

Drew Longacre\*

# The 11Q5 Psalter as a Scribal Product: Standing at the Nexus of Textual Development, Editorial Processes, and Manuscript Production

<https://doi.org/10.1515/zaw-2022-0004>

## 1 Introduction

Within the large body of secondary literature on the 11Q5 (11QP<sup>s</sup>) psalter, the impact of practical constraints associated with manuscript production remains largely unexplored. Previous studies have tended to approach the 11Q5 psalter as a composition from a literary perspective without a view to the practical factors that influenced the compiler<sup>1</sup> who produced it. Those interested in scribal practices tend to limit themselves to studying the manuscript 11Q5, rather than the compilation of which it is a copy.

In this article I investigate the nexus between textual development, editorial processes, and physical manuscript production through the example of the 11Q5 psalter. I propose that the 11Q5 psalter is best understood as the result of editorial planning and execution that was guided and partially determined by pragmatic concerns for manuscript production. Thus, scholars should carefully investigate

---

<sup>1</sup> I will normally refer to the creator of the 11Q5 psalter as its »compiler« in the functional sense of one whose creative contributions primarily entail the collection and interpolation of new material and the rearrangement of texts in the process of producing a new collection or version thereof.

---

**Article Note:** The research for this article was carried out under the ERC Starting Grant of the European Research Council (EU Horizon 2020): The Hands that Wrote the Bible: Digital Palaeography and Scribal Culture of the Dead Sea Scrolls (HandsandBible #640497), principal investigator: Mladen Popović. My subproject investigates the role of scribes in the copying and development of scriptural texts in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods. I owe a special debt of gratitude to Mladen Popović, Eibert Tigchelaar, and Wout van Bekkum, who read and responded to drafts of this article.

---

**\*Kontakt:** Drew Longacre, Qumran Institute, Faculty of Theology University of Groningen, Oude Boteringestraat 38, 9712 GK Groningen, The Netherlands, E-Mail: [d.g.longacre@rug.nl](mailto:d.g.longacre@rug.nl)

its source texts, the plan for revision, and the production of its first complete draft copy.

Close attention to practical factors of text production yields a coherent profile of the working practices of the compiler of the 11Q5 psalter. I suggest that the compiler operated with several default modes or working principles, some of which were conditioned specifically by the material processes of text production. These defaults include: an aim for an efficient workflow, preservation of source material, linear progression through both the primary exemplar and the first complete written draft document, the use of a minimal number of exemplars with a limited field of view, and the conception of the psalter as an open book, an anthology subject to further supplementation and rearrangement. With regard to the creative contributions of the compiler, the entire production of the well-preserved parts of the 11Q5 psalter entails two expansions of psalms, five insertions of supplementary material, eight or nine movements of psalms, and a corrective appendix. I further suggest that these various interventions frequently cluster together in concentrated focal points of editorial activity at seams in the macrostructure of the 11Q5 psalter. Some of these were already structural divisions in a base text, while others were newly effected by the compiler.

My explanation of the process of the creation of the 11Q5 psalter challenges the current near consensus that it was a distinct literary work other than a version of the traditional psalter. I suggest rather that the 11Q5 psalter was created as a revised version of the psalter, expanded and rearranged from an MT-like (i. e., Masoretic text) base text to enhance thematic, lexical, and sometimes formal connections between psalms.

## 2 Reconstruction and Base Text of the 11Q5 Psalter

The 11Q5 psalter is attested in at least three manuscripts from Qumran: 11Q5 (11QPs<sup>a</sup>), 11Q6 (11QPs<sup>b</sup>), and 4Q87 (4QPs<sup>c</sup>).<sup>2</sup> The best preserved copy of the 11Q5

---

<sup>2</sup> So also Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms*, STDJ 17 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 159–164; Patrick W. Skehan, Eugene Ulrich and Peter W. Flint, »87. 4QPs<sup>c</sup>,« in *Qumran Cave 4, XI: Psalms to Chronicles*, DJD 16 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 73–84: 76; 81; Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar and Adam S. van der Woude, »6. 11QPsalms<sup>b</sup>,« in *Qumran Cave 11, II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31*, DJD 23 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 37–47: 38. Ulrich Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QPs<sup>a</sup> aus Qumran*, STDJ 49 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 52–59, has objected to the inclusion of 4Q87 as a parallel to 11Q5 on the basis of small-scale textual differences between 4Q87 and 11Q5, but these are entirely understandable within the context of around two

psalter is its namesake 11Q5,<sup>3</sup> but Eva Jain has demonstrated that the lacunose portions at the beginning of this scroll before Ps 118 cannot be definitively reconstructed (parts of Pss 101→102→103 and 109 are preserved on separated fragments).<sup>4</sup> 11Q6 and 4Q87 indicate that the underlying collection included earlier psalms (Pss 76→77→78, 81, 86, 88, 89, 114, 115→116, apparently in the same order as the MT, though the manuscripts cannot confidently be reconstructed), such that the 11Q5 psalter likely encompassed the entire scope of the MT Pss 1–150.<sup>5</sup> In light of the poor preservation of the beginning of the collection, profiling the editorial work of the compiler of the 11Q5 psalter should be based primarily on the well-preserved portions of 11Q5 from frg. E i–Col. XXVIII, ranging from Pss 118–151A+B. Starting from what can be confidently known establishes a more secure basis for understanding the 11Q5 psalter, which can in turn potentially shed light on its fragmentary earlier portions.<sup>6</sup>

The influential studies of James Sanders, Gerald Wilson, and Peter Flint raised the possibility that the 11Q5 psalter may have been produced in parallel to the MT psalter on the basis of a common, shorter psalter containing only approximately books I–III of the MT psalter (Pss 1–89).<sup>7</sup> But many scholars objected that the 11Q5 psalter was directly dependent upon the full MT psalter as a secondary composition,<sup>8</sup> and further recent detailed textual studies have led to a near con-

---

centuries of textual transmission between the creation of the 11Q5 psalter and the copying of the Qumran manuscripts. 4Q87 shared the distinctive sequence Pss 118→104→[147]→105 with 11Q5.

**3** Note well that this article focuses on the 11Q5 psalter as a hypothetical, (re)constructed *composition* (everywhere labelled »the 11Q5 psalter«) and its presumed first complete written draft(s), rather than the *manuscript* 11Q5 itself.

**4** Eva Jain, *Psalmen oder Psalter? Materielle Rekonstruktion und inhaltliche Untersuchung der Psalmenhandschriften aus der Wüste Juda*, STDJ 109 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 176.

**5** Even if the manuscripts 4Q87, 11Q5, and 11Q6 themselves only contained the second half of the Davidic psalter, the total lack of psalms from the first half in their preserved portions probably presupposes the first half as an earlier part of the full 11Q5 psalter.

**6** For the preserved contents of the 11Q5 psalter, see Table 1 in section 4.

**7** See especially James A. Sanders, »Cave 11 Surprises and the Question of Canon,« in *New Directions in Biblical Archaeology*, ed. David N. Freedman and Jonas C. Greenfield (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1969), 101–116; Gerald H. Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*, SBL Dissertation Series 76 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), 91f.; Flint, *Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 168–171. Wilson was more ambivalent than Sanders and Flint.

**8** Patrick W. Skehan, »A Liturgical Complex in 11QPs<sup>a</sup>,« *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 35/2 (1973) 195–205; Patrick W. Skehan, »Qumran and Old Testament Criticism,« in *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, ed. M. Delcor, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium XLVI (Paris: Éditions Duculot, 1978), 163–182; Shemaryahu Talmon, »Pisqah Be'emša' Pasuq and 11QPs<sup>a</sup>,« *Textus* 5 (1966) 11–21: 12; Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, »The Psalms Scroll (11QPs<sup>a</sup>): A Problem of Canon and Text,« *Textus* 5 (1966) 22–33.

sensus that the 11Q5 psalter is actually dependent on a psalter very similar to the MT psalter.<sup>9</sup>

Indeed, the similarities in contents and general arrangement, supported by small-scale textual comparisons, require such dependency.<sup>10</sup> All of the major editorial features of the proto-MT psalter seem to be presupposed in the 11Q5 psalter, including: 1) all 150 MT psalms in their MT forms (including superscriptions, with very few exceptions), 2) in roughly the same general order, 3) with many of the same groups of psalms, 4) ending with Pss 149→150, and 5) with the book-dividing doxologies (cf. Ps 89:53 in 4Q87). Accordingly, I disagree with Sanders, Wilson, and Flint, and I will here suppose that the primary base text from which the compiler worked was essentially the fully formed proto-MT psalter.<sup>11</sup> Any

---

**9** Johannes P. M. van der Ploeg, »Le sens et un problème textuel du Ps LXXXIX,« in *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles*, Alter Orient und Altes Testament 212 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1981), 471–481: 476; Ben Zion Wacholder, »David's Eschatological Psalter 11Q Psalms,« *HUCA* 59 (1988) 23–72; Menahem Haran, »11QPs<sup>a</sup> and the Canonical Book of Psalms,« in *Minḥah Le-Naḥum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of His 70th Birthday*, ed. Marc Zvi Brettler and Michael Fishbane, JSOTSup 154 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 193–201; Heinz-Josef Fabry, »Der Psalter in Qumran,« in *Der Psalter in Judentum und Christentum*, ed. Erich Zenger (Freiburg: Herder, 1998), 137–163: 158–160; Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*; Martin Leuenberger, »Aufbau und Pragmatik des 11QPs<sup>a</sup>-Psalter,« *RevQ* 22/2 (2005) 163–211: 170; 200–204; esp. 203 f.; Emanuel Tov, »Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts from Qumran,« in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays*, Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 121 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 27–41: 37; Reinhard G. Kratz, »Blessed Be the Lord and Blessed Be His Name Forever: Psalm 145 in the Hebrew Bible and in the Psalms Scroll 11Q5,« in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday*, ed. Jeremy Penner, Ken M. Penner and Cecilia Wassen, STDJ 98 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 229–243: 236 f.; D. Andrew Teeter, »Wisdom, Torah, and Rewritten Scripture: Jubilees and 11QPs<sup>a</sup> in Comparative Perspective,« in *Wisdom and Torah: The Reception of 'Torah' in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period*, ed. Bernd U. Schipper and D. Andrew Teeter (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 233–272: 260; Jain, *Psalmen oder Psalter*, 278; 280; Mika S. Pajunen, »Perspectives on the Existence of a Particular Authoritative Book of Psalms in the Late Second Temple Period,« *JSOT* 39/2 (2014) 139–163; Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible*, VTSup 169 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 194–199; 203; Christiane Böhm, *Die Rezeption der Psalmen in den Qumranschriften, bei Philo von Alexandrien und im Corpus Paulinum*, WUNT 437 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 82.

**10** While memory and orality were no doubt important dynamics in ancient Jewish textual culture, the quantity of materials and the complexity of the text-production process envisioned here would have required the use of written source texts.

**11** Recognition of the proto-MT and 11Q5 psalters as substantial, well-defined, influential, and closely related collections would invalidate the argument of Eva Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 33, that there was no conceptual category of a determinate »book of Psalms« available in the Second Temple period. The evidence for such a definite composition is not negated by its amenability to modification and diverse

non-recoverable minor discrepancies between the MT and the now-lost base text are not likely to affect the overall profile of the editorial work of the compiler significantly. The cogency of this assertion is only reinforced by the consequent coherent profile of the compiler outlined below.

### 3 Formation of the 11Q5 Psalter

Much has been written on the contents and arrangement of the 11Q5 psalter as a composition and its dependence on a psalter similar to the MT, but scholars have devoted considerably less attention to elucidating the processes of text production by which it was created. In this core section, I will explore the impact of material factors and editorial processes on the formation of the 11Q5 psalter with a view to illuminating the possible conditions and constraints they may have imposed on the editing of the collection. In doing so, I will propose a comprehensive profile of the working practices of the compiler of the 11Q5 psalter, which I suggest sheds important new light on how the collection was intended to be received.

It must first be delineated what will and will not be considered as part of the compiler's work. Small-scale textual variants within the psalms and their paratexts are of limited usefulness for profiling the working practices of the compiler. Although it may be necessary to consider some as relevant on a case-by-case basis, most of these rather subtle changes are probably better explained by relatively mundane transmission processes with very little creative scribal input.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, it is often far from clear whether such variants were already found in the base text of the compiler, were created in the revision process, or were created in subsequent copying acts over as many as two hundred years of transmission of the collection before the extant copies.

On the other hand, larger interpolations and rearrangements have a more convincing claim to have come from the hand of the compiler of the 11Q5 psalter. 11Q5, 11Q6, and 4Q87 clearly agree on several distinctive series and interpolations of psalms and are compatible everywhere else, reinforcing the coherence of the

---

reuse for a variety of contexts and purposes. However, the significance of this malleability in relation to the status of the versions within their respective communities remains a challenging question.

<sup>12</sup> While Dahmen, *Psalm- und Psalter-Rezeption*, 101–266, is undoubtedly correct that the majority of these are secondary changes from texts now found in the MT psalter, he regularly overestimates both their intentionality and significance. For scribal tolerance of small differences, see Raymond F. Person Jr., »The Ancient Israelite Scribe as Performer,« *JBL* 117/4 (1998) 601–609.

common text form and suggesting that the formative editorial work was indeed carried out in a single, comprehensive revision of the psalter tradition. These changes yield a coherent profile that is best attributed to the work of a single individual (or at most a small collaborative project), who creatively reworked the base text to produce a new edition of the psalter. In section 3 I will elucidate this profile by classifying the default modes and specific editorial decisions implied by the work of the compiler.

### **3.1 Default Modes**

Because the compiler revised a prior base text, it is not safe to assume the same level of intentionality and significance in every feature of the 11Q5 psalter. Several phenomena in the 11Q5 psalter suggest that the compiler operated with a set of default modes. These defaults could have reflected either well-established conventions or conscious decisions about the overall workflow. Active departures from these more passive defaults at particular points would then imply specific reasons for the resulting changes. The general defaults contribute less to the unique and creative aspects of the compiler's revision of the psalter than the more focused and exceptional editorial interventions identified in section 3.2 below. The compiler's default modes or working principles apparently included: efficiency, preservation, linear progression, a limited number of exemplars, and the conception of psalm collection as anthologizing.

#### **3.1.1 Efficiency**

In the sections below I will attempt to delineate the editorial decisions made by the compiler on the assumption of an economical workflow, which limited unnecessary complexity and manual labor (e. g., linear progression and the use of a minimal number of exemplars, for which see sections 3.1.3–4). Of course, in some cases it can be demonstrated that editorial purposes trumped concerns for efficiency (e. g., movement of psalms, for which see section 3.2.3). But the most plausible assumption is that the compiler worked by default to optimize time and effort, and departures from this principle suggest intentional editorial aims.

#### **3.1.2 Preservation**

One important, but often neglected, default evident in the work of the compiler is an impulse for the preservation of material received from the primary base text. There is essentially no compelling evidence for the compiler's intentionally omitting any received material. In the well-preserved portions of 11Q5

(Pss 118–151A+B), all of the psalms in the base text were retained without exception (MT Pss 118–150); the compiler did not selectively pick and choose which of these psalms to reproduce.<sup>13</sup> The significance of this observation cannot be overstated. If the selective use of a base text is indeed a characteristic feature of new compositions,<sup>14</sup> then the systematic preservation of material from the base text surely implies that the compiler intended the 11Q5 psalter to be a continuation, revision, or extension of the psalter tradition, rather than a completely new and literarily distinct composition.<sup>15</sup> In other words, the 11Q5 psalter is indeed a version of the psalter (similarly Sanders, Wilson, and Flint), even though it is dependent upon the earlier proto-MT version.

A corollary of preservation is that the compiler copied most of the received psalms without making significant changes to their textual contents. With few exceptions, the variations between the texts of the psalms and other text forms are minimal, and most can be easily explained by relatively mundane transmission processes. Even if the compiler did occasionally alter the received texts (a possibility which cannot, of course, be completely precluded), it would have been an exceptional departure from the normal working mode, and there is no solid evidence either that it was done systematically or that it was related to the other editorial decisions. Thus, the compiler's work as a reviser or editor was not meticulous, redacting the wording of the individual psalms to fit some overarching structural or thematic program. Rather, it focused on a higher level of arrangement and inventory with the individual psalms as the primary units.

---

**13** Contra, e. g., Goshen-Gottstein, »The Psalms Scroll (11QPs<sup>a</sup>)«: 29 n. 32; Gerald H. Wilson, »The Qumran Psalms Scroll (11QPs<sup>a</sup>) and the Canonical Psalter: Comparison of Editorial Shaping,« *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 59 (1997) 448–464: 451–453; Leuenberger, »Aufbau und Pragmatik«: 172f.; Pajunen, »Perspectives«: 155 f.; Nancy L. deClaisse-Walford, »An Examination of the Songs of Ascents and Psalm 119 in 11QPs<sup>a</sup>,« in *Scribal Practice, Text and Canon in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essays in Memory of Peter W. Flint*, ed. John J. Collins and Ananda Geyser-Fouché, STDJ 130 (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 153–171: 160. For the characteristic selectiveness of later Jewish liturgies, see Stefan C. Reif, *Problems with Prayers: Studies in the Textual History of Early Rabbinic Liturgy*, SJ 37 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2006), 72f.

**14** See, e. g., John F. Quant, *Rewriting Scripture Inside and Out: A Typology of Rewriting in Variant Editions and Rewritten Scripture* (Emory University: Ph.D. diss., 2014).

**15** Contra many scholars, e. g., Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*; Kratz, »Blessed Be the Lord«: 236; Teeter, »Wisdom, Torah, and Rewritten Scripture«: 259 f.; Jain, *Psalmen oder Psalter*, 280. Mroczek, *Literary Imagination*, 38, considers the question unanswerable and anachronistic, since she denies the existence of any defined »book of Psalms« in the period (see also her pp. 25 f.).

### 3.1.3 Linear Progression

Since the 11Q5 psalter retains much of the same overall structure and sequence as its base text, the necessary conclusion is that the editor conducted the work (at both the planning and execution stages) by progressing through the primary exemplar in a linear fashion from start to finish.<sup>16</sup> Some long-range movements of psalms discussed below (section 3.2.3) would have necessarily interrupted this progress, forcing the editor to scroll back and forth within the exemplar. But once the movement was accomplished, the compiler inevitably returned to the original place in the scroll and continued the sporadically interrupted linear progression through the primary exemplar. This would have facilitated the inclusion of all material from the exemplar, which would have been more efficient and less error-prone than eclectic selection.

While in the planning stages there may have been great flexibility for making adjustments, once the compiler (or a collaborator) began writing down the revised version of the psalter on parchment sheets, they would have been almost completely restricted to a forward linear trajectory also in the production of the first complete written draft of the 11Q5 psalter. It would have been practically impossible to secondarily insert anything but the shortest of texts within the previously written portions without making a mess of things. Realistically, further psalms could only be written down after the most recently penned text.

### 3.1.4 Limited Number of Exemplars

Another default practice flowing from the optimization of the workflow is that the compiler apparently limited the number of exemplars necessary to complete the task. The creation of the 11Q5 psalter was guided by a single primary exemplar that provided the main contents and reference points throughout the revision process. Such a starting point would be highly efficient for ensuring the full preservation of its contents, while minimizing redundancies and other mishaps. In the case of some long-range movements of psalms (e. g., Ps 119 or 145–148), it is possible that the compiler chose to procure or create secondary exemplars to aid in the production of the first complete written draft of the 11Q5 psalter, but this would not have been necessary.

In contrast, the insertions of new texts certainly imply the use of one or more secondary exemplars, since the traditional nature of the psalms makes it unlikely that these were the original creations of the compiler. But even here, the com-

---

<sup>16</sup> For a similar observation with regard to the linear reuse of Amenemope (in multiple »sweeps«) in the composition of Proverbs 22:17–23:11, see Michael V. Fox, »From Amenemope to Proverbs: Editorial Art in Proverbs 22,17–23,11,« *ZAW* 126/1 (2014) 76–91.

piler seems to have sought economy, given the fact that these inserted texts often cluster together in the 11Q5 psalter, suggesting that the secondary exemplar(s) may have contained multiple psalms that were incorporated into the 11Q5 psalter *en bloc*.

### 3.1.5 Psalm Collection as Anthology

The aforementioned linear progression is practical and mechanical in nature, by no means implying the types of linear interpretation strategies for reading or reformulating the psalter as a »book« suggested by many modern Psalms scholars. Rather, the compiler's attitude towards rearrangement and supplementation suggests that he understood the psalter tradition as an anthology of individual psalms, to some extent crafted and consciously arranged, but nevertheless remaining an open and flexible sourcebook for psalmody to be used in a wide variety of liturgical and study contexts.<sup>17</sup>

## 3.2 Editorial Techniques

Having excluded most small textual changes from consideration and delineated the compiler's default modes, what remains are the main creative contributions apparently attributable to the compiler. These include: expansions of psalms, insertions of new texts, movements of psalms, a corrective appendix, advance planning, and spontaneous adjustments.

### 3.2.1 Expansion of Psalms

The redactional expansion of psalms is a well-known phenomenon in Psalms scholarship. That the compiler of the 11Q5 psalter likewise expanded psalms from the base text is suggested by the similarity in procedure between expanding psalms and inserting new texts (section 3.2.2), as well as the fact that the two expanded psalms are juxtaposed in the 11Q5 psalter.

---

<sup>17</sup> On the psalter as anthology, see David Willgren, *The Formation of the »Book« of Psalms: Reconsidering the Transmission and Canonization of Psalmody in Light of Material Culture and the Poetics of Anthologies*, FAT 88 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016). On the openness of psalm collections in this period, see Mroczek, *Literary Imagination*, 43 f., though I do not find this openness to be incompatible with the notion of the psalter as a recognizable »book«. Mroczek underappreciates both the flexibility entailed in ancient conceptions of the book and the overall cohesiveness of the written psalter tradition.

After the refrain of the last line of Ps 136 (כי לעולם חסדו), 11Q5 continues with six more lines of a catena of verses mostly taken from Ps 118 (Ps 118:1, 15, 16, 8, 9, 10, 29). The compiler could have scrolled back in the exemplar to Ps 118 for a written source text for the expansion or else composed it anew based on his familiarity with Ps 118, which could explain some of the differences. The lack of the repeated refrain in the catena shows that it has not been thoroughly integrated into Ps 136. While thematically Pss 118 and 136 differ considerably, formal links undoubtedly prompted the connection in the compiler's revision. Both psalms begin with הודו יהוה כי טוב כי לעולם חסדו, both end with similar הודו expressions, and both feature the antiphonal refrain כי לעולם חסדו after each hemistich (only vv. 1–4 and 29 in Ps 118).

There are two clear editorial interventions evident in Ps 145 in 11Q5. Beginning with v. 1b, each verse of the acrostic psalm is followed by the repeated refrain ועד לעולם ועד ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד (with copyist confusion in v. 18), which is patterned as an antiphonal response to וואברכה שמכה לעולם ועד in 145:1. Secondly, after the last verse of Ps 145, 11Q5 reads the note וזאת לזכרון followed by what can be reconstructed as approximately six lines of now-lost text. וזאת לזכרון continues on the same line as Ps 145 with only a small intervening blank space, seemingly indicating that this is a continuation of the psalm or some kind of extended post-script, even though this is formally in tension with the completeness of the acrostic form of Ps 145.

### 3.2.2 Insertion of New Texts

By almost all accounts, the formation history of the psalter has been driven in large part by the gradual accumulation of psalms in numerous stages. The creator of the 11Q5 psalter clearly continues this established tradition, and it is here more than anywhere else that his role as compiler is most evident. Each of the nine additional non-MT psalms (Ps 154; Plea for Deliverance [hereafter »Plea«]; Sir 51:1–30; Apostrophe to Zion [»ApostZion«]; Ps 155; Hymn to the Creator [»Hymn«]; 2 Sam 23:1–7; Pss 151A+B) and the prose epilogue (David's Compositions [»DavComp«])<sup>18</sup> are unlikely to have been found in the compiler's primary base text, implying the use of one or more secondary exemplars. While most of these texts are known from other traditions (Pss 151A+B ≈ Ps 151 in the Greek tradition; Pss 151, 154, 155 in some Syriac traditions; part of Ps 154 in 4Q448 [4QApo-

<sup>18</sup> For texts, translations, and bibliographies, see James A. Sanders, »Non-Masoretic Psalms,« in *The Dead Sea Scrolls—Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Vol. 4A, Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers*, ed. Charlesworth, James H. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 155–215.

cryptal Psalm and Prayer]; ApostZion in 4Q88 [4QPs<sup>f</sup>]; Sir 51:13–30 in the Wisdom of Ben Sira; 2 Sam 23:1–7 from 2 Samuel), they are nowhere else attested together or in this arrangement. It is also noteworthy that these additional compositions often cluster together in the 11Q5 psalter, frequently in juxtaposition to moved psalms. Thus, it is most probable that the insertion of new texts is related both to the expansion and rearrangement of psalms in a single editorial development.

The first supplementary cluster consists of Ps 154→Plea, which is inserted in the 11Q5 psalter between Ps 145+ (expanded and moved from elsewhere) and Ps 139 (also moved from elsewhere). Ps 154 continues the theme of the graciousness of God from Ps 145+ and transitions to the petitions and praise found also in Plea. The recognition of divine insight and request for personal spiritual transformation in Ps 139 also fit well with the preceding psalms. These clear thematic links likely explain why the compiler would choose to place Ps 154 and Plea at this point in the revision.

The second supplementary cluster consists of Sir 51:13–30→ApostZion, which is placed between Ps 138 and 93 (apparently moved from elsewhere).<sup>19</sup> There is minimal thematic continuity in this section, and the reasons for the insertion here remain obscure.<sup>20</sup> To speculate, it is possible that the lament over the destruction of Zion (Ps 137) and deliverance and temple worship (Ps 138) prompted the insertion of Sir 51:13–30→ApostZion as a unit from a source text without regard for the thematic disruption of Sir 51:13–30. Sir 51:13–30 and ApostZion are both acrostic psalms, a structural similarity that could help account for their juxtaposition in the 11Q5 psalter and probably also in the secondary source from which the compiler drew these psalms.

The third supplement to the base text of the compiler of the 11Q5 psalter is found in the insertion of Ps 155 between Pss 144 and 142. All of these psalms are personal laments, which provides a highly probable justification for the insertion of Ps 155 at this location.

The fourth supplement is a cluster of compositions consisting of Hymn→2Sam 23:1–7→DavComp, which is placed after Ps 150 and before Ps 140.

<sup>19</sup> Since Ps 93 is uncharacteristically placed so far from its position in MT, it is possible that the compiler found Ps 93 in the same secondary source as Sir 51:13–30 and ApostZion (cf. Ps 91 in 11Q11 [11QapocrPs]) without realizing that it was a duplicate of a psalm already found earlier in the base text, in which case it could perhaps be analyzed rather as part of this insertion (cf. section 3.2.3).

<sup>20</sup> Wilson, »Qumran Psalms Scroll (11QPs<sup>a</sup>)«: 461 f., suggests that these psalms help structure the section Pss 154–93 into two parts ending in contrasting Zion psalms of lament (Ps 137) and restoration (ApostZion) respectively. He also argues that Sir 51:13–30 parallels wisdom themes from Ps 154 and may indicate that Torah piety/wisdom was necessary for restoration.

Building on the conclusion of its base text (Pss 149→150), this cluster was evidently intended to bring the 11Q5 psalter to a close. David's last words from 2 Sam 23:1–7 form an appropriate conclusion to the largely Davidic collection, and the addition of the prose epilogue DavComp rounds off the primary collection with a fitting tribute to the patron of Hebrew psalmody and an idealistic enumeration of his compositions.<sup>21</sup> I suggest that the focus on Davidic psalmody in the conclusion of the 11Q5 psalter indeed supports the contention that the collection was intended as a representative of the primarily Davidic written psalter tradition, rather than a new and distinct liturgical work or incipient prayer book (*siddur*).<sup>22</sup>

The fifth supplement of non-MT content consists of Pss 151A→151B, which are placed at the end of 11Q5 after Ps 134. A combined form of these texts as a single psalm is also appended to the Greek psalter (G) after Ps 150, a parallel which is unlikely to be coincidence.<sup>23</sup> If the psalms after DavComp are indeed supplementary appendices (see section 3.2.4), then Pss 151A+B were appended after the initial creation of the first complete written draft of the 11Q5 psalter (either by the compiler or a later supplementer) in parallel to the tradition reflected in G.

It is noteworthy that all of the non-MT compositions were inserted towards the end of the 11Q5 psalter, which recalls the well-documented means of supplementation by appending. No non-MT psalms were placed before Ps 136, giving the appearance of much greater stability in the earlier portions of the 11Q5 psalter.

### 3.2.3 Movement of Psalms

It is also clear that the compiler of the 11Q5 psalter intentionally rearranged the order of psalms found in the base text, consciously departing from the default linear progression through the primary exemplar. These rearrangements often occur at editorial focal points or seams where the compiler has also inserted new material, creating clusters of psalms that were either moved or inserted. Here I will distinguish two different ranges of motion relative to the base text of the 11Q5 psalter, which at least potentially can be explained by different working processes: short- and long-range movements.

Some psalm positions result from *short-range movements* of distances fewer than about 3 columns in the primary exemplar (if reconstructed at the dimensions of 11Q5): Pss 139, 144, and 147. Ps 139 has clear thematic links with the preceding Plea, making it a much more obvious candidate for this posi-

<sup>21</sup> Mroczek, *Literary Imagination*, 75–78; 173.

<sup>22</sup> Similarly, James A. Sanders, »*Variation in the Psalms Scroll (11QPs<sup>a</sup>)*,« *Harvard Theological Review* 59 (1966) 83–94: 90; Flint, *Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 224.

<sup>23</sup> Skehan, »*Qumran and Old Testament Criticism*«: 170.

tion in the 11Q5 psalter than the following Ps 137.<sup>24</sup> Ps 144 transitions well from the positive mood and mention of blessing of Ps 133 to the personal laments Pss 155→142→143.<sup>25</sup> A more complex case pertains to Pss 146–148, which were moved before the Songs of Ascent (Pss 120–132), in which process Ps 147 was further dislocated from this group and moved forward two psalms, yielding the sequence Pss 104→147→105→146→148. The reason for the juxtaposition of Pss 104 and 147 likely relates to their many shared praise and creation themes.<sup>26</sup>

These short-range movements (except perhaps Ps 147) may have been facilitated by the limited range of view required and could have been executed without scrolling back and forth through the exemplar. The short distances would also have made it easier for the compiler to recall the contents of the immediately preceding psalms and to observe possible reasons for moving all three of these psalms forward. This implies that the compiler read and considered multiple psalms at a time before putting pen to parchment. The ways Pss 139, 144, and 147 fit into the overall arrangement of the 11Q5 psalter indicate that these movements were probably planned before beginning to create the first complete draft, rather than on the fly.

Other rearrangements of psalms required *long-range movements*, covering distances that cannot reasonably be expected to have been open and in the compiler's field of view of the exemplar at any single point of time. These movements would necessarily have required scrolling back and forth through the exemplar in the copying process (or consultation of secondary exemplars) and imply intimate familiarity with the contents of the base text, advance planning, and conscious attention to the macrostructure of the resulting text. Of these movements, four moved psalms further back towards the end of the collection (Pss 93?, 104–105, 119, 133), and two moved psalms forwards (Pss 145, 146–148).

---

**24** Cf. Wacholder, »David's Eschatological Psalter«: 52.

**25** Similarly, Matthias Millard, *Die Komposition des Psalters: Ein formgeschichtlicher Ansatz*, FAT 9 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 221; Ryan M. Armstrong, »Psalms Dwelling Together in Unity: The Placement of Psalms 133 and 134 in Two Different Psalms Collections,« *JBL* 131/3 (2012) 487–506: 503.

**26** Similarly, David Willgren, »Did David Lay Down His Crown? Reframing Issues of Deliberate Juxtaposition and Interpretive Contexts in the ›Book‹ of Psalms with Psalm 147 as a Case in Point,« in *Functions of Psalms and Prayers in the Late Second Temple Period*, ed. Mika S. Pajunen and Jeremy Penner, BZAW 486 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017), 212–228. The selection of Ps 147 for a praise cluster in combination with Ps 104 is also evident in 4Q86 (4QPs<sup>d</sup>), with the opposite order Pss 147→104.

Ps 133 was moved backwards to between Pss 141 and 144. There are several thematic and lexical parallels between Pss 141 and 133 that may have prompted the juxtaposition of these psalms.<sup>27</sup>

Pss 104–105 were moved backwards *en bloc* to after Ps 118. While Ps 103 is likewise a hymn of praise, it incorporates many elements in response to typical laments and so retains its position after the lament Ps 102. Pss 104 and 105, in contrast, are unmitigated and lofty hymns of praise, and so fit well in the praise cluster constructed after the Egyptian Hallel in the 11Q5 psalter (Pss [113–]118). In moving this block of psalms, the compiler retained the sequence Pss 104→105 of the base text, but placed Ps 147 between them on the basis of the aforementioned thematic similarities with Ps 104.

Pss 146–148 were likewise moved *en bloc* a very large distance forward to immediately after Pss 104–105, in which process Ps 147 was further moved a short distance before Ps 105 as discussed above. This slightly rearranged block of hymns concludes the aforementioned praise cluster, and its initial displacement may have been further influenced by the desire to juxtapose the thematically similar Pss 104 and 147. The join between Pss 105→146 could also have been considered appropriate, because both are hymns of praise that thematize the Lord's faithfulness to Israel.

Possibly related to the dislocation of Pss 146–148 is the forward movement of Ps 145 to after Ps 136+catena.<sup>28</sup> Ps 145 continues the praise themes of the previous Pss 135–136+catena, which could explain its position and parallel expansion in the 11Q5 psalter.<sup>29</sup> As noted above, Ps 145 also transitions nicely into Ps 154.

The significance and meaning of the backwards movement of Ps 119 to between Pss 120–132 and 135 have been frequently discussed, but also misunderstood. Pss 120–132 of the Songs of Ascent are dominated by lament and pilgrimage elements, with interspersed episodes of praise. This section concludes in the 11Q5 psalter with a plea for the restoration of the Davidic dynasty in Ps 132. In the MT psalter, Pss 133–134 round off the Songs of Ascent with blessing and praise in the Jerusalem temple, but these have been moved elsewhere in the 11Q5 psalter.

Following the suggestion that the Songs of Ascent (Pss 120–134) reflect a pilgrimage liturgy with a spatial movement culminating in the Jerusalem temple, several scholars have argued that the placement of Ps 119 at the end of the trun-

<sup>27</sup> E.g., the fellowship of the righteous, anointing oil, and distinctive lexical parallels such as נָעַם (133:1; 141:6) and יָדָד (133:1; 141:10); see Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*, 301–303; Armstrong, »Psalms Dwelling Together«: 502–505.

<sup>28</sup> Note also the short-range movement of Ps 144, such that the entire block of Pss 144–148 was apparently deconstructed.

<sup>29</sup> Kratz, »Blessed Be the Lord«: 237.

cated form of this group implies that Torah piety had replaced temple worship as the aim of spiritual pilgrimage within the community of the compiler who created the 11Q5 psalter.<sup>30</sup> This argument, however, relies heavily on the common modern assumption that the arrangement was not only principled and intentional, but also that the sequence is meant to convey developments in meaning in supposed linear trajectories as the reader progresses from psalm to psalm. In doing so, it promotes the meaning and significance of *arrangement* over actual *contents*. The compiler's willingness to rearrange the base text, however, suggests that he may not have understood the arrangement to be essential to the meaning of either the base text or the revised version. The actual contents of the 11Q5 psalter do not give any indication whatsoever of any anti-temple polemic and barely even advance the spiritualization of worship already evident in the MT psalter, which places Ps 119 at the beginning of the Songs of Ascent. On the other hand, the 11Q5 psalter does retain all of the MT psalms, and with them all of their positive exhortations and references to worship in the Jerusalem temple (including Pss 122:1 and 135:2, the latter of which follows immediately after Ps 119 in the 11Q5 psalter).<sup>31</sup> DavComp also explicitly affirms the (at least ideal) link between ritual sacrifices in the temple and Hebrew psalmody, suggesting that the highly spiritualized readings of the 11Q5 psalter proposed by some modern scholars were not intended by the ancient compiler.

Instead, the position of Ps 119 in the 11Q5 psalter can be better explained by thematic similarities. While Ps 119 is rightly classified thematically as a Torah and/or wisdom psalm, there are frequent elements of lament throughout the psalm, such as oppression from enemies, unfaithfulness in Israel, petitions, and delay

---

**30** E.g., Wacholder, »David's Eschatological Psalter«: 46f.; Wilson, »Qumran Psalms Scroll (11QPs<sup>a</sup>)«: 460; Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*, 292f.; Leuenberger, »Aufbau und Pragmatik«: 185; Kratz, »Blessed Be the Lord«: 239; Teeter, »Wisdom, Torah, and Rewritten Scripture«: 265; Jain, *Psalmen oder Psalter*, 279–281; Böhm, *Rezeption der Psalmen*, 50f.; 82f. This argument is dependent not only on the relocation of Ps 119 discussed here, but also the movements of Pss 133–134, which elsewhere in this article I suggest were more likely executed for other reasons. Furthermore, Martin Goodman, »Constructing Ancient Judaism from the Scrolls,« in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 81–91, has problematized the frequently asserted estrangement of the Qumran community from the Jerusalem temple.

**31** Ironically, Ps 135:2 repeats almost verbatim the explicit reference to temple worship in Ps 134:1 that is supposed to give the MT arrangement such a strong sense of arrival in the Jerusalem temple; cf. deClaisse-Walford, »Examination«: 169. Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*, 186, argues that the expansion ירושלים ובתוכך in 11Q5 Ps 135:2 is intended to accommodate the Qumran community's lack of participation in the temple cult, but the language could simply be traditional, formulaic, and non-partisan (e.g., Ps 116:19). Either way, even in 11Q5, Ps 135:2 is primarily addressed to approved worshippers in the Jerusalem temple.

in God's action on behalf of the psalmist.<sup>32</sup> From this perspective, the large Ps 119 may have seemed more fitting as the climax for the predominantly lament-oriented portion of the Songs of Ascent (Pss 120–132, in contrast to the praise-oriented Pss 133–134) than as its introduction. Ps 119 could also have been imagined as illustrating the piety requisite for the restoration requested in Ps 132, but this is far from certain.<sup>33</sup> Furthermore, Ps 119, which emphasizes Torah meditation, is followed directly by Pss 135–136, which praise the Lord precisely for his works in history as recounted in the Pentateuch.<sup>34</sup> The frequent occurrence of Ps 119 (e. g., 4Q89 [4QPs<sup>g</sup>], 4Q90 [4QPs<sup>h</sup>], and 5Q5 [5QPs]) and possibly Pss 135(–136) (e. g., 4Q92 [4QPs<sup>k</sup>] and 4Q95 [4QPs<sup>n</sup>]) in apparently small scrolls from Qumran may also suggest special interest in these psalms, so it is not entirely unexpected to find them clustered together. Thus, Ps 119 may simply have been placed between Pss 132 and 135 as a bridge based on the same kinds of thematic connections that appear to have motivated the movements of other psalms, which urges caution against reading the arrangement as implicit theological polemic.

The final long-range movement is Ps 93, which was apparently moved backwards to between *ApostZion* and Ps 141.<sup>35</sup> The reasons for the position of Ps 93 in the 11Q5 psalter are unclear, but its lofty praise does follow nicely upon the call to praise in the  $\psi$ -verse of *ApostZion*. Any possible connections to the following Ps 141 are difficult to discern.

These selective long-range movements of psalms allowed the compiler to reorganize the revised psalter efficiently and enhance perceived thematic connections between certain Psalms. It is probably not a coincidence that the locations to which these psalms were moved often correspond with points where new compositions were inserted or other psalms were also moved, indicating specific focal points of editorial activity within the general framework of working through the base text. Most of the movements identified within this section can be plausibly explained based on thematic parallels between individual juxtaposed psalms.

---

**32** For the lament elements, see also Kent Aaron Reynolds, *Torah as Teacher: The Exemplary Torah Student in Psalm 119*, VTSup 137 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 22–24; 43–49.

**33** So also deClaisé-Walford, »Examination«: 169 f.

**34** While the meaning and nature of »Torah« in this period is admittedly more flexible than just as a reference to the five books of Moses and Ps 119 focuses primarily on God's commandments for right living, it is entirely feasible that somewhere around the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE the compiler of the 11Q5 psalter read Ps 119 in conjunction with a conception of scripture meditation that also included the narrative portions of the Pentateuch. According to Reynolds, *Torah as Teacher*, 181, the concept of »Torah« in Ps 119 included—but was not limited to—the Pentateuch, already from its initial inclusion in the proto-MT psalter.

**35** It is also possible that Ps 93 was (accidentally) repeated (rather than moved) in conjunction with the supplement from Sir51→*ApostZion* (cf. section 3.2.2).

### 3.2.4 Secondary Appendices

In the scenario outlined above, there remain only two psalms whose position is yet to be accounted for: Pss 140 and 134. There is no obvious connection between these two psalms or the preceding DavComp that would suggest intentional arrangement. Neither is there any obvious link to the following biographical Pss 151A+B that could signal a conclusion to the collection, a fact that has long troubled interpreters. In contrast, as observed above, the preceding sequence Pss 149→150→Hymn→2 Sam 23:1–7→DavComp is evidently fitting as a well-formed conclusion to the primarily Davidic psalter. The revision processes entailed in the creation of the 11Q5 psalter required significant forethought and advance planning, and it seems quite implausible that the compiler would have ever intended such a well-crafted conclusion to serve in its current medial position. In light of this, the common deduction that Pss 140→134→151A→151B are secondary appendices is almost unavoidable.<sup>36</sup>

If this is the case, two possible explanations emerge. First, Pss 140 and 134 may have been purposefully selected for supplementation alongside Pss 151A+B on account of their contents,<sup>37</sup> but as mentioned above there is no clear justification for this in the texts themselves. Second, I note that Pss 140 and 134 are the only MT psalms missing in the 11Q5 psalter between Pss 118–DavComp, which suggests that these were originally missed in the complex process of the production of the first completely written draft of the 11Q5 psalter, only to be added on to the end once the manuscript had been constructed and checked.<sup>38</sup> The accidental omission of these two psalms is easily explicable not only by the complexity of the task, but even more specifically by the fact that each of these psalms occur at points where major editorial decisions could have distracted the compiler. Ps 140 in the primary exemplar would have occurred in a long string of psalms attributed to David (Pss 138–145) and could easily have been overlooked when the preceding Ps 139 was moved and the cluster Sir51→ApostZion→Ps 93 was inserted. Ps 134

---

**36** Wacholder, »David's Eschatological Psalter«: 57; Millard, *Komposition des Psalters*, 224 f.; Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*, 306–308; Leuenberger, »Aufbau und Pragmatik«: 175; Armin Lange, *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer, Band 1: Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 433; Kratz, »Blessed Be the Lord«: 238; Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls and Developmental Composition*, 198.

**37** E.g., Millard, *Komposition des Psalters*, 224 f.; Martin Kleer, »Der liebliche Sänger der Psalmen Israels«: *Untersuchungen zu David als Dichter und Beter der Psalmen*, BBB 108 (Bodenheim: Philo Verlagsgesellschaft, 1996), 313–316; Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*, 307; Leuenberger, »Aufbau und Pragmatik«: 192 f.

**38** Cf. Skehan, »Liturgical Complex«: 196 n. 9; Skehan, »Qumran and Old Testament Criticism«: 170; Wacholder, »David's Eschatological Psalter«: 57; Émile Puech, »Review of Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum*,« *RevQ* 22/2 (2005) 279–281: 281.

is a very short psalm, also sharing the same superscription as the other Songs of Ascent of which it was a part (Pss 120–134), so it too could have been easily missed when Ps 119 was moved in to that location and Ps 133 was moved out.

Once the first written draft of the revised 11Q5 psalter had been created, these psalms could no longer be easily inserted within the collection and so were appended to the end. The compiler (or perhaps someone else) presumably proofread the new scroll, checking its contents against the base text in light of the prepared plans for revision.<sup>39</sup> This proofreader evidently took note of the absence of Pss 140 and 134 and subsequently added them on to the end of the scroll. The order Pss 140→134 could have been intentionally constructed as a mini lament-praise cycle, but can be more plausibly explained simply by the appending scribe's working backwards from the end towards the beginning of the primary exemplar. After proofreading the entire scroll (and presumably marking missing psalms in the primary exemplar), both the exemplar and the draft scroll would have been rolled to their ends. It would have been most efficient for the scribe adding the appendices to start at the end of the exemplar, adding missing psalms as he reached them while rolling backwards to the beginning, rather than first scrolling to the beginning of the exemplar and then proceeding in the normal order. Pss 151A+B may then have been added at this or a later time as in the Greek psalter. It remains uncertain whether this correction process was executed by the compiler or a collaborator, but it fits coherently with the established profile for the compiler. Later scribes would be considerably less likely to make the time and effort to systematically check the contents of the scroll against a reference exemplar, since they would have lacked both an easy referencing system and knowledge of the plan for revision that would have been known to the original compiler and any collaborators.

### 3.2.5 Advance Planning and Spontaneous Adjustments

In total, the entire production of the preserved parts of the 11Q5 psalter can be accounted for on the supposition of two expansions of psalms, five insertions of supplementary material, eight or nine movements of psalms,<sup>40</sup> and a corrective appendix (see Figure 1 and Table 1 below). This creation process implies both careful forethought and real-time improvisation. The quantity and diversity of texts involved, the complexity of the editorial decisions, and the overall success of the execution make it abundantly clear that the compiler intentionally set out

---

<sup>39</sup> For proofreading and correction practices, see Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, STDJ 54 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 222–230.

<sup>40</sup> Depending on whether or not Ps 93 is so evaluated.



Figure 1: Sources → 11Q5 Psalter

to produce a substantial revision of the psalter. The compiler (and any collaborators) must have devoted considerable time and energy to advance planning, and the enormity of the project was likely manageable only with both intimate prior content knowledge and written notes.<sup>41</sup> Of course, one cannot know the precise format in which these plans were drawn up, but I would speculate that the primary exemplar itself was most likely marked up, or alternatively that a separate document or outline was created to describe the desired result. This advance planning undoubtedly covered (consciously or unconsciously) default modes, the expansion of psalms, insertions of new texts, and the movement of psalms. The fact that so many of these features cluster together at points within the scroll suggests that the compiler's editorial attentions were not equally divided, but rather some sections were left relatively untouched and others were focal points for innovative activities.

During the execution phase of these plans the compiler (or a collaborator) also had to make spontaneous adjustments. The clearest examples of improvisation come from the appended Pss 140 and 134, which I have argued were appended to the end of the collection after a subsequent checking stage in the production of the draft manuscript. But even this corrected draft of the 11Q5 psalter was not treated as closed or final, since Pss 151A+B were subsequently appended at the end in a move not likely to have been anticipated in the initial planning stages.

Because most of the editorial work was planned in advance, it is possible that the execution of the plan was performed by a different person, though of course there is no way to know for sure. For instance, the creative mastermind of the revision (i. e., the »compiler«) could have planned the new macrostructure and left it to a junior scribe or skilled copyist to implement the plan in a full written draft. But even in this case, both the compiler and the copyist would still be conditioned by material constraints.

#### 4 Macrostructure of the 11Q5 Psalter

As a result of the compiler's obvious attention to the macrostructure of the revised psalter and thematic connections between juxtaposed psalms, it comes as no surprise that significant grouping of psalms in meaningful patterns is clearly evident. While the beginning of the 11Q5 psalter is only very fragmen-

---

<sup>41</sup> The expertise, time, and labor required for such an enterprise partially explains why such extensive revision is relatively rare in the textual tradition.

tarily preserved, the compiler seems at least to have largely retained the Asaph subcollection (Pss 73–83) intact, followed by the (predominantly Korahite) supplement to the Elohist psalter (Pss 84–89). These are the only sections in the preserved parts of the 11Q5 psalter where author attributions might play a significant organizational role, but these groups were simply taken over from the compiler's base text. At least Pss 101–103, 109, 114–116 were likewise included. Given the characteristic preservation of psalms in the well-preserved portions of 11Q5 from Pss 118–151A+B, it is thus highly probable that most (if not all) of MT Pss 1–117 were originally incorporated at some point in the 11Q5 psalter (if not the manuscript 11Q5), and likely in the same general sequence as in the MT psalter (allowing for the possibility of rearrangements and supplementations also in these earlier portions).

In lieu of explicit structural demarcations, it seems to me that the well-preserved parts of the 11Q5 psalter can plausibly be divided roughly into five main sections, consisting of three lament-praise cycles,<sup>42</sup> one group of miscellaneous psalms, and the appendices (see Table 1 below). The seams between these sections often correspond to clusters of inserted and/or moved texts. Some of these seams were already evident in the base text, while others were newly effected by the compiler. The first [lament-]praise cycle (Pss [?–]118–148) concludes with the Egyptian Hallel and a supplementary praise cluster. It may in part have been formulated as a response to Ps 109 or other similar laments, though the lacunae at this point render this suggestion highly speculative. The second lament-praise cycle (Pss 120–145+) proceeds through the Songs of Ascent, a Torah psalm with lament elements (Ps 119), and another praise cluster. Both of these cycles parallel similar pilgrimage liturgies known in accord with the MT arrangement.

The third major section (Pss 154–93) appears to be a relatively eclectic collection of miscellaneous psalms, including diverse themes such as personal piety, community lament, thanksgiving, wisdom, Zion, and the Lord's reign.<sup>43</sup> Many of these psalms exhibit thematic or formal connections at the micro-level, but the section as a whole lacks any obvious coherence or trajectory. This section of the 11Q5 psalter is in part conditioned by the sequence and similarly miscellaneous nature of its primary base text at this point, as well as the apparent desire to insert additional assorted psalms at some point towards the end of the collection.

---

<sup>42</sup> On the frequency of lament-praise cycles in the formation of the psalter tradition, see especially Millard, *Komposition des Psalters*.

<sup>43</sup> Wilson, *Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*, 127, fittingly calls this section »more obscure«.

The fourth major section (Ps 141–DavComp) yields a third lament-praise cycle to conclude the 11Q5 psalter in conjunction with David’s last words and the prose epilogue cataloguing David’s contributions to psalmody. And the fifth and final section of the 11Q5 psalter consists of the secondary appendices (Pss 140–151A+B).

**Table 1:** Macrostructure of the 11Q5 Psalter

11Q5 Psalter Contents	Editorial Intervention	Macrostructure
...		...
76		Asaph Subcollection
77		
78		
...		
81		
...		...
86		Supplement to the Elohistic Psalter
...		
88		
89		
...		...
101		Personal Piety
102		Personal Lament
103		Praise
...		...
109		Personal Lament
...		...
...		Egyptian Hallel
114		
115		
116		
...		
118		

Tab. 1 (continued)

11Q5 Psalter Contents	Editorial Intervention		Macrostructure
104	Moved		Supplementary Praise Cluster I
147	Moved		
105	Moved		
146	Moved		
148	Moved		
[120]			Songs of Ascent
121			
122			
123			
124			
125			
126			
127			
128			
129			
130			
131			
132			
119	Moved		Torah Psalm
135			Praise Cluster II
136+catena	Expanded		
145+	Moved and Expanded		
154	Inserted	Supplement I	Personal Piety Cluster
Plea	Inserted		
139	Moved		
137			Communal Lament
138			Thanksgiving

Tab. 1 (continued)

11Q5 Psalter Contents	Editorial Intervention		Macrostructure	
Sir 51:13–30	Inserted	Supplement II	Wisdom	Acrostic Psalms
ApostZion	Inserted		Zion	
93	Moved or Inserted	?	Lord Reigns	
141			Fellowship of the Righteous	
133	Moved			
144	Moved		Personal Lament Cluster	
155	Inserted	Supplement III		
142				
143				
149			Praise Cluster III	Conclusion
150				
Hymn	Appended	Supplement IV	Last Words	
2 Sam 23:1–7	Appended			
DavComp	Appended		Epilogue	
140	Appended	Corrective Appendix	Secondary Appendices	
134	Appended			
151A	Appended	Supplement V		
151B	Appended			

I make several important observations based on this macrostructure. *First*, much of the structure of the 11Q5 psalter is determined by the arrangement of its underlying base text, with occasional but significant deviations. *Second*, most of the rearrangements evident in the 11Q5 psalter can be explained as enhancements of thematic connections between juxtaposed psalms relative to the base text, such that thematic concerns appear to have ranked relatively highly in the compiler's organizational hierarchy. *Third*, all non-MT psalms occur towards the end of the 11Q5 psalter only after Ps 136, such that the earlier parts remain much closer to their purported base text than the latter. *Fourth*, paratextual יה הללוֹי may in part have prompted the creation of the first supplementary praise cluster in the 11Q5 psalter (Pss 104–148) and seems to have been added after the catena after Ps 136 to reinforce the cluster of Pss 135–136+catena already present in the base

text.<sup>44</sup> *Fifth*, author attribution was apparently not a significant factor for the compiler in grouping psalms, since he creates no new clear author-based psalm groups and in fact deconstructs several such groups in the base text (Pss 103–104; 138–145).<sup>45</sup> *Sixth*, psalm type superscriptions like שיר המעלות and מזמר ranked below thematic concerns for the compiler, since he creates no new groups based on them but does deconstruct such groups from the base text (Pss 120–134; 139–141+143). *Seventh*, incipits such as ברכי נפשי and יהוה ליהוה (and possibly also מלך יהוה) do not seem to have had an organizational role for the compiler, since he does not create new groups based on them, but rather deconstructs them (Pss 103–104; 105–107; and possibly the enthronement Pss 93+95–99). Thus, relative to the compiler's MT-like base text with its predominant groupings based on formal concerns (especially superscriptions and incipits), the 11Q5 psalter evidences an increasing concern for thematic coherence. Even this concern for thematic connections, however, does not lead the compiler to completely rearrange the psalter according to any thoroughgoing thematic organizational principles, but rather he is constrained by more practical considerations of text production.

## 5 Conclusion

The coherent profile of the compiler of the 11Q5 psalter outlined above reinforces the cogency of the assertion that the 11Q5 psalter is a rearranged and expanded version of the psalter based on an MT-like base text. The 11Q5 psalter presupposes all of the main editorial features of the fully formed proto-MT psalter, and all of the major divergences can be explained by a limited number of clearly defined principles and practices.

In profiling the working practices of the compiler, I emphasized how pragmatic factors impacted its formation process. In particular, the enormity and complexity of the process required thorough prior content-knowledge (including previous familiarity and reading the exemplar, perhaps repeatedly), advance planning, and the use of written exemplars (probably marked up, or else along-

<sup>44</sup> Cf. the standalone יהוה הללו's of Pss 93:1 and 151A:1, which could also be structurally significant.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*, 278, who notes similarly that Davidic superscriptions are spread unsystematically across the entire 11Q5 composition, such that they cannot be primary structural indicators. Contra Wilson, *Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*, 130 f.; Flint, *Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 193–195, who argue that the dispersed Davidic superscriptions in the 11Q5 psalter in fact imply that the unattributed psalms intervening between Davidic superscriptions are to be understood as Davidic.

side separate written notes). The compiler's attention in the planning stages was unequally distributed, leaving the wording of the psalms themselves unchanged and focusing on some clusters of psalms more than others. The process was error-prone, requiring careful execution, close proofreading, and subsequent corrections. The potential for confusion and mishaps would be exacerbated by collaborative work, such as if the first draft was written by someone other than the one who planned the revision.

The process was facilitated by linear progression through a single primary exemplar, both in the planning and execution stages, which reduced the chances of redundancies and omissions. Short-range movements of psalms would have been relatively easy, since the proximity of the psalms would allow for easier recall in the planning stage and the entire range of movement could have been in the compiler's field of view of the primary exemplar at one time. Long-range movements would have required more long-term memory in the planning stage, as well as scrolling back and forth in the primary exemplar in both planning and execution stages, after which the compiler (and possibly a collaborator) returned to the previous place in the exemplar to continue the sporadically interrupted linear progression. The compiler sometimes minimized the disruption of scrolling back and forth by moving multiple psalms *en bloc*. The compiler apparently limited the number of secondary exemplars necessary to accomplish his goals, incorporating new texts likewise *en bloc*. Once the compiler (or a collaborator) started writing the first draft on parchment sheets, they were largely limited by space and aesthetics to appending accidentally omitted psalms and making subsequent supplementations only after the text that had already been penned. The reverse order of psalms added after proofreading is understandable if the corrector scrolled backwards from the end of the exemplar to copy the omitted psalms, thus avoiding having to reroll the exemplar another time to start at its beginning. These observations confirm and illustrate the essential interdependency between textual development, editorial processes, and physical manuscript production.

This interdependency observed in the formation of the 11Q5 psalter has significant ramifications beyond the corpus examined here. Some of the compiler's default modes find parallels in other texts and may reflect well-established conventions of text production in Second Temple Judaism. For example, I would argue that linear progression through a primary base text is characteristic of many revisions and rewritten compositions from the period. Also, the compiler's techniques for supplementation (expansion, insertion, and appending) and rearrangement have numerous parallels in the editorial development of a wide variety of texts, from the formation of the proto-MT psalter to the creation of the diverse literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Thus, the material factors

and pragmatic concerns that impacted the formation of the 11Q5 psalter provide useful parallels to help explain other textual developments in Second Temple Jewish literature.

**Abstract:** This article demonstrates how pragmatic factors impacted the formation of the 11Q5 (11QPs<sup>a</sup>) psalter, confirming the essential interdependency between textual development, editorial processes, and physical manuscript production. I enumerate several default modes that guided the compiler and the types of editorial interventions by which he created the 11Q5 psalter. These suggest that the 11Q5 psalter was produced as a revised version of the traditional psalter, expanded and rearranged from an MT-like base text to enhance thematic, lexical, and sometimes formal connections between psalms.

**Keywords:** Psalms, Qumran, Qumran Psalms Hypothesis, 11QPs<sup>a</sup>

**Zusammenfassung:** Dieser Artikel zeigt, in welcher Weise pragmatische Faktoren die Bildung des Psalters 11Q5 (11QPs<sup>a</sup>) beeinflusst haben, und bestätigt die wesentliche Wechselwirkung zwischen Textentwicklung, redaktionellen Prozessen und physischer Manuskriptproduktion. Dabei werden mehrere Standardmodi aufgezählt, die den Kompilator und die Art der redaktionellen Eingriffe leiteten, mit denen er den 11Q5-Psalter erstellte. Diese deuten darauf hin, dass der Psalter 11Q5 als überarbeitete Version des traditionellen Psalters geschaffen, erweitert und von einem MT-ähnlichen Basistext her neu arrangiert wurde, um thematische, lexikalische und manchmal formale Verbindungen zwischen Psalmen zu verbessern.

**Schlagwörter:** Psalmen, Qumran, Qumran Psalmen Hypothese, 11QPs<sup>a</sup>

**Résumé:** Cet article démontre comment des aspects pratiques ont influencé la formation du psautier 11Q5 (11QPs<sup>a</sup>), confirmant l'interdépendance essentielle entre le développement textuel, les processus éditoriaux et la production matérielle des manuscrits. Sont énumérés plusieurs modalités types qui ont guidé le compilateur et les types d'interventions éditoriales par lesquelles il a créé le psautier 11Q5. Ceux-ci suggèrent que 11Q5 a été produit comme une version révisée du psautier traditionnel, étendue et réarrangée à partir d'un texte de base proche du TM pour renforcer les connexions thématiques, lexicales et parfois formelles entre des psaumes.

**Mots-clés:** Psalm, Qumran, Qumran Psalm Hypothèse, 11QPs<sup>a</sup>