THE PSALMS SCROLL (11QPs)

A PROBLEM OF CANON AND TEXT

M. H. GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN

The historian of the future who will attempt to describe the development of the study of the Hebrew Bible text since 1948 may find that the publication of 11 QPs offered a challenge to scholarship not less exciting than earlier discoveries. Whereas scholars today differ in their interpretation of individual finds, the present writer would probably not be alone in summing up earlier stages of discoveries and discussions during the past two decades as follows: a. First discovery of a Hebrew Biblical manuscript (1QIs), about one thousand years older than the oldest Biblical codex known at that time, resulting in exaggerated hopes, subsequent depreciations and eventual strengthening of the moderate ‘conservative’ evaluation.

b. Further buttressing of the ‘conservative’ view after the publication of details about the text of the second Isaiah scroll (1QIs).

c. Widening of the perspective after preliminary publications of Bible fragments dating back as far as ca. 300 B.C.E. resulting in the overthrow of ‘exaggerated conservative’ claims.

d. Further widening of the perspective through finds down to the second century C.E.

Instead of being limited by the previous ‘telescoped’ view of textual development, scholars are now able to study texts written in the span of over four centuries, and for the first time tentative theories can be suggested to account for the various facts. It could be said that previously the discussion has turned on questions of ‘text and recension’. It was the theories about the development

---

of the text and the recensional activity that were challenged by the finds so far. The theories about ‘canon’ remained practically unchanged or, at the most, the new evidence caused some shifting of weight rather than calling forth any new view.\textsuperscript{2}

The recent publication of what has been termed a ‘Psalms Scroll’\textsuperscript{3} may change this picture and turn out to be the beginning of a new stage. For the first time problems of ‘canon’ will become the centre of discussion, and the answer to be given may necessitate a reformulation of existing theories no less incisive than the new outlook in matters of ‘text and recension’. For the present writer the problem of the Bible canon is thus the major issue for the theory of the growth of the Bible text which is raised by 11 Ps-a.\textsuperscript{4} He may therefore be pardoned if he feels a slight disappointment that a mong the various problems discussed by the editor of that scroll neither a full discussion of that problem nor a clear exposition of the editor’s own view are presented. But since, in practice, the editor seems to have decided in favour of a certain theory,\textsuperscript{5} it may not be superfluous to examine the question before that particular view

\textsuperscript{2} The questions raised by the ‘Septuagintoid’ Hebrew texts of Samuel and Jeremiah may be said to deal with borderline problems of ‘canon’, although they mainly affect issues of ‘recension’. In any case, the salient new feature is that the problem has been shifted back from the Greek to the Hebrew. Only the apparent absence of Esther in Qumran is exclusively a problem of ‘canon’. In the following discussion we are not concerned with the question of the inclusion or exclusion of a whole book, and ‘canon’ will refer only to problems of contents, arrangement and complete ‘closing’ of the individual book which was ultimately included in the Bible.

\textsuperscript{3} J. A. Sanders, \textit{The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11(11QPs\textsuperscript{8})}, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan IV (Oxford 1965). The scroll will be quoted in abbreviation as 11Ps-a and the edition as PSQ.

\textsuperscript{4} This does not detract from the interest roused by the hymns hitherto termed ‘Syriac Apocryphal Psalms’ and by compositions unknown so far. I hope to return to these on another occasion.

\textsuperscript{5} The issue is not clearly put (see below), and the present writer is not quite sure that he has got Sanders’ position fully right. Sanders is certainly to be commended for not delaying publication until he had arrived at a solution of the problem. But since he did take sides, at least a clear formulation of the problem might have been useful. Cp. below, n. 43. [Added in proof: In HTR 59 (1966) 83f., “Variorum in the Psalms Scroll”, which just arrived, Sanders states his position clearly and leaves no doubt that he thinks of the Scroll “not as a deviation from a rigidly fixed canon of the latter third of the Psalter, but rather as a sign-post in the multi-faceted history of the canonization of the Psalter” (p. 89). Hence, “it seems wise to view the Psalms Scroll as evidence of a Psalter tradition distinct from the “canonical” (Masoretic) which was accepted by the Rabbis after the First Jewish Revolt, in the last quarter of the first century A.D.” (p. 90). The details of his theory about the later canonization of the last third of the Psalter need not be gone into at present. There is nothing in the article that would make me change the solution suggested by me.]
becomes accepted without proper investigation of the alternatives. This paper is, therefore, meant to start the discussion, to state the two extreme opposed possible positions and to suggest a solution.\textsuperscript{6}

As far as we know at the moment, the scroll includes in size somewhat more than one-fourth of the canonical Book of Psalms — very roughly equivalent to the last fifty Psalms, in a partly different order,\textsuperscript{7} and interspersed towards the end with ‘non-canonical hymns’ and with a prose ‘Epilogue’. Two main rival theories suggest themselves to account for this arrangement:\textsuperscript{8} firstly, 11 Ps-a may be a representative of a different collection of psalms which was regarded as ‘canonical’ by some group somewhere at some time.\textsuperscript{9} In that case we are offered a unique opportunity to cast a glance into the workshop in which Biblical literature, as we know it, grew into a ‘canon’,\textsuperscript{10} and the term ‘Psalms Scroll’ is appropriate.\textsuperscript{11} Alternatively, our scroll is only based secondarily on the existing ‘canonical’ collection and is nothing but a selection for liturgical purposes, some ancient prototype of a ‘Hymn Book’.\textsuperscript{12} In that

\textsuperscript{6} It may be noted that this solution was already suggested in two preliminary notes in the Hebrew daily, \textit{Ha\'arez} 9.2.1962 and 24.8.1962 on the basis of information available at the time. It was more fully developed after the publication of the scroll in \textit{Ha\'arez} 10.12.1965. Cp. now also a similar point raised by J. van der Ploeg, “Le Psaume XCI dans une recension de Qumran”, \textit{RB} 72 (1965) 216.

\textsuperscript{7} This may account for the Psalms missing, as can be seen from PSQ, Index, p. 5. To the list given there the psalms from the fragment published by Y. Yadin in this volume, “Another fragment (E) of the Psalms Scroll from Qumran Cave 11” (pp. 1–10) must be added.

\textsuperscript{8} For our present argument it is useful to weigh the more extreme positions, although some slightly less extreme formulations may be envisaged. In trying to probe into the problems inherent in the ‘canonical theory’ there is no intention to stop where Sanders does, perhaps, stop.

\textsuperscript{9} For the sake of argument we assume as little restriction as possible.

\textsuperscript{10} At least typologically we are then carried back to a stage in the growth of the canon that we would have never dreamt of reaching. The collections out of which the canonical Book of Psalms is said to have grown are mentioned in most ‘Introductions’ and need not be gone into here. Cp. \textit{e.g.}, a century ago, J. Fuerst, \textit{Der Kanon des Alten Testaments} (Leipzig 1868) 62f. Cp. also, notes 21, 25f., 34 below.

\textsuperscript{11} Cp. n. 43, below. In the last issue of BA which just reached Jerusalem, Skehan expressly states his opinion that these are “...definitely Psalms manuscripts incorporating non-Biblical compositions” (P. W. Skehan, “The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran and the Text of the Old Testament”, \textit{BA} 28 [1965] 87f). However, he too has to admit (ib. 100) that he found “three small facts that seem... to indicate dependence of the cave 11 Psalter on the complete collection of Psalms as we know it.” I should be gratified if this may be taken as an indication that his position is not really opposed to the one I have advocated.

\textsuperscript{12} Cp. also S. Talmor’s remarks in the present volume “Pisqah Be\'em\'sha’ Pasuq and 11QPs” (pp. 11–21).
case it has little relevance for the problem of ‘canon’ and the term ‘Psalms Scroll’ is misleading, to say the least.\textsuperscript{13} It goes without saying that if the facts can be explained by our second assumption (or a similar theory), the first and more extreme one should not be adopted.

There is no doubt that the first explanation was favoured by Sanders. Since he had begun to look upon the scroll as part of a complete ‘Psalter’,\textsuperscript{14} it seemed to follow quite naturally that as late as the beginning of our era\textsuperscript{15} there was at least one group, the Qumran Covenanters, which knew\textsuperscript{16} side by side different collections of Psalms which enjoyed some recognition as ‘canonical’;\textsuperscript{17} the canon of Psalms known so far and the 11 Ps-a collection (or similar ones).\textsuperscript{18} The ‘Prose Epilogue’ (11 Ps-a, col. XXVII) is taken to prove that the hymns which for us are apocryphal were considered in Qumran as ‘canonical’ as those Biblical Psalms with which they are interspersed.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{13} From the sigla allotted to other scrolls which contain canonical Psalms too it would seem that ‘Psalms Scroll’ is not intended to be the term for any scroll which only primarily includes Psalms. It was hardly chosen devoid of any canonical connotation. Cp. below, n. 43.

\textsuperscript{14} This is clear from his discussion in BASOR 165 (1962) 14.

\textsuperscript{15} The date given in PSQ 9 (first half of the first century) seems acceptable. I doubt whether our palaeographical knowledge is secure enough to substantiate a date at the beginning of the 1st cent. C.E. (which I personally prefer).

\textsuperscript{16} I am not sure whether one may say “acknowledged”; but the scroll is hardly one man’s private invention.

\textsuperscript{17} In his main discussion (PSQ 75f.) Sanders uses both the terms ‘canonical’ and ‘Davidic’, although in general he seems to prefer to lay the stress on the belief in ‘Davidic origin’ (cp. ib. 64, 83). Although he mentions the question mainly in the paragraph dealing with the ‘apocryphal’ Psalms, it seems that he holds the view that the ‘Epilogue’ indicates that all compositions were supposed to be Davidic, including a hymn like 11Ps—a Plea, which in another Qumranic manuscript apparently is not part of a “scroll of biblical psalms” (cp. PSQ 76). Cp. above, n. 5 and below, n. 25f.

\textsuperscript{18} From notes in recent literature it seems that there are at least two other manuscripts which include both ‘canonical’ and ‘apocryphal’ psalms, although they differ from our scroll. These are scheduled for publication by Starcky and van der Ploeg (cp. RB 72 [1965] 210f.). Since the total of thirty MSS of Psalms quoted in the inventory published by Sanders (CBQ 27 [1965] 114f.) includes mostly fragments, the overall picture of the ratio between types of MSS is not absolutely clear. It is noteworthy, however, that Sanders goes on to state that “11QPs is the only Psalter manuscript in which — from our viewpoint — non-biblical material is included”. Incidentally, at present remnants of thirty-two MSS of Psalms seem to be known, adding Ps. 150 from Massada and another fragment mentioned by Skehan, BA 28 (1965) 89. This number does not include the manuscripts to be published by Starcky and van der Ploeg (see above) and the Pesharim.

\textsuperscript{19} Even if this view were acceptable in general, Sanders’ formulation (PSQ 75) “for the faithful at Qumran” is an overstatement. Cp. the preceding notes.
can thus hardly escape the conclusion that as late as the beginning of the first century C.E. the order and contents of the ‘Book of Psalms’ (or its latter part?) were not yet finally fixed and there still existed what can only be termed competing collections. A few decades later, however, when problems of canonicity were settled in Jamnia, the Rabbis were either ignorant of such rival claims or else quietly rejected them.20

This kind of view amounts to saying that the canonical Book of Psalms and 11 Ps-a represent two (out of more?) different canons, current at Qumran. But once we go so far, can we really stop there? If this theory is right, our whole picture of the completion of the growth of the various books of the Bible accepted as ‘canonical’ may be wrong. After all, the sources known prior to the publication of 11 Ps-a seemed quite abundant and reliable, and scholars had good reason to be more or less agreed on the picture to be drawn of the state of the ‘canon’ in the first century C.E.21 If this picture now turns out to be basically wrong, if a rival ‘canon’ of Psalms could exist as late as the first century, we must doubt whether any other view we hold with regard to questions of ‘canon’ is more than the result of lack of information. It is beyond discussion that cherished beliefs and theories must give way to newly emerging evidence. But it should be equally clear that such evidence must be compelling and decisive.

We may start by inquiring whether the ‘Prose Epilogue’ compulsus us to assume that the collector22 of 11 Ps-a intended, indeed, to hand down what he believed to be a rival canonical collection. The text of the ‘Epilogue’23 reads as follows:

20 For the moment I shall refrain from arguing that the concept of ‘canonization’ which underlies this train of thought — a concept fairly widespread in contemporary writing — is not borne out by the only sources we possess, and may have been influenced by concepts prevalent in New Testament studies. In any case, I am not aware of any evidence that the inclusion or exclusion of parts of any book was still discussed in Jamnia.

21 If 11 Ps-a were a scroll written ca. 300 B.C.E., the theory might be somewhat more acceptable. But even then we would have to accept the principle that we should adopt the less extreme hypothesis. Although further misunderstanding might be caused, attention should be drawn to the interesting theory about the original growth of the canon, proposed some years ago, without any connection with the discovery of the Scrolls, by N.H. Tur-Sinai, Ha-Lashon weho-Sefer II (Jerusalem 1950) 12f., which envisages different types of literary frameworks for collections of Psalms. That theory should now be reviewed in the light of Talmon’s suggestions on the Pisqah (cp. n. 13). But, of course, Tur-Sinai’s theory was not intended to describe the state of affairs in the first century C.E., but refers to a much earlier date.

22 This term may be the most appropriate one. But also scribe, copyist, etc., might be suggested.

23 The text is best understood as fulfilling some such function, and by its very contents stresses the liturgical character of the collection. We would then have to explain its
It is submitted that the 'Epilogue' does not offer any evidence that the collector put forward the claim of any 'canonicity' for this collection, and it is not only the rules of critical scholarship that interpret this 'blurb' as a conspicuous sign that this was never a canonical Biblical collection. The claim for 'Davidic' authorship (cp. above, n. 17) can hardly be taken as evidence that the collection enjoyed canonical status with anyone. What the collector wished his readers to believe was—possibly even in conscious contradiction to the accepted canon—that, similarly to the legendary number of the wise sayings attributed to Solomon, there was a huge treasure of hymns credited to David. Many of these had, perhaps, been used liturgically, as the 'Epilogue' informs us, and some of these were saved and were available—perhaps even in use in the community. No better way could be thought of to ensure future use of these hymns than to collect them together with a selection of 'canonical' Psalms. It is thus, at the utmost, 'Davidic' authorship that is also claimed for the 'non-present position within the scroll. If intended as a formal 'canon' statement, it would present a further difficulty. On the other hand, I shall not press the point that it was deliberately taken away from the end in order to prevent an interpretation as 'close of the canon'. Such an argument would be somewhat too sophisticated. Since according to the view expressed here nothing 'canonical' was intended, the collection did not have to remain 'closed'. Anyhow, the 'Epilogue' itself offers some indirect evidence as to the dependence of this collection on the canonical book. The growth would be pictured like this: canonical Psalms up to 150, added hymn, some or the whole of 'the last words of David'—of which only 2 Sam 23:7 remained—the 'Epilogue' and then the additions ending with Ps. 151.

24 Which also called forth apocryphal creations.

25 On a different level some typological lesson may be learned for the studying of problems put by the canonical collection (cp. n. 10, above). The old problem whether Davidic authorship (or 'mentorship') was originally claimed only for those seventy-three Psalms which bear his name (cp. Introductions to the Bible) can now be seen in the light of this collection, which includes some Psalms headed לְדוֹרי and then adds the 'Epilogue' which may reasonably, though not necessarily (cp. above, n. 17), be interpreted as claiming such authorship for the whole collection. A further problem, unlikely to be solved at the moment, is raised by the לְדוֹר heading of an 'apocryphal' psalm mentioned by van der Ploeg, loc. cit. 216.
canonical’ hymns in the collection. This would not have constituted a claim for a rival ‘canon’ even if the collector had given us all the four thousand psalms and hymns.

To be sure, were there anything to compel us to assume that the collection was meant to be ‘canonical’, we would be forced at the same time to admit that our scroll also proves the existence of a variant ‘canonical’ collection, specific to the Qumran Covenanters (and, possibly, other sectarian groups). Since nothing specifically ‘Qumranic’ has been discovered so far with regard to Bible texts, this would be a result of far-reaching consequences. To put it more strongly: The ‘canonical’ theory would create at one and the same time the additional difficulty of a specific ‘Qumranic’ collection of canonical character, not to mention at the moment the third difficulty connected with the recensional-textual side (see below). The assumption of ‘Qumranic’ (or allied sectarian) provenance of the collection is indicated not so much because of the contents of the ‘apocryphal’ hymns but because the ‘Epilogue’ presupposes the Qumranic calendar. Since it is this ‘Epilogue’ on which the theory rests, little would be gained by assuming separate origins for the Epilogue and the rest of the scroll and by pronouncing the ‘Epilogue’ a secondary addition. While this particular collection with its ‘Epilogue’ was thus probably restricted to Qumran, we have at present no way of knowing whether there existed similar collections outside Qumran based on similar beliefs or interests. But it ought to be stressed that the Qumran tendencies in our Epilogue should not be interpreted to mean that there was a similarity in origin,

26 The main doubt whether even as much as this was claimed for the whole of the collection is raised by the Wisdom song, hitherto known as the end of Sirach. No convincing explanation has been offered, but I would not regard it as an unsurmountable obstacle to the interpretation that the collector wished this song to be taken as Davidic (cp. PSQ 85). It may not be altogether impossible that the differences between the texts of Sirach and 11 Ps-a could have been regarded as something like the differences between almost identical prophecies, attributable to different prophets on account of ‘variations in style’.

27 This point is arguable; cp. PSQ 69f., 75. The discussion here does not touch upon the question of whether any of the ‘apocryphal’ psalms included was of an origin similar to that of those psalms which for some reason entered the canonical collection. Cp. above, n. 10.

28 The fact itself — though not the conclusion — has been noted PSQ 91.

29 Cp. also the problem mentioned above, n. 23.

30 Or other sects which accepted that calendar. It might be argued, of course, that in spite of the sectarian origin not everyone outside the sect need have noticed this nicety, and hence the collection might have gained wider currency.

31 It is a matter for speculation whether there was any connection between such collections and later ‘Hymnbooks’. Cp. below, notes 35, 42.
status, purpose, etc. to the specific Qumranic Hodayot — for which, of course, no ‘Davidic’ authorship was claimed.

This part of our inquiry has thus shown that not only is there no compelling evidence for the theory of a different canon, but there is no evidence at all. The theory is not only far-reaching, but involves considerable additional difficulties. There is no justification for building an interpretation of the scroll on such a theory and we must try to investigate whether a less extreme hypothesis will fit the facts equally well, or even better.

Our assumption that 11Ps-a was never intended to be more than a ‘liturgical’ collection is strengthened by the specific form of some of the ‘canonical’ Psalms.\(^{32}\) It is here that the problems of canon and text coincide. At present the most important point is raised by Ps. 145. The form of this psalm in 11Ps-a differs basically from its form in all other known witnesses. After each verse the refrain בְּרָעֶרֶךְ הָאָדָם יִשָּׁה עָלָיו וָעָלִיהָ was added.\(^ {33}\) If we accept the theory that in the beginning of the first century C.E. this is the ‘text’ of Ps. 145 in a collection which was meant to be canonical, an additional grave complication arises. Indeed, a far-reaching restatement of our theory with regard to the state of the Bible text at that time would become necessary. On the other hand, if we accept the ‘liturgical’ theory, the form of Ps. 145 in this scroll represents the ‘text’, rewritten for liturgical purposes.\(^ {34}\) In other words, if we take our clue from Ps. 145 and accept its from at face value, the two types of problems, canonical and textual, are solved at the same time.\(^ {35}\)

\(^{32}\) The selective character and radically different order of the canonical Psalms within the scroll are such obvious points in favour of the ‘liturgical’ theory that they need not be gone into. It should be noted that among all those Qumranic manuscripts of Psalms of which we possess a text long enough to permit an investigation (cp. Sanders list mentioned above, n. 18) there seems to be only one manuscript which in one instance shows clearly a change of order, (as opposed to some cases where a psalm may have been just omitted) i.e. Ps. 71 in 4QPsa. This case must be investigated once that scroll is published; cp. meanwhile Skehan’s remarks in Suppl. to VT 4(1957) 154. From these descriptions it would not seem that there is another instance in 4PQs. In that scroll, however, Ps. 112 may be out of place, according to Skehan’s remark in the Catalogue notes to the ‘Scrolls from the Wilderness of the Dead Sea Exhibition’ (1965) 30.

\(^{33}\) There is no reason to assume that the system was different in the part of the psalm now missing.

\(^{34}\) As throughout this study, one of the main issues between the exponents of the two opposed theories will be whether this first century manuscript is accepted as representing some state or process which was possible or existing already centuries earlier or whether we realize that certain forces which influenced the form of the canonical Psalms could remain active in a slightly different way also after the canonical form had become fixed. In any case, typologically Ps. 145 in 11Ps-a is a most interesting illustration of the introduction of refrains into psalms, as seen first and foremost in Ps. 136.

\(^{35}\) It is mainly because of instances like this that I take 11Ps-a as a liturgical scroll, but
Once we try out the hypothesis that 11Ps-a is a liturgical collection, based on the known canon, other details, though less conspicuous, will be better understood. Thus, col. XVI allegedly gives the text of Ps. 118:

One could think of three possible explanations for the variation: either we term this a new ‘uncanonical’ psalm — in spite of obvious affinities with Ps. 118 — in which case those lines have no bearing on the problem under discussion at the moment. Or this ‘text’ pertains to a completely different recension, in which case we have an even more impressive proof that much of what has been written recently about textual development up to the first century C.E. must be rewritten. Or else, like in later liturgies, the composition consists of a few loosely connected Biblical verses, with free variations, in which case we now possess proof from this scroll for the existence of a custom known so far from later periods only. In other words, the ‘liturgical’ theory again offers the most acceptable solution for the textual problem. The fact that the fragment now published by Yadin (see n. 7) contains parts of Ps. 118

the main argument would not be much influenced if we speak of a selection for liturgic and midrashic purposes. By the way, it should be noted that about one third of the ‘canonical’ component of the scroll is taken up by Ps. 119, which is known for its later liturgical application, and most of the canonical psalms included are parts of later liturgies. Cp. also n. 46, below.

36 Only details which seem to me the most important mainstay of this theory are mentioned here, but the secondary nature of 11Ps-a may be proved, perhaps, by other details too. For instance, in the canonical collection each psalm of a whole group (Pss. 120–134) is headed רֵשֵׁר לִמּוֹלָשׁ (121: רֵשֵׁר לִמּוֹלָשׁ). All the psalms of this group which are included in 11Ps-a (Pss. 121–132) appear together according to the canonical sequence (col. III–VI). Ps. 133 however, appears by itself in col. XXIII, yet it bears the heading. It is difficult to imagine a reasonable explanation unless we accept the most obvious one, i.e. that our selection is secondary. Cp. now Skehan’s remark BA, loc. cit. For the prose section in col. XXVII cp. above. Cp. also above, n. 11.

37 For my own position cp. above, n. 1 and Ha’arez 8 and 15.1.1965.

38 Cp. below, n. 41. The reason that the present writer is acquainted with this custom mainly from Syriac and Hebrew liturgical texts, is that these are the ones he happens to have studied. No doubt similar cases exist in Greek, Latin and other liturgies. In present-day Jewish prayers, apparently consisting of strings of Biblical verses, there is also a fair number of ‘ghost quotations’.

39 It may be too early to try and evolve a methodology for dealing with the considerable number of textual variations in 11Ps-a. Should all these be judged as variant readings of a Biblical text, or do we have to apply the category of ‘liturgical variant’ — and how
constitutes of course, the decisive proof for our argument (cp. below, n. 40).

A last example. The upper third of col. II is described in PSQ 23 as containing Ps. 146. But for the major part of that text the editor has to note in his apparatus that all the known witnesses omit it. The text (about one half of each line is missing) reads as follows: ...

In our submission this is not Ps. 146 but a ‘hymn’ based on themes from Psalms. 40

To sum up: The theory that 11 Ps.-a represents a different ‘canon’ has little
to commend it. Not only is that theory extreme, with no evidence to support
it, but it creates additional grave problems. While the present study was
intended to formulate and examine the two opposed theories, our investigation, as
shown by the above examples, 41 has made us come down heavily on one side.
The ‘liturgical’ theory solves all the difficulties at the same time and explains
the facts by less far-reaching assumptions. In accepting it we run into no

will we be able to differentiate? Surely, the mere absence from other witnesses is no
criterion. From Sanders’ notes one sees immediately that all types of variations occur:
paralleled (e.g. 129: 3: ) and unparalleled (e.g. 119: 129: ), interchange of ‘equivalents’ (e.g. 132: 12: ); and ‘hyper-
corrections’ (e.g. 144: 15: are the same as in this Psalm). Are the variations in Ps. 130
(col. V) dependent on liturgical use (v. 2: )? Or what about
the consistent change of (Ps. 119, noted as such in PsQ 11 (on what occurs in
MT only in this Psalm)? etc. etc. The present writer cannot but feel that the ‘liturgical’
theory accounts for the textual state of the scroll in general; but even among those
who will accept this explanation much discussion on details is still ahead.

40 It is not sufficient to introduce — as Sanders does — a question-mark into the heading
which designates the text as Ps. 146 and to note in the apparatus the verses in the canonical
Psalms which the words in 11Ps-a resemble. I would almost go so far as to suggest
that the assumption of a ‘hymn’ is, paradoxically, even more vital for those scholars
who believe in the ‘canonical theory’. For, as Sanders himself noted, the text of what
he calls Ps. 146 resembles to some extent part of Ps. 145. Ps. 145, however, as we have
seen, is included in our scroll in its own right — and in a different text form. Whether
the text at the top of col. II as a whole will be termed a ‘variation on a theme’ from Ps.
146 is not really important. Mutatis mutandis this holds true for what has been said
above about the alleged Ps. 118.

41 Other points may be added. Thus the beginning of Ps. 135 (col. XIV) is more easily
understood in a liturgical setting. Furthermore additions like (end
of Ps. 133) and (Ps. 149) are better understood in the frame-
work of a manuscript which is not a ‘Biblical’ scroll in the strictest sense of the word.
Cp. above, notes 11, 23, 36.
difficulties, and for future work it is at least the more acceptable hypothesis.

Our results, however, should in no way be interpreted as lessening the value or importance of the scroll; they may even enhance our interest. Its very nature as a prototype of 'psalters' or 'liturgies' — which by the way gives us a first inkling of what may have been intended in the much quoted correspondence of Timotheos I by the words:

its text, its connection with somewhat similar collections, its 'apocryphal psalms' and their amazing reappearance in Syriac, the 'Sirach' — hymn,

The only difficulty which might seem to exist is that 11 Ps-a includes, at present, forty 'canonical' Psalms. But we are too ignorant to allow any statement to the effect that this number is too large or too small for a liturgical collection, nor do we possess any yardstick to decide how such a collection ought to have been arranged. Jewish and Christian prayer books to this day contain about double that number, and during one Sabbath an orthodox Jew will recite in the course of his prayer (according to some rites) as many psalms as are included in the scroll — apart from 'hymns' made up from verses. According to van der Ploeg, loc. cit. 216 the same holds true for the breviary.

In order to explain the sequence of psalms within the scroll a little experiment was undertaken. The numbers of forty psalms were written down at random, the slips mixed and then put into a new sequence at random. This was repeated. On each occasion a rationale for the 'order' suggested itself. I shall, therefore, abstain from 'explaining' the order of the psalms in 11 Ps-a.

Since the nomenclature adopted by the scholars responsible for publication in the DJD series differentiates between strictly Biblical and other scrolls, the designation 11QPa is probably wrong. As a Hebrew term I have suggested (see Ha'arez 10.12.65), taking the clue from the 'Epilogue', thus leaving the term 11QPa for the canonical collection — simply in order to avoid confusion. Cp. n. 11. I am not absolutely convinced that the very term 'Psalms Scroll' has not in some way contributed to the fact that these problems connected with the scroll were not weighed up, and things were taken too much for granted. This does not diminish the gratitude all specialists owe the editor for his devoted work and for his endeavour to make the material available without undue delay. Cp. above, n. 5.

Cp. the edition of Braun, "Der Katholikon Timotheos I und seine Briefe", Oros Christianus I (1901) 307. Since Eissfeldt's remark on the subject ("Der Anlass zur Entdeckung der Höhle und ihr ähnliche Vorgänge aus älterer Zeit", ThLZ 74 [1949] 598), that story has been quoted again and again.

At present I shall just summarize my tentative conclusions in examining these psalms, i.e. that the Syriac depends directly on the Hebrew. I can find no convincing evidence for a Greek intermediary, assumed in Noth's important study, long before the present discovery ("Die fünf syrisch überlieferten apokryphen Psalmen", ZAW 48 [1930] 1f., esp. 12f.). Unless we assume that these 'apocryphal' Psalms were translated more or less concurrently with the 'canonical' ones — not too likely an assumption — the theory that it was indeed the Qumran caves which were discovered in the days of Timotheos (cp. n. 44) and that there was secondary influence on medieval literature may be considerably strengthened. I hope to deal with these questions elsewhere.
etc., all these will long continue to be discussed. As stated at the beginning, our scroll may usher in a new stage in our understanding of Biblical and allied manuscripts at Qumran; it is hoped that the position suggested here will turn out to be a step in the right direction.