

Habakkuk 2:5a: Denouncing ‘wine’ or ‘wealth’? Contextual readings of the Masoretic text and 1QpHab

**Author:**Gert Prinsloo¹**Affiliation:**¹Department of Ancient Languages, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa**Corresponding author:**Gert Prinsloo,
gert.prinsloo@up.ac.za**Dates:**

Received: 24 June 2016

Accepted: 19 Aug. 2016

Published: 30 Nov. 2016

How to cite this article:Prinsloo, G., 2016, ‘Habakkuk 2:5a: Denouncing “wine” or “wealth”? Contextual readings of the Masoretic text and 1QpHab’, *HTS Theologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 72(4), a3576. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102.hts.v72i4.3576>**Copyright:**© 2016. The Authors.
Licensee: AOSIS. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution License.

Habakkuk 2:5 is a problematic text. The ‘correctness’ of the Masoretic text’s passage ‘moreover, the wine is treacherous, an arrogant person – he will not come to rest’ has often been questioned. The discovery of the Peshier Habakkuk (1QpHab) in Cave 1 at Qumran gave impetus to this tendency. It contains a reading quite different from the Masoretic text. It reads ‘moreover, wealth deceives an arrogant man, and he will not come to rest’. Many modern commentaries and translations assume that 1QpHab contains the ‘correct’ reading. This study argues that this assumption is based upon questionable text critical practice and pleads for a contextual interpretation of variant readings before rash decisions about the status of the Masoretic text can be made.

Introduction

Several interpretational problems confront readers in Habakkuk 2:5.¹ What is the function of the particles ׀ and אף and כִּי in 2:5a? What kind of relationship is suggested with the preceding verse and with the following verses? What is the meaning of הַיַּיִן [the wine] in 2:5a and does the presence of the definite article have particular significance? What is the syntactic function of the participle בּוֹגֵד in 5a; the meaning of the rare form יְהִיר and the hapax legomenon יַנְיָה in 5b? What is the syntactic relationship between 5ab and 5cd? Especially under suspicion is the phrase אֶחָד כִּי־הַיַּיִן בּוֹגֵד in the Masoretic text (MT) of 2:5a. A reference to wine is absent in some of the ancient versions (Septuagint; Peshitta). Lothar Peritt bluntly states that a reference to wine *gibt hier kein Sinn* (Peritt 2004:67).² Ever since the discovery of the Peshier Habakkuk in Cave 1 at Qumran (1QpHab), the version of 2:5a in the Peshier’s quotation of 2:5–6 in 8.3–8 has been hailed as the perfect solution to the textual and interpretational difficulties posed by MT. Instead of MT’s הַיַּיִן [the wine], 1QpHab reads הוֹן, usually vocalised as הוֹן [wealth]. The syntactically awkward relationship between the participle בּוֹגֵד in 2:5a and the following יְהִיר נָבֵר in 2:5b in MT is simplified in 1QpHab where an imperfect יבגוד occurs with גבר יהיר as its logical object. Peritt (2004:67) regards this as an *empfehlenswerte Alternative* to MT.

A classic criterion in the evaluation of textual variants is that the *lectio difficilior* often represents the preferred reading (see Brotzman 1994:128; Deist 1978:244–245; Tov 1992:302–305).³ The consummate ease with which 1QpHab’s version of 2:5a is accepted is quite surprising.⁴ I question the assumption that 1QpHab contains the ‘better’ reading.⁵ My thesis is that a balanced evaluation of variant readings in different textual witnesses is only possible if the literary and social context of *each textual witness* is taken into consideration.⁶ Confronted by the different readings of 2:5a in MT and 1QpHab, our first order of business is to ask the following questions: (1) Does אֶחָד כִּי־הַיַּיִן בּוֹגֵד make sense in the context of MT? (2) Does הוֹן אף כִּי־הוֹן make sense in the context of 1QpHab?

1.Roberts (1991:116) remarks, ‘[v]ery serious textual problems make the interpretation of Hab. 2:5a hazardous’.

2.Roberts (1991:113) remarks, ‘[o]ne can do nothing with MT’s “wine is treacherous”’.

3.It is no absolute principle (Brooke 2013:3–4; Brotzman 1994:128; McCarter 1986:13), but its ‘basic validity ... cannot be denied’ (Tov 1992:303).

4.Van der Woude (1978:39) remarks, ‘[h]et in de context nauwelijks aanvaarbare *hayyayin*, “de wijn”, moet *ongetwijfeld* [my emphasis] met steun van 1 Q pHab (*hwn*) in *hōn*, “bezit, vermogen”, gewijzigd worden’.

5.This study is not concerned with text-critical practice as such (see Brooke 2013:1–17). Sources for Hebrew Bible textual criticism attest to a variety of textual forms (Lim 2000:66). All variants cannot be ascribed to scribal errors (Barthélemy 2012:97–136). It ‘is simply no longer appropriate to embark on the quest for the original form of the text, and especially no longer fitting to consider the MT as representing some form of Ur-text’ (Brooke 2013:7–8). Textual diversity should not be ‘reduced to a chosen, preferred reading’ (Brooke 2013:17).

6.A list of variant readings for specific words and phrases in MT in ‘critical’ editions of the Hebrew Bible indicates that, *according to the editors of the critical edition*, variant readings exist in other textual witnesses. Such lists by definition disregard the context of MT and the alternative textual tradition. Ideally interpreters should evaluate variant readings *in the context of all the respective textual traditions* before deciding to emend texts.

Read online:

Scan this QR code with your smart phone or mobile device to read online.

Failure to ask these fundamental questions leads to rash decisions about 'better' readings and disregards the possibility that different but equally valid versions of texts of Jewish origin might have existed at the dawn of the Common Era.⁷ This study is (1) a plea for contextual interpretations of two alternative textual traditions of Habakkuk 2:5a and (2) an argument for the retention of both readings in their respective contexts and *against* the practice of using one to 'correct' the other.

Habakkuk 2:5a: Ancient textual witnesses and modern studies – a review

In this section two issues are investigated:

- The delimitation of units in Habakkuk 2:1–8 as expressed by ancient scribal delimitation markers in various manuscript traditions (see Oesch 1979; Tov 2000:312–350):⁸ The purpose is to indicate how 2:5a is perceived in ancient scribal traditions to fit into its immediate context, especially in relation to 2:4 and 2:6.⁹
- The text of Habakkuk 2:5a in various ancient textual witnesses: The purpose is to indicate that three textual traditions regarding 2:5a exist in ancient textual witnesses.

Habakkuk 2:5a: Unit delimitation in ancient textual witnesses

In a study of ancient scribal unit delimiters in Habakkuk I remarked: 'It is quite surprising that the most basic of exegetical exercises, namely the demarcation of both larger and smaller units, has not been adequately addressed' (Prinsloo 2009:198).¹⁰ Apart from some general remarks on the delimitation of units in Habakkuk 2 (Prinsloo 2009:215–217), I have not undertaken a detailed study of the implications of unit delimitation for the interpretation of Habakkuk 2 yet. This section is a step in that direction with a very specific focus, namely the relationship between 2:4–5 and 2:5ff. It is important for the interpretation of Habakkuk 2. There has been considerable debate about the extent and content of the הוון that Habakkuk was instructed to write down (2:2b), a question directly related to the relationship

7. Available textual materials for the Second Temple period 'bountifully attest to a pluriformity – and as far as we can tell, a fully accepted pluriformity – in the text of the Scriptures' (Ulrich 2000:86).

8. See Korpel (2000:1–50) for a discussion of the principles of unit delimitation. In a previous study I argued that

modern exegetes have at their disposal the very ancient system of spaces left open in (*setumot*) or at the end of lines (*petuhot*) which can aid them in making decisions about the structure of texts, at least as the structure was perceived by ancient scribes. (Prinsloo 2009:197).

9. The text-critical and interpretational problems of 2:4 deserve a comprehensive study of their own (see Andersen 2001:208–216 for an overview). Only the relationship between 2:4 and 5 will be touched upon here.

10. Initially I regarded Habakkuk as a dialogue between the prophet and YHWH (Prinsloo 1989:243). Later I demarcated two major units (1:1–2:20; 3:1–19), each introduced by a superscript (1:1; 3:1) and questioned the book's 'dialogic' structure (Prinsloo 1999:520–526). Research in the field of unit delimitation prompted me to reconsider my opinions. I argued that 1:2–17 is 'not a dialogue between Yahweh and the prophet, but a single lament ... about the increase in violence and the disintegration of society at the end of the seventh century BC' (Prinsloo 2004:637). With reference to Habakkuk 3 I argued that '[d]ata in ancient Hebrew manuscripts suggest that three major sections can be demarcated in Habakkuk 3, namely 3:1–7; 3:8–13 and 3:14–19' (Prinsloo 2013b:4) and that ancient unit delimiters 'transcend the neat borders between units demarcated on form critical grounds' (Prinsloo 2013b:7).

between 2:4 and 5. Some regard 2:1–4 as a unit (Deden 1953:263; Elliger 1956:41; Nowack 1903:283; Van Katwijk 1912:51; Prinsloo 1999:524–525).¹¹ others 2:1–5 (Deissler 1984:226; Rudolph 1975:216; Sellin 1930:399),¹² still others 2:1–5b (Brownlee 1971:258–259; Prinsloo 1989:132),¹³ whereas some are of the opinion that 2:1–20 should be read as a single pericope (Van der Woude 1978:31).¹⁴

A key issue in this discussion is the interpretation of וַיִּי אֵל in 2:5. The function of the combination of three conjunctive and/or subordinate particles *without any obvious referent* is controversial. For those who propose a close relationship between 2:4 and 5, וַיִּי אֵל [how much more and/or less ...] introduces an argument *a minori ad maius* (Rudolph 1975:213; Van der Woude 1966:367–375, 1970:281–282). For others there is no logical *a minori ad maius* connection between 2:4 and 5 (Roberts 1991:116) and וַיִּי אֵל functions as an 'emphatic connective' (Bratcher 1985:145) to be translated by something like 'yes, indeed ...' (Deissler 1984:226; Van Katwijk 1912:108; Van der Woude 1978:39).

Principles of unit delimitation can assist modern interpreters in making exegetical decisions. Addendum 1 contains a brief discussion of textual witnesses used in this study and their bibliographical information. The consulted Hebrew textual witnesses unanimously suggest a section break between 1:17 and 2:1 and again between 2:8 and 9.¹⁵ Witnesses are divided about the delimitation of units in 2:1–8. Some regard it as a single paragraph, whereas others have a division between 2:4 and 5.¹⁶ 1QpHab supports this division. It quotes Habakkuk 2:4a in 7:14–15; 2:4b in 7:17; 2:5–6 in 8:3–8; 2:7–8a in 8:13–15; 2:8a again in 9:3–4 and 2:2:8b in 9:8. The combination of 2:5–6 in the quote in 8:3–8 suggests a close relationship between the introduction to the woe oracles (2:5–6d) and the first oracle itself (2:6e–8). Data from the Hebrew manuscripts is summarised in Table 1.

Greek textual witnesses by and large support the delimitation traditions in Masoretic manuscripts. Greek manuscripts

TABLE 1: Paragraph markers in Hebrew manuscripts.

Before	M ^c	M ^a	M ^l	M ^p	M ^r	BibR
2:1	⊞	⊞	⊞	⊞	⊞	⊞
2:5	⊞	⊞	--	⊞	--	--
2:9	⊞	⊞	⊞	⊞	⊞	⊞

Source: See Addendum 1 for the full bibliographical particulars of the Hebrew manuscripts consulted

11. Habakkuk 2:4 contains the content of the הוון with 2:5–6ca as introduction to the woe oracles.

12. Habakkuk 2:4–5 contains the content of the הוון with 2:6a–ca as introduction to the woe oracles.

13. Habakkuk 2:4–5b contains the content of the הוון with 2:5c–6ca as introduction to the woe oracles.

14. He regards 2:4 as the content of the הוון, whereas 2:5–20 is a kind of 'commentary' by the prophet upon YHWH's revelation in 2:4.

15. Between 1:17 and 2:1 *MurXII* has a *P^tûhâ*, while M^c, M^a, M^l, M^p, M^r and *BibR* have a *S^tûmâ*. The consulted witnesses agree that a section break occurs between 2:8 and 9. A *S^tûmâ* is present in M^c, M^r and *BibR*. A *Petûhâ* appears in M^a, M^l and M^p. *MurXII* is too fragmentary to determine the presence or absence of a delimiter.

16. No division is apparent in M^l, M^r and *BibR*. It is supported by the Peshitta and the Vulgate. A *S^tûmâ* appears between 2:4 and 5 in M^c, M^a and M^p. *MurXII* is too fragmentary to determine the presence or absence of a delimiter.

indicate in various ways that a new section begins with 2:1.¹⁷ Septuagint manuscripts demarcate 2:1 as a sub-unit, an indication that it was regarded as an introduction to 2:2–20.¹⁸ There is no uniform treatment of 2:2–8 in Septuagint manuscripts. Whereas 2:2–8 is subdivided into smaller units by some,¹⁹ no subdivisions are apparent in others.²⁰ All four consulted uncials demarcate καὶ ἐροῦσιν (2:6α) as a separate phrase.²¹ Thus, Greek manuscripts attest to the following: 2:1 is regarded as an introductory phrase in all manuscripts. As in some Hebrew manuscripts, Greek witnesses subdivide 2:2–8, regarding 2:2–4 as a unit and 2:5–6α as an introduction to the series of woe oracles commencing in 2:6β–20.²² Other Greek witnesses support the second Hebrew tradition with no subdivision in 2:2–8.²³ The two traditions in the consulted textual witnesses are summarised in Table 2.

In the evaluation of these witnesses, another classic principle in Hebrew textual criticism should be kept in mind, namely that textual evidence should be weighed and not counted (see Deist 1978:243–244; Tov 1992:300–301). The division of 2:1–8 into two paragraphs is attested in the Peshier Habakkuk and in three Masoretic codices dating from before 1000 CE. This tradition cannot simply be discounted.

The text of Habakkuk 2:5a In ancient textual witnesses

When the text of 2:5a is compared in six ancient textual witnesses (see Addendum 2), different textual traditions are apparent. The basic tenet in all witnesses is clear. All denounce

TABLE 2: Demarcated paragraphs in Habakkuk 2:1–8.

Witness	Tradition 1: Single paragraph	Tradition 2: Two paragraphs
Hebrew	M ¹ , M ⁸ , BibR	M ^C , M ^A , M ^P , 1QpHab
Greek	G ⁸ , G, G ²	G ^A
Others	Peshitta, Vulgate	--

Source: See Addendum 1 for the full bibliographical particulars of the manuscripts consulted.

17. The division is indicated: (1) In G^A: high dot after 1:17; space left open in the line after 1:17; 2:1 commences with a large letter and ekthesis. (2) In G^B: double dot after 1:17; line is left open; 2:1 commences with ekthesis. (3) In G^C: high dot between 1:17 and 2:1; 2:1 commences with a large letter. (4) In G^D: a high dot between 1:17 and 2:1. *8HevXligr* also supports the division by leaving the line open after 1:17. The manuscript is too fragmentary to determine the presence or absence of unit delimiters in 2:1–8.

18. (1) In G^A: line left open after 2:1; 2:2 commences with ekthesis and a large letter; paragraph in the left hand margin in the last line of 2:1. (2) In G^B: double dot after 2:1; space left open in the line before 2:2 commences. (3) In G^C: double dot after 2:1; 2:2 commences with ekthesis. (4) In G^D: high dot between 2:1 and 2:2.

19. In G^A 2:2–8 is subdivided into four units: (1) 2:2–4: High dot between 2:4 and 2:5; 2:5 commences with ekthesis and large letter. (2) 5a–e: High dot after 2:5e and the rest of the line is left open. The fact that 2:5f does not commence with a large letter suggests that the break between 2:5e and 2:5f is not strong. (3) 2:5f–6α: High dot after 2:6α; space left open in the line before 2:6β; first letter of the next line is a large letter with ekthesis. (4) 2:6β–8: The woe oracle commencing with 2:6β is regarded as the beginning of a unit running to the end of 2:8, where a middle dot appears between 2:8 and 9 and 2:9 commences with a large letter with ekthesis.

20. G⁸ and G⁵ have no subdivision in 2:2–8. In G⁸ a double dot separates 2:8 and 2:9 and 2:9 commences with ekthesis. No delimiters occur in G⁵ after 2:8. G² regards 2:2–6b as a unit. Ekthesis and the presence of a paragraphos suggest that a new unit commences with 2:6c. A high dot between 2:8 and 2:9 and a paragraphos in the left hand margin indicate that 2:6c–8 should be regarded as a unit.

21. It is preceded and followed by dots in all four manuscripts, suggesting that the Greek tradition regarded the phrase as an introductory formula to the following series of woe oracles.

22. See M^C, M^A, M^P, 1QpHab.

23. See M¹, M⁸, BibR, Peshitta, Vulgate.

‘an arrogant person’ whose insatiable appetite for violence is likened to *Sheol* [death] and finds expression in his obsession to gather to himself all the nations or peoples.

With regard to 2:5a, however, three textual traditions are apparent. The first refers to the treacherous nature of *wine*, which has exactly the effect described in the rest of the verse – those who become addicted to it always crave more. It is reflected in MT, the Targum and the Vulgate and is followed in many modern translations.²⁴ The second does not refer to wine, but contains a number of synonyms for *arrogance*. The Septuagint reads ὁ δὲ κατοιόμενος καὶ καταφρονητής, ἀνὴρ ἀλαζών [but the arrogant and the scorner, the boastful man] and the Peshitta ܐܘܪܘܟܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ ܕܥܘܠܐ [the arrogant and greedy man]. It is followed in a number of modern translations.²⁵ The third tradition is present only in 1QpHab, where MT’s וְיִהְיֶה is replaced by the orthographically similar וְיִהְיֶה, usually vocalised as וְיִהְיֶה [wealth].²⁶ This reading is popular in so-called dynamic-equivalent translations.²⁷

Unit delimitation thus suggests that consideration should be given to the scribal tradition demarcating a section break between 2:4 and 2:5. It implies that 2:5 should be interpreted in light of the following verses, and 2:5–20 then in conjunction with 2:1–4. A comparative reading of various textual witnesses suggests the existence of three traditions regarding 2:5a. Is wine, arrogance or wealth denounced in 2:5a? In this study I will focus on two of the three textual traditions and ask whether ‘wine’ or ‘wealth’ is denounced in 2:5a.

Towards contextual readings of Habakkuk 2:5a in MT and 1QpHab

Table 3 contains the text of Habakkuk 2:5–6 in MT and its quotation and interpretation in 1QpHab 8.3–13. Words marked in grey indicate differences between MT and 1QpHab. Words encircled indicate links between the quotation of 2:5 in 1QpHab and its interpretation.

I return to my main thesis, namely that a meaningful and balanced evaluation of variant readings in different textual witnesses is only possible if the variants are evaluated taking the literary and social context of *each textual witness* into consideration. Two questions should be asked: (1) Does וְיִהְיֶה

24. See Luther Bibel (1545); King James Version (1611); Statenvertaling (1637); Revised Standard Version (1952); New International Version (1984).

25. See Nederlandse Bijbelgenootschap (1951); Revidierte Lutherbibel (1984); New Living Translation (1996).

26. According to Brownlee (1979:132) the Septuagint and Peshitta are based upon a Hebrew original reading וְיִהְיֶה [the arrogant]. He relates the noun to the *single instance* where the root וְיִהְיֶה occurs as a verb in the Hebrew Bible, namely as a Hiph'il Imperfect verb in Deuteronomy 1:41 וְיִהְיֶה [and they regarded it as easy]). The text implies that the Israelites were presumptuous and regarded the conquest of Canaan as easy to execute. Barthélemy (1992:844) and Gelston (2010:118–119) accept this proposal and it became the ‘preferred’ reading recommended in the critical apparatus of *Biblia Hebraica Quinta*. I am not convinced that this (theoretical) noun should be preferred to nouns that are perfectly legible in the context of MT (וְיִהְיֶה) and 1QpHab (וְיִהְיֶה). I would rather regard the rendering of Habakkuk 2:5 in the Septuagint and Peshitta as a paraphrase of the intent of MT’s metaphorical use of וְיִהְיֶה.

27. See Today’s English Version (1976); Nuwe Afrikaanse Vertaling (1983); New Revised Standard Version (1989).

TABLE 3: Habakkuk 2:5–6 in MT and 1QpHab.

Habakkuk 2:5–6 in MT		
5a	וְאֵלֶּיךָ יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה הָאֲדָמָה	⁵ Yes, indeed – this wine is treacherous:
b	אֲדָמָה יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה וְלֹא יָנֹחַ	an arrogant man – he does not come to rest,
5c	אֲשֶׁר־הִרְחִיב כַּשְׂאוֹל נִפְשׁוֹ	(he) who opened like Sheol his throat,
d	וְהוּא כַּמָּוֶת לֹא יִשְׁבֵּעַ	and he is like death – yes, he is not satisfied;
5e	וַיֵּאסֵף אֵלָיו כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם	so he gathered to him all the nations,
f	וַיִּקְבֹּץ אֵלָיו כָּל־הָעַמִּים:	and he collected to him all the peoples.
6a	הֲלוֹא־אֵלֶּיךָ בָּלֵם עֲלֵיו מִשְׁלַח שְׂאֵן	⁶ Will not all of them lift up a proverb against him,
b	מִלְּמַלְצֵי חֵידוֹת לָּו	a derisive riddle (dedicated) to him?
6c	וַיֹּאמֶר הוּא הִמְרִיבָה לֹא־לוֹ	And it will say: ‘Woe to the one who increases what is not his,
d	עַד־מָתַי יִמְכַבֵּיד עָלָיו עֲבֹתָיו:	(yet for how long?), and makes himself glorious by pledges.
Habakkuk 2:5–6 in 1QpHab 8.3–13		
	וְאֵפֶס כִּי־אֵסֵף בִּבְגוֹת גְּבוּר יִהְיֶה וְלֹא	³ Yes, indeed – wealth betrays an arrogant man, and he does not
	יָנוּחַ אֲשֶׁר הִרְחִיב כַּשְׂאוֹל נִפְשׁוֹ וְהוּא כְמוֹת לֹא יִשְׁבֵּעַ	⁴ come to rest, he who opened like Sheol his throat, and he (who) is like death, he is not satiated.
	וְאֵסֵף אֵלָיו כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם וַיִּקְבֹּצוּ אֵלָיו כָּל־הָעַמִּים	⁵ And all the nations are gathered about him, and all the peoples are assembled to him.
	הֲלוֹא כְמוֹת אֲשֶׁל עָלָיו יִשְׂאֵן מִלְּמַלְצֵי חֵידוֹת לוֹ	⁶ will not all of them raise a taunt against him, interpreters of riddles at his expense?
	וַיֹּמְרוּ הוּא הִמְרִיבָה וְלֹא לוֹ עַד מָתַי יִכְבֵּיד עָלָיו	⁷ They will say: Woe to the one who multiplies – and not with his own! How long will he weigh himself down with
	פְּשֵׁר עַל הַכּוֹהֵן הָרָשָׁע אֲשֶׁר	⁸ debt? Its interpretation concerns the Wicked Priest, who
	נִקְרָא עַל שֵׁם הָאֱמֻת בְּתַחֲלַת עוֹמְדוֹתָיו אֲשֶׁר מִשְׁלַח	⁹ was called by the name of truth at the beginning of his standing, but when he ruled
	בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל רָם לְבוֹ וַיַּעֲזוּב אֱלֹהִים וַיִּבְגֵּד בְּחֻקֵּימ בַּעֲבוּר	¹⁰ in Israel his heart became haughty. He abandoned God, and he betrayed the statutes for the sake of
	הַנֶּהוּ . וַיִּמְכַּר אֶת־בְּרִיתוֹ אֲשֶׁר עִשָׂה עִם אֱלֹהֵי מִרְדּוֹ בְּאֵל	¹¹ wealth. He stole, and he amassed the wealth of the men of violence, who rebelled against God.
	וַיִּתֵּן עֲוֹנוֹ לְקַח לוֹסִיף עָלָיו עוֹן אֲשֶׁמָה וְדַרְכֵי	¹² He took the wealth of the peoples, to add against himself guilty iniquity. And the ways
	לְעִבּוּת פִּעַל בְּכָל־נְדָה טְמֵאָה	¹³ of abomination he pursued with every sort of unclean impurity.

Source: Author's own work

[wealth] make sense in the context of 1QpHab? (2) Does היין [the wine] make sense in the context of MT?

Reading הון [wealth] in the context of 1QpHab

Does הון [wealth] make sense in the context of 1QpHab? Three issues should be kept in mind in a contextual interpretation of 1QpHab 8:3–13.

The first is the Peshier's socio-historical context. The scroll dates from the latter half of the first century BCE,²⁸ but was probably first written in the time of Alexander Jannaeus (103–176 BCE) (Fabry 2003:252). It should be read against the background of the conflicts between successive imperial powers of the time (the Persians, Greeks and Romans) and their influence upon the Jewish minority in and around Jerusalem.²⁹ It should especially be read in the light of the second and first century BCE's emerging and often conflicting Judaism(s).³⁰ A core belief 'of Second Temple Judaism was to view the totality of the Jewish people as an organic whole, almost like a single body that was chosen by God' At the same time 'individual religious communities ... proliferated during this period', all adhering to 'this overarching view of Israel's sanctity', but

28. According to Horgan (2002:157) the script of both identifiable handwritings in the scroll (1:1–12:13; 12:13–13:4) is Herodian. The copying of the scroll 'can probably be placed in the second half of the first century BCE.'

29. For the history of the period, cf. Jagersma (1985); Kaiser (1998:447–486). In his history of Hasmonean high priesthood Vanderkam (2004:240–393) gives valuable information regarding the period.

30. Grabbe (2010) identifies four 'currents' in emerging Judaism: a priestly and scribal current or 'textual Judaism' (2010:40–65); political and 'messianic' currents or 'revolutionary Judaism' (2010:66–86); an apocalyptic current or 'eschatological Judaism' (2010:87–108); and a gnostic current or 'inverted Judaism' (2010:109–127). Cf. also Sanders (2000:1–43). He remarks:

The Qumran community had much in common with other Jews of the same place and time. It was, however, a very radical group, and in numerous ways it was distinctive, so distinctive that it separated itself from other Palestinian Jews. (2000:32)

'each group established its own ways to live a life of sanctity and saw itself as *verus Israel*' (Flusser 2009:8). Some groups 'placed their hopes in the institutions and leaders of their day, whether the High Priests, the Ptolemies, or the Maccabees' and 'had little interest in messianism', while '[a]pocalyptic groups developed the idea of a transcendent savior figure, either as an alternative or as a complement to earthly messianism'. At Qumran 'we find a group with a strong and developed interest in messianism' (Collins 1987:106).

The second is the nature of the Qumran community. Sometime 'before 150 BCE centuries of tension within the many priestly groups in the Jerusalem Temple came to a climax' and 'the Righteous Teacher led a group out of the Temple and Jerusalem and southeastward into the wilderness' (Charlesworth 2002:37) and established the so-called Qumran community:

[The] Qumran phenomenon derives from larger and earlier sectarian apocalyptic movements. It is likely that the origins of the Qumran Community are to be found 'within the Essene movement' which antedates Qumran, but that the settlement at Qumran dates towards the latter half of the 2nd century BCE. (2002:55–56)³¹

Much has been written about the community's mode(s) of self-identification and their 'sectarian' identity (Berg 2011:333–349; Jokiranta 2013; Newsom 2004)³²:

31. Cf. García Martínez (2007:3–29, 31–52) for a discussion on the origins and nature of the Qumran community. I concur with the basic tenets of the 'Groningen Hypothesis' which places 'the origins of the Essene movement in the Palestinian apocalyptic tradition of the late 3rd and early 2nd c. BCE, helps us to understand how and why within this Essene movement the influence of the Teacher of Righteousness gave rise to a fringe group and makes it clear how after opposing the High Priests Jonathan and Simon, this group eventually broke with the original Essene Community and retired to the desert' (García Martínez 2007:29).

32. For the history of the community, cf. García Martínez (2007:67–89).

[They] called themselves 'the Poor Ones', 'the Good Ones', 'the Sons of Aaron', 'the Sons of Light', 'the Sons of Truth', 'the Sons of Dawn', 'the Sons of Zadok', 'the Sons of Righteousness', 'the Righteous Ones', 'the Perfect Ones', 'the Perfect in the Way', 'the Holy Ones', and 'the Most Holy Ones'. (Charlesworth 2002:73)

The Qumran community:

... can best be described as a group of Jews possessed by an ardent messianic vision ... By extrapolating biblical texts, they had worked out the exact date of the onset of the ideal 'Age to Come', and held themselves in readiness to welcome its harbringers, the 'Anointed', who would usher it in. (Talmon 1987:115)

The third is the nature of the *peshet* genre. *Peshet* [פֶּשֶׁת] 'is a term ... largely distinctive of the Qumran sectarian literature' (Brooke 2013:101). It introduces 'a revealed interpretation ... of an earlier revelation' (Silberman 1961:326), indicates 'the meaning of a biblical word, phrase or verse' (Lim 2000:59) and 'introduces the specific point of reference from which the entire verse is to be understood' (Silberman 1961:328). The *pesharim* 'are hermeneutically focused. They are biblical commentaries in the sense of *fulfilment hermeneutics*' (Charlesworth 2002:5–6). *Peshet* interpretation 'is pneumatic, eschatological, and "fulfilment interpretation"; it is also self-serving and idiosyncratic' (2002:68). The *peshet*ist read the biblical text in the light of his community's interests and circumstances, as if 'the ancient men of wisdom, especially the prophets, focused their thoughts on the latter days' and as if the 'Qumranites ... were living in the latter days of time and history' (Charlesworth 2002:70).³³ The '*Habakkuk Peshet* and, indeed, all *Peshet* material are related on one side to *Daniel* and on the other to a body of midrashim whose structure is parallel to and perhaps derived from the form found in *Daniel* and developed in the Qumran *pesharim*' (see Instone Brewer 1992:187–198; Silberman 1961:326).³⁴

In 1QpHab 8:3–13 both the biblical lemma (8:3–8) and its interpretation and application (8:8–13) should be read against this background.³⁵ The interpretation 'is not merely juxtaposed to the lemma with but superficial relation to it. Rather does it grow out of the lemma, using literary devices to establish the connection' (Silberman 1961:334). The term הון [wealth] is key in 8:3–13. It occurs four times, once in the lemma (8:3) and three times in the application (8:11–12). The term הון occurs another five times in 1QpHab (1:8; 6:1; 9:5, 6; 12:10). The *Peshet* 'mentions wealth more extensively than any of the other exegetical works' (Murray 2002:235) and always uses the term in the sense of illegitimately taking the

possessions of others. The Qumran community 'displayed a distinct antipathy towards wealth and they regarded it as the result of violence, pillage and oppression' (Potgieter-Annandale 1999:81). In 1:8 and 6:1 the Romans are accused of seizing the wealth of others in order to increase their own wealth. Especially the so-called Wicked Priest is accused of committing this atrocity. In 8:3 Habakkuk 2:5 is quoted as 'wealth betrays a haughty man ...' It is applied to the Wicked Priest, who is accused of betraying God's statutes for the sake of wealth (8:11) and of amassing the wealth of men (8:11) and taking the wealth of peoples (8:12). In 12:10 he is accused of stealing the wealth of the poor ones. The last priests of Jerusalem are also accused of amassing wealth and profit (9:5) and warn that it will be given into the hands of the army of the Kittim (9:6).

הון occurs about 140 times in the Dead Sea 'sectarian' texts³⁶ and can be regarded as a key concept for the Qumran community.³⁷ The Damascus Document (14x)³⁸ stipulates:

that wealth be used to build up the community rather than to elevate the individual ... Wealth is a boundary marker for the community as well as a proper domain for its scrutiny and judgement. (Damascus Document)

The community disdains 'the arrogance and viciousness associated with wealth ... and give economic witness to the eschatological justice for which they hope' (Murray 2002:102). The Rule of the Community (23x)³⁹ shares with the Damascus Document 'an intense interest in wealth'. Whereas the Damascus Document focuses upon 'socio-economic critique', in the Rule:

... priority is given to the alternative ideal community ... organised around a renewed covenant. This new covenant, in turn, reorients the agricultural-sacrificial enterprise away from the urban sanctuary and towards the wilderness congregation committed more radically than others to the statutes of Deuteronomy. (Murray 2002:162)

4QInstruction and other wisdom texts (26x)⁴⁰ presume 'an audience that regularly finds itself in difficult economic circumstances to which the pooling of resources, charity and in the last resort loans appear to be the only avenues of recourse' (Murray 2002:209). In the *Pesharim* (10x)⁴¹ there is 'the association of arrogance and wickedness with wealth, the self-identification of the community as the poor and the meek' and 'the assertion that God will bless these poor ones by feeding them' (Murray 2002:235).

36. An exact count depends upon textual reconstructions. I did not take parallel texts (e.g. 1QS V.1–4 // 4Q258 1.2–3) into consideration but did a simple count of all occurrences of הון. The statistics simply illustrate that it is a keyword in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

37. The 'despising of personal wealth is characteristic of the Essenes and of this sect' (Brownlee 1951:67 n. 39).

38. CD 4:17; 6:15, 16; 8:5, 7; 9:22; 10:18; 11:15; 12:7; 13:11; 19:17, 19; 20:7.

39. 1QS 1:12, 13; 3:2; 5:2, 3, 14, 16, 20; 6:17, 19, 22, 25; 7:6, 25 (2x); 8:23; 9:7, 8, 22; 10:19; 11:2.

40. 4Q416 (Instruction^b): 5x; 4Q417 (Instruction^c): 3x; 4Q418 (Instruction^d): 11x; 4Q420 (Ways of Righteousness^e): 1x; 4Q423 (Instruction^f): 2x; 4Q424 (Sapiential Text): 4x.

41. 1QpHab 1:8; 6:1; 8:3, 11 (2x), 12; 9:5, 6; 12:10; 4Q169 (Peshet Nahum) f3_4i:11.

33. On apocalypticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls, see García Martínez (2007:195–226).

34. For Brownlee (1951:76) and Slomovic (1969–71:5) the exegesis in 1QpHab 'is essentially midrashic in character'. Elliger (1953:156–157) regards the dream interpretations in Daniel 2, 4, 5 and 7, also introduced by פֶּשֶׁת, as the background for *peshet* exegesis. For Brooke (1985:4) *peshet* exegesis stands fully in the tradition of 'early Jewish exegesis and especially that exegesis' technical methodology'.

35. See Brownlee (1979:131–144) for a detailed exegesis of the passage. 1QpHab 8:3–13 is the first paragraph in an extended passage (8:3–12:10) where Habakkuk 2:5–17 is applied to the Wicked Priest and his disciples (Potgieter-Annandale 1999:77).

Slomovic (1969–71:15) argues that in 8:3–13 ‘the general idea of the pesher is apparent. The Wicked Priest, after a period of enjoying a reputation for truth, grew arrogant and betrayed God and his precepts for the sake of wealth. *Wealth was the underlying cause for his betrayal*’ (my emphasis).⁴² Departing from the reading **וַיִּבְרַח בַּיָּמַי הַזֶּה** (8:3) the pesherist was able to apply the biblical phrase to **וַיִּבְרַח בַּיָּמַי הַזֶּה** in 8:8.⁴³ For Brownlee (1951:67) the ‘explication of the passage grows out of its distinctive readings.’ He identifies three distinctive readings of the biblical text in the *pesher*: Firstly, **הוֹן** [wealth] is read instead of MT’s **הַיִּין** [the wine], allowing the pesherist to make deceptive wealth the key term that ‘drives several sentences in the interpretation’ (VanderKam 2011:356). Secondly, for the pesherist MT’s **מִשְׁלַל** [proverb] (2:6; see 1QpHab 8:6) implies something cryptic (Brownlee 1951:67), hence it is read in the application as **מִשַׁל** [to rule] in the phrase ‘but when he ruled in Israel his heart became haughty’ (8:9–10).⁴⁴ Thirdly, the final word in MT 2:6, **עֲבָטִיט** [pledge], is written defectively in 1QpHab 8:8, thus **עֲבַטִט**, allowing the pesherist to read it as two words, **עַב טַט** [thickness of mud] and apply it as **נֹדַת טַמְאָה** [unclean impurity] (see Brownlee 1951:67, 1979:142).⁴⁵ Hence the Wicked Priest, who once ‘was called by the name of truth’ (8:9) became laden with every kind of unclean impurity’ (VanderKam 2011:358).

The accumulated evidence indicate that **וַיִּבְרַח בַּיָּמַי הַזֶּה** in 1QpHab 8:3 is an acceptable and explainable reading in the context of the Qumran community and its literature.

Reading **הַיִּין** [the wine] in the context of MT

Does **הַיִּין** [the wine] make sense in the context of MT? Three issues should be kept in mind in a contextual interpretation of Habakkuk 2:5–6.

The first is the text’s socio-historical context. At least for Habakkuk 1–2, readers have to transpose themselves about 400 years earlier than the events suggested in the Pesher Habakkuk. The text can be read against the background of the Babylonian exile (Prinsloo 2013a:132–154). Habakkuk displays a ‘curious reluctance to identify the wicked’, yet ‘there are hints that the Babylonians are the object of the scorn, the nation on whom imminent doom is pronounced’

42. The *identity* of the Wicked Priest is a contentious issue (see García Martínez 2007:53–66; VanderKam 2011:350–367). García Martínez allows for successive Hasmonean high priests/rulers to be called ‘the Wicked Priest’ and regards Judas Maccabeus, one of the leaders of the Maccabean revolt (167–160 BCE) as the likely candidate in 1QpHab 8:3–13 (García Martínez 2007:66). Vanderkam (2011:367) regards Jonathan, a brother of Judas Maccabeus who was high priest in 152–142 BCE, as the most likely candidate. For Brownlee (1982:18–26), John Hyrcanus, who was high priest in 134–104 BCE, is the likely candidate.

43. The title **הַכֹּהֵן הַרָשָׁע** ‘was probably a polemical play on the official title **הַכֹּהֵן הַרָשָׁע** therefore it seems ‘likely that the Wicked Priest was a high priest’ (VanderKam 2011:352). According to Slomovic (1969–71:15) the pesherist applied the midrashic exegetical principle *al tiqrei* ‘to change the masoretic text’. Brooke (1985:333 n. 56) acknowledges the possibility ‘but it could also be a simple textual variant belonging to the interpreter’s text’. Through *hillūf* [anagram] the pesherist adapted **וַיִּבְרַח בַּיָּמַי הַזֶּה** to **וַיִּבְרַח בַּיָּמַי הַזֶּה** (Brooke 1985:289).

44. **וַיִּבְרַח בַּיָּמַי הַזֶּה** (8:10) is the pesherist’s paraphrase of Hab 2:5 **וַיִּבְרַח בַּיָּמַי הַזֶּה** (Brownlee 1979:138).

45.

(Prinsloo 2013a:152). I inferred this from the ‘many parallels between Habakuk 2 and oracles of doom in Isaiah directed against the Babylonians (cf. Isa 13–14; 21:1–10)’ (Prinsloo 2013a:152). With reference to Habakkuk 3 I postulated that the:

... reference to **עַי** ‘the poor’ (3:14) ... points to the poet of Habakkuk 3 being a member of a specific social group in the late Persian and/or early Hellenistic period who regarded themselves as the true Israel and as the actual recipients of YHWH’s salvific intervention in and promises to his people. The poet appropriates YHWH’s promise to the prophet Habakkuk at the time of the Chaldean onslaught on and devastation of Jerusalem to his own predicament as a marginalised ‘poor’ in a wicked and hostile environment. (Prinsloo 2013b:7)

The reference to **הַיִּין** in 2:5 should be interpreted against the background of imperial powers’ domination of the people of Judah/Yehud during the Babylonian exile and Persian/early Hellenistic rule.

Secondly, readers sensitive to intertextual allusions in the Hebrew Bible will recognise a number of intertextual contexts illuminating the phrase **וַיִּבְרַח בַּיָּמַי הַזֶּה** in 2:5a. In wisdom literature the delusionary influence of **הַיִּין** [the wine] is a well-known motif (see Proverbs 23:29–35). Proverbs 20:1 is reminiscent of Habakkuk 2:5a’s **וַיִּבְרַח בַּיָּמַי הַזֶּה**:

1a **לֵץ הַיַּיִן הִמָּה שֹׁבֵר** ¹ A mocker is the wine, a brawler is beer,
b **וְכָל־שֹׁבֵר בּוֹ לֹא יִחְכָּם:** and everyone led astray by it, is not wise.

Wine is used as metaphor for YHWH’s wrath. In Psalm 75:9 ‘the wicked of the earth’ are condemned:

9a **כִּי כֹס בְּיַד־יְהוָה** ¹ For a cup is in the hand of YHWH:
b **וַיִּזְרַח מִכֹּס וַיִּבְרַח מִכֹּס וַיִּבְרַח מִכֹּס** and wine is foaming, spice is mixing – and he pours from it!
9c **אֲדַרְשׁ־מֵרֵיקָהּ וַיִּמְצוּ יִשְׁתּוּ** Indeed, its dregs they will drain, they will drink,
d **כָּל רָשָׁעֵי־אֲרֶץ:** all the wicked people of the earth.

In prophetic literature YHWH’s wrath is directed at Israel’s enemies in general, and at one enemy in particular – the Babylonians. Jeremiah 25:15–38 is a pronouncement of universal judgement directed at ‘Jerusalem and the towns of Judah, its kings and officials’ (Jer 25:18) and all surrounding kingdoms (Jer 25:19–26). The prophet is instructed (Jer 25:15–16):

15a **כִּי כֹה אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֵלַי** ¹⁵ For thus said YHWH the God of Israel to me:
b **קַח־סֵגֶל מִכֶּמַּר הַיַּיִן הַזֶּה וְהַאֵת מִיָּדִי** Take this cup of fuming wine from my hand
15c **וְהַשְׁקִיחָהּ אֶת־כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם** and let all the nations drink it,
d **אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי שֹׁלֵחַ אֹתָהּ אֵלֵיהֶם:** those to whom I am sending you.
16a **וְיִשְׁתּוּ וְהִתְעַשְׂשׂוּ וְהִתְהַלְּלוּ** ¹⁶ They will drink, and they will stagger, and they will go mad
b **מִפְּנֵי הַסֶּבֶר אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי שֹׁלֵחַ בֵּינְתֶם:** because of the sword that I will send among them.

The prophet obeys and hands the cup to all nations (Jer 25:17–26).

Jeremiah 51:1–58 is a pronouncement of Babylon’s complete destruction. ‘Wine’ serves as metaphor for Babylon’s violence (51:7–8):

7a	כוס־זָנָבִב כְּבִלֵי־יְהוָה	⁷ A golden cup was Babylon in the hand of YHWH,
b	מְשַׁבְּרַת כָּל־הָאָרֶץ	she made the whole earth drunk.
c	מִיַּיְנָהּ שָׁתוּ גוֹיִם	Of her wine the nations drank,
d	עַל־כֵּן יִתְהַלְּלוּ גוֹיִם:	therefore the nations have gone mad.
8a	פֶּתְאֵם נִפְּלָה בָּבֶל וְתִשָּׁבֵר	⁸ Suddenly Babel will fall and be broken.
8b	הִלְלִי עָלֶיהָ קַחֵי קָמָרִי לְמַכְאוֹבָהּ	Wail over her, get balm for her pain,
c	אִלְמָה תִּרְפָּא:	perhaps she can be healed!

A similar picture emerges in Isaiah 51:17–23. The exiles are comforted (51:17):

17a	הִתְעוֹרְרִי הִתְעוֹרְרִי קוּמִי יְרוּשָׁלַיִם	¹⁷ Wake up, wake up, stand up Jerusalem,
b	אֲשֶׁר שָׁתִית מִיַּד יְהוָה וְהִנֵּה אֶת־כּוֹס חֲמָתוֹ	you who drank from the hand of YHWH the cup of his wrath,
c	אֶת־קַבְּעֵת כּוֹס הַמְּרַעְלָה שָׁתִית מִצֵּית:	the goblet, the cup of staggering you drank, you drained.

A complete reversal of fortunes is about to occur (51:21–23a):

21a	לְכוּ שִׁמְעִי־נָא זֹאת עֲנָה	²¹ Therefore, hear this, afflicted one,
b	וְשִׁבְרַת וְלֹא מִיַּיִן:	Drunken one, but not from wine.
22a	כֹּה־אָמַר אֱדוּכְדוֹ יְהוָה	²² Thus says your Lord, YHWH,
b	וְאֱלֹהֶיךָ יִרְיֵב עִמּוֹ	and your God, who defends his people:
c	הִנֵּה לָקַחְתִּי מִיַּדְךָ אֶת־כּוֹס הַמְּרַעְלָה	‘See – I have taken from your hand the cup of staggering!
22d	אֶת־קַבְּעֵת כּוֹס חֲמָתִי	The goblet, the cup of my wrath –
e	לֹא־תוֹסִיפִי לְשַׁתּוֹתָהּ עוֹד:	you will never drink from it again.
23a	וְשִׁמַּתִּיךָ בְּיַד־מוֹדֵדֶיךָ	²³ I will put it into the hands of your tormentors ...

In Jeremiah 51:1–58 and Isaiah 51:17–23 ‘wine’ is a metaphor for the Babylonians’ violence against the people of Judah. The cup of wrath they handed to the Judeans will become the cup of wrath in the hand of YHWH and the Babylonians will now be forced to drink it. Daniel 5:1–31, a tale about the final destruction of the Babylonian Empire, repeatedly refers to ‘the wine’ drunk at King Belshazzar’s banquet from ‘the gold goblets’ taken by Nebuchadnezzar from ‘the temple of God in Jerusalem’ (see 5:1–4, 23). This action is interpreted by Daniel as a sure sign of Babylonian hubris (5:18–24) and it is the direct cause of the great empire’s fall (Kaiser 1992:172).

The intertexts teach a general principle: היין [the wine] is deceptive or treacherous and not to be trusted (see לץ in Prov 20:1).⁴⁶ When it is used metaphorically for YHWH’s wrath and/or a foreign power’s violence, a *Motivkonstellation* is created that might be called ‘drinking the cup of wrath from YHWH’s hand’.⁴⁷ It conveys a simple principle. The violence committed against others by imperial powers (metaphorically described as a cup filled with fuming wine) will turn against them. YHWH will force these powers to

46. Floyd (2000:113) remarks:

[σ] taste for wine, when overindulged, can give a man such delusions of grandeur that he is bound to fall; and a taste for conquest, when overextended to cosmic proportions, can likewise predispose a conqueror to make fatal mistakes.

47. For the term, see Berges (2000:153).

drink the cup of wrath themselves. The constellation consists of six motifs: a drinking vessel – hand (of YHWH) – fermented beverage – recipient(s) of the beverage – consuming the beverage – effect.

Thirdly, principles of unit delimitation suggest that a section break between Habakkuk 2:4 and 5 should seriously be considered. If 2:5 is interpreted in the light of 2:5–20, intratextual links in the pericope indicate that the reference to היין in 2:5a is not ‘hardly acceptable’ (Van der Woude 1978:39) or ‘senseless’ (Perlitt 2004:67). On the contrary, the general intent of the text is clear:

Like delusory wine, the arrogant man will not reach his destination. These Chaldean kings will no longer continue with their pillage and their voracious gathering of nations into their realm ... At a certain moment in time the nations they have plundered will get the opportunity to scoff at the Chaldeans. (Potgieter-Annandale 1999:79)

If 2:5 is read in this context, the presence of the *Motivkonstellation* referred to above becomes apparent (see 2:5, 15–16). Table 4 summarises its manifestation in different contexts.

Read in this light the presence of היין [the wine] in 2:5a becomes perfectly legible. It refers to the arrogance of the wicked Babylonians, prompting them to gather more (2:6–8), secure more (2:9–11), build more (2:12–14), lust more (2:15–17) and in the end commit the ultimate folly of relying solely upon himself (2:18–19) in the presence of YHWH, who is in his holy palace and before whom all the Earth should hush (2:20). Their lust for ‘wine’ borders on the absurd and has become an insatiable obsession (2:5). Ironically, by committing the atrocities described in the woe oracles, the perpetrator of violent acts satiated himself with shame (2:16) and his downfall is inevitable.

The accumulated evidence indicate that the reading וואף כי היין בוגד in MT 2:5a is an acceptable and explainable reading *in the context of MT*.

Conclusion

In this study I expressed my surprise at the way Habakkuk 2:5 is dealt with in many commentaries and modern translations. There is a marked difference between MT’s and 1QpHab’s וואף כי היין בוגד and וואף כי היין בוגד. I argued that both readings should be evaluated in their respective contexts before rash decisions are made about the ‘preferred’ reading. I asked two basic questions: Does *wealth* make sense in the context of 1QpHab? My answer was in the affirmative, but it would be negative if the reading were transposed to the context of MT. Does *wine* make sense in the context of MT? Again my answer was in the affirmative, but it would be negative if the reading were transposed to the context of 1QpHab. In essence this study was a plea for contextual interpretations of two alternative textual traditions of Habakkuk 2:5a.

TABLE 4: Drinking the cup of wrath from YHWH's hand.

Motif	Ps. 75:9	Jer. 25:15–15	Jer. 51:7–8	Is. 51:17	Is. 51:21–23	Hab. 2:5	Hab. 2:15–16
Drinking vessel	כוס	כוס	כוס	קבעת כוס	קבעת כוס		כוס
Hand (of YHWH)	ביד יהוה	מידי	ביד יהוה	מיד יהוה	בידמוגיד מידך		ימין יהוה
Fermented beverage	יין חמר	היין החמה	מיינה	חמתו	חמתי מין לא	היין	חמתך
Recipient(s)	כל רשע־ארץ	כל־גוים	גוים כל־הארץ			כל־הגוים כל־העמים	רעהו
Consume beverage	שתה מצה	שקה שתה	שתה	שתה מצה	שתה		שקה שתה
Effect		הלל געש	שכר הלל	רעל	רעל שכר	ישבע לא	ערל שבעת שכר

Source: Author's own work.

Acknowledgements

Competing interests

The author declares that he has no financial or personal relationships that may have inappropriately influenced him in writing this article.

References

- Andersen, F.I., 2001, *Habakkuk*, Doubleday, New York. (Anchor Bible, 15).
- Barthélemy, D., 1992, *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 3: Ezéchiel, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen. (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, 50/3).
- Barthélemy, D., 2012, *Studies in the text of the Old Testament: An introduction to the Hebrew Old Testament text project*, transl. S. Pisano et al., Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, IN. (Textual Criticism and the Translator, 3).
- Berg, S., 2011, 'Religious epistemology and the history of the Dead Sea Scrolls', in D.C. Harlow et al. (eds.), *The "other" in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in honor of John J. Collins*, pp. 333–349, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Berges, U., 2000, 'Die Knechte im Psalter. Ein Beitrag zu seiner Kompositionsgeschichte', *Biblica* 81, 153–178.
- Bratcher, D.R., 1985, *The theological message of Habakkuk: A literary-rhetorical analysis*, University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Brooke, G.J., 1985, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish context*, JSOT Press, Sheffield. (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 29).
- Brooke, G.J., 2013, *Reading the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essays in method*, Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, GA. (Society of Biblical Literature: Early Judaism and Its Literature, 39).
- Brotzman, E.R., 1994, *Old Testament textual criticism: A practical introduction*, Baker, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Brownlee, W.H., 1951, 'Biblical interpretation among the sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls', *Biblical Archaeologist* 14, 54–76. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3209322>
- Brownlee, W.H., 1971, 'The Composition of Habakkuk', in A. Caquot et al. (eds.), *Hommages à André Dupont Sommer*, pp. 255–275, Adrien-Maisonneuve, Paris. (Librairie D'Amérique et D'Orient).
- Brownlee, W.H., 1979, *The Midrash Peshet of Habakkuk*, Scholars Press, Missoula, MT. (Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, 24).
- Brownlee, W.H., 1982, 'The Wicked Priest, the Man of Lies, and the Righteous Teacher – The problem of identity', *Jewish Quarterly Review* 73, 1–37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1454458>
- Charlesworth, J.H., 2002, *The Pesharim and Qumran history: Chaos or consensus?*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Collins, J.J., 1987, 'Messianism in the Maccabean Period', in J.N. Neusner et al. (eds.), *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the turn of the Christian Era*, pp. 97–109, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Deden, D., 1953, *De kleine Propheten*, J.J. Romen, Roermond. (Boeken van het Oude Testament, 12).
- Deissler, A., 1984, *Zwölf Propheten II. Obadja, Jona, Micha Nahum, Habakuk*, Würzburg, Echter Verlag. (Neue Echter Bibel, 8).
- Deist, F.E., 1978, *Towards the text of the Old Testament*, D.R. Church Booksellers, Pretoria.
- Elliger, K., 1953, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer*, J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen. (Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie, 15).
- Elliger, K., 1956, *Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten II: Die Propheten Nahum, Habakuk, Zephania, Haggai, Zacharia, Maleachi*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen. (Das Alte Testament Deutsch, 25).
- Fabry, H.-J., 2003, 'The reception of Nahum and Habakkuk in the Septuagint and Qumran', in S.M. Paul et al. (eds.), *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in honor of Emanuel Tov*, pp. 241–256, Brill, Leiden. (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, 94).
- Floyd, M.H., 2000, *Minor Prophets Part 2*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI. (Forms of Old Testament Literature, 22).
- Flusser, D., 2009, *Judaism of the Second Temple Period, Volume 2: The Jewish sages and their literature*, transl. A. Yadin, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.
- García Martínez, F., 2007, *Qumranica Minora I: Qumran origins and apocalypticism*, edited by E.J.C. Tigchelaar, Brill, Leiden. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 63).
- Gelston, A., 2010, *הרי עשר The Twelve Minor Prophets*, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart. (Biblia Hebraica Quinta, 13).
- Grabbe, L.L., 2010, *An introduction to Second Temple Judaism: History and religion of the Jews in the time of Nehemiah, the Maccabees, Hillel and Jesus*, T&T Clark, London.
- Horgan, M.P., 2002, 'Habakkuk Peshet (1QpHab)', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek texts with English translations. Volume 6B: Pesharim, other commentaries and related documents*, pp. 157–185, Westminster John Knox, Louisville, KY. (The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project).
- Instone Brewer, D., 1992, *Techniques and assumptions in Jewish exegesis before 70 CE*, J.C.B. Mohr, Tübingen. (Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum, 30).
- Jagersma, H., 1985, *A history of Israel from Alexander the Great to Bar Kochba*, transl. J. Bowden, SCM, London.
- Jokiranta, J., 2013, *Social identity and sectarianism in the Qumran movement*, Brill, Leiden. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 105).
- Kaiser, W.C., 1992, *Micah – Malachi*, Word Books, Dallas, TX. (The Communicator's Commentary, 21).
- Kaiser, W.C., 1998, *A history of Israel: From the Bronze Age through the Jewish Wars*, Broadman & Holman, Nashville, TN.
- Korpel, M.C.A., 2000, 'Introduction to the Series Pericope', in M.C.A. Korpel & J.M. Oesch (eds.), *Delimitation criticism. A new tool in biblical scholarship*, pp. 1–50, Van Gorcum, Assen. (Pericope 1).
- Lim, T.H., 2000, 'The Qumran Scrolls, multilingualism and biblical interpretation', in J.J. Collins & R.A. Kugler (eds.), *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 57–73, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI. (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature).
- McCarter, P.K., 1986, *Textual criticism: Recovering the text of the Hebrew Bible*, Fortress, Philadelphia, PA. (Guides to Biblical Scholarship, OR Series, 11).
- Murray, C.M., 2002, *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community*, Brill, Leiden. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 40).
- Newsom, C.A., 2004, *The self as symbolic space: Constructing identity and community at Qumran*, Brill, Leiden. (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 52).
- Nowack, W., 1903, *Die kleinen Propheten*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen. (Handkommentar zum Alten Testament, 3/4).
- Oesch, J.M., 1979, *Petucha und Setuma. Untersuchungen zu einer überlieferten Gliederung im hebräischen Text des Alten Testaments*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen. (OBO 27).
- Perlitt, L., 2004, *Die Propheten Nahum, Habakuk, Zephania*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen. (Das Alte Testament Deutsch, 25/1).
- Potgieter-Annandale, J., 1999, *Qumran in and around the Bible: A new look at the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Van Schaik, Pretoria.
- Prinsloo, G.T.M., 1989, 'n Literêr-eksegetiese analise van die boek Habakuk', unpublished DD-thesis, University of Pretoria, Pretoria.
- Prinsloo, G.T.M., 1999, 'Reading Habakkuk as a literary unit: Exploring the possibilities', *Old Testament Essays* 12, 515–535.
- Prinsloo, G.T.M., 2004, 'Habakkuk 1 – A dialogue? Ancient unit delimiters in dialogue with modern critical scholarship', *Old Testament Essays* 17, 621–645.
- Prinsloo, G.T.M., 2009, 'Petuchot/Setumot and the structure of Habakkuk: Evaluating the evidence', in R. de Hoop, M.C.A. Korpel & S. Porter (eds.), *The impact of Unit Delimitation on exegesis*, pp. 196–227, Brill, Leiden. (Pericope, 7).
- Prinsloo, G.T.M., 2013a, 'From watchtower to holy temple: Reading the book of Habakkuk as a Spatial journey', in M.K. George (ed.), *Constructions of Space IV: Further developments in examining ancient Israel's social space*, pp. 132–154, Bloomsbury, New York. (Library of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies, 569).
- Prinsloo, G.T.M., 2013b, 'Reading Habakkuk 3 in the light of ancient unit delimiters', *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 69(1), Art. #1975, 1–11. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v69i1.1975>
- Roberts, J.J.M., 1991, *Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah: A Commentary*, Westminster/John Knox, Louisville, KY. (Old Testament Library).
- Rudolph, W., 1975, *Micha – Nahum – Habakuk – Zephania*, Gerd Mohn, Gütersloh. (Kommentar zum Alten Testament, 13/3).

- Sanders, E.P., 2000, 'The Dead Sea sect and other Jews: Commonalities, overlaps and differences', in T.H. Lim (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their historical context*, pp. 1–43, T&T Clark, Edinburgh.
- Sellin, E., 1930, *Das Zwölfprophetenbuch*, Werner Scholl, Leipzig. (Kommentar zum Alten Testament, 12).
- Silberman, L.H., 1961, 'Unriddling the riddle: A study in the structure and language of the Habakkuk Peshet (1 Q p Hab)', *Revue de Qumran* 3, 323–364.
- Slomovic, E., 1969–1971, 'Toward an understanding of exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls', *Revue de Qumran* 7, 3–15.
- Talmon, S., 1987, 'Waiting for the Messiah: The spiritual universe of the Qumran covenanters', in J.N. Neusner et al. (eds.), *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the turn of the Christian Era*, pp. 111–137, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Tov, E., 1992, *Textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, Fortress, Minneapolis, MN.
- Tov, E., 2000, 'The background of the sense divisions in biblical texts', in M.C.A. Korpel & J.M. Oesch (eds.), *Delimitation criticism. A new tool in biblical scholarship*, pp. 312–350, Van Gorcum, Assen. (Pericope 1).
- Ulrich, E.C., 2000, 'The Qumran Biblical scrolls – The Scriptures of late Second Temple Judaism', in T.H. Lim (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their historical context*, pp. 67–87, T&T Clark, Edinburgh.
- VanderKam, J.C., 2004, *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile*, Fortress Press, Minneapolis, MN.
- VanderKam, J.C., 2011, 'The Wicked Priest revisited', in D.C. Harlow et al. (eds.), *The "other" in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in honor of John J. Collins*, pp. 350–1367, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.
- Van der Woude, A.S., 1966, 'Der Gerechte wird durch seine Treue leben. Erwägungen zu Habakuk 2:4–5', in *Studia Biblica et Semitica Theodoro Christiano Vriezen qui Munere Professoris Theologiae per XXV Annos Functus Est, ab Amicis, Collegis, Discipulis Dedicata*, pp. 367–375, Veenman, Wageningen.
- Van der Woude, A.S., 1970, 'Habakuk 2 4', *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 82, 281–282.
- Van der Woude, A.S., 1978, *Habakuk – Zefanja*, Callenbach, Nijkerk. (Prediking van het Oude Testament).
- Van Katwijk, D.J., 1912, *De prophetie van Habakuk*, De Vries, Rotterdam.
- Würthwein, E., 1973, *Der Text des Alten Testaments: Eine Einführung in die Biblia Hebraica*, 4. erweiterte Aufl., Württembergische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart.
- Ziegler, J., 1952, 'Konjekturen oder überlieferte Lesart? Zu Hab 2,5 κατοιωμένος/κατοιόμενος', *Biblica* 33, 366–370.

Addendum starts on the next page →

Addendum 1: Textual witnesses utilised in the study

Hebrew witnesses

Proto-Masoretic⁴⁸ manuscripts:

1. *Pesher Habakkuk* (1QpHab): One of the first scrolls discovered in Cave 1 at Qumran (Würthwein 1973:36). I consulted the photographs and transcription of the scroll by Burrows *et al.* (1950) and Cross *et al.* (1970) and the critical edition by Horgan (2002).
Burrows, M., J. C. Trever and W. H. Brownlee (eds.), 1950, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery Volume 1: The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary*, American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven.
Cross, F. M., D. N. Freedman, and J. A. Sanders (eds.), 1970, *Scrolls from Qumrân Cave I. The Great Isaiah Scroll; The Order of the Community; The Pesher to Habakkuk. From Photographs by John C. Trever*, Albright Institute of Archaeological Research, Jerusalem.
Horgan, M. P., 2002, "Habakkuk Pesher (1QpHab)," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries and Related Documents* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; PTSDSSP), Westminster John Knox, Louisville, 157-85.
2. *Murabba'ât Twelve Prophets Scroll* (MurXII): Dating from circa 130 CE, this badly damaged scroll contains a version of the Hebrew Twelve Prophets close to MT (Würthwein 1973:150).
Benoit, P., J. T. Milik, and R. De Vaux, (eds.) 1961, *Les Grottes de Murabba'ât*, Clarendon, Oxford. (DJD II). Published in two volumes, I: *Texte* (cf. pp. 181–205) and II: *Planches* (cf. Planche LXVIII-LXVIX).

Tiberian manuscripts of the Ben Asher tradition (Tov 1992:46–47):

3. *Codex Cairo* (M^c): According to the colophon it was copied and punctuated by Moshe ben Asher in 895 CE. It contains the Former and Latter Prophets (Würthwein 1973:38–39; Barthélemy 2012:240).
Codex Cairo of the Bible: From the Karaite Synagogue at Abbasiya: The earliest extant Hebrew manuscript written in 895 by Moshe ben Asher (Introduction by D.S. Lowinger), 1976, Makor, Jerusalem.
4. *Codex Aleppo* (M^a): According to the colophon it was copied in 925 CE. It is regarded as the model example of a Ben Asher manuscript (Würthwein 1973:39; Barthélemy 2012:239–240).
Aleppo Codex: Provided with massoretic notes and pointed by Aaron Ben Asher, 1976, Makor, Jerusalem. (The Hebrew University Bible Project).
5. *Codex Leningrad* (M^l): It is the oldest complete Ben Asher manuscript of the Hebrew Bible, copied in 1008–1009 CE (Würthwein 1973:39; Barthélemy 2012:239).
Pentateuch, Prophets and Hagiographa: Codex Leningrad B 19A, 1970, Makor, Jerusalem.

48. Following Tov (1992:19) I define 'proto-Masoretic' as earlier forms of the Hebrew Bible consonantal text 'lacking the later vocalization and accentuation'.

Manuscripts with non-Tiberian vocalisation:

6. *Codex Petropolitanus* (M^p): According to the colophon the manuscript was copied in 916 CE. It utilises Babylonian vowel signs, but in the consonantal text and punctuation it follows the Tiberian tradition (Würthwein 1973:40; Barthélemy 2012:238).
The Hebrew Bible – Latter Prophets: The Babylonian Codex of Petrograd edited with preface and critical annotations by Hermann L. Strack. Prolegomenon by P. Wernberg-Møller, 1971, Ktav, New York.
7. *Codex Reuchlinianus* (M^r): The manuscript contains the former and latter prophets and dates from circa 1105 CE. The vocalisation of the manuscript is proto-Tiberian and it contains both the Masoretic text and the Targum Jonathan to the Prophets.
Codex Reuchlinianus. No. 3 of the Badische Landsbibliothek in Karlsruhe (Formerly Durlach No. 55) with a general introduction: Masoretic Hebrew by Alexander Sperber, 1956, Munksgaard, Copenhagen. (The Pre-Masoretic Bible, I).

Printed editions of the Hebrew Bible:

8. *Biblia Rabbinica* (BibRab): The so-called Second Rabbinic Bible was prepared by Jakob ben Chayyim and printed by Daniel Bomberg in Venice in 1524–1525. The Hebrew text occurs together with the Aramaic translation and the Rabbinic commentaries of Rashi, Ibn Ezra and Kimchi (Würthwein 1973:42; Deist 1978:84).
Biblia Rabbinica: A reprint of the 1525 Venice edition edited by Jacob ben Hayim ibn Adoniyah, 1972, Makor, Jerusalem.
9. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS): A 'critical' edition of the Hebrew Bible based upon M^l, prepared under the auspices of the Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft (Deist 1978:86).
Elliger, K. & Rudolph, W., 1967/77, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart.
10. *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (BHS): A revised 'critical' edition of the Hebrew Bible based upon M^l, currently prepared under the auspices of the Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
Gelston, A., 2010, תרי עשר *The Twelve Minor Prophets*, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart. (Biblia Hebraica Quinta, 13).

Aramaic witnesses

Manuscript with non-Tiberian vocalisation:

1. *Codex Reuchlinianus* (M^r): Cf. Hebrew witnesses (7). The manuscript contains both the Hebrew and Aramaic text of the Former and Latter Prophets.

Printed editions of the Targum:

2. Printed version of the Aramaic text of Codex Reuchlinianus edited by De Lagarde (1967).
De Lagarde, P. (ed.), 1967, *Prophetiae Chaldaice e fide codicis reuchliniani*, Otto Zeller, Osnabrück.
3. The Targum Jonathan edited by Sperber (1962).
Sperber, A. (ed.), 1962, *The Bible in Aramaic based on old manuscripts and printed texts Volume III: The Latter Prophets according to Targum Jonathan*, Brill, Leiden.

Greek witnesses

Scroll from the Judean Desert:

1. *Greek Minor Prophets scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8HevXIIgr)*: Dates from between 50 BCE and 50 CE and contains a Greek translation of the Twelve Minor Prophets. It shows similarities with Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion and represents a recension of the Septuagint containing a literal translation of an apparently pre-Masoretic Hebrew text (Würthwein 1973:178; Barthélemy 2012:443–444).
Tov, E. *The Greek Minor Prophets scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8HevXIIgr) (The Seîd Collection 1)* (DJD VIII), Oxford 1990.

Uncial Septuagint manuscripts:

2. *Codex Sinaiticus* (G^s): Dates from the fourth century CE. Originally contained the entire Bible, but large parts of the Old Testament have been lost (Deist 1978:190).
Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus et Friderico-Augustanus Lipsiensis: The Old Testament preserved in the public library of Petrograd, in the library of the Society of Ancient Literature in Petrograd, and in the library of the University of Leipzig now produced in facsimile from photographs by Helen and Kirsopp Lake, 1922, Clarendon, Oxford.
3. *Codex Vaticanus* (G^b): Dates from the fourth century CE and contains the entire Bible. It is regarded as the best complete Septuagint manuscript (Deist 1978:190).
Biblorum Sacrorum Graecus Codex Vaticanus Tomus IV: Libros Esther, Iudith, Tobiae et Prophetarum, 1872, Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, Roma.
4. *Codex Alexandrinus* (G^a): Dates from the fifth century CE and contains the entire Bible (Deist 1978:191).
Codex Alexandrinus, 1936, The Codex Alexandrinus in reduced photographic facsimile: Old Testament, Part III Hosea-Judith, (ed. F.G. Kenyon), 1936, British Museum, London.

5. *Codex Marchalianus* (G^m): Dates from the sixth century CE and contains the prophetic books. It is of interest because hexaplaric notes occur in the margins (Deist 1978:191).
Prophetarum Codex Graecus Vaticanus 2125 Qui Dicitur Marchalianus, (ed. J. Cozza-Luzi), 1890, Bibliotheca Vaticana, Romae.

Syriac witnesses

1. *Codex Ambrosianus* (7a1): Dates from the sixth to seventh century CE and contains the entire Old Testament written in elegant Estrangela script (Deist 1978:147–148).
Ceriani, A.M., 1876–1883, *Translatio syra pescitto Veteris Testamenti ex Codice Ambrosiano sec. fere VI photolithographice edita curante et adnotante Mediolani: In officinis photolithographica Angeli della Croce et typographica J.B. Pogliani et sociorum*, Williams & Norgate, London. Available online: <https://archive.org/details/CerianiVeterisTestamentum7a1PeshittaTanakhAramaicOldTestament>, accessed 2015/09/29
2. *Peshitta*: Printed version of the Syriac Old Testament with the *Codex Ambrosianus* as base text, produced by the Peshitta Institute in Leiden.
Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version. Edited on Behalf of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament by the Peshitta Institute Leiden. Part III, Fascicle 4. Dodekapropheton – Daniel-Bel-Draco, 1980, Brill, Leiden.

Latin witness

1. *Vulgate*: I utilised the critical printed edition prepared by the Benedictine order published since 1926 in numerous volumes (Deist 1978:213).
Biblia Sacra iuxta Latinam Vulgatam Versionem XVII: Duodecim Prophetarum, 1987, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Roma.

Appendix continued next page →

Addendum 2: The text of Habakkuk 2:5 in six ancient textual witnesses.

MT	1QpHab	Targum	Peshitta	Septuagint	Vulgate
וְאֵלֶּיךָ יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה בָּנִי גִבּוֹר יְהוָה וְלֹא יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה וְאֵלֶּיךָ יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה וְאֵלֶּיךָ יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה וְאֵלֶּיךָ יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה	ואף כח מין בוגד גבר יהוה ולא יוה אשר הדדיב כשאול נפשו והוא כמות (לוא ישבע ויאספון אלו כול הגוים ויקבצו אלו כול העמים	ואף קמא 2 קשעי 3 בקומר גבר יהוה קרשע ולא יקשעים קאקמי קשאול נפשיה והוא כמותא לא קשע וקבש קוניה כל עקמניא וקרבי קוניה כל מלקוניה:	והוא כח 4 פגמא סממא לח סממא האפוא נפסא אקמי עממא מלח סממא אקמי סממא בט לאחא סממא סממא לאחא סממא	ὁ δὲ 5 καταϊόμενος 6 καὶ κατασποννητής, ἀνήρ ἄλαστον, οὐδὲν μὴ περὶνάη, ὅς ἐπλάτυνε καθὼς ὄδης τῆν ψυχῆν αὐτοῦ καὶ οὕτως ὡς θάνατος οὐκ ἐμπροσθέντος καὶ ἐπισυνάξει ἐπ’ αὐτὸν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη καὶ εἰσδέξεται πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντας τοὺς λαοὺς.	et quomodo vinum potantem decipit sic erit vir superbus et non decorabitur qui dilatauit quasi infernus animam suam et ipse quasi mors et non adimpletur et congregabit ad se omnes gentes et coacervabit ad se omnes populos
And yes, indeed – this wine is treacherous; an arrogant man – yes, he does not come to rest – (he) who opened like Sheol his throat, and he is like death – yes, he is not satisfied; so he gathered to him all the nations, and he collected to him all the peoples.	And yes, indeed – wealth betrays an arrogant man, and he does not come to rest – (he) who opened like Sheol his throat, and he is like death, he is not satisfied. And all the nations are gathered about him, and all the peoples are assembled to him.	Moreover, like one led astray by wine is never satisfied because he has enlarged his appetite like Sheol and never was satisfied like death and he, like death, was not satisfied, but he gathered to him all the peoples, and he drew near to him all the nations.	ὁ δὲ 5 καταϊόμενος 6 καὶ κατασποννητής, ἀνήρ ἄλαστον, οὐδὲν μὴ περὶνάη, ὅς ἐπλάτυνε καθὼς ὄδης τῆν ψυχῆν αὐτοῦ καὶ οὕτως ὡς θάνατος οὐκ ἐμπροσθέντος καὶ ἐπισυνάξει ἐπ’ αὐτὸν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη καὶ εἰσδέξεται πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντας τοὺς λαοὺς.	et quomodo vinum potantem decipit sic erit vir superbus et non decorabitur qui dilatauit quasi infernus animam suam et ipse quasi mors et non adimpletur et congregabit ad se omnes gentes et coacervabit ad se omnes populos	et quomodo vinum potantem decipit sic erit vir superbus et non decorabitur qui dilatauit quasi infernus animam suam et ipse quasi mors et non adimpletur et congregabit ad se omnes gentes et coacervabit ad se omnes populos

49. The three masculine plural verbs in 1QpHab should presumably be vocalised as *Nifal* (Gelston 2010:119):

50. The Targum translates MT כִּי וְאֵלֶּיךָ כִּי as two emphatic particles, that is, וְאֵלֶּיךָ כִּי (Gelston 2010:118).

51. The Targum translates MT כִּי as the preposition כִּי (Gelston 2010:118).

52. The Peshitta omits MT וְאֵלֶּיךָ כִּי (Gelston 2010:118).

53. The Septuagint weakens MT כִּי וְאֵלֶּיךָ כִּי to a mere δέ (Gelston 2010:118).

54. Ziegler’s (1952:366–370) emendation of καταϊόμενος [the arrogant] in agreement with MT is not supported by LXX uncial manuscripts and should be rejected (Gelston 2010:118).