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A CRITICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE TEXTUAL VARIANCES OF THE BOOK OF JONAH

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The book of Jonah is grouped with the books of the Minor Prophets of the Old Testament. It is a book consisting mainly of narrative and contains a miraculous element which has led some critics to consider it a parable, didactic narrative, or even as fiction. Others maintain that it is history and that its historicity can be proved by Christ's reference to it.

The book of Jonah relates the story of a wilful prophet. Although it is very well known and widely discussed, it is one of the most misunderstood books of the Old Testament. It is

"an occasion for jest to the mocker, a cause of bewilderment to the literalist believer, but a reason for joy to the critic. The Old Testament reaches here one of its highest points, for the doctrine of God receives in it one of its clearest and most beautiful expressions, and the spirit of prophetic religion is revealed at its truest and best."

The Masoretic Text for the book of Jonah has been remarkably well preserved in comparison to that of some

of the other books of the Bible. There are variances, however, both in the texts and in the interpretation, and also in the opinions about the other facts of the book, such as the author, date, place, unity, meter, theme and translation.

Before taking up textual variances, it is necessary to consider these differences of opinion about the author, place, time, theme, translation and interpretation of this book.

A. AUTHOR

"Jonah, the son of Amittai, as we learn from II Kings 14:25, was a native of Gath-hepher, in the tribe of Zebulun, who lived in the reign of Jeroboam II., and predicted to that king the successful issue of his struggle with the Syrians, which ended with his restoration of the territory of Israel to its ancient limits."¹

This prediction must have been delivered in the early days of Jeroboam's reign, and it would be interesting if it were preserved to compare with the prophecy of Amos which announced how the former successes of the king would be undone.²

The name יְנַהֲוָה (Jonah) means "dove". יְנַהֲוָה

is a derivation of יִתְנָא (truth). According to Hebrew tradition the widow of Zarephath, who is regarded as the mother of Jonah, called her son, Jonah, meaning the "Son of Truth", because Elijah, the prophet, had spoken words of truth to her.¹

But there is no indication that this Jonah is the writer of the book of Jonah, nor are there utterances of Jonah in the book except in the psalm of Jon. 2 and the announcement in Jon. 3:4. Yet, these seem to bear no autographic stamp. The author seems to shape his story as a parable or didactic narrative. The name "Jonah" may be chosen because the name means "dove" and a main goddess of Nineveh was Ishtar, whose sacred bird was a dove.²

According to some critics, Pusey, Orelli, Trumbull, and others, there is no reason to doubt that the author of the book of Jonah was Jonah, the son of Amittai, the prophet whose prophecy was given in the reign of Jeroboam II. They seem to argue from the standpoint that certain fishes can swallow a man whole, that modern scholars cannot prove that Jonah was not the author, that it is wrong to doubt the truth of a book of the Bible, and that

¹. cp. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 31.
². cp. W.F. Adeney, New Century Bible, Minor Prophets, 70, 71.
the people of Nineveh would not have repented without the miraculous ejection of Jonah.¹

Thus, there are different opinions as to the author of the book of Jonah, but the argument that it cannot have been written by some one else other than the main character mentioned loses its force when the story is considered, as it surely was intended, as a didactic narrative. As long as it is considered as an actual fact, then the argument may hold some strength. But if is considered as a didactic narrative told to illustrate and teach a lesson to wayward, selfish peoples, then just such events as are related here can easily be adapted for the purpose, and they can be used by the author who has suffered none of them in actual life.

Since the book of Jonah contains Aramaisms belonging to a later date than the time of Jonah's life, since the psalm seems to be made up of fragments from psalms that were written after the lifetime of Jonah, since the name of the king of Nineveh is not mentioned, since there exists a post-exilic spirit throughout the entire book, and since there are many other characteristics of the later period of the Masoretic Text, the conclusion

¹. op. G.L. Robinson, Twelve Minor Prophets, pp. 70,71; Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 5.
is naturally drawn that Jonah, the son of Amittai, is not the author, but that a later writer used him to illustrate and make plain the lesson he wished to teach.

B. TIME

The opinions about the time when this book was written vary from the time when the Jonah of II Kings 14:25 lived, about 780 B.C., to the post-exilic date, 200 B.C. The opening words of the book of Jonah, "Now the word of Yahweh came to Jonah, the son of Amittai," might indicate that it was written when Jonah lived (about 788-747 B.C.), but the language throughout seems to prove that it is of a much later date. Careful consideration may place the date of its writing about 250 B.C. Surely the language cannot belong to a period very much earlier.1

The facts pointing to an early composition of this book will be more carefully considered when the historical interpretation is discussed. At present, opinions pointing to a later date of composition will be considered, because they seem more logical and more nearly correct.

According to the contents of the book of Jonah, the hero of the book is identified with the prophet, Jonah, who lived at the time of Jeroboam II. Just why he is identified with this prophet cannot be definitely discerned. It may be that the writer of the book needed a prophet whose name was familiar to the Hebrew people, but whose works were inconspicuous. Still it is possible that Jonah was used for this narrative because he may have gone on a dangerous mission similar to the one recorded in this book and had a miraculous escape from death. Be that as it may, the book is called Jonah after the prophet who lived about 780 B.C.; but it must have been written much later, for, as stated above, Aramaisms and other words found in later Hebrew literature afford clear evidence that it was written after the exile.

For example ω used for ω (Jon. 1:7,12; 4:10) is an abbreviation used only in later Hebrew. The book is probably a protest against the narrowness of post-exilic Judaism, which was very conspicuous after the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. It is probable that the date of the book is not earlier than 350 B.C. and likely as much as a century later.

According to the International Critical Commentary, everything points to a post-exilic period for the writing of the book of Jonah. It cannot, however, be dated later than the third century B.C. because Jesus Sirach (49:10) includes it among the twelve prophets, and III Maccabees (6:8) refers to it, as does Tobit (14:4). The author uses the same characterization of Yahweh's nature as Joel and seems to quote Joel. The attitude expressed in Joel 2:13b and 14a is so similar to the general attitude expressed in the book of Jonah that it would seem that the authors of these books were familiar with the works of each other. In that case the book of Jonah was written possibly between 350 and 300 B.C.1

Although the book of Jonah has a more didactic aim, it resembles the biographical sketches of Elijah and Elisha (I Kings 17-19, II Kings 4-6). Because of this, according to Driver, it has been claimed that the author was a prophet of the school of Elisha, but the evidence causes this claim to be disregarded and points to a later date: יִשָּׁבָּה (Jon. 1:5) and יִשָּׁבָּה (Jon. 1:6), for example. The psalm in chapter two contains reminiscences of other psalms, e.g. Psalm 142, 143, 144. If the book had been written in the lifetime of Jonah, it

1. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 15.
would have been more original in language, because it would have had a more archaic setting. The general thought of the book presupposes the monotheistic teaching of the great prophets such as Jeremiah and the writer of Deutero-Isaiah. The name of the king of Nineveh is not considered of enough importance to be even mentioned, which is another indication that the book is not a record of facts, but a story written later than the times of the existence of the city.\footnote{op. Driver. op. cit. p. 301.}

The style belongs to later Hebrew. \footnote{op. Bray, Driver, Plummer. op. cit. 12.}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Jon. 1:12}, \textit{Jon. 3:2}, and \textit{Jon. 3:7} and others show words of post-exilic origin. \footnote{op. Bray, Driver, Plummer. op. cit. 12.}
\end{itemize}

In conclusion, the following is a brief summary of the evidence for the post-exilic date of the book of Jonah:

1. The language and style have marked affinities with Ezra, Nehemiah and Daniel. The date of these books is computed in the third century B.C.

2. The poem in chapter two is made up largely of phrases taken from psalms of post-exilic origin.

3. The descriptive phrase "the god of heaven", \textit{(Jon. 1:9)}, is used in post-exilic times to designate
9

Yahweh, but not in pre-exilic times (Ezra 1:2).

4. The name of the king of Nineveh, who plays an important role, is not given. This leads to the inference that the writer was not familiar with or disregarded it.

5. The Assyrian empire had passed away, as can be seen in such expressions as "Nineveh was an exceeding great city" (Jon. 3:3), which, so far as can be ascertained, was never used when the Assyrian kingdom existed.

6. There is a legalistic spirit of prayer in chapter two. This is characteristic of the post-exilic period.

7. The underlying thought and spirit of the book also express a universalistic spirit, (Jon. 4:11). This was a very rare, if not unknown attitude in pre-exilic times.

While in view of such facts as these the post-exilic date is quite certain, it is exceedingly difficult to determine with certainty the precise date of the writing of the book of Jonah. The lesson of the book is one that would have been timely in almost any period of post-exilic Judaism. At any rate, on account of various evidence, especially linguistic, it seems reasonable to set the date about 250 B.C.
According to the International Critical Commentary, Frobenius and Schmidt have shown that a narrative was told among many ancient peoples in which a man was swallowed by a monster, remained alive inside of it and came out safely. Inland peoples told of a dragon or some other ferocious animal, while maritime peoples naturally told of a sea monster.¹

The place where this story of Jonah was written cannot be located with accuracy. However it is most assuredly a story of Palestine on account of the god referred to so often, the Hebrew name of the hero, the general language and style employed and the geographical proper nouns of Tarshish, Nineveh and Joppa. Further than this nothing can be proved.

D. THEME

The tale begins, "And the word of Yahweh came to Jonah". Whether this "word" was accompanied by a vision or reached him by means of audition or whether it was a voice in his soul is not told. However, since the story is a didactic narrative and not history the answer to this question does not need to be known.²

¹. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 6.
². op. ibid. 28.
According to Mowinckel, who wrote "The Spirit of the Word In Pre-Exilic Prophets," the "word" was considered at that time as the guidance of Yahweh. The term "Spirit" was a word sometimes connected with frenzy and fanaticism, and with the true prophets the ecstatic element was manifested in the realization that they had thoughts, words and impulses coming from Yahweh. Naturally they often used other expressions than "Spirit" for this realization of the communication coming from Yahweh such as: "Yahweh showed me" (Amos 1:4), and "I heard Yahweh's voice" (Isaiah 6:1,8). In post-exilic period the term "Spirit" became more or less synonymous with the term "word". And because the book of Jonah is considered to be among the post-exilic writings, it is well to note the different ways in which the guidance of Yahweh was designated by prophets living before this, and to realize that the "word" used in the first verse of the book of Jonah means a force from Yahweh that descends upon men and accomplishes its mission. The Oxford Group calls the "word" the "guidance". Today, as it probably was in the days of Jonah, "God's Spirit", "Holy Spirit", and "Word" have similar meanings.

The book of Jonah contains an account of the prophet's mission to Nineveh to announce its speedy

destruction. It is concerned with the messenger's personal feelings in reaction to this mission. Possessed with the national hatred of idolatrous Gentiles, and fearing that Yahweh, in His great long-suffering might, after all, spare these Assyrians to whom he is sent, and that his prediction will be discredited by them and a heathen nation be saved, he attempts to escape the unwelcome errand. Mingled with this apprehension there may be a dread of ill treatment at the hands of the cruel Assyrians. But this would have small influence upon him if his attitude were right. He knows his duty, but at the moment, determines to avoid its fulfilment. He flees to Joppa and takes a ship for Tarshish. However, he cannot escape Yahweh who hurls, suddenly, a terrible storm upon the Mediterranean Sea, evidently not long after the ship has left Joppa. With a few strokes, the disastrous danger is pictured by the author. The storm is so fierce that the sailors, who are probably Phoenicians, become frightened. First they invoke the help of the gods they know, and then they set about to do what they can to help themselves. They throw overboard (the utensils), a Hebrew word which may include tackle, utensils, and even cargo. They do this so that the ship will more easily respond to rudders and oars.¹

¹ op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 29-32.
Meanwhile Jonah is unconscious of all. He has gone below, to the "inner parts" of the ship, and has fallen into a deep sleep. The Septuagint says "he slept and snored". The sleep may have been caused by exhaustion brought about by his hasty flight. But however it was brought about, the including of an account of it in the story gives a picture of where Jonah is and prepares the reader for the subsequent, graphic interview of the captain with him.¹

Verse six of chapter one paints a very graphic picture. The heathen sailor tells the Hebrew prophet to pray "to your gods" (יָאָכְלָנָהּ). In spite of the fact that Jonah is asleep and in no way assisting in combating the storm, there is no evidence that the captain is angry or thinks that Jonah is intentionally refraining from prayer. But the captain is astonished that Jonah can sleep in such a storm and wants him to come and do his part, pray for the saving of the ship.²

After verse six there is a brief pause. It is possible that a portion of the narrative is lost, but this is not necessarily true. The storm shows no sign of abating and the sailors believe that it has been sent by a deity in pursuit of a guilty one. They cast lots to discover the offender and when the lot falls on Jonah

¹ op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 32, 33.
² op. ibid. 32, 33.
they have no doubt but that he is the cause of the trouble, for the decision of the lot was regarded as infallible among ancient peoples.¹

The Buddhist episode of Mittavindaka from Benares, who goes to sea against the wishes of his mother, affords a parallel to the story of Jonah. After the lot falls on him the sailors decide at once that he is the guilty one.²

It is possible that the passenger, Jonah, may have aroused the suspicion of the sailors before the casting of the lots. They begin to ask him all about himself, what his business is, where he comes from, who his people are, and the like. Jonah's answer seems rather unreasonable. He tells them, first that he is a Hebrew, but then goes on to say that he worships Yahweh, the creator of land and sea. Yet, he, Jonah, is fleeing because he refuses to believe that Yahweh is a god of grace and love to all nations.³

It is sometimes claimed that through his answer Jonah became a missionary in spite of his efforts to flee from his duty to obey Yahweh. That he become a missionary to these sailors was surely not in the author's mind. It seems possible and quite in keeping with the

1. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 32, 33.
2. op. ibid. 35.
3. op. ibid. 35, 36.
narrative that the text may have originally read, "I am fleeing from Yahweh, the God of heaven," instead of "I fear Yahweh, the God of heaven."¹ The next verse would substantiate this supposition, for it reads in part: "because the men knew that from the faces of Yahweh he was fleeing because he told them."

Jonah's answer, whichever it is, produces fear among the sailors (Jon. 1:10), and full of horror they ask him why he has done this thing. They do not ask about the nature of his crime, for "they knew he was fleeing from the presence of Yahweh."² Anxiously they ask Jonah what to do with him; and he tells them to cast him into the sea, for he is certain that the storm has been sent on his account and will cease if he is thrown overboard. The sailors hesitate to follow Jonah's advice, for they do not seem to feel assured that throwing him overboard will please Yahweh. They struggle to reach the shore, an unusual custom, for usually sailors try to avoid the dangers of the coast line; but these men probably feel that it is their only hope. Then they implore Yahweh not to hold them all guilty for the sin of one. Failing to reach the shore or to prevail upon Yahweh to save them, they finally do as Jonah said, cast

¹. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 36, 37.
². op. Jonah 1:10.
him overboard, and the sea becomes calm. The sailors then offer sacrifices and make vows to Yahweh.¹

According to the Buddhist narrative referred to above the sailors set Mittavindaka adrift on a float with the words "many must not perish on account of this one". The words used in the story of Jonah are very similar, "Yahweh, we pray Thee that we do not perish because of the soul of this man".²

In the book of Jonah the narrator does not tell just what these sailors vow or where they get their sacrificial animals, nor does he say that they become converted to the worship of Yahweh, but he describes a scene in which there are found incidents which harmonize with those in many ancient religious literatures and which recognize the existence of many gods.³

Yahweh orders or appoints a great fish to swallow Jonah. The Authorized Version and the Revised Version are somewhat misleading, for they say that Yahweh prepared a fish to swallow Jonah. According to the Masoretic Text, the Septuagint and the Vulgate, the fish was not created at that instant, but ordered, turned aside from his course, to swallow Jonah. The author does not specify

1. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 36-38.
2. op. ibid. 35.
3. op. ibid. 40.
what kind of a fish but simply states that the fish is a great one. Commentators have thought of a shark or a whale, but the author either was not interested in or did not know the species. To the author the fish has no other purpose except to save Jonah from drowning and to bring him back to the shore.¹

The three days and three nights which Jonah spent inside the fish need not be reduced to a shorter period in order to minimize the miraculous element. This does not do away with the whole "miracle", nor is it necessary to do so, since this book is not to be considered as an historical account. It is rather to be considered as a didactic narrative in which, as in many other stories told the world over, the main character is swallowed and saved by a large fish.²

"And Jonah prayed to Yahweh, his God." He prayed for deliverance, but the words of his prayer are not recorded here. Verse two of chapter two may be regarded as an introductory part for the interpolation, since the subject, Jonah, and the place, the belly of the fish are mentioned again; but considering the first chapter carefully, the repetition becomes significant. In chapter one, Jonah is told to pray to his god, but there is no

¹. cp. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 41.
². cp. ibid. 41, 42.
indication that he did so. Now, out of the stomach of the great fish, he prays to Yahweh. His terrible experience seems to be turning him to Yahweh for guidance.¹

"And Yahweh spoke to the fish and it vomited Jonah on dry land." This tenth verse of chapter two seems to follow naturally the second verse of the same chapter.² The second verse records the fact that Jonah prayed to Yahweh and the tenth records the result of the praying.

Jonah promptly obeys the renewed command, after he is released by the fish, goes to Nineveh, and delivers the message of Yahweh that the city will be destroyed. The story does not tell the size of the city nor the number of people in it, although in verse eleven of the fourth chapter the statement is made: "wherein are more than sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand." This is the nearest to a numerical estimate of the number of people in Nineveh that the book of Jonah affords, but one cannot decide just what that means.³

The people of Nineveh repent, proclaim a fast and put on sackcloth. The king also, lays aside his

2. op. ibid. 42.
3. op. ibid. 50-52.
robe, puts on sackcloth and sits in ashes. They do all in their power to turn from their evil ways. Yahweh repents and spares Nineveh.¹

Jonah, greatly provoked because Nineveh has been spared, protests to Yahweh that this is just what he anticipated when he left home and disobeyed the divine command. He is very angry, for he fled from the divine summons to prevent just this sparing of Nineveh, and now he has become the instrument in the hands of Yahweh that brought it about. He wishes he were dead; and when Yahweh asks him if his anger is justified he makes no reply, so far as this story goes, but leaves the city and sits down in sullen silence to the east of it. The probable loss of his personal prestige because of the non-fulfilment of his prophecy,² seems to be of little importance to Jonah in comparison to the sparing of the heathen city.³

Yahweh tries to show Jonah his unreasonableness by an object lesson. He orders a plant, likely a castor-oil plant, to grow up rapidly, to shade him and to deliver him from vexation. Jonah is interested in and pleased with the tree, and forgets his anger for a time.⁴

1. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 53-55.
3. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 56, 57.
4. op. ibid. 60.
The following morning Yahweh orders a worm to attack and kill the tree. Yahweh orders a scorching east wind which intensifies the mental and physical misery of Jonah. He is angry again and again wishes to die. This time he is angry because the plant has been destroyed. In the part of the story recorded in verse one of the fourth chapter, Jonah is angry because Nineveh had not been destroyed. His inconsistency is very evident here, for he cares for the preservation of the plant, but desires the destruction of the city and all the people in it. Again Yahweh asks him if he does well to be angry, and this time he answers emphatically, "I do well, even unto death." 1

Yahweh explains Jonah's selfish inconsistency; he, Jonah, is sorry about the tree which he did not create, but does not expect Yahweh to be sorry for Nineveh, which He did create. Yahweh draws the following lesson for Jonah:

"Thou hast regard for the castor-oil plant, which thou hast not labored for, neither madest it grow; which came up in a night, and perished in a night; and should not I have regard for Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and also much cattle?" 2

The psalm in Jon. 2:3-10 is not a main part of

1. cp. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 60, 61.
2. Jonah 4:10,11.
the story but an interpolation. The first two lines state the theme of the psalm. In anguish the sufferer has called upon Yahweh, and has been heard and answered.

"The mortal peril is not specified, but there can be no doubt that the one who inserted the psalm interpreted the distress in accordance with the story."^1

The original author of the psalm may have intended the distress to be mortal illness, but here it is drowning. Throughout the psalm, Sheol, the nether world, is personified as a monster with a belly. The clause "out of the belly of Sheol, I cried," evidently seemed to the writer, who inserted the psalm, to refer to the belly of a fish, but really there is no evidence that it had anything to do with a fish's belly in the original psalm. The sufferer's distress is pictured in this psalm in verses two to seven inclusive, as is also his belief in the necessity of prayer.2

---

1. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 44.
2. op. ibid. 44.
CHAPTER II

INTERPRETATIONS

The book of Jonah contains the account of the prophet's mission to denounce Nineveh, his attempted escape, the method used by Yahweh to curb his self-willed spirit, and the results of his preaching the message of Yahweh in Nineveh.

So far as the present investigation has gone, there are three main interpretations for the book of Jonah, i.e. allegory, history, and didactics. The last seems correct, but the thesis would not be complete without due consideration to the other two. The careful consideration to all three will enable one to form his or her own conclusion, although in the end, it seems to strengthen the idea that the didactic interpretation is the correct one.

A. ALLEGORY

According to Driver, the allegorical view of the book of Jonah is supported by Kleinert, Cheyne, and Wright. According to their opinion, Jonah represents the Hebrew nation, and indirectly the life
of Jesus. This nation was trusted with the great prophetic mission. They were unfaithful to their mission because they held a greedy, exclusive grasp on their religious privileges. As a result, they were cast in the sea of nations and were swallowed and disgorged by a great sea-monster of nations just as Jonah was swallowed and vomited up by the great fish. The calamity of exile brought about repentance, confession of faith, just as Jonah's calamity did. There were probably some of the Hebrew people who were disappointed because the prediction of the prophet (Jon. 3:4b) was not at once actualized,

"and that the cities of the nations still stood secure, just as Jonah was disappointed that the judgment pronounced against Nineveh had been averted."1

According to this opinion, the history of the Hebrews is typified in this history of Jonah.

The allegorical interpretation of the book of Jonah is consistent with the belief in the divine inspiration of the book. According to this interpretation, Jesus refers to the story of Jonah to teach a great lesson. The repentant Ninevites were to be compared to the

multitudinous Gentiles who turned from their idols to the true and living Yahweh. The repentance of the men of Nineveh was not a passing event but a lasting fact, the results of which were still to be manifested during and after Christ's generation.\(^1\)

Jonah was sufficiently unknown as a prophet that he could be used to represent the Hebrew people without violence to written history.\(^2\)

**B. HISTORY**

Keil, McGarvey and Wright maintain that the book of Jonah contains history. They claim that it is inserted among the books of prophecy because its author bears the title of a prophet (II Kings 14:25). The Hebrews regarded the story as history and two references to the book of Jonah are found in Tobit 14:4 and 8, where the author seems to base his advice to his son upon the certainty of the fulfilment of Jonah's prediction. Josephus recounts the story as containing all that is known of the prophet Jonah. Jesus uses the book as a vehicle of His teaching. Consequently some orthodox critics regard its contents as historical.

2. op. cit. ibid. pp. 210, 211.
According to Bewer, some Hebrew rabbis try to say that Jonah fled to protect his people. They say that he knew that if the Ninevites obeyed the voice of Yahweh it would make the disobedience of the Hebrew people seem all the worse and would eventually bring about their ruin. They maintain that the book is completely historical and that the events related in the book actually took place.¹

McGarvey says it is impossible for any one else but the prophet himself to affix to a prophet of Yahweh these traits of disobedience, narrowness and peevishness, which are found in this book. And had anyone been so brazen as to dare such a writing it is certain it would not have been accepted as a sacred book by the Hebrew people. The storm, the fish, the disobedience, the repentance and the gourd are parts of the Divine plan, and to doubt their actuality is to doubt the miraculous power of Yahweh and all the miracles of Jesus as well as other men of Yahweh. If any Hebrew writer had been so irreverent and bold as to write such a story about a prophet of Yahweh when it was not a positive fact, it is quite certain that it would never have been allowed a place among their sacred documents.²

2. op. McGarvey, op. cit. pp. 61,62.
McGarvey thinks that the extraordinary and supernatural occurrences here related cannot be pronounced incredible by him who believes in the reality of the miracles recorded elsewhere in the Bible. There is no doubt that the whole book rests upon a basis of facts and is historical, according to his opinion. True, the name of the king of the city of Nineveh is not recorded. However, not the name of the king, but his repentance and that of his people are significant in this book.¹

Thus McGarvey maintains unconditionally that the story of Jonah is history throughout. He wonders what they, who say the conversion of so many Ninevites in so short a time is impossible, have to say about the conversion of three thousand who heard Peter on the day of Pentecost. Some modern revivals have accomplished things almost as wonderful.²

True, he says, there seems to be no trace of the conversion of these people when they are again mentioned. But they are not mentioned until the time when Pul, King of Assyria, made an alliance with Menahem, King of Israel. That time was likely several years after the preaching of Jonah, for Menahem came to the throne two years after Jeroboam had died. He had been reigning some time before

2. cp. ibid. p. 28.
the above Assyro-Israelitish alliance was made, and Jonah had gone to Nineveh before the death of Jeroboam. Thus it is seen that there is quite a lapse of time between the conversion of Nineveh and the time when her people are spoken of as idolaters. Much can take place in the religion of a people in a short time. Paul marvelled that the Galatians could turn so quickly from his teachings of Christ to another faith.¹

According to McGarvey, the book of Jonah teaches a great lesson and thus becomes didactic, but history is said to be philosophy taught by example.²

McGarvey states further in his book, "Jesus and Jonah," that if the bare statement of a man being swallowed by a fish and vomited alive after three days were made with no explanation, it would justly be regarded as an idle tale. In like manner would the wondrous repentance of Nineveh and the growth and disappearance of the castor-oil plant be regarded if there were no historical connections. But the city of Nineveh was given to idolatry and abominations of the nations of Western Asia; and Yahweh, looking upon the great city, saw in every individual an immortal creature of His hand and must

¹. op. McGarvey, op. cit. p. 29.
². op. ibid. p. 30.
have desired to save him or her. It is the same Yahweh who so loved the world that He gave His Son, that any one who believed on Him would not perish, but have eternal life.  

O. DIDACTIC NARRATIVE

At no time so much as at the present hour has man realized that truth is much more profound than facts, and that religion, in its quest for ultimate truth, must see beyond historical events and chronological tables to those meanings, insights, and ideals of which the whole fabric of truth is woven. There is more truth about life's deepest meanings in many a myth than will ever appear in a mathematical table. The table marshals the dry bones of facts; the imagination and emotion which live in stories cover these bare facts with flesh and breathe the spirit of living truth into them. Poetry, art and narratives are sometimes greater vehicles of religion and truth than long recitations of mere events, because through these are revealed some of the more ideal longings and findings of the human mind: worship, devotion, love, and duty. It is a shallow religion which desires to try to prove the historicity of the story by confining

1. op. McGarvey, op. cit. 42-44.
cramp these age-old vehicles of its truth by forcing them through the uniform mold of science or history. The arts, which religion has mothered, should continue to enrich our spiritual life. Let it be insistently said that the book of Jonah does not contain a complete history or even an allegory, but a narrative with a vital message, and that it uses the literary arts to set forth this message. This is the answer to those who argue that Christ would not have referred to the book of Jonah, if it was not history throughout.

The materials for the book of Jonah may have been supplied by tradition and rest upon a basis of fact; even the outline may be historical, but irrespective of the miraculous issue, it must be admitted that the story is not entirely historical. The complete conversion of an entire heathen population is contrary to analogy. It is not likely that the great Assyrian king would have so behaved as is depicted in Jon. 3:6b in the presence of a Hebrew prophet; and it is very strange that, if there was such a complete conversion of this people, there were not some permanent effects.

Bewer states that König, Orelli, and Trumbull try to prove the historicity of the story by confirming that there are some fish that can swallow a man whole.
They cannot prove that a man can live inside the fish for three days, however. Trumbull tries to say it happened to make an impression on the Ninevites whose favorite god was the fish-god. As far as this dissertation goes there is no indication that the chief god of the Ninevites was the fish-god. Furthermore the question immediately arises: why should Jonah who was proclaiming Yahweh want to make an impression through the fish-god and thus minister to their superstitions and strengthen faith in another god?  

A good sign of the character of the story is the fact that the author does not think it necessary to designate in what language Jonah spoke.

Tobit may have based his advice to his son upon the certainty of the fulfilment of Jonah's prediction, as defenders of the historical interpretation of the book of Jonah maintain. However, many good pieces of advice have been illustrated and emphasized by a familiar story, consequently this does not prove historicity at all.

Josephus may maintain that the book of Jonah contains the history of the prophet, but today it is well known that Josephus is far from an authority in many things of history.

1. cp. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 5.
2. cp. ibid. 51-53.
As related above, McGarvey advances the theory that the story of Jonah must be history because it is incredible that any Hebrew was capable of conceiving a story so irreverent toward one of his own nation. He also says that it is fabulous that a story of this kind, even if written, would be accepted by and known to the Hebrews, and that it is unbelievable that a Hebrew would invent a story that represented Yahweh so regardful of the welfare of another people, namely the Ninevites.

What is McGarvey's answer to the fact that Jesus was a Hebrew and conceived the story of the Good Samaritan, and said to members of His people "O generation of vipers"? And in spite of this accusation some of His most ardent followers were of the Hebrew people. Furthermore, the accusations and outcries of Hosea and Amos must have been respected at least by some of the Hebrews or else the prophetic books bearing their names would not have come down to us.

There are many difficulties in the way of regarding this book of Jonah as an historical event. If the Ninevites were converted as this story says, as stated before, it was the greatest happening which took place from the days of Moses until those of the

1. op. McGarvey, op. cit. pp. 61,62.
Restoration. Would not the prophets, who spoke of Assyria, have alluded to it?  

Thayer, of Harvard Divinity school, says that the characteristics of the book of Jonah favor the opinion that it is a narrative didactic in aim. He states further:

"To regard our Lord's use of the narrative as vouching for it as history, is to confound the province and function of a preacher of righteousness with that of a higher critic or of a scientific lecturer. As reasonably might one infer from an allusion in a modern sermon to William Tell, or Effie Deans, or the Man Without a Country, that the speaker held these personages to be thoroughly historic, and their narrated experiences matters of fact. As warrantably might we make Christ's gratuitous mention (only three verses later) of evil spirits as frequenting waterless places, the basis of demonology for which he is to be held responsible."  

Barnes of Pittsburg, Johnson of Chicago, Hyde of Bowdoin, Rhees of Newton, Bradford of Montclair, and Ropes of Bangor have expressed the same opinion in different words and with different illustrations.  

In the book of Jonah the writer uses a story, as may be found in the third chapter of the book of Genesis, to bring home great truths. The story is an example of adaptation to the writer's purpose, who uses a didactic narrative very effectively.

1. op. Wright, op. cit. pp. 208, 209.  
According to Cadbury the book of Jonah contains a narrative written to oppose the "racial" narrowness and pride of the Hebrews. This opinion, in fact, is held by many scholars, and the book of Jonah is generally regarded as a narrative designed to rebuke the narrow and hostile attitude of later Judaism towards other nations.

The lessons of the book of Jonah are obvious: 1. to proclaim the universality of the Divine plan of salvation, i.e. Yahweh's thoughts were not for the Hebrew nation alone, but for mankind, even the Assyrian; 2. the impossibility of eluding the Divine purpose; 3. the natural piety of all men, Hebrew and Heathen; 4. the kindness of Yahweh who cares for men, children, and even cattle; 5. the rebuke to a prophet who is more concerned with his own selfish aggrandizement than with the saving of men.

The book of Jonah contains a message for all peoples of all times.

"The little book of 'Jonah' touches the high-water mark of Old Testament theology. No other pre-Christian writer quite reaches the universalism which it implies. Yahweh, the Israel's God, is seen as the God of the heathen too, concerned for the Assyrian, the most cruel and rapacious power in the world, calling a pagan city to repentance and accepting the signs of contrition."

Jonah, the Hebrew, is represented in this book as

2. ibid. 197.
trying to avoid his missionary enterprise, and as being bitterly annoyed because the Heathen were spared. The prophetic message has a religious value and teems with human interest. There is a wonderful picture of a heathen city and its docile obedience to the message of the prophet, as well as a vivid picture of the deeds of the pagan sailors. It is no wonder that Jesus used the book as a help in teaching a lesson he had to impress upon the minds of men, nor is it strange that it was the means that led to the conversion of the Cyprian. 1

The story in the book of Jonah is one of the best known and most misunderstood stories in the Old Testament. 2

"The Old Testament reaches here one of its highest points, for the doctrine of God receives in it one of its clearest and most beautiful expressions and the spirit of prophetic religion is revealed at its truest and best. It is sad that men have so often missed the spirit by fastening their attention on the form of the story. The form is indeed fantastic enough and, unless rightly understood, it is likely to create difficulties." 2

Any reader who takes the story of Jonah as a record of historical facts must ask how a sincere prophet could disobey a direct command of Yahweh and why Yahweh would cause so many to suffer from the storm for the sins of one when there were many other ways

1. op. cit. 197.
2. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 3.
to bring to the mind of Jonah his obligation. To such, it is also an occasion for wonder that the fish came to be beside the ship; that Jonah could pray a wonderful prayer of thanksgiving inside the fish; that the fish happened to eject Jonah on shore; that the people of Nineveh understood Jonah's language; and that such extraordinary results were brought about so suddenly.¹

The story contains strange and unusual elements, e.g. the repentance of the Ninevites, the speedy growth and death of the plant, and the experience of the prophet in relation to the fish. But the strangeness and wonder disappear when the story is treated as it should be. It is a didactic narrative. The author is not interested in things of vital importance to the historian. He does not give the name of the king of Nineveh, the date of the story; nor the nature of the sins prevalent in Nineveh which necessitated Jonah's mission. The story is one with a moral, it is similar to "The Good Samaritan" by Jesus or "The Teacher of Truth" by Oscar Wilde.²

Frobenius and Schmidt have found that a narrative, in which a man was swallowed by a monster and later came out safe and sound, was common among some peoples. As

¹ cp. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 3.
has been stated before, the book of Jonah is but one of a large number of "Jonah-stories.\(^1\)

The author took this story common to many lands and many peoples and used it as a prophetic story, pervaded by the spirit of the Hebrew religion. He used the fish incident for the purpose of bringing Jonah, the main character in the story, back to land.\(^2\)

The Oriental peoples loved romance and the Hebrews were no exception. A story would carry home a lesson when nothing else would. The author had a lesson which, in his opinion, dared not fall on deaf ears, so he used a story. He had a great vision of: 1. the oneness of Yahweh; 2. His universal interest in the salvation of all; 3. the punishment of sin wherever it was; 4. the high calling of the Hebrew people to spread a knowledge of this 'Yahweh'. Hence, he summoned the Hebrews to their great task by a story.\(^3\)

2. *op. ibid.* 6.
3. *op. ibid.* 7, 8.
CHAPTER III

CRITICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE MASORETIC TEXT

A. Possibilities of Various Translations

When the book of Jonah was translated from the Hebrew into Greek, the translator or translators first had to divide the undivided consonants into words. The grouping of the Hebrew characters into words naturally resulted in variations in the Hebrew text.

The variations resulting from the different groupings of characters were complicated by the application of different vowels and confusion of consonants similar in appearance. In some of these variations it is difficult to decide which one really is preferable. Then there are various renderings of the same Hebrew word or phrase as a result of translation into Greek. Each case must be studied carefully before a decision is made. In general, it may be said that the Masoretic Text is to be preferred, unless there is a good reason to support the Greek Version.

Another cause for confusion is the fact that in the Hebrew language almost all words are derived from triliteral roots in such a fashion that a long list of nouns, adjectives and verb forms may be derived from a
single root. On the other hand, the language is so constructed that similar and even identical words may be derived from different roots, and have totally different meanings. Moreover, some roots are identical in form, although actually different roots with different meanings. The problem of identifying the roots of a given word was much more difficult before the use of written vowels, for the identification of various roots depends to some extent, on the vowels, whether they are written or understood.

The translators of early texts had no written vowels. Consequently they must have been greatly puzzled, at times, as to the proper root from which certain words were derived. When Hebrew was a living language, the Hebrew learned the meaning of various words, not the roots; but when Hebrew became less commonly spoken, the translator needed to know the proper roots from which the words in question were derived.

There is also the human weakness of making mistakes. As the different copyists have copied the Hebrew literature down through the ages, it is not only possible, but very likely that letters were changed, some by chance entirely, others as a natural course of writing and still others were changed because the
change seemed more reasonable to the copyist than the text which was being copied.

Thus there are different opinions as to the exact translation of the Hebrew book of Jonah, and there are different ways of expressing the translation. Hebrew words and expressions are interpreted variously by different translatory students. In many cases, there are two or more different translations of the Hebrew text, any one of which may be the correct one. Some of these instances are quoted in the following:

1. "רִבְשֵׁה תַּלְכֶּר (was thought to be broken) of Jon. 1:4, the Septuagint translates ἐκινδυνεῦσαι συντρίβεται (was in danger to be broken), the Vulgate translates "pericolitabatur conteri" (was in danger to be destroyed). A literal translation of the Hebrew text, as stated above, is "thought to be broken" or "was estimated to be broken". It is not possible to say which is the best translation, and when carefully compared they are very similar in meaning. The American Revised Version reads, "was like to be broken", and An American Translation edited by Smith and Goodspeed, "was thought that (the ship) would be broken up.

2. In Jon. 1:5 the word נַשְׁבִּי is found. According to some authorities this word occurs only here, in the
Old Testament, but is a word used frequently in Aramaic. However, this does not necessarily mean that it is an Aramaic-loan word. On the contrary, from the root קָנָה comes the idea that its original meaning is "a covered ship", but it may be translated simply "ship". The Septuagint uses the same word for ship throughout, namely πλοῖον, and the Vulgate "navis". The Masoretic Text elsewhere in the book of Jonah uses מַיְץ.

3. יַעַנֶּן of Jon. 1:6 is a denominative from יַעַן meaning "rope". It may be translated "rope-puller" or "sailor". Together with the preceding word קָנָה, it is read in the Septuagint as παραπαύς (shipmaster); in the Vulgate "gubernator" (helmsman or pilot); the American Revised Version "shipmaster"; and An American Translation "captain".

4. יַעַנֶּן יַעַנ of Jon. 1:6 is used elsewhere only in Daniel 6:4, and is clearly an Aramaism. It may mean "think", "consider", "recall to mind," or "remember". The Septuagint puts it διασωκεῖ (save), while the Vulgate reads "recoquitet" (think, reconsider).

5. יַעַנ יַעַנ of Jon. 1:6 is "for us" and may be translated "for our benefit". The Septuagint reads מַעַנְיוּ and the Vulgate "nobis". When the two words יַעַנ יַעַנ are

1. cp. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 34.
2. cp. ibid. 34.
3. cp. ibid. 34.
4. cp. ibid. 34.
translated together (think for our benefit) there is not much difference in the meaning expressed in this phrase and that in the Septuagint which reads διασώσῃ...

6. ἢς (save us).

6. - Ἴης (on account of that which concerns whom) of Jon. 1:8 is very clumsy. It seems to be, together with the following three words, a repetition of Jon. 1:7b. Therefore, it is probably a marginal note explaining Ἴης that found its way into the text. The entire phrase beginning with Ἴης is said to be omitted in several Hebrew manuscripts and the Sinaitic Codex. Many modern scholars likewise omit it. Crell thinks the men wanted to see if Jonah would confess his guilt and confirm the decision of the lot. The American Revised Version reads "for whose cause" and An American Translation "for what reason". The Septuagint edited by Swete omits a translation of the entire clause Ἴης, and the one edited by Rahlfs reads τίνος ἐρξεὶς ἢ κακία αὐτὴ ἐστίν ἐν ἡμῖν. The Vulgate reads "cuius causa malum istud sit nobis" which may be translated "because of whom is this evil to us?"

7. ἵς (what is your business?) in Jon. 1:8, Ehr interprets as "was ist der zweck deiner reise?" (what is the purpose of your journey?), and Sievers says it

1. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 37.
means "what have you done?" ְךָם נָעַד meaning "work" or "business" has no verb form in any Hebrew Text of the Bible so far as is known to the writer. ְתִּן מָעַד from the verb ְתִּן (send) means "messenger" or "angel". The Septuagint, Vulgate, American Revised Version and An American Translation all seem to say, directly or indirectly, "what is your business?" 8. מַעַד (fear) of Jon. 1:9 is translated by the Septuagint as σιφομαὶ (worship), by the Vulgate as "timeo" (fear), the American Revised Version "fear", and An American Translation "stand in awe of". Just which is best is hard to determine for worship, fear and awe are very closely related in the ancient religions. 9. מַעַד (was tossed violently on and on) of Jon. 1:11, the Septuagint reads ἐπορεύεται καὶ ἐξηρεῖται μᾶλλον κλύδων (arose and lifted its waves exceedingly), the Vulgate "ibat, et intumescebat" (kept going and swelling up), the American Revised Version reads "grew more and more tempestuous", and An American Translation "was running higher and higher." These translations are very similar in meaning and seem to be of equal validity. 10. מַעַד in Jon. 1:13 literally means "and they dug". The Targum has פֶּרָש (caused to swish). The

1. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 37.
Septuagint has παρεμβαίνοντο (they made efforts, pressed closely, or drove), the Vulgate has "remigabant" (they rowed).¹ Both American Versions read "they rowed hard".

11. ἄνωθεν in Jon. 1:14 comes from ἄνω and ἄνω, and it means literally "ah now" or "we beseech thee". It is translated in the Targum וָֹ֔שְׁא וְכָלָ֖ים הִנֵּ֥ה (accept our invitation).² The Septuagint reads Μονάχισι (by no means), and the Vulgate says "quaesumus" (we ask, seek, implore). Both American Versions read "we beseech thee".

12. ἀνώθεν of Jon. 1:15 is like the German "abstehen von" meaning "cease". It is so translated by both the American Versions referred to in this thesis. The Septuagint reads Εἰστήθη (stood, stopped) and the Vulgate, "stetit" (stood, stopped, halted). ³υθ is used only here for the raging of the sea, elsewhere it is used for strong emotions.³

13. ἀνώθεν (and he assigned) of Jon. 2:1, the Septuagint reads προσέταξεν (commanded), and the Vulgate "praeparavit" (made ready beforehand). It is a favorite word of our author, (cp. Jon. 4:6,7,8). The Hebrew word means "assign", "command", "entrust", "turn to the right" or "order".⁴ The American Revised Version,

2. cp. ibid. 40.
3. cp. ibid. 40.
4. cp. ibid. 42.
which reads "prepared" is somewhat misleading, for this translation leads one to think that Yahweh prepared the fish at the time of this happening, while the fish was likely created long before this, but was commanded at this time. But if "prepare" is taken in the sense of making ready, it is very similar to the Vulgate.

An American Translation reads "had assigned".

14. For ἐνευσί (he answered me) of Jon. 2:3 of the Masoretic Text the Septuagint has εἰσακοεύει μου (he listened to me), the Vulgate "exaudivit me" (he heard or listened to me), and both American Versions read "he answered me".

15. Ἑν ἀντίλα (from Abyss) of Jon. 2:4 is read in the Septuagint as εἰς βάθος (into depths) and in the Vulgate "in profundum" (into depths) and the American Versions read "into" rather than "from" as in the Masoretic Text. This is a difficult phrase, and which is more nearly correct cannot be ascertained. כ and ב are confused frequently, because of similarity of form or sound, so it cannot be stated that the Masoretic Text is to be preferred.¹

16. ἔλθοι (and it came) of Jon. 2:8, the Septuagint reads ἐλθεῖς (may come) and the Vulgate "veniat" (may come). Both read as though the

¹. op. J. Kennedy, An Aid to the Textual Amendment of the Old Testament, pp. 14, 44.
of καὶ were conjunctive instead of converse.
This might be preferable, for Jonah, when his soul faints, remembers Yahweh, and hopes that his prayers will come into His holy place; and although the Masoretic Text and both American Texts read "came", it seems difficult to decide which is preferable.
17. τὰ (and he spoke or said) of Jon. 2:11 the Septuagint reads ᾧ πρὸσετάπη (and he commanded) and the Vulgate "et dixit " (and he said). The American Revised Version " and... spoke", and An American Translation "then... commanded". τὰ is usually followed by the words which any one speaks, but this is not always the case, and it may mean at times, according to the Lexicon, "command". A definite decision in this case is very difficult.
18. ῥῆ (it was evil, or it displeased) in Jon. 4:1, is read ἐλωπῆ (grieved) in the Septuagint and "afflictus est" (worried) in the Vulgate. Both American Versions read "displeased". Both the Hebrew and English seem to connote selfish dislike entirely while the Septuagint and Vulgate seem to denote worry or trouble. Here, the Hebrew and English versions seem better although nothing can be proved. But Jonah is selfish throughout, and one would expect him to be so now.
19. According to the International Critical Commentary there are two possible translations for Πλησίως ὅπερ...
found in Jon. 4:2, namely: "I sought to prevent by fleeing" or "I fled before". The second assumes that ‘fleet’ is used adverbially. 1 The Septuagint reads προέφθασα τοῦ φυγεῖν (I hastened to flee), the Vulgate "praepoccupavi ut fugerem" (I hastened or anticipated to flee). The translation of the American Revised Version is "I hastened to flee", and that of An American Translation "I hastened to flee". A good translation of the Masoretic Text seems to be "I anticipated to flee", or "I attempted to flee".

20. In Jon. 4:4 there are two possible translations for μή μὴ δοεις καλα ραγάζειν (are you very much grieved?). The same question is asked and the answer seems to be "I do well to be angry even unto death". Hence, the first translation seems better. Furthermore, μή μὴ δοεις καλα is not used adverbially, but as an auxiliary construed with the impersonal verb. The Vulgate, agreeing with the former translation, reads "putasse bene irasceris tu?" (do you think it well that you are angry?), while the Septuagint reads ἐὰν φοβῇσαι ἄλλων σὺ (are you very much grieved?). The American Revised Version reads "Dost thou well to be angry?" while An American Translation reads "are you so very angry?" "Dost thou well to be angry?" seems the better but cannot be proved.

1. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 59.
2. op. ibid. 59.
B. Masoretic Text Preferred

There are many translations of the book of Jonah, some of which are:

1. The Septuagint. It is an important Greek version of the Old Testament. It is so called from the legend that it was translated by seventy-two emissaries from Jerusalem, about 270 B.C. The church fathers made the number seventy, and this is why the Septuagint is used to signify the commonly accepted Greek Old Testament. The translation was probably begun about 270 B.C. and completed about the beginning of the Christian era. It differs from the Masoretic Text chiefly in Samuel, Kings, Proverbs, and Jeremiah. In Jeremiah it lacks about two thousand, seven hundred words present in the Masoretic Text.

2. The Vulgate. It is a Latin Version based on the Hebrew Bible, the Septuagint and Old Greek and Latin Versions. It is mostly the work of Saint Jerome in the fourth century A.D.

3. The Syriac Peshitto Version of the Bible was written in the eastern Aramaic dialect, probably about 200 A.D.

4. The Sinaitic Codex is a Greek translation of the Old Testament made in the fourth century A.D.
5. The Vatican Codex is a Greek translation of the Bible from Genesis to Hebrews, made about 400 A.D.

6. The Old Latin Version is one written in the language of ancient Rome.

7. The Targum is a paraphrase of the Old Testament. It is not usually counted authoritative, although it has some good suggestions.

8. The Masoretic Text is a text written by early Hebrew writers and transmitted through the years by the process of copying. They set a fixed reading to the Hebrew text by grouping the syllables into words. The pointing of this text cannot be definitely dated. Some say it dates back to the time of Moses, others say it was begun in the time of Ezra. It is probably the result of centuries of compilation and emendation; and may be said to be quite accurate when compared to the texts above.

The Masoretic Text, on the whole, has been very well preserved. The edition prepared by O. Froesch, priv. Württ. Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart, in 1933 is the Masoretic text used in this thesis; the texts used for the Septuagint are: "The Old Testament in Greek According To the Septuagint" by Henry Barclay Swete,
edited in 1912, and the "Septuaginta" edited by Alfred Rahlfs in 1935; and the one for the Vulgate is "Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis, Sistin", and the English versions are The American Revised Version of the Bible, and An American Translation edited by Smith and Goodspeed. Reference has been made to other texts where conflict between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint or between the Masoretic Text and the Vulgate seemed outstanding and could not be decided with the aid of the American Versions, or where suggestions by modern authors seemed to be of some importance.

Some of the outstanding variances between the above texts, where the Masoretic Text is to be preferred will be noted in the following:

1. In the Septuagint the Hebrew word נֵבָלְיָה (evil) is read as if it were נֵבָלְיָה יִשְׁרָאֵל thus: נֵבָלְיָה יִשְׁרָאֵל (an outcry of evil). This addition to the Masoretic Text of Jon. 1:2 seems to be entirely a gloss which is not found in the Vulgate, the American Revised Version or in An American Translation. יִשְׁרָאֵל does not resemble the following or the preceding word; it is not essential for logic, hence it cannot be assumed as original.

2. In Jon. 1:3 Sievers would insert נֵבָלְיָה after יִשְׁרָאֵל.¹

¹ op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 32.
This is not needed because the antecedent of the verb's subject is evident.

3. At the end of the same verse, the Syriac Peshitto Version repeats ܢܲܪ̈ܲܐ (to flee to). It is, however, possible that a transcriber would omit this word because it was already used in the verse, but it adds nothing to the verse either in meaning or smoothness of reading and is not found in the Septuagint, the Vulgate, or in either of the American Translations.

4. ܢ̈ܲܐ (great) of Jon. 1:4 is omitted in the Septuagint and by Nowack and Smith, but it is included in the Vulgate (magnum) and in the American Revised Version and An American Translation. It is quite descriptive and does not seem to be in the least superfluous.

5. In Jon. 1:5 the Targum adds ܐܠܢܐ ܠܒܐ (and when they saw it was of no use) after ܠܒܐ ܠܘܝܐ (they cried each man to his god). This addition is entirely superfluous and this Aramaic text is inferior to the Masoretic Text.

1. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 32.
2. op. ibid. 34.
3. op. ibid. 34.
6. τάπαι τῷ ω λ' of Jon. 1:5 reads "and he lay down and slept heavily". Neither the Septuagint nor the Vulgate seems to translate the word τῷ ω at all, the former reading ἐκάδευσεν ναὶ ἐρέγγεν (he slept and snored) and the latter "dormiebat sopore gravi" (he slept in a heavy sleep). The American Revised Version reads: "and he lay, and was fast asleep", and An American Translation "and was lying fast asleep." As far as can be ascertained there is no justification for the Greek verb ἐρέγγεν. It seems to have no relation to the verbs meaning "to lie" or "to sleep heavily". Therefore the Septuagint seems inferior on this point to the Masoretic Text, and this conclusion is confirmed by the American texts and the Vulgate.

7. In Jon. 1:6 the Masoretic Text reads ἦν ὅτι (what to you sleeping ?), the Septuagint Τί σοι ἐρέγγεις (why do you snore ?), and the Vulgate "quid tu sopore deprimeris ?" (why do you sink down in sleep ?). The American Revised Version reads: "what meanest thou, O Sleeper ?" and An American Translation "why are you sleeping ?" The same conclusion is drawn here as in the former criticism, namely that the Masoretic Text, supported by the Vulgate and American versions is preferred.

8. In Jon. 1:6 the Septuagint makes a purpose clause out of the next to the last clause, introducing it with ὧ (in order that); the Masoretic Text, Vulgate,
the American Revised Version and An American Translation all make it more or less a conditional clause introducing it with נַּעַשׁ (perhaps), "si forte" (if perchance), "if so be", and "perhaps" respectively.

9. According to Kennedy and others show considerable resemblance not only in Hebrew but in some of the more modern Semitic alphabets. Hence, the substitution of one for the other is fully to be expected. In Jon. 1:7 the Septuagint rendering for ἐν ἡμῖν is ἐν ἡμῖν (in us) instead of ἐν ἡμῖν (to us). The Vulgate reads "nobis" which may be either, but would likely have the preposition if it was "in us". The American Revised Version reads "upon us", and An American Translation "had befallen us". According to the above logic of Kennedy, the Septuagint may be correct. However, since ד and ל was written ל in ancient Hebrew script, there does not seem to be any possibility to this argument. The Masoretic Text seems preferable. It is supported by the Vulgate and An American Translation. When the Greek preposition ἐν and the English one "upon" are carefully considered it is found that they, too, may mean "to".

10. In early Hebrew manuscripts, to economize space

and to spare time, familiar words and grammatical terminations were represented by abbreviated or condensed forms. The Tetragrammaton קֶּרֶם is even now represented by קֶרֶם and was probably indicated at times by a single ק, which was apt to be misunderstood by later scribes. Thus, in Jon. 1:9 the prophet's answer קֶרֶם (I am a Hebrew) was misread by the Greek translator thus: Δούλος Κυπήκεν γάρ ε'μή (I am a servant of Yahweh). The Vulgate reads "Hebraeus ego sum", the American Revised Version and An American Translation read "I am a Hebrew". Although the ק of קֶרֶם could easily have been a ק and the ק an abbreviation for קֶרֶם meaning together "servant of Yahweh", the different translations except the Septuagint support the Masoretic Text, and it seems more probable that Jonah would have answered to a non-Hebraic group "I am a Hebrew", which would designate directly his nationality and indirectly his religion, rather than that he should have declared himself to be a servant of the Yahweh of whom they knew little or nothing.

11. The Targum reads קֶרֶם (Jew) instead of קֶרֶם (Hebrew) in Jon. 1:9, but the writer likely wanted to contrast the nationality of Jonah with that of the

1. op. Kennedy, op. cit. p. 173; and Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 37.
2. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 37.
sailors, and translated the word 'נִנְיָרָי בַּיָּהָה correctly according to the usage of Aramaic of his time.

12. In the same verse Sievers omits גְּלִי בַּיָּהָה (the god of heaven) and regards the relative clause נֶפֶשׁ-נִנְיָרָי בַּיָּהָה as a gloss intended to heighten the religious element of the text. He claims that the exclamation "I fear Yahweh", and the proud assertion of belief in Him as the great creator are not compatible. His main argument is metrical, however. The words do not fit in with the metrical scheme that he has for the book of Jonah.¹ His argument, however, offers no proof that these clauses should be omitted, and he cannot prove that the book of Jonah contains poetry and must be fitted to a metrical pattern of any kind. Hence, the Masoretic Text is to be preferred, for it is much more expressive and realistic. The Septuagint, the Vulgate, the American Revised Version and An American Translation all agree with the Masoretic Text.

13. Winckler transposes Jon. 1:10a after 1:7; and strikes out יִרְאֵה וְאָכֶל (and they said to him) and יִרְאֵה וְאָכֶל (on account of whom is this evil to us ?) of 8a, and verse 10b

¹ op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 38.
entirely.\textsuperscript{1} is also omitted by the Codices Sinaiaticus and Vaticanus. Both the clauses of 8a referred to above and the clauses of 10b are included in the Septuagint, Vulgate, the American Revised Version and An American Translation. Verse 10a of the Masoretic Text (what is this you have done?) is not a question asked for the sake of information, but an exclamation of horror. The Masoretic Text thus becomes logical without all the suggested transposition and elimination and is supported by the other texts referred to in this thesis.

14. Nowack, Marti, Wellhausen omit (because he told it to them) in Jon. 1:10b as a gloss.\textsuperscript{2} They give no reason for so doing and since it is included in the Septuagint, Vulgate and American Versions, the Masoretic Text seems better.

15. In Jon. 1:12 Sievers omits (from upon you).\textsuperscript{3} He gives no reason for so doing, and it seems better to let the Masoretic Text stand, for the clause is explanatory and useful and is read in the Septuagint as (away from you) and in the Vulgate "a vobis" (from you), in the American Revised Version "unto you",

1. \textsuperscript{1} Cpo Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 38.
2. \textsuperscript{2} Cpo ibid. 38.
3. \textsuperscript{3} Cpo ibid. 40.
and in An American Translation "for you.

16. The Targum has וָרוֹאַ הַנַּחֲלַ (debt of life) for דַּיַּהַל (innocent blood) found in Jon. 1:14. The Septuagint, Vulgate, American Revised Version and An American Translation read like the Masoretic Text, being respectively: αἰμα δίκαιον, "sanguinem innocentem", and "innocent blood" for both American texts. Thus the Masoretic Text seems to stand because of its naturalness and the agreement of other authorities with it.

17. In Jon. 1:14 Sievers omits יְהֹוָה after יְהוּד, and the Syriac text has "Thou art Yahweh and". The Masoretic Text seems better for it is supported by the Septuagint which reads Κύπε, the Vulgate "Domine", the American Revised Version, "O Jehovah", and An American Translation "Lord", or more accurately "O Lord".

18. In Jon. 1:16 Sievers regards both יְהֹוָה יְהֹוָה and יְהֹוָה יְהֹוהַ as glosses, but Marti insists that the real meaning is taken away if they are removed. The Sinaitic Codex omits יְהֹוָה יְהֹוהַ. יְהֹוָה יְהֹוהַ and יְהֹוָה יְהֹוהַ may be later additions to the original text, for it does seem questionable as to how these heathen sailors could fear a Yahweh and offer a sacrifice unto a Yahweh whom they did not know; and still since these words

2. cp. ibid. 40.
3. cp. ibid. 40.
are included in the Greek as τὸν κύριον and τῷ κυρίῳ, in the Vulgate as Domin and Dūνo, in the American Revised Version "Jehovah" and "unto Jehovah", and in an American Translation "Lord", and "to the Lord", the conclusion is drawn that the Masoretic Text is preferable and that the sailors feared, through Jonah's experience and their own hardship because of Jonah, the God whom he told them about.

19. In Jon. 1:16 the Targum says נִּצְצִי הַמִּיתָן, "and they promised to offer a sacrifice." The expression "they promised" or "they said" seems to be superfluous. It is not included in the authentic versions quoted above, consequently the conclusion is drawn that the Masoretic Text is better.

20. Duhm omits ה and י in Jon. 2:3, but the conclusion is drawn that they should be included as they are found in the following texts as well as in the Masoretic Text; Septuagint as μου and προφῆτας μου; Vulgate as "mea" and "vocem meam", American Revised Version "mine" and "my voice", and an American Translation as "my" and "my voice".

21. In Jon. 2:3 the Septuagint adds τὸν θεόν μου after a translation of נַנִּים of the Masoretic Text.

This is probably due to a similar expression in the preceding verse, but is uncalled for here and is not found in the Vulgate, American Revised Version and An American Translation.

22. According to Kennedy the Hebrew letters ו and י are often confused. In Jon. 2:3 instead of וְיִשְׂרָאֵל (out of distress) the Septuagint reads ἐὰν ἔλισψει (in distress). It is not difficult to confuse these letters, and the Masoretic Text seems preferable especially since the Vulgate uses "de", American Revised Version "by reason of" and An American Translation "out of".

23. יָשׁוּרַל in Jon. 2:5 is changed by Graetz and Böhme to יָשׁוּרַל, reading "I was cut off" rather than "I was expelled". Graetz and Böhme base their substitution on Psalm 31:23 where יָשׁוּרַל is used, but Duhm and Briggs change this word to יָשׁוּרַל. According to Kennedy, although ו and י are seldom interchanged, they are in Psalm 31:23 where יָשׁוּרַל (I am cut off) should be יָשׁוּרַל (I am driven out). In the Masoretic Text יָשׁוּרַל is used but once in the Old Testament (Psalm 31:23), but יָשׁוּרַל is employed many times (Amos 8:2, Isaiah 5:7, etc.). Consequently it seems that יָשׁוּרַל the word used in

1. op. Kennedy, op. cit. pp. 14, 44.
2. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 48.
the Masoretic Text in Jon. 2:5 is more likely correct than the suggested change. There is also the fact that the word used in the Masoretic Text fits in with the story of Jonah better than the suggested one.

The corresponding expression in the Septuagint is ἀποδέχομαι (I was expelled), in the Vulgate "abjactus sum" (I was cast out), in the American Revised Version "I am cast out", and in an American Translation "I am cast out".

24. The Vatican Codex has λαὸν (people) for ναὸν (sanctuary) in Jon. 2:5, but this is plainly a scribal error. 1

25. Haupt omits verse 6a as a gloss and transposes 6b after 7a, but these changes seem unnecessary. 2

That leaves the Masoretic Text supported by the Septuagint, Vulgate and American Versions, stand preferred.

26. יָנוּל (unto soul) of Jon. 2:6 the Targum reads יָנוּל (unto death). 3 The Targum has little weight in this instance particularly since the Septuagint, Vulgate and both American Versions all employ a word similar to "soul" or that word itself.

27. Jon. 2:6 is truly a puzzle. Only after much

2. cp. ibid. 48.
3. cp. ibid. 48.
comparison, contrast and thought can the conclusion be
drawn that the Masoretic Text is preferable. The entire
verse in the Masoretic Text reads: \( \psi \gamma \tau \nu \varepsilon \nu ' \psi \gamma \gamma \varepsilon \nu \) :
\( \varepsilon \nu \nu \gamma \nu \nu \nu \varepsilon \nu \gamma \nu \varepsilon \nu \gamma \nu \varepsilon \nu \gamma \nu \varepsilon \nu \) (the waters sur-
rounded me unto soul, the sea encompassed me, seaweed
was bound to my head). The Septuagint reads: \( \pi \pi \pi \varepsilon \gamma \delta \eta \) :
\( \pi \pi \pi \varepsilon \gamma \delta \eta \) (water was poured around me to the soul, the lowest deep encompassed
me, my head entered to clefts of the mountains). The
Vulgate reads: "Circumdederunt me aquae usque ad animam;
abyssus vallavit me, pelagus operuit caput meum" (waters
surrounded me unto the soul, the deep encompassed me,
the sea covered my head). The American Revised Version
reads: "The waters compassed me about, even to the soul:
the deep was round about me; the weeds were wrapped about
my head". An American Translation also reads "The waters
closed in over my life; the deep surrounded me, Sea-
weed was wound around my head." Thus it can be seen
that the Masoretic Text and both American Translations
are similar and lead to the conclusion that they may be
correct. \( \gamma \delta \) has probably been taken for the Hebrew
word meaning "end" instead of the one meaning "seaweed".
This could easily have been done since the words are
the same except for the vowel pointing, and there was
no vowel pointing at the time of the translation of the Septuagint and the Vulgate. Seeing that the clause "my head was clothed (or bound) with end", would make no sense whatever, it is likely that the transcribers of the Greek Text did the best they could, adding a little of the next clause to try and bring about coherence.

28. Duhm's substitution of 'I N Z O, the perfect tense of the verb for 'I Z O', the imperfect is unnecessary in Jon. 2:6.1

39. D' l n 'jyPb (to the ends of the mountains) of Jon. 2:7, the Targum reads 'i l b 'jPb (to the foundations of the mountains). Böhm, Nowack and Marti substitute w'Pb for 'jyPb, since 'jPb (form or shape) is not used, they say, elsewhere in the Old Testament in the sense of extremity. But it does occur in this sense in Ecclesiasticus 18:19 in a parallel phrase, and this occurrence helps prove its correctness in this verse.2 And since all words from the root 'P have a meaning of "cutting off" or "ending", it is possible that 'jyPb is correct. There is a possibility that the phrase should read D' l n 'jyPb (on account of the wrath of rivers, or to the wrath of rivers). 'J and 'S are similar not only in sound but in

2. cp. ibid. 48.
form, but since there seems no reason for saying that the use of \( \) on the end of the first word and the lack of \( ] \) on the beginning of the second is a case of either anterior dittogram or posterior haplography, there is no substantiation for the change, and the Masoretic Text, supported by the Septuagint, Vulgate, and by the American Versions, is preferable.

30. \( \square \top \) of Jon. 2:9 is paralleled only in Psalm 144:2. It is variously translated as "their mercy", "their fortune", "their kindness", or "their goodness". By metonymy one gets the meanings "benefactor", "God", "author of all goodness", or "supreme being". If this word is original, a good meaning for it is "true grace". Nowack and Marti emend the text to \( \square \top \) (their refuge). The Syriac Peshitto Version evades the difficulty by reading \( \top \top \) (your mercy or kindness). The Targum paraphrases it \( \top \top \) and Ehr writes it "wenn jemand zu nichigen Gotzen sich versieht, halten diese mit ihrer Gnade zuruck", (if anyone puts away his idols, then the reward returns to him). All these emendations seem strained and unnecessary. The Masoretic Text is the simplest and most understandable. It reads from the

2. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 49.
3. op. ibid. 49.
beginning of the verse, "those observing vain wickedness forsake their mercy". It may also read "those observing vain wickedness forsake their god". The texts referred to in this discourse, the Septuagint, Vulgate, American Revised Version and An American Translation all agree almost entirely with the first translation above.

Either one of these translations of the Masoretic Text seems better than any of the paraphrases.

31. ΠΗΩ of Jon. 2:10 is not connected in the Masoretic Text with ΠΠ. In the Vulgate and in the Septuagint it is. The Septuagint reads ὅσα ἔκαμιν ἀποδώσω σοι σωτηρίου τῷ Κυρίῳ (what I have vowed, I will pay to the Lord of my salvation), and the Vulgate reads "quaecumque vovi, reddam pro salute Domino" (whatsoever I have vowed, I will pay for salvation in the Lord).

The American Revised Version reads, "I will pay that which I have vowed, salvation is of Jehovah", and An American Translation reads "what I have vowed, I will pay. Deliverance belongs to the Lord". Since ΠΠΥἱω precedes ΠΠΠ, and there seems to be no reason for transposing it after, the Masoretic Text with which both American Versions agree seems preferable. ΠΠΥἱω could have

1. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 49.
been \( \text{\textit{Y \textit{Y}}w} \) (salvation now), but since the same word is found in Psalms 3:3 and 80:13 it seems better to let the Masoretic Text stand and regard \( \text{\textit{Y \textit{Y}}w} \) as a poetic substantive taken from \( \text{\textit{Y}}w \). Gesenius says that the termination \( \text{\textit{Y}} \) is often used with feminine nouns in poetry; \( \text{\textit{Y}} \) (terror) Exodus 15:16; \( \text{\textit{Y}} \) (help), Psalm 44:27, 63:8, 91:17; \( \text{\textit{Y}} \) (wickedness), Psalm 125:3; \( \text{\textit{Y}} \) (darkness), Job 16:22 and others. This may be a remnant of an old accusative of direction or intention, but here it is useless except for meter. 1

32. In Jon. 3:3 Sievers omits \( \text{\textit{Y}} \) (to it) and reads \( \text{\textit{Y}} \) for \( \text{\textit{Y}} \). His reason is metrical. 2 Since the book of Jonah is not considered poetry, except the psalm of the second chapter, the Masoretic Text is to be preferred to one changed merely for meter, and especially since the Septuagint, Vulgate, American Revised Version and An American Translation agree with it.

33. In Jon. 3:3 Sievers inserts \( \text{\textit{Y}} \) after \( \text{\textit{Y}} \). Again it is merely for metrical reasons. 3 This time the insertion is not only unnecessary but it is superfluous. To say "Jonah arose and went and came", is inferior to "Jonah arose and went". The texts compared in this thesis agree with the Masoretic Text, and it is to be preferred.

34. \( \text{\textit{Y} \textit{Y} \textit{Y}} \) (forty) in Jon. 3:4 is changed to \( \text{\textit{Y}} \).

2. op. Brigge, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 52.
3. op. ibid. 53.
(three) by the Septuagint and to "triduum" by the Old Latin. This interpretation is accepted by Köhler, Duhm, and Rieseler, who claim that the Masoretic Text changed three to forty because forty would go better with the period of fasting. As far as this investigation has gone there can be found no reason for believing that of the Masoretic Text is not original and correct. Surely it is more logical than . How could all the people of Nineveh hear the word and repent in three days? Even though this is considered a didactic narrative and need not be exact, still the more reasonable interpretation seems better. Even the notes of the Septuagint edited by Swete suggest that the word may be (forty), since the Marchalianus Codex has it so. The Vulgate and both American Versions referred to have "forty".

35. Sievers regards in Jon. 3:5 as a theological gloss. He reasons that the people believed in the truth of the word spoken by Jonah, but not in the Yahweh as the only god. The Masoretic Text does not say (in Yahweh), but (in god). They probably believed in a power, as yet unknown to them, yet felt through fear.

36. Sievers inserts (the king) after (and

1. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 53.
2. op. ibid. 55.
3. op. ibid. 59.
4. op. ibid. 59.
he arose) in Jon. 3:6. Again his reason is metrical and need not be considered.

37. In Jon. 3:7 Sievers would omit either \(\text{הָעִבְדוּ הָםוֹכְשָׁה} \) (and he said) and \(\text{לָשׁוֹנִי} \) (to say) or \(\text{לָשׁוֹנִי} \) \(\text{הָעִבְדוּ הָםוֹכְשָׁה} \) (the herd and the flock). But \(\text{לָשׁוֹנִי} \) with \(\text{רָע} \) (royal decree) belongs to the introduction of the edict and \(\text{רָע} \) \(\text{הָעִבְדוּ הָםוֹכְשָׁה} \) (the herd and the flock) seem to be a part of the formal edict of the king. The equivalent for these words is found in the Septuagint, Vulgate, and the American Versions. Since Sievers proffers no definite reason why they should be omitted, the conclusion is drawn that it is for metrical reasons, therefore the Masoretic Text is to be preferred.

38. Sievers omits also \(\text{לָשׁוֹנִי} \) \(\text{לָשׁוֹנִי} \) \(\text{לָשׁוֹנִי} \) \(\text{לָשׁוֹנִי} \) (that they turned from their evil way) in Jon. 3:10 for metrical reasons and because he reasons that the penitence is purely external. Here, as elsewhere, the metrical reason can be disregarded; and since the story is to be regarded as a didactic narrative the latter argument is useless, too. This leaves the Masoretic Text, supported by the Septuagint, Vulgate, and American Versions preferred.

39. In Jon. 4:2 Sievers omits \(\text{לָשׁוֹנִי} \) \(\text{לָשׁוֹנִי} \) \(\text{לָשׁוֹנִי} \) (and he prayed to Yahweh) as a gloss intended to soften the effect of Jonah’s ill-temper. Jonah’s ill-temper needs

1. cp. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 56.
2. cp. ibid. 56.
3. cp. ibid. 56.
4. cp. ibid. 59.
no softening, for it is used to teach a lesson.

40. In Jon. 4:3 Sievers omits \( \text{\texttt{n\texttt{n}}} \) for metrical reasons. The Septuagint and Old Latin read as though \( \text{\texttt{7\texttt{7}}} \) were inserted before \( \text{\texttt{n\texttt{n}}} \). The Septuagint reads \( \text{\texttt{D\texttt{e\texttt{c\texttt{e\texttt{p\texttt{t\texttt{a}}}}}}} \) \( \text{\texttt{K\texttt{u\texttt{p\texttt{i}}} (l}ord God)\). There is no need for the word \( \text{\texttt{D\texttt{e\texttt{c\texttt{e\texttt{p\texttt{t\texttt{a}}}}}}} \) because \( \text{\texttt{K\texttt{u\texttt{p\texttt{i}}} \text{\texttt{e}}} \) is used throughout for the Hebrew God.

41. The International Critical Commentary states that the Septuagint and Old Latin also omit \( \text{\texttt{n\texttt{n}}} \) in Jon. 4:3. This word is not found in the Masoretic Text. It is an unnecessary criticism.

42. In Jon. 4:6 and following the Septuagint translates \( \text{\texttt{P\texttt{P}}} \) as \( \text{\texttt{h\texttt{a\texttt{o\texttt{k\texttt{o\texttt{n\texttt{d}}} \text{\texttt{p}}}}} \) (gourd). The Vulgate reads "hedera" (vine). It is translated "gourd" by both American Revised Version and An American Translation. Etymologically it seems to be connected with the Egyptian kiki or castor-oil plant. To identify \( \text{\texttt{P\texttt{P}}} \) with the bottle-gourd is not justifiable philologically. Since there is no logical reason for changing it to "gourd", the Masoretic Text seems preferable without any change.

43. At the end of Jon. 4:8 Syriac Peschitto inserts "and it dried up the gourd"; Winckler inserts "it tore down the hut". These additions are not necessary.

44. Nowack suggests the placing of Jon. 4:8 before Jon. 4:6, but nothing is gained thereby and verse 9 presupposes

1. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 59
2. op. ibid. 59.
3. op. ibid. 61.
4. op. ibid. 62.
verse 8 immediately before. Hence the order of the Masoretic Text is the better.  

45. Syriac Peshitto in Jon. 4:8, introduces instead of "נָשָׁה הָנִּיתָ לַעֲשׂוּ (it is better for me to be dead than alive), the words of Elijah in I Kings 19:4, קָסְרֵו הָשָּׁה 'כ יָהִי (for I am not better than my fathers).  

One is reminded of these words, but there is no reason for substituting them for the Masoretic Text. The Septuagint reads: "Καλόν μοι ἀποθανεῖν με καὶ ἐμῆς (it is better for me to die than to live), the Vulgate reads: "melius est mihi mori, quam vivere" (it is better for me to die than to live), and An American Translation, "I am better off dead than alive".

46. In Jon. 4:10 Böhme and Riessler omit なん (which came up in the night) and thus get rid of the miracle. They say that Jonah found the plant when he went there. This cannot be substantiated in any way except by saying that なん (and he prepared) of Jon. 4:6 should be translated by a pluperfect.  

There are objections to this. なん なん becomes superfluous, and there is no grammatical evidence for its omission, and the Septuagint, Vulgate, and American Versions all include the expression.

47. In Jon. 4:11 々 יִנְתָּל (should I not have pity?) is an interrogative sentence only by tone.

1. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 62.
2. op. ibid. 62.
3. op. ibid. 64.
Schmidt and Sievers regard this sentence and \( \text{נַבְנַבִּי} \) 
\( \text{נַבְנַבִּי} \) (and much cattle) as glosses, but Jon. 3:7 substantiates the latter and there is no reason to disregard the former.\(^1\)

48. For \( \text{נַבְנַבִּי} \) \( \text{יְיִשְׁעָל} \) (where there is in it) in Jon. 4:11, the Septuagint reads \( \text{ἐν ἡ κατοικοῦσιν} \) (in which they dwell). It seems to substitute \( \text{ἡ ὁ} \) for \( \text{ὡ} \).\(^2\)

It is possible that the translators of the Septuagint read \( \text{נַבְנַבִּי} \) as the verb \( \text{נַבְנַבִּי} \) and took \( \text{נַבְנַבִּי} \) as the subject. If so, together with \( \text{יְיִשְׁעָל} \), the translation found in the Septuagint is correct. So far as this investigation has gone there is no reason for assuming that \( \text{ὡ} \) is an abbreviation, and the Vulgate reads "in qua sunt" and both American Versions read "wherein are", which seems preferable.

C. Septuagint Preferred

Apart from a few glosses the Hebrew Text has been well preserved as far as the book of Jonah is concerned. The Septuagint is of little value in improving this book. However, there are a few differences in the Septuagint that are not only worthy of notice, but seem better than the Masoretic Text. They are as follows:

1. Note: A sentence may be asked with interrogative words. The emphasis upon the words is enough.
2. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 64.
1. In Jon. 1:3 the Septuagint translates ναῦλον αὐτοῦ as $\phiλ\alpha\nu$ as if it were ναῦς. This is probably correct, for Jonah paid his own fare, his own price of transportation, not the price of the ship.

2. θυσία (sacrifice) of Jon. 1:16 is read in the Septuagint edited by Swete as $\thetaυ\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma$ (sacrifices) and as "hostias" in the Vulgate. This seems better because of the clause which follows and because of the logic that the men would offer sacrifices, not a sacrifice.

3. In Jon. 3:2 the Septuagint reads: κατὰ τὸ κήρυγμα τὸ εἰσπροσθεν ὃ ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα πρὸς σέ. (according to the former proclamation which I commanded you), instead of γιὰ θεόν ἐκλήσει λήσῃ νὰ ἑορτάσῃ (the proclamation which I command you). The Septuagint connects this passage with Jon. 1:2 very closely and makes the story more unified, hence it seems better.

D. Textual Reconstruction

Though the story in the book of Jonah gives the impression of literary unity, it is not without certain unevennesses and apparent incongruities. Some modern scholars have attempted to explain these. Research has made great and rapid advances in recent years. New lines of investigation have been opened up, fresh light
has been cast upon many Biblical subjects of the deepest interest and greatest value to the student who wishes to get the exact meaning of the original text.

The critics are at work, indeed. They fix their gaze, with microscopic intensity, upon the book of Jonah and apply the dissecting knife with care and caution. In the book of Jonah, as well as in most other books of the Old Testament, changes are made by some of the later scholars which have the approval of most careful thinkers. Some of these will be discussed:

1. The first \( \text{N} \) in Jon. 1:3 is omitted by Böhme and Sievers, not only for the sake of the meter, but because they think that Jonah did not start out with any specific goal in mind, but that he fled, and since the first ship he came across was one going to Tarshish, he took passage in it.\(^1\) The text seems better without this word, for although, according to this discourse, there is no definite metrical pattern, still it is quite likely that Jonah had no definite goal in mind.

2. \( \text{N} \) of Jon. 1:3 is a participle of imminent future according to Gesenius.\(^2\) The verb \( \text{N} \) is only

---

1. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 31.
rarely used of going away from the speaker, but when so used the limit of motion is given (Isaiah 22:15, Exodus 3:4, Genesis 45:17, I Samuel 22:5, Isaiah 47:5, and Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, Brown, Driver, and Briggs). It is thought by Brown, Driver, and Briggs that the wrong verb has been used in the Masoretic Text. This is especially true if \( \text{ביהיה} \) is omitted, for, they say, the verb \( \text{לשה} \) is used only when there is a limit of motion. \( \text{לשה} \) is the regular verb for going.

3. Sievers rearranges \( \text{לשה} \) \( \text{לשה} \) \( \text{לשה} \) (to return to land and they could not) in Jon. 1:13 and makes it read \( \text{לשה} \) \( \text{לשה} \) \( \text{לשה} \) \( \text{לשה} \) (and they were not able to return to land). The coherence is better this way.

4. Winckler proposes to place Jon. 1:13 directly after Jon. 1:4. This makes better connection at both ends: the men row hard to bring the ship to land right after Yahweh sends out a severe storm that is about to break the ship, and they pray that not all their lives be taken on account of one man, immediately after Jonah tells them that it is on his account that the tempest is upon them.

5. \( \text{לשה} \) in Jon. 2:3 is used only here of a single fish; elsewhere it is used collectively. Since the masculine occurs three times in this chapter (1 a, b, 11),

1. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 40.
2. op. ibid. 16.
it seems justifiable to regard יַעַל as a scribal error for יַעַל. ¹

6. Jon. 2:4 describes the writer's distress. The י או יַעַל seems to make better sense translated "for" instead of "and", since, as is often the case, Yahweh is regarded as the author of the calamity. The term here used seems to be employed figuratively.²

7. Duhm and Haupt, as well as the translators of the Septuagint and of the Old Latin Version treat יַעַל in Jon. 2:4 as if it were יַעַל.³ This is probably correct because it fits the meter better, although the word is used almost an equal number of times in the singular and plural as can be seen by referring to:


8. Since the meter of Jon. 2:4 demands that a word be omitted, Schmidt omits יַעַל (for you cast me forth), but this is needed. Marti, Nowack, and Gunkle disagreed.

¹. op. Braggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 43.
². op. ibid. 48.
³. op. ibid. 48.
omit ᾿ἡβρῶν (from abyss). ¹

9. Theodotion, Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti, and Steiner all agree that יַי of Jon. 2:5 should be יַֽיְכָל, thus reading "shall I take myself?" instead of "surely I shall take myself". ² This correction, which is in agreement with the Septuagint edited by Rahlfs is preferable, for this is a supplication of Jonah to Yahweh.

10. In Jon. 3:7 the ancient and modern versions, except the Septuagint and Old Latin Version, supply the verb "to close". It reads then: "the earth with its bars closed upon me forever". But this is not true, for they did not close upon Jonah forever. van Hoonaoker suggests a plausible solution by following the Septuagint and Old Latin: εἰς γῆς ἡς ὑπ’ ἰσόγοις ἄνευς κάτω καὶ ἀμφίνεσιν. "in terram cuius vectae sunt continentes aeternae". He reads ᾿ἡγί (whose) for ἱγί (near, upon) and translates "into the land whose bars are everlasting bolts." This seems to be the best interpretation and is preferable both to the Masoretic Text and to Marti's reconstruction. The Masoretic Text reads: יַלְנָה יְלַנְג הָלָה רֶחֶם (the earth's bars near me forever). Even if a verb may be supplied, Jonah was not in that place forever, but only for a short time, so the conclusion is drawn that there is some discrepancy here.

2. cp. ibid. 48.
Marti constructs the Hebrew Text thus: יִנֵּל עַל רְאוֹם (I had gone down to the lowest parts of the earth, to the people of antiquity). According to this change יִנֵּל in this verse is the same as the nether world of Exodus 15:12 and Ecclesiasticus 51:9. This much of a change is not necessary.

11. Haupt omits Jon. 2:7b. Targum, Septuagint, Syriac Peshitto, and Vulgate Versions connect רְאוֹם with the verb רְאוֹם (destroy) and make it a noun reading "destruction" or "ruin." It is then translated: "You have brought up my life from destruction." This seems correct rather than "pit" as found in the Masoretic Text and American Versions.

12. In Jon. 2:10, Nowack suggests רְאוֹם (in the assembly) for רְאוֹם (in a voice). Cheyne reads רְאוֹם (I will sing) for רְאוֹם (I will sacrifice). Either one of these reads better than the Masoretic Text, and it seems plausible to assume that there has been some corruption of the latter. Nowack's suggestion is acceptable, and the passage reads: "I in the assembly of thanksgiving will sing to you." Cheyne's solution, however, seems still better, although Nowack's involves less change in the Masoretic Text. Cheyne's reads:

1. cp. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 48, 49.
2. cp. ibid. 49.
"I, with a voice of thanksgiving will sing to you".  

13. Haupt regards נב' כו of Jon. 3:3 as a gloss. Riessler regards all of 3b as a gloss. He thinks the greatness of the city was deduced from the fact that Jonah made one day's journey before preaching. Haupt's conclusion may be correct, although he gives no reason for it, whatsoever. The passage seems complete when read: "and Jonah arose and went to Nineveh according to the word of Yahweh. And Nineveh was a great city to God". But since both American Versions omit a translation of the word כו, the passage seems better read "and Jonah arose and went to Nineveh according to the word of Yahweh. And Nineveh was a great city of three days' journey."

14. In Jon. 3:6 כו is a piel and as such is impossible to translate. Gesenius suggests, by means of vowel pointing, to change it into a nifal, which can then be translated "he covered himself". This seems the logical thing to do.

15. In Jon. 3:9 Budde, in his criticism, and the writers of the Septuagint and the Old Latin Version omit a translation for the word כו (turn). This word is superfluous and the sentence reads much more fluently

1. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 49.
2. op. ibid. 53.
4. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 56.
without it, and no thought is changed or omitted by its omission. Furthermore, it has no subject, for if it were the subject of both it and it would be between them.

16. The difficulties in Jon. 4:5 of time and logic cannot be evaded by translating the verbs pluperfect. Why Yahweh sent the plant if Jonah already had the shade of a hut, cannot be explained by inserting the ridiculous explanation that the shade of green leaves is more refreshing than any other. It is said on Wellhausen's authority that the Septuagint omits or does not support a translation of (in the shade). The Septuagint reads (in the shade or shade), however, and the Sinaitic Codex, Alexandrian, Vatican and Marchalianus Codices all have it. Winckler, Marti and Haupt transpose Jon. 4:5 after Jon. 3:4. Köhler and Kautzsch omit the reference to the hut. Either one of these explanations is logical and may be correct. (and he made for him there a booth and sat beneath it in the shade) can easily be a gloss, and the verse fits much better after Jon. 3:4. It certainly seems better to regard the clause as a gloss, for the shade of the plant would be unnecessary if Jonah already had a hut.

1. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 59.
2. op. ibid. 59.
17. \(\text{D} \text{N} \text{h} \text{N} - \text{n} \text{N} \text{n}\) in Jon. 4:6 represents a conflated text. It is thought that \(\text{n} \text{n}\) was used originally in this book to refer to Yahweh, the god of the Hebrew people, while \(\text{D} \text{N} \text{h} \text{N}\) was used to refer to gods of other people, or to Yahweh when other people referred to Him. According to this logic \(\text{D} \text{N} \text{h} \text{N}\) should not be used at all in chapter four, and where it is found, as in Jon. 4:6,7,8,9, it is entirely due to the copyist who did not understand the difference in the two words, and who was probably influenced by the use of it in the preceding chapter.¹

18. \(\text{h} \text{y} \text{n} \text{h}\) (to cause to shade to him) of Jon. 4:6 is an old error already in the text of the Septuagint which reads \(\text{y} \text{n} \text{o} \text{m} \text{i} \text{a} \text{m} \text{a} \text{n} \text{u} \text{r} \text{o}\) (to shade to him).² This is a case of posterior dittogram and should read, without doubt, \(\text{h} \text{y} \text{n} \text{h}\).

19. In Jon. 4:6 Böhme and Wellhausen omit \(\text{i} \text{y} \text{m} \text{b} \text{i} \text{y} \text{y} \text{n}\) (to cause to shade to him from his evil) as a doublet for \(\text{i} \text{y} \text{m} \text{b} \text{i} \text{y} \text{y} \text{n} \text{b} \text{h}\) (to be a shade for his head). Winckler prefers to omit the latter. Jonah had shade for his head in the hut, but he needed diversion.³ This repetition disappears entirely if Sb is omitted as suggested above.

1. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 64, 65.
2. op. ibid. Sl.
3. op. ibid. Sl.
20. The Septuagint reads for \( \text{Ως τον Μιχαύλ} \) of Jon. 4:7 the Greek word \( \text{εὐθύνη} \) (in the early morning). The exact meaning of \( \text{ιων μεθώ} \) is disputed. The logical conclusion to draw seems to be that it is an infinitive construct of the verb \( \text{ιων} \). It fits in with the context if so used, otherwise, the passage seems to be untranslatable.

21. \( \text{ην τούτου} \) of Jon. 4:7 in itself means "black". There is a possibility, if we consider the Masoretic Text only, to draw the conclusion that it refers to the moon deity, prominent at that time. \( \text{ην τούτου} \) signifies the moon god. \( \text{η} \) and \( \text{η} \) were often interchanged by copyists. But the meaning of the passage seems better if we follow the suggestion of the Lexicon and indirectly get the meaning of "dawn" for the word.

22. The exact meaning of \( \text{λέγω} \) of Jon. 4:8 is hard to determine. The Septuagint, Old Latin and Syriac Peshitto Versions translate it "burning" or "scorching"; the Targum, "quiet", "sultry", "sweltering". Hitzig, thinking it was derived from \( \text{ιων} \) (to plough), defined it as an autumnal east wind. Siegfried and Stade take it from the same root and translate it "a cutting east wind". Steiner reads it \( \text{λέγω} \) from \( \text{λέγω} \) (hot or glowing). The word may have been \( \text{λέγω} \).

1. op. Kennedy, op. cit. p. 17.
(scorching). If so \( \beta \) was omitted by haplography and \( \gamma \) was mistaken for \( \omega \), which in the older form of Hebrew writing was possible.\(^1\) The decision of Gesenius seems best. He says in part that "a silent east wind" is not suitable in context; "still" or "sultry", a conjecture arrived at by deriving the word from \( \delta \gamma \eta \) meaning "sun", is probably correct.\(^2\)

23. In Jon. 4:10-11 \( \gamma \eta \gamma \) is likely \( \gamma \eta \eta \) (cp. Jon. 1:7). \( \gamma \eta \) was often written in later Hebrew literature as \( \gamma \gamma \), according to the Lexicon.

24. \( \eta \gamma \eta \gamma \gamma \) Jon. 4:10 means "born in the night". According to the dictionary \( \gamma \eta \) followed by a genitive of time is translated "born in the night" and the same construction with the verb \( \gamma \gamma \) instead \( \eta \gamma \) means "died in the night".

25. In chapters one to three of Jonah, \( \eta \gamma \) is used by the Hebrew to indicate the Hebrew god, and \( \delta \gamma \) by the non-Hebrew to indicate another god or their designation of the Hebrew god. The only possible exception is in Jon. 3:10 where \( \delta \gamma \gamma \gamma \) is in line with the preceding. The real difficulty is in chapter four, where there seems to be no system. There is great confusion in the Septuagint, also, \( \delta \epsilon \delta \) and \( \kappa \nu \rho i \) are used interchangeably and combined. There can be no doubt that

\(^1\) op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 62.
\(^2\) op. Gesenius, op. cit. p. 360.
the author wrote $\text{Hebrew text}$ all through chapter four, for there is no reason for $\text{Masoretic Text}$ to be used as in former chapters. A copyist or reader, under the influence of chapter three, as has been stated before, has probably written or read $\text{Masoretic Text}$ throughout chapter four; but in some places the original reasserted itself and in other places both were used.\footnote{cp. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 64, 65.}

These are places in the book of Jonah where criticism of the Masoretic Text has either improved it noticeably or attracted attention of the careful student to flaws that need to be corrected. The criticisms are by no means infallible. The correction of different flaws or fallacies is often uncertain; critics have for different remedies for them. The time may come when all these difficulties will be cleared up.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

A. Unity

Although the story of Jonah makes the impression of literary unity, it is not without certain unevennesses and incongruities which tend to lead to the hypothesis of composite authorship which has been suggested by the various critics.¹

"J.G.A. Müller, in 1794, seems to have been the first to deny the unity of the book. He believed that the psalm in ch. 2 was composed by Jonah himself, but the story by an exilic author".²

In 1799 Nachtigal, in his desire to account for the miraculous story, assumed three sources for the book, which he thought were distinguished by "differences in language, spirit and manner of presentation":³

1. The prayer, composed by the prophet himself after his deliverance;
2. The poetical apology of a Hebrew, at the time of the exile, which was directed against the fanatical narrowness of his people;
3. Prosaic introduction written by a scribe living at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. The untenableness

2. op. ibid. 13.
3. op. ibid. 13.
of this theory is very apparent, but it is interesting to note how early comment was made on the fact that the book of Jonah was not a complete unity. ¹

Kleinert, in 1868, accounted for the incongruities found in chapters three and four by assuming that there are two accounts, which state the same facts, the one in laconic touches and the other in more minute detail, and which agree with one another. These two accounts, according to Kleinert, are so closely interwoven that they cannot be separated. He said that the first account is found in Jon. 3:1-5, 10, and 4:1-5. The second account is found in Jon. 3:1-4, 6-10, 4:1-3, 6-11. ² The confusion and impossibility of this is apparent.

Kleinert gave no argument in support of his theory, and the assumption of the interweaving of two accounts is justified only if there are evidences of real duplications or variations. Here the accounts are so nearly alike that, if there are two, they cannot be separated. The difficulties must be solved in some other way. ³

"In 1879 the Jewish scholar, K. Köhler, subjected the book to the most searching literary criticism it had as yet received and concluded that a number of interpolations, glosses, and redactional trans-

² cp. ibid. 14.
³ cp. ibid. 14.
positions were responsible for the book as we now have it".  

Köhler regarded the book as pre-exilic and the interpolations as post-exilic. He made changes, and regarded a number of expressions as glosses. There are elements of truth in his theory, but the book is more nearly a unit than he concluded.

Böhme's theory is so complicated and artificial that there is little doubt that it is anything else than incorrect. He magnifies little unevennesses, and counts upon a logical accuracy of the story that is unreasonable to expect in a book like the book of Jonah.

Böhme insists that there are four writers of the book of Jonah, and he apportions the parts of the book to each writer. His theory is so untenable that it needs no further consideration in the study of the unity of the book of Jonah.

Winckler, in 1899, tried to solve the problem of the book in a different and in some ways much simpler manner. He transposed Jon. 1:13 after Jon. 1:4; Jon. 1:10 after Jon. 1:7; and Jon. 4:5 after Jon. 3:4. In Jon. 4:6 he omitted "that shade should be over his head", and

2. cp. ibid. 15.
3. cp. ibid. 15, 16.
4. cp. ibid. 15.
in Jon. 4:8 he supplied after "east wind", "and it tore down the hut". ¹

The transposition of Jon. 1:13 is plausible, that of Jon. 1:10 is not so reasonable, that of Jon. 4:5 can be solved another way, and the change in Jon. 4:8 is not desirable at all. ²

The next attempt to bring about a unity in the book of Jonah was made by Schmidt, who believed that Böhme had pointed out the place where criticism must begin, but that he had shut himself out from a true solution by his theory of parallel narratives. Schmidt tried to account for the various insertions by assuming that they were added for religious motives. Thus, he thought that the prayer of thanksgiving in Jon. 2:3-10 was inserted because the change from wrath to mercy in the action of Yahweh seemed to a later translator to be entirely too abrupt. In Jon. 3:1-5, it seemed to such a translator, according to Schmidt, that Yahweh was too easily reconciled, so he added Jon. 3:6-9. Likewise, in Jon. 1:15 it seemed strange that the heathen sailors could throw a prophet of Yahweh into the sea without being punished for it, so the compiler inserted Jon. 1:13 and 14 to the original text. In addition to these

¹ cp. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 16.
² cp. ibid. 16.
interpolations Schmidt regards Jon. 1:4a, 5a, 5b, 6, 8-10a as an independent narrative. His arguments for removing these verses are unconvincing. He says that the deep sleep of Jonah is difficult to explain, as are the questions of the sailors and the silence of Jonah. Consequently, he removes these verses, regarding them as an independent narrative.  

But these verses do not bring an element of incongruity to the narrative. It is true that the questions of the sailors are unusual and unexpected, but they are not so incongruous to the narrative that they cannot be a part of it. Neither are the facts of Jonah's deep sleep or his silence so unexplainable that they cannot be a part of the narrative.  

In regard to Jon. 3:8-9, Schmidt says that it is strange that a king should proclaim a fact which the subjects of his kingdom are already keeping. Then he argues that there is a change in terms which helps to prove that this passage is a later addition. For instance, in Jon. 3:5 the terms τρω πνεύματα and "γράφε" are used, but in Jon. 3:8-9 θ'ο πνεύματα and "θ'ο γράφε" are employed. It is certainly unnecessary for an author to use continually the same phrases throughout a narrative. In Jon. 3:7  

1. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 18.
there is no hifil of the verb ḫaš to be used, so the author has to resort to a synonym.¹

Two interesting, although unconvincing, attempts to bring about complete unity were made by Sievers and Erbt. They tried to bring about unity by means of metrical criticism. Sievers regards the story as a unity except the psalm in chapter two and a few glosses which he thinks were added to emphasize the religious element of the story. But the question immediately arises as to just why the author should not be responsible for the religious element of the book. As to meter, the book appears to be prose, not poetry (the psalm excepted).²

The most recent contribution has been made to this problem by a Roman Catholic scholar, Riessler. He believes that the book was worked over several times, and that the revisers added explanatory material and glosses. As a rule he does not give the reason for believing certain passages are glosses. This may be due to the fact that most of the passages that he rules out have already been suggested as glosses by others. His most noteworthy point is his omission of Jon. 1:3b.³

The narrative begins with waw conjunctive and each event seems to be a continuation of something prior.

2. cp. ibid. 19.
3. cp. ibid. 20, 21.
Because of this, some critics may infer that the book is merely a fragment of a larger work, but in the Hebrew language it is employed where there is no connection whatever (op. Ruth 1:1, Esther 1:1 and Ezekiel 1:1). It seems to have the grammatical purpose of representing the historical past tense.

The text of the book of Jonah, on the whole, is remarkably well preserved, and only a few emendations are really necessary. There are a few glosses or doublets and they are easily recognized.1

The conclusion is now drawn that the entire book of Jonah is written by one author except the psalm in chapter two and a few glosses considered before in this dissertation. Jon. 2:3-10 does not fit in with the rest of the book and may have been inserted by the author, or more likely, someone else. The passage is inappropriate, and may have been a marginal insertion which was accidentally transposed. It is clearly not a part of the original book, but was added later as can be shown by how clearly the text reads without it. The psalm is supposed to represent the words Jonah uttered in the belly of the fish, but it is not a petition for deliverance, but thanksgiving for deliverance already received.

1. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 25.
There is a possibility that this psalm may be a prayer of thanksgiving by Jonah for deliverance from the deeps of the sea, but it does not seem logical that he would consider being in the belly of a fish as a real deliverance. Again, it may be a song of thanksgiving offered because Jonah has fully submitted to the will of Yahweh and is glad of his resignation. But neither one of these possibilities proves that the psalm was not inserted at a later date by a translator who missed an expression of gratitude on the part of Jonah, when he had been delivered, and inserted the psalm in the margin after verse eleven, from whence it was put after verse two.

There are many arguments for and against the theory that this psalm belongs to the book of Jonah. The fish is not mentioned in the entire psalm, but it may be that the psalmist ignored the instrument in his recognition of the author of his deliverance.

But there is no answer to the fact that this psalm does not seem to be the kind of a psalm which would have been composed for this book. The Hebrew is pure, with no Aramaic influence, as is found in the rest of the book of Jonah; the fish is not mentioned, which, although a fact that can be excused, seems quite essential to a story that goes into details as to the wrapping
of sea-weed about the victim's head, and the sinking down to the roots of the mountains.

The attempts to show that the book of Jonah is or is not a unity, not a single one of which is convincing, do show, however, that there are certain difficulties in the book which must be accounted for, but not magnified. Most solutions are too artificial to be true. The result of the present investigation is the conclusion that the book is a unity, with the exception of the psalm, Jon. 2:3-10, and a few possible glosses. Tarshish in Jon. 1:3 may be a gloss; it is the opinion of most critics that Jonah had no specific goal, that he fled and that flight was the only desire he had. Jon. 1:8a also seems to be a gloss, although it may be considered as a part of the salutations. "Beasts" in Jon. 3:8 may be a gloss, although when the animal worship of that day is considered, it is possible that this word was in the original text. The conclusion is drawn that the unity of the book is much more nearly complete than most critics would have us believe, and that the only part that surely does conflict with that unity of the book is the psalm in Jon. 2:3-10.

Müller and Eichhorn interpreted the book of Jonah as poetry in 1819. Sievers and Erbt continued the attempt to make the entire book of Jonah a poem. Because they have believed that it is a poem they have met many difficulties, which have been hard to explain away. So many omissions have to be made, and so many alterations have to be effected, if the story is to be made a poem, that it seems that those who have attempted it have only proved that the book is one of beautiful prose (the psalm, of course, excepted). Though there may be measured cadences in its sentences, surely they are unintentional. Deviations need no explanation, for they are expected in rhythmic prose. It is interesting to note that Sievers and Erbt, who are determined to make the book a poem, differ in their metrical arrangement. Sievers believes that the narrative is composed of smooth lines of seven beats each, throughout. Erbt thinks it is written partly in lines of seven beats each, and partly in lines of alternately three and six beats each.¹

The poetic structure of the psalm in Jon. 2:3-10, is after the manner of the psalms in the book of Psalms, and falls into three strophes. It is composed of pentameters or "kinah-lines". Two of these taken together are generally regarded as forming strophes of four half

¹ op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 19, 30.
lines each. The only exception to this is found in verse nine, where there is a single "kinah-line". Reuss and Marti think that this too was originally composed of two "kinah-lines" and that the second has been accidentally lost and may have been something like: "But I trust in Thee, O Yahweh, my Saviour". Böhme and Duhm regard verse nine as interpolated.

After different opinions have been considered about the meter of the psalm the conclusion is drawn, that the psalm consists of two complete strophes (vv. 3-5 and 6-8) concluding each with a refrain, and part of a strophe without a refrain (vv. 9, 10). The only drawback to this conclusion is that it cannot be proved that the phrase "unto Thy holy temple" is a refrain. If it occurred again, the conclusion would be more sure. It may have occurred again originally, for it is quite certain that the prayer is only part of a longer piece which must have been complete and symmetrical, as we see from the parts given. The meter demands that the first two words of verse seven be taken with verse six as a second part of the "kinah-line".

1. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 44.
2. op. ibid. 43, 44.
3. op. ibid. 44.
C. Message

When the didactic character of the book of Jonah is clearly understood, doubt as to the reasonableness of its being included among the prophetic books disappears, for it is then recognized as belonging there because of its teachings and of its spirit which are those of the greatest prophets. It, then, has truly a place in the canon among the prophetic books. König suggests that the placement of the book of Jonah in the canon after the book of Obadiah may be accounted for by the theory that the words, "a messenger was sent among the nations", found in the book of Obadiah 1:1 were clearly illustrated in the story of Jonah, and that the question concerning the reason why the threats against Edom remained unfulfilled was intended to be answered in the book of Jonah. Whether this theory is true or not cannot be proved, but the book of Jonah does have a great prophetic message for all times and all peoples.

The Hebrews, afflicted by heathen neighbors and rulers, had forgotten that they were supposed to be witnesses for Yahweh before the Gentiles and to conquer the world with love and service. The author of the book of Jonah stands apart, because he remembers and proclaims this message. He draws freely from tradition and wonder

1. op. Briggs, Driver, Plummer, op. cit. 11.
stories, but adapts his material to his purpose. The result is a story with a message of truth which is profound and of universal significance as well as dramatic and fascinating, with a quiet humor and irony. It is a protest against the hostility and narrow exclusiveness of the Hebrew people on the one hand, and a declaration of Yahweh's unlimited love and care on the other. It is a missionary tract calling the Hebrews from their desire of and prayer for the destruction of the heathen to the task of leading these heathen to a knowledge of Yahweh.  

Very few people can tell what the message of this book is. Speculation about the truth of Jonah's living inside the fish and the quick repentance of the people of Nineveh have completely overshadowed, for many, the great moral teaching. 

Jonah is so selfish that he refuses to preach the message of the living Yahweh to the Ninevites, lest the people repent and be saved. After he is practically compelled to preach it, he is chagrined because they whole-heartedly repent at his half-hearted warning. This book contains a great message of the mercy of Yahweh,

3. op. ibid. pp. 220, 221.
which is hope for the humble and penitent, but despair for the self-righteous.¹

The book of Jonah is devoted almost entirely to the narration of a short period in the prophet's life, his commission and preaching at Nineveh.

Jonah does not want to obey his command from Yahweh to preach against Nineveh, as has been stated before, so he tries to flee from the presence of Yahweh. He surely realizes that he cannot go anywhere and avoid Yahweh, but he wants to escape from the place and circumstances where Yahweh manifested Himself to him. He attempts to go to Tarshish on a boat, but Yahweh has a task for Jonah, and Jonah cannot escape from the task. A storm arises on the sea and the sailors believe that it is sent by some deity in pursuit of a guilty one. They cast lots to discover him, and the lot falls to Jonah. The sailors ask him about himself, and he confesses he is a Hebrew fleeing from Yahweh, the Creator of land and sea. He tells them to throw him overboard, for, from his own conscience he knows it is on his account that the storm has come. He realizes that by his sacrifice the storm will be calmed, for then the reason for it will be removed.

¹ op. Cadbury, op. cit. p. 217.
The sailors hesitate to follow Jonah's advice, for they do not know what he has done, and cannot be sure that throwing him overboard will please Yahweh. They struggle to reach the shore, an unusual custom, for usually sailors along the Palestinian coast prefer to seek the open sea rather than risk being wrecked upon the reefs of the dangerous coast line. In this storm they seem to feel that reaching the shore is their only hope. After all efforts fail, they do as Jonah said, and the sea becomes calm. Jonah is swallowed by a great fish, and three days later is cast forth by the fish on dry land and goes to preach at Nineveh. The people repent, Jonah is displeased because they are not destroyed as he said, and Yahweh teaches Jonah and mankind a lesson by means of a plant.

The writer of the book of Jonah plunges at once into the midst of what he is about to record. Yahweh commands Jonah to preach against Nineveh. The people have sinned and the message from Yahweh is that they will be destroyed unless they repent. When Jonah comes back, as it were, from the dead, he goes to the Gentile city and preaches as he has been commanded. There he beholds what he has longed and prayed to see in his own country, the turning of a whole city to Yahweh. The leaders of Nineveh lead the people in the right direction, and the
entire population follows and seeks Yahweh with eager hearts. Yahweh is moved by their repentance and does not destroy them as the prophet has prophesied.

The book ends abruptly, but the message is plain. Yahweh is righteous and would have all men saved. He has mercy on all, loves all, and hates no one. The prophet shows his countrymen their petty meanness and points out that they are falling short of the divine ideal.

Nowhere in the Old Testament is the love of God for the ignorant and sinful so simply portrayed. The book emphasizes the universality of the dominion of Yahweh and sets before the Jew his opportunity and duty to proclaim the message of Yahweh to mankind.¹

The writer is not only protesting against Hebrew intolerance, but he is emphasizing the universal rule of Yahweh and His divine fatherhood.²

The writer is also skilled enough to caricature the Hebrews so ironically as to make them ridiculous even to themselves. To do this he uses a short story

with a hero who is courageous and zealous, but narrow-minded and intolerant. He represents the Hebrews who exulted in the slaughter of the heathen and were ready to defy Yahweh that they might be destroyed.1

The greatest lesson of the book of Jonah is the universalism of Yahweh's love. It is comparable to the love expressed in John 3:16, and it brings out human brotherhood as no other book of the Old Testament does.

1. op. C.F. Kent, The Social Teachings of the Prophets and of Jesus, pp. 125, 126.
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## Textual Variances of the Book of Jonah.

Variations with General Similarities and No Preference.
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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### Notes

- **Masoretic Text Preferred**
- **Vulgate**
  - periclitabatur conteri
  - naves
  - gubernator
  - reasque
  - eius causa
  - ibat, et intumescebat
  - et remingabant
  - quasnuus
  - et praeparavit
  - et exaudivit me
  - in profundum
  - et veniat
  - et dixit
  - afflant remi
  - praecoccupied ut fugerem
  - putasse bene irasceris tu?

---

**APPENDIX**
Jon 2:3  en thlipsei
Jon 2:6  περιπληκτήν γόνως καὶ ἀνάυσα ψυχὴν.
Jon 2:10 ὁ διὰ τὴν πόλιν ἀπὸ δυσσοφάδον πέρα
Jon 3:4  τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς κυρίων
Jon 3:11  ΤΩ ΚΥΡΙΕ
Jon 4:3  δέσποτα Κύριε
Jon 4:6  κολακύνθη
ev ἐν καταικοειδήν
Jon 1:5  namum ejus
Jon 1:16  hostias
Jon 3:2  praedicationem quam ego
Jon 3:9  loquor ad te.