

26
—
45

HABAKKUK.

A GRADUATION THESIS

BY

EUGENE MANNHEIMER.

1902

12/78

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

REFERENCES

| | |
|--|----------------|
| PREFACE | -----I-IV. |
| I. LIFE OF HAEAKKUK | -----1-5 |
| II. CONTENT OF THE BOOK | -----5-14 |
| III. CRITICAL DISCUSSION OF SECTION Ia, 1 ² -2 ⁴ | pp. 15-50 |
| IV. CRITICAL DISCUSSION OF SECTION Ib, 2 ⁵ -2 ⁰ | pp. 51-64 |
| V. CRITICAL DISCUSSION OF SECTION II, chapter 3 | pp. 65-78 |
| VI. STYLE | -----pp. 79-89 |
| VII. THE THOUGHT OF THE BOOK OF HAEAKKUK | p. 89-93 |

REFERENCES

- A.E.Davidson, Nahum, Habakkuk and Zeph. , in the Cambridge
Bible series. 1896
- A.F.Kirkpatrick, The Doctrine of the Prophets. 1897
- G.A.Smith, The Book of the Twelve Prophets, in the Expositor
Bible series. 1901
- J.Wellhausen, Die Kleine Propheten. 1898
- Nowack, Kleine Propheten, in Handkommentar zum A.T. series
1897
- F.Giesebrecht, Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik. 1890
- R.Smend, Lehrbuch der AT. Religionsgeschichte. 1893
- Cornill, C.H., Einleitung in das A.T. 1892
- Fred Kelly, The Strophic Structure of Hab. In Jan. 1901
AM. Journal of Sem. Lan. and Lit.
- Eudde, art. on Hab. in Cheyne's Encyc. Bib.
- Driver, art. on Hab. in Hastings's Bib. Dictionary.
- D. von Orelli, Kleine Propheten in Strack u. Zöckler's
Kurzfassender Kom. etc. series. 1891
- E. Schrader, ed. of deWette Einleitung. 1869
- E.Nesibe, Das Lied Hab. und der Psalter, in Stade's Z.A.T.W
1900
- E. Stade in Z.A.T.W. 1884 pp.154ff.

Cheyne, The Hampton Lectures, 1889

Kleinert, art on Hab. in Riehm's Handwoerterbuch des Bib.
Altertums.

Hamburger's Real Encyc. art. on Hab.

Guthe, Geschichte des Volkes Israel.

Keil, C.F., Com. on the Minor Pro. trans. from the German
by Rev. James Martin
Ewald, Pro. of the Old Test. trans. by J.T. Smith. 1878

Geikie, Hours with the Bible. 1883.

Montefiore, Bible for Home Reading.

Strack, Intro. to O.T.

Volck, art on Hab. in Herzog and Plitt's Real Encyc. 1879

Preface.

In submitting this thesis to your honorable body it is, I suppose, almost unnecessary to state that the author lays little, if any, claim to originality in the following pages. I had intended proposing as a possibility a view which early in my work I had not seen brought forward by any of the critics. But later, in opening Smith, I found that he had anticipated the view I had intended proposing and this is almost the nearest that I perhaps came to offering something that would have been really my own.

As it is, I have for the most part simply striven to give in as compact and clear a form as possible the opinions of the different critics and the objections against these offered by others, wherever possible quoting directly from the words of the author himself, believing that he expresses his ideas in his own words better than I would express them if attempting to paraphrase them. So that by this work I hope to show careful reading and study of the more important critics who have handled this book and little more.

And here, before going any further, I may say at once that ~~x~~ it seems to me that not one of the theories thus far advanced by the critics in explanation of the prophecy offers a solution that is without some practically insurmountable[†] difficulties. In no case is the proof brought so conclusive as to silence all doubt. Most critics themselves seem willing to acknowledge that their own theories are not without some objections and no doubt are not greatly surprised when their fellow-critics can show even greater discrepancies than they themselves were at first willing to acknowledge. And that such is the case will not be wondered at when we see how corrupt the text is, how vague and open to doubleness of interpretation all the scant material which the critics have upon which to base their hypotheses.

I have, on this account, been unable to pick out for absolute preference any one theory or even to piece together parts of several theories ~~x~~ in a way to meet all possible objections and therefore must be satisfied, as said above, simply to present the

several theories thus far advanced and the principal objections stated against them. I have in places expressed my own opinion on the questions dealt with, but this is often based more on personal preference than on any scientific proof.

In regard to the method used in handling the critical questions arising from the book, instead of dealing with the different questions of unity, date, etc. in separate divisions, as some do, I considered that as the answers to the several questions were for the most part so involved in one another, the answer to one often depending upon that given to one or more of the others, it would be best to handle all the problems arising from one section together and discuss each section by itself. And this method used by me is also the one used to some extent by Eudde in his article on Habakkuk in Cheyne's Encyc. Bib. and by ^{G.A.} Smith, and seems to me to be the method most suited to the requirements of the case.

In closing, I would desire to thank Dr. Mielziner, Professor
Levias and Professor Euttenweiser for their kindness in the
loan of their books.

LIFE OF HALAKKUK.

That which we know of the life of Habakkuk, the eighth of the minor prophets, practically amounts to nothing. The name חֲבַקּוּק is a rather unusual ^{intensive} form, from a root חָבַק "to embrace", which Orelli thinks should perhaps read חֲבַקִּיק and for which the LXX reading *Ἀμφακοῦ* seems rather to suggest the reading חֲבַקִּיק

From the fact that in ¹1 (and ¹3) he is called נָחִיָּה חֲבַקּוּק it has been inferred-and with some plausibility- that Habakkuk held "a recognized position as prophet" in Judah.^a From the single expression עַל־כְּלִי־לִנְחָל "on my stringed instruments" (¹⁹3) it has also been inferred that he was of the tribe of Levi and a member of the temple choir. But this is very doubtful both because of the uncertainty attaching to the pronoun "my", which is against the analogy of similar notices in the psalms^b and because of the doubt as to the authenticity of this entire third chapter.^c

But though, as we see, authentic history tells us little, legends, in greatest profusion, have grown up around the name of this prophet, which, though regardless of "all chronological

and historical probability" would take the place left vacant by this

One legend, connecting the words of Is. 21⁶ "Go, set thee a watchman; let him declare what he seeth", with the words of Hab.

2¹ "I will stand upon my watchtower ---to see what he answereth to my complaint", tells us that Habakkuk was the sentinel set by Isaiah to watch for the fall of Babylon.

Another story, basing itself on II Kings 4^{16ff}, would have us believe that Habakkuk was the son of the Shunammite woman whom Elisha revived.

Still a third, and perhaps the best known of all, is the legend contained in the apocryphal book 'Bel and the Dragon' v33ff. according to which Habakkuk was commanded to bring a meal to Daniel in the lion's den, was transported by an angel from his home in Palestine to Babylon to do this and then after he had performed his task was in the same miraculous manner brought back home again.

In the Codex Chisianus this story has the superscription

Ἐκ προφητείας Ἀμβακὸν υἱὸν Ἰησοῦ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Λευί.

As said above, this assumption that he was a Levite is no doubt based on Hab. 3¹⁹ but on what authority he is called the son of

Joshua [?]~~Simeon~~ is unknown.

According to the two recensions of the lives of the prophets which we have, the one by Dorotheus, the second by Epiphanius, Habakkuk was of the tribe of Simeon, coming from a place called Bethzocher.^d At the approach of the invading Chaldeans he fled to Ostrocine, a city situated between Palestine, Egypt and Arabia. After the withdrawal of the hostile army he returned to Palestine and died there two years before the return of the exiles from Babylon. In one reference Eusebius states that his grave was shown at Gabatha, in another that it was at Echelah^r or Keeilah (Kella). But contrary to both of these it was said by Jewish writers of the Middle Ages that the grave was at Hukkah^e in the tribe of Naphtali^f.

a. Driver in Hasting's B.D., Orelli Kl. Pro. etc.

4

b. Driver.

c. Keil Minor Pro., Driver, G.A. Smith, etc.

d. Dorotheus has *ἐξ ἀγροῦ βῆθι τοῦ χάρ* Epiphanius has

ἐξ ἀγροῦ βῆθι τοῦ χάρ.

e. cf. Joshua 19³⁴

f. All legends concerning H. are found in Delitsch 'De Habacuci prophetae atque aetate' and in Hamaker 'Com. in libellum de vita et morte prophetarum.' Being unable to obtain these books the above statements were gathered from Eudde's article on H. in Cheyne's Encyc. Bib., Driver, Orelli, Schrader's ed. of De Wette's Einleitung, Davidson's Nahum Habakkuk and Zeph. in the Cambridge Bible series, and Keil's Minor Pro.

CONTENT OF THE BOOK.

In the form in which the book of Habakkuk has reached us it has three chapters ^hwhich are divided by 3¹ into two entirely independent sections. The first section is headed "The oracle which Habakkuk the prophet received by vision"(1¹) and the second "The prayer of Habakkuk the prophet!"(3¹) The first section is again divided into two main divisions 1^a, 1²-2⁴, a dialogue between God and the prophet, and 3 1^b, 2⁵-2²⁰, a taunt song raised by the remnants of the oppressed people over the fallen oppressor.

- 1^a, 1²-2⁴, a dialogue between God and the prophet is divided
- a. 1²-4 Hab. begins and asks God how long he will be left to complain in vain against the evil and violence about him, because of which all justice is at an end.
 - b. 1⁵-11 God answers telling the prophet to look about him among the nations and see how he is raising the violent Chaldeans to punish all this wrongdoing.

c. 1¹²⁻¹⁷ But as this answer of God's has only increased the perplexity in Nabakkuk's mind he begins again, asking how can God use as his instrument a people who are even more wicked than the nations whom they are sent to punish and how can he remain silent amid all the ruin this impious destroyer works.

d. 2¹ The prophet betakes himself to his watchtower to await the answer God may vouchsafe his complaint.

e. 2²⁻⁴ The answer, which the prophet is commanded to write upon a tablet that all who run may read, comes, announcing "The evil-doer, his soul is not upright within him- but the righteous shall live through his faithfulness."^a

1^b, 2⁵⁻²⁰, a series of taunts raised in the end by the remnants of the nations over the fallen evildoer. The series of five taunts each beginning with the word יִיָּן^b really commence with 2^{6a} and

a. 2^{5-6a} forms a sort of transition connecting 2⁴ with 2^{6b}, of which 2^{5a} is very corrupt, making it impossible to tell just how this transition was^{originally} made. [^]

b. 6b-8 The first woe against the oppressor who by the terribleness of his methods of conquest has accumulated vast debts for which the oppressed conquered when they finally rise will exact heavy interest.

c. 9-11 Against the evil deeds ~~of~~ committed by the oppressor in hopes of making his power impregnable, all of which will in the end avail him nothing.

d. 12-14 Against the bloodshed and cruelty of the oppressor while building up his magnificent cities. All this work is worthless since God does not favor it.

e. 15-17 Against the shameful abuse of the laws of hospitality by the impious conqueror. Because he made drunk his guests to look upon their ~~of~~ shame the same lot surely awaits him.

f. Against the folly of idolatry.

II, chapter 3, the prayer, or psalm, of Habakkuk divided as ffs:

a. ³²The congregation prays that God may renew his work in the

midst of the years, but even while in wrath, ^{to m}remember mercy.

- b. 3³-15 Lyric ode describing God's coming forth to render judgment and to execute vengeance on the enemies of his annointed.
- c. 3¹⁶-20 Conclusion in which the poet states that no matter what calamities may befall him or the land he will remain firm in his trust in God, his protector.

Chapter 1. The prophet begins with a complaint that for a long time he has cried against the violence he sees about him but God will not listen.(v2) Why indeed does God let him behold all this misery and oppression which is before him(v3)because of which the law is grown slack and judgment never rendered correctly.(v4)

b. God answers that the prophet should look among the nations and be astounded at the almost incredible deed God is about to do.(v5) God is about to raise up the Chaldeans, that bitter, impetuous, farwandering nation, terrible and dreadful, obeying only the law emanating from itself.(v6-7) The men are swift riders and fierce

as the eveningwolves, coming all for violence and to gather in the
the spoil.(v8-9) They scoff at all kings; the capturing of the
most fortified cities is mere child's play. They make their own
strength their God. (v10-11)

c. Then the prophet begins again. Surely God is eternal, he is
too pure of eye to gaze upon such evil and violence. How can he
bear it that the wicked swallows the righteous(v12-13), makes man
as the fish of the sea, treats him as the rulerless worm(v14)
rejoicing greatly while capturing all with his fishing instrument^S
(v15), then even sacrificing to these instruments as if they were
the cause of his success.(v16) Shall indeed these wicked continue
on in their course forever without let or hindrance?(v17)

d. Chapter II The prophet^e betakes himself to his watchtower to see
what answer God will vouchsafe to his complaint.(v1)

e. God answers him, first telling him to write the answer he is
about to receive upon tablets, that all who run may read. (v2)

- This vision is surely set for a fixed time and though it may delay yet it will be well to wait for it. (v3) Behold the evildoer^a -- his soul is not upright within him, but the righteous shall
- I^b a. live through his faithfulness. (v4) In the end the ⁿusatiab^ale robber, who gathers all nations into his power, must fall and the remnants of the nations will be able to raise a taunting song over
- b. him (v5-6a) saying: Woe to him who loads the debts of innumerable crimes upon himself. The debtors will finally rise up and exact ample interest. The spoiled will in the end spoil the spoilers.
- c. (6b-8) Woe to him who worked evil in order to raise his nest high above all danger. By all this evil conduct he will see that he has obtained but shame and no glory for himself. (9-11)
- d. Woe to him who builds cities with blood and iniquity. Surely God wills it not and therefore the people labor in vain. But in the end the earth will be filled with the knowledge of the glory of
- e. God, as the ^{waters} cover the seas. (12-14) Woe to him who makes drunk his

guests that he may gaze upon their nakedness. The same lot awaits the treacherous host. And besides this the violence he has done Lebanon and the animals of the field shall also be avenged. (15-17 f. Woe to him who foolishly trusts in idols, in whom there is no life. How can these help him any? And God is in his holy temple Let all the earth be silent before him.

Section II, chapter three, differs in character, tone and language from the preceding section. Though called the "prayer" of Habakkuk the prayer is really found only in the second verse and the rest of the work is a lyric poem descriptive of a theophany, the coloring of which is borrowed from earlier descriptions of theophanies, such e. g. as the one at the Red Sea. Owing to the ambiguity of the tenses it is doubtful whether the poem describes a past theophany as the type of the one ~~to come~~ the poet hopes to see again or whether it describes the theophany about to come in words and ideas borrowed from the earlier descriptions.^c

a. The poet begins, saying that he has heard the report of God and feared. Yet he prays that God may renew his work in the midst of years, but remembering mercy even while in wrath. (62)

b. He then sees God coming from Teman and Mount Paran and the earth is filled with his glory. (v3) God is most brilliant. The blinding light shoots forth from about him and is, as it were, a veil to his majesty. (v4) Before him comes pestilence, behind him walks the burning plague. (v5) He stands and the earth shakes, nations tremble, the hills are scattered, the mountains sink. (6) The tents of Cushan, the tent-hangings of the land of Midian tremble violently. (67) He rides his horses through the sea, - mighty waters well up. (v15) But is God angry with the mountains, is his anger against the sea, that he thus rides forth upon his horses of deliverance (v8), that his bow is uncovered, ----- that he cleaves the earth with rivers? (v9) Mountains see him and whirl; the clouds pour down rain; the deep roars. (v10)

The sun and moon dare not come forth because of the flying of
God's fearful arrows and the brightness of his glittering spear.

(v11) In wrath God marches about and bruises nations into bits.

(v12) For he has come forth for the deliverance of his people,
his annointed ones. Therefore he uproots cities, (v13) pierces the
heads of the mighty warriors of the earth, who have rejoiced to
~~to~~ destroy his people in secret. (v14)

c. The singer hears and is afraid. He trembles violently from
head to foot----- (v16) And yet though the fig-tree does
not flourish; though no fruit appears upon the vine; though the
olive fail and the f~~ie~~lds yield no produce; though there are no
sheep in the folds or cattle in the stalls (v17) still he will
exult in the God of his salvation (v18) who is his strength, who
leads him safely through all dangers. (v19)

- a. Instead of אֶל־יְהוָה I read לִפְנֵי־יְהוָה with Wellhausen and Nowack.
- b. The last taunt has its יְהוָה at the beginning of the second instead of at the beginning of the first verse of the taunt.
- c. Wellhausen e. g. holds that a former theophany is pictured as the model of the one to come (page 171 Kl. Pro.) While Kirkpatrick thinks that the author describes the theophany to come in colors borrowed from earlier descriptions. (pages 281 and 282 Doctrines of the Pro.) See also Eudde and Driver.

Critical Discussion of Section 1^a, 1²⁻²⁴.

In regard to the first section, 1²⁻²⁴, of the book of Habakkuk, it has been well said by G. A. Smith^a that though "none doubts the authenticity of "this" yet it is the first piece that raises the most difficult questions." The questions "Against whom is the prophecy directed?" "Does 1²⁻⁴ describe merely civic disorder or the result of foreign oppression?" "What is the proper date of the work?" "Is 1⁵⁻¹¹ by Habakkuk and in its proper place, or is it a gloss, or is it by Habakkuk but removed from its original position?" are questions which, depending on this first section, offer almost unconquerable difficulties to the interpreter of the prophecy.

By far the most commonly accepted view holds that 1²⁻²⁴ is a unity preserving the order that Habakkuk himself left. According to this theory 1²⁻⁴ complains of the oppression of Israelites by Israelites, against which, in 1⁵⁻¹¹, God announces the Chaldeans are being raised as punishment. Then, 1¹²⁻¹⁷, the

prophet begins again, asking, in wonder, how God can use as instrument of his wrath such a people as the Chaldeans, who are even worse than the people punished. The prophet goes to his watch-tower to await his answer, (2¹) which comes, 2²⁻⁴, announcing that the wicked, having the germ of destruction within him, must sooner or later perish, but that the righteous will survive through his faithfulness.

"1⁵⁻¹¹ is not a prophecy of the raising of the Chaldeans except in form!" It is merely an explanation "of their presence and meaning as instruments of Jehovah.^b" and the rest of the prophecy is a prediction of the sure downfall of ~~this~~ impious nation.

With Driver all, without one or two exceptions of minor importance, conclude ~~that it is clear from internal evidence~~ that it is clear from internal evidence that Habakkuk prophesied toward the beginning of the Chaldean supremacy, but the precise

^{date}
is difficult to fix.^c

And among those who hold this theory are Volck, Keil, Orelli, Kirkpatrick, Davidson and Driver.

Volck, Keil, Orelli and Kleinert all agree to the above outline of the prophecy and its ~~mean~~ing and that the prophecy is directed against the Chaldeans^d. But they differ as to the most probable date. Keil believes Habakkuk prophesied before 605 B.C. most probably under ~~Man~~asseh. Volck, after deciding that it is impossible for him to have prophesied in Jeho~~y~~jakim's reign, fixes the date as being most likely some time between the twentieth year before the first Chaldean invasion and the thirteenth or fourteenth^h year of Josiah's reign. Orelli rejects the arguments in favor of putting Habakkuk under either Manasseh or Josiah, and holds the time of his prophesying to have been shortly before 605, the year of Carchemish. Kleinert judges that his activity fell in the last decade of the seventh century E. C.^d

Of the others who hold this theory, Kirpatrick believes "it is ----in spite of some recent theories as to its character - an artistic and connected whole" (he is speaking of the entire book) and that the prophecy is a "denunciation of the Chaldeans." In regard to the date -. From 1⁵ he judges that the Chaldeans were already in ~~the~~ full career of conquest and their terrible reputation had reached Jerusalem. 1²⁻⁴ can not have been written under Josiah, but point to the "selfish luxury and oppressive exactions" of Jehojakim. From 1^{2ff.}, especially 13, which would show that the Chaldeans must have already entered Palestine, he would judge that Habakkuk wrote after 601, the year of Neb^chadnezzar's first invasion of Palestine. On the other hand, from 1^{5ff.}, which would show that the Chaldean power was as yet not fully established, he would be led to judge that the prophecy must have been written before 605, the year of Car^hemish, as after that year it must have been certain that the Chaldeans were to be

God's instrument. He concludes that on the whole the probability points to the earlier date, i. e. before Carchemish.^e

Davidson says that "this(the version as given above) is the most natural sense of the verses and the words used in them"(p47) and though "the construction of the book just stated has something artificial in it" (p49) " upon the whole the ---theory which accepts chapter 1 as ~~it~~ it stands and explains vv.1-4 of wrongdoing on the part of the people of Judah themselves, is the one which has the fewest difficulties, though it must be confessed that the interpretation it puts upon chapter 1¹⁻¹¹ is not quite natural."(p.55)^f From the chapter, as we have it, we see that the barbarities of the Chaldeans must have been familiar to the prophet and besides as "such thoughts(as we have in this prophecy) could not arise early in the Chaldean period, hardly before the deportation under Jehojakim in 597 "(p.49) ~~p~~ he puts the date of the prophecy as somewhere between 605, the

year of Carchemish, and 597.^f

Again, Driver, though admitting "there are difficulties connected with it" (i. e. the theory as given above) and that "it has failed to satisfy many recent scholars", after going over the objections against it concludes that "the explanation ~~why~~ which refers ~~31~~¹²⁻⁴ to the tyranny of the Chaldeans ---- is unnatural and forced".^g And so he decides with Kirkpatrick that the book ~~as~~ as a whole is the fruit of a long period of mental struggle and anxiety and therefore there is nothing unreasonable in the supposition that ~~12-11~~¹²⁻¹¹ reflects the impression left upon the prophet's mind when he first thought of the Chaldeans as the instrument appointed for the punishment of Judah's sins and that ~~31~~^{12ff.} expresses the perplexities of which he afterwards became conscious when the character of the Chaldeans had become more fully known to him." "The most probable date for the prophecy is shortly before E. C. 606 -- ¹²⁻¹¹, if the view adopted above be

correct, being written somewhat earlier than the rest of the prophecy."^h

Three critics, however, though accepting the order of the verses in chapter one as they now stand with the above named critics, contrary to them believe that 1²⁻⁴ speaks of the Chaldean oppression and its effects upon Judah just as does 1¹²⁻¹⁷. These three critics are Ewald, Schrader and Smend.

According to Ewald 1²⁻⁴ is a complaint against oppression from without, 1⁵⁻¹¹ the answer of God saying: "It is I who raise the Chaldeans," and 1¹²⁻¹⁷ continue the words of the prophet, unable to understand how God can use the Chaldeans as his instrument. Ewald believes that the Jewish mind, at the time of Habakkuk, was entirely free from all consciousness of personal guilt and that the Chaldean invasion nipped in the bud a fine moral outburst just as it was about to flower. Judging from this alone, we might suppose that Habakkuk lived in Josiah's reign but as

the first inroad of the Chaldeans was not until Jehoyakim, we must postpone the time until this king's reign." That the moral perversities of this king's reign are not mentioned, is accounted for by the fact that the problem raised by the arrival of the Chaldeans and their actions blotted all else from the mind of the prophet.†

Schrader, believing that ^{from} the description of the Chaldeans in the prophecy it is certain Carchemish must have been fought, but the Chaldeans as yet not in Palestine, ^{the date of} puts the prophecy in ~~77~~ 604 B.C. His idea of the prophecy is that "als die furchtbare Macht der Chaldaeer drohend herannaherte gegen das Vaterland, und der Prophet die von ihnen in Juda veruebten Graeuß im Geist schaute, trug er seine Klagen und Zweifel Jahve, dem Gerechten und Reinen, vor(1,2-17). Da ward ihm die Offenbarung der zukuenftigen Eestrafung der Chaldaeer.(II)†"

Smend remarks "dass Habakkuk 12-4 Jahve um Huelfe gegen die

Chaldaeer ruft. Weil Juda von den Chaldaeern Unrecht leidet (v2,3)
regiert das Unrecht in Juda. (6.4)" "Dass Habakkuk einige Zeit
nach der Schlacht bei Karkemish schreibt ist aus 2¹⁷ kennbar,
ueberhaupt erstammt das Buch selbstverstaendlich der Caldaeischen
Noth----.k

A third series of opinions, that of Giesebrecht, Wellhausen
Nowack, Budde, G.A. Smith and Fred. Kelly, holds with the three
just mentioned that the first chapter deals only with the Chal-
dean oppression and its effects on Judah and that in 1²⁻⁴ no men-
tion is made of Judah's wrongdoing. But for the reasons given
immediately below, in opposition to all the above critics, these
last named come to the conclusion that 1⁵⁻¹¹ is surely out of
harmony with the context where it now stands and is either a
gloss or a piece by Habakkuk himself moved by accident from its
original right position.

The reasons for this belief are as follows:

I. If you are to believe that in 1²⁻⁴ Judah is complained of and in 1⁵⁻¹¹ the Chaldeans are announced as the punishment, then it is impossible to understand the conclusion of the chapter, 11¹², for "in demselben Augenblick wo der Prophet ueber die Verachtung des goettlichen Rechts innerhalb seines Volkes auf das aeusserste entruestet die Chaldaeer als Strafe ankuendigt, kann er nicht // ein tief empfundenes Klagelied ueber die Misshandlungen des heil. Volkes anstimmen, durch deren Verhaengung die Chaldaeer das ihnen von Gott gestattete Zuechtigungsrecht bei weitem ueberschreiten.¹"

II. In " 1^{5ff.} treten die Chaldaeer---eben erst auf den Schauplatz der Geschichte, wenige Verse spaeter hausen sie schon, wer weiss wie lange, in empoeerendster Willkuer auf Erden."²

III. Der Anfang in 1⁵ ist eine Unterbrechung des Zusammenhangs, und v.12 bietet einen trefflichen Anschluss an v.4, ungezwungen beziehen sich die Verbalsuffixe v.12 auf den $\gamma\psi$, die in v.4 das

Unheil verhaengt."n

IV. "Mann kann den Gegensatz von $\gamma\psi\tau$ und $\pi\tau\gamma$ in v.4 nicht anders fassen als in v.13, und das Problem das ~~den~~ Propheten bedrueckt in 1² nicht anders als in 2¹."o

Giesebrecht comes to the conclusion that 1⁵⁻¹¹ "bilden ein in sich geschlossenes Orakel, das die Chaldaeer erst ankuendigt wie es ~~erscheint~~ unter dem Bilde der Skythen.--- Natuerlich gehoert diese Weissagung vor v.3, was uebrig bleibt bildet ein selbststaendiges Stueck, unter dem Druck der Chaldaeerherrschaft, warscheinlich im Exil verfasst."(p.198) Wellhausen(p.166) ends his discussion of ~~3~~ 1⁵⁻¹¹ with "Es ist ein aelteres Orakel, ~~welches~~ welches das Erscheinen der Chaldaeer weissagt und beschreibt." Eudde and Smith quote him as believing the prophecy pre-exilic in date and most probably written in the reign of Jehojakim. Nowack writes(p.248) "Es bleibt kaum etwas anders als die Annahme uebrig, das c.1⁵⁻¹¹ ein eingeschobenes, von Habakkuk gar nicht

verfasstes Stueck ist ---". In regard to the date he says:--"diese Charakterisirung Israels als פ'רש und des Feindes als ישר ~~ist~~ sich schwer vor dem Deutp. und der Cultusreform des Josiah's begreifen laesst. This ישר must be the Chaldean and "da der Druck derselben als ein ueberaus harter empfunden wird, und diese Feinde als alle Welt unter die Fuesse tretend ~~ist~~ dargestellt ^{en} ~~word~~, so kann der Prophet nicht vor 605 geschrieben haben, ja nicht in grosser Warscheinlichkeit werden wir ⁱⁿ die Zeit nach der ersten Gola gefuehrt, als rund um 590." (p.250)

Against these Davidson writes (p.50) "The proposal to read vv. 5~~1~~--11 before vv. 1-4 will not commend itself, while the removal of vv.5-11 from the prophecy altogether rather cuts the knot than looses it." And Driver says "The explanation which ~~is~~ refers 1²⁻⁴ to the tyranny of the Chaldeans and its effect upon Judah is unnatural and forced. Nor is there any intrinsic reason why righteous and wicked should refer to the same persons respec-

tively in ~~3~~ 1⁴ and 1¹³ ---". ~~He~~ ~~2~~ He does admit that 1¹⁻¹¹ 27
seems to presuppose a different historical situation than 1^{12ff.}
but accounts for that with the explanation given above. (p.20)

And now we come to the theory offered by Budde, the theory
which is by far the most elaborate and ingenious of them all. ~~He~~
believes with the three just ~~named~~ ~~we have~~ discussed that ~~33~~
1⁵⁻¹¹ is impossible where it now stands. With Giesebrecht he
thinks that it is by Habakkuk himself, but would place it not be-
fore v.1 but after 2⁴, arguing as follows: 1⁵⁻¹¹ is detached from
its surroundings and must be studied by itself. It describes
how Jehovah calls up a warrior people that he may give it an un-
heard of victory. By the 'D' "for" of v.6 this word of Jehovah
must have been connected with some word like it preceding. Adi-
vine word of such import will exactly correspond to the prophets
anxiety of 2¹. We do find a beginning made of an answer in 2² but
after v.4 there is an unexplainable hiatus. Now our ~~3~~ 1⁵⁻¹¹
fills the hiatus as it names the people who are the destined

conqueror of the oppressor. Now as the Chaldeans can not be supposed to destroy themselves the prophecy can not be against the Chaldeans, as most theories have heretofore supposed. The oppressor meant must be the power destroyed by the Chaldeans, i.e. the Assyrians, and therefore the prophecy must be against them.

In support of this theory Budde says:

I. The vivid picture of ¹⁴ff. 25 does not suit the Chaldeans, while it fits the Assyrian perfectly. The Assyrian conquest was slow and used all sorts of crafty means; the Chaldeans took twenty years, the whole Assyrian empire falling like ripe fruit into their hands.

II. Even if granted that ultimately the Chaldean ascendancy did partake of the character described, Judah had no time to experience it. Only between 605, the battle of Carchemish, and 597, destruction of Jerusalem, could the prophecy have been written, and this is too short a time to account for the picture

1^{14ff.}.. And besides a prediction of ~~the~~ fall of ~~the~~ Chaldea at this time would have been premature.

III. The strong personification of ~~the~~ enemy as a fisher, 1¹⁵ and elsewhere is noteworthy. It is very appropriate in the case of ~~the~~ Assyrian who is always designated by the singular Assur and Is. 10^{5ff.} affords a good example of a similar kind. It does not fit with the Kasdim nearly so well and we note that the apposition "the people" is met with in v.6, a phrase that controls the description to v.10.

As the superior limit for the date of the prophecy according to this theory Eudde gives 626 E.C., the year Nebopolasser began to reign over Babylon, and ^{as} the inferior 609, the year of Megiddo. "The time is fixed with more certainty as before Josiah's reform of 621, but with equal certainty before his death, 609; so split the difference and we have 615, a little earlier by preference."

How the oracle became changed from its original form to its

present one Eudde explains by saying: The oracle expected from the Chaldeans freedom and ~~very~~ prosperity for Judah. The actual result was different; they were the instrument of Judah's overthrow. Now we can understand that in the exile or post-exile period a prophecy that had been so falsified in fact could not escape mutilation. By displacement of the passage promising good fortune to the Chaldeans(16-10) and by other changes including the removal of the name Assur ~~from~~ the prophecy was so changed that it might read against Chaldea. These changes, hardly due to the exile period which produced its own prophecies against Chaldea, most probably occurred in the fifth or fourth century, centuries of great editorial activity.^p

Against this theory of Eudde's, Nowack simply writes(p.248):

"Aber so verlockend auch diese Loesung zunaechst ~~erscheint~~, sie ist dennoch aus mehr als einem Grunde ^{an}unnehmbar", and passes it by.

Driver has: "The explanation (of Budde's) is ingenious, but of a kind that could be deemed probable only if it rested on exceptionally strong grounds ^hwhich, however, in the present instance cannot be said to be the case."

Davidson reviews it at some length (p.50-55) and then decides against it, because: 1. "The transposition of vv.5-11 from their true place after 2⁴ into chapter one is difficult to account for. Budde's explanation "is possible; if it be true criticism is not without its romance." 2. "It is strange that in a prophecy of two chapters against the Assyrian his name ~~is nowhere~~ should nowhere occur". 3.- Though Budde claims that vv.5-11 are "quite phantastic and imaginative", still "this is not the impression which 1⁵⁻¹¹ leaves on other minds; the description appears quite as realistic as that in vv.12-17, supposed to refer to the Assyrians." 4.- To date the prophecy between 621 and 615, the years immediately following Josiah's reform, because Israel

then having a good conscience might be called righteous, as she is in ^{13, 13}, is not warranted for "even as applied to Israel the term 'righteous' is a very uncertain criterion of date. Besides ^{the} to date ~~the prophecy~~ 621-615 there are several objections "on the theory that the Assyrians are the subject of the prophecy", for by that time surely Assyria's grip on the west had become greatly relaxed and ¹²⁻⁴ if referring to the Assyrian oppression would be highly exaggerated to say the least. Then such terms as "the Torah is slackened" are not to be understood in a time following Josiah's reform. Nor was it very probable at a date as early as 621-615 that the Chaldeans were to play the role of destroyers of Assyria, as at that time Nebopolassar "was still probably the nominal vassal of Assyria." 5.- The 'woes' of chapter II might be applied either to the Assyrians or to the Chaldeans; "there is little in them that favors one application more than another. Also a point that seems to show that it is rather improbable

that two different nations are referred to in 1⁵⁻¹¹ and 1¹¹⁻¹⁷,
 is the fact that in 1¹⁶ the nation spoken of deifies its might
 and in 1¹¹ virtually the same thing is said of the Chaldeans.
 Nor can such verses as 1⁹ be understood of a nation that was to
 be "the liberator of Israel" and the destroyer of the impious
 Assyrian. Finally, in the woes 2⁶⁻²⁰ it is the remnants of the
 peoples and not some particular nation that will rise up against
 the oppressor.

Of these objections G.A. Smith says (p. 122) they "are not
 inconsiderable" but yet "they are scarcely conclusive", as we
 know so little of ~~the~~ history for that era that in 615 Assyrian
 power might still have been strongly felt in Palestine and by
 615 the methods of the Chaldeans, who had been independent for
 ten years, might have been well known in Palestine. ^{miss} Smith adⁿ
 that everything is not smoothed away by Budde's theory "but", he
 asks, "have not the other theories of the Book of ~~E.~~ Habakkuk

equally great difficulties?" and after going over these objections comes to the conclusion that "everything, in fact, points to 15-B1 being out of its proper place"(p.123) and there can be no doubt that 112-17 "describe a heathen oppressor who is not the Chaldean." Smith is not so sure this other people is the Assyrian, and thinks it might be the Egyptian. "From 608 to 605 Judah was sorely beset by Egypt", and "the picture of distress in 12-4 might easily be that of Judah in these three terrible years." This date would also be late enough to account for the ~~knowledge~~ knowledge of the Chaldeans shown in 15-11. Still "we can hardly affirm" that the "description of 114-17 suits ~~the~~ Egypt as well as it does Assyria" "until we know more of what Egypt did in those days, but it is very probable."(p.124)

Smith ^{then} ends with the following paragraphs:

"Therefore, the theory supported by the majority of the critics being unnatural, we are, with our present meagre know-

ledge of the time, flung back on Budde's interpretation that the prophet in 1²-2⁴ appeals from oppression by a heathen power, which is not the Chaldean, but upon which the Chaldeans shall bring the just vengeance of God. The tyrant is either Assyria up to about 615 or Egypt from 608 to 605, and there is not a little to be said for the latter date."

"In arriving at so uncertain a conclusion about I-II⁴, we have but these consolations, that no other is possible in our present knowledge, and that all the uncertainty will not hamper us much in our appreciation of Habakkuk's spiritual attitude and poetic gifts."

And finally we take up the views of Fred Kelly.⁹ He also discusses all sides of the questions but comes to no really definite conclusion, though he does believe that the "arrangement of Budde seems to present fewer difficulties than that of the MT.& though whether one can be as definite as ^{he} _{is} with regard to

naming the oppressor seems doubtful." In the end he adopts for his article the arrangement of material suggested by Budde. ~~Not~~ Against ~~the~~ charge that there are too many parallelisms between the two sections, 11-4, 12-17 and 15-11 to allow their being by the same author he urges that perhaps the author purposely used so many parallelisms in order to accentuate his message, that as the oppressor had done to the others so he would be done by, the more.^r

And thus we see what a confusion and diversity of opinion holds among the critics who have attempted to solve the problems arising from the discussion of Habakkuk 12-24. ~~As~~ As said before it is simply impossible to prefer one of these theories more than some other as there are great objections to them all. Even though Budde's theory with Smith's added suggestion that it is the Egyptians and not the Assyrians who are the people threatened does seem better than the others, still for the reasons given

above. I must believe with Driver that it is "too ingenious" ³⁷ and with Davidson that it rests upon too slight a foundation.

It is true that after 2⁴ there is a break and also that 2⁴ is not a sufficient answer, or in fact a direct answer at all to the complaint of the prophet. But why ^{just} 1⁵-11 should be inserted there, as Budde suggests, and to which others agree, needs more proof than Budde or any one else is able to bring. Of course there may be a possibility that originally more stood here than we now have, but 2⁵ is hopelessly corrupt and there is no absolute necessity that we should doubt that this verse when uncorrupt supplied the connection between 2⁴ and 2⁶ that is now missing.

Now if we were ^{willing} to accept the text in the order in which we now have it, it is Driver, I think, who gives us the most satisfactory interpretation that can possibly be obtained.

But I believe that the interpretation given by Driver, Davidson, and the others who hold as these do, ~~does~~ "puts a strain upon the natural sense", and Driver's attempted answer ~~to~~ to the ob-

jections made to 15-11 is unsatisfactory.

Those objections made by Giesebrecht, Wellhausen, Nowack and others against 15-11 seem to me to be well taken, and though number IV may be of comparatively slight importance, numbers I, II and III (seep. 25) are ample to prove their contention. Because of 112-17 it seems impossible to believe that 15-11 is in place and for all the reasons given I would prefer to remove 15-11 entirely and, if we must believe that the author wrote prophecy and describing dealing with ~~any~~ state of affairs actually present before him, read 12-4 and 112-17 against the Egyptians, or the Chaldeans, and their oppression of Judah.

If then we leave the text 12-4; 112-17 as we have it (not eliding 13^{hc} etc. as e.g. Nowack does) it seems to me that the terms used in 12-4 together with the tenor of all this section point to a time when there was not only oppression from without but also, perhaps some just taking advantage of this, great internal dissension.

Now there were two different periods when such a state of affairs as thus described existed, during one of which the prophet could have written.

Between 608, the year of Megiddo, when Josiah was killed and all hopes for a rejuvenated Israel lost, and 605, the year of Carchemish, when Egypt was crushed by Chaldea, Judah under the reign of Jehojakim, was harried by the Egyptians. Then to add to the trouble of the land the heathen party arose against the Jehovah party and these two engaged in a fierce struggle for power. Such a state of affairs would fully explain 1²⁻⁴, 12-17, but whether the picture presented in these verses and in the woes 2^{6b-20} will allow the Egyptians to be considered the subject of the prophecy is, as Smith says, with our present knowledge impossible to determine. The greatest objection to the idea that the Egyptians are the ones inveighed against is the fact that the shortness of the Egyptian supremacy makes it hard to account for such a

condition as is described in γ 1²⁻⁴ and for the things to be avenged mentioned in the 'woes' 2^{6b-20}.

If now we think the objections to this theory too strong we might, again basing ourselves upon the picture presented in γ 1²⁻⁴ etc., put the prophecy some time between about 597, the year Jerusalem was captured for the first time by the Chaldeans, and ⁵⁹⁰~~580~~, a few years before the Chaldean's second campaign against Jerusalem, when Chaldea was the nation that harshly oppressed Judah while at the same time the hostile political and religious parties within the people kept internal affairs in an uproar. By this time the Chaldeans would have been known well enough to account for everything written in the prophecy, and so late a date is necessary if, the Chaldeans being taken for the subject of of the prophecy, such a verse as 2¹⁷ is to be retained in the te^{xt}. But again we find strong objections to this theory, the principal one being that after such an event as happened in the year 597

we would expect from the prophet far different ideas and pictures than we have given us.

But now, looking at the work from a different standpoint, that the author was not writing ~~philosophy~~ prophecy or history but philosophy, I would like to offer still a third possibility, and at that one which seems to me not only to do away with the difficulties that beset the critics but which is also very probable and possible.

As we have seen, it is simply impossible to find a time recorded in history in which conditions existed with which we can, with even an attempt at exactness, fit the incidents and scene depicted in the book. If one part of the work speaks in favor of ~~one~~ interpretation, another can immediately be brought to show that this is impossible and to speak in favor of some second interpretation. And so no conclusion of much value can be reached if we attempt to consider the book truly historical prophecy.

Why then not drop this discussion which can have no end and consider the book not a description in detail of some state of affairs actually before the author, not the calling down of vengeance upon one of the great marauding peoples as the Assyrians or the Chaldeans or the Egyptians in particular, not the prophesying of the coming downfall of some particular power, mixed in with which we find a bit of early philosophy, but consider ~~this~~ that in this book we have what is primarily a work of philosophy in which the author uses a composite picture of his own and preceding generations as the frame-work for the presenting of his ideas on the seeming fact that the wicked ever prosper, while the righteous are ever treated by these as if they were but rulerless, protectorless worms.

And surely such a purpose seems born out by the examining of the book itself. We find that the terms used are all general, that nowhere does the author mention particular incidents, that

nowhere is mention made of the name of the oppressor, neither ~~as~~ Assur, nor Chaldea, nor Egypt. The answer in 2⁴ to the complaint is philosophy. In the woes, 2⁵⁻²⁰, the crimes described are such as might apply to the deeds of any people that had engaged in a course of heartless robbery and oppression. The wicked in general, rather, epitomized as one, are the object of the author's complaint. The righteous of all the world are to be interested in the final solution.

The thinker, it seems to me, has been struck by the seeming never-ending round of power that is enjoyed by the wicked at the expense of the righteous. As far back as he can gaze the same scene meets his eye. He, his father and fore-fathers ever witnessed the same. And perhaps after the attempted reform of Josiah, the promulgation of God's law and the attempt to restore his worship the fact that Josiah had been defeated and killed by a heathen conqueror and the worshippers of Jehovah trodden under

foot by the godless heathen made the anomaly even more inexplicable than before. "With some," says Smith, "the disaster was a cause of ~~some~~ complaint" and so I believe Habakkuk is one of ~~the~~ these who voices his complaint, demanding answer to the question how God who is too pure of eye to behold wickedness can silently endure the sight of the evildoers, who trust in no power but that of ~~their~~ ^{their} weapons and their right arms, oppress the righteous, who trust so faithfully in God and do his will, treating them as the fish of the sea, rulerless worms. There is no use of definite detail~~made~~; the history of all ages is pictured in one great scene

Long and anxiously must Habakkuk have thought over the ~~myst~~ mystery, and finally, after the longest deliberation, found what seemed to be to him a full solution to his problem. And though, perhaps, this is no real answer that he found still it is one that even we today have found it impossible to better.

"Behold," he proclaims, "the wicked - his soul is not upright

within him, but the righteous man shall live through his faithfulness!" In the end -it may not come for generations, but it will finally come -the wicked power, having the germ of destruction within him, must succumb^m and give way before the power of the righteous who, preserved through their faithfulness, will reign supreme. This is the only hope he can hold out to the complainers, yet this he considers fully sufficient to answer all the complaints and doubts. He can not explain why the wicked should triumph at all, -no one ever has. He simply exhorts "Trust in God and continue in his ways, That is the best course possible. In the end you will obtain your fitting reward," and trusts on.

This explanation of the book does away with all need of attempting to determine from the incidents of the book itself just exactly when the author wrote and against whom in particular. No need to show that here he must have meant the Chaldeans, there it is impossible he meant the Assyrians -he had them all in mind

No need to show that here he inveighs against the wicked in Israel alone, there we have proof that he wrote under Manasseh, or Josiah, or Jehojakim.

If we desire to fix the date, we might conclude that he wrote influenced in his ideas by his predecessor's Isaiah's ideas on the efficacy of ^{faith and} faithfulness. That he worked before the exile we might conclude from the negative proof that after such an event we would expect different descriptions than we have given us. Again, as after the failure of Josiah's reform the anomaly would weigh more heavily upon the mind of the thinker than ever before, we might judge that he wrote after Josiah's death, influenced by the course of events at that time. This break up at the death of Josiah must have occasioned much doubt and bewilderment in the minds of of Habakkuk's type, and this would easily account for the appearance of such a work as this in such early times. But to attempt to fix the date any more

exactly than this is, I think, not to be justified by the material we have upon which to base our judgment.

And in the end we see how impossible it is to come to any definite, positive conclusion. On the whole I think we are justified in removing 1⁵⁻¹¹ from the text. If it is necessary to decide on some definite time and people as the date and subject of the work as a prophecy I prefer the theory that dates the prophecy between 597 and 590 and holds the Chaldeans as its subject, though this is more the choosing between evils than anything else, and I prefer the third possibility just given to all the rest. But with doubt as to the true answer to all the points raised the only result we can obtain, unsatisfied and unable to obtain receive any satisfaction, we are forced to leave the investigation.

- a. see D.A.Smith Book of the 12 Minor Pro. p.115
- b. see Davidson's Nahum, Hab. and Zeph. p.48
- c. In fact nearly all, whether holding this first theory in regard to the prophecy or not, are willing to admit that "it is to be dated somewhere along the line of Jeremiah's long career circa 627-586 E.C." (Smith p.115) The trouble arises when they attempt to determine the 'somewhere'.
- d. see Keil Com. on the Minor Pro., Volck's art. on Hab. in Herzog and Plitt's Real Encyc., Orelli's Minor Pro., Kleinert's art. on Hab. in Riehm's H. des A.E. VOL. 31
- e. see Kirkpatrick The Doctrine of the Pro. p. 269-290
- f. see Davidson N. H. and Zeph. pp. 45-55
- g. Nowack, holding to the theory that 1²⁻⁴ speaks of Chaldean oppression is compelled to cut out as glosses all the words in this passage which Davidson and others believe to point to the fact that this passage refers to the oppression of Israelites by Israelites.

- h. see Driver's art. on Hab. in Hastings's Bib. Dict.
- i. see Ewald's Pro. of the O.T. Vol.III
- j. see Schrader's ed. of DeWette's Einleitung pp.470 and 471
- k. see Smend's Alttest. Rel. Geschichte ed. 1893 note p. 231
- l. see Giesebrecht's Beitræge zur Isaiahkritik p. 197
- m. Giesebrecht p. 197
- n. Giesebrecht p. 198
- o. see Wellhausen Kp. Pro. pp. ~~DZ~~ 165-6, Giesebrecht.p.197-8
Nowack KL. Pro. p. 248 and 253-4, G.A. Smith Minor Pro. p.123,
who all agree on these reasons.
- p. see Budde's art. on Hab. in Cheyne's Encyc. Bib.
- q. I have left out from the text Rothstein's theory as to the
prophecy as I was unable to obtain this at first hand. From
notices in Smith, Budde and Nowack I gather that this theory
holds the prophecy to be against Jehojakim and the godless in Is-
rael. The date is fixed c.605. Rothstein rearranges the proph-

ecy as follows: 1^{2-4, 12a, 13,} 2^{1-3, 4, 5a, 6-10, 14, 15a,} 2^{6b, 7, 9/50}

2^{1Cab, 11, 15, 16, 19, 18} and says it was given its present form

during the exile and made to read against Babylon. But "this labors under insuperable difficulties," says Budde, Cornill, quoted

by Smith (p. 124 note), "deems it too complicated" and Nowack

(p. 250) says "Diese Auffassung scheitert an 1²⁻⁴ und 12ff.: hier

sieht sich Rothstein zu Textausschneidungen veranlasst, die

sich durchaus nicht rechtfertigen lassen." etc.

q. see Kelly's art. on The Strophic Structure of Hab. pp. 94-9

r. same p. 108

Critical Discussion of Section I^b, 2⁵-20.

We continue now our discussion to Section I^b, 2⁵-20, which, as said above, is a series of five taunts raised by the remnants of the conquered nations over their fallen oppressor.

In regard to the authenticity of this section, though all the critics accept vv. 5-8 as authentic, in regard to the rest of the verses, just as in the case of 1⁵-11, the greatest diversity ^{of opinion} prevails among the critics over the question of the authenticity of either all or part of them. Some, as Stade, Kuenen and Cornill, agree that after v. 8 not a single verse can be by Habakkuk; others, as Driver, Kirkpatrick, Davidson and Smend, even after reviewing the objections made against the verses, ~~agree~~ agree with equal certainty that not a single verse should be rejected; while still a third group, Nowack, Wellhausen, Budde, Kelly and G. A. Smith, though ^{all} do not agree on the same verses, believe that some, as 9-11, are by Habakkuk but others, as 12-14,

can hardly be by him, even though the proof for this is not altogether conclusive. ^a

As is natural, we find that each critic sees in these 'woes' further proof for his theory as to what nation is referred to in 1²-2⁴ and evidence against the theories of opponents.

~~12~~ consider first the views of Stade, Kuenen and Cornill.

Though Stade writes, "Nach dem Vorgehenden kann man den Mann, welcher 'fuer sein Haus heillosen Erwerb erwirbt' nur----- auf den Chaldaeer deuten und zwar auf den Chaldaer als Personification des ganzen Volkes der Chaldaeer. Es entspricht daher schon nicht mehr voellig dem vorausgehenden Gedankenkreise, wenn als hier angeredete der Chaldaeerkoenig gefasst wird. Aber immerhin waere ein solcher Figurenwechsel denkbar und ertraeglich" still, with Hitzig he thinks he must believe that v.9b makes it impossible to read v.9 of the king of the Chaldeans. Against Hitzig he believes that vv.9-11 can not be read against

Jehojakim, but ,because of the picture they contain, they must refer to some Palestinian tyrant other than him. He concludes from this that we can see at once that these verses have no place here.

As vv. 12^y, 13, 14 are citations from Mic 3¹⁰, Jer. 51⁵⁸ and Is. 11⁹ respectively it must be acknowledged that as they stand here they must have been added at a date later than that of Hab^{akkuk} himself.

In regard to 15-17, v. 17 makes it impossible to consider these against Jehojakim or against the Chaldeans. The Chaldeans as a nation coming to conquer a new world would have no time to go hunting or tree-cutting on Lebanon and the context will not allow v. 17 to be considered as figure of speech. vv. 15 and 16 might refer to the deeds of some upstart king in Palestine, also v. 17, but never to the king of Chaldea.

Again, vv. 18-20 can not refer to either Jehojakim or the

king of the Chaldeans as such an idolatry ^{as is spoken of in these verses} is not reported of Jehojakim's reign and it would not be right (recht) for an Israelite to chide the Chaldeans for his idolatry. The entire thought vv. 18-20 smacks of a later period and besides it may be seen that v. 18 is even younger than 19 and 20.^b

Kuenen's views are on the same order as those of Stade. ~~They~~ They are reviewed at some length by Davidson in his discussion of this second section and I therefore omit them until ~~v. 3~~ I come to my synopsis of Davidson's ideas.

Cornill also believes that it is impossible to refer vv. 9-20 to the Chaldeans; either to a single Chaldean as the personification of the entire people or to Nebuchadnezzar alone. Besides the character of the literary style of vv. 9-20 cast reflections upon it, for, while 1²-2⁸ are of the finest and most poetical of styles and of the highest originality, in 2⁹-20 we find innumerable undeniable traces of quotations from other authors,

v.12 taken from Mic.3¹⁰, v.13 from Jer.51⁵⁸, v.14 from Wis.11⁹,
 17^b from 8^b above, v.20 from Zeph. 1⁷. The verses 9-20 were
 added to vv.4-8, most probably, because, as 'woes' usually ap-
 pear in groups, the one 'woe' of vv.4-8 was not considered suffic^{ient}.

Against these objections Kirkpatrick holds (p.286) that "if
 the view of the organic connection between the several parts of
 the book which I have endeavored to maintain is correct, the
 theory (that vv. 9-20 and chap.3 are not by Hab.) falls to the
 ground, unless it is to be supposed that the original prophecy
 has been worked up by an artist at least as skilful as the pro-
 phet himself."

Driver writes that "it is difficult to think the grounds for
 this conclusion (of Stade and Kuenen) are sufficient." Some
 passages may not suit the Chaldean king but they are surely ap-
 plicable to the personified Chaldean nation. As regards v.12-
 and v.14, Habakkuk himself may have quoted these verses, and

v.13 may be the original of Jer.51⁵⁸ and not vice versa. "There is nothing to prevent 2¹⁸⁻²⁰ being a satire on the vanities of idolatry quite independent of II.Is. or Jer. 10." d

Davidson states that "the objections to ^{the genuineness of} ~~vv.9-20~~ vv.9-20 do not appear of great weight." He reviews Kuenen's objections at length and believes: 1. That it is difficult to see the objection to believing vv.9-11 said of the Chaldeans. 2. In regard to vv. 15-17, the repetition of the refrain in v.17 of v.8 argues rather that v. 17 is authentic than otherwise, and the "statement that 'nothing is known' of devastations on Lebanon by the Chaldeans is strange", as Is. XIV 8 certainly seems to know of such. Though Kuenen believes that 'woe to him that giveth his neighbor drink' refers to some actual occurrence the fact that the whole passage is figurative is shown by the threat that in the end the same fate will overtake the Chaldeans. 3. The whole scope of vv.18-20 is against Kuenen's interpretation which

holds that because it would be hardly fitting for the prophet to blame a heathen nation for its idolatry the 'woe' can not be against the Chaldeans, but must be against some people 'who knew better', i.e. some people not heathen. The prophet assails idolatry itself, thinks Davidson, and though this theoretical condemnation of idolatry is more common in writers of a later date, as Habakkuk anticipates several other ideas of later times besides this, this ^{objection} can not form a serious ~~objection~~ difficulty.

4. The objection to 12-14 is more plausible than the rest, as both Micah and Isaiah are earlier than Habakkuk. Of course "opinions will differ on the question whether Habakkuk was likely to quote Isaiah and Micah" or not, but in regard to v. 13, as Jer. 51, in its present form, is probably later than Habakkuk, instead of v. 13 being original in Jeremiah perhaps the verse in Jeremiah is quoted from here.^e

Smend also believes that the objections raised by Stade

and Xuenen will not stand testing. Stade, he says, is right to believe that vv. 9-20, as continuation of vv. 4-8, must refer to a Chaldean as personification of the entire people and not to the Chaldean king, but why Stade does not continue and explain the ff. verses in this light, instead of cutting them out as un-authentic, as Stade does, he can not understand. To Smend it seems that this personification of a single Chaldean for the nation runs plainly throughout all the verses (9-20) in such a manner as to show not only that these all hang closely together but also that they are a necessary continuation to vv. 4-8. With justice it is ~~said~~ said that vv. 18-20 ^{contain} a complaint against the Chaldeans' idolatry, but to say that such an idea can not ^{have} emanated from a pre-exilic prophet is simply a "petitio principii".

If v. 13 is like Jer. 51⁵⁸ and v. 14 like Is. 11^{9b} it is to be questioned on which side the borrowing is; especially in the case of Is. 11^{9b} which is scarcely to be judged Isaianic. As ~~for~~

for v.12 and v.20 these simply correspond in idea to Mic.3¹⁰ and Zeph.1⁷ respectively and nothing more.^f

Now, taking position between these entirely opposed sides, are Nowack, Wellhausen, Budde, ~~Smith~~ Smith and Kelly.

Nowack thinks there are sufficient grounds for rejecting 8b, 12-14, 17b, 18 and 20 but sees no reason for not accepting 9-11, 15, 16 and also -though less surely- 17a and 19.

vv.9-11 are a picture of a Chaldean who stands for the nation, and there is no reason why they should be cut out of the text. V.12 is strongly reminiscent of Mic.3¹⁰ and most probably stood at one time as a note to v.9, but was by mistake put into the text, and at that in the wrong place. v.13 is a development of the woe of v.12, pointing to Jer.51^{58b}. v.14 is also not original, depending on Is.11⁹.

Of vv.15-17, 17b must surely be cut out, as it does not fit in at all, either here or in v.8. On the other hand, to v.16

not being understood^{to be} of the Chaldeans and ~~by~~ ~~by~~ by Habakkuk,
 neither the ideas contained nor the language are opposed, and in
 regard to v.17, though this is rather strange, since after vv.
 15 and 16 we would expect some different complaint than this
 verse contains, still, for all we know to the contrary, this
 verse also [Ⓢ] [Ⓢ] may be authentic.

In regard to vv.18-20, v.18 was, perhaps, at one time a mar-
 ginal note to v.19, afterwards, by mistake, put into the text
 in wrong position. v.20 is reminiscent of Zeph.1⁷. As the con-
 nection of vv.18-20 with the authentic parts of the chapter is
 slight and as these verses are all very reminiscent of Jer.10
 and Deuteroisaiah there need be little doubt that they are all
 a later addition.⁸

Wellhausen can see no reason why vv.9-20, as they stand,
 can not, as a whole, refer to the Chaldeans. He raises no ques-
 tion against the authenticity of vv.9-11 and 18-20, but be-

believes in regard to the rest that, for the reasons given by Stade and others, vv.12-14 can scarcely be by Habakkuk and that vv.15-17 can not have been written by a pre-exilic author.^h

Budde, following his theory as to against whom the prophecy is written, believes, of course, that the 'woes' are against the Assyrians, not the Chaldeans. vv.12-14, are according to him, an editorial gloss and vv.18-20 waste time in charging a heathen king with idolatry when the one desire of Judah was to be rid of his tyranny. In regard to the remaining 'woes', though the text is very corrupt, there is no doubt that these are authentic. ⁱ

Kelly agrees with those who hold vv.9-11 and 15-17 authentic but vv.12-14 and 18-20 doubtful. In regard to these last two 'woes', in addition to the reasons given by the other critics, ^k he judges that the poetical form of these also argues in favor of their being of a later date than the others. ^j

And finally, G.A. Smith believes that Stade's and Kuenen's

denial of the entire part, vv. 9-20, is without reason. He can not see why vv. 9-11, even though it must be admitted that they fit the Assyrians better, are strange when said of the Chaldeans, and also, for what reason vv. 15-17 should be taken from Habakkuk. He admits that vv. 12-14 are doubtful, while the fact that ⁱⁿ vv. 18-20, v. 19 has the 'woe' instead of v. 18, that the language closely resembles that of later prophets, and that v. 20 is a quotation from Zephaniah, are all signs of the composite character of the end of this second chapter.^k

And so here again, in this second section of the book of Habakkuk, we see how impossible it is to decide, with even an approach at certainty, on the authenticity of the verses, as ~~op~~ ^{op}inions based for the most part on mere conjecture can never be very conclusive. Still, on carefully weighing all the arguments offered pro and con, it seems to me that both ^{who hold} those [^]all the verses (9-20) a later addition and those who hold them all to be

authentic are less convincing than those who believe vv.12-14 and 18-20 a later addition but vv.9-11 and 15-17 by Habakkuk himself, and I therefore prefer this last theory to the other two.

On the question, "Against whom are the 'woes' directed?", following the theory offered by me, pp.41-47, in the preceding chapter, I would rather judge that these 'woes' are directed against the wicked in general than against Jehojakim, or the Assyrians, or the Egyptians, or the Chaldeans in particular. I do not believe that, from the allusions in the text, we have sufficient or definite enough material to judge that the author had any nation in particular in mind when he wrote his book and I think that it is this very indefiniteness and scantiness of the material that has led to this great variety of opinions and made such possible.

- a. Such men as Kleinert, Keil, Ewald and Schrader do not doubt the authenticity of any part of this section, or, for that matter of any part of the entire book.
- b. see Stade's Zeitschrift A.T.W. 1884, pp. 154-156.
- c. see Cornill Einl. in das A.T. p. 190.
- d. see Driver's art. in Hastings's Bib. Dict.
- e. see Davidson's N. H. and Z. pp. 56-8.
- f. see Smend Alt. Rel. Geschichte ed. 1893 p. 229 note 2.
- g. see Nowack Kl. Pro. pp. 248-9 and pp. 262-5.
- h. see Wellhausen Kl. Pro. pp. 168-170.
- i. see Budde's art. on Hab. in Cheyne's Encyc. Bib.
- j. see Kelly's art. 'The Strophic Structure of Hab.' in The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures pp. 112-13.
- k. see G.A. Smith Ik of the 12 Minor Pro. pp. 124-126.

Critical Discussion of Section II, Chapter 3.

And finally, we consider the 'psalm', or prayer, of Habakkuk, the third chapter of the book as we now have it. And here we find that though some commentators, as Ewald, Volck, Kleinert, Orelli and Kirkpatrick, just as in the case of 2⁵⁻²⁰, can see no reason to doubt the authenticity of this chapter, still nearly all the later critics, as Stade, Cornill, Nowack, Budde, Nestle, Wellhausen, Kelly and Cheyne, come to the conclusion that the proof is fully adequate to justify the claim that it is impossible for Habakkuk to have written this poem, though who really did and when he did it are impossible to determine with any certainty. Three others, Driver, Davidson and G.A. Smith, are unable to make up their minds just which opinion to hold, but in the end, even though they believe the holders of the first view have some grounds for justification, I think they are willing, even though reluctantly, to favor the opinion held by the second group.

Of those who hold the first view, Ewald thinks not only that Habakkuk himself arranged the work as a psalm with musical notes attached but also that the chapter is closely connected with the preceding and hangs on v.4, while Kirkpatrick must believe that "as the 'woes' upon the Chaldeans correspond to the first clause of the central oracle(2) so this poem(in chapter3) corresponds to the second" (p.281) and the relation of the parts and the progress of the thought in the entire book are so very plain and striking " as entirely to outweigh arguments against the unity of the book derived from some difficulty of detail!(p.275)

On the other hand, to begin with, it is said that because the psalm is inscribed to Habakkuk need be no proof that he wrote it as in the LXX, Itala and Peshito single psalms, which originally had no author's name, are ascribed to Jeremiah, Haggai and Zechariah. And besides, what the "difficulties of detail" are, which Kirkpatrick deems ⁱⁿ sufficient, but which the later critics

consider sufficient, to disprove Habakkuk's authorship of the chapter, are briefly as follows:

First, the chapter has words within it that seem to mark it out as "psalmus ~~ex~~ canonem". The superscription and subscription, the use of the word 'Selah' (which occurs in the psalms 71 times) in vv. 3, 9, 13; of the word מְנַחֵם (in the psalms 55 times); the immediately following word מִלְּפָנֶיךָ (cf. with psalms 4, 6, 54, etc) of מִלְּפָנֶיךָ ^{of the Sanctus, in v. 1 (cf. ps. 17, 86, 90, 102)} to mean a poetical piece; and of the word מִלְּפָנֶיךָ (in the plural), are things which, besides the psalms, this chapter alone uses and which, as Budde says, "give it the full apparatus of a poem fitted to be used in public worship." a

In regard to verse 19, though Nowack and Budde believe that this, with what is now verse 1, originally stood at the head of the chapter as one verse, which verse was only later divided into two as we now have them, I think that Nestle's idea on this point is far superior and one of the best arguments advanced to show

that chapter 3 was originally a psalm.

Nestle believes that v. 19 must have been the superscription of the psalm following the one we have here in chapter 3, while this latter was still in the psalm collection from which it was taken by the editor of the book of Habakkuk ~~when~~ because it happened to be inscribed to Habakkuk. When chapter 3 was copied to take its place where we now have it the first verse of the next psalm¹ was joined to it, by a mistake of the copyist, to form verse 19. The copying of the superscription of the following psalm to be the subscription of the preceding one, that occurred in this case, is not a *ἑπὰξ λεγόμενον*, but occurs repeatedly in ^bthe Hallelujah psalms of the Psalter (cf., e.g., Ps. 103 and 104, and Ps. 104 and 105.) and this would surely argue in favor of considering that chapter 3 was originally a psalm.

Secondly, the late or post-exilic date of the work is shown by the use of the word *אֲשֶׁר* in v. 13 to mean the people of Israel

and not the king, (cf. Ps. 28⁸, 84⁹, 89³⁸, etc.), of the late *qlyi* name *qlyi* in v.3, of the phrase *qlyi* *qlyi* in v.2, the sparing use of the article, all of which usages are very late.^c

Again, the third chapter connects very slightly, if at all, in content with the preceding. The calamities complained of in chapters one and two are surely different from those of v.17, and the prophet seeks consolation in the first section in ideas different from those in which consolation is sought for in the second. In the one the prophet himself is the speaker, in the other it is the community that prays. In the first and second chapters/ the enemy, whoever he may be, is described in clear-cut pictures, plainly and positively; in the third the description is very vague. It surely does not seem possible that 31⁴, "Their rejoicing was to devour the poor secretly", could apply to the same foe described in 1¹²⁻¹⁷. In the first section it is a man who is to punish man, no theophany seems thought of; in

the second section it is God himself who comes forth in a brilliant theophany to crush the oppressors of his people.^d

And lastly, the two parts differ greatly in style and language. The one is at most 'elevated prose', the other a lyric poem of great force and splendor. As Cornill writes (p.191) "— der Gedankenkreis dieses Liedes ist die eschatologisch gefärbte Apokalyptik, seine Ausdruckweise der künstlich archaisirende Styl von Stücken wie Dtn 32 IISam 23¹⁻⁸ Ps 68 u. 90, mit welchem letzterem es die entsprechende Ueberschrift gemein hat."

Stade, for these reasons, though ~~not~~ not believing the chapter originally to have been a psalm, concludes that this chapter, (as well as 2⁹⁻²⁰), could not have been written by Habakkuk himself but emanates from post-exilic times. Some later oppressor of the Israelites, he explains, no doubt by his great oppression caused some later period in Jewish history to become a counterpart of the period described in 1²⁻²⁸ and the later author of

2⁹-3¹⁹ simply used 1²-2⁸ as the first part of his own work because it was such a perfect picture of his own time and hope. To fix the time when this was done with any exactness is impossible owing to our imperfect knowledge of the post-exilic history and also to the indefiniteness of the part 2⁹-3¹⁹.e

Against Stade, Cornill, believing Stade's view not as probable as Kuenen's, agrees with Kuenen that chapter 3 was a psalm taken from some psalm collection and that the date can not be so very late in the post-exilic period as Psalm 77¹⁷⁻²⁰ is plainly dependent upon it. f

Wellhausen holds that even though 2²⁰ does connect chapter 3 closely with the preceding, the internal evidence is enough to prove the work to have been a psalm and not by Habakkuk. He also believes that the original ending of this psalm has been lost and therefore replaced by 3¹⁷⁻¹⁹. He thinks that if we had this original ending we might determine what the author~~s~~ really

intended in 3²⁻¹⁶ -whether he described a past theophany as type of the future one, or whether he described the future one in ~~the~~ terms taken from older pictures of theophanies, a question which is now doubtful; but as we do not have this original ending we can determine nothing.^g

Cheyne thinks that Habakkuk 3 " is one of the lyric passages inserted in the prophecies in the Persian period." That it was written in the Persian and not in the exile period he judges is shown by the "strong expressions" used in the chapter which could hardly be accounted for in the exile period unless "we are content to regard this church-ode as more or less of an academic study." "How imitative and how artificial, in a word how late (in spite of its archaic roughness) the style of the ode is, we need not be shown here." ^h

Nowack states(p.249) that under all considerations chapter 3 must be denied to be of Habakkuk's authorship. Also, as v.17

speaks of an existing condition of need which is the result of physical causes when ~~y~~ one would expect here, because of the foregoing verses, a description of a catastrophe, the result of man's action, he agrees with Wellhausen that most probably vv.17-19 are not the original conclusion of the poem. (pp.266 and 273)

Kelly agrees (p.94) that probability points to the fact that chapter 3 is not by Habakkuk and in regard to vv.17-19, because of Wellhausen's suggestions, and the additional fact that the strophic arrangement of these verses differs from that of the ~~the~~ remainder of the chapter, that these are a later addition. (p.119)

Budde joins Nowack and Wellhausen in their first conclusion but in regard to the second is not sure whether vv.17-19 are the original ending of the poem or not. He thinks that v.17 does seem strange here, and yet "it may give some fresh touch to the picture of the fate of the hostile people" to which v.18 not only forms a most appropriate contrast, but also a typical psalm epi-

logue, and compares it with Ps. 13^{5f}; 26^{11f}; 52^{8f}; etc. ⁱ

Of the three who seem unable to make up their minds, Driver thinks that "if 17-19 might be regarded as an appendix attached to vv. 2-16 by a later hand, one ground for doubting Habakkuk's authorship" would be removed, but that unfortunately the other ~~qvvvvv~~ difficulties (spoken of above) would still remain. Of Kirpatrick's attempt to show that the third chapter must ~~form~~ form an integral part of the book, he writes that the arguments advanced show "not so much that it is natural or necessary, as that it is possible so to explain it," and he ends, saying that "on the whole, while reluctant to conclude that the ode of chapter 3 is not the work of Habakkuk and while readily allowing that the reasons adduced do not demonstrate that it is not his, the present writer must own that it contains features ~~that~~ which seem to him to make it difficult to affirm its authorship confidently." ^{8;}

Davidson thinks (p. 58⁸) that the question ^ewhether or not chap.

3 is by Habakkuk can not be answered with certainty. After giving Kuenen's view on this question he gives the alternative supposition which holds that the poem is by Habakkuk and taken from the book to form part of the liturgical service, the musical notes ^h which it now has being given to it when it was thus used. But further than to say "such a use of any part of a prophetic book has no parallel" he does not comment on the discussion, (though it seems to me he might well have added, 'nor is there any proof of value brought forward to show why we should believe this to be true in this case',) and after showing how indefinite the third chapter is and that "it has few points of contact with the prophecy, ch. I. II" he leaves the point, with ~~not/any/~~ everything undetermined and in the air.

Though G.A. Smith believes the theory that Habakkuk did not write the poem is more probable than the alternative opinion, he believes at the same time that the critics who hold that the

chapter is genuine have some grounds for their opinion.. Then he simply says of the arguments of these last that "all this, however, only proves possibility," and closes the discussion.

(pp.127-8) Against Wellhausen and Nowack he holds that vv.17-19 are part of the original poem. (p. 152)

As for my own opinion concerning this third chapter, I think that the opinion that Habakkuk could not have written it is, from the evidence offered in its support, proven with more certainty than is any other that deals with any of the numerous difficulties arising from a study of the book. The arguments against this idea seem to me practically worthless in the face of those brought up in its favor and I can not see how the former establish even the 'possibility' of which Driver and Smith speak. There is not the slightest evidence, e.g., to show that a portion of a prophetic book was ever borrowed from its original position for use in a temple service, and to advocate such an

idea in order to explain how the liturgical signs of this third chapter were placed in the text simply shows what slight means of defence those critics have who try to maintain that the third chapter is by Habakkuk.

- a. see Budde's art. on H. in Cheyne's Encyc. Bib., Nowack 's Kl. Pro., notes to chapter 3., Wellhausen's Kl. Pro. pp. 170-72, Cornill Einleitung p. 191, etc.
- b. see Nestle in Z.A.T.W. 1900 p. 167.
- c. see Nowack, as above, Stade in Z.A.T.W. 1884 pp. 156 ff., Budde, as above, Wellhausen, as above, etc.
- d. see Cornill, Stade, Nowack, Budde, as above.
- e. see Stade Z.A.T.W. 1884 p. 158.
- f. see Cornill's Einleitung p. 191.
- g. see Wellhausen's Kl. Proph. p. 171.
- h. see Cheyne's Bampton Lectures, 1889, p. 147 and notes p. 156.
- i. see Budde's art. On H. in Cheyne's Encyc. Bib.
- j. see Driver's art. on H. in Hastings's Bib. D.

Style.

Small indeed are the remains of the prophet's works that have come down to us and, unfortunately, on top of that, half spoiling that which we have, this small remnant comes to us in a most badly mutilated condition; the splendid work is greatly injured by the extreme corruption of the text. Such places as 1^{9b}; 1¹¹; 2⁵; 3^{8a}; 3⁹; 3^{13c}; 3^{16end}, are beyond correction, and question as to whether words like ר'נכח in v.4, אפח in v.4, א'גב in v.5 of chapter one, etc. etc. are correct^{or not}, must ever remain doubtful. Even though Kautsch, Nowack, Eudde, Smith and others, and above all Wellhausen, have worked hard and succeeded in doing quite a deal ~~to~~ toward restoring the text, at least toward obtaining a text that is readable and makes sense, offering many suggestions that are both probable and good, still the hope for very great success in this attempted restoration

of the original text must be seen to be futile.

Fortunately however, this mutilation of the text does "not hamper us much in our appreciation of Habakkuk's spiritual attitude and poetic gifts", as Smith writes, and it surely takes no extremely great knowledge of Hebrew to be able to appreciate the striking characteristics and beauties of the style of Habakkuk that still shine forth through all the corruptions.

Driver's opinion that "the literary power of Habakkuk is considerable" and that "though the book is a brief one it is full of force"; its descriptions graphic and powerful; its thought and expression alike poetic, is more than borne out by the reading of the book.

In these few words Driver gives us all, and to say more is simply to add detail to the broad outline he thus gives us. The style of the book is dramatic and forceful; the language is

well-chosen for the ideas; parallelisms and alliterations abound; the figures used, as e.g., the metaphor in 1¹³⁻¹⁷, are excellent; a perfect, splendid rhythm runs through it all. The language of the complaint, 1²⁻⁴, the vivid description of the wicked conqueror in the guise of a fisherman, the picture of the tormented remnants arising in exultant chorus over the shattered strength of their former oppressor, are all done with more than usual ~~per~~ power and we are made to ~~y~~ feel, to see and to hear all that ~~(did)~~ the author himself ^{did}. And because of all these things, even if we may not agree with Kelly that the first two chapters are a poem, still there can be little question that the work possesses a style that is of the best of the highly poetical prose styles that we have in the Bible.

And ~~with~~ this opinion, with but one partial exception, all the critics, whom I consulted, who ~~expressed~~ rendered

judgment, have agreed in the strongest of terms, and this not only in regard to chapters one and two, but also in regard to chapter three, no matter who the author of this last may have been.

Kleinert, for example, says^w "Eigentuemlich ist ihm der durchweg lyrische Klang der Rede, in der sich der Kraft Jesaja's und die weiche Empfindung Jeremia's vereinigt." Der kraftvolle, kuehne und doch von Selbstbeherrschung zeugende Stil wird mit Recht bewundert.^a

Though of chapter three Cornill, the one partially dissenting critic, may write "Diese meist ungebuehrlich ueberschaetzte Psalm bietet reine Rhetorik"(p.191), DeWette thinks that the author in this "----uebertrifft --- alles was die Poesie der Hebraeer in dieser Art aufzuweisen hat; die groesste Staerke und Fuelle, den erhabensten Schwung beherrscht er mit dem Masse

der Schoenheit und Klarheit" and Driver writes that the "grand imagery and rythmic flow of this ode will bear comparison with some of the finest productions of the Hebrew muse."

In regard to the models used by Habakkuk for his work Budde believes that he is dependent in the main features of his book upon Isaiah. Eudde thinks that Hab. 1^{13,17} suggest Is. 10^{5ff}; that the announcement of the Chaldeans, 1⁵⁻¹¹, is suggestive of that of the Assyrians in Is. 5^{26ff}; that the three 'woes' of 2^{6b-17} are reminiscent of the seven 'woes' of Is. 5⁸⁻²³ 10¹⁻⁴. Eudde also agrees with Rothstein that Habakkuk shows "in details a close affinity" to Jeremiah, but that "one must not therefore be in haste to say he copies from Jeremiah" as the fact that both lived in the same period would easily account for such a similarity. But in spite of the influence Isaiah may have had upon him, Eudde agrees with Smith, Habakkuk has a literary power quite his own,

upon which he may lay due emphasis. "When all has been said", Eudde concludes, "Habakkuk is entitled to be regarded as a well marked prophetic and poetical personality; the remains of his work that have reached us are among the finest examples of prophetic literature." b

In regard to the form that the author used for his work, though all were willing heretofore to regard the first section, chapters one and two, as most elevated, rhythmic prose, of strong dramatic power, still none went so far as to believe it a poem. But recently Mr. Fred Kelly, of the University of Wisconsin, advocated this new theory,^c believing that on close scrutiny he found in these first two chapters all the characteristics of Hebrew poetry, "viz. y, parallelisms, archaic and poetic forms, alliterations, unusual words, chiasms, and the inverted order of words, as well as the rhythmical flow of the language in a def-

inite number of words to each line. (p. 99)^d

After giving a number of examples of these things he believes that "taking of all these lines of evidence into consideration we have good reasons for classing these two chapters as poetry". Then taking this for granted, accepting the best emendations of the text that he can find, he proceeds at length in an attempt to rediscover the original strophic form which he believes the material must once have had.

In 1²⁻⁴, 12-17, 21-4, which he calls "the plaint and the answer," Kelly arranges nine strophes, as follows: I. 2-vv. 2 and 3; II. -1⁴; III. -1^{12ab}, and 13ab; IV. -1^{13cd}, 14; V. -1¹⁵, 16a; VI. -1^{16b}, 17; VII. -2¹; VIII. -2^{2bc}, 3ab; IX. -2^{3c}, 4. The movement in these verses is, after v. 2, with but slight variation, trimeter. V. 2 has a pentameter movement, 3+2, called by Budde the *Qinah* measure, which is the regular form used in lamentations. The

slight variations in the length of the lines with which we meet is made purposely in order to vary the form with the thought.

(see pp. 101-105.)

Next, following the arrangement of the order suggested by Eudde, he puts 1⁵⁻¹¹, 'an address to the tyrant', in which he finds five strophes. I. -1⁵ ; II. -1⁶ and 7; III. -1^{8a-d} ; IV. -1^{8e, 9} ; V. -1¹⁰ and 11. This section is not as regular in its strophic arrangement and the flow of the lines seems in favor of a division 4+6+4+4+4+6. (see p.p. 105-108)

Then 2⁵⁻²⁰ 'the downfall of the tyrant', has six strophes. I. -2⁵, 6ab ; II. -2^{6cd}, 7, 8 ; III. -2^{9, 10, 11} ; IV. -2^{12, 13, 14} ; V. -2^{15, 16, 17} ; VI. -2^{19, 18, 20} . The strophic arrangement is again more complex than in the first section and also, though in the main the lines are trimeters, the measure is not as regular as in the other two divisions. The first, third and fifth strophes

are eight-lined, perhaps to be arranged 3+3+2, the first and third strophes being followed by a two-lined refrain which perhaps ought to follow all the other strophes. The fourth also has eight lines but these are rather to be arranged 2+3+3 than 3+3+2. The sixth strophe is of ten lines arranged 2+3+3+2, "with the two lines following as a sort of antiphon." (see pp. 108-113)

Finally, 3¹⁻¹⁹, 'the prayer of Habakkuk' has nine strophes. I. -3²; II. -3^{3,4}; III. -3^{5,6}; IV. -3^{7,8}; V. -3^{9ab,11,12}; VI. -3^{9c,10,15}; VII. -3^{13,14}; VIII. -3¹⁶; IX. -3^{17,18,19}. In this section the division of the material into strophes, because, no doubt, of the great corruption of the text, is extremely difficult and hard to decide upon. Strophe I. may be put in five lines, strophes II., III., IV., V., VI., and VII. in seven lines, strophe VIII. in six lines, while IX. is a strophe of eight lines plus a doxology of three lines plus a line that is probably a

musical direction. The movement in this section is again, in the main, trimeter, and the variations ~~dy~~, on the whole, seem to be due to the mutilations of the text. g (pp. 113-119)

Kelly's theory is so recent that none of the critics have, as yet, had an opportunity to deal with it. To me it seems that he has rather good grounds for his opinion that the first two chapters are poetry, but how far justified he is in the rearrangement of the material which he presents to us is of course impossible for me to decide and I leave this to those more fitted to render judgment, who will in the future deal with this prophecy and the commentaries to it.

- a. see Orelli's Minor Pro. p. 326, from where this is quoted.
- c. see The American Journal of Sem. Languages and Literatures for Jan. 1902, Kelly's art. on the Strophic Structure of Hab.
- d. It may be noted that, believing them to be corruptions, either Nowack or Wellhausen object to four of the five uncommon η words and three of the five archaic and poetic forms quoted by Kelly.
- b. see Budde's art on H. in Cheyne's Eib. $\mathcal{D}\gamma$ Encyc.

The Thought of the Book of Habakkuk.

Though Jeremiah and Habakkuk were contemporaries the difference in attitude toward the problems before them, as shown by their respective books, would surely seem to point to the ~~y~~ fact that at least several generations separated them from one another.

While Jeremiah sees only the evil in Israel; the criminality of the people; in the trouble that has come upon them only the just punishment for their wrongdoing; a state of affairs so hopeless that the averting of that ^{most} ~~awfullest~~ punishment, the utter overthrow of the kingdom, is no longer possible, to Habakkuk ~~the~~ things do not look so bad, and though it is true that he sees ~~the~~ the sins of the people, still, owing to the different standpoint he takes, these occupy but the ~~of~~ background of his field of vision and are never prominent.

While for Jeremiah the destruction of the Chaldeans, the oppressors, occupies the background, being seen only in the distant future, and ^{occurs} ~~is then~~ even then not because of their own tyranny and excesses but "is viewed as involved in God's purpose to restore his people", Habakkuk is engaged almost wholly with the doom of the impious conqueror, this inhuman monster who is a thousand times worse than the peoples whom by his conquest he is supposed to punish, and though he also sees this Punishment of the conqueror in the dim distance yet ~~this~~ ^{is} to come because of the wickedness of the evildoer and for no other cause.

To Habakkuk it seemed that though the people might have merited some punishment ^h ~~for~~ former evildoing, at this time they were more or less righteous. Yet in spite of all the attempts to introduce reforms pleasing to God ^{made} ~~undertaken~~ by Josiah, such as the doing away with idolworship and the promulgation of

God's law found in the book of law discovered in the Temple, the people were being crushed by a ruthless destroyer who ~~and~~ acknowledged no power other than that of his own ~~right~~ right arm. ~~and~~ ¹ the doubts and problems that arose in the mind of Habakkuk because of the sight of this seeming gross injustice in no way troubled the thoughts of the prophet Jeremiah.

As said before, I think that in this book Habakkuk shows himself to be the first who gave expression to the deepseated doubt and perplexity that must have arisen in the minds of more of the thinkers in Israel of that day because of this anomaly of the righteous being oppressed by the more ~~wy~~ wicked, -doubts and questions ^{the discussion of which} ~~that~~ ^{was} carried further and deeper by later men, such as the authors of the books of Job and Ecclesiastes.

Habakkuk can not understand this ^{anomaly} ~~at~~ all and anxiously sets himself to work to discover the answer. The problem is a hard

one to solve. It has perplexed all mankind during all ages, - is perhaps still unsolved today. And though Habakkuk does give the answer he has thought out in the fourth verse of the second chapter, this is really no answer to the main question at all. He simply advocates faithfulness and patience as the only things ~~things~~ possible for the doubting righteous. He does not, can ~~not~~ not, really explain why God's plan of government involves so many seeming injustices. He simply tells the pious doubters to labor on as best they can; that the wicked in the end must surely perish, - they can not continue on forever against God's laws without paying the just penalty, - but the righteous shall live through their faithfulness, ~~through~~ through their unswerving devotion to God and his law, and in the end they will reap their reward. In the end the righteous will be able to lift themselves in triumph above the broken, crushed oppressor. "Tyranny is suicide"

and "in the face of experience that baffles faith " let the righteous but remain faithful and their reward must ultimately come.

In this short work Habakkuk shows himself to be universal and not merely national in his thought. He speaks for all the world when he ~~cries~~ cries aloud his complaint, and not for Israel alone. Nowhere does he make special mention of Israel or the righteous in Israel; Habakkuk complains, for example, in verse four of the first chapter *רשע מכתיר את צדיק*, in the thirteenth verse *למה תחריש בבלע רשע צדיק מחלל*, in verse fourteen the wicked *יעשה אדם כדג*, in the fifth verse of the second chapter the wicked *ויאסף אלן כל הגוים* and these peoples, it is, who in verse six rise up to chant their taunt song over the fallen oppressor..