

## NOTES AND STUDIES

### PRIMITIVE LECTIONARY NOTES IN THE PSALM OF HABAKKUK.

THE Psalm or 'Prayer' of Habakkuk (Hab. iii) has been described as 'a lyric ode, which, for sublimity of poetic conception and splendour of diction, ranks with the finest . . . which Hebrew poetry has produced'.<sup>1</sup> Church and Synagogue have shewn their appreciation of its grand imagery by the large use which they have made of it in their services. As a *canticle* it is still appointed to be sung weekly at Lauds in the Greek and Latin Churches,<sup>2</sup> and already in the fifth century it appears in the Codex Alexandrinus in a collection of ecclesiastical canticles appended to the Psalter. But it bears on its face the marks of a similar use in far earlier times in the Jewish services; I refer to the musical terms which stand in the superscription and colophon, and the thrice-repeated 'Selah' which divides it into four portions. It has been aptly called a *Psalmus extra canonem*. It was not, however, only as a chant that it found a place in Jewish worship. It was read as well as sung, being appropriated in very early times as a *lesson* for one of the chief Festivals, and some long-observed rubrics with regard to this primitive lectionary use will form the subject of this paper. I have recovered, if I am not mistaken, no less than three such notes in this short chapter of nineteen verses. One discovery has led on to another, and the material has grown under my hands. The paper was originally planned as a note on the subscription to one of the old Greek versions, before I had discovered the full content and bearings of the Hebrew text which I had restored, or the other rubrics which elucidate and supplement it. The three lectionary glosses are interdependent. The discovery of their true nature not only removes from the text a notorious stumblingblock, but will also, I venture to think, be found to throw new light on, and to compel reconsideration of some dates connected with, the origins of Jewish lectionary practice. It is astonishing that the explanation here given has not hitherto, to my knowledge, been suggested. It is true that two of the notes are found only in a little-known Greek text, which has received scanty attention, but the third—the 'stumblingblock'—stands in all the texts. Before the passages in Habakkuk are considered, some preliminary observations will be necessary on two points:

<sup>1</sup> Driver *LOT*<sup>2</sup> 317.

<sup>2</sup> Swete *Introd. to O. T.* 254, *Dict. Christ. Ant. s. v.* Canticle.

(1) the Greek text just referred to, (2) the extent of our knowledge of the origin of the public reading of Scripture in the Jewish services.

The Psalm of Habakkuk has this further peculiarity that two independent Greek versions of it have come down to us. Besides the so-called 'Septuagint' version contained in the majority of the MSS and printed in the Cambridge Manual edition, there is a second, represented by a small group of four MSS, known as V-86-62-147. The first two are Italian MSS of about the ninth century, preserved respectively at Venice and in the Barberini collection in Rome; the other two are thirteenth-century MSS now at Oxford. I shall for convenience refer to the text of this group as *the Barberini text*, since cod. 86 (which has the peculiarity of containing the 'LXX' text as well) preserves a rather purer form of it than the coeval Venice MS, while the Oxford MSS are of later date. This eccentric version is printed consecutively by E. Klostermann<sup>1</sup> and piecemeal in Field's Hexapla. All four MSS contain a note appended to the Psalm, in which an early reader has recorded his discovery that the text is not identical with that of 'the Seventy' or of any of the three later Jewish translators, and has suggested that its source is perhaps to be looked for in one of the other anonymous versions known to Origen.<sup>2</sup> But the extant fragments of these anonymous versions are sufficient to prove that neither *Quinta* nor *Sexta* is responsible for this erratic text. The group V-86-62-147 represents therefore a version of uncertain and probably early origin. Its antiquity may be inferred from several characteristics: independence of the 'LXX', its occasional witness to an underlying Hebrew differing from the MT and from the exemplar of the 'LXX', its free and paraphrastic style in the manner of the first Greek translator of Job,<sup>3</sup> its peculiar vocabulary and quaint renderings, and lastly the presence of the lectionary notes referred to below. I believe that, like the Chigi Daniel, the Barberini Psalm of Habakkuk is the oldest Greek version, which was afterwards superseded and narrowly escaped being lost altogether. 'Independence of the LXX' holds good, I think, even of the opening verses, notwithstanding a curious approximation of the two texts in this portion. In fact, for the first two and a half verses, down to the first 'Selah', they are, with the exception of three words, identical. The numerous doublets in these verses suggest that this is the result of 'conflation'; the texts have been welded together, and it is possible to some extent to trace the handiwork of either translator. After that

<sup>1</sup> *Analecta sur Septuaginta* 50 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Τὴν φῶδὴν τοῦ ἀμβρακοῦ μ οὐχ εὖρον συμφωνοῦσαν (sic) οὔτε τοῖς ὀ οὔτε ἀκύλα οὔτε συμμάχῳ οὔτε θεοδοσίαν· ζητήσεις οὖν, εἰ τῆς εἴ η̄ τῆς ε̄ ἐκδώσεως ἐστίν.

<sup>3</sup> Ἐφαίσιος, e. g., occurs twice in the Barberini Hab., nine times in Job LXX, and nowhere else in the Greek Bible.

point the versions widely diverge, though there are slight indications here also in a few verses and in certain MSS<sup>1</sup> of a similar process. It should be added that outside Hab. iii these MSS contain indeed a very valuable text,<sup>2</sup> but one conforming generally to known types; the eccentricity of text which refuses to be brought under recognized categories seems to be restricted to that chapter.

As regards *Jewish lectionary practice* I have had the advantage of valuable counsel from Mr I. Abrahams, University Reader in Talmudic at Cambridge, and have also derived great assistance from Dr Büchler's classical articles on 'The Triennial Reading of the Law and the Prophets' in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*,<sup>3</sup> to which Mr Abrahams drew my attention. It will be well here to summarize Dr Büchler's results, in so far as they bear directly on the subject of this paper. (i) The public reading of *the Law* began with short lessons on the great Festivals. In Dr Büchler's opinion, 'it was the Samaritans who gave the occasion for the first step. . . . They showed their religious animosity chiefly in their deviation from the ordinary explanation of those portions of the Pentateuch which concern the festivals. . . . The people had to be taught by the Palestinian scholars how to meet their attack; this could not be better achieved, or in a simpler manner, than by reading and explaining the disputed passages in the Pentateuch on the Festivals themselves which had been made the subject of controversy.'<sup>4</sup> This beginning took place about 200 B.C. The primitive Festival lessons were all taken from a single chapter, Lev. xxiii, which consists of a catalogue of 'set feasts'; the appropriate verses were read on the several Feast-days. The Mishna expressly enacts that passages from this chapter should be read on three of the Feasts (Passover, New Year's Day, Tabernacles),<sup>5</sup> and that the same rule once held good of all of them is made probable by the Sifra (second century A.D.) which infers from the last verse of the chapter 'And Moses declared unto the children of Israel the set feasts of the Lord' that Moses taught on each Festival those laws which were special to it.<sup>6</sup> Though the earliest recorded lesson for Pentecost is taken not from Lev. xxiii, but from the parallel passage Deut. xvi 9 ff, Dr Büchler is convinced that this must have superseded an older lesson from Lev. xxiii 15 ff. The fact that Lev. xxiii 15 contains a phrase about

<sup>1</sup> And, notably, in the earliest printed text of the LXX (the Complutensian Polyglott) which represents on the whole the Lucianic recension.

<sup>2</sup> 'The MSS 62-147 contain Lucianic readings, but their singular element is often akin to the Old Latin,' Burkitt *Tyconius* cviii.

<sup>3</sup> v 420-468, vi 1-73. Cf. also Dr E. G. King's article on 'The Influence of the Triennial Cycle upon the Psalter' in *J.T.S.* v 203 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *J.Q.R.* v 424.

<sup>5</sup> *Ib.* 429.

<sup>6</sup> *Ib.* 424.

which controversy waxed warmest ('the morrow of the Sabbath') may account for the later substitution of the Deut. passage from which it is absent. (ii) The next stage was the introduction of weekly Sabbath readings and of the Triennial Cycle. The whole Law was divided into portions averaging rather more than one of our chapters and read through once in three years. An ancient division of the Pentateuch into 154 or more Sedarim (traditions vary as to their number and extent) has come down to us, and these have commonly been identified with the lessons in the Triennial Cycle. The arrangement of lessons in the Cycle produced certain traditions with regard to the dates of events described in the Pentateuch. The Decalogue was read at Pentecost; hence the tradition grew up that it was given at Pentecost. From similar traditions and with the help of the Sedarim Dr Büchler has conclusively proved that the starting-point of the Cycle was the 1st Nisan, and the lessons for the several sabbaths in the three years have thus been, at least approximately, determined. In the Cycle arrangement, the Festivals, like ordinary Sabbaths, had lessons allotted to them, so that there were now, in addition to the old special lesson from Lev. xxiii, three calendar lessons assigned to each of those days. The calendar lessons for Pentecost in the three years are estimated<sup>1</sup> to have been (1) Gen. xii 1 ff<sup>2</sup> (the call of Abraham); (2) Ex. xx<sup>3</sup> (the Decalogue); (3) Numb. xvii 16 (EV xvii 1) ff (Aaron's rod). (iii) The Triennial Cycle, which was in use in Palestine in the time of Christ, and continued in use long after in a few districts in Egypt, was generally replaced by the Babylonian or Annual Cycle of 54 lessons from the Law; the new system was, according to Büchler, probably introduced by Rab about 200 A. D., and soon became practically universal. (iv) The Haphtarahs or *Prophetical lessons* began with the reading on the Festivals of a single verse illustrating or corroborating the Torah lesson; their length was gradually increased. The growth of the Haphtarah will come up again in connexion with Habakkuk. The earliest lessons were taken from Ezekiel and the Minor Prophets, which afforded the more apposite passages for use in the controversy concerning the festivals and the Temple worship. The lectionary employment of Isaiah only came in later. There is no documentary evidence to shew whether the institution of the Festival Haphtarahs goes back to pre-Christian times. These results of

<sup>1</sup> See the large diagram in the article 'Triennial Cycle' in vol. xii of the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, and compare Dr King's Table I in *J.T.S. loc. cit.*

<sup>2</sup> Others say Gen. xi (the confusion of tongues), which would throw light on the events of Pentecost described in Acts ii.

<sup>3</sup> But see below: Ex. xix was certainly included at an early date, and apparently Ex. xviii as well.

<sup>4</sup> *J.Q.R.* vi 6, 38.

Dr Büchler, here very briefly set out, strikingly corroborate much of what follows in this paper, and in turn receive corroboration in many points from the glosses in Habakkuk. In one particular at least I venture to think that I can supplement Dr Büchler. The origin of the Haphtarahs proves to be more ancient than he supposed.

A few words must be added on what affords the clue to the Habakkuk passages, namely the Jewish system of *lectionary catchwords*. The foot-notes which appear in the Prophets in printed editions of the Hebrew Bible shew the system as applied to the Babylonian or annual calendar of Torah lessons. At the beginning of each Haphtarah or Prophetic lesson stands a catchword or catchwords indicating the Parashah or Torah lesson appointed to be read on the same day. The catchword is either the first word or words of the Torah lesson or, where that lesson opens with a recurrent formula, the first significant word. Occasionally, where the same Prophetic passage is read on two sabbaths, there are two catchwords: thus on Jer. i 1 we read 'Haphtarah of "And these are the names" (Ex. i 1) and also Haphtarah of "Heads of Tribes" (Numb. xxx 2)'. Haphtarahs for the Festivals have prefixed to them merely the name of the Festival, which here replaces the usual cross-reference to the Torah lesson: thus (Jos. v 2) 'Haphtarah of the first day of Passover'. This system, as already stated, is based on the later annual cycle, and it is of course not to be expected that it will in all points correspond to the earliest system or that the catchwords to the longer Torah lessons will often coincide with any which may have been employed in (say) the second century B.C., when the lessons from the Law were shorter. But that the Torah was already in the time of Christ divided into sections, with appropriate titles which could be used as references, may be inferred from phrases like ἐπὶ τῆς βάλτου 'in the Bush passage' (Lc. xx 37), ἐν Ἠλεία (Rom. xi 2), with which we may compare the Rabbinical name for Ez. i 'the Chariot'; these titles perhaps suggest that in the earliest period Torah lessons would be indicated rather by a word descriptive of their contents or one representing the predominant idea of the passage than by the actual opening word or words. These preliminary observations, necessarily somewhat long, put us in a position to consider the passages in Habakkuk.

(i) Hab. iii 9 בִּשְׂבָעוֹת מִטּוֹת אֶמֶר

These three words are a well-known *crux*. As Dr Davidson writes in the *Cambridge Bible*, they 'form a riddle which all the ingenuity of scholars has not been able to solve. Delitzsch calculates that a hundred

translations of them have been offered'.<sup>1</sup> He himself leaves the words untranslated, with the remark that 'the multiplication of conjectures would serve no purpose'. Rash as may be the venture, where so many conflicting interpretations have been suggested by eminent scholars, I propose to add yet another to their number, and am bold enough to think that I have had the good fortune to find the key to the conundrum. I differ in this from most of my predecessors, in that I do not propose either to tamper with the *unpointed* text or to give forced meanings to the words. I shall attempt to explain the text as it stands, not however as a line of poetry, but as an intrusive prosaic gloss. A line which has been tortured with little success to make it fit into the poem proves to be a highly illuminating rubric!

Among the multitude of renderings hitherto offered, the following may be selected as those of authoritative Bible versions in ancient and modern times and of leading commentators in this country and in Germany:—

Barberini text	ἐχόρτασας <sup>2</sup> βολίδας τῆς φαρέτρας αὐτοῦ. <sup>3</sup>
'LXX'	† ἐπὶ τὰ† <sup>4</sup> σκήπτρα λέγει (τ) Κύριος (χ). <sup>5</sup>
AV	according to the oaths of the tribes, <i>even thy</i> word.
RVtxt	The oaths to the tribes were a <i>sure</i> word.
RVmg	Sworn were the chastisements (Heb. rods) of <i>thy</i> word.
R. Sinker	Sworn are the punishments of the <i>solemn</i> decree. <sup>6</sup>
G. A. Smith	Thou gluttest (?) <i>Thy</i> shafts. <sup>7</sup>
D. W. Nowack	Gesättigt mit Geschossen hast du <i>deinen</i> Köcher. <sup>7</sup>
B. Duhm	Der Schwarm <i>deiner</i> Zornesspeere. <sup>8</sup>

These are all ingenious attempts to construct a connected and apposite sentence out of the three nouns, which in the Hebrew stand nakedly beside each other without preposition, suffix, epithet, or other adjunct. The italics (for which in three of the modern renderings I am responsible) indicate the difficulty of the task without resort to

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Nowack (*Handkomm. zum A. T.*): v. 9<sup>b</sup> 'spottet bei dem vorliegenden Text jeder Erklärung'.

<sup>2</sup> + τὰς V.

<sup>3</sup> αὐτῆς V.

<sup>4</sup> ἐπὶ τὰ is a corruption of ἐπὶ τὰ, as Nestle acutely observed (*Z. A. T. W.*, 1900, 167 f). The corruption appears already in the Old Latin of the Mozarabic Breviary: 'super sceptris, dicit Dominus', *J. T. S.* vi 219. In B<sup>N</sup>, &c., which omit τὰ, corruption has gone still further.

<sup>5</sup> Κύριος is obelized in the Syro-hexaplar.

<sup>6</sup> Comparing Is. xi 4 'the rod of his mouth', xxx 32.

<sup>7</sup> After the Barberini text.

<sup>8</sup> Emending the first and third words to ἡνθῶς (multitude), ἡνθῶς (thy wrath), and giving the second an unparalleled meaning.

imagination. The palm for ingenuity should perhaps be awarded to the first version, which has found modern imitators. This old Greek translator has constructed a clause in keeping with the preceding line (RV 'Thy bow was made quite bare') and rising almost to the level of the wonderful imagery of the poem. His *ἐχόρτσας* (שָׁבַעַת) is distinctly attractive; *βολίδας*, however, raises doubts, since 'rods' are not the same things as 'shafts' or 'arrows'; the sequel will shew that his last words are not such pure guess-work as at first sight they appear to be. If we set aside this attractive but untenable rendering, I think that any reader of Hab. iii will see how sadly the description of the Theophany is marred by any other version of those quoted. The whole clause is, as I have ventured to suggest, nothing more than a note which has crept into the text, written in the short-hand style characteristic of glossators. The particular form of short-hand here employed was, moreover, one quite familiar to the Massoretic school. What we did not know before is its great antiquity. It is the catchword system already mentioned. We will take the words one by one.

שָׁבַעַת, with the Massoretic pointing, means 'oaths', and this is the commonly accepted rendering in this passage. I have no doubt that the word should be pointed שָׁבַעַת (שָׁבַעַת), i. e. 'Weeks', as in e. g. Ex. xxxiv 22 חַג שָׁבַעַת 'Feast of Weeks'. This is suggested by the original text of the 'LXX', ἑπτά. Moreover, the clue to the interpretation of the word is afforded by a note subjoined in editions of the Hebrew Bible to Hab. ii 20, which has curiously escaped notice. That note runs—

הַפְּטָרָה לְיוֹם ב' שֶׁל שְׁבֻעוֹת

i. e. 'Haphtarah for day two of Weeks'. This with the correlative note at the end of iii 19 (עַד כֹּהֵן) informs us that the whole of chap. iii together with the last *v.* of chap. ii is and has for long been appointed as the Prophetic lesson for the second day of the Feast of Weeks or Pentecost. The note, which is of uncertain and not necessarily *very* ancient date,<sup>1</sup> was written at a time when the Feast, which originally lasted but one day, had been prolonged into a second.<sup>2</sup> We have, however, documentary evidence, carrying us right back to the second century of our era, which informs us that even at that early date a lesson from Habakkuk was read at Pentecost. A Baraita (or Tannaite tradition 'external' to the Mishna<sup>3</sup>), which, as I have the authority of Mr Abrahams for saying, cannot be later than 200 A. D., informs us of the

<sup>1</sup> The earliest MS of those used by Dr Ginsburg (*Liber Duodecim Proph.*, 1910) which contains it is dated c. 1350 A. D. In the MSS it appears as a note on iii 1, but reference is made to the practice of some congregations of beginning the lesson at ii 20.

<sup>2</sup> Hastings *D.B.* iii 742<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> See Oesterley and Box *Religion and Worship of the Synagogue* 60. The Tannaim flourished between 10 and 220 A. D. : *ib.* 55.

existence of two sets of Lessons for Pentecost : (1) Deut. xvi 9 ff 'Seven weeks . . .' with Habakkuk (passage unspecified), and, according to other authorities, (2) Ex. xix 1 ff 'In the third month . . .' with Ez. i 'the Chariot'; and the writer goes on to say that 'at the present time', as there are two days to the Feast, 'we' make use of both sets of lessons.<sup>1</sup> The lessons themselves here clearly belong to the Baraitha, not to the later Aramaic comment, and they go back apparently to a period before the institution of the second day of Weeks. I think we have evidence to shew that the observance of the second day was instituted before, probably shortly before, 100 B. C. Accepting Dr Charles's date for the Book of Jubilees (between 135 and 96 B. C.),<sup>2</sup> surely we may infer from the emphasis there laid upon the single day of the Feast that the introduction of a second day was a recent innovation, made (it appears) for the benefit of the Dispersion; the calendar, as Dr Charles points out,<sup>3</sup> was in an unsettled state at the time of writing. We thus have express evidence for referring the practice of reading a lesson from Habakkuk at Pentecost back to the second century A. D., and some warrant, though of a slighter kind, for carrying it right back to the second century B. C., the century in which the 'LXX' version was produced. The exact passage of Habakkuk is not specified in the Baraitha, but, in view of later Jewish practice, we may confidently affirm that the third chapter is intended.

This early evidence tends strongly to confirm the rendering which I have suggested for the first word in Hab. iii 9<sup>b</sup>. If this rendering is right, we note first that the old Pentecost lesson is a shorter one than that now appointed to be read. It ends in the middle of the chapter. For the position of the note seems to indicate not the beginning, but the end, of the lesson. This is made probable by two considerations. (1) It will be observed that a break was also made at this point when the passage was sung; the three puzzling words are immediately followed by the second 'Selah'.<sup>4</sup> (2) It was the opening verses, 'God came

<sup>1</sup> The passage occurs in *B. Meg.* 31 *a* and runs as follows:—

בעצרת שבעה שבועות (Deut. xvi 9) ומפטירין בחבקוק (Hab.) אחרים אומרים בחדש השלישי (Ex. xix 1) ומפטירין במרכבה (Ez. i) והאידנא דאיכה תרי יומי עבדינן כתרוייהו. Cf. *J.Q.R.* vi 16 ff on the whole Baraitha.

<sup>2</sup> Engl. trans., 1902, lix. The passage referred to is *Jub.* vi 17-22: 'For this reason it is ordained and written on the heavenly tables, that they should celebrate the feast of weeks in this month once a year, to renew the covenant every year. . . . One day in the year in this month they shall celebrate the festival. . . . thou shouldst celebrate it in its season, one day in the year . . . one day in every year.' Dr Charles misses what I take to be the point of this insistence on 'one day'.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.* lxvi.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Briggs *Psalms* 1 lxxxv ff for the tendency in certain minor collections in the Psalter to place Selah at the end of a gloss. 'If [the Elohist editor] added any Selahs to his Psalter, he did so only at the close of gl[osse]s.'

from Teman and the Holy One from Mount Paran', which gave the Habakkuk passage its special appropriateness for Pentecost. For they recalled the allusion to the lawgiving in the blessing of Moses, 'The Lord came from Sinai . . . He shined forth from Mount Paran, and he came from the ten thousands of holy ones : at his right hand was a fiery law unto them' (Deut. xxxiii 2), and Pentecost was regarded as the day when the Law was given. We have already observed that this tradition originated in the reading of Ex. xx at Pentecost in the course of the Triennial Cycle. The word Shabuoth in Hab. informs us therefore of this further fact, that the Triennial Cycle of lessons was already established in the second century B. C., as the 'LXX' version which dates from that century already contained the lectionary note.<sup>1</sup>

Granted, however, that שבועות here means 'Weeks', two explanations of the word are still open to us. It may, on the one hand, express, in curter fashion, what is more fully stated in the note in the printed Bibles, 'This is the lesson' or 'Here ends the lesson for Weeks'. In that case, as 'Weeks' is considered a sufficiently distinctive rubric, the Feast at the time of writing was presumably a one-day Feast. On the other hand, it may be a catchword to the corresponding lesson to be read from the Law. In the absence of early evidence for a similar note indicating by a single word the Festival for which the lesson is appointed, and in view of the two following words, which, I have no doubt, are catchwords, I incline to the latter explanation. The Torah lesson thus indicated is doubtless the lesson denoted in the Baraitha and in the Mishna<sup>2</sup> 'Seven weeks' (Deut. xvi 9-12). The 'seven' of the 'LXX' and the 'weeks' of the MT suggest that either of the two words could serve as catchword, or else that one of them has dropped out; the numeral, if expressed by the letter ז, might easily be lost. We conclude then that this word, the position of which alone sufficiently marks the end of the Pentecost Haphtarah, also tells us what was the *special lesson* from the Law appointed for Pentecost in the second century B. C.

סִפּוֹת has only two known meanings, 'Tribes' and 'Rods'. Commentators have sought in vain for an explanation of this abrupt reference to the tribes of Israel in the middle of a lyric description of a theophany of surpassing grandeur. Others have had recourse to the alternative meaning 'staves', which they have supposed may here stand for 'spears' or 'arrows', renderings for which there is no parallel. Now it so happens that 'Tribes' or 'Heads of tribes' (ראשי המטות) is a catchword in the Babylonian lectionary system, where it indicates the Torah

<sup>1</sup> The Samaritans as well as the Jews read the Decalogue on Shabuoth, *J.Q.R.* v 442. This seems to indicate a still higher antiquity for the origin of the Triennial Cycle.

<sup>2</sup> *Meg.* iii 5.

lesson beginning (Numb. xxx 2 [EV 1])<sup>1</sup> 'And Moses spake unto the heads of the tribes' and extending to the end of Numb. xxxii. But we cannot equate the catchwords of the Babylonian system with those of the older triennial arrangement of lessons. We have, however, already noticed, that the Pentecost lesson in the third year of the Triennial Cycle began at Numb. xvii 16 (Heb.)=xvii 1 (EV). That passage opens with the words: 'And the Lord spake unto Moses saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and take of them rods (מטה מטה) . . . twelve rods (מטות).' It is the passage about Aaron's rod that budded, and RODS is writ large over the whole eleven verses; no more suitable title could be used to describe its contents. Surely here we have the clue to the much debated 'Rods' in Habakkuk. The word tells us what was the *ordinary lesson* from the Law which in the round of the Triennial Cycle fell to be read at Pentecost in the *third year*.

אָמַר, i.e. 'Word', completes the gloss in the MT. Here again we must not be misled by a similar catchword in the Annual Cycle. אָמַר, 'Speak', is the catchword used in the Babylonian system to denote the Torah lesson beginning (Lev. xxi 1) 'And the Lord said unto Moses, Speak . . .' and extending to the end of Lev. xxiv. This catchword is alluring, since we have seen that Lev. xxiii was the chapter from which all the oldest lessons were drawn. But the Annual Cycle is not so old as this, and the lesson is abnormally long for the older system.<sup>2</sup> אָמַר does not recur lower down in the long Parashah; the formula reappears, but the verb used is דַּבֵּר. It had suggested itself to me that אָמַר might be a corruption of עֶמֶר, 'sheaf', which occurs in the first verse of the primitive special lesson for Pentecost, Lev. xxiii 15; the sheaf, the offering of which marked the date from which the day of Pentecost was calculated, and which gave its name to the fifty 'Days of Omer', might aptly be used as the symbol for the section *vv.* 15-22. But this again is unsatisfactory, since we have already identified the special lesson in the word 'Weeks'; a second *special* lesson would be superfluous. This catchword is puzzling, but the 'LXX' rendering λέγει Κύριος seems to suggest the true solution. אָמַר is apparently an abbreviated form of יְהוָה אָמַר (!), the first words of Gen. xii 1, which, as we have seen, marks the beginning of the *ordinary lesson* from the Law, which in the Triennial Cycle fell to be read at Pentecost in the *first year*.

We have still to account for the Barberini reading τῆς φαρέτρας

<sup>1</sup> A Seder or Triennial lesson also begins here and extends to the end of the chapter. <sup>2</sup> Four Sedarim are comprised in Lev. xxi-xxiv (Ginsburg's text).

<sup>3</sup> Written " or in archaic characters the tetragrammaton would easily drop out, as frequently happens in the LXX. In the Babylonian system the Parashah beginning at Gen. xii 1 is denoted by the words which follow, 'Get thee out' (לך לך).

αὐτοῦ. Now, if this were, as *prima facie* it appears to be, merely guess-work, due to the mention of 'thy bow' in the previous line, we should expect to have 'thy quiver', not 'his' or 'its quiver'. But, retranslated into Hebrew, τῆς φαρέτρας αὐτοῦ is יָתֵרוֹ (Job xxx 11), and יָתֵרוֹ is Jethro, and JETHRO is the recognized catchword in the Babylonian system for the section Ex. xviii-xx which includes the Decalogue, and the connexion of the Decalogue with Pentecost is notorious! This, I have no hesitation in thinking, is the clue to the Barberini reading. The fact that the Decalogue lesson is referred to by the title which it bore in the later *annual* calendar presents no difficulty, since it appears that the Seder (or Triennial lesson) and the Parashah (or Annual lesson) were in this instance identical. In Dr Ginsburg's text,<sup>1</sup> where the Sedarim are indicated in the margin, Ex. xviii-xx forms a single Seder. The catchword JETHRO in Habakkuk in fact corroborates the evidence of the Hebrew MSS of Exodus which mark this whole section as a single Seder, and helps to remove a doubt which exists as to the point where the Pentecost lesson in the first year of the Triennial Cycle did actually begin. All are agreed that Ex. xx (the Decalogue) was read at Pentecost, and Dr Büchler<sup>2</sup> is convinced that in Palestine the lesson was restricted to that chapter. But the early Baraita already mentioned tells us that Ex. xix (Sinai and the Theophany) was also included; a local practice of reading no more than these two chapters is attested by certain MSS which place the beginning of a new Seder at xix 6.<sup>3</sup> The evidence of Habakkuk, supported by the majority of the MSS in Exodus, shews that at a very early period the Pentecost lesson included a third chapter, viz. Ex. xviii (the visit of Jethro). It appears then that, while the extent of the Pentecost lesson in the second year of the Cycle was not rigidly fixed, it was customary in some districts to read as many as three chapters; when the Cycle was arranged perhaps a longer than the ordinary Sabbath lesson was purposely allotted to each of the great Festivals. In JETHRO therefore we have the catchword for the *ordinary lesson* from the Law which in the Triennial Cycle fell to be read at Pentecost in the *second year*.

The gloss in Hab. iii 9 informs us then in the cryptic words 'WEEKS—RODS—SAID (THE LORD)', with a variant in the third place 'JETHRO', not only of the extent of the special Prophetical lesson for Pentecost,

<sup>1</sup> *Pentateuchus diligenter revisus* . . . , London 1908.

<sup>2</sup> *J.Q.R.* v 436 note 3. The uncertainty attaching to the extent of the Pentecost lesson and the whole arrangement of lessons in Exodus in the older Cycle appears in Mr. Jacobs's art. (Trienn. Cycle) in the *Jewish Encyclopædia*. In his diagram he makes 'Jethro' (Ex. xviii-xx) the lesson for the *third Sabbath before Pentecost*; for Pentecost he gives Ex. xxvi, and in brackets [xx]. In the text he writes 'On Pentecost Ex. xix was read in the second year'.

<sup>3</sup> Ginsburg *Introd. to the Massoretico-critical ed. of Heb. Bible* 36.

but also of the special lesson appointed to be read from the Law on the same day, together with the ordinary lessons which were read in each of the three years of the Cycle respectively in the second century B. C.<sup>1</sup>

(ii) Hab. iii 19 subscription (Barberini text).

There appears to be a second obscured direction with regard to the lectionary use of this chapter which has escaped detection. Rightly interpreted, as I believe, it confirms in a remarkable way the explanation already given of the note in Hab. iii 9. This rubric is concealed in the subscription to the eccentric Barberini text. As is well known, the MT, together with the Hebrew underlying the 'LXX', has at this point a subscription referring to 'the Chief Musician', connected with the use of the Psalm as a canticle. The Barberini subscription appears to have a different, i. e. a lectionary, origin.

The subscription in the three texts runs as follows:—

- (1)  $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{MT} \\ = \text{RV} \end{array} \right.$  למנצח בנגינותי.  
For the Chief Musician, on my stringed instruments.  
(2) 'LXX' . . . τοῦ νικῆσαι ἐν τῇ ψῆδῇ αὐτοῦ.  
(3) Barberini text ταχίσας<sup>2</sup> κατεπαύσατο.

Now it is beyond doubt that (2) is a mistaken rendering of (1). As in the instance which we have been considering, the translator has erroneously incorporated a rubric into the poem; this is a patent instance of this kind of transformation. That he had the MT subscription before him is established by the versions of the words 'To the Chief Musician' employed by the later Jewish translators in the Psalter. Like this translator, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion interpreted למנצח 'To the Director' in the light of the meaning of נצח in later Hebrew, viz. 'conquer', their respective renderings being τῷ νικοποιῶ, ἐπινίκιος (or -ον) and εἰς τὸ νίκος.

But is (3) also merely a mistaken rendering of (1)? So Schleusner supposes.<sup>3</sup> Dr Sinker,<sup>4</sup> the only other scholar who has, to my know-

<sup>1</sup> For the double Torah or Prophetical lessons, as explained by the Triennial Cycle, see *J. Q. R.* vi 17 ff. For an instance of three Pentecost lessons from the O. T. in a Christian lectionary, which appears to have Jewish precedent behind it, I may refer to a previous article in *J. T. S.* iv 408.

<sup>2</sup> Corrected by V to καθίσας (= καθίσας).

<sup>3</sup> Writing, s. v. ταχίζω, 'נצח' notat quoque *in cursu vincere*, while elsewhere he suggests that κατεπαύσατο may be a duplicate rendering of למנצח: 'fortasse ibi τῷ מנצח respondet, ut legerit מנצח aut מנצח.'

<sup>4</sup> *The Psalm of Habakkuk* (Cambridge 1890).

ledge, attempted to explain the Barberini subscription, doubts whether the words are to be taken as representing the Hebrew however disguised. 'I prefer', he writes, 'to consider the words to have originated as a remark appended by some scribe: the subject of the verb being the Prophet, who, his task finished, ceases.' But a remark of a glossator on the brevity of the book, taking the form 'Quickly he stopped', seems, I venture to think, somewhat unnatural and fatuous. The use of the participle is, moreover, in the manner of this translator (cf. *v.* 6 *σπὰς διεμέτρησεν . . . κατανοήσας ἐξείκασεν*). No; a Hebrew original undoubtedly underlies the words, but, and here I agree with Dr Sinker, not that of the MT. *κατεπαύσατο* might represent some form of נוח ('rest'), due to misreading of the last part of בנניוחי, but the remaining Hebrew letters are too many to account for *ταχίσας*.

Disregarding, therefore, the MT, we proceed to enquire what Hebrew original will most naturally explain the Barberini subscription. The other texts shew that the poem has ended, and ended appropriately, and anything further will be in the nature of a gloss or rubric. Now, apart from נוח, the only verb which *κατεπαύσατο* is likely to represent is שבת, and this immediately suggests that the gloss contained some reference to the Sabbath. *Ταχίσας*, again, one of the rare words characteristic of this translator,<sup>1</sup> being in fact a *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον* in Greek literature, leaves us, nevertheless, in no doubt as to its Hebrew equivalent. The Septuagint Concordance (s. v. *ταχύνειν* and its congeners) conclusively proves that it can only stand for מהר or מהרה. But מהרה 'quickly' is very easily confused with מחרת 'morrow'. Here then I think we have the clue. I suggest that the Hebrew note before the translator took the form

מחרת השבת (מ)  
i. e. מחרת השַׁבַּת (מפ')

'Morrow of the Sabbath'.

The translator read this as

מהרה השַׁבַּת(י)ת  
i. e. 'Quickly he caused to cease'.<sup>2</sup>

The object of the verb would be the enemies introduced by the translator into the previous verse<sup>3</sup> or more generally the terror (*v.* 16)

<sup>1</sup> The following are not found elsewhere in the LXX: \*διαύγασμα, \*ἐκθάλλειν, ἐξεϊμάζεω, ἐξίτηλος, \*ταχίζειν, φορά. Those marked with an asterisk are unrecorded in Liddell and Scott.

<sup>2</sup> For the mid. used transitively cf. Eur. *Hel.* 1153 and probably Job LXX xxi 34 (= 'console').

<sup>3</sup> The curious rendering of the phrase 'high places' by 'the necks of one's enemies' reappears, as Dr Sinker points out, in Deut. xxxiii 29.

which the glorious Theophany and the attendant upheaval of nature had instilled into the Prophet.

The strongest proof, to my mind, of the correctness of this restoration of the Hebrew is that it was reached by the ordinary canons of textual criticism, without forcing, and in complete ignorance of the special associations of the phrase and of the Psalm which contains it with the Feast of Weeks. I took the rubric in the first place to be an unusual mode of expressing 'For the first day of the week'. But look at it in the light of its context elsewhere and the previous lectionary note in Habakkuk. The phrase 'the morrow of the Sabbath' occurs only in the chapter of Leviticus from which we have seen that the earliest festival-lessons were drawn, and there it is used three times in connexion with the Feast of Weeks (Lev. xxiii 11, 15, 16). Two 'morrrows of the Sabbath' are mentioned in that passage. The first figures as the occasion for the waving of the sheaf of the first-fruits at the beginning of the harvest period, but also as the point of departure for calculating the second date. A direction is given (*v.* 15) to count fifty days from the morrow of the first Sabbath 'even unto the morrow after the seventh Sabbath'; the latter date marked the end of the grain harvest and was observed as the Feast of Weeks. The phrase was, moreover, in consequence of the ambiguity of the Sabbath intended, one which gave rise to heated controversy, and two distinct interpretations of its meaning were given.<sup>1</sup> It was, in Dr Büchler's opinion, controversies such as this one which brought about the institution of the festival-lessons, and we may conjecture that this particular dispute occasioned the substitution of a Pentecost lesson from Deuteronomy for the older lesson from Leviticus. 'Morrow of the Sabbath' might, like 'Weeks' in *v.* 9, be a mere indication of date, another name for Pentecost; but the objections to this explanation which I stated above in connexion with 'Weeks' hold good here also. I prefer therefore to regard it as a catchword; no catchword would so readily recall the short lesson Lev. xxiii 15-22 as this notoriously controversial phrase. Once again, then, if we penetrate behind the translator's error, we are informed that the chapter is intended for use, and we need now have no hesitation in saying, for lectionary use, at Pentecost. The new elements in this second rubric are (1) that apparently the Habakkuk lesson embraces the whole chapter, and (2) that for the first time we have a mention, in this Barberini text, of the *primitive special lesson* from the Law appointed to be read at Pentecost.

<sup>1</sup> Schürer *H. J. P.* ii 2. 37, Hastings *D. B.* iii 740 f, *J. Q. R.* v 425.

(iii) Hab. iii 3: the first 'Selah'.

(1) MT	הָד
(2) LXX (many MSS omit)	διάψαλμα
(3) Barberini text (62-86-147)	μεταβολή διαψάλματος

We have found indications of the existence of two pre-Christian Pentecost lessons taken from Hab. iii, one comprising the whole chapter, the other limited to its first half. But this is not all; the Barberini text has apparently preserved in a disguised form an indication of a still shorter lesson. There is nothing surprising in this; it is, in fact, only what we should expect. The history of the extension of the Haphtarah from a single verse to several verses makes it *a priori* probable that the eight-verse lesson was preceded by a still briefer one. There are, moreover, several reasons for seeking the close of the primitive lesson in the middle of *v.* 3. The first Selah occurs at that point, and we have already found that the position of the second Selah coincides with the close of a lesson. The curious conflation of the two Greek texts ceases at the same point. Lastly, the word *μεταβολή* in the Barberini text requires explanation.

*Μεταβολή διαψάλματος* may, on the one hand, be a mere periphrasis for Selah, or *μεταβολή* may represent a second Hebrew word. Two facts have here to be considered: (1) Patristic explanations of *διάψαλμα*, (2) the Barberini use of periphrasis. (1) Among other explanations of *διάψαλμα* there occurs in three Patristic passages,<sup>1</sup> from whence it is copied by the old Lexicographers, the definition *μέλους μεταβολή* (or *ἐναλλαγή*). The earliest of these passages<sup>2</sup> is attributed to Hippolytus, but appears really to emanate from Origen. *Prima facie*, the writer seems to be giving expression to his own conjectures, not repeating an older tradition. Were this so, there might be *some* reason for regarding the Barberini text of Hab. as not earlier than the third century A.D. But there is at least one trace of the Barberini text in Irenaeus,<sup>3</sup> and

<sup>1</sup> Theodoret (*Migne P. G.* 80. 864), Origen (*P. G.* 12. 1057 = ed. Lommatzsch, xi 355 f), and pseudo-Hippolytus (*P. G.* 10. 720).

<sup>2</sup> The following is the text in *Migne (P. G.* 10. 720), the bracketed words being added from the longer and apparently glossed text in the Berlin edition of Hippolytus (I ii 142): 'Ἐπεὶ δὲ εὐρομεν παρὰ τοῖς ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ θεοδοσίῳ καὶ Συμμάχῳ ἐπὶ τῶν κείμενων ἐν μέσῳ ψαλμῶν οὐκ ὀλίγων τὸ 'διάψαλμα', ἔστοχασάμεθα μήποτε ὑπεσήμαναν οἱ θέντες αὐτὸ ῥυθμοῦ τινος ἢ μέλους [ἢ μέρους] μεταβολὴν γεγονέναι κατὰ τοὺς τόπους [ἢ κρουμάτων ἀνακαυχῆν, ἢ καὶ ἐποχὴν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος μάλιστα, ἢ, ὡς ἄλλοι φησὶ τῶν ἐξηγημένων, ἀπὸ νόηματος εἰς νόημα μεταβολήν,] ἢ καὶ τρόπον διδασκαλίας εἰς ἕτερον τρόπον ἢ διανοίας ἢ (Berlin ed. καὶ) δυνάμεως λόγου ἐνάλλαγμα.

<sup>3</sup> 'Deus ab Africo (= Barb. ἀπὸ λιβός: LXX ἐκ Θαιμάν) veniet, et sanctus de monte Effrem,' iii 20. 4 (Stieren). These words come from the 'conflate' portion; there is no other authority for Ἐφραΐμ; the rest of the quotation follows LXX. Cf. p. 192.

we are not justified in assuming that Origen (if it is he) had no older tradition behind him. The commentator seems to have no doubt that *διάψαλμα* refers to some kind of 'change' (*μεταβολή, ἐνάλλαγμα*); his own speculations apparently concern only the particular kind of change intended. It is quite possible, then, that the explanation of *διάψαλμα* as a *μεταβολή* is ultimately derived from the Barberini text in Habakkuk. (2) The Barberini translator is periphrastic and occasionally uses two or more Greek words to render a single Hebrew word (e.g. *v. 3 τὴν εὐπρέπειαν τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ = וְיוֹרָה, v. 11 τὸ φέγγος τῆς σελήνης = פֶּהַר*); but in these cases the second word is a synonym of, or contains an idea naturally suggested by, the primary word. *Μεταβολὴ διαψάλματος* seems to stand on rather a different footing; each word has a fullness of meaning of its own. That the words are a rendering of two Hebrew words is also suggested by the only parallel Biblical use of an oblique case of *διάψαλμα*: *ψδὴ διαψάλματος = סֵלָה הַיְיִן ψ ix 17*.

It is probable, therefore, that *Selah* in the Hebrew original of the Barberini translator was preceded<sup>1</sup> by another word, which our previous experience gives ground for thinking will prove to be a catchword. Can it be accidental that in one of the only two occurrences of *μεταβολή* in the translated books of the LXX (Is. xxx 32) *ἐκ μεταβολῆς* rather strangely<sup>2</sup> corresponds to a Hebrew *וַנִּזְבַּח*, and that *וַנִּזְבַּח* is the technical name for the 'wave offering' mentioned in the first verse of the primitive Pentecost lesson in Leviticus (xxiii 15)? The Barberini text has other renderings in common with the LXX of Isaiah, and, though I cannot speak with quite the same confidence as in the previous instance, I have on the whole little hesitation in equating *μεταβολή* with the catchword WAVE OFFERING. The Barberini text in that case informs us of the extent of the *primitive Pentecost lesson from Habakkuk*, and once again refers us to the primitive Pentecost lesson from Leviticus xxiii, this time, however, by a different catchword. The translator combined the two Hebrew words and doubtless used *μεταβολή* in its musical sense of a change of tone or key.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Or replaced: *διαψάλματος* may be due to conflation with the 'LXX' text.

<sup>2</sup> Confusion with *וַנִּזְבַּח* 'to turn' may be the explanation: or is Aramaic (some derivative of *כַּנְיָן* 'two') responsible, as elsewhere in the Greek Isaiah?

<sup>3</sup> See the definition quoted in Stephanus *s. v.*: *ἡ μὲν γὰρ μεταβολὴ ἐστὶν ἐξ ὁμοίου τόνου εἰς ἀνόμοιον μετάβασις*. There is a further obvious gloss just before this 'Selah' in LXX and in cod. V in the form of a doublet, *κατασκίου θασέος* (-ως). These are not, however, catchwords, but, as Dr Sinker points out, renderings of 'Seir', a *var. lect.* for 'Paran' and probably the true reading; Paran has come from the parallel passage in Deuteronomy.

Let us now put together the rubrics, lectionary and musical, which have become attached to Hab. iii, and attempt to trace out some of the consequences which follow from the discovery of what appears to be the true nature of the former. We have :—

Superscription.—A prayer of Habakkuk the prophet upon Shigionoth.

	SPECIAL LESSON	CYCLE LESSONS	CANTICLE
v. 3	WAVE OFFERING <sup>1</sup> (Lev. xxiii 15 : Primitive S. L.)		+ Selah <sup>2</sup>
v. 9	[SEVEN] WEEKS (Deut. xvi 9 : Later S. L.)	+ RODS + <sup>3</sup> SAID [JAHWE] <sup>3</sup> (Numb. xvii 16 (1) : 3rd year) or JETHRO <sup>1</sup> (Ex. xviii 1 : 2nd year)	+ Selah <sup>4</sup>
v. 13			Selah <sup>5</sup>
v. 19 Subscr.	MORROW OF THE SABBATH <sup>1</sup> (Lev. xxiii 15 : Primitive S. L.)	or	For the director on my stringed instruments <sup>3</sup>

The nature and origin of the catchwords for the special lessons can hardly be doubted when one reads the first verse of the primitive Pentecost lesson from the Law, and of that which not long afterwards replaced it :—

Lev. xxiii 15 'And ye shall count unto you from the *morrow of the Sabbath*, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the *wave offering*; seven Sabbaths shall there be complete'.

Deut. xvi 9 'Seven weeks shalt thou number unto thee: from the time thou beginnest to put the sickle to the standing corn shalt thou begin to number *seven weeks*'.

<sup>1</sup> In Barberini text only.

<sup>2</sup> Many MSS of LXX omit, also V<sup>ext</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> Not in Barberini text.

<sup>4</sup> Many MSS of LXX omit, also V-147.

<sup>5</sup> Many MSS of LXX omit, or contain a Hexaplaric rendering: 62-86-147 also omit. The line preceding this 'Selah', which runs in the RV 'Laying bare (ערוות) the foundation even unto the neck' is undoubtedly corrupt and probably a gloss. It is curious that the line preceding the catchwords in v. 9, which is not free from difficulty, also begins with the word 'bareness' (ערייה). It is conceivable that the two lines were originally rubrics indicating a variety of local practice in different cities as to the length of the lesson; some districts ended the lesson at v. 8, some at v. 13. Compare the allusion in the Mishna (*Meg., ad mit.*) to a variety of lectionary practice, concerning the day on which the book of Esther was read, as between 'towns which have been surrounded by a wall since the days of Joshua' on the one hand and 'great cities (עיריות) and villages' on the other.

The lectionary notes illustrate in a remarkable way the gradual *extension of the Haphtarah* which we know from external evidence actually to have taken place. As Dr Büchler writes, 'the Haftaras were extended in a similar manner to that adopted in the enlargement of the Pentateuch portions, first to three verses, then to ten, finally reaching twenty-one (*J. Megilla* iv 2 ; *B. Meg.* 23 a)'; 'R. Jochanan . . . never allowed more than ten verses to be recited at a time, even if the subject did not cease there'; another Talmudic passage mentions three, five, and seven verses.<sup>1</sup> Excluding the title, which was naturally not read, the ancient lessons which we have found in Habakkuk contain respectively  $1\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $7\frac{1}{2}$ , and 18 of the modern verses. Allowing for some difference between the old Pesukim and the modern verses, these lessons curiously approximate in length to the Rabbinical standards. A Bodleian MS of the eighth century gives us yet another variety in the length of the Habakkuk lesson, which here consists of four verses (*Hab.* iii 2-5).<sup>2</sup> These differences as to the exact point where the lesson ended doubtless reflect local or temporal variety of practice. The beginning of the lesson was clearly indicated—in the Psalm of Habakkuk by the title; there was originally no corresponding indication of its close, and the amount read was left to some extent to the discretion of individual readers or synagogues. To quote Dr Büchler once more: 'The reading was made out of the prophetic book itself. Now, in order that the *מפטיר* should hit upon the suitable passage without much search, the commencement of an Haftara for a Sabbath Seder must have been marked on the margin.'<sup>3</sup> Since, then, the initial verses were so exactly described, there was no room for difference of opinion on this score. . . . The end of the prophet portion, however, was never given, hence arose numerous variations; some persons preferring to recite one verse, others two, ten, and twenty-one.'<sup>4</sup> In the light of the new evidence this statement requires slight modification. The Habakkuk evidence fully corroborates the statement that the beginning of the lesson was fixed and the end variable; but it appears that its conclusion did gradually come to be marked on the synagogue rolls, though at different points in different districts, and that the reference to the Torah Seder was placed not at the beginning but at the end.

It is not likely that a Psalm which has had such a long liturgical history has escaped *interpolations of a more substantial kind* than the addition of rubrics. The most natural place for such additions is at the beginning and the end, and in both places there are passages which

<sup>1</sup> *J. Q. R.* vi 14 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Ib.* 38 ff.

<sup>3</sup> 'Sometimes with the name of the Torah Seder', Dr Büchler adds in the text.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.* 48 n.

have been suspected of forming no part of the original poem. Duhm has suggested that they were inserted when the Psalm was adapted for use as a canticle; there is reason for thinking that they may owe their origin rather to its lectionary use. It has often been remarked that the last three verses (17-19) are incongruous with the rest of the poem.<sup>1</sup> The gist of them is 'Though the harvest and the flocks and herds have failed, yet I will rejoice in the Lord'. Clearly a very appropriate addition to a lesson for a harvest-festival. But its appropriateness becomes still greater when the verses are brought into connexion with another feature in the Pentecost service. In addition to the other Torah lessons it was customary at Pentecost to read 'the curses' from Lev. xxvi, an institution which appears to go back to the time when the old Festival lessons were introduced.<sup>2</sup> Surely the fact that a passage like Lev. xxvi 20 'For your land shall not yield her increase, neither shall the trees of the land yield their fruit'<sup>3</sup> had been read in another part of the Pentecost service accounts for the amplification of the Haphtarah by the words 'For though the fig-tree shall not blossom, neither shall fruit be in the vines; the labour of the olive shall fail, and the fields shall yield no meat'. The lesson was at the same time brought up to the maximum lectionary length and was made to end with good tidings, 'He will make me to walk upon mine high places'.<sup>4</sup> At the opening of the Psalm the words 'In wrath remember mercy' (v. 2), the only words which justify the description of the poem in the title as a 'prayer', have also been recognized to be a liturgical insertion. This addition, again, is probably to be accounted for by the reading of 'the curses', which are followed by a double assurance that God will remember His covenant (Lev. xxvi 42, 45). A suggestion may be added as to the origin of this reading of the curses. Dr Büchler regards them as a sort of natural pendant to the Decalogue.<sup>5</sup> May not the association of curses with Pentecost have originated in the fact that the words Shabuoth, 'Weeks', and Shebuoth, 'Oaths' or 'Curses', are practically identical? We see the association of ideas in a passage like

<sup>1</sup> Hymnologists have recognized their distinct character. 'The closing verses have been torn from the rest to form the essence of a large number of hymns in many languages' (G. A. Smith). 'What though no flowers the fig-tree clothe, | Though vines their fruit deny . . .' and 'Though vine nor fig-tree neither | Their wonted fruit shall bear . . .' (a stanza in a hymn by W. Cowper) are two instances.

<sup>2</sup> 'A Boraitha (*B. Meg.* 31 b) says that Ezra enacted that the curses in Lev. xxvi and Deut. xxviii should be read respectively before Shebuoth and Rosh Hashana': *J. Q. R.* v 440 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the curses in Deut. xxviii 18, 39 f ('thine olive shall cast *its fruit*').

<sup>4</sup> The custom of making the Haphtarah open and end with good tidings lacks, however, very early authority: *J. Q. R.* vi 15.

<sup>5</sup> *Ib.* v 441.

Jubilees xxii 1 'Isaac and Ishmael came from the Well of the Oath to celebrate the Feast of Weeks', and it has been suggested<sup>1</sup> that one reason for the Rabbinical substitution of a new name for the festival, **עֲזָרָה**, may have been to avoid confusion between 'Weeks' and 'Oaths'.

What is the origin of the peculiar *Barberini text*? We have seen that this Greek version preserves under a disguise no less than three lectionary notes, and that the two which are peculiar to it refer to the *primitive* Torah lesson for Pentecost. The accumulation of these notes leaves little doubt that the Hebrew original from which the version was made was a synagogue roll, while their nature indicates that the roll was a very ancient one. The roll was used for lectionary, not for singing, purposes. It did not contain the subscription 'To the Chief Musician'; owing to the conflation of texts in the opening verses we cannot say what title, if any, stood at its head; it probably had no 'Selah' in verses 9 and 13, and, were it not for *μεταβολή διαψάλματος* in verse 3, it might be held that it contained no musical notes whatever; even in the last phrase the second word *may* have come in from the LXX text. The fact that the parent Hebrew text was a synagogue roll affords some ground for thinking that the version itself may owe its origin to the public reading of the Scriptures. My belief, which I state for what it may be worth, is that it represents a version made for lectionary use at Pentecost, before the Minor Prophets were translated as a whole. I have suggested elsewhere<sup>2</sup> that the germ or nucleus of the Greek versions of some of the Prophets may have been translations of short passages selected as lessons for festivals, and I have given an instance in Ezekiel where the LXX version of an early Christian Pentecost lesson (Ez. xxxvi 24-38), the lectionary use of which was inherited from Judaism, is clearly marked off from its context by peculiarities of style. In that instance the translators of Ezekiel and the Twelve (for the Greek version of the whole group is unquestionably the production of the same time and school) appear to have incorporated the older version of these fifteen verses. In Habakkuk, on the contrary, they were either unaware of the pre-existent lectionary version or they rejected it as inadequate. The LXX version naturally threw the older version into the background; but the latter apparently continued to be used locally for lectionary purposes and has thus, by some strange fortune, survived in a few MSS. If this conjecture as to its origin be correct, it is curious that the translator failed to recognize the nature of the Pentecostal rubrics which he included in the poem. It is noteworthy that the two instances discovered of Greek versions seemingly produced for synagogue use occur in the portions of Scripture (Ezekiel and the Minor

<sup>1</sup> *Jewish Encycl.*, art. Pentecost.

<sup>2</sup> *J. T. S.* iv 407 f, *Gramm. of O. T. in Greek* 11 f.

Prophets) from which we have seen that the earliest Prophetic lessons were drawn.<sup>1</sup>

There remains the further question: What bearing have these old lectionary notes on the *authenticity of Hab. iii*? Is it an integral portion of the Prophetic book? Without going into the whole question of authenticity I will confine my remarks to the narrower question: Did the use of the chapter as a canticle precede its use as a lesson? For the case against the authenticity turns largely on this point. It has been argued from the presence of *two* titles, in the superscription and the colophon, that the chapter originally stood in some minor Psalter, from which, on account of the mention of Habakkuk in the superscription, it was afterwards transferred to the prophetic book; the second title is, it is said, in reality the title to the *next* Psalm immediately following the Prayer of Habakkuk in the minor Psalter, which was inadvertently carried over to the prophetic book when the transfer was made.<sup>2</sup> The force of this suggestion is considerably weakened by the discovery that the lectionary notes also stand at the *end* of the passages to which they relate. Moreover, good reasons have been shewn<sup>3</sup> for believing that the notes in the Psalter 'To the Chief Musician' relate in many, if not in all, cases to the Psalms which *precede* them. It appears then that, if any transfer from Psalter to Prophecy took place, it is the superscription which is the intruder. But probably there was no transfer. It seems more likely, as Prof. Duhm has suggested, that the Chief Musician, at a time when the Temple music was being actively organized and collections of songs were few, used such material as came to hand, and in this case attached his musical notes to the Psalm where he found it, namely in the book of the Prophet. For the oldest Greek version shews us that the chapter was already read as a lesson before 150 B.C., and tells us of a shorter and a longer lesson. Time must be allowed for this growth

<sup>1</sup> An indication of the influence of the lectionary use on the Greek itself may perhaps be traced in the quaint renderings 'At his feet shall follow the largest of the birds' (v. 5) and 'In the midst of two living creatures shalt thou be known' (v. 2); the latter occurs in both texts in the 'conflate' portion, but must surely be due to the same translator as the former. The two living creatures in the mind of the translator were doubtless, as Dr Sinker has suggested, the cherubim overshadowing the mercy seat (cf. Ex. xxv 21 LXX). But he may also have been influenced in both passages by the recollection of the four living creatures beneath the throne, one of whose faces was that of an eagle, in Ez. i; that chapter, as we have seen, was another primitive Pentecost lesson.

<sup>2</sup> I was not aware in offering this suggestion (in *J. T. S.* xi 530 n. 2; where 'the Psalter' should be 'a Psalter') that it had already been made by Dr Nestle in *Z. A. T. W.*, 1900, 167.

<sup>3</sup> J. W. Thirtle *The Titles of the Psalms* ed. 2, 1905.

of the Haphtarah, so that the Habakkuk lesson is carried back into the third century B.C. If we accept Dr Briggs's date for the Chief Musician (about 250 B.C.), it seems incredible that a lesson for one of the chief festivals should have been drawn from a chapter which had so recently become attached to the Prophetical collection. This is the principal argument for giving the lesson priority in time over the canticle; but other facts point in the same direction. The lectionary catchwords in both *v.* 3 and *v.* 9 precede the Selah; the lengths of the three lessons approximate to what we know to have been normal lectionary lengths; the Barberini text lacks the musical colophon, and probably contained not more than one Selah, if it contained any at all.

On the basis of the available data I submit the following very tentative reconstruction of the *liturgical history of the Psalm*.

(i) Whatever its ultimate origin, the bulk of Hab. iii formed an integral portion of the prophetical book in 300 B.C.

(ii) A lesson was read from it at Pentecost early in the third century B.C.<sup>1</sup> The primitive lesson consisted of not more than one or one and a half of our verses, and was read as the sequel to the primitive Torah lesson from Lev. xxiii. Later in the century the special Torah lesson was replaced by the corresponding passage in Deut. xvi; the reading of a second Torah lesson, the ordinary calendar lesson of the Triennial Cycle, had now become usual. The lesson from Habakkuk was at about the same time extended to seven and a half of our verses. This was for long the normal length of the Habakkuk lesson; the gloss indicating this stopping-point is imbedded in all the texts.

(iii) About the middle of the third century the 'Director' adapted the Psalm for use as a canticle, adding to the chapter in the prophetical book the Selahs and the colophon with a reference to himself. These musical notes did not find their way into all copies.

(iv) The superscription (iii 1) was added at the same time or soon after, and marked the beginning of both Lesson and Canticle. The opening and close of the Psalm also appear to have received some amplification or adaptation to the Pentecost ritual.

(v) The text which found its way into Egypt about 200 B.C. contained the two lectionary rubrics at *vv.* 3 and 9, and perhaps the first Selah, but no further musical notes. The Egyptian Jews did not follow Palestinian practice, but read the whole Psalm as a lesson. On the

<sup>1</sup> See Dr H. E. Ryle *Canon of O. T.* 116 'Probably, therefore, during the third century B.C., the lesson from the Prophets (the *Haphtarah*) was added by the scribes to the lesson from the Law . . . It is . . . probable that the adoption of a lesson from "the Prophets" corresponded with the period of their admission into the Canon': cf. 108.

other hand, they adhered to the primitive Torah lesson; the rubric 'Morrow of the Sabbath' was appended at this time.

(vi) From this text, early in the second century B.C., the 'Barberini' Greek version was made for lectionary use in the synagogues of Alexandria. The translator failed to understand the rubrics in his Hebrew original, even that most recently appended.

(vii) Soon after 150 B.C. a Greek version of Ezekiel and the Minor Prophets was produced *en bloc*, no use being made of the existing version of the Psalm of Habakkuk.

(viii) Other districts, however, still continued to read only the shortest lesson<sup>1</sup> ending in *v.* 3, and in the first century B.C. or later a conflation of the two known Greek versions of these few verses was made for the use of the Methurgeman in the synagogues, and this mixed text has been transmitted in all extant Greek MSS.

The discovery of the true nature of these rubrics has led us to assign a very early date to the origin of the Haphtarah, and the introduction of the Torah lessons must be still older; the very selection of this Habakkuk passage for Pentecost seems to presuppose the existence of the Triennial Cycle. The discovery opens up possibilities of further development, but the range within which we may expect to find similar notes is likely to be limited to the primitive lessons for the greater festivals.<sup>2</sup> In conclusion, perhaps I may be permitted to add that my recent ventures in the field of Old Testament criticism have strongly brought home to me one lesson, viz. the wisdom of attempting to explain the text as it stands and only resorting to emendation as a last expedient. It has been my good fortune in this and a recent number of the JOURNAL to obtain some surprising, it is not for me to say convincing, results, largely by 'sticking to the text'. In Hab. iii 9 the 'Variorum Bible', reflecting the general verdict, pronounces the 'text' to be 'very corrupt'. On the contrary, I venture to think, the consonantal text has providentially come down to us almost in its pristine purity, and it seems scarcely credible that the Massoretes misunderstood what they have so faithfully transmitted. Had serious corruption taken place, the clue to the meaning of the catchwords might have been lost irretrievably.

H. ST J. THACKERAY.

<sup>1</sup> These short Haphtarahs were in vogue even in the Middle Ages: 'two verses, not more' is a direction in an eighth-century MS, *J. Q. R.* vi 14. Cf. the lesson from Isaiah of under two verses in Luke iv 18 f.

<sup>2</sup> Lectionary practice may possibly be found to throw light on the curious form in which the Song of Hannah (an early lesson for New Year's Day) has been transmitted in the LXX (1 Regn. ii). The verses from Jer. ix 23 (22) f, which are incorporated in it, formed a lesson in the Triennial Cycle.