

SOME FURTHER NOTES ON *HAFTAROTH* SCROLLS

N. FRIED

For technical reasons I had been unable to list all the parallels of the *Haftaroth* of the *Sedarim*, i.e. the pericopes of the triennial cycle, which I discussed in my previous paper in *Textus* 3 (1963) 128–129. Recently, however, photographs of Geniza fragments from the Adler collection have been made available to the HUBP, and from them I have drawn additional information. I now present all the new data pertaining to these *Haftaroth* culled from the Cambridge Geniza MSS and the Adler collection.¹

I

ANOTHER FRAGMENT OF A *HAFTAROTH* SCROLL

MS Cambridge T-S Misc. Box 1, 130, to be published here as fr. 2, constitutes the lower part of the fragment of the *Haftaroth* Scroll (fr. 1) published by I. Yeivin.² However, the two fragments are not continuous, since the connecting piece of parchment is missing. Here is a detailed account of the Biblical pericopes found in the new fragment:

Fr. 2, col. a: Hos. 10: 2–6 (from מִזְבְּחוֹתָם). These verses include the previous part of the *haftaroth* of the *seder* וַעֲשִׂיתָם, which is found in fragment 1, col. b. Thus the beginning of the *haftarah* is lacking also in the new fragment.

Col. b: Is. 11: 4–9 (from וְהָכָה). These verses constitute the previously mentioned part of the *haftarah* of the portion וְקָח מֵאֵתֶם מִטָּה, preserved in fr. 1, col. c. Here too, the beginning of the *haftarah* is missing.

Col. c: Is. 63: 3–7 (from אֲזִכִּיר לִבְדִּי to the sequel in the sequel to the

- 1 I wish to thank Mr. I. Yeivin for placing at my disposal all the data pertaining to the photographs of the Adler collection and for showing me a photograph of the new fragment of the *Haftaroth* Scroll which was discovered by M. Dietrich (see below). The fragment was given by Dietrich in his dissertation and will be published in his forthcoming book *Neue Palästinischpunktierte Bibelfragmente*. Special thanks must be rendered to the Editors of the HUBP for allowing me to examine the Geniza Photographs in the Project's collection. My gratitude is due also to Prof. D. S. Loewinger for his generous help in all matters relating to the Geniza material photographs which are in the possession of the Institute for microfilming Hebrew MSS at the National Library of Jerusalem.
- 2 I. Yeivin, *Textus* 3 (1963) 121–124.

haftarah of the *seder* ואל הלויים תדבר³ have not been preserved, due to the bad state of preservation of our fragment. Again, the beginning of the *haftarah* has not been preserved.

Col. d: Ob. 11–12. Only the words ואל תרא מהם remain, which are a remnant of the *haftarah* of the portion וישלח משה, as I had assumed in my earlier paper. Col. e: Is. 49: 23–50: 4. Only the words ... מניק[תיך] ... והיו לי to נתן לי are yet extant. They are part of the *haftarah* of the portion מי מנה.⁴ The *haftarah* begins with verse 23 and has been so preserved in the *Piyyuṭim* of Yannay.⁵ The first part of this *haftarah* is also to be found in MS Cambridge T.–S. B. 17, 31 and in fragment JTS 550.9 (= Adler 3590). The *haftarah* continued to Is. 50: 6 and from there skipped to 51: 3, containing eleven verses in all. This concluding part of the *haftarah* has been published by Adler.⁶ It also appears in MS Cambridge T.–S. B. 14, 13.

II

EXPLANATORY NOTES⁷

1. *Ad* the *haftarah* of the portion ועשיתם: the concluding part of this *haftarah* may also be found in fragment T.–S. B. 17, 86. In fragment T.–S. B. 17, 20 this portion is named ועשית' אשה in the heading of the *haftarah*. It is worthwhile to note in passing that in most fragments to the *haftaroth* of the triennial cycle the name of the portion is given in two words only.
2. *Ad* the *haftarah* of ויקח קרה: in fragment T.–S. B. 17, 6 the *haftarah* concludes with v. 12. According to this source then, the *haftarah* contained eleven verses. A part of this *haftarah* is also extant in fragment T.–S. B. 17, 31. But there its beginning and end are missing.
3. *Ad* the *haftarah* of ואל הלויים תדבר: parts of this *haftarah* also are preserved in fragment T.–S. B. 17, 31.
4. *Ad* the *haftarah* of וישלח משה: fragments T.–S. B. 17, 31 and JTS 550, 9 indicate that the *haftarah* of this portion concluded with Ob. 21. However, one usually skipped several verses in the middle of the prophecy. According to fragment T.–S. B. 17, 31. vv. 9–20 were omitted, and this source seems to indicate that the *haftarah* contained nine verses. Fragment JTS 550, 9 shows

3 For this *seder* cp. Yoel, *Kirjath Sepher* 38 (1963) 129; see also part III of the present paper.

4 Cp. C. D. Ginsburg, *The Massorah Compiled from MSS* (London 1883–1885) II, 330; III, 270, 300.

5 Cp. M. Zulay, *פיוטי יוני* (Berlin 1938) p. רטו.

6 In JQR 8 (1895/6) 528–529.

7 The notes to this chapter are based on the material discussed in my article in *Textus* 3.

that vv. 12–20 were omitted, and thus the *haftarah* comprised twelve verses.⁸

In the *haftarah* of the portion וישלח יעקב (Gen. 32: 4)⁹ which, like the *haftarah* of the portion וישלח משה, is taken from Obadiah,¹⁰ we also find this skipping to verse 21. According to fragment JTS 24, 1, it was the practice to omit vv. 12–20 just as is the case with fragment JTS 550, 9. It follows that this *haftarah* too was made up to twelve verses. In fragment Bodl. d. 42 (= Oxford No. 2740) vv. 8–20 were omitted, and one continued to read from v. 21, so that the *haftarah* contained eight verses.¹¹ Ob. v. 21 is also quoted by Yannai.¹² It is possible to prove that such a double citation by Yannai serves as an indication of a *haftarah* reading according to a different rite.¹³ It follows that according to some tradition(s) the *haftarah* for the above-noted portions started with Ob. v. 21. Such a *haftarah* may be found in the portion רב לכם (Deut. 2: 2)¹⁴ which, like the previous two portions, deals with the Land of Edom. There the *haftarah* began with Ob. v. 21 and continued into the book of Jonah.¹⁵ This is still the custom according to the Italian rite for reading the *haftarah* at the Minḥah service on the Day of Atonement.¹⁶

5. *Ad* the *haftarah* of וירא בלק: in fragment JTS 550, 9 the *haftarah* concludes with Na. 1: 6. According to this source it comprised eleven verses. But fragment T.–S. B. 17, 31 indicates that the *haftarah* contained just five verses. The shortness of the *haftarah* should cause no surprise, for it is legally permissible to reduce the length of the *haftarah* when it is concurrently translated or when it is made the subject of a homily.¹⁷ It should be noted that in the MS from which fragment T.–S. B. 17, 31 stems, and in other fragments found in the Geniza, quite short *haftaroth* are recorded. In this source a *haftarah* sometimes contains only *three* verses.

- 8 In the new fragment the end of the *haftarah* is missing. This source seems to indicate that the *haftarah* contained at least thirteen or more verses.
- 9 Yoel, *op. cit.*, presents a list of portions according to various sources. I intend to publish a comprehensive list of all the portions in the Torah which will be based upon many varied sources culled both from printed editions and from manuscripts.
- 10 See: J. Mann, *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue* (Cincinnati 1940) 260.
- 11 The beginning of the *haftarah* for this portion is extant also in fragment T.–S. B. 12, 31, but there the end of the *haftarah* is missing.
- 12 Zulay, *op. cit.*, p. 77.
- 13 See below part IV.
- 14 Cp. Yoel, *op. cit.*
- 15 Cp. e.g., the *Haftaroth* Scroll ENA 2105 (see Fried, *op. cit.*).
- 16 See the list of *haftaroth* in תלמודית אנציקלופדיה, end of vol. 10 (Jerusalem 1961), and *ib. p.* הפטרה s.v. יד.
- 17 See אנציקלופדיה תלמודית vol. 10, p. ח.

III

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON THE HAFTAROTH TO THE SEDARIM

וקח מאתם, ואל הלויים

Ad the *seder* וקח מאתם: I found the entire *haftarah* (comprising twelve verses: Is. 11: 1–12) in MS ENA 470.¹⁸ The heading which contains the name of the *seder* is not extant in this MS. It may have been written at the end of the page which preceded the first page of this collection of *haftaroth*.

In all the three fragments of the *haftarah* for this *seder* found in other MSS (T.–S. B. 17, 6; T.–S. B. 17, 25; T.–S. B. 17, 31), the end of the *haftarah* is missing, and only in one (T.–S. B. 17, 6) the beginning was preserved. Therefore, it causes satisfaction that now the complete *haftarah*, from beginning to end, has been discovered.

An interesting detail is the length of this *haftarah*: twelve verses. In the usual practice which is reflected in the Geniza fragments, a *haftarah* would contain only eight verses: seven corresponding to the seven parts of the weekly portion, and the eighth corresponding to the section of the *maftir* which concludes the reading from the Torah.¹⁹ In general the eighth verse occurs after skipping some preceding verses. To us, in the present instance, Is. 11: 10 would appear to be a most appropriate conclusion to the *haftarah*, exhibiting as it does a universalistic spirit: כי מלאה הארץ דעה את ה' כמים לים מכסים. The addition of two more verses, Is. 11: 11–12, in the MS under review, appears to give expression to the strong yearnings for redemption, characteristic of the generations after the destruction of the Second Temple. To them it seemed fitting to

18 A photograph of the MS was made available to me by Rabbi M. Luban of Forest Hills, N.Y., to whom my thanks are due.

19 Cp. the material pertaining to this matter which I assembled in the אנציקלופדיה תלמודית vol. 10, columns ט–ז and *ib.* notes 141–148. For reasons unknown to me not all the material which I had submitted was given there. Mann (*The Bible as Read etc.* p. 9) assumes that a regular *haftarah* of the triennial cycle contained ten verses. He arrived at this conclusion because, as stated in the introduction, he had not personally seen the fragments of *haftaroth* of the triennial cycle at Cambridge, but relied on notes made by Abrahams, and upon Cowley's catalogue of the Geniza fragments at Oxford. However, upon examining all the Cambridge material, photographs of which were made available to me through the generosity of Dr. G. Dimson of London, and photographs of the Oxford material, presented to me by Mr. I. Oviets of N.Y., I realized that the majority of *haftaroth* belonging to the triennial rite contain only eight verses. (It should be mentioned in passing that although Cowley gave us an accurate description of the triennial *haftaroth* fragments found in the Bodleian Library, he seems to have overlooked one fragment which contains many *haftaroth* for most of the book of Gen. according to both the annual and triennial rite. This fact also escaped Mann's attention.)

conclude the *haftarah* with the verse which heralds the redemption of Israel and the ingathering of the exiles: ואסף נדחי ישראל ונפצות יהודה יקבץ מארבע כנפות הארץ.

Ad the *seder* ואל הלויים: had it not been for Yannai we would not have known with which verse the *haftarah* for this portion begins. In the extant two fragments of this *haftarah* (T.-S. B. 17, 25 and T.-S. B. 17, 31) the beginning and end are lacking. Without Yannai's *piyyut*, it would have been difficult to establish the beginning of the *haftarah* which parallels, for some unknown reason, the third verse of the *sedra* ... כִּדְבַר מִן הַגֵּרָן ... Num. 18: 27), concurring with the first verse of the *haftarah* ... אם אתן את דְּבַרְךָ ... Is. 62: 8). The beginning of the *haftarah* for this *sedra* now has been found in MS 470 from the Adler collection. But much to our regret, the end is missing there too. The heading of the *haftarah* in this MS is וידבר²⁰ ואל הלויים. It begins at Is. 62: 8, as with Yannai, and comes to an abrupt end on the last page of the MS with the word ישתוהו (Is. 62: 9). We have, therefore, no information as to the conclusion of the *haftarah*. Perhaps this matter will be clarified after the examination of the Geniza fragments known as T.-S. N.S.²¹ Nevertheless we may make an almost certain conjecture, that this *haftarah* concluded with ch. 63 v. 7. Thus concludes the very same *haftarah* which also serves for the *sedra* יזרע יצחק (Gen. 26: 12) in the list of triennial *haftaroth* for the books of Genesis — Exodus, published by Büchler²² and Mann.²³ Therefore, also this *haftarah* contained twelve verses. But in this instance there was no room for a shorter text because the preceding verses are not quite suited as a conclusion of the *haftarah*.

As I have already intimated previously (*Textus* 3, 129), in other sources this *sedra* appears not in Num. 18: 25 but rather in 19: 1.²⁴ This can be proved from Tos. Meg., chap. 3.²⁵ There the possibility is discussed of reading this

20 It appears that the word וידבר was added to indicate the exact beginning of the *sedra* at v. 25 and not at v. 26 in which the *sedra* is named ואל הלויים. It is probable that the addition was intended as an aid for students.

21 For information about this collection the reader is referred to N. Allony, ארשת 3 (Jerusalem 1961) 395–425. The article deals with Hebrew MSS in the libraries of Cambridge in general, and the Geniza fragments in particular.

22 JQR 6 (1893/4) 39–42.

23 *The Bible as Read etc.* 553–574.

24 Cp. The list of *sedarim* published by Y. Yoel in *Kirjath Sepher* 38 (1963) 131 (and my own list for the book of Num. published separately in this volume).

25 Cp. S. Lieberman's remarks in his תוספתא כפשוטה. In his edition of Tractate Soferim (pp. 43, 158), Müller has correctly shown that this Tosefta proves that the reading of the Torah was concluded in Palestine at different times in the year. This is explicitly stated in חילוקי המנהגים של ארץ-ישראל ובבל (cp. my remarks in the introduction to the list of *sedarim* pertaining to the book of Num. in the present volume).

seder on the Sabbath preceding or following the Sabbath of Parashat Parah (Num. 19). We may conclude that the *seder* was not necessarily linked with Parashat Parah. Therefore, it seems feasible that the *seder* ואל הלויים came into being at a later period when the solution suggested by the Tosefta, namely to read Parashat Parah on two successive Sabbaths as in the instance cited above, no longer appeared practicable due to the special significance attributed to Parashat Parah and its three companions: ואל הלויים, זכור, וחדש.²⁶ It was not desirable to have this Parashah read on a "regular" Sabbath and so the beginning of the portion was moved back eight verses. This change must have occurred before the time of Yannai, since he is already aware of the existence of the *seder* ואל הלויים. Y. Yoel alludes to this solution in his short but exhaustive study of the Pentateuchal *sedarim*.²⁷ It would seem that the *seder* ואל הלויים came into existence after the known Midrashim on the book of Numbers underwent their final editing, and therefore no reference to this *seder* is found in them. Those scholars who postulate a late date for the closing of the Midrashim²⁸ must now subject their opinions to a thorough revision in light of the known fact that Yannai lived *after* this event. And Yannai is believed to have flourished in the 6th century or even earlier.²⁹

IV

AN ADDITIONAL HAFTARAH FOR THE SEDER

ואל הלויים (NUM. 18: 25)

It was the distinguished scholar of Palestinian liturgical poetry, Dr. Menahem Zulay, who first pointed the way to extracting the *haftarah* of the triennial cycle from the works of the early Palestinian *payyṭanim*.³⁰ Since then it has been taken for granted that at any given juncture, Yannai usually refers to only one particular *haftarah*. However, an examination of the *haftarah* of the triennial cycle which have been preserved in Cairo Geniza fragments proves that in the third *piyyuṭ* of the קרובה for a given *seder*, Yannai quite often alludes to additional *haftarah*. A clear case can be found in the *seder* ואשה כי יזוב (Lev. 15: 25). At the end of the third *piyyuṭ* for this portion,³¹ Yannai makes

26 See the entry ארבע פרשיות in the אנציקלופדיה תלמודית vol. 2, col. קסד.

27 *Kirjath Sepher* 38 (1963) 128/9.

28 A summary of these opinions is given by Albeck in his edition of Zunz, הדרשות בישראל (Jerusalem 1954).

29 See: M. Zulay, *Studies of the Research Institute for Hebrew Poetry*, vol. 2, רסז-רעא. In J. Schirmann's view, Yannai flourished in the fifth, or possibly even in the fourth century (JQR 44 [1953] 143).

30 Cp. *Studies of the Research Institute for Hebrew Poetry*, vol. 2, p. רעא.

31 See פיוטי ינאי, ed. M. Zulay, p. רא.

reference to the *haftarah* in Ez. 16: 9. As a matter of fact, I found the beginning of this *haftarah* in a fragment with Babylonian pointing³² from the new Geniza fragments which have come to light. Mr. Yeivin kindly showed me a photograph of this fragment (T.-S. N.S. 106, 1).³³ Yannai alludes there to Is. 4: 4 which is quoted after the above-mentioned verse from Ezekiel which Zulay had established as the *haftarah* for this *seder*.³⁴ I had long ago conjectured that Yannai here hints at an additional *haftarah* from Is. 4: 4. My conjecture now has been confirmed: among the photographs from the new Geniza fragments at Cambridge,³⁵ I found in T.-S. N.S. 80, 20 the *haftarah* for this *seder*, on the whole well preserved and, as stated, it is from the book of Isaiah. The photograph clearly shows all of the *haftarah* beginning with the words **כי על כל כבוד חפה** (Is. 4: 5).

From this example and many others we may conclude that Yannai will allude to additional *haftaroth* for a *seder* whenever more than one tradition was known to him. In any given instance, Yannai would refer in the last stanza of a *qerobah* to the particular *haftarah* to which he was accustomed, and he would hint at other traditions in the preceding stanzas of the third *piyyut* (or sometimes even in the first or second *piyyut*).

We now present in two parallel columns Yannai's *piyyut* for the *haftarah* of the *seder* under review.³¹ The parallels to the *haftarah* from Is. are given in regular script while the parallels to Jer. 2: 3 which, in my opinion, is the additional *haftarah* for his *seder* to which Yannai alludes are underlined:

Is. 62: 8-9

Yannai

נשבע ה' בימינו ובזרוע	1. ימין זרוע קודש
עזו, אם אתן את דגך	2. נשבע מלכי בקודש
עוד מאכל לאיביך, ואם	3. לבל יחלל קודש
ישתו בני נכר תירושך	4. זרע אנשי קודש
אשר יגעת בו: כי מאספיו	5. נכרים לא ישתו מזוג אנגם
יאכלהו והללו את ה'	6. ואויבים לא יאכלו טרף דגם
ומקבציו ישתהו בחצרות קדשי	7. <u>יאשמו כל אוכלי</u> <u>[ראשית³⁶ חלקם]</u>

32 The fact that many of the *haftaroth* of the triennial rite are provided with Babylonian vocalization raises strong doubts as to whether this punctuation indeed was peculiar to Babylonian Jewry who, as is known, did not adhere to the triennial but rather to the annual cycle.

33 I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to Mr. I. Yeivin for sharing with me on innumerable occasions information of the Geniza.

34 See *Studies* vol. 2, p. רענ, cited in note 30.

35 These photographs were made available to me by my friend, Mr. I. Ovits of New York.

36 Zulay restores מנת חלקם. My reconstruction appears to be preferable in light of the other parallels from the above-cited verse in Jer.

*Jer. 2:3**Yannai*

8. ורעה תאטה על חומדי חוקם
 9. יאוסף ויבוא
 10. ומהומה לא יהיה בו
 11. יגיעי בו
- קדש ישראל לה' ראשית
תבואתה כל אכליו יאשמו
רעה תבא אליהם נאם ה' :

The relationship between the *haftarah* from Jer. and the *seder* is definitely striking: תרומה לכהן = ראשית תבואתה. There can be no doubt, therefore, that Jer. 2:3 constituted the beginning of the *haftarah* for the *seder* ואל הלויים which deals with the priestly offerings and tithes. But a *haftarah* like this was suited to be read during the days of Tribulation, on the Sabbaths בין המצרים between the 17th of Tammuz and the 9th of Ab, since its continuation, beginning with verse 4, serves as the *haftarah* for the second Sabbath of Tribulation according to the Palestinian triennial cycle (and at the present time, also in the annual cycle). It is well known that Palestinian Jewry was especially fond of *haftaroth* which contained words of consolation for the people.³⁷ Therefore, the *haftarah* of comfort from Is. 62 captured the heart of the people to a greater degree than the one from Jer. 2 which is replete with rebuke and chastisement. This may be the reason that, until now, only parts of the *haftarah* from Is. have been recovered from among Geniza fragments.³⁸

V

In his thorough article on the *Haftaroth* Scroll, I. Yeivin called our attention to a strange phenomenon: only one of the five *haftaroth*³⁹ in the MS under review is punctuated in its entirety according to the Tiberian System. It appears that this phenomenon may be easily explained: the *Haftaroth* Scroll was originally designated for synagogal service according to the Palestinian rite, i.e. the triennial cycle. In the course of time this rite was supplanted by the Babylonian rite, i.e. by the annual cycle. It would seem that the above MS

37 Cp. e.g. the majority of *haftaroth* for Gen. and Ex. published by Büchler (JQR 6) and Mann (*The Bible as Read etc.* [Cincinnati 1940], which deals entirely with the *sedarim* of the triennial cycle for the books of Gen. and Ex.). Most of these *haftaroth*, and also the great majority of those for Lev.-Deut., are *haftaroth* of comfort, and more than half are drawn from the book of Is.

38 Still, we should bear in mind that lines 9-10 in the above *piyyut* of Yannai refer to a *haftarah* from Zech. 14:13-14. However, no connection between the *seder* and those verses from Zech. can be established.

39 With the material from the new fragment, we now have six *haftaroth* from this MS.

passed into the hands of the Karaites or of some Rabbanites who adhered to the Roumanian rite. These people had no use for all the *haftaroth* in the Palestinian cycle, but only for those which were read in their own annual cycle. Of the *haftaroth* included in the fragments of that Scroll only the one of the portion ויקח קרח suited their purpose. Therefore they supplied it with Tiberian punctuation, and also retraced the consonantal text of this *haftarah* only. We may presume that the same procedure was applied to all *haftaroth* which were common to the triennial cycle and to the Karaite-Roumanian custom. However, in our fragments only one such example has survived. In the photographs of the fragment attached to Yeivin's paper, the letters of the *haftarah* ויקח קרח indeed are much clearer than those of the other *haftaroth*, which is tangible proof of their having been retraced.