

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

mystery—the lives that have been cut off in their prime. When one is richly endowed and carefully trained, and has come to the zenith of his power, his sudden removal seems a reflection on the economy of God's kingdom. Why call this man to the choir celestial when he is so much needed in active service? According to Jesus, he has not sunk into inaction, so much subtracted from the forces of righteousness. He has gone where the fetters of this body of humiliation and the embarrassment of adverse circumstances shall be no longer felt. We must not think of him as withdrawn from the field; we must imagine him as in the van of battle. We must follow him, our friend, with hope and a high heart.

“No, at noonday, in the bustle of man's worktime,
Greet the unseen with a cheer;
Bid him forward breast and back as either should be,
“Strive and thrive,” cry “speed, fight on, fare ever
There as here!”

JOHN WATSON.

PROBLEMS OF THE PROPHETIC LITERATURE.

II. HABAKKUK.

OF latest critics it is admittedly Professor Stade to whom we are pre-eminently indebted for a fresh and fruitful impetus in the investigation of that extremely difficult section of Biblical literature, the Prophetic. This is the case with regard to the small but specially beautiful and remarkable Book of Habakkuk. In 1884, in a brief essay in his *Zeitschrift*,¹ Stade brought forward detailed proof of his view, that the passages ii. 9–20 and chap. iii. cannot be assigned to the prophet of the close of the seventh century. In ii. 9–20 he found a prophetic denunciation of a small Pales-

¹ *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, iv. pp. 154–9.

tinian tyrant; in chap. iii. a Prayer of the faithful community, after the manner of the Psalter, both pieces being of postexilic date. His view of chap. iii. was not only adopted by Kuenen in 1889,¹ but was corroborated by additional proof and by evidence for the fact, that the Prayer must have been taken from a postexilic hymn-book. In the same year Cheyne² put forward a similar view. Wellhausen³ supplied, in 1892, excellent elucidations of what still remains a very obscure and difficult poem. I do not know that there is anything of importance to be added to what he has said on chap. iii., and may therefore pass on.

The section chap. i. 2-ii. 8 was not disputed by Stade in any way, but was accepted as "the prophecy of a prophet of the Chaldean period; the thoughts harmonious and well arranged, and the text, except in a few places, well preserved." But it is precisely with this section that a series of recent investigations have been occupied, and to these we must now give our attention. Afterwards we shall have to speak of ii. 9-20.

Giesebrecht⁴ was the first, in 1890, to show convincingly that i. 12 immediately connects with i. 4. On that account he removed the verses i. 5-11 from their present position and placed them before verse 1, as an oracle complete in itself, containing the first announcement of the Chaldeans, as it appears, under the form of the Scythians. The remaining piece, complete in itself, i. 2-4, 12-ii. 8, he still regarded, as before, as a prophecy against the Chaldeans, probably written in the exile under their oppression. There was no reason why the prophet should mention their name to his readers here, least of all if he had placed i. 5-11 as an introduction at the beginning of his book. Well-

¹ *Hist.-kritisch Onderzoek*, ²ii. pp. 389 sqq.

² *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 147, 156 sq.

³ *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, i. pp. 166 sq.

⁴ In his book, *Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik*, pp. 197 sq.

hausen¹ accepted fully Giesebrecht's discovery, save that at the same time he seems to consider i. 2-4, 12-ii. 4 (this is his division) pre-exilic, which is certainly necessary (comp. i. 2-4).

It is only from its bearing on the critical question that I attach any value to the fact that I had myself independently separated the verses i. 5-11 from their present context and had worked out a complete theory of the structure of the Book of Habakkuk before I was made aware by Wellhausen's book of Giesebrecht's views.² My essay has since been published in the *Studien und Kritiken*.³ Without here repeating the reasons which I there gave in detail for the separation of i. 5-11, which are for the most part additional to those urged by Giesebrecht and Wellhausen, I will only indicate briefly my further conclusions and the solution of the problem of the book based thereon. It is evident that i. 5-11 do not form a complete oracle. The fact that the introduction is wanting may be explained from the misplacement of the verses; but the invasion of the nations announced lacks the reference to Judah which we must expect in the case of a Hebrew prophet. On the other hand, the prophecy i. 2-4, 12 sqq., ii. 1 sqq., regarded as a prophecy against the Chaldeans, has no intelligible conclusion. This cannot be better proved than by Wellhausen's words, "In connection with the following sentence [ii. 4], the question comes to our lips, Is it such an utterance as to require a revelation? If this is all, Habakkuk's vision was meagre indeed, although he was greatly exercised about it!" The *announcement* of the overthrow of the oppressive world-power is wholly absent; all at once ii. 6 opens a hymn in which the destruction, of which we have as yet

¹ *Ut supra*, pp. 161 sq.

² It appears from Kuenen, *Hist.-krit. Onderzoek*, 'ii. (1863) pp. 362 sq., that, unnoticed by any of us, de Goeje, following von Gumpach, was as early as 1861 upon the same track.

³ 1893, pp. 383 sqq.

heard nothing, of that power is presupposed. Moreover, if a powerful nation is to be overthrown, a second nation is required to effect the overthrow (according to the Divine purpose); Habakkuk must therefore speak of two nations. Now, as i. 5-11 announces to the Chaldeans not their destruction, but their conquest and possession of cities and kingdoms, they are manifestly in Habakkuk's oracle, to use Goethe's simile, not the anvil but the hammer. In that case, the proper place of i. 5-11 is not, as a piece complete in itself, *before* i. 2, but after ii. 4, as the needed conclusion, thus filling the hiatus which Wellhausen had rightly felt, but wrongly charged upon the prophet. With the view of overthrowing the oppressor of the present, Jahweh will *raise up* (i. 6) the Chaldeans and make them victorious. In that case the oppressor of that time is of course none other than the power *actually* overthrown by the Chaldeans, *i.e.* the Assyrian empire, and Habakkuk's prophecy is not directed, as had hitherto always been supposed, against the Chaldeans, but against *the Assyrians*. In my essay I have shown in detail that the history of the time and the description of the enemy of that period confirm my solution of the problem, and I have also supplied the corrections of the text rendered necessary by the corruptions incidental to the misplacement. The explanation of this displacement lies in the fact that Habakkuk's prophecy remained unfulfilled. The invasion of the Chaldeans did not bring to Judah life, freedom, external and moral religious prosperity, but destruction, vassalage, and misery. Undoubtedly this was not due to any want of essential truth in the prophecy itself, but to the evil policy of Judah, which defied all the prophetic warnings of a Jeremiah. But the abstract view of the nature of prophecy and its fulfilment prevailing at a later time could not be satisfied by such considerations. Accordingly by the transposition of the section i. 5-11, or strictly 6-11 (see below), perhaps also by the

erasure of the name Assyria, it was made to appear that the prophecy announced the overthrow of the Chaldean Empire, and with it the deliverance which actually occurred under Cyrus. Originally the book thus far consisted of the following passages: i. 2-4, 12-17, ii. 1-4, i. 6-11, ii. 5, and in this order.¹

For this solution Professor Rothstein,² of Halle, proposed in 1894 another, differing in essential respects, at which he arrived in the main independently of Giesebrecht and myself. At the same time, the most important of the textual changes which he makes are almost exactly the same as those I have proposed. He removes i. 5-11 from its present context, and places i. 6-10 after ii. 5^a; i. 5, 11 he considers editorial additions. After the removal of all such additions, the restored prophecy is as follows: i. 2-4, 12^a, 13; ii. 1-5^a; i. 6-10, 14 (read וַיַּעֲשֶׂה), 15^a. But it is not directed against the Assyrians, but against the *sinner* in Judah, being an oracle after the manner of Jeremiah, of about the year 605. By a process similar to that above supposed, a subsequent editor, of the time of the exile, sought to convert it into a

¹ As to the text, the following points may be noted: i. 12, perhaps the rest of the verse to begin with *לֹא נִמְוֹת* should be deleted (Wellhausen) as a premature tentative for a solution, only the two words cited might be kept according to old tradition as *לֹא תִמְוֹת*; instead of *צֹר* read *וְצָר*, i. 13, supply *בבגוד* before *בוגדים* (Wellh.)—i. 17, with Giesebrecht and Wellhausen, for *יהרג* read *העלם*; and perhaps for *חרבו*, *חרמו*; lastly, for *להרג*, with Wellhausen. In ii. 1-4 the inscription on the tables extends through verses 3 and 4, *כִּי* serves merely as quotation mark.—ii. 1 read *וְיָשִׁיב* for *אָשִׁיב* (Wellh.); ver. 3 *וַיִּפְחֶה* for *וַיִּפַּח* (Bredenkamp and Wellh. after LXX.); ver. 4^a has suffered serious mutilation; probably it uttered a warning against want of faith and impatience. i. 5 must (with Rothstein) be deleted, as interpolated when the passage was displaced; minor emendations of verses 6-10 are given by Wellh.; instead of *imperfectiva consecutiva*, point simple imperfects with *ו* in verses 9-11. i. 11 read *וַיַּחֲלֵף* *אֲזַי*, after which *וַיִּשְׁע* may have slipped out. But perhaps in *וַיִּשְׁע*, which is impossible, and for which Wellh. proposes *וַיִּשְׁע*, there lies an *אֲשִׁיר*, Assyria, so that the enemy of the time may have been named originally. ii. 5 read with Bredenkamp and Giesebrecht *כִּי אֵין וַיִּפְחֶה* instead of *כִּי הִיין וַיִּפְחֶה*; with Wellh. *יִנְוֶה* for *יִנְוֶה*.

² *Über Habakkuk Kap. 1 und 2 (Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1894, pp. 51 sqq.)*.

prophecy against the Chaldeans. In the same way, ii. 6-20, originally a prophecy against king Jehoiakim, was transformed into one against the king of Babylon and his empire. We shall revert to this later on.

Rothstein conducts his investigation with no less boldness than thoroughness. Had he succeeded in establishing his positions, it would have been a triumph of Old Testament criticism. It would not be easy to discover elsewhere in the Bible another instance of such far-reaching changes in the text as he supposes to have been made, and such a complete restoration of the original as he proposes. I do not believe the facts are as he thinks, and will briefly state the grounds on which his theory is based, and those in favour of my own solution of the problem.

The solution attempted by Rothstein starts from the supposition that the complaint of the prophet in i. 2-4 cannot possibly have as its subject wrongs inflicted by a foreign enemy, but can only relate to a domestic opposition within Judah itself between the righteous and the wicked, the oppressed and the oppressors. On this one point his attempted solution is based. If this point is established, the prophecy threatens neither Chaldeans nor Assyrians, but the wicked in Judah. Undoubtedly the strength of Rothstein's argument lies in the parallels from Jeremiah to i. 2-4. He refers specially to Jeremiah xi. 18-xii. 6; xv. 10-12, 15 sqq.; xvii. 14-18; xviii. 18 sqq.; viii. 8, 9; xx. 7 sqq. Certainly these complaints are very similar to Habakkuk i. 2-4, particularly if we read *חַמָּס וְשָׂד*, Jeremiah xx. 8, and *שָׂד וְחַמָּס*, Habakkuk i. 2. But Rothstein overlooks essential differences. Jeremiah complains everywhere of wrong which he had suffered personally. Habakkuk, subjectively as verses 2, 3 are expressed, is a spectator of wickedness which goes on around him; according to verse 4 he is not himself the victim of violence, and the mischief has not advanced anything like so far as in the case of Jeremiah.

The cry for help of i. 2 is explained by ii. 1, where the prophet stands on his watch-tower and looks out into the far distance; his complaint (תוֹכַחַת), Jahweh's answer to which he is there expecting, is no other than that of the previous chapter, beginning with i. 2-4. But according to ii. 3, it is to him not a chronic calamity, such as domestic corruption in his own nation, against which he desires help, for such a calamity cannot be removed by any sudden event which has to be waited for in patience. I have purposely first brought forward the beginning of chap. ii.; the case is still clearer when we pass from i. 4 directly to verses 12 sqq., as indeed Rothstein does himself. Thus verses 13-17 supply the authentic interpretation of the רשע and צדיק of verse 4. The "wicked" is the irresistible world-power, compared to a fisherman who sits with his angle and net on the world-sea and draws nation after nation, or all mankind, like fishes from the deep, slaying and devouring them with satisfaction. His victims did not deserve this; they are "more righteous than he" (verse 13); in particular the nation to which the prophet belongs is contrasted (verse 4) with the oppressor as "the righteous." As long as verse 4 was separated from verses 12 sqq. by a long section, the necessity of this interpretation of רשע and צדיק might not appear;¹ but when once it is perceived that they stand in direct connexion, it is no longer possible to call it in question. Nor are there any intrinsic reasons opposed to this interpretation of the terms. It is not necessary to resort to the comparative righteousness expressed in verse 13 in order to suppose the צדיק of verse 4 (and ii. 4) to represent the people of Judah as a nation. The period in question, if the Chaldeans were really only just appearing on the horizon, as I have shown, that is about 615 or a few

¹ So Kuenen, Reuss, and many others. But as early as 1873, long before he was convinced that i. 5-11 must be removed elsewhere, Wellhausen perceived that רשע and צדיק must be taken in the same sense in verse 4 as in verse 13.

years earlier, was that which closely followed upon Josiah's reformation (621), when the nation, in the consciousness of its good intentions and of the adoption of the Deuteronomic legislation, felt itself righteous under the rule of a truly religious king. So much was this the case, that even after the fall of Judah, after the evil days of a Jehoiakim and Zedekiah, the popular opinion still was that the nation had been punished for the sins of Manasseh (2 Kings xxiv. 3, Jer. xv. 4), or of "the fathers" (Jer. xxxi. 29, Ezek. xviii. 2, Lam. v. 7) and not for its own sins. Our book is of such eminent value on this very account that it is a prophetic utterance from this brief period of an approving conscience. The text of i. 2-4 itself presents still stronger proof that our interpretation is correct. The oppression and tyranny, the strife and contention, of which the prophet complains in verses 2, 3 are not in his view themselves a perversion of law and justice, but only the cause of the latter. "Therefore the law halts (?), and judgment cannot make way; for the wicked nets¹ the righteous, and therefore judgment goes forth perverted." This twice-repeated "therefore" ought to receive its full emphasis. If the sole point were the oppression of the common people in the administration of justice, this has been already represented in the words און, עמל, שר, חמס, verses 2 and 3, and is not the result thereof. But if what is meant by these words is the incessant acts of interference, violence, exaction, injury, and the instigation of factions and contention with which the Assyrian suzerain had for a century past tortured his vassal Judah, it is then easy to understand why the prophet should see in such treatment the *cause* of the little progress of true religion, of the rapid decline of the enthusiastic reformation of the year 621.²

¹ Read (Wellhausen's conjecture) מכמיר and comp. מכמרת, verses 15, 16.

² The unusual and difficult expressions in verse 4 (לֹא יצא לְנֶצַח, חַפּוּיֹנִי) are intelligible if an unusual *agens* is concerned.

Let us now see what account Rothstein can give of verses 12 sqq. He has to pay the penalty of his interpretation of i. 2-4 exclusively after the model of Jeremiah; to suit it he is compelled to treat all that follows most arbitrarily. He is obliged to make the complaint of the prophet end with verse 13, since in verse 14 plainly enough it is not the righteous in Judah, but mankind at large who are the victims of the "wicked" oppressor. The removal from the context of i. 5-11 is accordingly not enough; verses 14-17 must also be removed, and i. 13 must immediately precede ii. 1. Is Rothstein in a position to assign an obviously suitable place for verses 14-17 elsewhere? He seems to feel that if i. 6-10¹ were placed after ii. 5^a they would have no satisfactory conclusion; he seeks, therefore, to make use of verses 14 sqq. in that position. To effect this, he has, in the first instance, to change וַתַּעַשׂה, which is connected with תַּחֲרִישׁ, verse 13, into וַיַּעַשׂה. This is the contrary of an improvement, for as Jahweh, while all this wrong is done, looks on without interfering, although He could prevent it, so it is *He* also—and therein the declaration is intensified—who *makes* men like the fishes, in order that the world-tyrant may be able to catch and devour them. But, surely, the simile of the fisher, who sits comfortably on the shore and draws fish after fish out of the water, does not fitly describe the cavalry-nation of verses 6-10, which comes up like the storm and casts down everything before it. It is impossible that a writer and poet of Habakkuk's eminence should make such mistakes. But to proceed: it is only verses 14 and 15^a that Rothstein can use; in 15^b, 16 the accusation is heard again, in verse 17 the complaint. Neither is permissible, of course, if the

¹ As to verse 11 he is compelled to delete it as an editorial addition, instead of restoring the text, since 11^b speaks again of the impious tyrant whom the Chaldeans will overthrow. But it is precisely the difficulty of the verse that is an argument against an editorial origin, and is in favour of the supposition of its being due in part to intentional alteration.

fisher is the Chaldean, that is, the promised deliverer from the distress. Accordingly Rothstein, without any substantial justification,¹ deletes verses 15^b-17. Really, it needed no other proof of the inadmissibility of his theory. Than these exquisite verses, there is nothing in the whole book of Habakkuk more truly genuine; no editor could have invented them. Moreover, verses 14, 15^a are incomplete without these verses, and the tone of accusation, of which Rothstein wishes to get rid, is already heard in them.

And what is gained by all this? Only a wholly unsatisfactory result. The Chaldeans are to be the deliverers from the distress of which the prophet complains. They might be this were the distress caused by an external enemy: as Deutero-Isaiah announces deliverance from the Babylonian captivity by the Persians, so the Chaldeans might rescue Israel from the Assyrian oppression. But a foreign nation cannot by a victorious war save the righteous in Judah from the hands of the wicked. Whenever the prophets bring an impending war into connexion with the internal conditions of their people, it is as a means of punishment and not of salvation. But Habakkuk is not in i. 2-ii. 1 looking for punishment and vengeance, but for help and deliverance. Undoubtedly, punishment is also announced in ii. 5; but still the deliverance of the righteous remains, as in verse 4, the chief consideration. But it is impossible to imagine how the prophet could conceive the crushing subjugation of the people of Judah in war as the means of bringing judgment and deliverance to the righteous and punishment to the wicked. For there is not the slightest reference here to the view, to be met with elsewhere in the Prophets, particularly in Isaiah, Zephaniah, and Jeremiah, that a purified, converted, righteous remnant will come forth from the crucible of national trial. The

¹ The most specious is the triple occurrence of על כן, and that is removed by Giesebrecht's admirable emendation העלם in verse 17.

psalmist may expect from the direct interference of God a righteous separation of the godly from the ungodly, but the prophet cannot expect this from the invasion of Judah by the Chaldeans. And granted that this had been plainly declared. Before the principal evil-doers of the higher classes in Jerusalem could be reached, the unfortunate people in the open country and in the city itself must already have suffered the visitation. These calamities would no doubt be a matter worthy to be mentioned. But, as a fact, though the storm of war, i. 6 sqq., passes over many kingdoms and cities, and also reaches the chief offender, after all it spends itself in the far distance,—“hinten weit in der Türkei,”—and anything rather than the impression is left that it touched the vitals of Judah and Jerusalem.

But the case is entirely altered if by “the wicked” the Assyrian is meant, and by “the righteous” Judah as a nation.¹ When Rothstein maintains² that in the description of the enemy “nothing whatever points to Assur,” he has not taken note of what I have said on the point.³ The point might, undoubtedly, be much more fully worked out and presented more decisively. The description which is especially decisive is that of the fisher, i. 14 sqq., and it is not at all appropriate to the Chaldeans, but only and eminently to the Assyrian. The Assyrian drew the fishes, at one time with his angle, at another with his net, singly or collectively, from the water, with continued, patient labour; the Chaldeans came into possession of the nations of the earth as by easy inheritance without exertion. On this point this reference must here suffice.

¹ Which does not imply, of course, that all individual Judeans are pronounced righteous. Only much of their unrighteousness is explained and excused by their dependence on Assyria, and a change for the better is expected from the restored freedom.

² *Ut supra*, p. 64, note 2.

³ *Ut supra*, p. 386, note 1, and particularly pp. 391 sq.

After the above discussion of i. 2-ii. 5, I can deal more briefly with the next section, the series of "woes" to the end of chapter ii. I need not repeat the reasons against Stade's view, particularly as Wellhausen considers that the section refers to the Chaldeans, as I to the Assyrians. Rothstein's treatment of it is based simply on the results of his view of the first section. He states¹ it point blank as his "guiding point of view" with regard to ii. 6 sqq., "that all those sentences and parts of sentences which have as their aim the tyrannical procedure of the Babylonian power and the judgment about to come upon it are *ipso facto* exposed to the suspicion of being the work of an editor." As in our view the exact contrary holds, a few observations will here suffice. Rothstein seeks to interpret the section as referring to king Jehoiakim, as Hitzig had previously interpreted the verses 9-14. Again the parallels from Jeremiah are very striking, and were we not to go beyond *vv.* 9-11 (comp. especially Jer. xxii. 13-19) we might almost approve of Rothstein's view. But of this very first "woe" Rothstein is compelled to ascribe *v.* 10^b (קצות עמים רבים) to the editor, and in addition the entire verses 8 and 17; therefore, in the latter again, one of the finest and most characteristic sentences of the entire section (the destruction of forest and game on Lebanon by the Assyrians), which no editor could have made up. He finds himself, therefore, with reference to chapter ii. precisely in the same predicament as with chapter i. But with all this he has not yet deleted enough; neither can verses 6^b and 7 refer to Jehoiakim. For however many creditors this king may have made for himself by his robbery and injustice, they were confined to his own nation. But the creditors of these verses are described as themselves demanding their debts. This is the case, if the Chaldeans and their allies subdue their former rulers and plunderers, the Assyrians;

¹ *Ut supra*, p. 70.

but it is not so, if these same Chaldeans vanquish Jehoia-kim. There is nothing else for it, then, than to consider the reference is here also to the Assyrians, as I have shown at length in my essay. The expressive passage, after the additions have been removed, belongs therefore certainly to Habakkuk.

We cannot therefore accept Rothstein's main contention. Nevertheless his essay has not been unproductive. In the first place, the very fact that a new and original interpretation of these two chapters, and an interpretation which is probably the one remaining combination of the facts possible, has failed, is a corroboration of the immensely simpler and more productive solution which I have proposed, viz., that the prophecy threatens the Assyrian tyrant of the time with overthrow at the hands of the Chaldeans. In the next place, beyond question, Rothstein has done good service in the purification of the text from additions and interpolations, although his erroneous interpretation of i. 2-4 has led him into hypercritical scepticism. He has probably rightly perceived that i. 5 is only a connecting link, which was found necessary when the section was removed to its present place. But we are chiefly indebted to Rothstein for what he has done in the case of the second section, ii. 6-20. At present the section appears as a triumphal song of the subjugated nations over their fallen oppressor. "Surely they will all take up taunts against him, and a mocking and derisive song against him, and will sing: Woe," etc. There is no want of examples in the Prophets of this poetic form; we need only refer to Isaiah xiv. But in the passage before us we have not such an instance. For when the fallen oppressor is the subject, the perfect tense is used, while in this passage all the verbs are imperfects, denoting an unfinished, or, as in this case, a future action. What we have here, therefore, is not a de-

risive song, but a prophetic threat in the form of a catalogue of offences, the chapters of which are introduced with חן. A similar instance is not Isaiah xiv., but Isaiah v. 8 sqq. Accordingly 6^a, as far as וְיִאֲמָרוּ, must, with Rothstein, be deleted, and 6^b sqq. follows, as the prophet's word, immediately upon the announcement of Jahweh.

Rothstein's extremely careful comparison of the little book with Jeremiah is also of great value. The agreement in detail is often close. This proves that the prophets were contemporaries, and thereby establishes the *substantial* genuineness of the first two chapters of Habakkuk. But at the same time Rothstein acknowledges¹ that with all this close relationship no such thing as dependence on Jeremiah is implied. And together with all this pervasive relationship in details to Jeremiah, in the broad distinctive features Habakkuk yet belongs undoubtedly to Isaiah's school. To i. 13-17 no better parallel passages could possibly be found than Isaiah x. 5 sqq.; other parallels are: ii. 2-4 with Isaiah viii. 1 sqq.; i. 6-10 with Isaiah v. 26 sqq.; ii. 6^b sqq. with Isaiah v. 8-23, x. 1-4. Thus Habakkuk has been assigned his secure place in the body of prophetic literature and, as it seems to me, a not less secure place in the political and religious history of his people.

Strassburg.

K. BUDDÉ.

THE WORDS IN ACTS DENOTING MISSIONARY TRAVEL.²

In his admirable book on the *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, James Smith has pointed out the studied variety of terms used in *Acts* "to express the progression of a ship," and the appropriateness with which each is selected at the

¹ Especially pp. 61, 83; on p. 70, lines 6, 7, the expressions are somewhat different.

² The following article enlarges, without essential change in the theory, some pages printed in January, 1894.