255
3	255

CHAPTER

PAGE

4	255
5	256
6	258
7	258
8	258
9	259
10	259
11	260
12	261
13	262
14	263
15	263
17	263
Habakkuk II	264
1	264
2	265
3	265
4	266
5	266
6	268
7	268
8	269
9	269
13	269

CHAPTER	PAGE
14	270
15	270
16	271
17	271
18	272
19	273
Habakkuk III.	274
2	274
3	276
4	276
5	277
6	277
7	282
9	283
10	288
13	288
14	289
15	290
16	290
17	291
Conclusion.	291
V. A TRANSLATION OF HABAKKUK IN THE LIGHT OF	
MODERN RESEARCH AND DISCOVERY	293
BIBLIOGRAPHY	304

ABBREVIATIONS

ABBREVIATIONS

<u>A.J.S.L.L.</u>	<u>American Journal Of Semitic Languages And Literatures</u>
<u>B.A.</u>	<u>Biblical Archaeologist</u>
<u>B.A.S.O.R.</u>	<u>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</u>
BDB	Brown, Driver and Briggs, <u>Hebrew Lexicon</u>
BH	<u>Biblia Hebraica</u> , ed. R. Kittel
<u>C.B.Q.</u>	<u>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</u>
<u>E.T.</u>	<u>The Expository Times</u>
<u>H.U.C.A.</u>	<u>Hebrew Union College Annual</u>
<u>J.B.L.</u>	<u>Journal Of Biblical Literature</u>
<u>J.N.E.S.</u>	<u>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</u>
<u>J.Q.R.</u>	<u>Jewish Quarterly Review</u>
<u>J.S.S.</u>	<u>Journal of Semitic Studies</u>
<u>J.T.S.</u>	<u>Journal of Theological Studies</u>
LXX	<u>Septuagint</u>
MS	Manuscript
MSS	Manuscripts
MT	Massoretic Text
4QEx ^a	Fragment "a" of Exodus found in cave four at Qumran.
1QH	Habakkuk commentary from cave one at Qumran.
1QIsa	Isaiah scroll from cave one at Qumran; often abbreviated as DSIa or called the St. Mark's Isaiah in contradistinction to the other scroll of Isaiah found at Qumran.

4QS^a

Fragment "a" of Samuel found in cave
four at Qumran.

4QS^b

Fragment "b" of Samuel found in cave
four at Qumran.

Z.A.W.

Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche
Wissenschaft

CHAPTER I

THE FORMATION OF THE TEXT OF HABAKKUK

CHAPTER I

THE FORMATION OF THE TEXT OF HABAKKUK

The formation of the text of any book becomes the foundation from which the matters of transmission and restoration as well as interpretation must begin, for one cannot adequately deal with any one of these areas of study until the origin of the text has been investigated and, if not dogmatically settled, at least examined and understood as best possible in view of the evidence at hand.

Consequently, it will be the purpose of this chapter to examine the text of Habakkuk in the light of the contribution made by modern research to the understanding of its beginnings. That such a study has been attempted springs from the conviction that a proper reconstruction of the facts surrounding the formation of a book is invaluable not only for interpretation but is also highly important for the understanding of the history of its transmission and, ultimately, for the establishment of the best possible text for the book.

In fulfillment of this intention two areas of study shall be initiated; first, the type of literature to which the book of Habakkuk belongs shall be investigated and, second, its place in the cultic life of Israel shall be evaluated.

I. THE TYPE OF LITERATURE TO WHICH HABAKKUK BELONGS

The logical place to begin a study of the formation of Habakkuk is with the type of literature to which the book belongs, for such a study of the text automatically brings one to consider at the outset the peculiar form of the material that the prophet produced. Through the years there have been a number of different opinions concerning the literary classification of Habakkuk.

Habakkuk Is A Book Or Pamphlet

The oldest, and the most common, attitude toward the book is that it arose in much the same manner that a book or an article would be produced today. That is, after proper reflection and assimilation of thought, the prophet committed his views to writing and then exhibited or read this composition publicly so that the message might be presented to the people.¹

Great diversity of opinion has prevailed concerning what portion, or portions, of the book may be attributed to the original prophet. Extremes have ranged from Marti who left but seven authentic verses,² to Lehrman who

¹A. F. Kirkpatrick, The Doctrine Of The Prophets, The Warburtonian Lectures For 1886-1890, p. 273.

²Aage Bentzen, Introduction To The Old Testament, second edition, II, 151-52.

considered the book in its entirety to be the work of the prophet Habakkuk.³

The attempts to resolve the apparent difficulties inherent in the book may be summarized under the following theories, suggested by G. V. Stonehouse.⁴

The two-oracle theory. J. von Gumpach, who first questioned a passage of Habakkuk,⁵ proposed the theory in 1860 that the book consisted of two oracles. Included in the first oracle, directed against the Scythians, were 1:1-14a; 2:1-3; 3:16, 17. The second oracle consisted of 3:1, 2; 2:4-20; 3:3-7, 15, 8-14, 18, 19, and was concerned with Judah's deliverance.⁶ Von Gumpach has been followed in this theory by other scholars who have independently presented their own variation of his theory,⁷ although not following his details.

³S. M. Lehrman, "Habakkuk: Introduction And Commentary," The Twelve Prophets: Hebrew Text, English Translation And Commentary, ed. A. Cohen (in Soncino Books Of The Bible), pp. 211-12.

⁴George G. V. Stonehouse, The Book Of Habakkuk: Introduction, Translation, And Notes On The Hebrew Text, p. 66.

⁵Ibid., p. 65.

⁶Ibid., p. 68.

⁷A. T. Pearson, "The Problem of Unity and Date In Habakkuk," pp. 41-46; Stonehouse, op. cit., pp. 67-73.

The fragmentary or composite theory. There has also been advanced a "fragmentary" or "composite" theory in which the book is assumed to consist of a number of oracles or strata of material rather than the two oracles delineated by von Gumpach. "The book is not thought of as forming a literary unit, but as possessing a fragmentary character."⁸ The two best-known exponents of this view were W. B. Stevenson and K. Marti. Both men differed, however, concerning the precise definition of the component parts of the book.⁹

The reconstructive theory. The inexplicable problems inherent in chapters one and two brought about the further suggestion that these chapters be rearranged so that 1:5-11 would follow 2:4. Karl Budde led in this work, although he has been followed by others,¹⁰ among whom was G. A. Smith who took Budde's suggested theory and, with modifications, presented it as the most acceptable solution to the apparent contradictions in the book.¹¹

The redactional theory. J. W. Rothstein presented

⁸Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 73.

⁹Ibid., pp. 73-77.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 78.

¹¹G. A. Smith, The Book Of The Twelve Prophets, II, 117-30.

a fourth solution to the problems of the book in which he considered the book to contain a kernel original with Habakkuk but later reworked in a very minute manner by a redactor. This early oracle consisted of 1:2-4; 12a, 13; 2:1-5a; 1:6-10, 14, 15a; 2:6b, 7; 2:9-11; 2:15, 16; 2:19, 18; delivered about 605 B.C. and "In the exile . . . was revised and expanded by a later hand so that it became in its greater part a pronouncement against Chaldea."¹²

The interpretative theory. In addition to the solutions proposed above, there is an increasingly large number of competent scholars who feel that the book is a unit and that the evidences against the unity of the book are superficial and are by no means insuperable.¹³ This theory rests essentially upon a difference of interpretation and not upon a difference of opinion concerning unity.¹⁴

In the midst of this diversity of opinion, unanimity comes at one point, especially. In each case the proponents of the above-mentioned theories concerning the structure of the book agree that the book was produced by an author, or authors, who sat down and committed his (their) thoughts

¹²Pearson, op. cit., p. 60; Stonehouse, op. cit., pp. 91-93.

¹³Pearson, op. cit., pp. 69-100; Stonehouse, op. cit., pp. 94-108; W. F. Albright, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," Studies In Old Testament Prophecy, ed. H. H. Rowley, p. 9.

¹⁴Stonehouse, op. cit., pp. 66, 94.

to writing. This production was later read, or displayed in public for the people to read, in order that the message of the prophet might be proclaimed. Although disagreement prevails concerning the structure and authorship of the book, basic agreement is achieved concerning the manner in which the book was to be presented to the people.

Habakkuk Is A Drama

There is yet a second attitude that has been adopted concerning the type of literature to which Habakkuk belongs. Heinrich von Ewald proposed the theory in 1878 that Habakkuk was a drama of three parts intended for public performance.¹⁵

This classification of the book placed it in a different category of literature insofar as method of presentation was concerned, although Ewald remained a strong advocate of the theory that the prophet committed the work to writing without having spoken the message. He was quite forceful concerning the method of composition and stated concerning the prophet that,

He had no wish, or perhaps was unable to labor by word of mouth after the manner of the older prophets: with all the greater energy, therefore, he availed himself of the pen.¹⁶

¹⁵G. H. A. von Ewald, Commentary On The Prophets Of The Old Testament, trans. J. Frederick Smith, III, 30-32.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 30.

He thus agreed with others in his belief that the book was written down by the prophet but he differed from them in the use that was to be made of the book.

Scholars have generally taken one of three attitudes concerning the presentation and transmission of the prophetic message in Israel. (1) A book may have been written for the purpose of being publicly displayed.¹⁷ (2) It may have been written down by the prophet with the expectation of presenting it at a later time.¹⁸ (3) It may have been spoken by the prophet and recorded either by his disciples¹⁹ or by himself at a later time.

Ewald disagreed with each of these attitudes and insisted that the book was to be produced as a drama of three parts but he found little, if any, support among succeeding commentators and critics; Kirkpatrick stating that "Ewald's suggestion that it was intended for actual performance is destitute of all probability."²⁰

¹⁷Kirkpatrick, op. cit., p. 273.

¹⁸O. Eissfeldt, "The Prophetic Literature," The Old Testament And Modern Study: A Generation Of Discovery And Research, ed. H. H. Rowley, p. 131.

¹⁹Ibid., pp. 126f.

²⁰Kirkpatrick, op. cit., p. 274.

Habakkuk Is A Liturgy For Temple Usage

The unique emphases of Hermann Gunkel²¹ and Sigmund Mowinckel²² gave rise to an interpretation of Habakkuk in terms of a liturgy for presentation at the temple. This conception of the book has grown with each passing year, although it should not be implied that this attitude has found unanimity of opinion among present-day scholars.²³

Gunkel's main interests were twofold: first, the setting of the Old Testament in the larger context of ancient Oriental civilization; second, the connection of the Hebrew religion with the actual experience of the people.²⁴ Moffatt says that "in both departments he has been a pioneer, and in both his historical imagination and spiritual intuitions have been richly displayed."²⁵

It was the theory of Gunkel that the lyrical and

²¹Hermann Gunkel, "The Close Of Micah: A Prophetic Liturgy," What Remains Of The Old Testament And Other Essays, trans. A. K. Dallas, pp. 115-49.

²²Sigmund Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien, Vol. III Kultprophetie und Prophetische Psalmen, pp. 4-29. Cf. Mowinckel's reference to "der Templeprophet und Psalmdichter Habakkuk," ibid., p. 29.

²³B. D. Eerdmans, The Religion of Israel; cf. O. Eissfeldt's discussion, "Modern Criticism," Record and Revelation, ed. H. Wheeler Robinson, pp. 93-94.

²⁴James Moffatt, "Preface," What Remains Of The Old Testament And Other Essays, trans. A. K. Dallas, pp. 7-8.

²⁵Ibid., p. 8.

prophetical writings of the Old Testament could be analyzed into their native groups. "The constant recurrence of ways of expression, phrasings, words, metaphors, etc."²⁶ led to the isolation of particular types, and from this procedure he felt that the various sections could be identified and assigned to a definite "place in the life" of Israel.

The work of Gunkel centered largely in the Psalms and Aubrey Johnson said of his contribution toward this area of study that,

In so far as the study of the Psalter has made any progress during the generation which has passed since the foundation of the Society of Old Testament Study, it is largely due to the influence of one man-- Hermann Gunkel.²⁷

Gunkel's endeavors were not limited to the Psalter, however, and in connection with his study of the psalms, he also saw principles emerging that had value for the prophetical books as well. Especially was this true concerning the prophetic use of liturgy for,

Gunkel maintained that the blending of a lament with an oracular response, which is presupposed elsewhere in the Old Testament, and is supported by parallels from both Babylonia and Egypt, was

²⁶Gunkel, "The Close Of Micah: A Prophetic Liturgy," What Remains Of The Old Testament And Other Essays, pp. 115-16.

²⁷A. R. Johnson, "The Psalms," The Old Testament And Modern Study: A Generation Of Discovery And Research, ed. H. H. Rowley, p. 162.

a device which, like other liturgical forms, came to be adopted by the canonical prophets.²⁸

In 1924²⁹ and 1928³⁰ Gunkel published a study of Mic. 7:7-17 in which he concluded that, "We have therefore, in this close of Micah an artistically constructed unity. The poem was rendered as a 'liturgy' by different singers on one of the days in Jerusalem."³¹

Gunkel's imagined picture of its method of presentation summarizes his position concerning the prophetic use of the liturgy so well that his description is quoted at length below.

We can picture to ourselves the passage A being sung as two solos by two trained choristers, while B was rendered by the choir . . . In deep notes of restrained passionateness the pain and yearning of Zion was sung, and in response the mysterious and solemn voice of God became audible in words of consolation and cheer. The longing of human hearts was again expressed as the choir sang with fervour the prayers and desires of the people, and finally all sense of sorrow was lost in the hymn of exultation. It is only in this way that we can understand what poems like these meant for Jewish hearts--how their tears flowed as the dirge

²⁸Ibid., p. 179.

²⁹Hermann Gunkel, Zeitschrift fur Semitistik, ed. F. Littmann, II, 145ff. This article by Gunkel was translated by A. K. Dallas in 1928 under the title, "The Close Of Micah: A Prophetic Liturgy," in What Remains Of The Old Testament And Other Essays.

³⁰Gunkel, "The Close Of Micah: A Prophetic Liturgy," op. cit., pp. 115-49.

³¹Ibid., p. 147.

was sung, and how faith recovered when it heard the message of deliverance.³²

The emphasis of Sigmund Mowinckel upon the prophet's association with the cultic life of the nation³³ added a further basis for interpreting certain of the prophetic books as liturgical³⁴ and, for those who accepted Mowinckel's thesis, there was all the more reason for adopting the liturgical interpretation of certain prophetic writings.

Gunkel's connection of the liturgical form and the canonical prophets,³⁵ fused with Mowinckel's thesis concerning the association of the so-called reform prophets with the cult, thus led the way for a liturgical attitude toward a number of the prophetic books.

The decade following the work of Gunkel and Mowinckel

³²Ibid., pp. 147-48. Although not intended as such, Gunkel's description constitutes a most fitting analysis of the book of Habakkuk.

³³Mowinckel, loc. cit.; Eissfeldt, "The Prophetic Literature," The Old Testament And Modern Study: A Generation of Discovery And Research, p. 120.

³⁴Eissfeldt, "The Prophetic Literature," op. cit., pp. 145-46.

³⁵Gunkel, "The Close of Micah: A Prophetical Liturgy," op. cit., pp. 115f.; Johnson, "The Psalms," The Old Testament And Modern Study, p. 178, "Gunkel therefore described these as Torah liturgies . . . and . . . advanced evidence for the view that imitations of this style . . . may even be found in the works of the canonical prophets." Ibid. Johnson also cites Gunkel's interpretation of both Is. 33 and Mic. 6 as liturgies plus his essay, "Jesia 33, eine prophetische Liturgie," Z.A.W., XIII (1924), 177-208.

saw the rise of European scholars who classified prophetic books, either in part or in whole, as liturgies;³⁶ no less than six men adopting this view toward Habakkuk, alone.³⁷

In 1939, E. A. Leslie published The Prophets Tell Their Own Story, in which he portrayed the lives of the various prophets in the first person. His attitude toward Habakkuk was reflected in the following words, placed in the mouth of the prophet:

When his revelation came to me, I would declare to the congregation at worship what Yahweh had caused me to see and hear.³⁸

My liturgy began with a lamentation of our nation over the situation that had been created in the whole world of nations by the violence and pagan ruthlessness of the Chaldeans. The cries of Yahweh's faithful worshippers had apparently gone unheeded.³⁹

The interpretation of Habakkuk in terms of a liturgy

³⁶Arvid S. Kapelrud, Joel Studies; Aage Bentzen, op. cit., I, 149, citing Humbert's work on Nahum, Z.A.T.W. (1926), 206ff.; Adolphe Lods, The Prophets And The Rise Of Judaism, p. 9; I. Engnell, The Call of Isaiah, pp. 55-60, divides the prophetic literature into two main groups. "The 'liturgical type' . . . to be found in Nah. Hab., Joel, 'Deutero-Isaiah' et. al. with real writers behind them . . . and the 'diwantype' . . . e.g. Am., Proto-Isa. etc. . . ."

³⁷Cf. E. A. Leslie, The Prophets Tell Their Own Story, p. 274, who, apart from H. Gunkel and S. Mowinckel, cites E. Balla, E. Sellin, W. Staerk, J. Begrich and Charles Venn Pilcher, although the latter is not European.

³⁸Ibid., p. 204.

³⁹Ibid., p. 210.

for presentation in the temple was continued with the work of Paul Humbert's Problems Du Livre Habaccuc, published in 1944. According to him, the book is divided into the following liturgical outline:

1. 1:1 Titre.
2. 1:2-4 Premiere complainte.
3. 1:5-10 Premier oracle.
4. 1:11-17 Deuxieme complainte.
5. 2:1-5a Deuxieme oracle.
6. 2:5b-20 Cinq imprecations.
7. 3 Tefilla. ⁴⁰

Humbert concluded that Habakkuk was the product of a cult-prophet⁴¹ who composed the liturgy for presentation in 602-601 B.C. as a polemic against Jehoiakim.⁴²

In the years that followed the work of Humbert there arose other scholars who viewed Habakkuk either as an actual liturgy intended for presentation at the temple,⁴³ or as an imitation of the liturgical type of literature.⁴⁴ Detailed

⁴⁰Paul Humbert, Problems Du Livre Habaccuc, pp. 9-29.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 280.

⁴²Ibid., pp. 296-97; Bentzen, op. cit., II, 152-53.

⁴³Eissfeldt, "The Prophetic Literature," The Old Testament And Modern Study: A Generation of Discovery And Research, p. 146; Gunnar Ostborn, Cult And Canon, p. 60; Bentzen, op. cit., II, 152, citing Engnell, Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk who "considers the book /Habakkuk/ a real cultic liturgy presumably from the days of Josiah or Jehoiakim.

⁴⁴Bentzen, op. cit., I, 162. "The liturgy can assume a more hymnic character when it belongs to a festival of rejoicing, and be more plaintive on a day of penitence . . . Liturgies of this kind are sometimes imitated by the prophets

evidence has not always been submitted in substantiation of a particular theory,⁴⁵ and it must be admitted that the final word has possibly not yet been spoken concerning the validity of interpreting the book in terms of a liturgical composition for presentation at the temple. Yet, it cannot be denied that the past two decades have witnessed an increasingly large number of scholars who have advocated such an interpretation.

Conclusion

Old Testament scholarship has produced three different attitudes concerning the type of literature to which Habakkuk belongs. It is not sufficient, however, merely to list those who advocate each particular view and then select the most impressive viewpoint insofar as the weight of scholarship is concerned. The actual evidences both for and against the proposed theories must be evaluated and a definite conclusion based upon the valid evidence presented.

In seeking to arrive at a conclusion concerning the type of literature to which Habakkuk belongs, consideration has been limited to the first and the third theories. This

(cf. Jer. 14; Mic. 7; Is. 33; Hab. et. al.)" He also cites Engnell, Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok, 1945, who takes up the idea that "Deutero-Isaiah is a prophetic imitation of a collection of liturgies to the New Year Festival," ibid.

⁴⁵Leslie, op. cit., pp. 204-27, as one example.

was done since the difference between the drama and the liturgy is, in the case of Habakkuk, largely one of terminology, for both were intended for ritual performance at the temple.

The question of the type of literature to which the book belongs ultimately resolves itself into a question of the manner in which the book was to be presented to the people. Was it intended as a liturgy for presentation at the temple or to be circulated, apart from the temple, among the people of the day?

To resolve this question, evidence both for and against a liturgical interpretation of the book are advanced below.

Evidence opposed to a liturgical interpretation of Habakkuk. An unbroken tradition of over two thousand years supports the traditional attitude toward the book. This does not insure a correct interpretation, but it does place the burden of proof upon those who would attack the traditional view.

Second, the improbability that a prophet would write a liturgy for temple usage argues against the liturgical interpretation of Habakkuk. This is especially true in the light of the attitude of Jeremiah, a contemporary of Habakkuk, toward both the priest and the prophet associated

with the temple.⁴⁶

Third, the disunity of Habakkuk argues against its liturgical interpretation. Competent scholars have denied the unity of the book⁴⁷ and if this should prove to be true its use as a liturgy is seriously challenged, for the proponents of the liturgical interpretation assume that the book is unified in format.⁴⁸

Fourth, the differences of form⁴⁹ between the third chapter and chapters one and two argue against the liturgical interpretation of the book. If the entire book is a liturgy for temple usage, then it would be expected that the same form would prevail throughout the book, especially in so short a book as Habakkuk.⁵⁰

Fifth, in more recent times scholars have felt that prophetic utterances of the Old Testament were limited to short, pithy statements; not detailed compositions consisting

⁴⁶Jer. 23; 26:7-8; 27; 28.

⁴⁷R. H. Pfeiffer, Introduction To The Old Testament, p. 597; H. H. Rowley, The Growth Of The Old Testament, p. 119; and T. K. Cheyne, The Origin And Religious Contents Of The Psalter In The Light Of Old Testament Criticism And The History Of Religions, p. 147.

⁴⁸Rowley, loc. cit.

⁴⁹Biblia Hebraica, pp. 946-50. Cf. R.S.V., Habakkuk, wherein the change of format is obvious.

⁵⁰However, chapter three could have been a psalm rendered in response to the protestations of the prophet in chapters one and two.

of entire books.⁵¹ This particular weakness in the approach of Paul Humbert was called to attention by H. H. Rowley⁵² and, if this more recent attitude toward the composition of prophetic books prevails, it would seem unlikely that Habakkuk is a liturgy springing from the prophet Habakkuk.

Sixth, the lack of evidence in favor of the liturgical interpretation of the book argues against such an attitude. It is often assumed that Habakkuk is a liturgy, but seldom has extensive, valid evidence been adduced in support of such a theory.⁵³ In addition, it should be noted that evidence brought forth in substantiation of the theory is at times of a type whose own validity has not yet been demonstrated conclusively.⁵⁴

Evidence for the liturgical interpretation of Habakkuk. Despite the objection that the format of

⁵¹Cf. Eissfeldt, "The Prophetic Literature," The Old Testament And Modern Study: A Generation of Discovery And Research, p. 126.

⁵²H. H. Rowley, "Recent Foreign Theology," E.T., eds. James Hastings, A. W. Hastings and E. Hastings, LVIII (October, 1946-September, 1947), 192-93.

⁵³Leslie, loc. cit.; Charles Venn Pilcher, Three Hebrew Prophets And The Passing Of The Empires, Being a Study of Nahum, Habakkuk & Zephaniah, p. 85.

⁵⁴For instance, the attempt to validate the liturgical nature of Habakkuk by assuming that the prophet Habakkuk is a cultic prophet; or the attempt to prove that he is a cultic prophet because of the assumed liturgical nature of the book.

Habakkuk differs from chapter to chapter⁵⁵ it is nonetheless true that the over-all literary structure of the entire book argues for the acceptance of its liturgical nature for as previously noted, the lament followed by a response on the part of God is characteristic of liturgical compositions.⁵⁶

The liturgical pattern mentioned above is clearly illustrated in the dialogue between the prophet and God found in chapter one. The pronouncement of the five woes found in chapter two breaks this pattern established in chapter one, however, although it is entirely possible that the woes are a lengthy response to the lament expressed in 2:1. Liturgical usage in chapter two is not quite so definite as in chapter one, but it cannot be ruled out.

The third chapter presents little question as far as the acceptance of its liturgical nature is concerned. The notes added to the chapter indicate quite conclusively that the chapter was used at some time or other as a psalm,

⁵⁵Supra, p. 17.

⁵⁶Supra, pp. 10-11. Johnson, "The Psalms," The Old Testament and Modern Study, p. 179, citing Gunkel, lists the following "liturgical forms-. . . adopted by the canonical prophet": Is. 26:8-14a, 14bf.; 26:16-18, 19-21; 32:2, 3-6; 33:7-9, 10-12; 49:14, 15ff.; 49:24, 25f.; 59:9-15b, 15c-20; 63:7-64:11 (E.V.V. 12), 65; Jer. 3:22b-5, 4:1f.; 14:2-9, 10; 14:19-22, 15:1f.; 21:18f., 20; 51:34f., 36ff.; Hos. 6:1-3, 4-6; 14:3f., 5-9 (E.V.V. 2f., 4-8); Joel 1:5-11, 2:12-14; 2:15-17, 18-27; Mic. 7:7-10, 11-13; 7:14-17, 18-20; Hab. 1:2-4, 5ff.; 1:12-17, 2:1ff.

quite likely for public rendition. Whether the psalm was original with Habakkuk⁵⁷ or adapted from older material,⁵⁸ it has a definitely liturgical form and constitutes a fitting conclusion to the questions raised earlier in the book.

Second, insofar as the unity of the book is concerned it should be understood that it is characterized by a greater degree of unity than has been admitted by some.⁵⁹ In this regard, W. F. Albright has gone so far as to state that he sees,

. . . no valid reason why the book should not be treated as a substantial unit and dated between 605 and 589 B.C. . . . I regret that want of space requires such an apodictic tone, since there are many archaeological, historical and literary arguments which may be adduced in support of the traditional chronology of the book.⁶⁰

Third, the relationship of the prophet to the cultic life of Israel would favor the liturgical interpretation of the book of Habakkuk. It has often been pointed out that the prophets formed a part of the cultic life of Israel and at times could have a part in the worship service at the

⁵⁷Lehrman, loc. cit.

⁵⁸Albright, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," Studies In Old Testament Prophecy, pp. 18ff.

⁵⁹Pilcher, op. cit., pp. 85-86.

⁶⁰Albright, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," Studies In Old Testament Prophecy, p. 2.

temple.⁶¹ This would, of course, abolish the idea that the prophet could have nothing to do with the composition of a liturgy for temple usage. Naturally, this does not prove that Habakkuk was a liturgy, but it does admit the possibility that as a prophet he could have had cultic functions.

Fourth, the connection of the name "habakkuk" with liturgical groups within Israel argues for a liturgical attitude toward the book. The prophet Habakkuk is often connected with the Levites⁶² and W. F. Albright in concurrence with this states that, "the tradition that he was a prophet and a musician who flourished in the last years of the First Temple is thoroughly consonant with the literary picture as we have sketched it."⁶³

Fifth, the reference to Habakkuk as a "nabi" has been adduced as an evidence favoring the liturgical approach to the book; only Habakkuk, Zechariah and Haggai are called a "nabi" in the superscription of their respective books.⁶⁴

⁶¹Cf. A. R. Johnson, The Cultic Prophet In Ancient Israel; H. H. Rowley, The Re-discovery Of The Old Testament, p. 105, The Unity Of The Bible, p. 37.

⁶²Witton Davies, "Bel And The Dragon," Apocrypha And Pseudepigrapha Of The Old Testament, ed. R. H. Charles, pp. 652ff.; Bentzen, op. cit., p. 151; Stonehouse, op. cit., pp. 61ff.

⁶³Albright, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," Studies In Old Testament Prophecy, p. 9.

⁶⁴Bentzen, op. cit., II, 153.

Finally, although not an evidence, it should be noted that the liturgical interpretation of the book detracts in no way from either the message of the book or from its value for men of Habakkuk's day or for today. If the book should prove to be a liturgy, it is still the work of a prophet who writes out of the depth of his experience with God.

In view of both the positive and the negative evidences that may be advanced for the one side or the other, one of the two following conclusions should be accepted: (1) the book is a liturgy composed for presentation in the temple as a result of a national crisis, or (2) the book was written in imitation of a liturgy but it was not intended for public presentation.

The book is cast in a definitely liturgical mold, but there are problems which arise in connection with a liturgical interpretation for actual performance⁶⁵ that have not been solved with a degree of finality which would permit a dogmatic defense of the book in terms such as these. In the light of this, the only conclusion that may be definitely established is that the book is liturgical in form. Whether it was actually presented at the temple or not cannot be ascertained on the basis of the evidence

⁶⁵Especially the problems of unity, format and length.

now available; it may or it may not have been intended for actual performance. It did, however, spring from a definitely cultic background.

II. THE PLACE OF HABAKKUK IN THE CULTIC LIFE OF ISRAEL

A significant problem in connection with the formation of the text of Habakkuk is that of the precise relationship that the book sustained to the cultic life of Israel. The solution of this problem has a twofold bearing upon the total study of the text.

First, the relationship of Habakkuk to the cultic life of Israel occupies a significant role in the establishment of the type of literature to which the book belongs. Throughout the previous discussion concerning this issue there ran the underlying problem of the relationship of Habakkuk to the cult. If there should be a definite connection, then the likelihood that the book is a liturgy would be greatly enhanced. If, on the other hand, the opposite should prove to be true, then it is unlikely that the text should be interpreted in terms of a liturgy.

Second, the relationship of Habakkuk to the cultic life of Israel has significance for the problem of the transmission of the text. If the text sustained a vital relationship to the cult, then it would logically be assumed that the cultic life of Israel would have bearing

upon the integrity with which the text was transmitted.⁶⁶

The Cultic Life Of Israel

The present generation has witnessed an ever-increasing interest in the cultic life of Israel. There have been studies concerning the originality of the Israelite cult; the relationship of the priest and the prophet to the cult; and in more recent years there has been a serious attempt to analyse the cult of Israel and to examine it for evidence relating to sacral kingship, an enthronement ceremony, and a New Year Festival.⁶⁷

Definition of terminology. In the midst of this activity and interest in the cult, specific definition is characteristically lacking on the part of most scholars. Writers evidently assume that the meaning of the terminology is common knowledge and that definition is not needed. It would seem to be advantageous, however, if at

⁶⁶Cf. Gunnar Östborn, op. cit., who indicates that Habakkuk was employed in the cult, p. 60, and his further observation that everything connected with the cult was holy and that, "It is then quite natural that a cultic narrative should be holy," ibid., p. 104.

If associated with the cult of Israel and thereby classified as "holy," any such literature would, because of its religious associations, be less likely to suffer corruption in transmission.

⁶⁷Cf. A. C. Welch, Prophet And Priest In Old Israel; S. H. Hooke (ed.), The Labyrinth, pp. 9ff.; Henri Frankfort, Kingship And The Gods; E. C. Rust, "The Psalms," citing Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien.

some point specific definition of the terms used would be given in order that the connotation of the word as used by the author would be evident.

In the light of this it was deemed proper at this point to define the present writer's usage of "cult," "cultus" and "cultic." The following definitions of the terms as they apply to contemporary Old Testament studies are therefore presented for guidance in this thesis. "Cult" is to be understood as, "A system of worship of a deity, or a group of deities,"⁶⁸ and its usage is demonstrated in the expression, "The cult of Yahweh." "Cultus" has become a synonymous term for "cult" in contemporary usage,⁶⁹ and it will be used as such in this study while the adjective "cultic" may be defined as anything "pertaining to a cult, cults."⁷⁰

"Cult" includes the priest and other members of the temple staff, the physical implements of worship, the ritual and liturgy, and the people who gather to worship. The term "cult" embraces the totality of the Israelite's worship life and the expression, "ordered system of worship" could be

⁶⁸Webster's New International Dictionary Of The English Language, second edition, unabridged, p. 642.

⁶⁹Eissfeldt, "The Prophetic Literature," The Old Testament And Modern Study: A Generation of Discovery And Research, pp. 119ff.

⁷⁰Webster's New International Dictionary Of The English Language, loc. cit.

substituted for either of the words, "cult" or "cultus." It would seem preferable, however, to retain the terms "cult" and "cultus" in order to conform with the terminology of contemporary scholarship. By using the same terminology, one does not have to make the mental transition each time that the word "cult" appears. It was this desire for clarity that led to the adoption of the above-mentioned terms in this thesis.

Let it be clear that in making use of the words "cult," "cultus" and "cultic," it does not automatically follow that the various theories concerning the content of the cult are thereby accepted. Such acceptance or non-acceptance should be based upon further examination of the evidence and the use of current terminology should by no means be taken to imply the acceptance of particular theories concerning the content of the cult.

Necessity of the cult. "Men cannot live upon a memory," says A. C. Welch, "even the memory of an act of God."⁷¹ Unless man's relationship to the God of his deliverance can be maintained by acts of faith, such as make up an acting religion, each successive generation will see the memory grow more dim.⁷² Memory forms an

⁷¹Welch, op. cit., p. 46.

⁷²Ibid., pp. 46-47.

essential part of religious life, yet it alone is not sufficient to preserve faith.

The faith of Israel centered in the activities of a God who had revealed Himself in history. Israel's faith became a recital of the mighty acts of God as He had worked on behalf of His people.⁷³ If the activities of God should pass from the life of the people, Israel's faith would also pass away; for the recounting of God's mighty acts was essential to her faith. To preserve her faith, Israel of necessity had to preserve the account of the activities of God as He had revealed himself in history.

In order to accomplish the preservation of the activities of God it was necessary that Israel should have an ordered system of ritual and worship in which the activities of God could become enshrined. Without such a cultic life that would constantly stir up the memory of the acts of God, the activities of God in the past would soon grow dim and with this dimness of God's activity would come the passing of Israel's faith.

To preserve the faith of Israel the acts of God needed to be presented to the people of Israel in a two-fold manner. First, the memory of the activities of God

⁷³G. E. Wright, God Who Acts: Biblical Theology As Recital (in Studies In Biblical Theology series).

in the past had to be recalled. This the cult accomplished through the agitation of the memory so that the people were carried back to the event that had happened in years gone by.⁷⁴ Second, the acts of God had to be recreated, or perpetuated, in the living present. Through the very ritual employed in the cult the acts of God were caused to live again in the present before the eyes of the people. There was released a vital power in the re-enactment of the past event of God.⁷⁵

In the ritual and ceremony of the cult the worshipper was pointed back through the power of memory to the past events of God. At the same time something vital happened in the present; something mystical and intangible, yet something that was quite real to the participant. The cultic acts were not merely tools to bestir the memory; they were living acts when God once again entered in a special sense into the history of man. Every cultic act arising from a genuine quest for God resulted in a fresh

⁷⁴Gerhard Von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, p. 70.

⁷⁵Östborn, op. cit., p. 99, has stated that "In the synagogical service Yahweh's works were essentially visualized through the reading of the scriptures. It was always possible to have the recited word illustrate some part or side of Yahweh's activity. The intrinsic meaning of cult must no doubt be considered to exist in its very capacity of illustrating, vivifying, and contacting a Divine activity." (The emphasis added through underlining the above statement was done by the writer of this thesis).

inbreak of God into history. The ritual was not something dead and without life; it was alive and vital. Something happened in the life of Israel that would not have happened apart from the performance of the cultic act.⁷⁶

The fact of the cult. In the light of this need for a cult which would constantly set the activities of God before the people and thus preserve the faith of Israel there grew up in Israel an ordered system of worship, or cult, embodying the activities of God and fulfilling the twofold needs mentioned above.

To what extent this was original with the Israelites and to what extent elements were taken from other groups and, after transformation, added to the Israelite cult is not a point of discussion at this time. The point of emphasis falls upon, not the originality of the Israelite cult, but the fact that such a cult did exist.

The Relationship Of Habakkuk To The Cult

Having come to recognize the existence of the Israelite cultus in which the faith of Israel was enshrined, the

⁷⁶Cf. H. J. Franken, The Mystical Communion With YHWH In The Book of Psalms, p. 10, citing S. Mowinckel, Religion und Kultus, p. 93, wherein Mowinckel, although excluding the idea from Yahwism, states that ". . . primitive forms of mysticism originated everywhere in connection with the cult, where the unity with the godly world was experienced by means of rituals." One wonders whether this is entirely absent in Israel.

more immediate question at hand is, "What was the relationship of the prophet Habakkuk to that cult?" Is he to be interpreted in terms of a cultic prophet, closely associated with the temple, or is he to be understood as a prophet completely removed from the cultic life of the nation?

Little is known of the man Habakkuk other than his name and from the information contained within the book itself it is impossible to reconstruct the life of the prophet in exact detail. He is not mentioned in other canonical literature and, in view of this absence of information, it seems all but impossible to determine his precise relationship to the cult. Yet, the question is pertinent to this study and must be considered at this time.

Habakkuk was a cult-prophet associated with the temple. With the recent tendency to interpret the prophets of Israel in terms of cult-prophets there came the inclination on the part of many to assume that Habakkuk was a prophet closely associated with the cultic life of Israel and perhaps a cult prophet himself.⁷⁷

Convincing evidence has not always been presented in substantiation of this theory, but despite one's opinion

⁷⁷Leslie, op. cit., pp. 204ff.; Pilcher, op. cit.; C. Lindhagen, The Servant Motif In The Old Testament, p. 117; Humbert, op. cit., pp. 296ff.

concerning the validity of the evidence one must examine and weigh it carefully before a definite conclusion may be drawn. What are the evidences in support of the cultic interpretation of Habakkuk?

First, cult prophets did exist in Israel and their membership, in all probability, should not be limited to the "false" prophets, but should be extended to include the so-called "true" or canonical prophets.⁷⁸ Extremes in this regard have ranged from that of denying any prophetic associations with the cult⁷⁹ to the assumption that the prophetic movement was completely absorbed by the Israelite cultus.⁸⁰ As is often the case, the truth appears

⁷⁸Eissfeldt, "The Prophetic Literature," The Old Testament And Modern Study, pp. 119f.; J. Pedersen, Israel, I-II, 115 et passim; A. Haldar, Associations Of Cult Prophets Among The Ancient Semites, pp. 90ff.; A. R. Johnson, "The Prophet In Israelite Worship," E.T., XLVII (1936), 312-19, "The Psalms," The Old Testament And Modern Study, pp. 206ff.; H. H. Rowley, "The Nature of Old Testament Prophecy In The Light of Recent Study," The Servant Of The Lord And Other Old Testament Essays, pp. 104ff., The Re-discovery Of The Old Testament, pp. 139ff.

⁷⁹B. D. Eerdmans, The History Of Israel, pp. 185f.; Haldar, op. cit., p. 90, in summarizing this position stated, "The great 'single' prophets of the O.T. were seen as lonely figures opposed to the religion of their times."

⁸⁰Haldar, op. cit., best epitomizes those who view the prophetic movement as all but absorbed by the cult. Johnson in his earlier studies, loc. cit., and in The Cultic Prophet In Ancient Israel tended toward this but has since altered this view as is evidenced in Rowley's comment ". . . in private correspondence Dr. Johnson agrees that the word 'stationed' is too strong, and that the cultic prophet should not be thought of as in any sense resident at the shrines," The Servant Of The Lord And Other Essays On The Old Testament, pp. 105f.

to lie at a point midway between these two; a position that has been clearly articulated by H. H. Rowley who has insisted that,

Some [i.e. prophets] functioned in shrines, but some certainly did not, and the same prophet could sometimes function in a shrine and sometimes not. All prophets were probably cultic persons though not all seem to have been attached to the particular shrine.⁸¹

The prophets were cultic in that they were religious persons and therefore interested in the worship life of Israel. It should occasion no surprise, therefore, if the prophetic literature be identified, in part, as the literature and, at times, the very liturgy of Israel's cultus; nor should it prove surprising if the canonical prophets be viewed as men vitally interested in the cultic life and, beyond this, at times an actual part of that life.

The very fact that cult prophets existed in Israel raises the possibility that the prophet Habakkuk may have been such a prophet. The possibility does not prove the case, of course; yet, this does make it possible for him to be interpreted in terms of a cult prophet.

Second, the identification of Habakkuk as a Levite closely associated the prophet with the cultic life of the nation.

"Bel And The Dragon," one of the apocryphal additions

⁸¹Rowley, The Unity Of The Bible, p. 37.

to the book of Daniel, is assigned to "Ambaku, son of Jesus of the tribe of Levi,"⁸² and upon the strength of this reference both Habakkuk and his father have been identified as Levites. Regardless of one's conclusion concerning the historicity of the story itself, the fact remains that at the time "Bel And The Dragon" was written, the author attributed the status of Levite to Habakkuk and his father. Is it not logical to assume that, in all probability, such a statement was the result of a definite tradition concerning the prophet rather than a figment of the author's imagination? If this be true, then there is a tradition attributing Levitical status to Habakkuk that dates to a period prior to the composition of "Bel And The Dragon."⁸³

Third, the term "habakkuk" itself has been understood by some as a characteristic name for members of a musical guild and as such would closely unite Habakkuk with the cultus.

The idea was suggested by W. F. Albright as early as 1942 for J. D. Zimmerman stated that, "Albright wrote the present writer that he had a theory that the name Habakkuk is characteristic for members of a musical guild."⁸⁴

⁸²Bentzen, op. cit., p. 151; Davies, op. cit., pp. 652ff.; Stonehouse, op. cit., pp. 61ff.

⁸³Davies, op. cit., p. 656, assigns a date of ca. 136 B.C. to the composition.

⁸⁴John D. Zimmerman, The Prophecy Of Habakkuk, p. 130.

Subsequently, Albright developed the idea in one of his own works, Archaeology And The Religion Of Israel, in which he indicated that certain personal names in the Ancient Near East "reflect a class of plant-names or flower-names applied to musicians."⁸⁵

In the course of this discussion Albright observed that Habakkuk was also to be included within this category of names indicative of musical associations, suggesting that the reader should, ". . . Cf. also the name Habakkuk (Hab. 3.1) which cannot be separated from the Accadian plant-name hambaququ."⁸⁶

Albright's terminology "prophet-musician" with regard to Habakkuk is of no little significance and indicates that, for Albright, the prophet was definitely connected with the worship life of Israel.⁸⁷

Fourth, the use of the phrase 'על-משמרה' found in Hab. 2:1 has been interpreted to imply that the prophet was a cult prophet and that he was engaged in a cultic capacity

⁸⁵W. F. Albright, Archaeology And The Religion Of Israel, pp. 127f.

⁸⁶Ibid., p. 210.

⁸⁷Albright, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," Studies In Old Testament Prophecy, p. 9, "The tradition that he was a prophet and a musician who flourished in the last years of the First Temple is thoroughly consonant with the literary picture as we have sketched it."

within the context described in chapter two.⁸⁸

The expression occurs with definitely cultic connotations in other passages of the Old Testament and consequently creates cultic overtones in chapter two of Habakkuk. II Chron. 7:6 refers to the priests who "stood at their posts" or, literally, הכהנים על-משמרוֹתם ; II Chron. 35:2 states concerning the passover kept by Josiah that, "He appointed the priests to their offices," literally, ויעמד הכהנים על-משמרוֹתם ; and II Chron. 8:14 refers to the Levites as "The Levites for their offices," literally, והלויים על-משמרוֹתם . In each of these instances the term משמרה is associated with either priestly or levitical groups as that group was connected with some aspect of public worship.

In conjunction with this it should be observed that other terms similar in basic meaning to משמרה are utilized in connection with the cultic life of Israel. Especially is this true concerning the formulation or reception of the covenant (ברית) and the law (תורה).⁸⁹

After the reading of the book of the covenant by Josiah it is said that he made a covenant with Yahweh to

⁸⁸Humbert, op. cit., p. 280.

⁸⁹Cf. George Widengren, "King And Covenant," J.S.S., II, 1, pp. 1ff.

keep his commandments and execute the demands of the covenant. It is of significance to note that the "king stood by the pillar and made a covenant before the Lord,"

ויעמד המלך על-העמוד ויכרת את-הברית . Since על more frequently expresses the idea "upon" than it does that of "by" or "alongside"⁹⁰ the phrase may well be translated "upon the platform." Widengren suggested that,

. . . it would, of course, be tempting to combine the proposals of some scholars to read in II Kings xxiii.3 not על עמוד but with II Chron. xxiii.13 עמוד interpreting this expression as meaning "standing on his dias," or "on his platform."⁹¹

At the installation of Joash as King, Jehoiada the priest made a covenant between "the Lord, the King and people"⁹² during the course of which Joash the young king was "standing by the pillar (על העמוד), according to the custom."⁹³ It has been suggested that,

The infancy of the new king means that his active role is partly played by the priest Jehoiada, who acts as the performer of the covenant, not only between Yahweh and the people, but also between Yahweh and the king.⁹⁴

⁹⁰Cf. BDB, pp. 752ff. Cf. Pedersen, op. cit., I-II, 306, wherein he translates the phrase as "the King stood on the pillar."

⁹¹Widengren, op. cit., p. 9.

⁹²II Kings 11:17.

⁹³II Kings 11:14.

⁹⁴Widengren, op. cit., p. 7.

Once again the king stands upon his platform as a covenant is made, despite the fact that because of his infancy the leadership in the ceremony is taken by Jehoiada.

This same phenomenon is illustrated in the day of Solomon who, according to the Chronicler, "had made a bronze platform . . . and had set it in the court; and he stood upon it,"⁹⁵ and although "we cannot argue that this tradition is authentic, so far as it concerns the conditions prevailing during Solomon's own reign, . . . it obviously transmits to us the traditions prevalent in the Chronicler's time."⁹⁶

Ezra's action in the reading of the law also follows this pattern and during this event, "Ezra the scribe stood on a wooden pulpit (עזרא-למד-לעם) which they had made for the purpose; and beside him stood Mattithiah, Shema, Anaiah . . ."⁹⁷

Such instances suggest that there was perhaps a

⁹⁵II Chron. 6:13f. Cf. W. F. Albright, Archaeology And The Religion of Israel, pp. 152ff. concerning the kings. He also observes that a limestone stela found at Ugarit and dated ca. 1400 B.C. depicts the king praying to the storm god, Baal, at which time he stands upon a chest about one and one-half feet in height. This scene appears also in an Egyptian stela whereon a priest is depicted as appearing before a god and in so doing stands upon a chest about two feet in height. Ibid., p. 153.

⁹⁶Widengren, op. cit., p. 9.

⁹⁷Neh. 8:4.

specified place, regardless of the name assigned to it in different historical periods, whereon the king or other cultic official stood when communicating with Yahweh. In this connection "It is entirely in keeping with the foregoing that the king should have had his own place of honour in the Temple, probably on a raised platform."⁹⁸

Widengren concluded with regard to the king that, . . . at least towards the end of the pre-exilic period, but possibly from the beginning of that period, the king when reading to his people on a solemn occasion from the book of the law and acting as the mediator of the covenant making between Yahweh and the people had his place on a platform or a dais.⁹⁹

Although instances numerous enough to demonstrate unquestionably the theory are not present, upon the basis of available material it would seem that when a mediator, whether of kingly or priestly background, stood before Yahweh on behalf of the people he at times took his place upon a designated "platform" or "pillar" whereon he confronted Yahweh as representative of the people.

If this be true then the statement that Habakkuk stood upon his מַשְׁמֵרָה may well indicate that the prophet stood upon a platform similar to that used by the king or the priest.

⁹⁸Widengren, op. cit., p. 10, citing C. R. North, Z.A.W., L (1932), 20.

⁹⁹Ibid.

To stand upon the *משמרה* is to take part in the cultic life of Israel; therefore, the statement referring to Habakkuk as *על משמרה י* indicates that he was acting in a cultic capacity as he stood upon the *משמרה*.

Fifth, the fact that only Habakkuk, Haggai and Zechariah are called a "nabi" in the superscription of their respective books has also been advanced as an argument for the cultic interpretation of Habakkuk.¹⁰⁰ The validity of this assumption would, of course, depend upon the connotation given to the word *נבאי*, and the reference to Habakkuk as a "nabi" would have varying implications for different scholars.

Sixth, the type of literature produced by the prophet indicates that the prophet was a cultic personality. Assuming that the book is a liturgy, as many feel it to be,¹⁰¹ then the probability is heightened that the prophet was a cultic official directly associated with the temple and in this capacity composed such a liturgy for public rendition. The validity of this impinges, of course, upon the degree of finality with which the liturgical nature of the book of Habakkuk can be established.

¹⁰⁰Bentzen, op. cit., p. 153, citing Eissfeldt.

¹⁰¹Supra, pp. 9ff.

Habakkuk was not a cult prophet associated with the temple. What negative evidences may be discovered that have bearing upon this problem? Are there not weaknesses in the preceding arguments, or is it to be admitted that Habakkuk was undeniably a cult prophet?

In opposition to the theory that Habakkuk was a cult prophet, vitally connected with the temple, the following considerations should be evaluated.

First, the fact that a canonical prophet may have been associated with the cultic life of the nation does not prove that Habakkuk was thereby associated with the cultic life of the nation.¹⁰²

Second, the Levitical tradition relating to Habakkuk has been denied in a number of quarters and it is unlikely that the reference is characterized by historical validity.¹⁰³ In this connection it should be understood that although Habakkuk is referred to as of Levitical background this identification of the prophet is supported by only one textual witness.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰²It should be noted, however, that upon the basis of evidence already submitted if any of the canonical prophets were cultic Habakkuk seems most likely to have been so associated with the cultus.

¹⁰³Davies, op. cit., p. 658; Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 62.

¹⁰⁴LXX makes the connection while it is omitted in Theodotian. Cf. Bentzen, op. cit., p. 151. The LXX, "has been preserved in but one MS., the Codex Chisanus," Davies, op. cit., p. 654.

Third, it is true that the usage of *משמר* does have reference in the majority of instances to the revelation that has come from God¹⁰⁵ and that in addition to this it definitely refers to various cultic officials as they pursue their official duties. Yet, the word may have meanings completely apart from any cultic connotations; it may signify, at times, no more than a house of detention or of confinement.¹⁰⁶

Fourth, the exact meaning of "nabi'" is far from settled.¹⁰⁷ To assume that Habakkuk is a cult prophet merely because he is called a "nabi'," is to run far ahead of what has been established as undeniably true. The application of the term "nabi'" to a prophet is not sufficient evidence to indicate that he is a cultic personality.

Fifth, it has by no means been demonstrated that Habakkuk is a liturgy for temple presentation. To base the association of Habakkuk with the cult upon this hypothesis is to build the argument upon a theory that

¹⁰⁵BDB, p. 1038.

¹⁰⁶Ibid., in fairness it should be pointed out, however, that of seventy-two instances only two demand definition in terms of a place of confinement and, in addition, a different word (*משמר*) is more commonly used for "place of confinement, gaol, prison," ibid.

¹⁰⁷Rowley, "The Nature of Old Testament Prophecy In The Light of Recent Study," The Servant Of The Lord And Other Old Testament Essays, pp. 96ff.

has not, itself, been definitely established. If the book could be shown, beyond a shadow of a doubt, to be a liturgy then the argument would be greatly enhanced. Until this can be accomplished the argument must remain weak, to say the least.

Conclusion. Taking due consideration of both the positive and the negative arguments presented above, what conclusion may be validly drawn concerning the relationship of the prophet Habakkuk to the cult of Israel?

If the book of Habakkuk be assigned to the prophet,¹⁰⁸ then it seems probable that he was a cultic prophet connected with the Jerusalem temple although not necessarily a part of the temple staff. "Association with the cult" should not be equated with "absorption by the cult" and the prophet may quite likely have had cultic associations and at the same time have retained both his prophetic status and his independence from the organized form that the cult assumed.

This conclusion is presented without dogmatism, for the problem is of such nature that it cannot be resolved

¹⁰⁸ Albright, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," Studies In Old Testament Prophecy states concerning the entire book that he sees, "no valid reason why the book should not be treated as a substantial unit and dated between 605 and 589 B.C. . . . I repeat that want of space requires such an apodictic tone, since there are many archaeological, historical and literary arguments which may be adduced in support of the traditional chronology of the book."

without objections on the one side or the other. At the same time that this is presented, the recognition of certain weaknesses is expressed and a willingness to adjust the conclusion in the light of further evidence is made.¹⁰⁹

Summary

The investigation into the formation of the text of Habakkuk carried out in this chapter has indicated that (1) the book was written in imitation of a liturgy and (2) that, in all probability, Habakkuk was a cultic prophet associated with the Jerusalem temple.

As a result of these cultic associations, both on the part of the book and of the prophet, the text of Habakkuk was more likely to have been validly transmitted than had it arisen and developed in a non-cultic background. Consequently, one would expect the book to have been transmitted with a high degree of accuracy; suffering only the unavoidable errors of transmission plus possible minor alterations by the cultic personnel.

¹⁰⁹It is regrettable that a conclusion which may conceivably be misinterpreted in terms of indecision must be submitted. Such a conclusion is demanded by an honest examination of the evidences, however, for although one may amass evidence both for and against cultic associations of Habakkuk there remain points of strength on both sides that cannot be dismissed.

CHAPTER II

THE TRANSMISSION OF THE TEXT OF HABAKKUK

CHAPTER II

THE TRANSMISSION OF THE TEXT OF HABAKKUK

Once committed to written form, the text of Habakkuk faced, as did the remainder of the Scripture, a period of transmission often marked by both uncertainty and danger of corruption.

The degree of purity with which the original text survived this period of transmission is indeed questionable. Many feel that the years intervening (1) between the formation and the fixation of the text and (2) between the emergence of the fixed text and the era of the printed text, witnessed a transmission that at times obscured or obliterated the original text.

It is now universally admitted that the text of the Old Testament has not come down to us without mistake. Its absolute perfection and integrity are no longer upheld. Indeed, it requires no discernment or sagacity to perceive this fact. It is patent to the observation of everyone.¹

The traditional goal of lower criticism has been the restoration of the text to the form that it held when originally written down.² Although the quest for the

¹Samuel Davidson, A Treatise On Biblical Criticism, Exhibiting A Systematic View Of That Science (Vol. I, The Old Testament), p. 65.

²James Kennedy, An Aid To The Textual Amendment Of The Old Testament, p. 2.

recovery of the actual words of the prophet has often been forsaken, the search for the exact form of the original written text has proceeded with an abiding interest and zeal.³

There are two basic areas of approach necessary for the restoration of the original text.⁴ First, scribal errors must be noted and at times emendations made, although it should be remembered that:

. . . the instances where a purely conjectural emendation is advocated are comparatively infrequent, for, with some notable exceptions, he is very daring indeed who suggests an emendation without adequate support from some accepted source.⁵

Second, a minute examination of text transmission between the third century B.C. and the twelfth century A.D., plus the subsequent history of the text must be made. This particular emphasis has recently been singled out as the most important function of lower criticism.⁶

³Aage Bentzen, Introduction To The Old Testament, second edition, I, 95, "The goal of textual criticism can accordingly only be the reconstruction of different forms of tradition, fixed in writing." Also, ". . . it is not improbable that one 'original text' has never existed but only variants of the traditional books. In this connection the modern theories of the significance of oral tradition come in . . ."

⁴Bleddyn J. Roberts, The Old Testament Text And Versions, The Hebrew Text In Transmission And The History Of The Ancient Versions, p. 1.

⁵Ibid., p. xv.

⁶Ibid., p. 1.

A study of the text transmission of Habakkuk from the inception of the text to the present is therefore necessary before one can with a degree of finality establish the best possible text for the book. Consequently, the present chapter will be concerned with the examination of the history of text transmission, while the study of actual scribal errors and suggested emendations will follow in the further development of the thesis.

I. THE SOPHERIMIC ERA OF THE TEXT

The office of scribe (שֹׁפֵר) was not limited to Israel, for it was a phenomenon common to the entire Ancient Near East. Statuettes of scribes dating to the Third Dynasty have been discovered in Egypt,⁷ and the wealth of written material from other areas reveals the presence of scribal activity in these Near Eastern cultures as well.⁸

Within Israel itself, the scribe was eventually established as an exegetical authority whose prestige rested largely upon his "mastery of the minutae of the Word."⁹ This so-called "minutae" constitutes a valuable

⁷Jack Finegan, Light From The Ancient Past, p. 307. Cf. ibid., p. 102.

⁸Cf. James B. Pritchard, Ancient Near Eastern Texts.

⁹Roberts, op. cit., p. 30.

source for the pursual of textual studies and it is for this reason that an examination of the total ministry of the scribes (ספרים) is carried out below.

The Sopherim

Before the work of this group may be adequately assessed it is necessary to sketch a brief picture of the Sopherim themselves. What does the term mean? When did they work? Where did they work? These are questions the answers to which are necessary to place the Sopherim within a proper historical background.

The meaning of the term "Sopherim" (ספרים). The Sopherim, according to Roberts, "were the bearers of the tradition of the Scriptures."¹⁰ Agreement has generally been given to this definition of the broad function of the scribes,¹¹ although the precise meaning of the term ספרים has often been the center of controversy.

The Talmud designated these early students of the text as "Sopherim" (ספרים , Qal Active Participle of the verbal root, ספר) "because they reckoned every letter in the Torah."¹² According to this, the central activity

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹The Jewish Encyclopedia, XI, 123-26; W. H. Green, General Introduction To The Old Testament: The Text, p. 146.

¹²The Babylonian Talmud, "Qiddushin" 30.

of the "Sopherim" consisted in numbering or counting the letters of the Scripture.

In opposition to this emphasis upon the counting of letters as the characteristic function of the Sopherim, the root סָפַר has been considered as a denominative of the noun סֵפֶר. "I am not persuaded," states H. H. Rowley, "that the primary sense of the word סָפַר (sopher) had anything to do with counting. Certainly if it had, it lost that meaning altogether."¹³ In explanation of this position he proposed the theory that, "There is a second root, distinct from the Hebrew סָפַר (saphar)--count."¹⁴ This root is related to the Akkadian "saparu--send (a person, or a message),"¹⁵ and further that,

From Saparu there sprang sapiru, denoting primarily a commissioner, or representative, and sipru, meaning a written message. This latter appears to have been borrowed by the Hebrews in the form סָפַר (sepher)--writing, book, from which a denominative verb was then formed.¹⁶

Although there may be weaknesses in the arguments

¹³H. H. Rowley, "The Semitic Sources of 'Cipher' And Its Cognates," Werden Und Wesen Des Alten Testaments, eds. Paul Volz, Friedrich Stummer and Johannes Hempel, pp. 182-83.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 183.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 184.

¹⁶Ibid.

set forth by Rowley,¹⁷ his theory is supported by the more able lexicographers¹⁸ and it would seem that the denominative theory should be given priority. Hence, the meaning of the word stems not so much from the ministry of "counting," although this did take place, as it does from the fact that they were the handlers of the "book" or "message."

In the case of the first theory, the Sopherim were so called because they counted the letters within the text; in the latter case they are called Sopherim because of their concern and care for the "message" or "book."

Regardless of the attitude taken concerning the precise origin of the word, the Sopherim were men dedicated to the transmission of the text.¹⁹ To say that they received their name from their activity as "counters" certainly does not preclude other scribal activity; nor does the explanation of the name in terms of a denominative prevent the scribes from counting the letters of the text.

¹⁷This is evident in Rowley's theory that ". . . as the word cipher conceals beneath a single spelling two distinct words of separate origin, which reveal themselves in the two areas of meaning attached to the word, so here in Hebrew we have two separate roots, which have become confused because written with the same consonants." *Ibid.*, p. 181.

¹⁸Cf. BDB, pp. 707-8; Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *Lexicon In Verteris Testamenti Libros*, II, 665-66.

¹⁹Roberts, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

The date of the sopherimic era. When did the activity of the Sopherim begin and when did it come to an end? Through the years there has been a tendency for the dates assigned to the sopherim to fluctuate as the content of Old Testament scholarship has expanded.²⁰ The historical periods of the group often stand in marked contrast to one another in their delineation,²¹ and the establishment of exact dates is exceedingly difficult, if not impossible. The colors of the spectrum are easily distinguishable; yet, the exact point at which one color changes to another is most difficult to discern.²² The same is true of the fixation of dates for the Sopherim. One may distinguish between the sopherimic and the massoretic eras in a general way, but it is impossible to establish a specific date at which the one era passed into the other.²³

The most logical solution to this problem lies in

²⁰Cf. Bentzen, op. cit., p. 52, who places the rise of the Massoretes "as a consequence of the canonization of the texts ca. 100 A.D.," and Green, op. cit., p. 146, who extends the period of the scribes, "to the completion of the Talmud in the fifth century A.D."

²¹Ibid.

²²H. H. Rowley, "The Unity Of The Old Testament," Bulletin Of The John Rylands Library, XXIX (1945-46), 331.

²³Samuel Davidson, op. cit., p. 120. "We say perhaps, for both the beginning and end of the work can only be fixed arbitrarily . . ." Cf. Roberts, op. cit., p. 44.

an attempt to establish the approximate terminus a quo and terminus ad quem for the era but to abolish the idea of affixing dates to the exact year for either the sopherimic or the massoretic eras.

1. What evidences are available for the establishment of the terminus a quo of the sopherimic era?

First, archaeological discoveries illuminate the rise of the Sopherim and aid in the establishment of the terminus a quo. The Qumran Scrolls, especially 1QIsa, reflect an advanced activity on the part of the Sopherim.²⁴ The 1QIsa scroll has been dated ca. 100 B.C.,²⁵ and since the insertion of textual notes, changes to square characters, insertion of matres lectiones, final forms, etc. obviously was not done spontaneously; a rather lengthy period of time prior to 100 B.C. must be allowed for the accumulation of the body of scribal material present in the scroll. This would postulate a date of ca. 200 B.C. for the rise of the Sopherim as evidenced in 1QIsa and perhaps an even earlier date in the case of other scrolls and fragments.

Second, the highly developed office of scribe

²⁴Millar Burrows et al., The Dead Sea Scrolls Of St. Mark's Monastery, I, xv; cf. Millar Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 102ff.

²⁵Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 118.

indicated by Sirach argues for an early date for the rise of the Sopherim.²⁶ If the date of 200-175 B.C. be accepted for the date of Ben Sirach's book,²⁷ then the rise of the Sopherim would be driven back a number of years prior to this time since:

In Sirach, however, they [Sopherim] are an institution, for which a history must be assumed to bring it to the stage on which we find it there. The biblical scholars, students and teachers of the law written and unwritten, not only have attained great proficiency in their calling, but as a class have taken an independent place alongside the priesthood, in whose hands in older times was the law and its interpretation.²⁸

Third, Jewish tradition ascribed to Ezra the status of scribe²⁹ and he has subsequently been viewed as the progenitor of the Sopherim.³⁰ This would establish a date of

²⁶Sirach 39:lff., re the description of the ideal scribe.

²⁷G. H. Box and W. O. E. Oesterly, "Sirach," The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha Of The Old Testament, p. 293.

²⁸G. F. Moore, Judaism In The First Centuries Of The Christian Era: The Age Of The Tannim, I, 41.

²⁹Ezra 7:6, 10, 12; Neh. 8:1; cf. Roberts, op. cit., p. 30.

³⁰Green, op. cit., p. 148; Alfred S. Geden, Outlines Of Introduction To The Hebrew Bible, p. 89, "According to tradition, the Great Synagogue [Pirge Aboth i.17] was an assembly of wise men, said to have numbered one hundred and twenty, constituted by Ezra after the return from Babylon for the express purpose of maintaining the integrity of scriptural teaching and the preservation of the letter of the Law." Cf. R. T. Herford, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha Of The Old Testament, ed. R. H. Charles, p. 691. "No such permanent council can be shown to have existed; but the tradition is not wholly worthless."

as early as ca. the fifth century B.C. for the rise of the sopherimic group.

Fourth, the very fact that the text of the Scripture was transmitted implies that there must have been individuals who assumed this responsibility from the time that the text was formed. One is reminded of God's command to Isaiah to "bind up the testimony, seal the teaching among my disciples";³¹ or, the ministry of Baruch in the days of Jeremiah.³² Contemporary Old Testament scholarship has envisioned a teacher, or prophet, with a group of disciples gathered about him who transmitted his teachings³³ and although a developed school such as emerged in later times is not necessitated, it seems correct to see even in these instances the beginnings of a group of students committed to the transmission and preservation of the literature who were later to become known as "Sopherim."³⁴

³¹Isa. 8:16.

³²Jer. 36:4-6, 27-32.

³³O. Eissfeldt, "The Prophetic Literature," The Old Testament And Modern Study, pp. 126ff. Cf. Ivan Engnell, The Call of Isaiah, pp. 20ff.

³⁴Edward Robertson, "The Text of the O.T. And The Methods of Textual Criticism," Lectiones In Vetere Testamento Et In Rebus Judaicis, Lectio No. 1, p. 10, ". . . that a similar body existed or rather that the beginnings of the same body reached farther back in time, prior to Ezra when the crystallisation of the Pentateuch was not yet complete, is quite possible, and, indeed, probable."

One may definitely conclude, however, that at a period between the date ascribed to Ezra and the transcription of lQIsa there arose in Israel a group commonly referred to as Sopherim who had by about 200-150 B.C. so given themselves to the study of the text as to justify the status generally ascribed to them as "custodians of the sacred text."³⁵

2. Terminus ad quem

The terminus ad quem for the sopherimic era is quite difficult to establish since there was no specific date at which that era came to an end and the labors of the Massoretes began.³⁶ Although the initiation of the massoretic era, and consequently the conclusion of the sopherimic era, has been traditionally placed in the fifth to the sixth centuries A.D.,³⁷ it is doubtful if there was ever an abrupt change from the one group to the other.³⁸ It seems more likely that the Massoretes were simply an extension of the Sopherim and while the change of name is

³⁵Green, op. cit., p. 146.

³⁶Samuel Davidson, op. cit., p. 120.

³⁷Ibid., p. 152.

³⁸C. D. Ginsburg, Introduction To The Massoretico-Critical Edition Of The Hebrew Bible, p. 287, states that "the labours of the Massorites may be regarded as a later development and continuation of the earlier work which was carried on by the Sopherim . . ."

indicative of a change of function, it does not indicate the rise of a completely new and distinct group.³⁹

Those scholars who were concerned in earlier times with the text came to be known as Sopherim because of their concern for the text,⁴⁰ and as a consequence of their labors there grew up a mass of tradition, or massorah relating to its proper form. Once the problems that gave rise to the massorah had been solved, the primary effort of the group lay in the preservation of the traditions relating to textual changes. The basic area of activity now centered, not in correcting and adding to the text, but in the transmission of the results of earlier scholars.⁴¹

Just as earlier scholars had been called "Sopherim" because of the nature of their work, this same group later came to be called Massoretes because they were now concerned with the massorah (מסורה).⁴² The terms Sopherim and Massoretes do not, therefore, indicate the presence of two distinct groups of men but rather the same group designated by different names in separate periods of their history.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Supra, pp. 48ff.

⁴¹ Geden, op. cit., p. 87; Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 421, 422.

⁴² Roberts, op. cit., p. 44, "technically they were known as בְּעֵלֵי הַמְּסֹרָה."

The name Sopher gradually gave way to Massorete as the major function of the transmitter of the text changed.⁴³

The time at which this change of function gradually came about may be identified with the date for the establishment of the text. Once the Sopherim had accomplished their task as textual critics,⁴⁴ the text was placed in the hands of the Massorettes who were charged with the responsibility of preserving their work.

The words of the text . . . were now finally settled and passed over from the Sopherim or the redactors to the safe keeping of the Massorites. Henceforth the Massorites became the authoritative custodians of the traditionally transmitted text.⁴⁵

"The work of the massorettes," states Bentzen, "is a consequence of the canonization of the texts ca. 100 A.D."⁴⁶ A date of approximately the first century A.D. has generally been assigned to the emergence of the fixed text,⁴⁷ and in the light of this the massoretic era would have begun about this time although it should be remembered that the emergence of the Massorete was a gradual process occupying a

⁴³Cf. Edward Robertson, op. cit., pp. 16-17.

⁴⁴Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 307.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 421.

⁴⁶Bentzen, op. cit., p. 52.

⁴⁷R. H. Pfeiffer, Introduction To The Old Testament, p. 75; D. Winton Thomas, "The Textual Criticism Of The Old Testament," The Old Testament And Modern Study, ed. H. H. Rowley, p. 245.

number of years.⁴⁸

The exact date for the initiation of massoretic labors may not be determined with greater exactness than that mentioned above. The period of the first to the sixth centuries A.D. was a time of transition and evidence for the establishment of an exact date is exceedingly minute and inconclusive.⁴⁹ The Talmud makes reference to "Massorah,"⁵⁰ and although it is perhaps not to be interpreted as an advanced collection such as arose later, it does indicate that definite traditions had grown up concerning the text. Upon the basis of earlier discussion, one would assume that the Massoretes should closely follow the rise of these traditions or Massorah;⁵¹ yet, to further confuse the issue, when instructions for the handling of the text were given in the eighth century A.D.⁵² the

⁴⁸Although references to textual problems are raised, the Talmud makes no mention of a group known as "Massoretes" although it does mention the "Scribe" (Sopher). Cf. Makkoth 7b; Sanhedrin 3b-42.

⁴⁹Frants Buhl, Canon And Text Of The Old Testament, p. 79, "Whoever makes a study of the history of the Old Testament text must put up with very defective information in many directions."

⁵⁰Sanhedrin 3b-42; Makkoth 7b.

⁵¹Supra, pp. 56f.

⁵²The Jewish Encyclopedia, XI, 427. It should be remembered, however, that the VII century A.D. date is the date of final redaction.

tractate was entitled "Sopherim" in a period of time when it is unanimously believed that the Massoretes had come into power.⁵³

In conclusion it may be stated that the Sopherim had established themselves as the textual critics of the day by about 200-150 B.C. and that their labors extended down to a time between the first and fifth centuries A.D. when the Massoretes arose.

The center of sopherimic activity. Where did the Sopherim carry out their work concerning the scripture? Although the designation of geographical locations may be made in only a general way for the early period, in the era following the second Jewish rebellion under Bar-Choba⁵⁴ one may be more exact concerning these centers.

The Sopherim were concerned with text transmission, and undoubtedly carried out their endeavors at some place where they could gather together. Scribal activity centered in three areas (1) the synagogue school (2) the advanced school, or academy and (3) the called meetings of the Sopherim.⁵⁵

⁵³Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 421; Green, op. cit., p. 152; Bentzen, loc. cit.; Roberts, op. cit., p. 40; Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 88 et al.

⁵⁴Bentzen, loc. cit.

⁵⁵Moore, op. cit., 311-13.

Schools arose at an early date in the history of the Sopherim,⁵⁶ although their curriculum may have included only the teaching of the scripture since the scope of the scribe's activity was not limited to the examination of the text but was extended to the broader area of interpretation and teaching as well.⁵⁷ It does not follow, therefore, that the Sopherim of every school engaged in what would be called textual criticism, for the school was not necessarily concerned with text transmission; it may have differed only in emphasis from the elementary schools of today. It is more likely that this activity would have been carried out in connection with the advanced schools, or academies, than in the case of the synagogue schools.⁵⁸

Apart from the connection with the schools, the Sopherim likely assembled on other occasions:

It is probable that organized schools such as emerge in our sources shortly before the beginning of the

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 312, states, "It is fairly to be inferred that as early as the generation before the attempt of Antiochus IV on the Jewish religion, the school was an established institution."

⁵⁷The Jewish Encyclopedia, XII, 123f.; The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia Of Religious Knowledge, X, 307-9. Cf. The Babylonian Talmud which presents the Sopher largely in terms of interpreter.

⁵⁸This is assumed in the light of the more advanced nature of the academy over the synagogue school. The academy was of such stature to draw men from other countries. Cf. Moore, op. cit., p. 313.

Christian era were preceded at an earlier time by stated or occasional meetings of the Sopherim for study and discussions, the results of which were sometimes embodied in discussions or in rules promulgated by their authority.⁵⁹

These early group meetings of the Sopherim may well have formed the occasion for consultation concerning the text, although in this case the location for such meetings would not remain fixed but would perhaps change from time to time.

The specific locations of all schools are not readily available, but there were schools located throughout the Near East. There was a school located at Lydda that was famous after the destruction of the temple,⁶⁰ and in addition to this the Talmud locates the following schools:

Our Rabbis taught: "Justice, justice shalt thou follow." This means, Follow the scholars to their academies, e.g. R. Eliezer to Lydda, R. Johanan b. Zakkai to Beror Hail, R. Joshua to Peki'in, R. Mathia to Rome, R. Hanania b. Teradion to Sikni, R. Jose (b. Halaftha) to Sepphoris, R. Judah b. Bathyra to Nisibis, R. Joshua to the Exile, Rabbi to Beth She'arim, or the Sages to the chamber of hewn stones.⁶¹

Most of the emphasis prior to this point has been concerned with the activity of the Sopherim as centered in

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 311.

⁶⁰The Babylonian Talmud, "Sanhedrin," 32b, p. 204.

⁶¹Ibid., pp. 204-5.

Palestine but it should be remembered that there were scholastic centers in Babylonia as well.

Hillel had come to Palestine from Babylonia when already a mature man to study under the masters. He had, however, already been a student of the Law, and we are told that he brought with him from Babylonia certain definitions or interpretations . . .⁶²

Although he was not primarily concerned with transmission, it is significant to note that at the time of Hillel there were Babylonian schools and it is natural to conclude that there would have been a parallel emphasis upon interpretation and text transmission in these in Palestinian schools.

Within the first two centuries of the Christian era, the center of Judaistic activity shifted from Palestine to Babylonia. This has been attributed to (1) the triumph of the Christian faith in Palestine,⁶³ and (2) the disaster of the Bar-Choba rebellion of A.D. 132-135.⁶⁴

The leading schools of Babylonia were Neharda, Sura and, "after the destruction of Neharda in 259 A.D., Pumbedita."⁶⁵ There were other centers of learning in

⁶²Moore, op. cit., p. 313.

⁶³Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 88.

⁶⁴Bentzen, loc. cit., dates this insurrection A.D. 132-135.

⁶⁵Pfeiffer, loc. cit.

Babylonia⁶⁶ but the three mentioned above were the more prominent. This may be demonstrated by an examination of The Babylonian Talmud wherein Neharda is mentioned no less than 150 times, Sura 117 times and Pumbedita 113 times.⁶⁷ The frequency with which these cities were mentioned serves to indicate the position of importance that they held as Judaistic centers in Babylonia.

The Work Of The Sopherim

What constituted the area of work engaged in by the Sopherim? Without attempting to make an exhaustive study, the major functions of the group will be briefly sketched in order that their total ministry may be more properly understood.

Transmitters of the text. As has already been indicated, the Sopherim were concerned with the proper transmission of the scripture.⁶⁸ The complete absence of modern methods of reproduction necessitated the copying of each manuscript by hand, and

⁶⁶The Babylonian Talmud, "Nedarim" 78a refers to Mahuza and a school was also established at Nehaer Pekod.

⁶⁷The Babylonian Talmud, ed. I. Epstein, Index Vol., 273, 331, 402.

⁶⁸Cf. ante, p. 50.

The sofer was so indispensable that, according to R. Joshua b. Levi, the men of the Great Assembly observed twenty-four fast-days on which they prayed that the sopherim might not become rich and therefore unwilling to write.⁶⁹

It has been suggested that prophetic literature was orally transmitted following its formation;⁷⁰ yet, one of the more ardent supporters of the theory agrees that by ca. the fifth century B.C. the material was committed to written form,⁷¹ and another states that some of the material was no doubt committed to writing from the very beginning.⁷² Certainly by the time of the Sopherim the scripture was in written form and it was to the task of copying and correcting this material that the Sopherim gave themselves.

As transmitters of the text the Sopherim became the copyists and the correctors of the day.⁷³ One of the buildings at Qumran, "erected in the reign of John Hyrcanus

⁶⁹The Jewish Encyclopedia, XI, 124.

⁷⁰Eduard Nielsen, Oral Tradition, p. 39.

⁷¹Ibid.. "The Old Testament as 'written' literature may in all probability be ascribed to the period between the destruction of Jerusalem in 587 B.C. and the time of the Maccabees."

⁷²Engnell, op. cit., pp. 55-60.

⁷³Edward Robertson, op. cit., pp. 7ff.; Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 287ff.; Buhl, op. cit., pp. 195ff.; Geden, op. cit., p. 84; I. M. Price, The Ancestry of Our English Bible, second revised edition, W. A. Irwin and A. P. Wikgren, p. 19.

or Alexander Jannaeus,"⁷⁴ revealed an elaborate scriptorium where manuscripts were prepared,⁷⁵ and the Babylonian Talmud presents the work of copyist as a sopherimic function.⁷⁶

The Sopherim not only served as copyists but assumed the responsibility for the correction of completed manuscripts as well.⁷⁷ Robertson states that "when a scroll was completed it had to be carefully checked, and no Scroll of the Law was passed for public service until this was done."⁷⁸ All manuscripts were examined for errors and those that did not meet the specifications agreed upon as the standard for manuscript transcription⁷⁹ were destroyed

⁷⁴James L. Kelso, "The Archaeology of Qumran," J.B.L., LXXIV (September, 1955), 144.

⁷⁵Ibid., pp. 143-44; cf. H. H. Rowley, The Dead Sea Scrolls And Their Significance, p. 13.

⁷⁶The Jewish Encyclopedia, loc. cit., cf. also, Nedarim 37b-38a wherein the sopher is depicted as a transmitter of the text: "R. Isaac said: The textual reading, as transmitted by the Soferim, their stylistic embellishments (words), read (in the text) but not written, and words written but omitted in the reading are all halachah from Moses at Sinai . . ."

⁷⁷Roberts, op. cit., p. 39.

⁷⁸Edward Robertson, op. cit., p. 8.

⁷⁹D. R. Ap Thomas, A Primer Of Old Testament Text Criticism, pp. 12, 13, cites three sources for rules that evolved concerning writing, material, format, etc.: Masseketh Sepher Torah, Masseketh Sopherim, and Sopherim. Cf. Sir Frederick Kenyon, Our Bible And the Ancient Manuscripts, pp. 38ff., concerning copying of Hebrew manuscripts.

and new copies were made.⁸⁰ "Normally," states Roberts, such "manuscripts were to be taken to the correctors within thirty days of their completion."⁸¹

It was in this era of the transmission of the text that the Hebrew scripture became fixed. The exact part that the Sopherim had in the process is difficult to determine,⁸² but it is logical to assume that, as scholars charged with the responsibility of transmitting the text, they would have been instrumental in the fixation of that text.⁸³ The needs for a standard text were manifold and its accomplishment may be attributed to a number of factors.

First, the establishment of the public school throughout the country demanded that, "the greatest care was to be taken that the copies of the sacred books from which the Sopherim imparted instruction should be accurately written."⁸⁴

Second, the custom of reading the Pentateuch in triennial and annual pericopes in every Synagogue with the parallel passages from the prophets, plus the widespread use of the Psalter combined to demand a uniform text.

⁸⁰Robertson, loc. cit.

⁸¹Roberts, loc. cit.

⁸²Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 76.

⁸³Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 306.

⁸⁴Ibid., p. 304.

It would have occasioned the greatest confusion in the mind of the reader and indeed have shaken his faith, if the few verses which he had to read in one Synagogue exhibited one text, whilst the same portion which he should happen to read in another synagogue disclosed a different recension.⁸⁵

Third, the controversy with the Christians brought about a recognition for the need of a uniform and accepted text,⁸⁶ for it should be remembered that, "the attacks suffered by Judaism during the first century A.D. were the means of bringing about the strong movement which produced ultimately both the canon and the Massoretic Text . . ."⁸⁷

Fourth, the recognition on the part of Judaistic leaders that "the whole system of Jewish faith and practice rested on the authority of Scriptures . . . on the very letter of the sacred texts,"⁸⁸ led to the emergence of a standard text. They came to believe that Judaism "in every last detail had been divinely revealed in the canonical Scriptures and that no word or letter therein was devoid of significance."⁸⁹

These factors combined to bring about a standard

⁸⁵Ibid., p. 305.

⁸⁶Pfeiffer, op. cit., pp. 75-76.

⁸⁷Roberts, op. cit., p. 20.

⁸⁸Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 75.

⁸⁹Ibid., p. 76.

text and it has been generally agreed,⁹⁰ although with some opposition,⁹¹ that the Hebrew text became fixed about A.D. 100.

It is not to be understood, however, that the fixation of the text automatically eliminated competing texts. "Lacking official monopoly or oversight of manuscript reproduction, older and inexact types of text continued to be used for centuries."⁹² It has been stated that, "at no time in the history of the text had there ever been one archetype of the second century A.D., which was to be accepted or adopted by all Rabbis and scribes wherever they might be."⁹³ In spite of this, however, it should be emphasized that there was a definite movement toward the standardization of the text although it may have neither emerged without error nor achieved unanimous acceptance. The truth of the theory of a fixed text is adequately expressed in the conclusion reached by Roberts that,

There was a standardization of the text, perhaps before the time of our Lord, but more likely after

⁹⁰Ap Thomas, op. cit., p. 14; Price, op. cit., pp. 25-26; Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 75; Ap Thomas, op. cit., p. 245; Robert Gordis, The Biblical Text In The Making, pp. 44ff.; Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 306.

⁹¹Ap Thomas, op. cit., pp. 244-45.

⁹²Price, op. cit., p. 26; cf. Edward Robertson, op. cit., p. 18.

⁹³Roberts, op. cit., p. 29.

the fall of Jerusalem, and under the guidance of Rabbi Aqiba. But this text had numerous divergent readings and varying forms of orthography, morphology, and later, vocalization . . .⁹⁴

As a part of their function of accurately transmitting the text the Sopherim initiated the practice of counting the verses and letters within the text; an activity vitally connected with the valid transmission of the text.⁹⁵

Thus, they said the waw in gahon /Lev. 11:42/ marks half the letters of the Torah; darosh darash /Lev. 10:16/, half the words; we-hithggalah /Lev. 13:33/, half the verses. The boar out of the wood (mi-ya'or) doth ravage it /Ps. 80:14/: the 'ayin of ya'ar marks half of the Psalms. But he, being full of compassion, forgiveth their iniquity /Ps. 78:38/, half of the verses.⁹⁶

At first glance this practice might seem to reflect no more than an extreme adoration for the text itself; carried out by a "learned and leisured class";⁹⁷ yet serving little if any practical purpose.

The opposite is true, however, for the practice was instituted for the specific purpose of transmitting the text with as great a degree of accuracy as possible.

The middle verse and letter were obviously counted, not for curiosity, but for the guidance of an exact copyist, and it is in this sense that the Scribe is spoken of as having "fixed" the text.⁹⁸

⁹⁴Ibid.

⁹⁵Roberts, op. cit., p. 31; Edward Robertson, op. cit., p. 15.

⁹⁶The Babylonian Talmud, "Qiddushim" 30a.

⁹⁷Geden, op. cit., p. 84.

⁹⁸Roberts, loc. cit.

As a result of this activity the Sopherim were provided with a means for determining the degree of accuracy attained in copying a manuscript. If the location of the middle verse, letter, etc. in the scribe's manuscript did not match that of his exemplar, he had obviously miscopied the text.

It was primarily because of the activity of the Sopherim as transmitters of the text that the scripture was faithfully copied and handed down from one generation to another.

To the Jewish scholars and Rabbis for the anxious and unremitting care with which they have watched over the accuracy and preservation of their sacred Scriptures a great debt of obligation is due.⁹⁹

Textual critics of the day. "The Scribes did more than merely transfer the written text from one manuscript to another,"¹⁰⁰ however, and their activity must have included the correction or at least the notation of passages which they felt to be textually unsound.¹⁰¹ As critics of the text, the activities of this group found expression in a number of areas.

⁹⁹Geden, loc. cit.

¹⁰⁰Roberts, op. cit., p. 32.

¹⁰¹Ibid. Cf. Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 307ff.

1. Examination of questionable passages.

Passages of questionable validity, plus suggested variant readings, were carefully noted by the Sopherim.

Those passages whose correctness was deemed uncertain by the Sopherim were indicated by placing a small dot (puncta extraordinaria)¹⁰² over the letters in question. Fifteen such passages have been marked in this manner; ten in the Pentateuch¹⁰³ and five elsewhere.¹⁰⁴

Scholars have generally agreed that the passages were so marked because the scribe(s) felt some doubt concerning the validity of the text in question.¹⁰⁵ "These points are of supreme importance," states Ginsburg, "inasmuch as they exhibit the earliest result of textual criticism on the part of the scribes."¹⁰⁶

Although the correctness of the text was called into question by the Sopherim, their suspicions were not able to alter the text and "it was transcribed simply as

¹⁰²Roberts, loc. cit.

¹⁰³Num. 9:10; Gen. 16:5; 18:9; 19:33; 33:4; 37:12; Num. 21:30; 3:39; 29:15; Deut. 29:28. Cf. Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 82. "These dots mark words or passages which are textually, grammatically, or exegetically questionable."

¹⁰⁴II Sam. 19:20; Is. 44:9; Ezra 41:20; 46:22; Ps. 26:13. Cf. Pfeiffer, loc. cit.

¹⁰⁵Cf. Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 318ff.; Roberts, op. cit., pp. 32ff.; Pfeiffer, loc. cit.

¹⁰⁶Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 319.

it stood and the dots were used to express dissatisfaction with it."¹⁰⁷

2. At points within the text, the Sopherim also suggested variant readings and at other times indicated that the text under consideration assumed a form that was not normally expected.

Variant readings were indicated by the use of the Kethib and the Qere.¹⁰⁸ The Kethib was the word which was written in the text itself while the Qere was written in the margin of the text. The Qere was unpointed, its vowels having been placed beneath the Kethib,¹⁰⁹ and in actual practice the consonants of the Qere were to be read with the vowels beneath the Kethib.¹¹⁰ This practice led to the presence of a hybrid form in the text that was abnormal and unpronounceable¹¹¹ and as a result of this the original vowels of the text were lost inasmuch as they were displaced by the vowels of the Qere.¹¹²

The question of which of the two readings, the

¹⁰⁷Roberts, op. cit., p. 33, citing the suggestion of Kahle.

¹⁰⁸Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 183ff.

¹⁰⁹Geden, op. cit., p. 97.

¹¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹¹Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 183.

¹¹²Ibid., p. 184.

Kethib or the Qere, is to be preferred is highly debatable and unanimity of opinion among Old Testament scholarship has been generally lacking.¹¹³ It is sufficient to note here, however, that the Sopherim did place variant readings within the text; the questions of why they did so and whether the Qere is more acceptable than the Kethib are both irrelevant at this time.¹¹⁴

In addition to this, there was another method used to indicate variants; the use of "Severin" (סביריִם). The point at which the scribe felt the text could be improved upon was marked with the word סביר above the word or the phrase in question.¹¹⁵ The סביר has been equated with the Qere in importance and has been viewed "not simply as an alternative reading, but . . . was actually the received reading of the Babylonians."¹¹⁶

On the other hand, the סביר has been interpreted as no more than a means of noting that the text at that particular point assumed an unexpected form.

¹¹³Ibid., pp. 183-84.

¹¹⁴Cf. Gordis, op. cit., who gives a thorough examination of the entire problem of Kethib and Qere.

¹¹⁵Roberts, op. cit., p. 36; cf. Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 187ff.

¹¹⁶Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 189.

So, for example, the preposition על in Gen. 49.13 has the accompanying mark עך סביר i.e. "עך is to be expected", or, in other words, על has here the significance of עך.¹¹⁷

In all of these cases, the use of (1) the dot (2) the Kethib Qere and (3) the Sebir, each served to indicate that the Sopherim expressed doubt concerning certain portions of the text and at times suggested variant or alternative readings for these questionable passages.

3. Emendation of the text.

As textual critics the Sopherim not only noted questionable passages and listed variants but at times actually emended the text.¹¹⁸ This was not a general practice, for although alternate readings were quite often inserted in the margin or indicated in some other manner, actual changes in the received text were generally avoided.

There are eighteen passages in the Old Testament that are supposed to have been emended by the Sopherim,¹¹⁹ although no notice of this change is given in the text and

¹¹⁷Roberts, loc. cit.

¹¹⁸Geden, op. cit., pp. 99f.

¹¹⁹(1) Gen. 18:22; (2) Num. 11:15; (3) 12:12; (4) I Sam. 3:13; (5) II Sam. 16:12; (6), (7), (8) II Sam. 20:1; (9) Jer. 2:11; (10) Ezra 8:17 (11) Hos. 4:7; (12) Hab. 1:12; (13) Zech. 2:12; (14) Mal. 1:13; (15) Ps. 106:20; (16) Job 7:20; (17) Job 32:3; (18) Lam. 3:20. Cf. Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 347-63.

the location of such emendations is dependent upon information gleaned from Rabbinic commentaries and Massoretic works.¹²⁰

These emendations have been designated as "Tikkun Sopherim" (תקוני הסופרים) and deal with,

. . . attempts to avoid anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms, and, as a rule, consist of a change of suffix in order to avoid a direct reference to God, and so incur the danger of blasphemy.¹²¹

In light of the scrupulous care with which the text was guarded, such emendations come as a surprise,¹²² but have been justified at times by the theory that the authors of the text had abandoned the true meaning and that it consequently remained for the Sopherim to register what was "really intended."¹²³

On the other hand, the validity of the supposed emendations has been soundly denied and described as "a Midrashic fancy; an ambiguous phrase; a misinterpretation . . ."¹²⁴ At the conclusion of his survey of the problem

¹²⁰Roberts, op. cit., p. 35.

¹²¹Ibid., p. 34.

¹²²W. Emery Barnes, "Ancient Corrections In the Text Of The Old Testament (Tikkun Sopherim)," J.T.S., I (1900), 387.

¹²³Buhl, op. cit., p. 103.

¹²⁴Barnes, loc. cit.

of the *tikkun Sopherim*, Barnes stated, "the *tikkun* tradition is not Masoretic (i.e. textual), but Midrashic (i.e. exegetical or, more accurately homiletic)."¹²⁵ More recent scholars have retained emendation as a sopherimic function in the cases mentioned above, however, and continue to accept the validity of the *tikkun Sopherim*.¹²⁶

4. Omissions from the text.

As a part of their effort to purify the text, omissions were sometimes made by the scribes.

One such omission, referred to as the *טורר סופרים*, or the omissions of the scribes, is mentioned in The Babylonian Talmud,¹²⁷ and indicates that the "words in question are to be read without the Vav conjunctive."¹²⁸ The number of passages included are indefinite and the attempt to limit them to four or five words is an error, inasmuch as they but serve as typical examples of the practice.¹²⁹

In addition to this, there are five instances mentioned wherein a word has been written but is to be

¹²⁵Ibid., p. 413.

¹²⁶Cf. Roberts, op. cit., pp. 34ff.; Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 84; Roberts, op. cit., p. 35 cites Kahle as a supporter of the validity of the emendations.

¹²⁷The Babylonian Talmud, "Nedorim," 37b. Cf. Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 308ff.; Roberts, op. cit., pp. 35ff.

¹²⁸Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 308.

¹²⁹Ibid., pp. 308-9.

omitted in reading. These words have erroneously crept into the text and must be cancelled.¹³⁰ The omissions concern the particle **וְ**, the presence or absence of the definite article, cases of dittography and the particle **אֲשֶׁר**.¹³¹

Ginsburg cites II Kings 5:18, Jer. 32:11; 51:3; Ezek. 48:12 and Ruth 3:12 as examples of this practice, and at the same time warns that, "the Talmud does not fix the number of these . . . expressions, but simply leaves us to regard them as typical instances."¹³²

Concerning the significance of both of these omissions, it has been stated that while "None of these alterations appears to be of much moment . . . they indicate the close study given to the text by the scribes."¹³³

Omissions also took the form of the removal of indelicate expressions or obscenities from the text. These omissions were made without changing the outward form of the text by prescribing a euphemistic expression which was to be read in place of the objectionable word or phrase.¹³⁴ Directions for such omissions are to be

¹³⁰Ibid., pp. 316-17.

¹³¹Ibid., pp. 316-18.

¹³²Ibid., p. 318.

¹³³Edward Robertson, loc. cit.

¹³⁴Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 85.

found in The Babylonian Talmud¹³⁵ and the following instances are illustrative of this practice:

. . . "to lie" (with a woman) instead of "to ravish" (Deut. 28:30; later lists /Qere/ include Is. 13:16 Jer. 3:2; Zech. 14:2); boils associated with unnatural sexual practices, changed to hemorrhoids (Deut. 28:27; cf. qere in I Sam. 5:6, 9, 12; 6:4f.); an unknown word denoting some unpalatable food (or, according to A. Geiger, human excrements), changed to dove's dung (II Kings 6:25); excrements, changed to a less vulgar word of the same meaning (II Kings 18:27; Is. 36:12), and similarly in the case of "backhouses" (II Kings 10:27); urine, changed to "water of the legs" (18:27; Is. 36:12) . . .¹³⁶

In addition to the indelicate or obscene expressions, the Sopherim also removed impious expressions directed toward God.

This practice is depicted in the sopherimic treatment of II Sam. 12:14; ". . . by this deed you have utterly scorned the Lord," (R.S.V.). The Massoretic Text gives כִּי-נִאָמַרְתָּ נֹאצָה אֶת-אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה and may be literally translated, "scorning you have scorned the enemies of Yahweh . . ." although David had scorned or blasphemed, not his enemies, but the Lord by his conduct. The phrase, "You have scorned (blasphemed) the Lord," was softened by the insertion of the words, "enemies of." Because of this activity on the part of the Sopherim, the original reading, ". . . you have

¹³⁵Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 346, who quotes the entire Talmudic reference.

¹³⁶Pfeiffer, loc. cit.

scorned Yahweh" became, "You have scorned the enemies of Yahweh."¹³⁷ Rashi supports this theory with his statement that, "this is an alteration due to the reverence for the glory of God."¹³⁸

The story of Jezebel and Naboth in I Kings also illustrates this practice. Jezebel has instructed two men to testify that Naboth had "blasphemed" both God and the King; yet, the Massoretic Text reads, "You blessed (ברך) God and the king."¹³⁹ Ginsburg denies that the word ברך carries the additional meaning of "to renounce, to blaspheme, to curse, etc.," and states that the Sopherim have actually substituted the word ברך for קלל (to curse) in order to avoid an impious expression toward God.¹⁴⁰

These omissions, indelicate expressions or obscenities and the removal of impious statements toward God, were produced largely by "a deepening consciousness of the holiness and transcendence of God,"¹⁴¹ and had they not been omitted would have been deemed, "offensive to the ears of devout

¹³⁷Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 363-67.

¹³⁸Ibid., p. 364, citing Rashi.

¹³⁹I Kings 21:10, 13; cf. Ginsburg, ibid., pp. 366-67.

¹⁴⁰Ibid. Ginsburg would treat Job 1:5, 11; 2:5, 9 in the same manner as I Kings 21:10, 13 and Ps. 10:3; ברך יהוה has been substituted for נא יהוה, ibid., pp. 365-67.

¹⁴¹Edward Robertson, op. cit., p. 12.

worshippers when the scriptures were read publicly before the congregation."¹⁴²

5. Additions to the text.

The Sopherim not only omitted certain parts of the text, but at times made additions to it as well. Reference has already been made to instances in which they suggested variant readings and in that manner added to the text,¹⁴³ but there remain other scribal additions which were written into the manuscript.

There are a number of instances in the text of the Old Testament where different letters are suspended above a word or phrase.¹⁴⁴ These suspended letters were added to the text by the Sopherim and are but another method used to indicate variations within the different schools.¹⁴⁵

The account of the wandering young Levite who became priest in the house of Micah¹⁴⁶ well illustrates the purpose of the Sopherim in suspending these letters above the word within the text.

Five spies of the tribe of Dan stole the ephod,

¹⁴²Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 363.

¹⁴³Ante, pp. 72ff.

¹⁴⁴Judg. 18:30; Ps. 80:14; Job 38:13, 15; Cf. Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 335ff.

¹⁴⁵Ibid., p. 334.

¹⁴⁶Judg. 17:1-18:31.

the teraphim and the images from the house of Micah and persuaded Jonathan to accompany them and become their priest; he did so and became known as the first priest of idolatry.¹⁴⁷ This same Jonathan is identified as the grandson of Moses¹⁴⁸ and the fact that "the grandson of the great lawgiver should be the first priest of idolatry was considered both degrading to the memory of Moses and humiliating to the national susceptibilities."¹⁴⁹ As a result the Sopherim altered the text so that it would read Manasseh rather than Moses. This was accomplished, not by changing the text itself, but by suspending a nun above the word Moses (מֹשֶׁה) with the result that the Massoretic Text on Judges now reads Manasseh, not Moses.¹⁵⁰ If this text be accepted, it was the grandson of Manasseh the evil king and not the grandson of Moses the lawgiver who disgraced his nation.

In addition to the suspended letters, there are nine instances of an inverted nun suspended above the

¹⁴⁷Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 335.

¹⁴⁸Ibid.

¹⁴⁹Ibid., Ginsburg also states that it is for this reason that Jonathan is omitted from the family register in I Chron. 23:15, 16 and 26:24. Ibid., p. 337.

¹⁵⁰Biblia Hebraica, ed. R. Kittel; Judg. 18:30.

line of the Hebrew text.¹⁵¹ These inverted letters are designed to indicate that the passages so marked are transposed and in this function serve as modern brackets.¹⁵²

"The Siphra on Numb.X 35 emphatically declares that 'these two verses are marked at the beginning and at the end to show that this is not their proper place.'¹⁵³ Two of the nine examples of the inverted nun are found in Num. 10:35; the other seven are found in Ps. 107:23-28, 39, but the exact places where transposition has taken place are difficult to find in Ps. 107 since:

though the best MSS. and the Massorah distinctly mark the verses in question with the sign of dislocation, neither the Talmudic authorities nor the ancient Versions give us any indication as to where the proper place is for the bracketed sections.¹⁵⁴

Ginsburg indicates that there were perhaps other instances of the critical use of the nun,¹⁵⁵ and also implies that the Massoretes were quite anxious to "obliterate all the early traces of critical signs as to the condition

¹⁵¹Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 341ff. These should not be confused with the pendant] discussed above in connection with Judg. 18:30.

¹⁵²Ibid., p. 342. Num. 10:35 and Ps. 107:23-28, 29 are the only passages so marked. Num. 10:35 has two inverted nuns while the remaining seven are found in Ps. 107.

¹⁵³Ibid.

¹⁵⁴Ibid., p. 343.

¹⁵⁵Ibid., p. 345.

of the text."¹⁵⁶

Whatever one may conclude concerning the intrinsic value of the letters that have been added, they nonetheless serve to indicate a willingness on the part of the Sopherim to make additions to the text in an effort to establish its acceptability.

In conclusion, it has been found that the Sopherim functioned as textual critics of the day and that in this capacity they (1) noted questionable passages and made suggested emendations (2) emended the text (3) omitted parts of the text and (4) made certain additions to the text.

Regulators of the outward form of the text. In addition to their function as transmitters and critics of the text, the Sopherim were also instrumental in the emergence of the format assumed by the Old Testament;¹⁵⁷ divisions were made within the text, the shape of the consonants was fixed, and certain consonants were inserted as "vocalic consonants (also Matres Lectiones)."¹⁵⁸

1. Divisions within the text.

The text of the Old Testament was divided into

¹⁵⁶Ibid.

¹⁵⁷Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 9ff.

¹⁵⁸A. B. Davidson, An Introductory Hebrew Grammar, p. 11.

both sectional and liturgical divisions; the former were made at the natural or logical breaks within the text, comparable to the modern use of the paragraph,¹⁵⁹ while the latter were made for the purpose of delimiting a specified amount of material that was to be read in a limited amount of time as a part of the religious life of the people.¹⁶⁰

The earliest of the sectional divisions was that of the subdivision of the Hebrew books into verses and synagogue lessons.¹⁶¹ The practice of versicular division originated in "the practice of reading successively brief sections of the Hebrew Scriptures in the Synagogue and translating each into Aramaic."¹⁶² Such divisions within the text were preserved by placing a silluk (|) beneath the last word of each verse and a "soph pasuk" (:) at the

¹⁵⁹Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 81. As a necessary prerequisite to the division of larger sections, the Sopherim had divided the consonants into words. Cf. Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 296-97.

¹⁶⁰With the exception of Gen. 47:28 the annual liturgical divisions coincide with the sectional, or natural divisions. Cf. Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 66.

¹⁶¹Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 80. It should be noted, however, that Roberts places versicular division after the paragraph divisions, op. cit., p. 37. Cf. Ludwig Blau, "Massoretic Studies," J.Q.R., IX, No. 33 (1896), 122, ". . . the Parashah, are therefore of greater age than the latter, Pesukim . . ."

¹⁶²Blau, loc. cit.

conclusion of the verse.¹⁶³

Despite the care exercised by the Sopherim, however, different traditions prevailed concerning the proper verse division of the text,¹⁶⁴ and "it is expressly stated that a Torah scroll which has been divided into verses cannot be used for religious worship in the synagogue."¹⁶⁵

Apart from versicular division, the Sopherim further divided the text into sections marked off according to sense, or paragraphs.¹⁶⁶ These divisions are referred to by the terms "Setuma" (סְתוּמָה), or closed, and "Pethuach" (פְּתוּחָה) or open sections.¹⁶⁷ It is sufficient to note here that the "Pethuach" (פְּתוּחָה) was separated from the preceding material by a greater amount of space than was the "Setuma" (סְתוּמָה);¹⁶⁸ it was thus an open section by

¹⁶³Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 68; Roberts, op. cit., p. 37. Roberts follows Kahle in the conclusion that the verses were originally marked off at the beginning of the verses. Geden, op. cit., p. 136, dates the *soph pasuk* as a late introduction and states that it is not found in the rolls for use in the synagogues.

¹⁶⁴Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 69. The middle verse of the Pentateuch is variously held to be Lev. 13:33, 8:8 and 8:23.

¹⁶⁵Roberts, op. cit., p. 37.

¹⁶⁶Ibid., pp. 36-38; Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 81. Cf. Burrows, "Isaiah," The Dead Sea Scrolls Of St. Mark's Monastery.

¹⁶⁷Roberts, op. cit., cf. Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 9ff.

¹⁶⁸Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 9 for a more detailed study of the two types of division.

virtue of the amount of space which intervened between it and the prior section.

Such paragraph divisions were often designated by the letters D and E to indicate the closed and the open sections, but this is a late practice¹⁶⁹ and the determination of the particular classification of the section was ordinarily left to the initiative of the reader.¹⁷⁰

In addition to the division of the text into its sectional or natural divisions, it was also divided into liturgical sections for use in worship.

The heart of the devotional life of the synagogue lay in the reading of the Torah plus selected passages from the Prophets and the Hagiographa;¹⁷¹ each Sabbath witnessed the reading of this particular combination of passages from the Scripture.¹⁷²

In order to facilitate such liturgical usage of the Scriptures, the text was divided into weekly lessons; the Babylonian centers dividing the Torah into annual pericopes of fifty-four lessons referred to as "Parashiyoth" (פרשיות)¹⁷³

¹⁶⁹Ibid., p. 10.

¹⁷⁰Ibid., pp. 9-10.

¹⁷¹Roberts, op. cit., p. 38.

¹⁷²Pfeiffer, op. cit., pp. 81, 82.

¹⁷³Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 66-67.

while the Palestinian synagogues divided the same amount of material into triennial pericopes of 154 lessons referred to as "Sedarim" (סִדְרִים).¹⁷⁴ In the course of time, the Babylonian method of division prevailed over that of the Palestinian schools¹⁷⁵ with the result that, "The 'Sedarim' which exhibit the more ancient division of the text have been totally ignored in most MSS."¹⁷⁶

2. The shape of the consonants.

The shape that the consonants of the text assumed was also determined during this era and in all probability the Sopherim were instrumental in this process.¹⁷⁷ Prior to this time the consonants had been written in a more ancient form¹⁷⁸ and it was not until the era of the Sopherim that they assumed the square or angular shape often referred to as "Babylonian."¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁴Ibid., pp. 32ff.

¹⁷⁵Ibid., p. 32.

¹⁷⁶Ibid.

¹⁷⁷Ibid., p. 287, states that "the gradual substitution of the square characters for the so-called Phoenician or archaic Hebrew alphabet was one of the first tasks [of the Sopherim]."

¹⁷⁸Cf. ibid., p. 288, who calls attention to the fact that Jewish tradition ascribed the square, or "Assyrian," characters to Ezra, the Torah having been given in "Hebrew" characters.

¹⁷⁹Geden, op. cit., p. 42.

Various reasons have been suggested for this change of shape on the part of the consonants. Foremost among these are the factors of calligraphy and tacygraphy; calligraphy being the tendency to aim at regularity and uniformity for the purpose of adding to the beauty of the text, whereas tacygraphy has reference to the attempt to achieve both rapidity and ease of writing.¹⁸⁰

It has also been indicated that the square letters represent a Babylonian influence exerted upon Palestine in the following manner,

. . . the completion of the change was hastened by the Maccabaeen wars; new codices, to replace those lost or destroyed, would be brought from Babylonia, and, being written in the square character, served to familiarise the people with the new forms.¹⁸¹

The transition to the square character was more than likely brought about because of a combination of factors, however, rather than through any single influence or cause. Although Babylonian influence, from the Exile forward, may have been a determining factor it is not unreasonable to suppose that the change was due to a natural evolution of Hebrew script.¹⁸²

¹⁸⁰ Samuel Davidson, op. cit., pp. 28-29.

¹⁸¹ Geden, op. cit., p. 43. It should be noted, however, that the Qumran scrolls utilize the "square" consonants yet, some of them antedate the Maccabaeen wars.

¹⁸² Samuel Davidson, op. cit., p. 28, indicates that "the square character . . . passed to the Hebrews . . . not

Obviously, the change had been completed by the time of Jesus' reference to the yodh as the smallest letter¹⁸³ since it was not so classified in the older script.¹⁸⁴ At the same time, the discovery of scrolls embodying the square character and ante-dating the Christian era indicates that this form of writing had gained acceptance as early as about the second century B.C.¹⁸⁵

The terminus ad quem for this transition may, then, be dated at a time coeval with the Palestinian scrolls, in other words, about second century B.C.

Two factors constitute an approximate terminus a quo for the transition to the new letters. First, the Samaritan Pentateuch retains the old script and if the division between the Samaritans and the Jews be dated about 430 B.C.¹⁸⁶ it would seem that in the era immediately prior to this the Pentateuch of both groups utilized the

by any instantaneous or sudden exchange of one character for another, but gradually and insensibly, amid the pressure of circumstances. Time, art, and culture contributed to its formation."

¹⁸³Mt. 5:18.

¹⁸⁴Geden, loc. cit.

¹⁸⁵Cf. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 118, who identifies the St. Mark's Isaiah scroll as the oldest of the more or less complete scrolls and dates it about 100 B.C.

¹⁸⁶Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 296.

older script. Second, the Leviticus fragments discovered among the Palestinian scrolls utilizes the old, or Paleo Hebrew, script.¹⁸⁷ The fragments have been dated "in the second half of the fifth century B.C.E."¹⁸⁸ and indicate that the Jewish scribes were still using the older script in the fifth century B.C.

Consequently, at a period between ca. 450 B.C. and ca. 200 B.C. the transition to the square characters was effected. In agreement with this, yet dating the transition point more specifically, Birnbaum after dating the Leviticus fragments in the second half of the fifth century B.C. stated that ". . . the scroll of which the Leviticus Fragments formed a part belonged to the final period when Paleo-Hebrew was in use."¹⁸⁹

At a time subsequent to the introduction of the square type of characters the Sopherim began to write certain letters in a different manner when final than when initial or medial (ך as ך , ם as ם , ן as ן , ף as ף , ץ as ץ).¹⁹⁰ Such practice arose out of the desire on the part of the Sopherim "to indicate more definitely the

¹⁸⁷Solomon Birnbaum, "The Leviticus Fragments From The Cave," B.A.S.O.R., CXVIII (1950), 20ff.

¹⁸⁸Ibid., p. 27.

¹⁸⁹Ibid.

¹⁹⁰Cf. Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 297ff.

separation of some words and especially biliteral particles $\lceil \text{מא}, \text{אן}, \text{אן}, \text{מ}, \text{אן} \rceil$ ¹⁹¹ which were more liable to be read together with other vocables."¹⁹²

In addition to the basic shape of the characters, the Sopherim varied the format of the text in another respect insofar as the consonants themselves were concerned. This was accomplished through the use of both "majuscular" and "minuscular" letters,¹⁹³ the consonants being either enlarged or made smaller than normal.¹⁹⁴

The enlargement of letters occurred in Gen. 1:1, the first letter of the Torah¹⁹⁵ and of other books plus the enlargement of the Shema in Deut. 6:4.¹⁹⁶

The reduction of letters may be found "in Gen. 2.4; 30.18 and Lev. 6.2 where they indicate a variant reading; and in Gen. 23.2; 27.46, where they show the insertion of a letter."¹⁹⁷

¹⁹¹Ibid., Ginsburg cites these particles in a footnote to his own work.

¹⁹²Ibid.

¹⁹³Roberts, op. cit., pp. 47ff.

¹⁹⁴Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 672, notes that Appendix number two of MS Oriental 2201 contains "alphabetical lists of the majuscular and minuscular letters in the Bible."

¹⁹⁵Roberts, op. cit., pp. 45f.

¹⁹⁶Ibid., p. 46.

¹⁹⁷Ibid.

It appears certain that both the literae majusculae and the literae minusculae were used at those points that the Sopherim felt for some reason should be called to the attention of the reader.

3. Matres Lectiones.

Although all of the Semitic alphabets originally consisted of consonantal signs only, "in the course of time the need, or at least the desirability, of expressing in some way the vowels of a word came to be felt."¹⁹⁸

This need was met by the insertion of certain weak (ך, ם, ן, ף) consonants within the text to represent the particular vowels.¹⁹⁹ Because of this unusual usage of the consonants they were at times referred to as "vowel letters," "vocalic consonants" or matres lectiones.²⁰⁰

Every vowel within the text was not indicated by

¹⁹⁸ A. B. Davidson, op. cit., p. 10.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid. Cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, Hebrew Grammar, second Eng. edition, pp. 36ff. "The need of a written indication of the vowel first made itself felt in cases where, after the rejection of a consonant, or of an entire syllable, a long vowel formed the final sound of the word," ibid., p. 36. It should be noted, however, that the use of ך states A. B. Davidson, ". . . may be here ignored [in discussing the use of consonants in vocalization], as it is rare and late. Such a form as ךָ for qam (he arose) is extremely rare," op. cit., p. 10. Gesenius-Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 37, contradicts this, however, for ךָ, ךָ, ךָ and ךָ are cited as "instances of the retention of an originally consonantal ך as a vowel letter."

²⁰⁰ A. B. Davidson, op. cit., p. 11.

a vowel letter, however, for "it is an almost invariable usage that the merely tone long vowel does not have consonantal representation."²⁰¹ Neither was the insertion of these consonants carried out consistently; Ginsburg has stated that the insertion or the omission of the matres lectiones was carried out according to the "idiosyncrasy of the Scribes."²⁰²

While the Sopherim undoubtedly did have a great deal of freedom in the use of the matres lectiones, there is yet another factor that must be considered before one can accept "en toto" the idea that these inconsistencies are due solely to the idiosyncracies of the Sopherim.

It must be remembered that before the system of representing vowels by consonants could be fully developed the text was fixed and further additions could not be made. After this, a scribe inserting a vowel letter would be creating a non-massoretic codex; hence, the use

²⁰¹Ibid., p. 12. Cf. p. 11 also for "in the few cases where this [use of vowel letters to indicate tone long vowels] happens, it is considered an anomaly and attention is called to it in a footnote to the Hebrew text . . . this, too, is imminently reasonable, that the vowels deserving consonantal representation are those which, like the consonants, form an integral and immovable part of the word."

²⁰²Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 137.

of the consonants \aleph , η , ι and \daleth did not reach their full development.²⁰³ Had they been allowed to develop fully, the number of inconsistencies would likely have been greatly reduced, if not eliminated.

This practice on the part of the Sopherim dates to a time coeval with if not prior to the date assigned to lQIsa since this particular scroll reveals the use of the matres lectiones in both medial and final positions.²⁰⁴ How far prior to this time one may date the origin of the vocalic consonants is difficult to determine since no other group of manuscripts so large and so ancient as the Qumran material is available for comparison. In the light of the examples drawn from both the Mesha and the Siloam inscriptions by Gesenius,²⁰⁵ however, it would seem that the retention of consonants as vowel letters may have arisen at a quite early period.²⁰⁶

The Sopherim, therefore, also functioned as regulators of the outward form of the text and in this capacity

²⁰³Cf. A. B. Davidson's discussion of the coalition of the massoretic and textual vocalization, op. cit., pp. 19-20.

²⁰⁴Roberts, op. cit., p. 16.

²⁰⁵Gesenius-Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 37.

²⁰⁶The testimony of Gesenius concerning the Siloam and Mesha inscriptions is not sufficient to establish such usage as early as the dates ascribed to these finds, however, and the earliest extensive group of documents available for this study are the Palestinian Scrolls.

made both natural and liturgical divisions within the text, determined the shape of the consonants and initiated the practice of using certain consonants to represent the basic vowel sounds. It was largely because of this interest and activity on their part that the text assumed the basic form in which it has come down to contemporary times.

Theologians and teachers. In addition to their function as transmitters of the text, textual critics and regulators of the format of the text the Sopherim were cast in yet a fourth role; that of the theologians and the teachers of the day.²⁰⁷ As exegetes and teachers they assumed a place of influence and power in the life of Judaism and their pronouncements and interpretations were looked upon as authoritative; a fact that largely accounts for their right to attempt the correction of the text. This authority on the part of the Sopherim is indicated in the fact that,

Greater stringency applies to (the observance of) the words of the Scribes than to (the observance of) the words of the written Law. If a man said, There is no obligation to wear phylacteries so that he transgresses the words of the Law, he is not culpable; (but if he said), There should be in them five portions, so that he adds to the words of the Scribes, he is culpable.²⁰⁸

²⁰⁷Moore, op. cit., I, 313.

²⁰⁸Herbert Danby, The Mishnah: Translated From The Hebrew With Introduction And Brief Explanatory Notes, p. 400, citing Sanhedrin 11.3.

As contemporary theologians, the interest of the Sopherim was at times manifested in such a manner as to affect the transmission of the text of the Old Testament. Characterized by a concern for the theological purity of the text, they at times made changes within the text in order to (1) protect the divine name (2) safeguard the unity of divine worship at Jerusalem and (3) remove the application of the names of false gods to Yahweh.²⁰⁹ The first of these three changes will be considered at this point as an example of the manner in which the theological interest of the Sopherim influenced the transmission of the text.

"The awe manifested for the Tetragrammaton has played an important part in the redaction of the text,"²¹⁰ states Ginsburg, and the protection of the name was accomplished in a variety of ways.

When written alone, the word יהוה was pointed with the vowels of אֲדֹנָי; when it followed אֱלֹהִים the word was pointed with the vowels of אֱלֹהֵי־ם and in both instances the name was not pronounced as "Yahweh" but as "Adonai" (Lord) or "Elohim" (God).²¹¹

²⁰⁹Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 367ff.

²¹⁰Ibid., p. 367.

²¹¹Ibid., pp. 367-68.

In a further attempt to protect the sanctity of the divine name, the name יהוה was at times replaced completely by either אדני or אלהים. This is clearly illustrated by a comparison of the parallel passages found in II Sam. 5:9-25 and I Chron. 14:8-17. In Samuel the name יהוה has been retained while the Chronicler has substituted the name אלהים; this is done despite the fact that the passages are exact duplicates except for the names ascribed to Yahweh.²¹²

Another practice carried out in an effort to protect the name of God consisted of the removal of the ה from proper names beginning with יהו, since they would sound like יהוה if the ה should remain.²¹³ The accompanying chart should clearly illustrate this practice on the part of a number of the Sopherim.

It should be remembered, however, that this was not a universal practice and that "the alterations were only partially carried out and in most cases the primitive orthography has survived."²¹⁴ This practice does show, however, that there was a willingness on the part of the Sopherim to make textual adjustments in the light of their concern for the theological purity of the text.

²¹²Ibid., p. 368.

²¹³Ibid., pp. 369ff.

²¹⁴Ibid., p. 369.

THE CHANGE OF SPELLING IN PROPER NAMES
IN ORDER TO PROTECT THE NAME OF GOD²¹⁵

Recorded Spelling Of Name			Numerical Differences		
Name	Original	Altered	Original	Altered	Total
Jehoachaz	יהואחז	יואחז	20	4	24
Jehoash	יהואש	יואש	17	47	64
Jehozabad	יהוזבד	יוזבד	4	10	14
Jehohanan	יהוחנן	יוחנן	9	24	33
Jehoiada	יהוידע	יוידע	42	5	47
Jehoiachin	יהויכין	יויכין	10	1	11
Jehoiachim	יהויקים	יויקים	37	4	41
Jehoiarib	יהויריב	יויריב	2	5	7
Jehonadab	יהונדב	יונדב	8	7	15
Jehonathan	יהונחן	יונחן	79	42	121
Jehozadak	יהוצדך	יוצדך	8	5	13
Jehoram	יהורם	יורם	29	20	49
Jehoshaphat	יהושפט	יושפט	83	2	85
		Total	348	176	524

²¹⁵Ginsburg, *op. cit.*, pp. 367ff. The chart used above was not compiled by Ginsburg although the information came from him.

Conclusion. In retrospect it will be seen that the Sopherim were characterized by a multiple ministry and functioned with regard to the text in four broad areas of activity, (1) transmitters of the text (2) textual critics of the day (3) regulators of the outward form of the text and (4) theologians and teachers of the period.

As a result of this activity on their part, the Old Testament text should be examined at every point in order to determine whether or not it has been subjected to alteration by the Sopherim as they functioned in any one of these four areas of activity.

II. THE MASSORETIC ERA OF THE TEXT

Once the text of the Old Testament was settled and sopherimic labors had come to an end, the need arose for a method of preserving the accomplishments of this group; had such a means of preservation not evolved, it is conceivable that the results achieved by the Sopherim may have completely perished.

It is to a consideration of the men responsible for the preservation of sopherimic accomplishments and the effect, for good or for bad, that they had upon text transmission that attention is now directed.

The Massoretes

The successors of the Sopherim were called Massoretes

and, as in the case of their predecessors, received their name because of their activity. The traditions that emerged in the attempt to preserve the text of the Old Testament were combined in what came to be known as the massorah (מִסְרָה from מָסַר)²¹⁶ and those men who concerned themselves with this tradition, or massorah, came to be known as Massoretes.²¹⁷

Massoretic activity was centered largely in Babylonia and Palestine, the leadership in Biblical studies being taken by first one and then the other of the two geographical centers as favorable circumstances fluctuated between Judaism and Christianity.

The triumph of the Christian faith, the destruction of Jerusalem in the first century A.D. and the rebellion of Bar Choba ca. A.D. 132-135 all combined to force the removal of Jewish scholasticism from Palestine to Babylonia where it thrived under favorable circumstances during the early centuries of the Christian era.²¹⁸ At this time Jewish learning centered at the academies of Nehardea, Sura and after the destruction of Nehardea, Pumbedita, and at these centers it continued until the tenth century A.D.

²¹⁶Cf. post, pp.

²¹⁷Cf. Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 89.

²¹⁸Ibid., p. 88. Cf. Bentzen, op. cit., p. 52.

when the Palestinian Massoretes gained supremacy.²¹⁹

With the Moslem conquest of Palestine (A.D. 638)²²⁰ and the accompanying defeat of Palestinian Christianity there came about a revival of Jewish scholasticism in Palestine. The school of Massoretes at Tiberias became the center of massoretic endeavors in Palestine and with the decline of the Babylonian schools in the eighth and ninth centuries the Tiberian Massoretes assumed permanent leadership in the field of textual studies with the result that the Tiberian text of ben Asher became the only recognized text form.²²¹

The Massorah

Through the centuries in which the Sopherim labored with the text there arose a tremendous body of material, not necessarily committed to written form,²²² yet embodying the results of their work. This body of material formed the beginnings of the "Massorah" (מסורה) and constituted the results of scribal activity as reflected in the text of the Old Testament.

²¹⁹Roberts, op. cit., p. 43.

²²⁰Pfeiffer, loc. cit.

²²¹Roberts, loc. cit.

²²²Ibid.

The meaning of the term. The word "Massorah" (מסורה) was built from the post-Biblical root מוּד meaning to hand down, to deliver, to transmit²²³ and, according to Ginsburg, "denotes 'tradition' and hence technically 'the traditional text, the traditionally transmitted text of Holy Writ.'"²²⁴

"Massorah" as used in the present context includes more than the traditional text, however, and encompasses the text plus those traditions explaining particular changes produced within the text. In its initial stages, the massorah consisted of the sopherimic traditions necessary for the establishment of a true text and embodied the results of the prior labors of the Sopherim. It was not until the era of the Massoretes, however, that this kernel of material was expanded and a fully developed massorah must not be envisioned at the initiation of the massoretic era.

The massorah had as its purpose the protection of the established text and in this capacity was referred to as a "fence about the Torah."²²⁵ Concerning this purpose

²²³Ibid., p. 40.

²²⁴Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 421.

²²⁵"Pirque Aboth," 1:1, in The Apocrypha And Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, ed. R. H. Charles, II, 691.

and the growth of the massorah at the hands of the Massoretes, Ginsburg stated that:

Their massoretēs province was to safeguard the text delivered to them by "building a hedge around it," to protect it against alterations or the adoption of any readings which still survived in MSS. or were exhibited in the ancient Versions. For this reason they marked in the margin of every page in the Codices every unique form, every peculiarity in the orthography, every variation in ordinary phraseologies, every deviation in dittographs &c. ²²⁶

The massorah, then, was not something fixed in its final form at the time that the massoretic era began for although the Sopherim did hand down certain traditions (ןןןן) concerning the text, this massorah was added to and greatly enlarged by the Massoretēs. The massorah thus became a compilation of the traditions produced by both Sopherim and Massoretēs.

Content of the massorah. The massorah as it was developed by the Massoretēs was made up of notes written in the margin(s) of the text in order to protect and explain the text.

. . . the Massorites commenced their labors by minutely analysing the peculiarities of each book which they divided into sections for the purpose of registering every expression or phrase in the margin of the respective Codices . . . ²²⁷

²²⁶Ginsburg, loc. cit.

²²⁷Ibid., p. 423.

In general, the massorah was concerned with the consonants, the vowel points and accents, the spelling of the words (with or without the letters \aleph , η , \prime and \beth marking long vowels), variant readings, corrections of the text, irregularly shaped consonants and the tabulation of the letters of each book.²²⁸

It appears that nothing seemed devoid of significance to the Massoretes as they made their notations (i.e. the massorah). This is indicated by the treatment of the one word $\aleph \eta \aleph \eta$ of Gen. 1:1; "The massora parva . . . states that $\aleph \eta \aleph \eta$ occurs five times in the Bible, and of these the instances where the word occurs at the beginning of a verse are three."²²⁹ This treatment of the text is carried out in the further treatment of the passage, concerning which the massora parva states: "'God created' occurs three times, 'the heavens and the earth' three times, and 'the earth three times at the end of a verse.'²³⁰

The comment of Roberts serves to clarify both the content of the massorah as well as the activity of the Massoretes.

They [i.e. the Massoretes] apparently began with the more unusual forms, entering them in the margins of

²²⁸Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 92.

²²⁹Roberts, op. cit., p. 45.

²³⁰Pfeiffer, loc. cit.

their texts, and then indicating the less unusual features until finally all forms which had peculiarities were incorporated in the Massoretic lists . . . it must be remembered that the Massorettes were concerned with the scribal transmission of the text, and therefore items which appear to us to be insignificant would be of importance to them.²³¹

The massorah, therefore, constituted a vast storehouse of information concerning every section of the Old Testament and records those changes brought about by the Sopherim plus extensive notations made by the Massorettes concerning the text.

The form of the massorah. Although scribal notes were at times inserted within the margin of the text, such notations, constituting the beginnings of the massorah, were largely transmitted by word of mouth until about the end of the fifth century A.D. when the task of codifying the traditions was begun and the massorah assumed a written form.²³²

The form assumed by this written massorah is usually classified as (1) the initial massorah²³³ (2) the massorah marginalis, which includes both the massorah parva and the massorah magna, and (3) the massorah finalis.²³⁴

²³¹Roberts, op. cit., p. 47.

²³²Ibid., p. 43.

²³³Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 91.

²³⁴Roberts, op. cit., pp. 43-44.

The initial massorah gathered itself around the first word of a book as in מִן־הַיּוֹם of Gen. 1:1,²³⁵ while the massorah marginalis, as the name implies, was written in the margin(s) of the text. Remarks made in the central margins of the book or scroll were called the massorah parva and those occupying the upper and lower margins of the same page were called the massorah magna; the two combined to form the massorah marginalis. As a rule the massorah parva was not so lengthy as the massorah magna and the later usually elaborated upon the material mentioned in the former.²³⁶

The massorah finalis, on the other hand, was located at the conclusion of the book and although it resembled the massorah marginalis it contained longer rubrics in alphabetical order and its information related to matters such as the number of sections, verses, etc., all of which was more appropriate to the end of the book than to the body of the text.²³⁷

An example of the massorah finalis to the book of Genesis is cited below and is illustrative of the exactness with which the Massoretes examined the text.

²³⁵Pfeiffer, loc. cit.

²³⁶Ibid., p. 92.

²³⁷Roberts, op. cit., p. 45.

Be strong! The number of the verses of the Book of Genesis is 1534. Its sign /mnemonic symbol/ is $\overline{\text{לכל}}$, $\overline{\text{ל}} = 1000$, $\overline{\text{כ}} = 500$, $\overline{\text{ל}} = 30$, $\overline{\text{י}} = 47$. And its middle is, "and by thy sword shalt thou live" [$\overline{\text{ל}}\overline{\text{כ}}\overline{\text{ל}}$]. And its pericopes (perashiyoth) are 12; the sign is "This ($\overline{\text{ל}}\overline{\text{ל}} = 7 \neq 5$) is my name forever" (Ex. 3:15). And its sections (sedarim) are 43; the sign is, "Yea ($\overline{\text{ל}}\overline{\text{ל}} = 3 \neq 40$) shall be blessed" (Gen. 27:33). And its chapters are 50; the sign is, "O Lord be gracious unto us, we have waited for thee ($\overline{\text{ל}}\overline{\text{ל}} = 30 \neq 20$)" (Is. 33:2). The number of open perashiyoth is 43, and of the closed 48; the total is 91 perashiyoth; the sign is "Go ($\overline{\text{ל}}\overline{\text{ל}} = 90 \neq 1$) thou and all the people that is after thee" (Ex. 9:8).²³⁸

Uniformity of the massorah. Despite the energy expended by the Massoretes in the process of compiling the massoretic lists, the system of notations produced by them was often lacking in uniformity and at times was characterized by discrepancies and contradictions.²³⁹ These are at times of minor significance,²⁴⁰ yet they serve to indicate that the massorah was not "one corpus of tradition, uniformly developed and handed down from one generation to another."²⁴¹

It should be remembered that the massorah differed from school to school; each group producing a massorah which embodied the traditions enshrined in its particular

²³⁸Pfeiffer, loc. cit.

²³⁹Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 425ff. Cf. Roberts, op. cit., pp. 42ff.

²⁴⁰Price, op. cit., p. 27. Cf. Buhl, op. cit., p. 94 who speaks of these discrepancies as, "trifling, and [they] affected the received form of the text very little."

²⁴¹Roberts, op. cit., p. 42.

center of scholastic activity. Consequently, there were differences between the massoretic lists of Babylonia ("Easterns") and those of Palestine ("Westerns").

The Massorah itself has preserved lengthy lists of various readings from the Eastern recensions which are several hundred in number and extend over the whole Hebrew Scriptures. They not only affect the orthography but the division, insertion and omission of certain words.²⁴²

Lack of uniformity was not only found between the Eastern and the Western Massoretes, however, but extended to the various centers within each broad group. The Babylonian centers of Neharda, Sura and later Pumbedita had their own unique developments while the Palestinian Massoretes also had their separate school with differing traditions as was evidenced in the emergence of the competing traditions represented by ben Asher and ben Naphtali.²⁴³

The lack of uniformity which characterized the massorah, whether between Eastern and Western groups or between schools within these groups, was brought about simply because "each massorah faithfully records the text from which the Massoretes in question made the rubrics"²⁴⁴ and therefore reflects the presence of

²⁴²Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 425.

²⁴³Roberts, op. cit., p. 43.

²⁴⁴Ginsburg, loc. cit.

different recensions of the text at the various centers.²⁴⁵

In conclusion it should be stated that the massorah neither formed one body of material nor developed uniformly²⁴⁶ but rather "dealt with the text as it was preserved at the centre where the particular Massorah was composed."²⁴⁷

Massoretic Text Transmission

The Massorettes made significant contributions to the text of the Old Testament that took the form of both negative and positive emphases; negative in that they prevented alterations within the received text, positive in that they made original additions to the text.²⁴⁸

It is, therefore, of great importance that the attitude taken by the Massorettes toward transmission be thoroughly examined with the purpose of determining the exactness with which the text was likely to have been transmitted at their hands.

²⁴⁵Ibid.

²⁴⁶Roberts, op. cit., p. 42.

²⁴⁷Ibid., p. 44.

²⁴⁸Both the marks of vocalization and of accentuation are the result of additions to the text by the Massorettes. These areas of activity are omitted in this discussion, not because they are unimportant, but because (1) massoretic vocalization will be emphasized later (cf. pp. 142ff.) and (2) accentuation, although of great significance for the over-all study of the text, does not affect the actual process and validity of transmission.

The fulfillment of this examination will be achieved by considering both their guiding purpose and the positive and negative emphases alluded to above.

The purpose of the Massorettes. The Massorettes had as their guiding purpose the preservation of the prior accomplishments of the Sopherim. The text resulting from sopherimic labors came into their hands and its purity was zealously guarded. In the fulfillment of this purpose they differed somewhat from the Sopherim, for while the former were concerned with the restoration of the text, the latter were concerned with its preservation.

Indeed the Massorites so far from correcting any variations . . . or any manifest blunder . . . which had crept into the text, have carefully collected them and guarded them most religiously by their wonderful system of annotations, against any attempt at reconciliation or emendation on the part of professional copyists. The present text, therefore, is not what the Massorites have compiled or redacted, but what they themselves have received from their predecessors and conscientiously guarded and transmitted with the marvellous checks and counter checks which they have devised for its safe preservation.²⁴⁹

The purpose that lay behind every phase of massoretic activity, then, was the preservation of the exact text that had been entrusted to their keeping;²⁵⁰ all else was

²⁴⁹Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 422.

²⁵⁰Pfeiffer goes so far as to say that "the Masoretic text is a compromise in both its consonants and its vowels, between two or more traditional recensions. Essentially conservative and cautious, the Masorettes

sublimated to this one consuming purpose.

In keeping with this it should be expected that one of the most outstanding massoretic accomplishments would be that of preserving and transmitting the text entrusted to them. Speaking of this particular accomplishment, Bentzen states that "they had the task to preserve the consonant text and assure that it was pronounced in the right manner, i.e. to take care of the right writing of the manuscripts."²⁵¹

Despite the extreme care exercised by the Massorettes, however, it was during the process of transmitting the text that mistakes were most likely to occur.²⁵² Since they were concerned not with restoration but with the preservation and transmission of the text, errors attributable to the Massorettes were largely unintentional and occurred during the actual reproduction of manuscripts.²⁵³

lacked both the inclination and the authority for the preparation of a truly critical edition of the Scriptures," op. cit., p. 91.

²⁵¹Bentzen, op. cit., p. 52.

²⁵²It should be apparent that the same errors attributed to the Massorettes are characteristic of any group transmitting the text of the Old Testament; especially is this true of unintentional errors. It would seem, however, that intentional errors (or corrections of the text) would be more unique to the Sopherim than to the Massorettes since the former were more interested in restoration than were the latter. Cf. supra, p. 110.

²⁵³Green, op. cit., pp. 163f.; J. J. Owens, "The Value Of The Septuagint In Correction Of The Masoretic Text In Hosea," p. 22.

Errors possibly committed by the Massoretes in the process of transmitting the text²⁵⁴ may be broadly divided into two main groups: (1) unintentional and (2) intentional errors.²⁵⁵ Errors most likely to have been committed by the Massoretes in the process of transcribing manuscripts are cited below and for convenience have been classified according to the twofold division mentioned above.

Unintentional errors. Unintentional errors are, as the name implies, the result of imperfection on the part of the scribe(s). So long as the text was reproduced solely by human agency, apart from mechanical aids, it would be characterized by errors resulting from mistakes made by fallible men. Such errors have been grouped under one of six sub-divisions suggested by the exponents of New Testament textual criticism but adopted herein since the same types of error tend to characterize the transmission of texts, whether Greek or Hebrew.²⁵⁶ Unintentional errors

²⁵⁴In addition to unintentional errors made in the process of transmitting the text, the Massoretes quite likely perpetuated errors already made by the Sopherim, cf. Roberts, op. cit., p. 92; also E. Robertson, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

²⁵⁵Cf. Bentzen, op. cit., pp. 98-100; Buhl, op. cit., pp. 247ff.

²⁵⁶Compare the discussions of Bentzen, op. cit., 98ff. with regard to the Old Testament text and those of A. T. Robertson, An Introduction To The Textual Criticism Of the New Testament, pp. 150ff. or Alexandar Souter, The Text And Canon Of The New Testament, pp. 112ff.

are divided into errors of (1) eye, (2) ear, (3) memory, (4) judgment, (5) pen, and (6) speech.²⁵⁷ It should be borne in mind, however, that at times it is impossible to determine precisely how an error should be classified. For instance, in the case of the wrong division of a word the error might be attributed to either that of sight, misreading the text, or of judgment; confronted with two possible spellings or divisions the scribe erred in the selection of the proper word.

1. Errors of the eye.

A frequent, yet understandable, error committed by the Massoretes in the process of transmitting manuscripts consisted of errors of sight. Such mistakes were entirely unintentional on their part and were produced through weaknesses which tended to characterize the actual copying of manuscripts.

The similar appearance of certain letters, ך and ם, ן and ן, ם and ם, etc.,²⁵⁸ often brought about the interchange of the letters. The scribe simply misread one letter for another because of their striking similarity.²⁵⁹

²⁵⁷A. T. Robertson, op. cit., pp. 150-55.

²⁵⁸Kyle M. Yates, The Essentials Of Biblical Hebrew, revised by J. J. Owens, p. 4. Also compare other grammars.

²⁵⁹Cf. Burrows, "Waw and Yodh in the Isaiah Dead Sea Scroll (DSIa)," B.A.S.O.R., CXXIV (1951), 18-20. ן and ן are not easily distinguishable in Dead Sea Scrolls; even a cursory examination of lQIsa or lQH reveals this similarity of consonants.

Words were sometimes wrongly divided. Initially, words of Hebrew sentences flowed one into another without the intervening space with which one is presently accustomed.²⁶⁰ Because of this a letter would at times be separated from its own word and added to another²⁶¹ thus bringing about a construction foreign to the original intention of the author.

. . . in Amos vi.12 the M.T. took "Does one plough בַּבְּקָרִים?" to mean "Does one plough with oxen?" (literally "oxens"); since this gives the wrong answer, "Yes," it is clear that the correct division is בַּבְּקָר יָם, "Does one plough the sea with oxen?"²⁶²

The transposition of letters within a word was yet another error of this type committed by the Massoretes; Ps. 49:11 clearly illustrating this practice. The reading "Their inward parts (קַרְבָּם) are their houses forever" should actually read "Their grave(s) (קַבְרָם) are their houses forever."²⁶³ Amos 6:2 reflects a similar instance wherein two nouns have had their suffixes transposed.

. . . the M.T. gives, "Is their border גְּבוּלָם wider than your border? גְּבוּלֵכֶם". Since this would give the wrong answer, "Yes," your must be read for their, and vice versa.²⁶⁴

²⁶⁰Owens, op. cit., pp. 23f.

²⁶¹Buhl, op. cit., pp. 253-54.

²⁶²Ap Thomas, op. cit., p. 34.

²⁶³Ibid., p. 35.

²⁶⁴Ibid.

Instances of haplography (half-writing)²⁶⁵ constitute an error of the eye also; haplography being the error of writing only one letter in the manuscript while there are two letters in the exemplar.²⁶⁶

Closely associated with haplography, yet distinct from it, is the error of homoeoteleuton. In this case the eye of a copyist accidentally shifted from a word to a place further in the text where the same word reoccured; the intervening material being completely omitted. This mistake was at times further complicated when the omitted section(s) was (were) re-introduced into the text by later copyists, in the margin between the lines.²⁶⁷

Finally, letters or words were erroneously omitted from the text. This is similar to homoeoteleuton yet differs from it slightly. The two errors are similar in that both omit passages of the text; they are dissimilar in that homoeoteleuton omits the material between two identical words while in the other case the omission is not bounded by identical words.

²⁶⁵Ap Thomas, op. cit., p. 40.

²⁶⁶Bentzen, op. cit., p. 99.

²⁶⁷Ibid. Bentzen calls attention to the fact that such passages may "then be interpolated in wrong places." An example of homoeoteleuton is found in I Sam. 14:41.

2. Errors of the ear.

In addition to mistakes made because of sight there were also errors made because of poor hearing. Manuscripts were at times dictated to scribes for transcription²⁶⁸ with the result that errors were committed in the case of letters which were so highly similar in sound as \aleph and \beth , for example. The particles $\aleph\lrcorner$ and $\beth\lrcorner$ were thus often confused because of this similarity of sound between the two.²⁶⁹

Although not so frequent as errors of the eye, mistakes did creep into the text because the scribe did not hear correctly and consequently erred in the transmission of the text.

3. Errors of memory.

Although applied more specifically to New Testament textual criticism,²⁷⁰ it seems logical that errors of memory would have occurred within the text of the Old Testament as well, despite the difficulty of substantiating such a theory. Robertson states concerning the transmission of the New Testament that "the scribe may forget what he saw on the roll or codex or what he heard. He actually writes something else because of a lapsus memoriae."²⁷¹

²⁶⁸A. T. Robertson, op. cit., pp. 153-54.

²⁶⁹Cf. Is. 29:5; I Sam. 2:16; I Kings 11:22.

²⁷⁰A. T. Robertson, loc. cit.

²⁷¹Ibid., p. 153.

Familiarity often led to error on the part of the scribe and words or phrases that had become common through contemporary usage were written instead of a similar word. The confusion of שמר and שם is cited as a case in point by Ap Thomas in the phrases "Thou wilt keep me (השמרני)" and "Thou wilt set me (השמני)."²⁷²

4. Errors of judgment.²⁷³

Errors were also made because of the lack of good judgment on the part of the scribe for there were times in the transmission of the text when questions arose as to just what should or should not be copied into the new manuscript.

Abbreviations constituted one source of error in the matter of judgment on the part of the scribe for "the text may contain abbreviations which were not intelligible to the copyist, or he assumed abbreviations where they did

²⁷²Ap Thomas, *op. cit.*, p. 37. II Sam. 22:44 reads "thou wilt keep me (השמרני)" but should read as in the duplicate passage (Ps. 18:44), "thou wilt set me (השמני)"--without the 1.

²⁷³Errors of judgment may at first glance seem to be intentional errors. They are intentional in that they are not accidental but the result of deliberation; at the same time they are not intentional errors for in errors of judgment the scribe was not attempting to alter the text deliberately; any damage to the received text done by the scribe was purely accidental and unintentional.

not really occur."²⁷⁴

Errors of judgment also occurred in the addition of vowels to a consonantal text. "Where only consonants are written, several possibilities exist in the way of pronunciation, and so of meaning."²⁷⁵ In the light of this ~~ל~~ of Is. 7:11 has been replaced with ~~ל~~ by Ap Thomas²⁷⁶ and Buhl substituted ~~ל~~ for ~~ל~~ in II Sam. 13:18.²⁷⁷ Although pronunciation was perhaps correctly transmitted through the years,²⁷⁸ the difficulties confronted in dealing with a purely consonantal text are apparent to any student of Hebrew.

Other errors of judgment included conjectural emendation (brought about when a scribe was confronted

²⁷⁴Bentzen, op. cit., pp. 98-99. Cf. Ap Thomas, op. cit., p. 40, cites II Chron. 21:2 wherein Jehoshaphat is described as "King of Israel" instead of King of Judah-- "probably because ~~ל~~ which could stand for either, was wrongly expanded." ~~ל~~ could be "my anger" or "anger of Yahweh"; also, Buhl, op. cit., p. 253.

²⁷⁵Ap Thomas, op. cit., p. 33.

²⁷⁶Ibid.

²⁷⁷Buhl, loc. cit.

²⁷⁸This is questionable in view of the fragments found in The Cairo Geniza and their interpretation by Paul Kahle who stated that, "By comparing these old fragments with the text definitely fixed by the Masoretes . . . there can be no doubt that a distinct difference can be recognized between the pronunciation of Hebrew before and after the activity of the Masoretes during the ninth century." The Cairo Geniza, p. 85.

with a defective manuscript,²⁷⁹ the incorporation of marginal notes,²⁸⁰ the inclusion of variant readings (i.e. two readings from equally authoritative manuscripts are both allowed to stand in the text),²⁸¹ conflation, or the blending of two different accounts of the same or similar incidents,²⁸² and interpolation, or the addition of a passage to the original, "but not combined with it so that it can usually be taken out again without leaving an obvious gap."²⁸³

5. Errors of the pen.

This type of error includes those errors committed in the purely mechanical process of writing the manuscript. Easily confused letters were at times not distinctly written with the result that the text was misread by a later scribe.²⁸⁴ Not only in the indistinct formation of similar letters, but in the matter of penmanship in general errors were likely to have been made.

Among those errors ascribed to the pen was the error

²⁷⁹Ap Thomas, op. cit., p. 36.

²⁸⁰Ibid., p. 38.

²⁸¹Ibid.

²⁸²Ibid., pp. 38-39.

²⁸³Ibid., p. 39.

²⁸⁴Supra,

of dittography. This consisted in the duplication of a letter or word from the exemplar used by the scribe; the copyist saw or heard one form but in the mechanics of writing he wrote two.²⁸⁵

6. Errors of speech.

"Every scribe had his own habits of spelling (orthography) and pronunciation and of grammar (accidence and syntax)."²⁸⁶ The logical result of this was that the scribe would at times insert his own particular spelling into the text or perhaps an accidence or syntax peculiar to him; the resultant form differing, of course, from his exemplar.

Closely related to this type of error is the problem of dialectical differences as a factor in text transmission.²⁸⁷ In recent years the theory has been expounded that there are points of difference within the text of the Old Testament that are to be accounted for, not by assuming that erroneous transmission of the text has taken place, but that the textual differences simply reflect the presence of different dialects within the circumference of the Hebrew language. "Future study of the text will probably

²⁸⁵Bentzen, op. cit., p. 99.

²⁸⁶A. T. Robertson, op. cit., p. 115.

²⁸⁷Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 109f.

find that many divergent forms are not so much errors as indications of variant text forms, particularly of variations of dialects."²⁸⁸

Although treated in a summary fashion, the examples cited in each of the above instances should be sufficient to make it obvious that, despite the effort expended in an attempt not to do so, the Massoretes were in danger of making unintentional errors as they transmitted the text entrusted to them. In many cases the errors do not substantially alter the text, yet they must be examined and evaluated before a valid conclusion may be reached regarding the integrity of the particular text under consideration.

Intentional errors. The Massoretes admittedly made unintentional errors in the process of transmitting the text. The question now arises, did they ever make intentional errors, did they ever knowingly and willfully alter the text entrusted to them?

If the "text" be limited to the consonantal text, then it would seem best in the light of the purpose that guided their entire work²⁸⁹ to phrase the answer to this question in the negative. "The passion of the Hebrew

²⁸⁸Roberts, op. cit., p. 99.

²⁸⁹Supra,

scribe for his text would provide him with the inclination for this /i.e. the exact preservation of the text/; and minute instructions of Massoroth would give him the guidance; and explicit Rabbinic rule would warn against erroneous copies."²⁹⁰ The very character of the literature as "holy"²⁹¹ would preclude deliberate alteration of the accepted text.

It would seem therefore that, in the case of the consonantal text, intentional errors should be limited to the Sopherim while unintentional errors characterized both sopherimic and massoretic groups.²⁹² Complete assent is given to the conclusion of Roberts that,

. . . it would have been a very rare occurrence for a corrupt copy to have become public during

²⁹⁰Roberts, op. cit., p. 98.

²⁹¹G. Östborn, Cult And Canon, pp. 104-5. In connection with the concept of the holiness of Israel's literature it should be noted that with exceedingly few exceptions, the Massorettes so highly regarded the sanctity of the consonantal text that in the process of inserting vowel points they were consistently kept outside the line of the consonantal text.

²⁹²It should be understood, however, that what was true of the consonantal text was not necessarily true of the vocalic text. An excellent example of deliberate alteration of a vocalic text is present in the Babylonian Codex of the Prophets in Leningrad (cf. Kahle, op. cit., pp. 46-47) wherein the Babylonian vocalization has been eradicated and supplanted by that of the Tiberian Massorettes. Cf. Kahle's opinion that "the Masorettes altered and corrected the pronunciation of the Hebrew Biblical text," ibid., p. 109.

the centuries of Massoretic activity. It is fairly safe to say that the great majority of textual errors crept into the copies before the first century A.D.²⁹³

Conclusion. It must be understood that the transmission of the text of the Old Testament was not only the great and guiding purpose of the Massoretes but that the fulfillment of this purpose constituted what is perhaps their greatest single achievement. Although not achieved with total perfection, such transmission of the text was characterized by an amazing degree of success.²⁹⁴

III. SUMMARY

To the transmission of the Old Testament text both scribe and Massorete gave themselves unstintedly lest through either deliberate error or careless negligence the literature of Israel should be destroyed.

The era of the Sopherim was, to a high degree, a period of fluidity in which the text was not yet definitely settled. It was during their ministry, and, in part,

²⁹³Roberts, loc. cit.

²⁹⁴This is strikingly revealed by the fact that although 1QIsa was separated by almost 1000 years from the MSS underlying older versions, the R.S.V. called for only thirteen departures from the Massoretic Text and of these Burrows could state, "I must confess that in some cases where I probably voted for the emendation I am now convinced that our decision was a mistake, and the Masoretic reading should have been retained." The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 305.

largely a result of it that the text crystallized as it did. Although exercising greater freedom in their treatment of the text than their successors, the Massoretes, they nevertheless preserved for later generations the scripture entrusted to their care. At times they actually made additions and changes to, or deletions from the text; yet, had it not been for their abiding interest and concern it is within reason to feel that the text may well have perished.

By the time of the Massoretes the consonantal text had become fixed and from this time forward any manuscript differing from its exemplar was considered to be non-massoretic and consequently completely unacceptable.²⁹⁵ In contrast to their predecessors, the Sopherim, the Massoretes did not attempt either corrections or alterations of the consonantal text adopted by their school and any errors introduced after the initiation of their activity were entirely unintentional.

Although transmitted with a high degree of accuracy the Old Testament text was, nonetheless, susceptible to

²⁹⁵ Although the text had been fixed, this does not mean that a common text was shared by every school for competing texts no doubt continued to exist (cf. supra, pp. 68ff.). It does mean, however, that within each school or geographical area a particular text was fixed and became normative for all others within its area.

corruption at several points. In view of the errors that may possibly have been incurred in the process of transmission, the text of Habakkuk must be examined in the light of such possibilities in order that the present text may be substantiated or a better text established.

Consequently, a later chapter will be devoted to such a study in which Habakkuk will be examined for the purpose of determining whether or not errors of transmission indicated as possible in this chapter are actually to be found in the text of Habakkuk.

CHAPTER III

THE CONTRIBUTION OF MODERN DISCOVERY
TO THE TEXT OF HABAKKUK

CHAPTER III

THE CONTRIBUTION OF MODERN DISCOVERY TO THE TEXT OF HABAKKUK

The cloud of darkness tending to veil the early manuscripts and parallel literatures of the Old Testament has been dispelled to a great extent by the discovery and dissemination in recent times of (1) manuscripts antedating any previously known¹ (2) a literature so closely akin to Hebrew philologically that it has become a valuable aid for textual studies² and (3) Jewish literary works, both Biblical and extra-Biblical from the time of the Massoretes which have greatly illuminated massoretic activity with the result that text transmission has become much clearer in the light cast by such discoveries.³

In fact, a beam of shining light has suddenly been thrown over the "dark centuries" around the birth of our Lord, during which we before knew very little or nothing about the history of text and tradition.⁴

¹Millar Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 301ff., concerning the contribution of the scrolls to Old Testament textual criticism.

²Cf. W. H. Morton, "The Bearing Of The Records Of Ras Shamra On The Exegesis Of The Old Testament," p. 70.

³Cf. Paul Kahle, The Cairo Geniza, pp. 36ff.

⁴Ivan Engnell, The Call Of Isaiah, p. 62.

It will be the purpose of this chapter to sketch briefly the history of each of these discoveries and having done that to attempt an evaluation of their contribution to the text of the Old Testament and, more particularly, to the text of Habakkuk.

With this view in mind, it was felt that the more important discoveries consisted of the Cairo Geniza, the Ugaritic literature, and the scrolls and fragments discovered in Palestine since 1947. In order to facilitate their presentation they will be presented in their historical sequence of discovery thereby eliminating the danger of an evaluation of the discoveries upon the basis of their order of presentation within this thesis.

I. THE CAIRO GENIZA

Of the three major discoveries under consideration, the Cairo Geniza was the first to come to the attention of modern scholarship.⁵ The discovery itself consisted of the literature, dating to a period between the seventh and the fourteenth centuries,⁶ discarded by the Jewish synagogue at Cairo. The reason for its discard, its

⁵Although known for some time, the Cairo Geniza was scientifically examined by Solomon Schechter in the late nineteenth century. Cf. Studies in Judaism, p. 3.

⁶Ibid., p. 11.

preservation and its discovery plus other pertinent matters will be taken into consideration in the discussion that is to follow.

Nature And Purpose Of The Geniza In Jewish Life

What was a Geniza? What was its purpose in the religious life of the Jewish community? Where were they located? These are questions that must be answered before one may fully understand how such extremely old documents as were found in the Cairo Geniza were ever preserved for posterity.

Meaning of the term. The English word, "Genizah" (or Geniza) is a transliteration of the Hebrew word גניזא which in turn is built from the root גנז meaning "to hide" and the word "signifies a treasure-house, or hiding place." The Geniza, then, was literally a "hiding place."⁷

Into this storeroom, or hiding place, "worn-out and heretical or disgraced Hebrew books or papers are placed."⁸ In earlier days it was a common practice actually to bury worn-out, mutilated or incorrect copies of manuscripts in the graves of scholars and it was not until much later

⁷Ibid., p. 1.

⁸"Genizah," The Jewish Encyclopedia, V, 612-13.

that the Geniza became a repository.⁹

The Geniza as a definite repository, dates from the Middle Ages, when it became the practice to relegate manuscripts and old books to the lofts of the synagogue. Many congregations in the east, then, had two Genizas, one attached to the synagogue, and one in the graveyard, which received the overflow. In some places . . . a corner of the graveyard was set aside for the literary burial.¹⁰

Purpose of the geniza. The purpose of the geniza was to provide for the acceptable disposition of manuscripts that through wear, incorrectness or other factors were taken out of circulation.

Because of their extreme veneration for every word of scripture, to have merely discarded the writings would have been unthinkable.

When applied to books, it (i.e. גניזת) means much the same thing as burial means in the case of men. When the spirit is gone, we put the corpse out of sight to protect it from abuse. In like manner, when the writing is worn out, we hide the book to preserve it from profanation.¹¹

A geniza, then, had a twofold purpose; it preserved the "good things from bad" and at the same time prevented "bad things from harming."¹²

⁹Norman Bentwich, Solomon Schechter: A Biography,

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Schechter, loc. cit.

¹²The Jewish Encyclopedia, loc. cit. The "bad things from harming" has reference to the books that "once pretended to the rank of Scriptures, but were found by the authorities to be wanting in the qualification of being dictated by The Holy Spirit." Cf. Schechter, op. cit., p. 2.

In the course of time, however, its usage was broadened to include secular as well as religious documents with the result that marriage documents and other legal papers came to be included in the Geniza and it became a "combination sacred lumberroom and secular record office."¹³

Discovery of the Cairo Geniza

Of all the "Genizoth" (גניזות) present in the synagogues of Judaism, perhaps no single geniza has attained the renown of the one in the Synagogue at Cairo. Its prestige has become so great that it is rather common to leave off the appellative "Cairo" and refer to it as merely the "Geniza" with no confusion on the part of scholarship.¹⁴

Location of the Geniza. The Cairo Geniza, as the name indicates, was located in Cairo, at the "so-called Synagogue of Ezra the Scribe."¹⁵ The building itself has been observed to be quite early,¹⁶ and

¹³Ibid., p. 3; cf. pp. 6-7.

¹⁴The Jewish Encyclopedia, loc. cit.

¹⁵Schechter, op. cit., p. 5.

¹⁶Cf. The Jewish Encyclopedia, V, 612, ". . . the synagogue of Fortat near Cairo. This was a church dedicated to St. Michael until the conquest of Egypt by Chosroes in 616, when it became a synagogue."

. . . has an authentic record extending over more than a thousand years, having served originally as a Coptic Church (St. Michael's), and been thereafter converted into a Synagogue soon after the Mohammedan conquest of Egypt.¹⁷

This Geniza, in contradistinction to those found within a cemetery, is located within the synagogue itself. The Geniza has been described as "a secret chamber at the back of the east end, and is approached from the farthest extremity of the gallery by climbing a ladder and entering through a hole in the wall."¹⁸

The fragments acquired by Schechter, who more than any single person was responsible for the gathering and cataloguing of the fragments found in the Geniza, were described by Mrs. Lewis in the following manner,

Ragged scraps of writing to make glad the hearts of European scholars . . . For centuries whitewash has tumbled upon them /the fragments/ from walls and ceilings. The sand of the desert has lodged in their folds and wrinkles; water has drenched them; they have squeezed and hurt each other, whilst all the time some of them were keeping for us very precious secrets.¹⁹

Discovery of the Geniza. The initial discovery of the Geniza is shrouded in uncertainty. The presence

¹⁷Schechter, loc. cit.

¹⁸The Jewish Encyclopedia, loc. cit.

¹⁹Bentwich, op. cit., p. 129, citing Agnes Lewis who edited Palimpsest Fragments In The Taylor-Schechter Collection. (London: 1900).

of such a room, despite its size, would obviously have been known to those closely acquainted with the building. Yet, on one occasion E. N. Adler was informed that all the "shemot" had been buried in the Jewish cemetery at Basatin;²⁰ therefore it was assumed that,

Shortly afterward [Adler's visit of 1888] the synagogue was repaired by the Cairo community and during its renovation the old receptacle seems to have been rediscovered.²¹

In opposition to this, however, it is recorded that Jacob Saphir entered the room in 1864 but, "after spending two days there and becoming steeped in dust and ashes, he gave up the task."²²

Saphir was quite obviously acquainted with the Geniza in 1864 while Adler in 1888, only twenty-four years later, was told that there were no "shemot" within the premises of the synagogue; in other words, in only twenty-four years the knowledge of such a room had supposedly been lost. It is entirely possible that at least a part of the members of the synagogue knew of the Geniza all along and deliberately suppressed the knowledge of such a room.²³

²⁰The Jewish Encyclopedia, V, 613.

²¹Ibid.

²²Bentwich, op. cit., p. 139.

²³This is especially likely since Schechter has stated (as was obviously so) that someone within the synagogue was working with certain antiquities dealers in removing documents from the Geniza to be sold on the world market. Schechter, op. cit., pp. 8-9.

Certainly, the Geniza was visited as early as 1752 by Simon von Geldern²⁴ and its contents were made available through antiquities dealers²⁵ prior to the publicity given to the Geniza as a result of Solomon Schechter's visit of 1896. Yet, although scraps from the Geniza began to appear in the 1880's and 1890's, the source could not be determined and such material that was acquired was purchased solely from regular antiquities dealers.

Professor Sayce of Oxford, Dr. Cyrus Adler and Mr. Elkan Adler, Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson, the Bodleian, the British Museum and Cambridge University Library acquired scraps during the eighties and nineties; and it was apparent that a great store was hidden away. But still it eluded the search of scholars.²⁶

It remained for Solomon Schechter, then Reader in Talmudics at Cambridge University,²⁷ to locate and acquire the material contained in the Geniza.²⁸

Schechter learned from Elkan Adler, who had spent

²⁴Bentwich, op. cit. It was also visited by Jacob Saphir in 1864, cf. Encyclopedia of Religion And Ethics, VI, 188; by E. N. Adler in 1888, cf. Bentwich, loc. cit.

²⁵Ibid., p. 139.

²⁶Ibid., p. 140.

²⁷Ibid., pp. 86f.

²⁸Cf. ibid., pp. 136-64; also P. Kahle, op. cit., pp. 7ff. and Schechter, op. cit., pp. 1ff. Schechter was not alone in this, for others also obtained fragments from the Geniza in one way or another, the more notable of whom was A. Firkowitsch. Cf. Bleddyn J. Roberts, The Old Testament Text and Versions, pp. 75-77.

half a day in the Geniza and had been presented with manuscripts by the authorities, the location of the scraps that had begun to appear in the late nineteenth century.²⁹

Schechter then travelled to Cairo and through both his personality and persuasive powers³⁰ secured permission from the Rabbi to remove the entire collection from the Geniza. Once removed from the Geniza, the fragments, numbering approximately one hundred thousand,³¹ were sent to the Cambridge University library where they have remained under the name of the Taylor-Schechter Collection in honor of Solomon Schechter who brought them to Cambridge from Cairo and Dr. C. Taylor, mathematician and president of St. John's who financed Schechter's trip to Egypt.³²

In conclusion, it is all but impossible to attribute the honor of discovery to one person. For while Van Geldern was the earliest visitor of modern times, it was surely through the efforts of Solomon Schechter that the material

²⁹Bentwich, op. cit., p. 147.

³⁰Ibid., p. 129. In a letter to his wife Schechter frankly states the means used to influence the Rabbi.

³¹Schechter, op. cit., p. 9.

³²Bentwich, op. cit., p. 126. "It was in its inception a secret mission. Schechter had divined that there was in Cairo a treasure of manuscripts . . . It had been known to scholars for over a century, and scraps of it had been filtering for years through dealers and less reputable persons."

was removed from the Geniza to the Cambridge University Library. As Bentwich has stated,

He [Schechter] was at pains to point out that he did not discover the Geniza; it discovered itself. He saved its contents for scholarship, and he brought it to a place where it could be scientifically and reverently studied.³³

It was then, for all practical purposes, Solomon Schechter who discovered the horde of fragments at Cairo for although he was not the first visitor to the Geniza, he was the person responsible for their removal and their placement at Cambridge where they became accessible to the world of scholarship.

Documents acquired from the Geniza. Of what did the approximately one hundred thousand fragments collected by Schechter consist? In an announcement concerning the recently acquired Taylor-Schechter collection, the Library Syndicate gave the following statement concerning the documents acquired by Schechter from Cairo.

Among the more noteworthy treasures which this collection contains, are fragments of the Book of Ecclesiasticus in Hebrew, and certain Palimpsests of which the underwriting is Greek and which preserve to us unique fragments of the Hexapla and of Aquila's version of the Old Testament. There are, moreover, about twenty large boxes of fragments which contain matter of much interest to Semitic scholars; for example, Biblical fragments in an early Hebrew hand, presenting in some instances the super-linear

³³Ibid., p. 144.

punctuation, liturgical fragments and portions of the Talmud and of commentaries thereon; Historical documents (wills, & c): fragments in Syriac.³⁴

In addition to the Taylor-Schechter collection other fragments were taken from the Geniza and if the material from the Geniza, not at Cambridge, be reckoned with then the total number of fragments would number approximately two hundred thousand. Yet, "these may be either much more or much less. In any case it is clear that we have an amazing quantity of material."³⁵

Interpretation Of The Discovery

In the midst of this mass of material, there arises a most pertinent question, "What is the significance of this material for the study of the text of the Old Testament?" It is readily admitted that the Geniza fragments from Cairo furnish material for the study of both Jewish literature and the culture of Judaism, especially of the Gaonic period,³⁶ but what effect does it have upon the text of the Old Testament? The following areas are those in which the discovery of the material found at the Cairo Geniza has illuminated the study of the text.

³⁴Kahle, op. cit., p. 8, citing the "Cambridge University Reporter," 1897-98, p. 969.

³⁵Ibid., p. 10.

³⁶Encyclopaedia Of Religion And Ethics, loc. cit.

Theory of the archetype. The concept that "all manuscripts were derived from one single manuscript"³⁷ came to be known as the theory of the "archetype" and lies at the heart of the problem of text transmission. Based partly upon the conclusions of Kennicott and de Rossi, who attempted to show that within the Massoretic Text "there are no real variants, setting aside errors of copyists and orthographical differences,"³⁸ it was first propounded by Rosenmuller in 1864 but soon gained the support of other scholars, especially Olshausen and Paul de Lagarde.³⁹

Adherents of the theory contended that the archetype was fixed about A.D. 100 and that the text was henceforth transmitted with rigid uniformity.⁴⁰ Evidences for such an attitude were found mainly in the facts that (1) quotations from the Bible found in Talmudic literature presuppose the Massoretic Text (2) the translations of the second century bear witness to the Massoretic Text and (3) Jewish traditions concerning the work of textual

³⁷Aage Bentzen, Introduction To The Old Testament, second edition; I, 50.

³⁸Ibid.

³⁹Ibid.

⁴⁰Edward Robertson, The Text Of The Old Testament And The Methods Of Textual Criticism, p. 3. ". . . there-after /second century/ it was transmitted without material alteration in the form in which it now is."

critics reveal a critical edition of the text before A.D. 70.⁴¹

The result of this has been, of course, that, for those who accepted the theory, the Massoretic Text has been transmitted in its same form since about the first century of the Christian era, and "all deviations from it in existing manuscripts are due to unintentional errors of transcription, or in a few instances possibly to corrections by copyists on the basis of some ancient version."⁴²

A significant contribution attributed to the Geniza evidence has been to challenge this theory and to insist that the course pursued by the text in the process of its transmission was not the course outlined by the adherents of the archetype theory.

Paul Kahle, generally acknowledged as the foremost authority on the interpretation of the contents of the Geniza,⁴³ after a detailed study of the evidence has cited examples of multiple centers of transmission and of the differences at times characteristic of such groups.⁴⁴

⁴¹Bentzen, op. cit., pp. 50f.

⁴²William Henry Green, General Introduction To The Old Testament: The Text, pp. 164-65.

⁴³Cf. Kahle, op. cit.; also the evaluation of Bentzen, op. cit., p. 51; Roberts, op. cit., p. 51.

⁴⁴Kahle, op. cit., pp. 36ff. It should be noted, however, that the differences cited by Kahle are largely vocalic rather than consonantal.

Consequently, in opposition to the rigid transmission envisioned by the archetype theory the Geniza has been understood to reveal the presence of numerous schools of Massoretes, differing in both their systems of vocalization and in the consonantal text they preserved.⁴⁵

"It is evident," according to Winton Thomas, "that Hebrew manuscripts were not transmitted with the scrupulous exactness which the theory of the archetype implies."⁴⁶ The consonantal text was not so rigid as the theory of the archetype indicated and the variants between the ben Asher and the ben Naphtali texts, for example,⁴⁷ are

⁴⁵D. Winton Thomas, "The Textual Criticism Of The Old Testament," The Old Testament And Modern Study, ed. H. H. Rowley, p. 244. S. H. Blank, "A Hebrew Bible Manuscript In The Hebrew Union College Library," H.U.C.A., VIII-IX (1931-2), 229-55, who concludes that there were consonantal differences between ben Asher and ben Naphtali. Cf. Roberts, The Old Testament Text And Versions, pp. 63-67.

⁴⁶D. Winton Thomas, loc. cit.

⁴⁷Cf. Kahle, op. cit., p. 67. The degree of fluidity within the consonantal text as represented by ben Asher and ben Naphtali does not seem to be great, however. Cf. C. D. Ginsburg, Introduction To The Massoretico-Critical Edition Of The Hebrew Bible, pp. 241ff. Indeed, consonantal uniformity between the two prevailed to the degree that Ginsburg could speak with pride of having "found in one MS four instances in which these two textual critics differ in the consonants and textual readings," ibid., p. 245. He also speaks with great emphasis of "Professor Strack who has found three other variations which also affect the textual reading of the consonants," ibid., p. 246.

indicative of a general fluidity within the text, and the apparent uniformity of the Massoretic Text may well be the result of later Massoretic adjustments as was true in the case of the vocalization of the St. Petersburg Codex of the Prophets.⁴⁸

Kahle has incorporated the evidence of the Geniza into a theory concerning the text which stands in opposition to the traditional theory of the archetype and accordingly has been interpreted to feel that,

. . . from the time of Aqibe . . . there emerged a text form which became fixed and uniform. It was not established authoritatively by one act of adoption, but rather it survived a bitter and constant struggle among variant forms which existed alongside it, each of which had a long history and even an authentic tradition in its support, possibly representing the renderings preserved at various centres of learning in Palestine and Babylonia.⁴⁹

The evidence of the Geniza must not be exaggerated,⁵⁰ however, but should be counterbalanced with the Palestinian scrolls which present a text differing only slightly from the Massoretic Text⁵¹ although ante-dating the Geniza

⁴⁸Roberts, The Old Testament Text And Versions, pp. 52-53; cf. also Kahle, op. cit., p. 47.

⁴⁹Kahle, op. cit., p. 28.

⁵⁰Roberts, The Old Testament Text And Versions, p. 24, states that "earlier Genizah fragments show a practical uniformity of consonantal transmission."

⁵¹This comparison is based upon the Isaiah scroll which reflects only about thirteen real variants with the Massoretic Text; cf. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 303ff.

fragments by about seven or eight centuries.

With regard to the "archetype," there came a time, of course, when an authoritative archetype emerged but it was "the standard archetype of the ben Asher Massorettes, which received official status by the decree of Maimonides in the twelfth century A.D."⁵² and not an archetype dating to the second century A.D.⁵³

Vocalization of the text. The discovery of the fragments at Cairo not only affected the theory of the archetype, but had perhaps even greater significance for the understanding of the vocalization of the Old Testament text. Although the development of vocalization in its minute and technical details will not be attempted herein,⁵⁴ the manner in which the history of vocalization inherent in the fragments has affected the Old Testament will be presented.

The history of Hebrew vocalization has been complicated until recent times by the absence of pointed manuscripts preceding the activity of the Tiberian Massorettes,

⁵²Roberts, The Old Testament Text and Versions, p. 29.

⁵³Ibid., p. 24.

⁵⁴For such a study one should consult Kahle, op. cit., pp. 36-116 or Roberts, The Old Testament Text and Versions, pp. 52-63 for a less detailed survey.

with the result that vocalic studies of necessity have begun with their completed work.⁵⁵ Consequently, pre-Tiberian vocalization has been almost impossible to reconstruct⁵⁶ and, for many, the present massoretic vocalization has been viewed as the original or true vocalization of the consonantal text, reproduced with accuracy by succeeding generations of scribes and Massoretes.⁵⁷

It has been largely due to the discovery of the manuscripts and fragments of the Cairo Geniza and their interpretation, especially by Paul Kahle, that the above conclusions have been rendered inadequate as a statement of the history of vocalization.⁵⁸

The contents of the Geniza have revealed that rather than one, continuous system of vocalization, there was actually a series of prevailing systems and, although

⁵⁵Ira M. Price, The Ancestry Of Our English Bible, second revised edition by Wm. A. Irwin and Allen P. Wikgren, p. 32.

⁵⁶The exception to this is to be found in the investigation of the transcriptions of Hebrew in the Septuagint, Hexapla and in Jerome plus the pronunciation of Hebrew by the Samaritans, cf. Thomas, op. cit., p. 245.

⁵⁷The extreme was represented by Buxtorf the Younger who published a treatise (based on the Elder Buxtorf) on "the Origin, Antiquity, and Authority of the vowel points . . . that the points if not in existence prior to Ezra, were at least introduced by him." Green, op. cit., p. 64.

⁵⁸Roberts, The Old Testament Text And Versions, pp. 51f.

one may have arisen out of another and subsequently have supplanted it, the present system of vocalization is the result of a lengthy process of development and does not represent the only vocalic system used with the consonantal text.⁵⁹ This represents a vast departure from the traditional attitude which saw but one system, faithfully preserved and reproduced through the years, but it seems to capture best the true history of vocalization.

Although reference had been made in *Maḥzor Vitry*, an Aboth Commentary compiled about A.D. 1100 by Simha b. Shemuel of Vitry France,⁶⁰ to the systems of vocalization called Tiberian, Babylonian and the "punctuation of the land of Israel"⁶¹ the reference was not fully understood until the evaluation of the material from the Geniza by Paul Kahle,⁶² who made exhaustive studies of the three systems of vocalization with the result that it has been "mainly after the authority of Kahle [that scholars] have been able to reconstruct the story of vocalization."⁶³ Kahle's study of the Geniza material revealed the presence

⁵⁹Cf. Kahle, op. cit., pp. 45ff.; also Roberts, op. cit., pp. 47ff.

⁶⁰Kahle, op. cit., p. 49.

⁶¹Ibid.

⁶²Roberts, The Old Testament Text And Versions, p. 51.

⁶³Ibid.

of Palestinian, Babylonian and Tiberian systems of vocalization.

1. Palestinian Vocalization.

"Biblical MSS. with Palestinian punctuation are comparatively scarce,"⁶⁴ among the Geniza fragments, occurring in but six manuscripts.⁶⁵ Yet, despite this paucity of Biblical material, the system appears quite frequently in the Targum, Mishna, Palestinian Midrash, Massorah and liturgical manuscripts.⁶⁶ The Palestinian system of vocalization has been dated by Kahle at a period "before and after 700-750,"⁶⁷ in contrast with the Tiberian which he dates immediately following the period at the "end of the eighth century."⁶⁸

⁶⁴Kahle, op. cit., p. 50.

⁶⁵Ibid., p. 51.

1. A fragment of a scroll with parts of Ezek. 13-16.
2. Four fragments of a scroll with parts of Ps. 27-33, 35-40, 41-6, 55-9.
3. Two folios with the last four chapters of Daniel.
4. One folio with Jer. 1 and 2.
5. Two folios with parts of Ps. 51-5, 69-72.
6. Eight folios with Biblical fragments written in abbreviations (קטג'ק'ק'), containing Prophets, chiefly Isaiah and Jeremiah, and Ex. 28 and 29.

⁶⁶Ibid., pp. 51f.

⁶⁷Ibid., pp. 54.

⁶⁸Ibid., pp. 52f. They began to develop their (Tiberian) punctuation at this time. Regardless of the date assigned to the Tiberian, it was preceded by the Palestinian.

2. Babylonian Vocalization.

The Babylonian system of vocalization has been subdivided upon a basis of its structure into the einfach and the kompliziert, or the "simple" and the "complicated,"⁶⁹ both of which preceded the Tiberian system of vocalization.⁷⁰ The dates assigned to the two types of Babylonian vocalization are not exact but may be generally placed before A.D. 900 with the einfach preceding the kompliziert.⁷¹ Such dates are arrived at in light of the overwhelming influence of the Tiberian Massorettes as revealed in the eradication of the Babylonian vocalization and the substitution of the Tiberian system in the St. Petersburg Codex of 916.⁷² If Babylonian manuscripts had at that time to be adapted to the details of the Tiberian punctuation then, it is clear that MSS. with complicated punctuation which still show the characteristics of real Babylonian MSS. must be regarded as older, and as much older must be regarded the MSS. provided with the simple system of Babylonian punctuation.⁷³

The Babylonian system of vocalization is much wider represented in Biblical manuscripts than is the Palestinian.

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 45.

⁷⁰Ibid., p. 46.

⁷¹Ibid. Cf. Biblia Hebraica, seventh edition, p. XXXIV.

⁷²Roberts, The Old Testament Text And Versions, p. 52; also Kahle, op. cit., p. 47.

⁷³Kahle, op. cit., pp. 47-48.

Kahle made use of no less than one hundred and twenty such manuscripts in his study of Babylonian vocalization and in his contribution to the third edition of Biblia Hebraica⁷⁴ wherein the Babylonian manuscripts are cited in the apparatus.⁷⁵

3. Tiberian Vocalization.

The Tiberian system of vocalization and grammar is familiar to every student of Biblical Hebrew, although at times under a different name,⁷⁶ and for this reason space is not devoted to this system except to mark it apart as the final and culminating step in the history of vocalization. Indeed, few grammars other than those based upon Tiberian vocalization are available⁷⁷ since the Tiberian Massoretes triumphed over other groups with the result that it was the Tiberian vocalization with which the so-called Massoretic Text was pointed.⁷⁸

⁷⁴Ibid., p. 45.

⁷⁵Ibid., cf. Biblia Hebraica, pp. XXIXff.

⁷⁶Cf. Kyle M. Yates, The Essentials Of Biblical Hebrew, revised by J. J. Owens, p. 7 where "Palestinian" is used, with regard to Tiberian, although used for the purpose of distinguishing Babylonian and Tiberian.

⁷⁷Pre-massoretic Hebrew grammar is represented by the work of a Danish scholar Elinor Bruno, cf. review by H. H. Rowley, "Recent Foreign Theology," E.T., LVIII (1946-47), 220, of the grammar, Studien über hebraische Morphologie und Vokalismus auf Grundlage der Mercatischen Fragmente der zweiten Kolumne der Hexapla des Origenes (1943; Brockhaus, Leipzig).

⁷⁸Cf. ante, p. 101. Rowley has observed that Pre-Massoretic grammar will not likely affect "the

In conclusion, it should be emphasized that, apart from their contribution to the recovery of the pre-Tiberian system of Hebrew vocalization, the fragments from the Geniza are unusually important with regard to the vocalization of the text, for since their evaluation by Kahle and others it has been observed that,

One fact . . . stands out clearly, viz. that the Massoretic vocalization cannot any longer be regarded as wholly authoritative. The degree of authority will only be properly estimated when the true tradition it retains has been more closely distinguished from those elements in it which owe their origin to the Massorettes themselves.⁷⁹

It is precisely at this point that the Geniza fragments affect the text most strongly with regard to vocalization--"Massoretic vocalization cannot any longer be regarded as wholly authoritative."⁸⁰ This is not to say that the work of the Tiberian Massorettes is to be completely rejected or abandoned; it is to say, however, that (1) theirs was not the only system of vocalization, (2) their system of vocalization must be approached with caution and (3) it no longer possesses the intrinsic note of authority that it once possessed.

ordinary student's grammar of Hebrew, since the Massoretic text must continue to be the basis of their study and hence the Massorettes' grammar must be their introduction to it." Rowley, loc. cit.

⁷⁹Thomas, op. cit., p. 246.

⁸⁰Ibid.

The ben Asher text. Yet a third contribution of the fragments from Cairo lay in the light that they shed upon the divergencies present in the contending texts that evolved in the school of Massoretes at Tiberias plus the information that they preserved concerning the genealogy of the ben Asher Massoretes.

The textual labors of the Tiberian Massoretes were crystallized in the competing texts produced by the Massoretes ben Asher and ben Naphtali with the result that the beginning of the second millennium A.D. saw these two texts competing as the official text of the Old Testament within Judaism.⁸¹ The triumphant text was that of Aaron ben Asher, acclaimed by Maimonides in the twelfth century A.D. to be the official text.⁸²

In 1524-25 Jacob ben Chayim published the second edition of the Rabbinic Bible with the Massorah which came to be known as the editio princeps of Jacob ben Chayim,⁸³ and was the basis for most editions of the

⁸¹Although manuscripts traceable to ben Asher are accessible (cf. Kahle, op. cit., pp. 56ff.), no codex redacted by ben Naphtali (C. D. Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 245) has as yet come to light. The only means of determining the points of difference between the two texts is from lists which cite such differences (cf. Kahle, op. cit., pp. 67ff. and Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 245ff.

⁸²Roberts, The Old Testament Text and Versions, p. 29.

⁸³C. D. Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 956ff.

printed Hebrew Bible from that time until the third edition of Biblia Hebraica appeared in 1937.⁸⁴

Although the text of ben Chayim was intended to have reproduced the text of ben Asher⁸⁵ it did not do so inasmuch as it was based upon later copies which had blended the text of ben Asher with that of his contemporary and contender ben Naphtali and had also included other divergent readings.⁸⁶

The text of ben Asher, then, "was not preserved in its purity, and the first step toward regaining the genuine ben Asher text is to go behind all manuscripts which offer a mixed text."⁸⁷ This was done in the third edition of Biblia Hebraica, based upon the Ms. L (B19a), a genuine ben Asher manuscript copied by Samuel b. Jacob in A.D. 1009⁸⁸ from the corrected clear books prepared by the master Ahron b. Moshe b. Asher,⁸⁹ with the result that

⁸⁴Thomas, op. cit., pp. 238-59, 247.

⁸⁵Kahle, op. cit., pp. 71f.

⁸⁶Ibid., p. 69, "the result of this development is a kind of textus receptus which, although based on the Ben Asher text, must be regarded as a compromise between the two texts."

⁸⁷Roberts, The Old Testament Text And Versions, p. 80.

⁸⁸Kahle, op. cit., p. 60.

⁸⁹Ibid., citing Samuel b. Yacob (or Jacob).

an edition of the Hebrew text based not upon older, printed editions but upon a manuscript dating to a period immediately following the time of ben Asher himself is now available.⁹⁰

For this significant achievement the world of Scholarship has acknowledged a debt of gratitude to Kittel and his associates, as may be inferred from the evaluation made of the third edition of Biblia Hebraica by various Old Testament scholars.⁹¹

Yet, what part did the fragments from Cairo play in the restoration of the ben Asher text?

First, they were highly significant with regard not only to the text of Aaron ben Asher but to the history of the entire ben Asher family since a genealogy of the family was preserved among the fragments found in the Geniza.

In a treatise on the she'wa found at Cairo a

⁹⁰B. J. Roberts, "The Emergence Of The Tiberian Massoretic Text," J. T. S., XLIX (1948), 10.

⁹¹Cf. criticism of the ben Chayim text by Kahle: "How can we think that such a complicated text as that of the Hebrew Bible could be satisfactorily produced on the basis of late and inaccurate MSS. more than 400 years ago, after a preparation of not much more than two years, by a man overwhelmed with other work, printed together with all sorts of Targums and Commentaries, on 952 folios, about 1,900 folio pages, in the astonishingly short time of about fifteen months? Yet this has been regarded as the only authoritative text up to the present text," op. cit., p. 72.

genealogy of the ben Asher family for five or six generations was preserved in a list of Massoretes who worked in Tiberias.

It includes Rabbi Asher . . . the contemporary of the oldest of these Masorettes, his son Nehemia (his son Moshe), his son Asher, his son Moshe, and his son Ahron, the last of the chain.⁹²

Since Moses ben Asher completed a codex of the Prophets in A.D. 895 and his son Aaron was active in the first half of the tenth century, then if 25-30 years be allowed for each generation the earliest Asher would have been active within the period beginning about A.D. 750.⁹³

Second, the discoveries at Cairo are significant in that there were found among the fragments in the Geniza parts of the book of Mishael ben 'Uzziel on the differences between ben Asher and ben Haphtali.⁹⁴ These fragments, plus quotations from 'Adat Deborim,⁹⁵ a massoretical compendium in which the author had incorporated a treatise on the differences between ben Asher and ben Naphtali composed by ben 'Uzziel, make possible the restoration of the entire text of ben 'Uzziel's book which cites more than eight

⁹²Kahle, op. cit., p. 55.

⁹³Ibid.

⁹⁴Ibid., p. 67.

⁹⁵Ibid., p. 66.

hundred differences between ben Asher and ben Naphtali.⁹⁶

Consequently, the Geniza fragments are important in order to determine whether a manuscript under consideration is actually a ben Asher manuscript or not. Of this use of the fragments Kahle makes mention and states concerning the manuscript used as a basis for the third edition of Biblia Hebraica, that,

A careful examination of the Leningrad Bible MS. B 19a on the basis of these test passages /The 800 differences between Ben Asher and Ben Naphṭali cited by ben 'Uzziel/ had the result that in about 95 per. cent. of the cases the MS. had exactly the readings given by Mishael as those of Ahron b. Asher. The statement of the copyist, Samuel b. Jacob, that he had copied a MS. prepared by Ahron b. Asher, was therefore confirmed in an excellent way.⁹⁷

The Geniza fragments are therefore significant in two areas (1) they provide a genealogy of the ben Asher family and (2) they aid in the restoration of the book by Mishael ben 'Uzziel which in turn serves as the basic means for determining whether a manuscript originated with ben Asher or ben Naphtali.⁹⁸

Conclusion

The effect of the Geniza discoveries has had a

⁹⁶Ibid.

⁹⁷Ibid.

⁹⁸This remains the "basic" means; yet, C. D. Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 241-86, cites other means of comparing the differences between ben Asher and ben Naphtali.

twofold direction; first, toward the text itself and second, toward the vocalization of the text.

First, it is improbable that the text of either Habakkuk or the complete Old Testament ever existed in the form of an "archetype" dating to the time of approximately the second century A.D. and any study of the text must therefore take into consideration the possible fluidity of the consonantal text in attempting to establish the best possible text for a particular book.

At the same time, one must not pursue this course of thought to an extreme so that the truth of the archetype theory is abolished, for there is a basic core of truth within the theory.⁹⁹ There was a general uniformity which prevailed among the various texts¹⁰⁰ despite the readings and varying forms of orthography, morphology and

⁹⁹Cf. Roberts, The Old Testament Text And Versions, pp. 24-25, 29.

¹⁰⁰This is illustrated in the case of Isaiah by a comparison of 1QIsa and the Massoretic Text. However, if the Dead Sea Scrolls should be of the same family from which the Massoretic Text evolved the comparison would be without value. Such an assumption cannot be proved in view of the paucity of Hebrew manuscripts. For an adequate evaluation of the possible fluidity of the consonantal text, one would need manuscripts from centers isolated from Palestinian influence and ante-dating the time when all manuscripts were conformed to the pattern of the Tiberian manuscripts. Such material is not available and the entire discussion of families of manuscripts thus becomes impossible and if undertaken could only be done upon a hypothetical basis.

later vocalization . . .";¹⁰¹ and the point of emphasis in the above conclusion is that the Massoretic Text, in its consonantal form,¹⁰² must be examined in the light of a possible fluidity.¹⁰³

Rather than one rigidly fixed text, the Massoretic Text is best understood as "a succession of emergent recensions until the authoritative acceptance of the ben Asher text."¹⁰⁴ There was a general tendency toward uniformity but not of such strength as to ensure the exact refuplication of manuscripts at every center from Palestine to Babylonia.

Admittedly the ben Asher text . . . is not the one and only Massoretic text . . . nor is the Massoretic Text the only representative of the original Hebrew Bible--that is far from the truth . . .¹⁰⁵

¹⁰¹Roberts, The Old Testament Text And Versions, p. 29.

¹⁰²The term "consonantal form" is deliberately used since there seems to be a definite distinction between the treatment of the consonantal and the vocalic texts. Kahle seems to have unquestionably demonstrated the tension and flux concerning the vocalic text. The case of the consonantal text is entirely different, however, and it seems that it is yet to be demonstrated that significant and extensive differences existed in the consonantal form of the Old Testament text.

¹⁰³Before the question of fluidity may be settled, sources other than the Geniza fragments must be taken into consideration; these could prove that the consonantal text had been stabilized. The above conclusions refer to the evidence of the Geniza and do not represent a final conclusion.

¹⁰⁴Roberts, "The Emergence Of The Tiberian Massoretic Text," op. cit., p. 16.

¹⁰⁵Ibid.

Second, in view of the presence of not one but several systems of vocalization present among the Masoretes of Palestine and Babylonia¹⁰⁶ it becomes inadvisable to attempt to support the rigidity attributed by some to the system of vocalization introduced by the Tiberian Massoretes and "Massoretic vocalization cannot any longer be regarded as wholly authoritative."¹⁰⁷ In view of this, "the general uniformity of Tiberian punctuated MSS." as Kahle has stated, "must be regarded as the result of the endeavor of the Masoretes. We find it at the end of the development, not at the beginning."¹⁰⁸

II. THE UGARITIC LITERATURE

The world of scholarship did not have long to await the discovery of yet another epigraphic find which was to affect vastly not only the study of Hebrew linguistics¹⁰⁹ but the textual criticism of the Hebrew Old Testament as well.¹¹⁰

This discovery was precipitated through the accidental unearthing of a vaulted tomb by a Syrian

¹⁰⁶Supra, pp. 145ff.

¹⁰⁷Supra, p. 148.

¹⁰⁸Kahle, op. cit., p. 54.

¹⁰⁹Morton, op. cit., pp. 23ff.

¹¹⁰H. L. Ginsberg, "The Ugaritic Texts and Textual Criticism," J.B.L., LXII (1943), 109-15.

ploughman at Ras Shamra in 1928¹¹¹ and the literature, consisting of numerous inscribed clay tablets, subsequently recovered has been designated as either the "Ugaritic" or the "Ras Shamra" literature.¹¹²

The guiding purpose in the development of this discussion shall be the brief sketching¹¹³ of (1) the history and source of the literature, (2) its relationship to Biblical Hebrew, (3) its contribution to Old Testament textual criticism, and (4) its significance for the study of the text of Habakkuk. The results of this investigation will then be utilized in a versicular investigation of Habakkuk to appear in chapter four of this thesis.

¹¹¹Cf. Claude F. A. Schaeffer, The Cuneiform Texts of Ras Shamra-Ugarit; Morton, op. cit.

¹¹²For clarity in this thesis, Ras Shamra should be understood to have reference to the mound itself, while Ugarit has reference to the city occupying the first two strata of the mound. Cf. H. L. Ginsberg, "Ugaritic Studies And The Bible," B.A., VIII (1945), 42 ". . . the northwestern corner of a mound known as Ras esh Shamrah (its ancient name was Ugarit . . .). Cf. Madeliene S. Miller and J. Lane, "Ras Shamra," Harper's Dictionary Of The Bible, p. 601, however, for what appears to be a classification of Ras Shamra as the mound and Ugarit as the city.

¹¹³In view of the comprehensive study made by W. H. Morton, op. cit., anything more than a brief sketch of this material would prove to be a duplication of what time has proven to be a quite adequate and sound presentation of the Ugaritic material. The present writer confronts a dilemma in that (1) the material is significant for the thesis, yet (2) it has been presented in an exhaustive manner already. The only solution seems to be to discuss the discovery although not at great length, and to give credit for both direct and indirect influences to the above mentioned work.

Discovery And Source Of The Literature

Prior to an evaluation of the Ugaritic literature it will first be necessary to determine the salient points concerning both the discovery and the source of the material found at Ugarit.

Discovery. Ras Shamra, the modern Minet el-Beida (White Port) is the mound containing the remnants of the ancient city of Ugarit¹¹⁴ and is situated "on the N. Syrian coast, c. 8 m. north of Latika, 50 m. SW of Antioch and opposite the 'pointing finger' of Cyprus."¹¹⁵

The fact that a rich city had existed at Ras Shamra in days of antiquity had been generally known to those of the area for a considerable time prior to the investigation of the mound by scholars since valuable antiquities had been found at the site by inhabitants of the neighborhood.¹¹⁶ Despite this, it was not until less than thirty years ago, 1928, that the attention of the scholarly world was directed to the site of ancient Ugarit.

It was in the spring of 1928 that a peasant farmer's plough struck one of the stone slabs covering a sepulchre

¹¹⁴Harper's Dictionary Of The Bible, loc. cit.

¹¹⁵Ibid.

¹¹⁶H. L. Ginsberg, "Ugaritic Studies And The Bible," loc. cit.

containing not only the silt of many years but valuable artifacts as well. Although most of the valuables were removed by the peasants, the discovery eventually came to the notice of the Department of Antiquities in Beirut whose representatives recovered a number of excellent pottery specimens from the rubble.¹¹⁷

Even more significant than the recovery of the pottery was the fact that because of this initial find the harbor and the mound were both subjected to scientific excavation by French forces under the leadership of Mr. Claude A. F. Schaeffer.¹¹⁸ The excavation(s) begun by Schaeffer continued until hostilities prevented further work at the site in 1939 but since World War II work has been resumed at Ras Shamra and the full story of its excavation lies yet in the future.¹¹⁹

As important as other material finds were,¹²⁰ perhaps the most important of the discoveries at Ugarit

¹¹⁷Ibid.

¹¹⁸Ibid., p. 43. See Schaeffer, op. cit., for his personal account of the texts.

¹¹⁹The most significant contributions have perhaps already been unveiled at Ras Shamra and the above statements should be understood to mean only that the work continues at this site with significant finds still appearing, cf. "Archaeological Newsletter," American Schools of Research, #5, 1953-54, p. 2.

¹²⁰C. H. Gordon, The Loves And Wars Of Baal And Anat And Other Poems From Ugarit, p. ix.

was the library containing hundreds of inscribed clay tablets dating from the fifteenth and the early fourteenth centuries.¹²¹ Embodying the same characteristics as the Semitic languages,¹²² the language was soon determined to belong to that family¹²³ and mainly through the efforts of Virolleaud, Bauer, and Dhorme was deciphered¹²⁴ so that by the end of 1930 nearly all the difficulties of decipherment had been overcome.¹²⁵

Once the task of decipherment had been completed, the task of translation and interpretation had, of course, only begun. This phase of work progressed to the extent that in 1946 approximately one-half of the "well preserved material . . . can [could] be satisfactorily interpreted,"¹²⁶

¹²¹Jack Finegan, Light From The Ancient Past, p. 146.

¹²²Cf. Gordon, The Loves And Wars Of Baal And Anat And Other Poems From Ugarit, p. x, citing these characteristics as, ". . . certain laryngeal (or throat) and velar (or back-palatal) sounds that are difficult for most of us to imitate, by pairs of consonants that our ears are not trained to differentiate, by the presence of only three vowel qualities (a, i, u), by the fact that most words have roots of three consonants; by inflection through prefixes, suffixes (rarely infixes) and internal vocalic changes; by the lack of compound words, and by a simplicity of sentence structure."

¹²³Finegan, op. cit., pp. 146f. It should be understood, however, that Ugaritic was only one of six languages represented at Ugarit (cf. Morton, op. cit., pp. 2ff).

and the years since 1946 have witnessed an expansion of this number.¹²⁷

Source of the literature. What may be said of the source of this literature with regard to the city of Ugarit, the nature and content of the literature and the rise of the literature?

1. The city of Ugarit.

Excavation revealed that five superimposed cities reaching back to the fifth or sixth millennium B.C. were embraced by the mound known as Ras Shamra and that the first two strata, representing the first and second halves of the second millennium, included the city known as Ugarit.¹²⁸

As early as the second millennium the name "Ugarit" was applied to the city and it is mentioned in Egyptian inscriptions, the Amarna letters, certain Hittite documents,¹²⁹ as well as the Mari tablets.¹³⁰ Throughout its history it was in contact with the powers of the world,¹³¹

¹²⁷C. H. Gordon, Ugaritic Handbook, p. 1.

¹²⁸H. L. Ginsberg, "Ugaritic Studies And The Bible," B.A., VIII (1945), 43.

¹²⁹Finegan, op. cit., p. 146.

¹³⁰Schaeffer, op. cit., p. 9.

¹³¹Cf. ibid., pp. 1ff.

leading Gordon to apply the terms "internationalism" and "cross-fertilization" to his characterization of Ugarit.¹³² It was, perhaps, because of this "polyglot picture"¹³³ that no less than six different languages were represented at Ugarit¹³⁴ and Ugaritic itself "is an example of cultural blending, because it is a combination of the native Canaanite principle of the alphabet and the Mesopotamian principle of writing wedge-shaped signs on clay."¹³⁵

The city of Ugarit, then, stood at the international crossroads and from this vantage point absorbed much of neighboring cultures through a process of cultural osmosis.¹³⁶

2. The nature of the literature.

The Ugaritic tablets encompassed a variety of types of literature including, "lists of names, rituals, epistles and even prescriptions for curing horses,"¹³⁷ although the bulk of the material consisted of mythological

¹³²Gordon, The Loves And Wars Of Baal And Anat And Other Poems From Ugarit, p. x.

¹³³Ibid.

¹³⁴Morton, op. cit., p. 2.

¹³⁵Gordon, loc. cit.

¹³⁶Cf. the general tone of Schaeffer, op. cit., pp. 1-31.

¹³⁷Gordon, The Loves And Wars Of Baal And Anat And Other Poems From Ugarit, p. xi.

poems about Canaanite gods and heroes.¹³⁸ Gordon published a number of these poems under the title The Loves And Wars Of Baal And Anat which includes (1) "The Birth Of Dawn And Dusk," relating the conception and birth of two members of the Ugaritic pantheon,¹³⁹ (2) "The Loves and Wars Of Baal and Anat" which deals with the careers of Baal and his sister Anat,¹⁴⁰ (3) "The Nuptials Of Nikkal And The Moon" that, although dealing with a marriage of gods, reflects human matrimonial customs,¹⁴¹ (4) "King KRT And Princess HRY"; the highly romantic courtship of mortals,¹⁴² and (5) "The Saga Of Aqhat, Son Of Daniel" which recounts Daniel's attempt to get a son by offering food and drink offerings to the gods for a week.¹⁴³

3. The rise of the literature.

Using the account of the destruction of Ugarit by earthquake and fire plus the appearance of the name NQMD in the texts, W. H. Morton convincingly demonstrated the tenability of a date of about fourteenth century B.C.

¹³⁸Ibid.

¹³⁹Ibid., p. 3.

¹⁴⁰Ibid., p. 5.

¹⁴¹Ibid., p. 27.

¹⁴²Ibid., p. 28.

¹⁴³Ibid., p. 33.

for the Ugaritic texts,¹⁴⁴ a date other Old Testament scholars have supported.¹⁴⁵

Even though a period of ca. 1400 B.C. should be accepted for the date of these texts it should not be inferred that the material contained therein was composed de novo at that time. W. F. Albright has emphasized the fact that they existed in an oral form from an earlier period and states, "the original compositions had doubtless been handed down for a long time orally before they were reduced to writing."¹⁴⁶

Relationship Of Ugaritic And Hebrew

Totally apart from the intrinsic value of the language itself, what is the relationship between Ugaritic and Biblical Hebrew? Without attempting an exhaustive study of the relationships between the two languages, the following points of specific contact may be noticed.

Linguistic relationships. Ugaritic and Hebrew are admittedly of the same broad group in that both are of the

¹⁴⁴Morton, op. cit., pp. 15ff.

¹⁴⁵Cf. W. F. Albright, Archaeology And The Religion Of Israel, p. 38; Gordon, The Loves And Wars Of Baal And Anat And Other Poems From Ugarit, p. ix; Finegan, op. cit., p. 146; Harper's Bible Dictionary, p. 601b.

¹⁴⁶Albright, loc. cit.

Semitic family;¹⁴⁷ yet, there has arisen a difference of opinion as to whether they are of the same immediate subgroup. Virolleaud, Albright, Dussaud, Dhorme, Ginsberg, Montgomery, Harris, and Gordon have been cited as proponents of the view that "Ugaritic is simply a northern dialect of Canaanite,"¹⁴⁸ "springing . . . from the parent Canaanite stock like South Canaanite (Phoenician proper), East Canaanite ('Amorite'), and Proto-Hebrew."¹⁴⁹ At the same time, Bauer, Cantineau, Friedrich and Goetze were cited as representative of the group which maintains that "the new language is an independent dialect, intermediate between Canaanite and Accadian, or, more specifically, Hebrew and Aramaic."¹⁵⁰

The difficulty of assigning Ugaritic to a specific subgroup within the family of languages is reflected in the shifting position of C. H. Gordon who in his Ugaritic Grammar concluded that "we are nevertheless safe in attributing Ugaritic to the Canaanite branch of Northwest

¹⁴⁷Morton, op. cit., p. 33.

¹⁴⁸Ibid.

¹⁴⁹Ibid., citing Albright, "The Present State of Syro-Palestinian Archaeology," The Haverford Symposium On Archaeology And The Bible, p. 19.

¹⁵⁰Morton, op. cit., pp. 33-34.

Semitic . . . we may call Ugaritic 'North Canaanite'¹⁵¹
 yet in his Ugaritic Handbook of 1947 he concluded his
 study of linguistics by stating,

I feel less inclined to subsume Ugar. and Heb.
 under the category of Canaanite than when I wrote
 UG in 1940 . . . the plain fact is that the Semitic
 . . . languages are quite unsatisfactorily classi-
 fied and this, I believe, is the chief reason that
 Ugar. has been grouped with everything from Heb. to
 South Arabic . . . Meanwhile, we would do best to
 treat Ugaritic as a separate Semitic language rather
 than a dialect of another language, or of some sub-
 group, in the Semitic family.¹⁵²

Regardless of the specific subgroup to which
 Ugaritic may be assigned, two things should be remembered:
 (1) Ugaritic was definitely Semitic,¹⁵³ and (2) there are
 enough philological affinities between Ugaritic and Hebrew¹⁵⁴
 to indicate a close relationship within the Semitic family¹⁵⁵
 even if the two should prove to be of separate subgroups as
 suggested by Gordon.

Philological relationships. Not only in the broader
 area of linguistics are Ugaritic and Hebrew closely related,

¹⁵¹Ibid., citing C. H. Gordon, Ugaritic Grammar,
 pp. 36-58.

¹⁵²Gordon, Ugaritic Handbook, p. 116.

¹⁵³Ibid.

¹⁵⁴Cf. Morton, op. cit., pp. 25ff.

¹⁵⁵Millar Burrows, What Mean These Stones, p. 45.

but in the more specific are of philology as well.¹⁵⁶

If philology be understood to include grammar, etymology, phonology, morphology, accent, syntax and semantics¹⁵⁷ then there is a definite philological relationship between the two languages.

Studies of the possibility for such a relationship between the two have been made by numerous scholars¹⁵⁸ and the opinion of H. L. Ginsberg that "from the philological point of view, however, the Hebrew Bible and the Ugaritic texts are to be regarded as one literature"¹⁵⁹ seems to capture the consensus of scholarly opinion concerning the philological relationship of Ugaritic and Hebrew.

Lexicographical relationships. The conclusion that there is a valid philological relationship between Ugaritic and Hebrew would within itself precipitate yet a third conclusion: there is a definite relationship between the

¹⁵⁶For purposes of discussion linguistics and philology have been separated although the first has been considered as simply one area of the latter by some. Cf. R. H. Elliott, "A Comparative Study Of Deutero Isaiah And Job," p. 158.

¹⁵⁷Ibid.

¹⁵⁸Cf. Gordon, Ugaritic Grammar, also Ugaritic Handbook; H. L. Ginsberg, "The Ugaritic Studies And The Bible," B.A., VIII (1945); Morton, op. cit., pp. 25-50.

¹⁵⁹H. L. Ginsberg, "The Ugaritic Texts And Textual Criticism," J.B.L., LXII (1943), 109.

lexicography or vocabulary of Ugaritic and Biblical Hebrew.¹⁶⁰

The lexicographical affinities of the two languages will be adopted as a working hypothesis in this thesis and it is sufficient to note the statement of John Hasting Patton that,

. . . approximately 46 percent of all roots appearing in the Psalms are common to both /Ugaritic and Biblical Hebrew⁷, while 54 percent of the roots appearing in Ugaritic are common to both . . . "If comparison were made with the whole of Biblical literature, the percentages would be much higher."¹⁶¹

The significance of this relationship is reflected in the prediction of W. H. Morton that "the chief innovation of the next Hebrew Lexicon will be the extensive use of Ugaritic,"¹⁶² and the opinion of W. F. Albright who spoke of the tablets as likely to "revolutionize our knowledge of Hebrew lexicography."¹⁶³

Structural relationships. There remains yet a fourth area of kinship between the two languages: that of poetic structure.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶⁰Cf. Morton, op. cit., pp. 51-70 for a detailed study of this relationship.

¹⁶¹Ibid., p. 51.

¹⁶²Ibid., p. 52.

¹⁶³Ibid., citing W. F. Albright, "New Light On Early Canaanite Literature," B.A.S.O.R. XLVI (1932), 19-20.

¹⁶⁴Cf. Morton, op. cit., pp. 44-50.

"The formal element of Ugaritic poetry," according to C. H. Gordon, "is parallelism, whereby two or more 'lines'--or, more accurately, 'hemistichs'--paralleling each other in meaning make up a verse.¹⁶⁵ This is identical with the parallelism of Hebrew poetry first discovered by Bishop Lowth¹⁶⁶ and the similarity has led to the conclusion that there is an agreement of poetic form between Ugaritic and Hebrew.¹⁶⁷

In both parallelism and metric arrangement, Ugaritic and Hebrew have definite points of similarity¹⁶⁸ which are so strong as to lead to the assertion that "the formal elements of Hebrew poetry are largely borrowed from the Canaanites."¹⁶⁹ Completely apart from the problem of dependency raised by this statement, it is evident that there is a definite relationship between the poetic structure of the two languages that should be taken into consideration in any comparative study of the two and

¹⁶⁵Gordon, The Loves And Wars Of Baal And Anat And Other Poems From Ugarit, p. xi.

¹⁶⁶Elliott, op. cit., p. 173.

¹⁶⁷Morton, op. cit., p. 50.

¹⁶⁸Ibid., pp. 43ff., 46ff.

¹⁶⁹H. L. Ginsberg, "Ugaritic Studies And The Bible," B.A., VIII (1945), 55.

especially in the critical study of the Old Testament text.¹⁷⁰

Conclusion. Ugaritic sustained definite linguistic, philological, lexicographical and structural relationships between itself and Biblical Hebrew and "the Hebrew Scripture . . ." ¹⁷¹

Contribution To Old Testament Textual Criticism

As a result of their almost complete identification one with another, Hebrew and Ugaritic constitute a valid source of material for the textual study of either of the two languages. Indeed, it is the opinion of one author that,

From the philological point of view the Hebrew Bible and the Ugaritic texts are to be regarded as one literature, and consequently a reading in either one may be emended with the help of a parallel passage in the other.¹⁷²

It should be stressed, however, that because of

¹⁷⁰Morton, op. cit., p. 50. It should be emphasized at this point that parallelism plays a significant part in textual criticism as evidenced by its frequent usage in modern times. Cf. W. F. Albright, "The Psalm Of Habakkuk," Studies In Old Testament Prophecy, ed. H. H. Rowley, pp. 1-18 and the general attitude expressed throughout George V. Stonehouse, The Book Of Habakkuk: Introduction, Translation, And Notes On The Hebrew Text.

¹⁷¹Morton, loc. cit.

¹⁷²H. L. Ginsberg, "The Ugaritic Texts And Textual Criticism," J.B.L., LXII (1943), 109.

the nature of the material¹⁷³ it is more likely that the Hebrew text can be emended in the light of Ugaritic than can the Ugaritic be emended in the light of Hebrew. "The present writer," stated H. L. Ginsberg, "can not recall a single case where a Ugaritic reading has been corrected in a convincing manner in the light of a biblical parallel."¹⁷⁴

W. H. Morton submitted a thesis to the faculty of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1946 in which this principle was utilized in both textual criticism and lexicographical studies within the Old Testament.¹⁷⁵ Others have made less exhaustive studies¹⁷⁶ embodying this same principle and the practice of studying the Hebrew text in the light of parallel passages from Ugaritic literature has become an accepted method of approach to the textual study of the Old Testament.

Both H. L. Ginsberg and W. H. Morton pointed out a threefold contribution that such parallel studies of the

¹⁷³Especially is this true of the fact that the Ugaritic texts are extant in very ancient tablets while the Hebrew text was copied many times before the fixation of the Massoretic text. Cf. ibid.

¹⁷⁴Ibid.

¹⁷⁵Cf. Morton, op. cit.

¹⁷⁶Cf. H. L. Ginsberg, "The Ugaritic Texts And Textual Criticism," J.B.L., LXII (1943); Albright, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," Studies In Old Testament Prophecy, pp. 1-18.

two texts may make to the textual criticism of the Old Testament. The Ugaritic texts have (1) confirmed previous emendations, (2) suggested new emendations, or (3) rejected old emendations, at the same time "rigid/ly/ champion/ing/ a portion of the Masoretic text that has incurred the suspicion of having been produced by a scribal mistake."¹⁷⁷

Although of singular importance in the field of textual criticism, the Ugaritic material suffers certain limitations and is therefore only a partial means of establishing the text of the Old Testament. In the first place it is limited by the small number of texts¹⁷⁸ and, second, since Hebrew poetry is closer to Ugaritic than is Hebrew prose, occasions for emendation are more likely to occur in the poetical than in the prose sections of the Old Testament.¹⁷⁹

Used with discretion and proper understanding,¹⁸⁰ however, the texts constitute a quite valuable source for the textual study of the Old Testament as may be evidenced in the work of W. H. Morton who cited no less than fourteen

¹⁷⁷Morton, op. cit., pp. 70f. Cf. H. L. Ginsberg, "The Ugaritic Texts And Textual Criticism," J.B.L., LXII (1943), 109f.

¹⁷⁸Ginsberg, loc. cit.

¹⁷⁹Ibid.

¹⁸⁰Cf. the warning inherent in Morton, op. cit., p. 23.

instances wherein the texts proved of great value in the textual criticism of the Old Testament and fifteen occasions wherein the Ugaritic literature clarified the lexicographical study of the Biblical text.¹⁸¹

Significance Of The Ugaritic Literature For The Text Of Habakkuk

The more immediate concern of this thesis lies, of course, with the text of Habakkuk and, insofar as the present material is concerned, with the significance of the Ugaritic literature upon the Hebrew text.

Totally apart from the general cultural background of Habakkuk as it is illuminated by Ugaritic literature,¹⁸² the text itself has been more clearly defined because of the contributions of Ugaritic studies although these have

¹⁸¹Ibid., pp. viii, ix, 51-69, 70-96. A detailed study was made of fifteen words regarding lexicography and fourteen passages from Zechariah, Exodus, Psalms, Proverbs, Jeremiah, Habakkuk, II Samuel and Hosea were examined with a view toward clarifying the text itself in these instances.

¹⁸²Cf. Albright, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," Studies In Old Testament Prophecy, pp. 2ff. wherein he approves Cassuto's theory that "Habakkuk iii contains reminiscences of the myth of the conflict between Yahweh and the primordial Sea or River." In the same article Albright cites Habakkuk III as one of three poems in the Old Testament showing "striking agreement in style . . . between these . . . and the Canaanite epic poems of the early fourteenth century, B.C." Ibid., p. 5. He also identifies 3:8-15 as "adopted from an early poem or poems of Canaanite origin, celebrating the triumph of Baal over Judge River, Prince Sea and death," ibid., pp. 8-9.

not been of great significance numerically.¹⁸³ In keeping with the over-all plan of this dissertation, however, such versicular investigations will not be undertaken at this time but will be withheld until the following chapter at which time the text of Habakkuk will be examined not only in the light of Ugaritic studies but of other archaeological aids plus the insights gained from the study of text transmission.

III. THE PALESTINIAN SCROLLS

The observation of a recent writer that "to the humble of this earth it has been given to make some most amazing discoveries"¹⁸⁴ proved to be more prophetic than perhaps originally anticipated. For to the peasant woman who found the Amarna tablets and the Syrian ploughman whose activity led to the Ugaritic literature¹⁸⁵ must be added the bedouin shepherd whose curiosity precipitated discoveries¹⁸⁶ termed in an early announcement as the most important discovery ever made in Old Testament manuscripts.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸³Hab. 3:6b-7a. Cf. Morton, op. cit., pp. 85-88 for a detailed discussion of the difficulties of this passage and his use of Ugaritic in clarifying the verse.

¹⁸⁴Morton, op. cit., p. 1.

¹⁸⁵Ibid.

¹⁸⁶Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 4.

¹⁸⁷G. E. Wright, "A Phenomenal Discovery," B.A., XI (1948), 21.

The passage of almost ten years has served to substantiate this initial expression of confidence for with each succeeding year the import of the original discovery has been intensified as further finds have been made and as assembly, publication and evaluation of the scrolls has taken place.

The literature pertaining to the discoveries has reached a voluminous level¹⁸⁸ and, unfortunately, interest on the part of some has "almost taken on fad proportions."¹⁸⁹ Regardless of a rather superficial reaction on the part of a few,¹⁹⁰ the discoveries have injected new life into a field of study that as late as 1947 had been dismissed by one writer as ". . . all but over since we have simply exhausted the materials with which we can carry on our attempts to recover the original text of the Old Testament writings."¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁸Cf. the extensive bibliography of Burrows, op. cit., pp. 420-35.

¹⁸⁹T. C. Smith, quoted in "Sea Scrolls, Bible Value Called Limited," The Louisville Courier Journal, May 7, 1957, p. 10.

¹⁹⁰Cf. the attitude expressed through The Jewish Quarterly Review from the very time that the discovery was announced. Also, the flood of secondary books now on the market.

¹⁹¹Frederick C. Prussner, "Problems Ahead In Old Testament Research," The Study Of The Bible Today And Tomorrow, ed. Harold R. Willoughby, pp. 179-80.

It is hoped that within the scope of this discussion the significance of these discoveries for the textual study of the Old Testament and especially of Habakkuk may be adequately formulated. Competent students have recognized that "no single scholar is learned enough to pass judgment on all the problems involved"¹⁹² and with this principle constantly kept in recognition the investigation and synthesis of the problem will be attempted.

The Discovery Of The Scrolls

The story of the discovery of the initial scrolls in 1947 has become, through the excellent coverage given to the event, common knowledge among contemporary students of the Old Testament. For this reason no more than a brief sketch of both the initial and subsequent discoveries will be made and the reader is referred to any one of several competent sources for further details of the discoveries.¹⁹³

Qumran. First made public in 1948,¹⁹⁴ the initially

¹⁹²J. Philip Hyatt, "The Dead Sea Discoveries: Retrospect And Challenge," J.B.L., LXXVI (1957), 4.

¹⁹³Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 3-69. Geza Vermès, Discovery In The Judean Desert, pp. 5-28.

¹⁹⁴Cf. John C. Trever, "The Discovery of the Scrolls," B.A., XI (1948), 46-57.

discovered scrolls were found during the preceding year¹⁹⁵ in the vicinity of Wadi Qumran, a valley emptying into the Northeast section of the Dead Sea. Unfortunately, the discovery was made by Bedouin of the area rather than by trained archaeologists with the result that the entire discovery has no doubt been rendered less valuable because of the unscientific manner in which the scrolls were acquired.¹⁹⁶

A young shepherd of the Ta'amireh tribe, Muhammed Dib, first discovered the cave in modern times¹⁹⁷ as he rather idly tossed rocks through its opening while tending sheep in the region. Hearing the rock resound upon the pottery he became fearful and would not enter the cave unaccompanied¹⁹⁸ but reinforced by a number of associates he returned and found "a rocky chamber and in it large tall jars, broken pottery, and the leather scrolls which came to be known as the 'Dead Sea Scrolls' or more accurately now the Qumran Manuscripts."¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁵Frank M. Cross, Jr., "The Manuscripts of the Dead Sea Caves," B.A., XVII (1954), 2-22.

¹⁹⁶Hyatt, op. cit., pp. 1-2.

¹⁹⁷Vermes, op. cit., pp. 11f. calls attention to the likelihood of earlier "robberies" in both the third and the ninth centuries, A.D.

¹⁹⁸Cross, "The Manuscripts of the Dead Sea Caves," B.A., XVII (1954), p. 2.

¹⁹⁹Charles T. Fritsch, The Qumran Community: Its History And Scrolls, p. 28.

After a period of intrigue and mystery concerning the source of the discovery as well as its full extent,²⁰⁰ the scrolls ultimately came into the possession of two different groups; the Syrian Orthodox Community obtaining five of the eleven scrolls and the Hebrew University in Jerusalem the six remaining documents.²⁰¹

Once the material from the cave was recognized as genuine and of consequently great significance for Biblical studies, the search for further manuscript-bearing caves was initiated. Frank M. Cross, Jr., wrote,

the seven hundred or more Bedouin of this region have been scouring the caves and clefts of the wadis and cliffs abutting on the Dead Sea--hotly trailed by archaeologists and police, and in consequence there has been a steady stream of discoveries, some related to the original finds, some not.²⁰²

In the course of time other caves were examined and although not all such examinations yielded manuscripts "some twenty-five contained pottery of types common to the settlement and Cave One"²⁰³ and five sources other than the

²⁰⁰Cf. the accounts in Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 4ff.; Edmund Wilson, The Scrolls From The Dead Sea, pp. 3ff.; Mar Athanasius Y. Samuel, "The Purchase Of The Jerusalem Scrolls," B.A. XII (1949), 26-32.

²⁰¹Fritsch, loc. cit.

²⁰²Cross, "The Manuscripts of the Dead Sea Caves," B.A., XVII (1954), p. 4.

²⁰³Ibid., p. 7.

initial discovery yielded manuscripts.²⁰⁴

As a consequence of the multiplicity of caves discovered in Wadi Qumran it became impossible to speak any longer in the same terms used with regard to the initial discovery when referring to any one of the other caves. It has become the practice in more recent times to designate the caves by the name of the geographical location plus the number assigned to the cave by virtue of its sequence of discovery. The caves are therefore designated as 1Q for the first cave found at Qumran, 2Q, 3Q, 4Q, 5Q and 6Q for subsequent discoveries.²⁰⁵

Murabba'at. The appearance in late 1951 of manuscript fragments from a source other than Qumran called attention to the fact that the industrious Bedouin had discovered a new cache of manuscripts.²⁰⁶ After contacting the Ta'amireh Bedouin, from whom the fragments had been acquired, an expedition under the auspices of the Jordan Department of Antiquities, the French Archaeological School,

²⁰⁴Ibid., pp. 4ff.; Fritsch, op. cit., pp. 26-49 has a very good discussion of the manuscripts discovered in the caves of Qumran.

²⁰⁵Consequently the term "Dead Sea Scrolls" can only be used in a most general way to include the discoveries at not only Qumran but at other sites as well.

²⁰⁶Cross, "The Manuscripts of the Dead Sea Caves," B.A., XVII (1954), pp. 8f.

and the Archaeological Museum of Palestine was accompanied to the site on January 21, 1952.²⁰⁷

The expedition was led to the Wadi Murabba'at, a gorge which empties into the Dead Sea some twelve miles down the western side of the sea.²⁰⁸ The site is south of Khirbet Qumran and southeast of the city of Bethlehem, the wadi actually arising in the vicinity of the city.²⁰⁹

Excavations took place in January and February of 1952,²¹⁰ and in the course of the two months of activity four caves were discovered, two of them containing inscribed material and evidence of ancient occupation.²¹¹ According to Frank Cross, the fragments were mostly documents of the second century A.D. although a sixth century B.C. palimpsest embodying archaic Hebrew was also included.²¹² A few biblical texts from the second century A.D. were also found: Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, Isaiah and one phylactery,²¹³ but these were overshadowed by the

²⁰⁷Fritsch, op. cit., p. 53.

²⁰⁸Ibid., p. 52.

²⁰⁹Cf. the map given in Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 2.

²¹⁰Cross, "The Manuscripts of the Dead Sea Caves," B.A., XVII (1954), p. 10.

²¹¹Ibid.

²¹²Ibid., p. 11.

²¹³Ibid.

non-biblical literature.

Perhaps the most important of the literary remains from Murabba'at stems from the literature composed during the time of the Second Jewish Revolt against the Romans, A.D. 132-135.²¹⁴ Any documents from the period would have been valuable but correspondence believed to have belonged to Bar Choba enhanced this value tremendously.

These Hebrew documents from the period of the Second Jewish Revolt are truly sensational, the more so because of the meager literary sources of their period in Jewish history. Here are documents from Bar Kokhba himself, as well as from contemporaries who lived and fought at his side in the unsuccessful attempt to overthrow the Roman overlords.²¹⁵

Khirbet Mird. In July of 1952, the same year in which the caves of Wadi Murabba'at were excavated, the Ta'amireh discovered a number of "Greek and Arabic documents, as well as several Christo-Palestinian Syriac fragments,"²¹⁶ which they vaguely attributed to the Wadi Nar.²¹⁷

The actual site of the discovery was the ruins of a monastery located nine miles southeast of Jerusalem.

²¹⁴Fritsch, op. cit., p. 57.

²¹⁵Ibid., pp. 58-59.

²¹⁶Ibid., p. 51.

²¹⁷Cross, "The Manuscripts of the Dead Sea Caves," B.A., XVII (1954), p. 12.

The monastery was in use from the fifth to the ninth centuries A.D. but only the underground chambers and cisterns have remained.²¹⁸ From February until May of 1953 the site was excavated by a Belgian expedition which added to the previous discoveries and demonstrated that the material found by the Bedouins the previous summer had actually come from Khirbet Mird.²¹⁹

The manuscript fragments found by both the Bedouin and the expedition included,

bits of Greek and Syriac manuscripts of Old and New Testament books and Christian ritual texts, all from the fifth to eighth centuries A.D., as well as Arabic fragments and a few bits of Aramaic.²²⁰

An unknown source. Manuscripts from yet a fourth source appeared in August of 1952 although the exact location of the three caves in which the bedouin found the manuscripts had not been determined as late as 1956.²²¹ "Dates in the documents and coins found with them make it certain," according to Fritsch, "that this cache, like the one at Murabba'at belonged to a group of Jewish revolutionaries of the Second Revolt."²²²

²¹⁸Fritsch, op. cit., p. 50.

²¹⁹Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 64.

²²⁰Ibid.

²²¹Fritsch, op. cit., p. 59.

²²²Ibid.

The most important of the discoveries from this fourth group of caves consisted of a version of the Old Testament in Greek although other fragments of interest were also found.²²³ The Greek version consists of a text of the Minor Prophets and although in a highly fragmentary state²²⁴ it has been assessed a position of extreme importance in Septuagint studies in that it (the new Greek version)"solves many problems for the 'Proto-Septuagint' school of thought, and raises grave difficulties for defenders of alternate views."²²⁵

Significance Of The Scrolls

Discoveries so unique as to prompt the statement on the part of a recognized scholar that "the little world of biblical scholarship has been turned topsy-turvy by the discoveries"²²⁶ admittedly have far-reaching significance for the Biblical student. Without attempting a detailed examination of each single contribution of the scrolls it will be attempted to indicate the areas of study wherein they are most significant for Biblical study.

²²³Cross, "The Manuscripts of the Dead Sea Caves," B.A., XVII (1954), p. 12.

²²⁴Cf. ibid, the photograph of Hab. 1:14-2:5; 2:13-15.

²²⁵Ibid.

²²⁶Ibid., p. 4.

Higher criticism. Higher criticism, concerned among other things with the problems of authorship, unity and date of composition for various books, has been affected but little in a direct manner by the scrolls. At the same time there have been definite, although infrequent, points at which the scrolls have contributed to this study.

Arguments from silence are admittedly weak, yet coupled with other evidences they are significant in the critical study of a book. This is of particular significance insofar as the contribution of the scrolls to higher criticism is concerned for the evidence is often of a silent, although valid type.

As of March, 1957, the only book not represented among the scrolls was Esther.²²⁷ This may be in agreement with Pfeiffer who dates the book about 125 B.C.,²²⁸ while on the other hand, as Hyatt has indicated, "its absence may indicate only that it was not recognized at Qumran."²²⁹ In either case its absence is a point to be at least considered by higher critics.

The same type of evidence is presented by the absence of chapter three from the commentary of Habakkuk.

²²⁷Hyatt, op. cit., p. 4.

²²⁸R. H. Pfeiffer, Introduction To The Old Testament, p. 742.

²²⁹Hyatt, loc. cit.

This may support the school of thought which denies the Psalm to the prophet and assigns to it a late date²³⁰ or it may indicate no more than that, "being a psalm, it did not lend itself to such use as is made of other chapters. It is even possible that the commentary was never finished."²³¹ Again, the absence of the psalm from the commentary does not prove that it was never a part of the original book but it does constitute one source of evidence that must be considered in the criticism of the unity of Habakkuk.

The non-canonical form ascribed to the Daniel fragments seems to lend support to the theory that the book is a composition of the second century B.C.²³² Such non-canonical form has been assumed since "canonical books are usually written on leather, in the Jewish bookhand or in the paleo-Hebrew script, and the columns tend to be in length double their width";²³³ the Daniel fragments do not comply with these requirements.

Such was the opinion of Barthelemy²³⁴ and

²³⁰Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 598.

²³¹Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 321-22.

²³²Hyatt, op. cit., pp. 4-5.

²³³Ibid., p. 5.

²³⁴Cited by F. M. Cross, Jr., "Qumran Cave I," J.B.L., LXXV, II (1956), 122.

Hyatt²³⁵ and although Frank M. Cross has shown that ". . . exceptions among assuredly canonical works in matters of style do exist, such evidence [non-canonical form] is not infallible," he continued by stating, "We may say at least that the extraordinarily free treatment of Daniel at Qumran in at least four different copies strongly suggests its non-canonical status."²³⁶

Regardless of one's ultimate conclusions concerning the problem, the scrolls are significant for the criticism of the date of the book of Daniel and should at least be investigated with this in mind.

The quotation of canonical psalms by the Thanksgiving Psalms, composed not later than the second century B.C., has been understood to indicate that, contrary to the theory of many Old Testament scholars, the canonical psalms are not Maccabean in origin.²³⁷ In agreement with this line of evidence, one should also consider the fact that "if the MSS of the Psalter are from the second century B.C., a Maccabean dating of the individual psalms is to be ruled out."²³⁸

²³⁵Hyatt, loc. cit.

²³⁶Cross, "Qumran Cave I," J.B.L., LXXV, II (1956), 123.

²³⁷Fritsch, op. cit., p. 47.

²³⁸Hyatt, op. cit., p. 5.

A final consideration relative to the dating of the Psalter arises from a comparative study of the language, spirit and theology of the Old Testament psalms and the Thanksgiving Psalms of the Dead Sea Scrolls.²³⁹ Following such an investigation, Millar Burrows saw in their differences an indirect evidence testifying to the antiquity of the psalms of the Old Testament.²⁴⁰

Higher criticism must admittedly "await the further publication of materials and more detailed studies,"²⁴¹ yet present studies have advanced to the point that positive contributions have been made by the scrolls to the field of higher criticism.

Lower criticism. The scrolls contribute in a most significant manner to the attempted restoration of the text of the Old Testament in that they include, in both complete and fragmentary form, manuscripts older than any previously known²⁴² and, in addition, represent more than

²³⁹Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 323.

²⁴⁰Ibid.

²⁴¹Hyatt, loc. cit.

²⁴²Although opposition as epitomized in S. Zeitlin, editor of the Jewish Quarterly Review, may be found to the authenticity and early date of the scrolls, scholarly opinion appears unanimous in the ascription of pre-Christian and immediately post-Christian dates to the scrolls. Although dates must be reckoned on an individual basis for

one source or type from which they sprang.²⁴³

1. Ancient Manuscripts.

Although the antiquity of a scroll does not automatically demonstrate its superiority over later scrolls,²⁴⁴ it does give reassurance concerning the validity of textual transmission when general agreement may be found, for instance, between 1QIsa of about the second century B.C.²⁴⁵ and the tenth century A.D. manuscript reflecting the oldest complete Hebrew text prior to the discovery of the scrolls.²⁴⁶

The fact that they make specific manuscripts older than any previously known available for comparison with the traditional or massoretic text, coupled with the principle that the comparison of different manuscripts

particular scrolls, the opinion of W. F. Albright concerning the original find that, "I should prefer a date around 100 B.C. . . . there can happily not be the slightest doubt in the world about the genuineness of the manuscript," in "The Discovery Of The Scrolls," B.A., XI (1948), 55, seems to have survived and adequately captures the consensus of contemporary opinion regarding the date and authenticity of the scrolls. Cf. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 118-19 for a summary of contemporary thought relative to the dating of the scrolls.

²⁴³Cf. W. F. Albright, "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible," B.A.S.O.R., CXL (1955), 27-34.

²⁴⁴Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 303.

²⁴⁵Ibid., p. 118. Burrows dates 1QIsa ". . . a little before 100 B.C., or possibly a little later."

²⁴⁶Ibid., p. 302.

is the first and most important means of achieving the ends of textual criticism,²⁴⁷ makes the scrolls invaluable for lower criticism. This is especially true of IQIsa and the Habakkuk commentary since they represent the only works approximating completed form in the collection of scrolls,²⁴⁸ but it is no less true of the hundreds of fragments from each of the four different areas.²⁴⁹

2. Families of Manuscripts.

Apart from the presentation of ancient manuscripts, the scrolls make a second contribution to textual criticism in that at least three different sources or families of manuscripts are represented among their contents.²⁵⁰

Old Testament textual criticism has never had sufficient manuscripts from divergent sources to establish the manuscripts in "families" as in the case of the New Testament.²⁵¹ This condition was produced largely because of the triumph of the text form produced by the Tiberian

²⁴⁷Ibid., p. 301.

²⁴⁸Ibid., pp. 303, 315f.

²⁴⁹Ibid., p. 318.

²⁵⁰Hyatt, op. cit., p. 5. Perhaps it is premature to speak of "families of manuscripts" and one might adopt the terminology "pre-Masoretic recensions or text types" as suggested by Hyatt, ibid.

²⁵¹Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 301-2.

Massorettes,²⁵² after which the Massoretic Text was reproduced largely without change.²⁵³ This condition has only been remedied within the era following the discovery of the Palestinian scrolls.

Divergent recensions of the Hebrew text have been assumed for some time,²⁵⁴ but admittedly "these text-traditions have long perished"²⁵⁵ and it is largely to the credit of Frank M. Cross²⁵⁶ and Patrick W. Skehan²⁵⁷ that divergent recensions have been isolated among the Palestinian scrolls.²⁵⁸

²⁵²Cf. ante, p. 142.

²⁵³Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 302.

²⁵⁴Albright, "New Light On Early Recensions Of the Hebrew Bible," B.A.S.O.R., CXL (1955), 28.

²⁵⁵Ibid., citing J.Q.O.S., LXI (1941), 85b.

²⁵⁶F. M. Cross, "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related To The Original Hebrew Underlying The Septuagint," B.A.S.O.R., CXXXII (1953), 15ff.; also, Cross, "The Oldest Manuscripts From Qumran," J.B.L., LXXIV (1955), 147-73.

²⁵⁷Patrick W. Skehan, "The Text Of Isaias At Qumran," C.B.Q., XVII (1955), 38-43; cf. also Skehan, "Exodus In The Samaritan Recension From Qumran," J.B.L., LXXIV (1955), 182-88.

²⁵⁸Credit should also be given to W. F. Albright who, upon evidence from the scrolls, assumed Egyptian recensions "handed down for generations in Egypt itself." Cf. "New Light On Early Recensions Of the Hebrew Bible," B.A.S.O.R., CXL (1955), 31. His work did not consist of isolating particular recensions among the scrolls, however, and for that reason was not included above.

First among the recensions represented in the scrolls was that of a proto-massoretic type represented by the Isaiah scroll.²⁵⁹ As Albright observed,

The complete Isaiah Scroll (1QIs^a), now in Israel, is written in a text which belongs to the proto-Massoretic type, though it has a much fuller vocalization with the aid of waw and yodh and does have a few very useful variants, as well as a great many careless readings.²⁶⁰

With this analysis Skehan lends support by indicating that although the text represented in the manuscripts of Isaiah from Qumran are not held,

to the rigidly controlled transmission of a definitively fixed consonantal text such as we later find in the Masora, those cases are extremely rare in which any combination of them published or unpublished, gives exclusive or predominant witness to a non-masoretic reading.²⁶¹

A second recensional text form, corresponding to the Vorlage of the Septuagint,²⁶² was isolated through the investigation of fragments of I Samuel by Frank M. Cross.²⁶³

Following a study of a fragmentary text of two

²⁵⁹Hyatt, op. cit., p. 5.

²⁶⁰Albright, "New Light On Early Recensions Of the Hebrew Bible," B.A.S.O.R., CXL (1955), 28-29.

²⁶¹Skehan, "The Text Of Isaias At Qumran," C.B.Q., XVII (1955), 42.

²⁶²Hyatt, loc. cit.

²⁶³Cross, "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related To The Original Hebrew Underlying The Septuagint," B.A.S.O.R., CXXXII (1953), 15.

columns found in cave four at Qumran Cross concluded that the fragment stood "in the same general tradition as the Hebrew text upon which the Septuagint was based."²⁶⁴

As a result of this initial study he suggested that one's emphasis upon the faithfulness with which the Masoretic Text was transmitted "should not compromise our estimate of the fidelity of many LXX translators."²⁶⁵

Above all it should be emphasized that the authors of the Septuagint dealt quite seriously with the Hebrew text with the result that the Septuagint is of extreme value in "the establishment of a more original Hebrew text."²⁶⁶

Further research confirmed the earlier opinion of Cross, for an older fragment, 4QS^b, was found to agree "with LXX against MT thirteen times [and] with MT against LXX four times."²⁶⁷ As a result it was suggested that,

its [4QS^b] affinities with the tradition to which the Vorlage of the Old Greek belongs is most important and cannot be neglected in developing new methods and evaluations in future critical studies of the text of Samuel.²⁶⁸

²⁶⁴Ibid., p. 23.

²⁶⁵Ibid., p. 25.

²⁶⁶Ibid.

²⁶⁷Cross, "The Oldest Manuscripts From Qumran," J.B.L., LXXIV (1955), 172.

²⁶⁸Ibid.

Although reflected in fragments only, there appears to be represented among the Palestinian Scrolls a recension distinct from the proto-Massoretic recension which is to be equated with the Hebrew text form that formed the basis for the Septuagint.

Research into the Exodus scroll (4QEx^a), of which Ex. 6:25-37:15 is presently extant,²⁶⁹ has revealed a third pre-Massoretic recension; in this instance one quite like the Samaritan recension of the Pentateuch.²⁷⁰

Skehan unquestionably identified the fragment with the Samaritan since it reflects,

all the essential characteristics of that fuller text, including its repetitious manner of recounting the plague episodes, its borrowings from Deuteronomy and its transpositions; this is true at almost every point where the extant fragments make verification possible.²⁷¹

At the same time the fragment is in a script that is definitely Hebraic. "The script cannot by any stretch of the imagination be called Samaritan" stated Skehan, "it is now by far the fullest example we have, and a very fine one, of a quite regular Paleo-Hebrew bookhand."²⁷² Regardless

²⁶⁹Skehan, "Exodus In The Samaritan Recension From Qumran," J.B.L., LXXIV (1955), 182.

²⁷⁰Hyatt, op. cit., pp. 5-6.

²⁷¹Skehan, loc. cit.

²⁷²Ibid.

of by whom and for what purpose such texts were prepared, the fragments indicate that in the first and second centuries B.C. texts following the Samaritan recension were being produced at Qumran.²⁷³

Two observations should be made concerning the presence of pre-massoretic recensions among the Palestinian Scrolls. First, except for the proto-Massoretic recension all others have been discovered in relatively brief and at times highly fragmentary scrolls indicating that further evidence is an absolute necessity prior to postulating definite families of manuscripts within the Old Testament.²⁷⁴ A beginning in that direction has been made; to emphasize more than this at the present time would be premature.

Second, the two scrolls approximating complete books give clear support to the proto-Massoretic recension.²⁷⁵ Consequently, one should not envision a

²⁷³Ibid., pp. 182-83.

²⁷⁴The exception to this would be the Samaritan recension of Exodus in which approximately thirty-one chapters are intact, ibid.

²⁷⁵Isaiah and the Habakkuk Commentary both tend to support the proto-Massoretic recension. Cf. Skehan, "The Text Of Isaias At Qumran," C.B.Q., XVII (1955), 158-63, concerning Isaianic material. Also cf. Burrows, Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 315, who notes that apart from "differences in spelling, van der Plaeg finds about fifty variant readings in the commentary. Most of these have little or no importance."

disintegration of the traditional recension but should simply recognize that great freedom was exercised at Qumran with regard to authoritative recensions.²⁷⁶

Text transmission. At the same time that the scrolls contribute to the establishment of the original text they also aid in understanding the transmission of the text, both with regard to the emergence of a standard form and the errors incurred during the process of transmission.

Insofar as the fixation of the text is concerned, the scrolls reflect a text form that is almost identical with the Massoretic recension.²⁷⁷ Whether it had been officially adopted as authoritative is questionable,²⁷⁸ but at least the process of fixation had reached such a point that in numerous instances the scrolls and the Massoretic Text differ only superficially.²⁷⁹ Consequently, the emergence of a standard text has been forced to a

²⁷⁶Hyatt, op. cit., p. 6.

²⁷⁷Millar Burrows, "The Contents And Significance of the Manuscripts," B.A., XI (1948), 60, states that "the most significant fact about the Isaiah manuscript is the degree to which it agrees with our traditional Hebrew text."

²⁷⁸Hyatt, loc. cit. indicates that the Council of Jamnia had much more to do with establishing both the canon and the authoritative text than usually thought. He also indicates that prior to this time there was a great amount of freedom, among both Jews and Christians.

²⁷⁹Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 304, 305, 315.

period earlier than often supposed so that Rabbi Akiba now stands at the conclusion of the process rather than at its initiation.²⁸⁰

This should not be understood to mean that absolutely no other form than the Massoretic recension was to be found²⁸¹ but it does indicate that, especially with the Isaiah fragments, the differences between the scrolls and the Massoretic Text are largely accounted for by misspellings and common errors of transmission.²⁸²

Although an atmosphere of fluidity appears as an undercurrent within the scrolls²⁸³ this should not be

²⁸⁰Ibid., p. 320, "The process of standardization went through its most decisive phase within a century and a half after the abandonment of the Qumran caves, but it is clear that the rabbis of the second and subsequent centuries did not inaugurate the process. Their work evidently rested on ancient traditions, and the text they adopted as authoritative was one that had already been standardized to a considerable degree." Cf. also, Fritsch, op. cit., p. 47.

²⁸¹Cf. ante

²⁸²Skehan, "The Text Of Isaias At Qumran," C.B.Q., XVII (1955), 162.

²⁸³This emphasis has been made by Cross, especially as it was reflected in 4QS^a, cf. "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related To The Original Hebrew Underlying The Septuagint," B.A.S.O.R., CXXXII (1953), 24, wherein he speaks of finding for the first time "an Old Testament text in a state of relative fluidity." Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 320, feels that "the fragments from Cave 4 are clearly the remains of manuscripts made before the effort to standardize the text had gone very far . . . Isaiah may have been fixed relatively early."

allowed to obscure the fact that there is a basic agreement between the consonantal Massoretic Text and the Palestinian Scrolls.

The scrolls also have secondary significance for the history of text transmission in illustrating types of error incurred in the process of transmitting the text.

Examples of errors committed on the part of the transmitters of the text are clearly illustrated in the scrolls and, although these may be observed in later MSS, their presence in a scroll like lQIsa is indicative of the fact that such errors did occur and are not merely assumed by modern exponents of Old Testament textual criticism.²⁸⁴

Würthwein has limited the illustration of errors of transmission to material drawn from lQIsa and a comparison of that work will reveal the part that the scrolls play in this facet of text transmission.²⁸⁵

Other areas of significance. In addition to their significance for the areas of study mentioned above the scrolls have value for other areas of study as well. Of particular significance is the value of the scrolls for historical grammar, paleography and Judeo-Christian

²⁸⁴Ernst Würthwein, The Test Of The Old Testament: An Introduction To Kittel-Kahle's Biblia Hebraica, p. 71.

²⁸⁵Ibid., pp. 71ff.

backgrounds. No attempt will be made to do more than briefly summarize these areas of study and refer the reader to bibliographic material dealing with these issues since each area would, if fully developed, call for more than one person could competently carry out.²⁸⁶

1. Historical Grammar.

The history of pre-Massoretic Hebrew grammar was all but impossible to reconstruct prior to the discovery of the scrolls since its pronunciation was, until that time, discernible only in transliterations of parts of the Old Testament and Latin, the pronunciation of Hebrew by the Samaritans, and Hebrew texts with pre-Massoretic (Palestinian) pointing.²⁸⁷

A fourth source of evidence, more important than either of the three, is now available in the form of the Palestinian Scrolls and, as one authority has emphasized, "previous discussions of pre-Masoretic Hebrew grammar must now be revised in the light of this new evidence."²⁸⁸

²⁸⁶Hyatt, op. cit., p. 4, who emphasizes that "No single scholar is learned enough to pass judgment on all the problems involved."

²⁸⁷Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 323.

²⁸⁸Ibid. Burrows appears to be following Paul Kahle at this point for although the quotation is not specifically footnoted as such other material in the same context is credited to Kahle.

No pre-Massoretic grammar in the sense of a detailed text has evolved as a result of the scrolls, but numerous authorities have begun investigations²⁸⁹ and significant contributions to the history of grammar have been made.

At present, the main contributions made to grammatical studies as a result of the scrolls have been in the areas of orthography,²⁹⁰ pronunciation,²⁹¹ word formation,²⁹² syntax²⁹³ and the relationship of Hebrew to Aramaic insofar as usage was concerned.²⁹⁴

²⁸⁹Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 323, citing Paul Kahle. Edward P. Arbez, "Notes On The New Hebrew Manuscripts," C.B.Q., XII (1950), 173-89. Burrows, "The Contents And Significance of the Manuscripts," B.A., XI (1948), 57-61.

²⁹⁰Cf. the superabundance of scriptio plena, addition of \aleph at end of some words, \aleph written after \aleph quite commonly, are all illustrated by Arbez, loc. cit.

²⁹¹Apart from the study of orthography as an end in itself; "it shows also how Hebrew was pronounced at the time when the manuscripts were copied." Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 323. Cf. also, evidence pointing toward a similarity of pronunciation between all gutturals so that "the difference between guttural and guttural was not too noticeable at the time of the copying of the texts. Arbez, op. cit., pp. 178-81.

²⁹²Burrows, loc. cit., cf. also, Arbez, op. cit., pp. 186-89 wherein he discusses the discovery of new words and phrases found in the scrolls.

²⁹³Arbez, op. cit., pp. 181-86, discusses grammatical forms, including independent pronouns and pronominal suffixes, as well as verbal constructions.

²⁹⁴It is significant, although unexplained at present, that although most of the texts are in Hebrew, "the mother tongue of most of the Jews of Palestine at this time was Aramaic." Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 324.

2. Paleography.

"The contribution of the scrolls to the knowledge of Hebrew paleography thus becomes a significant part of the discovery," stated John C. Trever in an early article following the discovery of the scrolls,²⁹⁵ "especially in view of the paucity of epigraphic and paleographic evidence for Hebrew during the last centuries B.C. and the early centuries A.D."²⁹⁶

The paleographic study of the scrolls has presented one evidence upon which the date of the scrolls may be assessed,²⁹⁷ but apart from this contribution which paleography makes to the scrolls they have also made significant contributions to the study of paleography for, as Millar Burrows has stated, "Students of paleography will be kept busy for many years working out all the details of these new developments."²⁹⁸ The very fact that material

²⁹⁵John C. Trever, "A Paleographic Study Of The Jerusalem Scrolls," B.A.S.O.R., CXIII (1949), 6-24. Trever presents an individual characterization of each letter of the alphabet which is quite informative.

²⁹⁶Ibid., p. 6.

²⁹⁷Upon this basis a date of A.D. 70 for the latest items from the original discovery and a pre-Christian date for the three scrolls published by the American Schools of Oriental Research. W. F. Albright, "The Qumran (Dead Sea) Scrolls and Paleography," B.A.S.O.R. Supplementary Studies, Nos. 13-14, p. 2.

²⁹⁸Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 325.

has been made available for a period of time during which a paucity of material had previously prevailed would have been significant enough a contribution within itself. Beyond this, however, the scrolls have made possible a sequence of types of script, and contributed much toward the history of the square or Aramaic script.²⁹⁹

Not always favorably accepted as a criterion for dating, paleography has been ably defended by S. A. Birnbaum³⁰⁰ during the course of which he presented material from which "the careful reader will receive an excellent training in Hebrew paleographic method."³⁰¹

Although obviously of greater significance for the paleographic specialist than for the average scholar, the scrolls and fragments make available quantities of material not previously accessible and when eventually examined and interpreted by competent investigators they will no doubt extend the boundaries of scientific paleography into areas hitherto closed to minute investigation. All of this is

²⁹⁹Ibid., p. 324.

³⁰⁰Solomon A. Birnbaum, "The Qumran (Dead Sea) Scrolls and Paleography," B.A.S.O.R. Supplementary Studies, Nos. 13-14. Albright, loc. cit., notes that the attacks of Kahle, Teicher, Lehmann, Lacheman, and others constitute a "perfectly fantastic chapter of scholarly obscurantism."

³⁰¹Albright, loc. cit.

dependent upon investigation by the qualified specialist, however, and until his studies are completed one must simply await with expectancy what may well be a new chapter in the field of paleography.

3. Judeo-Christian Backgrounds.

Literature arising from immediately pre-Christian and post-Christian eras would naturally assume a position of relative importance in the understanding of both Judaism and Christianity since it would illuminate the theological, and at times historical, matrix out of which the movements sprang.

This is especially true in the case of Judaism since the literature sprang from a dissident group of non-conformists during the time that the temple was still standing.³⁰² It has been generally understood by historians that prior to the destruction of the temple Judaism was much more diversified than in the Talmudic period.³⁰³ At the same time it was "difficult for scholars to study Judaism before the year A.D. 70, partly because of the nature of rabbinic sources."³⁰⁴ All that was known of some of these diversified elements was from non-sympathetic

³⁰²Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 327.

³⁰³Ibid., p. 326.

³⁰⁴Hyatt, op. cit., p. 6.

sources, outside the group.

Only the apocryphal writings afforded any inside knowledge of Jewish groups other than the Pharisees; and these were preserved only by Christians, in translations (sometimes translations of translations), and often in more or less altered and Christianized editions.³⁰⁵

The great contribution of the scrolls at this point lies in the fact that information concerning the diversified elements within Judaism is no longer dependent upon external, non-sympathetic sources but is now available from documents produced by one of the groups.³⁰⁶ Such information has revealed "the fluidity, variety, and great vitality of Judaism in the period of the first two centuries B.C. and the first century of the Christian era."³⁰⁷

With regard to their contribution to a better understanding of Christianity, one should recognize their importance in this respect and while acknowledging possible influences or at least parallel thoughts between the two,³⁰⁸ the Christian faith must not be viewed as a mere extension of Essenism nor the person of Jesus as one whom "this

³⁰⁵Burrows, loc. cit.

³⁰⁶Ibid.

³⁰⁷Hyatt, loc. cit.

³⁰⁸Cf. Oscar Cullmann, "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research Into the Beginnings of Christianity," J.B.L., LXXIV (1955), 213-27.

movement had inspired [as] a leader who was to transcend both Judaism and Essenism."³⁰⁹

This is not to deny influences of the Qumran community upon the Christian movement; it is, however, to reject the specific union of the two. It would seem that the similarities often pointed out between the Christian movement and the community reflected in the scrolls³¹⁰ is more than coincidental and that although both the Christian faith and its founder transcended the teachings of Qumran they may have been susceptible to influences, either directly or indirectly,³¹¹ from the community life reflected in the scrolls.

Regardless of the problem of dependence that this may raise, the scrolls reflect a way of life and thought which should be given serious consideration since they were produced at approximately the time of Jesus' life and in a community located no less than ten miles³¹² from his birthplace and identical with the location customarily

³⁰⁹Wilson, op. cit., p. 97.

³¹⁰Cf. Cullmann, loc. cit.; J. M. Allegro, The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 134ff.; Wilson, op. cit., pp. 77ff. et passim.

³¹¹John the Baptist could well have formed such an avenue of influence. Cf. Cullmann, op. cit., pp. 218ff.

³¹²Cf. any acceptable map of Palestine.

ascribed to the temptation experience.³¹³

The present writer would value the scrolls for the light that they shed upon Jewish theology contemporaneous with Jesus' ministry and while acknowledging the possibility of direct influence upon the Christian movement would definitely reject Christianity as "an Essenism which succeeded on a broad scale"³¹⁴ or Jesus as one who merely walked the path already traveled by the teacher of righteousness.³¹⁵

The Contribution Of The Scrolls To Textual Studies Of Habakkuk

The scroll most pertinent to the present study is that of the Habakkuk Commentary, designated as 1QH and discovered in the first cave at Qumran.³¹⁶ The scroll is in the nature of a commentary on the first two chapters of Habakkuk and springs from the Qumran community of about the first century B.C.,³¹⁷ representing an attempt to

³¹³ Allegro, op. cit., pp. 56f.

³¹⁴ Cullmann, op. cit., p. 213, citing Ernest Renan.

³¹⁵ Cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey, trans. E. Margaret Rowley, pp. 99-100.

³¹⁶ Cross, "The Manuscripts of the Dead Sea Caves," B.A., XVII (1954), 2-3.

³¹⁷ Fritsch, op. cit., p. 34.

interpret the book of Habakkuk in terms of events contemporaneous with the author's own times.

Although the interpretative remarks interspersed through the commentary are quite valuable for a proper understanding of conditions during the time that the peshar was composed, they are of secondary importance at this point since only that part of the commentary actually embodying the text of Habakkuk is of significance to the present study. Consequently, no attention will be given to the problems of the identification of either the individuals mentioned within the commentary or the identification of adversaries³¹⁸ and investigation will be limited to that part of the commentary which actually reproduces the Hebrew text of Habakkuk.

Two limitations characterize LQH as it is used for textual studies and should be understood as its value for this area of study is estimated. First, the commentary is limited to the first two chapters of Habakkuk, the psalm constituting chapter three being completely omitted. The condition of the scrolls indicates that this omission was deliberate³¹⁹ and that either the psalm had not been

³¹⁸For such a discussion cf. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, pp. 123ff. Also cf. Vermes, op. cit., pp. 63ff.

³¹⁹Millar Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, vol. I, plate LXI.

composed at this date, or if composed it had not yet been attached to Habakkuk; or that the material of chapter three, being a psalm, did not suit the purpose of the commentary's author as did the prophetic material of chapters one and two. At any event, the commentary is, for textual study, limited by the absence of chapter number three from the scroll.

The second limitation of the scrolls for textual studies lies in the fact that the first chapter, being that part of the scroll which was on the outside of the roll and thus exposed, is in a deteriorated state.³²⁰ In addition to this, an examination of photographic copies of the scroll indicates that the entire lower part of the scroll has also deteriorated so that a part of the text has been destroyed.³²¹

This should not be understood to mean that the major part of chapters one and two are beyond recovery, for the great majority of the commentary has remained intact. The fact that certain portions, regardless of how small they may have been, were lost, none the less constitutes a limitation upon the scroll's usefulness for textual study.

³²⁰Ibid., plates LVf.

³²¹Ibid.

The discovery of the commentary at Qumran meant that there had been made available for the textual study of Habakkuk a part of that text dating to the first century B.C. and despite the minor limitations which characterize the scroll, lQH is at present the oldest Hebrew manuscript available for comparison with the traditional text of that book.

In the following chapter the Massoretic Text of Habakkuk and lQH will be collated and it is hoped that through this examination the contribution of lQH to textual studies will be adequately demonstrated.

IV. SUMMARY

The present chapter has served to indicate the significance of modern discovery for the study of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. The bearing of such discoveries have been both direct and indirect in their emphases but, regardless of the nature of the emphasis, Old Testament scholarship is able to come to a much clearer understanding of the formation, transmission and restoration of the Old Testament text as a result of the three discoveries discussed in this chapter.

Modern discovery has contributed to the study of the Old Testament text in that (1) it has demonstrated the flexibility of Massoretic vocalization, (2) it has

questioned the theory of the archetype, (3) it has revealed a parallel literature so closely akin to Hebrew that it may be used for textual corrections, and (4) it has made available for comparison with the Massoretic Text manuscripts older than any previously known.

CHAPTER IV

THE TEXT OF HABAKKUK EXAMINED IN THE LIGHT
OF MODERN RESEARCH AND DISCOVERY

CHAPTER IV

THE TEXT OF HABAKKUK EXAMINED IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN RESEARCH AND DISCOVERY

Despite any intrinsic value that the preceding areas of study may have possessed, this would not have justified an examination made solely to gain an esoteric knowledge of the various fields of research, regardless of the value that such an endeavor may have had for the one making the investigation. To the contrary, the previous studies, while of value within themselves, have been but part of a larger movement whose objective was broader in significance than the import of any single fragment of that movement.

The ultimate goal envisioned throughout this investigation has been not only that of more adequately defining and understanding the processes of the formation and the transmission of the text of the Old Testament, but to arrive at a text for the book of Habakkuk as nearly approximating the original text as possible with the resources available at the present time. In the words of Ernst Würthwein,

It would be quite wrong if our discussion, concerned with the actual fortunes of the Old Testament text, were to be understood as if it were written merely as a matter of academic interest in antiquities, or even to show the deficiencies which belong to the

Bible because of its transmission by men . . . we are not concerned so much with its deficiencies and errors as with endeavouring to overcome them. We are concerned to discover the original form of the Old Testament record, and that of the Bible as a whole, because we wish to be confronted with the Word itself, and not merely with that which fallible men have made of it in the process of transmission.¹

The ultimate goal of this thesis is so simple, and yet so profound, as this, "we wish to be confronted with the Word itself."² All other objectives, despite their intrinsic value, must subordinate themselves to this central purpose: the clarification of the text to the end that the prophet may coherently speak The Word through the written word.

It is therefore proper at this point to bring the contributions of the three previous chapters to bear upon a versicular examination of the text of Habakkuk. In fulfillment of this (1) certain guiding principles will be set forth as a standard for investigation, (2) textual variants will be classified according to types of variation in order not only to clarify the relationship of the text to other witnesses and to its own transmission but at the same time to facilitate the examination of the material by the reader, and (3) those textual problems

¹Ernst Würthwein, The Text Of The Old Testament: An Introduction To Kittel-Kahle's Biblia Hebraica, p. 82.

²Ibid.

deemed worthy of consideration will be studied in the light of both internal and external variants to the Massoretic Text.

I. PRINCIPLES OF INVESTIGATION

In order that the investigation of the text may be controlled by a sound methodology it is of the utmost importance that one formulate, whether in this or in any other textual study, certain principles that shall be considered normative for the examination of the text.

Unless this is done, studies may quite likely be carried out apart from any sense of uniformity with the result that decisions regarding the text may be of a highly individualistic nature with one concept prevailing at one time and another under yet other conditions; the controlling factor being determined by what the individual subjectively feels "should be done." It is hoped that by setting forth, although quite briefly, the following principles that such weakness will not characterize the present examination of the text of Habakkuk.

Cultic Associations Of The Text

The first chapter of this thesis was devoted in part to a study of the cultic associations of Habakkuk in which it was concluded that the book assumed cultic

relationships within Israel.³ Since one would expect a more valid transmission of cultic than of non-cultic literature,⁴ the text under consideration will be approached with the assumption that the attempt was made by those engaged in the process of its transmission to reproduce it with as high a degree of validity as possible.

Effect Of Transmission

Despite the attempts made to ensure the valid transmission of the text, it has been demonstrated in the course of this study that such transmission did not take place without error.⁵ As a consequence of this the text must be examined for errors perpetrated either deliberately or inadvertently during the process of reproduction.

Because transmission of the text was not achieved with absolute perfection, the present investigation will be undertaken with the assumption that the errors of transmission revealed during the course of earlier studies also characterize, in all probability, the text of Habakkuk and must therefore be taken into consideration in an attempt to arrive at the best possible text for the book.

³Supra, p. 43.

⁴Supra, pp. 23f.

⁵Supra, pp. 123ff.

Vocalization Of The Text

The vocalization of the Massoretic Text will be acknowledged as reasonably accurate, but, largely due to the contribution of the Cairo Geniza, not to the degree that Massoretic vocalization will be defended at every point merely because it is Massoretic in origin.

To the contrary, massoretic vocalization will be treated as simply the triumphant and not necessarily the sole system of Hebrew vocalization.⁶ Consequently, there will be times during the examination of the text when the vocalization now utilized in Massoretic Text will be altered in order to gain a more acceptable reading.⁷

It should be clear, therefore, that the vocalic text will not be approached with the same degree of caution as the consonantal text but will be dealt with on a much less rigid basis.

Parallel Literatures

The virtual linguistic equation of Ugaritic and Hebrew has enriched the textual study of the Old Testament in that there has been provided a new source of material

⁶Supra, p. 156.

⁷At the same time that any such changes are made, however, they must be justified and Massoretic vocalization will prevail unless adequate justification can be given for supplanting it.

for the textual examination of its poetic sections.⁸

The third chapter of Habakkuk, written as a psalm, will therefore be examined in the light of this new evidence with due emphasis upon both the linguistic and the structural composition of the chapter.

Qumran Commentary On Habakkuk

The Hebrew text of Habakkuk imbedded in lQH will be utilized in a comparison with the Massoretic Text. Dating to the pre-Christian era,⁹ the commentary should not only prove valuable in the study of individual words and phrases but should also give significant testimony to the validity of Massoretic transmission of the text since the commentary is separated by so great a period of time from the oldest previously accessible manuscript.

Evidence Of The Versions

The versions of the Old Testament will be utilized as possible corrective aids to the Hebrew text although only the Septuagint will be consulted on a minute basis.

The value inherent in the versions has not been a point of discussion in this thesis but in view of the extreme importance generally attached to the place of the

⁸Supra,

⁹Millar Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 186.

Septuagint in textual studies it was felt that it would of necessity have to be collated with the Massoretic Text. In the course of such a comparison three possibilities will be seen to emerge.¹⁰ (1) MT and LXX may agree, offering a text to be followed without serious question. (2) MT and LXX may offer deviating texts wherein MT may clearly be the original; MT and LXX may offer different but equally acceptable readings; or, MT may offer a reading that is "doubtful or impossible on grounds of language or content, whereas the other witnesses offer a satisfactory reading."¹¹ (3) It is also possible that neither MT nor LXX offer an acceptable reading and one must resort to conjecture although "the scholar must further beware of the uncertainty of a text established by such means."¹²

The Ben Asher Text Form.

The consonantal Massoretic Text represented by the ben Asher tradition will be accepted as normative and alterations will be made only when such changes have been unquestionably established.

In the case of two equally valid readings the

¹⁰A fuller statement of these principles may be found in Ernst Wurthwein, op. cit., pp. 80-81, who suggested the three possibilities included above.

¹¹Ibid., p. 80.

¹²Ibid., p. 81.

Massoretic Text will be considered superior in every instance; the same principle will also be followed in the case of divergent readings unless other textual witnesses are clearly to be preferred. Thus, at no point is MT to be considered to be textually inferior to other witnesses unless such inferiority can be validly demonstrated.

II. VARIATIONS BETWEEN LQH AND MT

A comparison of LQH and MT revealed the presence of one hundred and thirty-five variants between the two texts and although only sixty of these were considered of sufficient importance to warrant their inclusion in the seventh edition of Biblia Hebraica,¹³ the total number of variants has been classified by the present writer and will appear in the pages immediately following.¹⁴

In order to facilitate the examination of the variants and at the same time to clarify the relationship of LQH to MT, the textual differences will be classified

¹³Biblia Hebraica, seventh edition, pp. 946-48, wherein the variants may be discovered through an examination of the critical apparatus.

¹⁴Such an examination was felt to have been justified since one hundred thirty-five variants are present between LQH and MT, seventy-seven of which are not included in Biblia Hebraica, seventh edition. A detailed examination is needed for a study of historical grammar and the validity of text transmission.

according to variations due to addition, deletion, substitution, linguistic peculiarities and errors of the copyist. It should be understood that MT will be accepted as normative for this examination so that the classification of a LQH variant as an "addition" or as a "deletion" does so with MT as the point of reference.¹⁵

Additions To The Text

Among the one hundred thirty-five variants found between the first two chapters of MT and LQH eighteen were found to have been additions made by the LQH scribe.

The addition of a word. At only one point did LQH make the addition of a word not found in MT; such an occurrence taking place in 2:7.

In 2:7 LQH has added the word מאן , or מ'אן ,¹⁶ a word not found in MT. The addition has not generally

¹⁵One should not infer that the LQH scribe had MT before him. Emphasis should be given to the fact that MT has merely been accepted as the point of reference for convenience.

¹⁶This is a possibility since א and א' are indistinguishable in LQH, cf. Millar Burrows, "General Introduction," The Dead Sea Scrolls Of St. Mark's Monastery, I, xii; cf. also ibid., LQH, Plate LVII, Col. VII, line 13 for an example of the paleographic identification of א and א' .

been taken into serious consideration¹⁷ and is likely an erroneous insertion.

The addition of the definite article. At no point does LQH delete the definite article although it makes its addition in four instances.

1:4 מַשְׁפֵּט of MT becomes הַמַּשְׁפֵּט in LQH.

2:2 קוּרָא has been changed to הַקּוּרָא in LQH.

2:9 בָּצַע has suffered the change not only of the substantive but the article has also been added to give הַשָּׂעֵר.

2:14 עַל-הֵימָּ of MT has become עַל-הֵימָּ in LQH and although there is a lacuna at this point enough of the text has remained to indicate that the הַ has been added to the substantive.

The addition of the preposition. LQH adds the preposition in two instances but, as in the case of the definite article, it never deletes the preposition.

1:13 עַר has been altered to בָּרַע by the addition of the בּ.

2:20 מַפְנִיּוֹ of MT becomes מַלְפְּנִיּוֹ in LQH.

Of the two additions, 2:20 appears to be no more

¹⁷W. H. Brownlee, "The Jerusalem Habakkuk Scroll," B.A.S.O.R., CXII (1948), 8-18, does not consider this nor do either Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 368, or T. H. Gaster, The Dead Sea Scriptures In English Translation, p. 253, in their translations.

than an alternate means of expressing the same idea while 1:13 perhaps reflects a slightly greater accuracy than MT, or at least presents the idea with greater clarity.

The addition of the conjunction. The LQH scribe has added the conjunction nine times; once with the substantive, three times with the particle and five times with verbal forms. Although every example will not be cited the following are illustrative of this practice on the part of LQH scribe.

1:8 the substantive פֶּרֶשׁוֹ of MT has been altered to וּפֶרֶשׁוֹ in LQH.

2:6 is illustrative of the addition of the conjunction to the particle wherein לֹא of MT has been altered to וְלֹא in LQH.

1:13 has changed the MT תַּחֲרִישׁ to וְתַחֲרִישׁ in LQH.

1:15 has added the וְ to יִגְרֶהוּ of MT to give the form וְיִגְרֶהוּ found in LQH.

Addition of the pronominal suffix. In two instances LQH has added a pronominal suffix not found in MT.

2:1 is illustrative of the addition of the suffix to a substantive; מְצוֹר, appearing in MT without an affirmative, has been altered by the addition of the first person, common, singular suffix to give מְצוֹרִי in LQH.

1:12 has altered the MT form לְהוֹכִיחַ to read לְמוֹכִיחוֹ

in LQH, thus bringing about the addition of the third person, masculine, singular pronominal suffix used as the direct object of the verb under consideration.

Deletions From The Text

Less numerous than the former class of variants,¹⁸ the deletions made by LQH are nevertheless significant in determining not only the best possible text for Habakkuk but the degree of fidelity with which manuscripts were transmitted, as well.

Deletion of a word. A comparison of MT and LQH revealed that LQH deleted a word found in MT at only two points. It should be observed, however, that this has reference to absolute omission of a word and does not include the substitution of one word for another, a type of variant not yet considered.

2:6 MT has $\eta\lambda\kappa$ while LQH has deleted the form without making the substitution of an alternate form.

1:8 the verb $\eta\kappa\alpha'$ of MT has been deleted in LQH. In this connection it should be noted that an examination of the photographic copy of LQH will indicate that the deletion was not produced by fragmentation but seems to have been deliberate since ample space was available had

¹⁸Eleven deletions have been made by LQH from MT.

the scribe chosen to use it.

Deletion of the interrogative. 1:17 MT העל כן, translated "Shall, therefore. . .," has been altered to על כן in lQH and consequently translated as simply, "therefore." The change from an interrogative to a declarative sentence is significant and should be taken into consideration in arriving at a final text for Habakkuk.

Deletion of the conjunction. The conjunction has been omitted by lQH a total of seven times; once from a substantive,¹⁹ once from an adverb,²⁰ twice from a particle,²¹ and three times from a verb.²² The following instances illustrate this form of variant between MT and lQH.

1:8 lQH deletes the conjunction from וּפְרָשִׁי of MT to give פָּרַשׁ .

2:5 וְלֹא of MT has been altered to לֹא in lQH.

2:13 the verb וְיִגְעַי of MT has been changed to give יִגְעוּ in lQH.

Deletion of the pronominal suffix. lQH deletes the

¹⁹_{1:8}

²⁰_{1:17}

²¹_{2:5, 15}

²²_{2:3, 6, 13}

pronominal suffix at only one point, 2:18. At this point the third person, masculine, singular suffix of ׀לֹפּ in MT has been deleted to give simply ׀לֹפּ in LQH.

Substitutions Between LQH And MT.

A third class of variants between LQH and MT, comprising thirty-six of the one hundred thirty-five differences, is composed of those instances wherein the LQH scribe has substituted a form alternate to the one found in MT.

Substitution of a word. One of the most significant forms of substitution insofar as the reconstruction of Habakkuk is concerned is that of replacing a word in MT by a different word in LQH.²³

The practice followed in this connection has been to consider a word as an actual substitution if it spelled a word other than the one present in MT. This was done despite the fact that at certain points words classed as variants were obviously scribal errors. This has been allowed in an effort to arrive at an objectivity concerning the witness of LQH to MT which would have been impossible had a word been judged a scribal error and consequently disregarded when it actually spelled a word other than

²³Thirteen words have been substituted between LQH and MT.

the one in MT.²⁴

Because the substitution of one word for another constitutes an area of extreme importance for the text, each of the cases wherein LQH records a word other than the one found in MT will be cited below.

1:8 the form וקלו of MT has been altered to וקול in LQH and is a possible substitution although the change may reflect no more than an error produced by the transposition of consonants in the course of the transmission of the text.

1:9 MT reading קדימה has been replaced by LQH קדים.

1:11 MT reads ואשם while LQH substitutes וישם.

1:15 ויאספיהו appears in MT while LQH gives ויספיהו.

1:17 LQH substitutes חרבו for the MT חרמו.

2:5 היין of MT has been altered in LQH to give הון.

2:7 ויקצו of MT has been changed to read ויקיצו in LQH.

2:9 השצע has been used in LQH to replace בצע of MT.

2:13 LQH has substituted מעם for the MT מאח.

2:15a על of MT has given way to אל of LQH.

2:15b מעוריהם of MT has been replaced by the form מועדיהם in LQH.

²⁴For example in 2:19 LQH ורמה is most likely to be a case of confusion between ר and the ד of MT דרמה but ורמה could be located from ורם, cf. BDB, p. 926, and is therefore treated as a substitution of words although in the opinion of the present writer it is a scribal error.

2:16 lQH has replaced the וְהָעָרַל of MT with וְהָרַעַל.

2:18 וּמִוֵּרָה of MT has been replaced by וּמִרִי in lQH.

2:19 לֹאֲבָן דֹּמָה found in MT has been replaced by the form לֹאֲבָן דֹּמָה in lQH.

While neither an explanation of the basis for each substitution nor a justification for the alteration has been made, it should be apparent that if the above substitutions be accepted, either in whole or in part, the text of Habakkuk will be affected at numerous points.

Whether every substitution now present in lQH may be validated is debatable; the fact that serious substitutions appear in the text is beyond question.

Substitution of verbal forms. Variations between MT and lQH occur in the case of verbal forms on nine occasions. In view of the seriousness of this type of substitution each of the alterations will be listed although judgment will not be passed upon which of the two forms should be followed.

1:10 A hithpa'el imperfect, יִחְקֹלֵס, of MT has been supplanted by either a simple or an intensive perfect, וְקִלַּס, in lQH.

1:12 lQH has substituted לְמִוְכִיחַ, a participial form, for לְהוֹכִיחַ, an infinitive construct, of MT.

1:14 וְחָעֵשָׂה of MT has been replaced by וְחָעַשׂ in lQH.

1:14 ~~ללא~~ of MT has been replaced by ~~למשל~~ of LQH.

1:15 MT reads העלה, Hiphil Perfect, while LQH gives יעלה, an imperfect form.

2:5 בוגד, the participial form of MT, has been replaced by יבגוד of LQH.

2:6a may reflect a substitution of a verbal for a nominal form; ומליצי of LQH which replaced ומליצה of MT. If this be true, the pronominal suffix, first person, common, singular has also been added to the participle by LQH.

While this is suggested as a possible variation of verbal form it should be understood that it may be no more than a scribal error incurred in the process of transmission.

2:6b LQH has substituted יכביד for ומכביד of MT.

2:9 לנהנצל, a niphal infinitive construct, found in MT has been replaced by לנצל, a qal or piel infinitive construct, in LQH.

Each of the above substitutions must be evaluated in the light of its own construction and context; yet, regardless of one's ultimate decision to accept or reject the substitution, LQH presents the above variations of verbal forms between itself and MT.

Substitution of an alternate form. In Hebrew, certain words are found in both their final and their

abbreviated forms,²⁵ especially is this true of pronouns and one may find them in both their primary and their secondary forms as in the case of אֲנִי and אָנֹכִי,²⁶ הֵמָּה and הֵם;²⁷ plus זֶה and its secondary form זֶה,²⁸ to mention but three.

It should occasion no surprise, therefore, if LQH should reflect this same practice, once with a substantive, once in the case of an adjective, and three times in the case of pronouns.

1:9 MT קָדִים has been replaced by LQH קָדִים .

1:16 LQH has substituted the abbreviated form בָּרִי , for the full form בְּרִיאָה found in MT.²⁹

1:11 the demonstrative pronoun זֶה appears in LQH while its secondary form זֶה appears in MT.

1:16 the shortened form הֵם appears in LQH while the full הֵמָּה occurs in MT.

²⁵Although words were not abbreviated in the modern sense except on coins, cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, Hebrew Grammar, pp. 30f., words did appear in secondary forms that were more brief in their spelling; the deleted consonant normally being one weak in pronunciation.

²⁶Kyle M. Yates, The Essentials of Biblical Hebrew, revised by J. J. Owens, p. 32.

²⁷Ibid., p. 33.

²⁸Gesenius-Kautzsch, pp. 109f.

²⁹BDB, pp. 135, 138.

2:18 the personal pronoun used as direct object appears in this verse, the full form וְהוּ in LQH and the abbreviated form ו in MT.

Substitution of the pronominal suffix. On seven occasions LQH has made substitutions affecting the pronominal suffix as it determined the number of the verb, the substantive and the direct object.

The pronominal suffix appended to the verb has been modified by LQH so that on three occasions the number has been changed from the third person, masculine, singular to the third person, masculine, plural. Such alterations have occurred in 2:6 wherein MT וַיֹּאמֶר is altered to LQH וַיֹּמְרוּ , as well as the change of MT וַיֹּאסֶף to LQH וַיֹּאסְפוּ of 2:5a and the substitution of LQH וַיִּקְבְּצוּ for MT וַיִּקְבְּצֵן in 2:5b.³⁰

1:13 has also altered the suffix, in this case the MT תְּבִיט being changed to the LQH תְּבִיטוּ resulting in a change from second person, masculine, singular in MT to second person, masculine, plural in LQH.

Such substitutions are not limited to verbal forms,

³⁰The reversal of this is found in the change from the second person, masculine, singular to the third person, masculine, plural of 1:5 wherein MT תֹּאמְרוּ was altered to LQH יֹאמְרוּ . The change occurs in the commentary and not in the quoted text, however, and for that reason was not cited above.

however, and the same type of substitution is found in the following alterations made concerning substantives.

2:15 the second person, masculine, singular suffix found in MT ךמחך has been altered to a third person, masculine, singular suffix in LQH to give חמחו .

2:17 the second person, feminine, plural suffix found in יהיהן of MT has been supplanted by a third person, feminine, singular suffix found in יחה of LQH.

In addition to these two categories regarding the pronominal suffix, LQH has also made substitution of the pronominal suffix when used as the direct object of a verb.

1:10 MT וי לכדה with a third person, feminine, singular suffix as the direct object has been supplanted by the third person, masculine, singular suffix in the LQH reading ו.לכדהו .

Substitution in the number of a substantive. In 2:18 the alteration of MT יצרי to the reading יצריו in LQH indicates that the number of יצר has been changed from the singular to the plural; the י being the plural construct ending intervening between the substantive and its pronominal suffix.

Substitution of word order. Possibly no more than an error on the part of the scribe in transposing two words, the reversal of word order found in 2:6 may have been

deliberate and in the light of this possibility is considered as a variant. As such the effect of altering the MT מליו to the reading לעליו found in LQH would have been to intensify the word לעל.

Linguistic Peculiarities

In classifying particular variants as linguistic peculiarities three types of variation between MT and LQH have been considered³¹ although they could well have been divided between the categories of additions and deletions to the text.

This procedure has been followed since it was felt that the insertion of א, full and defective pointing, plus the use of matres lectiones were so characteristic of early scribal activity that they should be considered separately as unique linguistic practices of the period.

Insertion of א. Of the additions made by LQH to the text of Habakkuk one of the most unusual is the addition of א at various points throughout the text.

The addition occurs eleven times; once within a word in 1:6, once at the conclusion of a word in 1:5 and nine times following the ' of the MT form 'א to give א'א.

³¹A total of sixty-six linguistic peculiarities appear between MT and LQH.

1:6 has an ם added in the lQH text so that the MT הַכְּשָׁדִים becomes הַכְּשָׁדַיִם in lQH and evidently represents either an alternate or an erroneous spelling of the word.³²

1:16 serves as one example of a practice common to the lQH scribe; that of adding the ם to the כִּי of MT. In this particular verse MT כִּי בְהִמָּה has been replaced by the lQH reading כִּיָּא בְהִם .

In each of the nine examples, lQH demonstrates a preference for spelling the particle כִּיָּא rather than כִּי as in MT; a peculiarity also to be found in other Qumran manuscripts.³³

The presence of the form כִּיָּא in lQH is not the only point of significance in this connection, however, and it may be observed from an examination of the text that the lQH scribe utilizes the form כִּי, without the addition of ם, only once in the entire two chapters (2:8).³⁴

³²This should not be completely dismissed as a scribal error, however, for lQIsa 2:6 has inserted an ם in MT וַיִּכְרִימוּ to give וַיִּכְרִימוּם . Further examination of the insertion of ם may reveal a basis for such insertions.

³³A comparison of chapters one and two of lQIsa with the same chapters of lQH revealed the same tendency in lQIsa.

³⁴lQIsa, chapters one and two, reflect a less highly developed use of inserted ם and of full pointing than does lQH, chapters one and two. At one point, 2:6, lQIsa corrector has had to write in the ם; was the original scribe perhaps unaccustomed to so writing the particle?

A practice similar to the addition of ׀ to י׃ has occurred in the exposition on 1:5 for in this instance LQH has added an ׀ to י׃א׃א׃א׃ to give ׀א׃א׃א׃ in LQH. This could be simply the case of an error of spelling; yet, it is so similar to the addition of ׀ to י׃ that there may be a definite relationship between the two practices. The addition of ׀ to י׃ being limited to one occurrence, makes it impossible to evaluate properly the phenomenon, however, since instances frequent enough to establish a definite pattern do not occur in LQH.

Full and defective pointing. The writing of the "o" and "i" class vowels, holem and hirek yodh, as full or defective is constantly encountered in Biblical Hebrew and it was therefore of some considerable significance when it was noted in the examination of the Qumran scrolls that the LQH scribe habitually made use of the full spelling of the vowels, especially of the "o" class. No attempt will be made to list each variant of this type because of the large number of differences of this type found between MT and LQH.³⁵ Therefore, examples illustrating each problem of defective or full pointing will be cited.

Where MT and LQH are at variance in the writing of the "o" class vowel, LQH uses the full method of pointing

³⁵Forty-four such variants may be located.

the vowel twenty-three of the twenty-four times the two texts are at variance.

Such usages embrace both the short "o" as in כָּל of MT 2:20 and the long "o" in בְּנֵה of MT 2:12. In each of these instances lQH represented the vowel by ן as in 2:20 where כּוֹל appears and in בּוֹנֵה of 2:12. This practice on the part of the lQH scribe is further reflected in the following examples drawn at random from lQH.

2:17	MT	יִשְׁבִּי	:	lQH	יּוֹשְׁבִי .
2:18	MT	כָּל	:	lQH	כּוֹל .
2:6	MT	לֹא	:	lQH	וּלּוֹא .
2:4	MT	יִשְׁרָה	:	lQH	יּוֹשְׁרָה .
2:1	MT	אֶעֱמְדָה	:	lQH	אֶעֱמוֹדָה .

MT and lQH also differ in the pointing of at least one "u" class vowel, the kibbutz. Of five occurrences in MT, lQH never agrees with this pointing by writing it defectively but always uses ן to express the kibbutz of MT.

2:4 עֲפֹלָה of MT is altered to עּוֹפְלָה by lQH.

2:2 MT reading הֶלְחֹחַ is changed in lQH to הּלוֹחַח.

1:9 MT כָּלָה has been altered in lQH to כּוֹ.³⁶

1:8 יִעֲפֹי of MT is supplanted by יּעוֹפוּ of lQH.

2:13 וּלְאֻמִּים of MT is changed by lQH to וּלּוֹמִים .

³⁶Although a lacuna appears at this point the material remaining is sufficient to indicate that the ן was used for MT..

In the case of "i" class vowels, MT and LQH vary in their pointing on fifteen occasions. In only three of these instances does LQH use the full pointing ' . Examples of such usage by LQH are,

2:3	MT	וְיִפֹּן :	LQH	י'פִיח .
2:15	MT	וְרַעְיָהוּ :	LQH	וְרַעִיָהוּ .
2:13	MT	וְיַעֲפֹר :	LQH	וְיִיעֲפֹר .

It should be taken into consideration concerning the use of the "i" class vowel that of the three cases wherein LQH uses the full ' , two of these vowels were .. in MT and only one a . (hirek). It is quite likely that in the case of the use of ' for .. that one finds the use of the ' as matres lectiones and not as the full pointing of an "i" class vowel.³⁷ If this hypothesis be correct, then in only one of fifteen instances of variation does LQH use the full means of writing the hirek.

In summary this should be noticed: (1) LQH uses full "o" twenty-three of twenty-four times, (2) it uses waw for kibbutz five out of five times, and (3) it uses the full "i" class vowel, hirek, only three out of fifteen times, or if two of these be considered matres lectiones then only once in thirteen times does LQH use full hirek.

³⁷It is of course impossible to ascertain whether the yodh, or waw, appears as a matres lectiones or whether it is merely an alternate means of writing holem that was used by the scribe.

Use of matres lectiones. If the use of ך and ם as matres lectiones be dismissed in view of their consideration under the problem of full and defective pointing, lQH utilizes this phenomenon on eleven occasions; five times with verbal forms and six times with substantives.

Insofar as usage with verbal forms is concerned, the letter ך replaces the ך of the affirmative ך as represented in MT on numerous occasions; the clearest example of this occurring in 2:16 where the MT ךַּׁׂ׃׃ has been altered to ךַּׁׂ׃׃ by lQH, although other usages of this type occur in 2:7a, 2:7b, 2:8, and 2:10.

The letter ך also appears as a vowel, matres lectiones, in association with the substantive and the preposition. As such it is used by lQH solely to replace the ך of the pronominal suffix ך, second person, masculine, singular as that form appears in MT.

The MT ךַּׁׂ׃׃ of 2:16 has been replaced by ךַּׁׂ׃׃ in lQH and is illustrative of the change that occurs in the pronominal suffix attached to substantives. Such changes may also be noticed in 2:7, 8, 10a and 10b.

The usage of ך as a matres lectiones with the preposition is reflected in 2:16 wherein ךַּׁׂ׃׃ of MT has been altered to ךַּׁׂ׃׃ of lQH.

When the use of matres lectiones by the lQH scribe, whether with verbal forms, substantives or prepositions,

is considered it is of interest to note that only η is used to exercise the function of the "a" class vowel, despite the fact that \aleph is often cited as an "a" class matres lectiones.³⁸

Errors Attributable To The Copyist

Among the variants already classified there have been numerous examples of what seemed likely to have been scribal errors. Because of a desire to be as objective as possible these were allowed to stand under their particular classification regardless of the writer's personal opinion concerning the likelihood of scribal error.

There are, however, a number of variants that are obviously errors produced by scribal activity. Since these could not legitimately be included under any previous category they are cited here as examples of error introduced through the process of transmitting the text.

2:6b the MT reading $\eta\aleph\aleph$ has been replaced by $\eta\aleph\aleph$ in LQH and provides an example of a silent consonant having been omitted through an error of hearing or of carelessness.

2:7 the additional η present in LQH $\eta\aleph\aleph$ is probably an error in spelling the MT form $\eta\aleph\aleph$.

2:10 the double η in LQH $\eta\aleph\aleph$ represents an error introduced through the reduplication of a consonant in

³⁸Yates, op. cit., p. 7.

copying MT form קצוה.

2:16 the מכוּד of MT has been altered in lQH to מכוּד and reflects an error, perhaps of sight, by the copyist in omitting the כ of the word ככוּד.

Conclusion

Having collated the two manuscripts and classified the variants between lQH and MT, there are several observations that should be called to attention concerning the witness of lQH to MT.

First, in the main, lQH represents the same text tradition as that embodied in MT.

At no point did lQH introduce or omit an entire phrase foreign to MT. Rather, such divergencies of content that were found occurred with regard to the substitution of a single word by the lQH scribe. Even at this point, the attempt of the lQH scribe to adhere to the text now embodied in MT was reflected in that he never altered more than one letter in the spelling of the MT word. For instance, וקלו and וקול , ואשם and וישם , or חרמו and חרבו each reflects a tendency on the part of lQH to follow the basic spelling of MT.

Second, divergencies from MT are often attributable to the difference of grammatical development between the two texts; lQH not having developed so fully as MT. Such

variations of spelling, while valuable for historical grammar, do not vitally affect the text form of Habakkuk since at no point have such divergencies produced an alteration of the text in the form of a reading different from MT.

Third, still other divergencies may be traced to erroneous manuscript reproduction and insignificant variations on the part of the scribe who produced LQH. In each of these instances the variations appear to be negligible in their importance for the validity of the text and while representing an alteration of the text form are no more than minor scribal errors.

Fourth, despite the confirmation given by LQH to the text form of MT, the variation of words and grammatical structure between the two texts constitutes a most important challenge to MT which must be given serious consideration in the study of the text.

Variant words, while explainable as unintentional errors on the part of the LQH scribe, may equally well represent the same type of error in the formation of MT. For example, in the case of $\text{QW}\aleph$ and $\text{QW}^{\prime}\aleph$ did the LQH scribe substitute \prime for \aleph in $\text{QW}\aleph$ to give $\text{QW}^{\prime}\aleph$, or did the scribe(s) producing MT corrupt the form $\text{QW}^{\prime}\aleph$ and produce $\text{QW}\aleph$ instead? Which is original $\text{QW}\aleph$ or $\text{QW}^{\prime}\aleph$?

The question cannot be resolved with finality on

the one side or the other, but this much is clear: either possibility is at least conceivable.

Consequently, the examination of words and grammatical forms substituted by LQH for different forms in MT is most important in an examination of the text of Habakkuk.

Fifth, while LQH basically supports MT, each variant between the two must be carefully examined prior to the formulation of one's opinion with regard to the validity of the text form present in MT.

LQH does not vary from MT to the degree that one would be justified in stating that it represented a different family; yet, there are points of divergence between the two at which it appears that LQH can be invaluable for the clarification of MT.

III. VARIANTS BETWEEN LXX AND MT

A collation of the Septuagint with the Massoretic Text revealed the presence of three hundred and one variants between the two texts. In order that the character of the Septuagint's relationship to the Massoretic Text of Habakkuk may be clarified the variants between the two texts have been classified below and examples sufficient to illustrate the particular types of variation have been cited.

Additions To The Text

One is immediately made aware of the additions made by LXX to MT, since this category of variation comprises one hundred twenty-nine of the three hundred and one divergencies between the two texts.

Addition of words. LXX adds a word, or words, not found in MT on twenty-nine occasions and thus forms a most significant class of additions made to the text.

Some of these additions have been made in an attempt to capture the Hebrew phrase as in 2:20 where MT מַמְנִיךְ has been carried over into LXX as ἀπο προσώπον αὐτοῦ, a word comparable to προσώπον not appearing in MT. Examples of this could be multiplied³⁹ and it seems that the practice borders on that of paraphrasing for the sake of clarity.

At yet other points, however, LXX has made the addition of a word or a phrase where MT has no comparable form. This occurs, for instance, in 3:2 where the phrase ἐν τῷ παρεῖναι τὸν καιρὸν ἀναδειχθήσῃ found in LXX has no counterpart in MT.

This practice is also revealed in 3:9 where κυρίως appears in LXX although a comparable word is not found in MT.

³⁹Cf. MT יָנִיחַ and LXX καὶ οὐκ ἔσται of 3:17; אָרַח of MT and ἐστὶν of LXX in 1:7; plus לָל-לָל of MT and οὐκ ὄντα αὐτοῦ of LXX in 2:6.

The additions made by LXX to MT are of significance and should be taken into account in arriving at the text of Habakkuk.

Addition of the article. On seventy-five occasions LXX added the definite article where MT has no such form; a practice the uniqueness of which is intensified by the fact that LXX has omitted the definite article from MT only six times.

Such usage of the article is not limited to particular cases but may be found, as in 3:3 with the nominative ὁ θεός, or with the locative as in ἐπὶ τοὺς ἵππους σου of 3:8 and others.

This category of variation, while of importance for determining the literalness with which the LXX scribe translated, does not greatly affect the validity of the text. In fact, the article is used so consistently by LXX that one is prone to dismiss this usage as a grammatical peculiarity of the scribe rather than a failure to translate accurately the Hebrew text.

Addition of the preposition. The addition of the preposition is made by LXX on only five occasions. Of these instances only one, the addition of ἐν in 3:5, alters the meaning of MT and even at this point the alteration is not made solely to the preposition for LXX has substituted the

phrase ἐν πεδίλοις for MT ףַׁׁׁׁ.

The addition of πρόσ in 2:2 simply carries into Greek the Hebrew phrase ךַּׁׁׁׁׁ of MT 2:2, while the addition of εἰς and ἐπί in 2:6, 2:13 and 3:13 make no change in the meaning of the LXX translation.

In each instance, the addition of the preposition by the LXX scribe was quite likely made at his discretion in an attempt to carry the thought of MT into the translation made in LXX.

Addition of the conjunction. LXX has added the conjunction on sixteen occasions, at times with verbal forms as in 3:16 wherein MT ךַּׁׁׁׁׁ has been translated by LXX as καὶ εἰσῆλθεν and in the translation of MT ףַׁׁׁׁׁ of 3:2 by καὶ ἐφοβήθην .

Additions are also made to the personal pronoun, as in the translation of ךַּׁׁׁׁׁ as καὶ αὐτὸ in 2:19, and to the substantives as in 2:19 where ןַׁׁׁׁׁ of MT has become καὶ τῷ λιθῷ in LXX.

Addition of the personal pronoun. The addition of the personal pronoun by LXX, although occurring only four times, has greater significance than the addition of the article, the preposition or the conjunction.

1:5 MT ןַׁׁׁׁׁ has been translated ἐγὼ ἐγράφωμαι by LXX, an idea that one might infer from MT but certainly

not so strongly stated there as in the LXX translation.

1:12 MT completely omits the personal pronoun as a direct object while LXX translates ἔπλασεν με, an idea completely absent from MT wherein the phrase ׀ַיְרִיבֶּהּ ׀ַיְצַיֵּ׃ ׀ַיְרַדֶּהּ׃ has been replaced by καὶ ἐπλασέν με τοῦ ἐλέγχειν παιδεύων αὐτοῦ .

3:4 MT ׀ַיְרַדֶּהּ׃, without the pronominal suffix, has been translated by LXX as καὶ φέγγος αὐτοῦ .

2:6 MT ׀ַיְרַבֶּהּ׃ has no form comparable to LXX' ἡ πλεθύνων ἑαυτῶ .

Deletions From The Text

Less frequent, although still significant, are the thirty-two instances wherein LXX makes a deletion in its translation of MT. Such omissions concern entire words, definite articles, conjunctions, prepositions and personal pronouns.

Deletion of words from the text. Instances wherein words are deleted from the text are far less numerous than are the additions of words to the text, accounting for only nine of the total number of variants.

The most significant of the omissions made by LXX concerns the deletion of MT ׀ַיְרַבֶּהּ׃ in 1:8; an alteration which finds substantiation in lQH wherein ׀ַיְרַבֶּהּ׃ is also deleted.

Other deletions of this type that should be given special consideration are the removal of **וְדַמָּה** from 2:19, **שְׁבִעוֹת** from 3:9, **וְעַיִן** from 2:5, **יִצְרִי** from 2:18 and **עֲלִיצוֹתָם** from 3:14; all of which involve the removal of an entire word from MT.

Deletion of the definite article. The six deletions of the definite article by LXX, although standing in marked contrast to its addition on seventy-five occasions, do not appear to be of great significance for establishing the best text for Habakkuk.

MT gives **כְּחֹלִי** in 1:9 while LXX reads **ὡς ἄμμοον** and **זָקַץ** of 2:3 has been replaced by **εἰς πέρας** in LXX. Both of these are illustrative of a practice by the LXX scribe that may also be found at other points in the text of Habakkuk.⁴⁰

Deletion of the conjunction. At only three points in the entire book of Habakkuk has LXX deleted the conjunction from MT. In two of these instances, 2:5 and 3:19, the conjunction has been completely eradicated while in 2:15 the conjunction **καὶ** appears in LXX but fails to capture fully the double conjunction **וְעַיִן** of MT.

Deletion of the preposition. LXX has deleted the preposition on eleven occasions although at some points

⁴⁰Cf. 2:2, 9, 14; 3:17.

the omission appears to have been produced because of either an inability to translate an idiom or through the ability to express certain relationships in Greek without using the preposition normally required in Hebrew.

1:5 MT ׀׀׀׀ has been replaced by ׀ι καταφρονταί in LXX and illustrates the simple deletion of the preposition.

2:13 ׀׀׀׀ of MT has been replaced by ἐν πυρί in LXX and although the preposition ׀ has been correctly translated as ἐν, the idiom ׀׀ has not been reproduced in LXX. This may represent the inability of the translator to capture adequately the sense of the Hebrew idiom by a Greek word.

2:14 the translation of ׀׀-לַי ׀׀׀׀ by κατακαλύψει αὐτούς demonstrates the omission of the preposition that, although not affecting the sense of the passage, gives evidence concerning the literalness with which the scribe translated MT.

Deletion of the personal pronoun. On three occasions the pronominal suffix found in MT has been deleted by LXX.

1:15 MT ׀׀׀׀ has suffered the loss of the pronoun in the LXX ἐν ἀμφιβληστρω.

2:15 MT ׀׀׀׀ has been replaced by LXX θολερᾶ, thus deleting the pronominal suffix.

1:14 בְּרֵב לִפְנֵי-אֵל has been replaced by the phrase
τὰ οὐκ ἔχοντα ἡγούμενον.

Substitution Between The Texts

A third category of variants consists of those instances wherein LXX has substituted a word(s), syntax, personal pronoun, preposition, particle, or a verbal for a nominal form for a different reading in MT.⁴¹

Substitution of words. The substitution of one word, or words, by LXX for a different reading in MT is one of the most important of the substitutions made by the translators.

On occasion the substitution concerns only one word as in the reading λόγος for בְּרֵב in 3:5; or καὶ διασαλεύθη for לַחֲרָהּ in 2:16; or κατακαλύψει αὐτούς for יַכּוּ עַל-יָם in 2:14.

On the other hand, substitutions at times involve complete phrases as in the rendering of MT בְּקֶרֶב שְׁנַיִם חַיִּיהוּ by ἐν μέσῳ δύο ζώων γνωσθήσῃ.

The presence of thirty-three such substitutions prohibits the citation of each form at this point but such variations should be taken into consideration in the examination of significant textual problems in the text of Habakkuk.

⁴¹One hundred forty such occurrences may be found.

Substitution of syntax. Equal in importance for the text are the alterations of syntactical relationships on the part of LXX. Occurring a total of fifty-six times, such substitutions are of great significance for the proper understanding of the text of Habakkuk and include changes of number and person, alteration of tenses, variation of voice and the translation of a finite by an infinite form, or of an infinite by a finite form.

At those points at which LXX translated a Hebrew perfect by a Greek present, imperfect or future the two texts were considered to be at variance. It is recognized that the Hebrew perfect may, according to context, be translated as future in its time. Yet, it was felt that this type of translation must at times be subjectively arrived at and in order to remain as objective as possible the above practice was followed in cases of both the Hebrew perfect and imperfections.

On nine occasions LXX has translated a Hebrew perfect, denoting completed action, by a Greek tense suggesting incomplete action. This may be observed in the following cases which serve only to illustrate this practice.

1:2 MT יִבְרָא has been translated in LXX by κερράζομαι.

1:11 הִלֵּךְ has been replaced by μεταβαλεῖ .

1:11 וְיָבֵן has been translated as καὶ ἐξιδόσεσται in LXX.

The same practice occurred concerning the Hebrew imperfect and one may find fifteen such occurrences, of which the following are examples.

1:3 יִהְיֶיךָ has been translated γεγόνεν.

2:2 קָמַיְךָ has been replaced by καὶ εἶπεν.

2:16 בָּרוּךְ has been translated ἐκυκλωσεν.

3:16 אֵבֶרְךָ appears in LXX as εἰσήλθεν.

Variation of syntax has also taken place in the change of voice by LXX as in the following examples chosen from among twelve instances in Habakkuk.

3:2 יִתְאַוֶּיךָ was translated ἐφοβήθη.

3:16 יִתְאַוֶּיךָ was altered to ἐταράχθη.

3:14 אֵלֶיךָ was changed to σεισθήσονται .

3:8 אֵבֶרְךָ appears in LXX as ὠργίσθησθαι and is cited since it represents the translation of a Hebrew perfect by a Greek subjunctive, a mood confined in Hebrew to the imperfect.

LXX has also varied the person, number and gender of verbal forms, a differentiation that may be observed on eight occasions among which are the following,

2:13 אֵלֶיךָ has been translated ἐζέλιπον .

3:16 יִתְאַוֶּיךָ appears as ἐταράχθησθαι in LXX.

2:14 אֵבֶרְךָ has been altered to κατακαλυψει .

The same category of variants includes the translation of an infinitive by a different form five times, a

finite verb by an infinite verb on two occasions and a participle by an alternate form at six points.

3:13 נָּוֶרַח has been translated $\epsilon\xi\eta\gamma\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha\sigma$.

2:15 שָׁכַן has been altered to $\mu\epsilon\theta\upsilon\sigma\kappa\omega\nu$.

1:3 טִבְּיָהּ has been translated $\epsilon\pi\iota\beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\nu$.

2:5 יְהִיר has been changed to $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega\nu$.

1:4 מִכְּתִיר has been translated $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota$.

1:5 עָל has been expressed as $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$.

Substitution of pronominal suffix. At eight points LXX has made the substitution of a personal pronoun different in some aspect from the pronominal suffix of MT.

2:4 the suffix of MT בְּאִמּוֹנָהּ has been supplanted by $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa \pi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega\sigma \mu\omicron\upsilon$ of LXX.

2:4 $\eta \psi\upsilon\chi\eta \mu\omicron\upsilon$ has been substituted for MT בְּאִמּוֹנָהּ .

1:11 MT לֵאלֹהֵי has been replaced by LXX $\tau\omega \theta\epsilon\omega \mu\omicron\upsilon$.

These are only illustrative of this practice on the part of the LXX scribe and each of the eight variants should be considered prior to a conclusion concerning the text of Habakkuk.

Substitution of prepositions. LXX has also substituted certain prepositions for others found in MT. This has occurred a total of eight times and may be illustrated in the following verses.

2:4 בְּאִמּוֹנָהּ has been replaced by $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa \pi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega\sigma$.

3:1 μετὰ ὠδῆς has been substituted for נִוְנַגְלָעַל.

3:4 רִידִי has been displaced by ἐν χερσιν αὐτοῦ.

3:16 לְקוֹל of MT has been displaced by ἀπὸ φωνῆς in LXX.

Substitution of verbal forms. At points within the text LXX has substituted a verbal form where such usage was not embodied in MT and, on the other hand, has also displaced verbal forms of MT by nominal forms in LXX. Of the two practices the former is more prevalent, occurring fifteen of the twenty-two times that the substitution of verbal forms occurs within the text. This practice on the part of the translator is reflected in the following verses,

3:9 רָאָה has been supplanted by λεγεί.

2:6 וְלֹ-אֵל of MT has been translated οὐκ ὄντα αὐτοῦ in LXX.

1:14 בֹּרַח־אֵל of MT has been replaced by τὰ οὐκ ἔχοντα ἡγούμενον in LXX.

2:19 יִי of MT has been translated οὐκ ἔστιν in LXX.

3:10 the verb of MT, רָבַח , has been translated with the substantive πορεία αὐτοῦ in LXX.

3:16 יִפְתָּח לִי יְדַי of MT has been translated by προσευχῆς χειλέων μου in LXX.

Substitution of number. The number used in LXX

varies with that of MT on four occasions; twice LXX substitutes the singular for the plural and on two other occasions it alters the plural to the singular.

1:13 מִיָּנִי has been altered to οφθαλμοί in LXX.

1:16 לְכַלֵּי has been translated τὰ βρώματα in LXX.

Substitution of particles. A final type of substitution made by LXX consists of those points at which alteration has been made in the particles found within the text.

2:7 ἤγαγε has been replaced by the causal particle ὅτι ἐξαίφνης in LXX.

1:17 the interrogative לֹא-לֵךְ of MT has been replaced by διὰ τοῦτο in LXX.

2:4 הֲלֵפֹעַ הֲנִי of MT has been altered, the interjection having been replaced by εἰν ὑποστείληται.

Of the nine substitutions of this type made by LXX few seem to alter the meaning of the text but each example is worthy of consideration prior to a final conclusion regarding the text of Habakkuk.

Conclusion.

The comparison of LXX and MT revealed a number of significant results that should be embodied in one's examination of the text of Habakkuk.

First, the most significant type of variant between

LXX and MT consists in the differences of phraseology and of syntax.

On numerous occasions LXX has substituted a word or phrase for a different form, or on occasion where no comparable expression occurs, in MT. Such alterations do not necessarily reflect the use of a text other than the text form of MT by LXX translators but each variation of this type must be examined closely in the study of the text.

At the same time a similar consideration should be given to the change of syntax on the part of LXX for, although more frequently reflecting no significant alteration, such variations are worthy of consideration in the textual study of Habakkuk.

Second, a relatively large number of variations between LXX and MT are due to idiosyncrasies on the part of the scribe and do not vitally affect the text, except as they serve to illustrate the degree of literalness on the part of the scribe.

Third, numerous substitutions cause one to approach LXX with a degree of caution in the light of the rather free handling of the Hebrew text. This is not observable to an intense degree but it is present to the point that promotes caution, although not disregard, of LXX.

III. THE TEXT OF HABAKKUK EXAMINED IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN RESEARCH AND DISCOVERY

A versicular examination of the text of Habakkuk will now be undertaken in the light of the principles and textual evidences that have resulted from earlier studies within this dissertation. In attempting this examination not every variant word or passage will be studied and only those points within the text will be considered where, because of either external textual witnesses or internal evidences, clearly discernible textual problems present themselves.

Those points within the text where questionable passages may be successfully reproduced or substantiated through either the validation of MT or the introduction of readings different from MT will be considered below. The procedure will be to list, in numerical order, the verses to be treated, omitting those verses whose validity remains unchallenged by the results achieved in the course of this study.⁴²

⁴²Variants between MT and LXX or LQH that, while valuable for other purposes, do not alter the text have not been considered. Such omissions consist of the addition or deletion of the definite article, conjunction, prepositions, particles, as well as variants produced by linguistic peculiarities. Because of space limitations it was essential to confine investigations to significant variants since all four hundred forty-one examples could not be included. At only those points where, in the judgment of the writer, the minor variants should displace the MT reading will they be considered.

Habakkuk I

2 LXX $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, a future tense, has displaced וְהָיָה of MT but should not alter MT since the use of the future by LXX quite likely represents only an interpretative translation of the Hebrew perfect.

3 LXX $\acute{\sigma}\ \kappa\rho\iota\tau\eta\acute{\sigma}$ has been substituted for MT וְיָדוּן but presents no justification for the alteration of the MT reading and is therefore to be rejected.

LXX $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu$ is no doubt a translation of וְיִבְרָךְ and MT should be adjusted to LXX; the MT scribe perhaps reading ב of וְיִבְרָךְ as ו to give וְיִבְרַךְ . The suggested emendation of וְיִבְרַךְ to וְיִבְרַח by BH is to be disregarded however since it is based upon weak textual evidence⁴³ and is not so helpful as the suggestion made above.

The suggested deletion of וְיִהִי or וְיָהִי by BH in the phrase $\text{וְיָהִי רִיב וְיָדוּן יִשָּׂא}$ makes the reading smoother but is without textual witness and is not to be accepted.

4 The addition of the definite article in וְהַמְשַׁפֵּט , although a unique addition on its part,⁴⁴ does not justify such an alteration of MT, וְהַמְשַׁפֵּט , although it may give insight into late conceptions of וְהַמְשַׁפֵּט in Judaism of that period.

⁴³Only the Targum and Syriac support such an emendation.

⁴⁴Unique in that וְהַמְשַׁפֵּט adds the article only four times in two chapters; LXX adding it seventy-five times in three chapters.

MT עֲשֵׂר, wicked, finds support in LXX but the absence of the definite article and its presence with קִרְבָּנִים has been cited by Stonehouse⁴⁵ as basis for repointing עֲשֵׂר as עֲשֵׂר since by usage the words עֲשֵׂר and קִרְבָּנִים are in accord concerning the definite article when they appear in the same phrase. The acceptance of this emendation gives "wickedness" not "wicked"; a reading actually more meaningful in the context. The alteration involves only the repointing of the vowels and consequently will be accepted as valid.

BH suggests מְכַרֵּי for מְכַחֵר of MT and since it involves no more than the transposition of the consonants is possible. The result is seemingly less satisfactory than MT, however, for the historical situation of chapter one would not suit the use of מְכַרֵּי so well as מְכַחֵר in view of the strength of the former word.⁴⁶

5 Critics are all but unanimous in emending טֹבֵגִים to טֹבֵגִים since טֹבֵגִים appears in 1:13 and 2:5.⁴⁷ This change does not appear justified since at this point, 1:5, the

⁴⁵George G. V. Stonehouse, The Book Of Habakkuk: Introduction, Translation, And Notes On The Hebrew Text, pp. 161ff.

⁴⁶Ibid., pp. 163f.

⁴⁷William Hayes Ward, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary On Habakkuk," The International Critical Commentary, ed. S. R. Driver, Alfred Plummer and Charles Augustus Briggs, p. 10.

ones raised up are not yet viewed as treacherous nor are they necessarily the subject of 1:5. The text is clear as it stands; the people are to look among the nations and then within the circumference of this circle to see Yahweh at work with one nation. LXX does support the emendation with the reading καταφρονηταί, possibly following בַּגְּוִיִּם, but the LXX translator could have misread בַּגְּוִיִּם as easily as a Hebrew scribe could have corrupted בַּגְּוִיִּם into בַּגְּוִיִּם. Since the issue is in doubt the MT reading should be followed.

In keeping with this suggested change is the deletion of the preposition ב from בַּגְּוִיִּם in LXX καταφρονηταί. This of course must be treated as בַּגְּוִיִּם and in the light of the decision relative to that emendation the deletion of the preposition should not be carried out.

MT עֹלֵל עֹלֵל is reproduced as ἔργον ἐγὼ ἐργάζομαι in LXX, the latter substituting a personal pronoun and a finite verb for MT participle, עֹלֵל. Such is possible but MT, literally, states no more than "a work working" while LXX specifies that Yahweh is working. The more literal phrase is preferable since it builds up to the climax achieved with אֵל-הַכְּשָׁדִים of verse 6.

In addition to this, LXX stands as an interpretative translation of עֹלֵל עֹלֵל and of insufficient strength to justify the change of MT עֹלֵל to a possible עֹלֵל אֵל or אֵל-הַכְּשָׁדִים.

6 ἐξεγάφω bf LXX for ׀׀׀׀ of MT represents a stylistic or grammatical peculiarity of the LXX translator in translating a Hebrew participle by a verb.⁴⁸

The addition of τοῦ ὑμᾶν ἡμετέρας by LXX would overbalance the structure of verse 6 and in all probability represents an attempt by the translator to define more specifically ׀׀׀׀-׀׀׀׀.

The injection of ἐφ' ὑμᾶς into the text is likely an attempt by the later translator to make clear the fact that the Chaldaeans were being raised up upon Israel.

None of these should be allowed to alter verse 6 of MT, however, since they represent no more than stylistic peculiarities or the attempt to clarify the Hebrew text in making the Greek translation.

7 The appearance of ἔσται in LXX represents the attempt to capture the phrase ׀׀׀׀ in translating it as ἐξ αὐτοῦ . . . ἔσται and does not affect MT. The translation of ׀׀׀׀ by ἔστιν is also an attempt to carry the unexpressed Hebrew verb "to be" over into Greek and is also to be ignored.

BH suggests ׀׀׀׀ for ׀׀׀׀ but this reading is not superior to that of MT and consequently should be rejected.

8 1QH ל׀ל׀ represents a transposition of ׀ in MT ׀ל׀ל׀;

⁴⁸Supra, pp. 299f.

consequently MT should remain unaffected by the LQH variant.

The phrase $\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\ \lambda\upsilon\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\ \tau\eta\sigma\ \text{Αραβίας}$ has perhaps resulted from a misunderstanding of MT עַרַב since the words עַרְבִי and עַרַב are so similar as to be easily confused.

The reduplication of פַּרְשִׁי is suspicious⁴⁹ and is likely a case of dittography produced in transmitting the text. Consequently וּפַרְשִׁי should be deleted.

יְבוּא of the same phrase is deleted in both LXX and LQH and its omission in MT is therefore desirable. Such an alteration, coupled with the omission of וּפַרְשִׁי gives $\text{וּפַשׁוּ מְרוֹחַק פַּרְשִׁי}$, a reading which results in the presence of two clauses in the last half of the verse, as would be expected, instead of three, should MT remain unaltered.

9 $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\ \epsilon\nu\alpha\nu\tau\iota\alpha\sigma$, embodying the idea of "opposite" appears to be an attempt to translate קִדְמָה as "forward" in that forward is the direction opposite to the speaker. This is in opposition to a number of critics who insist upon the translation "eastward."

10 Addition of the conjunction in LXX reading $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ should be followed in MT producing וְהָיָא לְכָל- . This seems desirable since each of the other clauses in verse 10 is so introduced.

Χῶμα , "mound" of LXX is apparently an attempt on

⁴⁹Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 172.

the translator's part to be more specific than in the case of עפר , "earth, dust," of MT. LXX is more definite in view of the context but the difference is not so great in meaning as to justify an alteration of MT.

The substitution of הו for ה in the case of וילכדה should be followed in MT since מצבור is masculine.

- 11 The suggested emendation of וו to either וו or וו as suggested by BH seems advisable in view of the difficult reading present when וו is allowed to stand alone. וו is supported by the Syriac although וו is a more acceptable reading insofar as clarity is concerned. וו will be accepted despite its lack of textual substantiation.⁵⁰

LQH substitutes וו for MT וו, an emendation partially adopted by BH, seventh edition. LXX has used ἐξιλάσασθαι, evidently making use of וו in a secondary sense of "to make atonement" rather than the basic significance of "offend, be guilty."⁵¹ LXX is evidently following the Hebrew וו but since this could well have been corrupted from וו due to the similarity of sound the reading of LQH will be accepted since it offers a clearer sense than either MT or LXX.

⁵⁰ וו may be masculine but more often is feminine, cf. BDB, p. 924. If used as feminine here then וו would be preferable, if used as masculine, וו would be desirable.

⁵¹BDB, p. 79.

The concluding phrase of LXX αὕτη ἡ ἰσχυρὸς τῷ θεοῦ μου is at variance with MT and likely resulted from the translator's use of ἐξελάσεται rather than a word analogous to ׀ׁשׁ, the derivative of which appears in lQH ׀ׁשׁי.

12 The presence of a disjunctive accent of the third class would oppose the suggested change of יִשְׁׁרָאֵלִי יְהוָהִי to יִשְׁׁרָאֵלִי יְהוָהִי made by BH and the alteration of MT will not be accepted. ׁשׁי is a perfectly natural appellative⁵² and will be allowed to remain in MT.

נְמוֹן of MT is one of eighteen emendations of the scribes found in the Old Testament. At this point the reading נְמוֹן is suggested, referring to God, and if accepted as a valid emendation fits the parallelism of the clause quite well.

If this half of the verse stood alone the emendation would be accepted. Such is not the case and in view of the assurance expressed in the perfects נְמוֹן and נְמוֹן which follow the MT נְמוֹן is retained. If נְמוֹן were accepted the insertion of יְהוָהִי which follows would prove awkward. At the same time if נְמוֹן were valid one would expect imperatives based upon this assertion נְמוֹן לֹא; this could well read, "Thou shalt not die" and as a result

⁵²W. F. Albright, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," Studies In Old Testament Prophecy, ed. H. H. Rowley, p. 13, says concerning ׁשׁי that "it is one of the commonest appellations of Yahweh."

"Yahweh, for judgment set him, O Rock for correction establish him."

Accepting נִמְרוֹ one might understand, "We shall not die for Yahweh has set him for judgment, the Rock has established him for correction." This reading seems preferable since the perfects tend to indicate that an action has been completed on behalf of the people; an action that could lead them to exult "We shall not die."

Although צוֹר may be used for יְהוָה and almost every critic so understands this passage⁵³ it is not accepted here because of the conflict of person produced between צוֹר and יְסֻדָּתוֹ.

lQH alters לְמוֹכִיחוֹ to give the reading לְמוֹכִיחוֹ, "for his correction"; a change from the infinitive to the participle plus the addition of the pronominal suffix, third person, masculine, singular. lQH should be followed so that the entire phrase will be read "And a rock for his correction he has set him (it)."

13 LXX omits the expression רָשַׁע צְדִיק מִמֶּנּוּ from MT רָשַׁע צְדִיק מִמֶּנּוּ a change followed by BH and others.⁵⁴

It should be observed, however, that the word fills out the fourth member of the clause and completes the

⁵³Cf. Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 180; Ward, op. cit., p. 11.

⁵⁴Ward, loc. cit.

metric structure of 13a; at the same time MT has the support of LQH at this point. Because of these factors and in view of the fact that LXX is not necessarily superior in its omission of למנו the expression is to be retained.

- 14 The suggested change of אדם ונעשה by BH to אדם ונעש finds support in the LQH reading נעש although LQH does not add ה to אדם ; LXX does make the addition of the definite article but since this is characteristic of the LXX translator of Habakkuk it may not be used with any strength in supporting the addition of ה to אדם in MT.

The presence of ו would tend to produce an apocopated form, however, and since ה is present in MT the emendation of BH may be validly followed so that MT will read אדם ונעש .

- 15 The addition of the conjunction וא by LXX and in LQH ויגרהו should be followed in MT to counterbalance the conjunction in the opening word of the following phrase ויגרהו . Thus MT would be altered from ויגרהו to a possible ויגרהו .

יעלה of LQH should supplant העלה of MT in order to coincide with the imperfect in the two accompanying phrases.

- 17 LQH על כן agrees with LXX ἀὐτὰ τοῦτο against MT העל-כן . Prior to the appearance of LQH BH had suggested this as a probable reading and in view of the strong

textual evidence against MT plus a context that will permit the change of העל-כן, the interrogative is to be deleted so that MT will read על כן.

Although LQH suggests חרבו for חרמו, LXX supports MT and it seems that MT should be followed. An examination of line eight, column vi of LQH will reveal the ease with which ב and initial or medial ב could have been confused; a confusion which could account for LQH חרבו.

The omission of ו from והמיד in LQH to give המיד should be followed in MT, although LXX does not support this change. Despite the fact that חרמו and the emended form המיד are separated by an *athnah*, the alteration is still to be preferred since it helps to balance the first half of this clause. Such balance is achieved in the use of המיד in clause Ba and לא-יחמול in clause Bb.

The addition of ו by LQH to give ולא should be followed in order to ease the reading of phrase B following the removal of המיד.

Habakkuk II

- 1 LXX agrees with MT in the translation of על-מצור by ἐπι πέτρων; both omit the genitive relationship.⁵⁵ BH, prior to the discovery of LQH, had already suggested מצורי

⁵⁵They also differ slightly in the use of πέτρων "rock," for מצור, seige work although the sense is not affected.

as a conjectural emendation, an alteration which ultimately found substantiation in the LQH reading **מְצוּרֵי**. One would expect the addition of the pronominal suffix because of the parallelism in which **עַל-מְשַׁמְרֵהִי** is balanced by **עַל-מְצוּר** and its addition by LQH lends textual evidence of sufficient strength to validate the alteration of **עַל-מְצוּר** to **עַל-מְצוּרֵי**.

BH suggested the alteration of **אֲשִׁיב** to **יֵשֵׁב**, although neither LXX nor LQH support the emendation. The ease with which the sounds **י** and **א** could have been confused, especially following **מָה**; coupled with the fact that such an alteration presents a reading superior in thought to MT prompts the change of **אֲשִׁיב** to **יֵשֵׁב** despite the absence of textual evidence.

2 LXX **ὁ ἀναγινώσκων** agrees with LQH **הַקּוֹרֵא** in the addition of the definite article to MT **קוֹרֵא**, an emendation that not only has excellent textual witness but also improves the reading of MT. The addition of the article should be made so that MT will read **הַקּוֹרֵא**.

3 The conjectural emendation of **וַיִּפַּח** to **וַיִּפְתַּח** made by BH is not accepted since the substitution of **פָּתַח**, "to open," is not superior to **פָּוַח**, "breathe, blow" in the sense that the vision panteth (hastens) toward the end.⁵⁶

MT **לֹא יֵאָחֵז** stands in opposition to LQH **יֵאָחֵז**

⁵⁶BDB, p. 806.

and LXX καὶ οὐκ μὴ χρονίση and it seems preferable to emend MT to יאן נל in view of the strong textual evidence.⁵⁷

4 LXX differs completely with MT in 4a, reading εἴν ὑποστείληται ἡ ψυχὴ ἐν αὐτῷ. BH, partially following LXX, has emended MT to give הנה עפלה לא-ישרה נפשו בר instead of הנה עפלה לא-ישרה נפשו בר. Made without any textual evidence and at the same time departing so drastically from MT, the emendation is to be rejected. The sense is clear as the text appears in MT.

5 BH suggests the deletion of ויאף כי and the substitution of הוי to coincide with verses 6, 9, 12, 15 and 19. In addition to this, MT היין בוגד is emended to הינה בוגד. No textual evidence is available for the latter change and only LXX and Syriac support the former. Consequently, it would be best not to follow BH at this point because of the conjectural nature of the emendation; an emendation that requires all of 5a. Neither the emendation of BH nor the translations of LXX, while both are attractive, is to be followed.

lQH ויין, "wealth" stands in opposition to MT היין, "wine," an alteration that is difficult to evaluate since ו and ך are indistinguishable in lQH.⁵⁸ lQH scribe may

⁵⁷Cf. the textual apparatus of BH, seventh edition.

⁵⁸Millar Burrows, "General Introduction," The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, I, p. xii. While the

have seen ך׳י׳ and concluded that ׳ had been reduplicated, therefore writing ך׳ instead of ך׳י׳. The reverse is also true and ך׳ may have been original but through reduplication ך׳י׳ may have been produced.

One reading is as acceptable as the other but since in the context the oracle is concerned with the rapacious gain of possessions by the invader, the reading of LQH, ך׳, will be followed although ך׳י׳ cannot be ruled out as a possible reading.

In the same clause LQH differs with MT in the reading ך׳ instead of ך׳, an alteration that is to be preferred to MT since the presence of a finite verb greatly strengthens the clause.

The MT phrase ך׳י׳ has been emended by BH to ך׳, a change which finds partial support in LQH reading of ך׳ instead of ך׳י׳. While the emendation of ך׳י׳ to ך׳ will not be accepted, the deletion of ך׳ from ך׳י׳, in the light of LQH, will be followed.

As a consequence of the three textual changes mentioned above, 2:5 should now be read ך׳י׳ ך׳י׳ or, "And moreover because wealth is treacherous a presumptuous man shall not abide."

Isaiah manuscript has two quite distinct forms, they are in general used quite interchangeably for both letters. In the Habakkuk scroll there is no perceptible distinction at all in the writing of these two consonants.

6 Because of metric structure BH has suggested the deletion of עליו from MT. This is unsupported by either LXX or lQH and since clause Aa would still be overbalanced with clause Ab after the deletion there is no justification for the emendation.

LXX ἀὰ ἐποῦσεν and lQH ויומרו⁵⁹ have displaced MT ויאמר and should be accepted as a valid emendation since the plural כלם of 6a demands a plural in 6b. This can be fulfilled by the emendation of ויאמרוט ויאמר .

MT ומכביד has been altered by lQH to יכביד, a change involving the removal of the conjunction and the substitution of a finite verb for a participle.

Read with עד-מחי, an expression omitted because of its awkwardness by BH, MT would give עד-מחי יכביד עליו or, "How long shall he make heavy upon him heavy debts."

The acceptance of lQH יכביד thus allows the retention of an otherwise awkward phrase, עד-מחי, and at the same time presents a clearer reading than MT.

7 LXX deletes the interrogative of MT (and lQH) by the insertion of the causal form ὅτι. The change is attractive but since it does not have textual support and

⁵⁹ ויומרו of lQH is no doubt a misspelling of ויאמרו and should not be allowed to confuse the comparison made with LXX ἐποῦσεν and MT ויאמר.

the remaining maledictions do not parallel the construction the change will not be followed.

BH suggests the deletion of **והיית למשסוה למר** on the grounds of metric structure but since the resultant phrase would still be out of balance, although not so much as before, the alteration is to be rejected.

8 The omission of **לבי** from MT would produce a 3-3 metric structure throughout verse eight; both LXX and LQH support MT at this point, however, and since the metric structure has been out of balance at other points MT will not be emended by omitting **לבי** as suggested by BH.

9 LXX **εἰς ὅψοσ** deletes the definite article found in MT **במרום**; an emendation that shall be accepted in view of the fact that this is a reversal of the LXX translator's characteristic pattern of adding the definite article in Habakkuk. The consistent addition of the article adds increased textual value to instances where LXX may delete the article.

13 BH suggests the deletion of 13a **הלא הנה מאח יהוה** **צבאו** of MT. Such an omission does not harm the context; in fact the reading is smoother with regard both to metrical structure and content. However, the complete absence of textual evidence prohibits the omission of so large a segment of the text and BH will not be followed at this point.

14 BH indicates that all of verse fourteen has been added and calls attention to the parent passage in Isa. 11:9. The verse is no doubt dependent upon either Isa. 11:9 or a common source but this is not sufficient ground for the deletion of the verse from Habakkuk. Such an emendation is without any textual evidence.

lQH makes a minor change in MT by adding the definite article to ם' in its reading/ ןה.⁶⁰ Since the older reading in Isa. 11:9 has the article and its presence in MT produces a smoother reading this emendation will be accepted.

15 ןבבב has been emended by numerous critics⁶¹ to ןבב, the loss of the ן being justified by citing it as a case of dittography, the following letter being a ן (ןבב). The emendation clarifies the thought of the verse and with the above explanation is to be accepted as valid. To do this means that the accentual system must be violated but this seems desirable for it produces an improved reading.

lQH ןבבב stands at variance with MT ןבב in the substitution of a pronominal suffix of different number than MT. This is partially supported by LXX since it

⁶⁰ Although a lacuna appears at this point enough of the text remains to indicate that ן has been added.

⁶¹ BDB, p. 705, cites five such men.

omits the pronoun altogether. The emendation is to be accepted, however, since it agrees in person with the first half of the clause while the present MT does not.

As a result of these emendations 15a should now be read, **והוי משקח רעהו מסף חמתו** or, "Woe to the one causing his neighbor to drink from goblet of his wrath."

The last half of the verse, taking **וואף שכר** from clause A of MT and adding it to clause B, would now read, **וואף שכר למען הביט על-מוריהם** or, "Moreover causing to drink for the purpose of gazing upon their nakedness."

Such an alteration would, it is felt, add clarity to an otherwise difficult sentence and at the same time does no great violence to the metric balance of the sentence.

- 16 MT **וְהֶעֱרַל**, "be counted uncircumcised," is challenged by 1QH **והרעל**; a reading which finds support in LXX **διασαλεύθητι**.

MT is perhaps corrupt as a result of the transposition of **ר** and should be corrected to **והרעל**. Such an emendation translated "be shaken," is much more preferable than MT not only because of the textual evidence but in view of the fact that a malediction of the type in MT directed to a Chaldaean, already uncircumcised, would have little force.

- 17 LXX **πείσει σε** stands in opposition to MT **יְהִיִּי**, an emendation that should be followed in view of the presence

of a comparable form in the parallel clause Aa. Consequently, MT **הִתְּן** should be altered to **הִנְתָּה**.

18 BH suggests the transposition of verses 18 and 19 so that verse 19 will precede verse 18. This is unsupported by textual witnesses but in view of the analogous position of **הוֹי** and its accompanying phrase in the other four woes the emendation will be accepted and verse 19 will be transposed.

The only explanation for this would be an error commonly known as homoeoteleuton. What word, or words, were responsible for this cannot be ascertained with certainty but a scribe in copying the manuscript may have gone from **בה**, the last word of verse 17 to **מה**, the opening word of verse 18.⁶² This would have omitted verse 19, placing it after the present eighteenth verse. This is, naturally, only a possibility and if the verse of each malediction did not begin with **הוֹי** the transposition would not be accepted.

lQH **יצריו** substitutes a plural for the singular form found in the MT phrase **כי בטח יצר יצרן**. Clause Bb contains two plurals, **אלמים** and **אלמים**, both of which are the product of the "potter's" or "former's" activity.

⁶²This would, of course, have been after the present nineteenth verse.

The presence of these words in the plural form would suggest a reliance upon more than one "image" or "formed thing"; consequently the LQH reading יצרי' is to be accepted as a valid emendation and as such is to be translated "his forms," or "his formed things."

19 BH suggests the addition of הוּא יוֹרָה as a gloss; an emendation with no textual support. Such conjectural alterations are to be avoided if at all possible but the present phrase so breaks the metric structure of the clause and at the same times makes so weak a contribution to the thought of the passage that the suggestion of BH will be accepted and הוּא יוֹרָה will be rejected.

At the same time the deletion of וְכִסֵּף on grounds of metric structure will not be accepted as suggested by BH. Clause B of verse 19 now has a 4-3 structure, a composition balanced in Clause A by a similar 4-3 arrangement following the deletion of הוּא יוֹרָה as a later gloss.

BH is evidently seeking for a 3-3 structure throughout but such is impossible as an examination of Habakkuk will demonstrate; the metrical structure is simply not that consistent. There is a 3-2, 3-3 and a 4-3 arrangement throughout the book and so long as the verse balances, even if it is a 4-3 structure, an emendation on the basis of metrics does not appear to be justified.

Hence, הוּא יוֹרָה was deleted because its presence

completely upset the arrangement of verse 19 by giving a 4-3, an odd 2, plus a 4-3 structure. Its deletion, on the other hand, gave a 4-3 for clause A and a 4-3 for clause B; a perfectly balanced sentence in its metric composition.

At the same time, $\eta\kappa\sigma\iota$ was not deleted since if it is left in the text one is confronted with a metric structure of 4-3, 4-3; if it is removed a structure of 4-3, 3-3 is produced, an arrangement that places the verse out of balance.

Habakkuk III

2 LXX presents a translation at this point which is rather free and diverges from MT in a number of cases;

κύριε, εἰσακήκοα τὴν ἀκοήν καὶ ἐφοβήθην,

κατενόησα τὰ ἔργα σου καὶ ἐξέστην.

ἐν μέσω θθο ζώων γνοσθήση,

ἐν τῷ ἐγγίξειν τὰ ἔτη ἐπιγνωσθήση,

ἐν τῷ παρεῖναι τὴν ψυχὴν ἐν ὀργῇ ἐλέος μνησθήση.

standing in opposition to MT יהוה שמעתי שמעך יראתי יהוה פעלך
בקרב שנים חייהו בקרב שנים תודיע ברגז רחם תזכור

The rather consistent 3-3 metre of the material in chapter three would lead one to suspect that LXX has erred in the insertion of the additional material within the verse since it is all but impossible to transfer the LXX reading

to Hebrew and maintain anything like a consistent structure.

In this regard it has been observed that,

The present text of the LXX represents a conflate rendering, and is due to the work of later editors who endeavoured to bring the original translation into closer conformity with the existing Hebrew text.⁶³

Consequently, the general composition of MT is to be preferred over the LXX in verse 1 because of the free translation made on the part of the latter.

Although יראתי has been altered by "nearly all recent commentators"⁶⁴ the reading is to be retained inasmuch as the writer had not seen the work of Yahweh; else, why should he pray that it be brought to life? It could, of course, be no more than a literary device but in view of the over-all context of the entire book the retention of יראתי is to be desired.

The suggested emendation of חיהו to יהוה by BH has been rejected by W. F. Albright who retains the "excellent sense"⁶⁵ of MT and further suggests that "many new illustrations of this use of the pi-el can now be given from Canaanite."⁶⁶ The only need for emendation

⁶³Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 221.

⁶⁴Albright, "The Psalm Of Habakkuk," Studies In Old Testament Prophecy, p. 131.

⁶⁵Ibid.

⁶⁶Ibid.

lies in the omission of the extra yodh in חִייהוּ to give חִיהוּ.⁶⁷

- 3 LXX has substituted ἔξ κατασκίου δασέος for MT מַה־ר-פֶּאֶרֶן, an alteration produced by a misunderstanding of פֶּאֶרֶן on the part of the translator.⁶⁸

BH has suggested that סֶלָה has likely been transposed from the conclusion of the verse, an alteration that should perhaps be accepted for it could stand at the end of the verse just as acceptably as in its present position. In any case, it would not alter the text at all.

- 4 MT וַנִּגַּה should be altered, with LXX support, to וַנִּגְהוּ. Especially is this called for by virtue of הִיָּהּ, for without the pronominal suffix appended to נִגַּה Yahweh would be the subject, although unexpressed, while the verb is a second person not a third person in number.

The phrase וַשֵּׁם חֲבִיוֹן עֹזָה has been altered by Albright, with but two consonantal changes, to וַשֵּׁם בִּיּוֹם עֹזָה.⁶⁹ He proposed that the phrase וַשֵּׁם חֲבִיוֹן had likely resulted from an improper word-division at some period in

⁶⁷Ibid.

⁶⁸Stonehouse, *op. cit.*, p. 225, who feels that "M.T. פֶּאֶרֶן . . . regarded not as a pr. name but as an adjective to הָר , which they understood in the sense of overgrown with boughs (cf. פֶּאֶרֶה bough, Ez. 17:6, and פֶּאֶר go over the boughs, Dt. 24:20).

⁶⁹Albright, "The Psalm Of Habakkuk," Studies In Old Testament Prophecy, p. 11.

the transmission of the text; resulting in the expression וּשְׁמַח בְּיוֹם rather than the original וּשְׁמַח בְּיוֹם . In justification of the change of ך to כ in בְּיוֹם Albright states that "there are a few indications that ך and כ were written much alike in an early copy (as already in several passages in the Lachish Ostraca)."⁷⁰

The emendation represents a rather bold departure from the traditional reading but since it is a possibility with the alteration of only ך to כ and ש to ש it is accepted in view of the clarity that it gives to verse four.

5 LXX $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ has evidently resulted from a misreading of לִבְרָךְ as לִבְרָךְ ; the only difference being that of two vowels. The MT reading לִבְרָךְ should be accepted rather than LXX $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ (for לִבְרָךְ).

6 The suggested alteration of MT וַיִּמְדוּ to וַיִּמְדוּ made by BH has the support of LXX $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\theta\eta$ and in light of the nature of the other verbs in the sentence should be accepted as valid, for in each of the other instances the action is of a destructive, shaking nature.

The concluding clause of verse 6 and the opening words of verse 7 have been treated as a unit and are among those instances wherein the Old Testament has been reconstructed, or substantiated, with the aid of

⁷⁰Ibid., p. 14.

Ugaritic.⁷¹

The difficulties of הליכור עולם לו have been cited extensively and the phrase has been deleted by numerous critics.⁷² W. F. Albright in 1941⁷³ and 1950⁷⁴ and W. H. Morton in 1946⁷⁵ both concluded that the clause should not be deleted but retained and read with תחה און of verse 7. Attention has been called to the fact that Accadian alaktu and Ugaritic hlkt "are both used regularly as orbits of the stars"⁷⁶ and by reading הליכור in a manner analogous to Ugaritic hlkt MT would be slightly altered to הלכור and translated as "eternal orbits" by the above mentioned men.

The Hebrew form תחה of verse 7 has a comparable

⁷¹W. H. Morton, "The Bearing Of The Records Of Ras Shamra On The Exegesis Of The Old Testament," pp. 85ff.; Albright, "The Psalm Of Habakkuk," Studies In Old Testament Prophecy, pp. 11, 12, 14, 15; Albright, "Two Letters From Ugarit (Ras Shamrah)," B.A.S.O.R., LXXXII (1941), pp. 48-9.

⁷²Morton, op. cit., pp. 85-6 cites a number of those objecting to the present text and includes a brief synthesis of their attitudes toward the passage.

⁷³Albright, loc. cit.

⁷⁴Albright, "The Psalm Of Habakkuk," Studies In Old Testament Prophecy, pp. 14-15.

⁷⁵Morton, op. cit., pp. 85ff.

⁷⁶Albright, "The Psalm Of Habakkuk," Studies In Old Testament Prophecy, p. 14.

form in Ugaritic, ht', meaning "to be crushed, ruined"⁷⁷ and it is with this meaning that Albright feels that the form חחח of Hab. 3:7 should be translated.⁷⁸ To do this ל of verse 6 and לחחח of verse 7 are joined to חחח to form one word; the ל being understood in terms of an emphatic ל.⁷⁹ "Writing only consonants and discarding the vowel-letters w and y, most of which were introduced into the biblical text in the Hellenistic period"⁸⁰ one should read as לחחחחחח.⁸¹

This emendation, while retaining the consonantal text and at the same time adding clarity to the thought of verse 6, should be considered from a number of points of view prior to its acceptance.

First, one reason for the difficulty to begin with was that the concluding phrase of verse 6 produced a tristich line in a context where distich lines

⁷⁷Albright, "Two Letters From Ugarit (Ras Shamrah)," B.A.S.O.R., LXXXII (1941), 48.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 15.

⁷⁹W. F. Albright, "The Old Testament And Canaanite Language," C.B.Q., VII (1945), 24f.; H. L. Ginsberg, "The Ugaritic Texts And Textual Criticism," J.B.L., LXII (1943), 115.

⁸⁰Albright, "Two Letters From Ugarit (Ras Shamrah)," B.A.S.O.R., LXXXII (1941), 48-9.

⁸¹Ibid.

predominated.⁸² The above emendation does not alter this situation since it allows the tristich line to remain; only altering the thought of the third stichos of the line.

Second, if תחת ארן is removed from 7a and added to 6b, verse 7 will no longer be in proper metric balance. To overcome this Albright has reduplicated אלהי כושן⁸³ in order to counteract the removal of תחת ארן. While the pattern abc-bcd does appear, as Albright has pointed out, in the song of Deborah, verses 5 and 23b, as well as in Ugaritic I Danel (Aqhat),⁸⁴ the emendation made in adding אלהי כושן to verse 7 is conjectural in nature and is made solely to fill the vacuum produced by the removal of תחת ארן. The solution of the textual problem in 6b in the manner suggested by Albright gives rise to a textual problem in 7a that is non-existent in MT and one that can be solved only by a conjectural emendation.

Third, the verbal form produced by Albright's reconstruction is unusual in Biblical Hebrew; the existence of the emphatic ל being in the realm of the hypothetical.⁸⁵

⁸²Morton, *op. cit.*, p. 86, citing W. A. Irwin, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," *J.N.E.S.*, I (1942), 13.

⁸³Albright, "The Psalm Of Habakkuk," *Studies In Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 11.

⁸⁴*Ibid.*, p. 15.

⁸⁵Ginsberg, *loc. cit.*, brands Albright's work at this point as "legitimate, but far less reliable /than

These considerations convinced the writer during the earlier stages of his investigation that the emendation of Albright, although a brilliant hypothesis, was to be rejected and the present reading of MT retained.

Two further considerations altered this conclusion, however, and it now seems to be desirable that the emendation be accepted as valid.

First, the fact that the emendation greatly clarifies the reading of 3:6 is inescapable. Without some textual adjustment the phrase הליכוה עולם לו is inexplicable in the context and while the clarity added by the suggested emendation would not have justified such an alteration it is undeniably one basis for it.

Second, further study has tended to corroborate the existence of the emphatic ל not only in Akkadian, Ugaritic and Arabic⁸⁶ but the likelihood of such a form

the comparison of parallel passages of Ugaritic and Hebrew/ . . ." for "to assume that a refractory Hebrew text conceals linguistic elements otherwise attested only in Ugaritic without the support of phrase identity in a non-parallel context" is less reliable than the citation of parallel passages, ibid.

⁸⁶Albright, "The Old Testament And Canaanite Language," C.B.Q., VII (1945), 24; cf. also Israel Eitan, "Hebrew And Semitic Particles: Comparative Studies In Semitic Philology," A.J.S.L.L., XLV, (1928-29), 200-11, who states that "Imperfects with prefixed emphatic ל . . . morphologically correspond to the Assyrian preterit with emphatic lu, as in lu allik, 'I went,'" ibid., p. 203. C. H. Gordon, Ugaritic Manual, p. 61 discusses the use of proclitic used emphatically in Ugaritic.

in the Old Testament as well.⁸⁷

If one understands the relationship of chapter three to the remainder of the book of Habakkuk in terms of an older series of writings from a Canaanite-Ugaritic background, then the presence of such a form as the emphatic is certainly not unreasonable in verse 6.

In view of both the clarity added to the text because of the emendation and the possibility of an emphatic ל appearing in Biblical Hebrew the emendation of הלכות עולם לחחחאן to הליכות עולם לו חחח און is to be accepted as valid.

7 In view of reading חחח און of 7a with the final clause of 6b an adjustment must also be made in verse 7 since the deletion of the opening clause destroys not only the metric balance but the sense of the phrase as well.

It seems advisable to assume that 6b and 7a originally read, הליכות עולם לחחחאן חחח און ראיחי אהלי כושן and that חחח און was deleted in the process of transmission through

⁸⁷Eitan, *op. cit.*, p. 202, calls attention to the fact that "the deictic element la . . . has been much better preserved as an adverbial particle of corroboration always used proclitically" and that "medieval commentators and grammarians--e.g., Ibn Ezra--had more than once noticed the presence of an 'additional lamed'" *ibid.* The same writer has called attention to "the exegetical importance of this emphatic element to difficult passages where the supposed prep. ל or negative ל^א would appear out of place" *ibid.*, and cites Is. 8:20; Lam. 4:3; Hos. 9:13; Prov. 16:30; Ezra 17:9 and Job 13:12 as examples of emphatic ל in Biblical Hebrew, *ibid.*, pp. 202f. Cf. also, Gordon, *op. cit.*, p. 61, who cites Gen. 30:34 as an example of lu (לך) used emphatically.

the error of haplography.⁸⁸

The alteration is, of course, highly conjectural in nature and is presented simply as the most acceptable of a number of hypothetical emendations. If this change is accepted a more acceptable reading will have been introduced through no more than the reduplication of a single phrase.

9 LXX ἐντείνωσ ἐντενεῖσ stands in contrast to MT קָוַרְוּ וְקָוַרְוּ and the reduplication of the LXX root should quite likely be carried out in the double use of the same root in MT.

The use of the infinitive absolute preceding a finite verb for the purpose of intensifying the verbal action is common in the Old Testament⁸⁹ although an absolute noun may be used with the same force.⁹⁰ One would expect the infinitive absolute to predominate, however,⁹¹ and in this verse to parallel the use of the LXX

⁸⁸ Supra, p. 115

⁸⁹ Gesenius-Kautzsch, Hebrew Grammar, p. 342.

⁹⁰ Stonehouse, op. cit., pp. 234f., who cites Is. 1:6; 21:7; Mic. 4:9 as examples. Cf. also Gesenius-Kautzsch, op. cit., pp. 344f., wherein it is stated that "the infinitive absolute may equally well be represented by a substantive of kindred stem."

⁹¹ Ibid. The implication of Gesenius is that while the use of the substantive may be found, it does not exceed the infinitive absolute in its usages.

participle and finite verb.

If such a reduplication did occur in MT either צור or ערה would most likely have been used. Not differing greatly in meaning, either word would be acceptable and the determining factor should no doubt be based upon which of the two best explains the present constructions.

BH suggests the reading ערהּ אַערהּ basing the emendation upon a reduplicated use of ערה rather than עור. MT ערהּ differs consonantly from אַערהּ at only one point, the substitution of holem (ך) for yodh (ך). Since ך and ך were at times in their historical development paleographically indistinguishable,⁹² holem (ך), written full rather than defectively, could have been original. A later scribe may well have substituted the yodh (ך) for the holem (ך) thereby producing ערהּ rather than אַערהּ. It is certainly possible that אַערהּ was the original rather than ערהּ.

The assumption that אַערהּ was originally אַערהּ is more difficult to substantiate; the difference between the two being greater than that of ערהּ and אַערהּ.

To accept אַערהּ as original one must in some manner explain the change to אַערהּ. The loss of the weak consonant in the course of pronunciation is possible, especially

⁹²Burrows, "General Introduction," The Dead Sea Scrolls Of St. Mark's Monastery, I, xii.

in view of the nature of ה to be omitted at times.⁹³ The similarity of pronunciation between long "a" and the "o" class vowels is well known and such likeness of pronunciation may have accounted for the alteration of הָעוֹר to הָעוֹרָה. Hypothetically הָעוֹרָה by loss of ה may have become הָעוֹר and further confusion may well have given הָעוֹרָה.

Assuming no more than the expected errors of pronunciation both עוֹרָה and הָעוֹרָה may be explained. Thus the possibility of such confusion as cited above, the witness of LXX to the reduplication of the same root plus the Hebraic use of the infinitive absolute with the finite verb all combine to produce the emendation of MT עוֹרָה הָעוֹר to עוֹרָה הָעוֹרָה.

The phrase of clause Ab, שְׁבַעוֹת מִטוֹחַ אֹמֵר "oaths of rods a word (speech or promise," has proved exceedingly difficult and has been the object of a number of suggested alterations.⁹⁴

LXX has rendered MT at this point by ἐπί τὰ σκῆπτρα λέγει κύριος but connects it with Aa to read, literally,

⁹³With Mappik ה when final is inaudible and "a mere orthographic indication of a preceding vowel." Gesenius-Kautzsch, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

The inflexion of the ה-ל verb, Yates, *op. cit.*, pp. 83f., also illustrates this tendency.

⁹⁴Ward, *op. cit.*, p. 21 translates it as, "Thy quiver is filled with shafts"; Stonehouse, *op. cit.*, p. 142 translates it, "Thou didst light up the highway."

"Stretching you are stretching your bow upon sceptre (staff, or stick) says Lord," a reading that is not greatly superior to MT. If any help is to be obtained it must come from within MT or from external sources other than LXX since the Greek translation is not of such nature to supplant MT as a better reading.

The only recourse appears to be either the retention of MT, reading it with the sense of "an oath (i.e. almost a covenant) of rods promising," or the emendation of the text; either conjecturally or in light of other sources.

W. F. Albright has followed the latter alternative and has advanced an intriguing suggestion concerning this passage in which he has retained consonantal MT but has made a new division of the words.⁹⁵

The crux of his thesis lies in the understanding of מַטוֹן as מַטוֹ ; the final ן originally appearing as הַמַּטוֹן.⁹⁶ According to Albright,

I am convinced that the word matu (or the like) here and in v.14 has nothing to do with matteh, "rod, staff" (never "shaft") but is identical with South-Arabic mtw "war, campaign, fight" or the like . . . the stem is found in South Arabic as mtw, in Ethiopic as mattawa . . . and in Arabic as mtw with various meanings . . . My suggested vocalization follows מַטוֹן, swimming.⁹⁷

⁹⁵Albright, "The Psalm Of Habakkuk," Studies In Old Testament Prophecy, pp. 11, 15.

⁹⁶Ibid., p. 11.

⁹⁷Ibid., pp. 15-16.

These alterations plus the repointing of שְׁבָעוֹת as שְׁבָעָה produce the reading שְׁבָעָה מִטֶּרֶם הָאָמַר⁹⁸ to be translated "Sated by the fight which thou hast decreed."⁹⁹

This usage of מִטֶּרֶם is without parallel in the Old Testament and until it can be unquestionably demonstrated the emendation must remain no more than an attractive hypothesis.

If, on the other hand, one accept שְׁבָעוֹת as "oaths" in the sense of covenant or an agreement (or, even as a curse); add הָאָמַר to אָמַר giving הָאָמַר a change that is possible since the original double הָאָמַר may have caused a scribal deletion; and interpret שְׁבָעוֹת in the sense of a task master's rod or a rod of oppression¹⁰⁰ there is no reason not to accept the phrase מִטֶּרֶם הָאָמַר and to translate it as "a covenant of rods you are speaking."

The concluding phrase of the verse, נִהְרֹת חֲבָקֶךָ-אֶרֶץ, while not necessarily impossible stands in contrast to the other two sections in which the action of Yahweh is depicted.

Consequently the conjectural addition of כּ to נִהְרֹת producing כִּנְהִירוֹת seems desirable. This is especially true in view of the singular חֲבָקֶךָ which would demand a singular

⁹⁸Ibid., p. 11.

⁹⁹Ibid., p. 12.

¹⁰⁰BDB, p. 641.

subject; one not found in נהרות. Such an addition would result in כנהרות חבקע ארץ, or "like rivers you cleave (the) earth."

In the light of the combined emendations this verse should be read, "Laying bare you lay bare your bow, a covenant of rods you make, like rivers you cleave the earth."

- 10 The MT phrase זרם מים עבר has been altered by BH to זרמו מים עבוח and although the emendation is attractive and not impossible, the present reading does not have difficulties sufficient to warrant any such adjustment. The MT "a flood of waters passed over, Tehom gave its voice" is coherent and accurately depicts a rain and thunder storm.

The phrase רוח ידיהו נשא is difficult since there is no subject expressed in the clause. The subject could not be Tehom for this would be incongruous with רוח. BH has suggested that שמש of verse 11 therefore be included as the subject of clause Bb in verse 10, a change partially supported by W. F. Albright and one to be accepted as valid, giving "On high Sun lifted his hands."¹⁰¹

- 13 LXX balances MT לישע with σωτησ (αυ and לישע of Ab with τῶν σωσται; thereby including a verbal form with each

¹⁰¹Albright, "The Psalm Of Habakkuk," Studies In Old Testament Prophecy, pp. 11-12, 16.

section of the clause.

The parallelism between Aa and Ab would seem to demand a verbal form of some type in Ab to offset Aa. This may be provided, following the desire for a balanced structure as well as the evidence of LXX, by emending לישע to להושה. This will be accepted as valid and MT should now be read "You went forth for the deliverance of thy people, for the purpose of delivering thy anointed."

The preposition מן of MT מבניה should, in the context, be deleted. Had מחץ possessed a meaning of separation the preposition would have been retained; מחץ, "smite through, wound severely, shatter," has no such meaning, however, and the idea of separation inherent in מן is not appropriate to the context.

14 Clause Aa of verse 14 should be emended so that בטמין will be replaced by בטמין; a conjectural emendation made in the light of the context. The phrase should therefore be read, "You pierced with thy shafts the head of his warriors."

פיר of MT appears at only this point in the Old Testament¹⁰² and even here its meaning is dubious.¹⁰³ Consequently, it would seem that an emendation of פ to ש

¹⁰²BDB, p. 826.

¹⁰³Ibid.

to give פִּרְשִׁי would be advisable since the two sounds, פ and פֿ, could be confused with relative ease.

15 כחמר of MT has been emended by Albright to כחמר; the ח having been "omitted by haplography"¹⁰⁴ and therefore to be reintroduced into the text. The change seems to clarify the meaning of the verse and should be accepted.

16 By emending אֲשֶׁר to אֲשֶׁרִי and אֲרִגֵּז to אֲרִגֵּזִי the rather meaningless particle אֲשֶׁר is removed and the clause assumes clarity of meaning; now being translated "Beneath me my steps tremble." Both alterations are conjectural but it should be noted that in each instance only י or י was added.

The alteration of אֲרִגֵּז to אֲרִגֵּזִי has been made by W. F. Albright and while wholly conjectural in nature has been defended by him since,

In the Aramaic cursive of the fifth to third centuries it would not be difficult to misread a blurred פ as פֿ. In favour of my proposal is not only the fact that it makes complete sense, but also the fact that אֲרִגֵּזִי אֲנִי appears in Jer. xvii.16.¹⁰⁵

With this emendation there must be the parallel adjustment of אֲרִגֵּזִי to אֲרִגֵּזִי, an alteration not wholly inconceivable in the light of the possible elision of the י of אֲרִגֵּזִי and the י of אֲרִגֵּזִי.

¹⁰⁴Albright, "The Psalm Of Habakkuk," Studies In Old Testament Prophecy, p. 17.

¹⁰⁵Ibid.

Since these emendations add so greatly to the clarity of the following clause they will be accepted despite their conjectural nature and the phrase will be read, "Dreadful to me (is) day of distress."

17 **חפרה** of MT would best be read **הפרה**. Although the use of **פרח** is possible it is not so likely as **פרה** for a fig tree would more than likely bud (**פרח**, "bud, sprout, shoot,")¹⁰⁶ but it would not necessarily be fruitful (**פרה**).¹⁰⁷ The similarity of the two consonants may be vividly observed in 1QH, plate LVI, column iv, line 9, wherein both **ח** and **פ** appear and little, if any, distinction is discernible between the two.

The active **רזז** should, in view of the context, be emended to **רזז**, a passive and more acceptable form.

IV. CONCLUSION

The examination of the text of Habakkuk in the light of other textual witnesses has served to indicate that, while divergencies do occur between these sources and MT, the latter text has not been seriously challenged by the testimony of other texts although they do, at times, make significant contributions to the clarification of isolated

¹⁰⁶BDB, p. 827

¹⁰⁷Ibid., p. 826.

points within MT.

The tendency of lQH to support MT, coupled with the fact that LXX does not radically deviate from MT except at infrequent points, serves to confirm the trustworthiness of MT. This should not obscure the fact that MT can be corrected in the light of other sources at several points and one should consider such sources in one's attempt to reconstruct a text that will as nearly as possible coincide with the original text of Habakkuk.

CHAPTER V

THE TEXT OF HABAKKUK TRANSLATED IN THE LIGHT
OF MODERN RESEARCH AND DISCOVERY

CHAPTER V

THE TEXT OF HABAKKUK TRANSLATED IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN RESEARCH AND DISCOVERY¹

The Burden Which Habakkuk The Prophet Saw

I. How long, O Yahweh, I have cried out,
Yet you would not even begin to hear;
I constantly cry out unto thee: Violence!
Yet you do not even begin to save.

For what purpose do you cause me to see emptiness,
And to gaze upon trouble;
And destruction and violence (are) before me,
So that there is strife, and contention rises up?

¹The results of the previous areas of study have been utilized in this translation in which the specific conclusions arrived at in the course of the investigation have been indicated by the nature of the translation rendered.

The arrangement of the translation has been carried out on the basis of the accentual division made by the Tiberian Massoretes. Those sections closed by a soph pasuk have been set apart with a quadrupled space between them and correspond to the versicular division within contemporary translations; the athnah and silluk sections begin at the extreme left margin so that those lines beginning at the left margin should be understood in terms of these major disjunctive accents; the indented sections represent lesser disjunctive accents, the first indentation normally indicating the zaqeph qaton, the zaqeph gadhol, the segholta, or the rebhi(a); further disjunctive accents have not been indicated apart from the use of normal marks of punctuation.

Therefore the Torah is cold,
And judgment does not go forth effectively;
Because wickedness surrounds the righteous,
Therefore judgment goes forth twisted.

Look among the nations and gaze,
And marvelling - marvel!
Because a work (is) working in your days -
You would not believe it if it were told!

For look at me raising up the Chaldaeans,
The swift and bitter nation;
The one walking through the expanse of the earth,
For the purpose of taking dwellings other than his.

Dreadful and fearful (is) he,
From himself his judgment and his decree go forth.

And his horses are swifter than leopards,
And they are sharper than wolves of evening;
And his horsemen leap fiercely;
They come from afar,
They fly like an eagle hastening to devour.

All of them come for oppression,
 (The) set of their faces (is) forward;
And (he) gathers captives like the sand.

And he scoffs at kings,
 And princes (are) a laughingstock to him;
And he laughs at every defense,
 And he heaps up earth and then he captures it.

Then he comes on like the wind and passes over;
And he makes this, his strength, his God.

Are you not from ancient time, O Yahweh?
 My God, My Holy One, we shall not die!
Yahweh has set him for judgment,
 And a rock for his correction he is setting it.

(You are) too pure of eyes to see evil,
 And to look upon trouble you are not able;
Wherefore do you gaze upon treacherous ones,
 You are silent in the wicked swallowing up the one
 more righteous than he?

And then you make men like the fish of the sea;
Like creeping things, without a ruler.

All of them he causes to go up by the hook,
And he drags him away with his net,
And he gathers him in his snare;
Therefore he is glad and rejoices.

Therefore he sacrifices to his net,
And he burns incense to his snare;
Because by them his portion has grown fat,
And his food (is) excellent.

Therefore he empties his net continually;
And for the purpose of killing nations he does not cease.

II. I will stand upon my post,
And I will station myself upon my rampart;
Then I will watch to see what he will speak to me.
And what he will return concerning my argument..

Then Yahweh proceeded to answer me, and he was saying,

"Write the vision!"

And make it plain upon the tablets;
In order that the one reading it may run.

For yet (the) vision (is) for the appointed time,
 And it hastens to the end and will not fail;
 If it should linger, wait for it;
 Because coming, it will surely come, and it will
 not tarry.

Behold, swollen -

Not right in his nephesh in him.
 But (the) righteous in his faithfulness shall live.

And moreover because wealth is treacherous,
 A presumptuous man shall not abide;
 Who has enlarged his nephesh like Sheol,
 And he (is) like Death and is never satisfied,
 And he gathers unto himself all the nations,
 And then he gathers unto himself all the peoples.

Shall not these, all of them - against him lift up a wise
 saying,

And a mocking poem, a riddle to Him?
 And they will say, "Woe (to) one increasing (what is)
 not his,
 How long shall he make heavy upon him heavy debts?"

Shall thy debtors not suddenly rise up,
And thy foes shall awake;
And you will be plunder for him (them).

Because you have plundered many nations,
All (the) remaining peoples will plunder you'
On account of (the) bloods of men and (the) violence
of earth,
(The) town and all (the) ones dwelling in her.

Woe to one breaking off evil gain for his house;
For the purpose of setting on high his nest,
For the purpose of delivering himself from (the)
hand of evil.

You have counseled shame to thy house;
Cutting off many peoples and forfeiting thy nephesh.

For (the) stone from (the) wall will cry out;
And (the) beam from (the) timbers will answer.

Woe (to) one building a city with bloods;
And establishing a town by injustices.

Behold is not this from Yahweh of Armies?

That people toil only to satisfy fire,

And peoples faint only to satisfy emptiness?

For the earth will be filled,

With the knowledge of the glory of Yahweh;

Like the waters (that) cover the sea.

Woe to (the) one causing his neighbor to drink,

And moreover from (the) goblet of his wrath making

to drink;

For the purpose of gazing upon their nakedness.

You are sated with dishonor instead of glory,

Drink thou also and be shaken;

(The) cup of the right hand of Yahweh will be turned

against you,

And disgrace instead of honor.

For (the) violence of Lebanon will cover you,

And (the) devastation of beasts will dismay you;

On account of (the) bloods of men and (the) violence of

earth,

(The) town and all the ones dwelling in her.

Woe to one saying to a tree, "Awake!"

"Rouse up!" to a stone of silence;

Behold, it (is) grasped with gold and silver,

But (there is) no vital power in its midst.

What does an image profit, for his former hewed him into
shape,

A molten image and an idol of falsehood;

That (the) one forming (it) has trusted his form,

For the purpose of making dumb idols.

But Yahweh (is) in his holy temple,

Keep silence before him all the earth.

III. O Yahweh - I have heard thy report - I am afraid,²

O Yahweh - thy work in the midst of years - make it live,

In (the) midst of years make (it) known;

In wrath, remember mercy.

God came from Teman,

And the holy one from (the) mountain of Paran; (Selah)

His majesty covered (the) heavens,

And his praises filled the earth.

²A psalm for Habakkuk the prophet (with singing).

And His brightness (was) like the light,
Rays (were extending) from his hand to him;
And he rejoices in (the) day of his strength.

Pestilence walks before him;
And a fire bolt goes forth before his feet

He stood and he shook the earth - he looked and caused
nations to start,
Mountains of old were scattered,
Hills of antiquity sank down;
(The) everlasting roadways were shattered.

Beneath trouble I saw (the) tents of Cushan,
(The) curtains of (the) land of Midian were quaking.

Did Yahweh burn in anger against the rivers,
Or (was) thy anger against the rivers,
Or against (the) sea thy burning anger;
When you proceeded to ride upon thy horses,
Thy chariots of deliverance?

You utterly lay bare your bow,
An oath of roads you speak; (Selah)
Like the rivers you cleave the earth.

Mountains have seen thee and they writhe,

A flood of waters flows past;

Tehom gives forth his voice,

Sun lifts up his hands on high.

Moon stands upon his lofty abode;

They walk to (the) light of thy arrows,

To the shining of the brightness of thy spears.

In indignation you march across the earth,

In anger you trample nations.

You went forth for (the) deliverance of thy people,

For the purpose of delivering thy anointed.

You shattered (the) head from (the) house of (the) wicked.

Laying (it) bare (from) foundation unto neck. (Selah)

You pierced with thy shafts (the) head of his warriors,

They storm for the purpose of scattering me;

Their exaltation -

(It is) like (the) devouring of (the) poor in secret.

You trampled the sea (with) thy horses,

Like the foaming of many waters.

I heard and my belly began to tremble,
My lips quivered at (thy) voice,
Rottenness began to enter into my bones,
And beneath me my steps were trembling;
Dreadful to me (is the) day of distress,
(When) a people go up to attack us.

When the fig tree will not bear fruit,
And an absence of produce (is) on the vine,
The fruit of the olive tree has failed,
And (the) field has not made food;
(The) flock was cut off from (the) fold,
And an absence of cattle in the stables.

Yet I will exult in Yahweh;
I will rejoice in (the) God of my deliverance.

Yahweh my lord (is) my strength,
And he sets my feet like the doe,
And upon high places he causes me to tread

(To the director - with music).

APPENDIX

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Albright, William Foxwell. Archaeology And The Religion Of Israel. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1953.
- Ap Thomas, D. R. A Primer Of Old Testament Text Criticism. London: The Epworth Press, 1947.
- Bentwich, Norman. Solomon Schechter: A Biography. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1940.
- Bentzen, Aage. Introduction To The Old Testament. Second edition. 2 vols. Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad Publisher, 1952.
- Bewer, Julius A. The Book Of The Twelve Prophets. Vol. II of Harper's Annotated Bible Series. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1949.
- _____. The Literature Of The Old Testament In Its Historical Development. New York: Columbia University Press, 1922.
- Birnbaum, Solomon. The Qumran (Dead Sea) Scrolls And Paleography. Bulletin Of The American Schools Of Oriental Research Supplementary Studies, Nos. 13-14. New Haven: American Schools Of Oriental Research, 1952.
- Bostrom, Otto H. Alternative Readings In The Hebrew Of The Books Of Samuel. Rock Island: Augustana Book Concern, 1918.
- Brodie, Israel. "Index Volume To The Soncino Talmud," The Babylonian Talmud. Edited by I. Epstein. London: The Soncino Press, 1952.
- Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. A Hebrew And English Lexicon Of The Old Testament: Based on the Lexicon of William Gesenius as translated by Edward Robinson. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1952.
- Bruce, F. F. The Books And The Parchments: Some Chapters On The Transmission Of The Bible. Revised edition. London: Pickering & Inglis Ltd., 1953.

- Buhl, Frants. Canon And Text Of The Old Testament. Trans. John Macpherson. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1892.
- Burrows, Millar. The Dead Sea Scrolls. New York: The Viking Press, 1955.
- _____. (ed.). The Dead Sea Scrolls Of St. Mark's Monastery. Vol. I of The Isaiah Manuscript And The Habakkuk Commentary. New Haven: The American Schools Of Oriental Research, 1950.
- _____. What Mean These Stones. New Haven: The American Schools Of Oriental Research, 1941.
- Charles, R. H. (ed.). The Apocrypha And Pseudepigrapha Of The Old Testament In English With Introductions And Critical And Explanatory Notes To The Several Books. 2 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Cheyne, T. K. The Origin And Religious Contents Of The Psalter In The Light Of Old Testament Criticism And The History Of Religions. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd., 1891.
- Danby, Herbert. The Mishnah: Translated From the Hebrew With Introduction And Brief Explanatory Notes. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1933.
- Danell, G. A. Studies In The Name Israel In The Old Testament. Uppsala: Appelbergs Boktryckeri A.B., 1946.
- Davidson, A. B. An Introductory Hebrew Grammar. Revised edition by John Edgar McFadyen. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1923.
- _____. The Books Of Nahum, Habakkuk And Zephaniah. Revised by H. C. O. Lanchester. In The Cambridge Bible For Schools And Colleges. Edited by A. F. Kirkpatrick. Cambridge: University Press, 1920.
- Davidson, Samuel. A Treatise On Biblical Criticism, Exhibiting A Systematic View Of That Science. Vol. I. of The Old Testament. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 1852.
- _____. The Hebrew Text Of The Old Testament, Revised From Critical Sources. London: Samuel Bagster And Sons, 1855.
- Driver, Samuel R. An Introduction To The Literature Of The Old Testament. In The International Theological Library. Edited by Charles A. Briggs and Stewart D. F. Salmond. Ninth edition. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950.

- Dupont-Sommer, A. The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Survey. Trans. E. Margaret Rowley. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952.
- Eerdmans, B. D. The Religion Of Israel. Leiden: Universitaire Pers Leiden, 1947.
- Elliger, Karl. Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1953.
- Engnell, Ivan. The Call Of Isaiah. Uppsala: A. B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1949.
- _____. Studies In Divine Kingship In The Ancient Near East. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell's Boktryckeri AB, 1943.
- Ewald, Georg H. A. von. Commentary On The Prophets Of The Old Testament. Vol. III. Trans. J. Frederick Smith. 4 vols. Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1878.
- Finegan, Jack. Light From The Ancient Past: The Archaeological Background Of The Hebrew-Christian Religion. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951.
- Franken, H. J. The Mystical Communion With YHWH In The Book Of Psalms. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1954.
- Frankfort, Henri. Kingship And The Gods: A Study Of Ancient Near Eastern Religion As The Integration Of Society And Nature. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.
- Freedman, H. "Kiddushin: Translated Into English With Notes, Glossary And Indices," The Babylonian Talmud. Edited by I. Epstein. London: The Soncino Press, 1936.
- _____. "Nedarim: Translated Into English With Notes, Glossary And Indices," The Babylonian Talmud. Edited by I. Epstein. London: The Soncino Press, 1936.
- Fritsch, Charles T. The Qumran Community: Its History And Scrolls. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956.
- Frost, Stanley Brice. Old Testament Apocalyptic: Its Origins And Growth. London: The Epworth Press, 1952.
- Geden, Alfred S. Outlines Of Introduction To The Hebrew Bible. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909.
- Gesenius, William. Hebrew Grammar. Edited by E. Kautzsch; revised by A. E. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.
- Ginsburg, Christian D. Introduction To The Massoretico-Critical Edition Of The Hebrew Bible. London: The Trinitarian Bible Society, 1897.

- Gordis, Robert. The Biblical Text In The Making: A Study Of The Kethib-Qere. Philadelphia: Press Of The Jewish Publication Society, 1937.
- Gordon, C. H. The Loves And Wars Of Baal And Anat And Other Poems From Ugarit. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1943.
- _____. Ugaritic Grammar. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1940.
- _____. Ugaritic Handbook. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1947.
- _____. Ugaritic Manual: Newly Revised Grammar Texts In Transliteration Cuneiform Selections Paradigms-Glossary-Indices. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1955.
- Graham, W. C., and H. G. May. Culture And Conscience: An Archaeological Study Of The New Religious Past In Ancient Palestine. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1936.
- Green, William Henry. General Introduction To The Old Testament: The Text. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.
- Gullhaume, Alfred. Prophecy And Divination Among The Hebrews And Other Semites. London: Hodder And Stoughton Limited, 1938.
- Gunkel, Hermann. What Remains Of The Old Testament And Other Essays. Trans. A. K. Dallas. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928.
- Hahn, Herbert F. Old Testament In Modern Research. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1954.
- Haldar, Alfred. Associations Of Cult Prophets Among The Ancient Semites. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri AB, 1945.
- _____. Studies In The Book of Nahum. Uppsala: A. B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1946.
- The Holy Bible. Revised Standard Version. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1952.
- Hooke, S. H. (ed.). The Labyrinth. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935.

- Humbert, Paul. Problemes Du Livre D'Habacuc. Neuchatel: Secretariat De L'Universite, 1944.
- Hyatt, J. Philip. Prophetic Religion. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1947.
- Jepsen, Alfred. Nabi: Soziologische Studien Zur Alttestamentlichen Literatur Und Religionsgeschichte. Munchen: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934.
- Johnson, A. R. The Cultic Prophet In Ancient Israel. Cardiff: University of Wales Press Board, 1944.
- Kahle, Paul E. The Cairo Geniza: The Schweich Lectures Of The British Academy 1941. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, Oxford University Press, 1947.
- Kapelrud, Arvid S. Joel Studies. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri AB, 1948.
- Kennedy, James. An Aid To The Textual Amendment Of The Old Testament. Edited by N. Levison. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928.
- Kenyon, Sir Frederic. Our Bible And The Ancient Manuscripts. Fourth edition, revised, rewritten and enlarged. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1939.
- Kirkpatrick, A. F. The Doctrine Of The Prophets: The Warburtonian Lectures For 1886-1890. Third edition. London: Macmillan And Company, 1910.
- Kittel, Rudolph. Biblia Hebraica. Fifth edition. Stuttgart: Verlag und Druck der Privileg. Wurt. Bibelanstalt, 1949.
- _____. Biblia Hebraica. Seventh edition. Stuttgart: Verlag und Druck der Privileg. Wurt. Bibelanstalt, 1955.
- Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner (eds.). Lexicon In Veteris Testamenti Libros. Vol. II. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953.
- Leslie, E. A. Old Testament Religion In The Light Of Its Canaanite Background. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1936.

- _____. The Prophets Tell Their Own Story. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1939.
- _____. The Psalms Translated And Interpreted In The Light Of Hebrew Life And Worship. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949.
- Lidell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon. seventh revised edition. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1889.
- Lindhagen, Curt. The Servant Motif In The Old Testament, A Preliminary Study To The 'Ebed-Yahweh Problem' In Deutero-Isaiah. Uppsala: Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1950.
- Lods, Adolphe. The Prophets And The Rise Of Judaism. Trans. S. H. Hooke. In The History Of Civilization Series. Edited by C. K. Ogden. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1950.
- Moore, G. F. Judaism In The First Centuries Of The Christian Era: The Age of the Tannim. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927-30.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund von. Kultprophetie Und Prophetische Psalmen. Psalmstudien III. Kristiania In Kommission Bei Jacob Dylwad, A. W. Broggers Boktrykkeri A/S, 1923.
- Nielsen, Eduard. Oral Tradition: A Modern Problem In Old Testament Introduction. Vol. XI in Studies In Biblical Theology. Chicago: A. R. Allenson, 1954.
- Östborn, Gunnar. Cult And Canon: A Study In The Canonization Of The Old Testament. Uppsala: A. B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1950.
- Peake, Arthur S. The Problem Of Suffering In The Old Testament. London: The Epworth Press, 1947.
- Pedersen, Johannes. Israel: Its Life And Culture. 4 vols. Copenhagen: Povl Branner, 1946.
- Pfeiffer, Robert H. Introduction To The Old Testament. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1941.
- Pilcher, Charles Venn. Three Hebrew Prophets And The Passing Of The Empires, Being A Study of Nahum, Habakkuk & Zephaniah. London: The Religious Tract Society, 1931.

- Price, Ira Maurice. The Ancestry Of Our English Bible: An Account Of Manuscripts, Texts, And Versions Of The Bible. Second revised edition. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949.
- Pritchard, James B. Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating To The Old Testament. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950.
- Rad, Gerhard von. Studies In Deuteronomy. Vol. IX in Studies In Biblical Theology. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1953.
- Rahlfs, Alfred (ed.). Septuaginta. Vol. II, third edition. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1940.
- Roberts, Bleddyn J. The Old Testament Text And Versions: The Hebrew Text In Transmission And The History Of The Ancient Versions. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1951.
- Robertson, A. T. An Introduction To The Textual Criticism Of The New Testament. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1925.
- _____ and W. Hershey Davis. A New Short Grammar Of The Greek New Testament. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1933.
- Robertson, Edward. The Text Of The O.T. And The Methods Of Textual Criticism. Lectio No. 1 of In Vetere Testamento Et In Rebus Judaicis. London: Shapiro, Vallentine & Co. /n.d./.
- Robinson, H. Wheeler. Inspiration And Revelation In The Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950.
- _____. The Old Testament Its Making And Meaning. In The London Theological Library. Edited by E. S. Waterhouse. London: University of London Press, Ltd., 1937.
- _____ (ed.). Record And Revelation: Essays On The Old Testament By Members Of The Society For Old Testament Study. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1938.
- Rowley, H. H. The Biblical Doctrine Of Election. London: Lutterworth Press, 1950.
- _____. The Growth Of The Old Testament. Vol. XLV in Hutchinson's University Library. Edited by E. O. James. London: Hutchinson House, 1950.

- _____. (ed.). The Old Testament And Modern Study: A Generation Of Discovery And Research. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951.
- _____. The Re-discovery Of The Old Testament. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946.
- _____. The Servant Of The Lord And Other Essays On The Old Testament. London: Lutterworth Press, 1952.
- _____. (ed.). Studies In Old Testament Prophecy Presented To Professor Theodore H. Robinson. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950.
- _____. The Unity Of The Bible. London: The Carey Kingsgate Press Limited, 1953.
- _____. The Zadokite Fragments And The Dead Sea Scrolls. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952.
- Schaeffer, Claude F. A. The Cuneiform Texts Of Ras Shamra-Ugarit: The Schweich Lectures On Biblical Archaeology, 1936. London: Oxford University Press, 1939.
- Schechter, Solomon. Studies In Judaism: Second Series. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1938.
- Smith, George Adam. The Book Of The Twelve Prophets: commonly called The Minor. In 2 vols. Vol. II, revised edition. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers [n.d.].
- Smith, John Merlin Powis, William Hayes Ward, and Julius A. Bewer. A Critical And Exegetical Commentary On Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah And Joel. In The International Critical Commentary. Edited by Samuel Rolles Driver, Alfred Plummer, and Charles Augustus Briggs. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1948.
- Smith, W. Robertson. The Prophets Of Israel And Their Place In History To The Close Of The Eighth Century, B.C. New York: D. Appleton And Company, 1882.
- Souter, Alexander. The Text And Canon Of The New Testament. London: Duckworth, 1948.
- Stonehouse, George G. V. The Book Of Habakkuk: Introduction, Translation, And Notes On The Hebrew Text. London: Rivingtons, 1911.
- Vermes, Geza. Discovery In The Judean Desert. New York: Desclee Company, 1956.

Waterman, Leroy. Religion Faces The World Crisis: A Study Of The Religious Aspects And Motivations Of Civilization. Ann Arbor: G. Wahr, 1943.

Webster's New International Dictionary Of The English Language. Second edition, unabridged. Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Company Publishers, 1948.

Weir, T. H. A Short History Of The Hebrew Text Of The Old Testament. London: [n.n.], 1899.

Welch, Adam C. Kings And Prophets Of Israel. Edited by Norman W. Porteous. London: Lutterworth Press, 1953.

_____. Prophet And Priest In Old Israel. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1953.

Wellhausen, Julius. Prologomena To The History Of Israel. Trans. J. Sutherland Black and Allan Menzies. Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black, 1885.

Willoughby, H. R. (ed.). The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947.

Wilson, Edmund. The Scrolls From The Dead Sea. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955.

Woods, Francis H., and Francis E. Powell. The Hebrew Prophets For English Readers. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1914.

Wright, George E. God Who Acts: Biblical Theology As Recital. Vol. VIII in Studies In Biblical Theology. Chicago: H. Regnery, 1952.

Wurthwein, Ernst. The Text Of The Old Testament: An Introduction To Kittel-Kahle's Biblia Hebraica. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957.

Yates, Kyle M. The Essentials Of Biblical Hebrew. Revised by John Joseph Owens. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, [n.d.].

B. COLLECTED ESSAYS AND ARTICLES

Albright, W. F. "The Psalm Of Habakkuk," Studies In Old Testament Prophecy. Edited by H. H. Rowley. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950.

- Box, G. H., and W. O. E. Oesterley. "Sirach," The Apocrypha And Pseudepigrapha Of The Old Testament. Vol. I, Apocrypha. Edited by R. H. Charles. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Davies, Witton. "Bel And The Dragon," The Apocrypha And Pseudepigrapha Of The Old Testament. Vol. I, Apocrypha. Edited by R. H. Charles. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Eissfeldt, Otto. "The Prophetic Literature," The Old Testament And Modern Research: A Generation Of Discovery And Research. Edited by H. H. Rowley. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951.
- Gunkel, Hermann. "The Close Of Micah: A Prophetic Liturgy," What Remains Of The Old Testament And Other Essays. Trans. A. K. Dallas. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928.
- Herford, R. Travers. "Pirke Aboth: The Sayings of the Fathers," The Apocrypha And Pseudepigrapha Of The Old Testament. Vol. II, Pseudepigrapha. Edited by R. H. Charles. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Johnson, A. R. "The Psalms," The Old Testament And Modern Research: A Generation Of Discovery And Research. Edited by H. H. Rowley. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951.
- Lehrman, S. M. "Habakkuk: Introduction And Commentary," The Twelve Prophets: Hebrew Text, English Translation And Commentary. Edited by A. Cohen. The Soncino Books Of The Bible. London: Soncino Press, 1948.
- Moffatt, James. "Preface," in Herman Gunkel, What Remains Of The Old Testament And Other Essays. Trans. A. K. Dallas. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928.
- Prussner, Frederick C. "Problems Ahead In Old Testament Research," The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow. Edited by Harold Rideout Willoughby. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947.
- Rowley, H. H. "The Nature Of Old Testament Prophecy In The Light Of Recent Study," The Servant Of The Lord And Other Old Testament Essays. London: Lutterworth Press, 1952.

Thomas, D. Winton. "The Textual Criticism Of The Old Testament," The Old Testament And Modern Research: A Generation Of Discovery And Research. Edited by H. H. Rowley. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951.

C. PERIODICALS

Albright, W. F. "New Light On Early Recensions Of The Hebrew Bible," Bulletin Of The American Schools Of Oriental Research, CXL (December, 1955), 27-33.

_____. "Two Letters From Ugarit (Ras Shamrah)," B.A.S.O.R., LXXXII (1941), 48-9.

Arbez, Edward P. "Notes On The New Hebrew Manuscripts," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XI (1950), 173-89.

Barnes, W. E. "Ancient Corrections in the Text of the Old Testament," (Tikkun Sopherim). Journal Of Theological Studies, I (1900), 387-414.

Blank, S. H. "A Hebrew Bible Manuscript In The Hebrew Union College Library," Hebrew Union College Annual, VIII-IX (1931-32), 229-55.

Blau, Ludwig. "Massoretic Studies," The Jewish Quarterly Review, IX, No. 33 (October, 1896), 122-44.

Burrows, Millar. "The Contents And Significance Of The Manuscripts," Biblical Archaeologist, XI (September, 1948), 57-61.

_____. "Waw and Yodh in the Isaiah Dead Sea Scroll (DS1a)," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CXXIV (December, 1951), 18-20.

Cross, F. M. "Qumran Cave I," Journal Of Biblical Literature, LXXV (June, 1956), 121-25.

_____. "The Manuscripts Of The Dead Sea Caves," Biblical Archaeologist, XVII (February, 1954), 2-21.

_____. "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related To The Original Hebrew Underlying The Septuagint," Bulletin Of The American Schools Of Oriental Research, CXXXII (December, 1953), 15-26.

- _____. "The Oldest Manuscripts From Qumran," Journal Of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (September, 1955), 147-73.
- Gehman, Henry S. "The Burden Of The Prophets," Jewish Quarterly Review, XXXI (1940-41), 107-21.
- Ginsberg, H. L. "The Ugaritic Texts And Textual Criticism," Journal Of Biblical Literature, LXII (1943), 109-15.
- _____. "Ugaritic Studies And The Bible," Biblical Archaeologist, VIII (May, 1945), 42-56.
- Hyatt, J. Philip. "The Dead Sea Discoveries: Retrospect And Challenge," Journal Of Biblical Literature, LXXVI (March, 1957), 1-12.
- Johnson, A. R. "The Prophet In Israelite Worship," The Expository Times, XLVII (1936), 312-19.
- Kelso, James L. "The Archaeology Of Qumran," Journal Of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (September, 1955), 141-46.
- Porteous, N. W. "Prophet And Priest In Israel," The Expository Times, LXII (1950-51), 4, 9.
- Roberts, B. J. "The Emergence of the Tiberian Massoretic Text," Journal Of Theological Studies, XLIX (1948), 8-16.
- Rowley, H. H. "Recent Foreign Theology: The Book of Habakkuk," The Expository Times, LVIII (October, 1946-September, 1947), 192-93.
- _____. "Recent Foreign Theology: Pre-Massoretic Hebrew Grammar," The Expository Times, LVIII (October 1946-September, 1947), 220.
- _____. "The Semitic Sources of 'Cipher' and its Cognates," Werden Und Wesen Des Alten Testaments, Edited by Paul Volz, Friedrich Stummer and Johannes Hempel. (September, 1935), 175-90.
- _____. "The Unity Of The Old Testament," Bulletin Of The John Rylands Library, XXIX (1945-46), 326-58.
- Samuel, Mar Athanasius Y. "The Purchase Of The Jerusalem Scrolls," Biblical Archaeologist, XII (May, 1949), 26-32.

Skehan, Patrick W. "Exodus In The Samaritan Recension From Qumran," Journal Of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (September, 1955), 182-88.

_____. "The Text Of Isaias At Qumran," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XVII (1955), 38-43.

Trever, John C. "A Paleographic Study Of The Jerusalem Scrolls," Bulletin Of The American Schools Of Oriental Research, CXIII (February, 1949), 6-24.

_____. "The Discovery Of The Scrolls," Biblical Archaeologist, XI (September, 1948), 46-57.

Walker, H. H., and N. W. Lund. "The Literary Structure Of The Book Of Habakkuk," Journal Of Biblical Literature, LIII (1934), 355-70.

Widengren, George. "King And Covenant," Journal Of Semitic Studies, II (January, 1957), 1-32.

E. ENCYCLOPEDIA AND DICTIONARY ARTICLES

Adler, Elkan N. "Genizah," The Jewish Encyclopedia, V, 612-13.

Bacher, W. "Genizah," Encyclopaedia Of Religion and Ethics, edited by James Hastings, VI, 187-89. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914.

Blau, Ludwig. "Soferim," The Jewish Encyclopedia, XI, 426-29.

Eisenstein, Judah David. "Scribes," The Jewish Encyclopedia, XI, 123-26.

Miller, Madeleine S., and J. Lane Miller. "Ras Shamra," Harper's Bible Dictionary, third edition, pp. 601-2. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1955.

Moffatt, James. "Scribes," Encyclopaedia Of Religion and Ethics, edited by James Hastings, XI, 271-76. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921.

Strack, H. L. "Scribes," The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia Of Religious Knowledge, edited by Samuel Macauley Jackson, X, 307-9. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1911.

F. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- Elliott, Ralph Harrison. "A Comparative Study Of Deutero Isaiah And Job." Unpublished Doctor's thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 1956.
- Morton, W. H. "The Bearing Of The Records Of Ras Shamra On The Exegesis Of The Old Testament." Unpublished Doctor's thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 1946.
- Owens, John Joseph. "The Value Of The Septuagint In Correction Of The Masoretic Text In Hosea." Unpublished Doctor's thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 1943.
- Pearson, A. T. "The Problem Of Unity And Date in Habakkuk." Unpublished Doctor's thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 1947.
- Rust, E. C. "Old Testament Theology." Mimeographed paper, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 1953.
- _____. "The Psalms." Mimeographed paper, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, 1954.
- Zimmerman, J. D. "The Prophecy Of Habakkuk." Unpublished Doctor's thesis, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, 1941.

G. NEWSPAPERS

- "Archaeological Newsletter," Number 5 (1953-54).
New Haven: American Schools Of Oriental Research.
- The Louisville Courier Journal, May 7, 1957.