ANOTHER FRAGMENT (E) OF THE PSALMS SCROLL FROM QUMRAN CAVE 11 (11QPs<sup>a</sup>)

YIGAEL YADIN

I. INTRODUCTION

In a letter dated 16th September 1960, a citizen of the United States (who wishes to remain anonymous), offered me for sale at a high price, a fragment of a scroll. From a photograph attached to the letter (pl. 1) I could ascertain that it was a genuine Qumran fragment, and that it contained several chapters from a Psalter, arranged in an order which differed from that of the MT. On the 27th of September of the same year, I countered Mr. Anonymous' offer with a price which I thought appropriate for the fragment. One can imagine my surprise when, on the 7th of October, I received a registered air mail manila envelope, mailed on the 3rd of October, which contained the fragment wrapped in an ordinary table napkin. The purchase price was promptly sent to the vendor. I deciphered the scroll during the last two days of November after it had been photographed in infra-red by Mrs. H. Bieberkraut (pl. 2). The fragment was then further cleaned by Mr. J. Bieberkraut and again photographed in infra-red (pls. 3a–5a). With the aid of the second set of photographs, I was able to improve on my previous readings of the 4th of February 1961. In the meantime I had a chance to meet Mr. Anonymous who—for his own reasons—insisted that I postpone the publication of the scroll for several years. Reluctantly I acceded to his request, and left the deciphered MS to rest for a while. When I saw the first publication by Dr. J.A. Sanders of parts of 11QPs<sup>a</sup><sup>1</sup>, I was struck by the identity of the script of my fragment with that of his. Since the complete publication of 11QPs<sup>a</sup> was then imminent, I decided to wait a little longer before reaching a final conclusion.

Now that we have the splendid edition by Dr. J.A. Sanders,<sup>2</sup> I am absolutely convinced that the fragment in my possession is part of the same scroll; furthermore it is even possible to fit it in its proper place within the fragments at the beginning of 11QPs<sup>a</sup>. Therefore I hasten to publish it, in order to enable scholars who deal with this highly important scroll, to have all the known material at hand. Since the scroll has been admirably edited by Sanders, I intend to follow here his order of presentation. First I shall describe briefly

1 J. A. Sanders, “Ps. 151 in 11QPs<sup>a</sup>”, ZAW 75 (1963) 73–86; <i>ib.</i>, “Two Non-Canonical Psalms in 11QPs<sup>a</sup>”, <i>ib.</i> 76 (1964) 57–75.

2 J. A. Sanders, <i>The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11</i> (11QPs<sup>a</sup>), <i>DJD</i> IV (Oxford 1965).
the new fragment; then I shall try to prove that it is part of 11QPs\(^8\), and to suggest its proper place among the extant parts of the scroll. In the commentary to the text, I shall limit myself to very brief notes, since an exhaustive treatment of the text can be attempted only together with a full discussion of the main portion of the scroll.

A. Data

_Description of the Fragment (E)_\(^3\)

The fragment is of tanned animal skin, brown in hue, considerably darker than the infra-red photographs (pl. 2) would indicate (but compare pl. 1). It lacks little of being 1 mm. thick. At its widest points (length and width) the fragment measures 13.5 \( \times \) 36.5 cm.

Line spacing varies from 0.85 cm. to 1 cm., and the column margins between the ruled vertical lines are 2.1 cm.

The fragment contains remains of three columns; the one on the right (col. I) and the left (col. III) are defective at their right and left sides respectively, while in the center one (col. II) both column margins have been preserved. All three columns lack the bottom parts and considerable portions of their top parts which were eaten away.
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B. Palaeography

Wherever the Tetragrammaton appears in the fragment it is written in the Palaeo-Hebrew script.

Giving due consideration to possible individual characteristics the script of

\(^3\) As I shall try to prove, my fragment should be inserted between Sanders' Fragment D and col. I of the main portion of the Scroll. In the following I shall adopt Sanders' method and order of description, and whenever appropriate I shall even use his very words. Thus, the identity of the fragment with the 11Q Scroll will become evident, and the reader will find it easier to compare the new data with those of Sanders.
fr. E is clearly comparable to lines 5, 6 and 7 of Cross’s fig. 24. It exhibits the heavily drawn, large script most popular in the latter part of the Herodian era; however, a number of letter forms have not yet evolved fully into the late style. A date in the beginning of the first century C.E. may be assigned to it. For the detailed description of the individual letters, see Sanders’ study.5

I should like to quote here Sanders’ acute remarks concerning the waw and yod, since they apply perfectly to our fragment, and since my reading is based on these characteristics: “Waw and yod are distinguished in the scribe’s mind, not always by his pen, and not in ligatured forms. The shaded, angularly hooked head of yod tends to be broader, the leg shorter (except in ligatured forms of course), and the stance slightly less vertical than those of waw.” Cp. further my notes to col. I, l. 3.

C. Orthography

The fragment contains several variants to the MT, which will be dealt with in the notes to the text. In the following are grouped in alphabetical order only the variants in orthography. Comparison with Sanders’ treatment of this issue (ibid., p. 9 ff.) will suffice to show that we are dealing with the same scribe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragment E</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Psalms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אֲרוֹדֶה</td>
<td>אֹרֶד</td>
<td>118 : 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָוָלָם</td>
<td>אֹֽלָם</td>
<td>104 : 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָלָּלָה</td>
<td>אֹלָל</td>
<td>118 : 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָלָלָה</td>
<td>אֹלָל</td>
<td>104 : 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָלְךָ</td>
<td>אֹלָך</td>
<td>104 : 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָלָּמָה</td>
<td>אֹלָמ</td>
<td>105 : 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אָלִיוֹת</td>
<td>אֹלוֹת</td>
<td>104 : 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אַרְמַמְכֻּה</td>
<td>אָרְמָמ</td>
<td>118 : 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>גְּדוֹלָה</td>
<td>גָּדֹל</td>
<td>104 : 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דְּרוֹשֶׁה</td>
<td>דַּרְוֲשָׁ</td>
<td>105 : 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חָטָאָם</td>
<td>חָטָא</td>
<td>104 : 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יִשָּׁה</td>
<td>יִשָּׂ</td>
<td>104 : 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יְצַרְתָּ</td>
<td>יְצַרְתָּא</td>
<td>104 : 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְָֻלָּלָל</td>
<td>בָֻּלָּלָל</td>
<td>105 : 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


D. Surface Observations

Scribal dots
Scribal dots occur in two places in the fragment (col. I, 2; III, 13). In both cases the dots appear only above the letters which subsequently also were erased (by the scribe?).

Insertions
Letters were inserted by the original scribe above lines of text, in col. II, 4 and II, 11.

Erasures
In two cases there is clear evidence of erasures in the text (see above: scribal dots).

Spacing
Spaces are left blank to indicate new chapters: a) between Pss. 118 and 114. Ps. 118 terminates just before the end of the line, and Ps. 114 therefore begins at the end of the following line. b) between Pss. 104 and 147. Ps. 104 terminates exactly at the end of the line. Since there is a blank space at the end of the
following line, one can assume that the beginning of Ps. 147 was written after a blank line (but cp. the commentary).

_The Fragment and 11QPs_ a

I believe that the above description and the study of the photographs will suffice to prove that our fragment indeed is part of 11QPs a. It only remains to fix its proper position within that scroll. This task is relatively easy, and incidentally also can serve as additional proof for ascribing our fragment to the scroll. As stated by Sanders, and clearly indicated by his facsimiles, “the four fragments... probably derive from the sheet or sheets immediately preceding the extant sections of the scroll”. Furthermore, “four separable leaves form the first columns of the scroll proper. Decomposition along one side of the rolled scroll had destroyed the three or so layers of leather which had originally been continuous”. Since there is no doubt about the correct placing of the “four separate leaves,” the new fragment should be placed _among, before, or after_ the “four fragments” which are numbered by Sanders: A, B, C II and C III, and D. Since our fragment terminates with verse 12 of Ps. 105, and Sanders’ col. I begins with Ps. 105:24, it should be placed immediately before col. I. It is for this reason that I suggest to designate our fragment “E”, to follow Sanders’ fragments A–D. Ps. 119 which “is copied in the scroll in the alphabetic acrostic arrangement of eight verse-lines to the letter”, and a blank line-space between the groups, makes it clear that each column of the scroll had twenty-five lines. This number of lines fits fr. E exactly (see further the commentary to the text), and the remaining—now destroyed—eight lines at the bottom of its col. III must have contained Ps. 105:13–24.

Fixing thus the exact position of fr. E necessitates only some minor changes in Sanders’ commentary:

a. On the bottom of Frag. C II indeed begins Ps. 103, and Sanders’ cautious indication “103 (104?)” can now be eliminated; Ps. 104 is contained in col. I of fr. E.

b. Sanders’ suggestion (p. 21) that “Ps. 105 could have followed directly” Ps. 109 on fr. D obviously should be corrected.

The sequence of the psalms at the beginning of the scroll, with the psalms fragments A–D in brackets, is therefore: (101, 102, 103, 109), 118, 104, 147, 105.

**II. Text**

The text has been restored only in those lines which contain at least one letter. The restoration follows the MT also with regard to _plene_ and defective writing. The restoration is based on the assumption that each column contained
twenty-five lines (see above). The indication of the beginning of the verses in
the missing parts is approximate only, and aims to indicate the relation between
the top parts of the existing columns and the (missing) bottom parts of the
preceding ones.

The first group of notes (1) deals mainly with palaeographic or other tech-
nical observations, and is arranged according to line numbers. The second
group (2) deals with textual variants in relation to the MT, and is arranged
according to verse numbers. The sigla and abbreviations used are as in Sanders’
except that I use only one type of dot ־ to indicate both highly probable
readings and scribal dots. The latter are mentioned in the notes.

The consistent orthographic differences which were listed above under “or-
thography”, are not noted in the apparatus.
Notes to column I

(1)

1 This is the first line of the column, as attested to by the lack of any signs of a possible previous line at the top. At the end of the line (in the infra-red photograph before cleaning), some of the letters are covered by a small piece of leather which erroneously had not been removed when the photograph was taken, as becomes evident from the other photographs taken after cleaning. It is almost certain that the beginning of the line contained the end of verse 24.

2 The last word was cancelled by dots above the letters. Later the letters themselves were erased (by the scribe?). Cp. col. III, 14.

3 As indicated above, the scribe differentiates between the yod and the waw in such cases. The last letter seems to be a yod and not a waw. (Cp., דָּרְשָׁה in III, 11). However, see אָסָר in the next line, and consult the notes to verse 27.

7 Careful examination shows that this reading is definite. For cp. 11QPSa.

(2)

118: 26 By mistake the scribe wrote בָּשִׁים also after רבכרכם and then erased it. In any case the position of אָסָר (next line) at the end of the verse demands another word to precede it.

27 If we read אָסָר instead of דָּרְשָׁה (cp. in 105, 4), the reading conforms with the MT and the VSS, and the difficulties emanating from this hapax legomenon remain (cp. the commentaries, particularly ICC). However, on palaeographical grounds, a strong, although admittedly not a decisive case can be made for reading: אָסָר. This reading implies that the object of the verse are the festal animals—as was suggested by some commentators—and the are actual ropes, as in Jud. 16:11: אָסָר בַּעֲבוֹת; ib., 15:13: נַחֲנוּ בָּעָשׁ אָסָר בַּעֲבוֹת; Ez. 3:25: וַאֲסָרֵהוּ בְּעַזְזָר בִּתָּן.

104: 1 לְדֵי MT.

4 הַלּוֹם: דָּרְשָׁה MT; G: πᾶν φλέγεων

Col. II.
Notes to column II

1 A clear trace of the shin of הָלְבֵּךְשׁ (V. 21) is discernible in the infra-red photograph before cleaning. There can be no doubt that this is the first line of the column. It corresponds to line 1 of col. I.

2 [יִרְאוּבֶן] There appears to be no trace of a bottom end of a final nun. The mem was added by the scribe above the he.

11 [יִרְשָנִים] The nun was added by the scribe above the waw.

12 [לָלְבֵּךְשׁ] The word is written after a short blank space due to a flaw in the leather.

(2)

104: 22 רְאֵשָׁם G: מִשְׁרָשָׁם MT. Cp. Jer. 21:13; Job 37:18. I owe this reading to Dr. Sanders, who was kind enough to go over the proofs.
Thus the verse has two hemistichs instead of three.

MT, G: רוחם. A basic change!

[Uncertain MT]

147: 1 [המִלְּחֶרֶת] It is difficult to decide whether the word was written in line 15, separate from the text (as in MT) or whether it was part of line 16. If inserted at the beginning of line 16, as an integral part of the text (as in G) it would prolong the line abnormally. In both cases line 15 should have been left blank, since Ps. 104 terminates at the end of the line.
Notes to column III

(1)

5 יישה This must be the beginning of line 5, as is clear from its position in the column in relation to lines 5 in cols. II and III. The four missing lines at the top of the column contained vv. 14-17 as well as a part of v. 13.

14 The scribe cancelled the letters by puncta extraordinaria. Later they were erased (by the scribe?).

17 Only the very top of the lamed remains, as is perhaps the case with the lamed of תְּנַהֲגוּ in the same line.

18-25 The lower portion of the column is lost. A careful calculation of the space proves that it contained vv. 13-23 of the psalm, thus preceding col. I of Sanders’ text (see Introduction).

(2)

147: 20 ג weapons MT; יריעה G, S, T: יריעה MT.

105: 0 ... יָהָד G: From Ps. 136 or 118. Cp. 11QPs, col. XVI, 11.1.6.

3 יָשְׂפָא יִשְׁפָא הָלְכָה מְכַס נָח הָלְכָה MT. Cp. G of I Chr. 16:10 εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ. For this suggestion I am indebted to Dr. Sanders.

6 מ MT

2 MSS; מְכַס MT

7 מ MT

9 מ MT

MT.

11 MT. Cp. BH.
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