

When God's Word Takes Voice: The Transforming Power of Speaking and Singing Scripture

Biblical Foundations, the Cochin Cambridge Hebrew New Testament (MS Oo.1.32, Oo.1.16.1, Oo.1.16.2), and the Remarkable Results of Two Fifteen-Minute-a-Day Studies

Janice F. Baca

Living Scroll

United States

www.LivingScroll.org

ORCID: 0009-0008-1195-4738



LIVING SCROLL

Copyright © 2026 by Janice F. Baca

All rights reserved.

Independently Published

Hondo, Texas 78861

Abstract

Scripture presents the Word of God as active rather than inert: it is spoken, heard, remembered, obeyed, proclaimed, prayed, and sung. This article argues that when believers speak God's Word aloud in faith, prayer, obedience, and covenant remembrance, the Word becomes audible proclamation through which God may bring conviction, restoration, deliverance, healing, and miraculous intervention according to His purpose. It proposes Power-of-God-singing as a theological category for God-directed singing or instrumental music functioning under His authority as proclamation, praise, worship, covenant remembrance, edification, restoration, perseverance, deliverance, or participation in divine victory. Singing retains audible proclamation while adding melody, sustained breath, repetition, memory, bodily participation, and gratitude. God—not sound or music as an autonomous force—remains the source of power. The argument proceeds from biblical, lexical, canonical, covenantal, and manuscript evidence, including David's deliverance-associated playing, Paul's placement of psalmody within a Spirit-gift setting, the Hebrew lexical field of *zāmar* in contrast with ordinary *shir*-language, the Song of the Sea, Jehoshaphat's singers, prison praise, Revelation's victory songs, the proposed Janus resonance of song, divine might, and overcoming, and the distinctive *zāmar* and *mizmor* choices of the Cochin Hebrew New Testament. The applied evidence moves in the same predicted direction. Study 1 involved 40 participants in a 15-day baseline, spoken-Scripture, and sung-Scripture comparison. Speaking produced a 2.6% overall improvement, while singing produced an 11.5% improvement—approximately 4.4 times the improvement measured during the speaking phase. Study 2 involved 24 participants in a 15-day study focused on praying for children and descendants. Its purpose-created five-measure positive-outcome index placed speaking 13.7% above baseline and singing 16.1% above baseline, with singing approximately 5% higher than speaking on spiritual inspiration. These uncontrolled, self-reported studies do not scientifically prove divine causation. Scripture supplies the theological doctrine; the lexical and Cochin patterns support the proposed category; and the studies provide preliminary outcome evidence consistent with the claim that speaking Scripture is powerful and that singing Scripture carries the Word further into praise, worship, embodied remembrance, and covenant proclamation.

Keywords: Scripture; covenant; renewed covenant; Power-of-God-speaking; Power-of-God-singing; *zāmar*; Cochin Hebrew New Testament; proclamation; praise and worship; fifteen-minute practice; well-being; prayer for children and descendants

1. When Scripture Takes Voice

What happens when Scripture moves from the page into the human voice? A person may begin with a quiet line of text. Then breath enters it. People hear the words, remember them, pray them, and perhaps carry them in melody. The Bible presents God's Word in just this active way. God speaks, and creation answers. Prophets receive words they must announce. Israel is told to hear, remember, teach, recite, and embody the covenant. The apostolic writings call the Word living and active: it addresses, searches, summons, judges, consoles, and builds up. A written page may be still, but the Word to which Scripture bears witness is never inert.

This pattern gives the Word on our lips real theological weight. Speaking Scripture aloud is not magic, and sound is not an independent spiritual force. It matters because reading becomes proclamation. The speaker sees the words, breathes them, hears them, and places them into a real moment. Mouth, ear, attention, and memory gather around the same scriptural claim. Power-of-God-speaking therefore means deliberately proclaiming God's Word while depending on the God who speaks and acts through it.

When the Word is sung, proclamation takes on new dimensions. Melody shapes repetition. Breath carries each phrase. Rhythm supports memory, and the body joins the act of worship. Sung Scripture does not leave meaning behind. At its best, it is Scripture carried by breath and melody—intelligible proclamation extended through the whole person.

The article's central claim is cumulative and direct. Scripture portrays God's Word as powerful because it proceeds from God and accomplishes His purpose. When believers speak Scripture in faith, prayer, obedience, and covenant remembrance, they engage in audible proclamation through which they may experience conviction, restoration, deliverance, healing, and other forms of perceived spiritual change. Singing retains that proclamation while adding melody, sustained breath, repetition, memory, gratitude, and embodied participation. Biblical, lexical, canonical, covenantal, and Cochin manuscript evidence supports this theological category of Power-of-God-singing, while both applied studies produced outcomes consistent with the prediction that sung

Scripture would be associated with stronger measured results than spoken Scripture. Music is not an autonomous power. God is the source of power, Scripture is the covenant message, and the human voice is an instrument through which the Word is spoken and sung in faith.

This argument requires distinct kinds of evidence to remain distinct. Exegesis asks what biblical texts portray and teach. Lexical analysis asks what a word can mean and how it functions in context. Manuscript comparison asks why a translator or textual tradition chose one expression over another. Applied observation asks what measurable changes accompanied a defined practice. These questions cannot be collapsed into one another, but they can converge. Scripture supplies the doctrine; lexical and manuscript evidence sharpen its language; canonical patterns disclose its breadth; and the studies provide limited but measurable evidence consistent with the predicted practical direction.

This article also draws on my 2025 book, *Power of God Singing: In the Hebrew New Testament*, where I first gave the proposal book-length treatment.¹ That work follows the argument from Hebrew lexicons and grammar through the Song of the Sea, Davidic worship, the chief musician, the Cochin Cambridge Hebrew New Testament, the singers of Revelation, and comparison with other Hebrew New Testament witnesses. This article focuses on that broader exploration of the biblical case, the Cochin readings, and the outcomes of the two fifteen-day studies.

The expression “Power-of-God-singing” arose from a proposal made by my Biblical Hebrew instructor, a Cohen in Jerusalem, during Course E at the Israel Institute of Biblical Studies. He suggested that the archaic Hebrew form *zimir* might convey not merely “singing,” but “Power-of-God singing,” or “God singing.”² I develop that proposal here into a broader theological theory: when God-directed singing or instrumental music is used in faith, worship, dance, proclamation, or service under God’s authority, it may be understood as Power-of-God-singing in action. David’s playing before Saul provides a defining example. Although the passage describes instrumental music rather than vocal song, Saul was refreshed, and the harmful spirit departed while David played. The theory therefore includes both sung and instrumental expression within the wider

¹ Janice F. Baca, *Power of God Singing: In the Hebrew New Testament* (Primedia eLaunch LLC, 2025), 4–29.

² Biblical Hebrew instructor, classroom lecture in Course E, Israel Institute of Biblical Studies, personal communication to the author, [January 2017].

musical field, while maintaining that the power belongs to God and not to melody, sound, or human performance as an autonomous force.

2. From Page to Voice: Why Speaking Scripture Matters

2.1 The Word on Our Lips

Speaking Scripture aloud is an elementary act with far-reaching implications. It creates an event of address. The words are no longer only scanned inwardly; they are voiced in time, heard by the speaker, and made present within an environment. This does not mean that human sound activates an impersonal force. It means that a person deliberately agrees with, rehearses, and announces words received as God's Word. The action is consequential because proclamation is one of Scripture's own modes of life.

The distinction between inert text and active proclamation is not a distinction between written and spoken revelation as if writing were deficient. Written Scripture preserves, stabilizes, and transmits the witness. Yet Scripture repeatedly presses toward hearing and response. Reading aloud joins preservation to performance. The speaker becomes both proclaimer and immediate hearer. Attention is less easily scattered because eyes, mouth, breathing, and ears participate together. This action does not change the Word, but it does change the mode of engagement.

Power-of-God-speaking should therefore be defined carefully: it is the intentional, audible proclamation of Scripture in faith, prayer, confession, and obedience, with confidence that God acts through His Word. The phrase names divine agency first. It does not imply that volume, diction, or repetition compels God. Nor does it mean every desired outcome follows immediately. It affirms that speaking Scripture is a biblically serious action because the believer places heart and voice under a divine utterance and proclaims what God has said.

2.2 Why Speaking Matters Before We Consider Song

The two studies discussed below rightly included speaking as a substantive practice, not merely a control. In Study 1, the spoken phase showed an overall improvement of 2.6%, with sleep rising by 2.7 points by the end of the phase. In Study 2, speaking scored 13.7% above baseline on the five-measure positive-outcome index. Testimonies during that phase included peaceful interactions, children spending more time with parents, willingness to read Scripture aloud,

increased peace in the home, and renewed interest in God and His Word. Speaking was not powerless. It moved in the predicted direction and was associated with meaningful reports.

That result matters for the cumulative thesis. The comparison is not between a powerless activity and a powerful one. Speaking and singing are both forms of scriptural proclamation, and both studies associate these practices with positive outcomes. The proposed difference is one of intensification: speaking places the covenant Word audibly on the believer's lips, while singing retains the spoken Word and carries it into praise and worship through melody, sustained breath, repetition, memory, embodied participation, and gratitude. The paper therefore argues that the spoken Word is powerful and may accompany divine intervention, but the sung Word gathers more dimensions of biblical response into a single act of faith.

3. The Living Word: When God Speaks, Creation Responds

The biblical case begins not with music as an independent force, but with the character and action of God's Word. Scripture portrays God as the source of power: His Word creates, addresses, accomplishes, discerns, and summons a response. Voice and song matter because they become instruments through which that Word is proclaimed, heard, remembered, and offered back to God in worship. The following quotations are from the New Revised Standard Version Updated Edition (NRSVUE).

Hebrews 4:12

“Indeed, the word of God is living and active and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing until it divides soul from spirit, joints from marrow; it is able to judge the thoughts and intentions of the heart.”

Hebrews portrays the Word as living, active, penetrating, and discerning. Its force is not an impersonal energy in sound; it is the searching action of God's Word upon the whole person.

Isaiah 55:10–11

“For as the rain and the snow come down from heaven and do not return there until they have watered the earth, making it bring forth and sprout, giving seed to the sower and bread to the eater, so shall my word be that goes out from my mouth; it shall not return to me empty, but it shall accomplish that which I purpose and succeed in the thing for which I sent it.”

Isaiah presents the Word as accomplishing God’s purpose. Like rain that produces growth, the divine utterance is sent with intention and does not return empty.

Jeremiah 23:29

“Is not my word like fire, says the LORD, and like a hammer that breaks a rock in pieces?”

Jeremiah’s images are fire and a hammer: images of exposure, purification, impact, and breaking. The verse locates this efficacy in God’s Word, not in human performance.

Proverbs 18:21

“Death and life are in the power of the tongue, and those who love it will eat its fruits.”

Proverbs highlights the moral consequence of speech. Words can wound or nourish, condemn or encourage, and speakers live with the fruit of their words. This wisdom claim does not make every utterance omnipotent; it makes speech ethically consequential.

Romans 10:17

“So faith comes from what is heard, and what is heard comes through the word of Christ.”

Romans links faith directly with hearing: “faith comes from what is heard.” The Word is not only to remain silently on the page; it is proclaimed so that it enters an audible encounter. When believers speak Scripture aloud, they hear the Word of Messiah even as they give it voice. When they sing Scripture, that same heard Word is carried through melody, repetition, breath, memory, praise, and worship. Romans 10:17 therefore provides a crucial foundation for the paper’s progression from the written Word, to the spoken and heard Word, and then to the sung Word.

Cochin Hebrew Romans 10:17

The Cochin Hebrew wording makes this emphasis on hearing even more concrete. Cochin Hebrew Romans 10:17 reads:

וכל האמונה מן שמע אזנים הוא ושמע אזנים מן דבר אלהים
“And all faith comes from the hearing of ears, it is; and the hearing of ears is
from the word of God.”
(Cambridge MS Oo.1.16 and MS Oo.1.32;³ transcription and translation by
Janice F. Baca)

The wording preserves the central movement of Romans 10:17—faith, hearing, and the Word—while differing noticeably from the Greek. The Greek text uses the abstract noun *ἀκοή* (*akoē*, “hearing,” also capable of referring to what is heard), whereas the Cochin Hebrew employs the concrete Semitic expression שמע אזנים (*shema oznayim*), literally “hearing of ears.” It also adds וכל (“and all [faith]”) and uses הוא (*hu*, “it is/he is”) as a marked syntactic pause. These features support the conclusion that this reading is not a mechanically word-for-word rendering of the Greek, but a distinct Hebrew formulation that makes hearing concrete and embodied.

Its theological resonance is strengthened by Proverbs 20:12, which speaks of “the hearing ear” (אֶזְנוֹ שֹׁמֵעַ) as made by YHWH; Isaiah 50:4, where God awakens the servant’s ear to hear; and Yeshua’s command, “Let anyone with ears listen” (Matthew 13:9). Together these texts distinguish merely possessing ears from receptive, discerning hearing. The Cochin wording therefore supports this paper’s claim that faith arises through an audible encounter with the Word and that speaking

³ Cambridge University Library, “Hebrew Translation of the New Testament, MS Oo.1.32,” *Cambridge Digital Library*, accessed August 14, 2026, <https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-OO-00001-00032>.

and singing Scripture engage the hearer as well as the speaker. The grammar alone does not prove a biological mechanism, a “divine frequency,” or automatic spiritual receptivity; such claims would require evidence beyond the wording itself.

Psalm 33:6

“By the word of the LORD the heavens were made and all their host by the breath of his mouth.”

Psalm 33 joins divine speech and breath to creation. Creation responds because God speaks; human breath and voice can witness to that act, but they do not duplicate the Creator’s authority.

Colossians 3:16

“Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly; teach and admonish one another in all wisdom; and with gratitude in your hearts sing psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs to God.”

Colossians explicitly joins the indwelling Word to communal teaching, admonition, gratitude, and singing. This verse provides a direct bridge to the Cochin manuscript evidence discussed below, where song vocabulary is differentiated rather than treated as a single undivided category.

Psalm 149:6

“Let the high praises of God be in their throats and two-edged swords in their hands,”

Psalm 149 places high praise and two-edged swords in the same poetic scene. This creates a striking canonical echo with Hebrews 4:12, where the living and active Word is sharper than a two-edged sword. The echo should be handled carefully: Psalm 149 does not identify praise itself as a literal weapon. Rather, praise and the sword stand together in the psalm’s poetic vision, while Hebrews uses sword imagery to portray the Word’s penetrating and discerning action.

Taken together, these texts present God's Word as active, spoken, heard, remembered, and sung. God remains the source of power; Scripture is the message; and speech and song are instruments of proclamation, formation, and worship.

3.1 Covenant Words on the Lips and in the Song

The covenantal dimension brings these passages into sharper focus. At Mount Sinai, Israel did not receive religious information in isolation. The people heard the words of YHWH, were summoned to obey His voice, and entered a blood-ratified covenant in which divine promises and human response belonged together. The covenant words named identity, allegiance, obedience, worship, protection, blessing, and God's presence among His people. In that setting, speaking God's Word is more than positive speech: it is the voiced remembrance of what the covenant-making God has declared.

My related paper, "The Renewed Covenant: The Covenant of Friendship with Elohim—Blood Covenant Offered through Yeshua," develops the theological claim that the renewed covenant is established through Yeshua's blood sacrifice and is offered to those who receive it in faith and covenant obedience.⁴ Within that framework, God's people do not manufacture divine promises or command God by reciting them. They enter, remember, confess, and live within a covenant whose initiative and power belong to God. The promises spoken in Scripture may therefore be proclaimed as covenant words: trusted because of the One who gave them and received through the renewed covenant offered in Yeshua.

This distinction explains the relationship between Power-of-God-speaking and Power-of-God-singing. Speaking Scripture is powerful because God's Word does not return to Him empty; it accomplishes the purpose for which He sends it. The believer gives that Word voice through faith, remembrance, prayer, and obedience. Singing Scripture retains everything present in speaking, but carries the covenant Word into praise and worship. The words are not merely repeated; they are offered to God with melody, gratitude, reverence, and the whole person's participation. In this sense, singing is not more powerful because music adds an independent force. It is proposed as

⁴ Janice F. Baca, "The Renewed Covenant: The Covenant of Friendship with Elohim—Blood Covenant Offered through Yeshua" (*Academia.edu*, January 2025).

more powerful because the spoken covenant Word is intensified as worship: Scripture is confessed, heard, remembered, embodied, and returned to God in praise.

This covenantal model also establishes an essential boundary. Biblical promises are not detached formulas, and song is not an incantation. Covenant includes relationship, allegiance, repentance, obedience, and trust. The promises remain God’s promises, fulfilled according to His character and purpose. Power-of-God-singing therefore means worshipful agreement with the covenant Word under God’s authority—not human control over divine power.

4. A Hebrew Word with a Wider Horizon

4.1 Singing, Music-Making, Plucking, and Pruning

The Hebrew root *zāmar* (זמר) stands at the center of this proposal. The lexicons and studies consulted in the underlying research—Gesenius-Tregelles, Brown-Driver-Briggs, HALOT, TDOT, and comparative Semitic work—associate the root-family with three principal horizons: (1) singing, praising, and making music, with or without instruments, and dancing; (2) strength or might in debated forms and poetic associations; and (3) plucking, pruning, trimming, or cutting down.⁵ Hebrew *zāmar* is not derived from Akkadian, although Hebrew *zāmar* and Akkadian *zamārum*, “to sing” or “to play an instrument,” may reflect an older Semitic inheritance.⁶ In plain language, this is a song-word with a wider horizon: voice, musical action, strength, and cutting imagery can stand within its larger history, although context must determine what a particular occurrence communicates.

Comparative Semitic evidence can correct older lexical reconstructions. The history of the Hishtafel analysis of the verb “to bow down” provides a useful methodological analogy: Ugaritic evidence overturned an etymology that had previously seemed plausible. This example does not establish a new meaning for *zāmar*, but it cautions against treating inherited lexicon entries as the

⁵ Wilhelm Gesenius and Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, *Gesenius’ Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1979), s.v. “זמר”; Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2015), s.v. “זמר”; Ludwig Köhler and Walter Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), s.v. “זמר.”

⁶ G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, eds., *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974–2021), s.v. “זמר”; Mark S. Smith and Wayne T. Pitard, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle*, vol. 2, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 114 (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

final word when grammar, cognate evidence, poetic structure, manuscript usage, and context may disclose a wider semantic history. The present study therefore evaluates *zāmar* through those forms of evidence together rather than building the Power-of-God-singing proposal on a single gloss.

The responsible claim is neither flat nor extravagant. It would be too flat to treat every occurrence as generic singing without attention to its worship setting, instrumental associations, or canonical use. It would be extravagant to claim that every musical use secretly means cutting down enemies. The root family permits a resonant field in which praise, instrumental plucking, and pruning or cutting may illuminate one another in passages already concerned with deliverance, judgment, renewal, or victory. Context governs the claim.

This lexical breadth gives theological language for active song. Plucking produces sound through deliberate touch. Pruning removes what hinders growth. Praise proclaims God's identity and deeds. These senses should not be mechanically fused into a new dictionary definition, but their resonance can be poetically and theologically significant. In victory contexts, song may celebrate what God has cut off; in restorative contexts, it may accompany return and renewed growth; in worship contexts, instrumental action and voice become coordinated service before God.

4.2 The Piel Stem: Purposeful Action

In Tanakh worship contexts, *zāmar* typically appears in the Piel stem, a Hebrew verb pattern that often presents an action as active, purposeful, repeated, causative, or specially defined by usage. Piel is flexible, so it cannot be translated by a mechanical rule.⁷ Its presence does not let an interpreter insert 'intensely' into every verse, much less claim miraculous power from grammar alone. Put simply, the form draws attention to purposeful action, but the surrounding verse must tell us what kind of action is meant.

Yet the necessary caution does not make the stem meaningless. Piel commonly marks an active verbal formation, and the cited *zāmar* forms occur in directed worship. Psalm 98:5 uses *zammeru* as an imperative to make music to YHWH with lyre and voice. Psalm 147:1 presents praise as fitting communal action. Psalm 149:3 joins *yezammeru* to dance, tambourine, and lyre. Judges 5:3 uses *azammer* in a first-person vow within victory poetry. Second Samuel 22:50 and Psalm 18:49

⁷ Paul Joüon and Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2005), §§52–53.

place the same first-person form in royal thanksgiving among the nations after deliverance from enemies.

The measured conclusion is strong enough: in these contexts *zāmar* is not incidental humming. It is purposeful, directed, liturgically situated action. Grammar does not create the theology, but it accords with a canonical pattern in which God-directed music becomes proclamation, remembrance, public testimony, and embodied praise. The category Power-of-God-singing arises from that convergence, not from a single stem label.

4.3 Distinct Words, Distinct Emphases

The Cochin Hebrew New Testament broadens the field. Its relevant passages employ ordinary song language such as *shir* or *shir*ot (שיר/שירות), lament language such as *qonenim* (קוננים), praise language such as *meshabbehim* (משבחים) or *teshubahot* (תשובחות), and marked *zāmar/mizmor* forms. The vocabulary is not interchangeable. Matthew 11:17 and Acts 16:25 function as important controls: ordinary performance and lament are rendered with singing and lament vocabulary, while Paul and Silas are described with praise terminology rather than *zāmar*.

That lexical contrast permits a stronger inference than mere stylistic variation. If *shir* and related terms were available for ordinary song, yet the tradition repeatedly selected *zāmar/mizmor* in contexts of restoration, Spirit-given activity, congregational edification, tested faith, heavenly worship, and victory, the marked root may signal a particular kind of God-directed musical action. Paul's treatment of a *mizmor* among Spirit-given gifts in 1 Corinthians 14 and David's anointed playing when the harmful spirit departed provide canonical models for this category. Read through the proposed Janus parallelism, *zāmar* can look simultaneously toward song, divine might, and the cutting down or overcoming of opposition. The proposal is therefore that, where the Cochin tradition chooses *zāmar* rather than ordinary *shir*-language, the choice may intentionally imply Power-of-God-singing: song or instrumental music functioning under God's authority as proclamation, edification, restoration, perseverance, or participation in divine victory. This is a contextual theological implication of the distribution, not a claim that the root carries a mechanically identical miracle-sense in every biblical occurrence.

5. The First Victory Song

5.1 The Song of the Sea as a Biblical Pattern

Exodus 15 is the canonical archetype of victory song. Israel stands beyond the sea and interprets deliverance through worship. The song announces who YHWH is: warrior, strength, salvation, and king. It names the enemy, remembers the waters, recounts divine action, and carries the event into communal memory. The people do not sing because song defeated Egypt as an autonomous force. They sing because YHWH delivered them, and their singing becomes the appointed form in which that victory is proclaimed, remembered, and transmitted.

The phrase *‘ozzi we-zimrāt Yāh* (עֲזִי וְזִמְרַת יְהוָה), commonly rendered “Yah is my strength and my song,” binds strength and song within a single confession. Scholars have discussed the precise lexical history of *zimrāt* in different ways, but in the poem’s received form the theological union is unmistakable. Israel’s song is about divine strength, arises from divine strength, and becomes the communal voice of deliverance.

5.2 A Word That Looks in Two Directions

The book advances a Janus-parallelism reading of *zimrāt*. Janus parallelism is a recognized feature of biblical poetry in which a word or expression looks in two directions at once, creating more than one meaningful connection within its literary setting.⁸ Applied here, the proposal is that the *zāmar* word-field may intentionally resonate with its full range of associations: song or musical praise, might or strength, and pruning or cutting down. In the Song of the Sea, those associations converge naturally. Israel sings; YHWH is confessed as strength; and the enemy’s power has been decisively cut down. The word’s hint is therefore not merely “song,” but song charged with the memory of divine might and the overthrow of the enemy.

This reading belongs to a broader scholarly recognition that Janus parallelism can activate multiple senses or associations within compact Hebrew poetry.⁹ It should not be reduced to the claim that every occurrence of *zāmar* literally means all three things in equal measure. Rather, the proposal is contextual: where song, divine strength, deliverance, judgment, or defeat already shape the

⁸ Scott B. Noegel, *Janus Parallelism in the Book of Job*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 223 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 11–20.

⁹ Noegel, *Janus Parallelism*, 11–20; Adele Berlin, *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008).

passage, the root's wider resonances may work together. That disciplined formulation preserves the force of the theory while allowing the text—not a predetermined gloss—to govern the interpretation.

The result is a disciplined theological reading. Israel's worship does not retroactively cause the exodus; it truthfully names and participates in the meaning of God's act. Song and victory interpret each other. The deliverance becomes singable, and the song becomes a durable vessel of deliverance-memory. This is foundational for Power-of-God-singing: the power belongs to YHWH, while song is the people's Spirit-responsive proclamation of His victory.

5.3 From the First Song to the Final Song

Revelation 15 deliberately returns to this horizon when the victorious sing the song of Moses and the song of the Lamb. The exodus song becomes a canonical template for ultimate deliverance. Revelation does not treat victory song as a decorative epilogue. Song stands at the culmination of conflict, judgment, fidelity, and redemption. The first great corporate song of biblical deliverance thus opens toward the final song of victory.

6. David: When Music Changed the Atmosphere

6.1 David and Saul

First Samuel 16 presents David's music as the defining biblical example of Power-of-God-singing and music accompanying deliverance. Saul was suffering under a tormenting spirit when David took the lyre and played. The result is stated plainly: Saul was refreshed and became well, and the harmful spirit departed. The passage describes instrumental playing rather than explicitly reporting vocal singing, but instrumental music belongs within the broader *zāmar* field of singing, music-making, playing, and embodied worship. David's lyre therefore does not stand outside the theory merely because the narrative emphasizes playing. God used the anointed musician's purposeful musical action as the means through which relief and deliverance entered the room. Read alongside David's identity as Israel's psalmist, the scriptural songs attributed to him, and the wider biblical union of voice, instruments, and movement, the scene provides a defining model for the theory that God-directed music joined to worship and the Word may change an atmosphere and accompany miraculous deliverance.

The scene is theologically complex because the troubling spirit is described in relation to God's judgment on Saul. David's playing therefore cannot be reduced to a formula for manipulating spiritual conditions. Yet the narrative should not be reduced to aesthetic distraction. Saul is refreshed; the hostile presence departs; David's embodied instrumental service stands within that change. The safest strong claim is that God-directed music may become a setting in which God brings relief and reorders a troubled human environment.

The plucking dimension of stringed music provides a suggestive, though not lexical-proof-level, relation to *zāmar*'s wider field. Hands repeatedly touch and release strings, producing ordered sound. The earlier study describes this as symbolic spiritual pruning: not music wielding an independent blade, but worship clearing attention, fear, confusion, and oppression under God's authority. The image must remain an analogy, but it faithfully preserves the narrative's insistence that David's music mattered.

6.2 The sweet singer of Israel

Second Samuel 23:1 identifies David as *zemirot* Yisrael, the sweet singer of Israel.¹⁰ His roles belong together. David is a warrior, king, anointed servant, poet, instrumentalist, and psalmist. His songs arise from pursuit, rescue, repentance, covenant promise, fear, gratitude, and triumph. He does not sing from a protected distance. His worship has passed through caves, battlefields, royal courts, moral failure, and divine mercy.

The Psalter institutionalizes this union of experience, proclamation, and worship. *Mizmor* (מִזְמוֹר) names a liturgical composition intended for performance, while verbal *zāmar* forms describe acts of singing praise or making music before YHWH. Psalm headings addressed to the *menatzeach* place compositions in ordered communal service. The root behind *menatzeach* can carry senses of enduring, excelling, overcoming, or prevailing;¹¹ the title is conventionally a musical office, yet the wider resonance suits a corpus in which worship repeatedly teaches God's people to persevere and prevail through trust.

The book develops this further through the figure of the "chief prevailer." Older lexical discussion, including Jerome's interpretation noted in Brown-Driver-Briggs, connects the root נָצַח (*nāṣaḥ*)

¹⁰ Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2015), s.v. "נָצַח."

¹¹ Brown, Driver, and Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon*, s.v. "נָצַח."

behind *menatzeach* with enduring, excelling, overcoming, or prevailing. Habakkuk 3:19 closes with language conventionally rendered “to the choirmaster, with stringed instruments,” yet the root’s wider force allows the music leader to be heard as one who leads in perseverance and victory. This does not erase the office of choirmaster; it deepens its theological resonance. The leader of sacred song helps the community remember, endure, and prevail by directing its voice toward God.

David therefore supplies a central model. The psalmist does not deny enemies, grief, guilt, or bodily distress. He brings them into God-directed speech and song. Lament becomes prayer; memory becomes testimony; deliverance becomes praise; confession answers fear. Power-of-God-singing is not triumphal denial. It is worship that tells the truth about God in the presence of conflict.

7. Singers at the Front of the Battle

7.1 Worship That Remembers Victory

Second Chronicles 20 offers one of Scripture’s clearest warfare-and-worship scenes. Facing enemy armies, Jehoshaphat appoints singers to go before the troops and praise YHWH for steadfast covenant love. The narrative connects the beginning of song and praise with YHWH’s action against Judah’s enemies. The singers do not replace soldiers by musical technique, and they do not coerce a result. They take their place in obedience, publicly confess God’s character, and move toward danger with praise preceding military sight.

This is worship as battle formation. The arrangement announces Judah’s theological interpretation before the outcome is visible: the battle belongs to God. Praise resists panic by directing attention toward covenant faithfulness. It also creates corporate agreement. Singers, army, king, and people inhabit one confession. Power-of-God-singing here names the disciplined public praise that accompanies and anticipates YHWH’s intervention.

7.2 Songs in the Night: Paul and Silas

Acts 16 extends the canonical pattern into prison. Paul and Silas pray and hymn God at midnight while other prisoners listen. An earthquake follows; doors open and bonds are unfastened. The Cochin Hebrew text uses praise terminology rather than *zāmar*, reminding us that the theology extends beyond one Hebrew root. The scene is nevertheless indispensable: audible prayer and praise occupy a place of confinement, become public witness, and immediately precede release.

The narrative does not invite an equation in which a particular melody automatically produces an earthquake. It presents worship as faithful action under suffering. Paul and Silas proclaim God before circumstances change. Their bodies are imprisoned, but their voices are not. Their song reaches fellow prisoners and becomes part of a sequence ending not merely in opened doors but in the jailer's crisis, hearing, and household response. Worship is proclamation, endurance, and mission at once.

8. The Sound of Final Victory in Revelation

Revelation places song at decisive points in the drama of redemption. The elders sing a new song in Revelation 5:9. The sealed 144,000 sing a song no one else can learn in Revelation 14:3. Those who overcome the beast sing the song of Moses and the song of the Lamb in Revelation 15:3. Song belongs to the throne room, the redeemed community, and the disclosure of final victory.

The Cochin Hebrew renderings use *zāmar*-related forms in these passages: *zimru* in Revelation 5:9 and *mezamrim* in Revelation 14:3 and 15:3. The distribution is notable. The tradition had other available terms for song and praise, yet it placed marked *zāmar* language at the eschatological climax. That choice aligns heavenly redemption, the sealed community, and victory over the beast with the lexical field already associated with purposeful musical praise.

Revelation's singers do not entertain heaven. They confess worth, redemption, divine deeds, justice, and kingship. Their songs are doctrinal and participatory. They know the victory by worshiping the Victor. The song of Moses and the Lamb gathers exodus and eschaton into one canonical arc: God delivers, and the delivered sing. Power-of-God-singing is therefore not a marginal devotional innovation. It names a pattern that stretches from the sea to the throne.

9. What the Cochin Manuscripts Add

9.1 Why These Word Choices Matter

The Cambridge Cochin Hebrew New Testament witnesses—especially MS Oo.1.32, MS Oo.1.16.1, and MS Oo.1.16.2—preserve a substantial and internally varied Hebrew New Testament corpus. The earlier study, “The Cochin Hebrew New Testament Manuscripts at Cambridge (MS Oo.1.32, Oo.1.16.1, Oo.1.16.2): Late Copies with Signs of an Early Semitic

Tradition,”¹² argued that these witnesses should be evaluated as a stratified textual complex rather than dismissed as uniformly late and derivative.¹³

That earlier argument was carefully limited. It did not claim that the extant early modern codices are ancient. It did not prove descent from a single early exemplar. It distinguished manuscript date, provenance, scribal use, linguistic register, and textual origin. It identified recurring post-biblical Hebrew diction, Hebrew-Aramaic contact features, bounded internal differentiation, and selected readings resistant to simple reduction to familiar Greek, Syriac, or European models. Its conclusion was methodological: evaluate the corpus book by book and passage by passage.

This approach provides the needed foundation. A word choice in a late manuscript cannot simply be declared ancient or original. Yet it is not meaningless merely because the physical codex is late. Manuscript transmission means that words are copied, translated, revised, and handed down across generations; a late copy can preserve earlier features while also reflecting later scribes. When a tradition consistently distinguishes vocabulary across contexts, that distribution is evidence. The task is to ask what the choices do, compare available alternatives, and remain honest about what cannot be known with certainty.

9.2 The Power-of-God-Singing Passages in the Cochin Cambridge Hebrew New Testament

This subsection includes all Cochin Power-of-God-Singing verses discussed in the source paper, not merely a representative sample. The source treats the Cambridge Cochin corpus through MS Oo.1.32, MS Oo.1.16.1, and MS Oo.1.16.2; it does not assign a separate shelfmark to every excerpt below, so none is invented here. The compact entries preserve the source paper’s exact references, Hebrew wording, supplied transliterations, English glosses, and interpretive functions. The distinctions matter: ordinary singing, lament, praise, prayer, shir-language, praise-language, and marked *zāmar/mizmor* forms are not collapsed into one category.

¹² Janice F. Baca, “The Cochin Hebrew New Testament Manuscripts at Cambridge (MS Oo.1.32, Oo.1.16.1, Oo.1.16.2): Late Copies with Signs of an Early Semitic Tradition,” *European Hebrew Journal* 1, no. 1 (2026): 32–77.

¹³ Baca, “Cochin Hebrew New Testament Manuscripts,” 32–77.

Matthew 11:17 — Ordinary singing and lament

ואומרין שירים לכם ואינכם מרקדין וקוננים לכם ואינכם בוכים:
“And they say, ‘We **sang** for you, and you did not dance. And we lamented for you, but you do not weep.’”
(Cochin Hebrew Matthew 11:17; transcription and translation by Janice F. Baca)

Significance: a contrastive control for ordinary singing and lament. The use of song and lament vocabulary without *zāmar* shows that the tradition does not mark every vocal performance with the proposed Power-of-God-singing terminology.

Acts 16:25 — Prayer and praise without *zāmar*

ובחצי הלילה פולוס ושילה היו מתפללים ומשבחים לאלודים והיו שומעים להם האסורים שם:
“And at midnight, Paul and Silas were praying and **praising** God, and the prisoners there were listening to them.”
(Cochin Hebrew Acts 16:25; transcription and translation by Janice F. Baca)

Significance: a contrastive control for praise without *zāmar* (זמר). Paul and Silas pray and praise in a powerful release narrative, yet the Cochin wording uses praise-language rather than a marked *zāmar* form; this restraint is central to the lexical distinction.

Luke 15:25 — Singing at restoration

וזה בן הגדול בעיר וכיון שבא אצל הבית שמע קול זמר הרבה
“And his older son was in the field; and as he came and drew near to the house, he heard the sound of much **singing**.”
(Cochin Hebrew Luke 15:25; transcription and translation by Janice F. Baca)

Significance: restoration and covenantal joy. The lost son’s return is celebrated with marked song-language, extending the pattern beyond military victory to reconciliation, return, and shared joy.

Romans 15:9 — Witness among the nations

וגויים ישבחו להשם עילוף רחמים שהיו עליהם כמו דכתיב אודה לך בגוים וכל שמך **אומר**:
“*And the Gentiles will praise YHWH for the exchange of mercy that was upon them, just as it is written: ‘I will thank You among the Gentiles, and I will **sing** to all Your Name.’*”
(Cochin Hebrew Romans 15:9; transcription and translation by Janice F. Baca)

Significance: witness among the nations. The first-person form presents singing as personal and public testimony to divine mercy across national boundaries.

Ephesians 5:19 — Spirit-filled communal worship

ודברו עם נפשיכון **במזמור** ובתושבחות ושיר הרוח תהיו מזמרים בליכתכם לאדון
“*And speak with your souls in psalm(**mizmor**) and in praises and the song of the Spirit; you shall be making melody in your walking to the Lord.*”
(Cochin Hebrew Ephesians 5:19; transcription and translation by Janice F. Baca)

Significance: Spirit-filled communal worship. *Mizmor* names the song or psalm, while *mezamrim* marks the act of singing, placing the vocabulary within mutual address and worship.

Colossians 3:16 — The indwelling Word and differentiated song

והדיבר מהמשיח תהיה תדור בניכם בכל החכמות ולמדו ומוכיחים עצמיכם עם שירות ותושבחות
ומזמרים האדון בלבביכם
“*And the word from the Messiah, may it dwell among you in all wisdom; and teach and admonish yourselves with songs and praises, and **singing** to the Lord in your hearts.*”
(Cochin Hebrew Colossians 3:16; transcription and translation by Janice F. Baca)

Significance: the wording distinguishes songs, praises, and singing. This lexical differentiation directly echoes the NRSVUE foundation above: the word of Messiah dwells richly as the

community teaches, admonishes, and sings. The manuscript's separate shir-, praise-, and *zāmar*-related terms reinforce that Scripture-filled singing is not a vague appeal to music as an independent force.

1 Corinthians 14:15 — Spirit and understanding

מה עתה אעשה אתפלל ברוח ואתפלל בדעתי רמה שמזמר ברוח **אומר** אף בדעת
“What now shall I do? I will pray in the spirit, and I will pray in my mind; just
as one **sings** in the spirit, **I will also sing** in the mind.”
(Cochin Hebrew 1 Corinthians 14:15; transcription and translation by Janice
F. Baca)

Significance: a spiritual gift practiced with understanding. The marked forms occur where Spirit and intelligibility are held together, resisting any separation of musical intensity from comprehensible proclamation.

1 Corinthians 14:26 — Congregational edification

אומר אני עתה אחי שאמת שמתקצים אתם איזה מכם שיש לו מזמור ואמר ואם יש לימוד וזה שיש
לו גילוי דבר וזה שיש לו פירוש גב כל זה לבבין יהיו
“I will **sing** now, my brothers, when you assemble, any of you who has a
mizmor let him speak; and if there is a lesson, or one who has a revelation of a
word, or one who also has an interpretation—let all this be unto the hearts.”
(Cochin Hebrew 1 Corinthians 14:26; transcription and translation by Janice
F. Baca)

Significance: congregational edification within a miraculous-gift setting. In 1 Corinthians 12–14, Paul is regulating Spirit-given manifestations in the gathered assembly. In 14:26, the *mizmor* or psalm stands alongside a lesson, a revelation, tongues, and an interpretation—contributions associated in this context with the Spirit's charismatic activity. The singing described here should therefore not be reduced to ordinary congregational music; Paul presents it within an assembly where miraculous gifts are operating. Yet the governing criterion remains edification: whether the contribution is a psalm, revelation, tongue, interpretation, or teaching, all things must build up the gathered community.

James 5:13 — Pastoral song in joy

ואם אחד בכם סובל איזה דבר הוא צריך לתפלל ואם אחד בכם בטוב לב זה צריך לזמר תהילים
“And if one of you suffers anything, he needs to pray; and if one of you is of a
good heart, this one needs to *sing* psalms.”
(Cochin Hebrew James 5:13; transcription and translation by Janice F. Baca)

Significance: a pastoral command that may invoke the paper’s specific category of Power-of-God-singing. James distinguishes suffering, which calls for prayer, from a good or joyful heart, which calls for the purposeful action *lezammer*—to sing or make music in psalms. The choice is significant because ordinary *shir*-language was available, whereas *zāmar/mizmor* belongs to a marked biblical and Cochin pattern. Fifty-seven psalms bear the title *mizmor*, and many psalm headings are directed *la-menatzeach*, conventionally “to the conductor,” “director,” or “chief musician.” The noun *menatzeach* derives from the root *nāṣaḥ*, whose semantic field includes enduring, excelling, prevailing, and overcoming. Thus the conductor and the overcomer meet in the same Hebrew form. Paul likewise places *mizmor* within an assembly where Spirit-given gifts operate, while David’s anointed instrumental playing accompanies Saul’s relief and the departure of the harmful spirit. In light of those canonical parallels and the proposed Janus parallelism—by which the *zāmar* field can look toward song, divine might, and the cutting down of opposition—James’s use of *lezammer* may imply more than generic cheerful singing. It may call for the specific kind of God-directed psalmody this paper names Power-of-God-singing: musical praise through which the believer proclaims God’s rule, is strengthened to endure, and participates in divinely given victory. The claim remains theological and contextual: God performs the miracle, and the word choice signals the kind of musical action through which His power may be manifested rather than making music an autonomous force.

1 Peter 1:7 — Tested faith and praise

כדי שנמ צא אמונותיכם ישר יותר מכסף שיזקק באש לזמר ולתהילות ולתושבחות בעת שיתגלה יום
של ישו המשיח:
“So that your faith may be found more upright than silver that is refined in
fire—to *sing*, and for praises, and for hymns, at the time when the day of

Yeshua the Messiah shall be revealed.”
(Cochin Hebrew 1 Peter 1:7; transcription and translation by Janice F. Baca)

Significance: tested faith and eschatological praise. The Cochin choice places *zāmar*-language within faith refined by fire and awaiting the revelation of Yeshua Messiah; notably, the source paper observes that this wording is not mechanically required by the Greek praise-language.

Revelation 5:9 — The renewed song

וזמרו שיר חדש ואמרו אתה ראוייה ליקח הספר ולפתוח את חתימותיו כי אתה נהרג וקנית אותנו
בדמך:

*“And they sang a renewed song and said, ‘You are worthy to take the scroll
and open its seals, for You were slain, and You redeemed us by Your own
blood.’”*

*(Cochin Hebrew Revelation 5:9;¹⁴ transcription and translation by Janice F.
Baca)*

Significance: heavenly worship and redemption. The elders’ song confesses the worth and redeeming work of the Lamb, placing marked song-language before the throne.

Revelation 14:3 — The sealed 144,000

וזמורים בשיר חדש לפני הכסא ולפני הארבע חיות והזקנים ושום אחד יוכל ללמוד השיר הזאת
רק אילו המאה וארבע וארבעים אלפים שקנה מהאדמה:

*“They were singing the renewed song before the throne, the four living
creatures, and the elders. No one was able to learn this song but the hundred
and forty-four thousand that He redeemed from the ground.”*

¹⁴ Janice F. Baca, *The Scroll of Mysteries: Cochin Hebrew Revelation*, 3rd ed. (Hondo, TX: independently published, 2024).

(Cochin Hebrew Revelation 14:3; transcription and translation by Janice F. Baca)

Significance: the sealed 144,000 and the hidden song tradition. The marked singers belong to a consecrated community whose song is learned within the scene of eschatological fidelity and redemption.

Revelation 15:3 — The song of Moses and the Lamb

וּמְזַמְרִים הַשִּׁירָה שֶׁל מֹשֶׁה וְהַשִּׁיר הַשֶּׁה וְאוֹמְרִים גְּדוּלָּה מַעֲשֵׂי ה' אֱלֹהֵי הַצְּבָאוֹת צֶדֶק וְאֵמֶת דְּרָכֶיךָ
מֶלֶךְ הַמְּלָכִים:

“They sang the song of Moses and the song of the Lamb, saying, ‘Great are the works of Yehovah, Elohim of Armies! Justice and truth are your ways, King of kings!’”

(Cochin Hebrew Revelation 15:3; transcription and translation by Janice F. Baca)

Significance: final victory and the song of Moses. The passage joins the first great biblical deliverance-song to the final victory scene, locating song as proclamation of God’s deeds rather than as an autonomous cause of victory.

Why the distinctions matter

Across the complete set, Matthew 11:17 preserves ordinary singing and lament with *shirim* and *qonenim*; Acts 16:25 preserves prayer and praise with *meshabbehim*; Colossians 3:16 explicitly coordinates *shiroṭ*, *teshubahot*, and *meẓamrim*; and the remaining selected settings use marked *zāmar/mizmor* forms in restoration, witness, Spirit-filled worship, congregational edification, tested faith, heavenly redemption, and final victory. The pattern therefore rests on both presence and contrast. It does not turn every song, lament, prayer, or praise into a technical miracle category. It supports a bounded claim: God is the source of power, Scripture is the proclaimed message, and voice and song are instruments through which the community remembers, teaches, worships, and bears witness.

9.3 A Distinctive Pattern

The Cochin singing passages form a patterned set. Matthew 11:17 uses *shirim* and *qonenim* for singing and lamenting. Acts 16:25 uses *meshabbehim* for praising God. Luke 15:25 uses *zāmar* language in the restoration celebration. Romans 15:9 uses *azammer* for witness among the nations. Ephesians 5:19 includes *mizmor* and *mezamrim* in Spirit-filled communal worship. Colossians 3:16 places *shiroṭ*, *teshubahot*, and *mezamrim* together, differentiating songs, praises, and singing to the Lord in the heart.

First Corinthians 14:15 employs *mezammer* and *azammer* where singing in the Spirit is joined to understanding; 14:26 uses *mizmor* among congregational contributions ordered toward edification. James 5:13 joins *tzarikh* and *lezammer* in a pastoral instruction for the cheerful person. First Peter 1:7 uses *zāmar* language in relation to tested faith and eschatological praise. Revelation 5:9, 14:3, and 15:3 culminate in renewed song, the sealed singers, and the song of Moses and the Lamb.

This distribution is interpretively significant because the marked forms are concentrated in restorative, Spirit-oriented, edifying, tested, and victorious contexts, while ordinary singing, lament, prayer, and praise are expressed through other available terms. Comparative witnesses surveyed in the underlying article do not reproduce the full Cochin pattern. The Cochin readings should therefore be treated neither as automatic proof of a technical category nor as accidental wording, but as coherent textual choices worthy of theological interpretation.

The book's wider manuscript comparison strengthens this conclusion. Paris 131 contains several *zāmar*-related readings but does not reproduce the complete Cochin distribution; the Catalonia Gospels, Vatican ebr. 100, omit the root at Luke 15:25; Freiburg HS 314 does not reproduce the pattern; the Marseille Luke–Acts witness lacks it in the corresponding Luke passage; and the Shepreve New Testament uses a different verbal structure in James 5:13. Manchester Gaster 1616 contains the readings because it is textually dependent on the Cochin tradition. The point is not that no other Hebrew New Testament ever uses *zāmar*, but that the full, patterned cluster across these passages remains distinctive to the Cochin textual family.

9.4 From Textual Pattern to Theological Meaning

Power-of-God-singing is the paper's proposed name for the marked *zāmar/mizmor* pattern. The contrast with ordinary *shir*-language is central: where a writer or translator could designate song

generally but instead chooses the *zāmar* field, that choice may imply God-directed musical action associated with Spirit-given utterance, edification, restoration, perseverance, deliverance, or victory. Paul's charismatic setting in 1 Corinthians 14, David's deliverance-associated playing before Saul, the Song of the Sea, and the proposed Janus resonance of song, strength, and cutting or overcoming together support this stronger inference. Accordingly, the Cochin occurrences may be read not merely as references to music, but as instances or evocations of Power-of-God-singing. This remains a theological interpretation governed by context, not a replacement dictionary gloss: the term does not make every occurrence automatically miraculous, prove the antiquity of the Cochin wording, or locate power in music itself. It identifies a recurring biblical pattern in which God uses directed song or instrumental praise as proclamation, remembrance, edification, restoration, resistance, and participation in His victory.

10. Why Singing May Reach Us More Deeply

A conceptual model can identify plausible pathways without reducing divine action to psychology. Mechanism-level observations describe how human attention, memory, body, and community participate. The theological claim is different: God acts through His Word in freedom and faithfulness. Human mechanisms may be means, conditions, or correlates; they are not substitutes for divine agency.

10.1 Proclamation and attention

Speaking or singing Scripture concentrates attention by requiring active production. The participant must follow words, shape phrases, and sustain meaning across time. Audible proclamation also returns the words to the speaker as heard language. This feedback loop may reduce distraction and deepen engagement. Theologically, however, attention is not the power source. It is the posture by which a person deliberately attends to the Word through which God addresses His people.

10.2 Breath and vocalization

Both speech and song recruit breath, but song ordinarily extends and regulates it. Phrases must be supported; pauses become structured; the body participates in the articulation of the text. This may influence subjective calm, alertness, and readiness. Such observations can describe embodied

participation without claiming that breathing techniques cause divine action. Breath serves proclamation; it does not replace the Spirit.

10.3 Melody and memory

Melody gives verbal material contour. Pitch and rhythm create retrieval cues, while recurring motifs help words remain accessible after the practice ends. Scripture joined to a simple natural melody may therefore be remembered and mentally rehearsed more readily. That is a plausible explanation for why sung practice can extend beyond the scheduled period. Yet memory alone does not exhaust the theology: remembered Scripture continues to instruct, correct, console, and summon because of what it says and because God acts through His Word.

10.4 Repetition and internalization

Song naturally repeats words and phrases without making repetition feel merely mechanical. Repetition gives meaning time to move from initial recognition toward internalization. A promise, command, confession, or lament may be encountered several times within one melody. This can strengthen recall and personal appropriation. The theological danger is vain technique; the theological opportunity is sustained meditation.

10.5 Embodied participation

Singing involves posture, facial muscles, hearing, respiration, resonance, and often movement. Biblical worship likewise joins voice, instruments, hands, dance, kneeling, standing, and procession. Embodiment matters because faith is not practiced by a disembodied intellect. The whole person responds. This does not mean bodily intensity measures spiritual authenticity; it means sung Scripture offers a form in which cognition, affection, and physical action can be directed together toward God.

10.6 Expectancy and faith

Participants who undertake a spiritual practice bring expectations, hopes, and beliefs. Expectancy can affect attention and self-report, which matters methodologically. Theologically, expectancy may also express faith. These two statements answer different questions. A study should measure and control expectancy where possible, while theology should keep asking whether participants trust God rather than a technique. Study 1 usefully recorded expectations: 22 of 40 participants expected speaking and singing to be exactly equal, while 9 expected speaking to have greater

impact and 9 expected singing to have greater impact. The strongest singing result therefore did not simply mirror a majority expectation that singing would win.

10.7 Corporate reinforcement

Even when practiced individually, common assigned passages can create shared focus. In congregational settings, song also coordinates timing, words, and emotional expression across many people. Corporate reinforcement can normalize perseverance and strengthen communal memory. The biblical choirs, temple musicians, battle singers, and heavenly assemblies show that sacred song is often irreducibly communal.

10.8 Worshipful orientation

The decisive orientation is toward God. Scripture may be spoken as information, but in prayer and song it is also offered back as confession, petition, thanksgiving, and praise. Worshipful orientation guards against treating music as an autonomous force. Melody is not the deity; the singer is not the controller; the practice is not an incantation. God is the source, object, and judge of worship. Power-of-God-singing is powerful precisely because it refuses to separate the gift from the Giver.

11. Fifteen Minutes That Changed the Pattern: Study 1

11.1 Design and participants

The applied question was whether fifteen minutes of daily spoken or sung Scripture would be accompanied by different patterns in participants' self-reported outcomes. The predicted ordering was baseline lowest, spoken Scripture higher, and sung Scripture highest. Because the studies were descriptive and sequential rather than randomized controlled experiments, their purpose was to identify whether the observed pattern warranted stronger testing, not to establish a universal causal law or verify a spiritual mechanism.

The first study was the Comparative Scripture Expression Study, a 15-day personal reflection study for believers in Yeshua. Forty participants explored how different modes of engagement with Scripture related to daily well-being. The sequence was baseline, speaking, and singing. Participants first continued their normal routines and recorded a baseline. They then spent focused time speaking selected Scriptures aloud. In the final phase, they sang those Scriptures using a simple, natural melody. The daily practice was only fifteen minutes.

During the Scripture-expression phases, participants used the same selected passages: Isaiah 53:5, Philippians 4:6–7, and Psalm 91:1–16. These passages were provided in the NRSVUE translation for consistency and ease of reference, although participants were welcome to use their preferred Bible translation. The purpose was not to evaluate a specific translation, but to observe daily self-reported reflections while participants engaged with the meaning of Scripture through spoken and sung expression.

Each day, participants submitted brief self-reported ratings for physical health, mental/spiritual clarity, and sleep quality. In ordinary language, this was a descriptive study: it tracked patterns in what participants reported rather than using a randomized experiment to prove cause. The analysis asked whether spoken and sung Scripture were accompanied by noticeable changes in group daily averages. The final report used those averages without names or aliases, protecting participant privacy.

11.2 Expectations before the comparison

Before the study, participants were asked which method they expected would lead to more miracles and breakthroughs. Of the 40 who answered, 22 expected speaking and singing to be exactly equal (55%). Nine expected speaking the Word aloud to have the greater impact (22.5%), and nine expected singing the Word melodically to have the greater impact (22.5%). Expectations were therefore balanced between the two directional preferences, with the majority predicting equality. This distribution matters because the strongest measured singing result did not simply reproduce a majority expectation that singing would have the greater impact.

Participants reported experiences they interpreted as spiritual warfare during all three phases. In Phase 1 (baseline), reports included recurring negative thoughts attributed to “the enemy,” oppression, discouragement, physical illness, resistance while studying Scripture, and a perceived increase in opposition as a breakthrough approached. In Phase 2 (spoken Scripture), reports included sadness and thoughts of failure, technological difficulties perceived as interference, fatigue and blurred vision during reading, disrupted sleep and early-morning waking, unwanted thoughts, relational offenses and project conflict, a perceived attack after reciting Psalm 91, and a disturbing dream interpreted as demonic. In Phase 3 (sung Scripture), reports included continued intense warfare, project and interpersonal conflict, a spouse’s health and mobility difficulties interpreted as attacks, discomfort with singing and temptation to avoid or misreport the exercise,

a tense Bible-study discussion, perceived spiritual threats involving other people, and fasting and prayer understood as participation in spiritual warfare. Participants described responding through prayer, reading Psalms aloud, forgiveness and reconciliation, boundary-setting, fasting, and perseverance. These accounts reflect participants' personal spiritual interpretations and were not independently verified; nevertheless, they form part of the study's lived context and the participants' accounts of perseverance.

11.3 Spoken phase findings

During Phase 2, when participants spoke Scripture aloud, the group improved overall by 2.6%. Sleep rose by 2.7 points by the end of the phase. Physical and mental/spiritual ratings dipped slightly during this phase. Overall, the results point to modest positive movement rather than uniform gains across every measure.

This finding should not be minimized. A 2.6% net improvement during a brief daily spoken practice is consistent with the thesis that audible scriptural proclamation is consequential. At the same time, the pattern prepares the central comparison: speaking was beneficial overall, but the strongest and most consistent progress appeared when the same basic scriptural engagement became sung proclamation.

11.4 Sung phase findings

During Phase 3, when participants sang Scripture, the group improved overall by 11.5%. From the first to the last study date in the phase, physical health increased by 0.5 points, mental/spiritual clarity increased by 1.0 point, and sleep increased by 0.8 points. Singing was associated with positive movement across all three measured areas.

Based on the study's calculated group-level net improvements, Phase 3 singing (11.5%) was approximately 4.4 times the Phase 2 speaking improvement (2.6%). The absolute difference between the reported improvements was 8.9 percentage points, and the relative difference was approximately 342%. These figures describe the study's aggregated first-to-last calculation; they are not individual effect sizes, do not account for uncertainty or order effects, and do not establish that singing will produce an improvement 4.4 times as large as speaking in other participants or settings.

11.5 Participant Testimonies

Phase 1 — Baseline

During Phase 1, when participants followed their normal daily routines without the assigned Scripture exercise, one participant reported a cluster of perceived breakthroughs while very ill. Because the participant did not want to go to a hospital emergency room, the participant had already begun fasting and praying intensely. The reported experiences included relief from intestinal and lower-back pain, improved walking ability, reduced allergy-like or illness-related symptoms, improved sleep, unusual peace, and relief from emotional distress. Other baseline reports across the group included protection during severe weather, practical provision, positive family and workplace developments, a pet's recovery, and greater understanding of forgiveness and Scripture. Because the principal health breakthrough occurred alongside fasting and intense prayer before the assigned Scripture-expression phases began, it cannot be attributed to speaking or singing Scripture and should be understood within that participant's broader spiritual practice.

Phase 2 — Spoken Scripture

During Phase 2, participants spoke Scripture aloud for 15 minutes after sundown. Reported experiences included reduced back pain, improved mobility, increased energy, better sleep, and a painful rash nearly disappearing. One participant reported decreased inflammation that led them to consider less-invasive surgery. Other testimonies involved protection from illness or near-miss incidents, finding lost belongings after prayer, reconciliation and forgiveness, renewed communication with relatives, a family gathering after years apart, and greater peace during stressful circumstances.

Phase 3 — Sung Scripture

During Phase 3, participants sang Scripture melodically for 15 minutes after sundown. They reported improved sleep, energy, strength, and mobility; stable overnight blood-glucose readings; and relief from tooth, toe, sinus, headache, and other pain. Some participants described receiving clearer medical information, stronger advocacy, or greater confidence about healthcare decisions. Additional testimonies included improvement in a hospitalized relative's condition, renewed family contact, financial provision and benefits approval, successful project completion, safe travel, reduced anxiety, and deeper peace.

These testimonies represent participants' personal experiences and interpretations.

11.6 Interpretation

The result is striking because the practice was simple and brief—fifteen minutes that changed the measured pattern. Participants did not undertake lengthy musical training; they sang Isaiah 53:5, Philippians 4:6–7, and Psalm 91:1–16 with a simple natural melody for fifteen minutes per day. The principal breakthrough reported during the baseline phase came from one participant who was already fasting and praying intensely because of serious illness and a desire to avoid an emergency-room visit. That concurrent spiritual practice must be taken into account: the testimony cannot be treated as evidence for either the spoken- or sung-Scripture intervention. More broadly, baseline testimonies show that personal reports alone cannot establish that a particular phase caused an event. The quantitative pattern nevertheless changed across the assigned practices: speaking produced modest overall improvement, while the sung phase showed the clearest gains in physical health, mental and spiritual clarity, and sleep. The strongest evidentiary claim therefore rests not on testimonies by themselves, but on the ordered comparison of the measured phases together with the greater concentration of reported improvements during sung Scripture.

The honest, forceful conclusion is that Study 1 produced outcome evidence consistent with the Power-of-God-singing thesis. It does not scientifically prove that divine causation generated each score change. It does show that, within this 40-participant, 15-day, self-reported design, singing Scripture was associated with the greatest measured improvement, and that its advantage over speaking was substantial according to the reported calculation.

12. What the Second Study Found

12.1 Focus and design

The second study was a 15-day study involving 24 participants praying for children and descendants. Before the study, participants reported limited faith-related interaction and openness among those they prayed for. Their hopes included spiritual awakening, changed hearts, restored communication, reconciliation, and healing. The design again used three phases: ordinary daily experience as baseline, speaking assigned Scriptures aloud, and singing those same passages.

The assigned passages were Acts 16:31; Isaiah 44:1–5; Luke 15:20; Philippians 4:6–7; Hebrews 4:12; and Psalm 91. The focus was therefore relational and intercessory, while remaining explicitly scriptural. As in Study 1, the daily practice was only fifteen minutes.

For analysis, the study used a descriptive five-measure positive-outcome index created for this purpose. Its measures were lower anxiety, stronger faith and resolve, greater perceived closeness to reconciliation, greater joy and awareness of God’s presence, and lower resistance. Because the index was purpose-created rather than identified as a validated instrument, its findings are best treated as structured descriptive evidence.

12.2 Numerical findings

Phase 2, speaking Scripture, scored 13.7% higher than Phase 1 baseline. Phase 3, singing the same passages, scored 16.1% higher than baseline. On the spiritual-inspiration measure, singing scored about 5% higher than speaking. Once again, both active practices moved in the predicted direction, and singing produced the strongest measured result.

The difference between 13.7% and 16.1% should be stated accurately. It is not the same form of comparison as Study 1’s approximately 4.4-fold ratio. Both Study 2 phases were compared with baseline on the purpose-created positive-outcome index. The relevant conclusion is that speaking was associated with a marked improvement over baseline and singing with a still greater improvement, while the spiritual-inspiration measure showed an additional approximately 5% advantage for singing.

12.3 Relational and spiritual developments

During the spoken phase, testimonies included children spending more time with parents, peaceful interactions without arguments, an unexpected willingness to read Scripture aloud, increased peace in the home, and renewed interest in God and His Word. These reports correspond to the study’s focus on openness, reconciliation, faith, and reduced resistance.

A notable testimony arrived during the singing phase. A participant praying for several adult prodigals, some no longer in contact, received encouraging news about three of them. Two apologized for their behavior. The participant’s daughter also experienced her most wonderful family visit in years with the participant’s oldest son and his family after a period of separation.

The participant was moved to tears and reported a significant positive change in personal attitude and faith.

Across the study, participants reported renewed communication, apologies, peaceful family interactions, strengthened faith, greater hope, and perceived relational and spiritual breakthroughs. These are meaningful outcomes within the study's pastoral purpose. They remain self-reported and cannot establish that the intervention caused changes in other people. They do, however, show that participants experienced measurable and narrated developments aligned with the study's prayers and predictions.

12.4 Interpretation

Study 2 reinforces rather than duplicates Study 1. Its measures, participants, and prayer focus were different. Yet the direction converged: baseline was lowest, speaking was higher, and singing was highest. This convergence matters precisely because the studies were not identical. Different forms of observation addressed different practical questions and arrived at the same ordered pattern.

13. What the Two Studies Found—And What They Mean

The theological and applied evidence should neither be separated into unrelated worlds nor collapsed into one proof. Scripture answers the doctrinal question: what does the biblical canon portray about God's Word, proclamation, song, worship, and victory? Lexical study answers a linguistic question: how do *zāmar* and related forms function, and what resonances do they carry? Manuscript analysis asks why the Cochin tradition differentiates its vocabulary. The studies ask what outcomes accompanied short practices of speaking and singing Scripture in these participant groups.

Convergence is compelling when independent lines point in the same direction. Exodus presents victory interpreted in song. Davidic tradition joins anointed music, spiritual relief, warfare, and psalmody. Jehoshaphat places singers before the army. Paul and Silas worship in confinement before release. Revelation crowns victory with song. The Cochin tradition selects *zāmar/mizmor* language across restorative, Spirit-oriented, edifying, and eschatological contexts. Study 1 shows improved speaking and a much larger improvement in singing. Study 2 again shows both active phases above baseline, with singing highest.

Yet different evidence bears different weight. The studies do not create the doctrine and cannot prove divine causation. The doctrine does not exempt studies from methodological criticism. The appropriate synthesis is direct: Scripture supplies the theological doctrine; covenant supplies the relational setting in which God's people receive, obey, remember, and proclaim His promises; and the studies provide measurable outcome evidence consistent with the predicted direction. Speaking gives the covenant Word audible expression. Singing carries that same Word into praise and worship, joining confession to melody, embodied remembrance, and gratitude. Mechanisms may explain aspects of human participation, while divine action remains a theological claim grounded in Scripture rather than a variable isolated by these designs.

14. Could More Time Produce More Change?

14.1 The importance of brevity

The most practically arresting feature of both studies is duration: the reported changes accompanied only fifteen minutes of daily practice. That is short enough for an ordinary schedule and long enough to require intention. It needs no professional musicianship, elaborate technology, or special venue. A person can speak or sing a selected passage at home with a simple natural melody.

Brevity strengthens the practical significance of the findings. If measurable change can appear with fifteen minutes of practice, the threshold for participation is low. Clergy, worship leaders, families, and individuals can test disciplined scriptural vocalization without reorganizing an entire day. The findings therefore support a clear practical call: regularity may matter more than complexity at first.

14.2 A Strong Question for Future Research

The results also generate a duration-response hypothesis: longer, more frequent, or more sustained engagement may produce greater effects. This is a strong practical and research proposition, but it is not a conclusion already measured. The two studies did not test longer durations. They cannot tell us whether thirty minutes doubles an outcome, whether sixty minutes adds further benefit, whether gains plateau, or whether excessive duration reduces adherence.

The hypothesis is nevertheless well motivated. More time could permit greater repetition, deeper memorization, more settled attention, and stronger habit formation. Sustained practice across weeks or months could also distinguish immediate inspiration from durable change. The correct scholarly response is not to weaken the proposition into vagueness, but to state it clearly as a prediction awaiting direct test.

14.3 How Future Studies Can Test It

Future studies should compare fifteen-, thirty-, and sixty-minute conditions. Random assignment, where feasible, would strengthen inference. Follow-up periods should examine whether changes persist after the active phase. Validated measures should be used where suitable, while spiritually specific measures can be retained with transparent development and reliability testing. Daily adherence and actual practice time should be recorded rather than assumed.

Future designs should also distinguish speaking, singing, listening, and silent reading. A listening condition could test whether self-vocalization adds something beyond hearing. Silent reading could clarify the value of audible proclamation. Speaking and singing should use the same passages and matched durations. Control order effects by counterbalancing or using parallel groups rather than always moving from baseline to speaking to singing. Measure expectancy before each condition.

A robust program could combine quantitative outcomes with qualitative interviews. Physiological or behavioral measures may be included where ethically and practically appropriate, but they should not be treated as proxies for God's action. The goal is to understand observable human outcomes while preserving the theological claim at its proper level.

15. Limits That Point Toward Stronger Studies

The present article reports summarized group outcomes and selected qualitative accounts. Independent evaluation would require the phase-level scoring rules, daily group values, participant completion and missing-data information, the calculation used to derive each percentage, and the full wording and scoring procedure for the Study 2 index. Making those materials available in an appendix or supplementary dataset would enable readers to reproduce the reported comparisons while preserving participant confidentiality.

These studies are a beginning, not the final word. The samples were small: 40 participants in Study 1 and 24 in Study 2. Outcomes were self-reported and therefore sensitive to expectancy, interpretation, mood, and reporting preference. The baseline/spoken/sung sequence may also reflect time, practice, order, and carryover. Study 1's group-level first-to-last calculation is descriptive rather than an individual causal estimate. Study 2 used a purpose-created five-measure positive-outcome index rather than an identified validated instrument.

Study 2's relational reports are pastorally valuable, but they cannot establish why children or descendants acted differently. Reports of spiritual warfare preserve participants' genuine interpretation without independently verifying a spiritual mechanism. Neither study separately isolated melody, breath, repetition, social reinforcement, expectancy, or worshipful intention. These are clear targets for stronger future research.

These limits define the claims; they do not erase the pattern. Both active modes moved above baseline, and singing was strongest in both studies. The responsible conclusion is confident but bounded: the measurable outcomes were consistent with the predicted theological and practical thesis. Better-powered, controlled, and replicated studies can now test that foundation more rigorously.

16. Putting the Findings into Faithful Practice

16.1 For biblical and manuscript scholarship

The argument calls scholars to examine lexical distributions rather than isolated glosses. The Cochin manuscripts should be studied directly, with diplomatic transcription, folio references, morphology, and comparison across Greek, Syriac, and other Hebrew witnesses. Their early modern date and layered history require caution, but not dismissal. The earlier Cochin study's limited claim remains the right foundation: these are late copies with signs of a stratified Semitic tradition whose readings merit passage-level evaluation.

16.2 For clergy and pastoral practice

Clergy can teach congregants to move from silent reading to audible proclamation and from proclamation to simple scriptural song. The practice need not depend on performance skill. A short passage may be read carefully, spoken in prayer, and sung on a simple melody for fifteen minutes.

Pastoral framing should keep God at the center, avoid promises of automatic outcomes, and invite participants to attend to meaning rather than chase sensation.

16.3 For worship leaders

Worship leaders can recover Scripture song as more than a decorative refrain. Melody can serve exact scriptural language, communal memory, and theological formation. Repetition should deepen understanding rather than empty words of meaning. Spaces can be created for sung lament, sung intercession, sung proclamation, and sung victory. The canon's range extends beyond celebration.

16.4 For families and serious general readers

Families can select passages connected to covenant identity, peace, reconciliation, protection, hope, faithfulness, and obedience. The practice may begin by reading the passage in context, recognizing the promise or command as God's Word, responding in prayer, speaking it aloud, and then singing it as praise and worship. Individuals who do not consider themselves singers can chant, use a narrow melodic range, or repeat a natural phrase. The purpose is not aesthetic achievement or an attempt to compel an outcome. It is sustained, embodied covenant remembrance before God. Fifteen minutes makes the practice accessible; regularity makes it formative.

17. Speak the Word. Sing the Victory.

The cumulative case supports a bounded conclusion. Scripture portrays God's Word as active and presents speech and song as forms of proclamation, remembrance, worship, perseverance, and testimony. The lexical field of *zāmar*, its purposeful Piel worship forms, the Song of the Sea, the renewed covenant offered through Yeshua, and the Cochin Hebrew New Testament's distinctive renderings contribute to a theological account of speaking and singing Scripture. The two applied studies do not establish that singing Scripture is inherently or universally more powerful than speaking it, but they do show that, in these participant groups and under these study conditions, both active practices were associated with improvement, and the strongest measured outcomes occurred during singing. Power-of-God-singing therefore remains a theological proposal supported by converging biblical interpretation, manuscript observations, and preliminary outcome evidence rather than a scientifically demonstrated causal mechanism.

The two applied studies converge with that category. In Study 1, 40 participants completed a 15-day baseline, spoken, and sung comparison. Speaking improved overall by 2.6%; singing improved by 11.5%, approximately 4.4 times the reported improvement. In Study 2, 24 participants prayed for children and descendants. Speaking scored 13.7% above baseline; singing scored 16.1% above baseline, and singing was approximately 5% higher on spiritual inspiration. Both studies used only fifteen minutes per day.

These findings do not turn worship into a controllable formula, and the study designs cannot isolate divine causation. Their contribution is preliminary but identifiable: both studies produced measurable outcomes in the predicted order, with baseline lowest, speaking higher, and singing highest. This repeated pattern supports replication with stronger controls, transparent calculations, validated measures where appropriate, counterbalanced or parallel-group designs, and follow-up assessment. It also establishes a practical hypothesis worthy of further study: a brief, disciplined practice of speaking and singing Scripture may be associated with meaningful changes in self-reported well-being, spiritual inspiration, perseverance, and relational hope.

God—not music—is the power. Melody does not replace the Word; it carries it. Breath does not summon an impersonal force; it serves proclamation. Repetition does not compel heaven; it deepens remembrance. Embodiment does not manufacture the Spirit; it offers the whole person in worship. Faith does not trust a technique; it trusts the God whose Word is spoken and sung. This is song as proclamation and worship that remembers victory.

Readers, congregations, families, and research groups are invited to test this practice for themselves using a transparent version of the study design. Participants may record a baseline, practice speaking selected Scripture aloud for fifteen minutes daily, and then practice singing the same passages for the same duration, while consistently recording the same outcomes throughout each phase. Those conducting informal personal or congregational trials should describe their experiences cautiously and avoid treating perceived changes as proof of causation. More formal replications should preserve the passages, timing, measures, adherence records, and scoring procedures; protect participant confidentiality; report missing data and results transparently; and use stronger controls where possible. Independent replication across larger and more diverse groups would help determine whether the reported ordering—baseline lowest, speaking higher, and singing highest—appears reliably in other settings.

The call is direct. Read Scripture attentively. Speak it aloud with understanding. Sing it with faith, even on the simplest melody. Give the Word regular time in the mouth, ear, memory, body, and household. Begin with fifteen minutes, while future research tests what longer practice may yield. The outcome is not guaranteed, but the practice is faithful: God is the source, Scripture is the message, and the voice is an instrument of proclamation and worship. Put the Word on your lips. Give it breath. Give it melody. Speak the Word. Sing the victory.

Bibliography

- New Revised Standard Version Updated Edition*. National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA, 2021.
- Baca, Janice F. *Power of God Singing: In the Hebrew New Testament*. Primedia eLaunch LLC, published November 12, 2025. ISBN 979-8-90119-426-3.
- Baca, Janice F. “The Renewed Covenant: The Covenant of Friendship with Elohim—Blood Covenant Offered through Yeshua.” Academia.edu, January 2025.
- Baca, Janice F. *The Scroll of Mysteries: Cochin Hebrew Revelation*. 3rd ed. Hondo, TX: Independently published, 2024.
- Baca, Janice F. “The Cochin Hebrew New Testament Manuscripts at Cambridge (MS Oo.1.32, Oo.1.16.1, Oo.1.16.2): Late Copies with Signs of an Early Semitic Tradition.” *European Hebrew Journal* 1, no. 1 (2026): 32–77.
- Berlin, Adele. *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Botterweck, G. Johannes, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974–2021.
- Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2015.
- Cambridge University Library. “Hebrew Translation of the New Testament, MS Oo.1.32.” Cambridge Digital Library. Accessed August 14, 2026.
<https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-OO-00001-00032>.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm, and Samuel Prideaux Tregelles. *Gesenius’ Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1979.
- Gordon, Cyrus H. “New Directions.” *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 15 (1978): 59.
- Joüon, Paul, and Takamitsu Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2005.
- Köhler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Noegel, Scott B. *Janus Parallelism in the Book of Job*. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series* 223. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Smith, Mark S., and Wayne T. Pitard. *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle*. Vol. 2. *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 114. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- unfoldingWord. “Stem Piel.” *unfoldingWord Hebrew Grammar*. Accessed August 14, 2026.
https://uhg.readthedocs.io/en/latest/stem_piel.html.

