



LIBRARY COPYRIGHT NOTICE

www.huc.edu/libraries

Regulated Warning

See Code of Federal Regulations, Title 37, Volume 1, Section 201.14:

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be “used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research.” If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of “fair use,” that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

Statement by Referee of Senior Thesis

The Senior dissertation entitled:

"Text and Versions of Habakuk Ch. I & II"

written by Isaac Jerusalem
(name of student)

- 1) may (with revisions) be considered for publication: ()
cannot be considered for publication: (X)
- 2) may, on request, be loaned by the Library: (X)
may not be loaned by the Library: ()

Julius Lewy
(signature of referee)

Julius Lewy
(referee)

Givensburg, March 4, 1956
(date)

mic. 10/78

TEXT AND VERSIONS OF HABAKUK Ch. I & II

by

Isaac Jerusalmi

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the
Master of Hebrew Letters Degree
and Ordination.

Referee:
Professor _____

Dr. Julius Lewy

Hebrew Union College-
Jewish Institute of Religion
Cincinnati, Ohio
January, 1956

A MI SEÑOR PADRE n"y

que tanto peno
por ver y no alcanzar

A MI SEÑORA MADRE

que tanto aspero
parte de la grande paga
que no se paga
de Isico, el preciaducho

Y dixo el Dio: "Esta es
la tierra que juri.....
Te la hice ver con tus ojos,
ma no pasaras alli".....
Y murio alli Moxe!

Se levantan sus hijos,
y la llaman bienaventurada.

S U M M A R Y

The purpose of this paper is a critical, comparative study of the first two chapters of the Book of Habakuk, from the point of view of the Ancient Versions. The method used represents, in its broad lines, an application of Nyberg's approach toward this type of research, as defined and applied in his Studien zum Hoseabuche.

This investigation consists in a verse by verse confrontation of the Massoretic Text with the corresponding Septuagint, Peshitta, Targum and Vulgate readings. In addition, the quotations of the text of Habakuk, as they appear in the Dead Sea Scroll Habakuk Commentary, have been utilized, on the same level that one would use any other manuscripts of the Massoretic Text. Furthermore, each difficult passage has been subjected to an 'internal' treatment, whereby it has been attempted to find some satisfactory answer from the data that parallels in the respective languages could offer. Finally, an effort has been made in the direction of consulting as many important modern commentators on the topic as possible, in order to study their method of work and the results they have obtained. Out of this, came a series of textual proposals aiming at clarifying an otherwise obscure or difficult text.

As to deciding on the over-all value, reliability or even superiority of a given Version, our position may be defined as follows: The Ancient Versions were part of a living tradition, with its own special needs and claims. Their interrelationship with both the Massoretic Text and with older Versions cannot be established in terms of a clear-cut statement of dependency. Only "parallel" developments may be detected, which in turn have to be redefined as to whether they go back 1) to a genuine imitation, 2) to a common Hebrew Vorlage, 3) or are purely accidental. Here, no attempt has been made to push the task to that limit.

Finally, various lists of such outstanding "parallel" developments with regard to Chapter I & II of Habakuk have been drawn up at the end of this study. Along with the proposed, emended text, they constitute our conclusions for this investigation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations.....	I
Introduction.....	1
The Text of Habakuk Ch. 1 & II.....	9
Conclusions.....	78
Proposed Text.....	85
Bibliography.....	88

I

A B B R E V I A T I O N S

Aq.	Aquila
DSSH	Dead Sea Scroll Habakuk Commentary
G	Greek Version or Septuagint
MT	Massoretic Text
NT	New Testament
OT	Old Testament
S	Syriac Version or Peshitta
Sy.	Symmachus
T	Targum or Aramaic Version
Th.	Theodotion
V	Vulgate or Latin Version

INTRODUCTION

The comparative textual study of the Bible is by no means a recent discipline. Long before our modern Biblical critics, Origen was the first to think of the great advantages of a direct confrontation between the Hebrew text and the various Greek translations of the Bible. His magnum opus, the Hexapla, was the outcome of the belief that, on the comparative level of study, new data could be reached that are otherwise unattainable from a strictly linear approach. But, from Origen until very recent times, most Bible students seem to have initiated their research along the pattern of a major a priori assumption as to the superior value of a given text, as against another text, of a given tradition, as against another tradition.

Origen's idea was that the Hebrew text he had to labor on was fully reliable and could not possibly be subject to any alterations. In case of conflict, it would have to say the final word. Hence, the task for him consisted in bringing together all the extant Greek translations and in comparing them with this original Hebrew text. The most satisfactory rendition was naturally the one to be preferred. And, undoubtedly, this was bound to produce the original lesson of the Septuagint translators, whose activities are reported in the Letter of Aristeas. Whenever the Greek text would supply elements

which were not to be found in the Hebrew text, these were to be marked with special signs, in order to bring out their extraneous nature. Thus a new Greek text was established which purported to be the original Septuagint; actually, it was merely Origen's understanding of the Greek Versions, and to our day, it is conventionally quoted as O' , rather than as G .

A similar point of view ruled Jerome's activities in his attempt to produce a Latin Version of the Scriptures, though he aimed more at creating an independent translation than at discovering the original Old Latin text. Indeed, Jerome is believed to have used all the available Old Latin translations which he is supposed to have checked against Origen's Hexapla and also against the Hebrew Bible^[1]. In the opinion of specialists, this confrontation was not uniform throughout Jerome's work. In spite of his statement that he adhered to the Hebrew as closely as possible, Jerome,-especially in the prophets,- often deliberately accepted the rendering of the Greek Versions.

From Origen and Jerome until recent times, the prevalent attitude can be described as follows: In comparing the various Versions, one has to have a fairly strong belief as to the soundness of a given Version. Usually, it has been almost compulsory to believe that at least one among the many

[1] See H.B.Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, 1900, pp. 88-104, and B. Roberts, the Old Testament Text and Versions, 1951, p.254.

Versions has preserved for us the most reliable text. Hence, all the work will consist in a "one-sided confrontation", trying to prove that the Version we assumed to be reliable, is indeed reliable.

Generally this has been the theory of those who assumed that the Septuagint must have preserved a better text, since the older Hebrew manuscript extant is by far younger than the earliest Septuagint manuscript we have. This argument alone was for a while considered weighty enough to have every decision colored by what the Septuagint had to say. With Origen, it was the Hebrew text that was the immovable rock to which everything else had to be subservient. Now, it was the Septuagint that claimed all authority: the Hebrew text had in every respect to be adjusted to this new level of comparison.

But the Septuagint itself was not so infallible. Various theories were formulated to account for the phenomenon of a 'Septuagint'. On the basis of what the Aramaic Targum with regard to its own development has taught us, it has been postulated that the Septuagint itself might have gone through a similar process [1].

Indeed, the language of the Septuagint is not literary Greek, but the vernacular current in Egypt. The Book of Proverbs includes maxims of purely Greek origin. As a whole, the Pentateuch gives a more accurate translation than the rest of the Bible. All these broad considerations made it possible to believe that the concept of a single work produced by one

[1] See, H.St. John Thackeray, The Septuagint and Jewish Worship, Schweich Lectures for 1920, p. 12 and p. 28.

man or by a group of man at a given time was a fallacy.

The Septuagint, much as the Targumim were, was now closely connected with Jewish worship. Therefore, the Pentateuch, due to its more frequent usage, was evidently that part which was first orally translated and then put down to writing, the so-called Greek Torah. With regard to the rest of the Bible, those sections that were connected with the Synagogue worship, such as scriptural lessons for festivals, for special occasions, special sabbaths etc., were translated early enough to indicate a community of language and style with the pentateuchal portions. The parts that were not used for any liturgical purposes were filled in much later, when the need was felt for the bridging of the various lacunae thus created. In Kahle's opinion, this might well have happened when a commonly agreed upon Greek canonical text had to be devised as the official Version of an established Christian Church^[1].

But this notion of a primitive oral tradition as the background of any written text would imply the existence of a multitude of diverse renditions, corresponding to the independent traditions established by each Methurgeman, even though we might grant that they all had the same Hebrew text in front of them. Therefore, what are the criteria to determine whether a given Septuagint lesson reveals to us a much better Hebrew Vorlage than the Massoretic Text itself ? Anyone who has worked with Hatch & Redpath's Septuagint Concordance knows

[1] P. Kahle, The Cairo Geniza, Schweich Lectures for 1941, p.175

very well that the same Greek word is very frequently used to render a host of Hebrew roots, which shows that conversely, the same Hebrew word was understood and translated by means of a host of Greek roots. This eliminates any basis for searching religiously for accuracies. All we can look for are approximations^[1].

In conclusion, one has to admit that the text of the Septuagint cannot be dealt with as a single proposition. The several books composing the Old Testament were translated at different times and by different hands. Each group or group of books has its own textual problems which have to be worked out independently.

In his book on the Cairo Geniza, Kahle deals with great detail with the entire problem of transmission of the various versions. His theory is that all the Versions go back to a 'targumic' form, which later on was 'revised' and readjusted to specific needs. At the extreme of a non-revised Targum, Kahle cites "the Samaritan Targum which has always remained in the more primitive stage of a Targum, where nearly every

[1] See, G. Gerleman, Zephania, Textkritisch und Literarisch Untersucht, Lund 1942, p. 75: "Namentlich wäre die Ansicht übereilt, eine mechanische Rückübersetzung der LXX ins Hebräische ergäbe stets die Vorlage des griechischen Textes. A. Sperber scheint mir in dieser Hinsicht in seiner Studie über LXX reichlich optimistisch gewesen zu sein.... Hier wurde die geringste Nuance, durch welche LXX sich von unserem hebräischen Text unterschied, auf die Vorlage zurückgeführt. Ein griechisches λέγων kann laut Sperber nicht zurückgehen auf ויאמר des MT, sondern setzt voraus לאמר, Gen. 28,1. Ebenso wird an Stelle von אחזה עולם, 48,4 des MT für εἰς κατασχεσιν αἰώνων ויאמר לאחוז עולם gefordert. Hinter εἰπεν δὲ ἰσραὴλ τὸ ἰσραήλ steht nicht ויאמר ישראל, 48,21, אלהים, das wir im MT finden, sondern ויאמר... 48,21.' Die Beispiele liessen sich vervielfachen.

manuscript has its special text^[1]. Similarly, the so-called Old Palestinian Targum of the Torah with which we have been acquainted from Geniza fragments and from excerpts that have come to us along with the text of the Onkelos translation, was never ascribed the status of an "authorized version"^[2]. These Targumim were made for immediate liturgical purposes and lacked any fixity. Their language was the vernacular Palestinian Aramaic.

The Babylonian Targumim, namely Onkelos to the Pentateuch and Targum Jonathan to the prophets, are to be viewed differently. The very fact that a specific approach can be detected in their method, namely that of extreme literalness and of a vested interest in supporting halachic considerations^[3], puts them into the category of an "authorized version", made with constant reference ^{well-}to a/defined position held by a given group or better by a school.

The Syriac Version has not been the object of any thorough study. Actually, the Syriac text has yet to be published on a critical scholarly level^[4]. In order to do that, the historical development of the text will have to be determined. In Kahle's view, there could be established a relationship between the Old Palestinian Targum and the Syriac

[1] P. Kahle, *ibid.*, p. 125

[2] P. Kahle, *ibid.*, p. 120

[3] P. Kahle, *ibid.*, p. 119

[4] See Arthur Vööbus, *A Critical Apparatus for the Vetus Syra*, in JBL, (1951), vol. 70, p. 129-130: "A vast body of textual materials in quotation which throws new light upon historical questions is at the same time an invaluable source of the investigation of the Old Syriac phenomenon itself".

Pentateuch,^[1] if we take into account the fact of the existence of a Jewish Community in Adiabene where King Izates II and his sister Helena were converted to Judaism and helped establish a Jewish community in that area where a Syriac Pentateuch might have been created. Subsequently, with the wide spread of Christianity, a revision might have taken place in order to eliminate all the Jewish 'accretions', while the text was checked against the Greek Version current at the time. All in all, Kahle is convinced that "a standard text of any translation is always found at the end of the development, never at the beginning"^[2].

In view of all these considerations, it appears that our entire attitude toward comparative textual studies of the Bible has to be redefined. Before evaluating any text and trying to discover the 'ipsissima verba' of the author, we shall have to ask the more fundamental question: Could there be 'an author' ? Hence, all the Versions we shall have to deal with will have to be granted at the outset an equal relative value. Before formulating any judgment, one would have to cover every verse, chapter and book of the Bible and weigh both the outside evidence as well as the internal evidence. Before making any changes, it will be imperative to determine the meaning of every word or expression, first

[1] See P. Kahle, *ibid.*, p. 184.

[2] See P. Kahle, *ibid.*, p. 175: "The standard text of the Targum of the Pentateuch, the Targum Onkelos, was preceded by different forms of the Old Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch of which some valuable fragments have been found in the Cairo Geniza. The standard text of the Syriac Gospels in the Peshitta was preceded by different forms of the Old Syriac Gospels, of which at least two forms are still preserved. It is always so and there can be no doubt that the standard text of the Greek Tora was preceded by divergent forms of earlier translations."

with regard to its own background^[1], then with regard to the rest of the Versions. It is in this spirit that we have decided to include the Dead Sea Scroll Habakuk quotations into our study^[2]. No matter what the dating of these scrolls, the text of Habakuk as it appears in this commentary has to be treated on the same level as any other Hebrew manuscript. Manuscripta ponderantur, non numerantur !

That this approach has been very fruitful, has been proven by S.H. Nyberg and the scholars of the Swedish school^[3] who have dealt with individual Biblical books whose Hebrew text was universally recognized as being corrupt. They have succeeded to complete their research with a minimum of textual emendations. It is in that very same spirit that we have undertaken this modest study of Chapters I and II of the Book of Habakuk^[4], in order to find out the specific situation with regard to these two chapters. At the conclusion of our study, we shall sum up the results of the various discussions and evaluate them only in terms of the limited area of these two chapters.

[1] The general method has been outlined by H.S. Nyberg, Studien zum Hoseabuche, Uppsala 1935, pp. 1-20, and especially p.15.

[2] This idea was strongly recommended to me by Prof. H.Orlinsky in a private conversation.

[3] To quote some of the studies we have perused: G.Gerleman, Zephanja, Textkritisch und Literarisch Untersucht, Lund, 1942; A. Haldar, Studies in the Book of Nahum, Uppsala 1947; A. Kapelrud, Joel Studies, Uppsala 1948.

[4] By now, chapter 3 of Habakuk has been universally accepted as another Psalm, which has nothing to do with the prophecy of Habakuk. The many textual problems involved in the Hebrew text (see W.F.Albright, The Psalm of Habakuk, in Studies in OT Prophecy presented to T.H.Robinson p. 1-18) and especially in the various Greek Versions (see Max L. Margolis, The Character of the Anonymous Greek Version of Habakuk, Chapter 3, in OT and Semitic Studies in memory of W.Harper, p.133-142) as well as the main problem of outside influences on the composition of this particular Psalm, would take us far beyond our immediate purpose.

חַבְּקֻץ / וְכֵן וְכֵן חַבְּקֻץ וְכֵן / ὁ ἄλγος ὁ
 εἶδεν Ἀμβακούμ ὁ προφήτης / וְכֵן וְכֵן חַבְּקֻץ / Onus, quod
 vidit Habacuc propheta.

חַבְּקֻץ: From the root חָבַט="to raise", viz. one's voice,
 to speak; hence, "a prophetic utterance", "a vision"^[1] (So S
 and T). G has ἄλγος="burden", i.e. burden laid on one,
 commission received (λαμβάνω). The reading in V (onus) is a
 slavish rendition of G.

חַבְּקֻץ: G reads Ἀμβακούμ. This same spelling occurs
 in Bel and the Dragon (5 times). The name has been derived by
 Fr. Delitzsch^[2] from an Accadian hambaquū = the name of a plant,
 or even a personal name^[3]. On the basis of both the Greek
 spelling and the Accadian parallel, the vocalization of the
 name has been altered to חַבְּקֻץ, instead of חַבְּקֻץ^[4].

וְכֵן וְכֵן חַבְּקֻץ / וְכֵן וְכֵן חַבְּקֻץ / ὅς τις, κύριε κακῶς^{1.2}
 חַבְּקֻץ / Usquequo, Domine, clamabo.

וְכֵן וְכֵן:"until when", "how long"; usually constructed
 with the Imperfect. Even when the Perfect is used, the "excla-
 mation" refers to the future^[5], as seen in Ex. 16:28 וְכֵן וְכֵן

[1] For a similar usage, see Nahum 1:1; Jer. 23:33.

[2] Fr. Delitzsch, *Prolegomena*, p.84, n.2.

[3] See W.Nowack, *Die kleinen Propheten*, p.263: "...der Name findet sich auch bei den Assyriern als Personennamen".

[4] So Nowack, *ibid.*; Humbert, *Problèmes du Livre d'Habacuc*, Neuchâtel, 1944.

[5] See Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar*, 106 h. G and V use the future, while S and T use the participial construction with a future sense.

* Only Humbert is altered

סאנחם, "until when shall ye refuse".

יָוִי: Occurs in the Piel only. The root is found frequently in the Psalms and in Job. All the Versions give a faithful rendition of the Hebrew.

עַל־כֵּן וְלֹא־חֲשַׁמְעַתְּ אֶת־נֹכַח־יָדְךָ / *et non exaudies.*

וְלֹא־חֲשַׁמְעַתְּ + Subjunctive Aorist, used in the sense of an emphatic future indicative[1].

חֲשַׁמְעַתְּ אֶת־נֹכַח־יָדְךָ: T uses the Passive construction to avoid an anthropopathism. The interrogative form is for emphasis.
 חֲשַׁמְעַתְּ אֶת־נֹכַח־יָדְךָ / *βοήσομαι πρὸς σὲ ἄδοκούμενος*
 / *vociferabor ad te vim patiens.*

The word *חֲשַׁמְעַתְּ* occurs rarely before Jeremiah. It is found 61 times in the Bible, of which 9 in Jeremiah, 18 in Ezekiel, 6 in Habakuk and 16 in the Psalms, especially in the Psalms of "Lamentations of the People".[2] Almost exact parallels to this usage in Habakuk are found in Job 19:7 *הִנֵּן אֲצַעַק חֲסָם וְלֹא־אֶעֱנֶה* and in Jer. 20:8 *אֲצַעַק חֲסָם וְשֹׁר אֶקְרָא*. Kimhi understands it as *בְּעִינֵי חֲסָם*, while modern commentators render it as a direct exclamation.[3]

G and V use a participial form, connected to the main verb which makes the author the object of the injustice (*ἄδοκούμενος*, *vim patiens*). The MT, however, seems to describe a corrupt society where all righteous men, including the author,

[1] See W. Goodwin, *Greek Grammar*, p. 289.

[2] See H. Gunkel, *Einleitung in die Psalmen*, p. 117.

[3] See B. Duhm, *Das Buch Habakuk*, p. 13: "Ich rufe zu dir:Gewalt". But K. Marti, *Das Dodekapropheten*, p. 334 has: "Klage ich vor dir über Gewalt"; also Humbert, *ibid.*, has: "crierai-je vers toi à la violence."

This points to a modified word order for the G Vorlage, probably as follows:

למה תראני און ועל והניס שר וחמס
(c o r r u p t)
ויהי ריב ומדון לנגדי :: :: :: ::

The V goes a step farther and drags לנגדי - "contra me" from 3b to 3a. The T follows MT more faithfully.

הניס: The root ננס is always used in the Hiphil, with no causative meaning. It cannot therefore mean "to show", as a parallel to תראני. Sellin's rendition [1] as "ruhig zuschauen", namely to look at something without reacting, is in my opinion well founded. But because the G has rendered the Hebrew תניס with an infinitive, many scholars have been led to emend the Hebrew to תניס, while others following S, have proposed the first person אניס as the correct reading for the MT. [2]

I do not see any compelling reason why this emendation should be considered, since the MT makes perfect sense the way it stands, namely: "shouldest see evil" (allow Thyself to see evil). Furthermore, v.13 in this chapter implies that God's seeing is involved ~~in the involved~~ in the process. [3]

למה: as introducing a question addressed to God is completely missing in the early prophets, whereas it occurs twice in Habakuk (1:3 and 1:13) and 10 times in the Psalms. A similarity with the "Psalms of Complaint" is very plausible.

ועל: used 54 times in the Bible, of which 31 in Wisdom Literature and 13 in the Psalms. The word על is used with און almost exclusively in the Psalms and in Job.

[1] Quoted by Humbert, *ibid.*, p. 31.

[2] Duhm, Marti and Humbert read אניס.

[3] ספור עינים מראות רע והניס אל-ועל לא תוכל.

שד וחמם: each one of these terms is used throughout the Bible. חמם is encountered very frequently in the Psalms and in Wisdom Literature.

ר״ב: occurs throughout the Bible.

קדן: attested 23 times in the Bible, of which 19 in Proverbs, once in Habakuk, once in Jeremiah and once in the Book of Samuel. The word is characteristic of Wisdom Literature.

As a compound expression, ר״ב וקדן is found 3 times in the Bible, in Jer. 15:10; Hab. 1:3 and Prov. 15:18. However, the disparity of rendition in the various Versions tends to suggest that the last part of 3b is corrupt. In fact, G must have read קדן instead of קדן(ב) in order to arrive at κριτής, which has been taken over by S in كَرِيض.

אשׁ: Considered by many commentators to be a gloss, since there is no subject for it in the sentence. Ehrlich emends it to אשׁ and translates it: "Ich miss ertragen", which may have some support in view of the fact that the first half of the verse is indeed in the first person. Nowack follows the same opinion.^[1] The G leaves its verb without any object, while S completes the idea by adding the missing object |⁷עשׂ = bribe.



על כן פנת אוריתא ולא נפיק לאפרש/על-כן חפוג חורה ולא יצא לנצח משפט^{1.4}
 און/οὕτως τοῦτο διεσκέδασται νόμος, καὶ οὐ διεξάγεται εἰς τέλος κρίμα

مَدَّ لَا تَنْفُذُ فِي نَعْدَتِهِ. |⁷بَقِيَ بَيْنَ حُرْمَتِهِ

/Propter hoc lacerata est lex et non perveniet usque ad finem iudicium.

חפוג: "grow numb", "be ineffective".^[2] It occurs 4

[1] See W. Nowack, *ibid.*, p. 264

[2] cf. the cognate  = be cold; also  = grow cool.

times in the Bible, in Gen. 45:26; Ps. 38:9; 77:3 and in Hab.1:4. In Genesis, it is used as the opposite of חַיִּים in v. 27. Indeed, when he is first told about Joseph being alive, Jacob does not give any credit to the news וַיִּפֶּן לָבוֹא. But as soon as he sees the gifts sent by Joseph וַיִּחַי רֹאשִׁיתוֹ, Jacob's soul is revived.

Or, let us take the passage in Ps. 38:9, where נִפְּנִיתִי and נִדְּבַחְתִּי are used synonymously and mean "I was crushed", "I was broken". Hence, it is not imperative to emend מָפֹן into מָפֶן, as Marti^[1] does. מָפֹן means "disregarded", "rejected" and this is the meaning conveyed by G, S and T (the last use the very same root), and V. The Dead Sea Scrolls^[2] read: מָפֹן-עַל-כֵּן חֲפֹן חֲוִירָה.

נֶלְצָח: Has not here the literal meaning of "everlasting", "eternal"^[3]. It implies rather that judgment lacks permanence. Since the Torah is "disregarded", the criteria used in judgment have no enduring character any more. Something is considered to be right one day, and possibly condemned the very next day. Thus understood, the word need not be emended to לֶאֱחָזֵק^[4], on the basis of חֲזָקָה. The G and V are somewhat obscure, because they follow the Hebrew à la lettre.

אֲרִי רָשָׁעִים מִסְלֵמִין לְצַדִּיקִים / כִּי רָשָׁע מִכְתִּיר אֶת-הַצְדִּיק עַל-כֵּן יֵצֵא מִשֹּׁפֶם מֵעַל
 ὁ δὲ ἀσεβὴς καταδυναστεύει τὸν δίκαιον. / על כן לא נִפִּיךְ דִּינָא כִּיּוֹן
 مَلَأَ بِجَدَالٍ رَجُلٌ حَيِّفٌ حَيِّفٌ / τὸ κρίμα διεστραμμένον / حَيِّفٌ لِحَيِّفٍ
 /quia impius praevalet adversus justum,
 propterea egredietur iudicium perversum.

Duhm believes that the repetition of מָפֹן-עַל-כֵּן and of מָפֹן

[1] See, *ibid.*, p. 334.

[2] M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, pl. LV.

[3] Nowack, *ibid.*, p. 264, goes as far as stating: "Nicht die Wiederholung der Negation und ist nicht zu streichen".

[4] See A. Wolff, *Der Prophet Habakuk*, p. 98

in 3b is awkward^[1], whereas Torrey^[2] maintains that it is silly to excise עַל-כֵּן "merely on the ground that it overloads the meter". All the Versions have it and one fails to see any cogent reason why it should not be maintained.

Nowack would do away with the Nota Accusativi and the article of אֲנִי and keep simply אֲנִי as a parallel to אֲנִי.

מִכְרִית: Used once as a participle. The root occurs 6 times in the Bible, in the Psalms and in Proverbs only (once in Judges). It means "surround"^[3], "harass". Nowack and Halévy^[4] emend it to מִכְרִית, while Marti, Cannon^[5] and Humbert maintain the MT lesson. מִכְרִית, which is supported by T and S, is stronger than מִכְרִית. Actually, the end result of both interpretations is the same. Hence, the scripto difficilior is to be maintained.

קָעַל: This is a Hapax.

The same root is found in Syriac ܩܥܠ = twist

ܩܥܠܐ = perverse

and in Arabic قَعَلَ, where it means "to bind". In Hebrew, it appears in the intensive form קָעַל="crooked" and קָעַלְתִּי, meaning the same. This connotation is confirmed by ἀστροπεύματα of G and ܩܥܠܐ of S, and of course the "perversum" of V. The T uses the form לֹא יָשָׁר, from the root כָּוַן, which means "not straight", "perverted", when used in a negative sense. Hence, no changes are to be recommended on the MT.^[6]

[1] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 17: "Besonders anstößig sind aber noch die beiden עַל-כֵּן durch die ja wohl der Abschreiber den Zusammenhang deutlicher herausstellen wollte, in Wahrheit aber einen verkehrten Zusammenhang und schlechten Stil hergestellt hat".

[2] C.C. Torrey, *Prophecy of Habakuk*, in *Jewish Studies in Memory of George A. Kohut*, p. 577

[3] Contrast with Ps. 22:13 כְּחַרְוִי אֲבִירִי בָּשׁוּ כְּחַרְוִי.

[4] See J. Halévy, *Recherches Bibliques*, Tome IV, p. 391

[5] W. Cannon, *The Integrity of Habakuk* cc. 1 & 2, (ZAW XLIII, 1925,

[6] The Dead Sea Scroll text has אֲנִי in 4b. p. 65).

וְהִנֵּה בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים וְהִנֵּה בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים / ὁρατε, οἱ καταφρονήταί, καὶ ἐπιβλέψατε / بَارِكُوا فِي الْغُيُوبِ / Aspicite in gentibus et videte/ DSSH reads בְּנֵי instead of בְּנֵי.

בְּנֵי: Versions and commentators are split in respect to this word. While T, V and also Aq., Sy., and Th.^[1] remain faithful to the MT, G, S and the DSSH^[2] seem to favor the reading בְּנֵי.

Among the commentators, Torrey, Budde^[3], Nowack Cannon and Humbert retain the MT lesson, while Duhm, Marti and ICC emend the text to read בְּנֵי, in view of the fact that this same word occurs further in the book in 1:13 and 2:5. Actually, the fact of the matter -as Humbert puts it- is that a corruption either of בְּנֵי into בְּנֵי or vice versa is equally possible. In either case, the meaning of the text would not suffer greatly, since it is a mere announcement of the oracle to be given. We will therefore retain the MT lesson.

וְהִנֵּה בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים וְהִנֵּה בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים / καὶ θαυμάσατε θαυμάσια καὶ ἀφανίσθητε / اَعْجَبُوا / admiramini et obstupescite.

اَعْجَبُوا, is a Hithpael Imperative followed by a Qal Imperative. On the analogy of G which has θαυμάσατε θαυμάσια^[4], Torrey replaces the Qal Imperative with a noun of the same root, viz. اَعْجَبُوا. Marti considers the اَعْجَبُوا as a

[1] See, F. Field, Origenis Hexaplorum, p.1003: Aq., Sy., and Th. have "aspicite in gentibus".

[2] בְּנֵי does not figure as catchword in the DSSH; it is mentioned in the course of the commentary. Cf. K. Elliger, Studium zum Habakuk-Kommentar, p.48: "Ist das Ende des Textes von 1:5, Ibi der Anfang der Auslegung. Somit könnte das בְּנֵי ein Hinweis darauf sein, dass HK wie G dieses Wort statt בְּנֵי las. Es bleibt trotzdem bei M.

[3] See K. Budde, Zum Text von Habakuk, OLZ, 1931, vol. 34, pp.409-411

[4] It should be noted that this is the only case of a figura etymologica with θαυμάσια. Out of 42 usages, θαυμάσια renders 41 times the Hebrew אֲמִירָה and only once the Hebrew מִלָּה.

dittography of the last ם of וְהָיָה and the absence of a ם in front of תָּהָה as a haplography of the last ם of וְהָיָה. Hence, he suggests to read וְהָיָה וְהָיָה. This view was formerly proposed by Wellhausen^[1], and accepted by Dr. Blank for the text of Isaiah 29:9 where a similar expression occurs^[2]. For our purpose, this proposal seems acceptable, since it entails a minor change.

ἀφανίσθητε: All the Versions concur in leaving out this word which does not have any equivalent in the MT. In Origen's Hexapla, Column 5, it is marked with an obelos. Acts 13:41, however, quoting this verse from the Book of Habakuk, retains ἀφανίσθητε. In our opinion, there is no addition to make on the MT.

עָלַם עָלַם בְּיָמֵינוּ / כִּי-עָלַם עָלַם בְּיָמֵינוּ
ἐργάζομαι ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν בְּיָמֵינוּ בְּיָמֵינוּ בְּיָמֵינוּ quia
opus factum est in diebus vestris.

The identical expression occurs in Psalm 44:2 עָלַם
עָלַם בְּיָמֵינוּ. Sy^[3], T and V have a 3rd person passive
construction. G and S, on the other hand, have an active
construction with a 1st person pronoun explicitly stated.
Hence, Budde and Cannon propose the insertion of אֲנִי before עָלַם.
Nowack believes that the participle can be used pro verbo finito^[4],
and rejects the need for adding any pronoun. The verb, he inter-

[1] J. Wellhausen, *Die kleinen Propheten*, 1898, p. 166.

[2] S.H. Blank, *Introductions and Critical Notes to Isaiah 1-39*, HUC-JIR, 1940-41, revised 1950, p. 51.

[3] δίδωμι ἐργάζομαι ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν.

[4] See Ges.-Kautzsch, *ibid.*, 116 s.

pretends as 3rd person. Pushing his interpretation farther, he emends, with Duhm, the 'לנני of v.6 to הנני and phrases the entire oracle of vv.5-11 in the 3rd person.

But if the first person is assumed, vv. 5 and 6 become part of God's oracle. If the 3rd person is preferred, v.5 has merely a prefatory function: it reports the oracle that starts in v.6. We shall prefer this latter interpretation, which involves no emendation of v.6.

יִפְּרָא לֹא תִּהְיֶה אִי אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא תִּהְיֶה אִי אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא תִּהְיֶה אִי אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל
 ἐάν τις ἐκδοιγήται / لَا يَفْعَلُ أَحَدٌ / quod nemo
 credet cum narrabitur.

With minor stylistic divergencies, all the Versions concur in a faithful rendition of the MT. At the end of the verse, T and S add לנני and لح respectively, in addition to the root נאנ, used by both.

1.6
 וְעַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יִפְּרָא לֹא תִּהְיֶה אִי אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא תִּהְיֶה אִי אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא תִּהְיֶה אִי אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל
 ἐξεγείρω ἐφ' ὑμᾶς τοὺς Χαλδαίους τοὺς μαχητάς / لَا يَفْعَلُ أَحَدٌ
 Quia ecce ego suscitabo Chaldaeos/DSSH: וְעַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יִפְּרָא לֹא תִּהְיֶה אִי אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל (ב')

יִפְּרָא: Humbert has statistically established the existence of 125 cases of this word followed by a participle^[1]. In 118 cases, it refers to a divine threat or a divine promise. Only in 7 cases, does it refer to actions emanating with a human being. This "specialized" usage in oracles is explained by Humbert as an extension of the simple הנני "behold, I am here"

[1] P. Humbert, La formule hébraïque en HINENI suivi du participe, REJ, vol.97, 1934, p. 58.

used frequently in narratives. When Yahweh's name was invoked by the priest for the purpose of an oracle, the deity would naturally start his oracle with 'הו' + participle, as an answer to an immediate question^[1]. From this usage, the formula became eminently fit to be used as a "technical" word introducing divine oracles^[2]. Duhm's emendation of 'הו' to הוה and Torrey's proposal to read הוה, are therefore to be disregarded.

ἐφ' ὅπου τοὺς Χαλδαίους τοὺς μαχητὰς : The words τοὺς μαχητὰς, found in Cod. Alex., are absent in both Cod. Vat. and Cod. Sin., and in all the Versions. Most commentators consider them as a gloss that has crept into the Greek text. Some scholars, however, elaborate on them as follows: According to Lauterburg - as quoted by Marti^[3] - it is τοὺς Χαλδαίους that has to be viewed as secondary, while τοὺς μαχητὰς is primary, which helps him restore the Hebrew text thus הו' מ'ק'ים א'ל'י'כ'ם ש'ר'י'ם. According to other sources, quoted by Humbert^[4], τοὺς μαχητὰς would be best rendered by ה'נ'ו'ר'י'ם.

But the argument against such proposals of leaving out ה'נ'ו'ר'י'ם is very simple, because what would under such circumstances the expression הו' with the definite article of 6a mean ? It could not possibly refer to a generic term such as ה'נ'ו'ר'י'ם or ה'ש'ר'י'ם; rather would it require the background of a people whose name is specifically mentioned. And since that people is already stated, one fails to see the advantage of all these

[1] See Humbert, *ibid.*, p. 62: "c'est donc que la formule est employée essentiellement dans des oracles rendus par la divinité qui annonce ainsi son intervention soudaine et active".

[2] See Amos 6:14: הו' מ'ק'ים ע'ל'י'כ'ם... הו', another almost verbatim instance of this usage.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 338.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 34.

hypotheses.

The Cambridge (Swete) and Oxford editions of the G leave τοὺς μαχητάς out.

וְהַמְּחַרְרִים וְהַמְּחַרְרִים וְהַמְּחַרְרִים וְהַמְּחַרְרִים / τὸ ἔθνος τὸ πικρὸν καὶ τὸ ταχυνόν
gentem amaram et velocem.

G and V give a faithful rendition of the MT.

S has $\text{וְהַמְּחַרְרִים וְהַמְּחַרְרִים}$ where וְהַמְּחַרְרִים seems to correspond to מר rather than to נמהר, while וְהַמְּחַרְרִים means "insolent", "presumptuous", *daring, bold* which may be an interpretative rendition of נמהר. It might well be that S read originally $\text{וְהַמְּחַרְרִים וְהַמְּחַרְרִים}$ and that the two adjectives were transposed on account of their similar spelling.

T has מוחיא וקלילא which are synonymous^[1] and do not render the Hebrew מר.

So, both S and T depart slightly from MT; yet, each one of them has correctly rendered one of the two adjectives.

Scholars are unanimous in maintaining the MT.

דאזל לפתאי ארעא לאחסנא קרוין וילא/החולך למרחבי-ארץ לרשת משכנו לא-לו
πορευόμενον ἐπὶ τὰ πλάτη τῆς γῆς τοῦ κατακαληρονομήσαι
συναγεγνημένα οὐκ αὐτοῦ / $\text{וְהַמְּחַרְרִים וְהַמְּחַרְרִים}$ ambulantes
super latitudinem terrae, ut possideat tabernacula non sua.

The S and T use the identical words מוחיא וקלילא.

All the Versions are faithful to the MT. ICC proposes to read מרחק instead of מרחב, because this is the only instance of מרחב used in the plural. Actually both terms are equally acceptable

[1] Cf. J. Levy, Chaldäisches Wörterbuch, s.v. מוחיא וקלילא: "ein schnelles und leichtflüssiges Volk".

and there is no need to emend.

מִשְׁכָּנוֹת: σκαηνώματα, tabernacula. The V, based on G, is a slavish rendition of the Hebrew which means simply "dwelling-places", as is well illustrated by T's use of יְרֵיחוֹ = "cities".

S avoids the problem by simply using the same root as the Hebrew.

וְאֵלֶּיךָ: This is an incomplete relative clause^[1], אֵלֶּיךָ being understood.

The remainder of the verse needs no discussion, the MT being fully respected.

1.7

וְהָיָה כְּהָיָה וְהָיָה וְהָיָה וְהָיָה וְהָיָה וְהָיָה וְהָיָה וְהָיָה וְהָיָה וְהָיָה
Horribilis et terribilis est.

וְהָיָה: in the masculine is a hapax. The feminine occurs twice in the Songs of Songs. S understands it as meaning "powerful", "strong", rather than "fearful". T puts both adjectives in the plural with a plural verb and reverts to the singular in the b part of the verse.

וְהָיָה: G renders it by ἐπιφανής which means "famous", possibly through a confusion of the roots פָּאֵר and פָּאֵר. The rest of the Versions and the DDSH support the MT.

וְהָיָה כְּהָיָה וְהָיָה וְהָיָה וְהָיָה וְהָיָה וְהָיָה וְהָיָה וְהָיָה וְהָיָה וְהָיָה
/ex semetipsa judicium et onus ejus egredietur.

This half verse has been translated in various ways by the Versions. Sy. renders it by means of a complete paraphrase: αὐτὸς ἐαυτῷ δικάσει καὶ δόγματι ἐαυτοῦ ἐπεξελεύσεται.

[1] See Ges.-Kautzsch, *ibid.*, 155 e. This usage can be compared to Gen. 15:13 וְהָיָה לְךָ לְעֹלָם, or Prov. 26:17 וְהָיָה לְךָ לְעֹלָם.

G too seems to have had some difficulty with the terseness of the Hebrew text and has added as many explanatory words as felt necessary. The other Versions have not gone so far, although all seem to have mistranslated the Hebrew לְאֵלֵינוּ . G, S and V rendered it as though the Hebrew were לְאֵלֵינוּ ="oracle", which obviously does not fit into the context. Here what is needed is a word that will fit into the general idea of "fear", of "terror", as a parallel to 7a.

Troubled by the same problem, Marti and Humbert suppress לְאֵלֵינוּ , as being a gloss. On the other hand, Duhm and Nowack, because of meter considerations, drop לְאֵלֵינוּ and read לְאֵלֵינוּ or לְאֵלֵינוּ instead of לְאֵלֵינוּ . Halévy maintains both nouns and interprets the 3rd person suffix as denoting Yahweh. Torrey and Cannon ascribe them to the Chaldeans. ICG takes the middle road: it maintains לְאֵלֵינוּ and emends לְאֵלֵינוּ to לְאֵלֵינוּ .

In our opinion no such changes are necessary^[1]. One could consider the letter ו as a ו and translate לְאֵלֵינוּ ="his destruction"^[2]. Or, one could still maintain the MT and translate לְאֵלֵינוּ , -which means "his exaltation", "his dignity"-, with "his authority"^[3]. This will be a harsh, absolutistic invader. Once he is in the country, all judgment (לְאֵלֵינוּ), all authority will depend exclusively on him, who in 7a is described as "fearful and terrible". We therefore translate the verse as follows: "From him alone will come forth his judgment and his authority", because he will do what he pleases.

[1] Note that the DSSH has the identical lesson as the MT.

[2] See Lam. 3:47 לְאֵלֵינוּ = "devastation and destruction".

[3] See K.Elliger, *ibid.*, p. 174: Der Ausleger hat לְאֵלֵינוּ als "Ueberheblichkeit" empfunden, die sich um die normalen Regeln des Verkehrs von Mensch zu Mensch nicht kümmert".

וקלילין מנשרים מוסרין/ וקלילין מנשרים מוסרין/ καὶ ἑξαλοῦνται ὑπερ
 παροῦσαι οἱ ἴπποι αὐτοῦ /مَجْلِبٌ زَحْفَةً يَجِيئُ/ Leviores pardis equi
 ejus.

מנשרים: Humbert feels that a leopard is by no means
 "the symbol of velocity" to deserve the title of קל. On the
 basis of 2 Sam. 1:23 and especially of Jer. 4:13, he would
 prefer to read קלו מנשרים מוסרין, since this very expression is
 used in Jer. 4:13.

This view gains further support from S which has
 ٭٭٭. Of course, it might be argued that S is corrupt,
 since the other Versions abide by the MT lesson, and espe-
 cially since ٭ and ٭ might easily have been confused.

For our purpose, we will keep the Hebrew text unchan-
 ged, though we feel ready to prefer Humbert's proposal which
 seems to be more of a cliché, until some further evidence in
 that direction will present itself.

The DSSH lesson וקול has been recognized to be a
 scribal error for וקלו^[1].

וקלילין מנשרים מוסרין/ וקלילין מנשרים מוסרין/ καὶ ὀξύτεροι ὑπὲρ τοὺς λύκους
 τῆς 'Αραβίας /سَهِيحٌ جَيْحٌ زَحْفَةً/ et velociores lupis vespertinis.

וקל : T and S use the root וקל which fits well
 the Hebrew וקל. V departs slightly in that it uses "velociiores".
 G's ὀξύτεροι is perfectly acceptable. Though the root וקל
 occurs only once in the Qal, its meaning is clear from ar. ٭ =
 "be sharp".

[1] See Elliger, *ibid.*, p. 48. Also I. Rabinowitz, *The Second and Third columns of the Habakuk Interpretation-Scroll*, JBL, 1950, vol. 69, p. 47.

עֶרֶב מִזְמַר: A lot of misunderstanding exists with regard to this part of the verse. Aquila reads παρὰ παρόλαις τῆς ἑσπέρας, where G has ὑπὲρ τοὺς λύκους τῆς Ἀραβίας. According to the Septuagint Concordance, παρόλαις renders always מִמֶּנּוּ and λύκος stands either for דָּב (only once in Prov. 28:15) or for זֶמֶר (7 times in all). One is therefore surprised at Aquila's usage of παρόλαις in the second half of the verse, since this same word would be the right one to use in the first half of the verse^[1]. Considering Aquila's extreme literalness, one might speculate that the only reason why he used παρόλαις in the second half of the verse is because in the first half of his Hebrew Vorlage he had קְלו כְּנוֹסִיִּים rather than כְּנוֹסִיִּים קְלו as proposed by Humbert. At this point, we enter into the realm of speculation. All we can say is that Aquila is in full accord with the Versions in rendering עֶרֶב as τῆς ἑσπέρας and in eliminating the absurd G reading of τῆς Ἀραβίας.

Thus far all modern commentators^[2] -except Humbert and Elliger-, went along with the MT and the Versions (G being excepted) in translating עֶרֶב מִזְמַר as "evening wolves". Recently, Elliger took up the whole matter of the "evening wolves"^[3] and tried to solve the problem as follows:

There are three instances in the Bible where זֶמֶר is used in conjunction with the root עֶרֶב, namely Zeph. 3:3; Hab. 1:8 and Jer 5:6, in which last case the MT has עֶרְבוֹת זֶמֶר.

[1] We do not have Aquila's version of the first half of this verse, or, at least, it is not given in Field's Hexapla.

[2] We may cite: Duhm, Torrey, Nowack, Marti, Cannon and ICC.

[3] K. Elliger, Das Ende der Abendwölfe in Zeph. 3:3, Hab. 1:8, in Festschrift A. Bertholet, pp. 158-175.

G renders both Zeph. 3:3 and Hab 1:8 with Ἀπαβίτας [1] while in the case of Jer. 5:6, it uses the absurd ἔως τῶν οἰνοῦν [2]. This is absurd because the parallelism of the verse עָרֵבוּ חֶמְדָּם אֶרֶץ מִיָּעַר וְאֵבֶר עֲרֵבוּ requires that just as in the case of the lion, its place of origin, -namely עָרֵב is given-, in the case of the אֵבֶר too its place of origin be mentioned. The MT is clear in this respect, since it states עֲרֵבוּ = steppes, desert land. According to Elliger, the Septuagint Vorlage must have had a corrupt form such as עַר בֵּית for עֲרֵבוּ, which would account for ἔως τῶν οἰνοῦν, with overtones in the form οἰνοῦν, of the plural form עֲרֵבוּ!

Taking as basis the MT to Jer. 5:6, Elliger tries to shed some light on both Zeph. 3:3 and Hab. 1:8. In the case of Zephaniah, he has to explain the term לְבָקָר which seems to stand in contrast to עֶרֶב. He gets around the difficulty by assuming that Hab. 1:8 and Zeph. 3:3 have nothing to do with each other. Each verse being independent from the other, he is in a position to emend Zeph. 3:3 to read: שָׁפְמִיָּה וְאֵבֶר לֹא עֵינֵינוּ נֹרָם (לְבָקָר), which solves for him the problem of the "morning" as opposed to the "evening". Hence he proposes to read Hab. 1:8 either וְאֵבֶר (Steppenwölfe) or even וְאֵבֶר-עֶרֶב, on the analogy of the feminine usage found in Jer. 5:6.

[1] We have seen that in the case of Habakuk, Aquila had: ἔως ἰσθμῶν and not ἔως Ἀπαβίτας. It will be now worth noting here that Sy. to Zeph. 3:3 has ἔως ἰσθμῶν rather than ἔως Ἀπαβίτας.

[2] Interestingly enough, Aquila to Jer. 5:6 has ἔως ἰσθμῶν! Similarly all the Versions misunderstood עֲרֵבוּ rendering it with כִּינִי רִמָּה [T], or לִבְּרִית [S], or lupus (sing !) ad vesperam [V]. Actually, עֶרֶב meaning "evening" never occurs with a fem. plural ending. So, the Hebrew could not possibly mean "evenings", but rather, as we have established, "desert places", "steppes".

Humbert deals with this same idea, yet hesitates to commit himself, on account of Zeph. 3:3 which he does not attempt to alter^[1].

וירבון פרשוהי ופרשוהי מרחיק דייחון/ ופשו פרשו ופרשו מרחוק יבאו
 ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐξέλκεται / ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐξέλκεται / ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐξέλκεται
 /et diffundentur equites ejus: equites namque ejus
 de longe venient/ DSSH (no יבאו) פשו ופרשו פרשו מרחוק.

From the root פוש="spring about", used twice (Jer. 50:11 and Mal. 3:20) in reference to עגל. None of the Versions conveys that meaning ! ἐξέλκεται itself occurs only once in G. On the other hand Sy. uses ἐκχυνόμενοι = "be poured out", which sense is confirmed by V. The ^לעפ"י of S means rather "to fly", which, incidentally, is found in the c part of this verse, viz. עפ"י. The וירבון="they shall increase" of T is questionable.

The problem is further complicated by the double lesson פרשו. Wellhausen, Budde and Cannon are ready to consider this as a dittography^[2]. Duhm, Marti emend to פרשו פרשו = "die Rosse seiner Reiter".

Among the Version, G and S have פרשו only once, whereas T, V, and DSSH have retained both, as in the MT.

Still another difficulty arises from the rendition of יבאו. Of course, T and V show, as in the cases above, a close relationship with the MT. But S has absolutely no

[1] For a similar point of view, see G. Gerleman, Zephaniah, Textkritisch und Literarisch untersucht, Lund 1942, p. 48, who maintains Zeph. 3:3 unchanged.

[2] Humbert gets around the difficulty by reading: ופשו פרשו ופשו מרחוק יבאו עפ"י כנשר חש לאכל Nah. 3:16 ὁ ἰσχυρὸς corresponds to פשו.

corresponding word for it. The same holds true of DSSH which omits כָּאֵן altogether. G, on the other hand, has ἀρρησυσιν which, according to the Septuagint Concordance, never renders כָּאֵן. ἀρρησυσ stands usually for חוש^[1], פנה, פשם, פנה. From all these considerations, it appears distinctly that the verse is corrupt in more than one place. In this case, the S lessons seem to satisfy all the objections raised above and commend themselves to our consideration. Therefore, following S and G, we will omit the second פָּרָשִׁי. Furthermore, following S and DSSH^[2], we will omit כָּאֵן as a gloss, ending up with the following arrangement: וַעֲשֵׂנוּ (or וַפָּרְשֵׁנוּ) פָּרָשִׁי סִתּוּק יַעֲבֹד כֹּשֶׁר חֵשׁ לֹאכֵל.

כֹּשֶׁר/κατασφύσσοντα δὲ
δεῖδὲς κρόθυμος εἰς τὸ φαγεῖν/יְעֹבֵד חֵשׁ לֹאכֵל
quasi aquila festinans ad comedendum/DSSH חֵשׁ לֹאכֵל.

חש: The Versions had some difficulty with this word, as seen from the variegated renditions: κρόθυμος (the only case where it renders חש), טאם, 'festinans' and حَف. No conclusion to draw.

1.9

סִתּוּק/συντέλεια εἰς ἀσβεστὶς ἔξει/כָּאֵן לחם יבוא
כָּאֵן/Omnes ad praedam venient.

συντέλεια: "consummation", hardly the equivalent of כָּאֵן.

[1] Note that the root חוש is used in the c part of the verse.

[2] See, Elliger, *ibid.*, p. 49: "Keine Schwierigkeit bestand dagegen bei der Fortsetzung v8b. Wenn die HR hier das כָּאֵן nicht bezeugt, so dürfte der Schluss erlaubt sein, dass dieses Wort in M Zutat ist". Elliger goes a step farther in stating that if in the course of the commentary the expression סִתּוּק is given, this is "wie das vorangehende כָּאֵן zeigt, deutlich in einer Umschreibung, nicht im direkten Zitat des entsprechenden Textstückes."

All the other Versions and Sy. (πάντα) support the MT .

דמח: As in v.3, so here, T and ⁵ are consistent in using the root דמח, whereas V uses "ad praedam (?)".

According to the Septuagint Concordance, ἀσπερια renders דמח at least 11 times.

קרימח / מקבל אפיהון דמן כרות קדים קדומא / ἀνεστρηκός
προσώποις αὐτῶν ἐξ ἐναντίας / ^{سبوا} / ^{فج} / facies eorum ventus
urens.

דמח: Hapaxlegomenon.

In this case, the Versions are of no help, since the all seem to have had some difficulty with the MT . Modern commentators are no less perplexed. Duhm proposes to emend דמח into דמח: From Gomer, and to translate "Von Gomer zogen sie ostwärts". ICC gives up any hope of interpreting this "untranslatable intrusion into the text". Cannon proposes to read דמח

קרימח: "The terror of their faces goes before them". Finally, Humbert favors a derivation from the ar. ^س which would understand דמח-פניהם "the multitude of their faces" and hence "the totality of their faces". This is by no means a final answer to the problem, though it commends itself to our consideration, pending a more satisfactory solution.

דמח: T has כרות קדים "east wind"; Sy . has ἀνεμος αὐσων, and V uses 'ventus urens'. S understands it as meaning "strong" = ²⁴ ^{فج}, and G renders it with ἐξ ἐναντίας

Thus far no plausible solution of the problem has been proposed. We shall, therefore, retain the MT and translate it "forward", "straight ahead".

וַיִּקְרָא כָּחֹל שָׁבִי / και συνάξει ὡς ἄμμον αἰχμαλωσάν.

مَقْبَعِينَ مَجِيدًا / et congregabit quasi arenam, captivitatem.

קָרָא: with a Waw Conjunctive rather than with a Waw

Consecutive. All Versions agree with the MT, except that

S has "captives", where the Hebrew has "captivity". The passage can be translated as follows: "and he shall gather up a captivity (as numerous) as the sand".

1.10

מַלְכִּים וְהוּא עַל מַלְכֵיא מְחַלְעַב / και αὐτὸς ἐν βασιλεῦσιν

ἐντροφήσει: مَسَحًا مَسَحًا / Et ipse de regibus triumphabit.

מַלְכֵי: G has ἐντροφήσει = "to treat contemptuously", whereas Sy. gives ἐμπαίξεταί = "to mock at". S and T follow MT. Needless to say that V is a free translation.

In the other two instances where this root is used, viz. in 2 Ki. 2:23 and Ez. 22:5, it takes an indefinite object. In this case, the parallelism with מַלְכֵי also would require the suppression of the Pathah under the beth. G confirms this view.

וְרוֹנוֹיִם מְחַלְעַב / και τύραννοι παύγνια αὐτοῦ
مَحَقًا مَحَقًا / et tyranni ridiculi ejus erunt.

מְחַלְעַב: Hapaxlegomenon.

However, the meaning of the word is very clear.

Aquila has γελάσματα = "laughs". All the Versions support the MT.

וְהוּא עַל כָּרְךְ תִּקְרֶה מַעֲיָק / και αὐτὸς εἰς πᾶν ὄχλῳμα
ἐμπαίξεταί / وَلَا قُوَّةَ قُوَّةٍ / ipse super omnem munitionem ridebit.

There is full agreement among the Versions with regard to this section.

וַיִּצְנַר עַל וַיִּלְכְּדָהּ / καὶ βαλεῖ χάμα καὶ κρατήσῃ αὐτοῦ.
 וְעַתָּה / et comportabit aggerem, et capiet eam.

וַיִּצְנַר...: to be vocalized with a Waw Conjunctive,
 as in v.9c.

וַיִּצְנַר עַל means to heap up ground in order to
 build a mound. This figure has been differently rendered by
 each Version, although in the final analysis they all convey the
 same idea.

1.11

וַיִּצְנַר עַל דְּרֹמָה רוּחָהּ עָלָהּ / τότε μεταβαλεῖ
 τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ διελεύσεται / تَوَقَّعَ اِنْجَفَاقَ رُوحِهَا / Tunc mutabitur
 spiritus, et pertransibit.

This is a difficult verse presenting numerous problems.

G considers וַיִּצְנַר as the subject of both verbs. If
 that were the case, the Hebrew would have used the feminine.^[1]

T is nothing but a complete paraphrase of the MT,
 using words not found in the original.

S is conscious of the difficulty. Therefore, it
 uses the identical root as the Hebrew, but in the feminine.
 This by no means solves the problem.

V uses an unjustified passive construction, followed
 by the second verb slavishly rendered.

Disregarding all the fancy emendations proposed by
 modern commentators, we turn to Elliger who takes over Nowack's
 idea of supplying a *q* comparationis in front of וַיִּצְנַר, on the
 argument that the letter *q* which is similar to a *p*, was lost
 by haplography. This proposal has the merit of accounting for

[1] See S which does use the feminine.

discrepancy in grammatical gender encountered in this verse.

Pending a better solution, we shall accept it and translate the verse as follows: "Then he sweeps on like a wind, and passes away."

לאלהו יקרא למעוניה/אשם זו כחו לאלהו
 ἡ ἰσχυς τῷ θεῷ μου / **יִבְנִיתְּ סֻכֶּה** /et corrueat:haec est
 fortitudo ejus dei sui/ DSSH לאלהו יקרא זה כחו ויָשָׁם.

שָׁם: "become guilty". So T and S. But G would rather mean "to atone for", "to propitiate". V's rendition is not intelligible.

Commentators have proposed to read **יָשָׁם**^[1], which proposal finds now some support in the DSSH^[2]; we shall accept this emendation^[3].

זו: is masculine.^[4] Yet, G and V have a feminine pronoun^[5].

לאלהו: to be read with a Qameṣ, for לאלהיו. G has instead the 1st person pronominal suffix, which is out of place.

Under these circumstances, this entire verse may be translated as follows: " Then he (the enemy) sweeps on like a wind and passes away, because he (this) considers (places) his valor to be his god."

[1] To be included in this category are Duhm, Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti, ICC.

[2] Cf. Elliger, *ibid.*, p. 50: "Dagegen für die zweite Vershälfte bietet IV 9f. eine Leseart, die man ohne weiteres übernehmen kann und die dem bisherigen Rätselarten um die ursprüngliche Gestalt des Schlusssatzes des Orakels ein Ende bereitet."

[3] Humbert would rather read **יָשָׁם**.

[4] The DSSH has **זו**.

[5] Humbert's idea to substitute **זו** with **זאת** lacks any concrete support. He renders v.11 as follows: "Sur ce, est passé l'esprit et s'en est allé. Mais moi, j'exposerai ma remontrance à mon Dieu (τῷ θεῷ μου)".

Thus understood, v.11 constitutes a normal transition between the oracle of vv.5-10 and the complaint starting with v.12. Indeed, v.11 accounts for the apparent weakening of the power of this enemy nation, Yahwah's very tool, because it came to consider itself a self-sufficient power, trusting in its strength alone, its real deity.

1.12

הוֹאֵה אֶת־אֱלֹהֵי־חֲמָטִי / הִלָּא אֵת יְיָ בְּרִיחַ עֲלֵמָא מְבֹרָאשִׁי / הֲלֹא אַחַהּ מִקְדָּם יְהוָה
 ὁὐκ ἔστιν / ὁὐκ ἔστιν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς / Numquid non tu a principio, Domine.

מִקְדָּם : T renders it with בְּרִיחַ עֲלֵמָא quoting the "technical" term of Gen. 1:1. In S too, that seems to be the normal term to use.

אֵת אֱלֹהֵי יְיָ קָשׁוּם עַל כָּל בְּרִיחַת קְדִישׁ בְּעוֹבְדֵי הַיְּמִינוֹת / אֱלֹהֵי קְדִישׁ לֹא נִסְחָה
 ὁὐκ ἔστιν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς / ὁὐκ ἔστιν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς / ὁὐκ ἔστιν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς / Deus meus, Sancte meus, et non moriemur?

קְדִישׁ : With the 1st person pronominal suffix, it is a hapax. G followed by V, has ὁὐκ ἔστιν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, while S corresponds to אֱלֹהֵי קְדִישׁ. Duhm, Nowack and Marti subscribe to this vocalization. Budde emends קְדִישׁ-יִשְׂרָאֵל to קְדִישׁ (?). None of these changes is necessary, since the MT makes perfect sense the way it stands: "O Yahweh, my holy one".

תְּקוּנֵי הַסּוּפֵרִים 18 : לא נחמה ; [1]
 the original form would be תְּקוּנֵי הַסּוּפֵרִים 18.


The rendition in S is very peculiar and difficult to explain: וְלֹא־נִסְחָה אֶת־יְיָ מִקְדָּם = "nequam subditus es legi Domine ! (Walton). That the scribal emendation took place very early is

[1] See B. Roberts, The Old Testament Text and Versions, 1951, p. 35.

well illustrated by G's οὐ μὴ ἀποσώσῃμεν. However, the fact that T ends with ןלעלם קים ם'מרך, which appears to express the same idea as לא תחיה, seems to argue in favor of an original ןלעלם ןל[1]. For all practical purposes we shall keep the MT lesson unaltered.

Domine in iudicium posuisti eum.

In this Verse, S leaves out both ויצור and ויחיה;
G and V follow the MT, while T renders ויחיה
למען יבנה ביתו.

יְהוָה יִסְדּוּךָ לַחֲזֹקָה וְצֶדֶק / καὶ ἔπλασέν με τοῦ ἐλέγχειν
παῖδεσθαι αὐτοῦ / Συ. κραταίων εἰς τὸ ἐλέγχειν ἑστησας αὐτόν / Ακ. καὶ
στερεδὸν εἰς τὸ ἐλέγχειν ἐθεμελίωσας αὐτόν /  et
fortem ut corriperes, fundasti eum/ DSSH יְהוָה יִסְדּוּךָ לַחֲזֹקָה.

7101: with regard to this word, a variety of renditions is to be noted.

G is obviously translating an original וַיִּאָרְרֵי.
Aq. Sy. and V seem to consider צור as a description of the
object of both verbs, hence the use of the Acc.

Modern commentators have either regarded the entire second half of v.12 as a gloss^[2], or have emended it into וְצִיר^[3], "a messenger".

Cannon and Humbert have elaborated on the parallelism in this verse. Since לְהוֹכִיחַ corresponds to שָׁחַח and לְהוֹכִיחַ to לְהוֹכִיחַ, וְצִוְרִי must correspond to יְהוָה, which is a vocative.

[1] So A. Wolff, *Der Prophet Habakuk*, p. 123.

[2] So Wellhausen, Budde, Icc.

[3] So Duhm and Nowack.

Going a step farther, Humbert uses the personal note expressed in ἔπλασέν με in order to read צוֹרִי = "My Rock". But this is not absolutely necessary.

Finally, let us note that in the S, both verbs do not have the same personal suffixes, as is the case in the other Versions. S reads

שמחו שמחו for שמחו
but שמחו שמחו for שמחו

1.13

καθαρός ὁφθαλμός / בריר מִמְרוֹךְ מִלִּמְחוֹי בְּעוֹבְדֵי בִישׁ / מהור עינים מראות רע
τοῦ καὶ ὁραὶ πονηρᾶ / إِنَّمَا تَرَىٰ جِبَعًا / Mundi sunt oculi tui,
ne videas malum.

שמחו שמחו : T has מִמְרוֹךְ מִלִּמְחוֹי, to avoid the anthropopathism of the MT. S is not troubled by the same problem.

אֵלֶּה וְלֹא־מִלֵּאסְתָּכֶם בְּעַבְדֵי לֹאֻחַ שֶׁקֶר הָלֵא גִלִּי קְדָמְךָ / וחבים אל-עמל לא תוכל
ἐπιβλέπειν ἐπὶ πόνους οὐ δουήσῃ / لَا تَنْصَبُ حَقًّا / et respi-
cere ad iniquitatem non poteris.

שמחו שמחו : Same problem as above, which induces the translator into a complete paraphrase of the Hebrew. In the process חֵלֶא גִלִּי is lost. Note the ever recurrent חֵלֶא גִלִּי קְדָמְךָ ?

וְלֹא־אֵלֶּה מִסְתַּכֵּל בְּאַנְשֵׁי וְאֵלֶּה חֲבִיבִים בְּנוֹדִים חֲחִירִישׁ כְּבֹלֵעַ רֶשַׁע צָדִיק מִמֶּנּוּ
ἐνα τί ἐπιβλέπεις ἐπὶ κατα-
φρονοῦντας; παρασιωγήσῃ ἐν τῷ κατατίθειν ἀσεβῆ τὸν δίκαιον /
سَأَلْتُكَ بِحَقِّكَ سَعَاءٌ لِي.. قَدْ قَدْ حَقَّ لِي حَقِّي / quare respicis super
iniqua agentes et taces devorante impio justiore se ? / DSSH חֵלֶא חֲבִיבִים

בִּנְדִים וְחִרִישׁ בְּבֹלַע רֶשַׁע צְרִיִק סִמְנוּ.

For two reasons, the balance of this verse is disrupted.

1) The word division with regard to חִרִישׁ is not clear.

T, G (including Aq., Sy., Th.) and V consider it as being part of 13 d; S alone includes it into 13 c.

2) The סִמְנוּ at the end of 13 d is not attested in G [1] and in S. It might well be a gloss; otherwise, what is the meaning of צְרִיִק סִמְנוּ? Whoever deserves the title of צְרִיִק cannot be more of a צְרִיִק than a רֶשַׁע who is by no means a צְרִיִק. Hence, סִמְנוּ introduces a "comparison" which is rather obsolete.

Following most commentators [2], if we do consider סִמְנוּ as a gloss, we find it advisable to include חִרִישׁ into the d part of the verse (3) in order to balance תְּבִיִם in the c part of the verse. We thus obtain the following arrangement:

לְמַת תְּבִיִם בִּנְדִים חִרִישׁ בְּבֹלַע רֶשַׁע צְרִיִק

But for the sake of smooth parallelism, a final "improvement might be introduced which in reality is no more than a mere conjecture of no weighty consequence to the general idea expressed in the verse. With the root בִּנַּד, finite verbs are frequently used in the "paronomastic construction". We have only to turn to Jer. 5:11 בִּנְדוּ בְּיָמַי, Jer 12:1 בִּנְדוּ בְּיָמַי etc. This usage brought Wellhausen, Budde and Marti to postulate a similar construction for our verse, in view of the parallelism it would set with בְּבֹלַע רֶשַׁע. This is a minor change which claims no support

[1] Aq., Sy., and Th., follow the MT and render: ὁ ἑαυτοῦ ἰσχυρὸς αὐτοῦ

[2] Duhm, Budde, ICC, Nowack and Humbert.

[3] As further evidence to the confused word division, note that T, S, and V read חִרִישׁ with a Waw, absent both in MT and in G.

from the Versions. It can be posited on account of the confused word division in the verse. Actually it does not modify the meaning conveyed by the author, it only reinforces it.

1.14

הַיָּם / וְעָבְדָהּ אֶת כָּל־אֲדָמָה כְּדָגַיִם / וְעָבְדָהּ אֶת כָּל־אֲדָמָה כְּדָגַיִם
 ὡς τοὺς ἰχθύας τῆς θαλάσσης / וְעָבְדָהּ אֶת כָּל־אֲדָמָה כְּדָגַיִם
 Et facies homines quasi pisces maris/ DSSH הַיָּם וְעָבְדָהּ אֶת כָּל־אֲדָמָה כְּדָגַיִם

וְעָבְדָהּ : By using the future tense, both G and V misunderstood the MT . The apocopated form used in DSSH and already recommended by some scholars^[1] could be preferred. Yet, other such examples occur many times in the Bible^[2], and there is no need to alter the MT .

Moreover, all Versions use this verb in the 2nd person, thereby aiming at Yahweh as subject. In spite of this fact, Torrey, Marti and Humbert propose to read וְעָבְדָהּ, namely: "the enemy (and not God) has reduced mankind (to the status) of the fish in the sea". According to this view, the 2nd person was used on the analogy with v. 13 which refers to Yahweh. But, since vv. 15, 16 and 17 refer to the enemy and are therefore in the 3rd person, v. 14 too should be in the 3rd person.

This is a matter of subjective interpretation and it lacks any support from the Versions. We shall abstain from subscribing to it.

[1] So Duhm, Nowack etc.

[2] See: 1 Ki. 17:15; 1 Ki. 16:25; 2 Ki. 3:2; 2 Ki. 13:11; Ez. 18:19.

בֹּאֲרֵי־חַסְדֵּי־יְהוָה וְלִי־יִשְׁלַח־יְהוָה אֶת־חַסְדֵּי־יְהוָה / καὶ ὅς τὰ ἔρπετα τὰ οὐκ
 ἔχοντα ἡγοῦμενον / וְלִי־יִשְׁלַח־יְהוָה אֶת־חַסְדֵּי־יְהוָה / et quasi reptile non
 habens principem / כְּרֶמֶס לֹא־מֶלֶךְ בּוֹ. (Elliger: "Wie das Gewürm
darüber zu herrschen").

לֹא־חֲסִיד: An awkward usage of this negative particle
 with a participle. It is worth noting that a similar example
 in Prov. 6:7 has אֵין לֵה קֶצֶן שׁוֹמֵר וּמֶלֶךְ, with the expected אֵין
 instead of לֹא.

Most commentators accept this rendition of 14b.
 But what does "like reptiles without a ruler" mean ? Is it
 such a calamity to be "like reptiles without a ruler" ?
 Even though we fail to see why this should be so bad for the
 oppressed people, we cannot but accept the verse for whatever
 meaning it conveys: Yahweh has forsaken His people (and that is
 why they do not have a ruler anymore) into the hands of a
 foreign aggressor who has reduced the people to the status of
 the fish of the sea.

Recently, the DSSH brought us an interesting variant
 reading to v. 14b. Instead of לֹא־מֶלֶךְ בּוֹ, it has בּוֹ לִמְלֶכֶת: "to
 have power over him". Under these circumstances, if this lesson
 were accepted as the genuine one, 1) The difficulty of לֹא
 (instead of אֵין) + חֲסִיד would be solved. 2) The idea conveyed by
 לִמְלֶכֶת would now be ascribed to the enemy nation (the tool of Yahweh),
 which does rule over the subjugated people as though "they were
 reptiles", i.e. treats the nation as one would treat a reptile, -
 a universally hated being-, with extreme cruelty and harshness.

For this to be true, the DSSH would have to have

an original **וַיֵּשֶׁה**, which is not there. If, however, that were the case, the verse would run as follows:

וַיֵּשֶׁה אָדָם כְּדוֹג הַיָּם כְּרֶמֶשׂ לִמְשָׁל בּוֹ

"The enemy has reduced mankind to the level of the fish of the sea; he ruleth over it as one would rule over a reptile (i.e. is crushing it utterly).

In view of the appeal that this restoration has to the mind, we will accept it as an "alternate" reading for v.14, pending further proposals.

1.15

וַיֵּשֶׁה אָדָם כְּדוֹג הַיָּם כְּרֶמֶשׂ לִמְשָׁל בּוֹ / **וַיֵּשֶׁה אָדָם כְּדוֹג הַיָּם כְּרֶמֶשׂ לִמְשָׁל בּוֹ** / **וַיֵּשֶׁה אָדָם כְּדוֹג הַיָּם כְּרֶמֶשׂ לִמְשָׁל בּוֹ**

וַיֵּשֶׁה אָדָם כְּדוֹג הַיָּם כְּרֶמֶשׂ לִמְשָׁל בּוֹ / Totum in hamo sublevarit.

traxit illud in sagena sua / DSSH **וַיֵּשֶׁה אָדָם כְּדוֹג הַיָּם כְּרֶמֶשׂ לִמְשָׁל בּוֹ** [].

וַיֵּשֶׁה: This is the only occurrence of this verb with this vocalization^[1]. Nowack changes it to **וַיֵּשֶׁה**; Torrey and Budde read **וַיֵּשֶׁה**, on the basis that all the verbs in the subsequent part of the description are in the imperfect. Note that the DSSH reading is **וַיֵּשֶׁה** as well^[2].

וַיֵּשֶׁה: occurs only 3 times in the Bible (Hab. 1:15, Is. 19:8 - itself considered secondary by Dr. Blank - , and Job 40:25)^[3]. It seems highly probable that this is a rather late derivation from the root **וַיֵּשֶׁה** = "train up", "dedicate".
The same word appears in Aramaic as **וַיֵּשֶׁה**, at only exactly the same

[1] See Ges.-Kautzsch 63 p.

[2] Cf. Elliger, *ibid.*, p.51: "v 13 **וַיֵּשֶׁה** bestätigt die schon längst vorgeschlagene Korrektur des von M gebotenen **וַיֵּשֶׁה**."

[3] E. Dhorme, *Le Livre de Job*, ad loc. cit., has no special explanation to offer.

places as the Hebrew instances^[1].

Marti and ICC consider *בנחכה העלה* as a gloss. This shall be discussed at the end of v. 17.

The Targum to this half verse is in the nature of a paraphrase; G, S and V present no serious problems, except that G is inconsistent throughout vv. 15-17 in its rendition of the terms for fishing. Both *חרם* and *מכמרת* are given as *ἀμφίβλητρον*; on the other hand, *σαγήνα* too renders both *חרם* and *מכמרת*!

כּוּשׁ לִיָּה בַחֲרִים וְרָמִי לִיָּה בַמְצוֹרֶתִּיהָ / וַיִּאֱסָפוּהוּ בַמְכִמְרָתוֹ עַל-כֵּן יִשְׂמַח וַיִּגִּיל
 τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ταῖς σαγήναις αὐτοῦ. ἔνεαν
 τοῦτο εὐφρανθήσεται καὶ χαρήσεται ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ. סָבְבָה
 סָבְבָה סָבְבָה סָבְבָה / et congregavit in rete suam. Super hoc
 laetabitur et exultabit/ DSSH וַיִּפְתּוּ () לַחֲרֹמוֹ עַל כֵּן יִשְׂמַח

All the Versions render the Hebrew very closely.

G adds at the end of the verse ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ : לבו, not found in the MT. ICC notes that even *כּוּשׁ לִיָּה בַחֲרִים* itself is omitted in some MSS^[2]. Marti, presumably on the same basis, sees no reason why *כּוּשׁ לִיָּה בַחֲרִים* should not be a gloss.

Yet, as it stands, the verse can be translated as follows: (Cannon)
 "He catches them all with a hook, he collects them in his casting net; and gathers them in his drag net, therefore he rejoices and exults".

[1] See J. Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, sub voce *חַכְחָה*: "Angel, wahrscheinlich verwandt mit *חַכְחָה*." The root is used in the Targumim at exactly the same 3^d places as the Hebrew word, and seems to have no other reference beyond these 3.

[2] See ICC to Habakuk, p.11: HP, 62, 86, 147 and other MSS omit the last half verse.

All the Versions give a smooth rendition of the MT ,
with the exception of T that has חרמו for חרמו . S renders
על-כן with a simple waw.

וּמֵאֵלָיו: The word **מֵאֵלָיו** is masculine singular,

whereas נראה is of the feminine gender. Nowack and Marti emend it into נרא, to have a masculine form; Duhm and Humbert maintain the feminine נראה and emend מאכלתו into מאכלו, which is fem. Actually, both sides' interests center around העל of v. 17. If the lesson נרא is accepted, then the ה of העל has to be a ה interrogativum. If, on the other hand נראה is left unchanged, the ה of העל might be dropped as a dittography, especially in view of the fact that none of the Versions - including DSSH- has rendered or understood v. 17 as a question. Both arguments seem equally weighty and unless some additional explanation is presented, one finds it difficult to decide objectively either way.

At this point, Humbert's reasoning proves of some help. He contends that the reason why G rendered the sing. מִכְלִי with רֹאשׁוֹנָא might well be because the Septuagint translator

had before him a feminine singular noun, possibly מַאֲלֶּה, which he mistook for a plural form. This explanation, devious though it may appear, does account for the difficulty and commends itself to our attention.

As we have seen, the extreme interest shown toward this emendation is more in order to establish either the interrogative or the affirmative nature of v. 17, rather than in order to avoid the difficulty caused by the incompatible genders. It is relevant to establish this distinction because if v. 17 is a question, Chapter 2 will constitute a natural answer to it. If v. 17 is not a question, then Chapter 2 may assume the nature of an independent composition, rather than a direct sequel. Hence, the whole problem will have to be discussed after our analysis of v. 17.

1.17

העל אלן ישלח משריתיה / העל כן יריק חרמו ותמיד להרג גוים לא יחמול
 αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐδὲ παντὸς ἀποκτενεῖν ἔσθην οὐ φείσεται / חַרְמֵי הַיָּם וְהַיָּבֵשׁ
 חַרְמֵי הַיָּם וְהַיָּבֵשׁ / Propter hoc ergo expandit sagenam
 suam, et semper interficere Gentes non parcet / DSSH יריק חרמו
 חרמו תמיד להרוג גוים ולוא יחמול

העל-כן: This has been discussed in relation to v. 16.

The Versions, except T, give an affirmative rendition of the MT.

חרמו יריק: G and S translate an original חרמו.

T has משריתיה = "army".

The expression חרמו יריק is a hapax; on the other hand יריק חרמו occurs 8 times in the Bible. The DSSH reads יריק חרמו Cod. 86 of the G reads ἀνεῳξεν αὐτοῦ ἡ θύρα. ICG states that a Coptic manuscript of Habakuk has the equivalent

of חרנו^[1]. Wellhausen, Torrey, Marti and ICC emend to חרנו .

Actually, do we expect חרנו or חרנו? V. 17 is the conclusion of a passage (vv. 14-16) dealing with the image of the fisherman, with all of his paraphernalia. The comparison is introduced in order to illustrate a state of affairs, to convey a vivid picture of what is going on under the rule of this cruel enemy. V. 17, as a concluding statement, may therefore/^{be}expected to end the comparison. In other words, : "Just as the fisherman catches as much fish as he wills with his net (vv. 14-16), so the enemy is branding his sword (v. 17) to massacre human beings."

It is therefore probable that originally the MT lesson was חרנו and that later on, because of the frequency of חרנו in vv. 15 & 16, it was mistakenly copied as חרנו.

וחרי : G and V support this lesson, but place this word in the b part of the verse. T, S, and DSSH have חרי , without a Waw . Duhm, Nowack, Marti, ICC and Humbert favor the lesson without a Waw, which we accept as a possible correct reading.

לחרו : The S uses a participial construction. The proposed^[2] emendation into יחרו seems unnecessary.

לא יחל : Wellhausen, followed by Budde, proposes the unnecessary emendation into יחל .

Vv. 15, 16, 17: These verses constitute a descriptive

[1] See W. Grossouw, The Coptic Version of the Minor Prophets, p. 68.

[2] So Marti, Wellhausen.

unit. When one reads them without interruption, one is struck by the constant repetition of certain terms, such as חרסן and על-כן occurring three times each. In view of the discussion of these verses in the preceding pages, one is inclined to consider favorably some of the views proposed by the various scholars and to rearrange the entire passage accordingly. If נחמה העלה is really a gloss, and if ישמח ויגיל were to be left out in as much as 1) it does not figure in some manuscripts 2) it seems to detract from the perfect parallelism that can be established otherwise, the following arrangement may be obtained:

כלה יגרוהו בחרמו	ויאספיהו במכמרתו
על-כן יזבח לחרמו	ויקסר למכמרתו
כי בהמה שמן חלקו	ומאכלתו בראה
על-כן יריק חרבו תמיד	להרג בונים לא יחמל

We offer this as an alternative to the text established in our discussion and leave it there, for whatever merit it may have.

2.1

אמר נביא על משרתי אנה קאם עתיד/על משרתי אמהד ואתיצבה על-מצור
תת' /Super custodiam meam
stabo et figam gradum super munitionem/ DSSH על מצורי.

The two parts of this verse stand in synonymous parallelism, **אֶחָדָם** corresponding to **אֶחָדָם** and **מִצֹּר** to **מִמְרָחָי**. This would require a 1st person pronominal suffix after **מִצֹּר**, which though absent from G and V, is found in T and in S.

The DSSH too has the lesson **סצור**, which has led us to accept this minor emendation long proposed by many scholars^[1].

As to the meaning of **סצור**, there exists some difficulty in as much as the word means "siege", "entrenchment", which does not seem to parallel **משמרת**. G's lesson **πέτρα** (taken over by S), reflects the same difficulty on the part of the translator who made an "etymological guess", from the root **צור**. Aq. has **κυκλός**, Th. uses the word **ῥύπον**.

Commentators have either accepted the term as it is in the MT and translated it as a synonym of **משמרת**, or have modified its vocalization to **סצור** = "watch", a form derived, though not attested in Hebrew, from the root **וצר**.^[2] Under these circumstances, we shall follow the MT lesson.

ומסכיו לא למחזי מה / ואצפה לראות מה--דבר-בי ומה אשיב על-תוכחתי
 ומסכיו לא למחזי מה / και ἀποσκαπεύσω τοῦ ἰοεῖν τῆ λαλήσει
 ἐν ἐμοὶ και τῆ ἀποκριθῆ ἐπὶ τὸν ἑλεγχόν μου / **سَمِعْتُ سَمْعًا**
مَعْنَى / et contemplabor ut videam
 quid dicatur mihi et quid respondeam ad arguentem me.

מה--דבר-בי: T has a series of unnecessary passive constructions which, strangely enough, were imitated by V. G's **ἐν ἐμοί** is a slavish rendition of the MT, which uses the preposition **ב** as normal particle^[3] for the person addressed to.^[4]

[1] Duhm, Marti, Elliger

[2] Akk. **maṣṣartu** is often cited as a parallel to **סצור**.

[3] S and T have both the clearer renditions **מסכיו**, **מסכיו**.

[4] cf. Num. 12:8: **מה אל פה אדבר בו**; Hos. 1:2 **היה דבר יהוה** בתושי, and Nyberg, *Studien zum Hoseabuche*, ad loc. cit.: "Die Konstruktion des M ist altertümlicher".

G and V have the first person; but the parallelism of וְכָרֵב requires a 3rd person verb. T is in the 3rd and S is clearly translating a 3rd person verb. Hence, with Duhm, Wellhausen, Torrey, Nowack, Marti, Cannon and Humbert, we will read וְכָרֵב.

2.2

ואתחנניה מן קדם יי ואמר כתיבא נבואתא/ויעוני יהוה ויאמר כתוב חזון
 סְחִינָה / οὐρανὸν ἔγραψεν θεὸς καὶ ἐπελάττωσεν αὐτὸν μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος
 חֲזִינָה/ Et respondit mihi Dominus et dixit: scribe visum.

T uses the expected passive construction, followed by מן קדם. The other Versions follow the MT.

Unique usage of this construction in the Bible. The idea it expresses, however, is well known to us from Is. 8:1 and Is. 30:8

וּמְפָרֵשׂ עַל מִפְרָשׁ דְּאוּרִיתָּהּ/ וְבָאֵר עַל הַלְחָוּת
 /et explana eum super tabulas.

As a Piel, two other occurrences are known to us, in Deut. 1:5 and Deut 27:8 (in this case בָּאֵר) where it means "make distinct", "make plain". G renders it as an adverb.

T enlarges the concept into מִפְרָשׁ דְּאוּרִיתָּהּ; G uses the singular πτυξίον="tablet of box-wood".

καὶ ἀνὰ τὸν ὄχλον/ בְּרִיל דְּיוּחִי לַמַּחֲבֵּן מִן דְּקָרִי בִּיא/ לַמַּעַן יִרְוֶן קוּרָא בּו
 /ut percurrat qui legerit
 eum. (Ακ., Στ. περὶ αὐτοῦ)

A terse expression which has somewhat

misled the Versions. T has למחכם דייח: "Damit er schnell verstehe". G, S and V are very literal and merely reflect the difficulty they had in coping with this idiomatic construction.

English commentators experienced the same difficulty. Torrey has: "He who runs may read it" (?); and Cannon is no less obscure with his rendition: "that he may run that read it" (!). On the other hand, German and French scholars, apparently because of better possibilities in their respective languages, has no hardship whatever with this expression. They translated: "damit man sie geläufig lesen kann" (Nowack, Marti) or "en sorte qu'on la lise couramment" (Humbert).

The Hebrew construction remains thus far unexplained. From parallels^[1] in Greek and in Syriac and from a few scattered examples in the Bible^[2], we may surmise that this Imperfect + Participle combination conveys an adverbial meaning, such as found in the later מְרַבֵּה שׂוֹאֵל = "will increase in asking", hence "will ask much". Similarly, יִרְוֶן קוֹרֵא = "will run in reading", hence "will read fluently", "will be familiar with". This is the best explanation we can offer to account for this terse construction.

2.3

Quia adhuc visus procul. / חָזַק וְחָזַק / כי עוד חזון למועד
 חָזַק וְחָזַק / חָזַק וְחָזַק / כי עוד חזון למועד

A similar expression is found in Dan. 8:17: חָזַק וְחָזַק כי לעת-הבאה and in Dan. 10:14: חָזַק וְחָזַק כי עוד חזון למועד.

[1] See Ges.-Kautzsch, 120 b.

[2] Is. 33:1; Jer 22:30

וְכִנּוּן לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ וְלֹא יִכְנָן / καὶ ἀνατελεῖ εἰς πέρας καὶ οὐκ εἰς κενόν / et apparebit in finem et non mentidetur.

DSSH וְכִנּוּן לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ. (Ακ., Συ. καὶ οὐ οἰαψεύσεται)

וְכִנּוּן: From the root כִּנָּן = "breathe", "hlow". In the Hiphil="pant for", "aspire". G has ἀνατελεῖ, which seems to go back to an original וְכִנּוּן="to sprout"[1]

Nowack and Marti propose to read וְכִנּוּן, on the assumption that Ayin Waw verbs use occasionally shortened forms [2]. This view seems to be confirmed by the DSSH lesson which has precisely the proposed form וְכִנּוּן.

Yet, we need not emend the MT, as long as we understand the structure of this verb and its usage in this particular case [3].

T and V - and S, to a lesser degree -, depart from the MT, since in these Versions the original nuance is lost.

וְכִנּוּן: G's καὶ οὐκ εἰς κενόν is a free rendition, which did not satisfy Aquila and Symmachus who have instead καὶ οὐ οἰαψεύσεται.

וְכִנּוּן לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ וְלֹא יִכְנָן / ἔξιν ὑστερήσῃ, ὑπόμεινον αὐτόν / وَكُنْ لِلْمَلِكِ وَكُنْ لِلْمَلِكِ: si moram fecerit, expecta illum.

וְכִנּוּן: S renders the idea in the negative لا يَفْزَحْ


لا يَفْزَحْ: "do not lose hope".

[1] According to the Septuagint Concordance, ἀνατέλλω is used only once for כִּנָּן and 8 times for כִּנָּן.

[2] See Ges.-Kautzsch, 72dd.

[3] For a further illustration with regard to the meaning, see Prov. 14:5 וְכִנּוּן לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ וְלֹא יִכְנָן where וְכִנּוּן "proclaim, spread lies" is clearly in opposition to וְכִנּוּן. From this instance, one sees that כִּנָּן means "blow", "proclaim", "spread". Hence, the same root + וְ may mean "aspire to" and even "hasten to".

אחר / ὅτι ἐρχόμενος ἔξει / ארי בזמניה ייתי ולא יתעכב / כי בא יבא לא יאחר
 וְאֵלָּא בְּדָלָא וְצִדְלָא / قَالَ خَمْسًا / ὅτι ἔρχομαι ἔξει / quia veniens veniet et
 non tardabit / DSSH אחר וְלֹא יִבֹּא וְלֹא יִבֹּא.

It is interesting to observe the various ways in which this Infinitive of Certitude has been translated. G and V are slavish in their usage of ἐρχόμενος ἔξει and 'veniens veniet'. T uses בזמניה: "at the proper time"; S has : "quickly".

DSSH has אחר: לא יאחר, confirmed by G, T, S, and V and many Hebrew Mss. Moreover, this part of the verse stands as a parallel to ולא יכונן, and seems to require the lesson אחר ולא. The Waw might have been left out on account of "haplophony", viz. the existence in the close vicinity of other "v" sounds. Its restoration is therefore fully justified. ?

2.4

הא רשיעא אמרין לית / תנה עפלה לא-ישרה נפשו בו וצריך באמונתו יתיה
 ἔαν ὑποστειληται, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ
 ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐν αὐτῷ. ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου ζῆσται

Ecce qui incredulus est,
 non erit recta anima ejus in semetipso: justus autem in fide sua
 vivet / DSSH ישרה לוא יופלה לוא / Α. ἔαν ὑποστειληται οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ
 ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐν αὐτῷ / Α. ἐκ πίστεως αὐτοῦ ζῆσται / Σ. τῇ ἑαυτοῦ πίστει
 ζῆσει.

The first half of this verse presents many problems to which the Versions bring little help. Almost every word in the MT is open to question.

First, we notice that there is a parallelism between the a and the b part of this verse; from the Versions, we get the idea that it is probably an antithetic parallelism.

Hence:

באמנותו 'חיה is the antithesis to עפלה

and

צדיק is the antithesis to לא ישרה נפשו בו

עפלה: T and S suggest that we are dealing here with some sort of "wickedness". V uses "incredulus", which is of course a "happy guess" on the part of the translator, conveying an idea opposed to that of "justus" found in the b part of the verse. G is of no help, since υποστέλλομαι="to be subordinated", "withdrawn". Equally obscure, at least for our purpose, is Aquila's νωχελεσυμένους="be slothful".

The root עפל means "to swell", and one fails to see how any meaning could fit into this verse. Instead, it has been proposed^[1] to read עלה="to cover", "to faint". Marti even states that a few Hebrew MSS actually give the lesson עלה. Wellhausen would rather read העל and Torrey prefers the lesson העל. All of these ingenious proposals are highly subjective, and we have to be very careful before subscribing to any one of them. The verse is so corrupt^[2] that we might have to give up any hope of restoring it. Under these circumstances, all we can do is to try to make some sense, without using drastic conjectures.

If we accept עלה as a better reading and keep the feminine gender in anticipation of נפשו, our verse, though highly inverted in its word order, would mean:

"Behold, [his soul] fainteth whose soul is not upright in him, but.....", freely rendered as: "The wicked shall faint, but..."

[1] Marti, ICC, Cannon and Humbert.

[2] Marti's full reading is: הנה רשע עלה נפשו, as he considers לא ישרה as a gloss (?).

Recently Humbert has come up with some substantial contribution. First, he observes that כִּי יִהְיֶה introduces frequently a syllogism a minori ad majus (out of 26 usages, 21 yield that sense). Hence v. 5a is to be related to v.4, as an extension of the same idea. יִהְיֶה occurs only twice in the Bible, in Hab. 2:5 and in Prov. 21:24. Using Prov. 21:24 שָׁמוּ יִהְיֶה לֵן שָׁמוּ where יִהְיֶה and יִהְיֶה occur together, Humbert postulates a similar "יִהְיֶה" idea for the a part of verse 5, and sees in G's αὐτοδύναμος="be arrogant" a possible support for such a reading.

Furthermore, assuming that a consonantal similarity could account for a possible dittography between נָכַר and בָּנָה, Humbert concludes with the arrangement נָכַר כִּי הָיָה נָכַר, which though conjectural in its wording, deviates obviously very slightly from what the author originally wanted to convey. A défaut de mieux, we shall give our preference to Humbert's text, fully aware that it represents no more than a reasonable attempt to entangle an obscure text.

נָכַר : Hapaxlegomenon.

V has "non decorabitur", from נָכַר I (!). Aben Ezra comments as follows: וְלֹא יִנָּח וְלֹא יִנָּח בָּנָה, which apparently led most commentators to emend the text into וְלֹא יִנָּח. S has ^{וְלֹא יִנָּח} וְלֹא יִנָּח, which corresponds to וְלֹא יִנָּח (So Wellhausen, Nowack, ICC). Cannon and Humbert prefer the lesson וְלֹא יִנָּח.

Actually it makes very little difference whether נָכַר or נָכַר is read. The noun נָכַר="abode", "habitation" is attested frequently. Hence, one cannot deny the possibility of a verb derived from this noun, even though it may occur only once. We shall therefore keep the MT lesson, and the verse will read: וְלֹא יִנָּח כִּי הָיָה נָכַר יִהְיֶה וְלֹא יִנָּח, to be translated as:

"How much more so when a man acts arrogantly: he may be pre-sumptuous, but he shall (never) find a resting place".

דאפתי כשאול נפשיה והוא / אשר הרחיב כשאול נפשו והוא כמות ולא ישבע
 בשבוע / 8ς ἐπλάτυνεν καθὼς ὁ ἡδης τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ
 οὗτος ὡς θάνατος οὐκ ἐμπιπλόμενος / **וְיַגְבִּי־נַפְשׁוֹ כְּמֹתוֹ . וְלֹא יִשְׁבַּע**
וְיַגְבִּי־נַפְשׁוֹ / qui dilatavit quasi infernus animam suam: et ipse quasi
 mors, et non adimpletur. DSSH הוא כמות ולא ישבע.

All the Versions follow the MT literally.

G and DSSH leave out the copula.

וכנש לותיה כל עממא / ויאסף אליו כל הגוים ויקבץ אליו כל העמים
 ויאסף אליו כל עממא / καὶ ἐπισυνάξει ἐπ'αὐτὸν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη καὶ
 εἰσθέξεται πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντας τοὺς λαοὺς / **וְיַגְבִּי־נַפְשׁוֹ כְּמֹתוֹ . וְלֹא יִשְׁבַּע**
וְיַגְבִּי־נַפְשׁוֹ / et congregabit ad se omnes gentes et coacer-
 vabit ad se omnes populos. DSSH ויאסף אליו כל הגוים ויקבץ אליו כל העמים.
 ויאסף אליו כל עממא.

DSSH has both verbs in the plural, followed by prepositions with the 3rd person singular suffix(!), which would make sense only if a Niphal reading is assumed^[1].

No such changes are necessary on the MT which makes perfect sense as it stands.

All the Versions follow closely the MT .

The Qal of **וְיַגְבִּי** means: "to gather for judgment"^[2].

[1] See Elliger, *ibid.*, p. 197: "Und es versammeln sich bei ihm alle Völker und sammeln sich bei ihm alle Nationen".

[2] See Nyberg, *ibid.*, p. 65: "Das Qal **וְיַגְבִּי** = "zum Gericht versammeln".

הלא אלִין כולֵהוֹן/הלוֹא אלה כֵלם עֵליו מִשֵּׁל יִשְׂאוּ וּמִלִּיצָה חִידוֹת לֹן וַיֵּאמֶר
 οὐχὶ ταῦτα πάντα
 παραβολὴν κατ'αὐτοῦ λήψονται καὶ πρόβλημα εἰς διήγησιν αὐτοῦ;
 καὶ ἐροσιν / سَيَقُولُ قَوْلًا مِّمَّا يَكْفِي
 Numquid non omnes isti super eum parabolam sumunt et loquelam
 aenigmatum ejus et dicetur/ DSSH וְיֵאמֶר מִשֵּׁל יִשְׂאוּ וּמִלִּיצָה
 וְיֵאמֶר חִידוֹת לֹן וַיֵּאמֶר / Συ. μὴ οὕτῃ ταῦτα πάντα περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς παραβολὴν
 ληφθήσεται, καὶ αἰνίγμα προβλήματος κατ'αὐτοῦ .

As it stands, this verse presents difficulties on various levels.

אלה כלם: T , V interpret this expression as referring to human beings, "all these people". G and S render the expression as "all these things".

ומלִיצָה חִידוֹת: Two nouns, both in the absolute, conveying no definite meaning. G circumvents the difficulty by translating חִידוֹת with εἰς διήγησιν αὐτοῦ: "to describe it", introducing, for all practical purposes, a verbal element into the sentence. T goes a step farther and actually adds a verb in וַיֵּאמֶר. S obviates the difficulty by supplying a Waw between the two nouns. V and Sy. translate as if מִלִּיצָה were in the construct state. The DSSH is of no avail, since it presents an inverted word order, a missing form and מִלִּיצָה in the plural construct.

וַיֵּאמֶר: G , S and DSSH have the plural. T and V preserve the singular.

Commentators have tried to solve these problems in various ways. Duhm proposes to read וַיֵּאמֶר מִלִּיצָה וַיֵּאמֶר in various ways. Torrey changes חִידוֹת to חִידוֹת, and drops וַיֵּאמֶר as a

gloss. Wellhausen and Marti would rather read ויאמרו. Finally, Humbert proposes to read ומליצה חורו, on the following grounds:

There is a clear parallelism between the two sections of this verse; on that basis, ומליצה חורו לו is a parallel to מל ישא. But if the word מליצה corresponds to the word מל, we shall have to find a verb to suit the noun מליצה and at the same time to be the counterpart of ישא.

But מליצה itself occurs only twice in the Bible, in Hab. 2:6 and in Prov. 1:6 (להנין מל ומליצה), and in this latter case it is not used in conjunction with a verb akin to what we might expect. The Versions were conscious of this difficulty and tried various solutions. The nearest solution we can think of would be to use the verb cognate to the noun

חורו, in the same person as ישא; actually, this is Humbert's proposal to read חורו instead of חורו. The lesson חורו has no special cogency other than that of a working solution which we shall tentatively accept.

ויאמרו: Having the same subject as the other verbs in the verse, this verb too should be in the plural. The lesson ויאמרו is to be preferred to that of the MT ^[1].

וי דסגרי נכמין דלא דייליה / ווי המרבה לא-לו עד-מתי ומכביר עליו ענקים
 ו/Οὐαὶ ὁ πληθύνων ἑαυτῷ τὰ οὐκ
 ἔντα αὐτοῦ- ἕως τίνος - καὶ βαρύνων τὸν κλοιὸν αὐτοῦ στιβαρῶς
 مَجْمُوعَةٌ مَكْسِيَةٌ لَهُ لَا يَزِيدُ حَتَّىٰ يَظْلِمَ كُلَّ شَيْءٍ حَتَّىٰ يَسْتَنْزِلَ
 vae ei qui multiplicat non sua. Usquequo et aggravat contra se
 densum lutum ? DSSH מתי יכביר עלו ענש .

[1] G, S, DSSH are in the plural. Elliger translates the verse as follows: "Werden sie alle ein Spottlied auf ihn anstimmen und Sprüche machen über ihn, und sagen".

הו' המרנה לא לו ער סת' All the Versions agree with the MT in their rendition of לא-לו, "things that do not belong to him". However, the matter becomes more complicated when one tries to make some sense out of ער-סת'. Here again, all the Versions reflect clearly the fact that ער-סת', whether original or secondary, figures in the Vorlage of every translator. T and S drop the copula of ומכניר, thereby connecting ער-סת' with the b part of the verse. G and V follow the MT .

What is the relevance of an abruptly inserted exclamatory question such as ער-סת', amidst an affirmative verse ? Wellhausen, Nowack and Marti view ער-סת' as a textual gloss. Humbert, who was unhappy with לא-לו to begin with, proposes to reorder all the letters, starting with the scripto continua לאלוערסת' into לאִלון מִדֹּחַ = "to urge taxes". But both are very uncommon words in the language and the emendation proposed by Humbert is highly artificial and difficult to substantiate.

We are still left with the following alternatives:

- 1) include ער-סת' in the b part of the verse^[1]
- 2) discard it as a gloss.

If we glance at the other imprecations in vv. 9, 12, 15 and 19, we see that none of them contains any such intercalated questions as ער-סת' in v.6. All of them are constructed on the pattern of synonymous parallelism. And this same pattern is valid in v. 6 in view of the parallelism between המרנה and מכניר . This would eliminate the first alternative and lead us

[1] Elliger renders the DSSH verse as follows: "Weh dem, der anheuft, was ihm nicht gehört ! Wie lange belastet er sich mit Pfand !"

to accept the second solution of skipping עִמָּתָּי, as a later accretion to the original text.

עָלָי: G has been probably misled by the scripto defectiva עָלָי and read עָלָי=τὸν κλοῖον αὐτοῦ. S and V translate עָלָי as a reflexive, referring to the subject of the verb. But this is obviously a "forced" interpretation. We shall, therefore, translate עָלָי וּמַכְבִּיד = "and he makes heavy upon him (rather than upon himself)...".

עָבַדְתִּי: "A pledge". This a Hapaxlegomenon^[1], from the root עָבַד="be pledged". The Versions have completely missed this word. G has στυβαρῶς="violently". S and V are somewhat similar: حُجْنٌ مُصْنِنٌ="cloud of mourning (?) and 'densum lutum'". T has וְכִנּוּן חֲבִיבִי="the weight of sins". *Handwritten note: S does not have a solution = 4*

The DSSH lesson is עָבַדְתִּי and we see no reason why we should modify the MT. *Handwritten note: T 217 is to be taken as definite and amounts to a satisfactory paraphrase of עָבַדְתִּי* 2.7

וְשָׁכַח אֶת-יְקוֹמוֹ מִתַּעַן הָלוֹא אִנֹּכִי/ὁ ἐξέσθης ἀναστήσονται οὐκ ἀνοντες αὐτόν / *Handwritten: مَنْ عَجَزَ بِمَقْعَدِهِ مَتَحَلِّسٌ* / Numquid non repente consurgens qui mordeant te / DSSH וְיָקוֹמוֹ אִנֹּכִי (הָלוֹא פָּתַח) / *Handwritten: ὁ ἐξεγερθήσονται* for יָקוֹמוֹ.

פָּתַח: DSSH has אִנֹּכִי (פָּתַח) suggesting the stronger variant פָּתַח פָּתַח.

וְשָׁכַח: *the Versions* All/translated this verb literally^[2]. The root שָׁכַח means "to bite", from which is derived the noun שָׁכַח = "interest", "usury". In Deut. 23:20, both the Qal, "one who gives interest", and the Hiphil, "to make one to give interest",

[1] Budde proposes to read: נִכְבֵּד.

[2] Except for T which has "Thy oppressors" for וְשָׁכַח.

occur. Therefore, one may interpret the word as meaning "thy creditors" (So Nowack, Marti, Cannon). But, one could also argue from the point of view of the parallel counterpart מַעֲיָרִים and subscribe to the first meaning of the word, namely: "Those who shall bite you".

ὁἰκνοῦντες αὐτόν : has obviously the wrong personal pronoun. The Waw of וְיִצְרֹא might have caused a haplography, which in turn was understood as a 3rd person pronoun. But the expected meaning of the verse, the parallelism with the b part (even in G)and the evidence of all the Versions show conclusively that αὐτόν is not genuine.

מַעֲיָרִים וְיִצְרֹא / מַעֲיָרִים וְיִצְרֹא / καὶ ἐκνεψουσιν οἱ ἐπίβουλοι σου, et suscitantur lacerantes te.

וְיִצְרֹא : T and V use passive constructions of verbs that approximate the meaning of the MT lesson. G and S are literal.

מַעֲיָרִים : G is interpretative, using ἐπίβουλοι σου "thy plotters". S and T are literal renditions of the MT .

[1]
וְיִצְרֹא / וְיִצְרֹא / καὶ ἔσῃ εἰς διαρπαγὴν αὐτοῖς /
וְיִצְרֹא / et eris in rapinam eis.

וְיִצְרֹא ; A common formula in the OT (4 times).

It occurs 3 times in the early prophets (Jer., Zeph., and Hab)^[2]. Strangely enough, all the Versions use the sing., when translating וְיִצְרֹא, a plural form !

[1] Duhm completes this half verse by borrowing וְיִצְרֹא from v. 8, as follows: (וְיִצְרֹא) וְיִצְרֹא .

[2] One fails to see why, merely 'metri causa', Kittel decides to drop וְיִצְרֹא .

ארי את נחמא עמי'ן סגיאין/כי אתה שלות גוים רבים ישלון כל-יתר עמי'ם
 א'δ'οι σὺ ἐσκυλεύσας ἔθνη πολλὰ, σκυλεύσουσιν σε
 πάντες οἱ ὑπολαλειμμένοι λαοί / **قَدْ عَلَا بِإِسَاءِهَا خَقَقُوا قَهْرًا يَجْرُونَ**
 /Quia spoliasti gentes multas, spoliabunt te omnes
 qui reliqui fuerint de populis.

עמי'ם: As an expression, this is a Hapax !

According to Humbert^[1], **הַר** has two connotations:

- 1) "The rest" (das Uebergebliebene), namely the remnant from among the spoiled peoples.
- 2) "The others" (das Uebrig), namely those peoples who have remained untouched by the event.

It is felt that in Hab. 2:8, meaning N.2 is to be preferred^[2]. We must therefore conclude that G, V, and S misunderstood the MT by translating **כל יתר עמי'ם** as though **הַר** had the meaning we have defined sub N. 1.

מנמי אנשא וחמף ארעא ד־ישראל/סדמי אדם נחם ארץ קריה וכל ישבי בה
 ב'αἵματα ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἀσεβείας γῆς
 καὶ πόλεως καὶ πάντων τῶν κατοικούντων αὐτήν / **مَجَّ بِمَدَارِهَا دَسْمَةً عَنَّا**
 / **يَزْنُو بِمَنْبِيَةِ إِسْرَائِيلَ خَمَفَةً**
 /propter sanguinem hominis, et
 iniquitatem terrae civitatis et omnium habitantium in ea.

This verse occurs once again in 17b. Some commentators (Wellhausen, Marti) think that, in both instances, it has to be considered as a later addition; others (Duhm, Budde) believe that 8b is secondary and merely reproduces 17b, which would be primary.

[1] See, Humbert, *ibid.*, p. 163.

[2] So T, though T uses אֲשֵׁרִים="tribes".

In our opinion, there is no sufficient evidence to believe that **סדס־אדם** refers exclusively to intestine strife and civil bloodshed (which if true, would create a contradiction between 8a and 8b). In this context, it is clear that v.8 b aims to describe the results of an oppression caused by outsiders. Hence, we need not modify the MT .

All the Versions are faithful in their various renditions, except for T which adds two explanatory remarks, **קרמא** after **ארעא** and **ירושלם** after **קרמא**.

Furthermore, S seems to have translated an original **יושבי בה** instead of **יושבי** (and the same is true of verse 17b) . The confusion in either direction is easily understandable.

2.9

הוי קלעווענטוֹן / וי דאנס מסון דרשע לביית־הוי **בצע בצע** רע לבייתו
 κλεονεξῆσαν κακὴν τῇ οἰκῇ αὐτοῦ **בצע בצע** רע לבייתו

Vae qui congregat avaritiam malam domui suae/DSSH **הוי קלעווענטוֹן**

בצע בצע : occurs 6 times in the Bible; but this is the only instance where it is followed by an adjective. Even without an adjective, the expression has by itself a negative connotation and means "unredlichen Gewinn machen". On that basis, and also because it disturbs the meter, Duhm and Marti are ready to strike **רע**. Humbert thinks that **רע** is the result of a dittography of the final syllable of **בצע**, through a confusion of the **צ** and the **ר**.

All the Versions have an equivalent for **רע**; and it is not always easy to decide whether such a rendition goes back

to an independent word such as **רע** in the Hebrew Vorlage, or whether it is merely the result of the intrinsic negative meaning conveyed by the root **נצע**. In view of the lack of evidence to the contrary, we shall keep the MT unchanged^[1].

לנפשו^[2]: S has **לנפשו**="to himself".

לשואה במרום מדורה לאשתונא מיד ביש / לשום במרום קנו להוצל מכף-רע
τοῦ τῶσαι εἰς ὕψος νοσσιῶν αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐκπαθεῖναι ἐκ χειρὸς κακῶν
לשום .. רום קנו לוצל / DSSH **לשום .. רום קנו לוצל**
ש"ם קנו: For the same figure, see Jer. 49:16 and

Num. 24:21, where **קן** means "dwelling-place" (So T with **מדורה**).

לוצל : DSSH has **לוצל** מכף-רע .

G understands it as though it were **מכף-רע**="from the hand of the wicked". S overlooks completely the word **קן**, stating briefly: **לנפשו**.

2.10

מלכתא בהתא לביתך / ἐβουλεύσθω αἰσχύνῃν τὸ οἶκά σου
לנפשו / Gogitasti confusionem domui tuae.

This part of the verse presents no problems.

מלכתא מניאין ועל נפך חטיתא / συνεπέρανες λαοὺς πολλοὺς, καὶ ἐξήμαρτεν ἡ ψυχὴ σου / **לנפשו**
לנפשו / concidisti populos multos et peccavit anima tua / DSSH **לנפשו** רבים

לנפשו: The Infinite Construct is very awkward in this context. The underlying root seems to be **נצה**="to cut off",

[1] Elliger corrects M.Burrows' faulty reading **נצע**, for which he has **נכצע**.

[2] Marti and Nowack try to lengthen this verse by reading, -on the analogy of Amos 3:10, - **וואצר חסם לביתו**. This appears to be an extremely arbitrary proposal lacking absolutely any merit.

"to exterminate".

The form σουεπέρας in G is a hapax. περας, however, is used at least 25/^{times} in G as the equivalent of the roots פצ or פצפ. This guarantees the consonants p and ʕ as genuine (So Humbort). By the same token, it eliminates Duhm's proposal to read פצו or Torrey's emendation פצפ. The only difficulty is this peculiar use of the infinitive construct, where we might expect a finite verb, possibly in the 2nd person, corresponding to פצפ. Such a verb can easily be obtained through a slight alteration of the vowels of the MT lesson, from פצו to פצו. The Versions support this lesson, which we shall prefer to the MT.

מִטְרִי : Merely 'metri causa', Nowack and Marti view this expression as a gloss. Yet, Humbert has statistically established that the expression is typical of prophetic writings (19 times out of 20), and is attested in all the Versions.

נָשָׁא : ἐξήμαρτεν ἡ ψυχὴ σου.

ἐξήμαρτεν ἡ ψυχὴ σου supposes a feminine verbal form in its Hebrew Vorlage, such as נָשָׁא, to agree with נָשָׁא. This fem. form in turn might go back to a mistakenly vocalized 2nd person perfect נָשָׁא. If this were true, all the three verbs in the verse would be finite verbs in the 2nd person mas. sing. [1]

But this emendation which was proposed by Humbert, seems unnecessary, because נָשָׁא as nomen agentis makes perfect sense in the verse: "Thou art (become) a נָשָׁא against thyself".

V is similar to G.

[1] S brings some support to Humbert's proposal, though it uses the Aphel instead of the Qal.

וְכֹנֵן....וְכֹנֵן: The parallelism of the verse would require 2 participles^[1]. As a matter of fact, G, S and T use participial forms when rendering וְכֹנֵן. On this basis, Humbert proposes to read: וְכֹנֵן=ἐκτομῆς, although כֹּנֵן is not attested anywhere else in the O.T.

The DSSH lesson is וְכֹנֵן (imperfect + waw consecutive), a variant which Elliger prefers to the MT lesson.

But this is not the only instance of such a construction. Is. 29:15^[2] has a similar formation הִי הַמַּעֲמִיקִים הִי הַמַּעֲמִיקִים. We shall therefore keep the MT unchanged and translate it as a Perfect + waw conjunctive.

It is also worth noting that Micah 3:10 כֹּנֵן צִיּוֹן is very similar to this verse. Commentators are not at all agreed as to whether the idea is original with Micah or with Habakuk. Wellhausen thinks that Habakuk is here merely paraphrasing Micah. Conversely, Humbert's opinion is that Micah 3:10 is somewhat out of the context of Micah 3:9-12, whose theme is interrupted by the insertion of v. 10.

The problem is hard to solve^[2] and one can bring equally weighty arguments to defend either view.

כֹּנֵן: T uses the sing., adding אֶשֶׁר="spilled".

כֹּנֵן: G and T use the plural; S uses the identical root of the MT.

[1] Cf. vv. 6 and 15, where 2 participles are actually used.

[2] For further examples, see Amos 6:1; Ex. 21:16 and Ges.-Kautzsch 112 n.

[3] Torrey denies to Habakuk vv. 12, 13 & 14, because of the parallels to these verses in Micah 3:10, Jer. 51:58c and Is. 11:9b, respectively.

הא סתן תקיפן וחסינן אחין סן קדם יי צבאות / הלא הנה סאת יהוה צבאות
 οὗ ταῦτα ἐστὶν παρὰ κυρίου παντοκράτορος / **هَلْ هُنَا سَكُنَ**
 Numquid non haec sunt a Domino exercituum ? QSSH הלא הנה סעם
 סתן צבאות .

This half verse interrupts the smooth sequence of the oracle. On that basis, it has been completely discarded as an explanatory gloss (So Duhm and Nowack). But the evidence of the Versions shows clearly that this part of v. 13 figured in the respective Hebrew Vorlage of each Version.

הלא הנה : Occurs only once more in the OT , viz. in 2 Chron. 25.26: הלא הנה כחובים ; but, even in this last instance, the הלא is not unquestionable. 3 MSS, S and V leave it out. Hence, Hab. 2:13 would be the only instance of הלא הנה .

A better reading is indeed furnished by the Versions. G , S and V concur in supporting the vocalization הנה="these". T uses הא סתן תקיפן וחסינן אחין in order to translate הלא הנה ; but this too is obviously based on a plural form in the original, and would therefore favor the vocalization הנה , which we shall prefer to the הנה .

ולאו עמיה תקיפין כאשתא / ויגעו עמים בדי-אש ולאסם בדי-ריק יגעו
 καὶ ἐξέλειπον λαοὶ ἱκανοὶ ἐν πυρὶ , καὶ
 ἔθνη πολλὰ ὀλιγοψύχησαν / **يَذْهَبُ خَفِيفًا ضَعْفًا . هَلْ هُنَا سَكُنَ**
 Laborabunt enim populi in multo igne et gentes in vacuum et deficient.

This verse is in many respects similar to Jer 51:58c ויגעו עמים בדי-ריק ולאסם בדי-אש , which has the inverted order for בדי-אש and בדי-ריק , and a waw before the second verb.

Here again, the problem of dependency is very difficult to solve, though many scholars^[1] think that the verse is original in Habakuk.

וַיֵּן...עָלָה: There is a definite parallelism between the two parts of this verse, עָלָה corresponding to וַיֵּן, and בְּרִי-אֵשׁ to בְּרִי-יָקִין. Therefore עָלָה corresponds to וַיֵּן and since עָלָה is in the Imperfect, the waw of וַיֵּן is a waw conjunctive. Hence, both verbs refer to actions in the future (so V and S) and could even be rendered with Jussives. Strangely enough, G understands both verbs as referring to actions in the past. T is clear only with regard to the second verb; it uses a noun (לֵאנִת) instead of the first verb. V has 'et deficient' which seems as carry over from the וַיֵּן of Jer 51:58c.

בְּרִי-אֵשׁ...בְּרִי-יָקִין: This construction with בְּרִי is not frequent. Other instances are found in Job 39:25 בְּרִי-שׁוֹפָר = "in the abundance of the trumpet", i.e. "as often as the trumpet sounds", and in Nahum 2:13 בְּרִי-נִגְתִּי = "for the need of his whelps".

The Versions have rendered בְּרִי in various ways. G uses ἵνα for the first one (and for Nahum 2:13), and πολλὰ for the second one. V has "multo" for the first and nothing for the second. S and T skip it both times^[2].

If this shows anything, it certainly establishes the fact that the translators either had trouble with these particles,

[1] So Nowack, Cannon, Humbert.

[2] Instead, they used simple prepositions such as בְּ and לְ.

or did not consider them as particularly important and left them out. Probably at that time $\text{כִּי} = \text{כִּי}$.

Lexicographically, כִּי is composed of י which expresses the idea of "enough", "sufficient" and of a כִּי preti. The compound כִּי would then mean: "for the sufficiency of", or simply "for". Here are some of the modern renditions of this verse:

Nowack: Sodass die Völker arbeiten für das Feuer und die Nationen sich mühen für nichts.

Duhm: Dass Völker fürs Feuer sich quälen, umsonst Nationen sich abmühen.

Elliger: Es plagen sich Völker fürs Feuer, und Nationen mühen sich für nichts.

Humbert: Que les peuples se mettent à l'œuvre pour incendier et que les nations prennent peine pour anéantir.

2.14

אֲרִי חֲתָמִי אֶרְעָא / כִּי מִלֵּא הָאָרֶץ לְדַעַת אֵחָ כְּבוֹד יְהוָה כְּמִים יִכְסּוּ עַל-יָם
 ὅτι πλησθήσεται ἡ γῆ τοῦ / לִמִּדַע יְיָ דַחֲלָא דִּי כְמִיָּא דִּי לִימָא תִּפְן
 γῆναι τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, ὡς ὕδωρ κατακαλύψει αὐτοὺς قَدْ
 بِإِجْلَالِ زِينَةِ حَقِّهِ بِقِيَمِهِ بِ / Quia replebitur
 terra, ut cognosceant gloriam Domini, quasi aquae operientes mare.

This verse shows striking analogies with Is. 11:9b, $\text{כִּי מִלֵּא הָאָרֶץ דַּעַת אֵחָ כְּבוֹד יְהוָה כְּמִים יִכְסּוּ עַל-יָם}$. In fact, some variations aside, it is identical with it. Simply on that basis, some commentators are ready to deny it to Habakuk, as a gloss borrowed from Isaiah.

As far as the Versions are concerned, G presents obviously a corrupt text, in the latter part of the verse, $\text{ὡς ὕδωρ κατακαλύψει αὐτοὺς}$ for $\text{כְּמִים יִכְסּוּ עַל-יָם}$. T, S, V and

DSSH confirm the MT lesson מִי־לֵךְ, which is further found in Is. 9:11 ὅς ὕμῶν πολλὸν κατακαλύψει θαλάσσης.

The evidence of the Versions alone does not allow us to follow the general opinion^[1] that 2:14 is a gloss. The various translations are as faithful as one usually expects them to be. They all seem to go back to a solidly established Hebrew Vorlage, which, of course, might have been itself tempered with at an earlier time. To establish this would require further analysis and additional data which would take us beyond the immediate scope of this paper.

2.15

וְיָדָעְתָּ לְחֶבְרֹה/הוּא מִשְׁקָה רֵעֵהוּ
وَيَدْعُكُمْ خَمْرًا / Vae qui potum dat amico suo. DSSH הוּא מִשְׁקָה רֵעֵהוּ

וְיָדָעְתָּ: Has been understood by all Versions as "his friend", "his neighbor". If that were so, one wonders why the last word in this verse, namely מְיֻרִים = "their מְיֻרִים has a plural personal suffix. T and V were conscious of the difficulty, since both have disregarded this plural suffix of the Hebrew noun and used instead a singular suffix, viz. קְלִינִי and 'muditatem ejus'. G and S were more faithful to the MT by keeping the plural number and perpetuating the difficulty.

Are both nouns to have plural suffixes or is the singular to be preferred? The former alternative seems more probable in view of the fact that וְיָדָעְתָּ can always be understood as a defective spelling^[2] for וְיָדָעְתָּ.

[1] Marti sees in this verse a combination of Is. 11:9b and Is. 6:3. Duhm and Torrey believe that this is a quotation from Isaiah, introduced here under the influence of the formula in v.13a הֲלֹא הִנֵּה מֵאָה יְיָ צְבָאוֹת. For Humbert, v.14

Interestingly enough, the DSSH lesson is precisely מִשְׁקָה רַעֲיָהוּ, with a yod clearly stated.

מִשְׁקָה רַעֲיָהוּ /ἀνατροπή θολερός /mittens fel suum/
 DSSH מִשְׁקָה רַעֲיָהוּ (אַ. ἐξ ἐπιρρίψεως χόλου σου; Σὺ. καὶ ἀφ' ὧν ἀκρίτως
 τὸν θυμὸν ἑαυτοῦ; Θ. ἀπὸ χυσεῶς σου.

מִשְׁקָה: The 2nd person pronominal suffix which is found in Aq. and in Th. is questionable. G, S and T have no traces of any suffix whatever; V and Sy. have a 3rd person suffix. The meaning of the sentence would call for a 3rd person suffix. Torrey, Nowack and Humbert have proposed the lesson מִשְׁקָה, which is now confirmed by the DSSH text, which also has מִשְׁקָה. We shall therefore prefer this reading to that of the MT and emend accordingly.

מִשְׁקָה: The meaning of this word is obscure. In the MT, it appears as a Piel participle, from the root מִשְׁקָה="join". If we turn to the Versions, we observe that G, S and Aq. render it with a substantive, while T, Sy., and V use a verb. The problem is then: how reliable is the MT lesson with its Piel participle?

With regard to the meaning of the word, that some confusion is likewise reflected in the Versions, seems very indicative of "guesses" the Versions take whenever they are faced with an obscure text. S has "filth"; V has "sending"; T has "spreading"; G has "overthrown"; etc.

est évidemment secondaire: c'est une glose tirée d'Esaië 11:9b, car ce verset est sans pertinence organique quelconque dans Hab. 2:14.

[2] See Ges.-Kautzsch, 91 k. Elliger's translation of DSSH is "Weh dem, der seine Nächsten trinken lässt."

Since we cannot expect any help from the Versions, we shall turn to modern commentators for some clarification. Disregarding all fancy explanations, we think that Wellhausen's proposal deserves our attention^[1]. Wellhausen believes that the π of $\pi\pi\pi\pi$ is a dittography of the π of $\pi\pi\pi$. So, he proposes to read $\pi\pi\pi\pi$ ="from the cup of his (anger) passion.

A seemingly conservative proposal is Humbert's idea of changing the vocalization of the word as follows: $\pi\pi\pi\pi$ = "a pouring of his wrath", with $\pi\pi\pi$ (a word Humbert creates) from the root $\pi\pi$ ="to pour", for which he claims some support from Is. 5:7 ($\pi\pi\pi$).

For all practical purposes, Wellhausen's theory seems to carry more weight^[2] and we shall accept it, pending further evidence to the contrary.

וא/בריל יישתי ויתרוי קלוי/א ואף שפר למען הבים על-סעוריהם
 $\mu\epsilon\theta\upsilon\sigma\alpha\omega\nu$, $\delta\pi\alpha\sigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\beta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\pi\eta\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\ \sigma\pi\acute{\eta}\lambda\alpha\iota\alpha\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ $\pi\pi\pi\pi$

/et inebrians ut aspiciat nuditatem ejus/DSSH אף שפר למען חכס

אל מועריהם.

$\pi\pi\pi$: A Rigid Infinitive, corresponding to the Ablative of the Gerund in Latin^[3]. T adds $\pi\pi\pi$, not found in the MT.

$\pi\pi\pi$: The DSSH has instead the Rigid Infinitive.

על-סעוריהם: This is a Hapax. The DSSH lesson

$\pi\pi\pi$ ="their festivals" is highly improbable in this context^[4].

[1] Marti subscribes to Wellhausen's view.

[2] Compare with the expression $\pi\pi\pi$ "goblet of reeling" in Zech. 12:2.

[3] See Ges.-Kautzsch 113 h.

[4] See Elliger, *ibid.*, p. 56: "Ursprünglich ist diese Lesart nicht, da sie anders als MT im Zusammenhang keinen Sinn gibt".

G uses σπῆλαια="pudenda muliebria"; Aq. comes closer to the MT with γύμνωσιν="exposure". [1]

2.16

רַבּוֹתַי בְּחַטֹּאתַי וְעַתָּה בְּחַטֹּאתַי וְעַתָּה בְּחַטֹּאתַי / Replotus es ignominia pro gloria.

רַבּוֹתַי: A verbal form in the MT, and rendered as such in all the Versions, except G which has πλησμονήν, a noun, to be understood as the object of πίε !

The MT construction is perfectly smooth and no changes are to be envisaged simply on the basis of G .

וְעַתָּה בְּחַטֹּאתַי וְעַתָּה בְּחַטֹּאתַי / πίε καὶ σὺ καὶ διασάλευσθαι καὶ σεΐσθαι. / וְעַתָּה בְּחַטֹּאתַי / bibe tu quoque et conspire / DSSH וְעַתָּה בְּחַטֹּאתַי / O. -- καρδιά σαλεύσθαι καὶ σεΐσθαι.

וְעַתָּה: "be circumcised", or probably: "display the fact of thy circumcision" !

Except T, none of the Versions confirms this lesson. Instead, they all convey the idea of "be shaken", "stagger"[2]. This, of course, would imply an original וְעַתָּה, rather than וְעַתָּה which, in the Niphal, is a Hapax. On the other hand, the expressions וְעַתָּה, וְעַתָּה occur in various parts of the Bible.

[1] For a cognate example of this root, cf. Ar. عورت.

[2] G displays a 'doublet' in διασάλευσθαι καὶ σεΐσθαι, which has led Duhm to restore the MT as follows וְעַתָּה וְעַתָּה. But this is an unnecessary burdening of the verse. The MT does not call for such a heavy repetition, which is obviously secondary, even in G. Some manuscripts of G read: καρδιά σαλεύσθαι καὶ σεΐσθαι. Probably rightly, Humbert conjectures the following development for the G. Originally G read καὶ διασάλευσθαι = וְעַתָּה. Then, καὶ and δια formed καρδιά, and so the verse read καρδιά σαλεύσθαι καὶ διασάλευσθαι. At this stage, it became necessary to differentiate between these 2 verbs of identical etymology, and so emerged the final form καρδιά σαλεύσθαι καὶ σεΐσθαι.

On the basis of this evidence, modern commentators have long abandoned the MT lesson and have accepted instead the proposed וְהָרַעַל, which found recent confirmation in the DSSH lesson.

ἐκκαύσας / יִפְתָּח עַל כֵּס וְלֹנֶס מִן קֶרֶם / תִּפְּסֹב עֲלֶיךָ כּוֹס יִמִּין יְהוָה
 ἐπι καύσας / תִּפְּסֹב חֶסֶד יְמִינִי וְיָבִיטָהּ / οὐκ ἐστι καύσας / תִּפְּסֹב חֶסֶד יְמִינִי וְיָבִיטָהּ / οὐκ ἐστι καύσας
 circumdabit te calix dexteræ Domini.

תִּפְּסֹב: According to Joüon^[1], the Imperfect of פִּסַּב with metathesis of the germination has a reflexive meaning. The other imperfect of the תִּפְּסֹב form is used in the active transitive sense.

This reflexive meaning of the MT verb was clearly understood and rendered by the T, by means of the Hithp'el. G's Aorist changes the intent of the Hebrew text. S and V are better, since they purport the action about to happen as a result of the imperative שִׁתָּה.

μαῖ σὺν ἡτῶν ἀτιμὰ ἐπὶ τῇ
 οὐκ ἐστὶ σου / וְיִפְתָּח עַל כֵּס וְלֹנֶס מִן קֶרֶם / וְיִפְתָּח עַל כֵּס וְלֹנֶס מִן קֶרֶם / וְיִפְתָּח עַל כֵּס וְלֹנֶס מִן קֶרֶם
 et vomitus ignominiae super gloriam tuam.

וְיִפְתָּח: is a Hapax, from the root פִּל="curse".

It is possible that this was originally וְיִפְתָּח and that subsequently וְיִפְתָּח emerged as a result of a dittography of פּ, followed by a differentiation between Yod and Waw. At any rate, the DSSH reading וְיִפְתָּח confirms the antiquity of the MT.

Somehow, the Versions have felt the necessity of adding a verb to this part of the verse. G has, ^{σὺν ἡτῶν} T has וְיִפְתָּח, for which the MT has no equivalent. Similarly, V's ^{V found קִי, דִּבְרֵי} 'vomitus' in the expression 'vomitus ignominiae' is superfluous.

[1] See Paul Joüon, Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique, 82 h.

S alone reflects perfectly the MT , on which we shall bring nochanges^[1].

2.17

אִי־בָנוּס מַלְאָכָא חֲסִידָא בֵּית מִקְדָּשָׁא יִחְפֹּן/כִּי חָסִיד לִבְנוּן יִכְסֹךְ
 Αἰβάνου καλῦψε: σε **מַלְאָכָא יִחְפֹּן בְּחֶסֶד יִחְפֹּן** via iniquitas
 Libani operiet te.

לבנון: Torrey has questioned the authenticity of this word. Instead, he would read לֵוִיָּתָן "Leviathan". To quote him: "The 'violence' wrought upon Leviathan (Tiamat) and Behemoth is more familiar to us in the Babylonian literature than in Hebrew mythology".

וְכָל־מַלְאָכָא חֲסִידָא בֵּית מִקְדָּשָׁא יִחְפֹּן/וְכָל־מַלְאָכָא חֲסִידָא בֵּית מִקְדָּשָׁא יִחְפֹּן
וְכָל־מַלְאָכָא חֲסִידָא בֵּית מִקְדָּשָׁא יִחְפֹּן /et vastitas animalium deterrebit eos.

יחיתן: The nun is a feminine plural suffix, intending to have בָּנוּס as antecedent. Actually, in order to correspond to כִּסְךְ, the parallelism of the verse requires the lesson יִחְפֹּן, from the root חִתַּח="terrify" + a second person singular pronominal suffix. The evidence of the Versions, especially of G , S and, to a certain extent, of T , supports this slight modification. V, however, follows the MT closely, and has 'deterrebit eos'.

It is worth noting that T has עַמִּי "peoples", instead of בָּנוּס.

בָּנוּס אִי־בָנוּס מַלְאָכָא חֲסִידָא בֵּית מִקְדָּשָׁא יִחְפֹּן/כִּי חָסִיד לִבְנוּן יִכְסֹךְ : Cf. above, v. 2:8b, with which this verse is identical.

[1] Budde would rather read: יִקְוִי קִלְיוֹן = συνηχεῖ ἀριψία.

מא אהני צלמא ארי אתכיה/מה הועיל פמל כי פסלו יצרו סמכה ומורה שקר
 שר / τι ὄφρα εἴ γλυπτὸν, ὅτι ἐγλυψαν αὐτό; ἔπλασαν
 αὐτὸ δὲ χῶνευμα, παντράσαν ψευδοῦς. **פסלו יצרו סמכה ומורה שקר**
פסלו יצרו סמכה ומורה שקר / Quid prodest sculpsit, quia sculpsit illud
 factor suus, conflatile et imaginem falsam ?

פסלו: G has the verb in the plural, probably on account of a faulty vocalization of the Hebrew as **פסלו**. That the sing. is to be preferred (so all the Versions), is well shown by G itself in v. 18c, where the verb is in the sing. Besides, some G manuscripts [1] actually supply the sing. lesson.

ומורה: The Versions are in complete disagreement as to the rendition of this word:

T has **דחלת** which would assume a root **דחל** or a nominal form such as **דחלה**.

G has **παντράσια** which would assume a root **ראה** or a nominal form such as **מראה**.

S keeps in line with the root of the MT, using **דחלת** = "doctrine".

V follows G, with the expression 'imaginem falsam'.

While neither **מראה שר** nor **מורה שר** occur in the Bible, **מורה שר** is attested at least once more in Is. 9:14 [2]. But this, by and of itself, does not guarantee the correctness of the lesson in Hab. 2:18.

In this case, the Versions are of no help to us; all we can do is keep the MT reading for what it is worth !

[1] See J. Ziegler, Septuaginta, p. 267.

[2] Dr. S. Blank considers the whole verse of Is. 9:14 as a gloss.

ארי אתרחין לבא דעבדיה/כי במח יצר יצרו עליו לעשות אלילים אלמים
 ו/επειθεν δ πλασας επί το
 πλασμα αὐτοῦ τοῦ ποιῆσαι εἰδωλα ~~ממנה~~ /~~וְיַצְרָהּ כְּצֶלְמָהּ~~
 /quia speravit in figmento fictor ejus, ut
 faceret simulachra muta. DSSH כיא במח יצרו יצרו עליהו לעשות
 אלילים אלמים

T uses an Ithp'el + לבא. כי במח

S " " Ethp'el + ~~וְיַצְרָהּ~~, but neither of

the two has two distinct words from a cognate root, to cor-
 respond to יצר יצרו, as is the case in G's εἰδωλα ἐπὶ το
 πλασμα, or in V's 'figmento fictor'. How then can we account
 for this additional word לבא in T and in S ? The most
 likely explanation would be to use the Talmudic saying: בכל
 יצר בשני יצרי, which obviously equates לב with יצר; in this
 respect S must have imitated T.

Therefore, all we can say is that the Massoretic
 יצר יצרו, is supported by all the Versions. Of course, this
 does not exclude the possibility of a wrong vocalization in our
 present Hebrew text^[1]. It is possible that יצרו should be
 read יצרו. It is further possible that if we read יצרו, the
 first form יצר becomes unnecessary. Or that even originally
 the reading was יצר יצר and it was later changed to יצר יצרו.
 But, in order to go ahead with any such changes, further data
 would be necessary to support every step we would have to take.
 At this stage, to improve on the text coûte que coûte is not
 our purpose.

T deviates slightly from the MT : אלילים אלמים

[1] Torrey, Nowack, Marti and Humbert vocalize יצרו as יצרו and consider יצר as a dittography.

by translating this expression as כִּי לֹא צִיּוֹן צָרָה, "idols for which there is no need". No conclusions to draw.

2.19

וְיָ דִּי אַמֵּר לְצִלָּם אַעֲזָא קֻם וּלְדַחֲלֵה/חֲזִי אַמֵּר לְעֵץ הַקִּיצָה עוּרִי לֵאבֹן דְּנוֹם/
 אַמֵּר לְצִלָּם אַעֲזָא קֻם וּלְדַחֲלֵה/חֲזִי אַמֵּר לְעֵץ הַקִּיצָה עוּרִי לֵאבֹן דְּנוֹם/
 אַמֵּר לְצִלָּם אַעֲזָא קֻם וּלְדַחֲלֵה/חֲזִי אַמֵּר לְעֵץ הַקִּיצָה עוּרִי לֵאבֹן דְּנוֹם/
 אַמֵּר לְצִלָּם אַעֲזָא קֻם וּלְדַחֲלֵה/חֲזִי אַמֵּר לְעֵץ הַקִּיצָה עוּרִי לֵאבֹן דְּנוֹם/
 Vae qui dicit ligno expergiscere; surge, lapidi tacenti

לְעֵץ: T adds צִלָּם and reads אַעֲזָא.

הַקִּיצָה: G has two verbs to express this action, viz. ἔξαναψον ἔξεγέρθητι.

לֵאבֹן דְּנוֹם: S and V render the MT faithfully.

T conveys the idea, but deviates slightly in its mode of translation (וְהָיָה שְׂתָקָה); G has ἐψάθητι, which obviously goes back to a form דְּנוֹם rather than to דְּנוֹם. The Hebrew lesson, however, makes better sense.

וְיָ דִּי אַמֵּר לְצִלָּם אַעֲזָא קֻם וּלְדַחֲלֵה/חֲזִי אַמֵּר לְעֵץ הַקִּיצָה עוּרִי לֵאבֹן דְּנוֹם/
 וְיָ דִּי אַמֵּר לְצִלָּם אַעֲזָא קֻם וּלְדַחֲלֵה/חֲזִי אַמֵּר לְעֵץ הַקִּיצָה עוּרִי לֵאבֹן דְּנוֹם/
 וְיָ דִּי אַמֵּר לְצִלָּם אַעֲזָא קֻם וּלְדַחֲלֵה/חֲזִי אַמֵּר לְעֵץ הַקִּיצָה עוּרִי לֵאבֹן דְּנוֹם/
 וְיָ דִּי אַמֵּר לְצִלָּם אַעֲזָא קֻם וּלְדַחֲלֵה/חֲזִי אַמֵּר לְעֵץ הַקִּיצָה עוּרִי לֵאבֹן דְּנוֹם/
 ipse docere poterit ?

One wonders whether these two words are not misplaced here. None of the Versions could make any sense out of them. From G's παντασφα (see v. 18), one would think that there is some kind of a relationship between the מוֹרָה of v. 18 and this מוֹרָה. But this alone is absolutely insufficient to see the problem through.

Its position at the end of the verse is very awkward, though some sense can be made out of it. RSV renders it: "Can this give revelation (?)".

הא הוא מחפ'י דהב וכסף/ הנה הוא תפוש זהב וכסף וכל רוח א'ן בקרב
 ו' במעוה' / τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶν ἔλασμα χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργυροῦ
 καὶ πᾶν πνεῦμα οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ / **סִיחָא מִיַּעֲבָר. סִיחָא חֶסֶד. סִיחָא חֶסֶד.**
 Ecce iste coopertus est auro et argento; et omnis spiritus non est
 in visceribus ejus.

תפוש: From the root תפס="to hold". The construction
 here is similar to that of **זאח**="overlaid"^[1].

זאח וכסף: S translates זאח only and leaves out
 כסף.

זאח: is in the singular; T has **זאח** which is
 in the plural and has a slightly different meaning. Apparently,
 V's lesson 'in visceribus ejus' is nothing else but a
 slavish imitation of T [2].

2.

ו' אתרע' לאצאה שכנת'ה בחיכלא/ ו'יהוה בהיכל קדשו הם מפניו כל הארץ
 ו' δὲ κύριος ἐν ναῷ ἁγίῳ
 αὐτοῦ. εὐλαβεῖσθαι ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ / **סִיחָא חֶסֶד. סִיחָא חֶסֶד.**

סִיחָא חֶסֶד. סִיחָא חֶסֶד. / Dominus autem in templo sancto suo:
 sileat a facie ejus omnis terra.

ו'יהוה בהיכל קדשו: T avoids the anthropomorphic
 expression by the usual passive construction, plus the concept
 of **זאח** replacing that of God in his actual dwelling among men,
 amidst an earthly temple. The expression **זאח** is not
 uncommon in the OT (8 times).

[1] See Est. 1:6 **אחוז באחלי בון וארסון**.

[2] Duhm has a whole series of very imaginative corrections on
 the MT to v.19. He would read **חֶסֶד** for **חֶסֶד**, or **חֶסֶד** for
חֶסֶד or **חֶסֶד** for **חֶסֶד**. These and other such improve-
 ments may be welcome in a course on Hebrew prose composition.
 But when they are imposed on a text which has its own tradition,
 they become utterly objectionable.

הם: "hush", "keep silence"[1]. G has "honor",
"revere"; S has "tremble". T deviates more from the Hebrew
and indulges in a full paraphrase: ויטפון מן קדמוהי כל
ידחלת ארעא, "let all the idols of the earth be consumed before
him".

[1] For parallels to this phrase, see Zech. 2:17 הם כל בשר יהוה
and Zeph. 1:7 הם ספני ארני יהוה. According to
many scholars this is a cultic formula intended here to
introduce the Tefilla in Chapter 3.

C O N C L U S I O N S

We shall now list and evaluate the major results of our discussions in order to express an over-all judgment covering Chapters I and II of the Book of Habakuk.

DIFFICULT OR CORRUPT PASSAGES

a) In the Hebrew text:

- 1:3 ישא.
- 1:7 יבאו, ופעו פשריו ופרשיו, זאבי-ערב.
- 1:11 ואשם, רוח.
- 1:15 בחכה העלה.
- 2.5 כי-היין.
- 2.6 חידות.
- 2.13 ברי.
- 2.15 רעהו.
- 2.16 קיקלון, והערל.
- 2.17 יחיתן.

b) In the Greek text:

- 1:3 The end of the verse is corrupt.
- 1:7 Confusion of the root ירא and ראה.
- 1:14 Wrong verbal tense.
- 1:15 Not consistent in the usage of terms for fishing.
- 2.6 עליו understood-עליו.
- 2.7 3rd person instead of the 2nd person.
- 2.8 יתר mistranslated.
- 2.14 End of the verse is mistranslated.
- 2.15 The pronominal suffix of חמה has been left out.

- 2.16 Corrupt Greek text which in turn resulted in the addition of extra words not found in the MT .
- 2.18 פטלו is misvocalized.
- 2.18 סורה understood as if from the root ראה .
- 2.19 דומם understood as רומם .
- 2.19 יורה same as in 2.18.

c) In the Targum : 1] Avoiding anthropomorphisms.

- 1:2 By means of a Passive construction (twice).
- 1.13 פתור עינים rendered as בריר סמך מלמחזי . S. is not all troubled by the same problem.
- 1.13 הלא גלי קדטן rendered as לא תוכל .
- 2.2 By means of the passive אחותכית .
- 2.20 יהוה rendered as שכינה .

2] Paraphrases.

Minor paraphrases are to be found in 1:11; 15; 2.2; 8; 18; 20.

2:18 evidences a misunderstanding in the rendition of דחלח for סורה .

d) In the Syriac text:

- 1:8 יבאו is missing.
- 1.12 Strange form, לא נמות for דלא נמוס אנה .
- 1.12 Leaves out יהוה and וצור .
- 1.12 Confusion of suffixes in שמתו and יסדתו .
- 2.8 Has יושבי נח instead of יושביה .
- 2.19 Leaves out כסף .

e) Latin text:

- 1:11 V's rendition of שם is unintelligible.
- 2.16 קילון misunderstood as קיא קלון ="vomitus ignominiae"

Places where V and G show parallel developments:

- 1:1 Onus and $\lambda\eta\mu\alpha$
 1:2 Vim pations and $\alpha\lambda\kappa\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ (participle instead of noun).
 1:6 Tabernacula and $\sigma\kappa\eta\nu\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$.
 1:14 V follows G's wrong verbal tense.
 2.8 V and G mistranslate יתר.
 2.18 V and G confuse the verbal roots of ירה/ראח.

Places where V does not follow G :

- 1:5 V follows the MT lesson בנדים rather than G בנוים's.
 1.12 V " " " " וצור " " " יצרני.
 2.4 V " " " " באמנות " " " באמנותי.
 2.6 V " " " " ויאמר " " " ויאמרו
 2.6 V " " " " עליו " " " עליו
 2.19 V " " " " דומם " " " דומם

EMENDATIONS BASED ON THE VERSIONS

- 1.1 חֲבִיקָה, G .
 1.8 leave out second פִּרְשִׁיו, G, S .
 1.8 leave out יִבְאוּ, S, DSSH .
 1.8 alternate reading מוֹשְׁרִים instead of מוֹמְרִים.
 1.11 וִישָׁם, DSSH .
 1.13 leave out מִמֶּנּוּ, G, S .
 1.14 לִמְשָׁל, DSSH .
 1.17 חֲמִיר with no waw, T, S, DSSH .
 1.17 חֲרִבוּ, DSSH .
 2.1 מִצּוּרִי, T, S, DSSH .
 2.1 אֲשִׁיב, T, S .

- 2.16 וִיאָסְרוּ , G , S , DSSH .
 2.13 vocalize הִנֵּה , G , S , V .
 2.15 תַּחֲמוֹ , DSSH , V .
 2.16 חָרַעַל , G , S , DSSH .
 2.17 יַחֲחֵךְ , G , S , T .
 2.18 S alone preserved the root of the MT מִוְרָה lesson.

TREATMENT OF HAPAXLEGOMENA

- 1.4 מַעֲקַל offered no difficulty to the Versions.
 1.10 מַשְׁחָק " " " " " "
 1.9 טִנֵּס the Versions have either indulged in guesses or ignored the word completely.
 2.6 עֲבָטִים the Versions missed completely this word.
 2.11 כִּפִּים various renditions, reflecting 'happy' guesses.
 2.15 מַעֲוִיָּהּ The Versions had no difficulty in identifying this word.
 2.16 קִיקְלוֹן , except V , none of Versions has been misled by this hapaxlegomenon.

PLACES WHERE T AND S SHOW PARALLEL DEVELOPMENTS

- 1:2 Both have חֲסוּפִין , a plural form instead of the MT חָסֵם .
 1.5 Both add לִכֵּן at the end of the verse.
 1.6 Both depart slightly from the MT . Each one renders but one of the two adjectives of the MT .
 1.6 Both use the identical words פָּחַי אֶרְעָא .
 1.8 For זֶאבִי-עָרֵב , both have דִּמְשָׁא .
 1.11 Both use the identical verb חֹבֵב for וַאֲשֵׁם .

- 1.12 Both render **מקרים** with **ראשית**.
- 2.1 Both have the first person pronominal suffix with **וצור** .
- 2.1 Both have **אצלו** in the first person, while MT has the 3rd person.
- 2.4 Both have **באמנותו** in the 3rd person.
- 2.7 For **מועיל** both use the same root as the MT .
- 2.13 Both leave out the **בני** MT .
- 2.15 Both render **חסתו** with a noun that has no personal pronominal suffix.
- 2.18 Both render **יצרו** as **לבא** .

PLACES WHERE S AND G SHOW PARALLEL DEVELOPMENTS

- 1.3 Both read **נין** for the MT **מרון**.
- 1.5 Both have **בגדים** instead of MT **בגדים**.
- 1.8 Both leave out the second **פרשיו**.
- 2.6 Both have **ויאמר**, in the sing.
- 2.8 Both mistranslate **יתר**.

PLACES WHERE V AND T SHOW PARALLEL DEVELOPMENTS

- 2.1 Both have a series of unnecessary passive constructions, as if the MT read **מה-יגבר-בי**.
- 2.19 V is very similar to T in translating the MT **בקרבנו** with 'in visceribus ejus' (T has **במעוה**).

GENERAL EVALUATION

Looking back at the various categories we have been able to group together, we become aware of the "living" nature of the Ancient Versions. They all had to face similar textual problems and to solve them by analogous methods. If the Hebrew text was not clear to them, they either attempted to make guesses, or managed to perpetuate an obscure rendition by using another obscure word. Hapaxlegomenon for hapaxlegomenon (as in G to 2:11) is another way of saying: "We do not know what the word means".

We also notice "parallel" developments between the various Versions. We specifically use the word "parallel" in order to avoid any commitment that a more precise terminology would involve us into. When two Versions show "parallel" developments, at least three causes can be adduced to explain the facts:

- 1) The one is slavishly imitating the other.
- 2) Both worked independently; however, if they arrived at "parallel" results, this is merely due to the fact that both worked on the same Hebrew Vorlage, which being different from our MT, made us believe that Version A must have consulted or even imitated Version B.
- 3) The "parallel" results are simply accidental.

Therefore, in order to clarify with some degree of assurance what the term "parallel" means in every instance we have used it and to establish with enough certainty whether

meaning 1) or meaning 2) or even meaning 3) is intended, further investigation would be imperative.

Those remarks are especially true in the case of the relationship between S and T . It would be unwise, on the basis of this limited area of two chapters, to draw the conclusion that there is dependency of S on T , though our list contains many traits that could easily induce us to such a conclusion.

A final word about the DSSH . Going through the list of proposed emendations on page 80, we become convinced of the fact that the Dead Sea Scroll Habakuk Commentary has preserved in many places a text whose readings are in full accord with the readings we would have to introduce into the MT , on the basis of the Ancient Versions and of other critical evidence. Some of them were long postulated by scholars, as possible emendations and now the DSSH is merely confirming these conjectures of the past. Only 3 of our emendations were made solely on the basis of the DSSH evidence.

In terms of generalizing our conclusions, or of stating whether Version A is superior to Version B with regard to Chapters I and II of the Book of Habakuk, all we can do is refer the reader to the various lists we have established, and have him decide 'subjectively' in each case.

- | | | |
|----|--|---------------------------------------|
| 1 | המשא אשר חזח חֲפָקוֹק הַנְּבִיא | ולא תשמע |
| 2 | עֲד־אִנָּה יְהוֹה שׁוֹעֲתִי | ולא תושיע |
| 3 | לִמָּה תִרְאֵנִי אוֹן | ועמל תביס |
| | וְשֶׁד וְהִמָּס לִנְגְדִי | וִיְהִי רִיב נִמְדוֹן אֶשָּׂא |
| 4 | עַל־כֵּן תִּפּוֹג תּוֹרָה | ולא יצא לנצח משפט |
| | כִּי רָשָׁע מִבְּחִיר אֶת הַצְדִּיק | עַל־כֵּן יֵצֵא מִשְׁפָּט מִעֶקֶל |
| 5 | רְאוּ בְּגוֹיִם וְהִנֵּיטוּ
(בְּגוֹיִם) | הַתִּמְהוּ וְהִתְמַהוּ |
| | כִּי פֶעַל פֶּעַל בִּימִיכָם | לֹא תִאֱמִינוּ כִּי יִמְכַר |
| 6 | כִּי־הִנֵּנִי מְקִים אֶת הַכְּשָׁדִים | הַגּוֹי הַמֵּר וְהַנִּמְחָר |
| | הַהוֹלֵךְ לִמְרַחֲבֵי־אָרֶץ | לִרְשֵׁת מִשְׁכְּנוֹת לֹא־לוֹ |
| 7 | אִים וְנֹרָא הוּא | מִמֶּנּוּ מִשְׁפָּטוֹ וְשִׂאתוֹ יֵצֵא |
| 8 | וּקְלוֹ מִנִּמְרִים סוֹסִיו
(מִנְשָׁרִים) | וְחָדוּ מִזֹּאבֵי עֲרֶב (or עֲרֵבוֹת) |
| | וּפְשׁוֹ פִּרְשׁוֹ מִרְחוֹק | יַעֲפוּ כְּנֶשֶׁר חֹשׁ לֹאכֵל |
| 9 | כֹּלָה לַחֲמָס יָבוֹא | מִגִּמְתָּ פְּנֵיהֶם קְדִימָה |
| | וְיִאֲסֹף כַּחֲלוֹל שְׂבִי | |
| 10 | וְהוּא בְּמַלְכִים יִתְקַלֵּם | וּרְוִזִּים מִשְׁחָק לוֹ |
| | הוּא לְכֹל־מִבְצָר יִשְׁחָק | וְיִצְבֵּר עֶפֶר וְיִלְכַּדָּה |
| 11 | אִז חֲלָף מְרוֹחַ וַיַּעֲבֵר | וַיִּשָּׂם זֶו כַּחוֹ לֹאֲלַחֲו |
| 12 | חִלּוֹא אַחַת מִקִּדְמָם יְהוֹה | אֱלֹהֵי קִדְשֵׁי לֹא נִמּוֹת |
| | יְהוֹה לַמִּשְׁפָּט שִׁמְחוֹ | וְצוֹר לְהוֹכִיחַ יִסְדָּחוּ |
| 13 | סָהוּר עֵינַיִם מִרְאוֹת רַע | וְחַיִּים אֶל־עֵמֶל לֹא חוֹכֵל |
| | לִמָּה תִבִּים (בְּכַגֵּד) בּוֹגְדִים | תַּחֲרִישׁ בְּבִלַע רָשָׁע צִדִּיק |

- 14 וְחֶעֱשָׂה אָדָם כְּדֹגֵי הַיָּם
(וַיַּעֲשֶׂה)
- 15 כֹּלֶת יִגְרֹהוּ בַהֲרָמוֹ
- 16 עַל-כֵּן יִזְבַּח לַחֲרָמוֹ
- כִּי בַחֲמַת שָׁמַן חֲלָקוֹ
- 17 עַל כֵּן יִרִיק חֲרָבוֹ תַּחֲדֵי
- כֶּרֶם לְמַעַל בּוֹ
- וַיֹּאסְפֻהוּ בַמִּכְסָּרְתּוֹ
- וַיִּקְטֹר לַמִּכְסָּרְתּוֹ
- וּמֵאֲכַלְתּוֹ בִּרְאָה
- לַהֲרֹג גּוֹיִם לֹא יַחְמוֹל (or יַחְדֹּל)
- 1 עַל-שְׁמִרְתִּי אַעֲמֶדָה
- וְאַצְפֶּה לְרֹאשׁוֹת מַה־דְּבַר-בִּי
- 2 וַיַּעֲנֵנִי יְהוָה וַיֹּאמֶר
- וּבֹאֵר עַל-הַלְחֹת
- 3 כִּי עוֹד חֲזוֹן לַמוֹעֵד
- אִם-יִתְמַהֲמַה חֲכֵה-לִנּוֹ
- 4 הִנֵּה עֲלֶפְתָּ לֹא יִשְׂרָה נִפְשׁוֹ בּוֹ
- 5 וְאַף כִּי הִנֵּיד גִּבּוֹר
- אֲשֶׁר הִרְחִיב כְּשֹׂאוֹל נִפְשׁוֹ
- וַיֹּאסֶף אֵלָיו כָּל-הַגּוֹיִם
- 6 הֲלוֹא-אֵלֹהִים כָּלֵם עָלָיו מִשַּׁל יִשְׂאֹו
- הוּא הִמְרִיבָה לֹא-עָלוֹ
- 7 הֲלוֹא פָתַח יְקוֹמוֹ נִשְׁכִּיךְ
- וְהָיִיתָ לַמִּשְׁמֹת לְמוֹ
- 8 כִּי אַתָּה שְׁלוֹת גּוֹיִם רַבִּים
- מִדְּמֵי אָדָם וּחֲמַס-אַרְצָךְ
- 9 חוּי בָצַע בָּצַע רַע לְכִיתוֹ
- לְשׁוֹם בְּמִרוֹם קִנּוֹ
- וְאֶת־צִבְיָה עַל-מִצְוֵי
- וְמֵה יִשְׁיֵב עַל-תּוֹכַחְתִּי
- כָּתוּב חֲזוֹן
- לְמַעַן יִרְוַץ קוֹרָא בּוֹ
- וַיִּפַּח לִקְצֹ וְלֹא יִכְזֹב
- כִּי-בֹא יָבֹא וְלֹא יֵאָחֵז
- וְצָדִיק בְּאִמּוֹנָתוֹ יִחַי
- יֵהִיר וְלֹא יִנּוּחַ
- וְהוּא כְּמוֹת וְלֹא יִשְׁבַע
- וַיִּקְבֹּץ אֵלָיו כָּל-הָעַמִּים
- וּמְלִיצָה יִחְדָּדוּ לוֹ וַיֹּאמְרוּ
- וּמִכְבִּיד עָלָיו עַבְדִּים
- וַיִּקְצוּ מִזְעֻזְעִיךְ
- יִשְׁלֹךְ כָּל-יֵתֶר עַמִּים
- קִרְיָה וְכָל-יִשְׁבֵּי בָּהּ
- לְהַנְצִל מִכַּף-רָע

- | | |
|---------------------------|---|
| קצות עמים רבים | 10 יעצת נשת לביתך |
| | וחוסא נפשך |
| וכפים מעץ יעננה | 11 כי-אבן מקיר חזק |
| וכונן קריה בעולה | 12 הוי בנה עיר בדמים |
| | 13 הלוא הנה מאת יהוה צבאות |
| ולאמים בדי-ריק יעפו | וייגעו עמים בדי-אש |
| | 14 כי תמלא הארץ לדעת את-כבוד יהוה כמים יכסו על-ים |
| ספף-חמתו ואף שבר | 15 הוי משקה רע-הו |
| | למען הביס על-סעוריהם |
| שתה גמ-אתה ונהרעל | 16 שבעת קלון סכבוד |
| וקיקלון על-כבודך | תשוב עליך כוס ימין יהוה |
| ושד בהסנת חתך | 17 כי חמס לבגון יכסך |
| קריה וכל-ישיבי בה | מדמי אדם וחמס-ארץ |
| מסכה ומורה שקר | 18 מה-הועיל פמל כי פסלו יצרו |
| לעשות אלילים אלמים | כי בסח יצר יצרו עליו |
| עורי לאבן דומם (הוא יורה) | 19 הוי אמר לעץ הקיצה |
| וכל-רוח אין בקרבו | חנה-הוא תפוש זהב וכסף |
| חס מפניו כל-הארץ | 20 ויהוה בהיכל קדשו |

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

- Budde, K., "Zum Text von Habakuk, Kap. 1 und 2.", (OLZ, 34),
1931, pp. 409-411.
- Burlitt, F., "Aquila", (JQR, 10), 1898, pp. 207-216.
- Burrows, M., The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery,
New Haven, 1950.
- Cannon, W., "The integrity of Habakuk 1 and 2", (ZAW, 43),
1925, pp. 62-90.
- Duhm, B., Das Buch Habakuk, Tübingen, 1906.
- Elliger, K., Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer,
Tübingen, 1953.
- Elliger, K., "Das Ende der Abendwölfe, Zeph. 3.3 und Hab. 1.8"
in Festschrift A.Bertholet, Tübingen, 1950,
pp. 158-175.
- Gautier, L., Introduction à l'Ancien Testament, Lausanne, 1906.
- Gumpach, Der Prophet Habakuk, München 1860.
- Haldar, A., Studies in the Book of Nahum, Uppsala 1947.
- Halévy, J., Recherches Bibliques, Paris 1907.
- Hatch, E., and Redpath, H., A Concordance to the Septuagint,
Oxford, 1897.
- Holmes, R., Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum Variis Lectionibus,
Oxonii, 1827.
- Humbert, P., Problèmes du Livre d'Habacuc, Neuchâtel, 1944.

- Humbert, P., "La Formule Hébraïque en HINENI suivi du Participe", (REJ, 1934), pp. 58-64.
- Irwin, W., "The Psalm of Habakuk", (JNES, 1942), pp. 10-40.
- Jung, P., "Hab. 2.5, $\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\lambda\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ oder $\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\lambda\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$?", (BIBLICA, 32), 1951, pp. 564-566.
- Kahle, P., The Cairo Geniza, Schweich Lectures for 1947, London, 1947.
- Kaminka, A., Studien zur Septuaginta, an der Hand der 12 kleinen Prophetenbücher, Frankfurt, 1928.
- Kapelrud, A., Joel Studies, Uppsala, 1948.
- Kenyon, F., Recent developments in the textual criticism of the Greek Bible, Schweich Lectures for 1932, London, 1932.
- Lee, S., The Syriac Old and New Testament, London, 1823.
- Levy, J., Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim, Leipzig, 1876.
- Margolis, M., "Character of the anonymous Greek Version of Habakuk, Chapter 3", (OTSS, 1), 1908, pp. 133-142.
- Marti, K., Das Dodekapropheton, Tübingen, 1904.
- Nowack, W., Kleine Propheten, Göttingen, 1922.
- Nyberg, H., Studien zum Hoseabuche, Uppsala, 1935.
- Rabinowitz, I., "The Second and Third Columns of the Habakuk Interpretation-Scroll", (JBL, 69), 1950, pp. 31-49.
- Robert, B., The Old Testament Text and Versions, Cardiff, 1951.
- Schleusner, J., Novus Thesaurus Philologico-Criticus, sive Lexicon in LXX, Londini, 1829.

- Smith, P., A Compendious Syriac Dictionary, Oxford, 1903.
- Sperber, A., "Peschitta und Onkelos", in Jewish Studies in Memory of George Kohut, pp. 554-564, New York, 1935.
- Swete, A., The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint, Cambridge, 1899.
- Swete, A., An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, Cambridge, 1900.
- Thackeray, St. John, The Septuagint and Jewish Worship, Schweich 1920, London 1923.
- Thackeray, St. John, A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek, Cambridge, 1909.
- Vööbus, A., "A Critical Apparatus for the Vetus Syra", (JBL, 70), 1951, pp. 123-128.
- Walton, B., Biblia Sacra Polyglotta, London, 1653.
- Torrey, C., "The Prophecy of Habakuk", in Jewish Studies in Memory of George Kohut, pp. 565-582, New York, 1935.
- Wellhausen, J., Die Kleinen Propheten, Berlin 1898.
- Wolff, A., Der Prophet Habakuk, Darmstadt, 1822.
- Ziegler, J., Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum, Göttingen, 1943.