

The Peshar Nahum Scroll from Qumran

An Exegetical Study of 4Q169

BRILL

SHANI L. BERRIN

THE PESHER NAHUM SCROLL FROM QUMRAN

STUDIES ON THE TEXTS OF THE DESERT OF JUDAH

EDITED BY

FLORENTINO GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

PETER W. FLINT

EIBERT J.C. TIGCHELAAR

VOLUME LIII



THE PESHER NAHUM SCROLL
FROM QUMRAN

An Exegetical Study of 4Q169

BY

SHANI L. BERRIN



BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON
2004

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Berrin, Shani L.

The Peshar Nahum scroll from Qumran : an exegetical study of 4Q169 / by Shani L. Berrin.

p. cm. — (Studies on the texts of the desert of Judah ; v. 53)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 90-04-12484-5 (alk. paper)

I. Peshar Nahum. I. Title. II. Series.

BS1625.N3B47 2004

224'.94044—dc22

2004045602

ISSN 0169-9962

ISBN 90 04 12484 5

© Copyright 2004 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic,
mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written
permission from the publisher.

*Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal
use is granted by Brill provided that
the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright
Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910
Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

To Mace,
אשר לא נרפו ידיו בדמשך הקיץ

This page intentionally left blank

CONTENTS

List of Tables	xi
Acknowledgments	xiii
Abbreviations	xvii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Review of Literature	1
1.1.1 Principal Secondary Sources	3
1.2 Physical data	6
1.3 Hermeneutical and Methodological Considerations	9
1.3.1 Qumran Peshet	9
1.3.2 Significance of the base-text	12
1.3.3 Lemma/Peshet Correspondence	18
1.4 Chapter Outlines	19
1.4.1 Textual Analysis: Chapter 2	20
1.4.2 Historical Analysis (Chapters 4, 6, 8, and Excursus to ch. 5)	23
1.4.3 Literary Analysis: Lemma/Peshet Correspondence (Chapters 3, 5, 7, 8).....	28
II. THE TEXT	33
2.1 Transcription and Textual Variants	33
2.2 Readings and Restorations	39
2.2.1 Frags 1-2	39
2.2.2 Frags 3-4 I	46
2.2.3 Frags 3-4 II	60
2.2.4 Frags 3-4 III	63
2.2.5 Frags 3-4 IV	69
2.2.6 Fragment 5	71
III. PERICOPE 1, PESHER UNITS 1-5	73
3.1 Literary Analysis: Peshet Units 1-5	74
3.2 Peshet Unit 1	74
3.3 Peshet Unit 2	75
3.4 Peshet Unit 3	77

3.5	Pesher Unit 4	79
3.6	Pesher Unit 5	84
3.7	Summary of Pericope 1	84
IV. PERICOPE 2, PESHER UNITS 6–10:		
	HISTORICAL CONTEXT	87
4.1	Figures Named in Pericope 2	89
4.1.1	Demetrius	89
4.1.2	Seekers-after-Smooth-Things (דורשי החלקות)	91
4.1.3	Antiochus	100
4.1.4	Kittim	101
4.1.5	Young Lion of Wrath (כפיר החרון)	104
4.1.6	Ephraim	109
4.2	Historical Context of Individual Pesher Units (units 6–10)	118
4.2.1	Unit 6	118
4.2.2	Unit 7	118
4.2.3	Unit 8	122
4.2.4	Unit 9	126
4.2.5	Unit 10	126
4.3	Conclusion	130
V. PERICOPE 2, PESHER UNITS 6–10:		
	LITERARY ANALYSIS	131
5.1	Pesher Unit 6	131
5.2	Pesher Unit 7	134
5.3	Pesher Unit 8	145
5.4	Pesher Unit 9	155
5.5	Pesher Unit 10	158
5.6	Summary of Pericope 2	163
EXCURSUS: HANGING IN PESHER NAHUM: A LITERARY AND EXEGETICAL STUDY OF UNIT 9		
ex 5.1	Hanging: Strangulation (הנקה), Exposure to Predation (טרף), Crucifixion (תליה חי)	165
ex 5.1.1	Strangulation (הנקה)	165
ex 5.1.2	Exposure to Predation (טרף)	168

ex 5.1.3	Hanging alive/Crucifixion (תלה חי)	170
ex 5.2	Legal Precedent (בישראל מלפנים)	173
ex 5.3	The Phrase 'כי... [יקרא]	176
ex 5.3.1	Condemnation of crucifixion	177
ex 5.3.2	Approval of Jannaeus's crucifixion	180
ex 5.3.3	Explication	184
ex 5.3.4	"Linked reading": Nah 2:14 as part of peshet in Unit 9	185
ex 5.3.5	Prolonged Exposure	190

VI. PERICOPE 3, PESHER UNITS 11–16:

	HISTORICAL ANALYSIS	193
6.1	Technical Terms	196
6.1.1	Ephraim	196
6.1.2	תלמוד	201
6.1.3	ובהגלות כבוד יהודה	205
6.2	Key Temporal Phrases	208
6.2.1	לאחרית הימים (frag 3–4 II,2)	208
6.2.2	אחרית הימים in Pericope 3	214
6.2.3	ממשלת דורשי ההלקות	217
6.3	Historical Context of Pericope 2	220
6.3.1	The Reign of Salome Alexandra	220
6.3.2	Pompey's Takeover of Judea	222
6.3.3	The Reign of Alexander Jannaeus	224
6.3.4	Alternative Proposal: Adaptation of Dupont-Sommer's Attribution of the Pericope to Pompey's Conquest	228
6.4	Conclusion	231

VII. PERICOPE 3, PESHER UNITS 11–16: LITERARY

	ANALYSIS	235
7.1	Peshet Unit 11	235
7.2	Peshet Unit 12	237
7.3	Peshet Unit 13	244
7.4	Peshet Unit 14	254
7.5	Peshet Unit 15	256
7.6	Peshet Unit 16	262
7.7	Summary of Pericope 3	265

VIII. PERICOPE 4 (3–4 III,8 – IV,4 AND FRAG 5), PESHER UNITS 17–26	267
8.1 Historical Analysis of Pericope 4	268
8.2 Literary Analysis of Pericope 4	276
8.2.1 Peshet Unit 17	277
8.2.2 Peshet Unit 18	278
8.2.3 Peshet Unit 19	280
8.2.4 Peshet Unit 20	280
8.2.5 Peshet Unit 21	281
8.2.6 Peshet Unit 22	283
8.2.7 Peshet Unit 23	284
8.2.8 Peshet Unit 24	284
8.3 Fragment 5: Peshet Units 25–26	285
8.3.1 Peshet Unit 25	285
8.3.2 Peshet Unit 26	285
 IX. CONCLUSION: TEXTUAL, HISTORICAL, AND LITERARY EVALUATION OF PESHER NAHUM	 287
9.1 Textual Characteristics of 4QpNah	287
9.1.1 “Qumranic” features: Orthographic, Morphological, and Semantic Observations	287
9.1.2 Textual Variants	291
9.1.3 Erasures and Corrections	294
9.1.4 Relationship to Mur XII	294
9.1.5 Agreement of Pronominal Identification Formulas	295
9.1.6 Vacats	297
9.2 The Historical Context	301
9.3 Literary Analysis	306
 Bibliography	 309
 Indices	
Scriptural Citations and Ancient Sources	327
Subjects	343
Modern Authors	347

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1	Lemma/Pesher Correspondence according to Content of Pericope	Chapter 1, Page 29
Table 4-1	הלקות: Sapiential Texts	Chapter 4, Page 96
Table 4-2	דורשי ההלקות: Polemical Texts	Chapter 4, Page 97
Table 4-3	דורשי ההלקות: Exegetical Texts	Chapter 4, Page 98
Table 9-1	Vacats before Lemma	Chapter 9, Page 297
Table 9-2	Vacats after Lemma	Chapter 9, Page 299

This page intentionally left blank

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This exegetical study of 4QPesher Nahum is a reworking of my doctoral dissertation completed at the Skirball Department of Hebrew and Judaic Studies, New York University. In my preface to the dissertation, I gratefully acknowledged my debt to “so many teachers, colleagues, students, and friends on three continents.” Now, on yet a fourth continent, I have the privilege of adding my recognition of the support I have received at the University of Sydney. The completion of this publication was greatly facilitated by a research grant awarded to me through the University’s School of European, Asian and Middle Eastern Languages and Studies. My colleagues in the Department of Hebrew, Biblical, and Jewish Studies have been a source of much encouragement, and I would especially like to thank Prof. Suzanne Rutland, Prof. Alan Crown, Dr. Ian Young, Ms. Lucy Davey, and Dr. Jennifer Dowling.

I am most grateful to the members of my dissertation committee, particularly my supervisor, Prof. Lawrence Schiffman, as well as Prof. Baruch Levine, Prof. Mark Smith, Prof. Frank Peters, and especially Prof. Moshe J. Bernstein, who first introduced me to the world of Qumran when I was a student in his undergraduate classes at Stern College, Yeshiva University. Each of them has been a valuable mentor, and I have benefited in so many ways, directly and indirectly, from their specific comments and criticisms, and their general teaching and scholarship.

Much of my research on Pesher Nahum was conducted during periodic visits to Jerusalem. I would like to acknowledge the support of the Fulbright Foundation, as well as the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture, and the Interuniversity Fellowship Program for enabling me to spend an invaluable year in Israel at the Hebrew University. I am particularly grateful for having had the opportunity to study with Prof. Emanuel Tov and Prof. Daniel R. Schwartz; to have conducted my research in the unparalleled Jewish National and University Library on the Givat Ram campus; and to have participated in a number of the annual symposia conducted by the University’s Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls. I

would like to thank the director of the Orion Center, Dr. Esther Chazon, for her kind support. One tangible memento I have from Jerusalem is my copies of PAM photographs, numbers 43.429 and 43.350–51. These photos, provided to me by the Israel Antiquities Authority, were indispensable to my work upon the text (particularly a magnified photo of 4QpNah 3–4, which, to my chagrin, finally convinced me that I would not be able to solve the riddle of the “hanging passage” by getting a better look at the ink traces).

I subsequently obtained copies of additional photographs of Peshet Nahum from Prof. George Brooke of Manchester University, along with a collection of unpublished handwritten notes on the text from the estates of W.H. Brownlee and J.M. Allegro. I am grateful to Prof. Brooke for his generosity in providing me with that material, as well as for his ongoing interest in my work, and for the influence of his publications upon my approach to peshet.

I would like to thank Dr. Gregory Doudna for his collegiality. A doctoral candidate’s worst nightmare is the fear of a competing, overlapping work in progress. In retrospect, it seems somewhat remarkable how easily we cooperated in determining to bring our respective studies to independent conclusion, and then in sharing the final drafts of our theses. In the final stages of the revision process, I had the opportunity to utilize his published work on *4Q Peshet Nahum*, as well.

I am most grateful to Brill Academic Publishers for accepting this study for publication, and specifically to Mattie Kuiper and Alinda Damsma for assistance in preparation of the manuscript. I am indebted to Prof. Florentino García-Martínez for his expert editorial guidance and sensitivity. To the extent that I have succeeded in implementing his suggestions, the structure of this book has been greatly improved. Needless to say, responsibility for the flaws that remain is solely my own.

I would like to thank my parents Mr. Sidney Goldsmith י"ע and Mrs. Jean Goldsmith, for everything, as well as my husband Mace and our children Seraphya, Shlomia, and Shachar. Thanks are due Mace for his assistance with the production of this book as well. I will also extend the conventional authorial apology to my family for the enormous amounts of time and energy that have been devoted to my research at their expense, though I recognize that this is poor compensation. I hope that they share my sentiments that we have all gained from the process as well as from the product. Even so, this work could not have been completed without the assistance of

some exceptionally wonderful caregivers, and I would like to thank the following: Ms. Isabell Grill, Mrs. Rosemarie Snagg, Ms. Zelda Guldenhuys, and especially Ms. Daniela Schwarzmaier de Recacoechea who also provided technical assistance for this publication.

Above all, I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Hanan Eshel and Dr. Esti Eshel of Bar-Ilan University, who have been an unending source of personal and professional inspiration.

This page intentionally left blank

ABBREVIATIONS

- ABD* *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D.N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York, 1992
- ARAB* *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*. D.D. Luckenbill. 2 vols. Chicago, 1926–27
- BA* *Biblical Archaeologist*
- BASOR* *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
- BDB* Brown, F., S.R. Driver, and C.A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford, 1907.
- BHS* *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Edited by K. Elliger and W. Rudolph. Stuttgart, 1983
- CAD* *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, 1956–
- CAH* *Cambridge Ancient History*
- CBQ* *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
- CDSSE* *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. Geza Vermes. New York, 1995
- DJD* *Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan* series
- DSD* *Dead Sea Discoveries*
- EI* *Eretz Israel*
- GLAJJ* *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, M. Stern
- HALOT* *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner
- HUCA* *Hebrew Union College Annual*
- ICC* *International Critical Commentary*
- ICC, Daniel* *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. R.H. Charles
- ICC, Nahum* *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah and Joel*. J.M.P. Smith, W.H. Ward, and J.A. Bewer
- IDBSup* *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume*. Edited by K. Crim. Nashville, 1976
- IEJ* *Israel Exploration Journal*
- JAOs* *Journal of the American Oriental Society*
- JBL* *Journal of Biblical Literature*
- JJS* *Journal of Jewish Studies*

<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JSTOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
MGWJ	Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums
MurXII	“Rouleau des Douze Prophetes.” Pages 181–205 in <i>Discoveries in the Judean Desert II: Les Grottes de Muraba‘ât</i> . Edited by P. Benoit, J.T. Milik and R. de Vaux.
<i>NIB</i>	<i>New Interpreter’s Bible</i>
<i>NRSV</i>	New Revised Standard Version of the Bible, in <i>NIB</i>
<i>NIV</i>	New International Version of the Bible, in <i>NIB</i>
<i>NJPS</i>	<i>New Jewish Publication Society Translation of Tanakh</i>
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>O.E.D.</i>	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i> . 20 volumes. 2nd ed. J.A. Simpson and E.S.C. Weiner. Oxford. 1989.
<i>PEQ</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
PTSDSSP	Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue Biblique</i> .
<i>REJ</i>	<i>Revue des Études Juives</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
SVM	<i>The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ</i> . E. Schürer. Revised and Edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Goodman
<i>TDOT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> . Edited by G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>WCJS</i>	Proceedings of the <i>World Congress for Jewish Studies</i>

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In *Pesher Nahum*, one of the “continuous pesharim” from Qumran, successive verses from the biblical book of Nahum are interpreted as reflecting historical realities of the 1st century BCE. This composition is a significant source of data for a number of areas of inquiry within Qumran studies including history, exegesis, *halakha*, theology, and the transmission of biblical text. *Pesher Nahum* is preserved in a single copy, 4Q169 (4QpNah).¹ The *editio princeps* was published by John Marco Allegro in 1968, in DJD vol. V.² A number of revisions to Allegro’s readings and restorations were put forth by John Strugnell in his detailed critique of the DJD volume.³ Maurya

¹ Not only 4QpNah, but also each of the other “continuous pesharim” has survived in only a single copy. See below, p. 215.

² Pp. 37–42 and Plates XII–XIV. Allegro published preliminary editions of 4QpNah in 1956 (“Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect,” *JBL* 75 [1956]: 89–95; frags 3–4 I), and in 1962 (“More Unpublished Pieces of a Qumran Commentary on Nahum [4Q pNah],” *JSS* 7 [1962]: 304–8; frags 3–4 II–IV). The latter columns had appeared in the journal *Molad* the previous year. In 1961, Jacob Licht found a photo of *Pesher Nahum* in a brochure put out by the Jordanian Antiquities Authority. From this small, poor quality photo he produced an edition of cols. II–IV of 3–4 (“רפ"ם נוספים לפשר נחום,” *Molad* 19 [1961]: 454–56). At that time, Licht stated that Allegro’s DJD volume was purportedly completed: “That this volume [DJD *Cave 4*] is ready for print, we have been told some time ago; when it will see the light of publication we do not know” (454).

Even with this lengthy delay, Allegro was the first member of the original “international team” to complete the publication of his *Cave 4* allotment. Biographical information about Allegro and some of the academic politics related to the delayed publication can be found in Gregory L. Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum* (JSPSup 35; London: Sheffield, 2001), 29–33.

³ “Notes sur le N° 169 des ‘Discoveries,’” in “Notes en Marge du volume V des ‘Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan,” *RevQ* 7 (1970): 204–10. Strugnell used the original MSS in preparing his critique of Allegro. (See Strugnell’s recollections as reported in Neil A. Silberman’s popular book, *The Hidden Scrolls* [New York: G.P. Putnam’s, 1994], 159). He attributed many of his revisions to André Dupont-Sommer (Cf. “Le Commentaire de Nahum Découvert près de la Mer Morte [4QpNah]: Traduction et Notes,” *Semitica* 13 [1963]: 55–88; and “Observations sur le Commentaire de Nahum Découvert près de la Mer Morte,” *Journal des Savants* [October-December 1963]: 201–226). Strugnell did not offer formal citations but

P. Horgan incorporated many of these revisions, and supplemented them, in her 1979 edition of the work, which appeared as part of her general study on the continuous pesharim.⁴ Subsequent scholarship on 4Q169 frequently appeared within similar collections, and in-depth analyses of the work tended to be restricted to the particular column featuring the “Lion of Wrath” (3–4 I).⁵ A comprehensive and systematic treatment of Peshar Nahum, in the order of Billah Nitzan’s 1986 edition of Peshar Habakkuk,⁶ remained a desideratum for some time.

As the twentieth century drew to a close, and the publication of the Qumran corpus approached completion, Peshar Nahum was to receive the attention it deserved.⁷ Unbeknownst to each other, Gregory Doudna and myself each set out to produce Ph.D. theses devoted to 4Q169. When each of us later learned of the other’s work, we determined to continue our respective projects independently, later exchanging copies of our penultimate drafts. Doudna’s dissertation has been published in book form as *4Q Peshar Nahum: A Critical Edition*. The most significant similarity in our approaches is structural. Specifically, our presentations highlight the framework of 4QpNah as a series of lemma/peshar “units.” One of the more significant methodological differences in our works is Doudna’s objective of achieving maximal reconstruction of the text of 4QpNah.⁸ My own approach has favored

frequently, though informally, referred to Dupont-Sommer’s work. It is likely that some of their common readings reflect Strugnell’s dependence upon Dupont-Sommer’s publications, even when there is no explicit attribution. Dupont-Sommer himself seems to have relied upon some of the readings of Licht, פְּשָׁרִים נִסְפָּיִם, and of Johann Maier, “Weitere Stücke zum Nahumkommentar aus der Höhle 4 Von Qumran,” *Judaica* 18 (1962): 215–250. Strugnell also used the translation and notes of Jean Carmignac, “Interprétation de Nahum (4QpNah),” in *Les Textes de Qumrân Traduits et Annotés. Vol. 2* (eds., Jean Carmignac, Édouard Cothenet and Hubert Lignée; Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1963), 85–92.

⁴ *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (CBQ Monograph Series 8; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1979). See now, her revised editions in James H. Charlesworth, ed., *Pesharim, Other Commentaries and Related Documents* (Vol. 6B of *Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Texts with English Translations*; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002).

⁵ See the list of secondary sources at the end of this section.

⁶ מְנִילַת פֶּשֶׁר הַבְּקָרָה (*1QpHab*) (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1986).

⁷ Note, as well, the recent publication of two important works devoted to the corpus of pesharim as a whole: J.H. Charlesworth’s *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?* (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2002) and Timothy H. Lim’s *Pesharim, Companion to the Qumran Scrolls* (Sheffield, 2002).

⁸ Thus, the first two parts of his tripartite work are entitled, respectively, “Text Reconstruction and Analysis I” and “Text Reconstruction and Analysis II.” Doudna’s

minimal reconstruction, emphasizing literary analysis, and particularly “lemma/pesher correspondence.” The aim of the current work is to provide a systematic analysis of Pesher Nahum, with a stress on such correspondence. This edition includes a transcription of the full text of the pesher and an English translation as well as textual notes, readings, and restorations. These textual data provide the basis for the historical and literary/exegetical analyses of the text.

1.1.1 *Principal Secondary Sources*

Throughout our analyses, we have attempted to minimize the discussion of alternative readings and of earlier scholarly opinions that have not been incorporated into this edition.⁹ To further simplify presentation and avoid undue repetition, the principal secondary sources pertaining to 4QPesher Nahum are cited in abbreviated form. Except as noted, the following sources are cited by author’s name alone. Note that publications dated before 1961 contain only 4QpNah 3–4 I. Most subsequent transcriptions and translations present all four columns of frags 3–4. Most works published after the *editio princeps* in 1968 include frags 1–2 as well.

Transcriptions

Allegro, “Further Light” (1956; 3–4 I), “More Unpublished Pieces” (1962; 3–4 II–IV), and DJD (1968);¹⁰ Petrus Boccaccio and Guido Berardi, *Pšr Hbqweq: Interpretatio Habaccuc 1QpHab* (Fano: Seminario Piceno, 1958) Appendix I: “Interpretatio Nahum,” 36–37; Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum* (2001); Dupont-Sommer, “Le Commentaire” (1963); David Flusser, פרושים, צדוקים, ואסיים, in *Essays in Jewish History and*

study is noteworthy for its meticulous attention to technical details. Doudna made extensive use of the early photos of 4QpNah, devising a systematic approach to the reading of doubtful letters, and employing an innovative form of notation that facilitates reconstruction. He outlines his system on pp. 47–53. The other significant difference between our works pertains to the historical contextualization of the pesher. See chapters 4 and 6 below.

⁹ The interested reader can find lengthier explorations of specific issues in Shani L. Berrin, “4QpNah (4Q169, Pesher Nahum): A Critical Edition with Commentary, Historical Analysis, and In-Depth Study of Exegetical Method” (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 2001) as well as in Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum*. In the present work, the aim is to present the preferred textual readings that underlie our analyses.

¹⁰ Where relevant, citations will specify one of the preliminary publications or *editio princeps* by title.

Philology, in Memory of Gedaliahu Alon (Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 1970), 133–68; Florentino García-Martínez, and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1997); Abraham Meir Habermann, *מנילוח מדבר יהודה* (Jerusalem: Machbaroth Lesifruth, 1959); Horgan, *Pesharim* (1979);¹¹ Gert Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerichtigkeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1963); Licht, *דפים נוספים* (1961); Eduard Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran: Hebräisch und Deutsch, Mit Masoretischer Punktation/Übersetzung, Einführung und Anmerkungen* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971); Yigael Yadin, *המנילות הננויות ממדבר יהודה* (Tel Aviv: Schocken, 1957), and “Peshar Nahum Re-considered,” *IEJ* 21 (1971): 1–11.

Translations:

English: Allegro (as above); Iosif Davidovich Amusin, “The Reflection of Historical Events of the First Century B.C. in Qumran Commentaries (4Q 161; 4Q 169; 4Q 166),” *HUCA* 48 (1977): 123–52; Millar Burrows, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (NY: Viking, 1958); Edward Cook, in M. Wise, M. Abegg and E. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (Harper: San Francisco, 1996); Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings from Qumran* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1961), transl. from the Fr. (below); García-Martínez (as above); Theodore H. Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scriptures* (NY: Anchor Press, Doubleday, 1976); Horgan (as above); Michael A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Hugh Joseph Schonfield, *Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Studies Toward Their Solution* (New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 1957); Geza Vermes, *CDSSE* (New York: Allen Lane, Penguin Press, 1997);¹² Yadin, *The Message of the Scrolls* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1957).

¹¹ Horgan’s work is sometimes bound as 2 vols., with the Hebrew transcription as a supplement in vol. 2, entitled “Part II: The Texts.” References to the Hebrew transcription are designated as (Heb).

¹² Vermes’s translation has remained fairly stable throughout the successive editions of *Dead Sea Scrolls in English/Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. The earliest eds., issued prior to the publication of DJD V, lacked frags 1–2 of 4QpNah. A few additional modifications may be noted in various editions: the removal of some previously restored text in 3–4 I,8; the alteration of “mounting horseman” to “charging horseman” in 3–4 II,3; and some wavering between “council” and “counsel” for rendering עצה in 3–4 III,7.

- French:* Carmignac, *Les Textes* (1963); Dupont-Sommer, *Les Écrits Esséniens Découverts Près de la Mer Morte* (Paris: Payot, 1st ed., 1959), “Résumé des cours de 1969–70: Hébreu et Araméen,” *Annuaire du Collège de France* 70 (1970–71): 406–08 and “Le Commentaire” (as above).
- German:* Hans Bardtke, *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer: Die Sekte von Qumrân* vol. 2 (Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1958). Lohse (as above); Jeremias (as above); J. Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer*, vol. 2: *Die Texte der Höhle 4* (Munich and Basel: E. Reinhardt, 1995) and “Weitere Stücke” (1962, on 3–4 II–IV).
- Italian:* Luigi Moraldi, *I manoscritti de Qumrân* (Torino: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1971); Franco Michellini Tocci, *I manoscritti del Mar Morto: Introduzione, traduzione e commento* (Bari: Laterza, 1967).
- Latin:* E. Vogt, “Prima nomina historica in Qumrân (4QpNah),” *Biblica* 37 (1956): 530–32 (with transliteration of Heb).
- Russian:* Amusin, *Teksty Kumrana* (Moscow: Akademia Nauk, 1971).¹³

The following works are also cited by author’s name alone:

Unless otherwise noted, references to Schiffman are to Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Pharisees and Sadducees in Peshet Nahum,” in *Minhah Le-Nahum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honor of His 70th Birthday* (JSOTSup 154. ed., M.Z. Brettler and M.A. Fishbane. Sheffield: JSOT 1993) 272–90. References to Nitzan are to מנלה פשר הבקוק (1QpHab) (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1986). References to Tantlevskij are to Igor R. Tantlevskij, “The Reflection of the Political Situation in Judea in 88 BCE in the Qumran Commentary of Nahum (4QpNah, Columns 1–4),” *St. Petersburg Journal of Oriental Studies* 6 (1994): 221–31. References to Spronk are to Klaas Spronk, *Historical Commentary on the Old Testament: Nahum* (The Netherlands: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1997). References to W. Maier are to Walter Arthur Maier, *The Book of Nahum* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1959).

In addition to the above publications, the following unpublished material was also consulted for this study: handwritten personal notes

¹³ I would like to express my gratitude to Alexey Michaelovitch Siverstev for his translation of selected portions of Amusin’s commentary into English for my use.

of Allegro and of William H. Brownlee, generously supplied by George Brooke; and an excerpt from Armin Lange's unpublished MS of *Biblia Qumranica* kindly supplied by the author.¹⁴

1.2 PHYSICAL DATA

The final photographs of 4QpNah in the PAM series are 43.429 and 43.350–51.¹⁵ These are the photos that are reproduced in the *editio princeps*, and they form the primary basis of this study.

Five fragments of 4QpNah are extant. They comprise five fairly well to well-preserved columns of text, of varying widths, as well as a piece of a sixth column.¹⁶ It is important to remember that despite

¹⁴ Lange's 6-column synoptic edition of Nahum was a useful resource regarding textual readings in the lemmas. The synopsis features the texts of MT, MurXII, 4QpNah, 4QXII^g, HevXII, and LXX. On a smaller scale, Lidija Novakovic has now compiled a synoptic list of "Text-critical Variants in the Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents," in J.H. Charlesworth, *The Pesharim*, 129–158.

¹⁵ The complete photograph numbers are PAM: 41:312, 423, 580–581, 709, 800–801; 42:142, 512, 625–626; 43:350–351, 429. PAM 41.312 includes bottom portions of what is now called 3–4 II and III, as well as a piece of leather containing a bit of lines 7–8 of frag 2. PAM 41:423 includes the main portion of frag 2, among a number of other texts. The fragment had probably not yet been identified, or associated with the pieces in 41.312, at the time the photo was taken. 41:580–81 contains frag 2, and most of frag 4, with some pieces that had not yet been attached to the main fragments, as well as some extraneous pieces that do not belong to 4QpNah. 41:709 includes a small piece of III,8 with the word נִשְׁרָיִם, among many other small pieces of leather that were probably all unidentified at that point. 41.800–801 contains 1–2 and 3–4, as well as associated pieces that were later fitted directly into the text. (A piece containing " ט []" is misplaced at the bottom of 3–4 II. Allegro's preliminary publication features the same placement, but the piece is omitted in DJD; Carmignac places it at III, 12. Cf. ch. 3).

In 42:142, more pieces have been fitted into the main bloc of text of 3–4 I–II than in previous photos. The piece containing " ט []" has been removed from the bottom of 3–4 I and does not appear on the plate at all. In its stead Allegro has correctly placed the " שֶׁר־" of נִשְׁרָיִם at the end of 3–4 I,11. The piece containing the beginning of lines 9–12 of 3–4 I appears on the plate as an individual piece, but has not yet been put in place within the text. A small piece of col. III also appears on this plate. 42:512 contains 4QpNah frag 5, among miscellaneous texts. 42:625–26 contains 4QpNah frags 1–5; most of the previously loose pieces are joined with the main body of the text. Only the piece of III,8 with the word נִשְׁרָיִם appears on the plate un-attached. 41.493 is listed under 4Q169 in the companion volume to the microfiche (p. 35; see also, Strugnell, "Notes," 205); but the plate actually contains Mur 88 XII, the Minor Prophets scroll.

¹⁶ Doudna correctly demonstrates that the extant columns represent columns 2, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 of an original 13 column scroll (pp. 35–38, and Table 1 on pp. 29–30). (Contrast Horgan, 159; she perceives traces of an initial column of the scroll, and describes the plates as portions of 7 columns, of which only 5 are preserved).

the near coincidence of the number of fragments and columns in this manuscript, there is by no means a one-to-one correspondence between these numbers. The term “fragments” refers to separate pieces of leather that are denoted by Arabic numerals. “Columns” are distinct vertical blocks of text, set apart by margins either extant or inferred. Columns are designated by the numerals of the fragment(s) in which they are preserved, followed by the column number given in lower-case Roman numerals. Thus, e.g., “frags 3–4 I” represents the first column preserved by the joint unit of fragments 3 and 4.¹⁷

Frag 3–4 contains parts of 4 consecutive columns, comprising the bulk of the extant text.¹⁸ Frags 1–2 contains part of an earlier column, while frag 5 preserves bits of a later column. It is probable that each column originally consisted of 12 lines.¹⁹ The length of the lines varies from column to column.²⁰ The size of average letters (e.g., כ, ט) throughout is approximately 2mm square.

4QpNah features both vertical and horizontal line rulings. Horizontal rule lines, from which the letters are suspended, are spaced 7–8 mm

¹⁷ This, despite the fact that frag 3 itself does not actually contain any of col. I, but is only a small piece of col. II. (Frag 3 is 4 cm in width by 6.5 cm in height. It contains just a few letters on 4 lines, providing the beginning of col. II lines 9–12, which appear mostly on frag 4). In fact, the nomenclature is even less clear, and somewhat arbitrary, as at times separate pieces of leather are not assigned their own numbers. For example, PAM 41:312 shows 8 distinct pieces of text, which are 8 of the numerous pieces that were later joined to comprise the artificial entity named “frag 4.” For this general problem in Qumran studies, see Stephen A. Reed, “What is a Fragment?” *JJS* 45 (1994): 123–25. Some of the additional fragmentation may have occurred at a later date. Thus, Doudna (36) notes that a crack down the middle of 3–4 I that is visible in photos from the 1950’s has now increased to the point of severing the column.

¹⁸ The total width of the four consecutive columns is approximately 53 cm.

¹⁹ 12 lines, with top and bottom margins, are preserved in the first two columns of frags 3–4. 12 lines of text are preserved in frags 1–2, but one of these is an interlinear addition, and a line has probably been lost. See our discussion of the restoration of this column in ch. 2. In 3–4 III, 11 lines contain legible writing, and remnants of letters are visible from a twelfth line. In 3–4 IV, the column breaks off after line 9, with only a trace of the first letter of line 10 remaining.

²⁰ In frags 1–2, we posit an original line length of approximately 61–63 characters (approximately 12.5 cm) based upon the restoration of lines 9 and 10 according to MT. In 3–4 I, the original line length is estimated at approximately 75 characters, based upon line 9. The second column of 3–4 measures 15.1 cm between vertical side rulings, accommodating approximately 74 characters per line, as evidenced in the fully preserved lines 5 and 6. The third column of 3–4 measures approximately 13 cm between vertical rulings, and contains about 65–70 characters per line. In 3–4 IV, the restoration of lines 1–2 allows for an estimate of an original line length of about 67 characters, or approximately 13.5 cm.

apart on frags 2–4.²¹ Parts of top margins are preserved in 3–4 I–IV, and parts of bottom margins are preserved in the first two of these columns.²² 2 cm remains of the best-preserved bottom margin; 1 cm of the best-preserved top margin is extant. As for vertical rulings, the right margin rule is visible in frag 2; 1.6 cm of blank leather remains to the right of this line until the broken edge of the leather. On frags 3–4, full side margins of approximately 2 cm separate col. I from col. II (2.0 cm), and col. II from col. III (1.9 cm). A larger margin of nearly 3 cm separates col. III from col. IV.²³ Col. IV breaks off before the left margin.

The script of 4QpNah is aptly described by Strugnell as an “easily read, late Hasmonean-early Herodian formal script.”²⁴ This paleographic date of 50–1 BCE can be readily confirmed by an examination of Frank Moore Cross’s chartings of Hebrew scripts.²⁵ The script of 4QpNah is similar to that in line 4 of fig. 4 in “Development” and is best placed between lines 3 and 4 in Plate 10 of “Paleography.”²⁶ The script provides a rough date *ante quem* for the composition of Peshier Nahum, in the second half of the 1st century BCE.

²¹ An interlinear line (“5a”) is inserted between the 4th and 5th lines of frag 2, without ruling.

²² On 1–2, neither the top nor the bottom of text is extant. On 3–4, the distance from the top-most extant point to bottom-most is 11 cm, but neither point is the absolute end-point of the leather. The height of the inscribed portion is approximately 8 cm.

²³ There is a crack down the middle of the margin separating cols. III and IV. In the photos, it almost appears as though each of the two columns has its own side-margin, which was then joined to that of the other. There is 1.5 cm of blank leather to the left of col. III before the crack, and another 1.3 cm from the crack to the right-margin rule of col. IV. Perhaps the part of the leather that is cracked was already visibly weak in antiquity, and thus avoided by the scribe?

²⁴ “Notes,” 205.

²⁵ “The Development of the Jewish Scripts,” in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of W.F. Albright* (George E. Wright, ed.; Garden City: Doubleday, 1961), 133–202; Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam eds., “Paleography and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years* (vol. 1; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 379–402.

²⁶ See also, the earlier studies of Nahman Avigad, “The Paleography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents,” *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4 (1958): 56–87, esp. 65–76, and John C. Trevor, “A Paleographic Study of the Jerusalem Scrolls,” *BASOR* 113 (1949): 6–23. Support for broad paleographic dating has come from the corroboration of advanced carbon-14 dating techniques reported by Georges Bonani et al., “Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Atiqot* 20 (1991): 27–32; A.J. Timothy Jull et al., “Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls and Linen Fragments from the Judean Desert,” *Atiqot* 28 (1996): 85–91. Doudna is more skeptical about

Until 1999, 4QpNah was on display at the Shrine of The Book in the Israel Museum in Jerusalem. It is now in the archives of the museum. The scroll is quite dark and has suffered additional decay subsequent to the taking of the final PAM photographs in 1959–60.²⁷ Those infrared photos remain the best source for obtaining readings of the text. The Israel Antiquities Authority kindly provided me with copies of photos PAM 43.350–351. The transcription of 4QpNah (below, 33–38) was produced from these copies, in consultation with transcriptions, translations, and comments of earlier scholars, and some use of the microfiche of earlier photos.²⁸

1.3 HERMENEUTICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The approach to Peshar Nahum employed in this study is predicated upon certain views of Qumran peshar that bear elucidation. In the description of peshar that follows, emphasis is placed upon the significance of the base-text, especially in regard to lemma/peshar correspondence.

1.3.1 *Qumran Peshar*

Our working definition of Qumran peshar is as follows: “a form of biblical interpretation peculiar to Qumran, in which biblical poetic/

paleographic dating, and cautions that it is only effective for “low-precision” dating, i.e., placing the Qumran scrolls within “the Second Temple era, prior to the era of Bar Kokhba” (pp. 38–42 and Appendix A, 675–82). Nonetheless, he accurately observes that the formation of the letters in 4QpNah is similar to that in 1QpHab (ibid., 40; cf. Ada Yardeni, *The Book of Hebrew Script: History, Paleography, Script styles, Calligraphy and Design* [Jerusalem: Carta, 1997], 51).

²⁷ The PAM 43 series of Cave 4 MSS was taken between June of 1959 and July of 1960. As an indication of the ongoing deterioration, note that only the single letter D remains today of the very significant word “Demetrius” in 3–4 I, though all the photos preserve the three preceding letters. (Cf. Doudna, 24; he notes that this was observed earlier by George J. Brooke, when the scroll was on display at the Shrine of the Book at the Israel Museum in Jerusalem).

²⁸ Microfiche of the earlier photos is found in Emanuel Tov ed., with Stephen J. Pfann, *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche. A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judean Desert* and the Companion Volume (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993). In general, examination of the microfiche did not affect our readings of the text. (For a contrasting assessment of the use of the microfiche, see Doudna, 34–35, 46. Doudna occasionally supports some of his readings on the basis of those photos. For example, he uses 41.581 to re-align a join in a piece of frag 2 [p. 77]). Regarding other physical aspects of 4QpNah, Doudna gives a brief description of color evaluations made by Pfann, and observes that the attempt to apply the “Stegemann method” to identify damage patterns in 4QpNah has not been fruitful.

prophetic texts are applied to post-biblical historical/eschatological settings through various literary techniques in order to substantiate a theological conviction regarding divine reward and punishment.²⁹ This definition encompasses features pertaining to form, content, motive and method.³⁰

(1) Form: Continuous pesharim are comprised of a series of citation/interpretation “units.”³¹ The form of each unit may be expressed as: biblical *lemma* + *interpretation* with identifying *formula*.³²

(2) Content: The base-texts of the continuous pesharim are prophetic biblical texts.³³ The peshar interpretations are contemporizing historical/eschatological applications of the base-text that reflect the theology and concerns of the Qumran community.³⁴

²⁹ This section is a condensed adaptation of Shani L. Berrin, “Qumran Pesharim,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. Matthias Henze; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, forthcoming), which, in turn, is an adaptation of ch. 1 of Berrin, “4QpNah.”

³⁰ These categories derive from the distinction between primary generic factors of form and content, and secondary factors such as exegetical technique, as put forth by George J. Brooke, “Qumran Peshar: Towards the Re-definition of a Genre,” *RevQ* 10 (1981): 483–503.

³¹ Jean Carmignac, “Le Document de Qumrân sur Melkisédék,” *RevQ* 7 (1969–71): 361. The fifteen works published as a group in Horgan’s *Pesharim* are generally accepted as representing the existing corpus of such peshar compositions. On the additional works, 3QpIsa, 5QpMal, and 4QpMic, see García-Martínez, *Study Ed.*; Horgan, in Charlesworth, ed. *Dead Sea Scrolls*; Doudna, 15.

³² Or, more specifically, “citation + *identifying* interpretation with *identifying* formula, typically including (or assuming) a form of the word ‘peshar.’” In 4QpNah, the identifying formula always begins with the word פִּשְׁרֵי. For comprehensive discussions of standard peshar structures and citation formulas and their variations, see Horgan, 239–44; Brooke, “Qumran Peshar: Towards the Re-definition,” 497–501; Moshe J. Bernstein, “Introductory Formulas for Citation and Re-citation of Biblical Verses in the Qumran Pesharim: Observations on a Peshar Technique,” *DSD* 1 (1994): 30–70; Nitzan, 81–89. See also, Fred L. Horton, Jr., “Formulas of Introduction in the Qumran Literature,” *RevQ* 7 (1971): 505–14 and Isaac Rabinowitz, “*Peshar/Pittârôn*. Its Biblical Meaning and its Significance in the Qumran Literature,” *RevQ* 8 (1973): 226–30. For other forms of explicit biblical citations at Qumran, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament,” in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (Missoula: SBL, 1974), 3–58. Casey D. Elledge has provided an important resource, an appendix to Charlesworth, ed. *Dead Sea Scrolls* vol. 6B, entitled “A Graphic Index of Citation and Commentary Formulae in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 367–377.

³³ The extant continuous pesharim comment upon texts from the Minor Prophets, Isaiah, and Psalms.

³⁴ Karl Elliger delineates the prime “hermeneutical principles” of peshar as the beliefs that (1) the peshar refers to the end-time and (2) the end-time is now. (“Prophetische Verkündigung hat zum Inhalt das Ende, und Die Gegenwart ist die

(3) Motive: The aim of peshar is to assert the fulfillment of biblical prophecies, specifically in the contemporary setting that was identified as the eschatological era.

(4) Method: The terms “inspired exegesis” or “prophecy by interpretation” indicate the Qumran Community’s perception that the method of producing peshar involved both revelation and exegesis.³⁵ It is difficult to retrieve details concerning the methods employed in accessing “revelation.” However, information about exegetical technique can be readily extrapolated from the formulations of the pesharim themselves. That is because the techniques involved in deriving peshar applications from the lemma are inextricably linked to the literary techniques employed in composing the written expressions of the application. A number of scholars have assigned categories to the various exegetical techniques employed in peshar. Nitzan, for example, organizes the techniques into four categories: (1) paraphrase (2) allegory (3) polyvalence and (4) “re-contextualization” of specific elements of the lemma.³⁶ These methods are utilized in an integrative process in which they enable the derivation of a contemporizing application from words, phrases, or ideas in the lemma, and they also guide the written formulation of that event. Additional literary techniques include structural balance, especially parallelism, and the use of secondary biblical texts.³⁷

The task of defining peshar is related to the question of a suitable translation for the word itself. This is a pragmatic concern for translators of the pesharim since, as indicated above, the use of the

Endzeit.” *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer*. BHT 15. [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1953], 150). Cf. William H. Brownlee, “Biblical Interpretation Among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *BA* 14 (1951): 60. Elliger offers internal support for these principles from 1QpHab II,1–10 and VII,1–8 (cited below, p. 13). Our understanding of the “end-time” at Qumran assumes an extended scope of the term “end of days,” in the manner demonstrated by Annette Steudel, “אֶחָדֵי הַיָּמִים in the Texts From Qumran,” *RevQ* 16 (1993–94): 225–246. With the sense of the “end of days” as encompassing past, present, and future, the “eschatological” valence may be seen as more theological than strictly chronological. Other theological concepts evident in the pesharim include dualism, historical determinism, and the election of the Community.

³⁵ The latter term is that of John Joseph Collins, pp. 31–34 in “Jewish Apocalyptic Against its Hellenistic Near Eastern Environment,” *BASOR* 220 (1975): 27–36.

³⁶ Nitzan terms the last technique “נתוך ההקשר” (pp. 51–54). Compare Elliger’s “atomization.”

³⁷ Cf. Nitzan, 81–103, on “style.” Again, contrast Nitzan’s emphasis on the sensitivity of peshar to the literary structure of its lemma to Elliger’s stress on “atomization.”

term itself is a prominent feature of these works. Horgan addressed the problem at some length and decided upon “interpretation.”³⁸ Rabinowitz, wishing to stress the revelatory aspect of the term, rendered “actualized presage.”³⁹ This is rather awkward and ignores the exegetical force of the word.⁴⁰ “Interpretation” reflects the exegetical focus, but obscures the technical, specifying, aspect of the interpretation. This specificity is emphasized by Lou H. Silberman, who rendered the introductory formula as, “the specific reference is to . . .” and “the specific meaning of the utterance is that. . . .”⁴¹ The translation “specific meaning” captures much of the nuance of the term, but it falls short of indicating the religious and eschatological valence of *peshet*. In the present work, the formulaic פֶּשֶׁר is rendered in quasi-transliteration as “its *peshet*.” In referring to the comments following the introductory formula, the terms “peshet” “peshet interpretation” and “interpretation” are employed interchangeably.

1.3.2 *Significance of the base-text*

In her study of Peshet Habakkuk, Nitzan observed that previous scholarship had focused upon the formation of specific peshet interpretations in 1QpHab, but had not attended to characteristics of the peshet composition as a whole.⁴² Nitzan demonstrated that the peshet is an organic structure in its own right. At the same time, her analysis served as a corrective for Elliger’s over-emphasis on “atomization,” by demonstrating the peshet’s sensitivity to the structure of its base-text. She showed that as a tendency, though not as a strict rule, the peshetim in 1QpHab reflect the form of their lemmas. She further argued that “atomization” of the biblical text is only a last resort, and that an attempt is made to adhere to biblical structure.⁴³

This desire to preserve the structure of the base-text raises the question of whether a similar sensitivity pertained toward the con-

³⁸ Pp. 236–37. Thus, Carmignac, Schiffman, and Vermes. Horgan notes the similar rendering, “meaning” by Brownlee, Józef T. Milik, Burrows, Elliger, Hartmut Stegemann; and “explication” by Dupont-Sommer.

³⁹ “The Meaning of the Key (‘Demetrius’)-Passage of the Qumran Nahum-Peshet,” *JAO* 98 (1978): 394–399.

⁴⁰ This is Horgan’s critique, p. 237.

⁴¹ “Unriddling the Riddle: A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Peshet (1 QpHab),” *RevQ* 3 (1961–2): 340–41.

⁴² P. 39.

⁴³ P. 54.

tent of the base-text. It is clear that the members of the Qumran Community used biblical prophecy as a guidebook to their own contemporary situation. What is not clear is whether they saw the pesher applications as the *only* intended sense of those prophecies. The dominant view is that the author(s) of pesher believed the value of the prophetic text to lie solely in its contemporary meaning(s), meanings unknown to the author of the base-text. To employ Elliger's model of a "mosaic"⁴⁴ the configuration of the mosaic tiles in 1QpHab would be the only meaningful arrangement of these pieces, while the complete picture present in the book of Habakkuk itself was only a clever facade, a receptacle for the temporary storage of these tiles. Thus, the book of Nahum would be understood not to have referred to Assyria at all, but exclusively to have addressed the concerns of the Community portrayed in 4QpNah.

This prevalent understanding, taking the pesher application as the only valid interpretation of the text for the author of the pesher, assumes a kind of denigration of the prophet and his text. The prophet is assumed to have been unaware of the true significance of his message. Moreover, the overt content of the text is supposed to be meaningless, a mere code for its esoteric message. The degree of knowledge ascribed to the original prophet is a matter that has received some explicit scholarly attention, in light of 1QpHab II,7–10 and VII,1–8. According to 1QpHab II,7–10, commenting on Hab 1:5, "all that is to come upon the last generation" is told by "the priest, into whose heart God placed knowledge to interpret (לְפֶשֶׁר) all the words of the prophets by whose hand God recounted all which is to come upon his nation and[. . ." According to 1QpHab VII,1–8, "God told Habakkuk to write down the things that are going to come upon the last generation, but the fulfillment of the end-time He did not make known to him. . . . God made known to [the Teacher of Righteousness] all the mysteries of the words of the prophets."

These pesharim have generally been understood as indicating the superiority of the Teacher of Righteousness over Habakkuk. Habakkuk received only the words of prophecy, whereas the Teacher of Righteousness received knowledge of the meaning of the prophecy, and the details of its specific fulfillment in history.⁴⁵ Some questions

⁴⁴ *Habakuk-Kommentar*, 163–64.

⁴⁵ Cf. Nitzan, 27–28; David S. Russel, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964), 181.

remain, however. How would the original prophet have understood his own role and his message? When the pesher states that God did not reveal “to him” the fulfillment of the end-time, does this refer to the prophet or to the Teacher of Righteousness? Frederick F. Bruce is representative of those who take Habakkuk as the object of the verb, and view the pesher as contrasting the two human figures. He states that God’s revelation to the prophets “could not be understood until its meaning was imparted to the Teacher of Righteousness . . . particularly with regard to the time when His purpose would be fulfilled.”⁴⁶ The minority view, that the Teacher of Righteousness is the object of the verb, has been put forth by Nitzan, Dupont-Sommer, Wieder, and Patte. In their understanding, the phrase in the pesher excludes some mysteries from human capacity, and does not simply limit the original prophet.⁴⁷ The level of understanding ascribed to the prophet is simply not clear in the pesher.⁴⁸

The significance of the original prophecy is related to the significance of the original prophet, but is essentially a separate question. There is no direct evidence from the pesharim themselves to indicate the

⁴⁶ *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1959), 10. Bruce described a “two-part” revelation consisting of, first, the communication of a mystery and only later, the communication of the interpretation of that mystery (ibid., 7–11. Cf. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* [NY: Doubleday, 1994], 225–26). So too, Burrows, Milik, and Vermes understood 1QpHab as claiming that the Teacher of Righteousness was endowed with greater knowledge than the Prophets. (Cf. Daniel Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine*, Society of Biblical Literature, Dissertation Series, No. 22 [Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975], 216, n. 23; see also, Russell, *Method and Message*, 181; and Horgan, 237). Fishbane similarly states that the ancient prophet, the “authoritative spokesman of God,” did not know the “true meaning” of the prophecies he communicated, whereas the Teacher of Righteousness was so privileged (“Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran,” in *Miqra: Text, Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* [ed. M.J. Mulder, with H. Sysling; vol. 2 of *Compendia Rerum Judaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*; Assen/Mastricht: Van Gorcum, 1990], 339–77). Of the 2-step revelatory process, Schiffman states, “The first stage took place when God delivered his prophecies to the prophets. Yet they did not really understand their own prophecies” (*Reclaiming*, 226).

⁴⁷ In this view, God revealed many mysteries to the Teacher of Righteousness, but some divine mysteries were not accessible to any humans, and one of these extreme esoterica was knowledge of the specific end-time (Nitzan, 171; Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 216–17; Naphtali Wieder, *The Judean Scrolls and Karaism* [London: East and West Library, 1962]).

⁴⁸ Nitzan states: “[as for] the prophets, who communicated these ‘hidden matters’ from the mouth of God, it is possible (יָכוֹן) that they did not know their ‘pesher.’” (ibid., 26. [*Italics added*]). Nitzan refers to Ithamar Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* [Leiden: Brill, 1980], 9–23).

status of other readings besides the pesher interpretation. When we say with Carmignac that pesher provides a “non-literal” reading of the base-text, revealing its hidden mysteries, do we mean that it supplements or supplants the literal reading, or rather that it denies any value whatsoever to the ostensible content of the base-text?⁴⁹

Some strong statements have been made against allowing any value for the original content. Bruce was very clear in saying that, “Pesher deprive[s] Old Testament prophecies of that relevance and coherence which can best be appreciated when they are studied in their historical setting.”⁵⁰ So, too, “all the prophecies, so to speak, were given in code,”⁵¹ and, “It is in this situation [of the commentator’s day], and not in the text, that logical coherence is to be looked for.”⁵² Similarly, Russell stated that, for the author of pesher, “the text of Scripture does not, and never did, refer to the prophets’ own day, but to this day in which its meaning for the first time is being clearly revealed. Thus, the exegesis given in the Commentaries [the pesharim] and elsewhere is an interpretation, not a *re*-interpretation of prophecy. This is the true and only meaning of Scripture.”⁵³ For Otto Betz as well, the exclusive meaning of the text is the meaning revealed to the Teacher of Righteousness, about the end-time which is the present.⁵⁴ For these scholars, pesher presumes a perspective in which the pesher reading is understood to have been the only real meaning of the text, which in its original form is meaning-less.

Let us consider an alternate model, predicated upon a supposition of textual multivalence at Qumran. In this model, the author of pesher does not take the eschatological significance of biblical prophecy as its only intended meaning. Rather, the pesher application would have superseded, but not invalidated, the earlier historical significance that the original prophet himself believed to be the subject of his prophecy. The words of the biblical prophet Nahum would have been perceived as applicable to Assyria, but as ultimately

⁴⁹ Carmignac, *Les Textes* vol. 2, 46–47. To put the question another way, is there a sense of “*nigleh*” and “*nistar*” for historical prophecy, as there is for *halakha*? See the cautious remarks of Steven D. Fraade, “Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran,” *JJS* 44 (1993): 50–51.

⁵⁰ *Biblical Exegesis*, 10.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 11.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 18.

⁵³ *Method and Message*, 181.

⁵⁴ *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1960), 75.

important because of their applicability to the end-time. They would *make sense* in regard to Assyria, but would *matter* in regard to the Community and its contemporaries. In this view, pesher does in fact presuppose an originally meaningful base-text.⁵⁵ This seems especially clear in the case of Nahum, which features such explicit historical and geographical terminology.

It is possible that the modern supposition of the irrelevance of the original context of the base-text of pesher has its origins in a mistaken analogy with early Christian exegesis. Like much of the New Testament, Qumran pesher is aptly described as contemporizing exegesis, and fulfillment literature.⁵⁶ However, although the content of the non-literal reading the prophets is similar to that of the early Christians, this does not mean that the Christian attitude to the base-text was already felt by the Qumran Community.⁵⁷ The late rabbinic hermeneutic that enabled non-literal readings of the prophets was multivalence;⁵⁸ for Christianity it was the supplanting of the literal meaning of the Hebrew Bible by allegorical interpretation. For the Qumran Community, the problem may not yet have been felt, and certainly was not articulated in our extant sources. Perhaps the

⁵⁵ We have not found an explicit articulation of this view in the secondary literature. Nitzan does state in passing that Habakkuk's prophecy was partially fulfilled in the past by means of Babylonian events, but that its ultimate fulfillment is awaited with the Kittim (72, n. 129). Perhaps her implicit rejection of Bruce and Russell (despite her strong reliance upon the latter generally) may be associated with her sensitivity to the pesher's adherence to the structure of its base-text, i.e., with a general perception of respect for the base-text.

⁵⁶ Thus, Burrows stated of the Qumran commentators that "like the early Christians, they felt that what had happened to them was so obviously the climax of the whole divine plan that it must be what the prophets had had in mind" ("Prophecy and the Prophets at Qumrân," in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenberg* [ed. Bernhard W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson; NY: Harper, 1962], 223–232).

⁵⁷ Compare Schiffman's view in *Reclaiming*, 223–24: "Although Jewish tradition, in virtually all its phases and approaches, has understood the message of the prophets to apply in each and every generation, it has nonetheless acknowledged the true historical context of the prophecies in the biblical period. In pesher interpretation, on the other hand, the original context is nonexistent. Habakkuk or the Psalms are understood as applying in their original sense to the time of the sect and foretelling its history. Indeed, in that sense, pesher shares a common element with much of the quotation and interpretation of the Hebrew Bible found in the New Testament. . . . Early Christians regarded the works of the ancient prophets as referring to the events of their own day."

⁵⁸ See Berrin, "Qumran Pesharim," and the works of Paul Mandel cited therein, including "Midrashic Exegesis and its Precedents in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 8,2 (2001): 149–68.

authors and readers of pesher managed with some level of cognitive dissonance that enabled them to propose radical readings without actively denying the value of the original text. Without any evidence of the coping mechanisms devised by these later groups, we may hypothesize that the Community did not consciously address the conflict that we see in balancing the univalence of prophetic texts, the validity of their ostensible meanings, and the supremacy of innovative applications. Of the two above-mentioned choices for resolving this conflict, the multivalence of the rabbis seems more consistent with the attitude of the Qumran Community to the Bible than does the Christian abrogation of the literal sense of the Hebrew Bible. Bearing in mind that the Qumran Community preceded Christianity, and that there is evidence of its high regard for the literal sense of the Hebrew Bible (specifically in terms of observing *halakhic* practice), it seems most likely that the Community had at least a nascent sense of multivalence.⁵⁹ It would have assumed, rather than disregarded, the integrity of prophetic texts. It is our contention that the author of pesher perceived his biblical base-text as polysemous, allegorical, and generally cohesive. This understanding is vital to our approach to pesher, and specifically to Pesher Nahum.⁶⁰ Throughout

⁵⁹ We would concede that as a developmental stage preceding Christianity, the Qumran Community would have experienced some of the same motivations that later led to rejections of the “Old Testament.” 1QpHab VII,8, commenting upon the prolonged delay in the coming of salvation, voices an apocalyptic concern in which we may detect doubts about the validity of the prophecies as they were traditionally understood. Russell describes apocalyptic biblical interpretation as a response to “disillusionment” in the repeated “deferment” of the fulfillment of biblical prophecies (*Method and Message*, 182–84). The countering or prevention of such disillusionment is certainly visible at Qumran. However, in the pesher’s assertion of the validity of the prophecies, we see a way of “saving” the prophecies through re-interpretation, rather than the distancing from these prophecies described by Russell. Also, despite the contemporizing stance of the pesharim, these works do not feature the overt interpolation of non-Jewish imagery and detail that is found in Christian literature and in the syncretistic aspects of the apocalyptic literature described by Russell (*ibid.*, 185–86).

⁶⁰ Systematic correspondence between base-text and pesher is clearly evident in 1QpHab, 4QpPs^a (4Q171), 4QpIsa^d (4Q164) and 4QpHos^a (4Q166). Some of the other continuous pesharim are too fragmentary to assess with respect to correspondence. 4QpIsa^{a-c,c} (4Q161, 162, 163, 165) exhibit looser structure. They tend to consist mostly of citations and feature direct identifications without elaboration; 4QpIsa^c also features explicit citation of supplementary biblical sources. It is likely that these pesharim represent an early stage of pesher production. See Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b})* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 188–89. See also Collins’ comments on stages of generic development in *The Apocalyptic*

this work, we will attempt to demonstrate that 4QpNah is characterized by an underlying appreciation of the text and context of the biblical book of Nahum at a number of levels. The pesher viewed individual lemmas cohesively, and it perceived larger units, “pericopes,” consisting of a series of lemmas from a cohesive biblical passage. In general, 4QpNah exhibits sensitivity to the content, structure, and the original context of the book of Nahum.

1.3.3 *Lemma/Pesher Correspondence*

Central to our understanding of Qumran pesher is the significance of the relationship between the biblical base-text and its pesher identification. This issue has been addressed elsewhere at length and a summary statement will suffice here.⁶¹ “Correspondence” between the biblical text and its accompanying pesher can be mapped in terms of message, language, and medium. In each lemma/pesher pair, 4QpNah can be seen to adapt the message of Nahum (thus, reflecting a coherent meaning of the base-text). The pesher expresses that adaptation in a manner that reflects the language of the base-text. Furthermore, the reflection of the original language is such that there is an arithmetical correspondence between the particular elements in the lemma and in the pesher interpretation. In chapters 3, 5, 7, and 8 of this work, the analysis of each lemma/pesher unit includes a chart that reflects this arithmetical alignment, as well as the exegetical ties between each aligned pair. These pairs are referred to as “equivalents.”⁶²

The underlying premise of this work is that there is a high level of inter-dependence between the lemma and pesher.⁶³ It is expected

Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 4.

⁶¹ Cf. Berrin, “Lemma/Pesher Correspondence,” and *4QpNah (4Q169 Pesher Nahum)*. The dissertation incorporates some modifications of the earlier formulation.

⁶² This is by analogy to the system of mapping equivalence between LXX and MT. See, *inter alia*, Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem: Simor, 1997).

⁶³ Contrast our position to the view expressed by Allegro (“Further Light,” 93). In reference to the Qumran pesharim, he stated, “These commentaries are in no way works of connected history, and the method of the authors does not necessarily require any historical connection to be made between the interpretation of one verse and another, or even one word and another. The general pattern of interpretation is clear: mention of a righteous man in Scripture is referred automatically to the Teacher, of a persecutor of the righteous to the Wicked Priest, of

that 4QpNah will treat each lemma as a complete logical entity as well as a sum of its parts, and will reflect a sense of the lemma that suits the meaning of the text in its biblical context. Only interpretations that are potentially valid within the original context of Nahum will have been employed by the author of 4QpNah. The pesher will reflect sensitivity to and interest in the (perceived) meaning of the lemma in its original context, and it must respond to particular elements of the lemma. An appropriate interpretation of any lemma/pesher unit will thus reflect contextual correspondence and it will allow for direct arithmetical alignment between the individual elements of the lemma and the corresponding pesher.

1.4 CHAPTER OUTLINES

Our treatment of Pesher Nahum is divided by “pericopes,” by which we mean a series of thematically related pesher “units.” We use the term “unit” to refer to a block of text consisting of “lemma + pesher interpretation.”⁶⁴ In the extant text of 4QpNah, “pericopes” happen

internal enemies to the Seekers-After-Smooth-Things or the like, of external foes to the Kittim.” He further stated in reference to Pesher Nahum that “there is thus no *necessary* connection between Demetrius in line 2 [of 3–4, I] and the Lion of Wrath in line 5, since they are commenting on different verses. But here other factors make the connection probable” (*ibid.*, n. 6). Allegro saw each pesher interpretation as a discrete entity, and even claimed that each lemma is randomly treated as unified or disjointed. Cross similarly remarked about this passage, “The exposition deals with a very small unit of Scripture and in all probability deals with a single series of events” (*The Ancient Library of Qumran* 3d ed. [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995], 98). We propose an alternate model in which the pesher is viewed as being sensitive to the integrity of the biblical text. Allegro appears to give pesher textual freedom, but his proposal of “stock” identifications actually restricts the interpretations, even automates them. In our model, there is a necessary connection between Demetrius and the Lion of Wrath because there is an inherent connection between the content of Nah 2:12 and 2:13.

In accordance with our view, see Burrows, “The Ascent from Acco in 4QpIsa^a,” *Vetus Testamentum* 7 (1957): 104–05. Burrows rejects Allegro’s proposal that 4QpIsa^a refers to the coming of the Messiah via Acco, on the basis of the fact that the base-text in Isaiah is about enemies, so that the pesher must be expected to be about enemies as well.

⁶⁴ Although Dupont-Sommer has used the term “pericopae” for the “lemma + pesher” blocks that we call “pesher units” (in “Le Commentaire,” 55–88) there has been no widespread adoption of his nomenclature, and the terms here should not cause any confusion. Nitzan (39–40), discussed the need to approach 1QpHab both as a unified work and in its component parts, but did not provide consistent terminology for referring to these smaller segments. Vermes used “unit” for the

to roughly coincide with column divisions, especially for the first two sections.⁶⁵ Frags 1–2 thus comprise one pericope, consisting of pesher units 1–5. Col. I of frags 3–4 is also a nearly self-contained pericope, with the addition of part of line 1 of col. II. This pericope contains units 6–10. The third pericope consists of 3–4 II,1–III,8, units 11–16. The fourth pericope consists of 3–4 III,8 –IV,8, with units 17–23. The remnants of units 24–26 are rather negligible, and our analysis of 3–4 IV,8–9 and of frag 5 is presented together with Pericope 4.

Our treatment of 4QPesher Nahum begins with the presentation of the text in chapter 2. Chapters 3–8 comprise a systematic historical and literary analysis of the three pericopes, and of each of the 26 pesher units within those pericopes. Chapter 3 contains a unit-by-unit study of Pericope 1. Chapters 4 and 5 contain our historical and literary analyses of Pericope 2, respectively. An excursus to chapter 5 addresses the specific issue of “hanging” in Pericope 2. Chapters 6 and 7 contain our historical and literary analyses of Pericope 3, respectively.⁶⁶ Chapter 8 is devoted to Pericope 4 and frag 5.

1.4.1 *Textual Analysis: Chapter 2*

The textual component of our analysis consists of a transcription accompanied by a list of variants from MT, and followed by a discussion of textual issues, primarily disputed readings and restorations, and related syntactical difficulties.

1.4.1.1 *Transcription, Translation, Textual Variants and Notes on Variants*

An annotated transcription of the full text of 4QpNah appears in ch. 2. A separate transcription of each of the four individual peri-

segment of Scripture used in a lemma, saying that continuous pesher cites and interprets a biblical book “verse by verse (or unit by unit);” this too was not a technical term but only a way of expressing varying lemma lengths (“Interpretation, History of . . . at Qumran and in the Targums,” in *IDBSup* [Nashville: 1976], 439). Doudna and I have independently arrived at the decision to employ the term “unit” in the manner described above.

⁶⁵ A similar observation is made by Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 209.

⁶⁶ Pericope 2 is the most well-known section of the pesher and more than a single chapter is required to analyze it properly. In contrast, the historical contextualization of Pericope 1 is inconclusive, and the discussion of historical issues in this pericope is incorporated into the literary discussion in chapter 3.

copes, along with an English translation, precedes the analysis of its respective pericope. (Thus, pericope 1 is transcribed and translated in ch. 3; pericope 2 in ch. 4; pericope 3 in ch. 6; and pericope 4 in ch. 8). The transcriptions incorporate some minimal restorations [in brackets], such as the completion of lemmas, the insertion of introductory formulas, and the indication of proposed vacats.⁶⁷ We employ the following conventional notations in our transcription of poorly legible letters:

A small circle in place of a letter (°) indicates the presence of an illegible or indeterminate letter.

A dotted letter (e.g., ṣ̌), indicates that the letter is restored with confidence. Generally, the form of the traces is the primary criterion for the restoration, but context may be taken into account, particularly in biblical citations.

A larger circle above a letter (e.g., š̂) indicates a “possible” restoration. In general, partially missing or illegible letters are restored with less confidence if there are a number of other letters that could be accommodated by the traces. The stimulus for transcribing the letter may be either legibility or context.

Lastly, in the transcription in chapter 2, lemmas appear in **bold**. Note that this is only a device to facilitate the reading of the text and the identification of pesher units. The manuscript itself does not differentiate between the biblical citation and the pesher interpretation, except at times by leaving a space (vacat) between the two.⁶⁸

Our attitude toward restoration in our translations is slightly more liberal than in the transcriptions. On a few occasions, when there is insufficient data to justify an English representation of an isolated legible letter, we transliterate the letter in *italics*. Lemmas in our translation appear in **bold italics**. Note that **bold italics** are employed for the complete initial citation. Unitalicized **bold type** is employed for the re-citation of individual elements of a lemma within the pesher identification of that lemma, or for the re-citation of elements of a lemma within the pesher identification of an adjacent lemma.

⁶⁷ Lemmas are restored primarily in accordance with MT, with occasional adjustments on the basis of considerations such as typical orthographic features of 4QpNah. In the transcriptions of the individual pericopes (at the beginning of chs. 3, 4, 6, and 8) we have occasionally incorporated some restorations that were presented and justified in ch. 2.

⁶⁸ See Tables 9–1 and 9–2 in ch. 9.

The text of Nahum as cited in 4QpNah differs in a number of instances from the text of MT. Most of the textual disagreements are minor, and are primarily orthographical, but some are more significant and warrant discussion. Variants from MT are marked by footnotes in our transcription. Thus, only readings that are preserved in extant portions of the text are addressed in this section. Restored variants, or suggested variant readings, are discussed in the subsequent section, “Readings and Restorations.” The brief notes accompanying the transcription state the nature of each variant and address its relationship, if any, to LXX, Peshitta, Vg, Targ.⁶⁹ Other witnesses to the text of Nahum in antiquity are MurXII and 8HevXII gr (and 4QXII^g, which has no overlap with 4QpNah). A paraphrase of Nah 3:8–10 is found in 4Q385.⁷⁰ Of particular value for the study of textual variants in 4QpNah is the work of Raphael Weiss.⁷¹ Unless otherwise noted, references to Weiss herein are to “Comparison.” Also, unless otherwise noted, references to Brooke are to “The Biblical Texts in the Qumran Commentaries: Scribal Errors or Exegetical

⁶⁹ Regarding the ancient translations, we must bear in mind that retroversions can not be definitive. For example, an apparent “variant” may reflect an actual textual variant in the Vorlage, or it may represent a “silent emendation” or a “free translation” of the Vorlage. Tov refers to textual corruption of the translated text and to exegesis as two “inner-translational factors” limiting the value of the ancient translations for textual criticism (*Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992], 123). See too, Kevin J. Cathcart and Robert P. Gordon, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets. The Aramaic Bible*, vol. 14 (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1987), 11. The 4QpNah readings that also appear in medieval MSS are, for the most part, insignificant variants from MT.

⁷⁰ Cf. Devorah Dimant, “A Quotation from Nahum 3:8–10 in 4Q385 6,” in *המקרא קמין בראי מפרשיו: ספר זכרון לשרה קמין* (ed. Sara Japhet; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1994), 31–37; and Menahem Kister, “A Common Heritage: Biblical Interpretation at Qumran and Its Implications,” in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature* (ed. Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 107–8, esp. n. 26. Some of the readings found in this text may be considered textual variants, whereas others seem to reflect exegetical emendations.

4Q177 (4QCata) 14,3 incorporates a citation from Nah 2:11 “knees buckle, all loins tremble (והלחיים והגחלים בכול מתנאים)”; this verse is not preserved in the extant portion of 4QpNah.

⁷¹ “A Comparison between the Masoretic and the Qumran Texts of Nahum III,1–11,” *RevQ* 4 (1963–64): 433–39. In “Comparison,” Weiss addresses the variants from MT in 4QpNah 3–4 II–IV. הערות לדפים נוספים בפשר נחום. 14 בית מקרא. אהרות לדפים נוספים בפשר נחום. עוד לפשר נחום; 15 בית מקרא. כאורה, (נ), כאורה. (פשר נחום ב,ו). 17 בית מקרא. See now, Lidija Novakovic’s “Text-critical Variants in the Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents” in Charlesworth, *Pesharim*.

Variants?"⁷² and references to Timothy Lim are to *Holy Scriptures in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1997). Doudna presents some important arguments against the view of Brooke and Lim that pesherim create exegetical variants or even deliberately use pre-existing variant texts.⁷³ In our opinion, the evidence remains inconclusive.

1.4.1.2 *Readings and Restorations*

This section is devoted to the examination of possible readings of difficult portions of the text, and the justification of the readings presented in our transcription. Primary concerns are legibility, syntax, and pesher forms. Issues of content or of a lexical nature are touched upon insofar as they affect textual decisions. It is our strong contention that text should be reconstructed as little as possible within transcriptions themselves. The "readings and restorations" section provides an outlet for exploring possible restorations. The aim of this section is not to provide a comprehensive catalog of suggested readings, but rather to provide the reader with a guide to our edition and analysis of the text.⁷⁴

1.4.2 *Historical Analysis (Chapters 4, 6, 8, and Excursus to ch. 5)*

This section examines the historical context of Pericopes 2–4, in order to provide the background for our literary/exegetical discussion. Any attempt to restore historically-oriented pesher, or to use such pesher as a historical source, involves a series of assumptions and decisions. Particularly in Pericope 2, our acceptance of the 2nd century dating for Demetrius and the Lion of Wrath is the product of a lengthy process. The first step in our research was the compilation of known historical situations that lent themselves to the context of the pesher. Given the thoroughness of Josephus's account within the given time frame, it is most likely that he would have discussed the highly significant events with which the pesher is concerned. Potential textual restorations were thus generated and adapted

⁷² In Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring, eds. *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 85–100.

⁷³ Pp. 67–70.

⁷⁴ To this end, we only cite the speculative restorations of earlier scholars when they have had direct bearing on our editorial decisions.

to fit promising historical scenarios. After the historical and textual viability of these restorations was tested within each pesher unit, the results were carried through to the next unit. In each case, some interpretations were eliminated while others generated a number of permutations for hypothetical continuations of the scenario. The identifications presented in this work are those hypotheses that survived the process of being carried throughout the pericope. For the most part, our historical analysis is concerned with supporting these conclusions, though some of the rejected alternatives are mentioned where appropriate.⁷⁵

The explicit mention of post-biblical historical individuals in 4QpNah is a noteworthy feature of the work.⁷⁶ References such as those to Demetrius and Antiochus, unprecedented at the time of the initial publication of 4QpNah, are still rarities in the Qumran corpus. The few scrolls that explicitly name significant post-biblical historical figures are 4Q245 (4Qpseudo-Daniel^c ar), 4Q331–333 (4QHistorical Texts C–E), 4Q448 (4QApocryphal Psalm and Prayer), 4Q468^c (4QHistorical Text F) and 4Q523 (4QJonathan).⁷⁷ Pesher Nahum also employs various sobriquets in referring to historical individuals and groups, as

⁷⁵ The criteria for assessing whether a given identification “works” are currently rather subjective. Thus, for example, we argue that the use of Deut 21: 22–23 in 4QpNah 3–4 II will only work with a Jewish Lion of Wrath, and that the graphic specification of crucifixion indicates a well-known historical event. For Doudna, it is important that imperfect verbs in the pesher are understood as temporal futures, and he identifies the figure of the Lion of Wrath as a future Gentile ruler.

⁷⁶ Even in 4Q248, now named 4QHistorical Text, and identified as a “historical composition” by Magen Broshi and Esti Eshel, the extant portion of the text does not explicitly name the historical figure to whom it refers (“The Greek King is Antiochus IV [4QHistorical Text = 4Q248],” *JJS* 48 [1997]: 120–29).

⁷⁷ See Martin G. Abegg, Jr., “Concordance of Proper Nouns in the Non-biblical Texts from Qumran,” in E. Tov, ed. *DJD XXXIX*, esp. pp. 234–235. 4Q245 contains a list of high priests that seems to extend to the Hasmonean dynasty, concluding with Simon or possibly John Hyrcanus (Cf. Peter W. Flint and J.J. Collins, in Brooke et al. [eds.], *DJD XXII*).

A number of names appear in the “Mishmarot texts.” 4Q331 (formerly part of 4Q324^b MishmarotC) features the name Johanan (understood as a reference to John Hyrcanus, high priest from 135–104 BCE) and the name Shelamzion (that is, Salome Alexandra, queen from 76–67 BCE Cf. Fitzmyer in P. Alexander et al [eds.] *DJD XXXVI*). Shelamzion is also named in 4Q332 (formerly part of 4Q322, which was known as Mishmarot A or Mishmarot C^a), as is Hyrcanus (here understood as a reference to Hyrcanus II, leader from 63–40 BCE). The name Aemilius in 4Q333 (formerly 4Q324^a) is understood to be a reference to Marcus Aemilius Scaurus, a lieutenant of Pompey. On these Mishmarot texts, see Michael Owen Wise, *Thunder in Gemini* (JSPSup 15; Sheffield: JSOT, 1994), 208–211.

is common practice in the Damascus Document and the pesharim. The entities behind the sobriquets employed at Qumran are not always clear to the modern scholar, though the terms are likely to have been fairly transparent in antiquity.⁷⁸ Our discussion of the various epithets focuses upon the meanings of the terms and the basis for their use as sobriquets in Peshar Nahum and in other works of the Qumran corpus. The consistency of the meanings of epithets in different Qumran compositions has been a particularly vexing question. The most significant examples of this problem are the key figures of

4Q448 has been deciphered as mentioning “Jonathan the king” (see further below, ch. 4; Eshel et al. DJD XI). 4Q468e contains a reference to פֹּהֶלְאוֹס which has been identified as a reference to a “Ptollas” named in Josephus *Ant* 17 §219 in association with Archelaus who was tetrarch from 4 BCE–6CE (by Broshi in DJD XXXVI) or to Peitholaus, a Jewish general from 55–51 BCE (see sources cited by Abegg, DJD XXXIX, 235). Lastly, the name “Jonathan” appears in 4Q523. This figure has been identified by Puech as Jonathan the Hasmonean, or possibly Alexander Jannaeus (in DJD XXV; cf. “Jonathan le Prêtre Impie et les Débuts de la Communauté de Qumrân, 4QJonathan [4Q523] et 4QPsAp [4Q448]” *RevQ* 17 [1996], 241–270), and by Doudna (702) as Jannaeus or Hyrcanus II.

⁷⁸ The purpose of employing these epithets is thus not clear. The phenomenon should probably be explored from a psychological/sociological perspective. H. Eshel has suggested that the authors of Qumran compositions “concealed their true intentions, either out of fear of reprisal from their opponents—in the event of discovery—or out of a desire to have the texts remain the exclusive property of the members of the sect—who were the only ones who could understand these interpretations” (from an English translation of תולדתיה של הקבוצה שישבה, “תולדתיה של הקבוצה שישבה והרמוזים ההסתריים שבמניחות” קדמוניות 30:2 [1997]: 86–87 kindly provided to me by the author). However, the meaning of these texts is not likely to have eluded any reader who was contemporary to the authors. It is only chronological distance and relative ignorance about the time period that leads to the confusion of the modern reader. It is more likely that the use of allusive, but not cryptic, terminology would have served to further group cohesiveness, and to heighten the sense of identity vis-a-vis “the Other.” The Community’s use of jargon would have been a form of “boundary-marking” to employ a term used by Albert Baumgarten in describing other aspects of sectarian practice and doctrine (throughout *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: an Interpretation*. Supplement to the *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, vol. 55; [Brill: Leiden, 1997]). The use of these sobriquets should probably be linked to the general question of the derivation and use of group names in Second Temple Judaism. (The literature on the origins and meanings of the terms “Pharisee,” “Sadducee,” and “Essene” is vast. Cf. *inter alia* A. Baumgarten, “The Name of the Pharisees,” *JBL* 102 [1983]: 411–28, and the literature cited there, esp. in n.1; Adiel Schremer, “The Name of the Boethusians: A Reconsideration of Suggested Explanations and Another One,” *JJS* 48 [1997]: 297–99 and sources cited). Baumgarten further suggests that “code names can give an aura of eternity to an interpretation of past and present, while making that interpretation flexible enough to be mythologized as needed in the future” (“Perception of the Past in the Damascus Document,” in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery* [eds., Joseph Baumgarten, Esther Chazon, and Avital Pinnick; Brill: Leiden, 2000], 14).

the “Wicked Priest” and the “Teacher of Righteousness.” Was there one “Wicked Priest” or were several opponents of the Community so styled?⁷⁹ Was there a single Teacher of Righteousness, or was this a term bestowed on more than one person, or variously upon a historical individual or individuals and idealized eschatological figures?

In reference to the figurative names “Absalom” (1QpHab) and “House of Peleg” (CD, 4QpNah), Gaster compared “Machiavelli,” “Benedict Arnold,” or “Quisling,” arguing that “there is no need to take such references literally and consequently to set off on a wild-goose chase after historical identifications.”⁸⁰ He decries the “ingenious but forced” attempts to peg the “Man of Lies,” the “Wicked Priest,” or the “Teacher of Righteousness,” to “a single biography.” Gaster basically describes a situation in which “stock” epithets are applied to various individuals in a wide number of settings and contexts.⁸¹ In its most extreme formulation, this position begs the question of why a particular epithet is employed in a particular instance. It also misses the connection between the various applications of a single epithet, even to different individuals, within a particular cultural setting.

An alternative claim for standardization of epithets at Qumran would involve a restriction of the use of an epithet to a single individual or to a particular group. This view, however, does not allow for adaptation and development over time and assumes too great a

⁷⁹ Cf. Florentino García-Martínez and Adam S. van Der Woude, “A ‘Groningen’ Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History,” *RevQ* 14 (1990): 538–40; van Der Woude, “Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Commentary,” *JJS* 33 (1982): 349–59; García-Martínez, *People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs, and Practices* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 83–84.

⁸⁰ *TDSS*, 27–28. Thus, regarding Damascus, Gaster speaks of “figurative geography” and rejects the possibility of a historical exile of the Community in the literal location of Damascus. Vermes has stated similarly regarding Targum that “a word, or key expression, acquires its new value from an association of various biblical texts. Subsequently, this new meaning is applied almost automatically to numerous other passages including the same word, irrespective of the context” (Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* [Leiden: Brill, 1961], 38).

⁸¹ For example, he argues that the rebels of the “House of Absalom” are so named because of David’s rebellious son (28). In Gaster’s view, the claim that the leader of this group was named Absalom not only misses the point, but attempts to impose limits upon, and thereby disable, the true significance of the epithet. However, Gaster’s position does not sufficiently attend to the tendency toward multivalence in the literary expression of the Qumran Community. See Allegro’s comments on “stock phrases,” n. 63 above.

rigidity in group identifications. It also does not sufficiently allow for flexibility of expression.

The use of epithets at Qumran was likely to have been intermediate between these two models. The contemporary idiom of both sectarian and nonsectarian Jews would surely have incorporated a number of biblically derived epithets. The Qumran Community would have applied these epithets in a fashion that suited their own needs and interests, and perhaps coined some of their own. The initial sectarian application of significant terms such as “Wicked Priest” or “Man of Lies” would have influenced the subsequent use of these terms. Thus, for example, the “Wicked Priest,” an epithet that was probably applied initially to Jonathan the Hasmonean, could be reapplied to later Hasmonean rulers.⁸² Similarly, Gaster’s concluding formulation of his view is more reasonable. He states that “the commentators are merely (*sic*) fitting a stock set of masks (‘the righteous man’, ‘the wicked man’, ‘the foreign invader’) upon a stock set of characters (‘the teacher of righteousness’, ‘the wicked priest’, ‘the Kittians’), differently identified at different epochs.”⁸³ This statement recognizes a development in the application of epithets over time. We would add that the context of a composition or passage influences the choice of epithet to be used for a particular figure within that text, and that this choice reflects the previous applications of that epithet within the literature of the Community.⁸⁴

⁸² The application of the term “Wicked Priest” to successive Hasmoneans is a central claim of the so-called Groningen Hypothesis of van Der Woude and García-Martínez. (See n. 79 above). García-Martínez (*People of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 243, n. 99) finds the same idea in Brownlee, “Historical Allusions of the Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash,” *BASOR* 126 (1950): 10–20; see also, Brownlee’s “The Wicked Priest, the Man of Lies, and the Teacher of Righteousness—The Problem of Identity,” *JQR* 73 (1982): 1–37, and B. Reicke, “Die Ta’amire-Schriften und die Damaskus Fragmenten,” *Studia Theologica* 2 (1949): 60.

The play of *כהן דרשע/כהן דראש* seems so obvious and effective, that it might easily be supposed to have pre-dated the founding of the Qumran Community. (Brownlee notes that the pun was observed by both himself and Elliger; *Meaning*, 63). In a similar vein, one might imagine that the term “Tricky Dicky” was applied to other individuals before the sobriquet was given to Richard Nixon (example taken from Dupriez/Halsall p. 124). Once the name was applied to the then-president, it has taken on a specific cultural valence, and that usage influences subsequent applications of the epithet. A somewhat different re-use of political denomination in recent times is evident in the numerous presidential “–Gate” scandals that have cropped up in the U.S. in the wake of Watergate (“Billygate,” “Contragate,” “Monicagate” to name a few).

⁸³ P. 28.

⁸⁴ From a somewhat different, but also balanced stance, Doudna (279) states that

1.4.3 *Literary Analysis: Lemma/Pesher Correspondence*
(Chapters 3, 5, 7, 8)

These chapters investigate the nature of the relationship between each lemma and its pesher comment. We suppose a tri-fold model, such that in a paradigmatic pesher unit, lemma/pesher correspondence will be arithmetical, lexical, and contextual. “Arithmetical” correspondence refers to the proportionality between the terms in the pesher and the words of the lemma, which we have termed “equivalents.”⁸⁵ “Lexical” correspondence includes various “midrash-like” techniques characteristic of pesher: paraphrase, word-play, and the like. “Contextual” correspondence refers to the impact of the content of the base-text upon the pesher.⁸⁶ In these chapters, in addition to charting “equivalents,” we also attempt to isolate the aspects of the lemma that influenced the pesher, and to identify factors that may give priority to one type of correspondence over another. We further seek to determine whether any aspects of correspondence are sustained consistently throughout the pericope.

The biblical book of Nahum describes the terrifying might of God, and the impending outpouring of that power against Nineveh.⁸⁷ In

“unless motivated by wordplay considerations or specific reasons, the language of the pesherim is almost always common and redundant, typically drawing from repeated use of stock phrases.”

⁸⁵ Related to arithmetical correspondence is a tendency to “balanced prose” as derived from the base-text. In reference to 1QpHab, see Nitzan, 91–97.

⁸⁶ In an article entitled “Lemma/Pesher Correspondence in Pesher Nahum,” I employed the terms “arithmetical, exegetical, and contextual.” In that article, I struggled with an apparent tension between contextual correspondence and the pesher technique of “atomization.” However, it now seems clear to me that it is not necessary to set these two against each other. Rather, atomization may in fact be seen as one possible approach to the biblical context. Thus, our middle category has been re-named “lexical,” with the realization that both “lexical” and “contextual” correspondence are of an exegetical nature. A similar distinction may be discerned in Nitzan (40). She separates, “methods of pesher formation”: concerning content and ideas, which she treats in ch. 3 of her introduction (focusing on details of pesher techniques), from “style and literary structure,” to which she devotes ch. 4 (attending to pesher as a whole). All three of my current categories incorporate syntactic and structural concerns, but the former is most significant in “arithmetical” equivalence, while the latter is particularly relevant to “contextual” correspondence.

⁸⁷ The composition of the biblical book of Nahum is dated prior to the actual destruction of Nineveh, but later than the destruction of Thebes (alluded to in Nah 3:8), which probably took place in 661 BCE. Nineveh’s destruction is dated to 614–612 BCE, with the final downfall of Assyria in 605 (cf. J. Oates, *CAH*, vol. 3, pt. 2, 175–82).

consonance with our stress on lemma/pesher correspondence, it is clear that 4QpNah follows the structure of the base-text as it adapts the text to contemporary experience. The overall structure may be outlined roughly as follows:

Table 1–1 Lemma/Pesher Correspondence according to Content of Pericope

4QpNah	Biblical base-text and content	Content of pesher
Pericope 1, units 1–5. frags 1–2	1:3b–6 God’s avenging wrath	God’s avenging wrath
Pericope 2, units 6–10. 3–4 I–II,1	2:12–14 lion imagery, Nineveh’s reversal	Lion of Wrath
Pericope 3, units 11–16. 3–4 II,1–III,8	3:1–5 vivid depiction of Nineveh’s fall, guilt	Vivid depiction of terror and guilt associated with “Seekers-after-Smooth Things”
Pericope 4, units 17–23. 3–4 III,8–IV,8	3:6–9 comparison of Nineveh to Thebes	Comparison of Ephraim to Manasseh

This structural/contextual correspondence drives the arithmetical and lexical correspondence of each of the individual units of 4QpNah. In contrast to Doudna’s proposal that “wordplay” in the pesher is restricted to particular units, we maintain that each of the pesher’s lexical choices is determined by the words of the biblical base-text.⁸⁸ The following is a list of terms employed in our literary analysis, especially to describe the nature of the relationship of equivalents.⁸⁹

⁸⁸ Doudna’s comprehensive review of the secondary literature on “wordplay” in the pesharim is a useful resource (252–255). Doudna proposes that 4QpNah employs a highly structured pattern of types of lemma/pesher units, in which “type #3,” which feature re-quotation of the lemma, are characterized by “wordplay . . . in which prominent nouns in the quotation were given alliterative correspondence in key words in the composition of the pesher” (ch. 7, 253–265). He acknowledges other kinds of word-play, but the dominant focus of his lexical concern is upon this “type #3” construction, whereas he describes lemma/pesher correspondence in general as a result of the “creation of analogies between figures and images” (57). In general, Doudna’s systematic construct seems to us to be imposed upon the text, rather than derived from it.

⁸⁹ Our definitions are adapted from those of Dupriez/Halsall in *A Dictionary of Literary Devices, Gradus, A–Z* (Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1991).

<i>abbreviation</i>	the representation of a word or words by one or more of its letters. This includes the use of the initial letters of a word (e.g., Heb. For <i>Hebrew</i>), the use of letters from different parts of a word or words (e.g., Mr. For <i>Mister</i>), and the use of the first letter of each word in a series (e.g., MT for <i>Masoretic Text</i>). ⁹⁰ These techniques are roughly equivalent to rabbinic <i>notarikon</i> .
<i>allegory</i>	an “extended metaphor” ⁹¹
<i>alliteration</i>	serial succession of similar sounds (e.g., this definition)
<i>anagram</i>	the rearrangement of letters in a word or words to form a new word; we also use this term to refer to a rearrangement of the letters that comprise the root of a word (e.g., 1QpHab XI,9–11, in which the lemma’s ודרעל (poison) is reflected in the pesher by עורלה (foreskin).
<i>antithesis</i>	contrast; the highlighting of a word or concept by the presentation of its opposite
<i>apposition</i>	“the characterization of one substantive or pronoun by another which follows it” ⁹²
<i>asyndeton</i>	the omission of conjunctions
<i>atomization</i>	following Elliger, we use this term to denote the treatment of individual elements of a lemma in isolation from each other and removed from the <i>context of the lemma as a whole</i>
<i>chiasmus</i>	“the placing in inverse order of the segments formed by two syntactically identical groups of words” ⁹³
<i>concretization</i>	the use of concrete expressions to represent abstractions; the replacement of figurative expressions by literal ones
<i>cross-reference</i>	see “plus,” below
<i>denomination</i>	we use this term to denote (1) the use of a proper name in place of a common noun and (2) the use of nouns in place of pronouns (“pronominal denomination”) ⁹⁴
<i>ellipsis</i>	the omission of syntactically necessary word or words

⁹⁰ This last technique may sometimes form an “acronym,” a new word unto itself. Cf. Dupriez/Halsall, 12; Fishbane, “The Qumran Pesher and traits of Ancient Hermeneutics,” in *WCJS* 6:1 (1977): 98–100.

⁹¹ Dupriez/Halsall, 21.

⁹² Dupriez/Halsall, 61.

⁹³ Dupriez/Halsall, 95.

⁹⁴ Pronominal denomination most commonly refers to the naming of a substantive in the pesher that has no explicit equivalent in the lemma, but rather reflects an implied subject, object, or referent.

<i>equivalents</i>	corresponding elements of a lemma and pesher unit
<i>hendiadys</i>	“one by means of two . . . the addition of a conjunction between a word and its modifier” and a concomitant modification and rearrangement of the words (e.g., “sound and fury” for “furious sound”) ⁹⁵
<i>homographs</i>	words that are spelled the same way as each other, but have different pronunciations and meanings (e.g., בלע as destroy/swallow in 1QpHab XI,5–7; סכוח in CD VII,14–16 [סכוח/סכוח]) ⁹⁶
<i>homonym</i>	words that sound the same as each other, but have different meanings
<i>hyperbaton</i>	“deviation from ordinary word order” ⁹⁷
<i>hypostasis</i>	the elevation of natural phenomena to the supernatural ⁹⁸
<i>hypotyposis</i>	vivid imagery; “an image which paints a picture” ⁹⁹
<i>isolexism</i>	“the return, within a sentence, of a lexeme already uttered, but in different conditions.” ¹⁰⁰ For BH, this may be described in most cases as the syntactic modification of a word’s root, e.g., changing the tense, voice, number, or gender for verbs; changing the number or gender for nouns; adding or removing prefixes or suffixes; changing the part of speech altogether
<i>metaphor</i>	we use the term in its broadest sense of “literary image.” We tend to employ the term “metaphor” when the pesher identification uses verbs, and to employ the term “symbol” for representations expressed by means of nouns
<i>paragram</i>	the substitution of one or more letters of a word by an alternate letter or letters (e.g., מועדיהם in the lemma of 1QpHab XI,2, instead of מועדיהם in MT Hab 2:15, if this is a deliberate variant). This technique is a form of paronomasia, and may be compared to the rabbinic <i>‘al tigrē</i>

⁹⁵ Dupriez/Halsall, 208–9. Contrast “asyndeton,” above.

⁹⁶ The examples are from Fishbane (“Qumran Pesher,” 99). He refers to these as “non-homonymic homographs,” a term taken from C.H. Gordon’s *Ugaritic Textbook*, Grammar, 4.1.

⁹⁷ Dupriez/Halsall, 214.

⁹⁸ Cf. the description of current academic usage, put forth by B.A. Pearson. He refers to “mythic objectifications or personifications of divine qualities, gifts, or attributes or of abstract concepts or aspects of human existence whereby such entities assume an identity of their own” (*Encyclopedia of Religion*, s.v., p. 546).

⁹⁹ Dupriez/Halsall, 225, s.v. “Image.”

¹⁰⁰ Dupriez/Halsall, 245.

<i>paronomasia</i>	“a playing on words which sound alike; a word-play; a type of pun” ¹⁰¹
<i>pleonasm</i>	redundancy
“ <i>plus</i> ”	a term in the pesher that has no equivalent in lemma ¹⁰²
<i>schema</i>	“diagrammatic representation” ¹⁰³
<i>stereotype</i>	we use this term to indicate a symbol, the use of which is so rooted in convention, that the relationship between signifier and signified may not even be relevant to the particular case at hand
<i>symbol</i>	the use of one object or expression (the “signifier,” or “vehicle”) to represent another (the “signified,” or “tenor”). We generally use this term, rather than metaphor (1) when the signifying element in the pesher is a noun and/or (2) when the use of the image is conventional. We use the term “derivative symbol” for a pesher identification that derives from an earlier use of a symbol in the pesher
<i>synecdoche</i>	the use of a part to represent the whole

¹⁰¹ *OED*, s.v. “paronomasia.”

¹⁰² Also called “un-pegged plus.” Cf. Nitzan on “הוספות ללא אחריות בכתוב” (“additions without a ‘peg’ in the text,” pp. 58–61). She states that these “pluses” may be motivated by content or style. The latter would include “pronominal denomination” (see above), and perhaps theological and temporal glosses. In the former category, the most significant type of “plus” is that which signals an allusion to a source from another biblical text. Nitzan describes this technique as “similar to, but more sophisticated than, the explicit use of secondary sources in 4QFlor” (64–65). By tracing sources for words or phrases that appear to be without pegs in the lemma, one will be led to biblical contexts that will illuminate the pesher. We term this sort of plus a “cross-reference.” On “cross-reference” type “pluses” in Peshet Nahum, see Berrin, “Secondary Citations in Peshet Nahum,” *DSD* (forthcoming).

¹⁰³ *OED*, s.v. “schema.”

CHAPTER TWO

THE TEXT

2.1 TRANSCRIPTION AND TEXTUAL VARIANTS

Frgs 1–2 on Nah 1:3b–1:6

.....בסופה ובשערה דרכו ון ענן אבן רגליו.....פשרו.....	1
.....]ת ר' [...] עי שמיו וארצו אשר ב'.....]	2
.....]גוער [בים וייב]שהו' vac פ] שרו הים הם כל ה'.....]	3
.....]לעש[ות [בדם משפט ולכלותם מעל פני [הארמה.....]	4
.....]עם [...]מו]שליהם אשר החם ממשלחם]	5a
.....]אמלל בשן [זכרמל ופרח לבנן ² אמלל vac] פשרו.....]	5
.....]דו בו רבים רום רשעה כי ה'.....]	6
.....]מל ולמושליו לבנון ופרה לבנון היא.....]	7
.....]תם ואבדו מלפני'.....]בחור.....]	8
.....]כ'ל יושבי תבל vac ה'ר]ים רעשו ממנו והגבעות התמוגגו	9
.....]ותשא [הארץ ממנו ³ ומלפני'ו תבל וכו' ל [יושבי בה לפני זעמו מי יעמוד ומי	10
.....]יקום [בחרון אפו.....]	11

¹ MT, MurXII: ויבשהו, with a single *yod* serving both as a root letter and as a marker for the *pi'el* imperfect. Our reading of בשהו וי' employs standard orthography for the *pi'el* form. An alternate reading of *hiphil* ויב' is also possible.

² MT: לבנון. Note that the defective orthography of לבנן appears only in the lemma, whereas the pesher interpretation in line 7 features the plene לבנון, as in MT. The defective form is unusual for 4QpNah and is likely to be a scribal error.

³ MT: מפניו ותבל. Dupont-Sommer was the first to reconstruct lines 9–11 as a lemma, with variants from MT. Strugnell noted that the plus of ממנו may be a doublet from the previous hemistichē (רעשו ממנו).

Frgs 3–4 I on Nah 2:12–14

1[מְדוּר לְרַשְׁעֵי נְוִים vac אֲשֶׁר הִלַּךְ אַרְיָ לְבִיאַ שָׁם גּוֹר אַרְיָ
2	וְאֵינְ מַחְרִיד.....פִּשְׁרו.....דְּמִין]טְרִים מִלֶּךְ יוֹן אֲשֶׁר בִּקֵּשׁ לְבוֹא יְרוּשָׁלַיִם בְּעֶצֶת דּוֹרְשֵׁי הַחֲלָקוֹת
3[בְּיַד מַלְכֵי יוֹן מֵאַנְתִּיכּוֹס עַד עַמּוּד מוֹשְׁלֵי כְּתִיִּים וְאַחַר תְּרַמֵּס
4v[ac אַרְיָ טוֹרֶף ² בְּדֵי גּוֹרִיו ³ [ן]מַחְנֵק לְלִבְיֹתָיו ⁴ טוֹרֶף ⁵
5[עַל כַּפִּיר הַחֲרוֹן אֲשֶׁר יָכָה בְּנִדּוּלָיו וְאִנְשֵׁי עֲצָתוֹ
6וְיִמְלֵא טוֹרֶף] חִירָה ⁶ וּמַעֲנֹתוֹ ⁷ טוֹרֶפָה vac פִּשְׁרו עַל כַּפִּיר הַחֲרוֹן
7[מֹות כְּדוֹרְשֵׁי הַחֲלָקוֹת אֲשֶׁר יִתְּלָה אֲנָשִׁים חַיִּים
8[בִּישְׂרָאֵל מִלְּפָנִים כִּי לַחֲלוֹי הִי עַל °° [יק]רָא הַנְּנִי אֲלֵי[כָה]
9	נָא]ם יְהוּה צַבָּאוֹת וְהִבְעַרְתִּי בַעֲשָׂן רוֹבֵכָה וּכְפִירִיכָה ⁸ תֹּאכַל חֶרֶב וְהִכַרְתִּי מֵאַרְץ ט]רֶפָה ⁹ vac
10	וְלֹא י]שְׁמַע עוֹד קוֹל מִלְּאִיכָה vac פ]שְׁרו רֹבֵכָה הֵם נִדּוּדֵי חִילוֹ °[.....]° וּכְפִירָיו הֵם
11	נִדּוּלָיו [.....] וְטְרָפוּ הוּא הַחֲרוֹן אֲשֶׁר ק]°[.....]° יְרוּשָׁלַיִם אֲשֶׁר
12	י]תְּנוּהוּ ע[.....] א]פְּרִים יִתֵּן יִשְׂרָאֵל [v[ac.....]

¹ MT: אַרְיָ in both occurrences in line 1 (so too, MurXII), and in line 4. The forms differ in both pronunciation and orthography. Both forms are common throughout MT.

² MT: טוֹרֶף. The pesher's plene orthographic variant is in accord with other *qal* participles in 4QpNah.

³ MT: גּוֹרִיו, (MurXII נִדּוּדָיו). The form in the pesher accommodates standard vocalization and a plene spelling of גֹּר, as well as normal masc. plural formation. Horgan describes the less typical form in MT as a fem. pl., but it is more likely an alternate masc. form, like עוֹרוֹת, עוֹרוֹת, עוֹרוֹת.

⁴ MT: לְלִבְאֹתָיו (MurXII לְלִבְאֹתָיו). The fem. pl. of לְבִיאַ is not otherwise attested in BH. Brooke proposed a deliberate variant, describing MT לְלִבְאֹתָיו as a pl. of the distinctly feminine *lb'h*, and 4QpNah לְלִבְיֹתָיו as a pl. of *lby'* which is of indeterminate gender. However, either spelling could reflect the plural of either singular word.

⁵ MT, MurXII lack טוֹרֶף. See section 2.2, below.

⁶ MT: חִירָה. See section 2.2, below, on the reading of this word in 4QpNah.

⁷ MT: וּמַעֲנֹתָיו (MurXII וּמַעֲנֹתָיו). The form in the pesher most likely reflects a fem. sing noun, in contrast to the plural of MT, and in agreement with the probable singular of חִירָה. Brooke's argument in favor of a deliberate exegetical variant is not persuasive.

⁸ MT: וּכְפִירִיכָה. The clearly masc. form in the pesher diverges from the vocalization of MT, which indicates a fem. 2nd person possessive suffix in this word and throughout the verse. See below, on the restorations of אֲלֵי[כָה], רוֹבֵכָה, and מִלְּאִיכָה].

⁹ MT: טוֹרֶפָה (MurXII טוֹרֶפָה). The form in the pesher is best taken as a free-standing feminine abstract noun, "predation," like טוֹרֶפָה in Nah 2:13b, cited in line 6 in the pesher. See section 2.2.

NOTE: The following variants from MT are restored with a high degree of certainty, as discussed in section 2.2: line 8, אֲלֵי[כָה]; line 9, רוֹבֵכָה; and line 10, [מִלְּאִיכָה].

Frag. 3-4 II on Nah 3:1-5

1	ומלאכיו הם צירו אשר לא ישמע קולם עוד בנייים vac הוי עיר הדמים ¹ כולה ² [כחש פר]ק מ[ל]אה
2	פשרו היא עיר אפרים דורשי החלקות לאהרית הימים אשר בכחש ושקף[...]. תהלכו
3	לא ימוש ³ טרף וקול ⁴ שוט וקול רעש אופן וסוס דהר ומרכבה מרקדה פרש מעלה להוב ⁵
4	וברק חנית רוב ⁶ חלל וכבוד ⁷ פגר ואין קץ ⁸ לגויה וכשלו ⁹ וגויתם ¹⁰ vac פשרו על ממשלת דורשי החלקות
5	אשר לא ימוש מקרב עדתם הרב גוים שבי ובו והרחור בינותם ונלות מפחד אויב רוב
6	פגרי אשמה יפולו בימיהם ואין קץ לכלל הלליהם ואף בנויה בשרם יכשולו בעצת אשמתם

¹ MT: דמים. Weiss notes the possible influence of Ezek 22:2; 24:6,9 עיר הדמים.

² MT: כלה. The plene orthography is typical of 4QpNah.

³ MT: ימוש. This "hollow" root appears as מוש in 4QpNah (both in the lemma and in the interpretation in line 5), and as מיש in MT. Note the visual similarity between י and ו, and the semantic interchangeability of the forms of the root. Cf. HALOT s.v. מוש; Prov 17:13 *ketib* תמיש, *qeri* תמיש.

⁴ MT: קול. Although the absence or presence of a conjunction is generally insignificant, in this instance the added *vav* probably reflects a deliberate exegetical variant. See ch. 7.

⁵ For 4QpNah להוב, MT has להב הרב. The *qtol* form is typical of Qumran morphology, though להוב, להוב, and להוב are all attested elsewhere in Qumran literature (see occurrences listed by Maier). See Qimron's discussion of the *qutl*, *qtol*, and *qotol* forms as variations on the *qutl* pattern at Qumran (*The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1986] 200.24 and the chart at 200.241). The omission of the word הרב, and perhaps that of the conjunctive ו, may be attributed to scribal error. Note that הרב does appear in the pesher interpretation in line 5.

⁶ MT, MurXII: רוב. The plene orthography is typical of 4QpNah. Cf. מרוב, in line 7.

⁷ MT: וכבד. The pesher's *qtol* form is typical of Qumran Hebrew. Cf. 1.4 להוב above.

⁸ MT: קצה (ק[צ]ה⁸ MurXII). The morphological variation may have semantic underpinnings, as קצה in BH generally refers to spatial limits, or "edges," whereas קץ is more commonly used to indicate numeric or temporal finitude, which is the required meaning here.

⁹ וכשלו = MT *qere*; MT *ketib*: יכשלו. The converted perfect is synonymous with the graphically similar imperfect.

¹⁰ MT: בנייהם. The conjunction in 4QpNah produces an illogical variant homophone of MT, and is most probably a scribal error. Cp. בנייה in the pesher interpretation in line 6. Allegro observes that 4QpPs^a (171) 3-10 iv 7 features a similar error, along with a correction, {ו} בהשפטו. Fitzmyer seems to view the "consonantal shift" between ב and ו as a normal phenomenon rather than an error. See his note on אהרית, which he understands as אהרית, in 4Q196 frag. 2 line 1 (DJD XIX, 10).

- 7 מרוב¹¹ זנוני זונה טובת חן ובעלת¹² כשפים הממכרת¹³ גוים בזנותה¹⁴
ומשפחות ב[כ]שפיה
- 8 פשר[ו]ע[ל] מתעי אפרים vac אשר בתלמוד שקרם ולשון כזביהם ושפת
מרמה יתעו רבים
- 9 מלכים שרים כוהנים ועם עם נר נלוה ערים ומשפחות יובדו בעצחם
נ[כ]בדים ומושלים
- 10 יפולו [..] עם לשונם vac הנני אליך נאם יהוה צ[באון]ת וגלית¹⁵
- 11 שוליו[ך] על פניך והרא[י]ת[ג]וים מער[ך] וממלכות /// קלונך
פשרו [.....]°°°
- 12 [... ערי המזרח כי השול[י]ם [.....]

¹¹ MT: מרב (MurXII מִרְב). Cf. the plene orthography for רוב in line 4.

¹² MT: בעלה. See section 2.2, for our reading of the conjunction in 4QpNah.

¹³ MT: המכרת. The form in the pesher is best viewed as a *piel* variant for the MT *gal*. See further, below.

¹⁴ MT: בזנוניה. The word is not very legible in 4QpNah, but definitely differs from MT. See further, below.

¹⁵ MT, MurXII ונלית. See section 2.2 below on the pesher's use of the second person suffix in this word and in our restoration of והרא[י]ת in the continuation of the lemma.

Frgs 3–4 III on Nah 3:6–9

- 1 הנוים בניתם [ובש] קִוְצִי תועבותותיהם והשלכתי עליך שקוצים¹ [ונ] בלתיך
 ושמתיך
 2 כאורה² והיה כול רואיך³ יודו⁴ ממך vac
 3 פשרו על דורשי החלקות אשר באחרית הקץ ינלו מעשיהם הרעים לכול ישראל
 4 ורכים יבינו בעונם ושנאום וכארום על זדון אשמתם ובה[.] לות כבוד יהודה
 5 יודו פתאי אפרים מתוך קהלם ועזבו את מתעיהם ונלוו על °[.] [ישראל ואמרו]⁵
 6 שודרה⁶ נינוה מי ינוד לה מאין אבקשה⁷ מנחמים לך vac פשרו[.] [דורשי
 7 החלקות אשר תוכד עצתם ונפרדה כנסתם ולא יוסיפו עוד לתעות [.] קהל
 ופת[א]ים
 8 לא יהוקן עוד את עצתם vac הת־טיבי⁸ מנ⁹ אמ[ון] היושבה ב[יאר]ים
 9 פשרו אמון הם מנשה והיארים הם נד[ן] ל^י מנשה נכבדי ה[.....] ים את מ[.....]
 10 מים סביב לה אשר חילה¹⁰ ים ומים¹¹ חומותיה¹² vac
 11 [פ]שרו הם אנשי [ת]לה נכור[י] מ[ל]חמתה //ע// כוש עוצמה¹³ [ומצרים
 ואין קצה...
 12 ..°°°[...][.....] ° הַמִּים[.....] מ[.....] פ[וט] וה[ל]וכים היו בעזרתך

¹ MT: שקצים. The plene orthography is typical of 4QpNah (cf. MurXII שקוצים).

² MT: כראי. See section 2.2 for our discussion of the odd form in MT and the pesher variant.

³ MT: ראיך. כל. The plene orthography of both words in 4QpNah is as expected. The plene כול appears in the pesher interpretation as well, in III.3. Note the plene orthography of כול in the lemma at the end of IV.2 (כול נד[ן] ליה), but the defective כל in the earlier הוצת כל in that line (Weiss).

⁴ MT: יודו. The use of the plural in both the lemma and the identification in line 5, is probably a harmonizing emendation, towards agreement with the plural subject רואיך. LXX (ὁ ὀρώσ) and the Peshitta correct in the opposite direction, with a sing. subject (Cf. Strugnell). Brooke (89) views the harmonization as an accommodation of the pesher interpretation rather than the biblical text itself.

⁵ MT: ואמר. See above, יודו.

⁶ MT, MurXII: שדרה. The form in the pesher is best viewed as a plene orthographic variant of MT.

⁷ MT: אבקש. The addition of a lengthening suffix is one of the Qumran scribal characteristics catalogued by Tov, "Orthography," 31–57. Cf. Qimron, *Hebrew*, 44.

⁸ MT: התשיבי (MurXII, התשיבי). See section 2.2.

⁹ MT: מנא (MurXII מנא). In MT, "No" is part of the place name "No-Amon." As noted by Allegro, 4QpNah seems to take מני as a preposition, a lengthened poetic form of מן: "than Am[on]." Cf. Peshitta and LXX.

¹⁰ MT, MurXII: היל. The fem. possessive suffix of 4QpNah is absent in MT. Strugnell views the possessive pronouns in LXX and Peshitta as attesting to this variant, but the pronouns could reflect exegetical or practical translation choices rather than an alternative text. Thus, *NJPS* renders MT, "Its rampart a river."

¹¹ MT: מים. See section 2.2.

¹² MT, MurXII: חומותה. Our reading follows Strugnell, with an apparent pl. possessive suffix rather than the sing. possessive of MT. Cp. Allegro's מוריה [ת]מוריה.

¹³ MT: עצמה. Perhaps an orthographic variant, if vocalized as a *pu'al* verb, meaning, "she was mighty." Alternatively, מנחמים may be a *qull* noun with a fem. possessive suffix, "her might," like the Peshitta and LXX (ισχύς αὐτῆς). (Thus, Allegro). In fact, even without a *mappiq* in the *heh*, the MT form itself might be taken as a noun with a feminine suffix. (Cf. Spronk, 130).

Frag 3–4 IV on Nah 3:10–12

פִּשְׁרוֹ הֵם רִשְׁעֵי [...] הַ בֵּית פְּלַן הַנְּלוּיִם עַל מִנְשָׁה גַם הִיא בְּגוּלָה! ¹	1
הַלֵּכָה בִּשְׁבִי גַם	
עִלּוּלִיָּה ² יְרוּשָׁו ³ בְּרֹאשׁ כָּל חוּצוֹת וְעַל נִכְבְּדֵיהֶּ יוֹרוּ ⁴ גּוֹרֵל וְכוּל	2
גְּדוּן לַיָּה רֹתְקוֹ ⁵	
בּוֹקִים פִּשְׁרֵי עַל מִנְשָׁה לִקְץ הָאֲהָרוֹן אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁפֵּל מִלְּכוּתוֹ בִּיִּם [...]	3
נִשְׂו עִלּוּלִיו וּמִפּוֹ יִלְכוּ בִּשְׁבִי נְבוּרִיו וְנִכְבְּדֵיו בְּחָרִים [...] גַּם אֵת תִּשְׁכְּרֵי	4
וְתַחֲוִי ⁶ נַעֲלָמָה vac פִּשְׁרוֹ עַל רִשְׁעֵי אֲ[פְרִים . . .	5
אֲשֶׁר תְּבוֹא כּוֹסֵם אַחֵר מִנְשָׁה [] לְ[... גַּם אֵת תְּבַקֵּשִׁי	6
מַעֲזוֹ בַעִיר ⁷ מֵאוֹיִב פִּשְׁרָו עַל[...]	7
אוֹיְבֵיהֶם בַּעִיר[...]	8
תֹּאנִים עִם בְּכוּרִים[...]	9
]	10
[11]	
[12]	

Frag 5 on Nah 3:13–14

[...]	1
[...]	2
[...]	3

¹ MT: (MurXII: [לנלה]). Weiss notes that this is the only occurrence in MT of הלך לנלה, with *lamed* as the preposition. The variant in 4QpNah employs the more usual prepositional *bet*, which also appears in the subsequent phrase, בשבי. (The Peshitta בשביה probably renders MT בשבי, without any equivalent for (לנלה/בנולה.) Strugnell notes the plene orthography in the peshet as well.

² MT: (עלליה: 4Q385 6 II,8). See Section 2.2.

³ MT: ירוששו. The plene orthographic variant is typical of Qumran Hebrew.

⁴ MT: ירו. Both ירה and ידה appear elsewhere with גורל in BH, in the sense of “to cast.” For this reason, the ancient translations cannot be used as evidence of either reading. Cf. Weiss for other examples of *dalet/resh* interchanges in the Bible, and for references to the phenomenon in rabbinic literature. Note also that the imperfect form in the peshet, in contrast to the perfect in MT, is in agreement with ירוששו.

⁵ MT: וכול. The plene orthography in the peshet is to be expected, but note, with Weiss, the defective orthography in כל חוצות, a few words earlier in the verse, in accordance with MT.

⁶ MT: ותחוי. The simplest explanation for the *vav* is that it is an added conjunction, as in LXX and Peshitta. Doudna (223–25), however, explores the possibility that the *vav* held some greater significance, e.g., that it functioned as a conversive-*vav* or that it is a reflection of some more serious lexical variant and/or scribal error.

⁷ בעיר is not in MT or other versions. The plus in 4QpNah is not well-suited to the lemma. (Thus, Carmignac). Brooke (86) suggests that the author of the peshet “anticipated his interpretation and inadvertently slipped an extra word into his text of Nahum.” He rejects Allegro’s suggestion that the plus reflects a deliberate accommodation of the lemma to suit the peshet interpretation in line 8. He observes that the word is superfluous, since the lemma’s מעוז provides a sufficient peg for the peshet interpretation.

2.2 READINGS AND RESTORATIONS

2.2.1 *Frgs 1–2*

Frgs 1–2 contain the pesher to Nah 1:3b–1:6. It may be presumed that Nah 1:1–3a and its pesher had appeared in the previous, initial, column of the work.¹ Average line length in this column can be estimated on the basis of line 10, which is restored in accordance with MT to yield a length of 61–63 characters (allowing for expected variants).² Parts of 11 regular lines, plus one interlinear line (“5a”), are extant in this column.³ The column originally consisted of 12 lines.⁴

line 1: בַּק רַנְלִיּוֹ]א[עֲנֵן וְנִשְׁעֵרָה דְרָכּוֹ וְנִשְׁעֵרָה דְרָכּוֹ . . . The full colon of Nah 1:3b is the minimum plausible restoration of this first lemma.⁵

¹ Cf. Strugnell. Allegro mistakenly supposed that the previous column cited Nah 1:2–6, and that this extant column contained secondary citations of some of that text. In contrast, Dupont-Sommer viewed our column as the initial column of the pesher, restoring a “line 1” with a citation of Nah 1:1–2a, 3b. However, it is unlikely that the pesher would have cited Nah 1:1–2a without any pesher interpretation. As this column is the sole surviving text on fragments 1–2, we call it simply frags 1–2. Horgan identified the column as col. II of 1–2, but the marks on the upper right of frag 1, which she interpreted as traces of letters from “col. I” are in fact simply defects in the leather.

² Allegro’s failure to recognize lines 9–11 as a lemma contributed to a number of misconceptions about this column. Allegro assumed a narrow column, in which all extant biblical citations were secondary re-citations.

³ Frag 1 contains parts of four lines, including part of the interlinear insert. In frag 2, twelve lines are extant, including the inserted line. Frag 1 measures 2.3 cm from the top-most point to the bottom-most point; frag 2 measures 8 cm. In neither fragment is the top or the bottom of the original column preserved.

⁴ This is the same number of lines found in cols. I and II of frags 3–4, in which both top and bottom margins are preserved. The original 12-line count of this column is likely to have been exclusive of interlinear additions. It is most probable that the current line 1 was the original first line of the column, and that line 12 has been lost. This suggestion is supported by Doudna’s observation of the “damage patterns” in the subsequent columns (p. 78). Frags 3–4 are characterized by greater loss of text in their lower portions. Contrast Dupont-Sommer and Horgan who suppose that line 1 has been lost.

⁵ According to traditional Masoretic accentuation, the Tetragrammaton preceding בַּסּוּפָה is actually part of this colon, as the word prior to it is marked by an *etnah*. The tendency among modern critics is to attach the Tetragrammaton to the previous colon, thus allowing בַּסּוּפָה to begin a new colon, in accordance with an acrostic that is partially evident in this chapter. (Cf. ICC: *Nahum*, 287–89). 4QpNah offers no new insight into the division of the verse.

line 2: Only a few words remain of the pesher interpretation of Nah 1:3b. Allegro's restoration of the word רַקְיָעִי is probably correct.⁶ Attempts at further reconstruction have not been convincing.⁷

line 3: A small vacat, the space of an extra letter or two, is restored in the lacuna in the middle of this line after the citation, but this is not certain, given variability in letter size. The missing text at the end of the line identified enemies, those against whom judgment is executed in the next line. Allegro's restoration of "the Kittim" is attractive and is generally accepted, but it should be noted that the conjecture is driven solely by context, and that there are no identifiable traces for the כ in Allegro's transcription, הַכְּתִיִּים.⁸

lines 4–5a: The restoration of לַעֲשׂוֹת at the beginning of line 4 is certain.⁹ The restoration of a word meaning "land" or "world" in the following lacuna, מֵעַל פְּנֵי הָאָדָמָה, is also certain.¹⁰ This is to be

⁶ In response to Horgan's objection to the previously unattested plural form, see now 4QShirShabb (4Q405) 23 I,7 (and the restoration in line 6); 11QShirShabb (11Q17) 2-1-9, 7 (and the restoration line 4); 11QShir Shabb 5-6 I,1 רַקְיָעִי (in Carol Ann Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985]) and 4Q418Instruction^d 69:15 (in DJD XXXIV, pp. 281, 289). For רַקְיָעִי with שָׂמִים, see, e.g., Gen 1:14.

⁷ Most restorations of the beginning of line 2 have derived from Allegro's reconstruction of הַיְהוָה וְהַשְׂעִירִים, put forth as a re-citation of elements of the lemma cited in line 1. However, Allegro's proposal derives from his ill-conceived assumption of a narrow column, and his questionable reading of the initial letter ה. Strugnell, Gaster, and Moraldi adapted Allegro's restoration to a greater line length. Horgan pointed out that a re-citation of lemma elements might have begun in line 1, continuing in line 2 with a personal pronoun of the identifying formula הַיְהוָה or הַיְהוָה, continuing in line 2 with a personal pronoun of the identifying formula הַיְהוָה or הַיְהוָה. In fact, the introductory formula in line 1 may have been of the form פֶּשֶׁר עַל פֶּשֶׁר rather than the assumed פֶּשֶׁר, so that the initial letter of line 2 is not limited to the representation of either an identifying pronoun (Horgan), or a re-citation (Allegro), but could be anything at all (even if the letter is taken as a ה, which remains doubtful). Doudna (80–81) maintains that Allegro's reconstruction is rendered impossible on the basis of PAM 41.312, and that the formula עַל פֶּשֶׁר is not only possible, but mandatory, in accordance with his proposed patterns of formulas in 4QpNah. (*ibid.*, 263–265).

Allegro's further restoration of אֲשֶׁר בְּרָאָם though widely accepted, is dependent upon his problematic restoration of the beginning of the line.

⁸ Doudna argues against the widespread acceptance of the reading, on both contextual and graphic grounds, and he especially opposes the subsequent restoration of Kittim elsewhere in this column (88–91, 275–78). He describes the origin of Allegro's reading, based on an insightful analysis of Allegro's private papers (91–94).

⁹ For . . . עֲשָׂה מִשְׁפַּט ב . . . , denoting the punitive execution of judgment, cf. Ps 119:84; Ps 149:9.

¹⁰ For our choice of הָאָדָמָה (rather than הָאָרֶץ or הַבַּיִת), to pair with פְּנֵי, especially in the context of eradication and destruction, cf. Gen 6:7, 7:4 (the flood);

followed by the restoration of a citation of Nah 1:4aβ וכול הנהרות החרים.¹¹ Reconstruction of the remainder of line 4 and of line 5a is more problematic. The most reasonable approach is that of Dupont-Sommer, in which interlinear 5a is taken as the direct continuation of a peshet interpretation of Nah 1:4a that begins in line 4.¹² The reconstruction would approximate:

..... ולכלוחם מעל פני [האדמה וכול הנהרות החרים פשרו על הכתים] 4
 עם [מן] שלייהם.... 5a
 אמלל... 5

In line 5a, the large space between the words עם and מן־שלייהם . . . is best viewed as a deliberate accommodation for the ל's of the line below.¹³

line 5: Verse 4b is restored in accord with MT; traces of the initial *vav* of וְכַרְמֶל are visible. An introductory peshet formula must be restored following the lemma. As in line 3 (restored), a not very distinct vacat appears between the lemma and the introductory formula.

line 6: Some word signifying destruction is appropriate at the beginning of the line, perhaps Allegro's בּוּ יֵאָבֵד.¹⁴ Allegro translated the syntactically difficult בּוּ רַבִּים רוּם רַשְׁעָה . . . as “and] many [shall

Zeph 1:3; Amos 9:8; IKi 9:7, 13:34; Deut 6:15; and especially Ex 32:12 “to annihilate them from the face of the earth”; Deut 28:21 “until He has put an end to you in the land. . . .”

¹¹ Although Allegro did not restore this phrase, in keeping with his misconception about line length in this column, subsequent scholars have all done so. וְכַרְמֶל is restored with *plene* orthography, as in 3-4 II,1 כּוּלָה; III,2, 3; IV,2).

¹² Dupont-Sommer restored “[L’explication de ceci: ce sont les bands des Kittim].” Allegro took line 5a as a direct continuation of his short line 4. Strugnell proposed an additional interlinear insertion prior to line 4, with 5a dependent upon this hypothetical “4a.”

The most plausible supposition is that line 4 of this scroll had originally ended mid-line, at the end of the previous peshet interpretation, leaving approximately 30 units vacant before beginning the next lemma in line 5. (See the large vacat in line 9 of this column, and the blank half-lines in 3-4 II,10; III,2). Both the lemma וְכַרְמֶל and its peshet interpretation will have been added subsequently. It is likely that the scribe would have used smaller characters to fit the lemma and the introductory formula into the vacat of line 4, and/or extended his insertion beyond the left margin. Objections to Dupont-Sommer’s restoration tend to focus on its excessive length, but calculations of anticipated length must allow for the fact that insertions, by definition, are vehicles for fitting extra characters into available space, and will tend to use the space economically and maximally.

¹³ So, Allegro. Dupont-Sommer reads עם [מן] שלייהם, using up some of the space.

¹⁴ Or, preferably, בּוּ יֵאָבֵד, in line with the spelling found in 3-4 II,9; III,7 (as

per]ish by it at the height of wickedness.”¹⁵ However, this adverbial construction would require a preposition preceding רום. One, rather speculative, approach toward accommodating the extant text, is to restore the beginning of a pesher interpretation in line 5 with a general introductory formula of the sort פִּשְׁרוֹ עַל¹⁶ and to render בו in a temporal sense.¹⁷ Thus, for example, “Its pesher: concerning . . . in the Period of Wrath . . . and in it (in that era) will perish many, the height of wickedness.”¹⁸

At the end of the preserved text on this line, Allegro transcribed]הב, which Dupont-Sommer and Strugnell augmented to]הב[שן. The כ does not seem clearly discernible, but contextually, a re-citation of a lemma element is appropriate with the word כִּי. Although the specifics of the interpretation are difficult to recover, the overall structure of the pesher is recognizable. Lines 5–6 provide a general setting for the implementation of the prophecy, while the specific elements of the lemma were “plugged in” for individual identification in lines 6–7.

pointed out by Doudna, 292). Horgan restores]ה[הר[בו, but the reading does not fit the traces.

¹⁵ Strugnell accepts Allegro’s reconstruction, but objects to the syntax of his translation, and suggests that רום רשעה might better be taken as the object of the verb, with רבים as the subject. Gaster’s translation seems to take רבים as an adjective modifying רום, “This means that through Him the towering pride of wickedness [will be abased].” The attempt is not successful. The early translation of García-Martínez, “many will die for him at the height of sin,” did not resolve the syntactic difficulty, and introduced martyriological concepts that are not warranted by the context of the pesher (*The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated* [1994], 195. The later *Study Ed.* reads “many [will per]ish because of it at the height of wickedness,” 337). Cook’s more literal “many will [perish . . .] in it the height of wickedness,” preserves the awkwardness and difficulty of the Hebrew text.

¹⁶ This formula is especially appropriate here, since it lends itself to requotation; specific identifications of the individual elements of the lemma are given subsequently in lines 6–7.

¹⁷ The geographical nature of the lemma elements might also accommodate a general pesher identification of a location in which many will perish. The suggested reconstruction of temporal or geographical phrases is intended to avoid the syntactic difficulties raised by the assumption of a causal כ in the prepositional בו. Alternatively, Doudna (294) has suggested some plausible antecedents that would allow for a general interpretation even with a causal כ, using the following rubric: “Its interpretation: this is the <attribute/activity> of the <wicked group> . . .”

¹⁸ This reading supposes Dupont-Sommer’s appositional understanding of רבים רום רשעה. He translates “un grande nombre, les impies orgueilleux.” Cf. Isa 2:11,17 in which “the arrogance of men” (רום אנשים) appears in parallel to “Man’s haughty

line 7: We follow Allegro's restoration of מַלְל [כר], in keeping with the re-citation of the other elements of the lemma, "Bashan" and "Lebanon."¹⁹ The preposition ל in ולמושליו indicates that מושליו functions as an indirect object and the initial conjunctive ו signals a compound sentence.²⁰ Some preceding verb seems to be required prior to the intervening מַלְל [כר]. No satisfactory restoration has been put forth. Strugnell offered the following reconstruction of lines 6–7:²¹

6 ... כי הב[שן] היא הכתיים ולמלכם קרא
7 [כר] מל ולמושליו לבנון ופרח לבנון היא[. . .]

This is a creative approach to a difficult text with limited room for restoration, but the syntax is awkward and contrived.²² More effective, though less comprehensive, is Dupont-Sommer's proposal to restore a prefixed ל to the initial word in line 7 (his "Israel(?)"; our "Carmel"). This allows "Carmel" and "its rulers" to function co-ordinately as indirect objects of some appropriate, but irretrievable, verb from the end of line 6.

look" (thus, NJPS, for עיני נבדחה). These verses describe the Day of God at the End of Days, which is designated against the proud and haughty. The descriptions include a metaphor concerning the destruction of the tall cedars of Lebanon and the oaks of the Bashan, which parallels the image in Nahum here.

¹⁹ Though the traces are of the מ are scanty, they are strategically placed. Dupont-Sommer's restoration of [Israe]l is not tenable. Doudna's proposal (297–98) of מַלְל [י] would suit the traces, but the word is only feasible if the initial *vav* of the next word is discounted, as described in the next note.

²⁰ Doudna maintains that there is no conjunctive *vav* in this word. He identifies the ink-trace preceding ולמושליו as part of the top of a *lamed* protruding from below, in a supposed interlinear line "8a" (p. 98). On a number of occasions, he elaborates upon his reading, and the helpfulness of eliminating the *vav* (see esp., p. 295). However, the proliferation of interlinear insertions does not seem to be very helpful. While it is true that the remnants of the disputed letter are a bit thicker and much longer than usual for a *vav*, they do not seem to fit the shape of the top of a *lamed* either.

²¹ He presents the proposal as a model of exegetical format alone, without insisting upon the particular words of his reconstruction. A translation will clarify the restoration: "For the 'Bashan' is the Kittim, and their king he (Nahum) called 'Carmel' and (the Empire's) rulers (he called) 'Lebanon'; and the 'flower of Lebanon' is. . . ." (Similar, and smoother, renderings in the passive voice are offered by Cook and Garcia-Martinez).

²² Strugnell's strategic placement of the word קרא enables the verb to serve both the preceding and subsequent nouns. Unfortunately, Strugnell supports his use of קרא, as well as his proposed structure—"x קרא a" (and "ל,ב,ע")—by pointing to 3–4 I,8 (pesher unit 9) קרא [י]קרא על העץ, which is most problematic in itself. The function of קרא in Strugnell's proposal is even more difficult to account for than the usage in unit 9.

An additional difficulty in line 7 is the juxtaposition of “Lebanon” and “flower of Lebanon” following ולמושליו. We follow Allegro’s punctuation of this line, so that the formulaic re-citation of “flower of Lebanon” is supplemented by the redundant term “Lebanon.”²³ This doubling of the cited elements maximizes compatibility with the pesher.²⁴

Strugnell wonders why פרה is treated as feminine (i.e., as the referent of the pronoun היא). However, the gender of the introductory pronouns in pesher identification formulae tends to depend more upon the referents in the pesher rather than those in the lemma. The referent in the pesher identification must have been a fem. sing. noun.²⁵

²³ In Strugnell’s restoration, above, “Lebanon” was attached to the preceding clause. This allowed “flower of Lebanon” to stand alone as a re-cited element of the lemma, though it exacerbated the syntactic awkwardness of his proposal. Doudna resolves the problem of the repetition of “Lebanon” by positing a scribal error and eliminating the repeated word (103–4).

²⁴ Cf. a similarly divergent re-citation in 1QpHab which, oddly, also features the word “Lebanon.” 1QpHab XII,7 reads “On account of the bloodshed of the city and the violence of the land.” This is an imprecise re-citation of Hab 2:17, cited fully in 1QpHab XI,17–XII,1 “[For the violence to Lebanon will cover you and the assault of beasts] will destroy, on account of the bloodshed of man and violence to the land, the city, and all who inhabit it.” Nitzan (*ad loc.*) suggests that the re-citation may reflect a deliberate accommodation of the lemma to the pesher interpretation.

The isolation of “the flower of Lebanon” from “Lebanon” would lead to logical incompatibility in the symbolism of the pesher. It is difficult to imagine that “Lebanon” itself referred to the rulers of some entity, but that the “flower of Lebanon” was applied to something more specific. We would expect Lebanon to be an epithet for a general group, with the flower of Lebanon as its rulers. (Cf. 4QpNah 3–4 III,9 in which the terms of the lemma are linked by the pesher, and identified as group and sub-group: “Amon: they are Manasseh and the rivers: they are the nobles of Manasseh, the honored ones of the [. . .].”) Strugnell’s reading problematically results in the reverse relationship. By detaching ולמושליו לבנון from ופרה לבנון, he has “the rulers” being represented by “Lebanon,” so that the more specific “flower of Lebanon” apparently must refer to those who are ruled.

²⁵ See below, ch. 9. Cf. Horgan; Doudna, 299–300. Our supposition of a double identification in the pesher, would require that the first identified element had been a sing. fem. noun, e.g., “Lebanon and the flower of Lebanon is the council (עצה) *x* and its rulers.” In three cases of pronominal pesher identification in 4QpNah, in unit 10, the pronoun agrees with both the lemma and pesher element (3–4 I,10 – II,1). The other pronominal identifications exhibit some divergence, and tend to be instances of collective nouns in which the pronoun is plural. Thus, frags 1–2, line 3 הן כל הן and 3–4 I,10 הן נדודי הן, in which the plural הן agrees more closely with the elements of the pesher than the lemma. In 3–4 III,9 הן מנשה and אמן הן מנשה, the first pronoun, the masculine הן, conforms in gender to the pesher element, but its plural form diverges from both the lemma and pesher element.

line 8: The ending of הם[points to a 3rd person plural possessive. There really is not enough basis for responsible restoration.²⁶ Dupont Sommer reconstructs the end of the line as מלפני [עדת] בחר'י אל, “before the congregation of] the Elect [of God.”²⁷

line 9: ל° is almost certainly a remnant of the word “all,” anticipating the phrase הבל וכול יושבי בה in the next verse, cited in line 10. Either plene or defective orthography is possible, and the word may have been preceded by a conjunctive *vav* or a preposition.²⁸

lines 9–11: At least part of Nah 1:5–6 survives in these lines. The lemma is likely to have exhibited some variation from MT. The peshet may have included a definite article in ה[הר'ים] (as compared to MT הרים).²⁹ The words החמונונו, וכול, and/or יושבי, are likely to have featured plene orthography, rather than the defective spelling of MT, in keeping with a tendency toward full orthography in 4QpNah.³⁰ The arrangement of extant text fortuitously enables us to reconstruct line 10 with a high level of certainty, following Dupont-Sommer. The citation is restored in a straightforward manner through בחרון אפי in line 11. Subsequently, there is a dot of ink from what was once the upper right hand portion of a now indistinguishable letter.

²⁶ Allegro restored הם עצ[אני, to which Horgan adds a conjunctive ו. Strugnell restored בני אשמ[הם, and Brownlee restored וביה אשמ[הם in one of his notes.

²⁷ Doudna (105) observes the pairing of עדה and בחר' in 4QpIsa^d 1, 3; 4QpPs^a 1–10 II,5; III,5.

²⁸ Doudna (304–5) maintains that the spacing requires restoration of a two-letter word preceding “כול” at the beginning of line 9. He restores על. Dupont-Sommer restores “[avec to]us,” and García-Martínez includes an ellipsis.

Strugnell’s suggestion that lines 8–9 may cite Ps 33:8 is highly speculative, and the proposed text is probably too lengthy for the allotted space.

²⁹ Cf. Strugnell. Commenting on הדמים in 4QpNah 3–4 II,1 (variant to MT דמים), R. Weiss observes a tendency in 1QpHab to add the definite article in its citations, adducing three examples: Hab 1:14, 9:12, and 10:15 (“הערוה,” 59). In the case of ה[הר'ים] here in Nahum, there are other factors supporting the proposed variant, such as a likely dittography/haplography of the initial *heh*, or the influence of the article in the parallel noun, והנבעת.

The article is found in MurXII, LXX, and Targ. However, regarding the latter two sources, it must be noted that an article in translation does not necessarily reflect an original article in the *Vorlage*. In relation to LXX, see Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 162. Particularly, it has been observed that the Targum to the Prophets “is not consistent in its use of the emphatic and absolute states.” (Cathcart and Gordon, *The Aramaic Bible*, 132, n. 17. See also Gordon’s note on the definite article in MurXII in “The Targum to the Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Texts: Textual and Exegetical Notes,” *RevQ* 8 [1974]: 426).

³⁰ See the plene יושבי in the previous line of the peshet. MurXII reads וכל יושבי.

Allegro and most others restore פ]שרו . Horgan prefers to continue verse 6 to its completion, restoring $\text{נחמה נתכה כאש והיצורים נתצו ממנו}$.³¹ Her motivation is her contention that a vacat would be required between the lemma and the pesher formula, in conformity with the style of 4QpNah, whereas the questionable trace follows the extant text immediately.³² On the other hand, the continuation of the citation would yield an unusually long lemma for this composition.³³ Both features, separational vacats and intermediate lemma lengths, are discernible in 4QpNah, but irregularly so. Neither one carries more weight than the other in determining the extent of the biblical citation. In any case, even if the trace represents the פ of the pesher introduction, it would be all that remains of the interpretation. The next extant piece of 4QpNah picks up in the following chapter, at Nah 2:12.

2.2.2 *Frag 3–4 I*

The 12 lines of frags 3–4 col. I contain pesher interpretations to Nah 2:12–14, including the lemmas to vss. 12b–14.³⁴ Line 1 contains the end of a pesher to verse 2:12a. The pesher to 2:14 concludes on line 1 of the next column (3–4 II). A section of leather 5 cm long and varying in width from 1–2 cm is missing from the bottom of this column up through line 8, so that lines 8–12 each lack some writing. The right margin, as well as some text on the right hand side, is missing. The initial portions of lines 9–12 are provided by the small fragment, “frag 3,” that Allegro joined here in DJD V (Plate 12). An original line length of approximately 76 characters may be posited for col. I, on the basis of the restoration of line 9 according to MT, adjusted for expected variants.³⁵

³¹ Thus, also, Lange and Doudna (p. 326, in accordance with his own assessment of vacat patterns in 4QpNah).

³² Horgan may overstate the case somewhat. Many of the lemmas begin or end in lacunae, so that Horgan tends to rely upon restored vacats to support the restoration of additional vacats. See section 9.1.6, below.

³³ Lemmas tend to vary between a half-line to a line-and-a-half of text in the extant examples in 4QpNah. Restoring vss. 5–6 *in toto* in lines 9–11 would create a lemma longer than any that has been preserved, though perhaps not excessively out of range. (3–4 II, 3–4 comprises more than two verses in nearly two lines).

³⁴ On the basis of the attributes of the extant text, we may calculate that there is a gap of six columns between the previous extant portion of 4QpNah (i.e., frags 1–2) and this column (frags 3–4 I). This column was thus originally column VIII of 4QpNah (cf. Doudna, p. 38, Table 1).

³⁵ Allegro initially gave the width of col. I as either about 13.5 or 16 cm, which

line 1: No restoration can be responsibly supplied to supplement the remains of the pesher interpretation to Nah 2:12a in this line.³⁶ In the subsequent citation of 2:12b, we read לְבִיָּא, in accordance with MT;³⁷ some commentators read לְבוֹיָא.³⁸ Strugnell does not commit to a reading, but observes that the form of the third letter is unclear. The letter is somewhat indistinct, but it seems to exhibit the thicker heavy top wedge and the shorter thicker stem of a *yod*. In any case, the choice of reading for most scholars is based less on legibility than on textual and contextual factors.³⁹

The use of the word לְבוֹיָא in the pesher interpretation in line 2 is occasionally cited as support of that reading in the lemma, but the pesher's לְבוֹיָא is not a re-citation of the lemma. Since pesher interpretation is, by its nature, a re-working of the lemma, isolexism or paronomasia with an element of the lemma is at least as likely to occur as a direct repetition of that element.⁴⁰

he estimated on the basis of two possible restorations of lines 2 and 9 ("Further Light"). He later revised the 16 cm figure to 15, in his personal notes. This last figure is to be preferred.

Restoring the missing portions of the biblical citation of Nah 2:14 in this line in accordance with MT yields a total of 67 units. There is a stretch of unscribed leather, the length of approximately 7–8 characters, between the last word of line 9 and the left margin, the line's presumed end-point. The sum of these figures (the reconstructed biblical text, and the existing vacat) yields a guide length of 75–76 units per line in this column.

³⁶ Commentators attempting restoration have tended to begin the line with an initial pesher formula (cf. Gaster, Horgan, Vermes) but the column could just as well continue a pesher interpretation begun in the previous column (cf. Dupont-Sommer). Note that the remains of the pesher interpretation of Nah 2:12a do not appear to be followed by a vacat. Horgan does not record a vacat here, but she also does not mention this location as an exception to her rule that "there is a space after the pesher and before the citation" (*Pesharim*, 160. In that context, she describes frags 3–4 III 1,5 as exceptions, and frags 3–4 I,8 as a "special case.")

³⁷ Thus, Allegro, Amusin, Boccaccio and Berardi, Burrows, Carmignac, Doudna, Gaster, Habermann, Jeremias, Lohse, Maier, Michelini Tocci, Moraldi, Rabin, Schonfield, Vogt, Yadin.

³⁸ Thus, Cook, Dupont-Sommer, Flusser, Horgan, García-Martínez, Knibb, Lange, Schiffman, Vermes, and probably Bardtke.

³⁹ The variant reading has been supported by comparison with LXX τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν (cf. Peshitta, Vg). Unfortunately, the word is poorly preserved in MurXII (Lange follows Milik's transcription, לְ[ב]יָא). On the suggested emendation of MT, see ICC: *Nahum*, 325, and the commentators cited there, p. 333; *HALOT*, s.v. לְבִיָּא.

⁴⁰ In fact, to the opposite effect, some scholars have observed a deliberate tendency in pesher toward the use of non-identical forms of a word in citation and in interpretation, perhaps to preserve multiple textual traditions. Cf. Nitzan, 51; Shemaryahu Talmon, "Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Hebrew Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts," in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, ed. by F.M. Cross and S. Talmon (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1975), 261–63.

line 2: The completion of verse 2:12 is restored in accordance with MT,⁴¹ followed by the introductory pesher formula, and possibly a vacat.⁴² The spelling of Demetrius's name may be either דמי[טר]וס or דמי[טר]וס. Graphically, the wedge of the disputed letter seems a bit more like that of a ׳ than a ך, and a ׳ is probably better-suited to the Greek, though either alternative could represent a legitimate Hebrew form of the Greek name.⁴³

line 3: In the lacuna at the beginning of this line, most commentators restore some variation of the following: [ולא בא כי לוא נתנה אל] ביד.⁴⁴ This proposal is likely to reflect of the basic idea of the original pesher, and it has not been seriously challenged.⁴⁵

⁴¹ Rabinowitz ("Key-Passage," 395, n. 8) restored [ואין מחריד] in the previous line instead, maintaining that the ם of ואין is "clearly visible" at the end of line 1. Horgan does note a mark at the end of that line, but dismisses the possibility that it is a letter, and surmises that it may be "a darkening of the skin along a fold." In the photographs, the mark appears to be a crack in the leather.

⁴² Thus, פשרו על דמי[טר]וס or, the shorter פשרו הארי הוא דמי[טר]וס, preceded by a vacat (following Horgan, *Pesharim*, 163; 172–73. Apparently inadvertently omitted in her "Pesharim" in Charlesworth, *Dead Sea Scrolls*). 4QpNah occasionally, but inconsistently, features a vacat between the lemma and introductory formula. (See Table 9–2 below). Doudna discusses this lacuna at great length, from the perspective of his schematization of types of pesher structure and his position that there is a precise pattern of vacats discernible in 4QpNah (119–126; 341–349). He reconstructs פשרו >הלביא הוא <דמי[טר]וס.

⁴³ Allegro ("Further Light") discusses variability in the Hebrew rendering of the Greek nominative suffix, even when the suffix is preceded by an *iota* in the Greek. Cf. Doudna (117–119) for further speculation about the spelling and pronunciation of Demetrius in 4QpNah, and for support of the reading with a *yod*. Physical observations must rely on photographs, since, as noted in ch. 1, this portion of the leather of 4QpNah has suffered marked deterioration in modern times.

⁴⁴ i.e., "[But he did not enter, for God did not deliver it] into the hand of the kings of Yawan from Antiochus until the rising of the commanders of the Kittim." Variations of this reconstruction appear in Amusin, Brownlee, Cook, Doudna, Fitzmyer ("Crucifixion in Ancient Palestine, Qumran Literature, and the New Testament," *CBQ* 40 [1978]: 493–513), Flusser, García-Martínez, Horgan, Maier, Vermes, Strugnell, Yadin. The re-construction is usually associated with Dupont-Sommer. However, see the reading אשׁר . . . ביד, cited by Habermann, 210, who attributed the restoration to S.A. Lowenstamm, in the Israeli daily newspaper *Ha'aretz*, Aug. 3, 1956. For Habermann's own reading, see our next note.

The reconstruction almost certainly derives from a comparison of this passage of 4QpNah with ISam 23:10–15. (See below, ch. 5) The similar use of בקשׁ in ISam and 4QpNah, and the letters ד, taken as the word "hand," in line 3 of of the pesher, invite this restoration. Despite the lack of real parallels of content, the restoration does seem lexically justifiable.

⁴⁵ Rabinowitz alone held to a maverick interpretation of this pesher unit, involving Hellenizers and Demetrius I, but even he accepted the restoration of ביד (396). Allegro had initially proposed restoring מוח[ל]יד ("Further Light"). This reading,

The spelling of Antiochus's name is somewhat unusual. The usual Hebrew transliteration for Greek τ is the letter ט, but ת is also attested.⁴⁶

line 4: The interpretation of Nah 2:12b will have continued in this line, featuring a subject and/or an object for the verb תרמס.⁴⁷ In addition to identifying a trampling one and/or a trampled one, line 4 probably included some additional peshet interpretation prior to the vacat preceding the next lemma; perhaps a theological gloss, such as באשמת רשעי ישראל.⁴⁸

derived from Nah 2:12b, was accepted by Boccaccio and Berardi, Jeremias (with a question mark), and Schonfield. Gaster had attempted a creative interpretation based upon Allegro's early reading: "Never] from the days of Antiochus until the time when the rulers of the Kittim arose, [has that city daunt]ed (הה[ר]י) the kings of Greece; and eventually it will be trodden under." This clever, but not quite successful, effort has been made obsolete by Dupont-Sommer's reading.

An additional attempt at restoration was made by Habermann, יבוא להפר יד, מלכי יון. He identified Antiochus in the peshet as Antiochus X, a rival to Demetrius III, and saw in this phrase an allusion to a delegitimization of Antiochus, a distinction (פרד) between him and the Seleucid kings.

⁴⁶ Allegro ("Further Light," 90) cites S. Krauss, *Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter*, 76, for a reference to Targ 2 Esther 3:1, where אנהיפתריס occurs rather than אנשיפתריס.

⁴⁷ Line 3 is syntactically complete on its own, but the new lemma begins in the middle of line 4, and the line is unlikely to have begun with a vacat. (Compare the objections of Strugnell and Horgan to the proposal of an initial vacat in line 5). The peshet is generally understood as referring to the trampling of Jerusalem. Most scholars take Jerusalem as the implied subject of תרמס in line 3, and assume a passive construction. Thus, Dupont-Sommer, Allegro (DJD): . . . she will be trodden down[. . .]; cp. "Further Light": "will tread (be trodden) down"). Dupont-Sommer supplies an agent for the action, restoring [. . . בכהיים] in line 4. Other scholars achieve the same sense of the trampling of Jerusalem, by supplying an explicit sing. fem. noun as the subject of the passive verb, continuing their reconstructions into line 4. Thus Habermann proposed beginning 1.4 with הארץ; Horgan proposed העיר (i.e., Jerusalem).

Other alternatives are less attractive: Rabin suggested an allusion to the trampling of the kingdom of the Seleucids [by the Romans]. The peshet could also be viewed as referring to the trampling of the Roman republic (cp. 4QpNah 1-2, 5a where most scholars associate ממשלהם with the eschatological eradication of Rome). This would accommodate Schonfield's view that 4QpNah "foretells the doom of Rome in due time." Doudna diverges from previous commentators, by restoring an additional peshet identification in line 4. Thus, following line 3 "... and after that it will be trampled," Doudna reconstructs "[And 'the strong lion'—this is the Lion of Wrath who will <dwel there.> <LONG VAC>AT]." His introduction of the Lion of Wrath into this unit, followed by the long vacat, is in keeping with his view of the schematic structure of 4Q169.

⁴⁸ Cf. 1QpHab IV,8 בעון הישבים ועורסום and perhaps 4QpNah 3-4 II,6 בעצת אשמהם.

In the subsequent lemma, Nah 2:13, we restore [נ]מזנֶק as MT, LXX, Peshitta; some editions follow Allegro's reading of מזנֶק, with no נ. It is likely that the thin letter נ has been lost in the crack in the leather.

Horgan and Brooke view the words נוריו and ולביותיו as masculine variants from MT. Brooke supposes a deliberate alteration, bringing the lemma in line with the masculine analogs of the terms in the pesher. In fact, the former term is probably masculine even in MT, and the latter term could be either feminine or masculine in both MT and 4QpNah. Also, in both cases, the forms in 4QpNah are the more usual forms of the word. These observations lessen the force of Brooke's proposal, but it remains plausible that the composer of the pesher will have chosen to disambiguate unusual forms in keeping with his interpretation.

The final word in line 4, טרף, is not attested in any other version of Nahum. The "plus" in the pesher is usually taken as a noun, an explicit direct object for the transitive verb ומזנֶק. Thus, "strangles *prey* for his lionesses." If ללביותיו itself is taken as the direct object of [נ]מזנֶק (following Gaster's suggestion, "strangled his lionesses for prey," as discussed below), the added word could be understood adverbially. Alternatively, טרף could be understood as a verb, beginning a longer variant phrase that would have continued into line 5. Or, Schiffman may be correct in ascribing the plus to scribal error.

line 5: The restoration of the beginning of line 5 is very difficult. The most reasonable starting-point is the suggestion of Carmignac, that the extant word על is to be taken as a preposition within a pesher identification. Carmignac restores, "[Ceci s'interprète au sujet de- -]contre le Lionceau Furieux."⁴⁹ The "Lion of Wrath" is thus

⁴⁹ "Its pesher is concerning . . .]against the Lion of Wrath." "Carmignac's" structure was accepted by Cook, Doudna, Horgan, Knibb, and Schiffman.

The word על at the beginning of the extant portion of line 5 is confusing. One expects it to be the second word of the introductory pesher formula על פִּשְׁרוֹ following immediately upon the lemma. (This natural inclination is reinforced by the appearance of this particular introductory formula in the following pesher. The pesher begins in line 6 with the words על כפיר החרון, and we expect the same here.) However, the length of the lacuna at the beginning of line 5 requires more than just פִּשְׁרוֹ. Nah 13a was already cited in line 4, and 13b is cited later in line 6, as part of the following lemma. There is no additional MT text to continue the lemma into this line. Many commentators make no attempt at reconstruction, but the suggestions that have been put forth tend to assume that the word

the victim of an attack by the subject of the peshet; grammatically, this figure is the object of the opponent's attack.

A number of grammatically acceptable readings can be accommodated within Carmignac's basic structure of, "its interpretation: . . . opponent X, אִשֶּׁר . . . against the Lion of Wrath, אִשֶּׁר . . ." This multiplicity is largely due to the double relative clause in the proposed restoration.⁵⁰ The isolation of specific potential readings in our text necessitates the identification of the head of the clause וְאִנְשֵׁי עֲצָרוֹ and the identification of the referent of the possessive suffixes in the clause. אִשֶּׁר יִכֶּה בְּנִדְוֹלָיו and the identification of the referent of the possessive suffixes in the clause.⁵¹ The identity of these "great ones" and their possessor cannot be determined on grammatical grounds. Alternatives are discussed in our historical analysis in ch. 4.

על, is part of an introductory peshet formula. Some of the proposals are: (1) the beginning of the line was left blank up until the peshet (cf. the initial vacat at 1QpHab VIII,16 and XI,4, as noted by Doudna); (2) the beginning of line 5 contained a citation of Nah 2:13b, even though it is cited in line 6, followed by a vacat and then the peshet; (3) the beginning of the line featured additional text of Nahum that is not found in MT, continuing the "plus" of בְּרִיךְ at the end of line 3, perhaps followed by a vacat, and then the peshet. Cf. Berrin, dissertation (208–209), for a critique of these proposals.

⁵⁰ Relative clauses in the pesharim may have either distant or adjacent heads (That is, the noun that is modified by the relative clause may immediately precede the word אִשֶּׁר, or may be separated from the clause by a number of other words, including other nouns). Moreover, the noun that is modified by the relative clause may be either the subject or the object of a verb in the clause. Also, the pronouns and pronominal suffixes in the relative clauses may refer to any noun in the sentence. Double relative clause constructions increase the likelihood that these factors will create syntactic ambiguity. Agreement in number and gender between the heads of the clauses makes such ambiguity inevitable, as in this case, in which the proposed subject and the Young Lion of Wrath are both masc. sing. nouns. (Cf. Berrin, "4QpNah," 211–212, for examples of the variability of grammatical function in the elements of multiple relative clauses in the pesharim.)

⁵¹ An additional source of contention has been the function of the preposition in . . . הִכָּה ב. In fact, this *bet* is unquestionably prefixed to the direct object of the transitive verb, introducing the victim of attack. Strugnell points to 4QpHos^b frag 2,3 (the other context featuring הִדְרִיךְ/וְנָכַח), "will send forth his hand against Ephraim," with *bet* introducing the object. Cf. Gert Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1963), 128; David J. Halperin, "Crucifixion, the Nahum Peshet, and the Penalty of Strangulation," *JJS* 32 [1981]: 33.

Despite claims to the contrary, the preposition here may not signal an object of instrument or an accomplice. Neither "with" nor "by means of" are valid renderings (*pace* Allegro, Bardtke, Carmignac, Halperin, Horgan, Maier, Schonfield, Vermes, Halperin, Yadin. See the evidence in Berrin, "4QpNah," 213–214, and Doudna's different arguments in support of the same conclusion—that the ב here must function as a direct object marker.) It is likely that the ב has some partitive sense as well, as rendered by Cook, "he will smite <some of> his great ones.

line 6: The restoration of line 6 is dependent upon that of line 5. We suppose that line 6 will have concluded the peshet interpretation to Nah 2:13a that was begun in line 5, before proceeding to the citation of 2:13b.⁵² The actual sense of the missing text is difficult to recover, particularly because of the lack of a preposition before *וְאִנְשֵׁי עֲצָתוֹ* at the end of line 5, and the loss of the text that immediately followed those words at the beginning of line 6. Two basic syntactic structures are possible. (1) “Men of his counsel” may function as a direct object of “smite,” coordinate with “great ones”⁵³ or (2) “men of his counsel” could begin its own clause, which would continue here in line 6.⁵⁴ Any specific restoration would be very speculative.

For our *הִירָה* in the subsequent lemma, as a variant to MT *הָרִיו*,⁵⁵ Dupont-Sommer and Horgan read *הִוְרָה*. The thickness of the top wedge and the length of the letter seem more characteristic of a *yod*. The word *הִיר* is a plausible, though otherwise unknown, variant synonym for *הוּר* “hole.”⁵⁶ The final *ה* is best explained as a 3rd person masc. sing. poss. suffix, varying in number from MT, and employing an unusual alternative to the expected *vav*.⁵⁷ Brooke (96)

⁵² Cf. Dupont-Sommer, followed by Horgan. Approximately 27 textual units are missing at the beginning of line 6, preceding the words *וַיְמַלֵּא טָרֶף* that start the next lemma. Some of this lacuna may be taken up with a vacat separating the interpretation from the citation.

⁵³ The masc. sing. poss. suffix in both elements would refer to a single individual. Line 5 would be a complete clause. Line 6 would then have begun a new clause, the sense of which cannot be recovered.

⁵⁴ This construction would accommodate greater correspondence with the lemma. The lemma’s “strangles [?for] his lionesses” is a complete clause, and warrants representation as such in the peshet. The construction also avoids the asyndeton of the previous proposal. In that reconstruction, “men of counsel” function with “great ones” as a compound object of “smite,” despite the fact that “men of counsel” (*וְאִנְשֵׁי עֲצָתוֹ*) lacks the prefixed *בְּ* of *בְּנִדְלִי*.

⁵⁵ The word is poorly preserved in MurXII; the transcription in DJD II, 198 reads *הָרִיו* in agreement with MT.

⁵⁶ Note the variation in orthography and vocalization, e.g., in ISam 14:11 *הַדְּרִים*; Isa 42:22 *בְּהוּרִים*; Isa 11:8 *הוּר פֶּתֶן*. The proposed *הִיר* could reflect a further variation.

⁵⁷ Horgan blamed scribal error for the odd form of *הִירָה*, dismissing Dupont-Sommer’s explanation of the *ה* as an archaic masc. suffix. But, see now the evidence from 4Q266 offered by Doudna (133, n. 163) for the use of *heh* as a sing. masc. poss. suffix. Note especially the cases that have parallels in CD in which the more usual *vav* is used (from Joseph Baumgarten, ed., DJD XVIII). Cf. Ian Young, “Observations on the Third Person Masculine Singular Pronominal Suffix *-H* in Hebrew Biblical Texts,” *Hebrew Studies* 42 (2001): 225–242, esp. 238.

maintains that היררה reflects the author's reconfiguration of his *Vorlage* so as to more closely approximate the name of the החרון כפיר, the subject of this pesher. However, it is not clear how היררה would be more effective in this capacity than הריי.

We take ומענתו as a sing. fem. noun with sing. masc. poss. suffix, in contrast to the plural of MT and MurXII ומענתיו, and in agreement with the sing. suffix of היררה.⁵⁸ Some commentators have taken the pesher's ומענתו as morphologically equivalent to MT ומענתיו, but employing *plene* orthography for the noun itself, and defective orthography for the plural and the masc. suffix. See esp. Horgan, who points to 3–4 II,1 צירו, a defective pl. with masc. poss. suffix. However, that is an anomalous occurrence.⁵⁹

Doudna observes that there is no space dividing the two words על and כפיר in line 6 and he states that “this suggests that the כ was written secondarily.” However, the proximity of the words may be accounted for by normal variation in spacing. Doudna's observation that the smudged ׳ in כפיר represents a correction seems more on the mark.

line 7: [אשר] is probably to be restored at the beginning of the line, following the formulaic pesher identification at the end of line 6.⁶⁰

Following Horgan, we have left מוה[. . . without any restoration in the Hebrew and without translation in the English. The word has been restored as נק[מוה],⁶¹ or has been understood as complete in itself—meaning “death.”⁶² Both “death” and “revenge” are appropriate

⁵⁸ Cf. the sing. in LXX τὸ κατοικητήριον αὐτοῦ.

⁵⁹ Horgan's preference for reading a plural suffix is consistent with her contention that היררה is a scribal error for a masc. pl. She points to 1QpHab III,5 מוהשבתם, and III,10 בהמותם for defective fem. plurals, but those are more likely singular, collective nouns. MurXII ומענתיו, as well as נורחיו and ללבאחיו earlier in the column, feature defective “-ot” plural suffixes (though not necessarily feminine in gender in the latter two cases). However, unlike ומענתו, these examples include a *yod* in the poss. suffix.

⁶⁰ Cf. Dupont-Sommer.

⁶¹ Cf. Gaster, “venge[ance]”; he was followed by Allegro, Cook, Dupont-Sommer, Flusser, García-Martínez (and see “4QpNah y la Crucifixión: Nueva hipótesis de reconstrucción de 4Q169, 3–4, I,4–8,” *Estudios Bíblicos* 38 [1978–80] 230), Lohse, Moraldi, Tantlevskij (331), and Vermes. Dupont-Sommer refers to 1QpHab IX,2; CD III,18 for נקמוה with עשה. Josephus writes, concerning Jannaeus's crucifixion of his Pharisaic opponents (as described below, ch. 4), “this was the revenge he took for the injuries he had suffered (ὅτι ἐπὶ μὲν ὧν ἠδικητο ἀμυνόμενος; *Ant* 13 §381).

⁶² This had been Allegro's tentative translation in “Further Light” (with a question mark. Adapted to מוה [המשלה] by Leibel).

contextually, as “hanging men alive” is a vengeful means of putting people to death.⁶³ Yadin suggested restoring מוֹת [משפט, which is compatible with an understanding of this pesher as relating to Deut 21:22–23.⁶⁴

line 8: This is the most widely discussed, and disputed, line in 4QpNah. The underlying supposition in the voluminous literature is that the missing text at the beginning of this line expressed either approval or condemnation of some form of execution by hanging. The restoration of the beginning of the line is somewhat dependent upon the reading of the damaged text in the middle of the line. This is now nearly universally restored as **עַל הַעֵץ [יִקְרָא]**.⁶⁵ The reconstructions vary only in the degree of probability indicated for the poorly legible letters and in the tense and voice of **קָרָא**. The reading is contextually appropriate, but difficult to interpret decisively. It has been used to support both of the two prevalent restoration-types proposed for the beginning of this line:

1) . . . **אֲשֶׁר לֹא יַעֲשֶׂה כֵן בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל מִלְּפָנִים כִּי** . . .⁶⁶ The early consensus for such a restoration has not been sustained, despite its ardent defense by Joseph M. Baumgarten.⁶⁷ In the 1950’s and 60’s, the prevailing

⁶³ Maier treats this word as questionable, including both “revenge” and “death” in the body of his translation (“... Rachejakte/Tod”). Amusin also records both choices, noting that other restorations are possible as well.

⁶⁴ “Re-considered,” 11. See our excursus to ch. 5.

⁶⁵ Leibel had proposed **יִקְרָא** **בִּי לְחַלּוֹי הִי קָלְלָהּ יִקְרָא**, derived from Deut. 21:22–23 (*ibid.* So, Habermann and Hoenig, “Dorshé Halakot in the Pesher Nahum Scrolls,” *JBL* 83 [1964]: 133). In “4QpNah y la Crucifixión,” García-Martínez had suggested restoring **נִרְאָה** (228; 231–32).

⁶⁶ This was Allegro’s restoration in “Further Light,” translated as “[... which was never done (?) before.” He left the lacuna without restoration in DJD. Dupont-Sommer adapted Allegro’s early reading to **אֲשֶׁר לֹא יַעֲשֶׂה אִישׁ בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל**. (For Dupont-Sommer’s later position, see our next note). Rabin brings attention to the fact that Allegro’s restoration is a citation of IISam 13:12, **כִּי לֹא יַעֲשֶׂה כֵן בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל**, Tamar’s protest to Amnon about his sexual proposition (“Alexander Jannaeus and the Pharisees,” *JJS* 7 [1956], p. 10. See also, Carmignac and Dupont-Sommer). The usage in IISam itself is probably related to the language in Gen 34:7, in which the rape of Dinah is called “an abomination in Israel” and the assertion is made that such a thing “is not to be done.” Leibel’s **חֲרוּעְבָה**] derives from Deut 17:4 **וְחֲרוּעְבָה נַעֲשָׂה בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל** and Mal 2:11 **וְחֲרוּעְבָה נַעֲשָׂה בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל**. Cf. García-Martínez, [לְפַעֲוֹל חֲרוּעְבָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא יַעֲשֶׂה], “4QpNah y la Crucifixión,” 230, Rabin also had suggested “abomination” as a possible restoration, citing Deut 17:4, as well as the alternative, “he brought a curse upon Israel,” based on Deut 21:22.

⁶⁷ Cf. “Does TLH in the Temple Scroll Refer to Crucifixion?” in *Studies in Qumran Law* (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 172–82; “Hanging and Treason in Qumran and Roman Law,” *EI* 16 (1982): 7–16.

view was that the pesher condemned the Lion of Wrath for his unauthorized execution of his opponents.

2) . . . [כי כן המשפט] בישראל מלפנים כי . . . Based upon 11QT, Yadin argued for restoring some phrase with this sort of approbative meaning, both of Jannaeus and of crucifixion as a legitimate mode of execution.⁶⁸

More speculation on the restoration of this lacuna, and the punctuation, translation, and sense of this pesher interpretation, as well as the general question of “crucifixion” and 4QpNah, can be found below in the excursus to ch. 5. The text itself is best left without restoration.⁶⁹

In the citation of Nah 2:14, אֱלִי־כַה is restored as a variant to MT אֱלִיךְ, with a masc. suffix using full orthography to agree with the suffix of וּכְפִירִיכָה in line 9. So, too, [רֹבֶכְה] and [מְלֹאכִיכָה] below.

line 9: The estimated line length of 75–76 character units in this column is derived from this line. The reconstruction of [רֹבֶכְה] is very likely, in light of the re-citation of the word in the pesher interpretation in line 10.⁷⁰ The 2nd person masc. suffix in full orthography agrees with אֱלִי־כַה and וּכְפִירִיכָה. This is in contrast to MT רַכְבָּה (and MurXII רַכְבָּה) in which the 3rd person fem. is inconsistent with the 2nd person fem. of the other two words.⁷¹ The re-citation רֹבֶכְה

⁶⁸ “Re-considered,” p. 11. He restored כִּי זֶמֶן/כִּי הַתּוֹרָה/הַמִּשְׁפָּט. In his first, minimalist, transcription on p. 2, Yadin left the lacuna without restoration. Dupont-Sommer was persuaded by Yadin’s argument that 4QpNah be taken as maintaining the legality of the crucifixion. He changed his previous translation to: “sur le bois, ainsi que l’on faisait] en Israel des les temps anciens.” (In “Observations nouvelles sur l’expression ‘suspendu . . . ,’” 715). Yadin is followed by Cook, Tantlevskij (331) and Fitzmyer (“Crucifixion,” 502, בישראל מלפנים, כי כן נעשה).

⁶⁹ Thus, Allegro in DJD.

⁷⁰ In “Further Light,” Allegro transcribed רַכְבָּה but pointed to רֹבֶכְה in line 10 and its equivalent in LXX (πληθός σου). In DJD, he incorporated the variant into the transcription of the lemma, as most scholars have done.

⁷¹ Cathcart raises the possibility that the ה of MT was not intended to be a possessive suffix, but was rather an accusative ending, without *mappiq* (*Nahum in the Light of Northwest Semitic* [Rome: Biblical Institute, 1973]). Cf. the free-standing רַכְבָּה in Ezek 27:20, as noted by W. Maier, and our understanding of טַרְפָּה in the lemma in line 9 here. This would address the internal difficulty in MT. The readings of Targ רַחֲבִיכָךְ and Vg, “*quadrigas tuas*,” “your chariots,” agree semantically with MT, but syntactically with the proposed variant 2nd person suffix. Either “multitude”/“great ones” or “chariots” is appropriate to the context. The variation is easily accounted for by metathesis of graphically similar letters.

in the pesher interpretation supports the restoration in the lemma of a form of רוב rather than רכב.⁷²

The word טרפה in the pesher is best taken as a free-standing feminine abstract noun, “predation.” This is the way טרפה is usually understood in line 6 of the pesher, where it appears as a plus to the MT of Nah 2:13b. Most commentators however follow Habermann in viewing the ה in טרפה here in line 9 as a possessive suffix, in which the 2nd person fem. suffix of MT טרפך (and MurXII, LXX θήραν σου, Targ סהורתיך) is replaced with a 3rd person, apparently feminine, suffix. Strugnell supposes a deliberate harmonizing emendation. Allegro and Dupont-Sommer suggest that the ה is a masc. possessive suffix (cf. חירה, in line 6 above).⁷³ Doudna restores טרפ{כ}ה, proposing a “scribal error for what originally would have been intended in composition as a 2nd masc. sing. suffix, in agreement with 2nd masc. sing. forms of address in all four cases”: אלי[כה]; וכפיריכה; [מלאכיכה] (see pp. 151–54). The emendation seems unwarranted, since the text makes sense as it is.

The clearly masc. form of the suffix in the pesher’s וכפיריכה diverges from the vocalization of MT וכפיריך, which indicates a fem. 2nd person possessive suffix. This variant is the basis for the restorations of אלי[כה]; [רובכ]ה and [מלאכיכה] in the lemma. The pesher forms are best viewed as reflecting orthographic lengthening of consonantal MT, in a manner typical of “Qumran scribal practice.” This lengthening serves as a disambiguating device, since consonantal MT (and presumably the *Vorlage* of the pesher) can be taken as either masculine or feminine.⁷⁴

⁷² The argument that pesher tends to preserve multiple readings applies to incidental citations, or to applications of literary techniques, not to a direct re-citation of this sort. Re-citations will alter grammatical forms of a word to conform to pesher identifications, but do not change the actual root of the word as it appears in the lemma citation. Moreover, since the pesher equivalent of רובכה (i.e., חילו), is in 3rd person, the only explanation for the second person form in line 10 is that it is reproduced from the lemma.

Brooke lists this example within his category of variants resulting from “word-play,” which seems to indicate a deliberate variant in the pesher. However, Brooke is tentatively inclined to take the MT form as secondary, in light of the LXX (“Biblical Texts . . .,” 93). Without judging the primacy or preferable character of either reading, it does seem most likely that 4QpNah reflects a pre-existing textual variant rather than a novel exegetical one.

⁷³ See Young, “Observations,” 238.

⁷⁴ On the phenomenon generally, cf. Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 110; Qimron, *Hebrew*, 43. With respect to 4QpNah, see Horgan. In contrast, Strugnell claims that the

line 10: We follow Horgan in restoring [מלאכיכה], using the normal plural form along with the lengthened suffix, as a variant to the anomalous defective form of MT, MurXII מלאכיכה.⁷⁵ It is probably mere coincidence that the analog of this element in the pesher interpretation, the word צירו, features a defective pl. poss. suffix.⁷⁶

Following the completion of Nah 2:14, a vacat of app. 7 spaces is restored prior to the identifying formula פש[ר]. The restoration of this line was greatly facilitated by the joining of frag. 3 to frag. 4. Frag. 3 contains the initial letters of lines 9–12, including the beginning of line 10: וּלְאִי.⁷⁷

Allegro's reconstruction of אִשְׁר בִּירוּשָׁלַיִם is rather speculative. Even the reading of the final *mem* is difficult to justify on the basis of the photos.⁷⁸

For our כפירוי, Strugnell reads וּכפירוי. As the defective spelling would be rather odd, we have retained Allegro's *plene* spelling, supposing the י to have been damaged and its visibility to have been impaired by imprecise placement of the text's fragments in modernity.⁷⁹

masc. form reflects a deliberate, exegetically motivated harmonization by the author of the pesher. Cf. Timothy Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 107.

⁷⁵ Cf. Gesenius, §91; Cathcart, *Nahum*, on the odd form in MT. Consonantal MT is compatible with a masc. possessive, which the pesher seems to assume, in agreement with וּכפיריכה, and with our restoration of the other elements in this lemma, but it lacks the plural marker of the *yod* inserted by Horgan. In the pesher re-citation, this element is reflected as וּמלאכיו.

⁷⁶ The plural suffix of קולם, which has צירו as its head, demonstrates that צירו is plural. For additional examples of 3rd person masc. sing. suffixes written without the *yod*, see Qimron, *Grammar*, 91, 322.

⁷⁷ See Plate XII in DJD V. Prior to the join, instead of the citation and פש[ר], Allegro had simply ט[, preceded by a long lacuna ("Further Light," 91). Subsequent to the *editio princeps*, most scholars have incorporated the joined piece and continue the lemma into this line. The exceptions are Gaster and Vermes, who place Nah 2:14b "And the voice of your messengers . . ." at the end of this column. This is most likely a simple error, though it may reflect a rejection of the join.

⁷⁸ In "Further Light" Allegro had not ventured any reconstruction, and read a doubtful *vav* after the closing bracket as we do, rather than a final *mem*. His later restoration of "Jerusalem" has not been universally adopted, but it has been well-received, and is even incorporated in J.H. Charlesworth's *Graphic Concordance*, as אִשְׁר בִּירוּשָׁלַיִם. Doudna is quite emphatic about identifying the letter as a *vav* rather than a *mem* (139; 155–156). This proposed *vav* has been explained as a 3rd person sing. masc. poss. suffix (by Habermann; Gaster) or as a 3rd person pl. passive verb ending (by Doudna, 156–160).

⁷⁹ The location of the proposed *yod* is at a join. It is difficult to be sure whether the letter ever existed here or how well the traces of the imperfectly aligned letter or letters can accommodate it. Parts of lines 10–11 were inserted after PAM 41.581

line 11: The text in the first lacuna is not retrievable.⁸⁰

Our transcription of הָרֹחַן follows the conventional reading of this poorly preserved word, first proposed by Allegro on the basis of 1QpHab IX,4–6:⁸¹

פּשְׁרוֹ עַל כּוֹהֵנֵי יְרוּשָׁלַיִם הַחֲחֻרָנִים אֲשֶׁר יִקְבְּצוּ הוּן וּבִצְעַ מִשְׁלַל הָעַמִּים
וְלֵאחֲרָיִת הַיּוֹמִים יִתֵּן הוֹנֵם עִם שְׁלָלָם בִּיד הַיָּל הַכְּתוּבִים

Allegro reconstructs the following phrase, on the same basis, as אֲשֶׁר קָבְצוּ כוֹהֵנֵי יְרוּשָׁלַיִם.⁸²

line 12: We follow the conventional restoration of [י]תְּנוּהוּ, but the verb may have been in the perfect, נִתְּנוּהוּ, following upon קָבְצוּ in the previous line. Carmignac observes that the subsequent lacuna is likely to have provided temporal or causal information, blaming the defeat upon the sins of Ephraim.⁸³ The restoration of the א of Ephraim is universally accepted.

was taken; the extant part of this word is on at least 3 visibly separate pieces of leather. Doudna (139) maintains that PAM 41.581 offers clear evidence that the word contains no *yod*.

It has sometimes been suggested that וּכְפִירִיךְ in MT be emended to וּכְפִירִיךְ, meaning villages, but see Cathcart, *Nahum*. Strugnell does not indicate whether he takes the word as indicating “villages” or “young lions.” Horgan accepts his defective reading but renders “young lions,” which is certainly the correct translation, regardless of the orthography. In line 9, the word in the lemma is clearly וּכְפִירִיךְ, with the *yod*.

⁸⁰ Horgan offers some plausible, but speculative, restorations by transporting additional lexical associations from other pesharim.

⁸¹ Carmignac objects that the word הָרֹחַן is one letter too short for the traces. However, Horgan is probably accurate in her surmise that a fissure causes the letters to appear more distant from each other than they originally were.

⁸² Dupont-Sommer (57, 69–70) rejects the “ligature of the ך and י” in Allegro’s reconstruction, though his objection is not really grounded in the legibility of the traces. He restores אֲשֶׁר קָבְצוּ בְּהוֹכֵל יְרוּשָׁלַיִם primarily because he wishes the subject of the peshar here to be only Jannaeus, to the exclusion of Aristobulus and Hyrcanus. (Cf. ch. 6). Carmignac remarks in his notes that the trace seems more like a ל, but Strugnell points to the ligature in הַגְּנִי in line 10 of 3–4 II in support of Allegro’s reading.

⁸³ Writing before the join of frag. 3, and the placement of [י]תְּנוּהוּ עַן at the beginning of this line, Dupont-Sommer had offered the following reconstruction אֲשֶׁר נָתַן בְּיַד הַיָּל הַכְּתוּבִים . . . וְנִם בְּעוֹן אֲפְרַיִם יִתֵּן יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר [י]תְּנוּהוּ עַן לַיָּד >חֵיל כְּתוּבִים. Doudna reconstructs אֲשֶׁר [י]תְּנוּהוּ עַן לַיָּד which he renders as “which [they will give in[to the hand of the <army of the Kittim.” However, in the sources cited by Doudna to support his reconstruction, אֲשֶׁר לַיָּד indicates that an object is placed “in trust of” an intermediary, rather than being given over directly to a recipient. The peshar may in fact have described the priests of Jerusalem as having unsuccessfully given their treasure “into the hand” of some agent for safekeeping. There is simply insufficient evidence for restoration.

Allegro's preliminary publication included a fragment with "[ט]" at the end of line 12, but, in his subsequent personal notes, he observed that the fragment was improperly placed.⁸⁴ Allegro did not include the fragment at all in DJD V, but Carmignac moved the fragment to III,12, and read it as part of the lemma there.⁸⁵ In place of the earlier fragment, frag. 4 now includes a small piece of leather that supplies the lower portion of the ש and ך of the word ישראל, but is mostly uninscribed.

ישראל is the final legible word in line 12, but Allegro's restoration of a subsequent ל is quite certain. The *lamed* is to be taken as a prepositional prefix.⁸⁶ Photos of line 12, particularly a magnified copy supplied to me by the IAA, show some peeling of the extant leather following the *lamed*, where it is clear that the writing has flaked off. However, some of the remaining leather seems not to have been inscribed at all. There seems to be a vacat of at least 7 spaces at the end of this line.⁸⁷ This poses a problem, since the first line of the next column is a pesher interpretation of part of the lemma that was restored in line 10 of this unit. We would thus expect the pesher interpretation of unit 10 to run continuously from line 10 through line 12 of this column, and onto the next column. It is difficult to account for the gap at the end of line 12, in the middle of this pesher interpretation.⁸⁸

⁸⁴ Cf. "Further Light," Plate I, and PAM 41.801 and 41.943, taken in 1956.

⁸⁵ P. 89, n. 25; p. 91, n. 11.

⁸⁶ Dupont-Sommer proposed, for example, [ל]הרב or [ל]עריצי נואים; Doudna's [ל]שלל is a variation on Haberman's [ל]בוזים.

⁸⁷ This vacat would start from the point below the ך of ירושלים in line 11 where blank leather is preserved; the leather at the point below the ך and ך has mostly flaked off.

⁸⁸ Doudna (450–453) develops a complex explanation for this vacat, speculating about a scribal history that involved the incorporation of interlinear additions from an earlier manuscript of Pesher Nahum through homoioteleuton between שמע ולא of Nah 2:14, and לא ימוש of 3:1. Although his explanation is not persuasive, his observation about the vacat is astute (161–162). Doudna points out that the lemma of unit 10 is comprised of an introductory phrase followed by 4 phrases of "imprecation," and that the fourth phrase seems to be set off from the other three in both the lemma and the pesher interpretation. Line 9 ends with the word טרפה, a number of spaces before the margin, essentially creating a vacat between the word טרפה and the continuation of the lemma at the beginning of line 10 (restored as ולא שמע עוד קול מלאכיכה). Thus, והבערת עשן רובכ,ה stands with תאכל חרב וכפיריכה תאכל חרב, but is set apart from מלאכיכה קול מלאכיכה and ולא שמע עוד קול מלאכיכה. This same division is evident in the pesher interpretation. The vacat in line 12 separates the interpretation of the first three phrases from the interpretation of

2.2.3 *Frag 3–4 II*

Column II of frags 3–4 is in very good condition. The average line length between vertical side rulings is 74 characters, as evidenced in the fully preserved lines 5 and 6. (Some letters extend beyond the left rule in lines 4–6). Most of the 12 lines of text are intact, though there is some damage at the bottom of the column. Approximately .5 cm of leather is missing near the beginning of lines 8–11. Only the right-hand third of line 12 remains, so that most of the pesher interpretation in unit 14 has been lost. Also, two triangular areas of text are missing on the left side of this column, affecting lines 1–3 and lines 7–11.

line 2: In the pesher interpretation to Nah 3:1, Allegro's restoration of בכהש ושקר[ים י] תהלכו has been widely accepted and is very likely correct.

line 3: דהר should be read as a participle, in accordance with MT of Nah 3:2, despite the objections of Strugnell. Strugnell remarks that although the word is written in the same manner as in MT, vocalization in accordance with MT produces the only defectively written participle in the pesher. He thus suggests vocalizing the word as a variant (presumably in perfect tense). Compare the other active *gal* participles preserved in the text: רואיך, דורשי, טורף, יושבי, נוע[ר]. However, the participial reading is best suited to our understanding of the lemma, in which all the elements up until וכבוד פנר are governed by לא ימוש. All of the things that “will not cease” are described in present tense, or rather as frozen in a still-frame image, as indicated by the participles מרקדה and מעלה and by all the free-standing nouns. דהר should be no exception to the list. For other cases of unexpected defective orthography in the text, see frags 1–2, line 5, לבנן, explained above as a probable scribal error, and possibly ומעונה in 3–4 I,6.

line 7: We read a conjunctive *vav* in ובעלה, as a variant to MT בעלה, in Nah 3:4. The leather is damaged just at the point of the ו. A

ולא ישמע עוד קול מלאכיכה, which begins in line 1 of col. II with the identification formula ומלאכיו הם צידו. If the spaces at the end of line 9 and line 12 are taken as deliberate vacats, then 4QpNah has physically separated this fourth phrase from the previous three, in both the lemma and the pesher interpretation.

very distinct, though very small, trace of ink is discernible just prior to the כ of this word, at the upper right.⁸⁹

We take הממכרה as a *pi'el* variant to the *qal* המכרה of MT. Although מכר is unattested in the *pi'el* elsewhere in BH or QH, Qimron notes that the root appears exclusively in the *pi'el* in the Samaritan biblical tradition.⁹⁰ On contextual grounds independent of this Qumran variant, scholars have proposed various emendations of MT.⁹¹ The most widely accepted emendations view the form in MT as arising from a metathesis of the root כמר, “to entrap.” Schiffman believes that the pesher interprets the word in this manner, with “misleading” (יחער) in line 8 reflecting the sense of “ensnares.” This would seem to require הכמרה or המכמרה, rather than the הממכרה of the lemma. Such a discrepancy between the citation and the pesher interpretation could be accounted for by (1) scribal error in the lemma, (2) reliance upon an alternate text for the interpretation or (3) the exegetical transposition of letters from the cited text for creation of the interpretation.

The word that we read as בנותה is poorly legible. Strugnell accounts for the smudge by positing a scribal modification of the word to בוננה. The latter is closer to MT בונניה, but the masc. sing. is not attested in BH. The forms attested in MT are the fem. sing. נונה and the masc. pl. זנונים. Cf. Qimron, *Hebrew*, 66, on the abstract noun form זנונה found at Qumran.

line 8: There is a space the length of 3–4 characters between the words אפרים and אשר, which may be an intentional vacat, but is more plausibly accounted for by ordinary variation in spacing. Such a separation between the initial pesher identification and the expanded relative clause does not appear elsewhere in the composition. In rejecting Strugnell’s addition of a *vav* prior to בעלה in line 7, Horgan (183) maintains that deviations in spaces between words are to be expected, and points to this space between Ephraim and אשר as being unusually large, but within normal range.

⁸⁹ Strugnell does not perceive any trace of the letter, but he points to LXX and Peshitta in favor of restoring the variant. However, the presence or absence of conjunctions, especially in translation, is of little textual significance.

⁹⁰ *Hebrew*, 49. Earlier scholars presumed a scribal error (cf. Weiss, Horgan).

⁹¹ Cf. Mitchell Dahood, “Causal *Beth* and the Root NKR in Nahum 3,4,” *Biblica* 52 (1971): 395–96; Cathcart, *Nahum*, relating the word to נכר.

line 9: Allegro's reading of מלכיים is consistent with the suffixes of the other nouns in the series. Strugnell suggested [מלכיה] instead.⁹²

Rather than our גר נלוה, following Allegro, Strugnell maintains that the text reads גר נלום, but this is unlikely.⁹³

Allegro's restoration of גר נלום ומושלים has been widely adopted. "Notables" appears in unit 21 of 4QpNah, at 3-4 IV,2-4; נכבריה in the lemma is represented by נכבריו in the pesher.

line 10: The length of the lacuna at the beginning of the line allows for 1-2 average letters. The preferred restoration is [מז]עם or [בז]עם, based upon Hos 7:16, in which princes are felled by the sword due to the "cursing" of their tongues, מזעם לשונם (cf. HALOT).⁹⁴

Note, with Licht, that the Tetragrammaton in this line appears in ordinary Aramaic script, rather than in paleo-Hebrew.

Line 10 is cut off after the word ונליה which we read, with Allegro, as a 2nd person verb, variant to the 1st person in MT ונליחי in Nah 3:5.⁹⁵ Although the word is at the end of the line, enough un-inscribed leather is preserved following the ה to confirm the 2nd person ending. Compare והרא[ת] in the continuation of the lemma in line 11. Brooke views the variation in the suffixes in this verse as a reflection of the different applications of the verbs in the pesher. He suggests that the 2nd person was employed in order to strengthen the sense of culpability on the part of the accused sinners, as compared to the 1st person of והשלכתי, with God as the subject meting out punishment (rather than Allegro's והראת).

⁹² Strugnell's inclination toward the possessive suffix was motivated primarily by his reading of נלום later in the line. Horgan was swayed to his view by the appearance of the traces. However, Doudna prefers Allegro's reading on that same basis, as well as for the sake of consistency among the suffixes of the nouns (171, 177).

⁹³ Strugnell describes his proposed reading as a 3rd person pl. masc. poss. suffix attached to the single masc. *niphal* participle. The addition of a suffix to a *niphal* participle is awkward. Moreover, the traces of this letter seem to better accommodate a ה than a ם (though the apparent discontinuity in the top of the letter may simply reflect some loss of ink at the damaged spot). Lastly, Strugnell's reading would introduce an incongruously suffixed noun into a string of unattributed nouns.

⁹⁴ Licht had already transcribed [בז]עם, though Strugnell credits only Dupont-Sommer for the restoration of [מז]עם. See also, Amusin, ("fierce language"), Cook ("arrog[ant] talk"), Horgan ("[inso]lent speech"), J. Maier ("Ver[wüns]chung" [curse]).

Allegro's [מז]עם לשונם uses מעם as a causal preposition. He translates, "because of what they say." However, the sense of מעם is always spatial ("from"), even when it is used figuratively, so that עם maintains its base sense of "with."

⁹⁵ Both the MT and pesher forms are *pi'el*, *pace* Horgan.

line 11: Since the text is damaged just after the ה, the reading of]ה[והרס]ת[can not be determined by the physical evidence. It is probably best taken as a 2nd person verb, in agreement with נליה in the previous clause of the lemma at the end of line 10. Alternatively, it could be restored as והרס]ת[in accordance with the 1st person ending in MT and MurXII, and in agreement with והשלכתי in the next lemma.⁹⁶ In either case, it is advisable to restore a medial *yod*, with Horgan, as is expected for the *hiphil* form.

We restore נויים in the lemma in accordance with the spelling in MT, as this is the spelling that is used for this word throughout 4QpNah (despite the fact that the lacuna could accommodate an additional ׳ and possibly even an additional א, as is common in 1QpHab).

Under the erasure in this line, following the word וממלכות, Strugnell detects the letters נ,ל,ה and suggests that the erased error may have been the word גדולות, perhaps influenced by Jer 28:8, ועל ממלכות, גדולות גדולות.

Perhaps פשרו ע[ל] should be restored as פשרו ע[ל].

Allegro recorded an uncertain ה towards the end of the line, where we have recorded illegible traces.

line 12: For ערי המזרח . . . Allegro's translation of "cities of the east" is very plausible.⁹⁷ Dupont-Sommer, quite reasonably, restores והרס at the end of this line, to precede הניים at the beginning of the next column, in keeping with the words of the lemma. ורס would also be appropriate.

2.2.4 *Frgs 3–4 III*

Col. III of frags 3–4 is another fairly well-preserved column, but the state of the text progressively declines towards the bottom of the column. Fortunately, the worst lines are the last two, in which much of the lost text is biblical citation that can be restored on the basis

⁹⁶ The resultant lack of agreement between והרס]ת[and נליה could be accounted for by scribal error (in either of the words) or as a deliberate exegetical modification.

⁹⁷ Carmignac proposed that, rather than representing the complete word, "cities," these letters may comprise the remnant of a longer word, such as שערי "gates of." He points to Neh 3:29 for eastern gates (cf. Neh 3:26; 12:37). However, there is no apparent relevance to gates in the pesher.

of MT.⁹⁸ Average line length is approximately 13 cm between vertical rulings. From lines 3–5, it can be determined that this column has approximately 65–70 characters per line. Line 3 has 64 characters and ends about 3 spaces before the rule marking, and line 4 has 65 characters and ends in the same place. Lines 1–6 all stop before the rule line.⁹⁹

line 1: Dupont-Sommer's restoration of בנורחם has been widely accepted.¹⁰⁰ The restoration of [ובש] קוצי proceeds naturally from תם[בנ]ר, and anticipates the word שקוצים in the next lemma.¹⁰¹

line 2: The pesher's כאורה has been viewed as a metathesis of MT כרא in Nah 3:6. This could reflect variant orthography, scribal error, or deliberate exegesis of the difficult *hapax* in MT.¹⁰² The word

⁹⁸ Much of the leather is cracked in this column. A hole in the upper margin on the right-hand side affects about 1 cm of line 1. A square hole, approximately 1 cm square, in the middle of line 8 fortunately appears in a vacat, so that no text is affected. Much of the lower left side of this column has not survived, affecting primarily lines 8–12.

⁹⁹ Dupont-Sommer measures the lines at 13.5 cm. So too, Doudna (*4Q Pesher Nahum*, 23). Perhaps this figure reflects an adjustment of the physical measurement of the column in photo 43.350 in order to allow for the shrinkage that is evident in the left-hand portion of the leather.

¹⁰⁰ Allegro's restoration of בנורחם, which he translated as "between them," was followed by early scholars. Strugnell remarks that Allegro's reading would be better translated as "their daughters," referring to suburbs of the cities. Dupont-Sommer rejects the likelihood of a defective writing of the preposition בן at Qumran. Cp. בנורחם in 3–4 II,5.

¹⁰¹ Strugnell attributes the restoration to Dupont-Sommer. In fact, Dupont-Sommer restored קוצי [ש] with no conjunction or preposition, in accordance with Allegro, but he described the syntax as a "double accusative," seeming to take the latter phrase in apposition to the former. He translates, ("qu'ils monteront] aux nations avec leurs souillure, leurs abominable [or]dures.")

The prefixed *vav* and *bet* appear in Horgan's restoration (and in Amusin's earlier Russian edition, as noted by Doudna).

¹⁰² Weiss points out that ראי (= רעי) is used in rabbinic writings to denote excrement, or dirt, and observes that medieval commentators relate MT here to excrement (Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Radak). In contrast, LXX παράδειγμα (followed by Vulg: exemplum) seems to represent an attempt to associate ראי with the root ראה. Weiss sees the influence of the surrounding verses of Nahum at work in this attempt (היה כול רואיך; והראת נים מערך). He suggests that Nahum deliberately chose the rare word ראי as a play on these words.

Brooke (93) detects a deliberate metathesis in the pesher to emphasize the "overtones of indecency" in the context of Nah 3:5–6. However, Brooke's description focuses upon the suitability of the emendation within Nahum itself. This does not sufficiently support his case that the change was introduced by the author of the pesher.

appears to be a passive *qal* participle of כָּאֵר, a weakened form of כֶּעַר meaning “repulsive,” “ugly.”¹⁰³ The active verb וּכְאָרוּם, presumably a *pi’el*, appears in the peshet interpretation in line 4.

Note that line 2 breaks off abruptly with the conclusion of the lemma, leaving blank space for the remainder of the line, over half the total line-length.

line 4: The restoration of וּבִה[נ] לֹוֹת, originally suggested by Licht, is now the standard reading.¹⁰⁴

line 5: Some text has been lost between the words עַל and יִשְׂרָאֵל toward the end of this line (as indicated in our transcription, (עַל [. . .] יִשְׂרָאֵל).¹⁰⁵ Specific attempts at restoration have included Licht’s עַל [בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל];¹⁰⁶ Strugnell’s עַל [כֹּל יִשְׂרָאֵל] (and, his additional alternative, [בְּנִי]); Doudna’s עַל [אֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל].¹⁰⁷

line 6: For our שׁוֹרְדָה, a *plene* orthographic variant from MT, MurXII שׁוֹרְדָה in Nah 3:7, Brooke (96) has proposed reading שׁוֹרְדָה (“escaped/abandoned”), with a *dalet/resh* interchange. This is exegetically interesting, but unwarranted.

¹⁰³ Allegro offers the connection with כֶּעַר hesitantly, with a question mark. See Jastrow, *s.v.* כָּאֵר for the interchange of כָּאֵר and כֶּעַר in rabbinic sources and note Targ מכֶּעַר here in Nah. Cf. Weiss, esp. “כְּאָרוּה”; Maier; Qimron, *Grammar*, 297.

¹⁰⁴ Allegro omitted a middle letter entirely in “More Unpublished Pieces.” He transcribed only וּבִהֹוֹת כְּבוֹד יְהוּדָה which he translated as “and the ruin of Judah’s glory.” The necessity for restoring a letter is clear from the crack in the leather, and the fact that the ך at the same spot in the line above is missing its top line. In DJD, Allegro adopted the reconstruction of וּבִה[נ] לֹוֹת which he attributed to Kuhn (“Reconstruction suggested privately by Kuhn,” p. 41). In fact, the restoration had actually been put forth by Licht and had appeared in Dupont-Sommer’s transcription as well (with the ך marked as poorly legible rather than restored).

¹⁰⁵ Allegro read simply עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל, without indicating the loss of any text. However, the space is rather wide even as it appears in the photos, and it must be assumed to have been even wider originally. Damage to the leather has obliterated parts of letters in the corresponding sections of the previous two lines.

¹⁰⁶ So, Maier, Nachtrag, “Weitere Stücke,” 250. In 1995, Maier transcribed instead עַל [עָ] [יִשְׂרָאֵל (?)].

¹⁰⁷ The parallel with מְנַשָּׁה עַל הַגְּלוּיִם in line 1 of the next column, and 1QS V,6 וְהַגְּלוּיִם עֲלֵיהֶם; CD IV,3 וְהַגְּלוּיִם עֲמָהֶם offer support for a restoration that is indicative of a Community. Biblical sources cited by Doudna (198–199) employ the Tetragrammaton as the object of *niphal* עַל אֵל/לֹוֹת, offering further support for his restoration (with the pious substitution of the appellation אֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל for the Tetragrammaton). From the perspective of the Qumran Community, attaching oneself to (the true) “Israel” would mean the same thing as attaching oneself to God, though the literary and exegetical treatment would vary according to the specific word.

Strugnell is probably correct in observing that the word לך in the phrase מִאֵין אֲבָקְשָׁה מִנְהַמִּים לְךָ bears evidence of having been modified from an original לָהּ. The 3rd person variant is equivalent to the harmonizing readings of LXX αὐτῆν and a number of medieval biblical Hebrew manuscripts. Although the trace of the erased left leg of a ה is faint and on a crack in the leather, it is detectable. Also, the right leg of the ה is discernible as is the thicker upper portion of the vertical portion of the ה.

Allegro's restoration of the introductory formula [על] פֶּשֶׁרוֹ at the end of this line is very probably correct. Doudna (192) observes that the formula [הם] פֶּשֶׁרוֹ is also possible.

line 7: Allegro restores the definite article in the lacuna between קְהָל and לַחֲעוֹת, yielding לַחֲעוֹת [הַ] קְהָל. The word קְהָל appears frequently in the Bible without the article, in the sense of “a large population,” or “the public,” but the spacing may be better with the added letter. The use of the definite article would be smoother with the word אֶס, and Horgan adds this particle as well, though admitting that the space is not very accommodating of her reading.

In the word prior to לַחֲעוֹת, which is universally read as עוֹד, Doudna is troubled by the middle letter, which he identifies as a י (200–1). His suggestion that עוֹד is a correction of a mistakenly written עֵיר does not seem warranted. The partly damaged middle letter is an entirely acceptable ו, and the final letter seems like an original ד.

Allegro's וּפְתֵי אֵיִם at the end of the line is certainly correct. The פְּתֵיִם of Ephraim appear alongside the קְהָל in the previous pesher as well.

line 8: In the citation of Nah 3:8, Strugnell followed Allegro in reading הַחֲוִטִּיבִי, but identified the visible smudge by the middle *yod* as a deliberate erasure, suggesting that this is evidence of a correction toward agreement with MT הַחֲוִטִּיבִי. Lohse described the variant as a scribal error. Brownlee, and now Doudna, read the word as הַחֲוִטִּיבִי, which Brownlee saw as an Aramaicism. The uncertain letter does extend down, even beyond the other letters of the word, but there is wide range in the appearances of *vavs* and *yods* in 4QpNah.

line 9: The final letter of מִנֵּי אֶמּוֹן in מִנֵּי אֶמּוֹן has been identified as either a *yod* or a *vav*. The reading מִנֵּי would reflect a simple orthographic variant for MT מִנֵּי, in which “נֵי” is clearly part of the place name

“No-Amon.” It seems preferable to read מני, as a lengthened poetic form of the preposition מן: “than Am[on].”¹⁰⁸ Note that the pesher interpretation refers simply to אַמון (rather than No-Amon, as noted by Weiss; Cf. Jer 46:25, אַמון). In 4Q385 6 II,4 אַמון (מנא/מנא) is paraphrased as מני/מנא (מנא/מנא), interpreting (מני/מנא) as “portion,” and thus not at all as part of the place name No-Amon.¹⁰⁹

We restore [היושבה] as a *plene* variant from the defective MT הַיִּשְׁבָּה.¹¹⁰ Similarly, we follow Allegro in inserting a *vav* in the small space in the middle of the word גַּד[וּן] לִי, yielding full orthography. A very distinct white mark in the photos seems to indicate that there is a piece of leather from which the topmost layer has peeled off.

For נַכְבְּדֵי הַיָּם [אֵת . . .] אֵת מִן[נְשָׂה], suggested restorations have included Dupont-Sommer’s אֵת מִן[נְשָׂה] יָם אֵת [הָאָרֶץ הַסּוֹבֵב] יָם אֵת;¹¹¹ נַכְבְּדֵי הַיָּם [הָאָרֶץ הַסּוֹבֵב] יָם אֵת מִן[נְשָׂה];¹¹² and Horgan’s אֵת מִן[נְשָׂה] יָם אֵת [הָעִיר הַמְּחֻקָּת] יָם אֵת.

It is difficult to determine the exact nature of the difference between 4QpNah וּמֵיָם and MT מֵיָם. MT is vocalized as מֵיָם “from (or of) the sea,” but the consonants would also make sense as מַיָּם (water). 4QpNah may reflect either of these, with the addition of the conjunctive *vav*.¹¹³ יָם as sea and מַיָּם as water are nearly synonymous, but the syntax would necessarily vary according to the lexical choice.

We read הַיָּמֹתִיהָ, as a plural in both the noun itself and the possessive suffix, rather than the sing. of MT הַיָּמֹתָהּ.¹¹⁴ (Cf. LXX τὰ

¹⁰⁸ Thus, Allegro. Carmignac, however, explained מני as a corruption of the place name (“Ni-Amon”), rather than a preposition.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Dimant, “A Quotation from Nahum 3:8–10,” 31–37; and Kister, “A Common Heritage,” 107–8. Cf. LXX ἐτοίμασαι μερίδα Ἀμων, apparently reflecting a similar Vorlage to 4Q385, with possible metathesis of הַיָּכִין/הַיָּכִין.

¹¹⁰ Thus, Licht. Spacing and letter size are sufficiently variable to preclude responsible conjecture on the presence or lack of a single letter, especially a thin letter such as a *vav* in the midst of missing text. The suggestion is based on the assumption of generally fuller orthography in 4QpNah, especially in participles (though see our note on דָּהַר in 3–4 II,3.)

¹¹¹ He cites Isa 23:8 for נַכְבְּדֵי הָאָרֶץ. For the end of the restoration, he also offers the alternative, הַסּוֹבֵב יָם אֵת מִן[נְשָׂה].

¹¹² Attributed by Strugnell to Dupont-Sommer.

¹¹³ Cf. LXX καὶ ὕδατος, Peshitta, Vg. These seem to reflect a text like 4QpNah (cf. Allegro, Strugnell. Targ. reads מִי יָמָא). The duplication is lacking entirely in MurXII, which reads מֵיָם הַיָּמֹתָהּ. (Cf. Spronk).

¹¹⁴ Cp. Allegro’s הַיָּמֹתִיהָ. Horgan transcribes הַיָּמֹתִיהָ, stating that “the first *w* has been obliterated, perhaps deliberately erased.” It seems more likely that the *vav* has simply been damaged; a very small trace of ink appears to remain of its bottom point. Maier reads the word as הַיָּמֹתָהּ, which he describes as a singular noun, differing from MT in substituting הַיָּמֹתָהּ for הַיָּמֹתִיהָ; he discerns the same morphological phenomenon in IV,2 עוֹלֹלִיהָ.

τείχῃ αὐτῆς). Either one is grammatically appropriate. עוצמה may be an orthographic variant from MT עֲצֻמָה in Nah 3:9, if it is taken as a *pu'al* verb, meaning, “she was mighty.” Alternatively, עוצמה may be a *qutl* noun with a fem. possessive suffix, “her might,” like the Peshitta and LXX (ἰσχυρὸς αὐτῆς).¹¹⁵

line 11: Licht’s restoration of [ח] ילה נבורי [מ] לחמה is certainly correct.

Allegro points out that between [מ] לחמה and כוש, there is an ע that is legible despite erasure. The word following כוש is עוצמה, which begins with an ע. Presumably, the scribe had begun to write עוצמה, skipping the word כוש, but caught himself after the first letter, and started over.¹¹⁶

Horgan restores the final word in this line as [קץ] instead of MT קצה, in light of this variant in 3–4 II,4.

The introductory formula פשרו will have followed the lemma. The formula, and the beginning of the peshet identification may have begun in this line (as noted by Doudna) rather than in line 12.

line 12: The beginning of this line is impossible to restore. The end of the line contains the citation of Nah 3:9a. This was already restored by Allegro, without any physical basis, since the peshet to the verse begins in line 1 of the following column, col. IV. Carmignac went one step further, placing a fragment containing a few letters at this juncture, as part of the lemma. This fragment is the one that Allegro read as ט [], and had misplaced at the end of line 12 of 3–4, I in his preliminary publication, but eliminated in DJD V. Carmignac moved the fragment to line 12 of col. III, reading the traces as וט [which he restored as part of Nah 3:9a, וט [לובים, with the variant addition of an article before “Lubim” as compared to MT לובים.

The final word in this line, has been restored in accordance with MT בעורתך, but 4QpNah might have featured a variant 3rd person suffix instead, בעורתה.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁵ Thus, Allegro. In fact, MT itself, even without a *mappiq* in the *heh*, might be taken as a noun with a feminine suffix. Cf. Spronk, 130.

¹¹⁶ See our similar suggestion in 3–4 II,11, where, however, the traces of the erased letters are harder to decipher.

¹¹⁷ Thus, LXX αὐτῆς. Cf. Horgan. Spronk expresses a preference for the third person suffix as the original reading in Nahum itself. (So, *NJPS*).

2.2.5 *Frgs 3–4 IV*

It may be presumed that col. IV, like the previous columns, originally consisted of 12 lines, but it has not survived in very good condition. The column has been preserved along a diagonal, so that the amount of text extant on the left-hand side decreases with line number. The text breaks off entirely after line 9, with only a trace of the first letter of line 10 remaining. The restoration of line 2 enables an estimate of the original line length as approximately 67 characters.¹¹⁸

line 1: For רשע[] ה[ה], Allegro restores רשע[י חיל] ה. His restoration of the first word has been widely accepted,¹¹⁹ but the restoration of the second word has been more varied. Gaster hesitantly suggested רשע[י חיל] ה. Horgan points out the parallel to רשעי אפרים (partially restored) in line 5, and restores רשע[י מנש] ה.

line 2: In the citation of Nah 3:10, we have accepted Allegro's reading of עוליה as a morphological variant from MT עלליה (and 4Q385 6 II,8 [עלליה]) rather than Dupont-Sommer's reading of עוליה as a doubly *plene* orthographic variant from MT. The initial vowel is also unclear in 1QH XV,21 עילול/עולול and 1QIsa^a 11:23 (= Isa 13:16) ועיליהמה/ועוליהמה, and it has been disputed in the pesher interpretation to our lemma in line 4. Doudna is persuasive concerning the orthographic necessity of reading a *yod* in the pesher interpretation. Qimron favors reading a *yod* in all of the disputed cases.¹²¹ (MurXII is recorded by Milik as עלליה, but it is not actually legible).

¹¹⁸ This is a somewhat rough estimate, as both נדוליה and רותקו may have been *plene* or defective; רותקו may have been either perfect (like הלכה) or imperfect (like יורו, יורו, יורו); also, the scribe may have allowed this line to extend beyond the margin in an attempt to complete the lemma on this line.

¹¹⁹ However, see Dupont-Sommer's רשע[י מנש] ה, accepted by Flusser, and explicitly rejected by Strugnell. The juxtaposition is counted to usual conceptions of Manasseh at Qumran.

¹²⁰ So, García-Martínez; Jerome Murphy O'Connor, "The Essenes and Their History," *RB* 81 (1974): 240; Vermes; Richard T. White, "The House of Peleg in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History*. (ed., Philip R. Davies and Richard T. White; Sheffield: JSOT, 1990), 80. Murphy O'Connor points to CD XX 26–27 רשעי יהודה, citing Stegemann, *Die Entstehung*, 92–93.

¹²¹ "ההבחנה בין זה לירד" 52 בית מקרא (1973): 110. Edward Yecheskel Kutscher indicates that both עילול/עולול are valid forms, though he himself reads ועיליהמה in 1QIsa^a (*The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a)*) [Leiden: Brill, 1974], 381).

At the end of this line, Strugnell proposed the restoration of ירותקו instead of MT ירותקו, in agreement with the imperfect ירוטשו and יורו.¹²²

line 3: The supralinear *vav* in פשרו corrects an accidental omission of that letter in the introductory formula.¹²³

Allegro's restoration of בישׁ[ראל] at the end of this line is attractive. Gaster had proposed "at [the hand of]" ([בי]דין).

line 4: Following upon the dilemma in the lemma in line 2, scholars have disagreed about whether to read ע'לוליו or ע'לוליו in the pesher interpretation. Doudna's description (218) of the disputed letter's "huge 'triangle' head" (*italics* in original) highlights the paleographic necessity to read a *yod*.

Allegro's reading of]בחרב[has been universally accepted. Carmignac and Dupont-Sommer proposed restoring]יפולו[. Horgan supplied יוברו. A term of destruction is clearly required. There is likely to have been a vacat prior to the citation of Nah 3:11a at the end of the line.

line 5: Allegro's]א[פרים] רשעי is certainly correct.

line 6: The damaged text in the middle of the line is not retrievable. At the end of the line,]... נם אה תבקשי, the beginning of Nah 3:11b, is restored. The lemma continues in line 7.

line 7: Following the citation of Nah 3:11, the pesher formula ל[פשרו]ע is restored in accordance with the visible letters.

line 8: Because of the general tendency of 4QpNah to full orthography, we restore כול, *plene*, in line 8, as a variant to MT כל in Nah

¹²² Strugnell described the proposed variant as according with LXX δεθήσονται. However, note, with Spronk, that the perfect form would still imply an action that is simultaneous with the other imperfect verbs, so that LXX may reflect not a textual variant, but merely a contextually appropriate translation.

¹²³ Doudna relates this scribal error to the fact that this is the only place in 4QpNah where there is definitely no vacat between the lemma and the subsequent pesher formula. This is an interesting observation, but it is worth noting that the space prior to the word פשרי is actually a bit larger than that between other words in the vicinity. It is comparable to the space before the pesher formula in the next unit, at 3-4 IV,7, which Doudna does consider a vacat. The proposed connection between the scribal error and the anomalous omission of the vacat serves Doudna as a springboard for a very speculative argument concerning a specific history of scribal transmission for 4QpNah (pp. 218-20).

3:12. Either spelling is possible, as both occur elsewhere in 4QpNah.

line 9: Lohse records תאניי, *plene*, in line 9, rather than the more common תאני.

2.2.6 Fragment 5

Frag 5 contains a piece of the beginning of the next column of 4QpNah, following immediately upon 3–4, IV. Enough leather remains above line 1 to allow for the recognition of a top margin. Scant text is preserved on the remnants of this small fragment, which contains only a few legible words and some additional broken letters, on three lines. The width of the fragment is 3 cm and its height is 2.5 cm. Line 1 originally consisted of part of a citation and/or peshet of Nah 3:13. A few words of the peshet have survived in line 2. Bits of a citation of Nah 3:14 are preserved in line 3.

Only two letters are legible in line 1. Strugnell restores part of a citation of Nah 3:13a: הנה עמך נש[ים] בקרבך, but Horgan objects that the complete v. 13 would be too lengthy to restore in line 1, so that the lemma must have begun in the previous column. In line 2, the letter *gimmel* in נבול is not very clear, but it is the only possibility.¹²⁴

Because of the tendency of 4QpNah to full orthography, we restore בוא in line 3 as a *plene* variant to MT בא. The traces can accommodate either reading.

¹²⁴ At the upper left of the ך in the word prior to נבול, a very small, but well-defined, bottom of a *lamed* is visible (compare the 1st *lamed* in אצלל in frags 1–2, as well as the one above it, in the interlinear ממשלה).

Allegro reads the phrase as לכול נבול ישראל לים, which he renders, “[...] all the territory of Isra[el] to the sea[...].” Doudna (229) also determines that the letter after the restored *lamed* is another *lamed* (i.e., לים, following “Israe[l]”).

We follow Horgan’s transcription: םם ל נבל ישראל ל [. . . ; (“ . . .]^ol the boundary of Israe[l] . . . m[.]

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER THREE

PERICOPE 1, PESHER UNITS 1–5

Frag 1–2 on Nah 1:3b–1:6

.....בסופה ובשערה דרכו ו]ענן א[בק רגליו.....פשרו.....	1
.....]°[.....ת ר[...]עי שמיו וארצו אשר ב°[.....]	2
.....גוע[ר] בים וי]ב[שהו vac פ[שרו הים כל ה°[.....]	3
.....לעש[ות] בהם משפט ולכלותם מעל פני האדמה...וכול הנהרות החריב...פשרו...	4
.....עם [מו]שליהם אשר תחם ממשלתם]	5a
.....אמלל בשן]זכרמל ופרח לבנן אמלל vac v[פשרו].....	5
.....]°[...דו בו רבים רום רשעה כי ה°[.....]	6
.....לכר[מל] ולמושליו לבנון ופרח לבנון היא[.....]	7
.....]°[.....תם ואבדו מלפני[.....]בחיר[.....]	8
.....כ[ל] יושבי תבל vac v[הר]ים רעשו ממנו והגבעות התמוגגו	9
.....ותשא [הארץ ממנו ומלפניו תבל וכו'] יושבי בה לפני זעמו מי יעמוד ומי יקום] בחרון אפו °[.....]	10
.....]°[.....]	11

Translation

- 1 ^{Nah 1:3b} . . . in whirlwind and storm is His way, and] cloud is the dust of His feet Its peshet . . .
- 2 ° [. . .] t v[ault]s of His heavens and His earth which b[. . .
- 3 ^{Nah 1:4a} He rebu[kes] the sea and dr[ies] it up vac Its p[eshet]: the sea is all the °[
- 4 to exe[cute] judgment upon them and to destroy them from upon the face of [the world ^{Nah 1:4b} And all the rivers He parches dry . . .
- 5a Its peshet with [. . .] their [ru]lers, that their rule will end [
- 5 ^{Nah 1:4b} Withered are Bashan and Carmel] and the flower of Lebanon, withered vac [Its peshet:
- 6 peri]sh in it many, the height of wickedness. For the °[. . .
- 7 to Car]mel and to its rulers. Lebanon and the flower of Lebanon is . . .
- 8 . . .]tm and will perish from before [. . .] Elect[. . .
- 9 a]ll the inhabitants of the world vac ^{Nah 1:5–6} Moun[tains quake because of Him and the hills melt;
- 10 the Land [rises up] because of Him, and before Hi[m] (rises) the world and al]l [the inhabitants thereof. Before His wrath who can stand, and who
- 11 can withstand] His burning rage? °[.

3.1 LITERARY ANALYSIS: PESHER UNITS 1–5

The Book of Nahum opens with an acrostic poem about God’s avenging wrath. Nahum predicts the unleashing of this divine fury against Nineveh. In frags 1–2 of 4QpNah, this passage is adapted to describe God’s anger against a contemporary adversary. Unfortunately, the name of this adversary has not survived.

3.2 PESHER UNIT 1

Lines 1–2 on Nah 1:3b “*in whirlwind and tempest is His way, and clouds are the dust of his feet*”

Without restoration, only “His heavens and His earth” remains of the peshet. This is a natural literary outgrowth from the text, as storms and dust represent sky and land respectively. The biblical text employs the metaphor of the storm to describe the manifestation of God’s power in nature. Storm-related terminology is quite common in biblical descriptions of violent punishment,¹ and also appears in non-destructive theophanies.² Similarly, the image of God’s “feet” is invoked in descriptions of divine military power as well as in non-violent anthropomorphic descriptions of God.³ The peshet will have associated the lemma’s description of divine might with retribution, in keeping with the larger context of chapter 1 of Nahum.

¹ Cf. Jer 23:19 (= 30:23, in the context of the End of Days), 25:32; Isa 17:13, 41:16, 66:15; Zech 9:14; Ezek 13:11,13, Ps 83:16. In Amos 1:14, and Isa 29:6 the words סופה and שׁערה are paired. See also non-biblical ANE uses of the storm as a metaphor for conquest, e.g. Sargon’s boast: “I made the smoke thereof rise and cover the face of heaven like a storm . . . like a hurricane” (*ARAB* #164, vol. 2, 90). Similarly, Sennacherib, “I swept like a hurricane” (*ARAB* #237, vol. 2, 118). In the Bavarian Inscription, he says of his defeat of Babylon: “Like the on-coming of a storm I broke loose, and overwhelmed it like a hurricane” (*ARAB* #339, vol. 2, 152).

² Specifically, the divine chariot in Ezek 1:4. For the storm as an element of ANE theophanies, see Nahum Sarna, *Exploring Exodus* (New York: Schocken Books, 1986), 111–33, and 233 n. 30.

³ The outstanding reference to the feet of God in the Bible is Ex 24:10, the sapphire-like vision seen by Moses and the elders. In later biblical contexts the feet of God, and especially God’s “footstool,” are associated with the Temple (Isa 66:1; Lam 2:1; Ps. 132:7; I Chron 28:2). For a separate tradition, associating the feet of God with His military power, see Zech 14:4 and Hab 3:5, in addition to Nahum. In II Sam 22 (= Ps. 18), the extended anthropomorphic depiction of God as warrior includes an association of God’s feet with clouds in vs. 10. Ps. 99:5 appears to use both traditions, mentioning God’s feet and clouds in connection with terrifying divine judgment, but also describing God’s immanence, theophany, and divine responsiveness to His faithful, including Moses and Aaron.

This adaptation is likely to have been effected by means of concretization and/or hypostasis. In the former case, the author of the pesher would have identified the poetic elements of the lemma with the physical sky and land. The divine destructive powers of the lemma would be described as manifesting themselves in reality with the imminent cataclysmic punishment of the Community's enemies. Alternatively, the author might have hypostasized the poetic elements of the lemma, relating the storms and clouds of the lemma to activity in the heavenly realm, with the understanding that divine destruction and creation are two sides of a single coin.⁴

The existing elements of the pesher interpretation can best be equated with the elements of the lemma on the basis of concretization:

דרכו	=	ר(ק) עי שמיז	concretization
(וב) שעררה, (ב) סופה	=	[. . .]	
ר(ק) עי שמיז	=	וארצו	concretization
{NO equivalent}	=	אשר ב"ש	

3.3 PESHER UNIT 2

Lines 3-4 on Nah 1:4a "*He rebukes the sea and dries it up*"

In this verse, Nahum continues his description of the destructive power of God, with the implication that this might is to be unleashed against Nineveh. The pesher asserts that divine power will be directed against a particular group. Unfortunately, the key word of this pesher, the name of the group to be destroyed, has not survived. Allegro's restoration of this word as "Kittim" reflects his attempt to seek an intrinsic connection between the symbol of the sea and that which it represents. The Kittim are associated with the islands of the sea in the Bible and in 1QpHab III,11, as well as with sea-fishing imagery in the latter source.⁵ The use of the words ממשלהם and מן שלייהם

⁴ Brownlee clearly preferred this view, stating, "Curiously, none of the theophanic elements of this and the following line has survived" (personal notes). Brownlee accounted for his assumption of theophanic elements in frags 1-2 on the basis that "eschatological epiphany is an important messianic theme at Qumran," offering support from 1QM I,8-14; XVIII,1,9-10; 1QH IV,22; 11QMelch; CD XX,10, 14-16, 25-26; 1QpHab X,16-17 (in his review of Horgan's *Pesharim*, in *JBL* 102 [1983]: 325). Note that if the restoration of ר(ק) עי is correct, then the term may preserve some theophanic overtones, since the plural is otherwise attested in antiquity in sapiential and liturgical texts from the DSS corpus (in versions of Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and 4QInstruction^d. Cf. ch. 2 *ad loc.*)

⁵ Although Horgan restores "Kittim" here in frags 1-2, she notes that images

in line 5a has contributed to the inclination to restore Kittim, as the term is often associated by Qumran scholars with the Roman republic—though actual usage does not support this supposition.⁶ Although Doudna rejects the restoration of the word “Kittim,” he adduces some linguistic overlaps with 1QpHab and 4QpPs^a as evidence that this pesher unit addresses Gentile enemies rather than rival Jewish groups.⁷ Note that the pesher interpretation in 1QpPs 9, lines 2–4, applies God’s “rebuke” of Ps 68:31 to the K]ittim (כ]תים).⁸ Brooke has noted the similarity of this unit to 1QM XIV, which features נער in a similar context, and shares some additional terminology.⁹ It is possible that the pesher takes “the sea” as an inclusive general term denoting all evil ones, and that the opponents in this passage of 4QpNah, like those in 1QM, are all non-sectarians, whether Gentile or Jewish.

Equivalents:

[נער] = להעש[ות] בהם משפט¹⁰ metaphor¹¹

related to water represent Manasseh in 3–4 III,9. In general, the sea is a symbol of power, associated with life, and the origins of life, especially in ANE writings (See Ringgren, *TDOT*, vol. 6 s.v. ים, 87–98). Gaster comments upon the mythological significance of the image in our verse, but notes that the phrase is “virtually demythologized” already in the Bible (338).

⁶ See below, on 5a.

⁷ pp. 276–80.

⁸ Cf. Milik, *DJD* I: “Commentaire de Psaumes,” pp. 81–82, Pl. XV.

⁹ משפט is used in XIV,10; כלה is found in XIV,5. Brooke argues that since the language of the pesher depends closely upon the words of Nahum itself, and perhaps upon this “poetic liturgy” of 1QM, it is inappropriate to mine the pesher for detailed information about the contemporary referent. Whether the opponent is the Kittim, or another group, all that can be said with certainty is that the author of the pesher lived during a time of “continued domination” and awaited “divine vindication” (“The Kittim in the Qumran Pesharim,” in *Images of Empire* [ed. Loveday Alexander; Sheffield: JSOT, 1991], 138–9). Such caution is well-advised. However, this possible dependence upon earlier texts opens up a new avenue of investigation. If this dependence mandates restraint in attributing specific historical significance to the words of pesher interpretation, it highlights the need to appreciate the value of the base-text in the investigation of pesher. Moreover, it seems to mark the existence of a motif, so that the contemporary entity will be expected to share certain attributes with its earlier analogs.

¹⁰ For the punitive sense of “executing judgment,” cf. 1QpHab IX,1, X,3–5, XIII,3. In X,3–5, the judgment is executed in the form of fire and brimstone. See too 4Q511 (4QShirShabb); CD I,2; 1QS IV,20; V,13; 1QH VII,22; IX,33; X,24; XII,20; XIV,29. The conflation of the concepts of justice and divine judgment against opponents is most strongly felt in the War Scroll, in which it is quite clear that the enemies include all non-sectarians. A weapons inscription in 1QM VI,3 reads “flame of the sword devouring the wicked dead by God’s Judgment.” In BH, see esp. the root עשה with שפטים for the meting out of divine punishment in Exodus and Ezekiel.

¹¹ The pesher’s לעשות משפט is a legal expression of the lemma’s “rebuke” or

בים	= [. . .] כל, (and בהם) ¹²	symbol ¹³
וייב[שהו]	= ולכלותם מעל פני [הארמה]	metaphor ¹⁴

There appears to be a particularly tight lemma/pesher correlation in this unit, which may be related to the nature of the pesher formula. This formula, which Horgan unjustifiably believes to be in use throughout the column, is the mathematical, “‘*pishro*’, x is y ,” which accommodates direct equivalence.

3.4 PESHER UNIT 3

Lines 4–5a on Nah 1:4b “*And all the rivers He parches dry*”

The pesher continues to apply Nahum’s figurative description of God’s potential force to the actual extermination of more, still unidentified, contemporary enemies. In light of the wide range of applications of the root משל in the Qumran corpus, the use of this root in the words for “dominion” or “rule” cannot provide a clue for specific historical identification.¹⁵ In mapping correspondence, the

“condemnation,” extending the term beyond the pronouncement of a guilty verdict to the consequences of the execution of judgment. Cf. the use of יכה in 1QpHab V,4 ובתוכחהם. Nitzan (165) observes that יכה (which usually denotes “rebuke”) is taken as both “judgment” (as in Isa 11:3–4) and “execution of penalty” (cp. IISam 7:14; Jer 2:19; Ps 39:12). In Ps 9:5–6 נערה ניים reflects the divine execution of justice (עשיה משפטי) through the eradication of the wicked.

¹² Note the prepositional ב in בהם, resulting in syntactic correspondence and (perhaps deliberate) auditory similarity between בים and בהם.

¹³ Since the name of the enemy is lacking, we cannot know whether the “sea” was presumed to have any intrinsic metaphoric value, beyond standing in for the entity that was going to be rebuked/judged/destroyed. (See the observations of Brooke, n. 9 above).

¹⁴ The lemma’s extinction of the sea as a result of rebuke is paralleled in the pesher by the utter extinction of the accused through judgment. [פני [הארמה]] מעל פני [הארמה]] may be a simple expansion of the equivalent for drying up, emphasizing the scope of the complete obliteration. It is also possible that “earth” functions as a second equivalent for ייב[שהו], employing paronomasia to associate the root יבש with a synonym for יבשה. The root כלה for destruction hints at totality, as it denotes completion, and may reflect some word-play with the word כל, all.

¹⁵ Much has been made of the use of the term מושלים, as opposed to מלכים, with the “Kittim” in 1QpHab IV,5, 10, [12] and 4QpNah 3–4 I,3. As noted above, Brooke maintains that the depiction of the Kittim in the pesharim is so closely dependent upon the prophetic lemmas as to invalidate any historical extrapolation from these Qumran texts (“Kittim,” 135–59). Nonetheless, the usage in the pesharim is widely cited in support of the identification of the Kittim as the Romans, as they were members of a republic rather than subjects of a king (in distinction to the Seleucids; see ch. 4). In the Bible משל usually denotes control and power, rather than kingship *per se*, in the case of human beings. (Only in reference to God does supreme dominion regularly appear together with the language of divine kingship).

peshet structure is to be construed such that [מִן שְׁלִיָּהִים . . .] functions as part of an identification formula, along with some masc. pl. entity that is reflected in the possessive suffix.¹⁶

Equivalents:

[וכל הנחרות]	= [. . .], ממשלהם and/or שְׁלִיָּהִים [מִן . . .]	symbol ¹⁸
[החרוב]	= תחם ממשלהם	metaphor, paronomasia ¹⁹

In the DSS, the root is used in reference to various rulers, human and other-worldly. In another well-known passage in 1QpHab, משל describes the rule of the Wicked Priest over Israel (VIII,9). In different contexts, 1QS discusses the dominion of the sons of Aaron (IX,7), Belial (I,18, 23) darkness (III,20), light (III,20; X,1), righteousness and evil (IV,20), and humanity (III,17). 1QSb V,28 bestows upon the Prince of Congregation superiority over those who rule all the nations. 1QH IX,11; XX,23 describe the rule of the spirits and IIXX,8 that of God over the spirits and all else. The War Scroll speaks of the rule of the Kittim, angels, spirits, Israel. 4QpIsa^a 7–10 III,20 mentions the rule of the scion of David. CD XII,2 describes Belial as ruling over an individual. XIII,13 warns that an individual member may not take authority (משל) to introduce a non-member into the Community. In 4QpNah II,4, the root is applied to the dominion of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things over Israel. In sum, the root משל for “dominion” or “rule” is widespread and not limited to a particular entity.

¹⁶ i.e., “Its peshet: ‘x’ and their rulers are. . .” If, instead, the form of the peshet is sought in a direct identification (“Its peshet: they are the . . .”), we would expect to find equivalence in this identifying phrase, and take the clause “that their rule will end” as a looser expansion, explaining why the identification is justified. If the form were of the more general type (“Its peshet is concerning . . .”), then the latter phrase would exhibit greater equivalence. The identified element would merely be introduced, while the “אשר” clause would implement the actualization.

¹⁷ Dupont-Sommer’s proposed restoration of [כל מִן שְׁלִיָּהִים] would be even more closely equivalent.

¹⁸ Rivers are apt symbols for leaders. A distinctive characteristic of rivers is that they direct a flow or stream of water along a particular course toward the sea. The root נהר means to follow or “stream” after. In general, rivers in the Bible represent powerful overwhelming forces. Of special relevance to Nahum is Isa 8:7, in which the “mighty, massive waters of the river” represent the King of Assyria.

¹⁹ הרב is used in the *hiphil* in MT with equal frequency to denote “drying up” and “destroying.” In Nahum itself, the primary sense of the word is drying up, though the prophet certainly must have appreciated the destructive connotation of his lexical choice. The peshet applies החרוב to represent the ending of leadership. This application may derive from paronomasia, relying upon the alternate meaning of הרב as destruction. Alternatively, it may be a natural representation of Nahum’s drying metaphor. Just as יבש triggered the use of כלה in unit 2, so might הרב, the drying up of rivers, trigger תמם. Like כלה, תמם is associated with the concept of completeness and wholeness, signifying here the absolute end of the opposed rule.

3.5 PESHER UNIT 4

Lines 5-9 on Nah 1:4c “*Withered is Bashan, and Carmel], and the flower of Lebanon is withered*”

In this verse, Nahum asserts that God in His might can reduce even the most stalwart and flourishing regions to barren wasteland. In contrast to the general terminology employed in the previous lemmas, Nahum 1:4c names specific geographic entities. However, even in the original context these names do not refer to the literal locations that they designate, but function figuratively as prototypes for fertile, flourishing lands.²⁰ Once again, the peshet seems to apply the verse to literal contemporary wicked entities, and once again these entities cannot be definitively determined from the fragmentary text.²¹ As in the earlier units of this pericope, modern scholarship has tended to view the Kittim as the subject of unit 4.²² The phrase “all the inhabitants of the world” at the end of the unit might support a more universal identification for the “evil ones.” Horgan described a 2-part polemic aimed at both the Kittim and Jewish opponents.²³

The term “Lebanon” that appears in this unit is particularly significant because of its symbolic function in other ancient Jewish texts. Vermes discerns two streams of traditions in the Targumic

²⁰ “Carmel” as a common noun denotes an area of fields and vineyards, as well as a particular type of grain. The proper noun refers to a forested mountain range in western Israel. It is often paired in MT with Bashan, which, literally, refers to the geographical area east of the river Jordan famed for the rich quality of its cattle and its mighty oak trees (further defined in *HALOT* as “between Hermon to the N, Slacha to the E, Gilead to the S, Geshur and Maacah to the W.” See Yohanan Aharoni, *Carta’s Atlas of the Bible* [3rd ed., rev. by A.F. Rainey; Jerusalem: Carta], 1995, map #106). The terms serve metaphorically for fertile land and, by extension, for powerful enemies. The only other mention of Carmel at Qumran, is at 4QpIsa^c XXI,3 (cf. Horgan, 170). The fragmentary context there partially preserves הַלְבָנוֹן but adds nothing substantial to our discussion.

²¹ Although we raised the possibility that unit 2 might oppose evil-doers generally, unit 4 seems to name a specific group or groups. Nonetheless, a more general polemic need not be ruled out.

²² Cf. Strugnell, Moraldi, Nitzan (43). Allegro did not explicitly identify the elements in this unit, but he noted that Lebanon is identified with the Kittim in 4QpIsa^a.

²³ pp. 168-69. Horgan supports her identification of Bashan and Carmel as the Kittim, by pointing to “its rulers” in line 7, since she believes that “rulers” in 5a refers to the Kittim. However she views the “flower of Lebanon” as the Seekers-after-Smooth things. Nitzan criticizes Horgan’s identification of internal enemies as contextually inappropriate, and not grounded in the exegetical traditions for the significance of Lebanon as described by Vermes (see below).

renderings of this term: Lebanon as a powerful person or group, and Lebanon as the Temple.²⁴ He views the identification with the Temple as a fixed symbolic equation in Tannaitic literature. However he sees a greater variety of symbolic understandings functioning in earlier tradition (e.g., Lebanon = a king, the rich, Gentile nations). These earlier symbols were “natural” in their biblical contexts, according to Vermes. They are basically found in passages that are themselves symbolic, or that “lend themselves” to such exegesis.²⁵

Vermes sees both streams of Jewish traditions as having been in place by the time of the composition of the Dead Sea Scrolls, and he discerns both of the traditions at Qumran. He cites 4QpIsa^a for the identification of Lebanon as the Kittim, i.e., the Gentiles, one of the powerful groups that appear in Targumic identifications. 1QpHab XII,3–4 identifies the Lebanon of Hab 2:17 as the “Council of the Community,” an association shown by Vermes to be derivative of the traditional Temple identification.²⁶ The Temple identification, with its positive valence, is not appropriate in 4QpNah, in which the lemma describes the destruction of Lebanon. We must assume that Lebanon (and “flower of Lebanon”) represented powerful and/or

²⁴ The specific examples from the Targum are presented and analyzed thoroughly in Vermes’s important study, “Symbolical Interpretation of Lebanon in the Targums: The Origin and Development of an Exegetical Tradition,” *JTS* 9 (April 1958): 1–12. (See also, his earlier “‘Car le Liban,’ c’est le Conseil de la Communauté.” *Notes sur Peshet d’Habacuc 12, 3–4.*” in *Mélanges Bibliques rédigés en l’honneur de André Robert* [Paris: 1957] 316–25 and the later formulation in *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* [Leiden: Brill, 1961], 26–43). Vermes’s thesis is summarized well by H.F.D. Sparks in “The Symbolical Interpretation of *Lebanon* in the Fathers,” *JTS* New Series 10 (1959): 264–79. Sparks traces the Christian identification of Lebanon as the Church to these same symbolic traditions. See also, Bertil Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* (Society for New Testament Monograph Studies; Cambridge: University Press, 1965), 43–44. The identification with the Temple is also discussed by Brownlee in “The Habakkuk Midrash and the Targum of Jonathan,” *JJS* 7 (1956): 169–186 and by Nitzan, p. 43, n. 44.

²⁵ In contrast, Vermes sees the later equation of Lebanon with the Temple as “created” and not based in the symbolism of biblical text itself. We would object, with Sparks, that Ezek 17:3,12 seems to provide an appropriate scriptural basis for the identification of the Temple with Lebanon. Isa 60:13 may do so as well. For our analysis of Peshet Nahum, however, the nature of the identification with the Temple is less relevant than the existence of other early Jewish traditions, particularly that of “the nations.”

²⁶ Vermes convincingly posits two steps to this equation: (1) General Jewish exegetical tradition equated the Temple with Lebanon. (2) The Qumran sect identified its community with the Temple.

influential opponents of the Community, and it is very likely that the term represented the Gentiles.²⁷

Although a variety of symbolic values may be attached to the term "Lebanon" at Qumran, considerable weight should be given to the particular parallel of 4QpIsa^a. The author of 4QpIsa^a identified Lebanon as the Kittim in his interpretation of Isa 10:33-34 (in 7, 1-14). Both Lebanon and the root קטם appear in these verses.²⁸ Since the use of the word קטם in 4QpNah has no apparent basis in the text of Nahum, it is likely to have been "imported" from some other context. Isa 10, and especially 4QpIsa^a, provide that context.²⁹ In identifying "Lebanon" as the Kittim, Peshar Nahum would reflect early exegetical traditions associating Lebanon with the "Gentile nations."

Horgan's double identification of foreign and internal enemies does not particularly accommodate this traditional association of Lebanon and Gentiles.³⁰ Her view is useful, however, for highlighting the fact that there is a two-part structure to this unit.³¹ In our understanding of this two-part pesher, the first part consists of a *general* identification and includes the equivalents of (1) a verb of destruction (perhaps "perish") corresponding to "wither" and (2) "Many,

²⁷ Vermes himself takes "Lebanon" in the pesher interpretation here to refer to the Community. He translates, "Carmel and to his commanders. Lebanon and the sprout of Lebanon are [the priests, the sons of Zadok and the men of] their [council] and they shall perish from before . . . the elect . . ." (*CDSSE* 473-4). He seems to intend that "Lebanon" is the Elect, though this is difficult to accommodate syntactically. More importantly, in the biblical verse, Lebanon withers. Therefore, its analog in the pesher should do so as well.

²⁸ 4QpIsa^c XXI,2,3 contain the words Lebanon and Carmel, in what is probably a comment upon the end of Isa chapter 29. However, the text is too fragmentary to be of aid in analyzing Peshar Nahum (cf. Horgan, 170).

²⁹ It is true that Isa 24:4, reads אַמְלֵלֵי בְרוּם עַם הָאָרֶץ ("the haughty of the people of the land will wither"), featuring some of the language of Nah and 4QpNah in describing the destruction of internal corrupt figures. However, the use of the term Lebanon in 4QpIsa^a increases the significance of Isa 10 as a parallel to Peshar Nahum. In Isa 33:9 the withering of the land is associated with the shame of Lebanon, Bashan, and Carmel, and opposed to the rising of God (אֱלֹהִים). However, the metaphoric terms in this context seem to be generic for mighty ones, and do not provide support for a particular metaphoric analog in our pesher.

³⁰ Horgan's proposal might be more effective if her identifications are reversed, with Bashan and Carmel representing Jewish opponents and Lebanon as the Kittim.

³¹ The structure is similar to a "double pesher," but is actually a double expression of a single pesher, rather than two distinct applications of the lemma. It can be termed a "duplicated pesher." Compare the classic example of multiple pesher in 1QpHab II,1-10 where it is unclear whether the triple identification of the "traitors" (בְּנֵי יָם) in the pesher reflects three characterizations of a single group, or a series of three distinct groups of "traitors."

height of wickedness” corresponding to Bashan and Carmel, and to Lebanon.³² The subsequent *specific* identification consists of (1) a repetition of “perish” for “wither”³³ and (2) specific referents for Bashan, Carmel, and Lebanon (though these have not survived).³⁴

The final phrase of the pesher appears to be an un-pegged plus. Although we do not accept Strugnell’s suggestion that lines 8–9 feature a citation of Ps 33:8,³⁵ we do accept Nitzan’s premise that allusions to secondary texts are typically found in “plus”es.³⁶ If that is the case here, then Psalm 98 seems even more relevant than Psalm 33. In addition to featuring uproar among the inhabitants of the world (תבל וישבי בה) and amidst nature (rivers and mountains), it specifically describes these actions as accompanying the execution of divine judgment upon the inhabitants of the world. The words “in justice” and “in equity” (ישפט תבל בצדק בעמים במישרים, Ps 98:9) would

³² Recall that we follow Dupont-Sommer in taking “the height of wickedness” as modifying the “many,” with these terms functioning together as the subject of the intransitive verb, “they will perish.” As noted above, Isa 24:4 reads “the haughty of the people of the land will wither.” Just as the singular מרום in that verse is the subject of the plural intransitive verb of “withering,” so here is the singular רום (in apposition to רבים), the subject of the plural intransitive verb which is the “equivalent” of the lemma’s “withering.” Some specificity may be perceptible even in this “general identification,” in that the fertile Bashan and Carmel aptly represent “Many” and the lofty Lebanon is well-matched with “height of wickedness.” The fertility of Bashan and Carmel equates with both abundance and high quality, the two senses of רבים.

³³ Strictly speaking, this is a response to the second אמלל in the verse itself. Perhaps the structure we are outlining might more aptly be described as a “pesher and a half” than a double, or even duplicated, pesher. In this structure, the pesher is understood to be playing upon the chiasmus in the biblical verse. Essentially, we are suggesting that the pesher approached the verse as follows:

“Withered are Bashan and Carmel [and the flower of Lebanon]; [Bashan and Carmel] and the flower of Lebanon are withered.”

³⁴ In keeping with Allegro’s reading, described above, ch. 2, we understand an additional sub-division such that “Bashan” and “Carmel” would have been identified together, followed by “the flower of Lebanon,” expressed here as “Lebanon and the flower of Lebanon.” It may be suggested that issues related to correspondence and to the traditional symbolic associations of “Lebanon” might account for the deviant recitation here, in which the term “Lebanon” is added prior to the actual element of the lemma, “flower of Lebanon.” Although the term “Lebanon” in the Qumran corpus is associated with both the Community and its enemies, the only extant attestations of “flower” portray a positive image of the future flourishing remnant of the Community (1QH XIV,15 and XVI,7). The author of 4QpNah may have chosen to highlight the basis of his exegesis, namely “Lebanon,” emphasizing that he was following a conventional association of Lebanon with enemies, in applying the lemma’s “flower of Lebanon” to enemies as well.

³⁵ The continuous pesharim do not tend to cite secondary biblical sources explicitly.

³⁶ See above, chapter 1.

accommodate a peshar application involving the Elect as instruments of divine justice.³⁷

Equivalents:

I. [אמלל]	= [יאב] דו	metaphor
(1) ופרח לבנון, וכרמל, בשן, וכרמל, ופרח לבנון	= רבים ³⁹ רום רשעה ³⁸	allegory ⁴⁰
AND		

³⁷ In the Hebrew Bible, divine “election” primarily refers to the singling out of an individual person, dynasty, nation, or place from a whole, and imbuing that individual with a special mission to serve that whole. (Cf. Seebass in *TDOT*, s.v. בחר, 75–87.) In particular, the election of Israel usually appears in universalist passages, stressing the role of Israel as an inspiration to the other nations (*ibid.*, 82–84). There is a less common, but distinct, strand of usages stressing the intrinsic merit of the chosen as opposed to the non-Elect. This trend is more fully developed in post-biblical Jewish eschatology and in Christianity.

At Qumran, the Elect are the pious ones of the Community, singled out from among the sinners for salvation from the cataclysmic events in which all the non-Elect will perish. In the pesharim, there are at least seven such cases, as well as a number of fairly certain restorations. (Cf. Horgan, p. 32, on 1QpHab V,4. This passage promises the ultimate Judgment of the guilty, both Gentile and Jewish, by the Elect.)

³⁸ In the extant pesharim, the root רום is associated with arrogance in 1QpHab VIII,10 (of the Wicked Priest); in 4QpIsa^a 7–10 III,[2], [9], (restored in the lemma as per MT; the peshar is associated with Kittim); and in the lemma of 4QpIsa^c 6–7 II,2. The root appears in 1QS IV,9, in a list of negative characteristics of the wicked, but in X,12 it describes the loftiness of God. (Cf. the positive contexts of “lifting up” in the lemmas 4QpPs^a 1–10 IV,10 and 4QpIsa^c 23 II,8.) The expression here is surely intended to encompass both lofty position and arrogant disposition, and perhaps the extremity of the wickedness (as the “height” of evil, they are the most extremely evil). See Isa 2:11,17 (“the haughtiness of men”).

The use of the word רום is likely to reflect a deliberate allusion to Isaiah. Cf. CD II,18–III,2, in which the Nefilim and their sons, depicted as lofty cedars (כרום ארום נהם), serve as a prototype for the sinner who follows his own inclination rather than God’s will, thereby incurring the punishment of eradication. See also 1QH XXV,7 (Sukenik, frag 5) וכרום רשעה, which García-Martínez renders “when wickedness arises” (201. Cf. Gaster, 339).

In one of his personal MSS., Allegro drew attention to Rabin’s n. 2 on CD VI,10 הרשיעא קין הרשיעא (The *Zadokite Documents* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954], “Addenda”) regarding the use of the term רומא רשיעא for the Roman Empire in later Jewish tradition (cf. especially bBabaQama 38a). The pun would seem relevant here if the subject of the peshar is the Kittim, but there is no evidence to support the use of this epithet prior to the talmudic era.

³⁹ רבים may denote “many” or “great ones,” and it is probable that both abundance and grandeur are intended here. Cf. Carmignac, “HRBYM: Les ‘Nombres’ ou les ‘Notables?’” *RevQ* 7 (1971) 575–86. In 1QpHab, רבים are clearly “great ones” in IV,2, but a “numerous multitude” in VI,10. In our own peshar, רבים in II,8 signifies “many,” but the subsequent itemized list specifies important personages. The technical use of רבים as a term for the corporate membership of the Qumran Community is common in CD (XIII,7; XIV,7, 12; XV,8) and 1QS (VI,1–25, *passim*; VII,10–25) but not in the pesharim, where the term has more general connotations.

⁴⁰ This technique is almost the reverse of the concretization of figuratives in the

(2) ופרח לבנון, וכרמל, לבנון, ופרח לבנון [. . .]⁴¹; one of the elements is or has “rulers” (ולמושלין)⁴²

II. אמלל = ואבדו metaphor
 {NO equivalent} = מלפני[...] בחיר [כ...] ול יושבי חבל⁴³ un-pegged plus⁴⁴

3.6 PESHER UNIT 5

Lines 9–11 comprise a citation of Nah 1:5–6a “*Moun[tains quake because of Him . . .*” None of the interpretation has survived.

3.7 SUMMARY OF PERICOPE 1

The imagery in ch.1 of Nahum establishes the might of God that is to be directed against Assyria. G.G.V. Stonehouse discerns a unified natural image linking vs. 3–6 of this chapter.⁴⁵ The sirocco raises clouds of dust, drives back the waves of seas, shakes the land and melts the hills in torrential mud-slides. Nahum’s portrait of an extreme, but familiar, expression of divine power enables the reader to envision the devastation destined for Nineveh. Alternatively, the biblical

previous unit, and is akin to the “hypostasis” which was presented as a possible interpretation of Unit 1. The lemma’s literal geographic regions are transformed into metaphorical terms representing qualities associated with these regions. The nouns in the peshet themselves represent different concrete entities, the enemies of the Community. Explicit identification of these opponents certainly appeared in the ensuing lines.

⁴¹ After the “general identification,” the peshet included more “mathematical” identifications for the particular re-cited substantives of the lemma. The peshet appears to have originally contained full equivalents, but these are irretrievable.

⁴² The term could reflect an equivalent for one of the elements of the lemma, or it may refer back to the “rulers” of line 5a.

⁴³ The use of מלפני in unit 4 may be related to the word ומלפנין in the lemma in unit 5, as a variant from MT. מלפני may function spatially or causally: either the subject will be eradicated from before God, or will perish at the divine Presence, i.e. at the hand of God, or by means of God’s agent. The phrase “all the inhabitants of the world” is certainly a lexical anticipation (perhaps a sort of “pre-citation”) of the phrase in the following lemma, חבל וכנל [ישובי בה, Nah 1:5. It does not appear to have a peg in our lemma. Cf. Horgan, 245, on peshet interpretations that refer back to previous or subsequent lemmas.

⁴⁴ Perhaps a secondary reference to Ps 98, as observed above.

⁴⁵ *The Book of Zephaniah, Nahum, and Habakkuk* (vol 21 of Westminster Commentaries, eds. George Stonehouse and G.W. Wade; London: Methuen & Co., 1929), 103–04. See too, W. Maier, p. 162.

text of Nahum may benefit from a more supernatural reading. The prophet may be seen as describing a cataclysmic destruction in which God reverses the acts of His creation.⁴⁶ The author of 4QpNah appears to have read Nahum through a supernatural lens. He then applied the retributive unleashing of the divine forces to a later historical time-period, which we may suppose was to have been the cataclysmic end-time.

The evidence of the subsequent columns of Peshar Nahum might initially seem to favor identifying the evil ones in frags 1-2 as Jewish opponents: e.g., Ephraim whose "dominion" is described in 3-4 III, and/or "Manassch" which is compared to rivers in 3-4 IV. However, those columns are reacting to very different passages of the biblical Nahum.⁴⁷ Moreover, other pesharim tend to include both national and international data.⁴⁸ The examples of the images in this column that are found in other Qumran texts tend to favor the identification of the enemy as the Kittim, or perhaps as all non-sectarians. The latter also coincides well with the inclusive "a]ll the inhabitants of the world" in line 9. The clear certainty is that this first extant column of 4QpNah promises God's total destruction of the sect's enemy[ies].

Regarding the peshar's treatment of the text, a somewhat paradoxical phenomenon is discernible. The biblical Nahum presents physical images, fashioning hypothetical scenarios that serve as metaphors for divine power. 4QpNah transfers the substances in these images to particular, but more amorphous, entities—specifically to groups of people. We have called this "concretization" in that the process removes the objects in the metaphor from the category of

⁴⁶ Ps 104 uses many of the same and similar elements as Nahum—e.g., quaking mountains, chariot clouds, water fleeing from divine rebuke—in depicting God's creation of the world and His ongoing dominion.

⁴⁷ The focus of the peshar will depend to a great degree upon the focus of its base-text, as we argue throughout this study. The concern of "the rest of the surviving" text of the scroll with the wicked of Israel stems from the peshar's correspondence with the specific entities of Nineveh and Amon in the base-text; the base-text in this initial column is more general and universal.

⁴⁸ Doudna argues that 1QpHab uses the Kittim only as representatives of instruments for the infliction of divine punishment, and does not refer to any harm to be suffered by them. He thus believes that 4QpNah will similarly not refer to the downfall of the Kittim, though he concedes that "in 4QpIsa^a, 1QpPs, and the 1QM/War Scroll texts, the Kittim are to be defeated" (275-76). There is no reason to limit the range of comparable texts to 1QpHab in this matter.

the literary to that of the literal. However, there is also a move away from the “concrete”: The conceptualization of a “ruler,” a human being who holds a type of office, is more abstract than that of a “river.” “Executing judgment” is a less corporeal, less graphic, activity than “roaring.”

Units 1 and 5 are too poorly preserved to evaluate properly in this regard. Unit 2 most clearly exemplifies the phenomenon of “conceptual concretization,” applying the prophet’s physical images to specific political entities and activities. In our understanding of a duplicated peshar in unit 4, the geographical regions named in the lemma were at first conceptualized; they were removed from the physical realm by means of a metaphorical interpretation. They were then “conceptually concretized” by means of identification as people within particular human communities or in certain roles.

CHAPTER FOUR

PERICOPE 2, PESHER UNITS 6–10:
HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Frag 3–4 I–II,1 on Nah 2:12–14

Col. I

- 1[מְדוּר לְרִשְׁעֵי גוֹיִם vac אֲשֶׁר הִלֵּךְ אֲרִי לְבִיאַ שָׁם גּוֹר אֲרִי
2 וְאֵין מַחְרִיד.....פִּשְׁרוֹ.....דְּמִין טְרִיס מֶלֶךְ יוֹן אֲשֶׁר בִּקֵּשׁ לְבוֹא יְרוּשָׁלַיִם
בְּעֵצַת דּוֹרְשֵׁי הַחֲלָקוֹת
3[בְּיַד מַלְכֵי יוֹן מֵאַנְחִיכּוֹס עַד עֲמוּד מוֹשְׁלֵי כַחֲיִים
וְאַחַר תְּרַמֵּס
4 v[ac]..... אֲרִי טוֹרֵף בְּדֵי גּוּרֵיו [נ]מַחְנֵק לְלִבְיוֹתָיו טוֹרֵף
5[עַל כַּפִּיר הַחֲרוֹן אֲשֶׁר יָכָה בְּגִדּוֹלָיו וְאֲנָשֵׁי עֲצָתוֹ
6וַיִּמְלֵא טוֹרֵף] חִירָהּ וּמַעֲנֹתָהּ טוֹרֵפָה vac פִּשְׁרוֹ עַל כַּפִּיר
הַחֲרוֹן
7[מוֹת בְּדוֹרְשֵׁי הַחֲלָקוֹת אֲשֶׁר יִתְּלָה אֲנָשִׁים חַיִּים
8[בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל מִלְּפָנִים כִּי לַחֲלוּי הָיוּ עַל הַעֵץ [יִקְרָא הַגְּנִי אֵלָי]כָּה
9 נֹא]ם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת וְהִבְעַרְתִּי בְּעֵשֶׂן רוֹבֵכָה וּכְפִירִיכָה תֹאכַל חֶרֶב
וְהִכְרַתִּי מֵאַרְצֵי טָרֵף vac
10 וְלֹא יִשְׁמַע עוֹד קוֹל מְלֹאכִיכָה vac פִּשְׁרוֹ רוֹבֵכָה הֵם נְדוּדֵי הַיָּלֹד
וּכְפִירָיו הֵם
11 נְדוּלָיו[וְטָרְפוֹ הוּא הַחֲרוֹן אֲשֶׁר קָבַץ]צוֹ.....[יְרוּשָׁלַיִם אֲשֶׁר
12 יִתְּנֶהוּ עַ]פְּרִים יִתֵּן יִשְׂרָאֵל v[ac].....]

Col. II

- 1 ומְלֹאכֵי הֵם צִירוֹ אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִשְׁמַע קוֹלָם עוֹד בְּנוֹיִם vac

Frag 3–4 I,1–12–II,1

Col. I

- 1 . . .]a dwelling-place for the wicked of the Gentiles. ^{Nah 2:12b} **Whither
the lion went to bring the lion's cub,**
2 **and there was none to frighten** Its *peshet*: concerning Deme]trius
King of Greece who sought to come (upon) Jerusalem at the counsel
of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things
3 . . .]*yd* the kings of Greece from Antiochus until the rising of the
rulers of the Kitim. And afterwards will be trampled
4 . . .] ^{Nah 2:13a} **The lion tears at his cubs, and strangles his lionesses
for prey;**
5 . . .] upon the Young Lion of Wrath who will smite his great ones,
and the men of his counsel

- 6 . . . ^{Nah 2:13b} **and he fills with prey his] holes and his lairs with torn flesh** *vac* Its *pesher*: concerning the Young Lion of Wrath
- 7 . . .]*mwot* on the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, that he will hang people alive.
- 8 . . .] in Israel aforesimes, for of one hanged alive o[n a tree is to be re]ad: ^{Nah 2:14} **“Behold I am against you,”**
- 9 **it is the declar]ation of the Lord of Hosts. “I will burn in smoke you]r [multitude], and your young lions the sword will consume. I will cut [off p]rey [from the land],**
- 10 **and no [longer will be heard the voice of your messengers.”** Its *pes]her*: **Your multitude**: they are the legions of his army[] and his **young lions**: they are
- 11 his great ones [. . .] his **prey**: it is the [. . . weal]th which q[. . .] Jerusalem that
- 12 th]ey will give it [. . .] Ephraim. Israel will be given [. . .]

Col. II

- 1 and his **messengers** are his envoys, that their voice will no longer be heard among the nations. *vac*

As noted in our Introduction in ch. 1, 4QpNah 3–4 I has been associated with the reign of Alexander Jannaeus ever since its preliminary publication by Allegro.¹ This historical setting remains the most plausible context for Pericope 2. The first part of this chapter addresses the identification of figures mentioned in the pericope, generally confirming the conventional identifications of: “Demetrius” as Demetrius III Eukairos; “Antiochus” as Antiochus IV; the “Seekers-after-Smooth-Things” as the Pharisees; the “Kittim” as the Romans; the “Young Lion of Wrath” as Alexander Jannaeus; and “Ephraim” as the Pharisees. In the second part of this chapter, we evaluate the historical significance of individual *pesher* units, and address a number of ancillary figures in the *pesher*, including “his great ones,” “the men of his counsel,” and “the priests of Jerusalem.”

¹ Allegro, “Further Light,” 92–93 and the majority of relevant secondary literature. Occasional voices have sought a 2nd century BCE context instead. Cf. Henry H. Rowley, “4QpNahum and the Teacher of Righteousness,” *JBL* 75 (1956): 188–93 and Isaac Rabinowitz, “The Meaning of the Key (‘Demetrius’) Passage of the Qumran Nahum-Pesher,” *JAOS* 98 (1978): 394–9. A later date, within the Roman period, has been proposed by Hugh Joseph Schonfield, *Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Studies toward their Solution* (New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 1957), 96–97; Godfrey Rolles Driver, *The Judean Scrolls* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), 288–98; Barbara Elizabeth Thiering, *Redating the Teacher of Righteousness* (Australian and New Zealand Studies in Theology and Religion. Sydney: Theological Explorations, 1979); and now Doudna, who views Pompey as the Lion of Wrath (639–674).

4.1 FIGURES NAMED IN PERICOPE 2

4.1.1 *Demetrius*

The phrase דְּמִטְרִיָּס מֶלֶךְ יוֹן indicates a Seleucid monarch.² The significant events in pericope 2 are: an invasion of Judea by a Seleucid king named Demetrius at the behest of a Jewish faction; a military encounter; and the execution by hanging of members of that Jewish faction. The primary clue for the historical placement of this pericope appears in unit 7, with the attribution of the invasion to an explicitly named individual, the Seleucid king Demetrius. All of the Seleucid monarchs, the “kings of Greece,” were named either “Seleucus” or “Antiochus” or “Demetrius,” so that, although the pesher preserves only half the letters of this king’s name, it is clear that it designates a Demetrius. There were three Seleucid kings by that name: Demetrius I Soter (ruled 162–150 BCE),³ Demetrius II Nicator (145–139 BCE),⁴ and Demetrius III Eukairos (94–88 BCE).⁵

All three of the above Seleucid kings invaded Judea and battled a Jewish leader at the behest of Jewish collaborators. However, executions such as those in unit 9 of Pericope 2 are only attested in the period of Demetrius III. A summary of the relevant account in Josephus will be helpful. In pursuit of reconciliation with his alienated nation, King Alexander Jannaeus asked his subjects what they would like him to do. “They all” replied “to die,” and “they” sent to Demetrius III to be their ally. Demetrius arrived with an army, engaging Jannaeus near Shechem, where Jannaeus’s mercenaries were routed, but Demetrius also sustained losses. 6000 of Demetrius’s Jewish supporters defected, and Demetrius withdrew from Judea. The Jews who remained to oppose Jannaeus were defeated, and he besieged

² The plural דְּמִטְרִיָּס in line 3 also refers to Seleucid kings, though some assume a broader application there. In the Hebrew Bible, יוֹן refers to the Greek-speaking world. Specifically, in Dan 8:21, in the series of the four kings, יוֹן refers to the domain of Alexander the Great (cf. Dan 10:20; 11:2). In biblical genealogy, יוֹן is the son of Japhet, and in 1QM I,6, XVIII,2 the sons of Japhet represent the Seleucids. Brooke detects an “anti-Greek exclusivism” in 4Q252’s treatment of Japhet (“The Thematic Content of 4Q252,” *JQR* 85 [1994]: 33–59), but his interpretation is opposed by Bernstein (“4Q252: Method and Context, Genre and Sources: A Response to George J. Brooke,” *JQR* 85 [1994]: 66–67).

³ Cf. *IMacc* ch. 7, 9–10; *Jos. Ant* 12 §390–13 §61.

⁴ *Ant* 13 §120–268; *IMacc* 11:21–14:48.

⁵ *Ant* 13 §372–416; *Bḥ* 1 §92.

them at Bethoma and captured many. Jannaeus ordered 800 of these opponents to be killed, after first watching the slaughter of their wives and children. Jannaeus watched the crucifixion of these men while feasting with his concubines. When 8000 more of these opponents fled into exile, Jannaeus's ruthlessness proved to have achieved its aim of securing his throne.⁶

There is no basis for associating the hanging executions of unit 9 with the period of Demetrius II, and attempts to place them within the period of Demetrius I are problematic.⁷ Despite the speculation of some scholars, there is no historical evidence of a situation that involved the hanging deaths of Hellenizing Jews.⁸ The most potentially relevant historical scenario would be Bacchides' execution of sixty belated supporters of Alcimus. However, the mode of those executions is unknown, and there is no basis for calling those apparently non-Hellenizing victims "Seekers-after-Smooth-Things." The only documented executions of Hellenizing Jews are those that were

⁶ Cf. SVM I: 224–25; III: 430–32.

⁷ The identification of Demetrius I poses some difficulty even in unit 7, which refers to the Seleucid invasion of Jerusalem. Demetrius's generals, Bacchides and Nicanor, did not only "seek" to enter Jerusalem, but they actually did enter the city. Thus Cross objects to Rowley's 2nd century hypothesis, "It seems rather unlikely that one would speak of 'an attempt to enter Jerusalem' unless the attempt was against opposition and was not carried out. And if it were a famous *general* who *entered* Jerusalem, why speak of a *king trying* to enter?" (*Ancient Library*, 99; cf. Chaim Rabin, "Alexander Jannaeus and the Pharisees," *JJS* 7 [1956]: 4; Rabinowitz, "Key Passage," 394, n. 1; Edmund Felix Sutcliffe, *The Monks of Qumran as Depicted in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1960], 180). Although the word שָׁקַט is sometimes used even when a desired objective is attained, (cf. Jer 26:21; Zech 6:7, 12:9), it does generally indicate unfulfilled intentions (see esp. I Sam 23:10, 4QpPs^a II,18, IV,14).

⁸ If Demetrius I were to be identified in this pesher, then the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things in unit 7 would have to be a Hellenizing Jewish faction. Supposing even minimal coherence within the pericope, this faction must be identified with the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things named in unit 9 as victims of the hangings.

Rabinowitz felt quite certain that Demetrius in 4QpNah refers to Demetrius I and his attempt to Hellenize Jerusalem in accordance with the wishes of his Hellenized supporters. He rendered unit 7 of the pesher as follows (clarifying notes are added in brackets, in accordance with Rabinowitz's extensive explanations): "... Its (fulfilled) presage was upon Deme]trius, king of Asiatic Greece; that he sought to bring Jerusalem into the Council of the Resorters-to-Flatteries" [i.e., the Hellenizing supporters of Alcimus, who had feared to be in Jerusalem] "... from Antiochus until the appearance of the rulers of the Kittim" [i.e., the Seleucid generals, Bacchides and Nicanor] "but she was later to be trodden" [i.e., by the "Resorters-to-Flatteries" who could safely inhabit Jerusalem after the Seleucid intervention]. For a critique of his position, especially on the grounds that this reading distorts the words of the pesher, see Berrin, "Lemma/Pesher Correspondence."

overseen by Judah Maccabeus, which were not likely to have been effected by hanging. Hanging was sufficiently noteworthy that it would not have escaped explicit mention in our sources. The identification of Demetrius III in 4QpNah is virtually universal today.

4.1.2 *Seekers-after-Smooth-Things* (דורשי החלקות)

In Peshar Nahum, the Jews who called for Demetrius's intervention are identified only by the epithet "Seekers-after-Smooth-Things."⁹ Josephus uses only generic terms and pronouns to refer to the opponents of Jannaeus who appealed to Demetrius, but scholars have long associated these opponents with the Pharisees.¹⁰ So, too, the "Seekers-after-Smooth-Things" at Qumran had been identified as Pharisees even before the publication of Peshar Nahum.¹¹ As demonstrated by

⁹ This epithet appears six times in 4QpNah 3–4, at I,2, 7; II,2, 4; and III,3, 6–7. See now, VanderKam, "Those Who Look for Smooth Things, Pharisees, and Oral Law," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. (ed. Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields; Brill: Leiden, 2003), 465–477. See also, Charlesworth, *The Pesharim*, 97–98.

¹⁰ Schiffman notes that in *Bj* 1 §97, the 800 victims of crucifixion are called "the captives" and in *Ant* 13 §380, simply "Jews." The strongest evidence in favor of the Pharisaic identification of these men is in *Ant* 13 §408–11 (*Bj* 1 §110–14) wherein the explicitly named Pharisees "tried to persuade her (Alexandra) to kill those who had urged Alexander to put the 800 to death." Surely, the aim of these Pharisees is to avenge members of their own party. Schiffman (277–78) also points to details in Josephus's description of a decisive confrontation between Jannaeus and his opponents in *Ant* 13 §372–74. Both the pelting of Jannaeus with citrons and the question of his priestly legitimacy are echoed in rabbinic texts related to the Pharisees. Cf. *mSuk* 4:9 for the pelting of a "Sadduceean priest" with citrons; *bQjd* 66a for Hasmonean lineage and persecution of Pharisees. Cf. *SVM* I: 221–24.

Rabin's arguments against the accepted identification are not convincing ("Alexander Jannaeus," 5–11). His statement that "Josephus evidently wishes to depict here popular fury rather than party intrigues" (6–7) overlooks the connection between the Pharisees and the populace (see n. 28, below). Rabin cites *Bj* 1 §67 and *Ant* 13 §288 to contrast Josephus's silence about the identity of Jannaeus's opponents with his explicit identification of the Pharisees as the rebels against John Hyrcanus. Rabin glosses over the fact that these sources state that the Pharisees opposed "John and his sons," of whom Jannaeus was the principal one to rule the people. In fact Rabin omits these words in the citation from *Antiquities* without comment, though there is a strong textual basis for their presence. Cp. Doudna's highlighting of the references to John's sons in *Ant* 13 §288 and 13 §296. He states that the words appear "in most mss" (647). In favor of taking Jannaeus only, and not John Hyrcanus, as the antagonist of the Pharisees, see Mark Geller, "Alexander Jannaeus and the Pharisee Rift," *JJS* 30 (1979): 202–11.

¹¹ See Maier, "Weitere Stücke" 234–49, for a comprehensive discussion of the term at Qumran, and a systematic argument in favor of Pharisaic identification.

Schiffman, 4QpNah corroborates both of these identifications.¹² The pesher identifies the Jews who appealed to Demetrius as the “Seekers-after-Smooth-Things,” and provides additional information about this group to solidify its identification as the Pharisees.

Flusser was one early proponent of the Pharisaic identification of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things.¹³ In his later publications, Flusser’s arguments are largely dependent upon the historical events described in 4QpNah. However, he also points to ancient descriptions of the Pharisees that match attributes associated with the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things. He focuses on statements in the New Testament and the Talmud that deride “Pharisees” as hypocrites (noting especially Jannaeus’s statement to that effect in bSota 22b), as well as statements in Josephus and the Talmud that indicate Pharisaic influence with the populace.¹⁴

The epithet *החלקות דורשי* is complex. The difficulty of capturing the nuances of the term is evident in the fact that there is no consensus regarding its translation, despite the nearly universal consensus that it refers to the Pharisees. The predominant translation is Horgan’s rather literal “Seekers-After-Smooth-Things.” This does not

For early Pharisaic identifications of the group, see Brownlee, “Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Biblical Archaeologist* 14 (1951): 59–60; Moses H. Segal, “The Habakkuk ‘Commentary’ and the Damascus Fragments,” *JBL* 70 (1951): 145–47.

¹² “Pharisees and Sadducees,” 272–90. The main obstacle to consensus on this identification is the larger question of the identity of the Pharisees. See esp. Jacob Neusner, *From Politics To Piety: the Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism* (NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972; particularly pp. 1–11, 152–54) and Anthony J. Saldarini’s discussion and bibliography in *ABD*, s.v. Pharisees, including his observation that, “recent research on the Pharisees has paradoxically made them and their role in Palestinian society more obscure and difficult to describe” (289). An appreciation of ancient Jewish diversity is certainly indispensable. Still, the simplification imposed by the Pharisaic label is, like many generalizations, at least as useful as it is misleading. For a historiographic look at the modern investigation of Pharisaic identity and influence, see Daniel R. Schwartz, “MMT, Josephus, and the Pharisees,” pp. 67–80 in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*, ed. J. Kampen and M.J. Bernstein (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

¹³ Cf. his review of J.T. Milik’s *Ten Years of Discovery* in *קריית ספר* (1957): 458–59.
¹⁴ P. 136. See also, Dupont-Sommer, “Observations nouvelles sur l’expression ‘suspendu vivant sur le bois’ dans le Commentaire de Nahum (4Q pNah II 8) à la lumière du Rouleau du Temple (11Q Temple Scroll LXIV 6–13),” *Comptes rendus de l’Académie des Inscriptions et belles-lettres* (1972): 709–720; “Lumières Nouvelles sur l’arrière-plan historique des écrits de Qoumran,” *EI* 8 (1967, *E.L. Sukenik Memorial Volume*): 30*–31*; Moshe Weinfeld, “The Charge of Hypocrisy in Matthew 23 and in Jewish Sources,” *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990): 52–58; Baruch Sharvit, “הפרושים לפי מנילות כת מדבר יהודה,” *בית המקרא* 34 (1989): 142–48.

manage to convey the exegetical connotation of the root *דרש* or the concepts of leniency, seductiveness, and deceit that are encapsulated in the word *החלקות*.¹⁵ Nonetheless, in the absence of a translation that can do full justice to the epithet, we have followed the familiar rendering. The following analysis will address the individual components of the term *החלקות דורשי*, as well as the epithet itself, to clarify the richness of the term that underlies the English “Seekers after Smooth Things.”

דרש, seeking, or probing, appears frequently in the Bible in a large variety of contexts. At Qumran, the verb often describes a seeking after God, specifically through study.¹⁶ The focus on study is similar to the rabbinic use of the root in the sense of “expound,” most familiarly in the concept of “midrash.”¹⁷ In the eyes of the Qumran

¹⁵ On the leniency of the Pharisees, cf. Josephus *Ant* 13 §294. Attempts at more evocative translations of *החלקות דורשי* have included, for example, Brownlee’s “expounders of smooth things” (“Biblical Interpretation”); Maier’s “die ‘glatten’ Anweisungen” (*Die Texte*; and his earlier, “die nach glatten (Lehren) suchen” in “Weitere Stücke”); Rabin’s “Interpreters of smooth things” (“Alexander Jannaeus”); so, too, Wieder, *Judean Scrolls*, Amusin’s “interpreters of ‘slippery things’” in “the Reflection of Historical Events”), and Schiffman’s “interpreters of false laws” (*Reclaiming: Pharisees*). In the 2nd ed. of *Ancient Library*, Cross translated the epithet as “Clever Expositors” and “facile interpreters of the law”; in the 3rd ed., he reverted to his earlier, “Those who Seek Flattery.”

¹⁶ See Schiffman, *Halakhah at Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 54–60. In 1QS VI,7–8, 24; VIII,12 and probably in 1QH 12:6, study (*דרש*) is seen as vital to obtaining revelation of the hidden laws of God. The term *דורש התורה* is an epithet for a leader of the Community, in CD VI,7; VII,18 and 4Q174(4QFlor) I,11. (Cf. Flusser, 136, 162 n. 6). Wieder views this term as the basis for the coinage of the antithetical *החלקות דורשי* (*Judean Scrolls*, 135). Note also the use of *דרש* in reference to the probing of prospective members of the community to evaluate their merits (1QS V,20–21).

¹⁷ Albert I. Baumgarten has described the epithet *החלקות דורשי* as “a particularly apt attack on their [the Pharisees’] movement” in light of his interpretation of the name “Pharisee” (“The Name of the Pharisees,” *JBL* 102 [1983]: 422). Baumgarten derives “Pharisee” from the root *פרש*, meaning “specify,” which he relates to the frequent use of the Gr. term *ἀκρίβεια* (“precision”) in reference to the Pharisees in ancient sources (413–17). Thus, he determines, “the meaning of *דורשי החלרות* is simple: do not think the Pharisees offer precise, uncompromising regulations, as they claim. All they offer are smooth, easy, but false interpretations” (422). Baumgarten rejects the association between the name “Pharisees” and “interpreters” in earlier scholarship (*ibid.*, 427). He states that the root *פרש* did not acquire the meaning of “interpret” until “the end of the Talmudic period.” However, *פרש* seems to have already acquired some of this interpretive connotation earlier. This is indicated by the aptness of the critique *החלקות דורשי*, observed by Baumgarten himself, as well as the work of Mandel on *מפרש בקבלה* on *עליו מפרש בקבלה* as an interpretive specifying application (“Midrashic Exegesis,” 149–68.)

Community, the failure to seek God in this way is one negative attribute of wicked people.¹⁸ Perhaps worse than those who fail to seek God, are those who seek God falsely, in untrue ways and/or insincerely. Thus, the Community rails against a group that it views as seductively engaging and endangering many people through its false applications of Torah study—the דורשי החלקות who seek (or “expound”) “smooth things.”

The root חלק denotes smoothness.¹⁹ It is widely recognized that the primary biblical basis for the idiom דורשי החלקות in the Qumran corpus is Isa 30:10 “speak to us smooth things” (דברו לנו חלקות). In this verse, the people oppose the true prophets, refusing divinely revealed visions of reality and insisting upon “smooth things” and delusions. This verse is the basis for CD I,18, אשר דרשו בחלקות,²⁰ ויבחרו במהתלות. Conjecture about the means by which the verse generated the epithet at Qumran has proceeded from both textual and exegetical perspectives. Rabin states that the usage in CD I,18 derives from “a variant sectarian reading” of the text of Isaiah, with the root דרש substituted for דבר.²¹ It is more likely that the sobriquet was a deliberate combination of the theologically significant term דרש with the verse’s חלקות. Norman M. Bronznick offers evidence that חלק may denote “empty” or “flat,” and sees the epithet as a dep-

¹⁸ Thus, 1QS V,11, “the men of Evil . . . for they did not seek Him in His laws to know the hidden things . . .”. Licht detects the biblical basis for this passage in Zeph 1:7 “those who turn back from God and those who do not seek Him and do not probe after Him” (in מנילה הסרכים ממנילות מדבר יהודה [Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1965]).

¹⁹ חלק also denotes “division” (and “portion” or “part”). A secondary valence of this sort may be discerned, e.g. in Amusin’s occasional rendering of דורשי החלקות as “Chercheurs de Dissensions,” seeing חלקות as indicating מחלוקות, arguments (“Éphraïm et Manassé dans le Péschér de Nahum (4 Q p Nahum),” *RevQ* 4 (1963–4): 389–96.

²⁰ The dependence upon Isa 30:10 is noted by Solomon Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, Vol. I of *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*. Cambridge: University Press, 1910. Similar usages appear in ch. 11 of Daniel, which is so influential in the language of Pericope 3 of 4QpNah. Cf. Dan 11:32–35 for a contrast between חלקות/חלקות and משכילים. Ezek 12:24 looks forward to the approaching fulfillment of divine prophecies, at which time there will be no more vain vision or “smooth” divination. In Prov 28:23 the מהליך לשון is contrasted negatively with the rebuker, מוכיח, a term associated in the Bible and at Qumran with encouraging people to reform. Cf. Prov 2:16=7:5; 7:21; and 26:28 for the smooth-talking seductress, and Ps 5:10; 12:3–4; 36:3; 55:22 for smooth speech associated with deceit and hypocrisy.

²¹ “Alexander Jannaeus,” 4.

recation of the value of Pharisaic exposition.²² Other scholars point to an auditory pun on the term *halakha*.²³ In actuality, דורשי ההלקות must be seen as a complex epithet, typifying Qumran multivalence. Its connotation emerges as a conglomerate of biblical influences, polysemy (דרש as seeking and expounding), pun (הלקות/הלכות), and stereotyping, i.e. repeated specialized use within the Community.

A number of common elements are found in different contexts in association with דורשי ההלקות. Table 4 highlights the features associated with these “Seekers-after-Smooth-Things.” The sources are organized into three groupings: polemical passages, sapiential works, and pesharim. CD I,18, like its base-verse in Isaiah, describes the desire of the populace for palliative leadership. In that passage, the איש הלצון (the Scoffer) is seen to spout from the waters of lies, prompting people to seek smooth things, and choose delusions.²⁴ 1QH X,14–16 similarly contrasts the “Seekers-after-Smooth-Things,” the men of deception (רמיה), with the Men of Truth who see reality. These terms כוב, רמיה, and לץ recur in passages mentioning the דורשי ההלקות.²⁵ 1QH X,32 uses the idiom together with מליצי הכוב, and continues in the same context to denounce the מליצי רמיה (X,34). 1QH XII,7–14 decries the מליצי רמיה and חווי רמיה who exchange Torah for “smooth things” on behalf of God’s nation.

4Q185 1–2 II,14, in praise of the man who seeks true divine wisdom, blesses the man who does not seek wisdom in הלקות or מרמה. 4Q184 (4Q Seductress or 4Q Wiles of the Wicked Woman) I,17 denounces the evil woman who corrupts the righteous with smooth things.

²² Cecil Roth sees the use of the term דורשי ההלקות in reference to the Pharisees as an antithesis to the term דורשי החמורות that appears in the Talmud (“A Talmudic Reference to the Qumran Sect?” *RevQ* 2 [1960]: 261–65.)

²³ Brownlee, “Biblical Interpretation,” 58; followed by Burrows, *More Light*, 250; Maier, “Weitere Stücke,” 230 n. 88; Hoenig, “Dorshé Halakot,” 127; Schiffman, 276.

²⁴ In CD and 1QpHab, the terms איש הלצון, משיף הכוב, and איש הכוב signify the leader of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things. Flusser further views this individual as the founder of the Pharisees, contemporary with and parallel to the Teacher of Righteousness “פרושים, צדוקים,” 137. Cf. H. Eshel, “The Meaning and Significance of CD 20:3–15,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and reformulated Issues*. (ed. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 336.

²⁵ Rabin lists various terms for “lies” in 1QH and CD (“Alexander Jannaeus,”

As for the pesharim, 4QpIsa^c (163) frag 23 II,10, places the congregation of החלקות [ד]ורשי in Jerusalem at the End of Days, and the fragmentary context mentions Torah and trampling. In 4QpNah, the “Seekers-after-Smooth-Things” are identified with Ephraim (II,2, III,6)²⁶ and associated with the Last Days (II,2; III,3), lies (II,2), guilt (II,4, III,3), influence (I,3, II,2, 4; III,3, 6–7), Jerusalem (I,2, II,2) and trampling (I,3). Frag 9 of 4Q177Cat^a II,12 is not very well preserved, but it too places the congregation of Seekers-after-Smooth-Things in the Last Days.²⁷

Recurrent terminology and concepts associated with החלקות דורשי at Qumran.

Table 4–1 החלקות: Sapiential Texts

Relevant terms/ concepts	4Q184	4Q185
חלק	line 17 לפתות בחלקות להשנות ה[ח]ק, להפשיע, להשות	II,14 ובחלקות לא יחזיקנה מרמה לא יבקשנה

4). Maier lists Qumran sources attributing falsehood to the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things (“Weitere Stücke,” 234–35). He further lists sources that associate this falsehood with false biblical interpretation (235–36) as well as false teaching (237), thus propagating the observance of false laws (238–39).

²⁶ In II,8 Ephraim is certainly the same group as it is throughout the scroll, identified with the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, though the identification is not stated explicitly as it is in II,2, or even indirectly, as at III,5. In II,8, too, the group is associated with lies and influence.

²⁷ We place 4Q177Cat^a with the “pesharim,” employing the latter term more informally than elsewhere, as a shortened notation for “eschatological exegetical works.”

Table 4–2 דורשי החלקות: Polemical Texts

	CD I,14–18*	1QH X,10–15	1QH X,31–37	1QH XII,7–20
דרש חלקות	I,18 דרשו בחלקות	X,15 דורשי חל[קות]	X,32 דורשי החלקות	החליקו 7, XII בחלקות 10, XII XII,14–16 (3x) וידרשוכה
מי כזב	ממי כזב הטיף	כקול המון מים רבים	מליצי כזב	מליצי כזב; ולצמאם ישקום, נביאי כזב
העה	ויהעם	מליצי העות	—	העותם, (2x) העות
רמה	—	אנשי רמיה	דורשי רמיה	מליצי רמיה, להולל ברמיה, אנשי רמיה
ליין	איש הלצון	מליצי העות, לצים	מליצי כזב	מליצי רמיה, מליצי כזב
“the many”	עדה, המונם	קהלת רשעים, (המון מים)	עדת	לעמך
future punishment/ failure	להסנירם לחרב	להלבט במשנתם	(והצילני)	במ[שפ]ט חכרת
oppose good, esp. להמיר	וירשיעו צדיק, ובכל הולכי המים העבה נפשם	... בינה דעת ... וימירום	להמיר בהולל יצר סמוך ... הוקים	להמיר תורתך

* CD I,12 also features the term אחרונים דורות, which is associated with דורשי החלקות in the pesharim. (See Table 4–3).

Table 4–3 דורשי החלקות: Exegetical Texts

	4QpIsa ^c (4Q163)	4Q177 (4QCat ^a)	4QpNah, frags 3–4
דורשי החלקות	f. 23 II,10 ד[ורשי] החלקות	II,4 דורשי ה[חלקות]	I,2,7; II,2,4; III,3,6 דורשי החלקות
אחרית הימים	לאחרית הימים	II,10 באחרית[ת] המים	(I,2,7: Demetrius) לאחרית הימים II,2 באחרית הקץ III,3*
city	ירושלים	IV,15 ירושלים, ציון	I,2 ירושלים II,2 עיר אפרים II,4 (ממשלה) III,4 (יהודה) III,6 (in lemma)
group, many, influence	עדה	II,4 עדה	I,2 עצה; II,2 עיר II,4 ממשלה, עדתם III,3 כול ישראל, רבים III,6 פת[אים], כנסתם
deceit (לִיג, תעה)		I,7 הלצון	II,2 בכחש ובשקר] III,5 מתעיהם III,7 לתעות
future punishment/ failure			I,3 תרמס II,4 לא ימוש הרב ... III,3–5
rejection by populace			III,7 תובד ...

* דורשי החלקות appears twice in each of the first 3 columns of 4QpNah frags 3–4. In each column, the first mention is accompanied by a phrase indicating the historical/eschatological context, while the second occurrence stands alone.

The above polemical passages in CD and 1QH establish the hypocritical and dishonest nature of the influential Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, and set them in dualistic contrast to the righteous.²⁸ Some of these contexts predict the divine punishment of these sinners.

²⁸ On the “hypocrisy” of the Pharisees and Pharisaic influence over the masses, see n. 14 above, as well as Amusin, “Historical Events,” 145; H. Eshel, “תולדותיה,” 92. Cf. *Ant* 13 §288, 298, “the Pharisees have the support of the masses (τὸ πλῆθος). In 13 §400–4, Alexander’s deathbed advice to Salome emphasizes Pharisaic control over their “fellow-Jews” (τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις), “the masses” (τῷ πλῆθει), “the nation”

The sapiential texts 4Q184–85 feature concepts that are consistent with those in the other Qumran documents, but may also be accounted for by biblical influence alone. In these texts, “smooth things” are used to cause people to sin and veer from righteousness, and righteous people avoid them.

In the pesharim, the negative attributes delineated in the other works appear to be assumed, and the focus is more upon the historical/eschatological reality befalling the group. The main characteristic preserved in the pesharim is the influential nature of the *דורשי החלקות*, with a new stress on their “urban” position.²⁹ The association with Ephraim is key in 4QpNah. 4QpNah II,8, which refers to the corrupt faction as *מהעי אפרים* (rather than employing *דורשי החלקות* itself), includes the key terms from CD and 1QH: *רבים*, *מחעי*, *מרמה*, *כזב* terms which appear less frequently in the passages of 4QpNah that mention the *דורשי החלקות* explicitly.³⁰ Note that each of the relevant pesharim specifies an eschatological time-frame for the fulfillment of the prophecies concerning the *דורשי החלקות*, by means of the phrase *אחרית הימים*.

In sum, the *דורשי החלקות*, i.e. the Pharisees, were viewed by the Community as corrupt leaders, who swayed the populace with politically expedient *halakhic* rulings.³¹ The Community awaited the group’s eschatological eradication, and Pericope 2 aims to demonstrate a partial fulfillment of this hope. Unit 7 of Peshar Nahum describes the appeal of the Pharisees to Demetrius III; Unit 8 describes Jannaeus’s military defeat of his Pharisaic opponents; and unit 9 describes his crucifixion of 800 of them.

(*τῶ ἔθνει*). Similarly, 18 §15 “they are extremely influential among the townsfolk (*τοὺς ἄμους*); and all prayers and sacred rites of divine worship are performed according to their exposition” (transl. L.H. Feldman in *LCL*). Flusser maintained that 1QH XIV,5; XV,34 also indicate Pharisaic dominance as terms usually employed for *דורשי החלקות* are applied there to all of Israel (“*פרושים, צדוקים*,” 137, 162 n. 12).

²⁹ Cf. *Ant* 18 §15. Josephus singles out “the inhabitants of the cities (*τας πόλεις*)” as honoring and following the Pharisees.

³⁰ Apparently, the explicit naming of *דורשי החלקות* obviated the need to delineate so many of their attributes, as these were subsumed within the term itself. In the absence of the epithet, the author may have, perhaps unwittingly, felt more compelled to list particular details.

³¹ Note that it is the claim of Pharisaic dominance, found in Josephus, the Talmud, and NT, that supports the identification of the *דורשי החלקות* with the Pharisees on the basis of a similar attribution to this group at Qumran. The accuracy of this claim is a separate matter. For an insightful, balanced perspective on the nature of Pharisaic popularity, see Martin Goodman, “A Note on Josephus, the Pharisees, and Ancestral Tradition,” *JJS* 50 (1999): 17–20. See also the sources cited in n. 28 above. The issue is addressed more fully below in reference to Ephraim.

4.1.3 *Antiochus*

There is a greater quantity of candidates for the identification of Antiochus than for Demetrius. However, of the nine kings by that name, only two—Antiochus III or IV—are suitable for the context of the pesher. 4QpNah makes a general statement about the status of Judea within a certain time-frame, beginning with Antiochus and ending with the Kittim, i.e., the Romans.³² Significant changes in the status of Judea took place under Antiochus III, who secured the Seleucid conquest of Judea from the Ptolemies, and under Antiochus IV who instituted the notorious persecutions that led to the Maccabean revolt.

It would seem more likely that a figure referred to simply as Antiochus, without further clarifying designation, would be the notorious Antiochus IV. In any case, the precise identification of the figure does not really have a direct bearing on the determination of the historical framework of the pesher, since the name occurs in a historical gloss.³³ The function of Antiochus in the pesher, whether Antiochus III or Antiochus IV, is to mark a period of Judean invulnerability.

³² The Antiochus in the pesher is identified as Antiochus IV by Amusin, Burrows, Carmignac, Cross (though he also offers Antiochus VII Sidetes as a possibility, in which he is followed by Jeremias, 129); Dupont-Sommer, Gaster, Horgan, Knibb, Michelini Tocci, Lohse, Maier, Rabinowitz.

Rowley and Vogt offer Antiochus III or IV. Antiochus III is preferred by Schiffman and Tantlevskij. Habermann observes that the identification of Antiochus III was put forth by S.A. Lowenstamm (in *Ha'aretz* Aug. 3, 1956), but he himself suggested Antiochus X, the rival of Demetrius. García-Martínez proposed Antiochus V Eupator (in García-Martínez and Julio C. Trebolle Barrera, *People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: their Writings, Beliefs, and Practices* [Leiden: Brill, 1995], 80 n. 75).

On other references to Antiochus IV in ancient Jewish writings see Broshi and Eshel, "The Greek King is Antiochus," 120. Puech identifies the "antichrist" figure of 4Q246 as Antiochus Epiphanes (DJD XXII, 183–84).

³³ This observation reflects a different approach than that of some early scholarship, in which the historical analysis of Pesher Nahum sometimes consisted of sweeping generalizations stemming from select, isolated details. Thus, the naming of Antiochus had been used by some scholars to indicate a 2nd century BCE setting for this section, on the basis of the crucifixions ordered by Antiochus IV in *Ant* 12 §256. (Cf. Rowley, "4QpNah," 192–93; "The Kittim and the Dead Sea Scrolls," *PEQ* 88 [1956]: 92–109 and Solomon Zeitlin, "The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Travesty on Scholarship," *JQR* 47 [1956–7], 1–37). These scholars apparently view the pesher as sufficiently integrated that it would refer to Antiochus in adjacent pesher interpretations, but not so coherent as to be strictly consecutive. However, Antiochus IV surely did not crucify members of the Hellenizing faction that appealed to Demetrius I. More significantly, Antiochus and the Kittim in unit 7 are not por-

4.1.4 *Kittim*

The attempt to identify the “Kittim” in the Dead Sea Scrolls engendered much controversy in the early decades of Qumran studies. At the time, the Seleucid or Roman identification of this group was considered a key issue in the debate that has consistently consumed Qumran scholars—the date of the scrolls’ composition.³⁴ The question of the identity of the Kittim is no longer viewed as a focal point for this debate, and recent discourse on the group has proceeded with greater objectivity.³⁵ In the most recent investigation of the “Kittim” in Qumran literature, H. Eshel renews the claim that both the Seleucid and Roman identifications are found in the corpus.³⁶ Eshel traces a development of the term from a general appellation for “western nations” in the Bible,³⁷ to a specific application to the Seleucids,³⁸ and finally to a designation for the Romans.³⁹

The figurative use of “Kittim” at Qumran derives from the oracle of Balaam in Num 24:24: “Ships come from the quarter of Kittim; they subject Asshur, subject Eber. They, too, shall perish forever” (transl. *NJPS*). On this basis, the term Kittim came to represent a/the eschatological Gentile power that would serve as an

trayed as contemporaries of Demetrius and Jannaeus, and are not active in the central events of the pesher themselves.

³⁴ Thus, for example, Dupont-Sommer’s original motivation for a Roman identification was his desire to date the establishment of the Qumran sect in the 60’s BCE, a position that he subsequently retracted.

³⁵ One influential publication leading in this direction was “The Kittim in the Qumran Pesharim,” in which Brooke cautioned against using the references to Kittim in the pesharim as historical sources at all. See ch. 3.

³⁶ “The *Kittim* in the War Scroll and in the Pesharim,” in *Historical Perspectives from the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. David Goodblatt, Avital Pinnick, and Daniel R. Schwartz; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 29–44.

³⁷ Cf. *HALOT*, s.v., for the biblical use of “Kittim” to denote the inhabitants of southern Cyprus in the Bible.

³⁸ In 1QM *passim* and 4QpIsa^a III,1–8.

³⁹ Cf. Stegemann’s characterization of 4QpNah: “What is new [in the *Commentary on Nahum*] is that the enemies of Israel, known as the Kittim, are no longer the Seleucids and the Ptolemies, as they have been in all earlier Essene works through the second *Commentary on Isaiah*, but instead, for the first time, the Romans” (*The Library of Qumran, On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* [Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1998], 131). Contrast Knibb’s assertion that “in the scrolls, the Kittim are always the Romans” (212); Dupont-Sommer, (“le mot *Kittim* désigne les Romains, est aujourd’hui admise de façon pratiquement unanime,” “Le Commentaire,” 64); Vermes, “the identification of the Romans as the ‘Kittim’ [in Qumran literature] is nowadays generally accepted” (*CDSSE*, 59).

instrument for inflicting divine retribution.⁴⁰ Targ and Vg to Num 24:24 refer the Kittim in this verse to the Romans.⁴¹ This demonstrates the potential applicability of the epithet to Rome but does not limit the identification to that nation. In Dan 11:30, the Roman identification of the “Kittim” is clear.⁴² However, the identification of Kittim as Seleucids is equally clear in IMacc 1:1; 8:5. The question is which identification is in effect in the various Qumran texts. At the next level of inquiry, the issue is what significance should be attached to the variability in identification. Three main alternatives can be outlined: (1) The significance of “Kittim” at Qumran may be viewed as operating along a range of possible applications, at times functioning as a general term for powerful Gentiles (as in ordinary biblical usage),⁴³ and at times bearing eschatological valence (following upon Num 24:24), and applicable to either the Seleucids or the Romans as appropriate in any particular context. (2) “Kittim” at Qumran may be taken to allude specifically to the supreme dominant power in any given time period, so that the Seleucid identification would naturally give way to the Roman.⁴⁴ (3) If the

⁴⁰ Cf. Nitzan, 26, 35, 125–28, 161.

⁴¹ Gaster, *TDSS*, 339.

⁴² Cf. Dupont-Sommer “Le Commentaire,” 64; “Observations,” 204; “Observations sur le Commentaire d’Habacuc.” Similarly, the oft-cited 1QpHab VI,4 is useful only regarding that particular occurrence of “Kittim,” or at most, regarding the work as a whole. Early attempts to identify the Kittim focused upon the statement in 1QpHab IV,6 that they sacrifice to their military standards, since this is a practice that is associated with Roman soldiers. Rowley, arguing for an earlier composition date for the pesher, countered that standard-worship is documented among Seleucids (though not specifically sacrifice), but is not attested among Romans prior to the Imperial Era (“The Kittim,” 92–109; “4QpNahum,” 192). In any case, even if this “proof” of Roman identification is accepted, its value does not extend to the corpus as a whole.

⁴³ Vermes views *Ant* 1 §128 as reflecting this usage (*CDSSE*, 59). Josephus views the term as originally referring specifically to Cyprus, but having been subsequently applied to “all islands and to most maritime countries.”

⁴⁴ Thus, Gaster states that the term “originally denoted the inhabitants of Kittim, in Cyprus (cp. Gen 10:4), but came later to be used in an extended sense—rather like “Huns” or “Tartars”—of ‘barbarians’ in general and was applied in the Hellenistic age to the ‘Macedonians’ of the Alexandrian Empire, and in the Roman age to the Romans themselves” (*TDSS*, 28). This view is similar to that of Stegemann, cited above, and Vermes (*CDSSE*, 59). However, although Vermes perceives such a chronological development in Jewish usage generally, he maintains that the Qumran Community used the term exclusively in reference to the Romans. He also states that the epithet would have been neutral up until the time of the destruction of the Temple.

Qumran Community always employed “Kittim” in an eschatological sense, then a shift in the application of the epithet from Seleucids to Romans would indicate some sort of recognition or at least adaptation to the fact that the Community’s expectations and predictions for the Seleucids had failed to be fulfilled.⁴⁵

The larger issue of the identity of Kittim in the general corpus has thus not yet been resolved, and each case must be judged on its own merits. Our interpretation of the context of Pericope 2 in 4QpNah calls for the acceptance of the Roman identification of the Kittim in this instance. One oft-mentioned support for the Roman identification in the pesharim is the pointed contrast between the “rulers” of the Kittim and the “kings” of מלך in unit 7 of 4QpNah.⁴⁶ The dominant sense of ממשל as dominion argues in favor of the conventional identification here of the “Rulers of the Kittim” as Roman leaders, contrasted with Greek kings. It is not just the usage of the term ממשל itself, which is employed in various contexts, but its juxtaposition with the term מלך.⁴⁷ Further evidence of this conscious juxtaposition in antiquity is offered by IMacc 8:12–15, which highlights the contrast between instituting kingship and governing by senate:

The Romans had conquered kings both near and far, and all those who heard of the Romans feared them. Those whom they chose to aid to be kings, were kings; those whom they chose to, they deposed.

⁴⁵ Cf. Eshel, who relates such unfulfilled predictions to the eventual cessation of the recording of peshar interpretations (“תולדותיה,” 93; “The Kittim in the War Scroll and in the Pesharim”).

Eshel states that the usage in Daniel would have facilitated the adaptation and the new identification. However, this does not account sufficiently for the Roman identification in Daniel, since at that date, the identification could hardly be attributed to a resort to desperate measures in an effort to adapt to reality. The difference in identifications in the roughly contemporary sources of IMaccabees and Daniel might also argue against the rigidity of expression claimed by Eshel. Contrast Eshel’s supposition of a rigid identification of “Kittim” with his view of 4Q372, described below. Eshel accepts 4Q372 as an anti-Samaritan polemic, and seems to accept Schuller’s claim of a specifically anti-Joseph formulation. Eshel maintains that the text, despite its pre-Qumranic composition, reflects the anti-Samaritan stance of the Qumran Community. He thus allows the negative connotation of “Joseph” at Qumran to refer simultaneously to the Samaritans and the Pharisees.

56 ציון, “תפילה יוסף מקומראן, בפירוס ממצדה והמקדש השומרוני בהר גריזים” [1991]: 125–36)

⁴⁶ Cf. ch. 3, on frags 1–2:5a. Rabin, “Alexander Jannaeus,” points to bBavaQamma 38a for the use of the term מושלים to denote “Roman central authority.”

⁴⁷ Cf. Yadin, *Message*, 164–65.

Thus the Romans had risen to great heights of power. Nevertheless, not one of them had sought self-glorification by putting on a diadem or wearing purple. They had instituted a senate for themselves. . . .⁴⁸

4.1.5 *Young Lion of Wrath* (כפיר ההרון)⁴⁹

The term כפיר ההרון appears in units 7 and 8 of 4QpNah (frags 3–4 I,5, 6) as well as in 4QpHos^b (4Q167) frag 2:2 in a peshet to Hos 5:13.⁵⁰ The word ההרון derives from the root הָרַר, to burn, which is most commonly used in the Bible as a metaphor to denote burning anger.⁵¹ Daniel Leibel traces the basis for the sobriquet to the book of Proverbs.⁵² Prov 19:12 reads, “Like the roar of the young lion, so is the wrath of the king” (נַהֵם כַּכְּפִיר זַעַף מַלְךְ), with the jux-

⁴⁸ Eng. transl. from Jonathan A. Goldstein, *Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1983).

⁴⁹ Vermes’s “furious young lion” (*CDSSE*, 474) is probably a smoother rendition of the attributive genitive than the standard “Lion of Wrath” of Allegro, but we have maintained the latter because of its widespread use.

⁵⁰ The word כפיר is read by Strugnell (“Notes,” 191) in 4QpIsa^c (4Q163) frag 14: line 5 as well, but the context has not survived. (Cf. Horgan, 117. Allegro read כפרם, DJD V,21).

⁵¹ e.g., Nah 1:6, cited in 4QpNah I,11. This particular noun form is used in the Hebrew Bible only for divine wrath. Jer 25:38 and Hos 5:14 use הָרַר in metaphors, with God as a כפיר against His sinful nation. Yadin argues that the use of this term stresses the role of the Lion as the instrument of God, and he claims that this requires a positive attitude toward the Lion in 4QpHos^b, and thus in 4QpNah as well (“Peshet Nahum Reconsidered,” 3). It is indeed likely that the Lion is portrayed as carrying out the will of God, since this is precisely the point of peshet as fulfillment literature. However, his role in executing divine punishment does not automatically entitle him to favorable regard. Cf. Joseph M. Baumgarten’s decisive refutation of Yadin in this matter, demonstrating that the enemy of one’s enemy is not necessarily one’s friend, in “Does TLH in the Temple Scroll Refer to Crucifixion?” in *Studies in Qumran Law* (Leiden: Brill, 1977. Repr., *JBL* 91 [1972]: 180–81).

⁵² “הַעֲרֹדִי,” 12. According to Leibel, the use of the sobriquet at Qumran was derived in the first instance from Proverbs. The epithet was secondarily employed in the contextually appropriate pesharim to Nahum and Hosea, which describe a murderous leader of Israel. Cf. Ezek 19:2–6 for a more generalized use of כפיר for abusive Israelite leaders. From this perspective, the term “Young Lion of Wrath” appears to be of somewhat general usage, perhaps even a stereotype. This could seem to weaken the case for identifying the figure in the two peshet compositions as a single individual. However, the identification of Jannaeus in both texts does not necessitate a claim that the Qumran Community coined the term Lion of Wrath for Jannaeus on the basis of a single text, and then proceeded to employ the code-word elsewhere. Even if the epithet “Lion of Wrath” had been widely and variously applied prior to its application to Jannaeus, once it was applied to him, subsequent usage would be influenced by that application and, where appropriate, there would be a tendency to repeat it.

taposition of the words king, young lion, and wrath. A parallel verse at 20:2 continues “. . . one who angers him forfeits his soul” (נָהַם כַּכְפִּיר אֵימַת מֶלֶךְ מִחַעֲבֵרו חוּטֵא נִפְשׁוֹ) (נָהַם כַּכְפִּיר אֵימַת מֶלֶךְ מִחַעֲבֵרו חוּטֵא נִפְשׁוֹ). In 4QpNah, the epithet כַּפִּיר הַחֲרוֹן is associated with military prowess (unit 8 and perhaps 10) and savagery toward disloyal subjects (unit 9).⁵³ As noted above, the naming of Demetrius in unit 7 and the hanging executions of Seekers-after-Smooth-Things in unit 9 in this pericope firmly establish Alexander Jannaeus as the Lion of Wrath.⁵⁴

The historical context of Peshet Hosea is more difficult to determine. 4Q167 (4QpHos^b) frag 2,1–4 (on Hos 5:13–14) reads as follows:⁵⁵

	1 . . . פִּי שֶׁר . . .]
	2 . . .] כַּפִּיר הַחֲרוֹן כִּי אֲנוּכִי כִשְׁחָל לֹא פִּי רִי אֶם [וּכְכַפִּיר לְבֵית]
	3 יְהוּדָה . . . פִּשְׁרוֹ . . . (?) עַל כֹּהֵן הָאֲחֵרוֹן אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁלַח יָדוֹ לְהַכּוֹת בְּאֶפְרַיִם
	4 . . .] יָדוֹ vac

The right hand side of this column has not survived, and there is a considerable amount of text missing. The remnant of the pesher interpretation in line 2, the words כַּפִּיר חֲרוֹן, presumably comments

⁵³ Allegro unsuccessfully attempted to relate this epithet etymologically to the term “Thrakidan,” recorded by Josephus as a name applied to Alexander Jannaeus because of his cruelty (“Further Light,” 92; “Thrakidan,” 47–51). Menahem Stern evaluated this hypothesis as “not only difficult in itself, and very strange, but also contradicted by several facts” (“הַרְאָקִידִס,” 125–27). Stern himself investigated the possibility of a logical (not etymological) relationship between “Thrakides” and “Young Lion of Wrath” as two epithets that express popular opposition to Jannaeus. He associates both with opposition to the king’s policy of hiring mercenaries.

Even before his publication of the text in 1956, Allegro had publicized his interpretation of this column (e.g., in a BBC broadcast on Oct. 30, 1955). His comments prompted press releases in Israel to the effect that the term “Thrakidan” itself appeared in the scroll. (Cf. Jeremias, 127 n. 4; Zeitlin, “Travesty,” 34; Yadin, *Message*, 169; המנילוח, 191–92). Allegro further claimed that Peshet Nahum described the crucifixion of the Teacher of Righteousness, in a manner prefiguring the death of Jesus Christ.

⁵⁴ Those who favor an earlier context for the pesher identify the Lion of Wrath as Alcimus (thus, proposed tentatively by Rowley “4QpNah,” 192) or Antiochus IV (also suggested by Rowley, *ibid.*; cf. Zeitlin, “Travesty,” 33. Cf. *Ant* 12 §256). However, among other difficulties, neither of these proposals can accommodate the identification of the hanged victims in unit 9 as דוֹרְשֵׁי הַחֲלִיקוֹת. As noted above, the same objection would apply to Schonfield’s suggestion of Titus (*Secrets*, 96–97) and, we believe, to Doudna’s proposal of Pompey.

⁵⁵ DJD V, 33; Plate X. Note that line 3 features a similar problem to 4QpNah 3–4 I,5 על כַּפִּיר הַחֲרוֹן . . . The figure named after the lacuna may be the subject of the pesher interpretation, following immediately upon the formulaic “*pishro*”; or it may be the object of a preposition, coming some words after the formula and the subject of the pesher, which will have been lost in the lacuna (what we refer to as “Carmignac’s restoration” in Peshet Nahum). See Doudna’s reconstruction of Peshet Hosea, 557–573.

upon Hos 5:13. Line 2 continues with a citation of Hos 5:14, which features the word כפיר. The pesher interpretation to this verse, which has been partially preserved in line 3, seems to describe an attack by the “Last Priest” against Ephraim.

The Last Priest who opposes Ephraim in line 3 has been associated with the “Lion of Wrath” in line 2, and thereby identified with the “Lion of Wrath” in 4QpNah.⁵⁶ Within 4QpHos^b, the equation relies upon the proximity of the two pesher units, the occurrence of כפיר in both units (in the pesher of the first, and the lemma of the latter), and the similarity of אהרון/הרון. However, the chief motivation for connecting the units derives from comparison with 4QpNah in which the “Young Lion of Wrath” opposes the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things (= Ephraim, as per II,2). In addition to the opposition of the כפיר בהרון to Ephraim, and reference to “last priest(s)” in both texts, Amusin has noted the shared element of the root נכה, in that the Lion of Wrath “smite(s)” the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things in 4QpNah, just as the Last Priest in 4QpHos^b “smite(s)” Ephraim.⁵⁷ An even closer connection has been perceived between the two pesher compositions, on the basis of Hos 5:13, the base-text of the comment containing the term “Lion of Wrath,” which includes the words, “Ephraim went to Assyria, and sent to a patron King” (וילך אפרים אל אשור וישלח אל מלך ירב).⁵⁸ Kister and Eshel maintain that the pesher in 4QpHos^b alludes to the Pharisaic appeal to Demetrius, i.e., the event that is the subject of unit 7 of Pesher Nahum.⁵⁹ The historical setting of Pharisaic opposition to Jannaeus

⁵⁶ Allegro suggested the potential relevance of 4QpHos^b to 4QpNah, though only in a general way (“Further Light,” 93). The equation of the “Lion of Wrath” in the two texts is found in Amusin, 141; Eshel, “תולדותיה,” 92; Flusser, “פרושים, צדוקים,” 142; Knibb, 209–213; Puech, “Jonathan le Prêtre,” 259; and Vermes, 62.

Horgan appears not to accept the identification of the “Lion of Wrath” in Pesher Hosea with the figure of the same name in Pesher Nahum. She states of the “last priest” in 4QpHos that he is “probably on the side of the Qumran Community,” in light of his opposition to Ephraim (p. 149).

⁵⁷ “Historical Events,” 141. In fact, the Lion is not necessarily the subject of “smite” in line 5. The use of the same lexeme is noteworthy in any case. See n. 55 above.

⁵⁸ The translation “patron” is that of NJPS; Kister transliterates מלך ירב in his rendering of Pesher Hosea, and states that the “original meaning of the biblical text” was “great king” (“Biblical Phrases and Hidden Biblical Interpretations and Pesharim,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport [Leiden: Brill, 1992], 31).

⁵⁹ Kister, *ibid.*; Eshel, “תולדותיה,” 92. Cf. Yadin’s observation that “there can be

and Jannaeus's harsh response is thus identified in 4QpHos^b as well as in 4QpNah.⁶⁰

Doudna also equates the Lion of Wrath figures in 4QpNah and 4QpHos^b, but he views both as a Gentile ruler.⁶¹ He has some very important observations about physical aspects of 4Q167, pertaining to column length, line length, and placement of fragments. The overall assessment of the text described above, however, does not depend upon specific restorations, but rather upon key terminology in the extant portions of the peshet interpretation and in the base-texts.

The possible identification of Jannaeus in Peshet Hosea raises the larger question of the attitude of the Qumran Community toward Alexander Jannaeus. Our three potential sources for this issue are Peshet Hosea, Peshet Nahum, and 4Q448 "Prayer for King Jonathan."⁶² Peshet Hosea has been interpreted as indicating Jannaeus's hostility to the Qumran Community. In the extant text, the Lion seems to be pitted against Ephraim. Since the lemma exhibits a parallelism between opposition to Ephraim and Judah, and the extant portion of the interpretation describes the persecution of Ephraim, it is supposed that the lost portion of Peshet Hosea had described the

no doubt that the association in Peshet Nahum with the Demetrius incident, and the subsequent punishment of the Dorshei Hahalaqot," was prompted mainly by the verse in Hosea, *וַיִּלֶךְ אַפְרַיִם אֶל אֲשׁוּר וַיִּשְׁלַח אֹתוֹ מֶלֶךְ יִרְבָּ* ("Re-considered," 3). The larger context of Hosea favors this understanding.

⁶⁰ Allegro relies upon 4QpHos^b to further equate the Lion of Wrath and Last Priest with the Wicked Priest, persecutor of the Teacher of Righteousness ("Further Light," 93; *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 105. Cf the discussion in Flusser, "פרושים, צדוקים," 138, 142; Yadin, *Message*, 166–70; "Re-Considered," 3, 12). It is now generally believed that the Wicked Priest of 4QpPs^a and 1QpHab appeared at an early stage of the Community's history, as he was a contemporary of the Community's founding figure, the Teacher of Righteousness. This figure, then, would have to pre-date the Lion of Wrath if the latter is Jannaeus. (Cf. Dimant's critique of Nitzan's *מנילה פשר הבקוק*, *RevQ* 12 [1987]: 600). The equation of the Lion of Wrath and the Wicked Priest has been explicitly rejected by Cross, *Ancient Library*, 100, 116; "The Early History of the Qumran Community," in *New Directions in Biblical Archaeology*, ed. D.N. Freedman and J.C. Greenfield (New York: Doubleday, 1971), 72–79; and Eshel, "תולדותיה," 89.

⁶¹ Pp. 557–573.

⁶² 4Q471 has recently been interpreted as a polemic against Hasmonean militarism, including that of Alexander Jannaeus. Cf. Esti Eshel and Kister, "A Polemical Qumran Fragment (4Q471)," *JJS* 43,2 (1992): 277–281. H. Eshel describes this text as directed against the Sadducees, "תולדותיה," 93). These interpretations, plausible as they are, rely upon a generalization derived from 4QpNah so that the text itself cannot be used to prove opposition to Jannaeus at Qumran. Although it is possible that 4Q523 may be associated with Jannaeus, that text has eluded satisfactory explanation to date, and can not illuminate our discussion.

persecution of “House of Judah,” which elsewhere refers to the Qumran Community.⁶³ Peshet Hosea is thus taken as a source for an anti-Jannaeus stance at Qumran.⁶⁴ In contrast, the Prayer for King Jonathan was understood by its editors to demonstrate a very favorable attitude to Jannaeus.⁶⁵

Vermes sees the subject of this prayer as Jonathan, the first Hasmonean high priest, and believes that the text represents the Qumran community’s early approval of Jonathan, prior to his corruption (cf. 1QpHab VIII,8–9). Although there is no evidence that Jonathan styled himself as a “king,” Vermes argues for a loose use of that term by supporters or “flatterers.” He points, for example, to the references to royalty in the exhortation of the addressee of 4QMMT, who is generally taken to be an early Hasmonean, probably Jonathan. Nonetheless, in 4Q448 the use of המלך is clearly titular, and it seems more likely that the Jonathan of the text is Jannaeus.

⁶³ See ch. 6 for the equation Judah=Qumran Community. Contrast Horgan’s position in n. 56 above, that the Young Lion’s opposition to Ephraim will have put him on the side of the community. Cf. Baumgarten’s refutation of a similar claim by Yadin in regard to 4QpNah, cited above, n. 51.

⁶⁴ The persecution is assumed, reasonably, to reflect mutual opposition. Whether the Community’s enmity toward the king pre-dated this persecution or not, Jannaeus would have been opposed thereafter. The scholars who have argued for this interpretation of Peshet Hosea have not filled in the details regarding this alleged attack by Jannaeus. That is because the reconstruction stems from a perspective that is more textual and intertextual than historical. The restoration of the text assumes a certain kind of lemma/peshet correspondence, as well as a consistency in the use of the epithets “Ephraim” and “Judah” at Qumran, and in the identity of “last priest/s.” The use of Peshet Hosea as a source for opposition to Jannaeus is thus dependent upon a string of textual associations. These links form a convincing chain, though Jannaeus’s attack on the Community is not corroborated or elaborated upon by historical sources. As Josephus’s account is particularly focused upon the monarchy, it is to be expected that the threat to royal power posed by Demetrius and his Jewish backers would receive full detailed treatment, whereas a lesser confrontation such as the one proposed here would be subsumed in his more general statements about Jannaeus’s suppression of his subjects.

⁶⁵ E. Eshel, H. Eshel, and Ada Yardeni, “A Qumran Composition Containing Part of Ps. 154 and a Prayer for the Welfare of King Jonathan and his Kingdom,” *IEJ* 42 (1992): 199–229; Vermes, “The So-called King Jonathan Fragment (4Q488),” *JJS* 44 (1993), 294–300; Puech, “Jonathan le Prêtre,” 241–70; Daniel J. Harrington and John Strugnell, “Qumran cave 4 Texts: A New Publication,” *JBL* 112 (1993): 498–99; Emmanuelle Main, “For King Jonathan or Against? The Use of the Bible in 4Q448,” in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Michael Stone and Esther Chazon (Leiden: Brill, 1998). (For syntactic notes on this text, see Flusser, “הערה לתפלה לשלמו של יונתן המלך,” *תרביץ* 61 [1992–3]: 297–300; Philip S. Alexander, “A Note on the Syntax of 4Q448,” *JJS* 44 [1993]: 301–302).

Wise, Abegg, and Cook determine that the Community held a positive stance toward Jannaeus (26–27, 216). Yadin had maintained that the Community initially supported Jannaeus prior to a souring of relations.⁶⁶ Wise, Abegg, and Cook state that the Community “admired” Jannaeus (216) and considered him a “hero” (27) not simply prior to the manifestations of his cruelty but despite his violent actions, and even because of them.⁶⁷

Eshel and Eshel are less willing to accept the likelihood that the Community approved of Jannaeus. They view 4Q448 as a non-sectarian work in praise of Jannaeus.⁶⁸

Harrington and Strugnell, followed by Main, argue that 4Q448 is actually directed against Jonathan (whom they identify as Jannaeus). The textual and syntactic difficulties of this composition have not been satisfactorily resolved by any of the interpretations.⁶⁹

As discussed in the excursus to ch. 5, unit 9 of Peshar Nahum has been variously interpreted as a strong condemnation of Alexander Jannaeus, as an expression of support for him or, probably most reasonably, as a statement relating to his action rather than an approval rating of his person.⁷⁰

4.1.6 *Ephraim*

“Ephraim” is the focus of pesher interpretations in later columns of 4QpNah (frags 3–4, col. II,2, 8; III,5), but the epithet first appears in the poorly preserved line 12 of 3–4 I. The group is associated

⁶⁶ This is similar to Vermes’s interpretation of 1QpHab concerning Jonathan. Cf. “Reconsidered,” 12.

⁶⁷ So, too, A. Baumgarten, “Rabbinic Literature as a Source for the History of Jewish Sectarianism in the Second Temple Period.” *DSD* 2 (1995): 48–51.

⁶⁸ Cf. “A Qumran Composition,” 218–19; more tentatively, in “הגלדה והיה,” 92. The Eshels’ more recent identification of a pesher-like connection between the psalm and the prayer in 4Q448 may mitigate the force of this stance, if pesher is viewed as a uniquely Qumranic phenomenon, although they offer evidence of similar contemporizing interpretation outside the sectarian corpus (in “4Q448, Psalm 154 [Syriac], Sirach 48:20, and 4QpIsa^a,” *JBL* 119 [2000]: 645–659).

⁶⁹ Nonetheless, Main’s methods of intertextual investigation are compatible with our own and her conclusions are attractive. After a detailed analysis of the context of the biblical texts underlying 4Q448, she states, “it is not a prayer on behalf of “King Jonathan” but a wish that God Himself will fight against him. This interpretation not only fits what is known about Qumran’s relationship towards the Hasmoneans, and especially towards Jannaeus, the Lion of Wrath, but also suits the way they employ the Prophets to further their aims.”

⁷⁰ See also, Charlesworth, *The Pesharim*, 99–106.

with the Pharisees, though the term is applied in a less straightforward manner than דורשי הלכות. It seems to reflect sub-divisions within the party, at least between leaders and followers.

The symbolism of “Ephraim” begins with the biblical person of that name. The second of Joseph’s sons, Ephraim received the primary blessing from his grandfather Jacob (Gen 48:13–20). In Jacob’s deathbed testaments, both Judah and Joseph received prophetic blessings referring to supremacy among the sons of Jacob. Ancient interpretation of this supremacy as “kingship” both reflected and reinforced the rival monarchic ambitions of the two tribes. Within the tribe of Joseph, Ephraim, rather than the elder brother Manasseh, was associated with these royal aspirations. In the reality of the dual kingdoms of Israel, Ephraim came to represent the Northern Kingdom of the ten tribes of Israel, as opposed to the Kingdom of Judah, headed by Davidic monarchs. The prophetic books sometimes speak of salvation for Ephraim, but primarily denigrate the Northern Kingdom, and certainly oppose its leadership. Hosea, as a prophet to the Northern Kingdom, stands out in his vision of future divine reconciliation with Ephraim. The prophets generally anticipate the ultimate salvation of Israel as culminating in a unified nation led by a Davidic monarch, i.e., one descended from Judah.

At Qumran, Ephraim was imbued with a new symbolic dimension. In the sectarian documents, Ephraim no longer refers to genealogical non-Judahites and to the geographical area inhabited by them. Instead, the term appears in the pesharim and related writings as an epithet for spiritual opponents of the true Jews. It is generally agreed that “Ephraim” is used consistently within Qumran literature, as a technical term for a particular group of opponents, conventionally identified as the Pharisees. The sect’s self-designation as “Judah” leads to the labeling of their opponents as Ephraim.⁷¹ The identification has been perceived as effective not only on the symbolic level, but also as perceptible in the auditory similarity between Ephraim (אֶפְרַיִם) and Pharisees (פְּרוּשִׁים).⁷²

Flusser and Amusin comment upon the Biblical equation of Ephraim as Israel, juxtaposed to Judah, pointing especially to Isa 9:18–20,

⁷¹ For the sect as Judah, see Flusser, “פרושים צדוקים,” 140–41. Cf. esp. 1QpHab VIII,1–3 where “all the doers of the Torah in the House of Judah” are affiliated with the Teacher of Righteousness. This is discussed further in ch. 6.

⁷² Schiffman, 279.

along with Isa 7:17 (cited in CD VII,12,13; XIII,23); 11:13; and Hos 5:3,5, 11–14. The citations in CD indicate that these verses were treated by the Qumran Community as allegories signifying contemporary rivals.⁷³ In 4QpNah, the Pharisaic identity, or association, of these opponents is more clearly identifiable.⁷⁴ At II,2, the city of Ephraim is equated to the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things in the End of Days.⁷⁵ We have already discussed 4QpHos^b frag 2:2–4 in which the Last Priest stretches out his hand against Ephraim.⁷⁶ In 4QpPs37^a II,17, the evil ones of Ephraim, paired with the evil ones of Manasseh, venture forth against “the Priest and the men of his counsel,” at the period of “affliction.”⁷⁷ The pesher maintains that they will be given over to Gentiles for judgment. Unlike the case in Pesher Hosea, the lemmas in 4QpNah and 4QpPs37^a contain no mention of Ephraim or Manasseh. In Pesher Hosea, the presence of “Ephraim” in the lemma may have influenced the use of the term in the pesher. The appearance of these names in the other pesharim is purely typological.⁷⁸

⁷³ Flusser, *ibid.*, Amusin, “Éphraïm et Manassé dans le Pêshèr de Nahum (4Qp Nahum),” 390; “Historical Events,” 142.

⁷⁴ However, in the opinion of Dupont-Sommer, “Ephraim” is primarily a code for Hyrcanus II, and only by extension for the Pharisaic faction that supported him (“Le Commentaire,” 73–74, “Observations,” 209; 215–16). Dupont-Sommer sees Jacob’s blessing of Joseph’s sons in Gen 48:13–20 as a paradigm for rivalry over “primogeniture.” Although he is aware that in the biblical case, Ephraim is the younger son who receives the greater blessing than the older Manasseh, Dupont-Sommer nonetheless sees Hyrcanus II, the elder son, as Ephraim, and Aristobulus, the younger son, as Manasseh. Dennis Pardee is more cautious about limiting the epithets to specific entities, and concludes that a group identification may be warranted, but associating the terms “Ephraim” and “Manasseh” with individuals is not (“A Restudy of the Commentary on Psalm 37 from Qumran Cave 4 [Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan, vol V n° 171],” *RevQ* 8 [1973]: 179–80).

⁷⁵ At frag. 3–4 I,12 the subject of the pesher is probably either Jannaeus or the Pharisees. In II,8 “Ephraim” refers to lying, powerful leaders and פְּרָאִי אֲפָרַיִם appear in III,5 in association with the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things.

⁷⁶ Frag 5–6 line 3 contains a citation of Hos 6:4 in which Ephraim is restored in accordance with MT, but the pesher has not survived. Similarly, line 1 of frags 10,26 cites Hos 6:9–10 in which Ephraim is restored in accordance with MT, but scant pesher is preserved. 4QpIsa^a frag 4–6, I,20 cites Isa 9:20 in which Ephraim and Manasseh are pitted each against the other and both are against Judah. However, no pesher has survived.

⁷⁷ בְּצִרְרָה, connoting “crucible,” or “testing.” See Horgan, 211–12, and the sources cited by her.

⁷⁸ For the possible polemic significance of an omission of “Ephraim” in NT, see Stephen Goranson, “The Exclusion of Ephraim in Rev. 7:4–8 and Essene Polemic Against the Pharisees,” *DSD* 2 (1995): 80–85. He argues that the inclusion of Joseph and Manasseh, but not Ephraim, in the list of tribes in Rev 7:4–8 may reflect an anti-Pharisaic stance like the one evidenced at Qumran.

4.1.6.1 “Ephraim” and the Samaritans

The use of the term “Ephraim” to deny the religious legitimacy of an opposing group is often depicted as a complete *novum* at Qumran, but its development is likely to have been influenced by earlier anti-Samaritan usage.⁷⁹ The Samaritans claimed to have been descended from the tribe of Joseph and they inhabited the region of Ephraim in Northern Israel.⁸⁰ Schuller has identified an anti-Samaritan perspective in 4Q372 “Narrative and Poetic Composition^b” a text she views as non-Qumranic.⁸¹ 4Q371–72 seems on the one hand to exhibit a sympathetic attitude to Joseph, and on the other hand to oppose a group that is laying claim to the legacy of Joseph. 4Q372 lines 16–31 consist of a pious prayer for redemption uttered in first person by “Joseph.”⁸² Lines 1–15 comprise a prose segment referring to the exile of Joseph, and the destruction of both Joseph and Judah. The core of the polemic appears in lines 11–15:

11. All their mountains were desolate of them . . . [*w* and fools were dwelling in their land]
12. and making for themselves a high place upon a high mountain to provoke Israel to jealousy; and they spoke with wor[ds of]
13. the sons of Jacob and they acted terribly with the words of their mouth to revile against the tent of Zion; and they spoke . . . [words of falsehood, and all]
14. words of deceit they spoke to anger Levi and Judah and Benjamin with their words . . .

⁷⁹ The connection is observed by Gaster, who, however, erred in interpreting frags 3–4 col. III of 4QpNah as an anti-Samaritan polemic. He did take Ephraim in col. I as a reference to Jannaeus’s Jewish opponents of *Ant* 13 (*TDSS*, 341). The disparate identifications are in line with his polemic against a “historicizing” tendency in Qumran scholarship (as described in ch. 1). Doudna (578) observes that Zangenberg identifies Ephraim as the Samaritans in a number of Qumran texts, including 4Q372, which we discuss here. (J. Zangenberg, *Samaria. Antike Quellen zur Geschichte und Kultur der Samaritaner in deutscher Übersetzung* [Tübingen: Francke-Verlag, 1994]).

⁸⁰ Josephus states that the Samaritans “trace their line back to Ephraim and Manasseh, the descendants of Joseph” (*Ant* 11 §341. Cf. *Ant* 9 §291; Eileen M. Schuller “4Q372 1: A Text About Joseph,” *RevQ* 14 [1990]: 374). Cf. Isa 7:9, “the chief city of Ephraim is Samaria” (cited by Dupont-Sommer, “Le Commentaire,” 71).

⁸¹ Formerly, “Apocryphal Joseph^b.” Cf. the article cited in the previous note, pp. 349–76. See now, *DjD* XXVIII, 155–197. The assessment of this text as anti-Samaritan is accepted by H. Eshel, “הפילה יוסף,” 125–36.

⁸² Perhaps we should say, with Schuller, that this is a figure representing the “real Joseph.”

The connection between the group criticized in this passage and “Joseph” is not clear, but Schuller suggests that the text opposes the legitimacy of the Samaritan Temple at Mt. Gerizim.⁸³ Those who worship there may claim to be “the true descendants of Joseph,” but they are in fact idolators, denounced in language taken from Deut 32:21.⁸⁴ The Samaritans are accused of cultic violation in constructing a false Temple. They are also said to be guilty of the less clearly-defined social/theological transgressions of false and inflammatory speech towards fellow Jews, and blasphemy. Schuller states that “the charge [of blasphemy, deceit and falsehood] is expanded at considerable length (lines 12–14) but the language is so generalized . . . that it is difficult to know what is at stake.”⁸⁵ For our purposes, we maintain that lines 12–14 raise very specific associations. Whatever the force of *דברי שקר* and *אמרי כזב* in the “pre-Qumranic” composition(s) of 4Q371–72, the sectarian literature of Qumran uses these words (and variations of them) to signify opposition to Pharisaic teachings. The pairing of *שקר* and *כזב* is particularly striking.⁸⁶ In our context, the most relevant occurrence is at 4QpNah 3–4 II,8:

פּשֶׁר [ו] עַל מַחְזֵי אַפְרַיִם vac אֲשֶׁר בַּחֲלֻמוֹד שְׁקָרָם וּלְשׁוֹן כּוֹזְבֵיהֶם וּשְׁפַח
מִרְמָה יִתְעוּ רַבִּים

⁸³ Pp. 371–76.

⁸⁴ The text seems to refer to three groups. There is a legitimate “Joseph,” i.e., a group that has sinned but will ultimately be redeemed. Following Schuller, we can also discern a rival group that claims to be Joseph, i.e., the Samaritans, whose claims are rejected by the author. Lastly, there is a group referred to as “Levi, Judah, and Benjamin,” which we would identify as representing legitimate Jewry. This last identification may be viewed as foreshadowing the self-identification of the Qumran Community as “Judah.” (Cp. Eshel’s suggestion in “הַפִּילָה יוֹסֵף,” 126, that “Benjamin, Judah, and Levi” in 1QM may be included among the “wicked of the Covenant.”) The typological/symbolic development that we propose regarding the term “Ephraim” involves the second, “Pseudo-Joseph” group.

The text maintains that the salvation of the true Joseph will occur in due time (עַתָּה קֵץ לוֹ). Note the potentially eschatological and perhaps deterministic valence of the expression. Schuller translates “until the time of the end for him” (“the time of his end,” in the preliminary publication). The phrase also emphasizes the contrast between this future divine redemption and the current illegitimate attempt at return and reconstruction that it opposes.

⁸⁵ Schuller very tentatively suggests a connection to an event described in the scholion to *Megillat Ta’anit* (p. 373). It is true that the original intent and historical context of these words is difficult to recover.

⁸⁶ See above, section 4.1.2. Schuller states that the initial letters of *נִדְרָף* are not legible. Assuming the reading is correct, it is worth noting that this term is found at Qumran in the following polemical contexts, where it denotes the adoption and

In 4QpPs^a I,26–27, the Man of Lies (אִישׁ הַכּוֹזֵב) is associated with “false sayings” (אִמְרֵי שֶׁקֶר). 1QpHab X,9–13, comments upon Hab 2:12 “Woe to him who builds a city with blood and founds a town upon wickedness.” The pesher applies the verse to the Spouter of Lies (מְטִיף הַכּוֹזֵב), twice employing the word שֶׁקֶר in describing his establishment of a community. The use of imagery related to “building” in Qumran Literature has received much scholarly attention.⁸⁷ 4Q372 may reflect a step in the development of the image, as it opposes the literal construction of a Temple by an excluded Community, employing language that is used in the sectarian texts to denounce the founders of a rival Community.⁸⁸

The influence of 4Q372 upon the polemic of Qumran is evident not only in the lexical similarity and adapted imagery noted above, but also in the use of biblical text. Schuller notes that lines 7–8 of 4Q372 1 were formed by combining Mic 3:12⁸⁹ with Ps 79:1, to yield וְיִשְׂמוּ אֹתָן יְרוּשָׁלַיִם לְעַיִים וְאֶת הַר אֱלֹהֵי לְבַמּוֹתָ יֵעָר [and] We would add that these lines also reflect Mic 1:5–6. Moreover, it is the use of this latter passage, which links the others, that accounts for the citation in 4Q372. Mic 1:5–6 reads “what is the transgression of Jacob but Samaria, and what the shrines (בְּמִוֹתָ) of Judah but Jerusalem? So I will turn (וְשַׁמְתִּי) Samaria into a ruin (לְעַיִ) in open country, into a ground for planting vineyards.” The effectiveness of lines 7–8 in the context of 4Q372 derives from the juxtaposition of Samaria and Jerusalem in Mic 1:5. The shared terminology of Mic 1:6 with the other sources noted by Schuller evokes Mic 1:5 even though it is not cited explicitly.

The fragments of 1QpMic (1Q14) contain a comment to Mic 1:5–6 that is relevant to our hypothesis. Frags 8–10 apply Mic 1:5 to the מְטִיף הַכּוֹזֵב who does something to פְּרָזְאִים. The pesher applies “Judah” and “Jerusalem” to the Teacher of Righteousness and his

propagation of false doctrine pertaining to law, rather than the usual biblical connotation of blaspheming against God. Cf. הוֹקִי בְרִית אֱלֹהִים in CD V,12 (with הוֹקִי בְרִית אֱלֹהִים) and 1QS IV,11; נְדוּפִיהֶם in 4Q501 line 6 (with בְּמַצּוּחֵיכֶּה); and esp. 4QMMT B 70 “concerning him who purposely transgresses the precepts it is writ[ten] that he ‘despises and blasphemes’” (וּמְנַדֵּף), paraphrasing Num 15:30 (Qimron-Strugnell *MMT* credit Kister with the detection of the biblical source, p. 55).

⁸⁷ See the sources cited in ch. 6 in reference to עֵיד אֲפֻרִים in 3–4 II,2.

⁸⁸ For the comparison of Pharisaic corruption to idolatry, particularly in Pesher Hosea, see Flusser, “פְּרוּשִׁים, צְדוּקִים” 136.

⁸⁹ = Jer 26:18, the verse in Jeremiah is attributed to Micah.

followers. 4Q372 relied upon Mic 1:5–6 in formulating its opposition to the Samaritans, whom it accuses of deceit and false speech and the construction of a false Temple, and whom it associates in some way with Ephraim. 1QpMic applies this same verse to the *מְטִיף הַכֹּזֵב*, a figure associated elsewhere with false speech and with the foundation of a false Community, associated with Ephraim. We propose that the pesher exhibits an adaptation and expansion of a typology that is nascent but discernible in 4Q372.

Schuller states that 4Q372 is “not based upon the figure and story of Joseph in Genesis 37–45, but instead ‘Joseph’ is a designation for the northern tribes . . . The use of ‘Joseph’ in this sense is found in a number of biblical passages.”⁹⁰ This statement must be qualified. The explicit use of the term “Joseph” in the composition does indeed follow earlier usage and refers to the Northern tribes. However, the text also introduces an association between “Joseph” and the builders of the “high place”—the “imposters” as Schuller calls them (or “Pseudo-Joseph”). This association and quasi-identification would evolve into a new sense of the epithet “Joseph.”

4Q372 illustrates that one Judean response to Samaritan claims of descent from Joseph was a counter assertion to the effect that the genealogy was false. It also sets the stage for an alternative polemic, grounded in negative biblical attitudes toward Ephraim and the North. Rather than combating the Samaritan self-identification as “Joseph,” Judeans could insist upon the identification and turn it against their rivals. Judeans could claim that although the Samaritans were not the physical, genealogical descendants of Joseph, they were in fact the symbolic, spiritual heirs of the biblical “Ephraim and Manasseh,” the prototypical sinful population of Israel. Although there are no explicit examples of the use of “Joseph” as an anti-Samaritan epithet in the extant literature of the Second Temple era, we propose that anti-Samaritan polemic has left its mark in the formulation of later polemic at Qumran.

4.1.6.2 *Ephraim as Pharisees or Jewry in general?*

The term “Ephraim” is accompanied by modifiers in 4QpPs37^a II,17 and on a number of occasions in 4QpNah.⁹¹ The use of such qualifiers

⁹⁰ DJD XXVIII, p. 170.

⁹¹ In II,2, *עֵד אֶפְרַיִם* appears in apposition with *הַחֲלֻקָּה*; and in genitive construct in II,8 *אֶפְרַיִם מִחַעֵי*, III,5 *אֶפְרַיִם פְּתָאִי*, and IV,5 *אֶפְרַיִם רְשָׁעִי*.

seems to indicate a degree of ambiguity or imprecision in the term “Ephraim” alone. Amusin has described “Ephraim” as representing a greater whole, comprised of both leaders and those who are misled.⁹² He states that the author of 4QpNah “obviously distinguishes the leaders of the Pharisaic group (‘interpreters of slippery things’, leading people astray, ‘the proponents of false teaching’) from common adherents of the Pharisaic Communities, whom he names ‘common People of Ephraim (III,5–7).’” Amusin apparently considers both the leaders and the followers to be Pharisees, with Peshar Nahum specifying in each instance which of these Pharisees it refers to.⁹³ Flusser explains the discrepancy in the various occurrences of “Ephraim” in terms of a chronological development. He sees a progression, from an initial use of “Ephraim” as a general term applied to all Jews who were not members of the Community (as in CD) to its function as a specific designation for the Pharisees (in the pesharim).⁹⁴

We would suggest a synthesis of the views of Amusin and Flusser. It is likely that the Qumran Community first employed the term “Ephraim” to designate the category of Jews outside their own Community. This would be parallel to the biblical model in which monarchic Ephraimites were those Israelites who were outside the kingdom of Judah.⁹⁵ The usage would be in place in CD, and perhaps still in Peshar Hosea^b as well. With the emergence of the Pharisees as a significant force, the understanding that “Ephraim” represented the non-Qumranic Jewish population would lead to a description of the Pharisees as those who “lead Ephraim astray” (as in 4QpNah). In light of the well-documented view of the Pharisees as the pop-

⁹² “Historical Events,” 145.

⁹³ Amusin does not actually clarify whether or not the followers would have been called “Pharisees,” but he seems to imply that they are a sub-section of the same party. Cp. Cook, “sometimes Ephraim is associated with the Flattery-Seekers as it is below [in 3–4 II,2]; at other times, the writer is hopeful that some of Ephraim will repent”(218).

⁹⁴ “. . . פרושים, צדוקים,” 141. Flusser believes that the narrowing of the term Ephraim to refer to the Pharisees, rather than to Israel in general, came about when the epithet Manasseh was applied to the Sadducees. Doudna rejects the identification of Ephraim with the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things. He views Ephraim exclusively as a sobriquet for Israel, and Manasseh as a sobriquet for the ruler of Israel (491–511 *passim*).

⁹⁵ A development from the application of the epithet to the Samaritans would have facilitated this usage.

ulist party, it is likely that “Ephraim” came to be used specifically of the Pharisees, as is probably the case in 4QpPs^a. The use of “Ephraim” with various qualifiers may be taken as a reflection of the blurred distinction between the Pharisees and the Jewish people as a whole.⁹⁶ Following Martin Goodman, we may view “Ephraim” as the general Jewish population, who tended on the whole to observe “ancestral custom” as they were instructed to do by the Pharisees.⁹⁷ Goodman ascribes a dual religious agenda to the “ostentatious religious pietists” known as Pharisees, with a devotion to “particular doctrines of their own” coexisting with a commitment to propagating “conservative behaviour” among the masses. The commitment of the masses to traditional Jewish ways thus became associated with their allegiance to the Pharisees who endorsed that behavior. This could account for the imprecision of the term “Ephraim” at Qumran.

A challenge to our identification of Ephraim as “non-Community Israel” is posed by 4QpNah III,5, which predicts that the simple of Ephraim will join Israel. 4QpNah obviously sees Ephraim as currently distinct from Israel in some sense. The partially preserved I,12 implies a similar distinction. However, this difficulty may be resolved by examination of the use of the term “Israel” at Qumran. In the Bible, “Israel” can refer to the nation as a whole, as separate from the Gentiles, or to the sinful majority of the nation, as separate from the loyal “Judah.” At Qumran, this latter symbolic pejorative sense does not appear. “Israel” often implies “the true Israel” and denotes the Qumran Community, or a future, ideal Israel, which is, in essence, identical to the Community. This is especially evident throughout 1QS and in much of CD.⁹⁸ If “Israel” in 4QpNah is the true Israel, i.e. the Community and the ideal nation, then III,5 may be understood

⁹⁶ Our earlier treatment of “Joseph” in 4Q372 may have bearing upon this issue as well. The Qumran Community would have distinguished between “Ephraim” as the general populace, who would be likened to the contrite, distressed “legitimate” Joseph figure in 4Q372, and be eligible for redemption, and the “Ephraim” that was the Pharisaic community, likened to the “pseudo-Joseph” symbol of the Samaritans.

⁹⁷ “A Note on Josephus, the Pharisees, and Ancestral Tradition,” *JJS* 50 (1999): 17–20. Cf. *Ant* 13 §297, §408. The key point in Goodman’s study is its revised perspective on the distinction between Pharisees and Sadducees in the matter of *halakhic* authority, in distinguishing “ancestral custom” from Oral Torah. That larger issue is beyond the scope of the current investigation.

⁹⁸ The latter work also includes references to sinners among Israel, as do, e.g., 1QpHab and 4pPs^a, but in these cases, the term Israel denotes the nation as a whole, and a modifier partitions out the wicked.

as a declaration that Ephraim—i.e., contemporary non-Qumranic Jewry—is currently under the sway of the Pharisees, but is potentially subject to salvation.

4.2 HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF INDIVIDUAL PESHER UNITS (UNITS 6–10)

4.2.1 *Unit 6*

Unit 6 is too fragmentary for a full evaluation. It is frequently understood as describing a situation in which Gentiles inhabit Judea.

4.2.2 *Unit 7*

The context of this unit as a whole is the unsuccessful invasion of Demetrius III, following the restoration of line 3, “[But he did not enter, for God did not deliver it] into the hand of the kings . . .”⁹⁹ The fact that Jerusalem withstood Demetrius’s attack is seen as characteristic of a particular era, for which Antiochus and the rise of the Kittim serve as endpoints. We understand this phrase as indicating that once Judea was rid of Antiochus IV, it was not taken over again by Seleucids for the remainder of the duration of the Seleucid Empire, i.e., until the ascendancy of the Roman Empire.

In our restoration of the peshet, the time between Antiochus and the rise of the Romans is characterized as a time when Judea “did not come into Seleucid hands.”¹⁰⁰ The “rising of the rulers of the

⁹⁹ Allegro has claimed, on the basis of Peshet Nahum, that Demetrius III actually succeeded in invading Jerusalem proper (“Further Light,” 93). However, this poorly preserved peshet unit cannot reasonably serve as a basis for establishing an otherwise unknown historical event of such significance. Vogt, Gaster, and Cross followed Allegro in using “sought to enter” as a springboard for historical speculation. Cross states that the unexplained Jewish desertion of Demetrius may be seen as a response to a plan by Demetrius “to attack the capital and subjugate Judea once more to the Seleucid crown” (*Ancient Library*, 99). His suggestion is more in line with the usual sense of “seek” as indicating a failed attempt. He also does not make claims about otherwise unattested *events*, but rather about previously unknown *intentions*. (Allegro adopted Cross’s position in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 108).

Still, it is inadvisable to use peshet as a historical source in this way. Although peshet can corroborate and clarify historical data from other sources, it should not be used to infer data that is not otherwise attested at all. It is entirely more reasonable to suppose that the known attack of Demetrius upon Jannaeus was described as an attack against “Jerusalem,” than to speculate about additional unknown attacks.

¹⁰⁰ For a similar juxtaposition, cf. *Bj* 1 §7, “I shall relate how Antiochus, sur-

Romans” apparently refers to the supplanting of the Seleucid Empire by Rome, in the 60’s BCE.¹⁰¹ The pesher describes Demetrius’s failed efforts as an example of Judea’s ability to withstand the Seleucids. With the ascension of Rome, this ability became useless, as Judea was not similarly impervious to the power of Rome.

This explanation differs from that of Horgan who stresses the pesher’s reference to the “independence” of Judea. She is troubled by the fact that, as she states, the pesher “seems to be saying that Jerusalem (or Judea) was independent from the time of Antiochus until the coming of the Kittim (i.e., the Romans),” a statement that is historically inaccurate.¹⁰² The problem resides in her understanding

named Epiphanes, took Jerusalem by storm and, after holding it for three years and six months was expelled from the country by the Hasmoneans; next how their descendants, in their quarrel for the throne, dragged the Romans and Pompey upon the scene.”

¹⁰¹ Cf. the picture of the Roman Republic in the 2nd century BCE provided in *CAH* vol. 8. A major theme in this volume is the symmetry of Roman ascendancy with the decline of earlier Hellenistic monarchies. See esp. Alan E. Astin, ed., “Roman Government and Politics, 200–134 BC” (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 188–233; C. Habicht, “The Seleucids and their Rivals” 324–88.

Cross, probably influenced by Rabin, identifies עָמוֹד here as a technical term, denoting “taking office,” related to the word בְּעָמֹד, “station” or “office.” Cross translates “accession,” though his paraphrase is less technical. He identifies the rulers of the Kittim as the Roman rulers who “arrive on the scene” with Pompey’s conquest of Jerusalem in 63 BCE. He thus takes “rise” to mean rising to a particular position with respect to Judea (*Ancient Library*, 97). Rabin, in “Alexander Jannaeus” renders עָמוֹד as “took office,” pointing to CD I,14 (of the Kittim) and 1QpHab VIII,9 (of the Wicked Priest). Horgan adds Ezra 2:63; Neh 7:65; CD V,5; XII,23; XX,1. Allegro rendered simply “to the appearance of.”

¹⁰² Horgan is puzzled by the fact that 4QpNah seems to date Judean independence to the time of Antiochus, when in actuality it was acquired from Demetrius II in 142 BCE. She thus states that it is difficult to determine which Antiochus is intended by the pesher, but then suggests that the pesher refers to “religious liberty . . . regained” after the death of Ant IV. In our understanding, the pesher is not a positive assertion of Judean independence but a negative assertion concerning Seleucid military conquest.

Horgan is further disturbed by the temporal sense of the preposition ׀ in בְּאַחֲרֵי הַיּוֹם, stating that “no such usage is attested in Hebrew.” In fact, BH frequently uses a temporal ׀ or בֵּן. Most likely, Horgan intended to indicate that the preposition is not attested elsewhere in elliptical fashion. In the Hebrew Bible and in CD, temporal בֵּן generally introduces a verbal phrase, and is attached to a temporal noun such as “day” or “year.” It is used here directly with the personal name “Antiochus.” Doudna points to the similarly elliptical, בְּמִצְרַיִם עַד הַיּוֹם, Num 14:19 in which the geographical proper noun “Egypt” is used to designate a particularly period of time characterized by Israel’s enslavement in that location. “From Antiochus” would be a similarly evocative way to refer to the time of Judea’s subjugation and persecution by that Seleucid king.

the state of “not being in the hand of מלכי יון” as indicating independence from all foreign rule.¹⁰³

Our explanation of the pesher takes the generalizing time-frame as referring to the span *between* the “Seleucid kings” and the “Roman rulers.” The point is not so much foreign dominion itself (or lack thereof), but the century-long failure of *Seleucid military attempts* to assert control in Judea.¹⁰⁴ The supersession of the Seleucid Empire by Rome replaced the threat of Seleucid domination with the reality of Roman domination in Judea. The significance of Antiochus in marking the beginning of this period, is that Antiochus was the first Seleucid ruler to be repulsed by the Jews.

The end of unit 7 is best reconstructed as asserting that Jerusalem will be trampled by Rome. A contrast would be in place: foreign dominion was avoided during the Seleucid era until Roman ascendancy, but then Jerusalem will be subjugated by Rome. Dupont-Sommer views this statement as testimony to Pompey’s seizure of Jerusalem, and as evidence that the pesher was written soon after this event in 63 BCE. However it may have been written prior to

¹⁰³ Dupont-Sommer explicitly says as much, referring to “le point de départ de la période d’indépendance” (“Le Commentaire,” 64). He further states that 3–4, I refers to the century prior to Pompey’s conquest in 63 BCE, a time in which Jerusalem was capital of a sovereign state, from the expulsion of Antiochus IV until the arrival of Pompey (“Observations,” 204). This conventional understanding of the phrase seems to presume that “the Roman rulers” are subsumed in the category of מלכי יון. That is, Judea was free of מלכי יון from Antiochus, one of מלכי יון, until the rulers of the Kittim, another of מלכי יון, at which point Judea was again subject to מלכי יון. This inclusive understanding of the phrase is problematic. (Thus, in Horgan’s note on יון, she states that the term is “used variously in biblical Hebrew to indicate all or part of the Greek-speaking Hellenistic world.” However, her examples refer to Alexander the Great or Greece, and she translates “Greece.”) This reading is also inconsistent with the desired contrast between the rulers of the Kittim rulers and the kings of יון. Both the problem of the assertion of Judean independence, and the inclusion of the Roman rulers in the category of מלכי יון are resolved by our reading, which takes Antiochus and Pompey as demarcations for a period of unsuccessful Seleucid ambitions in Judea.

¹⁰⁴ Thus, Eshel’s paraphrase: “this precise historical description summarizes [the fact] that from the days of Antiochus IV until the campaign of Pompey, Jerusalem did not fall into the hands of Seleucid kings” (“תולדותיה,” 92, Eshel’s translation). This understanding of the gloss will have some implications for Eshel’s thesis of the Community’s struggle with unfulfilled predictions. Eshel describes the Community’s frustration at the failure of the Seleucids to have fulfilled the role of ultimate eschatological retributive power. If he is correct in that assessment, and if 4QpNah emphasizes the failure of the Seleucids to take Jerusalem, the pesher would effectively be addressing, and apparently rationalizing in some way, the inaccuracy of the earlier identification and expectations.

Pompey's invasion, in anticipation of such an event. The assessment of these alternatives is best discussed within the context of the pesher composition as a whole.¹⁰⁵

In order to understand the significance of the “trampling of Jerusalem” in this unit, one must appreciate the complexity of the attitude to Jerusalem as evidenced in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The city of Jerusalem, and its names, had manifold connotations for the Qumran Community.¹⁰⁶ The physical Jerusalem is, on the one hand, the center of Pharisaic influence and aristocratic corruption, and as such its destruction is foreseen. On the other hand, Jerusalem is the rightful site for the true Temple, the construction of which is awaited.

The symbolic valence of the city spreads from these two opposing attitudes. In 4QpNah, to the extent that Jerusalem is seen as analogous to Nineveh, it is representative of the Pharisees, and the pesher anticipates its deserved destruction. However, in this particular unit, we see Jerusalem as the target of Demetrius and the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things. This is the physical city that signifies the Jewish nation as a whole, or even the opponents of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things in particular. Apparently, its invulnerability is viewed positively in the first part of this pesher unit, but its destruction in the second part is also desirable.¹⁰⁷ We suggest that the multivalence of Jerusalem enabled the author of 4QpNah to identify both the Community and its opponents as Jerusalem. Thus, the trampling of Judea/Jerusalem at the end of this unit (i.e., the fall of the

¹⁰⁵ Doudna maintains that *ואהרר הרמס* must refer to an event that is in the same time-frame as the “standing of the Kittim,” and specifically, that both of these events must be placed in the future (336–40). The pesher certainly expresses these events in the future, but this would be a normal form of expression for *ex eventu* prophecy. Demetrius is clearly located in past time, but the eschatologically significant point of the pesher is expressed as a future. Doudna himself states that, “the predictions *within* an *ex eventu* prophecy are still in the future (and should be so rendered) from the standpoint of the present of the implied author of the text” (614). However, he rejects the notion of the presence of *ex eventu* prophecy in the pesherim.

¹⁰⁶ For the variety of attitudes to Jerusalem found in the Qumran Scrolls, see Schiffman, “Jerusalem in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 73–88; *Reclaiming*, 385–94.

¹⁰⁷ Ironically, Jerusalem is the center of the geographical location “Judah,” and in the Bible it is symbolic of Judah, in marked contrast to the Northern region of Ephraim. Yet in the pesher, it functions as an embodiment of the symbolic “Ephraim,” the Pharisees. Skehan comments: “that Jerusalem under the Pharisees should contain ‘the ingenuous ones of Ephraim’ is allegory gone wild!” (Review of Vermes’s *A New Translation of Qumrân Texts*, 121).

Jerusalem of the Pharisees) would have been viewed as a triumph for the remnant of Judea, i.e. the Community.¹⁰⁸

4.2.3 *Unit 8*

Our analysis of this unit presumes Carmignac's restoration for line 5 על כפיר החרון [. . .], such that the beginning of the pesher will have named an opponent of the Young Lion of Wrath. This opponent could have been Demetrius III or the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things ("Pharisees"). There are manifold possibilities for explaining the phrase אֲשֶׁר יָכָה בְּנִדְוֹלָיו וְאֲנָשֵׁי עֲצָתוֹ. In ch. 2, we observed that the possibilities are limited by the grammatical necessity that the "great ones" function as victims of an attack, the object of the verb יָכָה. The question remains: by whom are they attacked and to whom do they belong? The subject of יָכָה is either the opponent that is proposed to have been named in the lacuna (so that there is a distant head to the relative clause) or the Young Lion (immediately adjacent head).¹⁰⁹ Similarly, the referent of the possessive pronoun in בְּנִדְוֹלָיו is not obvious, and may be either the Lion of Wrath or the opponent. There are thus two basic ways to understand this pesher:

¹⁰⁸ Line 4 could even be restored in a manner that would name the Community as the entity that would trample corrupt Jerusalem. In 1QS^b (1Q28^b) V,27 Licht restores כְּמִיטַי הַצֹּהַר based upon Mic 7:10, in which the latter two words appear. The passage in 1QS^b continues with the image of a lion and other animals in a triumphal description of the ultimate victory of the Community over the wicked. Frag. 5 of 4QpNah apparently interprets Nah 3:14, "tread the mortar" as preparation for siege, but the pesher has not survived. The most significant parallel to our instance is probably 4QpIsa^c frag 23 II,10, but it is too fragmentary to do more than provide a general context featuring the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, Jerusalem, the End of Days, the Torah, and trampling. Cf. Isa 28:3 in which the *niph'al* of רָמַס is used in the prediction that "trampled underfoot shall be the proud crowns of the drunkards of Ephraim."

¹⁰⁹ There is no satisfactory restoration that will accommodate the alternative suggestion, "the Young Lion smites the Young Lion's great ones." Cf. Gaster's, "who proceeded to smite his own great men and his own confederates"; also the comments of Dupont-Sommer, Amusin, Carmignac (as an alternative to his main reading); Driver, "who used to smite amongst his great ones . . .". In any case, there is no direct evidence of Jannaeus attacking his own partisans. (He did kill his own subjects, e.g. in *Ant* 13 §373, §376, but these were opponents, not supporters). García-Martínez translates, "who struck (together) with his nobles and the men of his counsel [the simple folk of Ephraim]" (*Study ed.*, 337). He introduces a new, third, entity into the pesher, as Jannaeus's victims, but does not explain how the bracketed words might have been expressed or alluded to in the pesher. (For the syntactic difficulty of this translation of the prepositional *bet*, see ch. 2).

- 1) the opponent smites the Young Lion's great ones
or
- 2) the Young Lion smites the opponent's great ones.

Allegro translated נדוליו as “mighty ones” in “Further Light” and as “nobles” in DJD. There are undoubtedly many facets to greatness.¹¹⁰ The wide range of the Hebrew can indicate magnitude in size, number, physical strength, social status and more. Dupont-Sommer saw these “great ones” as referring to an “aristocratic” elite, specifically, the Sadducees.¹¹¹ However, this narrow view of the Sadducees as the elite Hellenized aristocracy is a bit too limiting. Certainly Pharisees and Sadducees alike had influential positions in their own spheres.¹¹² If the “great men” were possessed by the opponent named in the lacuna, then the masc. singular of the possessive (in בנדוליו) would be smoothest if that opponent is identified as an individual leader, though it could also be compatible with a collective noun.¹¹³ Although

¹¹⁰ See the similar broad semantic range of רבים, and Carmignac's “*RBYM*” cited in ch. 3.

¹¹¹ Cf. Horgan and, somewhat tentatively, Knibb. Dupont-Sommer stated that the Sadducee supporters of Aristobulus II are called “les grands” in *Ant* 13 §411. (The Greek term is οἱ δυνάσται, but Josephus does not expressly identify these men as Sadducees). Gaster took these “great ones” to be Jannaeus's own men and victims (cf. n. 109 above). Those scholars who translated this pesher so that Jannaeus struck “with” or “by means of” these “great ones” obviously identify these men as Jannaeus's fighters.

¹¹² In describing Jannaeus's siege against his opponents at Bethoma (in *Ant* 13 §380), Josephus uses the superlative of the term in the previous note, the “most powerful” (τοὺς δυνατωτάτους) to describe those opponents. In 4QpIsa^a 7–10 3:12, the “great ones” are the military leaders associated with the victorious eschatological Israel, presumably the Community—an identification which is clearly not transferable to the context in 4QpNah.

“Great ones” appears in line 11 of this column of 4QpNah, but the context is ambiguous there as well. In 3–4 III,9 there is a reference to the great ones of Manasseh, and IV,2 applies the “great ones” of Nah 3:10 to Manasseh, but in Pericope 2, Manasseh has not yet been introduced.

¹¹³ One possibility would be Ephraim, e.g., “Its pesher is concerning Ephraim, who comes upon the Young Lion of Wrath.” (פשרו על אפרים אשר יבואן). The identification would require some lengthening to fit the lacuna. An individual leader seems better-suited to the context, but it is difficult to offer specific restorations. There is no consensus on the identity of individual leaders of the Jewish opposition who are named cryptically in the Qumran corpus. Candidates for this lacuna may be the Spouter of Lies, or the Scoffer, or both epithets in apposition if they may refer to the same person:

פשרו הארי הוא משיף הכוב אשר יקום]

or

פשרו על איש הלצון ואנשי עדתו אשר יקומון].

Demetrius would thus be a good candidate on syntactic grounds, it is more contextually appropriate to restore a Pharisaic leader as the aggressive opponent.¹¹⁴

[Its peshar is concerning . . . leader of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things . . . who strikes] against the Young Lion of Wrath, that (the Young Lion of Wrath) smites his (the leader's) great ones . . .

Demetrius's campaign of the previous unit did not accomplish its aim. Upon Demetrius's withdrawal, the leader of the Jews launches his own attack in this unit, but his group is slain by Jannaeus (cf. *Ant* 13 §379). Unit 8 thus continues unit 7 chronologically and logically.

As in בְּנִדְלוּי, the sing. masc. possessive suffix in אֲנָשֵׁי עֲצָתוֹ is also ambiguous.¹¹⁵ The use of the term עֲצָה in 4QpNah 3–4 III,7 in reference to the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things would support associating this group with the opponent.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁴ With Demetrius III as the opponent instead, the peshar would refer to the battle of Shechem (*Ant* 13 §337–79; cf. Horgan, 175): Demetrius attacked Alexander and slew Alexander's men. On the one hand, it is appropriate to have Demetrius as the subject of the peshar here, since he was the subject in Unit 7. However, this recapitulation of Demetrius's attack does not follow logically upon the previous unit, wherein the threat posed by the Seleucid ruler had already been related and dismissed, and Judean invulnerability had been characterized as a norm.

Another alternative remains: "Demetrius smites Jannaeus's great ones but Jannaeus defeats the men of Demetrius's counsel." This would be a recapitulation of the attack at Shechem, but would then go beyond that attack to describe Jannaeus's suppression of the Jewish opponents who continued the battle after Demetrius's departure. This is acceptable, but it still seems preferable not to have unit 8 return to Demetrius after having disposed of him in unit 7.

¹¹⁵ The lack of a preposition with אֲנָשֵׁי עֲצָתוֹ and the loss of text following these words make it impossible to know whether the "men of his counsel" are to be viewed as accessory subjects or additional objects/victims. They may be possessed by the attacker or by the Young Lion, and may complete the previous phrase or begin a new one. On the juxtaposition of "great men" and "men of counsel," Wieder observes that the three wealthy men who are called "great ones" in Gen Rab 41:1 (Theodor-Albeck, 398) are called *Bouleutes* in Ecc Rab 7:11. For more on the terms בְּנִדְלוּי and אֲנָשֵׁי עֲצָתוֹ, Wieder directs attention to Adolf Büchler, *The Political and Social Leaders of the Jewish Community of Sepphoris in the Second and Third Centuries* (7–8; cited by Wieder in "Notes on the New Documents from the Fourth Cave of Qumran." *JJS* 7 [1956]: 72).

¹¹⁶ עֲצָה is neutral in itself, appearing in Qumran literature in association with God and the Community, as well as with the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things and Belial. This variability is evident in 1QpHab where עֲצָה associated with Gentiles at 4:11, the House of Absalom at 5:10, and the Teacher of Righteousness at 9:10. The word occurs six times in 4QpNah, with greater uniformity. The other instances are frags 3–4 I,5; II,6,8; III,5,6. In four of these six passages, the term is joined to the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things (I,1; II,6; III,5,6). In II,8 it refers to those who

There remain a number of permutations for the reconstruction of this unit according to the syntactic variables stated above. In the neatest structure, the Pharisaic men of counsel function as victims, in coordination with the great men of the first clause. Retaining the language of 4QpNah, this may be expressed as follows: the Young Lion will smite the opponent's great ones and the Young Lion will kill/defeat the men of the opponent's counsel.

The substitution of our historical identifications for the cryptic epithets and pronouns would yield the following: the Pharisees attack Jannaeus, and Jannaeus smites the Pharisees' great ones, and defeats the men of the Pharisees' counsel. If peshet unit 7 dealt with the failed attack by Demetrius III upon Jannaeus, unit 8 would follow with the continued clashes between the Pharisees and their king. *Ant* 13 §379 reads: "Demetrius withdrew in alarm. But later on the Jews fought against Alexander and were defeated, many of them dying in battle."

We may further propose a variation of this alternative. Josephus describes the post-Demetrius clash between the Pharisees and Jannaeus as resulting in the defeat of the Pharisees. In *Ant* 13 §380, he relates that after imposing heavy casualties upon his Pharisaic opponents in battle, Jannaeus besieged them at Bethoma. It was captives from this battle who were subsequently subjected to the crucifixion associated with this column of 4QpNah.¹¹⁷ Thus, we suggest the following: The leader of the Seekers attacks Jannaeus, who smites the leader's great ones and *besieges* the men of his counsel. Reading the "men of counsel" here as victims of the siege is in place sequentially, and also represents an appropriate exegetical use of the lemma's מְדוּנָה. A siege chokes a city, restricting the access of supplies and contacts, as strangulation cuts off respiration.

lead Ephraim astray (or those of Ephraim who lead [others] astray), a group that is associated with or identical to the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things.

¹¹⁷ Allegro actually suggests that Khirbet Qumran itself was "none other than the *Bethome* (also called *Bemesilis*) to which Josephus tells us the ringleaders of the revolt against Jannaeus fled" (*Dead Sea Scrolls*, 109). Bemesilis is the name recorded in the parallel at *Bḡ* §I 96. Cf. Adam Zertal, "The Pahwah of Samaria (Northern Israel) during the Persian Period. Types of Settlement, Economy, History and New Discoveries," *Transeuphratène* 3 (1990): 15 on the identification of Bethulia/Bethomastim in *Judith* 4:6.

4.2.4 *Unit 9*

This unit is discussed at length in the excursus to ch. 5. It refers to Jannaëus's crucifixion of his captured opponents as described by Josephus in *Ant* 13 §379–381. We understand the pesher as approving the execution of the Pharisees, and viewing their punishment as an actualization of divine retribution against the Wicked.

4.2.5 *Unit 10*

This unit describes the downfall of a powerful leader, a man with military strength, financial resources, and foreign connections.¹¹⁸ Jannaëus was noteworthy for these characteristics, and it is quite likely that he is the subject of this unit as he was in unit 9.¹¹⁹ For each of the elements in the pesher, a case may be made for association with Jannaëus.

(1) *army*: Dupont-Sommer observes that Jannaëus's militarism, and his hiring of mercenaries, is a salient feature in Josephus's account of his regime.¹²⁰ (2) "*great ones*": the portion of the text that would have further characterized these "great ones" has not survived, and so this term is not very useful for identification.¹²¹ (3) *wealth . . . Jerusalem*. The association between Jannaëus and the "wealth amassed

¹¹⁸ We do not accept Tantlevskij's claim that unit 9 refers to Jannaëus's defeat at Shechem ("Historical Background," 332). This understanding is connected to his views about the historical context of Pericopes 3 and 4, addressed below. Even within this pericope itself, the tone of this unit seems to refer to a far greater and decisive reversal than Jannaëus's setback at Shechem.

¹¹⁹ Thus, Horgan, 180–81; Dupont-Sommer ("sans doute," in "Le Commentaire," 69). Cf. Tantlevskij "Historical Background," 332. Strugnell apparently takes "the hanged one" as the subject of this pesher, but it is difficult to apply that interpretation to any historical context ("Notes," 209).

It is contextually possible to read the pesher as referring to the opponent of the Lion. The details in this unit and its general message of ultimate downfall can accommodate either Jannaëus or a Pharisaic leader. The determining factor between the two alternatives is the style of pesher identification in this unit. The subject of the unit is implied in the masculine possessive suffixes of the identified elements, but no individual is named. Our conjectural restoration of a Pharisaic opponent in this pericope only allows for the appearance of this figure in unit 7, attacking Jannaëus. Unit 8 referred to Jannaëus's opponents in the plural. Unit 9 assumes a known singular masculine individual, and that individual is most likely to be the named subject of the previous unit, the Lion of Wrath. Those who view Pesher Nahum as indicating support for Jannaëus (see n. 66, 67 above), do not offer alternative identifications of the figure opposed here in unit 10.

¹²⁰ "Le Commentaire," 69.

¹²¹ In line 5 we identified the "great ones" as Pharisaic opponents of Jannaëus,

by the last priests” is discussed further below. (4) *messengers among the Gentiles*: International affairs dominate Josephus’s account of Jannaeus’s reign. Besides waging military campaigns, Jannaeus also hired mercenaries, maintained diplomatic contacts, and managed conquered territories, and he would have required a network of messengers for these activities.¹²²

The association of the term “wealth” with Jannaeus is strengthened by the restoration of the words “last priests” and “gathered,” following Allegro. Allegro’s restoration is based upon 1QpHab IX,5–6, where *הון* appears as the object of *קבץ* in an accusation against the “last priests” of Jerusalem.

פשרו על כוהני ירושלים האחרונים אשר יקבוצו הון ובצע משלל העמים
ולאחרית הימים יתן הונם עם שללם ביד חיל הכתובים

The interpretation of it concerns the last priests of *Jerusalem*, who *amass wealth* and profit from the plunder of the peoples; but, at the end of days their wealth together with their booty will be *given* into the hands of the army of the Kittim.¹²³

The relevance of this passage to 4QpNah depends to some extent upon its own historical setting. Dupont-Sommer identifies the “last priests” of 1QpHab as Jannaeus, Aristobulus, and Hyrcanus II, so that 4QpNah is viewed as a very close parallel to this passage. They are differentiated by each other only in that 4QpNah is limited to Alexander, while 1QpHab applies to both Alexander and his sons. This is the reason that Dupont-Sommer modified Allegro’s restoration of this unit, arguing for *אשר קבץ בהיכל ירושלים*, with “sanctuary” replacing Allegro’s plural “last priests.” Since, in Dupont-Sommer’s opinion, Jannaeus’s sons do not appear in 4QpNah until the next

but Dupont-Sommer viewed the term as referring to Jannaeus’s Sadducee supporters. He was followed by Horgan who identified those “great ones” with the ones here in unit 10 (p. 181). In this unit, Dupont-Sommer takes the term as reflecting Jannaeus’s officers, or perhaps his sons.

¹²² Cf. *Ant* 13 §335, §353 regarding Cleopatra; §374, §378 in reference to Alexander’s mercenaries; §§395–97 for territories captured by Jannaeus. The role of Antipater is particularly noteworthy. Josephus states that the Idumean Antipater (the grandfather of Herod) was made a general of Idumaea by Jannaeus and Salome (στρατηγός; Marcus renders this as “governor,” *Ant* 14 §10). In this capacity, he formed a league with the Arabs, Gazites, and Ascalonites.

¹²³ Transl. Horgan. The italicized words in the English highlight the lexical overlap with 4QpNah. Allegro’s restoration of 4QpNah has the attraction of lexical similarity to 1QpHab: *יתן*, *יקבוצו*, and *ירושלים*, and the probable rendering of “*וטרפ*” as *הון*.

column, and since unit 9 of 4QpNah has a single male individual as his subject, he wished to restrict the subject of unit 10 to Alexander, *one of the “last priests.”*¹²⁴

Allegro also took Jannaeus as the subject of this unit of 4QpNah. He associated his restoration of the unit with his identification of the Wicked Priest and the Lion of Wrath, an identification we have already described as dubious, above. Earlier in 1QpHab, the Wicked Priest, like the last priests in column IX, had been accused of plundering nations.¹²⁵ 1QpHab VIII,11 states that the Wicked Priest also stole and accumulated the wealth of the men of violence who had rebelled against God (וּיקבוֹץ הוּן אֲנָשֵׁי הַמָּס), and XXII,10 states that he stole the “wealth of the poor” (הוּן אֲבִיּוֹנִים), presumably the Qumran Community.

1QpHab seems to describe a three stage process. Initially, the “men of violence,” the “poor” and “the nations” were possessed of some wealth. Then the Wicked Priest and “last priests” stole this wealth. Lastly, it will be given to the Kittim. Allegro assumed that 1QpHab refers to a single historical setting throughout and that 4QpNah referred to the same situation.¹²⁶ For Allegro, both compositions state that the wealth of Jannaeus (= the Wicked Priest/the last priests) will be given to the Kittim.

In fact, it is most probable that 4QpNah does not reflect a specific historical scenario that is equivalent to that of 1QpHab. The Wicked Priest of 1QpHab VIII is best identified as Jonathan the Hasmonean, who preceded Jannaeus.¹²⁷ If the setting of 1QpHab col. VIII differs from that of col. IX, then col. IX could refer to a time before or after that of Alexander Jannaeus. The shared terminology between

¹²⁴ Horgan comments, “The wealth of the priests of Jerusalem could be said to be ‘his prey’ inasmuch as Jannaeus himself was the high priest” (181). Dupont-Sommer also seems committed to have the “last priests” of 1QpHab be literally the final high priestly rulers, but “last” need not be interpreted with such rigidity. (See our comments on “latter days” in ch. 6).

¹²⁵ A different verb is employed, however, הוּן עַמִּים לָקַח, 1QpHab VIII,12. García-Martínez (19) translates this as “public money” but Gentile wealth is more likely.

¹²⁶ The basis for connecting this unit of 4QpNah with 1QpHab is its shared terminology with 1QpHab IX,5–6. The relevance of 1QpHab col. VIII, then, depends upon an association between the Wicked Priest of col. VIII with the “last priests” of col. IX.

¹²⁷ Cf. Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 234–35; Vermes, *CDSSE*, 60–62; James C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1994), 103. See n. 65 on 4Q448, above.

1QpHab and 4QpNah is significant, but it cannot offer a decisive clue to historical identification. The use of the term “last priests” in the later of these compositions will have been influenced by the earlier usage of the term. This earlier usage is certainly relevant to our understanding of peshar composition, and of the particular passages at hand, but cannot determine absolute identifications.

Since the dating of the events in 1QpHab col. IX is not certain, we can not determine whether the two passages refer to an identical historical event. However, in light of the mention of “Ephraim” in line 12, we maintain that they both indicate the same conceptual setting. Although the particular players in the drama may differ, 4QpNah and 1QpHab may each be interpreted as describing both the loss of Pharisaic wealth to a priestly faction, and the subsequent seizure of that wealth by the Kittim. Peshar Nahum could be taken to say that the wealth of Ephraim (= the men of violence)¹²⁸ had been taken by Jannaeus (= [?]a Wicked Priest/one of the last priests)¹²⁹ but now will be given to Kittim.

¹²⁸ The Seekers-after-Smooth-Things might even be associated with the *אנשי מלחמה* of CD X,14, “men of war,” or war-mongers, opponents of the Community, who will perish. (The term also appears in 1QH XV,22 with *בעלי ריבי, מנאצי*; and in XVII,22, describing the author’s anticipated triumph over his adversaries).

This term derives from the biblical reference to the generation that departed from Egypt. Deut 2:14,16 records that the entrance to the Land of Israel was delayed, “until that whole generation of warriors (*אנשי מלחמה*) had perished from the camp . . . when all the warriors among the people had died off” (NJPS transl). Thus, in Josh 5:4,6, “all the people who had come out of Egypt, all the males of military age (*אנשי המלחמה*) had died . . . for the Israelites had traveled in the wilderness forty years, until the entire nation—the men of military age who had left Egypt—had perished; because they had not obeyed the Lord.” The “men of war” in CD are so styled in accordance with their figurative rebellion, following that of their desert ancestors, but there may be some intention of literal, physical, militarism associated with these opponents as well.

Above (n. 62) we mentioned the view of Eshel and Kister that 4Q471 opposes the militarism of Jannaeus and other Hasmonean rulers, but we described this view as dependent upon pre-conceived notions of the Community’s stance toward Jannaeus. 4Q471 text might be associated with the Pharisees and/or with the general Jewish population. *והשקרו בבריתו* (line 2) implies religious as well as political opposition, and would be relevant in a polemic against Pharisees (see our remarks on Pharisees and deceit in section 4.1.2 of this chapter). Josephus seems to indicate popular support for Jannaeus’s military successes (cf. *Ant* 13 §394. Josephus states that in response to Alexander’s victories in Transjordan, “the Jews welcomed him eagerly because of his successes” [transl. Marcus, *LCL*]). See too 4QpIsa^c in which Isa 31:1, “. . . in horses they trust and they rely on chariots . . .” is applied to “the people” (*העם*).

¹²⁹ See above on Jannaeus as the/a Wicked priest. Josephus does not mention any financial abuse on Jannaeus’s part, but presumably the king would have taken advantage of the execution and exile of his opponents.

The cessation of Jannaeus's political activity would signal the end of an era, and is a fitting conclusion to Pericope 2. We take this pericope to have been composed after the reign of Alexander Jannaeus.

4.3 CONCLUSION

To reiterate the flow of Pericope 2 as established above:

In unit 7, Demetrius III comes to Jerusalem in response to an appeal by Jannaeus's opponents, the Pharisees (and, perhaps, the peshar anticipates the ultimate destruction of these opponents). In unit 8, the Pharisees attack Jannaeus, but then Jannaeus defeats the Pharisees (and, possibly, besieges and captures some of them). In unit 9, Jannaeus hangs some of the Pharisaic opponents and the peshar approves of these deaths. Unit 10 describes the decline of Jannaeus's power (and, perhaps, the decline of the Pharisees).

CHAPTER FIVE

PERICOPE 2, PESHER UNITS 6–10: LITERARY ANALYSIS

The biblical base-text of Pericope 2, Nah 2:12–14, is concerned with the downfall of Nineveh. In these verses, Nahum employs the image of the lion in an extended metaphor, contrasting the current invulnerability of Nineveh with its impending doom. The following analysis is predicated upon the understanding that this pericope of 4QpNah focuses upon the downfall of the Hasmonean king Alexander Jannaeus and his powerful Pharisaic opponents, as discussed in ch. 4.¹

5.1 PESHER UNIT 6

Only a few words of this unit have been preserved, the final words of a peshet interpretation that is to be taken as a comment upon Nah 2:12a “*Where is the lions’ lair, which was a pasture for the young lions?*”²

In the biblical text of Nahum, the words “pasture for the young lions” provide a positive parallel to “the lions’ lair,” with both phrases describing the beasts’ enviable initial status. In contrast, 4QpNah is usually understood as describing Gentile occupation of Jerusalem, thereby spelling out the implication of Nahum’s rhetorical question. To the query, “What has become of the lair?” the peshet replies, “it is now occupied by Gentiles.”³

¹ We have dealt at length with various interpretations of the biblical metaphor and its component images in “4QpNah” and, to a lesser extent, in “Lemma/Peshet Correspondence.” Our remarks here are limited to the necessary data for determining lemma/peshet correspondence.

² Our treatment of Nah 2:12a is predicated upon the text of MT: אִיהָ מַעַן אֲרִיּוֹתָּהּ וּמִרְעֵהָ הוּא לְכַפִּירִים.

³ The term גוֹיִם can frequently have the general meaning of “nations,” but in this text, the specific connotation of “Gentiles” is intended. The construct form may reflect a partitive genitive, “the wicked among the nations,” or a superlative usage, as suggested elsewhere by Carmignac. (He translates 4QpPs^a II,20 עֲרִיִצֵי נְאֻיִם as “the most frightful of the nations” in *Textes*, 123. On the “superlative genitive,” see Bruce K. Waltke and Michael Patrick O’Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990. §9.5.3j).

The following correspondences of individual phrases can accommodate this conventional interpretation:

מעון	=	[Jerusalem/Israel]	metaphor ⁴
אדיוה	=	[Jews]	symbol
ומרעה	=	מדור	?metaphor ⁵
(דור)	=	[. . .]	
לכפרים	=	לרשעי נויים	symbol ⁶

In this schematization, individual equivalents are neatly aligned, but the structure of the complete lemma is not parallel to the pesher. Whereas the two phrases in verse 12a are complementary in Nahum, 4QpNah is understood to form a contrast between the second phrase and the first.⁷ Conceptually, 4QpNah moves beyond Nahum's image

⁴ Gaster notes that Jerusalem is called the מעון of God in Ps 26:8; 68:6; 76:3 and IIChron 36:15.

⁵ The Hebrew root דור, meaning to dwell, appears in the Bible only at Ps 84:11. For the Aramaic cognate, cf. Dan 2:38; 3:31; 4:9, 18, 32; 6:26. The equivalence would depend upon the understanding that the "pasture" in the lemma is the home of the lion.

Allegro observed that in post-biblical Hebrew the word מדור is especially used of Gentile dwellings ("Further Light"; he refers to Jastrow *q.v.*; mOhalot 18:9–10 מדרור כוהים; מדור עכרים; מדור). At Qumran, the term is associated with impurity in a number of texts, an association that would be appropriate to the context of the pesher. Cf. 1QS XI,21, 1QH XX,25–26, 4QapLam^a (4Q179) frag. 1 II,9.

One might also consider the possibility of a variant lemma. Although all textual representatives, including MurXII, read מרעה, it has been suggested that the lemma in 4QpNah would have read מערה. (So, Horgan, Knibb. Cf. Wellhausen's emendation of MT; Smith, *ICC: Nahum*, 310; NRSV in NIB, 611; Cathcart, *Nahum*). A cave would be an apt symbol for a "dwelling-place."

⁶ In the Bible, כפיר frequently represents an enemy of Israel. Gentile enemies, specifically, are found in Isa 5:29; Jer 2:15, 51:38; Ezek 32:2, 38:13. Gaster emphasizes the relevance of Jer 2:15 for 4QpNah. The roaring "young lions" in Jer 2:15 represent the Gentiles who come to ravage the Land of Israel, reducing the Land from its former glory to desolation, on account of the faithlessness of the Israelites.

⁷ Doudna understands the groups of lions in the lemma as two distinct entities, but he identifies both terms with Gentiles: "The wicked ones of the nations who make Jerusalem or Israel their dwelling appear to correspond to the lions of the quotation . . . This is in agreement with the two lions of the next unit who are interpreted with reference to a king of Yavan from the past who failed, and a conqueror who is coming who will be successful, both of whom are gentiles" (315). Doudna illustrates the parallelism he perceives between unit 6 and unit 7: "lions A, and lions B . . . where lion A used to go, and there was the dwelling of lion B . . ." (p. 113). This would suppose that the pesher departs from the sense of the lemma even more than it does according to the conventional understanding of the unit. Verse 12 of Nahum describes the security of the lions' habitat. In the conventional interpretation, "lions B" correspond to attackers, but "lions A" dwell in security; according to Doudna, all of the lions are attackers, and the pesher would exhibit no correspondence to the context of Nahum.

of a once impregnable domain, introducing the idea of the subsequent intrusion of Gentiles into the erstwhile impregnable domain of Judea. Unit 6 does not reflect the message of inviolability that is the point of the lemma in its original context, but rather its opposite.

Two exegetical explanations may be offered for the considerable atomization required by this interpretation. (1) The redundancy in the lemma may have triggered the departure from the base-text. The two phrases for “lions’ abodes” could have prompted the author of the pesher to differentiate between two analogs for lions. (2) The framing of the biblical text as a rhetorical question may have induced some expansion in the pesher. The tone and context of Nah 2:12a anticipate a response that will indicate a reversal. This reversal, which appears in subsequent verses in the biblical text, could be supplied in this unit itself by the author of the pesher.

The above analysis must be viewed as tentative due to the fragmentary state of this unit. Alternate reconstructions of the pesher can be generated that would provide even greater compatibility with the original context. For example, atomization could be minimized by a “double pesher” construction in which the pesher first applies **מַרְעָה הוּא לַכַּפְרִים** to describe a *status ante quem*, and then reapplies the phrase to a later situation. Consider the following sequence for the pesher (phrased in question-and-answer format so as to reflect the structure of the lemma): “What has become of Jerusalem, city of the Jews, that was a power-base for the Jewish elite? It has been given over as a dwelling-place for wicked Gentiles.” This hypothetical reconstruction presents a model of “strict” or “close” conceptual and structural correspondence between the lemma and pesher in this unit. It would entail the following equivalents:

מַעוֹן	= [Jerusalem]	
אַרְיֹת	= [Jews]	
מַרְעָה	= I. [power-base, secure home]	II. מַדוֹר ⁸
לַכַּפְרִים	= I. [Jewish political/military leaders] ⁹	II. לְרַשְׁעֵי נַוְיִים

⁸ Perhaps this could reflect a word-play on “רע” with **מַדוֹר** as rotteness and impurity?

⁹ In unit 10, of this pericope “young lions” are identified as “his great ones,” members of the Jewish elite opposed by the pesher. Of course, the most salient use of the term in the DSS is in the epithet **כַּפְרֵי הַדְרִינָן**. Cf. 1QH XIII,7, 9, 13, and 19, which refer to the opponents of the author of the hymns, who are also the enemies of God, as young lions. Habermann observed that traditional Jewish commentators have connected the **כַּפְרִים** of Ps 34:11 **רְשׁוּ וְרַעְבוּ כַּפְרִים**, with **כּוֹפְרִים**, heretics.

The application of the lemma's כפיריִם to Jerusalem's elite would achieve an appropriate contextualization of unit 6 within pericope 2, and would suit the anti-establishment polemic that is found throughout frags 3–4 of 4QpNah.¹⁰

5.2 PESHER UNIT 7

3–4 I 1–3 on Nah 2:12b “*whither the lion went to bring the lion’s cub, and there was no intimidator*”¹¹

In Nahum, 2:12b reiterates the point made in v. 12a, “it was as pasture for the young lions.” The biblical text further develops the depiction of the unchallenged authority of Assyrian Nineveh, to serve as a foil for the upcoming reversal.¹² Unit 7 of the peshar may be taken as a similar reiteration of unit 6. Unit 7 illustrates the one-time invulnerability of Jerusalem, this time with a particular example (the failure of an attack by Demetrius), and proceeds to spell out the reversal, predicting the capital’s downfall.

Our translation of the lemma presumes the reading “לביא,” understood as a *hiphil* infinitive.¹³ The image is one of secure dominance in which the lion may bring the cub wherever he wills. While this image is not likely to have been intended by the original biblical author of Nahum, the author of the peshar could reasonably have supposed that it was.¹⁴ In Nahum itself, we would prefer the inter-

¹⁰ Knibb suggests that the “wicked of the nations” may refer to Jannaeus’s mercenaries. He states, “In Nahum the lions represent the Assyrians and the den or cave is Nineveh; in the Commentary on Nahum, the lion-symbolism has been applied to Alexander Jannaeus, and the den or cave is now Jerusalem.”

¹¹ Other translations of this lemma are discussed at length in Berrin, “4QpNah” and “Lemma/Peshar Correspondence.” There is no need to review all the literature on ארי לביא (or ארי לביא) here. It is worth reiterating that the frequent translation of לביא in this verse as “lioness” is unwarranted by biblical usage. Recall, in any case, that we are not concerned here with the original meaning of the verse in Nahum, but rather with how the lemma was understood and used by the author of the peshar.

¹² We use the term “foil” to indicate that the description of Assyria’s former status is provided in order to serve as a contrast for the destruction. See *O.E.D. q.v.*, def. 6, “anything that serves by contrast to adorn another thing or set it off.”

¹³ See *ICC: Nahum*, 333 and sources cited, for the suggestion that לביא in this verse is to be taken as a *hiphil* infinitive, a shortened form of להביא. Cf. Jer 39:7; IIChron 31:10 as clear examples of this usage. For examples of *hiphil* infinitives lacking the ה in Qumran writings, see Doudna, 115 n. 133.

¹⁴ As we have discussed elsewhere, male lions do not tend to bring their cubs

pretation reflected in the translation “whither the lion and the lion’s cub went.”¹⁵ This interpretation also merits consideration within the pesher, and will be addressed below.

The two translations differ in two significant and related respects, both of which have bearing on our analysis of correspondence. First, the verb is transitive in the former translation, but intransitive in the latter (הלך לביא or הלך). Also, the “lion’s cub” is a direct object (of לביא) in the first translation, but is one element of a compound subject in the second translation (with intransitive הלך). Within the pesher interpretation, the verb לבוא is grammatically intransitive, but the logical role of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things may be either that of accomplice or causal agent. Thus, both Demetrius and the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things may correspond to either the lion or the lion’s cub.¹⁶ Any of the following sets of alignments may be valid, and each poses its own difficulty.

The first translation, “whither the lion went to *bring* the lion’s cub,” accommodates two models of correspondence for the beginning of the pesher interpretation, “concerning Deme]trius King of Greece who sought to come (upon) Jerusalem at the counsel of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things.”

anywhere, nor do they hunt food for their cubs (cf. “Lemma/Pesher Correspondence”). It may be supposed that the biblical author would have been aware of the behavior of lions and would not have constructed such an unnatural metaphor. In contrast, the author of 4QpNah may have been unaware of, or indifferent to, lions’ actual habits.

¹⁵ With לביא as “male lion,” functioning as a pleonastic synonym of ארי. Among scholars who prefer this construction, there have been some unconvincing attempts to distinguish between the two terms. Cf. *NJPS* “lion and lion’s breed,” and G.J. Botterweck’s discussion of the possibility that ארי/הארי specifies the African lion, whereas לביא denotes the Asiatic lion (in *TDOT*, s.v. ארי). Doudna translates “lion and old lion.”

¹⁶ Doudna argues that the “Seekers” do not have any direct counterpart in the lemma, but that the group was included in the pesher interpretation in order to provide background information. He maintains that the two lions of the lemma must correspond to two different Gentile conquerors, and that neither term refers to the Seekers-After-Smooth-Things (see n. 7, above). Doudna particularly objects to our suggestion that a masc. sing. noun in the lemma would have a group as its equivalent, rather than a masc. sing. figure (340; 357). However, in unit 13, Doudna himself correlates the fem. sing. noun of the lemma with a masc. pl. group in the pesher, with this equation: “harlot/sorceress (= the leaders-astroy of Ephraim)” (p. 484).

Pesher Unit 7, Model I: the “lion” is Demetrius.

ארי	= Demetrius	symbol ¹⁷
הלך לביא	= (בעצה) לבוא בקש ¹⁸	adaptational paraphrase; isolexism: בוא in intransitive rather than transitive form ¹⁹
נור ארי	= Seekers	derivative symbol ²⁰
שם	= Jerusalem	denomination, ²¹ abbreviation ²²

¹⁷ Demetrius, as king, is generally taken as the analog to the lemma's lion. Botterweck traces the importance of the lion as a majestic figure in the Ancient Near East in the categories of cult, royal symbolism, and art (*IDOT*, s.v. ארי vol. 1, 377–82). He identifies some particularly popular *topoi* of lions in the Bible, namely the “roaring lion,” the “attacking and hunting lion” and “the hunted or slain lion.” All three are reflected in this passage in Nahum. Gaster notes Arabic and Greek uses of the lion as warrior or hero, a stereotype that is relevant to the pesher application here. The “king of the jungle” lives on today in popular idiom.

Vermes claims a polarity in Targumatic use of the lion (*Scripture and Tradition*, 40–66). He demonstrates that the Targum operates with the basic symbolic equation “lion = king,” but that in the particular applications of the symbol, the king tends to be either a wicked or Gentile ruler, or the messiah of God. He sees this polar tendency at Qumran as well, as part of a trend of “symbolic traditions.” The use of the lion as a symbol for Gentile royalty is appropriate to the image of Demetrius in this unit.

¹⁸ For the root בוא in the sense of attack, see *BDB* def. B; *HALOT* def. 1g, “to fall upon.” This is the understanding of all commentators here, other than Rabinowitz. The semantic ambiguity of עצה complicates our understanding of the syntax of the phrase החלקות דורשי בעצה. In the Bible, this word denotes advice, or counsel. At Qumran, the word often seems to denote a formal gathering, and is sometimes rendered “council.” Hanoah Yalon compared the Latin *consilium*, and the Greek *synhedrion* as “gatherings for counsel” (מניחות מדבר יהודה: דברי לשון [Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1967], 75). Cf. John E. Worrel, “עצה: ‘Counsel’ or ‘Council’ at Qumran?” *VT* 20 [1970]: 45–74. Following Allegro, the usual translation in this unit is “counsel,” advice, which is better suited to a causal understanding of the prepositional phrase, with the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things as the agents engendering Demetrius's attack.

¹⁹ The exegetical technique of the pesher might alternatively be viewed as the substitution of the similar letters ו/י. The influence of a variant text is possible as well. Lastly, the force of “at the counsel” may be an exegetical justification for the switch: for an individual in the pesher to *come because of an agent* (לבווא בעצה) is logically equivalent to having *an agent bring* (לביא) an individual, as in the lemma.

²⁰ Jannaeus's Jewish opponents are affiliated with Demetrius, the lion, but they are junior to the Seleucid king in their power and military prowess (hence, “cub”).

²¹ Jerusalem itself is probably a synecdoche for Judea here. This identification is a further link to the previous pesher unit. Schiffman (276) notes that Demetrius's destination in unit 7, Jerusalem, is identified with the אריות of Nah 3:12, “which in turn had already been explained by the pesher as מדור לרשעי נים in line 1” in unit 6.

²² I.e., שם may be taken as a shortened notation for ירושלים. At the least, the auditory similarity is noteworthy.

Pesher Unit 7, Model II: the “lion” represents the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things:

ארי	= Seekers	symbol ²³
הלך לבוא	= בקש לבוא (בעצה)	paraphrase; isolexism ²⁴
נור ארי	= Demetrius	symbol; paronomasia ²⁵
שם	= Jerusalem	denomination; abbreviation

The second translation, “whither the lion and the lion’s cub *went*,” would engender the following model of correspondence:

Pesher Unit 7, Model III:

ארי, לביא	= Demetrius	symbol; pleonasm ²⁶
נור ארי	= Council of Seekers ²⁷	derivative symbol
הלך	= בקש לבוא	paraphrase ²⁸ (paronomasia with לביא) ²⁹
שם	= Jerusalem	denomination; abbreviation

This final example enables fairly direct arithmetical and exegetical correspondence but it is difficult contextually. Demetrius and the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things align smoothly with the lion and cubs. However, Model III engenders a thematic imbalance between the lemma and pesher. Whereas the lemma describes the security of the aggressor (the lion), the pesher focuses upon the security of the would-be victim (Jerusalem).

²³ Here, the lion would symbolize “power” rather than royalty. Recall that the “lions” in the previous unit (in the phrase *מעון אריות*) are generally understood as representing the Jewish nation.

²⁴ Demetrius’s attempt “to come” in to Jerusalem would be a syntactic variation on the citation’s “to bring,” but the verse’s logical sense of the lion “bringing” in another party would extend to 4QpNah.

²⁵ Recall the restoration of the end of this unit as indicating Demetrius’s failure in his attack upon Jerusalem, thereby reflecting the words of the lemma, “and there was no intimidator” (*ואין מהרוד*). *נור*, which means “lion cub” here, is also an alternate form of the verbal root *נר*, “to be afraid” (*HALOT s.v.*, def. III, p. 185). This homography could enhance the equation of the lemma’s “cub” with the figure of the would-be “terrifier” in the pesher.

²⁶ This model is easily adapted to the alternative reading of *לבוא* in the lemma, rather than *לביא*. Instead of the pleonasm of the two terms for lion, substitute the pleonasm of two words for “going.” *בקש לבוא* would be a paraphrastic repetition of the lemma’s *הלך לבוא* with a syntactically similar compound verb.

²⁷ In this model, the translation of *עצה* as “council” indicates that Demetrius attempted to enter “together with” (or “by means of”) the Council of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, with the prepositional *ב* indicating complicity or instrumentality.

²⁸ Both *הלך* and *בקש לבוא* convey a sense of intention.

²⁹ The pesher’s *לבוא* would play on the sound of the lemma’s *לביא*, but not function as an equivalent to it. (With the reading *לבוא* in the lemma, the pesher would be a true equivalent, repeating the element from the lemma).

The translation in which the lion “brings” the cub engenders a more complex, but also more effective, overall model of correspondence. The arithmetical alignment of equivalents is less straightforward in Models I and II than in Model III. That is because the exegetical technique proposed in those models involves the reconfiguration of the syntactic function of the individual elements.³⁰ The extent of structural atomization assumed by these interpretations is difficult to assess, because in each case the structure of the pesher is determined by the use of isolexism (לְבוֹא/לְבִיא). In these readings, the focus of the pesher upon the security of Judea corresponds to the lemma’s concern with the invulnerability of the lion. However, the lemma, which functioned as a generalized metaphor in Nahum, is re-contextualized and applied to a concrete historical event in the pesher. The motif of “inviolability” that is central to the lemma is only indirectly apparent in this part of the pesher, which introduces Demetrius’s (ultimately unsuccessful) attack.³¹

The continuation of the pesher exhibits greater contextual correspondence. We propose a “double pesher” of the sort suggested in the previous unit, with וְאֵין מְהַרִּיד indicating both the current secure status of Jerusalem, as well as its future downfall. The lack of an intimidator is fairly straightforward in Nahum itself, but is ambiguous in 4QpNah. In Nahum, the lack of a “terrifier” represents the initial condition of the unchallenged predator in his domain. In 4QpNah, this phrase seems to be the basis for the observation that Demetrius did not succeed in “terrifying” the Jews, i.e., in defeating Jerusalem. We propose that וְאֵין מְהַרִּיד is also used as the basis for the assertion that the city will “afterward” be trampled (תִּרְמַס), stressing that at a later point there will be none to scare away and repulse the invaders.

The root הָרַד denotes fear and trembling. The Bible employs the participial phrase וְאֵין מְהַרִּיד in depictions of undisturbed dwelling and, particularly, feeding. The context is often a blessing (such as

³⁰ If the pesher takes Demetrius as the lion who “comes,” playing on the verb “to bring” in the lemma, then this word-play reverses the roles of the figures involved in the action (Model I). Syntactically, Demetrius, the analog of the lion, is the subject of the verb in the pesher, as the lion is in the lemma but, logically, he no longer “brings.” If, instead, Demetrius corresponds to the lion’s cub that is brought, then the analog of the lion is no longer the subject, but remains the entity that performs the act of bringing (Model II).

³¹ Following Dupont-Sommer’s restoration. See ch. 2.

the promise that the remnant of Israel will return to the Land unopposed and partake freely of the bounty of the land), or a curse (such as the threat of scavenger birds feeding undeterred upon the corpses of sinful Israelites, or flocks grazing upon a desolate Damascus).³² 4QpNah may be viewed as employing both senses. The impersonal מוֹחֲרִיד leaves the implied object of the terror undefined. “There was none to frighten” may signify that there was (1) none to frighten the native inhabitants, i.e., no successful invader;³³ or (2) none to frighten away the invader, i.e., no protector, implying a successful invader.

We restore this unit as asserting that Demetrius was “not a terrifier,” but that later, the Romans will destroy the city and “will not be deterred.” Equivalents may be mapped as follows:

I.

וְאִין	= restored [וְלֹא]	paraphrase
מוֹחֲרִיד	= restored [verb: came, entered]	i.e. Demetrius did not succeed in coming in and terrorizing. ³⁴

II.

וְאִין מוֹחֲרִיד	= Antiochus, Kittim . . . (תְּרַמֵּס) ³⁵	i.e., none will protect Jerusalem from the later invasion (by the Kittim), and Jerusalem will be destroyed
------------------	---	--

³² For a blessing, cf. Jer 30:10; 46:27; Ezek 34:28; 39:26; Mic 4:4; Zeph 3:13; Lev 26:6; for a curse, cf. Deut 28:26; Jer 7:33; Isa 17:2.

³³ There has been some discussion as to whether the use of בִּקֵּשׁ necessarily indicates an unsuccessful attempt—i.e., that the aggressor “sought” to conquer, but, by implication, did not actually conquer. (See esp. Cross’s critique of Rowley’s interpretation of this unit, cited in ch. 4, n. 7, above). Semantically and syntactically, this is not the only option, but it is the most logical. Cf. I Sam 23:10, in which Saul seeks to come into Keilah to besiege David (וַיִּבְקֵשׁ . . . לְבִיאָה). Verse 14 states that, after this thwarted attempt, David remained in the wilderness, and Saul sought after him constantly, but “God did not deliver him into his hands.” (This verse is presumably the basis for Dupont-Sommer’s restoration of the pesher in this unit.) See also 4QpPs^a II,18, in which the wicked of Ephraim and Manasseh “sought to put forth their hands” against the priest, and IV,14, in which the Man of Lies is pictured as opposing the Elect of God: and he “soug]ht to destroy. . . .”

³⁴ The use of וְאִין מוֹחֲרִיד as a peg for the pesher’s comment about Demetrius’s failed attempt against Jerusalem is also observed by Knibb and Dupont-Sommer (see below).

³⁵ The verb תְּרַמֵּס is employed in Ezek 34:18 and Dan 8:7 in portrayals of eschatological cataclysm featuring a highly developed metaphor involving hierarchy among sheep. The contexts of Ezekiel and Daniel are more clearly relevant to that of 4QpNah than the text of Micah discussed below, though the lexical ties are not as strong. These passages might have influenced the author of 4QpNah in employing the root רַמֵּס in the context of latter-day destruction. The pastoral settings in Ezekiel

Taking **ואין מהריר** as reflecting a failed invasion entails an exegetical transformation of the lemma's original sense. A phrase that indicated the security of the aggressor is utilized to indicate the security of the victim. The *vav* in its original context was conjunctive, and perhaps explicative, elaborating upon the fact that the lion took his cub to the location *because* there was no threat there. In our interpretation of the pesher, the *vav* is disjunctive, indicating that the aggressor came *but* he was not successful. Furthermore, the absent "terrifier" in Nahum was an external entity, a hypothetical threat to the lion; in the pesher the "non-terrifier" is the lion (or lion's cub) himself. The pesher would best be characterized as engaging in a type of atomization that is rooted in textual exegesis.

The terms "Antiochus" and "the Kittim" could be viewed as supplementary descriptive elements that are not triggered by the text. It seems preferable, though, to relate these figures to **מהריר**, so that they function as antithetical examples and highlight Demetrius's failure. Demetrius was not a "terrifier" i.e., a successful conqueror, in contrast to these other invaders who were "terrifiers." The word **תרמס** is part of this additional equivalence with **ואין מהריר**, as the act that will not be deterred is Rome's imminent destruction of Jerusalem.

In this description, the word **תרמס** is not exactly an "un-pegged plus," since the suggested secondary correspondence with "and there was none to frighten off" requires the pesher to record some sort of destructive activity that is not prevented. Nonetheless, there is no direct equivalent for the verb in the lemma. The lexical choice of the root **רמס** is best evaluated as an allusion to a secondary biblical text, specifically Mic 5:7.³⁶ The terminology and imagery of 4QpNah and Mic 5:7–8 overlap greatly:

and Daniel also highlight the appropriateness of the verb in the pesher in light of the word **מרעה** in the previous lemma.

³⁶ On the correlation between "un-pegged pluses" and allusions to the contexts of secondary biblical verses, see above, ch. 1, n. 102.

A number of scholars have pointed out the use of **רמס** to describe the destruction of Jerusalem in some later post-biblical writings. Thus, yBer 4.8a (in a prayer for the Ninth of Ab, bemoaning the fact that Jerusalem was downtrodden by tyrants **בעריצים הרמוסה** cited by Allegro); Luke 21:24, "They will fall by the edge of the sword and be taken away as captives among all nations; and Jerusalem will be trampled upon by the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled" (cited by Jeremias, *Der Lehrer*, 128); bQidd 66a (in which "Yannai" conducts a purge against the Pharisaic Sages, after being urged to "smash them," **רמסם**, cited by

the remnant of Jacob shall be among the nations . . . like a lion (כֹּאֲרִידָה) among the beasts of the wild, like a fierce lion (כִּכְפִיר) among flocks of sheep, which tramples (יִרְמֹס) wherever it goes, and rends (וַיִּטְרֹף), with none to deliver (וְאֵין מְצִיל).³⁷

Micah describes the triumph of the remnant of Judea over its enemies, with “none to deliver.” Although, according to our interpretation, this section of 4QpNah describes the destruction of Jerusalem, the messages are actually equivalent. Bear in mind that the destruction of “Jerusalem” refers to the downfall of Pharisaic leadership and that, in 4QpNah, that downfall results in the victory of the true, spiritual “Judah”—the Community.

Evaluation of Lemma/Pesher Correspondence in Unit 7

A number of difficulties have been encountered in the above literary analysis of unit 7, including lacunae in the text, and lexical and syntactic ambiguities in the extant text. The first half of the lemma exhibits close lexical/exegetical correspondence. For וַאֲיִן מְהַרִּיד this is not as easily demonstrable, but lexical/exegetical equivalents may have been lost in the lacunae. The secondary influence of Micah accounts for the use of הִרְמֹס without any clear peg in the lemma. Lemma/pesher correspondence is maximized for the beginning of the lemma with לְבִיִּא as a *hiphil* infinitive, “whither the lion went to bring the lion’s cub,” representing the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things bringing Demetrius in 4QpNah. For the end of the verse, the sense of “none to frighten” must be transformed from describing a lion’s desirable status in Nahum to indicating a lion’s failure in Pesher Nahum. This atomization may be rooted in exegesis of the letter *vav*. According to our interpretation, the pesher describes the failure of Demetrius III to take over Jerusalem as a reflection of the city’s inviolability. This requires that the physical city of Jerusalem, which is the object of Pharisaic attack in the pesher, be taken as analogous

Brownlee). See also, 4QpIsa^c frag 23 II,10 (which seems to say that the Torah will be “trampled,” in a context involving the דְּהִלְקוּת [דִּוְן־רִשְׁיָן] in Jerusalem at the End of Days).

³⁷ Further links with 4QpNah can be discerned in this chapter of Micah, but it is difficult to assess their possible impact upon the pesher. Thus, the concluding words of 5:6, “do not look to any man nor place their hope in mortals” could be viewed as antithetical to the Pharisaic appeal to Demetrius. The subsequent verse, 5:9, presents the “declaration of the Lord” that he will destroy (וְהִכְרִית) the horses, chariots, cities etc. of the Land, resonating with Nah 2:14, cited in unit 10.

to Nineveh, the bane of the biblical text.³⁸ Such a transfer of the biblical message is made possible by the fact that Jerusalem functions in both capacities, as the physical city and as a symbol of the Pharisees. The conceptual correspondence lies in the focus upon the invulnerability of a particular power, though in the pesher this power would be Jerusalem, in a defensive position, in contrast to the imperialistic Assyria of the original context.

This idea is achieved most easily by identifying the equivalent of the סרר as the group of Seekers-after-Smooth-Things. The difficulty with this view is that the lion is the grammatical subject of the lemma, and Demetrius is the grammatical subject of the pesher. However, the switch from the lemma's transitive לביס to the intransitive לבוט may be sufficient excuse for this difference. With the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things as the subject, 4QpNah would be applying the concept of the supremacy of the dominant power, as a foil for its downfall.

The pesher further asserts that following their unsuccessful appeal to Demetrius, the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things will be destroyed. "None to frighten" is atomized to reflect the failure of Jannaeus's opponents. Verse 12b is still part of the rhetorical question put forth in the previous lemma, and it too anticipates a response that will indicate reversal. We have described the pesher as applying ואין מזהריד once to show the impenetrability of Jerusalem, in keeping with the message of the lemma, and then again, concluding with the implicit message of the lemma that this situation will be turned around.³⁹

The primary function of the verse in Nahum, that of a foil, can be transferred to 4QpNah if "and afterward Jerusalem will be trampled" is seen as a plus to the rest of the pesher, while the main body of the pesher describes the inviolability of Jerusalem. In Nahum,

³⁸ Thus, Dupont-Sommer, "le commentateur, par une transposition hardie, applique à Jérusalem . . . ce qui concernait proprement Nineveh" ("Le Commentaire," 62). Horgan adopts this position, saying that the "trampling" in the pesher refers to the fall of Jerusalem, the city that is "presumably the subject of the preceding interpretations."

³⁹ The significance of verbal tenses in the pesharim is the subject of some debate, but it may be significant that תרמס is in the imperfect whereas בקש לבוט was in the perfect. This would suit the future turnaround implied in the lemma. The imperfect tense may be understood as an indication that the "trampling" will occur much later than the other events described in unit 7 and in pericope 1 as a whole.

this lemma is an extension of the rhetorical question posed in the beginning of the verse, setting up the picture of the lion's erstwhile power and imperialism. In Nahum itself, the impending reversal is still implicit at this point. In 4QpNah, the attack by Demetrius and the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things reflects this initial condition, indicating the strength of these entities, while the addition of the untriggered comment attests to the implied reversal.

Before ending our treatment of this unit, we should observe the implications of our identifications for consistency within the pesher. In most understandings of pesher unit 6, אַרְיָה is taken to represent the Jews. In unit 7, אַרְיָ must be either Demetrius or a particular group of Jews. In the latter case, the variation between the units could be explained as reflecting the use of the singular אַרְיָ in 2:12b rather than the plural in 2:12a. This would be a less convincing rationale for the identification of Demetrius. Perhaps, as a very general term for lion, applicable to all the *dramatis personae* involved, אַרְיָ would be less bound to consistent identification than other terms.⁴⁰

Additional Note: Dupont-Sommer's Interpretation of Pericope 2, Unit 7

Although Dupont-Sommer does not enumerate "equivalents," his discussion of this pesher unit implies a sort of correspondence between אַרְיָ מְחַרֵּד and וַאֲשֵׁר הִחְלִיקוּ בְּעֵצַת דְּרוֹשֵׁי הַחֲלִיקוֹת.⁴¹ Dupont-Sommer attempted to correlate the language of unit 7 to the historical scenario in which Pharisaic opponents of Jannaeus appealed to Demetrius III. He explained אַרְיָ מְחַרֵּד as reflecting the fact that Demetrius III anticipated a supportive reception in Judea, since he was coming at the behest of the Pharisees. As Demetrius knew that he had allies in

⁴⁰ Horgan, however, does assume consistency. In line 5, she restores Demetrius as the attacker so that he may serve as the identification of the אַרְיָ in Nah 2:13. The basis for her identification is her belief that the אַרְיָ of Nah 2:12 was identified as Demetrius here in line 2. Contrast Knibb (211), "it is interesting that whereas the lion-symbolism of the biblical text is primarily applied to Alexander Jannaeus, 'Where the lion went to enter' of the biblical text is referred not to Alexander but to Demetrius." Doudna also assumes consistency between units 6 and 7, maintaining that both units refer to a failed Seleucid attacker and a successful Roman attacker, and that each does so by employing two references to lions אַרְיָה/כַּפְרִים and אַרְיָ/לִבִּיא respectively. Rather than translating נֹר as "cub," which would introduce an asymmetric third term for lion in unit 7, he takes the word as an infinitive, and translates, rather awkwardly, "where the old lion used to go, there was the dwelling of the strong lion."

⁴¹ "Le Commentaire," 63–64.

Jerusalem, he had no fear of being confronted by seriously intimidating opponents.⁴² By our criteria, this proposal exhibits a high degree of conceptual correspondence, but it is weaker in terms of arithmetic and exegetical alignment. According to Dupont-Sommer, the lemma's lack of "intimidator" encumbering the lion is reflected in the pesher by Demetrius's expectation that his invasion would not encounter significant opposition. However, there are no words to this effect in the text of the pesher.⁴³ At most, it could be said to be implicit in the statement that Demetrius was acting "at the counsel of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things."

Furthermore, Dupont-Sommer seems to believe that וְאֵין מְזַרְרִיד is also reflected in some way in the subsequent Pharisaic rejection of Demetrius. Dupont-Sommer states that it was the defection of his Pharisaic allies that ultimately halted Demetrius's campaign. In his view, Demetrius's failure to take Jerusalem is a central statement of the pesher. We may presume that he perceives this failure as "corresponding" to the words of the lemma.⁴⁴ Thus, Dupont-Sommer views וְאֵין מְזַרְרִיד as both an indication of Demetrius's confidence, based upon his trust in his allies (implicit in the words of the pesher), and as an explanation of the cause of Demetrius's defeat, the defection of these allies (lacking in the words of the pesher). Perhaps Dupont-Sommer was attempting to construct a kind of double pesher, like the structure proposed by us above, with "no intimidator" indicating both Demetrius's confidence against potential threats, and his ultimate failure in "intimidating," i.e., conquering, Jerusalem.⁴⁵

⁴² Contrary to the position of Dupont-Sommer, the latter premise does not follow necessarily from the former one, but the assumption will be granted for the sake of this analysis.

⁴³ Neither in the extant text, nor in the conventional restoration—which originated with Dupont-Sommer himself.

⁴⁴ Dupont-Sommer states that the "trampling" at the end of this unit was recorded by the author as an expansion upon one of the essential points of the pesher, namely the checking of Demetrius. Once the pesher had mentioned Demetrius's failure to take Jerusalem, the author took the occasion to make the general observation that neither Demetrius, nor in fact any other Seleucid king since Antiochus IV, had disrupted the state of Jewish independence. From Antiochus IV to Pompey, no Seleucid had taken control, but then Pompey would trample Jerusalem. (Dupont-Sommer sees Pompey's subjugation of Judea in pesher unit 6 as well, "Observations," 204). We remain with the sense that there is an "un-pegged plus" in the pesher, but that it begins with the reference to Antiochus. Dupont-Sommer views Demetrius's defeat itself as a necessary component of the pesher interpretation. As such, it should reflect the lemma.

⁴⁵ In any case, Dupont-Sommer's stance is instructive in that it reflects an impor-

5.3 PESHER UNIT 8

3–4 I, lines 4–6 on Nah 2:13a “[Now,] the lion tears at his cubs, and strangles his lionesses (for prey)”⁴⁶

Nah 2:13a has been interpreted in a number of different ways, both in its original context, and as a base-text in 4QpNah. Probably, the best translation of the verse in Nahum itself is “*The lion tears prey for his cubs and strangles (prey) for his lionesses.*”⁴⁷

However, 4QpNah best accommodates a translation in which the cubs and lionesses function as victims of the lion’s aggression, rather than as beneficiaries of his acts. Such a translation requires unusual, but plausible, renderings of כָּדִי and לִּי so that each introduces a direct object. The לִּי prefix in לִּי לְלִבְיֹהָיו can easily function as an accusative preposition, introducing a direct object.⁴⁸ Gaster explained כָּדִי as a construct form of כָּד—a “part” or, specifically, a body part as in Job 18:13, and translated the lemma as “the lion rends the

tant stage in the development of the modern study of Qumran peshet. His explanation exhibits a strong sensitivity to lemma/peshet correspondence, but the interpretation is supported by means of many propositions that are unstated in either text, with insufficient attention to the actual words of the peshet.

⁴⁶ אָרִי שׁוֹרֵף כָּדִי נֹרֵיו וּמַחֲנֵק לְלִבְיֹהָיו שָׂרָף (with שָׂרָף, a variant plus to MT); our translation follows Gaster, as described below.

⁴⁷ In these translations, the difficult word כָּדִי is rendered in the sense of “for the needs of,” either by derivation from כָּד, “enough,” or simply as an uncommon preposition meaning “for.” The latter basis is more reasonable, though less commonly cited. Cf. Hab 2:13, in which כָּדִי clearly means “for.” Variations of this translation are found in *ICC: Nahum*, 310; *NRSV* and *NIV* in *NIB*, 611; *NJPS*. Thus, Allegro (“sufficient for”), Amusin (“for the sake of”) in “Historical Events,” 135; Bardtke (“für”), Boccaccio and Berardi (“satis”), Carmignac, Burrows, Cathcart, Dupont-Sommer (“pour,” in “Le Commentaire,” “Observations”; also, “pour la suffisance” in “Le Commentaire”), García-Martínez, Horgan (“enough for”), Knibb, Lohse, J. Maier, Vermes, Vogt, I. Tantlevskij, Yadin. See n. 49.

In accordance with this translation, verse 13a is generally taken as developing the image of Assyrian power introduced in the previous verse. It continues the description of an enviable original status of prosperity and security, thereby serving as a “foil” for a prediction of future downfall. In this view, verse 13 strengthens the force of the rhetorical question of verse 12, as it describes the wealth and acquisitiveness of Nineveh through the metaphor of the predatory lion hunting to provide for its family. More plausibly, but less frequently, the violence of the imagery in verse 13a has been understood as a depiction of excess, indicating the culpability of Nineveh. Thus, John Calvin maintained that Nahum’s use of the lion was intended to indicate Assyrian cruelty, rather than Assyrian power (*Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets*).

⁴⁸ See Gesenius §117n. Thus, e.g., II Sam 3:30: “And Yoav and Avishai his brother killed (ל) Avner.” Dupont-Sommer describes the use of *lamed* as an accusative particle as an Aramaism (“Le Commentaire,” 64–65).

limbs of his whelps.” It is more probable that the author of the peshar would have understood the word as a compound of ׀ in a way that introduced the cubs as a direct object.⁴⁹ According to this translation, Nah 2:13a initiates the reversal of the previous idyllic status of the lions/Assyria. The verse depicts internecine strife, using a metaphor in which the once peaceful domain of the lion family is transformed into a bloody killing-field.⁵⁰

This understanding is well-suited to a number of proposed interpretations for this peshar unit. The two basic configurations for the reconstruction of unit 8, which we have dubbed the “Carmignac” and “non-Carmignac” types, can each be adapted to suit numerous specific scenarios, even within the strict limitations of a historical context involving Alexander Jannaeus and his opponents.⁵¹ Many of these potentially valid restorations allow for a high level of lemma/peshar correspondence. For our purposes, it will suffice to demonstrate such correspondence for the simplest of the proposals. The most basic reconstruction is the “non-Carmignac” reading in which the peshar is understood to begin with the extant words in line 5, . . .] על כפיר החרון אשר יכה בנדוליו ואנשי עצתו [. . .], and is viewed as a description of Jannaeus’s defeat of his Pharisaic opponents.⁵² This

⁴⁹ Tov discusses the difficulty posed by the words ברי and גדי for the ancient translator (*Text-Critical Use*, 164–66). Tov himself views these words as “compounds of ׀,” in the sense of “enough,” but he states that the meaning “may have been unknown to the translator” of Jer 51:58, and that the meaning “was unclear to the translator of Hab 2:13.” Unfortunately, the compounds of ׀ are not yet entirely understood by modern scholars either. For example, there is no ostensible relationship between the sense of גדי, as “whenever” and the meaning “enough.” C. Rabin attempted to explain ברי in these conjunctions as denoting “hand” (“Hebrew D = ‘HAND’,” *JJS* 6 [1955]: 111–115). His arguments are not very persuasive, but his critique of the conventional association with “enough” is forceful and prefigures our own. ׀ has a more complex nuance and history than is generally recognized, and its precise meaning in Nahum, and especially in Peshar Nahum, is elusive.

⁵⁰ In nature, male lions have been observed to kill young cubs and, occasionally, lionesses. Cf. George Schaller, *The Serengeti Lion* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1972), 50, 189, 220; Plate 16. This is *pace* Doudna (390) who states that “a lion killing his own cubs and lionesses as prey is definitely an abnormal and unnatural reading.” In this reading, verse 13 does not continue the image of Assyrian supremacy, but rather shows how the mighty Assyria, impervious to all other nations, begins to crumble from within.

⁵¹ For the restorations, see above, ch. 2.

⁵² “*vac* Its peshar is] upon the Lion of Wrath, that he smites his great ones and the men of his counsel. . . .” It is probably best to take “his great ones” as indicating “Demetrius’s great ones,” either literally (with the peshar referring to Demetrius’s

matches the image of internecine strife in the verse, according to the translation, “*the lion tears at his cubs, and strangles his lionesses (for prey).*”

Correspondence may be charted as follows:

5.3.1 *Model I: Basic equivalence in unit 8 (“non-Carmignac” restoration)*

ארי	=	כפיר החרון (Jannaeus)	synonymy; ⁵³ symbol ⁵⁴
טורף	=	יכה	adaptational paraphrase ⁵⁵
בדי נוריו	=	בנדוליו	derivative symbol; auditory similarity
ומחנק	=	[?] ⁵⁶	
ללבויתו	=	אנשי עצתו	derivative symbol: subordinates ⁵⁷
טרף	=	[?] ⁵⁸	

attack) or by association (with the pesher continuing to refer to the Pharisees as Demetrius’s accomplices, even as it describes a scenario that took place after the departure of the Seleucid king).

In an even simpler, but less plausible version of this structure, the Lion is taken as killing his own men. Correspondence would be charted in identical fashion, but the referent of the possessive pronouns would be the same masc. sing. individual that is named in the pesher. However, this version has been excluded on historical and literary grounds. There is no evidence of Jannaeus’s killing his supporters and elite followers. One would be forced to assume that the pesher relates an undocumented event, or else strain to identify the advisors and great men possessed by the Young Lion as Jannaeus’s opponents. Moreover, this reconstruction would create an exclusively political statement, without any of the theological tenor or content expected in pesher, and without any real relevance to the polemic in the other units of this pericope.

⁵³ I.e., ארי as equivalent to כפיר.

⁵⁴ For the lion as a symbol of royalty, see above. See ch. 4 for a full discussion of the term כפיר החרון.

⁵⁵ The lexical range of the English “smite” is similar to that of the Hebrew root נכה, from hitting, to wounding, to killing. This scope provides a good human counterpart to the beast’s טרף. This equivalent pair may also reflect a bilingual paronomasia; note that Palestinian Aramaic טרפ denotes “hitting” or “throwing down” (Sokoloff, *s.v.* #2 טרפ, p. 232). As discussed in ch. 2, the verb נכה is employed in 4QpHos^b, in which the last priest smites Ephraim.

⁵⁶ It is most likely that the corresponding text to this element of the lemma has not survived, but was originally found in the lacuna at the beginning of line 6: “... and the men of his counsel/council, ⁶[he (Jannaeus) <defeated/conquered/destroyed>]”

⁵⁷ The genitive construct of “the men of his counsel” may indicate those who give “him” advice or those who follow “his” advice. In either case, it refers to supporters. Cf. Horgan on 1QpHabV,10, where she rendered “partisans,” noting, “literally ‘men of their counsel’, i.e., those who hold the same opinions” (33). It is most likely that עצה here has “advice” as its primary sense, but is also intended to convey a secondary valence of “congregation.”

⁵⁸ If טרף is viewed as a scribal error in 4QpNah, it would not have had any equivalent. If it reflects a textual variant from MT, in the adverbial sense of “as prey,” then its equivalent would have been found in line 6. If the word is taken as a perfect verb, the first word of a new clause that had originally continued into

Arithmetical and lexical correspondence is clear in this model. The conceptual correspondence lies in the focus upon internecine strife in both the pesher and the lemma. Although the schema exhibits smooth correspondence in all three of the above spheres, the reconstruction remains problematic in the three major areas of inquiry in this study, the textual, historical, and literary. This basic schema can be adapted for the “Carmignac”-type of restoration:

5.3.2 *Model II: “Carmignac restoration”:*
Demetrius attacks Alexander Jannaeus

The most familiar reconstruction of this unit is the one favored by Horgan, in which “Demetrius” is restored in the lacuna at the beginning of line 5. Here is one variation of this approach:

Its pesher: concerning Demetrius who strikes] against the Lion of Wrath (=Jannaeus), that he (=Demetrius) smites his (=Jannaeus’s) great ones, but the men of his (=Demetrius’s) counsel [are defeated by the Lion of Wrath=Jannaeus]⁵⁹

Equivalences may be charted as follows:

ארי	= [Demetrius]	symbol (and extension from previous lemma)
{No equivalent}	= [attacked; came upon]	un-pegged plus
שורף	= יכה	adaptational paraphrase
בדי	= ב	paraphrase
גוריו	= גדוליו	symbol; auditory similarity
poss. suffix יו-	= כפיר ההרון (Jannaeus)	pronominal denomination: the possessor of the cubs is a lion; symbol (leadership)
ומדנק	= [defeat]	[paraphrase or metaphor]
ללבויותיו	= אנשי עצתו	symbol: subordinates
שרף	= [. . .]	

In this model, the arithmetical and exegetical correspondence of extant elements seems fairly close. However, there is no basis in the

the beginning of line 5, then both this hypothetical lost phrase and its pesher interpretation would be irretrievable.

⁵⁹ Or, in an active verbal construction, “[but the Lion of Wrath defeats] the men of his (= Demetrius’s) counsel. Horgan herself restores “the Lion of Wrath, who would strike with with his great ones and his partisans.” However, as discussed in ch. 2, the prepositional *bet* cannot sustain this instrumental usage here.

lemma for the verb signifying attack that must be restored in the initial lacuna. Moreover, the lion in the lemma tears at his own cubs and lionesses, while in the pesher, the analog of the lion smites those who belong to another entity, to the Young Lion of Wrath. The presence of two lion figures, rather than one, entails significant atomization. This could be viewed as a deliberate, exegetically motivated distinction between the stated subject and the pronominal suffix of the lemma. Still, it creates a syntactic imbalance in which the pesher must introduce an un-pegged third verb, while the analogs of the two verbs in the lemma each have a different subject. The most problematic aspect of this reconstruction is that the resultant focus upon a foreign invader in the pesher does not correspond to the biblical context. Demetrius's presence in this unit is a carry-over from the previous unit, but is not rooted in the base-text. The extension of the "lion" of unit 7 into unit 8 would achieve an internal consistency of identification within consecutive units of the pesher, at the expense of correspondence between the pesher and its lemma in a particular unit.

5.3.3 *Model III: The Seekers-after-Smooth-Things attack* *Alexander Jannaeus*

The "Carmignac" restoration can be adjusted to achieve a greater degree of lemma/pesher correspondence, if the attacker in the lacuna is restored as "the Seekers-After-Smooth-Things," rather than Demetrius. Consider the following, admittedly speculative, reconstruction, in which the following words are supplied to complete unit 8: וילכדם וילכדם ויכבשו ויצר עליהם וילכדם ("they will be conquered; and he will besiege them and vanquish them.") This is not intended as a restoration of the original text of the pesher, but rather as a construction that can illuminate our understanding of the extant text:

its pesher: concerning the leader of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things⁶⁰ who strikes] against the Young Lion (Jannaeus), that he (Jannaeus) smites (the leader's) great ones, and the men of (the leader's) council [(Jannaeus) besieges and captures]⁶¹

⁶⁰ Or a collective noun indicating the Pharisees as a group, e.g., היל.

⁶¹ The subject of the pesher is supplied in the lacuna at the beginning of line 5, following Carmignac. This attacker is identified as a Pharisaic leader. The "great ones" in the pesher are taken to be the followers of this leader, and the victims of

in- in נדוליו and אנשי עצתו	= [Pharisaic leader]	pronominal denomination ⁶²
{NO equivalent}	= [attacked; came upon]	un-pegged plus ⁶³
ארי	= כפיר ההרון	synonym; symbol
טורף	= יכה	adaptational paraphrase
בדי	= ב-	paraphrase
נוריו	= נדוליו	derivative symbol; auditory similarity
ומחנק ללבויותיו	= [ויצד-] = אנשי עצתו	metaphor ⁶⁴ derivative symbol:
טרף	= [יולכדם or יוכבשו-]	subordinates adaptational paraphrase

This model exhibits close arithmetical proportion, particularly if the pronominal possessive suffix of נדוליו and אנשי עצתו is treated as a distinct element of the lemma. A similar phenomenon may be observed in 1QpHab. At times, pronominal suffixes or imperative verbs in the lemma assume a noun, but none is explicitly supplied. When these implied entities are identified in pesher interpretations, they tend to be the formal subjects of the pesher.⁶⁵

the smiting that is explicit in the pesher. Our conjectural addition has the leader's advisors being besieged and captured. Jannaeus's men inflict most of the damage, while his Jewish opponents only initiate the attack.

⁶² The pesher supplies an explicit noun for an entity that is implied in the possessive suffixes.

⁶³ Nitzan observes that un-pegged additions occasionally feature elements that are not explicitly accounted for in the biblical text. Thus, 1QpHab repeatedly specifies the objects of the Kittim's aggression ("all the nations"), which are not explicit in the biblical text (III,4–5; 6; 12–13; VI,6–7). In our reconstruction, the initial words of this pesher unit are seen as spelling out the actions and identity of a figure whose appearance in the lemma was only implicit. The possessive pronoun indicating ownership of the cubs alluded to this individual, but provided no details about him. This whole reconstruction is entirely speculative, but it may be noted that an un-pegged verb may also have been selected as an allusion to an additional biblical context.

⁶⁴ I.e., strangling representing besieging.

⁶⁵ In 1QpHab III,6–7, the grammatical subjects of the lemma are the horses and riders, but the pesher names their (implied) possessor, the Kittim, as its explicit subject (פ[שר]ן על הכיתהים in line 9) The pesher's paraphrase modifies the structure, so that the Kittim are the grammatical subjects and their horses are just instruments, objects of a preposition. In VII,8–14 on Hab 2:3b, "if it tarries, wait for it," the pesher reads, "Its pesher is concerning the men of truth, observers of the Law . . . for all of God's end-times will come. . . ." The subject of the pesher, i.e., the object of the prepositional phrase על פשרו is the implied "subject" of the imperative verb in the lemma. The Men of Truth, acting in third person in the pesher, correspond to those addressed by the imperative verb in the lemma. The use of the suffix as the basis for introducing an additional figure is in line with the reve-

The most significant difference between the pesher and the lemma in “Model III,” as in “Model II,” is that the pesher features two individuals in contrast to the solitary lion of the lemma. The smiting Young Lion of the pesher corresponds to the smiting lion of the lemma. However, he does not tear his own cubs, but those of another lion—an aggressive Pharisaic leader who is introduced at the beginning of the interpretation. The pesher can be reconciled with the lemma, if we associate this additional figure with the lion of the previous lemma. In unit 7, we identified the lion of Nah 2:12b as the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things. The pesher in unit 8 thus takes the pronominal suffix of נָדָלְיָי as referring back to the previous pesher, to the earlier, explicitly named lion, i.e., the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things. The explicit lion in Nah 2:13 is identified as a new figure, the Young Lion of Wrath, but the pronominal suffix in this verse is assumed to be the previously identified Pharisees. In this case, syntactic correspondence would be very close for the extant text. Note that in this model, unlike model II, the Lion of Wrath is the subject of both active verbs that correspond to the verbs in the lemma. This reading understands the pesher as focusing upon Jannaeus’s slaughter of his Pharisaic opponents. Both the lemma and the pesher aim to convey internal national conflict and to give the impression that this violent suppression is one step toward a more pervasive systemic breakdown.

Additional Note:

Brownlee and Halperin’s interpretation of Pericope 2, Unit 8

There is a particular variation of the “non-Carmignac” structure that stems from an exegetical rather than a formal focus. Brownlee and Halperin see unit 8 as referring to Jannaeus’s crucifixion of his opponents, as described in *Ant* 13 §380.⁶⁶ For this interpretation, it is significant to note that in reporting the festivities surrounding these executions, Josephus makes special mention of the presence of Jannaeus’s concubines. Above, we described two basic approaches toward interpreting this lemma in its original context. The lion may

latory function of pesher. In his elucidation of the hidden messages already present in the base-text, the author of the pesher treats the suffix as a clue requiring attention.

⁶⁶ So too, SVM I:225 n. 22. As we have noted, this crucifixion is nearly universally understood to be the subject of the subsequent pesher unit.

be viewed either as killing his cubs and lionesses, or as killing *for* them, i.e., providing for them. Brownlee proposes a mixed translation of the lemma, such that the lion “mangles *the limbs of* his own whelps,” but “strangles a catch *for* his lionesses.” Thus, he reads the peshet as describing Jannaeus’s hanging of his disloyal subjects (the “cubs”) for the viewing pleasure of his consorts (the “lionesses”).⁶⁷ Halperin views the cubs as representing Jannaeus’s henchmen who execute the traitors.

Their interpretations correspond especially well to some aspects of the peshet, but not at all to others:

אורי	= כפיר החרון,	synonymy; symbol
	Jannaeus	
טורף	= יכה	adaptational paraphrase
בדי	= ב-	paronomasia and paraphrase ⁶⁸
נוריו	= נדוליו	for Brownlee: Jewish victims for Halperin: Alexander’s execution squad
ומדנק	= [. .]	metaphor for hanging, crucifixion
{No equivalent}	= ואנשי עזתו	?
ללבויותו	= [<concubines>]	symbol: female counterparts ⁶⁹
טרף	= [. .]	metaphor for indulgence

⁶⁷ Halperin is quite certain that this is the sense of the peshet. He also states that the plus to MT, טורף, is an intentional variant, which he interprets adverbially. The peshet does not only have the Young lion tear at his cubs, and strangle for his lionesses; it has the Young Lion tear at his cubs *as prey* for his lionesses. In Halperin’s words, “for the[ir] delectation” (“Crucifixion,” 34). This reading requires that Jannaeus, the Lion of Wrath, function as the grammatical and thematic subject of the peshet. Hence, the necessity for the “non-Carmignac” model.

⁶⁸ Halperin describes a specific exegetical technique that would underlie this correspondence. He suggests that בדי was read exegetically as בדי, which the peshet then rendered by ב- in the sense of “by the agency of” (*Crucifixion* 33, n. 5). This would enable the change from בדי to “ב” without harming a corresponding relationship. The proposed exegesis is thus appealing. Nonetheless, as far as can be determined, the ב in the peshet remains unable to bear the instrumental sense.

⁶⁹ If the concubines were not mentioned in the lacuna, the peshet may yet have intended the reader to infer their relevance. Tal Ilan has suggested that deviations in lemma/peshet correspondence may occur specifically in connection with female figures (“Shelamzion in Qumran,” in *Historical Perspectives from the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba on Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by D. Goodblatt, A. Pinnick, and D.R. Schwartz [Leiden: Brill, 2001], 60–61.) The author of 4QpNah may have intended that the lionesses of the text be understood to represent Jannaeus’s concubines, but nonetheless have avoided explicitly naming these real female personalities.

The exegetical correspondence in this model is obviously strong. Numerical correspondence is maintained to some degree, but “men of council” appears to be an inexplicable plus, while the “lionesses” have no counterpart in the extant text of the pesher interpretation. Syntactically, it is difficult to understand the formulation “his great ones” with Jannaeus as the possessor,⁷⁰ and it is ungrammatical to view them as Jannaeus’s executioners, because of the function of the prepositional *bet*. The end of the pesher is unknown, but the proposal intends something to the effect that the men of Jannaeus’s council will crucify the opponents for the sake of (the entertainment of) the concubines.⁷¹ Contextually, this interpretation requires that the pesher refer to a very specific historical event that does not correspond to the reality of the biblical context.⁷² If “strangles cubs for his lionesses” is relevant to the pesher at all, it must be taken as a secondary re-reading (accomplished by deliberate, exegetical “misunderstanding” of elements of the text), rather than as an understanding of the lemma itself.⁷³ Brownlee described his proposal as a

A similar phenomenon may be detected in the next column, which is conventionally associated with Salome Alexandra. Ilan observes that the queen is not named in the pesher, in which the “dominion of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things” is offered as the contemporary counterpart to the biblical harlot. She suggests that the female figure in Nahum may have been expected to be associated with the female ruler, though the author avoided explicit reference of Salome. Ilan admits that this is only speculative. She is herself skeptical of any allusion to Jannaeus’s concubines in 4QpNah, as she is doubtful about the historicity of Josephus’s dramatic account of the crucifixions (personal communication).

⁷⁰ The smitten opponents could be referred to as “great men,” and they were possessed by Jannaeus in that he was their king, but they could hardly be called “his great ones.”

⁷¹ Halperin (“Crucifixion,” 34, n. 12) compares Judg 16:25 *וַשְׁחַק לָהּ*, for the sense of the prepositional *lamed*, and cites *BDB s.v.* *ל*. 5h.

⁷² In Nahum itself, one could imagine a scenario such as that described in the campaign against Ekron in *ARAB* #240 (119–121). In that text, disloyal citizens are killed at the reinstallation of Padi, their king, who was bound by a treaty with Assyria. The subjects were killed by the dominant power *for the sake of* the installed subordinate. However, it is difficult to imagine that Nahum had such a nuanced scenario in mind. It would be even more unlikely for the author of the pesher to have believed this to be Nahum’s intent.

⁷³ Halperin claims that the pesher perceives its reading here to be the only correct way in which the lemma may be understood. He asserts that in the mind of the Qumran commentator, the use of *לִיּוֹנִים* was never intended to be appropriate for lions. Instead, the very inappropriateness of the term led the commentator to infer that the verb applied to a contemporary figure (“Crucifixion” 34). Cathcart notes that strangulation has been documented as a method used by lions to kill prey. He states that ancient artistic representations of lions strangling include a 715

case of “the lemma as understood” by the author of the pesher. It might better be seen as “the lemma as it was exegetically recast” by the author of the pesher. This is the sort of approach to pesher that should only be attempted as a last resort.

Another potentially effective interpretation of this lemma would take the cubs and lionesses as representing the sons and wives of the men crucified by Jannaeus. Jannaeus had the families of these men killed before their eyes.⁷⁴ Despite the exegetical neatness of this proposal, with cubs = sons; lionesses = wives; and מְדוּנָק . . . מְדוּנָק = the slaughter of these victims (ἀπέσφαττεν), the extant words of the pesher do not provide any basis for restoring a description of this scenario. The pesher refers to “great men” and “men of council” and does not mention wives or sons, and even the crucifixions do not appear in the pesher until the following unit. This critique applies to the suggestions of Brownlee and Halperin as well. Halperin’s “interpretation of the pesher” is actually an interpretation of the *lemma* in a manner that could have appeared in a pesher, but there is no indication that it actually ever did so. The text as it stands does not accommodate these interpretations.⁷⁵

BCE Phoenician ivory in the British Museum of a “lioness standing over a man with its left paw around its neck.” See also Schaller, *Serengeti Lion*, 265; Plates 30–31. Halperin is not swayed by Cathcart’s demonstration that the strangulation of prey by lions is documented in antiquity. He questions the significance of either the natural reality or its ancient Near Eastern representations for students of pesher. He points to an apparent ignorance of this reality in periods closer to the Qumran authors, as indicated in the paraphrase in *Vg et necavit leaenīs suis*, and the Peshitta *wafsaq ‘af letenyanoḥi*” (He mitigates the force of the Peshitta, though, by noting the possibility that it read מְדוּלָק for מְדוּנָק). Halperin sets Jerome’s purported unfamiliarity with lions’ strangling against ancient Near Eastern evidence of the phenomenon. He judges that it is “very plausible that the Qumran commentator, like Jerome, was surprised by the use of מְדוּנָק for a lion, and inferred that it must be applied not to the lion of the prophetic image, but to the king concealed behind the image” (*ibid.*). This is an extreme view of “the lemma as understood by the author of the pesher,” in that it views the prophetic base-text as unintelligible in its own context. The “surprise” of Jerome and of modern scholars is not sufficient justification for this radical position.

⁷⁴ ἀνασταυρώσαι προσέταξεν . . . τοὺς δὲ παῖδας αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας ἔτι ζώντων παρὰ τὰς ἐκείνων ὄψεις ἀπέσφαττεν (“he ordered them crucified, and slaughtered their children and wives before the eyes of the still living wretches,” *Ant* 13 §380).

⁷⁵ Our introduction of Jannaeus’s siege, in “Model III” above was a similar creation of pesher. However, the extant text of this unit accommodates the structure of Model III without the speculative elements.

Summary: Evaluation of Lemma/Pesher Correspondence in Unit 8

From both historical and literary perspectives, it is preferable to take unit 8 as describing civil strife between the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things and Alexander Jannaeus (Model I or Model III, above). The alternative view, that the subject of the pesher is Demetrius's attack upon Jannaeus, is also viable (Model II). However, this would probably entail a needless repetition of the attack described in unit 7, and would exhibit lesser lemma/pesher correspondence than the other alternatives. The internal antagonism that we view as the key point of the pesher and the lemma would be overshadowed with a foreign king as the attacker. Other proposed interpretations of this unit seem attractive in terms of the potential exegetical equivalence they would engender, but cannot be accommodated by the extant text.

5.4 PESHER UNIT 9

3–4 I, lines 6–8 on 2:13b “*and he fills his ho]les [with predation], and his lairs with preying.*” We also view the citation of 2:14a as part of the pesher interpretation of 2:13: “*Behold I am against you, it is the declaration of the Lord of Hosts.*”⁷⁶

Our “pesher unit 9” is thus:

וימלא טרף] הירדָּה ומעונתו טרפה vac פשרו על כפיר החרון [...] מות
 בדורשי החלקות אשר יתלה אנשים חיים [...] בישראל מלפנים כי לחלוי
 חי על הַעֲזָ [יִקְרָא הנני אלי] כה] נא]ם יהוה צבאות

Unit 9 is the most controversial section of 4QpNah, as it has been understood to either condemn or uphold “hanging” as a means of execution. The historical, exegetical, and *halakhic* issues are discussed at length in the excursus to this chapter. The following analysis is based upon the premise that this unit interprets Jannaeus's hanging of his opponents as a fulfillment of Deut 21:22–23. The fragmentary nature of the pesher precludes any possibility of recovering accurate original correspondences. As in the previous unit, “equivalence” here is not so much exposed as it is imposed. As in the previous unit, the lemma could be interpreted as indicating security and prosperity, unnatural excess, or internecine strife and, as in the previous

⁷⁶ This “linked reading” is discussed in the excursus to this chapter.

unit, our analysis is predicated on an interpretation of internecine strife.⁷⁷

In our understanding, this pesher unit describes the execution of Jannaeus's opponents as "fulfilling" Deut 21:22, in the sense of creating a reality that matches the scenario described in the biblical verse. The pesher also seems to condemn Jannaeus's victims, presumably for their appeal to the Seleucid Demetrius against Jannaeus.

Equivalents align as follows:

{implied}	= Lion of Wrath	denomination ⁷⁸
הירה	= ? ⁷⁹	
וימלא	= מות בני . . . [יק]רא	figurative paronomasia: "fulfilled" ⁸⁰
{NO equivalent}	= Seekers-after-Smooth-Things	unpegged, identification of victim ⁸¹

⁷⁷ Also, as in the previous unit, this probably does not reflect the best interpretation of the verse in its original context in Nahum. A more appropriate translation in the original context would be "and he fills with prey his holes and his lairs with torn flesh." In this translation, "prey," a physical object, represents the plunder gathered by Assyria; the verse continues the depiction of Assyrian might and success. Thus, Allegro, Dupont-Sommer, Yadin. Our rendering of "predation," as an abstract act, indicates acts of violence in addition to the gathering of spoils, and stresses Assyrian culpability and/or Assyrian degeneration. Cf. Amusin ("preying," in "Historical Events," 136). This is more suitable to the pesher.

⁷⁸ The pesher provides an explicit subject for the masc. sing. verb and the possessive suffixes in the lemma. The Lion of Wrath is "carried over" from the previous unit.

⁷⁹ The lemma's הירה is certainly associated through wordplay with the כפיר החרון of the pesher (though we have not embraced Brooke's proposal that the strange form of the word reflects an attempt to strengthen this association). There may even be a direct arithmetical equivalence between הירה and החרון, which the pesher would have achieved by means of hyperbaton. Instead of reading the lemma as "he filled with prey his holes," the pesher could shift the function of הירה from direct object to subject—"He filled with prey, <i.e.> the Lion of Wrath <did>, or, with normal English word order—the Lion of Wrath filled with prey.

⁸⁰ Playing on the word "fill," the pesher portrays Jannaeus's execution of his opponents as "fulfilling" a biblical injunction. This is represented in the pesher by the introductory formula "וימלא . . . [יק]רא." For the biblical use of the root מלא in this sense, cf. I Ki 2:27 in which Solomon expelled Abiathar from the priesthood, "to fulfill the word of God which he had spoken about the house of Eli in Shiloh." II Chron 36:21 uses מלא in describing the completion of a seventy year period of exile (למלאות שבעים שנה) as fulfilling the word of God as proclaimed by Jeremiah (למלאות דבר יהוה).

⁸¹ There appears to be no exegetical peg for the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things. The epithet is a specifying identification of the more general "men" in the later part of the pesher, but does not seem to have a specific equivalent in the lemma. On such contextually required "pluses," see n. 63 in the previous unit.

טרף	= יתלה אנשים חיים . . .	metaphor: hanging as “prey” ⁸²
ומעונתו	= perhaps, (1) בִּישְׂרָאֵל or (2) . . . הֲנִי אֵלֵיכָה ⁸⁴	symbol ⁸³ paronomasia: “from his sin” ⁸⁵
טרפה	= תלוי הי על העץ	metaphor ⁸⁶

In this chart, unit 9 is shown to accommodate a scheme of arithmetical alignment, and to demonstrate a reasonable degree of correspondence in language. The pesher seems to recast its lemma in order to introduce the idea of fulfillment of the Law, in addition to the fulfillment of prophecy. Our explanation of the use of מִלֵּא and the possible exegetical treatment of ומעונתו as indicating transgression would exemplify more radical re-reading and atomization than we have witnessed so far in 4QpNah. In another context, Fitzmyer

⁸² For the relationship between “carrion” and hanging, see the excursus to this chapter.

⁸³ The equivalence here is not obvious. One possibility is that the pesher’s mention of “Israel” is related to the idea of “home” in the lemma’s ומעונתו. In fact, it is tempting to posit an association between מעון and the location of the crucifixions. Jannaeus arranged for the spectacle of these executions to take place in Jerusalem (ἀπήγαγεν εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα, *Ant* 13 §380; War 1 §97 εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα . . . ἐν μέσῃ τῆ πόλει). Nitzan has maintained that the focus of this pesher unit is a condemnation of Jannaeus for his defiling of Jerusalem by the crucifixions (pp. 195–96 on 1QpHab X,6–10 “city with blood”; 132–136 on the Wicked Priest, and the juxtaposition of fornication and defilement of the Sanctuary). However, there is nothing in the extant text of the interpretation to indicate that the pesher addressed the location of the hangings.

Brooke (89) described the fem. sing. form of this word as a deliberate deviation from the pl. ומעונתו as preserved in MT. He stated that “the purpose of the alteration is to underline that there is just one Lion of Wrath, whoever he is, and that he has just one den which seems to be Jerusalem (cf. 3–4 I,2,11).” However, neither the uniqueness of the Lion of Wrath nor his exclusive tie to Jerusalem appear to be of any concern in the extant interpretation.

⁸⁴ אל functions as על “against.” The phrase, “Behold I am against you”, it is the declar[ation of the Lord of Hosts] is repeated in Nah 3:5, cited in 4QpNah 3–4 III.

⁸⁵ The suggestion here is that the pesher reflects a re-vocalization of ומעונתו to be read as “because of his transgressions” (*me’avvonotav*), thereby ascribing the crucifixion of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things to their iniquity (in appealing to Demetrius). עון occurs frequently in the books of Samuel in the context of potential summary executions of disloyal subjects. Cf. I Sam 20:8, אַם יֵשׁ בִּי עוֹן, in David’s plea to Jonathan that he would rather be killed by Jonathan than sent back to Saul; see also Absalom’s plea to Joab in II Sam 14:32, and the words of Shimei ben Gera in II Sam 19:20. Note that Brooke’s proposal of a textual variant in this word would be highly effective for this interpretation.

⁸⁶ See the previous equivalent pair, טרף = יתלה אנשים חיים.

has commented on the lack of the formulaic use of סלמ in biblical quotation at Qumran, contrasting this to the NT formulas of “fulfillment or realization.” He related this distinction to theological differences between the groups, contrasting Qumran’s forward-looking perspective with the “backward glance” of Christian theology.⁸⁷

We do not propose a formulaic use of סלמ here in 4QpNah, but an exegetical wordplay that may prefigure the NT usage. Nonetheless, it is noteworthy that our interpretation of the use of Deuteronomy in this unit indicates a sort of “backward” perspective, in which a particular historical scenario is homiletically presented as an actualization of a legal text. Contextually, we have taken Nahum as continuing an image of internecine strife; 4QpNah presents a concrete historical case that epitomizes such strife. Thus, the message of the pesher suits that of its lemma.

5.5 PESHER UNIT 10

Lines 9–12 of 3–4 II initiate the pesher on Nah 2:14, which continues in line 1 of col. III.

“Behold I am against you”, it is the declar[ation of the Lord of Hosts. “I will burn in smoke you]r [multitude], and the sword will consume your young lions. I will cut [off p]rey [from the land], and no [longer will be heard the voice of your messengers”

In this verse, Nahum emerges from the confines of his extensive metaphor, lashing out against Nineveh with much starker imagery. The term “young lions” ties this verse to the preceding metaphor, and additional figurative language remains evident,⁸⁸ but the “multitude” and “messengers” are overtly human.⁸⁹ If the lemmas of the previous two units lent themselves to conflicting interpretations (accommodating depictions of either internecine strife or triumphant imperialism), Nah 2:14 leaves no doubt that it describes the eradication of Nineveh.

⁸⁷ “Old Testament Quotations,” in *Essays*, 13.

⁸⁸ Thus, the evocative mention of the detail of “smoke,” the synecdoche of the “sword,” the personification in the term “consume,” and the use of the words “your lions” and “prey.”

⁸⁹ Doudna cites Haldar (155) regarding the effect of “reality and figure merging into one.”

Notwithstanding the clarity of the lemma, the sense of the pesher interpretation in this unit cannot be ascertained with confidence. Assuming continuity with the previous units, the subject of the pesher may be either the Young Lion of Wrath or his opponent. Formally speaking, the extant portions of the pesher identify the elements of the lemma in a very straightforward manner. This unit utilizes the pesher formula that entails “identifying pronouns,” thus explicitly indicating the exegetical “pegs” in the lemma (“*x* is *a*,” “*y*” is “*b*” etc.). However, these identifications are less straightforward in content than form. The allusive nature of these lines, and their poor state of preservation, precludes a determination of whether the message is directed against the Lion of Wrath or his opponent. The pesher might be predicting the downfall of the Lion of Wrath, the last named masculine singular individual, and the subject of the previous pesher, who hanged men etc. Alternatively, it is possible that the victims in this pesher unit are the followers of “the hanged one” of the previous pesher, as Strugnell seems to imply.⁹⁰ If this unit is understood as opposing the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, then a consistent focus on antagonism to the Seekers would be exhibited throughout the pericope.

An interesting phenomenon in the pesher interpretation in unit 10 is a depersonalization of the action in the lemma.⁹¹ The lemma employs 1st person verbs in pronouncements voiced by God, and 2nd person possessive suffixes as indicators of explicit address. In contrast, the pesher employs the 3rd person throughout the extant interpretation, and even in some re-citations of elements of the lemma.⁹² The shift from 2nd person was necessary since the biblical

⁹⁰ Strugnell saw “Behold I am against you,” as being directed against the hanged one in unit 8, and continuing against the messengers et al. in unit 10. However, the “hanged one” in the previous pesher stood for a group of hanging victims. The primary opponent in the pesher interpretation of unit 10 seems to be an individual leader, as indicated in the masc. sing. possessive pronominal suffixes in the lemma variants and in the interpretation.

Doudna argues that the Lion of Wrath is not the subject of unit 10. Since Doudna inserted “Manasseh” as a Jewish ruler earlier in this pericope, that individual is available to him to function as the antecedent of the sing. masc. pronouns in this unit (454–462).

⁹¹ Cf. unit 14; 3–4 II,10–III,1 on Nah 3:5.

⁹² Horgan surmises that the 3rd person suffix in וּכְפָרְיוֹ was “probably influenced by the preceding וְהוֹלִי’.” Subsequent to this shift, the re-citations of וְטָרְפוּ and וּמְלֹאכֵיוֹ also employed the 3rd person.

text is a kind of apostrophe to a wicked entity, while the pesher interpretation is intended as a source of information for the Elect Community. The impersonal construction is better suited to the stance of the pesher than the 1st person forms in the lemma, since the aim of pesher is to disclose the fulfillment of the divine word (whether this fulfillment is placed in the past, present, or future) rather than to record novel divine statements. This is in keeping with the fact that the underlying premise of pesher composition is that all historical events are ordained and executed by God, and that the role of the author of pesharim is to record relevant narrative material that demonstrates the fulfillment of the prophetically uttered divine word.

Equivalents align as follows:

נא]ם יהוה צבאות	=	{NO equivalent} ⁹³	
הגני אלי[כה]			
והבערתיו בעשן	=	◦[.....]◦	?
[רוכב]ה	=	נדודי חילו	symbol ⁹⁴
וכפיריכה	=	נדוליו	symbol ⁹⁵
חאכל חרב	=	[. . .]	?
והכרתי	=	[תנהו ע[. . .]]	?
מארץ	=	ירושלים	denomination, possibly synecdoche
ט]רפה	=	ההון	symbol ⁹⁶

⁹³ The lack of equivalent for this phrase in unit 10 supports our attachment of this segment of the verse to the previous, in the “linked reading” discussed at length in the excursus to this chapter. The declaration is to be connected backward to the adjacent pesher interpretation, and does not stand united with the rest of Nah 2:14 as the introductory lemma in this unit. If it is to be connected to this unit at all, the phrase is best understood as a heading.

⁹⁴ The pesher adapts the general word “abundance” or “multitude” in the lemma to a specific military context, probably on the strength of the “numerical” connotation of the word נדוד (cf. *HALOT*, “bunch,” “band”).

⁹⁵ The effectiveness of the symbol depends in part upon the identity of these “great ones,” discussed in ch. 4, but primarily reflects the use of the young lion as an image of power. If Allegro’s reconstruction is accepted, then the gloss אשר קבצו כוהן] ירושלים אשר would probably indicate that the term “priests” is another appellation for these “great ones,” and thus also in a sense an equivalent to the “young lions” of the lemma. The restoration has the attraction of lexical similarity to 1QpHab IX,5–6, יתן, יקבצו, יתן, ירושלים, and ההון.

⁹⁶ The explicit peg for the word that is read as “wealth” is “prey,” the physical objects that are accumulated by means of acts of predation and conquest. Cf. *OED* def. 1, *s.v.* “prey”: “that which is taken in war, or by pillage or violence; booty, spoil, plunder.” In Qumran literature, the word הון is usually a neutral term for possessions, but it is employed in some well-known condemnatory passages. Cf. Baruch Sharvit, 27 בית מקרא, “מידת הענווה והיחס להון לפי כת מדבר יהודה” (1981):

ולא [ישמע עוד קול {NO equivalent}	= לא ישמע קולם עוד = בניים	adaptive repetition ⁹⁷ unpegged plus: biblical cross-reference ⁹⁸
מלאכיכה	= צירו	synonymy (influenced by biblical reference)

Summary: Evaluation of Lemma/Pesher Correspondence in Unit 10

Despite the poor state of preservation of this unit, a particularly tight lemma/pesher correlation is discernible. This is highlighted by the nature of the pronominal pesher formula “פֶּשֶׁר־ו x is y,” which is employed here and in units 2, 3, 14 and 17 (frags 1–2, lines 3 and 7, and frags 3–4 II,12; III,9).⁹⁹ The balanced mathematical formulation accommodates direct equivalence. Note the possibility of further correspondence in the placement of vacats in this unit, as described in ch. 2. Even as it maximizes mathematical alignment, the use of the pesher formula “פֶּשֶׁר־ו x is y,” highlights a syntactic deviation from MT. The individual elements of the lemma are repeated in the identification; רובכיה, כפיריו, וטרפו, and מלאכיו, are all preserved, each with a masculine 3rd person singular possessor (or, 2nd person masc. in רובכיה). The function of this possessor, a male individual, corresponds to the function of “the city” implicitly

22–28. See Catherine M. Murphy, *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls & in the Qumran Community* (Leiden: Brill, 2002). Note esp. the association of the term with the “men of the pit” in 1QS VIII,22 and the exhortation to avoid הוֹסֵס הַמַּסַּח in X,19, as well as the designation of הוֹן as one of the three snares of Belial in CD IV,17–18. 1QpHab is most significant for 4QpNah, esp. 1QpHab IX,5–6 and XII,10 as described in the previous note, but also an association with corruption in VIII,3, 11–12. (Note that טרפה may be better understood as “predation” in Nahum itself, than “plunder,” but the latter is certainly plausible even in the biblical context.)

⁹⁷ The omission of the conjunction before the word לֹא and the addition of the possessive suffix to קוֹל accommodate the relative clause structure that is necessary for the pesher identification formula.

⁹⁸ The plus of word בניים is to be viewed as a specifying detail, unless one supposes that an additional element, corresponding to this term, was present in the lacuna at the beginning of line 10. Doudna argues for a variant plus to MT, restoring the word בה (i.e., ולא [ישמע עוד קול מלאככה בה]). However, the referent of בה would be אֶרֶץ, and a cessation of messengers “in the land” does not make any sense—the messengers were sent out of the land.

By adding the word בניים and employing the distinctive BH ציר as a synonym for מלאך, the author of the pesher echoes the prophecies against Edom in Jer 49:14 (= Obad 1:1) “I have received tidings from the Lord and an envoy is sent out among the nations” ציר בניים שלוה . . . שמועה שמעתי . . . pl., “we have received tidings” in Obad). The echo may reflect an intentional allusion to those biblical passages.

⁹⁹ We do not accept Horgan’s claim that this formula is in use throughout frags 1–2.

addressed in MT Nahum. The switch from 2nd person to 3rd person in some of these re-citations is simply a stylistic adaptation to the employment of the identification formula. However, the masc. suffixes reflects a change that actually was effected in the lemma itself. This change is rather surprising. Brooke argues persuasively for a pronounced tendency towards exegetically motivated emendations of the lemmas in pesharim. More research is needed in this area, but there seems usually to be a reason for the emendation, an effort to insure a certain understanding of the lemma. The motivation for a clarifying emendation in this unit is not clear. We suggest that the rationale may be sought in the peshar's deviation from a standard identification. The third person possessive in the biblical base-text refers to Nineveh which, elsewhere in 4QpNah, stands for "official Jerusalem." Since the application of the verse to a masculine individual, probably Jannaeus, was a departure from the usual identification of "the city" with the Pharisaic party or Jerusalem, this switch to the masculine gender was incorporated into the lemma itself.¹⁰⁰

Both the lemma and the peshar depict the downfall of a formerly powerful entity. The biblical text stresses the physical eradication of the city, though it also refers to the political sphere (the silencing of the messengers). The peshar emphasizes the decline in power, specifying military might and wealth, in keeping with its figurative adaptation of the biblical text.¹⁰¹

Verse 2:14 is a turning point in Nahum, an unveiling of the meaning of the preceding metaphor. Unit 10 in 4QpNah has a similar function. As discussed in chapters 6–8, we understand the events in pericope 2 to pre-date those of the subsequent pericopes. In this framework, unit 10 explains the point of the flashback to Jannaeus's

¹⁰⁰ The emendation may also reflect some misogyny on the part of the author, such that he was unwilling to blatantly apply a feminine referent to the subject of the peshar, particularly if that was Alexander Jannaeus. In the invective of the Qumran Community, opponents could be called murderers, liars, thieves, blasphemers, and fornicators but perhaps the line would be drawn at referring to a powerful warrior, even implicitly, as a female.

¹⁰¹ If the addition of בנייִם and the use of צִיָּה were intended as allusions to the prophetic vituperations against Edom in Jer 49:14 and Obad 1:1, this may be associated with a renunciation of the latter-day Edomites, namely the Idumeans. Perhaps those "whose voices will no longer be heard among the Gentiles" may be Idumean ambassadors of Jannaeus and Salome, headed by Antipater, as noted in ch. 4.

time. The earlier events foreshadowed/were part of the imminent, ultimate downfall of all of the Jerusalem establishment. The Lion of Wrath, whose reign provides the historical setting for pericope 2, will be eradicated, along with his supporters, and the Pharisees as well.

5.6 SUMMARY OF PERICOPE 2

In verses 12 to 14, Nahum employs a highly developed metaphor to communicate his message of Assyria's imminent transition from its status as the unchallenged superpower to its extinction at the hands of God. The individual images are subject to some variation in interpretation, but the composite meaning is clearly that of punitive destruction. In this chapter, we have demonstrated how *peshet* units 6–10 employ these verses in producing a description of conflict between Jannaeus and his Jewish subjects, with particular focus upon the Pharisaic appeal to Demetrius and Jannaeus's retribution for that act. Lemma/*peshet* correspondence has been maximized by interpreting much of the biblical text as a depiction of internal strife. This interpretation may not be best-suited to the originally intended meaning of the biblical text, but it does reflect plausible readings of the text that may be attributed to the author of the *peshet*.

This page intentionally left blank

EXCURSUS

HANGING IN PESHER NAHUM: A LITERARY AND EXEGETICAL STUDY OF UNIT 9

Despite the sizable amount of literature devoted to the issue of “hanging” in Peshar Nahum, consensus has yet to be achieved regarding the sense and structure of unit 9 in Pericope 2, lines 6–9. The restoration of the damaged text in line 8 is unanimously accepted to be **כי לחלוי חי על העץ [יק]רא**, but the syntax and significance of these words is still debated. Also, whereas the historical context is generally agreed to be Jannaeus’s crucifixion of 800 of his opponents, it remains uncertain whether the peshar expresses approval or disapproval of this act. Most significantly, previous studies have exhibited minimal interest in the exegetical relationship of this peshar to its lemma.

Part 1 of this excursus is devoted to exploration of the lexical/exegetical connections between **הנקה**, **טריף**, and **תלה חי**. Part 2 addresses the issue of legal precedent, as probably implied in the phrase “aforetimes in Israel,”¹ and perhaps in the lemma’s **וימלא**. Part 3 investigates the numerous ways in which the end of unit 9 has been understood, focusing on the structure of the peshar, and the meaning of **[יק]רא**. We argue in favor of what we term the “linked reading,” in which the expression of divine wrath in Nah 2:14b is viewed as part of the peshar to 2:14a.

ex 5.1 HANGING: STRANGULATION (**הנקה**), EXPOSURE TO PREDATION (**טריף**), CRUCIFIXION (**תלה חי**)

ex 5.1.1 *Strangulation* (**הנקה**)

The word **ומהנקה** in unit 8 has been associated with Jannaeus’s crucifixion of his Pharisaic opponents, the subject of peshar unit 9.²

¹ As first suggested by Yadin, “Peshar Nahum Re-considered,” 10.

² As discussed in ch. 5 above, Halperin (“Crucifixion,” 33–34) and Brownlee see these crucifixions as the subject of the peshar in unit 8 as well; the extant text does

Although unit 9 does not contain an overt application of הַנֶּק , indirect influence may be supposed. Relationships between elements of adjacent pesher units are not uncommon.³ הַנֶּק technically denotes “strangulation,” but the term has been associated with hanging, particularly through its usage for Ahitophel’s suicide in IISam 17:23.⁴ However, the LXX equivalent for הַנֶּק in that verse is ἀπάξασθαι⁵ which appears in LXX only in this verse and at Tob 3:10, wherein Sarah contemplates suicide. Fitzmyer restores the Hebrew for ἀπάξασθαι in 4Q200 Tob^c (Hebrew Tobit) as לה[ת]לות.⁶

not accommodate their interpretation. We have speculated that the pesher may have used וּמַהֲנֶק as a basis for alluding to Alexander’s siege of Bethoma.

³ In reference to the apparent dependence on the word וּמַהֲנֶק from the previous lemma, Halperin states that Dupont-Sommer “gives examples of Biblical words or phrases that are expounded in the pesher but not quoted in the appropriate lemma” (“Crucifixion,” 33, n. 9, citing “Le Commentaire,” 69, 73). However, Dupont-Sommer was addressing a different phenomenon. His discussion focused upon words that appear in MT but have been omitted in a particular lemma, and yet appear in the pesher to that lemma. The inter-relationship of adjacent pesher units is discussed by Nitzan, 54–58; Horgan, 245; and Weiss, “Comparison,” 435. Horgan describes cases in which a word from an adjacent lemma is used in a pesher interpretation, including 4QpNah 1–2 line 9 (on Nah 1:4b, using $\text{וְיִשְׁבִּי הַבֵּל}$ from 1:5) and 4QpNah 3–4 III,1 (on Nah 3:5, using שְׂקוּיָן from 3:6). Nitzan adds that 4QpNah 3–4 III,3 (on Nah 3:6) uses נִלָּה from 3:5. Weiss observes that 4QpNah 3–4 II,5 on Nah 3:2–3 uses יָמוּשׁ from Nah 3:1.

The association proposed here is more complex, as the interpretation does not employ a word from the previous lemma, but rather appears to use another word, and concept, which is *related* to a word in the previous lemma. This phenomenon is more difficult to detect or to demonstrate.

⁴ See also, bPesahim 112, $\text{אִם בְּקֶשֶׁה לִהְנוֹק הָהֵלָה בְּאֵילָן נִדוּל}$; Genesis Rabba 65:22 in which a figure named Jaqim kills himself in a manner incorporating the four rabbinic modes of capital punishment, and strangulation is achieved by hanging from a post. (This figure is generally identified as Alcimus, the high priest following the Maccabean revolt). Cf. J. Baumgarten, “TLH,” 174–75.

⁵ “to hang oneself,” middle voice of ἀπάγω, “to choke” (Liddel-Scott, *s.v.*).

⁶ It is possible that a form of הַנֶּק could be placed at this juncture in Aramaic Tobit. The root הַנֶּק appears in fragment 3 of Aramaic Tobit, 4Q196 Tobit^a (DJD XIX, 20) Fitzmyer places the fragment at Tob 2:3, Tobias’s report to his father regarding the corpse found in the market-place, where the Greek uses the word στράγγω (“strangle”; ἐστραγγαλωμένος in the short recension, ἐστραγγάληται in the long recension). Fitzmyer remarks, “It certainly belongs here because this is the only place in the Tobit story where ‘strangle’ would occur.” In fact, 3:10 is a plausible location for הַנֶּק as well, as an equivalent for one of the two occurrences of ἀπάξασθαι (in the short recension; the long recension features three occurrences). Perhaps Fitzmyer is reluctant to associate הַנֶּק with hanging, despite the evidence of LXX. See his objections to Baumgarten’s claim of equivalence between הַנֶּק and הַלָּה (“Crucifixion,” 505–6, in reaction to Baumgarten’s “TLH,” 173–76).

(Tob 3:8 is not an appropriate option for the placement of frag 3, despite the fact that the short recension of the Greek there reads ἀποπνίγουσά (“to choke”). This verb is listed in Hatch and Redpath’s *Concordance* only at Tob 3:8 and at Nah

Allegro raised the possibility that the term *וּמְחַנֵּק* triggered the reference to hanging executions in Peshar Nahum, but he rejected the association. He decided that the terms are not related, as nowhere in the Bible is “strangulation” denoted by *חֲנִיקָה*.⁷ However, this negative biblical evidence for *equivalence* does not weaken the argument that the roots *חֲנִיקָה* and *תְּלִיחָה* have significant *semantic overlap* in indicating modes of death. Although the former root stresses suffocation, and the latter suspension, practical usage of the terms allows for interchange.

One example of such an interchange appears in Targ Ruth 1:17.⁸ The phrase “and as you die, I will die” is expounded by the Targum as referring to the four modes of execution in the Jewish legal system. Instead of the traditional *חֲנִיקָה*, the Targum lists *קִיסָא*.⁹ As the Aramaic means simply “hanging on a tree,” the Aramaic expression does not provide insight into whether the “hanging” in question was “on a rope or on a cross” to adopt Yadin’s formulation.¹⁰ The contribution of Targ Ruth to our discussion is its demonstration of a connection between strangulation and suspension.

2:13 (*ἀπέπνιξε*), as an equivalent for *חֲנִיקָה*. However, the space after the *ρ* in frag 3 precludes the suffix required at 3:8. Also, the context favors the more general *ἀποκτείνουσα* [“to put to death”] of the long recension).

⁷ “Further Light.” This observation is conveniently posed by Allegro in order to demonstrate that the peshar must refer specifically to crucifixion, thereby supporting his own historical interpretation.

⁸ Cf. Joseph Heinemann, “The Targum of Ex. 22:4 and the Ancient Halakha,” *תְּרַבְרִי* 38 (1968/69): 294–97.

⁹ Ruth Raba 2:24 does in fact read *חֲנִיקָה*, and apparently reflects later adjustment in accordance with the Mishna. Cf. S. Speier, “*קִיסָא* ‘Death by Hanging’ in Targum Ruth 1:17,” *תְּרַבְרִי* 40 (1971): 259.

¹⁰ 11QT, vol. 1, 378, n. 11. *עַל הָעֵץ* could be appropriate for either type of execution (as well as for impalement, or even for post-mortem exhibition, as in Josh 10:26; Esther 9:13,14). The beam of wood to which a person would be attached for crucifixion, or the stake upon which one would be impaled, as well as the tree from which an individual would be suspended by a rope, would correctly be termed *עֵץ*.

Halperin lists instances of *קִיסָא* in the specific sense of crucifixion, claiming that this is the only sense of the term (“Crucifixion,” 37–38). In fact, *קִיסָא* is simply ordinary Aramaic for *תְּלִיחָה*. It cannot be limited in a given instance to a particular mode of hanging in the absence of external evidence. Cf. Baumgarten, “*TLH*,” 176. M.J. Bernstein remarks, regarding the mechanical renderings of *תְּלִיחָה*, *דְּרוּקִיעַ*, and *חֲנִיקָה* in the Targum: “It is this uniformity of translation which supersedes exegetical fine-tuning and prevents, in my view, any inference from the Aramaic versions regarding the precise meaning of Hebrew *תְּלִיחָה* or Aramaic *קִיסָא* in particular contexts” (“*תְּלִיחָה* and ‘Synonymous’ Terms in the Ancient versions,” unpublished paper, kindly made available to me by the author).

This semantic overlap does not require equivalence. Thus, Halperin and Baumgarten may be described as erring in the opposite direction to Allegro. If Allegro denies the relationship between הַנֶּק and תְּלִיָּה, these scholars overstate it. Halperin goes so far as to claim that the pesher's use of "strangulation" indicates the author's physiological understanding of asphyxiation as the cause of death in crucifixion.¹¹ Baumgarten's strict equation of הַנֶּק and תְּלִיָּה stems from his reluctance to posit any official Jewish acceptance of crucifixion in antiquity.¹² In actuality, it is most likely that the range of the term תְּלִיָּה included, but was not limited to, sorts of hanging executions denoted by the word הַנֶּק. Some hanging deaths could aptly be called either; for others, only one of the terms would apply. The mode of execution categorized as הַנֶּק in the Talmud ("choking with a cloth") would not be called תְּלִיָּה. Crucifixion could be called תְּלִיָּה though it would probably not be called הַנֶּק.

In our assessment, the "hanging" executions in pesher unit 9 reflect the term הַנֶּק in the lemma of unit 8, but only superficially.

ex 5.1.2 *Exposure to Predation* (טָרֵף)

For all the scholarly attention paid to the term הַנֶּק in the context of unit 9, the literature on Pesher Nahum does not include any dis-

¹¹ Halperin ("Crucifixion," 34) cites J. Blinzler, *Der Prozess Jesu*, 381–84, and the *New Encyclopedia Britannica* (15th ed. 1974, 886–95) on asphyxiation as the cause of death in crucifixion. However, the direct cause of death in crucifixion is not definitely known even today, and we can in no way ascertain the ancient understanding in this matter. There is no basis for Halperin's statement, "we learn that the author of the Nahum Pesher regarded crucifixion as a form of strangulation, and assumed that it could be designated by the root *heneq*." We may accept that 4QpNah takes וְהַמָּוֶת as a *trigger* for its discussion of crucifixion. However, pesher is dependent upon word-plays, and the lexical association may not be used as a basis for imposing more specific conclusions. Halperin's position can be neither proved nor disproved.

¹² Cf. the similar position of Adolf Büchler, "Die Todestrafen der Bibel und der judischnachbiblischen Zeit," *MGWJ*, vol. 50 (1906): 706. Baumgarten extrapolates from the lexical interchange of הַנֶּק and תְּלִיָּה in some ancient Jewish sources, that תְּלִיָּה cannot refer to crucifixion ("*TLH*," 177–79). He argues that since הַנֶּק refers to strangulation, תְּלִיָּה can *only* refer to a sort of hanging that is equivalent to strangulation, and this is only the case in rope-suspension, not in crucifixion. In his view, *only* with the additional qualifying term "alive" can תְּלִיָּה be made to refer to crucifixion, in absolute distinction from its ordinary sense of "suspension."

However, for examples of תְּלִיָּה as a possible indication of crucifixion, cf. Rowley, "4QpNahum," Wieder, "Notes," 71–72. Against the necessary equation of תְּלִיָּה and הַנֶּק, cf. II Sam 18:10 in which Absalom is תְּלִיָּה from a tree, presumably by his hair, and Yoma 69a in which the "Cutheans" (Samaritans) are hanged by their heels

cussion of the association between the term טרף and hangings in antiquity (whether strangulation, crucifixion, or post-mortem exposure).¹³ We see this association as the exegetical key to peshet unit 9.

Martin Hengel shows that the crucifixion victim was called “carion.”¹⁴ Evidence of a connection between hanging and exposing the body to animals is found already in the Bible. In Gen 40:17, ותלה אוחך על עץ ואכל העוף את בשרך מעליך, Joseph’s interpretation of the baker’s dream—and even the content of the dream itself—associates victimization by birds of prey with being “hanged on a tree.”¹⁵ In II Sam 21:10, Rizpa protects the corpses of her hanged sons from birds and beasts.¹⁶ The association of hanging with predators and scavengers is further evidenced in classical writings and idioms.¹⁷ In some cases, the exposure of the hanging victim to hungry beasts was viewed as intrinsic to the punishment.¹⁸

from horses’ tails and dragged to Mt. Gerizim. These cases involve hanging, but there is no indication of strangulation.

¹³ Thiering, however, does call attention to the word, although without any direct correlation with the words of the peshet. She describes טרף as part of the condemnation of the Seekers-after-smooth-things (*Redating*, 30), “in their equation with ‘torn flesh’ . . . they are ‘unclean food’ (‘pigs!’);” (i.e. “*treif*”).

¹⁴ *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross* (Phila.: Fortress, 1977), 9–10.

¹⁵ Or, “upon wood.” Again, the precise method of execution is not clear.

¹⁶ Moshe Bernstein points out that טרף refers specifically to predation, while the biblical examples imply vulnerability to scavengers (personal communication). We may more accurately describe “vulnerability to being eaten by animals” as a general characteristic of hanging victims. Hanged corpses would be subject to scavengers, while live victims would suffer from predators, but both would be subject to being fed upon by animals. Bernstein’s distinction could in fact support the specific association of תלה הי in the peshet with טרף in the lemma, as described below. On the meaning of הוּקַע as a form of hanging in II Sam 21: 6, 9; 13; and Num 25:4, see Samuel Rolles Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*. (2nd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1966).

¹⁷ G.G. O’Collins (*ABD*, s.v. crucifixion, I: 1207) cites Horace (*Epistles* 1.16.46–48), describing crucified slaves as “feeding crows on the cross.” In detailing the degrading cruelty of hanging executions, Hengel (*ibid.*, 31–32) cites *Thesaurus Lingua Latinae*, 1259; Plautus, *Aularia* §522; *Bacchides* §584; *Casina* §416; *Persa* §795; and Terence, *Eunuch* 383; Valerius Maximus 6.9 ext. 5. Petronius *Satyricon* 58.2, 126.9 uses the terms *crucis offla* (= *offula*), *corvorum cibaria*, i.e., “gallows-bird,” “carion.” Apuleius, writes of “the torment of the gibbet, where dogs and vultures shall drag out her innermost entrails” (*Metamorphoses* 6.32.1).

¹⁸ Paul Winter presents a glaring example of crucifixion as exposure to predation, from Martial’s *On the Spectacles* (*De Spectaculis*, Liber 7; in Winter, *on The Trial of Jesus*, [Berlin: De Gruyter, 1961], 103). Martial describes a convict being crucified onstage and torn to pieces by a wild bear: “his mangled limbs lived, though the parts dripped gore, and in all his body was nowhere a body’s shape.” This contrived

The above evidence demonstrates the aptness of the word *טָרַף* in Nahum 2:13 as a peg for the crucifixion in the pesher. In fact, the intent of the Deuteronomic injunction discussed at length below may have been to counter this very aspect of hanging—the vulnerability of the hanged body to predatory and scavenging beasts.¹⁹

ex 5.1.3 *Hanging alive/Crucifixion* (תלה חי)

It is almost universally accepted that the words *אשר יתלה אנשים חיים* in this pesher refer to crucifixion. The word “alive” in the phrase “hang alive” is generally taken as a qualifier, emphasizing that the hanging was a means of execution, and perhaps specifying the means of execution as crucifixion. “Hanging alive” would be distinguished from the act of “hanging the dead,” i.e. the post-mortem display of an already executed corpse, as prescribed in various ancient legal systems, including rabbinic law. Martin Hengel has observed that ancient sources would often use identical terminology for hanging executions and post-mortem hangings. A disambiguating addition would thus be appropriate.²⁰ We would add that a hanged or crucified

situation was probably not typical, but its conceptual stimulus must have been the conventional, and inevitable, image of beasts preying upon hanged bodies.

Hengel describes the usual Roman practice of flogging victims both prior to and during crucifixion, and states that this practice and that of using nails to secure the body engendered “copious amounts of blood” (31–32). Certainly, such excessive blood would attract predatory animals.

¹⁹ Thus, the injunction *לא תלך בלבו* in Deut 21:22. Étan Levine’s translation of T11 on that verse “so that wild animals do not abuse him” would support our case (“Parallel to Deuteronomy of Ps.-Jon,” in *Neophyti V* [ed. A. Díez Macho; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1978], 603). However, the correct translation of the Targum’s *בִּיהַּ בְּרִיחָא בִּיהַּ יְקִילֵן* is certainly “so that people do not mock him,” in consonance with the view of R. Meir as noted by Bernstein (“כי קללת אלהים תלוי”: A study in Early Jewish Exegesis,” *JQR* 74 [1983]: 30 n. 20).

²⁰ Cf. *Crucifixion*, 24 for non-Jewish sources. Regarding Jewish writers, Hengel states that Philo uses only *ἀνασκολοπιζω* and Josephus exclusively (*ἀνασταυρω* for both execution and post-mortem hanging (p. 26). This generalization is a bit too broad, but these authors do not seem to distinguish lexically between post-mortem hanging and hanging execution.

In the Hebrew Bible, there are 18 occurrences of the root *תלה* in the contexts of ten different executions (in addition to the two occurrences in Deut 21:22–23 discussed below). Of these ten contexts, some are cases of execution and some are cases of post-execution exposure. Five instances are clearly post-mortem: Pharaoh’s royal baker (if “remove his head from upon him” is seen as literally describing a mode of execution, rather than simply mirroring the idiom for forgiveness of the royal butler; Gen 40:19, 22); the five Canaanite kings in Josh 10:26; Saul and his sons in II Sam 21:12 (in I Sam 31:10, the corpses are found and impaled [תקע]); Rechab and Baanah in II Sam 4:12 (either their limbs, or their limbless torsos);

corpse was itself often left exposed for extended lengths of time, combining both aspects of “hanging.” The boundaries were not clearly demarcated in reality as well as semantically.

The formulation “hanged alive upon a tree” in 4QpNah almost certainly reflects an association of some sort between the peshet and Deut 21:22–23, which has been interpreted as requiring either hanging execution or post-mortem hanging:

וכי יהיה באיש חטא משפט מות והומת ותליה אהו על עץ לא תלין נבלתו
 על העץ כי קבור תקברנו ביום ההוא כי קללת אלהים תלוי . . .

if there should be in a man a sin [deserving] of the judgment of death, he is to be put to death, and you must hang him upon a tree. You shall not leave his corpse on the tree overnight (or: his corpse shall not remain on the tree overnight), but you shall surely bury him on that day for accursed of God (or: a curse to God) is the hanged one.

ex 5.1.3.1 *Post-mortem Exposure vs. Execution*

The primary rabbinic interpretation of the ambiguous syntax in verse 22 applies the verse to the post-mortem exposure of the corpses of certain executed criminals: “he is killed (by stoning), and then he is hanged.”²¹ This stance was supported by the word order in Deut 21:22: “and he shall be put to death” precedes “and you shall hang him.” The Sifre specifies that this is in contradistinction to what one might have erroneously thought (“יכול”), namely that the Bible might refer to hanging a live victim. Sifre on Deut 21:22 reads:

ותליה אהו . . . יכול יהו תולים אהו חי כדרך שהמלכות עושה תלמוד לומר
 והומת ותליה אהו על העץ

Haman’s sons (Esth 9:7–10, 13). The three cases in which תלה appears to be the means of execution are all in the book of Esther: Bigthan and Teresh (2:23); Haman’s intention for Mordecai (5:14); Haman himself (7:10). Two cases are indeterminate: the king of Ai in Josh 8:29, whose corpse was certainly displayed, and who may have been executed by hanging, and the hanging of the “princes” in Lam 5:12. Esther 9:25 states, “they hanged him and his sons upon the tree,” equating the hangings of Haman and his sons, though the former was apparently the means of execution, and the latter took place subsequent to alternate means of execution.

Bernstein discusses Targumic renderings of these biblical occurrences of תלה in “Synonymous’ Terms in the Ancient versions.” See above, n. 10.

²¹ In mSan 6:4 (bSan 46b), Rabbi Eliezer applies the law to all criminals who are subject to the penalty of stoning; the rabbis limit the category to the blasphemer and idolator. Cf. Josephus, for the public exposure of the stoned corpse of the blasphemer (*Ant* 4 §202) and the rebellious son (*ibid.*, §264). He does not specify the crime in *Bḥ* 4 §317.

In contrast, 11QT supposes that the biblical injunction requires execution by hanging.²² In its adaptation of these verses, 11QT (col. LXIV) transposes “he is killed” and “you must hang” to clarify its own resolution of the ambiguity: hanging is the means by which the particular criminal is to be killed. 4QpNah apparently reflects the same conscious interpretation of Deut 21:22 as that which is found in 11QT, and which is rejected in the Sifre.²³

ex 5.1.3.2 *Crucifixion vs. Other forms of hanging*

It has been proposed that the expression “hanging alive” is intended to specify the mode of execution as crucifixion, rather than any other form of hanging. תלה alone could refer to crucifixion, or to a number of other forms of hanging execution; the qualifying “alive” would specify crucifixion.²⁴ The terminology of the ancient sources does not generally seem to exhibit a semantic distinction between types of hanging deaths, including impalement, strangulation, and crucifixion.²⁵

²² Cf. Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, vol. 2, 289. See section 5.3.2 below.

²³ For the equivalence of 11QT and the rejected view in the Sifre, cf. the parallel to the Sifre, the baraita cited in bSan 46b. There, the rejected hypothesis appears as, “one might have thought that you hang him and then you kill him, as the State does.”

²⁴ Presumably, the operative force of the expression would be the expectation that a crucifixion victim remains alive for much of the duration of his suspension, rather than dying immediately. Cf. Herodotus, *Histories*, 7:33, “ζῶντα . . .,” emphasizing the fact that the victim of a crucifixion remains alive for some time.

Halperin (“Crucifixion,” 37–40) and J. Baumgarten (“TLH,” 174–76) each attempts to use the equivalence of Hebrew תלה with Aramaic צלב for his own purpose, by imposing unwarranted limitations upon the ranges of these terms. Halperin takes צלב = crucifixion as given, and extrapolates that תנג too must denote crucifixion. Baumgarten takes תנג = strangulation as given, and extrapolates that targumic and midrashic צלב must similarly denote strangulation, to the exclusion of crucifixion. Baumgarten uses the same argument for הרוקע in Num 25:4, rejecting the conventional understanding of “impalement.” But cf. “Hanging and Treason,” 15, notes 9 and 15, where he concedes that צלב probably refers to crucifixion in mSan 9:7, the parable of R. Meir, and mYeb 16:3 (“Hanging and Treason in Qumran and Roman Law,” *EI* 16 [1982]: 7–16). The examples cited by Halperin and Baumgarten actually demonstrate the generic “hanging” sense of all these terms. It is in fact this very lack of precision which argues for the effectiveness of the deliberate employment of the term “alive” as a qualifier for “hanged” in order to specify crucifixion.

²⁵ Perhaps semantic precision was subverted by the multiplicity of combinations of tortures and indignities to which hanging victims tended to be subjected. (Cf. Hengel, *Crucifixion*, esp. 9, 10; 21–24). See n. 20 above in reference to similar lack of precision in distinguishing between hanging as execution or post-mortem exposure. When ancient texts reflect precise descriptions of hanging executions, they apparently tend to do so by recording specific aspects of the executions, rather than by placing them into defined categories, or by employing precise terminology.

Wieder was the first to stress the use of תלה הי in the Sifre, and in 4QpNah, as a definitive representation of crucifixion.²⁶ The idea that “hanging alive” denotes crucifixion in Peshet Nahum is now nearly universally accepted, particularly because the dominant historical identification associates the peshet with the crucifixions ordered by Jannaeus. There is no question that “hang alive” *may* denote crucifixion, and there is little doubt that the phrase does in fact denote crucifixion here. However, it is unclear whether the term as it appears is deliberately disambiguating, indicating the author’s intent to highlight the particular method of hanging execution, or whether it is simply a descriptive expression. If the lexical choice in 4QpNah does reflect an emphasis upon the form of execution, the question remains as to whether it bears legal or judgmental valence. This is the focus of part 2 of this excursus.

ex 5.2 LEGAL PRECEDENT (בישראל מלפנים)

Both of the dominant restorations/interpretations of this unit in 4QpNah attribute a judgmental value to the idiom בישראל מלפנים in relationship to Deut 21:22–23. Some see the peshet as accusing the Lion of Wrath of violating Deut 21:22–23, assuming that the biblical law not only forbade post-mortem exposure but also implicitly proscribed hanging executions, or at least hangings as executed by Jannaeus. Thus, 4QpNah would declare hanging alive to be *unprecedented*, having “not been done *from* antiquity.” Others, in light of 11QT, see the peshet as appealing to Deuteronomy to demonstrate that the Lion of Wrath was fulfilling biblical law. 4QpNah would assert that crucifixion did take place/was sanctioned *in* antiquity. This correlation is not a necessary one, however. The author of the peshet could have disapproved of Jannaeus’s actions on another basis rather than on legal grounds. Conversely, he could have reacted positively to the executions even if he believed that they were not effected in a legal fashion.

We have accepted Yadin’s view that Peshet Nahum condones the hanging of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, viewing their execution

²⁶ “Notes,” 71–72. The formulation of the rejected view in the Sifre is כדרך שהמלכות עושה, i.e., “as the Roman Empire does,” referring to crucifixion. The legal point of the Sifre is to oppose the use of hanging as a means of execution. The expression implies crucifixion specifically.

as fulfilling the words of Nahum, and probably, the law of Deuteronomy (see part 3 of this excursus, below). However, we do not believe that legal justification was the aim of the pesher. Yadin unsuccessfully attempts to adduce a lexical proof that *בישראל מלפנים* must indicate positive legal precedent.²⁷ He contends that the time period covered by “aforetimes” cannot extend from former times to the current period.²⁸ Therefore, in his view, it is impossible to read the pesher as asserting that a particular action was forbidden “from antiquity and into the present.” Yadin is probably correct in observing that *בישראל מלפנים* should describe a past situation, rather than a state that continues into the present. However, his observation does

²⁷ Some additional support for ascribing a legal valence to *בישראל* may be found in CD V,3, “the sealed book of the Law . . . was not opened in Israel. . . .” “In Israel” is understood to mean “in the Community of Israel.”

In contrast, Rowley argued that the sense of *בישראל* in the 4QpNah was geographic, rather than national. For Rowley and Zeitlin, this phrase would bear no association to Deut 21:22–23, as they interpret unit 9 as referring to crucifixions carried out by Antiochus IV. (See ch. 4, above). As a Gentile, Antiochus would not have been evaluated in terms of his adherence to biblical law. Carmignac thus suggests that if “as was not done in Israel aforetimes” is taken “in a strict sense” then this would argue in favor of the “Seleucid thesis” [placing the pesharim in an earlier historical context] (*Les Textes*, 87). If the pesher is taken to assert that, literally, there had been no executions in the Land of Israel prior to the ones described in the pesher itself, then it would have to refer to the crucifixions carried out by Antiochus IV. Jannaeus’s crucifixions could not be described as unprecedented in the Land of Israel, having post-dated those of Antiochus.

Doudna dissociates 4QpNah from the legal sphere, since he views the Lion of Wrath as a Gentile. “If there is an echo in 4QpNah to Deut 21:22–23 or 11QT^a 64 in the language of crucifixions and accursedness, this has no bearing on an identification of the Lion of Wrath as Israelite or involved with Israelite law.” (433). He suggests that “any such allusion is easily understood as authorial comment on a coming invader or a noting of irony.” We disagree.

²⁸ Yadin observed that in CD II,17 and III,19 the word *למלפנים* is qualified by the phrase *ועד הנה*. He believed that the sense of “from aforetimes,” cannot be transferred to 4QpNah in the absence of this modifier. Cf. too, CD V,15 *למלפנים*, V,17 *מלפנים*, which refer only to events of the past, specifically pre-exilic times (similar to *הראשונה* in V,19, *ראשונים* in VI,2).

מלפנים in the Bible occurs only once, in Isa 41:26, parallel to *מראש*. Yadin describes the usage in Isaiah as having a “slightly different nuance” than in CD. One similarity, though, is that the verse describes the former revelation of a historical reality (or lack thereof), reflecting the pre-exilic time period that we discern in CD. A similar sense may be intended in 1QS I,25 *מלפנינו* *אנו* [א] *בוחינו מלפנינו* (הרשענו אנו [א] בוחינו מלפנינו *מלפנינו* in V,19, *ראשונים* in VI,2). (“we have done evil, we and our fathers before us”).

In the Bible and at Qumran, the closely related *מקדם* and *מימי* also place an event in the past. The prefatory *מ* in these terms does not denote a starting point for a continuous action, as might be expected by analogy with the usual sense of prepositional *מ* meaning “from.” Rather the *מ* is integral to the idiom, and restricted to the past.

not preclude the restoration of 4QpNah as indicating a negative precedent: “*as was not done in antiquity.*” The ancestral forbearance, having taken place in the past, would be understood as a model for later times, so that Jannaeus’s executions would be viewed as a negative departure from the traditional model.²⁹

Yadin further appeals to Ruth 4:7 as the only biblical verse that, like 4QpNah, has **לפנים** together with **ישראל** in a “similar judicial phrase.”³⁰ That instance describes early precedent for a prescribed act, not a prohibition. However, it does not prove Yadin’s claim that the usage is limited to positive precedent. As the only such “judicial” usage in the Bible, it does not offer a basis for generalization.³¹

The “judicial” usage in Ruth is distinct from the “historical/theological” connotation observed above in CD. ISam 9:9 employs **לפנים** **בישראל** in a third manner. The verse has a “terminological” focus which seems on the surface as though it should be transferable to 4QpNah, but no satisfactory restoration can be adduced on this basis. ISam 9:9 reads **כי לנביא היום יקרא לפנים הרואה** (“for the ‘prophet’ today was called in antiquity the ‘seer’”). Here, **לפנים** introduces an obsolete term, which is juxtaposed to the current equivalent.³² The obstacle to interpreting 4QpNah in this light, is that the peshet seems to contain only a single idiom, “hanged alive on a tree.”³³

The force of “aforetimes in Israel” remains elusive.

²⁹ One might even propose, “as had been prohibited in antiquity,” and thus, remains forbidden.

³⁰ “Peshet Nahum Reconsidered,” n. 34.

³¹ Baumgarten refers to this verse in Ruth as well as to ISam 9:9 to discredit Yadin’s claim that **לפנים** **בישראל** necessitates positive precedent. Baumgarten states that “this expression is used for archaic practices no longer familiar in the times of the writer” (“Hanging and Treason,” 13). However, Baumgarten’s own restoration of the peshet as indicating negative precedent does not accommodate this nuanced understanding of the phrase.

³² The verse begins **לפנים** **בישראל** and it has the word **יקרא** which seems so close to 4QpNah. In fact, most cases of **לפנים** in the Bible provide ancient names, specifically place names, “for the name of [a place] in former times was. . .”

³³ Yadin has attempted to read the peshet as including two distinct terms with his rendering, “for the ‘hanged one’ is called ‘alive on the tree’.” With some strain, the ‘hanged one’ could be seen as the ancient word, and ‘alive on a tree’ as the contemporary idiom, but ‘alive on the tree’ cannot stand independently. Unlike the example in Samuel, “alive on the tree” does not replace “hanged,” but only augments it.

The awkwardness of Yadin’s attempt is evident in his “various possibilities” for reading the phrase: “‘since the hanged one (of Deut 21:22–23) is called alive on the tree’ . . . or, more freely: ‘since the hanged one is called (hanged) alive on the

ex 5.3 THE PHRASE כִּי לְהַלֹּוי הִי עַל הָעֵץ [יִקְרָא] . . .

The phrase כִּי לְהַלֹּוי הִי עַל הָעֵץ [יִקְרָא] appears to be lacking an important piece of data. *BDB* offers three primary definitions for קָרָא: call, proclaim, and read.³⁴ If קָרָא here means “call” or “proclaim,” the phrase demands that the “one hanged upon the tree” be called or proclaimed to be something. The definition “read” would require a text and a reader. Thus, it has been proposed that Nah 2:14 “for behold I am against you” be linked to pesher unit 9, supplying a text to be read or proclaimed about the hanged one.

A brief outline will facilitate comprehension of the following discussion.

I. Unit 9 as independent of Nah 2:14

- 1) כִּי [יִקְרָא] . . . *condemns* crucifixion, based on Deut 21:22–23
Objection: Deut 21 does not lend itself to a condemnation of crucifixion
- 2) The phrase *condones* crucifixion, based on Deut 21:22–23
Objection: Deut 21:22–23 is not cited in 4QpNah
- 3) The phrase is explicative, *indifferent* to the legality of crucifixion
Objection: the phrase would be pointless

II. “Linked reading”: Nah 2:14 as part of pesher in Unit 9

tree’; or, ‘since the hanged (of old, i.e., Deut 21) is (now) called (hanged) alive on the tree.’” The ubiquitous parentheses highlight the weakness of Yadin’s attempted constructions, which all force double-duty upon the “hanged one.” In his translations, מִלְפָּנֵים must refer to the antiquity of the practice of hanging as well as to the former use of the term “hanged.” “Hanged” must reflect the term in Deuteronomy as well as the idiom in the pesher.

In his edition of the Temple Scroll (vol. 1, p. 378), Yadin tried yet another alternative, “the הַלֹּוי, ‘the hanged one’ (mentioned in Deuteronomy) is, in fact, ‘hanged alive on a tree.’” Presumably, the rationale for this rendering is that the hanged one of Deuteronomy “should be read as,” i.e. “is equivalent to” one who is hanged alive upon a tree. (The words “on a tree” are appended to “the hanged one” in both 11QT LXIV and the LXX to Deut 21:23, πᾶς κρεμᾶμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου). The earlier objections apply: “aforesimes in Israel” is not actually a part of this phrase, and an implied double-duty of “the hanged one” must be assumed.

³⁴ *HALOT* features a further sub-division of these categories, but the three-fold schema suits our purposes here. García-Martínez’s unusual translation of קָרָא here appears to reflect an Aramaic root, related to BH קָרָה. He renders, “for it is [hor]rible for the one hanged alive from the tree” (*Study ed.*, 337).

ex 5.3.1 *Condemnation of Crucifixion*

In Allegro's preliminary publication, he already suggested that the pesher hinges upon an implied allusion to Deut 21:23, "accursed of God is the hanged one."³⁵ "For one hanged alive upon a tree is called" invited the reader to supply the facts that (1) what the hanged one is called is "accursed" and (2) where he is called it is in Deut 21:23. The anacoluthon engendered by the omission of the actual biblical phrase was attributed to religious sensibilities, an extreme case of euphemism.³⁶

The force of the gloss is perceived to bolster the condemnation of Jannaeus's actions: by crucifying his victims, he created a condition of cursedness. However, this interpretation is problematic. As Bernstein points out, "we confront the difficulty that the Biblical text mandates hanging, yet the one carrying out the order is offensive to God."³⁷

If 4QpNah asserts an actualization of the condition of cursedness described by Deut 21:23, how does it view this cursedness as arising?

³⁵ "Further Light," 91. He wrote, "For the reconstruction of the first two words I am indebted to my friends Frank M. Cross, Jr., and David Noel Freedman, with whom I agree that the deadly words קללה אלהים (Deut 21:23) have been avoided for pietistic reasons, the writer and readers knowing full well what was intended." Allegro rendered, "for it (the Scripture) calls the one hanged alive on the tree—."

³⁶ The term "anacoluthon" appears in the literature, but "aposiopesis" would be more appropriate. The former is defined as "a breakdown in the syntactic construction of a sentence" (Dupriez/Halsall, 34). "Aposiopesis" refers more specifically to "a sudden interruption betraying an emotion, a threat, or hesitation" (*ibid.*, 57).

The omission is compared to that in Gal 3:13, where the same verse in Deuteronomy 21 is used as a testimonium, but the parallel is not convincing. Horgan (178) cites Jeremias (*Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1963], 133–34) in support of the idea that Paul omitted "by God" in Galatians "deliberately in order to avoid speaking expressly of the divine curse." Wilcox, though, argues that a textual variant, rather than a theological exegetical decision, is behind the Galatians text. ("Upon the Tree." Deut. 21:22–23 in the New Testament," *JBL* 96 [1977]: 87). Moreover, in Galatians, the curse itself is central to the usage of the biblical citation, and only "by God" is omitted. If the omission of these words is deliberate in NT, it would be an evasion of the characterization of Jesus as cursed by God, out of reverence for Jesus (cf. J. Baumgarten, "Hanging and Treason," 14). In 4QpNah, the entire phrase is supposedly omitted, creating a syntactic problem, without any clear authorial motive to avoid describing the victims explicitly as cursed by God.

As noted in ch. 2, Leibel restored קראי חי [קללה] which features a full syntactically correct sentence, and a non-elliptic (though paraphrastic) reference to Deut 21:23. Cf. Gaster, "for the Scripture designates a man hung up alive as [a reproach unto God]" (*IDSS*, 314; he neglected to bracket "Scripture"). Unfortunately, the restoration cannot be reconciled with the visible traces.

³⁷ "Early Jewish Exegesis," 34 n. 25, responding specifically to Baumgarten's interpretation of תלוי as an active participle. See n. 63 below.

The ambiguity of the verse in Deuteronomy allows for two alternatives. Cursedness may either be the result of (1) prolonged exposure (violation of the law by the one who executes the hanging) or of (2) hanging as prescribed (fulfillment of the law, so that the victim of the hanging is punished for a violation).³⁸

“Accursed of God” may only function as a condemnation of the executioner if the executioner was perceived as violating Deuteronomy 21. Recently, H. Eshel has proposed that 4QpNah does indeed criticize Jannaeus for leaving the corpses exposed beyond sundown.³⁹ However, Josephus does not state that Jannaeus left the corpses exposed for a prolonged period of time. Moreover, cursedness in Deuteronomy 21 does not appear to be a status that arises only in the case of prolonged exposure. This status is the rationale for not leaving the corpse exposed excessively, but it does not seem to arise only in that case; rather it appears to be the status of all hanging victims. Thus, it does not seem that this expression would be useful for the pesher. Jannaeus could not be blamed for causing his opponents to become “accursed of God”; they were cursed because they were hanged, and they were hanged because of their crimes. In Deuteronomy, the negative result of prolonged exposure is “defilement of the Land.” Had the pesher reflected this phrase, then the interpretation of prolonged exposure would be more convincing. As it stands, 4QpNah does not seem to condemn the executioner.

Barring other evidence, we cannot presume that Jannaeus violated Deut 21: 22–23 explicitly. If, instead, he fulfilled its requirements, the situation could be seen as unfortunate, but must be viewed as legally required, and could not serve as a basis for denouncing the executioner. The fallacious supposition that the pesher could condemn Jannaeus for fulfilling Deut 21:22–23 derives largely from a retrojection of modern views of crucifixion. Both Christian and Jewish scholars in the last century simply assumed that the pesher reflected both opposition to crucifixion and an association with Deut 21:22–23. From a Christian perspective, NT texts applied Deut 21:22–23 to the crucifixion of Jesus, despite the condemnatory nature of the act.⁴⁰

³⁸ The ancient Jewish approaches to this question are discussed at length by Bernstein, “Early Jewish Exegesis,” 21–45.

³⁹ “חילדוהיה,” 92. The question is discussed further at the end of this chapter.

⁴⁰ Allegro refers to the cruelty of the execution by crucifixion, but he does not clarify the specific connection to Deuteronomy (“Further Light,” 91–93).

However, these are homiletical, not legal applications of the biblical verses.⁴¹ Among Jewish Qumran scholars, there was a sense of conviction that ancient Jews opposed crucifixion, but they did not correlate this position with an explicit interpretation of Deut 21:22–23.⁴² Baumgarten has gone to great lengths to interpret 4QpNah as using Deut 21:23 to condemn the crucifier, though he is aware of the logical difficulty involved.⁴³ In sum, the restoration of an appeal to precedent in the peshet implies a legal position, and there is no legal precedent in Deut 21:22–23 for condemnation of the executioner.

Carmignac is one of the few scholars who recognizes that Deut 21:22–23, which prescribes hanging, would be an inappropriate proof-text in 4QpNah for the condemnation of hanging executions. He is nonetheless comfortable in asserting that while the biblical verse actually only prohibits the prolonged suspension of corpses and delay of burial, the author of 4QpNah “took Deut 21:23” to prohibit crucifixion (87 n.18). Carmignac begins with the supposition that Jews considered crucifixion legitimate (based upon Matt 27:22–23; Mark 15:13–14; Luke 23:21–23; John 19:6,15) and even associated its legitimacy with Deut 21:23. (He cites John 19:31–34 in which “the Jews” request that Pilate remove the crucified bodies by nightfall, but does not mention the specific association of the request with the Sabbath in that passage). Carmignac sees the Qumran Community as divergent in rejecting crucifixion. He does not explain how they might have derived this position from Deut 21:23.

⁴¹ In reference to Gal 3:13, Baumgarten says that homilies “hardly suffice to prove that in the legal exegesis of the time Deut 21:22–23 was understood to refer to crucifixion” (“Hanging and Treason,” 8). Paul’s non-literal attitude to Deut 21:22–23 in Gal 3:13 is obvious inasmuch as he clearly did not believe that Jesus had committed a capital crime, while the original legal context is precisely that.

⁴² Gaster and Rabin were vague as to the grounds for condemnation in the peshet. Gaster pointed to the rabbinic opinion in mSan 6:4 limiting hanging to the blasphemer and idolator, but did not explain the precise relevance of this observation to the peshet (*TDSS*, 340). Rabin cited mSan 6:4 as requiring only post-mortem hanging, and even then in a limited capacity (“Alexander Jannaeus,” 10). He seemed to imply that the peshet’s “mild disapproval” of Jannaeus was a reaction to a mode of execution that negated the spirit of Deuteronomy 21. Rabin may have been somewhat cognizant of the difficulty of condemning an executioner based on the wording of that verse, and this difficulty may have prompted the alternate restorations suggested by him (see below).

⁴³ If Carmignac asserted a link between Pharisees, crucifixion, and cursedness, Baumgarten aims as far as possible to distance ancient Jews from the acceptance of crucifixion. Baumgarten endeavors to entirely remove crucifixion from the legal system of any Jews, and so does not wish to consider its acceptance even by the sectarian Qumran Community. The historiography of early research on this passage is succinctly summarized by D.R. Schwartz, “In this Yadin-Baumgarten debate, it is characteristic that the Israeli had no qualms about publishing—years before the rest of the scroll! [11QT]—a text and argument which could support New Testament claims of Jewish initiative for the crucifixion of Jesus, while it was the American rabbi . . . who immediately set out to rebut” (“The Contemners of Judges and Men [11QTemple 64:12],” in *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity* [Tubingen: Mohr, 1992], 81–88. Baumgarten responds to the imputation of apologetic motives in “Hanging and Treason,” 15 n. 10).

ex 5.3.2 *Approval of Jannaeus's Crucifixion*

In preparing the Temple Scroll for publication, Yadin found cause to believe that 4QpNah uses Deut 21:22–23 to *support* the execution of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things.⁴⁴ The text which gave rise to this idea is 11QT LXIV, 6–13:

כי	6
יהיה איש רכיל בעמו ומשלים אה עמו לנוי נכר ועושה רעה בעמו	7
ותליחמה אותו על העץ וימת על פי שנים עדים ועל פי שלושה עדים	8
וימת והמה יתלו אותו העץ כי יהיה באיש חט' משפט מות ויברתה אל	9
תוך הנואים ויקלל את עמו, את בני ישראל ותליחמה גם אותו על העץ	10
וימות ולוא תלין נבלחמה על העץ כי קבור תקוברמ{ה} ביום ההוא כי	11
מקוללי אלוהים ואנשים תלוי על העץ ולוא תטמא את האדמה אשר אנכי	12
נתן לכה נחלה	13

6 If
 7 a man informs against his people, and delivers his people up to a foreign nation, and does harm to his people,
 8 you shall hang him on the tree, and he shall die. On the evidence of two witnesses and on the evidence of three witnesses
 9 he shall be put to death, and they shall hang him (on) the tree. And if a man has committed a crime punishable by death, and has defected into
 10 the midst of the nations, and has cursed his people and the children of Israel you shall hang him also on the tree,

Baumgarten initially proposed that 4QpNah condemned Jannaeus for *mis-interpreting* Deuteronomy, in that he crucified the criminals rather than hanging them; Jannaeus killed people alive, in violation of the ancient law of Israel, “for *he* took ‘the hanged one’ [of Deut 21:23] to mean ‘alive upon a tree’” (in the original version of “*TLH*,” in *JBL*, 481. See section I of this chapter on “hanged alive” for Baumgarten’s view that only the latter phrase, “hanging alive on a tree” may refer to crucifixion, while the former, “hanged one,” must refer only to strangulation).

⁴⁴ Some scholars have represented Yadin as claiming that the Community understood Deut 21:22–23 to specifically *require* crucifixion as the mode of death in the hanging executions mandated by the passage. Thus, Horgan states that Yadin “presents a passage from the Temple Scroll (64:6–13) that he thinks prescribes crucifixion as punishment for certain political crimes” (177). Wilcox tentatively placed 4QpNah with 11QT, the Peshitta, and Acts (5:30; 10:39) as sources that interpret Deut 21:22–23 as requiring crucifixion (“Upon the Tree,” 90). We do not accept Wilcox’s interpretation of Peshet Nahum, and his interpretation of Yadin’s argument is clearly not that which was intended by Yadin himself.

Yadin clarified his position in his edition of the Temple Scroll (vol. 1, 378). He suggested that the Community would not have been sensitive to a legal distinction between crucifixion and other means of hanging execution. Jannaeus would not have earned their approval by ordering crucifixion *per se*, but rather by having the rebels executed in a manner that could be subsumed under the category of “hanging alive,” i.e., hanging in order to put to death.

11 and he shall die. And you shall not leave their body to remain upon the tree all night, but you shall surely bury them on that same day, for
 12 those hanged on the tree are accursed by God and men; you shall not defile the land which I
 13 give you for an inheritance.

There is extensive literature on this section of 11QT, which re-works the “hanging passage” in Deuteronomy via paraphrase and expansions derived from other biblical texts.⁴⁵ Above, we noted that by reversing the order of MT, 11QT clarifies that it takes the hanging in this passage to refer to a means of execution. The scroll applies this penalty to certain types of political criminals. In forming their military alliance with Demetrius, the “Seekers-after-Smooth-Things” of 4QpNah easily fit the criteria of 11QT LXIV.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ See especially, Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* vol. 1, 373–79; Schwartz, “Contemners,” 81–88; M.J. Bernstein, “Midrash Halakha at Qumran?” *Gesher* 7 (1979): 145–66; Aharon Shemesh, “Scriptural Interpretations in the Damascus Document and Their Parallels in Rabbinic Midrash,” in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery*. (ed. Joseph Baumgarten, Esther Chazon, and Avital Pinnick; Brill: Leiden, 2000), 173–75; Chaim H. Cohen, “החלליה אף היא במיתה בית דין?” *WCJS* 8/3 (1982): 19–20, 24–26; Michael Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll From Qumran Cave 11*, (Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990), 107–109, 121–127.

⁴⁶ This, despite scholarly disagreement concerning some of the details of the crime(s) referred to in the Temple Scroll. Cf. the sources in the previous note. It seems most likely that the pesher viewed Jannaeus’s victims as doubly embodying קללה אלהים or, more precisely, מקוללי אלהים ואדם, as expressed in the Temple Scroll. They disrespected their leaders and their nation, and were cursed by God. The full elaboration of this view is beyond the scope of this work. Some of the key issues include the question of whether the phrases מקוללי אלהים and קללה אלהים are to be understood as “subjective” or “objective” genitives (see below on מזהי אפרים for a similar syntactic ambiguity); whether מקוללי is a passive *pu’al* or an active *poel* participle; and whether אלהים refers to God or human judges. Cf. Bernstein, “Early Jewish Exegesis,” 21–45, esp. 38–43; Schwartz, “Contemners,” 84–88; Yadin, *Temple Scroll I*, 373–79; II, 289–91.

Yadin sees 11QT as having been composed on the basis of the scenario of 4QpNah (“4QpNah Reconsidered,” 9). He takes the two related crimes named in the passage as references to: (1) the appeal of the Pharisees to Demetrius III and (2) the flight of the Pharisees recorded in *Ant* 13 §383 (War 1 §98): “they fled by night, and remained in exile as long as Alexander lived.” However, Yadin seems to have collapsed too much similar data: if the basis for associating col. LXIV with a particular event is Jannaeus’s crucifixions, the second event cannot be relevant to the second crime. Jannaeus could not have hanged men who fled from him and remained in exile until after his death! 11QT may reflect the influence of a particular historical situation, namely that of Jannaeus and his opponents, but it should not be seen as a specially created polemic in favor of his actions.

See Wise’s objections to the claim that 11QT reflects a specific historical scenario, especially this particular scenario. Among other difficulties, there remains no

Following upon Yadin's argument, Dupont-Sommer maintains the implicit allusion to Deut 21:23 first suggested by Cross-Freedman, but renders סֵפֶר as "parle l'Écriture," and takes the allusion as offering a positive basis for the act.⁴⁷ In addition to removing the anacoluthon, Dupont-Sommer demonstrates a sensitivity to the exegetical perspective of 4QpNah by perceiving סֵפֶר as indicative of textual interpretation.⁴⁸ Thus, "for of 'the one hanged alive on the tree' [Scripture in Deut] reads" (or "is to be read").⁴⁹

The "reader" in this interpretation is the implied reader of Scripture, and the text is Deut 21:23. This understanding is superior to the proposed use of Deut 21:23 to condemn crucifixion. Whereas that proposal required Deuteronomy to be invoked against hanging execution, contrary to its original sense, Yadin's position entails an appeal to the law in a contextually appropriate manner—to provide for hanging as a penalty.⁵⁰

Nonetheless, the inclusion of halakhic exegesis of Deuteronomy in the middle of a pesher on the book of Nahum is awkward. Some

consensus as to the nature of the association between 11QT and the community that produced 4QpNah, even among those scholars who accept the consensus view that 4QpNah is part of a unified corpus produced by the "Qumran Community."

⁴⁷ "Observations Nouvelles," 715.

⁴⁸ Earlier, Dupont-Sommer translated, "mais celui que a été suspendu vivant sur [le] bois [on (!)in]voque[ra]" ("for the hanged one is called alive on the tree") ("Commentaire," 68; "Observations," 206; and *L'Écrits Esséniens*, 281, n. 3). He had rejected the relevance of Deuteronomy: since it did not use the term hanging alive, there was no *a priori* justification for the Community to use it as a proof-text for hanging alive. Only after the appearance of 11QT was there a basis for believing that the Community took the verse in Deuteronomy as referring to hanging alive, and for understanding 4QpNah in that light (assuming that 11QT was a Qumran sectarian text). Dupont-Sommer evidenced a sensitivity to the function of citation not shown by the majority of scholars. (This was a great step forward from his position in *Essene Writings* [269] wherein he claimed that a restoration of [YQJR] should be translated '[They will c]all (on him);' so that "the phrase refers to someone who suffered punishment on the cross and became an object of invocation." For a refutation of the claim that 4QpNah alluded to the crucifixion of the Teacher of Righteousness, see Carmignac, *Les Textes*, II,87).

⁴⁹ Thus, Knibb, 210. Fitzmyer prefers the former ("Crucifixion," 500). He supplies "who has found a crime punishable by death" in the earlier lacuna. Cf. 1QpHab VII,3-5 in which $\text{למען ירוץ הקורא בו}$ is applied to the revelation of prophetic mysteries to the Teacher of Righteousness, i.e. the production of pesher.

⁵⁰ However, Yadin over-emphasized the legal focus of the text, missing the exegetical point of Dupont-Sommer's original understanding (as n. 48 above). His efforts to adapt Dupont-Sommer's early formulation to an association with Deuteronomy are not successful. (See n. 33 above). Translating "called" only emphasizes the difficulty in this phrase, which is that we have no citation outside of 4QpNah where anybody is called "alive on the tree."

justification for such inclusion of a tangential halakhic note may be sought in Dupont-Sommer's belief that the interpretation of Deut 21:23 was a specifically sectarian controversy in antiquity. Dupont-Sommer argues that Pharisaic *halakhah* read the verse in Deuteronomy as requiring post-mortem display, while Sadducees/Essenes maintained that it referred to execution by hanging.⁵¹ It might be acceptable for 4QpNah to include a tangential allusion in the context of a well-known halakhic/interpretive debate. The difficult phrase could be rendered, "‘hanged’ (in the famous context of Deut 21:23) must be read as ‘alive upon a tree.’" Because of its polemic valence, the theological gloss could be viewed as compatible with the sectarian focus of 4QpNah.⁵²

Despite their improvement over earlier attempts, these interpretations are still problematic. Besides the intrusive halakhic content, there is the serious formal problem that 4QpNah does not cite the text of Deut 21 to which it supposedly appeals.⁵³ Even Yadin's pro-

⁵¹ "Observations Nouvelles," 719. His position is directly antithetical to that of Carmignac cited above, n. 40. Compare also the view of Leibel that Peshet Nahum interpreted the biblical injunction in the rabbinic manner, as referring to post-mortem display ("הערוה," 12–13).

⁵² Dupont-Sommer viewed the "Essene" interpretation of Deut 21:22–23 as an indication of Essene severity in penal law. He further saw this strictness as a characteristic which set the Community apart from the lenient Pharisees, but that demonstrates its halakhic affinity with the Sadducees. (Cf. Josephus, *Ant* 13 §294, "the Pharisees are naturally lenient in the matter of punishments.") Dupont-Sommer took the testimony of Mark 15:11–14 that the chief priests called for Jesus's crucifixion as an indication that it was Sadducee halakha which permitted crucifixion (*ibid.*).

This hypothesis of strict sectarian alignment on this issue would conflict with the view of Joseph Heinemann who sees the acceptance of hanging execution as one of many co-existing positions held by the forerunners of the Mishna. Cf. "The Targum of Ex. 22:4 and the Ancient Halakha," *הרב* 38 (1968/69): 294–97; Efraim E. Urbach, "The Sanhedrin of Twenty-three and Capital Punishment" (Vol. 2 of *Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies* [Jerusalem, 1972]), 43–45. Heinemann stresses temporal factors in early halakhic diversity ("pre-Tannaic halakha"), whereas Urbach stresses the spatial aspect, arguing that outside of Jerusalem, smaller courts of 23 judges tried capital cases, and that the practices in the local courts differed in some ways from those of the Great Sanhedrin of 70–72 members. Speier also argues for variability in the legal procedures for capital punishment in ancient Judaism, and particularly in the modes of burning and hanging ("Death by Hanging," 259). There is no smooth reconciliation for these two positions: taking hanging as "ancient" general halakha, in common practice at the time of Simeon ben Shetach (a contemporary of Alexander Jannaeus), and as an axe being ground by the author of 4QpNah with reference to Jannaeus.

⁵³ Bernstein states that, "although 4QpNahum is often discussed with our passage of the Temple Scroll (11QT64.6–13), no clear exegesis of Deut 21:23 can be extrapolated from the clause *כי לחלוי חי על העץ* [יך]רא (4QpNahum 3–4 I,8). The

posals include only partial citation of Deut 21:23, and they do not feature any introduction of the sort that typically precedes a biblical proof-text.⁵⁴

In sum, the attempts to read unit 9 as a legal polemic with Deut 21:23 as its basis have not been successful.

ex 5.3.3 *Explication*

א[י]ק[ר]א כי לחלוי חי על העץ [י]ק[ר]א may be understood without an appeal to Deuteronomy, as follows: “for concerning the ‘one hanged alive upon a tree’ *it* is to be read,” with “*it*” referring to the lemma.⁵⁵ The function of the phrase is to re-iterate the relationship between the lemma and its pesher identification. Nah 2:13 applies to the Young Lion who crucified his opponents . . . “for ‘concerning the one executed by being hanged alive upon the tree’, the lemma is to be read.” Indeed, the function of the word כי in the extant continuous pesharim is to strengthen lemma/pesher identifications.⁵⁶ The possi-

phrase קללה אלוהים has simply left no overt mark there” (“Early Jewish Exegesis,” 22 n. 4).

⁵⁴ Restorations of משפט or תורה in the previous lacuna may mitigate this objection somewhat, (such as “for thus was the law in Israel as of old”) by implying a source-text, which the reader would infer to be the verse from Deuteronomy. The mention of a law instituted “aforetimes in Israel” might give the reader some basis for contextualizing the interpretation of an external text, especially if the pesher described Jannaeus as carrying out מוֹת משפט מוֹת. Still, it is awkward to employ a technical exegetical term (קרא) in a vacuum, and to find exegesis of a Pentateuchal verse without any introduction, in the middle of 4QpNah. These readings really require not just an allusion to Deut 21:23, but a citation.

⁵⁵ “Read” here would mean “apply prophetically” as in 1QpHab VII,3–5 in the interpretation of “למען ירוץ הקורא בו”, as noted above, n. 49.

⁵⁶ Nearly every כי/א in 1QpHab (excluding those within biblical quotations) introduces or strengthens a connection between lemma and pesher. The phrase כי/א הוא אשר אמר appears three times, in III,2; III,[13]; and V,6; each time bridging a pesher interpretation with a re-citation of a portion of the lemma being interpreted. כי is used with a pronoun in identifying formulae, linking a lemma element with its analog, e.g. 1QpHab IX,7, “for they are ‘the rest of the peoples’” or, in reverse order, XII,3, “for ‘Lebanon’ is the council of the Community. . . .” A more subtle but essentially similar usage of כי as a link between pesher and lemma is found in 1QpHab II,3–6, wherein two pesher identifications are explicated by the repetition of a key word in the lemma. Thus, “[the pesher of the matter is upon] x, כי verb (from lemma), and upon x’, א[י]ק[ר]א verb (same verb from lemma). 1QpHab VII,12 also explicates a pesher application, using a verb from the lemma. 1QpHab XI,13 is less formulaic, though כי still functions as a link between an idea in the pesher and a word in the lemma. We take the כי of 1QpHab VII,8 as reflecting the כי in the lemma, not as an independent construction of the author. In 4QpNah 3–4 II,12 כי identifies a particular substantive to explicate the pesher, and frags

bly technical use of כִּי supports reading line 8 as purely explicative, rather than as expressing a legal opinion or referring to the external source of Deuteronomy.⁵⁷ The lost text at the beginning of the line could have been politically and/or halakhically approving, disapproving, or neutral.

The primary objection to this interpretation is the lack of any element from the lemma in the problematic phrase.⁵⁸ Without a repeated substantive stressing the force of the linguistic link, a statement relating the peshet to its lemma appears tautological. If the peshet of verse “a” is given as interpretation “x,” there does not seem to be anything gained by stating “for regarding “x” is “a” to be read.

ex 5.3.4 “Linked reading”: Nah 2:14 as part of peshet in Unit 9

The above explanations presuppose a distinct separation between the problematic peshet interpretation and the following lemma, “Behold I am against you.” In the *editio princeps*, Allegro revised his reading to that which has been accredited to Hans Bardtke, connecting the phrase to Nah 2:14.⁵⁹ Horgan followed suit: “for regarding one hanged alive upon the tree [it] reads: BEHOLD I AM. . . .” The connection may be further strengthened by the fact, observed by Horgan, that there is no vacat between the peshet interpretation

1–2, line 6 is restored in a similar fashion. Horgan associates the formula here with the more common peshet formula אָשֶׁר אָמַר (179, 243).

⁵⁷ Wilcox proposes a similar function for the word כִּי in the Temple Scroll (“‘Upon the Tree’,” 90). Taking מִקּוֹלֵי as a disambiguating, univalently passive participle, he understands 11QT as: “for מִקּוֹלֵי אֱלֹהִים is referred to by the [קָלְלָה אֱלֹהִים], i.e., the hanged one.” Addressing the lack of agreement between מִקּוֹלֵי . . . and הַלְוִי he tentatively suggests: “Has the whole the meaning: ‘“a curse of God’ (MT) refers to ‘the accursed of God and men’ thus constituting a midrash on the words of Scripture?’” (n. 27). This כִּי structure is similar to “for ‘the one hanged upon the tree’ is referred to [by the lemma].” Wilcox’ view is instructive as a formal parallel to the “explicative” reading of 4QpNah proposed here, but it seems more likely that the כִּי in 11QT is simply a repetition of the כִּי from the original biblical text. Cf. Fitzmyer, “Crucifixion,” 507.

⁵⁸ One would have preferred, e.g., “for the one hanged alive is called מִטְרָף” or “for God called the one hanged alive upon the wood, מִטְרָף” (cf. CD VI,6 “that God called them all princes”). These readings do not accommodate the traces in the damaged text.

⁵⁹ “denn über den lebendig an [das] Holz Gehängten [hei]sst es: *Siehe, ich will an [dich] . . .*” (in *Die Handschriftenfunde*, 1958, 298). He was followed by Horgan, Lohse, J. Maier, Skehan (“For with reference to living men hanged on a tree He—i.e., God—declares, ‘Behold, . . .’” in “A New Translation,” 120–21), Vermes (“Because of a man hanged alive on [the] tree, He proclaims, ‘Behold . . .’”). See Dupont-Sommer, “Le Commentaire,” 67.

and the lemma.⁶⁰ Horgan seeks a similar structure to the one proposed here, in 4QpIsa^b 2:7:

(6) . . . EXULTING IN IT. (Isa 5:11–14) These are the Scoffers (7) who are in Jerusalem. They are the ones who “REJECTED THE LAW . . .” (Isa 5:24c–25).

She sees this parallel as countering objections that the linking of interpretation and subsequent lemma would “violate pesher structure.” However, the overall structure of 4QpIsa^b is very different from that of 4QpNah.⁶¹

Nonetheless, as demonstrated in our mapping of equivalents in ch. 5, there is support for the linked reading within 4QpNah itself. One of the objections raised to this reading has been the double-duty forced upon the lemma. The phrase “Behold I am against you” appears to be applied both backwards and forward.⁶² Closer attention to the interpretation of unit 9 reveals that the pesher interpretation is of the identifying sort, and begins its identification with “and your multitude.” “Behold I am against you” is ignored in the extant interpretation and seems not to have been addressed at all in pesher unit 9.⁶³ This increases the likelihood that these words

⁶⁰ The strength of this argument depends on the regularity with which 4QpNah features a vacat between pesher and subsequent lemma, a datum which is less clear than Horgan believes. See ch. 9.

⁶¹ 4QpIsa^b does not feature the systematic application of exegetical techniques that is obviously at work in 4QpNah. The long text citations in 4QpIsa^b are interrupted only by brief identifications of people, place, and time. In addition to this “connecting phrase” at 4QpIsa^b 2:7, pre-citation formulae occur at 1:3, and apparently at 3:8. Also, the second citation in the pair we have cited from 4QpIsa^b is ten verses after the first one. In contrast, 4QpNah is characterized by the citation of strictly consecutive text, and by well-balanced and exegetically connected lemmas and pesher interpretations. In 4QpIsa^b it is impossible to tell whether the pesher to Isa 5:24 is found before or after the lemma; both “interpretations” simply identify the subject of the verses as the arrogant men of Jerusalem. Since the detail in 4QpNah reflects greater lemma/pesher correspondence and a more defined complex structure, a breach of structure does require justification.

⁶² Thus, Yadin, in rejecting the linked reading, states that it is “nullified by the fact that the following Pesher deals with the above verse from Nahum (i.e. the quotation is the beginning of a new Pesher).” Cf. the detailed discussion by Dupont-Sommer (“Le Commentaire,” 67–68).

Yadin’s motive for rejecting the linked reading was his presupposition that the use of Nah 2:14 in unit 9 necessarily entailed a condemnation of the crucifier. This is not the case with the interpretation put forth here.

⁶³ Strugnell accounts for the variant (masc.) suffixes in lines 8–9 of the pesher, as follows, “Elle s’explique par le fait que le verset, qui parlait, selon le TM, de la cité, a été interprété ici de l’homme הַלְוִי” (“Notes,” 209). Actually, verse 2:14

were associated backward, to the hanged one. קרא could denote either “it is proclaimed” or “it is read.”

A bifurcation of the lemma is thus in order. The hanged one of the previous peshet is associated with the first part of the lemma, “Behold I am against you, it is the declar[ation of the Lord of Hosts.” However, the rest of the lemma, “I will burn in smoke you]r [multitude] . . .” leads forward to the ensuing peshet interpretation, which is independent of the “hanged one.” “Behold I am against you” is thus singled out as addressing the hanged one. The formulaic כ flags the identification, in a manner similar to that discussed in reference to our proposed “explicative” interpretation of this unit, above.⁶⁴

The conventional understanding of the “linked reading” presumes a judicial perspective, and depends upon an implicit appeal to Deut 21:22–23.⁶⁵ The use of Deut 21:22–23 to condemn the hanging execution of criminals by hanging would remain problematic. The use of these verses to support Jannaeus’s actions would be somewhat more viable with this reading than in the earlier reading.⁶⁶ However, the required connections between Nahum and Deuteronomy depend upon a great deal of literary association that does not really add up to a legal argument.⁶⁷

as a whole is generally understood to be applied to the one who orchestrated the hangings, and not to the hanged one. In ch. 4, we identified the subject of the peshet as Jannaeus.

Baumgarten’s explanation of the תלי חי as the one who hangs people alive, would eliminate the distinction between the two subjects, since the Young Lion is the crucifier (“Hanging and Treason,” 14–16). But cf. Bernstein, “Early Jewish Exegesis,” 34–35, n. 25 for the impossibility of having תלי חי function as an active participle.

⁶⁴ In effect, we are supposing a peshet sub-unit “8a,” which exhibits a reversed form: rather than “lemma ‘x’; its interpretation is identification ‘y,’” we have “for regarding identification ‘x’ is how we read lemma ‘y.’” “For of the one hanged alive upon a tree, it is proclaimed (or, ‘Scripture calls’, or ‘it is read’), ‘Behold I am against you . . .’”

⁶⁵ Cf. sections III.1.a–b of this chapter above. One advantage of this linked reading is that the divine wrath of Nah 2:14 is identified with the divine curse in the Pentateuchal קללת אלהים.

⁶⁶ By hanging the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things alive, Jannaeus fulfilled ancient biblical law, for “of the one hanged alive upon the tree” Nahum proclaims “Behold I am against you.” Thus, Dupont-Sommer says of the peshet: “Il présente simplement une observation d’ordre juridique concernant la punition infligée aux Pharisiens” (*CRAIBL*, 717).

⁶⁷ The כ remains somewhat enigmatic in this interpretation, and the relationships between Deuteronomy, the peshet interpretation, and the verses of Nahum are unclear. The author of the peshet would depend upon his reader to recognize

Our own “explicative” understanding of this linked reading retains a possible echo of Deuteronomy 21. However, the role of the allusion is not to justify or condemn Jannaeus, judging his actions in relation to Deuteronomy. Rather it aims to strengthen the sense that the crucifixions were the fulfillment of the prophecy of *Nahum*. We do not see the pesher as stating that “the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things were hanged because God hates them.” We see the pesher as conveying, “Nahum 2:13 is about the hanging of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things in conformity with ancient law, as Nahum 2:14, ‘Behold I am against you’, is proclaimed against the one hanged alive, (i.e. one who embodied Deut 21:22–23 in being a traitor,⁶⁸ hanged alive upon a tree, and cursed by God).” Deuteronomy is not interpreted polemically, with technical exegetical language. Its language is adapted allusively, literarily. The crucifixion of the traitors pegged on the predation in verse 13b is connected to the divine antagonism of verse 14 by the Deuteronomic expression of God’s cursing of hanged traitors.

If we accept that the author of 4QpNah interpreted Deut 21:23 in the way in which it is reflected in the Temple Scroll, then the Pentateuchal verses provide suitable expression for linking the verses in Nahum. For the author of 11QT, the proper fulfillment of the Pentateuchal verse entails hanging “alive,” a category that certainly includes crucifixion. It is possible that the Qumran Community itself might have favored effecting this punishment in some manner other than crucifixion. Even so, when confronted with Jannaeus’s act as *fait accompli*, in terms of fulfilling the law in Deuteronomy, the language of 4QpNah shows that the author was more impressed by the fact that he hanged traitors alive, fulfilling the biblical injunction, than by the particular mode of hanging which neither specifically fulfilled nor violated the biblical words.⁶⁹

a reference to ancient law as recalling the expression “hanged upon a tree” in Deuteronomy, just as the reader would need to identify Nahum’s “Behold I am against you” as a paraphrase of “accused by God.”

⁶⁸ See notes 44–46, above, esp. Cohen. Wise translates אִישׁ רָכִיל in 11QT as “traitor” (Wise, Abegg, Cook, 490).

⁶⁹ Yadin n. 11 p. 378 of *The Temple Scroll* summarizes: “Baumgarten agrees with my view that the subject in the scroll [4QpNah] is hanging that results in death. He also shares my opinion that the scroll undoubtedly ruled that the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things deserved the penalty of hanging for their deeds. He does not believe that crucifixion is the specific theme in the scroll. In fact, that was not my contention, although I do have doubts whether the members of the sect differentiated

In fact, no reference to Deuteronomy 21:23 is mandated by our interpretation. This reading is most effective in conjunction with two of Yadin's positions. (1) The author of the pesher believed that certain traitors were to be executed by hanging (i.e. they shared the view presented in 11QT). (2) the lacuna preceding "aforetimes in Israel" asserted this legal precedent. Unlike Yadin, we do not see any exegesis of Deuteronomy in the pesher.⁷⁰

Additional support may be offered for supposing an anti-Pharisaic valence to the phrase, "Behold, I am against you, it is the declaration of the Lord of h[os]ts." The very same phrase appears again in Nah 3:5, and is cited in 3-4 II, 10 of 4QpNah, in the midst of an anti-Pharisaic passage. This is not a blanket acceptance of Yadin's argument that the sect would be unlikely to condemn an enemy of the Seekers-After-Smooth-Things. However, it is an acknowledgment of his observation that "the main objective of the Pesher [is] an attack on the other Jewish sects, and in particular the דורשי החלקות." Any understanding of the pesher requires an appreciation of its solipsistic focus. Sectarian evaluation of non-sectarians is based entirely on the relationship of the Other to the Community. References to outsiders consist of accusations about their evil nature and deeds in contrast to the Community; depictions of their suffering for rejecting the True Way embraced by the Community; and anticipation of their future acceptance of the Way, or their future punishment for refusing to do so. It is most reasonable to suppose that Pericope 2 of 4QpNah fits within this rubric, and views the executions as a cause for triumphalism over the arch-enemies the Pharisees, rather than condemnation of Jannaeus in some way that is not directly related to the Community.

between hanging alive—that is, at the end of a rope- and crucifixion." (Note that Baumgarten's early proposal that Jannaeus "took [the verse in Deut] to mean 'hanged alive'" did indicate that he took crucifixion to be the theme of the pesher.)

Similarly, the author of the pesher did not react to other horrifying details of the executions: the strangulation of wives and children, the festive air, the carousing, etc., but focused only on the fact that the Seekers were deserving of being hanged to death. (This is *contra* Nitzan. Cf. ch. 5 on מעתהו.)

⁷⁰ Such exegesis can be found in col. LXIV of the Temple Scroll, although even there, "association" may be a better description for the use of some of the Pentateuchal texts in the passage (see the sources cited in n. 45 above).

ex 5.3.5 *Prolonged Exposure*

Having demonstrated that the thrust of unit 9 of Peshar Nahum is the defeat of the Pharisees, we may re-visit the question of whether Jannaeus might indeed have violated Deut 21: 23 by prolonged exposure of his victims.⁷¹ We maintain that the author of the peshar could nonetheless have expressed approval of the hanging execution of the Pharisees, even if Jannaeus did violate the letter of the Torah (i.e. by leaving the corpses suspended as well as killing family members) as well as its spirit (i.e. by the flagrant carousing and frivolity surrounding the torture and death of the victims). More important than whether he approved or not, he saw this event as a fulfillment of Nahum via fulfillment of Deuteronomy. If Deuteronomy warns that prolonged exposure creates a state of cursedness and defilement, overexposure of the Seekers will have produced just such a state. The message of the peshar would remain as we have stated. But it may be possible that the peshar also incorporated an accusation against Jannaeus for having left the carcasses hanging as prey for birds, which is an abomination in Israel. The following speculative re-construction is offered: וילך אותם על העץ וזאת נבלה] בישראל מלפנים.

“For the hanged one” would re-affirm the application of the lemma to the victims of this abominable act. The “linked reading” would still be smoothest: “for of the one hanged alive upon a tree” (and left exposed, entailing an impure abomination) it is proclaimed “Behold I am against you.”⁷² Through paronomasia, נבלה of Deut 21:23 would

⁷¹ See the view of H. Eshel, n. 39 above.

⁷² Baumgarten, in explaining why there could be no basis for a *halakhic* acceptance of crucifixion, argued that crucifixion intrinsically entailed prolonged exposure of the victim. (“*TLH*,” 172–82). He maintained that 11QT could not refer to crucifixion, since that prolonged means of execution could not be compatible with the Pentateuchal injunction to remove the corpse by sundown. (In “*TLH*,” 177–79, he presented ancient accounts of prolonged impalement/crucifixion deaths). However, this sort of argument addresses the solidity of a particular exegesis of the verse itself, rather than the question of whether a given source may have interpreted the verse this way. Following Baumgarten’s reasoning, 4QpNah could be seen as claiming that the curse of Deuteronomy was specifically applicable in the case of crucifixions, since in that slow manner of death, it was inevitable that the corpse would remain past nightfall. This would also explain the peshar’s seeming emphasis on “alive.”

However, any discussion of Deuteronomy 21:23 must contend with the tension between exposure and non-exposure already present in the Pentateuch itself. Thus, although Deuteronomy expressly forbids overexposure, even the rabbinic post-mortem hanging requires some exposure; in fact, the exposure is the entire basis for rabbinic hanging, since it does not effect execution. Baumgarten’s objection regarding the incompatibility of crucifixion and removal by sundown is not so convincing,

be associated with the impurity in the same verse, and with טרף in Nahum. For the equation of נבלה and טרפה, see Lev 7:24; 17:15; 22:8; Ezek 44:31.⁷³ Leibel had suggested that the peshet relies upon Mal 2:11 and Deut 17:4, and restored [תועבה].⁷⁴ נבלה seems a more appropriate choice for conveying this concept. The two meanings of נבלה, (1) dead body and (2) abomination, are described as derivatives of a single root in *HALOT*.⁷⁵ Also, the expression is particularly suitable to the lacuna, as six of the thirteen occurrences of נבלה in the Bible are described as נבלה בישראל. The source of the curse in Deuteronomy, and of the divine wrath in Nah 2:14 as applied in the peshet, would be the defilement of the land by the exposure of the hanged corpse, constituting an abomination. From the perspective of 4QpNah, Jannaeus's crucifixion of his Pharisaic opponents involved the retribution of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, and the fulfillment of the word of Nahum, as indicated by Deut 21:22.⁷⁶

To summarize the literary aspects of the above discussion:

1) It is illogical for 4QpNah to use Deuteronomy 21:22–23 to condemn crucifixion. These verses mandate hanging of some sort, and cannot be read as forbidding crucifixion.⁷⁷ Moreover, the peshet's

then. Baumgarten's attempt to minimize the extent to which Deuteronomy may be associated with the exposure of hanged bodies cannot change the fact that exposure is required by the verse.

⁷³ Early thinking along a similar line of this textual reconstruction may be found in Rabin ("Alexander Jannaeus," 10), "perhaps 'he wrought an abomination in Israel.'"

⁷⁴ "הערה," 12.

⁷⁵ This concept is developed by W.M.W. Roth who further associates this original root with the Akkadian *nabālu*, "tearing out" ("NBL," *VT* 10 [1960]: 394–409).

⁷⁶ It is true that Josephus does not directly accuse Jannaeus of express violation of Deuteronomy, and we would have expected his criticism to include this aspect of Jannaeus's impropriety if it were applicable. Still, the general barbaric nature of the act might have overshadowed the technical *halakhic* violation for the historian. There may be some hint of such a transgression of this law in Jannaeus's deathbed admonition to his wife Salome. His urging of the inclusion of the Pharisees in the planning of his funeral was prompted by his fear of a reprisal by them against his corpse. Post-mortem vengeance might most reasonably have been feared as a sort of *quid pro quo* in retaliation for similar abuse by Jannaeus against their compatriots. In *Ant* 13 §403–4, Alexander expresses his belief that the Pharisees may want to suffer indignities upon his dead body, including leaving his body unburied; presumably he anticipates retaliation for his treatment of the crucified Pharisees. This may be a hint that he did indeed violate Deut 21:23, even according to the understanding in the Temple Scroll.

⁷⁷ At most, the biblical injunction against prolonged exposure can be seen as a practical reason to implement hanging by some method other than crucifixion; it cannot be taken as an outright prohibition of crucifixion.

focus in this pericope is its opposition to the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things. The disputed phrase should accommodate this perspective rather than introduce a contextually irrelevant condemnation of the opponent of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things.

(2) In fact, any elliptical allusion to the external source of Deuteronomy is problematic. Proponents of understanding 4QpNah in light of Deuteronomy must account for the lack of obvious exegetical or sectarian relevance of the verse, as well as for the unusual technical aspects of the Pentateuchal “reference.”⁷⁸

(3) We have suggested that the allusion to the verse was neither legal nor overtly exegetical, but rather stylistic or literary. The biblically-centered author found Deuteronomy to be a useful vehicle for expressing his interpretation, since the Pentateuchal verse encompassed the key elements of his pesher: divine opposition to traitors executed by hanging. This “explicative” understanding of the gloss lacks the provocative attractions of the other options, though it avoids some of their pitfalls as well.

(3a) The lack of any element of the lemma in the problematic phrase makes this choice unlikely with the non-linked reading.

(3b) With the linked reading, the “explicative” interpretation focuses upon the fulfillment of Nahum. Nahum refers to these rebels who were hanged alive in accordance with ancient Jewish law, for it is of these hanged ones that Nahum writes when he speaks of the opposition of God. The echo of Deuteronomy here is not legal but theological and deterministic, evidence for prophetic fulfillment. The force of “hanged alive” is not to support crucifixion *per se*, but to present Jannaeus as having fulfilled Deuteronomy by hanging the guilty ones alive, and to prompt the association of their execution with their being cursed, thereby fulfilling the words of Nahum.

Therefore, the preferred reading is the linked reading in which the author of the pesher sees the Young Lion’s hanging of the Seekers-After-Smooth Things as fulfilling Nahum’s prophecy of a lion filling his lairs with prey; he sees the fate of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things as evidence of God’s opposition to them.

⁷⁸ Yadin’s proposal interjects Deuteronomy into 4QpNah, without any explanation of how the reference would help demonstrate prophetic fulfillment.

CHAPTER SIX

PERICOPE 3, UNITS 11–16: HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

Frgs 3–4 II,1–III,8 on Nah 3:1–9

Col. II

- 1 *vac*... הוי עיר הדמים כולה [כחש פר] קַמ[ל] אה
- 2 פשרו היא עיר אפרים דורשי החלקות לאחרית הימים אשר בכחש
ושקר[...].]תהלכו
- 3 לא ימוש טרף וקול שוט וקול רעש אופן וסוס דהר ומרכבה מרקדה
פרש מעלה להוב
- 4 וברק חנית ורוב חלל וכבוד פגר ואין קץ לגויה וכשלו וגויתם *vac*
פשרו על ממשלת דורשי החלקות
- 5 אשר לא ימוש מקרב עדתם חרב גוים שבי ובו ותרחור בינותם ונלות
מפחד אויב ורוב
- 6 פנאי אשמה יפולו בימיהם ואין קץ לכלל חלליהם ואף בנוית בשרם יכשולו
בעצת אשמתם
- 7 מרוב זנוני זונה טובת חן ובעלת כשפים הממכרת גוים בזנותה
ומשפחות ב[כ]שפיה
- 8 פשר[ו] ע[ל] מחעי אפרים *vac* אשר בתלמוד שקרם ולשון כזביהם ושפת
מרמה יתער רכים
- 9 מלכים שרים כוהנים ועם עם נר גלזה ערים ומשפחות יובדו בעצתם
נ[כ]בדים ומושלים
- 10 יפולו [מז]עם לשונם *vac* הנני אליך נאם יהוה צ[בא]ת וגלית]
- 11 שול[ך] על פניך והרא[ת] ג[וים מער[ך]] וממלכות /// קלונך פשרו
[.....]°
- 12 [... ערי המזרח כי השול[ת]ם].....]

Col. III, 1–8

- 1 הגוים בנ[ך]חם [ובש] קוצי תועבותותיהם והשלכתי עליך שקוצים
[ונ]בלתיך ושמתוך
- 2 כאורה והיה כול רואיך ידודו ממך *vac*
- 3 פשרו על דורשי החלקות אשר באחרית הקץ ינלו מעשיהם הרעים לכול
ישראל
- 4 ורכים יבינו בעוונם ושנאום וכארום על זדון אשמתם ובה[נ]לות כבוד
יהודה
- 5 ידוד פחאי אפרים מתוך קהלם ועזבו את מתעיהם ונלוו על °[.].] ישראל
ואמרו
- 6 שודדה נינוה מי ינוד לה מאין אבקשה מנחמים לך *vac* פשרו[.].] דורשי
החלקות אשר תובד עצתם ונפרדה כנסתם ולא יוסיפו עוד לחעות [.] קהל
ופת[א]ים
- 8 לא יחזקו עוד את עצתם *vac*

Frgs 3–4 II,1–III,8

Col. II

Nah 3:1a **Woe, city of blood! She is all [deception, with pillage] she is filled**

2 Its *pesher*: “she” is the **city** of Ephraim, the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things at the end of days, that the[y will] conduct themselves in **deception** and falsehoo[ds].

3 *Nah 3:1b-3* **There will not cease predation, nor the sound of the whip and the sound of the rumbling of the wheel, and the galloping horse, and the charging chariot. Lunging horseman! Flame 4 and flash of spear! And a multitude of slain and a mass of corpses! and there is no end of (dead) bodi(es) and they will stumble over their bodies** Its *pesher*: concerning the domain of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things

5 that there shall not **cease** from the midst of their congregation the sword of Gentiles, captivity, and plunder, and fever among them, and exile from fear of the enemy; and a **multitude** of

6 guilty **corpses** will fall in their days, and **there will be no end** to the sum of their **slain**, and even over their fleshly **bodies** they shall **stumble**, by their guilty counsel.

7 *Nah 3:4* **Because of the many harlotries of the harlot, charmingly pleasing, and mistress of sorceries, who betrays nations through her harlotries and families through her sor[ce]ries**

8 [Its] *pesher*: concer[ning] the misleaders of Ephraim, who mislead many by their false teaching, and their lying tongue and their wily lip;

9 kings, princes, priests, and populace together with the resident alien. Cities and **clans** will perish through their counsel, n[ob]les and rul[ers]

10 will fall [by the fur]y of their tongue. *Nah 3:5* **“Behold I am against you,” it is the declaration of the Lord of h[os]ts, “and you will uncover**

11 [your] skirts up over your face; you will sh[ow] nat[ions] [your] nakedness and kingdoms your shame Its *pesher*: [

12 . . .]cities of the east, for the **skir[t]s** [. . .

Col. III, 1–8

1 and the **nations** in their de[filem]ent and in their [det]estable abominations. *Nah 3:6-7a* **And I will cast upon you detested things, and I will [de]grade you, and I will make you**

2 **despicable. And it will be that all who see you will flee from you** *vac*

3 Its *pesher*: concerning the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things that at the end of time their evil deeds will be **revealed** to all Israel,

4 and many will understand their iniquity and hate them and **despise them** because of their insolent guilt. And upon the revelation of the glory of Judah,

5 the simple ones of Ephraim will flee from the midst of their congregation and will leave those who mislead them and will join themselves to Israel. ^{Nah 3:7b} *And they will say,*

6 *‘Nineveh is despoiled; who will mourn for her?’ Where shall I seek comforters for you?’* Its *peshet*. [concerning] the Seekers-

7 after-Smooth-Things that their council will perish and their assembly will be broken up and they will not continue to lead [the] congregation astray and the simp[le]

8 will not support their counsel any more. *vac*

Unlike the case in Pericope 2, it is not appropriate to speak of a “consensus” regarding the historical context of Pericope 3. The conventional association of Pericope 2 with Alexander Jannaeus and his Pharisaic opponents was discussed in ch. 4. It is generally accepted that Pericope 3 continues to focus on the Pharisees, but there is no agreement about the time period in which the pericope has been set. The following assessments have been offered. (1) Flusser and Amusin identified the historical context of 4QpNah 3–4 col. II as the reign of the Hasmonean queen Salome Alexandra, the wife and successor of Jannaeus (76–67 BCE).¹ (2) Dupont-Sommer argued in favor of a slightly later context, placing the events described in the *peshet* during the period of Salome’s sons Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II (67–63 BCE).² (3) Schiffman suggests that col. II, like the preceding column, refers to the reign of Alexander Jannaeus himself (c. 88 BCE).³ In the concluding section of this chapter these three views are presented and evaluated.⁴

First, it is necessary to discuss some key phrases that have affected the formation of these views. Pericope 3 employs a number of

¹ Flusser, “פרושים צדוקים,” 136; “כת מדבר יהודה והפרושים,” 457; Amusin, “Éphraïm et Manassé,” 389–96; “Historical Events,” 143–45. So, too, Horgan, 161, Fröhlich, “Le Genre Littéraire des *Pesharim* du Qumran,” *RevQ* 12 (1986): 391.

² “Observations,” 201–26; “Le Commentaire,” 55–88. In his interpretation of 4QpNah he views the *peshet* as addressing three Hasmonean monarchs: Alexander Jannaeus, Hyrcanus II, Aristobulus II (“Le Commentaire,” 87). These are the same figures found by him in 4QTestimonia, but see the rebuttal of H. Eshel, “The Historical Background of the *Peshet* Interpreting Joshua’s Curse on the Rebuilder of Jericho,” *RevQ* 15 (1991–92): 409–20.

³ “Pharisees and Sadducees,” 281.

⁴ Cf. Tantlevskij, “Historical Background,” 329–338. J. Maier had raised this possibility alongside the hypothesis of Flusser (i.e., the period of Salome) in “Weitere Stucke,” 245. An earlier proposal by Gaster to associate col. III of 4QpNah with the Samaritans is no longer considered tenable (*TDSS*, 341). For a discussion of the relationship between the use of “Ephraim” as a sobriquet for the Samaritans, and for the opponents of the Qumran Community, see ch. 4. Doudna associates this pericope with Pompey, but views the *peshet* as predictive, rather than historical.

expressions that appear to be technical terms. The first section of this chapter investigates (1) the use of “Ephraim” in genitive construct form with the words (a) עיר (b) מתעי and (c) פתאי; (2) the word תלמוד; and (3) the epithet “Judah” and the phrase ובהגלות כבוד יהודה. Most attempts to determine the historical context of this pericope have begun with the phrase ממשלת דורשי החלקות in line 4 of col. II. Scholars have been also been influenced by the phrase אחרית הימים in line 2 of that column. The second section of this chapter will address these two phrases as they pertain to the historical framework of the pericope. The final section will evaluate proposals for the historical contextualization of Pericope 3, with particular attention to unit 12.

6.1 TECHNICAL TERMS

6.1.1 *Ephraim*

In ch. 4, we discussed the use of the epithet “Ephraim” at Qumran and determined that this term functioned both as a general name for those outside the Qumran Community and as a particular designation for the Pharisees. In Pericope 2, Ephraim appeared in a damaged section of frag 3–4 I,12. In Pericope 3, the term is much more accessible, and is used with a number of qualifiers, as follows:

6.1.1.1 עיר אפרים

There has been some disagreement as to whether the “city of Ephraim” is a purely sociological term, referring to the Pharisees themselves as a group, or whether the term has any geographic valence, representing the city of Jerusalem as the locus of Pharisaic dominance.

Dupont-Sommer views the city of Ephraim as Jerusalem, specifically, “official Jerusalem.”⁵ Since Ephraim is equivalent to the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, the city of Ephraim is the city of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, i.e. the Pharisaic Jerusalem Establishment (as today one would refer to “Washington,” “Moscow,” or “the Vatican”). Tantlevskij takes the term “city” in an even more concrete fashion. He views this pesher as referring to the physical city, identifying the city of Ephraim as “Jerusalem captured by the Pharisees.”⁶

⁵ “Le Commentaire,” 71; “Observations,” 208. See ch. 4 on “Jerusalem” in Pericope 2.

⁶ “Historical Background,” 333. Tantlevskij maintains that upon the defeat of

Flusser objects to the literal interpretation of “city” in the pesher, insisting that the word be taken symbolically, as an indication of a community. He notes that the Qumran sect is described as a fortified city in 1QH XIV,25. He points to the use of further building imagery in the comparison of the sect to a house or Temple in IQS V,6–11; IX,5–6; XI,8.⁷ J. Maier discusses the use of “city” to denote community (“Gemeinde”) in “eschatological” circles.⁸ For Flusser, the “city of blood” refers to the community of the Pharisees, with no geographic intent.⁹

However, the definite symbolic valence of the term need not exclude the additional association of the Pharisaic community with the physical city of Jerusalem.¹⁰ It is true that the plural הַלְלוּ in the pesher indicates that “city” denotes members of a community rather than a geo-political entity. Nonetheless, there is a basis for situating this Community in the particular location of Jerusalem. 4QpIsa^c explicitly places the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things in Jerusalem, and 1QpHab implies the same situation.¹¹ Ezekiel 22 also supports the association of this pericope with Jerusalem. In Ezekiel, the “bloody city” is the city of Jerusalem, as defiled by its corrupt inhabitants,

Alexander Jannaeus at Shechem, the Pharisees officially established control in Jerusalem.

⁷ “פרושים, צדוקים,” 145–49. For building imagery and the sect’s opponents, see Nitzan, pp. 11, 13, 45, 166. For the imagery in both positive and negative contexts, see Licht, *בנילה הסרכים* para. 103, pp. 171–72; and *בנילה ההוריה*, 117, on 1QH XIV,26 (VI,26, in Licht’s numbering system), in which he notes the influence of Isa 28:16–17. See too, Carmignac, *Les Textes*, II, 112.

⁸ “Weitere Stücke,” 228 n. 76; 241–42; *Die Texte* (Ann.1) II, 93, 148, 165.

⁹ 1QpHab X,6, in interpreting Hab 2:12 which decries those “who build the city in blood,” applies the verse to the Spouter of Lies, a figure associated with the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things. The association of the Liar with the city of blood in 1QpHab, and of Ephraim with the city of blood and with the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things here, strengthens our composite understanding of this group as opponents of the Community. The accusation that the opponents walked in כהש may also be relevant to the ancient stereotype of Pharisees as “hypocrites,” discussed in 4.1.2 above (*Seekers-after-Smooth-Things*/ההלכות/הדרש).

¹⁰ See the urban association of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things in fig. 4–3.

¹¹ 4QpIsa^c frag. 23 II,10–11 “The pesher of the matter in regard to the end of days concerns the S[earchers-After-]Smooth-Things who are in Jerusalem.” In 1QpHab XII,7, the “city” of Hab 2:17 is identified as Jerusalem. Moreover, the secondary citation of the lemma features the phrase “blood of the city” (דמי קרייה), rather than “blood of man” (דמי אדם) as appears in the initial citation and MT (the word קרייה appears later in the verse). There seems to be a deliberate attempt to strengthen the identification of Jerusalem as the bloody city. Cf. Isa 28:14, in which Isaiah addresses the “men of Scoffing, the rulers of this nation who are in Jerusalem” (כזב, שקר) who hide behind deceit and lies (אנשי לצון משלי העם הזה אשר בירושלם).

particularly its leadership.¹² Ezekiel's "city of blood" is a city that sinned in blood and will experience retribution in blood. Although Nahum itself predates Ezekiel, Ezekiel's use of the epithet probably strengthened the identification of the bloody city with "Ephraim" for the author of 4QpNah.

6.1.1.1 מַחֲעֵי אֶפְרַיִם

4QpNah 3–4 II,8 identifies מַחֲעֵי אֶפְרַיִם as the subject of the pesher upon Nah 3:4. The phrase may be taken as either an objective or partitive genitive.¹³ The former is generally assumed, in translations such as "those who lead Ephraim astray."¹⁴ The latter would indicate, "those of Ephraim who lead [others] astray."¹⁵

¹² Ezek 22:2 uses the term עִיר הַדְּמוּיִם to describe Jerusalem at the eve of her destruction by Babylonia. The prophet decries the fact that Jerusalem is bloodied by murder, and guilty of multitudes of social, moral, and religious transgressions that have led to bloodshed. He specifies the desecration of Holy days, defiling of sexual relationships, and perversion of justice for monetary gain (bringing to mind the "three nets of Belial" in CD IV,15, פְּמִאָה הַמְקַדֵּשׁ, (הוֹן, זָנוּת, פְּמִאָה הַמְקַדֵּשׁ)). In ghastly imagery, Ezek 24:6–14 develops the image of the city of blood as a pot, filled with filth and with its own blood, that will be consumed by divine fire.

Spronk (118) addresses the question of whether this epithet was originally used of Jerusalem within the Hebrew Bible itself (so Jeremias) or of Nineveh (Spronk's own view).

¹³ It is not likely that a subjective genitive is intended, with מַחֲעֵי as a passive participle ("those whom are led astray by Ephraim"). For a helpful examination of subjective vs. objective genitive constructions, cf. Bernstein, "Early Jewish Exegesis," 23, n.5 and the sources cited there. The subject of his investigation is Deut 21:23 קָלְלָהּ אֱלֹהִים and 11QT LXIV,12 מִקְּוֵלֵי אֱלֹהִים (see our excursus to ch. 5). See also Waltke and O'Connor, pp. 141–54, 616–17. In a subjective genitive the *nomen rectum* (סוּמֵן) and the modifying term, i.e. the second term of the word pair) is the subject of the verb that is implicit in the *nomen regens* (בְּסוּמֵן). In an objective genitive, the *nomen rectum* is the object of the verb implied in the first term.

¹⁴ Thus, Allegro ("More Unpublished Pieces," 306; DJD V, 40); Gaster (315); Ben Zion Wacholder, ("A Qumran Attack on the Oral Exegesis? The Phrase *šr bilmud šqm* in 4 Q Peshar Nahum," *RevQ* 5 [1966]: 578); Brownlee, ("beguiling teachers"); Hoenig, ("misleaders," 120), Doudna (519). Horgan states, "Ephraim here probably refers to the followers of the Pharisees (cf. פֹּהֲאֵי אֶפְרַיִם in 3–4 III,5), who are led astray by the leaders" (184). Dupont-Sommer similarly describes Ephraim in this phrase as representing the masses who are misled by the Pharisees ("Le Commentaire," 60, 75; "Observations," 210). However, his designations are rather fuzzy in general. He has "Ephraim" serve as a sobriquet for Hyrcanus II, as well as for the Pharisees, and for the general Jewish populace who fell under the sway of the Pharisees ("Le Commentaire," 74). Amusin describes the מַחֲעֵי אֶפְרַיִם as the Pharisaic leaders who lead the populace astray. He seems to take "Ephraim" in this phrase as referring both to those who mislead and to those who are misled. He states that "Ephraim" refers to the Pharisees, but that there are Pharisaic leaders, and Pharisaic followers, the "simple of Ephraim" (cf. "Historical Events," 142, 145, 151).

¹⁵ This appears as a secondary possibility in Wacholder, "A Qumran Attack,"

One important difference between the two lies in the characterization of Ephraim as a whole. Is Ephraim basically a neutral pool of people, some of whom are led astray by these “misleaders” (as supposed by the objective genitive construction Ephraim),¹⁶ or is Ephraim a guilty Community, all of whom sin, and some of whom cause other people to sin (as in the partitive genitive)? In ch. 4 we drew the conclusion that the term covered a range of Pharisaic affiliation. As Schiffman states, “apparently, large groups of Jews had allegiance to the teachings of these groups without full membership.”¹⁷ Ephraim appears to have been a somewhat fluid term used of both the Pharisaic leadership, and of the masses of Jews who tended to support that leadership. In this particular phrase in unit 13, the partitive genitive seems more logical. The misleaders among Ephraim are those who cause others, including non-Pharisees, to stray. Those who are misled in the peshet do not seem to be Pharisees alone, but rather are comprised of larger segments of the population.

6.1.1.2 פתאי אפרים

Pericope 3 contains another partitive genitive with אפרים, in addition to מזהעי אפרים, and in reaction to that term. 4QpNah 3–4 III,5 states that פתאי אפרים, “the simple ones of Ephraim,” will abandon those who mislead them (מזהעיהם).

In theory, פתאי אפרים could be a subjective genitive, indicating “those who were beguiled by Ephraim,” with Ephraim as the Pharisees, and these followers as unaffiliated Jews. But the contrast with מזהעי אפרים and the parallel with the other terms in this peshet interpretation argue for an identification of Ephraim itself as a term for the general population, which is described as being under Pharisaic influence.¹⁸ The subject of the peshet is the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things,

575–578; as well as in one of Allegro’s manuscripts and one of Brownlee’s. Cf. Cook, “deceivers ‘from’ Ephraim,” 219.

¹⁶ I.e., those whose actions are directed toward corrupting Ephraim.

¹⁷ “Pharisees and Sadducees,” 285–86. He states further, “For both the Pharisees and Sadducees we hear of the ‘retainers’, those followers who were at the outer fringes of the power elite but who were themselves part of the group in one way or another. In general, we realize that no group of Jews in this period could be expected to embrace such large numbers of people. Rather, they functioned by teaching and influencing, a process in which the Pharisees indeed excelled” (289).

¹⁸ Thus, Gaster translates here “those in Ephraim who have hitherto been duped” (316). Amusin states that, “In this context ‘the simple ones of Ephraim’ means either average people, ‘little ones’, who are influenced by the Pharisees, or more probably, the rank and file of the Pharisaic community” (he refers to his article “Ideological Affiliation,” pp. 3–10 [in Russian]).

and the point of the pesher is the future rejection of the Seekers-After-Smooth-Things by the general Jewish population, referred to as “all of Israel” (לכול ישראל, line 3), “many” (ורבים, line 4) and פתאי אפרים (line 5). In line 7, the term פתאים is repeated (partially restored), in the prediction that simple ones will no longer accept “their” counsel, with the “Seekers-after-Smooth-Things” as the referent of the resumptive pronominal suffix “their.”

The word פתאי implies gullibility. פתה in the *pi'el* means to entice, and in the *qal* the meaning is “to be simple” or “gullible.”¹⁹ א פתאי is a simple, naive person. At the same time, he is someone who has allowed himself to be deluded. The term פתאי can signify both acceptable and undesirable sorts of simplicity.²⁰ As a mildly negative epithet, it would describe its subject as unintelligent (thus, parallel with כסילים in Prov 1:32; 8:5); gullible (“believes everything” in Prov 14:15); or worse, subject to mis-guidance, seduction,²¹ and sin (Prov 14:18; 22:3; 27:12).²² Despite the fact that sin is a natural consequence of “simplicity,” the פתאי is not inherently evil. In the Bible, the פתאי is not only susceptible to wickedness, but is also a suitable recipient for divine assistance toward over-coming his short-coming (Ps 19:8; Ps 116:6; 119:130).

Thus, although the term is somewhat pejorative at Qumran, repentance is nonetheless foreseeable for the simple in our pesher. At 1QH X,9, the פתאי is contrasted to the פושע who is beyond help. The simple individual is one who is expected to be healed of this handicap by God.²³ In 1QpHab XII,4, the phrase “simple ones of

¹⁹ Cf. HALOT.

²⁰ Compare the word חם. Whereas חם can be neutral or positive, פתאי seems to be employed in the neutral to negative range. Flusser “כה מדבר יהודה והשקפיהיה” 93, n.19 associates the use of the term פתאי in 1QpHab XII,4 and 1QH X,9 with the NT usage of νήπιος, especially in Matt 11:25–30; Luke 10:21–22, “Thou hast hidden these things from the wise and understanding and have revealed them to babes.”

²¹ For the sexual connotations of פתה see Ex 22:15, Job 31:9. For the image of sexual seduction in representations of idolatry, and hence false teaching, see our next note, and our discussion of pesher unit 13 in ch. 7.

²² For susceptibility to idolatry in particular, see the use of the verb in Deut 11:16; I Ki 22:21–22 (and II Chron 18:19–21), and Ezek 14:9.

²³ In the non-symbolic context of CD XIII,3, it is stated that even if a priest is a פתאי he is still granted certain honors associated with his status. However, 1QS^a I,19–22 bars the פתאי from community services. Similarly, in CD XV,15–17 (and 4QD^b) the פתאי is included in a list of categories of disabled people to be barred from the Community. (Cf. Lawrence H. Schiffman, יהודה, בכת מדבר יהודה, ומשיחיות בכת מדבר יהודה, [Jerusalem: Merkaz Zalman Shazar le-toldot Yisra'el, 1993], 295.) See too CD

Judah” seems to refer to members of the Qumran Community.²⁴

Dupont-Sommer aptly describes the פתאים at Qumran as “sympathizers.” Nitzan similarly equates פתאים with “גלויים” the simple followers who are aligned with a particular group.

6.1.2 תלמוד

The word תלמוד in 4QpNah has received much attention. The key issue is semantic, stemming from the rabbinic use of the word as a term for the corpus of Oral Law that was redacted in the Mishna, c. 200 CE, and the Gemara, in the fourth and fifth centuries CE. Sidney B. Hoenig relied upon the term *talmud* in Peshar Nahum to support his attribution of a late date to the Dead Sea Scrolls, following the view of Solomon Zeitlin.²⁵

The use of the term in 4QpNah has also raised syntactic questions. We follow Allegro in taking אשר in the peshar as applying to a chain of three prepositional phrases by means of which “those who lead Ephraim astray” will “lead many astray.”²⁶ These three instruments

XV,11, in which the *hitpaal* הפתה is used to describe an initiate who fails his examination for entry into the Community. Daniel R. Schwartz renders the phrase, “lest he prove to be a fool” in *Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Charlesworth), 39.

²⁴ Thus, Dupont-Sommer (“Le Commentaire,” 79), Flusser (“פרושים, צדוקים” 140–41), and Amusin (*Teksty Kumrana*, 229 n. 71), though J. Maier disagrees (*Texte II*, 146). Cf. Horgan, 53.

²⁵ From 1962–1967 Hoenig and Zeitlin published a number of articles maintaining that תלמוד was a late tannaïtic word, and that its presence in Peshar Nahum was evidence of the medieval Karaite authorship of the document. Cf. Zeitlin, “Travesty,” 1–37; “The Expression B‘Talmud in the Scrolls Militates Against the Views of the Protagonists of Their Antiquity,” *JQR* 54 (1963): 89–97; and (1964): 340; “The Word BeTalmud and the Method of Congruity of Words,” *JQR* 58 (1967–68): 78–80. Hoenig, “What is the Explanation for the Term ‘B‘Talmud’ in the Scrolls?” *JQR* 53 (1962–63): 274–76; “BeTalmud and Talmud,” *JQR* 54 (1963–4): 334–39; “Dorshé Halakot,” 119–38; “The Peshar Nahum ‘Talmud,’” *JBL* 86 (1967): 441–45.

²⁶ “[Its] interpretation [con]cerns those who lead Ephraim astray, who, by their false teaching and their lying tongue and lip of deceit, will lead many astray . . .” (“More Unpublished Pieces,” 306; DJD V, 40; the same syntax is employed by Cook, 219; For our purposes, we may also include in this category Amusin, “Historical Events” 137, and Horgan, 164). A passive construction is also possible, as Gaster, “those by whose false teaching, lying tongue, and guileful lips many shall indeed be led astray” (*IDSS*, 315). The tri-partite series calls to mind Amos 2:4, which exhibits other similarities to our unit and the preceding one: “For three transgressions of Judah, for a fourth I will not revoke it: because they have spurned the Teaching of the Lord and have not observed His laws; they are beguiled by the delusions after which their fathers walked (יהנעם כזבִידם). I will send down a fire upon Judah, and it shall devour the fortresses of Jerusalem.”

are “their false teaching,” “their lying tongue,” and “lip of deceit.” The prepositional “ב” prefixed to the first term is understood to function distributively.

However, Hoenig claimed that the pesher may only be read as a compound sentence. He required that the first half of the sentence stand alone as a stative construction—“that their falsehood is in their teaching.” The second half thus contains a compound subject with only two elements, the tongue and lip (of the leaders) which “will lead astray.” Hoenig maintained that the prepositional suffix “ב” indicates that תלמוד “is a distinct substantive,” and thus “refers to the well-known word *Talmud*, meaning the compilation of rabbinic commentary.”²⁷ His syntactic argument is intended to bolster his semantic claim.²⁸ A refutation of Hoenig’s position appears in a com-

²⁷ Weiss and Schiffman read the pesher according to this split syntax, but without viewing *talmud* as the late rabbinic corpus. Schiffman rendered, “in whose teaching (*talmud*) is their falsehood, and whose lying tongue and dishonest lip(s) lead many astray” (“Pharisees and Sadducees,” 282).

²⁸ In “What is the Explanation for the term ‘B’Talmud’ in the Scrolls?” (274–76), Hoenig stated that תלמוד does not appear in the Bible, and that in late tannaitic sources it denotes the *study* (Hoenig’s italics) of the Torah, as it denotes the *study of the Mishna* in Amoraic sources. Hoenig traced a development of the term from a mid-2nd century CE usage to denote “study” to the more technical, “elaboration of the Mishna” which is the sense found in Amoraic sources. Since the concept of the Talmud as a corpus only becomes viable in the late Amoraic period, Hoenig’s claim about the “ב” allowed him to maintain an even later date for 4QpNah than he would claim on the basis of the word תלמוד alone. His stance was repeated and defended both by himself and by Zeitlin in response to Nathan Drazin (see the sources cited in n. 25 above). Drazin maintained that “Talmud” as a technical term for a “specific body of learning” was already in use in Second Temple times. He cited mAvot 5:21 and “an ancient baraita” in b.Sukkah 28a as including “Talmud” as a subject in the religious curriculum (“What Can ‘Betalmud’ Prove?” *JQR* 54 [1964]: 333; *History of Jewish Education from 515 BCE to 220 CE*. [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1940], 87–99). Hoenig rejected Drazin’s interpretation of the text in Avot, and also claimed that the statement is a “late appendage” to the tractate. Hoenig reiterated his claim that the phrase in 4QpNah must be rendered “whose lies are in the Talmud” requiring a specific corpus, “in the *text*” (“BeTalmud and Talmud,” 334–39; “Dorshé Halakot,” 119–38; “The Pesher Nahum ‘Talmud,’” 444; “B’Talmud in the Scrolls” 263–65). Most probably, neither Hoenig nor Drazin was correct in this argument. *Talmud* probably did not denote a set corpus as early as Drazin maintained, but it probably did serve as a technical term for some sort of study associated particularly with Pharisees.

In a different context, Bruce Metzger has seen the Mishna’s use of the word תלמוד as an indication of an early rabbinic valence of the term even prior to its use in designating a particular corpus. In discussing scriptural citation formulas, he states, “. . . the Mishna makes use of a phrase, תלמוד לומר, which has no apparent parallel in the NT. The formula is particularly appropriate in a body of literature which became the basis of the Talmud (compare the first word of the formula)”

munication from H. Merhavva in the 1964 issue of סניי. The writer demonstrates that the term תלמוד in 4pQ^Nah means simply “study,” and does not denote a set corpus or even the material studied. He enforces this understanding of the word by claiming that the syntax of the verse is in fact best understood as a series of three elements, in accordance with the structure presented by Allegro.²⁹ Hoening attempted to reply to this argument, too, claiming that the “ב” prefix may not be distributed to “לשון” and “שפת מרמה,” since biblical and Qumran syntax requires the repetition of the prefix before each element.³⁰ In actuality, the opposite is the case.

Goshen-Gottstein has commented in another context that “the dropping of the preposition ב . . . reflects one of the syntactical tendencies of the scrolls, i.e. the omission of a co-ordinated identical conjunction.” He cited ונבבל ובמרמה (III,5); בעשק ומעל (1QpHab I,6); ובאמה ופחד (IV,7).³¹ Gottstein offers an example in 1QH XII,16 that is particularly telling, as the objects of the prepositions are, as in 4Qp^Nah, the “tongue” and “lip” whereby the opponents of the sect mislead the nation: והם [ב]ל[וע]נ שפה ולשון אחרת ידברו לעמד (“and

(“The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah,” *JBL* 70 [1951]: 306).

²⁹ הרי ה"תלמוד" כאן (ולא כך בנוסח לפי קריאת וייס) מקביל ל"לשון" ול"שפה". הפרשנות הקרובה ביותר היא שאף ה"תלמוד" הוא מושג של דבור ולשון, כלומר, של לימוד, ולא של חומר לימודי.

³⁰ Hoening presented some cases of repeated conjunctions and prepositions, and repeated his claim that the syntax precludes parallelism, so that אשר בתלמוד שקדם must be an independent clause. However, his examples merely demonstrate that prefixes *may* be repeated in a series; they do not provide proof that they *must* be repeated.

Hoening's response in *JBL* was essentially a re-statement of his earlier arguments, including many additional hypothetical alternatives that the author of the pesher could have used. Hoening viewed the author's deliberate abstention from using the other biblical terms at his disposal as proof that he was employing a very definite technical term, “Talmud,” meaning a rabbinic corpus. Hoening also pointed to correspondence with the lemma to corroborate his syntactic division of the pesher:

1. Identification: אשר בתלמוד שקדם = זוגי זונה טובת הן בעלת כשפים
2. Activity: ולשון כוניהם ושפת מרמה יתעו רבים = הממכרת ניום בנותה ומשפחות בכשפיה

See our explanation of correspondence in the pesher, which involves a more complex structure and accommodates the three elements as successive components of a chain.

³¹ Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, “Bible Quotations in the Sectarial Dead Sea Scrolls,” *VT* 3 (1953): 79–82. We would add 1QH IX,31–32 ואתה ברחמיך הרבים (“and You, in Your mercy and <in> the greatness of Your kindness”); 1QH X,7–8 בחוק מתנים ואמין כוח (“by the girding of loins and <by> the strengthening of power”).

they will speak to your people with mocking lip and foreign tongue”). As Goshen-Gottstein notes, the MT of Isa 28:11 (and 1QIsa^a), upon which the hymn relies, reads בלענ שפה ובלשון אחרת. The repetition of the prepositional כ before the second element, present in the biblical text, is omitted at Qumran.³²

In taking the three elements as a coordinated chain, Wacholder found even Allegro’s translation to be insufficiently attentive to the semantic parallelism. He opined, “by their false teaching” does not reflect the symmetry of “tongue of their lies” “lip of deceit.” He “provisionally” preferred “by their false oral teaching (or oral interpretation).”³³ Dupont-Sommer too associated the term Talmud here with the “Oral Tradition” of Pharisees, viewed by Josephus as one of that sect’s defining characteristics.³⁴ As noted by Doudna, strict Pharisaic valence for “talmud” is ruled out by the appearance of the term in a positive context in 4Q525 (4QBeatitudes) 14 II,15 ובתלמודכה יתהלכו יהוד כול יודעיכה.³⁵

Schiffman has made a connection between the use of the term *talmud* in Peshet Nahum and the use of the terms *darash* and *halakhot* in the peshet’s description of the Pharisees. “This *talmud* was the method of logical analysis which must have already been part of the intellectual equipment of Pharisaic endeavor, and it was regarded as

³² See too, 1QH X,18–19 בינות לא אחרת לעם לא בינות (“and they exchanged them for uncircumcised lip and foreign tongue for a nation without understanding”).

³³ Wacholder’s observation that הלמיד appears as a hapax in I Chron 25:8 may be significant in showing an emergence of complex forms of the root למד in the Second Temple period. He listed a number of denotations of תלמוד in rabbinic literature, culled from W. Bacher, *Die Exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur* I 199–202; 234–35. (ערכי מדרש הנאים, 66–67; 135–37). A component of orality is present in a number of these meanings.

Already in 1961, Licht noted that, although the meaning of Talmud is not equivalent to our understanding of the term, 4QpNah still presents the first use of the word found outside of rabbinic writings. Licht (455) stated that a departure from biblical vocabulary by a Qumran author may be taken to signal that the term has sectarian significance.

³⁴ He cited *Ant* 13 §297. (This follows the conventional understanding of “ancestral regulations” in Josephus’s characterizations, in contrast to Goodman’s more recent approach, mentioned in n. 97 of ch. 4). Wacholder also cited 1QH X,17 for another occurrence of הלמיד in DSS, but that reading has been rejected in favor of תלמוד. Cf. García-Martínez *Study Ed.*, 168; Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 37.

³⁵ Cf. E. Puech, *DJD XXV*. See also, VanderKam, “Those Who Look for Smooth Things,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. ed. Paul, Kraft, Schiffman, and Fields (Brill: Leiden, 2003), 465–477.

false by the Qumran sectarians, just like the exegesis and the laws of the Pharisaic tradition.”³⁶

6.1.3 ובהגלות כבוד יהודה

The identification of Judah in Peshier Nahum is part of the more general question of the identity of Judah in the Qumran corpus. At times the term “Judah” clearly serves as a symbolic epithet for the Community or part of the Community.³⁷ At other times, Judah seems to refer to the Jewish nation as a whole, or maybe to the region of Judea.³⁸ Other occurrences of the term are of disputed valence. In 1QpHab VII,1 the reference to “all the doers of the Law in the House of Judah” may indicate that the House of Judah consisted wholly of observers of the Law (with the prepositional phrase in apposition to the genitive construct), or it may imply that only some of the members of the House of Judah were observers (with the prepositional phrase serving a restricting function). Similarly, at 1QpHab XII,4, 9, victims of the Wicked Priest are identified as “the simple of Judah, the observers of the Law” and “cities of Judah.”³⁹ The suffering of the House of Judah in the time of Belial, in 4Q174 Flor II,4, 7 is also subject to differing interpretations. On the disputed meaning of the term “Judah” in 4QPs^a 1–10 II,14–16

³⁶ “Pharisees and Sadducees,” 283. He cited the commentary of Rashi to bSuk 28a, *s.v.* תלמוד. Thus, like דרש, “talmud” could be used in a positive sense in some contexts, but would lend itself to a particular sort of usage in relation to Pharisaic opponents.

³⁷ In 1QpMic (1Q14), the author of the pesher identifies the words “Judah” and “Jerusalem” in Mic 1:5 as positive references to the Teacher of Righteousness and his Community (frags 8–10, line 3).

³⁸ In 1QpZeph 1:6, it appears that the divine wrath of the biblical lemma will befall “the land of Judah” in the pesher. In CD IV,3; VI,5, the reference to “those who go out from the Land of Judah” appears to be literal, that is geographical. The Community’s perception of itself as the legitimate, true Israel, engenders some overlap in the usage of the epithet. 1QM introduces the Sons of Light as the sons of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin, exiled in the desert (I,2). 1QM XII,13 and XIX,5 address the “cities of Judah” and “Zion.” In this work, Israel seems to consist exclusively of the Sons of Light so that “Judah” can function as a general term at the same time that it applies only to the “true” Israel.

³⁹ The verse’s “city” is identified as Jerusalem, and the “Land” is identified as the cities of Judah and the אַבְיִיִם—the twin victims of the Wicked Priest. The contrast between Judah and Jerusalem is marked in that text, with Judah representing the Community. Cf. 4QpHos^a, in which the two groups persecuted by the Last Priest have been widely identified as the Pharisees and the Qumran Community, as discussed in ch. 4 above.

עריצי הכרית אשר בבית יהודה, see Horgan, *Pesharim*, 210, and the sources cited there. Stegemann, in particular, argues for variability in the application of the epithet. CD IV,11 *אין עוד להשתפח לבית יהודה* is generally understood to describe a period in which it will no longer be possible to join the Qumran Community, but this sense is not made explicit by the text itself.⁴⁰

Here in unit 15 of 4QpNah, the “glory of Judah” can accommodate either a positive or negative interpretation of “Judah.” The pesher reads *... ובה[נ]לות כבוד יהודה יודרו פתאי אפרים מתוך קהלים*. . . . Given the negative connotations of *נלה* in this section of 4QpNah (in the previous lemma *על פניך* at II,10, and in this pesher at III,3 *ינלו מעשיהם הרעים*), one might understand *ובה[נ]לות כבוד יהודה* as referring to the departure of Israel’s glory.⁴¹ With Judah as a geographical-political term, the pesher could be viewed as describing the defeat of the Establishment, whereupon the remnant of the nation would abandon its current leadership and look to the Qumran Community for new guidance. The departure of the glory of Judah would continue the illustration of Pharisaic decline begun in the pesher interpretation.

However, we follow the majority of commentators in viewing Judah in 4QpNah as the (Essene) Community of Qumran.⁴² We thus take the phrase as indicating that the glory of the Community will be *revealed*.⁴³ Dupont-Sommer cites *ינלו מעשיהם הרעים* in line 3 as sup-

⁴⁰ CD VII,10–14 is complicated by scribal error (the apparent omission of a negative particle in line 12), in addition to the uncertain identifications of the groups alluded to. Cf. Flusser, *פרושים, צדוקים*, 140–43; and Kister, “Biblical Phrases,” 35–37, for an understanding of the passage as referring to the departure of the Pharisees and Sadducees from the Qumran Community, preserving a standardized use of the epithet “Judah” as a positive reference to the Community. In CD VIII,3, “שרי יהודה” may be rendered as “the princes of Judah,” or “those who depart from Judah” (or, similarly, though not identically, “those of Judah who turn aside”). Contextually, the epithet seems to indicate backsliders from within the Community, and is best understood with “Judah” as a reference to the Community (cf. CD XIX,15, and *מרשעי יהודה* in CD XX,26–27).

⁴¹ Cf. the analogous but more literal formulation in IChron 5:41 *ובהנלות יהודה* in reference to the actual Babylonian exile, which would be paradigmatic of the downfall of the Pharisees.

⁴² Cf. Dupont-Sommer, “Le Commentaire,” 78; Flusser, *פרושים, צדוקים*, 142–43; Amusin, “Éphraïm et Manassé,” 394; Carmignac (*Les Textes*, 91 n. 6); Horgan, 161, 210; Knibb, 216.

⁴³ He renders the phrase, “quand sera révélée” (“Le Commentaire,” 60; “Observations,” 213). So, Amusin, “when the glory of Judah is revealed” (“Historical Events,” 138) “becomes manifest” (*ibid.*, 145).

port for this interpretation. Just as the evil of the Pharisee will be revealed, so too, and at the same time, will the glory of the Community be made manifest.

נלה appears with כבוד a few times in the Hebrew Bible, but only Isa 40:5 seems to offer any assistance toward deciphering the sense of this phrase in the pesher.⁴⁴ Isa 40:5 reads, “The presence of the Lord shall appear, and all flesh as one shall behold” (ונגלה כבוד יהוה) (וראו כל בשר).⁴⁵ The pesher’s ובהגלות כבוד יהודה differs from the biblical phrase כבוד יהוה only in the switch from the imperfect tense to an infinitive with prefixed preposition—as is appropriate in a biblical allusion, and in the addition of the *dalet* in “Judah” as compared to the Tetragrammaton of the biblical text. וראו כל בשר in Isa 40:5 is reflected in the lemma’s כול רואיך of this unit in 4QpNah. Ch. 40 of Isaiah is a significant text for the Qumran Community.⁴⁶ We propose that the pesher equates the revelation of God’s presence—presumably through the punishment of the Pharisees—with the revelation of the glory of the Community, such that many will join the Community at that time. In mapping lemma/pesher correspondence in this unit, we represent ובהגלות כבוד יהודה as aligning with the word והיה in the lemma. והיה functions in the Bible as a kind of code-word for predicting eschatological moments of supreme significance.⁴⁷ We thus view the pesher as interpreting והיה as shorthand

⁴⁴ ISam 4:21, 22, נלה כבוד מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל, refers to the naming of Ichabod; it does not seem directly relevant. Nor does Hos 10: 5 demonstrate any strong connection to our text, despite many other similarities that have been noted between the book of Hosea and this pericope of 4QpNah. The verse reads אבל עליו . . . על כבוד כי נלה ממנו (N⁷PS, “mourn over it for the glory that is departed from it”). Although this text juxtaposes the two terms that appear together in our pesher interpretation, Hosea offers no basis for linking this interpretation to our lemma. Moreover, נלה in these verses is not in the *niphal*, in contrast to the form in both the pesher and Isa 40.

⁴⁵ N⁷PS renders כבוד here as “presence.” The Divine Presence is a manifestation of God’s glory. In unit 13, we have seen כבוד also as “abundance,” but that is not likely to be a sense of the word here in unit 15.

⁴⁶ Of particular significance is vs. 3, referring to the voice in the wilderness clearing the way for the Lord. Cf. 1QS VII,13; IX,19–20, and 4Q176 (4QTanhumim) frags 1–2, I,17. (See Brooke, “Isaiah 40:3 and the Wilderness Community,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies* [ed. George J. Brooke and Florentino García-Martínez; Leiden: Brill, 1994], 117–32). The herald of Zion in vs. 9, may be associated with the figure in Isa 52:7, referred to in 11QMelchizedek 2:16–22.

⁴⁷ Cf. esp. the phrase והיה ביום ההוא in, e.g., Isa 7:18–23; 10:20–27; 11:10,11; 27:12,13; Jer 4:9; 30:8; Ezek 38:10,18; 39:11; Joel 4:18; Zech 12:3,9.

for ultimate revelation, and spelling out the allusion, “and when the Lord’s presence is revealed.”⁴⁸

6.2 KEY TEMPORAL PHRASES

6.2.1 לְאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים (frag 3–4 II,2)

Line 2 of frag 3–4 column II provides an explicit context for the events of Pericope 3, locating the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things in אַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים. In order to evaluate the significance of this gloss, we must have a sense of the meaning(s) of this term in Qumran literature. Our analysis does not aim to arrive at the ultimate resolution of this major question but, more modestly, to present current thinking on the issue and clarify our own conception of the phrase.

The term אַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים at Qumran is characteristic of pesher. The preponderance of the occurrences of this idiom at Qumran are in the pesharim and in the pesher-like texts of 4QFlor (174), 4QCat^a (177), and 11QMelch as well as 1QS^a and CD.

In the Hebrew Bible, אַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים is always preceded by the preposition ב. The predictive force of the word is brought out in the translation “Latter Days,” but the more eschatological “End of Days” and “Last Days” are also common. The seminal article on the use of this term at Qumran is that of Annette Steudel. Steudel observes a recent tendency in biblical scholarship to prefer the simple “future” understanding of the term rather than a more “eschatological” sense.⁴⁹

⁴⁸ The above formulation has been influenced by a proposal put forth by Doudna, though subsequently rejected by him. Doudna writes “Could כְּבוֹד יְהוָה mean ‘the glory of *Yahweh*’ with Judah as a direct circumlocution for *Yahweh*?” Doudna rejected his own proposal for lack of comparative examples for such a technique (554). He also proposed, and rejected, explaining the term as “*Yahweh* of Judah” with כְּבוֹד as a circumlocution for the Tetragrammaton [555]. Prior to seeing Doudna’s work, we had speculated about other means of viewing יְהוָה in the pesher as related to the Tetragrammaton in Isa 40:5 (cf. “4QpNah”). See also, Brownlee, “Wicked Priest,” 28 on the wordplay between Judah/*Yahweh* in Leah’s naming of Judah (Gen 29:35) and in the beginnings of the Teacher’s hymns in 1QH, “I thank Thee, Lord.”

⁴⁹ Strictly speaking, the term is by definition “eschatological,” as ἔσχατον is the Greek rendering of אַחֲרֵית. The “future” and “eschatological” senses of this term may be correlated respectively with “restorative” and “utopian” messianism as described by Schiffman (*Reclaiming*, 317–27; following Gershom Scholem, “Toward the Understanding of the Messianic Idea in Judaism,” in *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays in Jewish Spirituality* [London: Allen and Unwin, 1971], 1–36. Cf. Doudna, 63–66).

D.L. Petersen defines current usage as referring “to a time in the future when the course of history will be changed to such an extent that one can speak of an entirely new state of reality.”⁵⁰ We perceive two groups of biblical **אָהַרִית הַיָּמִים** material. The examples in the first group are poetic and of marked “eschatological” nature or tone. Thus, for example, Gen 49:1, in introducing Jacob’s testamental words to his sons. Although the fulfillment of these prophecies is relegated to an undefined period of possession of the Land, an eschatological aspect is arguably inherent in the original context and is certainly asserted by Jewish tradition, including that at Qumran. Similarly, Balaam’s prophecy in Num 24:14 may be taken to apply to David, but is traditionally viewed as (also) eschatological. Isa 2:2 depicts the exaltation of an ideal eschatological Jerusalem, as does Mic 4:1. Daniel’s **בְּאֶהְרִית יוֹמָאֵ** in 2:28 and **בְּאֶהְרִית הַיָּמִים** in 10:14 are eschatological in their original contexts.

Deuteronomy appears to be a special case. Deut 4:30 is a testamental context in which Moses warns that disobedience will lead to a period of exile, to be followed by repentance, and return. Likewise, Deut 31:29 warns about a future exile and invokes the sky and land as witnesses. This latter verse is an introduction to Moses’ penultimate words to the Israelites in Deuteronomy ch. 32. This address is explicitly called a “song” in the Bible, and is generally interpreted eschatologically.

There is another set of **אָהַרִית הַיָּמִים** passages which are less poetic, and in which the “eschatological” elements are more concretized in known historical time. **אָהַרִית הַיָּמִים** occurs in Jer 23:20 and 30:24, in contexts predicting a restoration to follow upon the Babylonian exile. Jer 48:47 and 49:39 locate the restoration of Moab and Elam, respectively, in **אָהַרִית הַיָּמִים**, to follow upon an imminent catastrophe to these nations. Ezek 38:16 places the invasion, and thus the defeat, of Gog in **אָהַרִית הַיָּמִים**. This enigmatic prophecy is to be fulfilled in the post-exilic future. (Ezek 38:8 has the similar “in the End of Years,” **בְּאֶהְרִית הַשָּׁנִים**) Hos 3:5 predicts that the leaderless, cultless Israel will experience a “return” (perhaps [also] repentance) and restoration in **אָהַרִית הַיָּמִים**, subsequent to a period of neglect and suffering.

These last sources may be seen as using **אָהַרִית הַיָּמִים** to describe the “simple” or “historical” future, a future which in all cases represents

⁵⁰ *ABD* s.v. “Eschatology,” 575.

the exilic and post-exilic era of history, and is thus directly connected with the concept of exile. These contexts would accommodate “End of Days” terminology to the extent that particular cataclysmic events might be viewed as *the* (i.e. the unique, or the ultimate) fulfillment of Pentateuchal prophecy.

In her article, Steudel observes a parallel to biblical studies in the trend of Qumran scholars to reject “future-eschatological” understanding of the term in favor of a “simple ‘future’” sense.⁵¹ She especially comments upon a tendency to assume that the “eschatological” sense must limit the duration of the time period.⁵² The restriction of the “End of Days” to one specific period in historical time would appear to be incompatible with the fact that events from different historical periods are placed in *אחרית הימים* in Qumran literature. Steudel resolves the seeming contradiction by defining the term as follows: “a limited period of time that is the last of a series of divinely pre-planned [periods] . . . This last period of time directly before the time of salvation covers aspects of the past (A) as well as aspects of the present (B) and of the future (C).”⁵³

⁵¹ P. 226. That is “latter days” may signify a final stage of human existence, or “latter days” may indicate a time period that is “latter” simply by virtue of contrast to “former days.”

⁵² See ch. 4 for the related problem of the identification of the “last priest(s)” of 1QpHab and 4QpHos^b. Must all “last priests” be placed in the same specific time-frame, or may the term be of general use for the Second Temple period, and, in either case, does the term imply an eschatological valence? Are the priests of 1QpHab IX,5–6 (בְּיְהוֹשֵׁעַ הַיְרוּשָׁלַיִם הָאֲחֵרִימִים) the final priests known to the author of the pesher? Are they supposed to be the final priests to have ever served in the corrupt Temple, taking the adjective in a restricted eschatological sense? Or are they simply a group, or successive groups, of priests serving in the post-Monarchic period, taking the term in a broad eschatological sense?

Rowley argued that the Kittim in 1QpHab must be the Seleucids, rather than the Romans, since the Kittim obtain the wealth of the last priests of Jerusalem (“The Kittim,” 108). He stated that it would not be logical for the pesher to refer to Crassus’s raiding of the Temple, since anybody writing after the time of Crassus would not call Jannaeus and his contemporaries “Last priests.” However, as in the phrase *אחרונים*, the use of the term “last” may be taken as eschatologically significant rather than historically precise. The term “last priests” could be applicable for any of those priests functioning in the extended eschatological period of the Community’s existence.

⁵³ *Ibid.* Carmignac had stressed that *אחרית הימים* at Qumran did not denote the final time, but rather the period preceding the end (“Notes sur les Peshârîm,” 527–29). Steudel too stresses that the “End of Days” refers to the final period prior to the actual end-time, or time of salvation. This is the period in which the salvation of the chosen group culminates in the destruction of everybody else. Bernstein points out that when 4Q252 places the requirement to eradicate the memory of Amalek in *אחרית הימים*, it uses this temporal phrase as a replacement for the fol-

Theologically, we perceive significant influence of Deuteronomy in the sectarian perception of אֶחָדֵי יְמֵי הַיָּמִים. The “Deuteronomistic” perspective, laid out clearly in Deut 4:30 and 32:15–43, anticipates four successive historical stages: (1) sin (2) destruction/exile (3) remnant/repentance⁵⁴ and (4) return/restoration. At Qumran, the linear Deuteronomistic model assumed the shape of a paradigmatic pattern, especially evident in the historical review of CD cols. I–VI, and MMT section C. The “former days” are depicted as having been comprised of repeated cycles of sin, exile, repentance, and return. The most catastrophic exile, the Babylonian conquest of Judah, should have been the ultimate exile and should have ushered in the age of salvation. The biblical prophets had predicted a glorious post-exilic return in the “End of Days.” The Return under Ezra and Nehemiah and the formation of the Second Commonwealth did not meet the Community’s standards for the fulfillment of these prophecies of restoration. The “true” End of Days would thus require an additional four-fold cycle.

We propose that the post-exilic return to Israel was viewed by the Community as a period of overlap between two cycles of “sin, destruction, repentance, and return.” While the Jews returning from Babylon were experiencing the “return” phase of one cycle, the “sin” phase of a new cycle was already beginning. This new cycle was to be the final one, so that the “End of Days” commenced with this new “sin” phase. This “sin” phase further overlapped with the beginning of the “destruction” phase, both of which were perceived by the Community as currently in progress. Thus, from the perspective of the Qumran authors, the “End of Days” may be understood to refer to the post-exilic era in its entirety. It began in the past, is currently ongoing, and is expected to continue until the final phases of this final cycle. We would add that the Community believed that the third phase, too, had already begun, with the establishment of a penitent remnant—themselves. Of course, the ultimate beneficiaries of

lowing phrase in Deut 25:10: “When the Lord your God grants you rest from all your enemies roundabout” (“4Q252,” 16). The End of Days is the period in which the exclusive salvation of the Elect is achieved by the utter destruction of everybody else.

⁵⁴ In Deut 32:26–42, God is described as halting his punishment of Israel in order to stir Israel’s enemies to recognition of His power. In this chapter, the sparing of a remnant of Israel is not a response to repentance, but a demonstration of divine omnipotence, and is intended to serve as a stimulus to national return. (See the comments of J. Tigay *ad. loc.*, NJPS, *Commentary on Deuteronomy*).

salvation were expected to become known only at the “ultimate end-time.”⁵⁵

MMT C 12–24, is constructed upon the basic four-stage model of sin, curses, repentance, and blessings. The author of MMT, however, seems to struggle with the simplified generalization. In his model of the “former days” (קדמוניות, line 12) the Solomonic era is portrayed as the paradigmatic time of blessing. The remainder of the monarchic period is viewed primarily as a time of curses (18–19; the “sin” stage is only implicit), but also as interspersed with individual kings who repented and flourished (23–24).⁵⁶ We would have expected exile (19) to be followed by a transition to repentance and blessing

⁵⁵ It is likely that this last time is designated אחרית הקץ, a term that we view as more precise than אחרית הימים. It is the eschatological moment when the period of Belial comes to an end. Cf. 4QpNah frag 3–4 III,3 and אחרית העתה in MMT C line 30. Cf. Gaster, “at the end of the present epoch” (*TDSS*, 316), and Horgan’s comments to “at the end of days,” in 1QpHab II,5–6 (p. 25). Cp. Dupont-Sommer, who simply views the phrase אחרית הקץ as a less usual equivalent of אחרית הימים (78). Carmignac views both terms as referring to the tumultuous period immediately preceding the final epoch of justice and peace (*Les Textes*, II 67 n. 6, 95 n. 8). Nitzan states that the “last generation” in 1QpHab II,7 (and CD I,12; 1QpMic frag 17–18:5) is the final generation before the end of days, those who live in the last historical period before the cataclysm. She equates that generation with the דור הפקודה in 4QpHos^a I,10. The phrase קץ האחרון at 1QpHab VII,7,12 similarly indicates the period just prior to the end. (The term קץ itself may connote finality, but it is also used to indicate any set amount of time, without eschatological overtones; see כול קצי אל, in line 13 of the same pesher. Cf. Wieder “The Term קץ in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in Hebrew Liturgical Poetry,” *JJS* 5 [1954]: 22–31; and Meir Wallenstein, “Some Lexical Material in the Judean Scrolls,” *VT* 4 [1954]: 211–14. More significant than finality is the determinism evident in the Qumran usage of the term. Cf. Yadin, *Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light*, 258 n. 4, and literature cited there).

⁵⁶ Lange observes that MMT C 12–16 eliminates the words “אחרית הימים” in its paraphrase of Deut 31:29 about straying. In the subsequent paraphrase of Deut 30:1–3, concerning return and blessing, the words “אחרית הימים” and also “אחרית העתה” are added (in harmonization with Deut 4:30. “The Essene Position on Magic and Divination,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*. [Edited by Moshe J. Bernstein, Florentino García-Martínez and John Kampen. Leiden: Brill, 1997], 421–22. Cf. Bernstein, “The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations,” in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. [Edited by John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein. Atlanta: Scholars, 1996], 48–49). Lange maintains that the fulfillment of the Deuteronomical prediction of blessings and curses is transferred by MMT to the eschaton.

Lange’s observations are important for furthering our understanding of the compositional approach of MMT, and specifically its use of the biblical text. He has certainly demonstrated the emphasis placed upon the eschatological fulfillment of the biblical predictions. But he seems to go too far in stating that the “redactional changes” in the paraphrased verses “demonstrate beyond any doubt that the blessings and curses were viewed in MMT as being fulfilled *only* in the eschaton” (empha-

in the Latter Days. Instead, the Second Temple era is depicted as a more mixed period. The underlying assumption is still a four-part cycle culminating in blessing, but reality does not seem to accommodate this neat division. Thus, in line 20 the author writes that “some of the blessings and curses have been fulfilled.” In the End of Days (אַהֲרִית הַיָּמִים) an “(?eternal) return” is anticipated (21), but at the very same time the wicked will still act wickedly (22). The author is apparently attempting to fit reality, and particularly the role of the addressee, into his world-view. Writing to someone whom he perceives as less than ideal, but whom he has not entirely rejected, he invokes the figure of David. The single figure of David is depicted as having encompassed all four “stages” on the individual plane: sin (the words וְנִסְלַח לוֹ “he was forgiven” imply that he had sinned), punishment (צָרוֹת רַבּוֹת, “many troubles”), repentance (חֲסִדִּים, “righteous deeds,” implying a change from the former actions, for which he was forgiven), and salvation (נִצְלָה “he was delivered”). The author of MMT wishes to motivate the addressee of his composition to fit into the paradigm such that his personal repentance can tip the balance in a volatile historical, national situation and help achieve the final redemption (אַהֲרִית הָעֵת).

Following in Steudel’s footsteps, we have in effect adapted Elliger’s main “hermeneutic principle” in peshet.⁵⁷ “Prophecy refers to the End-time, and the End-time is now,” but it must be realized that the “now” of the present is applied widely to include events of the past and future. Consider Cecil Roth’s description of אַהֲרִית הַיָּמִים at Qumran, which he renders as “Last Days” or “End of Days”: “this was not something associated with the remote future, but a process which in the eyes of the adherents of the Sect was well advanced towards its culmination.”⁵⁸ In this way, אַהֲרִית הַיָּמִים functions in a technical way as an absolute term, denoting the “last days” in a

sis added—SLB). He thereby posits a later shift such that “this eschatological approach to blessings and curses can no longer be found,” pointing to 1QS II,1–18; 1QSB, 4QBer^{a–f} (422). MMT does not seem to be saying that the curses are exclusively eschatological. In using Deuteronomy 31 to describe the monarchic period, MMT indicates that the Pentateuchal description is indeed relevant for that period, although it was not the end-time. In our view, the removal of the words “אַהֲרִית הַיָּמִים” in lines 12–16 implies that the situation described therein was an earlier version of the Deuteronomical cycle, which was thus viewed as a partial, but not ultimate, fulfillment of the biblical predictions.

⁵⁷ See ch. 1.

⁵⁸ “The Subject Matter of Qumran Exegesis,” *VT* 10 (1960): 52.

modified (i.e., broadened) eschatological sense. The past/present/future aspect of אהרית הימים does not detract from its finality.

6.2.2 אהרית הימים in *Pericope 3*

In ch. 4 we noted the tendency of the pesharim to gloss the epithet Seekers-after-Smooth-Things with the words אהרית הימים. The occurrence of “Seekers-after-Smooth-Things” without this gloss in 4QpNah 3–4, I is exceptional. In light of the omission, one could suppose that the events in col. I were not considered to have occurred in the End of Days.⁵⁹ Thus, Horgan sees the use of the eschatological gloss in col. II as an indication that “the interpretation is shifting from a historical thrust to an eschatological focus.”⁶⁰

Schiffman rejects this view, pointing to 4QMMT C 21–23 as evidence that “the sect saw its own history and its own times as eschatological.”⁶¹ We would accept Schiffman’s argument and observe further that Qumran pesher, by definition, transmits eschatological realities.⁶² The Seekers-after Smooth-Things in col. I must be understood as located in אהרית הימים, even without an explicit statement to that effect, since inclusion of a historical event in a pesher interpretation implies that the event is so perceived.⁶³ Nonetheless, it does seem that the first occurrence of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things in 4QpNah is deliberately placed in historical time, *rather than* eschatological time. The author apparently does not relate to the period of Demetrius’s attack with the same immediacy as he does to the events in the subsequent columns. This earlier event would have been perceived on some level as occurring in “the End of Days.” The use

⁵⁹ The use of the phrase אהרית הימים as a qualifier of Seekers-after-Smooth-Things seems to imply the existence of Seekers-after-Smooth-Things who are not to be placed in “the End of Days.” In Horgan’s view, these non-eschatological Seekers were precursors to the author’s contemporary opponents (p. 182).

⁶⁰ P. 182. Gaster (*TDSS*, 315) translates, “This alludes to the city of Ephraim—to those (future) ‘seekers after smooth things’ who, in the Latter Days, will walk in fraud and lies. . . .” Cf. Knibb, “it may be observed that whereas I.I–II.Ia for the most part looks back on past events and is retrospective in character, II.I.b–IV.8a has an eschatological perspective” (209).

⁶¹ “Pharisees and Sadducees,” 280.

⁶² That is, by the definition we have imposed on the term in light of its usage at Qumran.

⁶³ Recall that, as stated in the previous section, we follow Steudel in understanding an extended scope of the term אהרית הימים such that it applies to any time period—whether it is in the historical past, present, or future—that is perceived as within the scope of the eschatological age.

of the event as material for a pesher interpretation demonstrates that it was understood as a latter day fulfillment of biblical prophecy. Still, the author relegated it to a somewhat different category than the events in the subsequent columns. Pericope 2 simply seems “less eschatological.”

In conjecturing about the extent to which the events concerning Demetrius were placed in eschatological time, it is interesting to consider the hypothesis of the revision of pesher compositions over time.⁶⁴ Perhaps Jannaeus’s suppression of the Pharisees had been presented in an early version of 4QpNah as “the” eschatological fulfillment of Nahum, possibly with the flight of the Pharisees described as their final eradication.⁶⁵ Subsequently, with the Pharisaic revival and dominance under Salome, the pesher would have required editing. Some of the interpretations would have required serious updating. Other parts of the earlier piece could have been retained; for example, the military defeat and crucifixion were pretty compelling evidence against the Pharisees. However, even while retaining these pesharim, the revising editor might not have been able to bring himself (consciously or unconsciously) to describe those events as taking place in the Final Days. That description would have been reserved for events contemporaneous with his own time.⁶⁶ There are other persistently troubling data about the pesharim which should be investigated in this context. The fact that all extant pesharim survive in single copies only might be evidence of an effort by the Community to preserve the authoritative nature of a given current version. Oddities in verbal tenses of the pesharim may be relevant, such as the perfect בִּקֵּשׁ

⁶⁴ Cf. esp. Eshel “תולדותיה,” 93, discussed below.

⁶⁵ Cf. *Ant* 13 §383.

⁶⁶ 4QpIsa^a 2–6 II,27 mentions an ascension to battle from the Valley of Acco. Line 26 dates the event of this pesher to the End of Days. Amusin presents a convincing case for identifying this battle as an encounter between Jannaeus and Ptolemy Lathyrus (“A propos de l’interpretation de 4Q161,” *RevQ* 8 (1974): 381–92. Cf. *Ant* 13 §§324–37). Our proposal that 4QpNah may reflect a pesher about Jannaeus that has undergone revision can be put in an interesting light by a pesher about Jannaeus that is explicitly dated to the End of Days. It is most intriguing to speculate that the less formal structure of 4QpIsa^a, as compared to 4QpNah and 1QpHab for example, might indicate an earlier stage of pesher composition. (Cf., on different grounds, Steudel “4QMdrEschat: A Midrash on Eschatology 4Q174 + 4Q177,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991*. [Edited by Julio C. Trebolle Barrera and L.V. Montaner. Leiden: Brill, 1992], 538.) A “proto-Pesher Nahum,” such as the hypothetical stratum we are proposing, might have been composed at the same stage as 4QpIsa^a.

in Pericope 2, in contrast to the imperfect tense of the other verbs in the peshar. Rabin's remarks in "Alexander Jannaeus and the Pharisees" should also be reconsidered in this light. He observes the inconsistency of this column of 4QpNah with the tendency of DSS to "circumlocutions," and argues that "the appearance of proper names rather suggests that we have here events of the distant past, introduced as historical *exempla* in the manner of CD II,14—III,10."⁶⁷

H. Eshel has maintained that the community stopped writing pesharim some time before 31 BCE, and shifted to an exclusively oral mode of producing and transmitting actualizing exegesis.⁶⁸ He suggests that this shift was a response to the phenomenon of unfulfilled predictions. Might a similar accommodation underlie the fact that each of the extant pesharim has been preserved in only a single copy? Perhaps the pesharim were modified over time in order to adjust the compositions to reality as history unfolded. A single authoritative copy of each peshar may have been in use at any given time, or there may have been a cap on the number of copies produced in order to facilitate a later replacement by "revised editions." Earlier scholars had already proposed a stage of oral transmission prior to the writing of peshar interpretations. Thus, Cross stated that, "the commentaries contain traditions of exegesis developed over a considerable period of time, written down late."⁶⁹ Eshel describes further oral development subsequent to the stage of written composition. We accept the likelihood of both Cross's and Eshel's perspectives, and further propose editorial development during the written stages of transmission. Schiffman addressed the possibility that "parts of this text pre-existed the invasion [of 63 BCE]." He observed that other Qumran works developed in stages and "circulated in various recensions . . . yet, in this case, because we are dealing with a sus-

⁶⁷ P. 11.

⁶⁸ "תולדותיה," 93. See now, the arguments of Doudna (Appendix B, 698–736) and, on different and significant grounds, Young, for considering that all the manuscripts in the Qumran corpus might best be dated prior to the mid-first century BCE. (Young, "The Stabilization of the Biblical Text in the Light of Qumran and Masada: A Challenge For Conventional Qumran Chronology?" *DSD* 9:3 [2002]: 364–390.)

⁶⁹ *Ancient Library*, 1st ed., 1958, pp. 92–93 n.28. Brownlee addressed development over time as a factor in the diversity of separate peshar compositions, as well as within particular works, stating "Variations in style, interpretation and interest in the pesharim may reflect not only different generations of interpreters, but also different Essene communities" ("The Background of Biblical Interpretation," 188).

tained interpretation of the biblical book of Nahum, it seems most reasonable to expect composition to have occurred at one time.”⁷⁰ We suggest that even if Peshet Nahum came into being as a complete composition, whether in written or oral form, that composition may then have undergone changes over time, specifically in reaction to the delayed fulfillment of eschatological predictions.⁷¹ The use of the term *לְאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים* and related eschatological glosses in cols. II–IV of 4QPⁿNah frags 3–4, but not in col. I, remains a factor in associating the later columns with later events.

6.2.3 ממשלה דורשי החלקות

In 3–4 II,2, Ephraim was equated with the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things and placed explicitly in the eschatological era, *לְאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים*. The epithet Seekers-after-Smooth-Things appears again in line 4, with *ממשלה*. A strong impetus for placing this pericope within the reign of Salome Alexandra has been offered by the words *ממשלה דורשי החלקות* in II,4.⁷² Josephus’s description of Salome as a puppet of the Pharisees seemed to dovetail with the pesher’s reference to the “rule of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things.” *משל* is taken to indicate that the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things were the authoritative political power.

Thus, in *Ant* 13 §§408–410, Josephus asserts that Salome was queen only in name, while the Pharisees had the real power (*δύναμιν, δεσποτῶν*). Again, in *Bj* 1 §112, he states that “while Alexandra reigned over the nation, the Pharisees ruled her.”⁷³ Josephus also

⁷⁰ “Pharisees,” 274.

⁷¹ Such an attempt to update pesher may be compared with the original motive of pesher to bring biblical prophecy up to date. Nitzan describes the use of the term “Kittim” at Qumran as a way of making the biblical prophecy of Num 24:24 relevant, despite the fact that it had remained unfulfilled for so long. In this context, she cites Russel (*Method and Message*, 181–82). He writes of “an attempt to recast or re-interpret certain prophecies so as to revive the old hopes in a new form and to adapt them to new circumstances in the life of a nation.”

⁷² Cf. Amusin, “Éphraïm et Manassé,” 389–96; “Historical Events,” 143–45; Flusser, “פרושים, צדוקים,” 136. Amusin had also pointed to the then unpublished texts now termed 4QMishmarot C (4Q322–24) as support for his identification, attaching significance to the appearance of the names “Salome” “Hyrcanus” and “Aemilius” (see ch. 1). However, this calendrical text has no direct bearing on Peshet Nahum.

⁷³ Amusin also discusses the background of Salome’s submission to the Pharisees, as influenced by Jannaeus’s deathbed advice to reconcile with his long-time opponents (“Éphraïm et Manassé,” 392). Cf. *Ant* 13 §§399–404 and bSota 22b for

describes the Pharisees as using their power to seek revenge upon those who had previously supported Jannaeus. Amusin thus describes the civil war, exile, and mass terror of lines 3–6 as acts perpetrated by the Pharisees against their Sadduceean opponents.⁷⁴ He cites specifically the case of Diogenes, who was executed by the Pharisees during Salome’s reign. Josephus identifies this death as an act of revenge for Diogenes’ involvement in Jannaeus’s infamous crucifixion of his eight hundred opponents.⁷⁵ Pericope 2 would thus follow Pericope 1 logically and chronologically. Alexander’s persecution of the Pharisees would be followed by Pharisaic revenge against Alexander’s Sadduceean advisors, and Pharisaic dominion.

Dupont-Sommer also relies upon ממשלה דרשי ההלקות for identifying the context of this pericope, but he reaches a different conclusion from that of Flusser and Amusin. Dupont-Sommer states that ממשלה is the most important word in this pericope, since it dates the pesher to the time of Hyrcanus II (76–40 BCE), when Pharisees dominated the Judean political scene.⁷⁶ For Dupont-Sommer, the death, captivity, and plunder of unit 12 (3–4 II,5, . . . וחרהור ובי, שבי, ובי) reflect the suffering of Judea at the hands of Pompey. In the pesher, the Pharisaic leadership of the time is held culpable for this tragedy.

Tantlevskij proposes that the date of composition of the pesher and the subject of its concern both be placed precisely in the year 88 BCE. He views the “dominion” of the Pharisees as reflecting Pharisaic control of Jerusalem, a condition that he claims to have obtained prior to Jannaeus’s defeat of his opponents.⁷⁷

In contrast to the above-named scholars, Schiffman does not view the word ממשלה as a significant clue to determining the historical context of this pericope. The sense of the term in the corpus of the Dead Sea Scrolls does not necessitate the attachment of a specific political valence. It is true that ממשלה can denote dominion or government, as it does when it appears in parallel construction with

Jannaeus’s advice. For Salome’s implementation of this policy, and her intensification of the policy to include anti-Sadduceean measures, see *B7* 1 §§110–12; *Ant* 13 §409.

⁷⁴ “Éphraïm et Manassé,” 392–93, “Historical Events,” 144. In discussions of this pesher, the word חרהור is often defined as “strife.” Horgan notes that this sense of the word is found in post-biblical Hebrew, but Schiffman (280) points out that all the examples in Eliezer ben Yehuda’s lexicon, III,1755, are medieval. García-Martínez, *Study ed.*, 339 simply renders “fire.”

⁷⁵ Cf. *Ant* 13 §§410–11; *B7* 1 §§113–14.

⁷⁶ “Observations,” 209; “Le Commentaire,” 73–74.

⁷⁷ “Historical Background,” 335.

ממלכה. However, it may also indicate dominance or power of a less official sort.⁷⁸ Thus, Carmignac translates “domination,” saying that the pesher wishes to communicate the “profonde autorité” exercised by the rival sect upon the populace.⁷⁹ Additionally, the term often implies a duration of time, so that rather than “the rule of the Seekers . . .” the phrase may indicate “the time when the Seekers were powerful,” perhaps “the prime of the Seekers.”⁸⁰ ממשלה רשעה and ממשלה בליעל refer to a period when evil is rampant. Schiffman thus describes ממשלה (domain) as similar in meaning to נורל (lot) in its Qumran usage.⁸¹ The phrase ממשלה דורשי ההלקות may in fact have theological overtones in addition to being some sort of political characterization. These more generalized translations would suit any period of strong Pharisaic influence, including the period of revolt against Jannaeus, the reign of Alexandra Salome, and perhaps the time of the rivalry between Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II.

ממשלה, then, cannot serve as the exegetical key to this pericope after all. We will need to look more closely at the historical assumptions behind the above hypotheses. Unit 12 provides the most specific data for this inquiry.

⁷⁸ The variety of contexts for the use of משל at Qumran are discussed above, in relation to frag 1–2, 5a, in ch. 3.

⁷⁹ *Les Textes*, vol. 2, p. 89 n. 7. Already, Licht (454) had noted that despite the term ממשלה, the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things are not noble rulers like Peshar Habakkuk’s last priests of Jerusalem. Tantlevskij translates, “the power (or ‘rule,’ ‘dominion’),” “Historical Background,” 333.

⁸⁰ Gaster renders “the period when the ‘seekers after smooth things’ hold sway” (*TDSS*, 315). In favor of the understanding “designated temporal period,” it may be observed that *HALOT*, s.v. משל in the sense of “saying” or “proverb,” associates the root with the Akkadian *mišlu*, meaning “a half.” Cf. Gen 1:16, 18 in which the sun and moon are assigned their respective “dominions” (ממשלה), and are said to “dominate” over night and day (משל; thus NJPS; cp. NRSV “to rule”). Although in *HALOT*, this usage is listed as II משל, “to rule,” it seems more accommodating of a sense related to apportioning. See *CAD* s.v. *mišlu*, defs. 10 and 11 for the sense of the root as a fraction, with particular association with time.

⁸¹ p. 281. He refers to Jacob Licht, “המונח נורל בכתיבה של כה מדבר יהודה” (1955–56): 90–99. Licht describes the use of the term נורל at Qumran to denote a “Community of members bound by their common fate” (הבורה שוחפים) (“הבורה שוחפים” (p. 97), specifically in relation to the dualistic deterministic Qumran worldview. The significance of this dualistic determinism lends further weight to the likelihood that the similar use of משל is related to “half.” (Cf. esp. “the dominion of Belial” 1QS I,18, 23. Similarly, Yadin renders נורל as “‘preordained segment’ (of humanity, of time, of an event, of a collection of objects)” [*Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light*, 256; see his lengthier comments related to Qumran dualism in the Heb. ed., p. 254]).

6.3 HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF PERICOPE 2

Unit 12 is the focal point of Pericope 2. The following section evaluates the interpretation of unit 12 according to the three proposals presented at the outset of this chapter. Our criteria for the evaluation of the proposals emerge from our criteria for investigating lemma/pesher correspondence. By analogy with the spheres of “language, medium, and context,” we examine how the proponents of each view account for (1) the specific elements of the pesher interpretation; (2) the tenor of the pesher in unit 12 as a whole and (3) the placement of Pericope 2 within the context of 4QpNah.

6.3.1 *The Reign of Salome Alexandra*

Amusin takes unit 12 and in fact, the whole of col. II, as referring to the persecution of Sadducees by Pharisees.⁸² The first obstacle to this interpretation is that Pharisaic persecution of Sadducees is not an explicitly documented phenomenon, but Amusin defends this position convincingly.⁸³ However, there is a more significant objection to associating this pericope with Pharisaic abuse of power. 4QpNah seems to describe the downfall of Ephraim in this pericope (just as the verses cited from Nahum describe the downfall of Assyria). Specifically, the words מִקְרַב עֲדָהֶם in line 5 indicate that the horrors of pesher unit 12 will afflict the congregation of Seekers-After-Smooth-Things, rather than that they will be inflicted by them against their enemies.

This difficulty is particularly noticeable when Amusin’s comments on specific phrases of the unit are viewed in larger context. Amusin does not address the relevance of plunder and captivity to his proposed context.⁸⁴ In reference to exile, he cites *Bḡ* §110, “In accor-

⁸² “Éphraim et Manassé,” 394; “Historical Events,” 134–52.

⁸³ Despite the lack of specific Sadduceean identification for these men in Josephus, there are attestations of their loyal service of Jannaeus (*Ant* 13 §§411, 415, 422) and their influence during his reign (§414), as well as their opposition to the Pharisees (§§416–17). In this context, Amusin mentions the characterization of Diogenes as a “notable” (τινα τῶν ἐπισημόνων, *Bḡ* 1 §113) and the description of Aristobulus’s supporters as “powerful” (οἱ δυνατοὶ, *Ant* 13 §411), in light of Josephus characterization of the Sadducees as aristocrats (*Ant* 18 §417; 13: §298, §§415–23. Cf. “Éphraim et Manassé,” 393; “Historical Events,” 144). Cf. Schiffman, “Pharisees and Sadducees,” 285; SVM II:404.

⁸⁴ The only captives mentioned by Josephus during Salome’s reign are those taken by her troops in their forays against local Gentile rulers (*Ant* 13 §409).

dance with their will they exiled, promoted, imprisoned and freed whomever they wished . . .”⁸⁵ He views the “exile” in the pesher as reflecting the fact that the Pharisees “forced their opponents into exile.”⁸⁶ However, this interpretation is not sensitive to the context of the word “exile” in the pesher. “Exile from fear of the enemy” implies self-exile, the seeking of refuge, rather than deportation.⁸⁷ Amusin similarly addresses the word “fear” out of this context, observing simply that the Pharisees “conducted a policy of terror and murder.”⁸⁸ Regarding *הרהור*, Amusin states that the Pharisees “unleashed civil war.” Again, this is incompatible with the wider context. The suffix in *הרהור בניהם* has the same referent as *מקרב עדהם*, presumably the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things themselves. For the phrase to mean “civil war” the suffix would have to refer to the parties involved in the civil war, not to those who “unleashed civil war” as Amusin maintains.

Amusin’s other identifications are not as problematic internally, but still seem incompatible with the general theme of the pesher unit. In identifying the “Gentile sword” in the pesher, Amusin and Flusser point to Salome’s mercenaries. The “Gentile” sword is thus effectively possessed by the Seekers.⁸⁹

As an example of the “death” mentioned in the pesher, Amusin describes the murder of Diogenes as typical of the Pharisees’ “policy of terror and mass murder.” He states that the Pharisaic regime “found Diogenes and his followers guilty of killing 800 Pharisees.” Presumably, his use of the word “guilty” is intended to reflect the pesher’s “guilty” corpses. But the pesher implies that the victims are indeed guilty, not just that they were viewed as culpable by their killers. These guilty individuals seem to be the focus of the pesher, and are to be identified as the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, rather than as opponents of the Seekers.⁹⁰ Moreover, the guilty slain in the

⁸⁵ Note that the parallel passage in *Ant* 13 §409 describes the Pharisees as recalling exiles and freeing prisoners without mentioning their imposition of these penalties.

⁸⁶ “Historical Events,” 144.

⁸⁷ For a similar use of the root *גלה*, see 1QpHab XI,6, which relates that the Wicked Priest pursued the Teacher of Righteousness to his “place of exile.”

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

⁸⁹ “Historical Events,” 146. Cf. *Ant* 13 §409. He thus takes the “sword of the Gentiles” to describe a negative characteristic of the rule of the Seekers-After-Smooth-Things—Salome’s hiring of mercenaries—rather than a punitive experience suffered by the group.

⁹⁰ Amusin himself translates, “This refers to the power of the interpreters of

pesher correspond to the guilty corpses of Nineveh in the biblical text, who are certainly viewed as deserving of punishment.

In sum, a few specific elements of the pesher can be understood as relevant to Salome's reign. Moreover, the association of this pesher with Salome Alexandra seems logical insofar as it assumes smooth chronological continuity within the pesher, following upon the events of Jannaeus's reign described in Pericope 2. The thrust of the pesher however, is Pharisaic setback and decline. Unit 12 emphasizes the status of the Seekers-After-Smooth-Things as victims, whereas dating this pesher to a time of Pharisaic rule would imply their function as victimizers. Despite some suitability in terms of the composition as a whole, and as regards some details, the sense of the pesher does not accommodate the proposed historical context.

6.3.2 *Pompey's Takeover of Judea*

Dupont-Sommer is much more sensitive to the issue of correspondence between historical reality and the words of the pesher, as well as to the connection between the pesher and the lemma. In his opinion, unit 12 of 4QpNah refers to Pompey's military conquest of Jerusalem.⁹¹ His identification of the Pharisees as supporters of Hyrcanus II allows the Pharisees to be the protagonists of the pericope. In fact, this characterization allows the Pharisees to function as both victims and agents of the calamities in unit 12. The main difficulty with Dupont-Sommer's thesis is that there is no direct evidence of Pharisaic support for Hyrcanus II. Dupont-Sommer bases his claim upon the fact that Hyrcanus II presided as high priest during Salome's reign. He assumes that the relationship between Salome and the Pharisees

slippery things in whose community there never ends the foreign blade, captivity, brigandage, the unleashing of civil war, going into exile because of fear of enemies; the *multitude of bodies of sinners* fall during those days, and there is no end to the multitude of corpses, they even stumble over them; all because of their guilty council" ("Historical Events," 137. [italics added]).

⁹¹ "Le Commentaire," 74. Thus, the pesher refers to a sword wielded by Gentiles against Judea, as is more contextually appropriate than Amusin's claim of a reference to Salome's mercenaries. For parallels between Pericope 3 of Peshar Nahum and Psalm 2 of the *Psalms of Solomon*, which corroborate the association of the pericope with Pompey, see Berrin, "Peshar Nahum, Psalms of Solomon and Pompey." Although Kenneth Atkinson has demonstrated persuasively that Psalm 17 of the *Psalms of Solomon* is better associated with Herod than Pompey, his arguments do not apply to Psalm 2. (cf. Atkinson, "On the Herodian Origin of Militant Davidic Messianism at Qumran: New Light from Psalm of Solomon 17," *JBL* 118 [1999], 435-60).

implies Pharisaic approval of his tenure.⁹² Our own view of the relationship between Hyrcanus II and the Pharisees assumes greater complexity, and is discussed further below.

For the sake of our investigation, let us accept for now Dupont-Sommer's assessment of Pharisaic support for Hyrcanus II and look at his treatment of the isolated phrases in pesher unit 12. Dupont-Sommer identifies the pesher's reference to "plunder" as reflecting the carrying off of Temple treasures by Pompey.⁹³ If the pesher is placed in this historical context, then "plunder . . . in the midst of their congregation" would refer to the plunder of Judea, in a time of Pharisaic sway over the masses. This would not refer to the plundering by Pharisees specifically, then, but to the plunder of Judea under the Pharisees. Similarly, Dupont-Sommer describes the "sword of Gentiles" as a reference to "the Roman conquest of the Holy Land, particularly the taking of Jerusalem by Pompey, in which many Jews perished."⁹⁴ Dupont-Sommer sees the pesher's treatment of the phrase "countless slain" as reflecting the slaughter of the Jews in Jerusalem during Pompey's conquest of the city (12,000 in number, according to *Ant* 14 §§69–70). In reference to the "fear" in the pesher, Dupont-Sommer simply asserts that the civil war and the war against Pompey would have caused many to flee Jerusalem,⁹⁵ but we have no explicit record of this fact from antiquity.

To this point, the pesher has been viewed as describing the suffering of Judea on account of the Pharisees. Some of Dupont-Sommer's identifications are inconsistent with this proposal, though. He associates the "captivity" in the pesher with Pompey's deportation of Aristobulus II and his sons, as recorded in *Ant* 14 §79. However, this would imply the suffering of Manasseh, rather than Ephraim.⁹⁶

⁹² "Le Commentaire," 74. In his association of Hyrcanus II and the Pharisees, Dupont-Sommer also identifies Hyrcanus II as the Man of Lies in CD, and the Wicked Priest of 1QpHab, identifications that are no longer tenable ("Observations," 211).

⁹³ Dio Cassius contains the lone statement to that effect (*Historia Romana*, xxxvii, 16:4) in direct contradiction to *Ant* 14 §72, *Bj* 1 §152 and Cicero, *Pro Flacco*, 28, 67. (See M. Stern, *GLAJJ* II, 349–53.) Stern explains that although Pompey may have respected the sacred vessels of the Temple, he still would have carried away other treasures. Also, the large tribute that was levied upon Judea after its defeat may have been accounted as plunder.

⁹⁴ "Le Commentaire," 74.

⁹⁵ "Observations," 209.

⁹⁶ Cf. the discussion of "Manasseh" as Sadducees in Pericope 4. He also mentions Pompey's exile of much of the general population. Josephus does not mention such

Dupont-Sommer's remarks on *הדרור* are problematic. He perceives the term as referring to the civil wars between Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II.⁹⁷ However, given the grammatical referent of the suffix, a reference to internal strife would require both sets of antagonists to be within the camp of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things. It is more contextually appropriate to understand *הדרור* as a general reference to strife or feverishness, rather than to "civil strife" specifically.

As in the case of the previous proposal, Dupont-Sommer's suggested historical context is compatible with 4QpNah as a whole, and with some specific elements of unit 12. However, other elements are not accounted for in a way that suits the sense of this pesher unit (e.g., the deportation of Aristobulus, or civil strife). Unlike the reign of Salome, Pompey's conquest of Jerusalem accommodates the integrity of unit 12.

6.3.3 *The Reign of Alexander Jannaeus*

6.3.3.1 *Pericope 2 as a Recapitulation of Pericope 1*

Schiffman's placement of the pesher within the reign of Jannaeus accommodates some of the elements of the pesher, but is difficult to reconcile with others. Schiffman states,

This picture (4QpNah 3–4 6–8) corresponds closely with that of Josephus. *Ant* 13.14.2 (§§379–83)⁹⁸ describes the manner in which Jannaeus dealt with his Jewish enemies who had allied themselves with him in order to expel their erstwhile ally Demetrius. He captured and killed the most powerful of them in what Josephus considers a cruel manner, crucifying them as we have already seen. Then his remaining opponents fled the country and remained in exile for as long as he lived.⁹⁹

deportation. However, Dupont-Sommer points to Psalms of Solomon 2:6–8, "the sons and daughters in harsh captivity," and 8:21, "he led away their sons and daughters, those born in defilement."

Similarly, cf. the statement in SVM I:241, and n.29, that Pompey "was accompanied by a great number of Jewish captives." (See Philo, *Leg ad Gaium*, 155, referring to the sizable Jewish population of Rome as "having been brought as captives to Italy"). In light of Pompey's suppression of Judean resistance, his reduction of Judean borders, and his subjugation of Judea to Rome as a tributary, it is likely that the exile of Judeans was not limited to Aristobulus and his family. Cf. *Ant* 14 §71, "one of those taken captive was Absalom . . ." implying that there were others as well.

⁹⁷ "Observations," 209.

⁹⁸ Cf. *Bj* §§96–98.

⁹⁹ "Pharisees and Sadducees," 282.

Key words in Schiffman's summary that recall the pesher's terminology are "captured," "fled" (implying fear), and "exile."¹⁰⁰ The unstable alliances and opposition may be reflected in the word *הרהור*.¹⁰¹ Schiffman does not address the element of "plunder." He seems to imply that the "cruelty" of the crucifixions is comparable to the pesher's "abundance" of slain. The "sword of the nations" in line 5 is taken as a reference to the Pharisaic appeal to Demetrius for aid in their opposition to Jannaeus. For Schiffman, the slaughter, flight, and exile of unit 12 "clearly refers to the aftermath of the war with Demetrius, rather than to some period of Pharisaic rule . . . Even after the war with Demetrius and his expulsion, the Pharisees were still pursued by destruction and were forced to flee. Further, the text describes the slaying of large numbers of their comrades. All this the author blames on the plot hatched by the Pharisees to overthrow Jannaeus with the help of the Seleucids."¹⁰²

It seems difficult to have the pesher refer to Demetrius again, after the previous pericope already recorded the defeat of the Pharisees. Schiffman accounts for the recapitulation by viewing the unit as a kind of summary attached to an attribution of blame. However, the structure of the pesher incorporates "the Gentile sword" in the list of calamities suffered by the Pharisees. This element is included with captivity, plunder, exile, and death in a list of those things which shall not cease "from the midst of their congregation." If the integrity of the pesher in unit 12 is to be maintained, then "the sword of Gentiles" cannot be viewed as a cause of the calamities listed, as it is itself one element in the list.

This proposal accommodates many of the details in pesher unit 12. It accounts for the placement of Pericope 2 within 4QpNah, though not as smoothly as the previous suggestions, since it requires a recapitulation of events that appeared to have already been resolved in Pericope 1. It preserves the integrity of the pesher unit to a great extent, by supposing Pharisaic suffering rather than Pharisaic

¹⁰⁰ Along with Flusser's hypothesis associating this unit with Salome, Maier raised the possibility that this pesher referred to Jannaeus's persecution of the Pharisees. He cited the flight of the sages and the hiding of Simon ben Shetah described in the Talmud ("Weitere Stucke," 245. Cf. SVM II: 221–24; bBer 48a and parallels; bKidd 66a).

¹⁰¹ The defection of a number of opponents to Jannaeus after Demetrius's departure from the land could reflect internal strife in the Pharisaic camp.

¹⁰² "Pharisees and Sadducees," 281–82.

victimization of others. However, the interpretation of the element “sword of Gentiles” upsets this balance. Most significantly, this hypothesis does not accommodate the distinction we have observed between the “historical” thrust of Pericope 1 and the pesher’s explicit placement of Pericope 2 in אֲדָרִית הַיָּמִים.

6.3.3.2 *A Short Interval of Pharisaic Dominion during Jannaeus’s Reign*

Tantlevskij places unit 12 in nearly the same timeframe as Schiffman, but in a different political milieu.¹⁰³ He proposes that following Jannaeus’s defeat at Shechem, but prior to Jannaeus’s capture of Bethoma, the Pharisees enjoyed a brief period of power during which they actually controlled Jerusalem. He thus has col. IV refer to Jannaeus’s recapture of Jerusalem. Such official Pharisaic rule in this period is not attested by Josephus.¹⁰⁴ More problematic is the fact that this alleged control would have pre-dated the crucifixion of the captives from Bethoma. Yet these crucifixions have been the key to the historical contextualization of Pericope 1!¹⁰⁵ In Tantlevskij’s view, the hangings in 3–4, col. I would refer to some other case of “hanging alive” that occurred prior to the battle of Shechem.¹⁰⁶ However, it is precisely the exceptional nature of the crucifixions recorded in *Ant* §380 that allows for an association of the pesher with Alexander Jannaeus altogether. By dismissing the uniqueness of the event in Josephus, Tantlevskij rids the identification of any substantial validity.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰³ “Historical Background,” 329–38.

¹⁰⁴ Tantlevskij assigns col. II to a period just after Alexander Jannaeus’s defeat at Shechem at the hands of Demetrius III. After Jannaeus’s flight, Tantlevskij maintains that, “in Jerusalem, the Pharisees temporarily came to power, supported by thousands of their adherents” (“Historical Background,” 332–33). He describes a “diarchy of the Pharisees and the Sadducees headed by the King Alexander—the situation that lasted only a few months (?) in 88 BC” (*ibid.*, 335). He points to *Bḡ* 1 §§95, 98 and *Ant* 13 §§379, 383 as testimony to this turn of events. *Bḡ* §95 indicates that following his defeat Alexander fled to the mountains for an unspecified amount of time. In itself, Tantlevskij’s assumption that the Pharisees were in charge during this period is not unreasonable. However, it must be recognized that this is a hypothesis, not a recorded fact.

¹⁰⁵ The dating of frag 3–4 col. I of 4QpNah is based upon the identification of the “Lion of Wrath who hanged men alive” as Alexander Jannaeus. See ch. 4.

¹⁰⁶ Hence, his assertion that the crucifixion recorded in *Ant* 13 §380 and *Bḡ* 1 §113, was “probably by no means the only case of the death penalty by crucifixion (or simply ‘hanging men alive’) being imposed on insurgents during the 94/93–88 uprising” (“Historical Background,” 331). As for Alexander’s crushing of the Pharisees, and the notorious crucifixions recorded in Josephus, Tantlevskij says, “the commentator seems to have failed to have noticed these events.”

¹⁰⁷ Moreover, Josephus’s presentation of the crucifixions indicates that the exe-

In terms of the specific elements of the pesher, Tantlevskij's proposal does not allow for a high level of correspondence. He adopts Schiffman's association of the "sword of Gentiles" with the invitation to Demetrius—but Demetrius had withdrawn from Judea prior to the period of alleged Pharisaic supremacy.¹⁰⁸ He does not present specific historical conditions reflecting captivity and plunder. Tantlevskij seems to identify unit 12 as referring to the period during which "they waged continuous war with Alexander," with "they" as the Pharisees in control of Judea.¹⁰⁹ He writes that the pesher "seems to hint at the reprisals the Pharisees carried out in the capital and the territories under their control against their opponents who had failed to flee."¹¹⁰ However, Josephus writes about waging war against Jannaeus, not about reprisals. Also, Tantlevskij's interpretation retains the problem of the hypothesis of Flusser and Amusin in which the pericope is dated to Salome's reign. If the "guilty corpses" are the enemies of the Pharisees, with the Pharisees as victimizers, this would be a major departure from the sense of the biblical text. The pesher seems to refer to the Pharisees as victims, comparable to Nahum's Nineveh, suffering on account of their own guilt. As for the appropriateness of the dating for the composition of a whole, Tantlevskij's hypothesis forces the disparate events in cols. I–IV into a single historical reality, and one that is of doubtful historicity at that.

One more aspect of Tantlevskij's position bears notice. Tantlevskij points to the use of imperfect verbs to describe the downfall of "Manasseh" in col. IV as evidence that the pesher was composed during a time when Sadducees were still in power, thus before their rise under Salome.¹¹¹ In actuality, this "proof" would rule out only the time of Salome herself. It would still allow for a later dating of the pesher, given the temporary successes of Aristobulus II and his

cutions were viewed as an outstanding event. He comments upon Alexander's "excessive cruelty" in that specific context. In *Ant* 13 §410, the death of Diogenes and the general vengeful policy of the Pharisees is presented as a Pharisaic attempt to "kill those who had urged Alexander to put the eight hundred to death." The crucifixion of the 800 does not seem to be just one of many such instances ordered by Jannaeus.

¹⁰⁸ "Historical Background," 333.

¹⁰⁹ *B7* I §96 describes the situation subsequent to Jannaeus's flight as follows, "the remainder of the people, however, did not, on the withdrawal of their allies, drop their quarrel, but waged continuous war with Alexander, until, after killing a very large number of them, he drove the rest into Bemeselis."

¹¹⁰ P. 333.

¹¹¹ "Historical Background," 334.

priestly supporters. More importantly, though, verbal tenses are not suitable chronological indicators in peshet. The use of the imperfect may indicate that a particular event was being predicted and had not yet occurred in fact; however, it may instead be a sign of *vaticinium ex eventu*. The Community's perception of the ongoing nature of the eschatological era creates a kind of transcendence of time. In the words of Dupont-Sommer, "ce temps futur relève du style oraculaire, prophétique, cher à nos commentateurs esséniens, et le fait visé appartient en réalité au passé."¹¹²

6.3.4 *Alternative Proposal: Adaptation of Dupont-Sommer's Attribution of the Pericope to Pompey's Conquest*

In light of the above critiques, there remains a need to find a historical context for col. II that would maximize lemma/peshet correspondence. The phrase ממשלה דורשי החלקות implies a time period in which Pharisees were key political players. The terms בימיהם, בינוהם, מקרב עדהם, and בעצה אשמחם indicate that the tragedies in the peshet occurred under the watch of the Pharisees, though not that the Pharisees themselves committed the acts. In fact, we expect the Pharisees themselves to experience the negative repercussions of these horrors, just as Nineveh suffers in the biblical text of the lemma.

Dupont-Sommer's hypothesis seems to provide the most suitable scenario for the peshet, though it requires some modification.¹¹³ Assuming chronological continuity in 4QpNah, the most likely context of col. II seems to be a time period after Jannaeus's crucifixion of the 800. Since the Pharisees were in exile during the remainder of Alexander's reign, that period may be excluded. Pharisaic dominance is documented under Salome, but not the suffering of the nation as a whole or of the Pharisees themselves. The Pharisees may be assumed to have retained some measure of influence following

¹¹² He points to 1QpHab IX,9–12; X,13; XI,4–6; XII,2–10 to exemplify this phenomenon ("Observations," 223–24). Peshet does not aim to be predictive, but to serve as fulfillment literature. A related phenomenon would be the oft-noted tendency of peshet to compress, or "telescope," non-contemporaneous events. Since post-exilic Judaism is viewed as a final era, its historical events transcend chronological criteria and are judged by their value in demonstrating the fulfillment of biblical prophecies. In general, peshet lends itself to the use of the imperfect tense since from the vantage point of the original biblical prophet, which they ostensibly represent, all the events of the Second Temple period occur in the "future."

¹¹³ See also, Stegemann, *Library of Qumran*, 131. He dates 4QpNah 3–4 III,6–8 to "their fall from power under Aristobulus II," and the antecedent of "their" seems to be both the Pharisees and Sadducees.

Salome's death, in the ensuing disastrous period. Pompey's conquest is thus the most likely subject of the peshar, but we are lacking information on the role of the Pharisees in this period that would enable us to evaluate this interpretation properly.¹¹⁴ We propose that the peshar refers to an independent Pharisaic bid to maintain authority during this period.

It may be assumed that the Pharisees opposed Aristobulus II in the civil conflict of this period. Josephus describes the priests alone as supporting Aristobulus during his control of Jerusalem.¹¹⁵ However, it may not be automatically supposed that the Pharisees supported Hyrcanus II. The most likely scenario may be that there was no unified Pharisaic policy. In *Ant* 14 §§40–41 Josephus writes of a hearing before Pompey that includes a delegation representing “the nation,” in opposing both of the Hasmonean brothers.¹¹⁶ Earlier, in *Ant* 14 §§34–37, delegations to Pompey included only envoys from Hyrcanus and Aristobulus. If the representatives of “the nation” were Pharisees, in consonance with the conventional characterization of the popular Pharisees,¹¹⁷ then perhaps they split with Hyrcanus at some point between these two audiences. Moreover, they were likely to have experienced internal dissension in attempting to determine a policy, given the abysmal alternatives before them.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁴ Cf. Neusner, *From Politics To Piety*, 49–66.

¹¹⁵ For the priestly association of the Sadducees, see SVM II:404–14; Schwartz, “Scribes and Pharisees,” in *Studies in the Jewish Background*, 101 n. 65. For the Sadducean affiliation of Aristobulus's earlier supporters, see the arguments of Amusin, presented above. It is reasonable to expect that these Sadducees continued to support Aristobulus, while Hyrcanus, Salome's choice of high priest, will have continued to court the Pharisees. Regarding the siege of Aristobulus, *Ant* 14 §20 reads, “the citizens, joining Hyrcanus's side, assisted him in the siege, while only the priests remained loyal to Aristobulus.” The devotion of the priests in his faction, refusing to halt their sacrifices as they themselves are being slaughtered, indicates the priestly nature of the group.

¹¹⁶ *Ant* 14 §40 reads, “He [Pompey] heard the case of the Jews and their leaders, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, who were quarreling with one another, while the nation (Gr. τὸ ἔθνος) was against them both, saying that it was the custom of their country (Gr. πάτριον) to obey the priests of the God who was venerated by them, but that these two, who were descended from the priests, were seeking to change their form of government in order that they might become a nation of slaves.”

¹¹⁷ See ch. 4 on “Seekers-after-Smooth-Things” and section 6.1.2 of this chapter on “talmud”.

¹¹⁸ Changes of allegiance are mentioned a number of times in Josephus's account of this period, and it appears that neutrality was not a very viable option. Witness the fate of Onias (“Honio the Circledrawer”) who was stoned to death for refusing to curse Aristobulus's supporters at the demand of “the people” who were enforcing the siege (*Ant* 14 §§22–24; mTa'an 3:8, bTa'an 23a, yTa'an 66d–67a).

We propose that Pharisees were divided among themselves in the years 67–63 BCE, but sought nonetheless to retain the mantle of national authority. This proposal can accommodate a number of details in the pesher. The relevance of “plunder” and “captivity” was demonstrated above in reference to Pompey’s conquest of Jerusalem. The reference to “plunder” might also reflect the escalation of bribery of Seleucid officials prior to Pompey’s actual conquest and the transformation of Judea into a tributary of Rome.¹¹⁹

Regarding “exile from fear,” Josephus’s account does not provide direct evidence. However, in recounting the story of Ḥonio the Circledrawer, Josephus mentions in passing that the besieging party had to seek Ḥonio out, since “this man hid himself when he saw that the civil war continued to rage.”¹²⁰ In the early stages of conflict between Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II, Josephus twice describes Hyrcanus himself as fleeing and seeking refuge.¹²¹ Also, in explaining Aemilius Scaurus’s decision to support Aristobulus, Josephus contrasts Aristobulus’s position within a “city which was among the most fortified and powerful,” to that of Hyrcanus supporters, described disparagingly as “some fugitives together with the host of Nabateans.”¹²²

The explanation of the pesher’s phrase וחרהור בינתם remains difficult in the context of this historical setting as it has been in the previous proposals. We may perhaps discern a reference to political dissension among the Pharisees.¹²³

The “sword of the Gentiles” would refer to Roman military presence, generally, and particularly to the slaughter of the Jews during the conquest of Jerusalem.¹²⁴ The status and loyalties of the Pharisees during Pompey’s conquest of the Temple Mount cannot be deter-

¹¹⁹ Cf. *Ant* 14 §§30–32, 34–35, 37. Similarly, Hyrcanus offered gifts to Aretas the Nabatean and promised to cede territory to him in exchange for his support. Cf. *Ant* 14 §§17, 18.

¹²⁰ *Ant* 14 §22.

¹²¹ *Ant* 14 §5, 16; *BJ* 1 §§121, 125.

¹²² *Ant* 14 §32. *BJ* 1 §129 states that after Aristobulus bribed Scaurus, Aretas retreated from Judea “terror-struck” by Scaurus’s threats.

¹²³ Alternatively, the phrase could be taken to denote actual fire instead. In describing the desperate state of the population of Jerusalem at the time of Pompey’s conquest, Josephus records that people “set fire to their houses, and burned themselves within them” (*Ant* 14 §70. Cf. *BJ* 1 §150: “some, driven mad by their hopeless plight, set fire to the buildings around the wall and were consumed in flames”).

¹²⁴ The “sword of the Gentiles” may also refer to Aretas and his Nabatean force. Hyrcanus’s alliance with Aretas at Antipater’s behest may have weakened Pharisaic leverage in that camp.

mined. Some Pharisees, at least, are likely to have been among those slain in the battle on the Temple Mount: “most of the slain perished at the hands of their countrymen of the opposite faction . . . of the Jews 12,000 perished.”¹²⁵ Perhaps the Pharisees, or many of them, abstained from engaging in the conflict; they may have been among those whom Hyrcanus dissuaded from opposing Pompey.¹²⁶ The slaughter at the Temple Mount would then reflect the failure of Pharisaic leadership, and the ineffectuality of the party in the face of Gentile conquest and bloodshed. Pharisaic misguidance would have led thousands of their supporters down the path of civil war, culminating in *their* deaths.¹²⁷

6.4 CONCLUSION

The author of 4QpNah apparently saw the decline of Pharisaic power at the beginning of this period and the larger issue of the deterioration of Judean sovereignty together as related manifestations of the eradication of the existing order.¹²⁸ Unit 12 describes the horrors suffered by the Pharisees, and the suffering imposed upon the nation in the cataclysm surrounding their fall from power. Unit 12 may be viewed as a summary or outline of the negative effects of Pharisaic power. The author of the pesher believes that the leaders of Ephraim brought ruin upon Judea. He asserts that their distorted policies devastated both their proponents and their antagonists.

¹²⁵ *Bj* 1 §150; Cf. *Ant* 14 §§69–70.

¹²⁶ *Ant* 14 §73 explains that Pompey restored the high priesthood Hyrcanus in part because Hyrcanus had dissuaded “the Jews throughout the country” (τοὺς κατα τὴν χώραν Ἰουδαίους) from fighting alongside Aristobulus (τὸ κατὰ τὴν χώραν πλῆθος, in *Bj* 1 §153).

¹²⁷ Cf. *Ant* 14 §77 (no parallel in *Bj*) “For this misfortune which befell Jerusalem Hyrcanus and Aristobulus were responsible, because of their dissension (προς ἀλλήλους στασιάσαντες).”

¹²⁸ The smug tone of 4QpNah is striking. Whatever the precise legal attitude held by the sect toward contemporary physical Jerusalem and the Temple, the detached attitude of the Jewish author to Pompey’s bloody conquest is remarkable. It has been demonstrated by others that the Qumran texts view history only as it pertains to their cosmic scheme. (Thus, for example, A. Baumgarten states, “what was important about the past for a sectarian was not some *antiquarian* interest, but the relevance of the past for present and future, establishing that sectarian’s link with previous and future generations” [“Perception of the Past,” 12]). The author of this pesher was apparently so stoic as to regard the significance of the bloody capture of Jerusalem *only* in terms of the fulfillment of a prophetic datum that would bring him closer to a determined historical/eschatological point.

There are a number of ways to understand the structure of unit 13. According to our preferred structure, the first series of nouns indicates those who suffered because they were swayed by Pharisaic demagogues.¹²⁹ The stronger language of *וּבְרָדוֹ* and *פְּוִלָו* used in the second part of the pesher indicates the fate of those opponents who were the object of Pharisaic incitement.¹³⁰

Units 14 and 15 look forward to the total destruction of the Pharisees. These opponents of the Community had already suffered and declined before the composition of the pesher, but these units anticipate the actual end of the Pharisees, the stage following *אֲהָרִית הַקָּץ*. At that time, the Community will comprise the true Israel.

Thus, units 12 and 13 seem to reflect an observed, recent, reality witnessed by the author of the pesher; units 14 and 15 reflect his hope for the permanence of this Pharisaic defeat and for the subsequent emergence of the dominance of his own Community. It appears from Josephus that the Pharisaic party was dormant from the death of Salome until the rise of Herod. Josephus does not speak of the Pharisees as a group from the time of Aristobulus's flight at the end of Salome's reign (*Ant* 13 §423, or §428 if the "elders" with Hyrcanus are assumed to be the Pharisees) until Herod's reign (*Ant* 17 §41). Upon Hyrcanus's defeat and concession to Aristobulus, Pharisaic power seems to have vanished. When Hyrcanus re-emerges to reclaim his position, Antipater is at the helm and Aretas's Arabs form his army (*Ant* 14 §§19–20). Only after Aretas's victory do we see Jewish support of Hyrcanus, but it is that of "the people," *τοῦ δήμου*, rather than an organized faction. The "most esteemed Jews (*οἱ δοκιμώτατοι τῶν Ἰουδαίων*), fled to Egypt." Whereas Aristobulus seems to have retained his Sadduceean supporters, designated here as "the priests," the populace and Pharisees no longer seem to function as a bloc, as they did earlier. As noted above, *Ant* 14 §40 describes Pompey's audience with Hyrcanus, Aristobulus, and "the nation," *τὸ ἔθνος*. The request of the people to return to theocracy

¹²⁹ "Kings, officers, priests, the people, and proselytes" provides specification of the "many" who were misled. This would include Salome Alexandra and Hyrcanus II as monarchs; probably the "priests" would refer to the early Hasmoneans, Jonathan, Simon, and perhaps John Hyrcanus as well as Hyrcanus II. The "masses" are commonly associated with the Pharisees. The inclusion of the "proselytes" appears to be exegetically prompted, presumably by the mention of *מִשְׁפָּהוֹת* in the lemma, as explained in our discussion in ch. 7.

¹³⁰ The terms are more general in this latter portion of the unit. "Rulers" could refer to Jannaeus and Aristobulus II, as well as to Diogenes and his group.

and avoid kingship is a far cry from Pharisaic cooperation with supportive earlier Hasmoneans.¹³¹ We would identify this independent group with the pesher's "Israel" in unit 14.

The author of Pesher Nahum gloats over the fact that the Assembly of the Seekers has been dismantled, with the group having failed in its legislative endeavors (their council perishes, line 7), in its (mis-)education of the masses (they will no longer mislead the congregation of the simple, line 7) and in its judicial/executive monopoly (their counsel will no longer be accepted, line 8). This pesher describes the eradication of Pharisaic institutions as a result of Aristobulus's rise to power. We suggest that it reflects the situation pertaining from the time of Salome's death, particularly Pompey's takeover of Jerusalem and the immediate aftermath of those events.¹³²

¹³¹ Hyrcanus is supported by more than a thousand "most-esteemed" Jews (τῶν δοκιμωτάτων), but these are recruited by Antipater the Idumean and can thus not be identified with the once-powerful leading Pharisees. If some, or even many, of these individuals were Hyrcanus's former supporters, they nonetheless may not be said to represent a Pharisaic party or "council." The will of the masses, formerly subsumed under that of the Pharisees, is expressed at this point by "the nation."

¹³² It is likely that the composition of this pesher pre-dates the apparent resurgence of the Pharisees later in Hyrcanus's administration. The tone of Pericope 3 is one of confidence that the plight of the Pharisees as described in unit 12 is not a temporary setback, but the major step toward their final eradication. This finality is particularly evident in lines 7 and 8 of col. III "and they will not continue. . . ." However, the Pharisees do appear again as a major force under Herod, and it is likely that they began to reconsolidate their power even while Hyrcanus was still nominally leading the nation. *Ant* 14 §§163–65 describes the emergence of a faction that is hostile to Hyrcanus. These "leading Jews" (τέλει τῶν Ἰουδαίων) or "chief Jews" (οἱ πρότοι τῶν Ἰουδαίων) lie low at first, but finally confront Hyrcanus with the accusation that he had abandoned control of Judea to Antipater and his sons. (Cp. *B7* 1 §§208–09 where those who approach Hyrcanus are referred to as "a number of malicious persons").

The role of the Sanhedrin and its relationship to the Pharisees could potentially be brought to bear on the question of Pharisaic resurgence, but a thorough investigation is beyond our scope here. From *Ant* 14 §168–79 (Herod's trial) and *Ant* 15 §370 (Pollion the Pharisee and his interaction with Herod) it is apparent that Pharisees were members of the Sanhedrin, which was the authoritative judicial body at that point in time. The dating of the body known as the Sanhedrin and its nature has been much discussed (cf. SVM II:199–218 and sources cited). The Sanhedrin which tried (or actually failed to try) Herod has been seen as (1) a link in an unbroken ancient chain of authority (e.g., from the time of Moses, as in *mAvot* 1:1) or (2) a newly established institution or (3) a newly re-instated institution. Its membership has been viewed as (at least in part) Pharisaic. Its authority has been understood to encompass (1) legislative and/or (2) judicial/executive and/or (3) educational spheres, the realms addressed in unit 13 of Pesher Nahum. There is likely to be a connection between Josephus's association of the Sanhedrin with Hyrcanus's tenure and a Pharisaic revival. We suggest that Pesher Nahum was composed prior to that time.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER SEVEN

PERICOPE 3, UNITS 11–16: LITERARY ANALYSIS

The base-text of Pericope 3 is Nah 3:1–7, which describes the culpability and punishment of Nineveh. A statement of Nineveh’s offenses precedes a vivid picture of the impending attack upon the city and its devastation. Then, Nahum employs the metaphor of a harlot in a corresponding illustration of Nineveh’s corrupt nature and its coming fall. The pesher applies these biblical verses to the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, demonstrating their guilt and their decline, and predicting their eradication. As described in ch. 6, we understand this pericope to comment upon the decline of Pharisaic power associated with Pompey’s conquest of Judea in 67 BCE.

7.1 PESHER UNIT 11

3–4, II, lines 1–2 on Nah 3:1a

*Woe, city of blood, she is all lies, with pillage she is filled*¹

In Nahum, the words of this lemma describe the corruption of Nineveh. The pesher closely paraphrases its lemma, but identifies the contemporary guilty entity as the city of Ephraim, which we have associated with the Pharisees. In 4QpNah, the accusation of corruption would have theological as well as social and moral significance. Josephus’s depiction of the conflict between Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II, which we take as the context of this pericope, offers a glimpse of factional splits, reorganizations, and intrigue. The Qumran corpus features repeated characterizations of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things as liars.²

¹ Alternatively, with asyndetic conjunction rather than a compound construction: “all of it is full of lies and pillage” (Vermes). Compare Smith’s “Oh city, bloody throughout, full of lies and booty” (*ICC: Nahum*, 334).

² See section 1 of ch. 4, above. In reference to the particular words for deceit in this unit, cf. 1QS X,22 for שׁוֹרֵר as evil speech, and 1QS IV,9, 21 for the diametric opposition between those who engage in שׁוֹרֵר and the men of אֱמֶת in the dualistic Qumran schema. 1QS V,15 applies Ex 23:7, “from every matter of falsehood

The specific elements in the lemma and pesher may be aligned as follows:

הוי	= היא	paragram ³
עיר הדמים	= עיר אפרים דורשי ההלקות	symbol ⁴
{NO equivalent}	= לאחריה הימים	un-pegged temporal gloss ⁵
כולה	= ׀תהלכו	anagram ⁶
[כחש]	= בכחש	repetition
פרק	= ..ושקר]	? ⁷
מלאה	= {NO Equivalent}	

(דבר שקר) distance yourself,” to support the ban on any interaction between community members and non-sectarians. In CD VI,1 the “false prophets” of the days of Jeremiah serve as paradigms for the contemporary false preachers, the opponents of the sect. Cf. 4Q339 (4List of False Prophets ar), which may name John Hyrcanus at the end of the list of biblical prophets (see the discussion in *DJD* XIX, and the sources cited there). Cf. 1QpHab X,9–13 on Hab 2:12 “city of blood” which twice employs the word שקר in describing the Spouter of Lies.

³ Although “פשרו היא” conforms to one of the types of introductory formulas listed by Horgan (p. 242, category I.A.2.d), it is not employed frequently. In the extant portions of 4QpNah, the form “פשרו + pronoun” is preserved only here and in the short pesher interpretations in units 18 and 19 (frags 3–4 III,11–IV,1). This particular pesher formula seems to have been chosen intentionally in this unit, in order to achieve correspondence with the interjection in the lemma.

⁴ For the equation of the bloody city/Nineveh with Ephraim/the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, see ch. 4.

⁵ On this type of temporal addition to pesher identifications, see Nitzan, 85 and Horgan, 182. Cf. 3–4 III,3 באחריה הקץ; IV,3 לקץ האחרון.

⁶ We follow Allegro in taking the *hitpa’el* ׀תהלכו to denote “conducting themselves” rather than simply “walking.” Schiffman raises the possibility that the lexical choice of a form of הלכ here reflects an intentional pun on *halakha*, “religious law, way of life” as practiced by the Pharisees (a term that is reflected in the epithet דורשי ההלקות, as described in ch. 4). In that case, ׀תהלכו may be viewed as related to כולה primarily as an anagram, but would also reflect a nod to the pervasive role of *halakha* in Pharisaic life. Note that the masc. pl. verb agrees with דורשי ההלקות rather than with the fem. sing. pronoun היא, which linked “the city” in the lemma and in the pesher.

⁷ It is possible that both בכחש and ושקר] in this unit derive from the lemma’s כחש. In that case, פרק would not be represented in the pesher. This is the view of Schiffman (280), who states that the pesher “substitutes the hendiadys בכחש ושקר] for the biblical כחש, no doubt for emphasis.” It seems more likely that פרק is somehow the equivalent of ושקר], though no exegetical link is readily discernible, beyond the rough similarity in the letters of the words. Talmudic associations of פרק with sessions or units of rabbinic teachings are too late to be of value for 4QpNah. It is worth noting that the use of פרק in the biblical verse itself is unusual, and not entirely clear. Our translation, “pillage” derives from the context. (Cf. Spronk; *HALOT* defines פרק here as “plunder,” stretching the base meaning of the root, which is to “remove,” to “tear apart or off.”)

The word might also denote anarchy, or “unbridled” lawlessness. This would be a similar extension into abstraction, with the physical act of “tearing apart” or “separating into pieces” applied to society. For positive metaphorical usages of פרק in

The author of the pesher seems to have paraphrased the lemma fairly closely, restating some elements, adding a temporal gloss, and substituting the contemporary entity for the text's "city of blood." The sense of the pesher is identical to that of the lemma, and yet there is a jarring flaw in alignment, as one element on each side of the above chart lacks an equivalent (לְאַהֲרִית הַיָּמִים; מְלֹאָה). It is possible, however, that the lemma's מְלֹאָה may provide an exegetical basis for the temporal gloss. Perhaps the word "fill" was interpreted as an allusion to "fulfillment," particularly in an ultimate sense. Although falling short of "equivalence," this interpretation allows an association between the two unaligned elements in this lemma.⁸

7.2 PESHER UNIT 12

3–4, II, lines 3–6 on Nah 3:1b–3

There will not cease predation, nor the sound of the whip and the sound of the rumbling of the wheel, and the galloping horse, and the charging chariot. Lunging horseman! Flame and flash of spear! And a multitude of slain and a mass of corpses! and there is no end of (dead) bodi(es) and they will stumble over their bodies

In Nahum, the vivid imagery in verses 2–3 is almost always understood as a description of the imminent punishment of Nineveh.⁹ In the biblical text of Nahum, the phrase לֹא יִמוֹשׁ טָרֶף ends verse 3:1, and is part of the prophet's description of the evil of Nineveh, with

the sense of removal of sovereignty, see Gen 27:40, Lam 5:8 and Ps 136:24, and the Aramaic sense of the root as "redemption." In later Hebrew, the idiom פְּרִיקַת עוֹל, denotes a "lack of law" (cf. Even-Shoshan Dictionary). J. Maier's translation here, "Gewaltat" (violence), may derive from the same idea ("Weitere Stucke," 228). Thus, Nahum may be deploring the plunder committed by Nineveh, which has been a recurring theme of his; or he may be referring to the "unbridled" lawlessness of the city. Cf. Ps 7:3, "lest like a lion they tear me apart (טָרַף), rending in pieces (פָּרַק)." In any case, the exegesis of this word in the pesher is not clear.

⁸ See our comments on 3–4 I, 6–8, pesher unit 9, in reference to "fill" as "fulfill." It may also be suggested that the pesher treated הַיָּמִים as a sort of anagram/acronym for בְּרִישֵׁי הַהֲלָקוֹת לְאַהֲרִית הַיָּמִים. This would also resolve another difficulty. The pesher's analog to "city of blood" seems to treat the idiom as a whole. Although the word "city" is repeated, there is no direct exegesis of the word "blood." (Carmignac contrasts 1QpHab X,9–13, where the pesher repeats the word "blood" as well as "city"; *Les Textes*, 89).

⁹ Spronk names only a handful of scholars who view these verses as describing acts committed by Assyria. Proponents of the standard view are too numerous to name.

טרף connoting an offense (whether plunder or bloodshed). However, 4QpNah attaches these words to the following verse, so that they introduce and become part of the string of phrases indicating terror within Nineveh.¹⁰ It might be possible to construe verses 2–3 of Nahum as expansions of the corrupt acts committed by inhabitants of the “bloody city,” but they are more naturally viewed as retribution experienced by these inhabitants. The placement of this unit in the time of Pompey’s conquest of Jerusalem, following Dupont-Sommer, allows the pesher to be understood as faithfully reflecting the retributive context in the Bible.¹¹ Only the first phrase is recontextualized, and this is achieved via a deliberate exegetical act of “cutting and pasting,” i.e. the dissociation of “predation will not cease” from the previous lemma.

Additional support for viewing the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things as the victims in this unit, can be found in the pesher’s dependence on Daniel 11:32–35. After describing the desecration of the Temple by the navies of the Kittim, and the establishment of the “desolation of abomination” (שקוץ משומם) by the King of the North, Daniel states:

W. Maier remarks upon the “staccato style” in these verses, as well as the “progressive action” (*Nahum*, 295). The whip sets the chariot in motion and the wheels start turning, increasing in speed with the galloping horses, and rising to a frenzied, jolting pace. Pesher Nahum, however, does not seem to emphasize this progressive factor; it uses the base-text as a springboard for enumerating a number of afflictions besetting the “domain of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things.”

¹⁰ We follow Dupont-Sommer in perceiving a deliberate exegetical re-alignment on the part of the pesher in detaching the phrase “there shall not cease” from the previous verse and prefixing it to the initial phrases in vs. 2 (“Le Commentaire,” 72). The addition of the conjunctive *vav* in 4QpNah (as compared to MT קול) facilitates this re-configuration. In MT, לא ימוש טרף is the concluding phrase of Nah 3:1. In 4QpNah, ולא ימוש טרף is detached from the first half of verse 1, to initiate the lemma in unit 12. The phrase acquires a different sense when attached to verses 2–3, such that לא ימוש טרף governs the ensuing succession of phrases.

Charlesworth’s *Graphic Concordance* cites 1Q55 line 3 as ימש ממנו טרף. Unfortunately, the citation does not appear in any meaningful context. The only other word clearly preserved on 1Q55 is ניים on the previous line. Cf. Milik, *DJD* I, 146; Pl. XXXV.

¹¹ In contrast, the association of this unit with Salome Alexandra, e.g., by Flusser and Amusin, would require the pesher to depart from the apparent biblical context of these verses, as described in ch. 6. Cf. Flusser, “Pharisees,” 136; בנה מדבר, 456–58; Amusin, “Éphraïm et Manassé,” 389–96; “Historical Events,” 123–52.

Locating the pesher within the period of Alexander Jannaeus, as Schiffman does, also allows the Pharisees to function as victims, as is consistent with the biblical context. Although Tantlevskij places the pesher within the same time period, his interpretation poses greater difficulty for contextual correspondence (cf. “Historical Background,” 333).

He will flatter with smooth words (בחלקות) those who act wickedly toward the covenant, but the people devoted to their God will stand firm. The knowledgeable among the people will make the many understand; and for a while they shall fall (ונכשלו) by sword and flame (בחרב ובלהבה), suffer captivity and spoliation (בשבי ובבוזה). In defeat they will receive a little help, and many will join them insincerely . . . for an interval still remains until the appointed time

The strong lexical dependence of unit 11 of 4QpNah upon this biblical text indicates that the pesher directs the reader to the passage in Daniel.¹² Presumably, the author of 4QpNah also describes a time in which the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things suffer along with their followers, after having been swayed in some measure to support a powerful foreign king who proceeded to desecrate their Temple.

Lastly, the internal evidence of the pesher also demonstrates the status of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things as victims. In mapping lemma/pesher correspondence, there are obvious “pluses” in the pesher that stand out as specifications of the identity of the victims, indicating the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things: בעצת אשמחם, בינוחם, מקרב עדתם. The addition of בימיהם also seems to stress that the terror was experienced during a period of dominance by the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, rather than indicating that it was inflicted by them.¹³ The function of the above elements as “context-markers” accounts for their presence in the pesher, despite the absence of a “peg” in the lemma. The central elements of this pesher unit have a firmer basis in the words of the lemma itself. The pesher appears to have taken the lemma’s לא ימוש as governing the subsequent text up until וברק הניה.¹⁴ All these horrors are “not to cease.” The rest of the lemma was viewed as a second series of phrases. Structural correspondence in the two halves of unit 12 can be mapped as follows.

¹² Cf. our observations on “un-pegged pluses” in “Secondary Citations in Pesher Nahum.”

¹³ Similarly, the designation of ניים as perpetrators of the violence in line 5, seems to stress that they occupy this role vis-a-vis the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things (rather than that they are employed by the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things to harm others, as suggested by Amusin).

¹⁴ This assessment is not universal. Allegro and Gaster ended the series of afflictions that “departeth not” with “the great heap of carcasses.” Dupont-Sommer viewed לא ימוש as governing the sounds of the whip and the noise of the wheel in addition to predation, but took the subsequent phrases as independent exclamations. Carmignac stated that “predation will not cease” stands alone, with the rest of the lemma as one long “sentence” of which the elements are separated by commas.

(Note that the elements cited from 4QpNah are not cited in the order in which they appear in the pesher):

I. Nahum	4QpNah
הנית [חרב],	חרב נזים
טרף	ובז
שוט (וקול)	שבי
דהר (וקול) רעש אופן וסוס דהר	ונלות מפחד אױב
ומרכבה מרקדה פרש מעלה	
להוב, וברק	וחרחור בינותם

II. After הנית, the pesher treats the remaining portion of 3:3 as a separate series. The section begins with a compound exclamation with no predicate.¹⁵ This is followed by a clause including ואין קץ, and then וכשלו ונויהם. The symmetry is identifiable in the following outline:

Nahum	4QpNah
a <u>ורוב חלל וכבוד פנר</u>	= a' <u>ורוב פנרי אשמה יפולו בימיהם</u>
b <u>ואין קץ לנויה</u>	= b' <u>ואין קץ לכלל הלליהם</u>
c <u>וכשלו ונויהם</u>	= c' <u>ואף בניית בשרם יכשולו בעצת אשמתם</u>

In section II, the elements ורוב, ואין קץ, and וכשלו appear in the same order in successive clauses in Nahum and 4QpNah. The middle clause uses the preposition ל in both cases, the final clause uses prepositional ב, and the initial clause features no preposition.¹⁶ פנר and נויה are represented in corresponding order in the first and last equation (i.e. a = a'; c = c'). However the lemma's נויה in the middle clause is represented instead by הלליהם. In fact, כלל הלליהם is a paraphrase of ורוב חלל (b' paraphrases a). The structure of the pesher retains the tri-partite series of the base-text, but with some overlap.

Internal symmetry within the pesher interpretation itself is also noteworthy. Most strikingly, all three clauses conclude with a prepositional phrase ending with a 3rd person possessive suffix (בימיהם) (בעצת אשמתם, לכלל הלליהם).¹⁷

¹⁵ The pesher supplies a verb (יפולו) in its representation of the first element of the series. For the lexical choice, see Num 14:32–34 and n. 30 below.

¹⁶ בימיהם is a temporal gloss, as observed above, and is not essential to the syntactic structure of the clause.

¹⁷ Moreover, the mention of culpability, overt in both a' and c' may be implicit in b', if the term הלליהם is understood in the sense of "desecration" as well as "slain body."

Individual elements may be aligned as follows:

Implied subject: i.e. the inhabitants of Nineveh¹⁸ = ממשלת דורשי החלקות¹⁸
denomination

לא ימוש	=	לא ימוש	repetition
{NO equivalent}	=	מקרב עדתם	“context-marker” ¹⁹
טרף	=	ובו	metaphor ²⁰
{NO equivalent}	=	נוים	un-pegged plus ²¹
וקול שוט	=	שבי	symbol, or paraphrase of homonym ²²

וקול:

רעש אופן	}	ונגלות מפחד אויב ²³
וסוס דהר		
ומרכבה מרקדה		
פרש מעלה		

¹⁸ Implied in the suffix of ונויהם.

¹⁹ This “plus” clarifies the exegetical recontextualization of the verse, emphasizing that the afflictions described in this unit are imposed upon the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, rather than inflicted by them upon others. On מקרב, see Deut 2:14–15, in reference to the termination of the generation of the men of war “from the midst of the camp” after 40 years in the wilderness. CD XX,13–15 echoes this verse in designating a period of 40 years from the death of the Teacher of Righteousness to the end of the men of war. 4QpNah uses similar language here, in referring to the eradication of individuals within the community of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things.

²⁰ Cf. Dupont-Sommer, “Le Commentaire,” 73. Although טרף in Nahum refers to acts of physical violence (“predation”), the pesher relies upon the related sense of this root as accumulation of “prey.” Cf. Targ ביוא here, Dan 11:33, ובבזה, and the proposed correspondence of טרף and הון in unit 10.

There are some grounds for viewing ובו as an antithetical reflection of the lemma’s וכבוד (i.e., using an antonym of a homograph, with כבוד as “glory” rather than “abundance”). The terms כבוד and בו appear as contrasts in a number of sectarian and military contexts at Qumran. However, the structural alignment, as outlined above, argues in favor of the translation “plunder” rather than humiliation. (Cf. Maier’s translation, “Schande” in “Weitere Stücke,” but “Plünderung” in the Nachtrag and in Qumran-Essener.)

²¹ This “plus” may be an oblique allusion to a secondary biblical source, Ezek 6:8, which is the only biblical occurrence of נויים and הרב together. Chapter 6 of Ezekiel predicts the destruction of the idolatry and idolators of the mountains of Israel, stressing that their annihilation is the direct result of their sinfulness. In addition to “sword” and “Gentiles,” the passage includes references to corpses (הלל... הלליהם) and carcasses (פנר), as well as exile and captives (נשבו), and harlotry (הזונה... הזונה). Cf. the note on לגויה, as well as our comments upon the apparently un-pegged “בנויים” in unit 10, in Pericope 2.

²² The pesher’s “captivity” may reflect a figurative interpretation of “being under a master’s whip.” Alternatively, it may treat the lemma’s “whip” as a homograph for the verbal root שוט, meaning to wander or roam, as an indication of the forced migration of captives.

²³ Brownlee had commented on the apparent absence of representations of these four elements in the pesher, “perhaps 3:1c–2 are summarized under ממשלת דורשי החלקות, but how? Or... under ‘sword of the gentiles?’” In our understanding, this

להוב, וברק	= וחרהור	symbol ²⁴
חניה, [חרב]	= חרב	synonymy ²⁵
{NO equivalent}	= בינותם	“context marker” ²⁶
ורוב הלל	= לכלל הלליהם	synonymy and repetition ²⁷
וכבוד פנר	= ורוב פנרי אשמה	synonymy, ²⁸ repetition, additional gloss ²⁹

portion of the lemma is reflected in **וּנְלוּ מִפַּחַד אוֹיֵב**. The whole series serves as a composite equivalent of “exile from fear of the enemy,” with an implied distribution of the word **קוֹל** for each of the components. The graphic biblical images are conflated in a single contemporary manifestation in the pesher, with the chariot, horse, and horseman representing the enemy. An exegetical link between **מִפַּחַד אוֹיֵב** and **קוֹל** may perhaps be found in Ps 64:2. The psalmist entreats God to hear his voice (**קוֹלִי**) and save him from the terror of his enemies (**מִפַּחַד אוֹיֵב**), enemies who have sharpened their tongues like swords. Another basis for relating these elements is the concept of motion. The pesher’s “fear,” a form of trembling, could reflect Nahum’s imagery of quaking, rattling, rumbling and jolting (see *HALOT*, פָּחַד).

²⁴ The sense of the word **וּחְרָהוֹר** in 4QpNah cannot be definitively determined. **וּחְרָהוֹר** appears as a *hapax* in the Bible at Deut 28:22 . . . **וּבְחָרֵב**. The proximity of the words **וּחְרָהוֹר** and **חָרֵב** in this verse, and the relationship of **וּחְרָהוֹר** to fire, would suggest that **וּחְרָהוֹר** in 4QpNah corresponds to **וּבְרָק** in the lemma (with **לְהוֹב** in the sense of flame). **וּחְרָהוֹר** in the biblical verse is usually interpreted as a type of illness characterized by fever (from **וּחָרַר**, to burn), similar to the preceding words **וּדְלַקַת** and **קָדַחַח**, but this is simply a contextually appropriate conjecture. Cf. Sir 40:9, where **וּחְרָהוֹר** is paired with **חָרֵב** (which itself is ambiguous, denoting either “drought” or “sword”). In 4QpNah, **וּחְרָהוֹר** encompasses the fiery elements of the lemma, the “flame” and “flash,” and complements the lemma’s “sword” and “spear.”

²⁵ The single element **חָרֵב** reflects both the restored **חָרֵב** in the lemma and the **חָרֵב** in the pesher. This compression of the elements of the lemma is in proportion to the use of **וּחְרָהוֹר** to reflect both **לְהוֹב** and **וּבְרָק**. Carmignac sees a word play within the pesher, between **וּבְרָק** and **חָרֵב** (*Les Textes*, 89 n. 8).

²⁶ **בִּינֹתָם** stresses the locus of the suffering as the Pharisaic Community, i.e. the application of the verse to internal Pharisaic punishment rather than to atrocities committed by them. (Cf. n. 19 on **מִקָּרֵב** above.) A syntactic ambiguity that correlates to the semantic difficulty of **וּחְרָהוֹר**, is the intended distribution of **בִּינֹתָם**. Treating **וּחְרָהוֹר** as a unit has yielded a sense of “internecine strife.” Thus, Gaster, adapting Allegro’s, “heated strife among themselves.” Similarly, Cook, Dupont-Sommer, Tantlevskij, Amusin, (“the unleashing of civil war”). However, Vermes supposes a wider application of **בִּינֹתָם**, translating, “the sword of the nations shall never be wanting. Captivity, looting, and burning shall be among them, and exile out of dread for the enemy” (*CDSSE*, 475). This suits a more general connotation for **וּחְרָהוֹר**. The latter construction also allows greater compatibility between **בִּינֹתָם** and the other “context-markers” in this unit.

²⁷ Note, with Carmignac and Brownlee, the auditory similarity of **וּחְרָהוֹר** and **וּחָלַל**. The pesher repeats the word for “slain” in the plural, but also uses a similar sounding word that is a collective singular noun, and that is roughly synonymous with **וּרֹב**. Strugnell observes that **וּחָלַל** is a post-biblical word that is not attested elsewhere in the extant Qumran corpus. Cf. Qimron, *Hebrew*, 66.

²⁸ Cf. John S. Kselman, “RB/KBD: A New Hebrew-Akkadian Formulaic Pair,” *VT* 29 (1979): 110–114. Note that the word **וּרֹב** occurs in the previous phrase of the lemma.

²⁹ **וּשְׁמָה** may be a theologically-motivated addition, or a wordplay on the lemma’s

{NO equivalent}	= יפולו בימיהם	“context marker” ³⁰
ואין קץ	= ואין קץ	repetition
לנויה	= {NO equivalent}	(?)word-play with נוים ³¹
וכשלו	= יכשילו	repetition ³²
ונותחם	= (1) ואף בנויה בשרם	clarifying paraphrase ³³
	= (2) בעצת אשמהם	metaphor ³⁴

הלל. Cf. 1QM XIV,3 פניו אשמה; 1QM VI,17 הללי אשמתם. The image in the War Scroll, as in the pesher, is that of masses of dead bodies strewn about.

The Dead Sea Scrolls frequently ascribe “guilt” to the enemies of the Community, e.g. the Kittim in 1QpHab IV,11, and those of the lot of Darkness and Belial in 1QS II,5; III,23. “Guilt” is associated in 1QH, 1QS and CD with the sinful nature of the wicked as well as with sinful acts of the naturally righteous. The root אשם appears frequently throughout 1QS, 1QM, and 1QH.

³⁰ בימיהם is a “context-marker.” The verb is added for syntactic smoothness, and symmetry within the pesher. For the lexical choice of יפולו, see Num 14:32–34, “Your carcasses will drop in the wilderness (ופניריכם יפולו) while your children roam the wilderness for forty years, suffering for your faithlessness (זנוהיכם), until the last of your carcasses is down in the wilderness.” (Additional lexical overlap with our pesher unit is found in v. 44, which states of Moses and Aaron, לא משו מקרב המהנה. On the 40-year paradigm in Numbers, Deuteronomy, and CD, see H. Eshel, “תולדותיה,” 90–91).

³¹ Weiss points out that LXX renders MT לנויה as *legoyeha* לנויה (τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀντήσ) and proposes that the pesher’s נרים הרב may hint at this variant. A similar connection may be found in 1QpHab IX,2, in which the rebellious priest, identified with the Wicked Priest of the previous and following lines, is punished and subjected to physical affliction (נויה בשרו). This is the pesher to Hab 2:8, which asserts that “nations will pillage you.” Cf. J. Maier, Dupont-Sommer, “Le Commentaire,” 75.

³² For כשל in Qumran as denoting transgression, particularly in sectarian contexts, see for example, CD II,17, “many strayed by them and strong men stumbled because of them from aforesaid times until now;” 1QpHab XI,8 לכהשיל ביום צום; 1QS III,24 להכשיל בני אור.

³³ The bodies of the Community’s opponents are not only the objects that experience and demonstrate punitive suffering, but they are also the instruments that incurred the guilt leading to the affliction. בשר emphasizes the physicality of the transgressions, and is most probably an allusion to violations of the laws of purity and sexuality, which come up in the next unit. Cf. 1QH XVI,32; CD II,16–20, נויותיהם, בשר, in reference to licentiousness. In DJD, Allegro translated, “in their body of flesh they shall stumble over their own guilty counsel.” (Cp. “in their fleshly natures,” in “More Unpublished Pieces.” The change appears deliberate. Allegro seems to have viewed “flesh” originally as the locus of sin, and subsequently as the locus of punishment.) For the theological connotations of בשר, esp. נויה בשר, see the discussions of Kuhn and Davies in K. Stendahl, *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (W.D. Davies, “Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit,” 157–82; Kuhn, “Temptation, Sin, and Flesh,” 106–8).

³⁴ Carmignac’s “dans leur association coupable,” takes the prepositional *bet* as indicating location; compare his alternative translation with causal *bet*, “en punition de leur association coupable.” On עצה as “counsel” or “council,” see Worrel, “עצה: ‘Counsel’ or ‘Council.’” In 1QpHab IV,11, Nitzan (163) renders אשמה בית בעצת (in reference to “the rulers of the Kittim,”) as “by the decision of the Roman Senate.” 4QpNah seems to suppose a figurative understanding of נויה, similar to that of “corporation,” derived from the Latin *corpus*. Our explanation of בעצת אשמהם as a

Our understanding of the pesher's structure allows for a high degree of correspondence between individual elements of the lemma and pesher, with the addition of "context-markers." The pesher exhibits particularly close adherence to the lemma at the beginning and end, largely reusing the words of the biblical text, but in the middle section of this unit, Nahum's detailed imagery seems to have been conflated into a general contemporary comment in the pesher.³⁵ The chart of equivalents features one noteworthy irregularity. The word נַיִם in the pesher does not correspond arithmetically to any element in the lemma, but it does appear to be a word-play upon the word לַנְיָה in the biblical text, which is also unaligned.

Syntactic correspondence in this unit is dependent upon the detachment of the initial phrase of the lemma from the previous verse. The placement of לֹא יְמוֹשׁ טַרְף־ is best viewed as a deliberate, exegetically-motivated realignment of the biblical text. We have described the reconfigured lemma as corresponding in a definite, though somewhat complex manner to the pesher. In our understanding, the message of the pesher corresponds well to that of the lemma as well. Nahum's description of the destruction of Nineveh is adapted to reflect the contemporary downfall of the Pharisees and their supporters, as occurred during Pompey's conquest of Jerusalem.

7.3 PESHER UNIT 13

3–4, II, lines 7–10 on Nah 3:4

Because of the many harlotries of the harlot, charmingly pleasing, and mistress of sorceries, who sells nations through her harlotries and families through her sor[ce]ries

Nah 3:4 is the metaphorical counterpart of Nah 3:1, "Woe, city of blood! She is all deception, filled with pillage," supplying the reason for the destruction described in the previous two verses (and in their

second interpretation of נַיִם is like that of Schiffman (281), who explains the pesher as stating that "the Pharisees will transgress in matters pertaining to their bodies, such as sexual prohibitions, as a result of their guilty council."

Perhaps this double pesher on נַיִם may indicate that the illogical variant of the conjunction in נַיִם is not a scribal error in our manuscript, but actually reflects a corruption that was already present in the author's Vorlage? If so, the pesher's נַיִם could reflect an attempt to make sense of the conjunctive *vav*, in addition to employing prepositional *bet*.

³⁵ Cf. Dupont-Sommer, "Le Commentaire," 74.

metaphorical counterpart in verses 5–6). The use of the initial word **מורב** ties verse 4 to the preceding verse: the “abundance,” the “mass,” and the “innumerable amount” of slain bodies in verse 3 are in accordance with the abundance of Nineveh’s violations.

Nahum uses the metaphor of a harlot to depict Assyrian might. Nineveh’s ability to control and manipulate the Assyrian empire is expressed in terms of seductive powers.³⁶ At Qumran, this image would have potency beyond that arising from the text of Nahum itself. “Fornication” is a common accusation against the enemies of the Qumran Community. In commenting on the “stumbling in their fleshly bodies” in the previous unit, we cited CD II,16, in which “licentious eyes” are said to be a major factor in the downfall of humanity since its earliest days. CD IV,14–V,11 focuses upon three traps of Belial listed in IV,17–18 **שמא המקדש הון, זנות, טמא המקדש** (wealth, fornication, defilement of the Temple). The perception among the Community of its opponents’ laxity regarding sexual laws was generalized into a stereotype of sexual immorality.³⁷ It is difficult to know to what extent the sect’s opponents were in fact guilty of violating accepted laws and mores of sexuality, rather than simply observing established codes according to their own interpretations. The model of sexual immorality is further generalized in the Qumran corpus to represent abstract infidelity to God, adapting the metaphor underlying the book of Hosea. In fact, the identification of the opposed faction in 4QpNah as “Ephraim” calls to mind Hosea’s prophecies against Ephraim. The plural noun form **זנותים** is common in the book of Hosea, in which the prophet is commanded to take a harlot as a wife in order to illustrate the theological “harlotry” of Ephraim.³⁸

³⁶ Spronk observes that this passage of Nahum has influenced the description of the “daughter of Babylon” in ch. 47 of Isaiah as a seductive sorceress who will suffer divine punishment. He also points to the use of this image in Rev 17–18.

³⁷ The passage in CD probably conflates the literal and figurative uses of **זנה** at Qumran. The Dead Sea Scrolls are characterized by strict *halakhic* positions on sexual issues, so that opponents are accused of “fornication” for variant marriage practices. See 4Q513 Ord b frag 2 II,2,5; 4QMMT B 75, 82; C 5. In DJD X, p. 171, Qimron states, “the word **זנה** in the Dead Sea Scrolls refers to all kinds of illegal marital acts.” He cites as parallels the term **πορνεία** (as discussed by Fitzmyer, “The Matthean Divorce Texts and Some New Palestinian Evidence,” 197–226) and **נאוף** in Karaite literature (as discussed by Wieder in *The Judean Scrolls and Karaism*, 131, n. 2).

³⁸ Cf. Hos 4:12, “a lecherous impulse (**רוח זנותים**) has made them go wrong (**הזערה**), and they have strayed (**רינו**) from submission to their God” (*NJPS* transl.). Regarding the potential difficulty in distinguishing between physical and metaphorical harlotry

The interconnection of sexual offenses and magic (כשפים) is an early stereotype that can be found, for example, in Mal 3:5.³⁹ This link also provides the structure of ch. 7 of the Book of the Watchers in Enoch.⁴⁰ In IIKi 9:22 the sorcery and harlotry (זונונים) of Jezebel are noted together. The pesher applies the concept of seductive magic to the false teachings of its opponents, the “misleaders of Ephraim,” identified with the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, the Pharisees.⁴¹ One operative link is that both the utterance of charms and the transmission of oral traditions are functions of speech.

The language of this unit is very similar to a number of Qumran texts, including 1QS X,21–23, a prayer in which the devotee thanks God and commits himself to follow the proper path;⁴² CD V,11 which states that the sinners of Israel who err in the traps of Belial use a blasphemous tongue to speak against God’s correct laws; 1QH X,19; XII,16 which accuse an enemy of using a “foreign tongue” (לשון אחרת). In the latter instance, a seminal passage decrying the rule of the Scoffers in Jerusalem, the author denounces his “smooth” opponents;⁴³ 1QH XIII,13–14, 27; 1QS IV,11, in which a blasphe-

in literary texts, note the debate as to whether the “harlot” in 4Q184 refers to an actual “seductress,” or is a metaphorical personification of “false doctrine” (the antithesis of “Lady Wisdom”). Cf. the literature on this work, cited in Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 426. Line 17 of this composition mentions seduction with smooth things (הלקוח). Cf. Table 4–1).

³⁹ “I will act as a relentless accuser against those who have no fear of Me; who practice sorcery, who commit adultery” (בכשפים ובמנאפים).

⁴⁰ On the association between sexual offenses and improper revelation in the Book of the Watchers, see Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 53.

⁴¹ Flusser refers to 4QpHos^a II,5 which renounces those who reject the prophets, listening to those who “led them astray.” In his opinion, the author of the pesher depicts the agenda of the Pharisaic preachers as bordering upon idolatry. Other instances of the use of the root הטה in accusations against Jerusalem leadership include Mic 3:5; Isa 3:12; 9:15; Jer 23:13,32; 50:6. For הטה in the Qumran corpus, cf. 1QpHab X,9, in reference to the Spouter of Lies; 4QpPs^a line 26, of the Man of Lies; and CD I,15, of the Scoffer). In 1QH X,14, הוליצו העוה is parallel to דורשי ההלקוח. CD V,20 refers to the movers of the boundary who caused Israel to stray at the time of Destruction; these corrupt leaders of an earlier age are viewed as paradigmatic of the Community’s opponents. The connection between falsehood and magic that appears in this unit is also prominent in Ezekiel 13, describing God’s wrath against the false prophets. The term כזב appears 6 times (vss 6,7,8,9, and twice in 19) in that chapter.

⁴² ולוא ישמע בפי נבלות וכחש עוון ומרמזה וכזבים לוא ימצאו בשפתי ופרי קודש בלשוני בה ושקוצים לא ימצאו בה. “In my mouth shall be heard no folly or sinful deceit, no cunning or lies shall be found on my lips. The fruit of holiness shall be on my tongue and no abominations shall be found upon it” (transl. Vermes, *CDSSE* 115). The accusation in the pesher is a sort of inversion of this prayer.

⁴³ [ב]ל[וע]נ שפה ולשון אחרת ידברו לעמך. Licht identifies Isa 28:11 as the source for the formulation, כי בלעני שפה ובלשון אחרת ידבר אל העם הזה.

mous tongue is listed as one of the attributes of those who are with the Spirit of Deceit. The passage also mentions a spirit of זנות , and a number of other words found in this pericope of 4QpNah.⁴⁴

The misleading words of the opponents clearly have a legal and pedagogical valence, as highlighted by the term תלמוד , discussed in ch. 6. We propose that the term בתלמוד שקרם in the peshar functions as an equivalent to the lemma's הן טובת הן . An exegetical connection between “study” and “favor” may be found in 1QS II,3, in which the sectarian expansion of the priestly blessing of Num 6:25 reads, “and He will grace you with eternal knowledge.”⁴⁵ In our understanding, תלמוד corresponds to the word הן in the lemma. Of course the point is not that these particular teachings are the products

⁴⁴ See also 4Q501 (4QapocrLam B), in which the author beseeches God to punish the wretched ones of His people who have surrounded the author's group with their lying tongue (frag 1, line 4). Some of the parallels cited here were noted already by J. Maier, “Weitere Stucke,” 243.

⁴⁵ See Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context*. JSOT Supp. 29 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1985), 297–300; Manfred Weise, *Kultzeiten und kultischer Bundesschluss in der “ordensregal” vom Toten Meer* (Leiden: Brill, 1961), 88–93. Cf. 1QH VI,25, דעה ברוח דעה ; 11QPs^a XIX,14 (“Plea for Deliverance” = 11QPs^b frag b, 3) $\text{כי רחמון והגון אלה}$ 4Q381Non-canonical Psalms B, frag 47, line 1 reads ואשכילה מביניך . 1QS^b also relates הן to knowledge. Cf. col. II, in which the word ויהונכה is preserved at the beginning of fragmentary blessings, which include mention of “holy spirit” (a term associated with prophetic writings in 1QS VIII,16); and “eternal truth.”

In this context, Saul Friedman (in private communication) has pointed to the blessing הגון הדעה in the rabbinic Amidah prayer (cf. bBer 26b; 29a; 33:1; bPes 3:1, bYoma 88a; bNidda 8b). The connection between the liturgical formula of the Amidah and the biblical priestly blessing of Num 6: 23 is noted in Num Rab 11:6 and Sifre Num 6:25 (see Brooke and Weise, *op. cit.*). Weise also points to Ps 67:2 הגנו ותורדתך and Ps 119:2 $\text{אלוהים יתנו וברכנו יאר פניו אחנו לדעת בארץ דרך}$ as associating grace and knowledge, and relying upon the biblical priestly formula.

Philo offers “thy Grace” as the etymological basis for the name Enoch (הנוך ; *Posteritate Caini* §§35, 41; *Confusione Linguarum* §123). Philo states that the “gift” indicated by the name Enoch consists of sensory perception as well as “thinking, including in itself countless products of thought, resolves, counsels, forethought, comprehension, acquisition of knowledge, skill in arts and in organizing, other faculties too many to recount” (§36; transl. Colson, *LCL* vol. iv). He contrasts the Cain-like attitude of “those who assert that everything that is involved in thought or perception or speech is a free gift of their own soul” to those who “acknowledge all as due to the gift of God” and who resemble Enoch, who was “translated and removed from perishable to immortal races” (§42–43).

In a later period, the epithet הנוכי was conferred upon kabbalists. Although the term הן in this idiom is an abbreviation for הכמה נסתר , the earlier tradition is certainly relevant as well. (Lawrence Schiffman brought this idiom to my attention, and Elliot Wolfson has confirmed its early basis). Cf. Eccl 9:11 ליודעים הן (“favor to the learned”) and 10:12 דברי פי חכם הן (“a wise man's talk brings him favor” [transl. *MJPS*]).

of divine grace, but rather that they falsely purport to be so. Like the charms of the harlot, they are superficial and untrue.

Correspondence is not easy to map for this unit. There is an overall sense of symmetry, but the details are elusive. Although a linear chart would seem to indicate poor alignment, we propose a more complex model of “double pesher” in which direct alignment can be discerned.⁴⁶ We take רבים as a heading, introducing the victims listed in “section I” of the pesher unit. Our syntactic division follows Gaster, Carmignac, and Schiffman, in that we take all the elements from “kings” to “converts” as comprising a compound object of the verb יהעו. In Schiffman’s words, “All of these are said to have been victimized.” The term רבים may indicate greatness of number or stature (cf. our comments on רבים in unit 4 of Pericope 1, and esp. cf. J. Carmignac, “HRBYM: Les ‘Nombres’ ou les ‘Notables?’”). In the context of this unit, there is an antithetical tension between the two. A denotation of “elite” status would be appropriate for the reference to the kings, officers, and priests. In contrast, “many,” would specify the lower classes of the population. Thus, Flusser understands the “many” here as “the masses,” comparing the Greek οἱ πολλοί, τὸ πλῆθος. He takes this passage as corroborating Josephus’s picture of Pharisaic sway over the masses, in *Ant* 18 §15, *Bḡ* 2 §162.⁴⁷ In our double pesher, the first three terms for the victims (the equivalents of נויים in our chart), reflect the sense of רבים as “notables”; the latter two elements (equivalent to ומשפחות), reflect the sense of רבים as “the masses.” Together, they indicate “numerous” victims.

In our model, the second half of the pesher is interpreted as treating הממכרת נויים בנינותה ומשפחות ב[כש]פיה in expanded form, as though it were הממכרת נויים בנינותה ו[הממכרת] משפחות ב[כש]פיה.

The lemma features one verb, הממכרת while the pesher includes יהעו, יפולו, and יובדו. The lemma itself is not a grammatical sentence, and the pesher appears to supply these words to complete the thought and the syntactic unit. In the chart below, הממכרת serves as the peg for the action in both sections of the pesher. In section I, יהעו reflects הממכרת as “mislead,” probably in the sense associ-

⁴⁶ A parallel to this split construction may be discerned even within the lemma itself. The dual attributes זונני זונה טובתה הן בעלה כשפים in the beginning of the lemma align with בנינותה and ב[כש]פיה in the latter portion.

⁴⁷ He also cites 1QpHab X,9–11, in which the Preacher of Lies “leads many astray.” Thus, too, Dupont-Sommer, who adds 4pPs^a I,26; 4QpIsa^c frag. 6 II,6.

ated with I and II Kings as described by D.W. Thomas.⁴⁸ Section II is an additional double pesher on *הממכרת*, using the word as the basis for verbs signifying destruction, probably derived from the variant *המכמרת* “ensnare.” The victims in the pesher serve as syntactic and exegetical equivalents of the victims in the lemma.

I.

מרוב	= {No direct equivalent}	see רבים below
זנוני	= מתעי	stereotyped paraphrase ⁴⁹
זונה	= אפרים	stereotyped denomination
טובת חן	= בתלמוד שקרם	stereotype ⁵⁰
ישראל	= ובלשון כזיבהם ושפת מרמה	symbol ⁵¹
הממכרת	= יתעו	stereotyped paraphrase
{No direct equivalent}	= רבים ⁵²	isolexism with מרוב above
נוים	= מלכים שרים כהנים	paronomasia; paraphrase ⁵³

(בזנותה) the pesher relies upon the earlier use of זנה in זנוני.

⁴⁸ David W. Thomas attempted to define the root *מכר* as “to practice deceit, guile,” pointing to the use of the *hitpa’el* in IKi 21: 20,25, IIKi 17:17 (“The Root *מכר* in Hebrew,” *JThS* 37 [1936]: 388–89; “A Further Note on the Root *מכר* in Hebrew,” *JThS* N.S. 3 [1952J]: 214). Spronk cites additional proponents of this view. This line of thinking is likely to approximate that of the author of the pesher. In IIKi 17:17, *ויהמכרו לעשות הרע* (*NJPS*: “they gave themselves over to what as displeasing . . .”), the context is the practice of idolatry and magic by the Northern tribes of Israel, for which they are cut off and exiled. The author of 4QpNah apparently believed that a *pi’el* form of *מכר* could denote “selling out” to purveyors of idolatry and harlotry. The word *הממכרת* is rendered as “betray” by Amusin (“Historical Events”) and Knibb. *הממכרת* has been rendered “sell” by Allegro and a number of subsequent scholars. Horgan renders “trades [?]”; conversely, Cook renders the word as “acquire.” Doudna argues for a sense of “delivered” (175–77).

⁴⁹ These are Pharisaic leaders, as discussed in section I of ch. 6.

⁵⁰ On the term *talmud*, see ch. 6, section 6.1.2. The proposed link relies upon the concept of grace as the source of wisdom, as described above n. 45.

⁵¹ The skills of the sorceress involve incantations and charms uttered by mouth. The lexical choices of the pesher reflect Qumran terminology that is associated with the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things and related figures. See the use of the root *רמה* in 1QS X,22; 1QH X,20; CD I,15; VII,13; XX,14–15, and *כזב* in the epithets “Man of Lies” and “Spouter of Lies.”

⁵² We explain רבים as an introductory heading preceding the itemized list of victims. Cf. the phrase *יהיו עליהם רבים בהלקקוהו* in Dan 11:34. Yadin notes the influence of this passage upon the opening segment of 1QM, particularly in the designation of the Jewish opponents of the author as “offenders against the covenant” (*Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light*, 255 [Heb. ed.]).

⁵³ See below for the equivalence of *נוים* = *נוים ומושלים* as a play on *נאים*. Schiffman (283) points out that kings, officers, and priests are also listed together in Jer 2:26; 32:32, but that those contexts have a fourth group as well, “the prophets,” which is not included in Pesher Nahum. (Cf. Jer 4:9.) These passages in Jeremiah are certainly relevant to the pesher, and it is likely that the prophets are in fact

ומפשותה = ועם עם נר נלוה adaptational paraphrase⁵⁴
 (בכשפיה) the peshet relies upon the earlier use of כשפ in כשפים

II.

הממכרת = (1) יוברו⁵⁵ (2) יפולו anagram: variant text⁵⁶
 נויים = [כ]דים ומושלים paronomasia⁵⁷
 בזנותה = בעצתם adaptation of stereotype
 ומפשותה = עדים ומשפחות paraphrase⁵⁸ and repetition
 בכשפיה = [מן] עם לשונם symbol

represented in the peshet—by the leaders. As noted above, those who “mislead Ephraim” are contemporary incarnations of the false prophets of Jeremiah’s days. Schiffman further sees the third person possessive suffixes in Jeremiah as similar to 4QpNah, but in Peshet Nahum, only the “kings” might have this suffix, and even in that word it is not certain. (See ch. 2). For a similar list of dignitaries, of less contextual significance, cf. 1QpHab IV,2. Note that נויים and kings are linked in the subsequent lemma in unit 14.

⁵⁴ Hoening sees עם as the “[common] people” (“Dorshé Halakot,” 120. Cf. Flusser and Dupont-Sommer on רבנים, above). Carmignac points out an internal word play in the juxtaposition of עם (nation) and עם (with).

נלוה has been rendered rather literally, e.g., “resident alien” (Allegro), “affiliated strangers” (Gaster); “stranger who joins them” (Vermes). In Isa 14:1, וגולה הגר refers to proselytes. The term designates those of Gentile origin who have aligned themselves with the Jewish Community, and may indicate full converts, or Gentile sympathizers. (Cf. 1QS V,6 in which the phrase “those who join them” seems to refer to initiates, or prospective members of the Community and CD IV,3 where the phrase seems to refer to full-fledged members of the Community, in distinction to the leadership. Cf. Samuel Iwry, “Was There a Migration to Damascus: The Problem of שבני ישראל,” *EI* 9 (1969): 86–88. 4QFlor I,4 and CD VI,21 reflect biblical usage, and probably refer to proselytes. On the phenomenon of “sympathizers” to Judaism, also known as “God-fearers,” see Stern, *GLA* II, 103–6.)

For משפחות as “nations,” see Amos 3:2; Zech 14:17; Ps 22:28; 96:7. CD XIV,10 requires the examiner of the Camp to be proficient in the language of the “families” of men, implying again that Gentiles are intended. (Contrast the more limited scope of the term in CD XX,13, and 1QS^a I,9,15,21).

⁵⁵ יוברו could be transitive (“destroy”) or intransitive (“perish”). The latter is the more common understanding here, and is preferable in order to maximize the parallel with יפולו in the peshet. Cf. CD III,9–10, “through it their sons perished and their kings were cut off נכרתו בו אבדו ומלכיהם בו נכרתו.” The root אבד appears also in 4QpNah frags 1–2, 8 and in 3–4 III,7, תוכד עצתם.

⁵⁶ In section II of the proposed double peshet, the interpretation of הממכרת seems to rely upon the variant וממכרת, “ensnare.” (Cf. Schiffman, “Pharisees,” 282; Maier; see above, ch. 2, on textual readings and variants). The exegesis could be grounded in an alternate textual tradition or could reflect the use of an anagram of the word as it appears in the lemma. The victims of the Pharisees are ensnared by them, and thus “fall” and “perish.”

⁵⁷ Cf. Schiffman (283), “the peshet takes נויים as referring to ‘nobles, eminences’ (= נאים).”

⁵⁸ However, it is difficult to see why “cities” would paraphrase “families.” See our alternate construction below, for a resolution of this problem.

⁵⁹ In addition to Hos 7:16 which associates מועם לשונם with the downfall of princes, cf. Isa 30:27, “His lips are full of fury (ועם), His tongue like devouring fire.”

Up to this point, we have interpreted the second half of the pesher as though it were משפחות ב[כש]פיה {והממכרת} בנייה בנותה.

The following chart supposes a further expansion:

הממכרת ניים {ומשפחות} בנייה {והממכרת} {נייים} ומשפחות ב[כש]פיה

Thus,

II.a			
הממכרת	=	יברו	paraphrase, intransitive for transitive verb
נייים ומשפחות	=	ערים ומשפחות	adaptational paraphrase ⁶⁰ and repetition
בנותה	=	בעצתם	adaptation of stereotype
II.b			
הממכרת	=	יפלו	paraphrase, intransitive for transitive verb
נייים ומשפחות	=	נ[כ]בדים ומוש[לים]	paronomasia and symbol ⁶¹
ב[כש]פיה	=	עם לשונם [..]	adaptational paraphrase

The Pharisees were viewed by the Qumran Community as destroying both their followers and their opponents. As “false prophets” they seduced people to tread an unacceptable religious path. At the same time, they used their clout in instigating popular wrath against leaders who did not meet with their approval. There is no intrinsic or obvious clue in the pesher as to which of these two categories comprises the victims who “perish” because of עצתם, and which sort “falls” because of לשונם. The parallelism may work as duplication or antithesis, with either group indicating supporters or opponents. In each of the sections of the pesher above (sections I, IIa, and IIb) it must be determined whether the victims of the Pharisees are victimized because of their adherence to Pharisaic propaganda, or

⁶⁰ Thus, Dupont-Sommer observes that the pesher retains the lemma’s ומשפחות, but substitutes the word “cities” for the “Gentiles” of the base-text. He explains the cause of this shift as the fact that the subject of the pesher is limited to the Jewish people (*Le Commentaire*, 77). He further cites the importance of the cities as centers of Pharisaic influence.

⁶¹ For נ[כ]בדים as the product of a word-play of ניים/נאים, see n. 57 above. The proposed equivalence of ומשפחות and מוש[לים] accommodates a particular interpretation of the pesher in which the word “families” in Nahum is taken by the pesher to apply to the dynasty of the Hasmoneans.

Schiffman identifies משפחות as being reflected also in “the various cities and clans of the Jewish people as well as their leaders” (that is, in ערים, עם נר נלוח, ערים, ועם עם נר נלוח, ערים). We too view both ומשפחות and מוש[לים] as reflections of the lemma’s ומשפחות, but as a double pesher, rather than serially.

because they bear the brunt of Pharisaic propaganda directed against themselves.

The grammatical structure of the pesher consists of a verb, followed by a series of objective nouns and then another verb: “mislead . . . perish.” The series of nouns is presumably to be separated between “accompanying resident” and “cities” as there is no conjunction between the two. Thus, the pesher asserts: (I) the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things “mislead many: kings, princes . . . resident”⁶² (IIa) “cities and families” perish by their counsel (IIb) “nobles and rulers” fall by their tongue.⁶³

The syntax allows for a number of interpretations. We prefer the following: All of section I is best understood as referring to adherents of the Pharisees (those who were “misled” are surely those who were led).⁶⁴ In section II, the affiliations are less clear. It seems most likely that IIa also refers to those who were misled. Specifically, the word “cities” would hint at Pharisaic influence in urban centers, as noted by Josephus. “Families” would allude to cooperation with the

⁶² An alternative syntactic construction is assumed by Amusin: “they will mislead many people. The kings, princes . . . and families will perish by their counsel,” with an asyndeton of the conjunction before “cities.” Even with our structure, some ambiguity remains.

⁶³ J. Maier also stresses the balance between cities and families perishing (our IIa) and nobles and rulers falling (our IIb) (in his Nachtrag, “Weitere Stucke,” 250).

⁶⁴ Thus, Schiffman (283) states that “the leaders are actually able to influence members of the aristocracy” as well as common people and proselytes. The kings, priests, and officers are among those who have been swayed by the Pharisees. Cf. Kister “Biblical Phrases,” 32. Kister cites Hos 7:16, “Their princes [i.e. the princes of Ephraim] fall upon the sword on account of their insolent speech” (מזעם לשונם) (פלו בהרב שריהם). In light of the references to Ephraim in ch. 7 of Hosea, and in light of the use of the epithet “Ephraim” to refer to the Pharisees at Qumran, Kister states that “we may infer that the ‘honored men and rulers’ mentioned in the Qumranic text (4QpNah), are Pharisees, an important historical fact, which is not fully clear from the text of the pesher itself.” The wording of the initial section of this pesher recalls 4QpPs^a I, 26–27, *על איש הכוב אשר הזהה רבים באמרי שקר, כיא בהרו בקלות ולא שמ[ען] למליץ דעה*.

Alternatively, section I could be viewed as a general statement, encompassing all those who suffered at the hands of the Pharisees, whether as followers or opponents. The kings, priests, and officers could refer both to individuals who supported the Pharisees and to those against whom the Pharisees incited their followers, or those who were blackmailed into submission.

Dupont-Sommer seems to take *העו* as connoting the imposition of Pharisaic practice. He translates “égarent,” but in his notes, it is clear that he sees only the masses as having been “misguided” in the sense of having been persuaded and won over by the Pharisees. He identifies the “mis-guidance,” or rather the corruption, of the kings and high-priests as their acquiescence to Pharisaic control of cultic issues as described by Josephus.

Pharisees on the part of figures in the Hasmonean dynasty.⁶⁵ These would be said to “perish” in that they were spiritually “lost,” having forfeited the opportunity to lead righteously, and having thrown in their lot with the wicked.

In 11b, the honored ones and rulers would represent the opponents of the Pharisees, whose fall is blamed on Pharisaic incitement (the “fury of their tongues”). The “nobles” may refer to Sadducean antagonists.⁶⁶ The “rulers” would refer to those Hasmoneans who were not supportive of the Pharisees, specifically Alexander Jannaeus and, presumably Aristobulus II.

Thus, the first group of “kings, etc.” is comprised of Pharisaic supporters, suffering because they yielded to seduction (זנות). The last group consists of the opponents of the Pharisees, maligned by Pharisaic propaganda (the lemma’s כשפיה). The “cities” and “clans” are indeterminate, perhaps deliberately.⁶⁷ The Community believed that cities and families, particularly Jerusalem and the Hasmonean dynasty, suffered from Pharisaic domination as well as from Pharisaic incitement.

Our analysis of this unit yields a complex double pesher structure with close correspondence between individual elements of the lemma and pesher. The relationship between the pesher’s רבים and the lemma’s מרוב is similar to that between ניים and לניה in unit 12. The semantic difficulty of הממכרה hinders attempts to detect the message of the lemma, and thus the pesher’s correspondence in this aspect. It also complicates our understanding of the syntax of the lemma. The relationship between the syntax of the pesher and that

⁶⁵ The Hasmonean high priests/rulers who are likely to have aligned themselves with the Pharisaic party were Jonathan, Simon, and John Hyrcanus, until his break with them (see *Ant* 13 §288–97), and perhaps Alexander before his break with them, as well as Salome and possibly Hyrcanus II. Scholarship has not yet reached a consensus as to whether John Hyrcanus, or Alexander Jannaeus, or both, experienced a rupture with the Pharisees. See, most recently, the work of M. Geller who argues that the “Pharisee rift” is to be dated exclusively to Jannaeus (“Alexander Jannaeus,” 202–11. See too, D.R. Schwartz, “Pharisees and Hasmonean Monarchy,” in *Studies in the Background*, 44–56).

⁶⁶ The association of “nobles” with Manasseh in the next column of 4QpNah, would support viewing the term in this unit as an epithet for Sadducean opponents.

⁶⁷ In contrast to the specific view presented here, but in support of the generally parallel structure, Brownlee maintained that “nations and families” are inseparable from “dignitaries and rulers.” Schiffman translates עצה in this unit as “plot.” This is an attractive rendering, but if it were to be accepted, then it would be more appropriate to view those victims of Pharisaic plots as opponents rather than followers of the Pharisees.

of the lemma is best described as “systematic adaptation.” The pesher relies heavily upon ch. 11 of Daniel in formulating this adaptation.

7.4 PESHER UNIT 14

3–4, II, line 10–III, line 1 on Nah 3:5

‘Behold I am against you’, it is the declaration of the Lord of h[os]ts, ‘and you will uncover [your] skirts up over your face; you will sh[ow nat]ions [your] nakedness and kingdoms your shame.’

In verse 5, God proclaims that the nations that were described in verse 4 as having been enslaved and oppressed by Assyria will now be shown Assyria’s downfall and humiliation.⁶⁸ The image of exposure is appropriate both for the metaphorical figure of the harlot and for the realistic situation of military defeat. In antiquity, military victors parading vanquished peoples would sometimes maximize the humiliation of the captives by forcing them to expose their bodies.⁶⁹

The pesher is too fragmentary to allow for a proper analysis of correspondence. This situation is particularly unfortunate in this unit, as it would have been instructive to compare the treatment of Nah 3:5 to that of 2:14, both of which begin with the words, “Behold I am against you.” The vacat preceding the lemma in this unit is worthy of note. It eliminates the possibility of attaching the words “Behold I am against you” backwards to the previous pesher, as we do in the earlier instance (frag 3–4 I,8–9, units 9–10 of Pericope 2).⁷⁰

⁶⁸ The previous verse named “nations” and “clans” as those who were subjected to the harlot’s schemes. Now, the “nations” and “kingdoms” are the spectators of her humiliation. The partial parallelism signals the renewed power of the one-time victims, as the “clans” are transformed, or restored, into “kingdoms.”

⁶⁹ Cf. Smith, *ICC: Nahum*, 339, incl. his reference to the bronze gates from Balawat (now in the British Museum), which are engraved with depictions of naked male captives and of female captives lifting up their skirts. Cf. Isa 20:2–4, in which Isaiah is directed to walk about naked and barefoot, to illustrate how Assyria will lead the captives of Egypt and Cush into exile, naked and barefoot. The Bible attests to a similar treatment of adulteresses (Jer 13:22,26–27, which include the terms שולֵיךְ, זנות, ועל פניך, שקץ, וזנה; Ezek 16:36–38; 23:10,29; Hos 2:5,12). These cases are metaphorical representations of Israel’s infidelity to God.

⁷⁰ The phrase “Behold I am against . . .” appears in two biblical contexts about “false prophets” that are relevant to the pesher, in Jer 23:30–32 and Ezek 13:8. Jer 23:30,31 reads הנני על הנביאים and 23:32 reads הנביאי הלומות השקר. In chapter 23 of Jeremiah, God states that He will cast the city away, along with the false prophets, and that He will “lay upon [them] a disgrace for all time, shame for all time” (vs. 40). Ezek 13:8 reads הנני אלקיכם נאם יהוה צבאות. In chapter 13 of

The form of the pesher in unit 13 is basically the same as that of unit 10: "Its pesher, [element from lemma], pronoun, [identification]," but in unit 13 we also find the remains of a prefatory general identification. It must be supposed that the pesher in this unit did originally address the words "Behold I am against you," though we cannot determine how.⁷¹ One of the difficulties with fitting the declaration into the pesher unit is that it is uttered in the first person by God, whereas the rest of the lemma seems to have been altered to minimize the divine role in this unit.⁷² Compare the similar syntactic adjustments in unit 10.

The following chart reflects the alignment of the extant equivalents in this unit:

הגני אליך נאם יהוה צ[באו]ת	= [. .]	
{No equivalent}	= ערי המזרח	
ונלית	= [. .]	
שולי[ך]	= [. .] ⁷³	
על פניך	= [. .]	
והרא[ת]ת	= [ורא]	isolexism
נ[ים]	= הנזים	repetition ⁷⁴
מע[ך]	= בנ[ך]תם	paraphrase ⁷⁵

Ezekiel, God promises to make Himself known by eliminating the false prophets. The false prophets are described as נביאים נבלים, and their false visions are derided, with extensive use of the motifs of sorcery and building. The phrase "I am against you . . ." precedes an assurance that God will oppose the corrupt leaders, and that Israel will know that He is God.

⁷¹ If these words were not addressed by the pesher, then one of the arguments presented in Pericope 2 would be weakened. One supporting factor in favor of joining the phrase to the end of unit 9 is the fact that it was not subjected to interpretation in unit 10. The strength of this position depends upon the fact that these words would normally be subject to pesher interpretation in the unit in which they appear.

⁷² See above, ch. 2, for Brooke's assessment of the textual variants in this unit as deliberate exegetical moves in this direction. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that the role of the Pharisees is maximized, or emphasized. The divine origin of Pharisaic humiliation is surely assumed by the author of 4QpNah.

⁷³ Although the pesher's equivalent of שולי[ך] has not survived, the re-citation of the element (השולי[ת]ם) in the pesher formula "the pesher of x is y," indicates that the pesher did originally include a direct equivalent for this word.

⁷⁴ See below, n. 76.

⁷⁵ מע[ך], from the root ערה, denotes nakedness; בנ[ך]תם (from the root נדר, according to *HALOT*) denotes shame and defilement, and is most often used as a technical term for menstruation. Though not synonymous, the terms are clearly related. The pesher employs a term of similar sense, but greater severity. There is also a switch from 2nd to 3rd person and from sing. to pl. to better accommodate the subject of the pesher. The prefatory ב found in בנ[ך]תם and restored in [ובש] קוצי

וממלכות
קלונך = [. . .]⁷⁶
= [ובש] קוצי תועבותיהם ?⁷⁷

Extant elements of this pesher unit feature some direct repetition and some close exegetical paraphrase, adapted for sectarian purposes. The emendation of an original first person ונליחי to second person ונליח in the pesher facilitates the transformation of the punishment depicted in Nahum to an accusation against the Pharisees in 4QpNah. The second part of the interpretation, which refers to Gentiles, seems to refer to punishment, but with the Gentiles as the subject of a verb (we restore [וראן]) rather than as indirect objects, as in the lemma.

7.5 PESHER UNIT 15

3–4, III, lines 1–5 on Nah 3:6–7a

And I will cast upon you detested things, and I will [de]grade you, and I will make you despicable. And it will be that all who see you will flee from you

Nah 3:6–7a continues the humiliating picture of Assyria’s public experience of defeat. Nahum speaks in general terms, stating that Assyria will become repulsive and degraded.⁷⁸ In the pesher, the fall of the Pharisees has a more specific expression, as the group loses its former adherents. Nahum states that the exposure of Assyria will

indicates that the syntax was altered in the pesher interpretation. The subject of the lost verb was probably “the Gentiles.”

⁷⁶ Either the pesher’s הנזים represents both words, וממלכות and הנזים, or the equivalent to וממלכות has been lost. The use of the article in הנזים is probably intended to indicate “Gentiles,” which would accommodate, but not necessitate, the incorporation of both terms.

⁷⁷ Our “detestable abominations” expresses the pesher’s genitive construct as a noun modified by an adjective. A hendiadys could also be appropriate: “their detested things and their abominations.” A more literal translation would be “the detested things of their abominations.” It is not clear why the author of the pesher saw fit to use two terms to correspond to the single word קלונך. The language of the pesher anticipates the שקוצים of the next lemma (cf. Horgan, 185, 245). The root שקצ denotes abomination, and is often associated specifically with idolatry—most notoriously in the שקרין (ה)שומם of Dan 9:27; 11:31; 12:11. The word תועבה is employed in other Qumran texts in denouncing opponents of the Community. Cf. 1QS IV,10, 17; CD XI,21; 1QpHab VIII,13, XII,8.

⁷⁸ W. Maier points to a similar act of degradation in Mal 2:3 “I will spread dung upon your face” (*Nahum*, 309), though the Hebrew words differ from those in Nahum.

be a spectacle, with the nations viewing Assyria's misfortune. The exposure of the Pharisees will similarly entail the public display of their downfall, but it will also entail the manifestation of their evil nature. The people will not only witness the results of Pharisaic power, but they will come to realize the wickedness of the Pharisees.⁷⁹

The exposure of the Pharisees requires an audience. These viewers are very much of interest to the author of the peshar as they are the future converts to his Community. Whereas the lemma conveys the presence of these spectators with the words כול רואיך alone, the peshar refers to כול ישראל, רבים, and פתאי אפרים. Only the last element is directly equivalent to כול רואיך. The two previous elements are secondary reflections of כול רואיך, explicitly acknowledging the presence of witnesses (assumed in Nahum) to the process of humiliation as well as its results.

This maneuver can best be appreciated if the peshar is viewed as approaching the lemma according to the following sections:

- Ia. והשלכתי עליך שקוצים ויגלו מעשיהם הרעים לכול ישראל
 Ib. [וב]בלתיך ושמתוך כאורה ורבים יבינו בעונם ושנאום וכארום על זדון ואשמתם
 II. יהיה כול רואיך ידודו ממך⁸⁰ ידודו פתאי אפרים . . .

Ia and Ib reflect the process of humiliation; II reflects the consequences. The peshar "borrows" the spectators from section II (כול רואיך in the lemma), inserting the terms לכול ישראל and ורבים into Ia and Ib respectively. In Ib itself, the peshar exhibits some syntactic variation, but of a systematic sort, in its interpretation of ושמתוך כאורה as וכארום על זדון ואשמתם.⁸¹ וכארום functions as a verb in the lemma, and the predicate is completed with the prepositional element, כאורה. In the peshar, the equivalent of כאורה is the verbal כארום. It is tied

⁷⁹ The people's rejection of the Pharisees will entail the hatred of their former leaders. This is consistent with the belief of the Qumran Community to hate all the "sons of Darkness," a category that included anybody who was not an upstanding member of the Community (cf. 1QS I,4,10; 1QH XI,24–27). Licht compared Josephus's description of the Essenes' oaths, which included a commitment to "for ever hate the unjust and fight the battle of the just" (*Bj* 2§139). Contrast our view with that of Edmund F. Sutcliffe, who maintained that the Qumran Community rejected personal hatred, and preached only the theological hatred of evil, in consonance with the positions expressed in the Bible and in Christian and rabbinic teachings ("Hatred at Qumran," *RevQ* 2 [1959–60]: 345–55).

⁸⁰ With a "duplicated peshar" on ידודו ממך. See below.

⁸¹ The other equivalent elements in this section, [ת]בלתיך and ושנאום, are both verbs with pronominal suffixes.

to the prepositional phrase על זרון אשמתם, which we understand to be the equivalent of ושמתוך.⁸²

Section II of the lemma is reflected in 4QpNah by two synonymous pesher phrases, and an additional phrase. ידודו פתאי אפרים מתוך קהלים and ידודו פתאי אפרים מתוך קהלים ועזבו את מתעיהם both reflect the idea in the lemma, that the consequences of the degradation of the subject will repel all viewers. We term this double application of the lemma's כול רואיך ידודו ממך a "duplicated pesher."⁸³ ידודו פתאי אפרים מתוך קהלים is a close paraphrase; ידודו פתאי אפרים מתוך קהלים ועזבו את מתעיהם highlights the contemporization, as it restates the idea in more sectarian terms.⁸⁴ The pesher then adds על .[י.שראל] .[י.שראל], an additional, positive consequence. Apparently, this plus is not exegetically motivated by the words of the lemma. It is a statement of theological significance that arises from contextual considerations. The biblical exegesis evident in this phrase is not dependent directly upon Nahum, but on related contexts of rejection of evil.

The correspondence for the unit can be charted as follows:

והשלכתי	=	ינלו	paronomasia ⁸⁵
עליך (Nineveh)	=	[דורשי החלקות]	
		(the suffix in מעשיהם)	

⁸² Carmignac placed ובה[נ]לוח כבוד יהודה together with על זרון אשמתם as the basis for the hatred of the spectators. He takes this phrase to be dependent upon the earlier verbs, "they will hate them and revile them," על ושנאום וכארום על. His attempt to take the *bet* as a causal preposition, parallel to על, is creative, but yields an awkward reading.

⁸³ Cf. frags 1–2, lines 5–9, pesher unit 4. This is in contrast to the more usual "double pesher" which is characterized by a dissimilarity between the two pesher applications, e.g. by reflecting a textual variant.

⁸⁴ Brownlee observed that the prefatory prepositional מ in ממך could be interpreted both spatially and causally, indicating "from you" and "because of you." The double pesher gives expression to each of these senses in a separate locution: (1) "they will flee from the midst of their congregation" relates the place from which they will withdraw; the expansion of the preposition מתוך emphasizes the spatial aspect; (2) "they will leave those who mislead them" indicates the reason for the withdrawal. The theological language of עזב and עזבה stresses causality.

⁸⁵ The pesher's use of the root נלה plays on the word ונליה in the previous lemma (from Nah 3:5, unit 14) as observed by Carmignac, Horgan (245 n. 70) and Nitzan (57). Whereas the sense of ינלו in the pesher is revelation (which is similar but not identical to the sense of exposure in ונליה), its connection to this lemma's והשלכתי relies upon a pun, with נלה in the sense of exile or casting forth. Cf. the double usage of נלה in 4Q300 Myst^a, frag. 3, lines 5–6 and its parallel 1Q27, where the root first denotes expulsion or removal, and then revelation. Line 5 reads "evil will disappear (ונלה) before righteousness as [darkness] disapp[ears] ([לי]ת[ן]) [from before light]." Then, in line 6: "righteousness shall be reveale[d] ([נלה]ת[ן]) as the s[un] . . ." (cf. Ps 37:6 and 4QpPs^a I,6 on the latter simile). The pesher's connection between initiation into the Community and receiving revelation of the ways of the wicked is also found in the exhortation in CD II,2–3: "Listen to me, all who enter the covenant, and I will open (ואנלה) your ears to the ways of the wicked."

שקוצים	= מעשיהם הרעים	paraphrase ⁸⁶
{No direct	= לכול ישראל	(borrowed from
equivalent}		כול רואיך below) ⁸⁷
ונ] בלהיך	= ושנאום	paronomasia ⁸⁸
ושמחך	= על זרון אשמתם	double paronomasia; biblical allusion ⁸⁹

⁸⁶ The שקוצים in the lemma are the disgusting things that will degrade the harlot; the equivalent term in the pesher is the awful things that the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things have done. The subtle implication of this recontextualization is that the very acts by which the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things accrued their guilt are the acts through which they will be degraded. The שקוצים of their transgressions will be thrown right back in their faces. (In this context, note the use of the term שקץ in the pesher in the previous unit.)

Both שקוצים and מעשיהם הרעים are associated with idolatry in the Hebrew Bible. For the former term, see above n. 77; for the latter, cf. Ex 23:24, I Sam 8:8, Jer 1:16, 44:8, IIChron 34:25, Ps 106:35,39.

⁸⁷ See the introduction to this unit on this plus as a secondary reflection of the lemma's "all who see you." The words "all Israel" recall CD III,13–14 in which the establishment of God's eternal covenant with his people involves the revelation (לגלה) of hidden matters in which "all Israel" had gone astray. In the pesher, the wickedness of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things will be revealed to "all of Israel." This is the population that had gone astray as they followed the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, accepting Pharisaic misinterpretations of Torah (as in unit 13), and oblivious to Pharisaic ignorance of esoteric *halakha*.

⁸⁸ The most likely exegetical link in this equivalent pair stems from a specialized sense of שנא pertaining to the spurning of a woman (cf. HALOT, 1339, "decrease in the status" of a woman). Cf. Gen 29:31,33; Deut 22:13,16; 24:3; Judges 14:16; 15:2; Isa 60:15; Prov 30:23. The last case provides the direct biblical basis for the link in 4QpNah. The text asserts that the Land shudders because of three things, and will not tolerate a fourth. Of the four intolerable situations, one is a sated scoundrel (נבל) and another is a "hated woman (שנואה) who is taken to wife." The pesher expresses the rejection of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things by means of a technical term for the rejection of a sexual relationship with a woman, in light of Nahum's characterization of Nineveh as a harlot.

The root נבל lends itself to many interpretations and wordplays, and is probably intended as a pregnant term within Nahum itself. Relevant spheres are "disgrace" or "base foolishness"; "withering" or "decay"; "abominable act"; "lewdness" (נבלה in Hos 2:12), and "carcass" (נבלה). In Nahum itself, the primary sense is degradation, but the connotations of withering, disgust, and lewdness are also contextually appropriate. (Note, with Spronk, a possible relation to the previous term שקוצים, in reference to idolatry; as in Deut 32:15).

⁸⁹ The exegetical technique here is lexical alteration, resembling rabbinic *'al tigre*. The ש of ושמחך is treated as a ש, allowing the word to be interpreted as though it were וּשְׁמַחְךָ, from the root אשמ. Thus, "and I will set you" becomes "I will make you guilty," i.e., make others see your guilt. The exegetical switch to ש also allows for a play on the root שמח, "to be aghast." A similar word play is evident in Jer 18:16–17, "To make (לשום) their land become a desolation (לשממה) . . . every passerby will be appalled (ישם)." This leads to the pesher's זרון (ישם).⁸⁹ This leads to the pesher's זרון (ישם).⁸⁹ This leads to the pesher's זרון (ישם).⁸⁹ This leads to the pesher's זרון (ישם).⁸⁹ Your arrogant heart (זרון בלבך) has seduced you . . . Edom shall be a cause of appallment (לשממה); whoever passes by will be appalled (ישם)."

כאורה	= וכארום	isolexism ⁹⁰
{No equivalent} ⁹¹	= ורבים יבינו בעוונם	unpegged plus; biblical cross- reference ⁹²
{No equivalent}	= באחרית הקץ	biblical allusion ⁹³
והיה	= ובה[נ]לות כבוד יהודה	biblical allusion ⁹⁴
כול רואיך	= פתאי אפרים ⁹⁵	denomination ⁹⁶

⁹⁰ The difficulty of MT כראי is discussed in ch. 2. The variant in 4QpNah, כאורה, means “repulsive.” The pesher reuses this word in the same sense but in a different grammatical form, with the spectators as the subject of the *pi’el* verb וכארום.

⁹¹ However, this un-pegged text may possibly be related to a play on כאורה as “like a light,” so that the evil of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things will become clearly visible, hence understood, by many.

⁹² This plus derives from Dan 11:31–35, cited in full in the introduction to unit 12 above. After describing the desecration of the Temple by the King of the North, and the limited success of the king’s smooth words, Daniel predicts that “the knowledgeable among the people will make the many understand (יבינו לרבים).” (There יבינו is a causative verb, with the “many” serving as the indirect object; in the pesher, the “many” functions as the subject of יבינו, indicating those who will understand). Also of significance is Deut 32:28. This verse appears to have influenced 4QpNah at units 12 and 16 (by the juxtaposition of אבד and עצה) and is relevant here as well. It describes the nation as “void of sense . . . they have no discernment (תבונה).” Vs. 29 continues, “were they wise, they would . . . gain insight into their future (יבינו לאהריתם).” This passage seems to have influenced the above selection from Daniel, and it also forms the basis for CD V,17, “a nation void of sense (נוי אבד עזות).” According to CD VIII,12, those who “do not understand” are the “builders of the Wall” who follow the Preacher of Lies (לא הבינו בני החיץ).

Particularly relevant to 4QpNah is CD I,8 which recalls that after the biblical destruction of the First Temple, God reserved a shoot of the planting from which emerged a group of people who “discerned their iniquity” (ויבינו בעונם) and knew that they were guilty. God, in turn, discerned their deeds. The pesher awaits the time when the worthy remnant of Israel will join them in righteousness, reenacting the manner in which the early founders of the Community left the wicked ways of their contemporaries.

⁹³ This plus may be associated with the word יבינו as described in the previous note. According to Deut 38:29, that which an enlightened person discerns is his אהרית. Cf. Jer 23:20. In reference to the false prophets of Jerusalem opposed by God, Jeremiah tells the people, “in the end of days they will clearly perceive it” (תחבוננו בה בינה). Lam 1:9, describing the destruction and humiliation of Zion, reads, “Her uncleanness clings to her skirts, she gave no thought to her future (לא אהריתה).” Nitzan (85–86) discusses the insertion of temporal qualifiers as subordinate clauses in pesher headings. Here, the temporal phrase is not in the introductory identification, but is syntactically integrated into the relative clause of the actual interpretation, and thus must be recognized as having greater exegetical significance. We take אהרית הקץ as specifying a particular moment in eschatological time, the end of the period of the dominion of Belial. (See section 6.2.2, ch. 6). Dan 11:35 describes the designated final time, עת קץ, as delayed, but the pesher anticipates its arrival.

⁹⁴ See ch. 6 for this pair of equivalents.

⁹⁵ See ch. 6 for this idiom.

⁹⁶ The choice of the root פתה may possibly be an allusion to Hos 7:11, in which Ephraim is likened to a פוחה. Amusin credits A.M. Gazow-Ginzberg with bring-

ידודו	= ידודו, ועזבו	repetition, synonymy, ⁹⁷
מִמָּן	= מִמָּן קִדְמָה, אֵת מִתְעִיָּהֶם	pronominal denomination ⁹⁸
{No equivalent}	= וְנִלְווּ עַל [י. .] שְׂרָאֵל ⁹⁹	unpegged plus ¹⁰⁰

ing this Hosea citation to his attention in this context (“Éphraïm et Manassé,” 394, n. 21).

There is no clear connection between the words **רוֹאֵךְ** and **פְּהַאי**, and the pesher seems to have simply used a standard epithet with relevance to the larger context (of seduction) to stand in for the generic participle in the lemma. Contrast the alignment here with 1QpHab XII,4, in which “the simple” correspond quite aptly to the “beasts” in the lemma. We view the phrase **כֹּל רוֹאֵךְ** in the lemma as having influenced the wording of the pesher in that **וּבִהַן [נ] לֹחַ כְּבוֹד יְהוּדָה** is an adapted reference to Isa 40:5.

⁹⁷ In the Qumran corpus, as in the Bible, **עֹב** is used most often regarding the abandonment of man by God or the rejection of God by man. Steadfastness is often expressed as a negative assertion of the above (God not abandoning man; man not rejecting God). Divine abandonment of man is a particular concern for the author of 1QH, and human rejection of God is found, e.g., 1QpHab VIII,10; 1QH X,36; CD I,3; III,11; 4QpHos^b VII,2.

The use of the term to denote repentance is less common, occurring in only three places in the Bible (and, elsewhere at Qumran, at 1QH XIV,6). Ezek 20:8 reads, “no man of them cast away the detestable things they were drawn to and they did not forsake the idols of Egypt” (**שְׁקִיזֵי עִינֵיהֶם לֹא הִשְׁלִיכוּ וְאֵל גִּלּוּלֵי מִצְרַיִם לֹא עֹב**). The significant lexical overlap of this verse with our lemma could have motivated the author of the pesher to borrow its vocabulary for expressing the idea of abandoning evil, even though the larger context of Ezek 20 is not relevant. Prov 9:6; 10:17 are also relevant here. In the former verse, wisdom exhorts the simpleton (**פְּתִי**), “Give up simpleness and live (**עֹבֵר פְּתָאִים וְחָיו**), walk in the way of understanding (**בִּינָה**).” The latter verse features **עֹב** with **מַחֲזֵה**. (The third instance of **עֹב** as the abandonment of evil, at Isa 55:7, does not seem to have affected 4QpNah).

The use of **עֹב** is especially appropriate to the context of this pericope, since the root functions as a technical term for an abandoned woman. Cp. Akk *ezēbu*, and cf. Isa 54:6; 60:15 (with **שְׂנוּאָה**); 62:4; Ezek 23:29 (with **שָׂנָא** and **זָנוּיךְ**; 4QapLam(179) frag 2, line 6. (See our note on **וּשְׂנוּאִים**, above.) Further, **עֹב** is a technical term for the abandonment of a city, and the pesher here portrays the “simple ones of Ephraim” as abandoning the “city of Ephraim” (see above, line 2). For this sense of **עֹב**, cf. I Sam 31:7; Isa 6:12; Jer 4:29; Zeph 2:4.

⁹⁸ See above on **הָעָה** as a key term for the opponents of the Community. **קִדְמָה** does not appear to be a technical term, but simply serves as a generic noun to provide the locus from which the people would flee (see the introduction to this unit).

⁹⁹ See n. 87 **יִשְׂרָאֵל** above. Gaster and Dupont-Sommer observe that the term “Israel” here denotes the true Israel (“au véritable Israël”). The Pharisees’ wickedness will be revealed to “all Israel,” with “Israel” being employed in an inclusive national sense. This population will join itself to the Qumran Community, which views itself as “Israel” in the restricted theological sense and which will at that time, to the mind of the pesher’s author, become the only “Israel.” Whereas in the previous unit **נִרְ גִּלּוּי** referred to Gentiles, here **וְנִלְווּ** refers to Jews. Yet these Jews are depicted as undergoing a conversion of sorts, becoming real Israelites as they embrace the life of the Qumran Community. Doudna’s restoration of **עַל אֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל** (198–99) would accommodate the same basic explanation.

¹⁰⁰ The pesher expands upon its description of the abandonment of evil with a description of the embracing of good. The biblical basis for its formulation can be

This unit exhibits many of the characteristic forms of lemma/pesher correspondence, from the direct repetition of an exact word (ידודר), to paraphrases emerging from synonymy (ושמתיך), and word-play (e.g., ושנאום), to more complex reconfigurations. The seeming deviations from correspondence actually conform to norms that have emerged in the course of our study. Thus, the pesher features unpegged phrases, which function as allusions to relevant secondary biblical sources, esp. ch. 11 of Daniel (ורבים יבינו, ונלוו). The varied components of the pesher are interwoven to form a literary unit that corresponds in a basic way to the structure of the lemma, but which is characterized even more markedly by internal cohesion. The syntax of the lemma has been maintained as a framework, but it has been systematically manipulated, e.g. via the “duplicated pesher” on כול רואיך ידודר ממך.

7.6 PESHER UNIT 16

3–4, III, lines 5–8 on Nah 3:7b

And they will say, ‘Nineveh is despoiled; who will mourn for her? Where shall I seek comforters for you?’

In the original biblical context, Nah 3:7b is best viewed as consisting of two sections. First, an observation and a rhetorical question are attributed to the spectators who were introduced in verse 6. In this section, Nineveh is referred to in 3rd person (שודרה גינה . . . לה). Next, a rhetorical question is uttered by God, addressed directly to Nineveh in 2nd person, as was the case in v. 5 (לך). Although this is our preferred interpretation of the biblical text, it does not seem to be the way in which the lemma was understood by the author of the pesher.¹⁰¹ In fact, the pesher does not reflect any rhetorical

found in Jer 50:4–5, “In those days and at that time . . . the children of Israel and the children of Judah together will come and attach themselves to the Lord (ונלוו על) by a covenant for all time.” The pesher anticipates the day (והיה) that all the factions of Israel will join together to establish the true eschatological, and thus eternal, Community. See also Dan 11:34, as cited above.

¹⁰¹ Nor by many scholars since. Spronk parses the verse as we do, but we are in the minority. Thus, some emend the final word from “you” to “her” (*ICC:Nahum*, 334, 356; see ch. 2 for the suggestion that an internally harmonizing variant in 4QpNah was corrected toward agreement with MT). Cathcart cites a number of

question or quotation at all! It is easy to see why Horgan (245) includes 4QpNah 3–4 III,5–8 as an example of “instances in which the pesher seems only loosely related to the lemma.”

The total lack of correspondence to וְאָמַר־וֹ eludes explanation. There is neither any direct equivalent nor any formal representation of the fact that the lemma features direct speech.¹⁰² Nonetheless, rather than viewing this pesher as “loosely related” to the lemma of this unit, it is more fruitful to view it as quite closely related to the pesher of the previous unit, which commented upon the first half of verse 7.¹⁰³ The words אֵת מַתְעִיָּהֶם and מִתּוֹךְ קְהָלָם (unit 15, line 5) are paraphrased by כִּנְסָתָם and עֲצָתָם (unit 16, line 7).¹⁰⁴ The very words themselves reappear as לַתְּעוּת הַקְּהָל (unit 16, line 7).

commentators who view the change in person as reflective of “the prophetic style.” Similar variation occurs in Isa 51:18–19, “*She* has none to guide *her* [“you” in 1QIsa^a] of all the sons *she* bore . . . These two things have befallen *you*: wrack and ruin—who can console *you*? Famine and sword—how shall I comfort *you*.”

In our understanding of Nah 3:7, the comforters would be sought in the present in order to offer Nineveh solace for the fate that is being predicted for her future. Thus, we would render Nahum in its original context with quotation marks inserted as follows, “And they will say, ‘Nineveh is despoiled; who will mourn for her?’ Where shall I seek comforters for you?”

However, in the lemma of 4QpNah, we place the marks in the conventional manner: “And they will say, ‘Nineveh is despoiled; who will mourn for her? Where shall I seek comforters for you?’”

¹⁰² In units 10 and 13, it was noted that 4QpNah avoided the first person formulations of MT, in favor of 3rd person observations in the pesher, and even in favor of 2nd person emendations in the lemma of unit 10. Perhaps a related phenomenon is at work in this unit as well.

¹⁰³ This recapitulation might itself be a literary reflection of וְאָמַר־וֹ as a designation of confirmation. (Cf. *HALOT*, def. I 3e of אָמַר, “to assure”; IIKi 8:19 “for the sake of His servant David, in accordance with his promise [כְּאֲשֶׁר אָמַר לִי] to maintain a lamp for his descendants for all time”; IChron 27:23 “for the Lord had promised [כִּי אָמַר] to make Israel as numerous as the stars of heaven”). The interconnection between units 15 and 16 might also be related to the long vacat after the lemma of unit 15, though it is difficult to determine the precise mechanism of this proposed technique. (Recall that half of III,2 was left blank; this creates a greater sense of unity between the pesher of unit 15 and the whole of unit 16).

¹⁰⁴ Dupont-Sommer has observed that כִּנְסָתָם is a non-biblical word, used in mishnaic Hebrew to designate “Synagogue.” Hoenic characteristically attempted to use this fact as evidence of a late date for the pesher (“Dorshé Halakot,” 123). Rabbinic tradition dates the “Men of the Great Assembly” (אֲנָשֵׁי כִּנְסַת הַגְּדוּלָה) to the Persian era (cf. Avot 1:1. See Finkelstein, *Ha-Perushim ve-Anshe Keneset Ha-Gedolah* [*The Pharisees and the Men of the Great Synagogue*, Hebrew with English Summary; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950]). It is possible that the term כִּנְסָתָם was already associated with Pharisaic leadership by the time of the composition of Pesher Nahum. (Cf. Gaster and Horgan.) However, in 4Q252CommGen^a, although the

Appreciation of this exegetical correspondence with peshet unit 15 will facilitate the comprehension of correspondence between the lemma and peshet within this unit itself, as follows:

ואמר	= {No equivalent}	
שודרה	= ¹⁰⁵ חובד עצתם, ונפרדה כנסתם	paronomasia, metaphor ¹⁰⁶
נינה	= דורשי החלקות	denomination
מי ינוד לה	= ולא יוסיפו עוד לתעות [.] קהל	paraphrase, paronomasia ¹⁰⁷

context is not well-preserved, the word *כנסת* appears to be associated with the leadership of the Qumran Community.

¹⁰⁵ On the root *אבד* with *עצה* as a common biblical idiom, see Weiss (*עוד לפשר*) "ורבים יבינו בעוונם" and n. 92 above, in reference to Deut 32:28 and (נחום, 61). Despite the shared content, the texts exhibit interesting variation in the meaning of the words. In the passage in Deuteronomy, as in CD V,17, the phrase indicates "void of sense." Here, we translate "their council will be destroyed," and in III,9 above, the word pair described the plight of the followers of the Pharisees, "they will perish because of their counsel."

¹⁰⁶ As observed in our introduction to this unit, *חובד עצתם* and *נפרדה כנסתם* paraphrase elements of the peshet in the previous unit. Nonetheless, these words also correspond to their shared peg in this lemma. The peshet provides a contemporizing adaptation of the passive verb in the lemma, "was devastated, despoiled." A geo-political city like Nineveh is "devastated" by military defeat; a metaphorical "city" like the community of Seekers-after-Smooth-Things is devastated when it "breaks up."

Weiss observes the parallel of the roots *אבד* and *פרד* in Ps 92:10 and Job 4:11. In Job, Eliphaz the Temanite discourses about God's ultimate punishment of the wicked and his preservation of the innocent. He says, "the lion perishes for lack of prey (ויש אבד מבלי טרף) and its whelps are scattered (ובני לביא יתפרדו). Psalm 92 has the same theological focus, with verse 10 asserting that God's enemies will be destroyed (יאבדו . . . יתפרדו). The other elements of the word pairs are parallel as well.

¹⁰⁷ The echo of unit 15 by *לתעות [.] קהל* was noted in the introduction to our unit. The internal lemma/peshet correspondence is less clear. The best explanation is that *ינוד* was associated with *יודרו במך* of the lemma in the previous unit. The equivalents of this phrase in the peshet were delineated as *ידרו פתאי אפרים את* *מתעיהם*, *ועזבו את מתעיהם*. In a similar fashion, the equivalent of *ינוד* here in unit 16 is the assertion of the cessation of the influence of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, with the peshet reusing the root *תעה*.

It is possible that the simple meaning of Nahum was adapted as well. If head-shaking is viewed as a signal of general acquiescence rather than strictly referring to pity, then the peshet could be interpreted as asserting that the Pharisees will have no followers, no "sympathizers." Just as Nineveh will have no sympathizing mourners, the Pharisees will have no more willing audiences nodding their heads. Cf. the definition of *ינוד* as "to indicate cooperation" in *HALOT*. However, the cited examples all to refer to sympathetic grief.

ופת[אים] לא יחזקו עוד את = מאין אבקשה מנחמים לך עצמם	denomination, paronomasia, synonymy, ¹⁰⁸ syntactic adaptation ¹⁰⁹
---	---

The most striking characteristic of the pesher interpretation in unit 16 is its correspondence to the pesher of the previous unit. The individual elements of the pesher and lemma within unit 16 itself can be aligned as equivalents, except for the lemma's וְאָמְרוּ which remains unpaired. Whereas the lemma features words in first, second, and third person, the pesher is constructed entirely in third person. The message of the base-text, as understood by the author of the pesher, appears to be the isolation that will accompany the imminent devastation of Nineveh. This message is contemporized and adapted by the pesher, in that the isolation and disintegration of the Pharisees is in itself the essence of the group's eradication. Unit 16 ends Pericope 3 with a reiteration of the message of unit 15, predicting the erosion of Pharisaic influence.

7.7 SUMMARY OF PERICOPE 3

In verses 1–7 of chapter 3, Nahum uses his vivid poetic language and imagery to portray the guilt of Nineveh and the horrific divine punishment engendered by that guilt. From the hyper-realism and hypotyposis of verses 1–3, Nahum moves to the metaphor of the harlot. The metaphor is employed in a brief reiteration of Assyria's

¹⁰⁸ The mainstay of the link is the synonymy of מְנַחֵםִים and חֲזָקָה. The correspondence emerges from the understanding that נָחַם, generally rendered “to comfort,” connotes “encouragement,” rather than merely sympathy (cf. *HALOT*, citing K. Elliger, *Biblischer Kommentar*). If we think of the verb in the lemma as meaning “comfort” in this sense, and the verb in the pesher as signifying “fortify,” then the English words illustrate the common denotation of strengthening. Further, the term חֲזָקָה connotes the concept of grasping, specifically “upholding” as well as strengthening. Simple ones will not strengthen the Council of Seekers-after-Smooth-Things by joining it, and current adherents will no longer hold onto that affiliation.

¹⁰⁹ On פְּרִיָּאִים, see the previous unit, and ch. 6. The pesher appears to have reinterpreted the lemma's אֵין to mean “there will be none” in a departure from its original contextual sense of “from where?” Or, perhaps, the pesher derives from a wordplay with בָּאֵן, “to refuse”. (Consider the pairing of בָּאֵן and נָחַם in Jer 31:15; Ps 77:3; Gen 37:35). In either case, the lemma's rhetorical question is re-textured as an assertion.

current sinful state, flourishing in her abusiveness, followed by the prediction of her utter humiliation. In Peshet Nahum, the harlot/Assyria is identified as the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things. When contextualized in the time of Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II, this entails a correspondence between Pompey's violent takeover of Jerusalem and the havoc wreaked upon the "bloody city"; between Nahum's prediction of Assyria's descent from seductive superpower to humiliated pariah and the peshet's assertion and anticipation of the waning of Pharisaic influence.

CHAPTER EIGHT

PERICOPE 4 (3–4 III,8–IV,4 AND FRAG 5),
PESHER UNITS 17–26

Frag 3–4 III,8–IV,9 on Nah 3:8–12

Col. III

	vac . . .	הת־טִיבִי מִנִּי אִמְ[וֹן הַיּוֹשְׁבָה בַּיָּאֲרִים	8
....		פִּשְׂרוֹ אִמְוֹן הֵם מִנְשֵׁה וְהַיָּאֲרִים הֵם גִּדְ[וֹן] לִי מִנְשֵׁה נִכְבְּדִי הִ[...]. יָם אֶת מִ[...].	9
	vac	מִים סָבִיב לָהּ אֲשֶׁר חִילָה יָם וּמִים חוֹמוֹתֶיהָ	10
		פִּשְׂרוֹ הֵם אֲנָשִׁי [הַ] לִּילָה נְבוּרִי מִ[לְ]הַמַּתָּה // עֵ[...]. כֹּשׁ עוֹצְמָה[ן] וּמְצָרִים וְאִין קָצָה...	11
		פִּשְׂרוֹ הֵם רִשְׁעֵי[...]. הִ[...]. הִמְ[...]. מְ[...]. פִּשְׂרוֹ וְהָ[לּוֹבִים הִיוּ בְעוֹרְתָךְ	12

Col. IV

		פִּשְׂרוֹ הֵם רִשְׁעֵי[...]. הִ[...]. בֵּית פְּלַנְגִּים הַנְּלוּיִם עַל מִנְשֵׁה גַם הִיא בְּגוּלָה הַנְּלָכָה בְּשָׂבִי גַם	1
		עִלּוּלִיָּהּ יִרְוֹשׁוּ בְּרֹאשׁ כָּל חוֹצוֹת וְעַל נִכְבְּדִיָּהּ יוֹרוּ גוֹרֵל וְכוּל גִּדְ[וֹן] לִיָּהּ רוֹחֵקוֹ	2
		בְּזִקִּים פִּשְׂרֵי עַל מִנְשֵׁה לִקְץ הָאֲחֵרוֹן אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁפֵּל מַלְכוּתוֹ בִּי[...].	3
		נְשִׂי עִלּוּלִיָּהּ וְטַפּוֹ יִלְכוּ בְּשָׂבִי נְבוּרִי וְנִכְבְּדִי בְּחֹרְבָן[...]. גַּם אֶת תִּשְׁכְּרֵי וְתַחֲדֵי נְעִלְמָה vac פִּשְׂרוֹ עַל רִשְׁעֵי אֲ[פְרִים]	4
		אֲשֶׁר חִבּוֹא כּוֹסֵם אַחֲרַי מִנְשֵׁה [] לִ[...]. גַּם אֶת תִּבְקָשִׁי	5
		מַעֲזוֹ בְעִיר מְאֹיִב פִּשְׂרוֹ עַל[...].	6
		אֲוִיבֵיהֶם בְּעִיר[...].	7
		תִּאֲנִים עִמָּן בְּכוֹרִים[...].	8
		[...].	9
		[...].	10
		[11]	
		[12]	

Frag 3–4 III,8–IV,9

Col. III

- 8 . . . ^{Nah 3:8a} *Are you better than Am[on situated among] the rivers?*
 9 Its *pesher*: “**Amon**”: they are Manasseh and “**the rivers**”: they are the nobles of Manasseh, the honored ones of the[. . .]
 10 ^{Nah 3:8b} *which was surrounded by waters, whose rampart was the sea and whose walls were waters vac*
 11 Its [*pe*] *sher*: they are her [w]arriors, her mighty men o[f w]ar.
^{Nah 3:9} *Ethiopia was her might [and Egypt, and it was without limit.*
 12 [. . . *Put and the Libyans were in your aid.*

Col. IV

1 Its *peshet*: they are the wicked ones of its [...], the House of Peleg who have joined themselves to Manasseh. ^{Nah 3:10} **Yet even she w[ent] into exile [in captivity]. Also**

2 **her young children were dashed to pieces at the top of every street. And they cast lots for her honored men and all [her g]reat men [were bound**

3 **in fetters.** Its *peshet*: concerning Manasseh at the final age when his kingdom will be brought low in y°[...]

4 his women, his infants, and his children will go into captivity, his warriors and his nobles by the sword [^{Nah 3:11a} ... **You too will be drunken**

5 **you will be obscured** Its *peshet*: concerning the evil ones of E[phraim

6 that their cup will come after Manasseh [^{Nah 3:11b} ... **you too will seek**

7 **refuge in the city from the enemy** Its *pesh[er: upo]n* [

8 their enemies in the city [^{Nah 3:12} ... **All your fortresses**

9 **will be fig-trees with [their first-ripe fruits;**

10 °[...]

11 [...]

12 [...]

8.1 HISTORICAL ANALYSIS OF PERICOPE 4

Pericope 4 refers to the downfall of Manasseh as a comparison for the eradication of Ephraim (= the Pharisees), predicted in Pericopes 3 and 4. In Nah 3:8–11, Nineveh is compared to Thebes. The prophet addresses Nineveh, saying that just as Assyria has crushed the mighty Egyptian city of “No-Amon,” so too will Assyria herself be destroyed.¹ In the *peshet*, Assyria is represented by Ephraim throughout. Pericope 4 introduces Manasseh as the analog to Thebes.² Since Ephraim has been identified as the Pharisees, it is generally acknowledged that Manasseh is to be identified as the Sadducees,

¹ The reference is to Thebes, which was sacked in 663 BCE by Assurbanipal (though ancient tradition identified the city as Alexandria. Cf. Vg, Targ, Spronk).

² Tantlevskij sees the later destruction of Thebes in 88 BCE by Ptolemy IX Soter II (Lathyrus) as “having a certain association for the author” of the *peshet* (“Historical Background,” 334). He uses this fact in dating the composition of the *peshet* to that year. The coincidence is worth noting, but one might argue the opposite in terms of the relevance of second century BCE Thebes to the *peshet*. If contemporary events in Amon had actually informed the *peshet*, an allusion to such events would be expected in the *peshet* interpretation. The *peshet* as it is preserved seems to refer only to internal matters.

in keeping with the three-party model outlined by Josephus.³ Just as Assyria (= Ninveh), which had conquered Egypt (= No-Amon), fell shortly after that conquest, so does the pesher predict that the Pharisees (“the city of Ephraim”), who have defeated the Sadducees (“Manasseh”), will soon fall themselves.⁴ Other instances of the term Manasseh in Qumran pesharim offer less insight into the group’s identity, but are consistent with the Sadducean identification.⁵ The most relevant Sadducean characteristic associated with “Manasseh” is the aristocratic nature of the group.⁶ Military associations have also been noted.⁷ Dupont-Sommer stresses the military context of this section of the pesher (e.g., אַנְשֵׁי [הַן] יִלְהֶוּ נְבוּרֵי [בְּ] לְהַמָּתָה). He maintains that the association with warriors is particularly suitable for Aristobulus, a military man like his father Jannaeus. Recently, Eyal Regev has reinforced the Sadducean identification of “Manasseh” in Pesher Nahum by associating strict Sadducean attitudes to Sabbath law with Josephus’ claim in *Bj* I §148–51 that the Temple priests did not cease from their service during Pompey’s attack and Josephus’ statement in *Ant* XIV §67–68 that Pompey encountered minimal military resistance to that attack.⁸ Although Josephus frames his comment in *Bj* as a drama-enhancing description of priestly dedication

³ This identification was arrived at independently by Amusin, “Éphraïm et Manassé”; Dupont-Sommer, “Observations,” and “Le Commentaire,” 82–83; and Yadin, in private correspondence to Flusser. (Cf. Flusser, פְּרוּשִׁים וְצִדּוּקִים, 139 and n. 24). Compare Licht’s description of “Manasseh” as a *novum*, the sense of which was not known (דְּפִים וְנוֹסְפִים, 456).

⁴ Cf. Amusin, “Éphraïm et Manassé,” 389–96; Carmignac, 91 n. 9; Dupont-Sommer, “Le Commentaire,” 80–82.

⁵ Manasseh is paired with Ephraim in 4QpPs^a 1–10 II, 18–20, in which the epithets are applied to two groups of enemies opposing the Teacher of Righteousness, “the wicked of Ephraim and Manasseh who will seek to lay their hands on the priest and on his partisans” (transl. of Horgan, 196). 4QpIsa^c frags 4–6, I, 20 cites Isa 9:20, which also pits Ephraim against Manasseh, in joint opposition to Judah (“Manasseh is against Ephraim, Ephraim is against Manasseh; both together are against Judah.” Cf. Amusin “Éphraïm et Manassé” 390–91, Carmignac, 91).

⁶ Cf. the reference to the “great ones” and “nobles” of Manasseh. On the aristocracy of the Sadducees, see *Ant* 13 §298; 18 §17 (cf. Amusin, “Historical Events,” 144). In *Ant* 14 §45, Aristobulus’s supporters appear before Pompey in all the aristocratic finery associated with Hellenizing Sadducees.

⁷ “Le Commentaire,” 85; “Observations,” 216. Cf. Flusser “פְּרוּשִׁים וְצִדּוּקִים,” 139 and p. 163 n. 24; he notes that Yadin’s personal communication to him emphasized the military characterization of Manasseh in the pesher.

⁸ in “How Did The Temple Mount Fall to Pompey?” *JJS* 48 (1997): 276–89, esp. 286–89. See p. 277 regarding the claim that Pompey’s capture of Jerusalem occurred on a Sabbath.

to sacrificial obligations, Regev argues that, in fact, these priests were exhibiting their devotion to strict observance of the Sabbath. Thus, the reason that Pompey did not encounter serious military resistance to his attack upon the Temple is that these Sadduceean priests were also Aristobulus' fighting force, and their sectarian views required them to abstain from any military activity on the Sabbath.

Dupont-Sommer broadens the identification of the epithets in 4QpNah, grouping Hyrcanus II with Ephraim/Pharisees and Aristobulus II with Manasseh/Sadducees.⁹ This is consistent with his dating of col. III to the time of Pompey's conquest, as described in ch. 6, above. As noted by Amusin, the pesher's use of Nah 3:7 depends upon the fact that the Sadducees had already been toppled. Their past experience enables the use of their plight as an example for the future downfall of Pharisees.¹⁰ For Amusin, Flusser, and Dupont-Sommer, this is a reference to the defeat and deportation of Aristobulus II by Pompey in 63 BCE.¹¹

Those who date the events of 4QpNah to an earlier period are more vague about the historical analog of the suffering of "Manasseh," though they accept the basic premise of Sadduceean identification. Schiffman cites Amusin, and agrees that the "interpretation presumes that the Sadducees had met their match and been weakened before the Pharisees."¹² Since he places the pesher during the time of Alexander, he states in a general fashion that "to a great extent Hasmonean priestly power came at the expense of their Sadduceean predecessors." However, this pericope describes a suffering that exceeds

⁹ Specifically he sees the "House of Peleg" as Hasmoneans, in apposition to the chiefs of Manasseh ("Le Commentaire," 82, 84). In his view, since many, though not all, of the Hasmoneans were Sadduceean, the pesher associates the two, but qualifies which members of the "House of Peleg" it refers to, i.e., those who joined Manasseh. J. Maier's initial speculations about "Manasseh" included the possibility that the term represented the Hasmonean dynasty. (He also suggested that the term might be a synonym for Ephraim. Cf. "Weitere Stücke," 232). Carmignac also associated Manasseh with the Hasmoneans, especially with Alexander Jannaeus (*Les Textes*, 91 n. 9). Cook suggests that "Manasseh may be the secular followers of Jannaeus, i.e. the aristocrats who have no sincere interest in religious controversy" (218). In the context of his remark, it is noteworthy that contemporary scholarship often depicts Sadducees as "Hellenized" in a sense that indicates irreligiosity, even when rabbinic accounts of halakhic disputes are brought to bear on the discussion. (Contrast our observations concerning strict Sadduceean attitudes to Sabbath observance, above.)

¹⁰ "Historical Events," 144.

¹¹ Cf. *Ant* 14 §73-79, *BJ* 1 §157.

¹² "Pharisees and Sadducees," 285.

merely having “been weakened.” Note particularly “the captivity” and “sword” in IV,4.

Following upon our assessment of Pericope 3, we view Pericope 4 as referring to the defeat of Aristobulus and his supporters, whom we identify as Sadducees.¹³ In this case, we agree with Amusin and Flusser as well as Dupont-Sommer regarding the historical context of the peshar. As for the specific epithets, we prefer the approach of Amusin and Flusser, identifying Ephraim as Pharisees and Manasseh as Sadducees, rather than that of Dupont-Sommer who alternately distinguishes and conflates individuals and groups. The term “House of Peleg” requires some additional attention.

This term was the subject of extensive and thorough investigation by Richard T. White.¹⁴ The reader is directed to his study for an analysis of the derivation and connotations of the term, which we fully endorse and need not duplicate here. We do not, however, accept White’s conclusion that the epithet is a label for the followers of Onias IV who built a Temple in Leontopolis.¹⁵ We incline more to the view of Stegemann and Murphy O’Connor, who perceive the “House of Peleg” as an epithet for defectors from the Qumran Community.¹⁶

Those who suppose a standardization of epithets throughout the Qumran sectarian corpus have been troubled by the apparent positive valence of the “House of Peleg” in CD and its negative association in 4QpNah. In CD XX,22, the “House of Peleg” is named as a group that left “the holy city” and relied upon God. It is generally supposed that CD views this group favorably, approving of the fact that they did not follow the corrupt leadership of Jerusalem.¹⁷

¹³ Cf. Stegemann, *Library of Qumran*, 131. He assigns 4QpNah a composition date soon after 63 BCE, stating that the peshar relates to “very recent times” in describing the deportation of Aristobulus and the elimination of the Judean kingdom.

¹⁴ “The House of Peleg in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (ed. Philip R. Davies and Richard T. White; Sheffield: JSOT, 1990), 67–98. Cf. Murphy O’Connor, “The Essenes and Their History,” *RB* 81 (1974): 239–43.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 82–87.

¹⁶ However, their identification of this group with “Ephraim” is less convincing. Cf. Murphy O’Connor “The Essenes and Their History,” 238–41. He cites Stegemann *Die Entstehung*, 69–82, 178. See now Charlesworth’s discussion of the scholarship concerning the identity of the “House of Peleg” in *The Pesharim*, 107–109.

¹⁷ Cf. White, “House of Peleg,” 67–68, and the sources cited in his notes, p. 89. We would add Flusser, “פרושים, צדוקים,” 164. Dupont-Sommer understands CD XX,22–24 as referring to loyal Essenes who separated themselves from the House of Peleg, whom he identifies as the Hasmoneans (“Le Commentaire” 84, n. 1).

Specifically, they have been identified as a sub-group of the Qumran Community. However, in Peshet Nahum the idiom indicates a group that had joined itself to Manasseh, opponents of the author.

In light of this inconsistency, and in response to textual and contextual difficulties within CD XX, alternate assessments of the term have emerged.¹⁸ One approach was to posit a change in the allegiance of the designated group over time. Thus, Eshel views the use of “House of Peleg” in CD as an epithet for members of the Qumran Community. However, he writes, “It is possible that the ‘House of Peleg’ left Jerusalem and joined the sect, but later returned to Jerusalem and joined the Sadducees. Information such as this reflects the inherent instability in the sect and dynamic conditions in Qumran as the ideological disputes emerged among the members.”¹⁹ Similarly, Allegro maintained that the “House of Peleg” was a group that was already associated with waywardness and militarism in CD. Nonetheless, they acted acceptably in CD XX,22, “but later caused dissension among the people and apostasized, joining the party of the ruling house (‘Manasseh’).”²⁰

One difficulty in this approach is its assumption of the sustained integrity of an isolated self-contained unit within the Qumran Community. It is inherently difficult to imagine a Qumran Community fostering the continued existence of an independent sub-group within its domain. Moreover, the very basis for employing the term “House of Peleg” is to stress the act of separation. In CD, as much as in 4QpNah, the House of Peleg is described as rejecting a larger entity. In 4QpNah the “House of Peleg” seems to be described as having broken away from the Qumran Community; in CD, the term must reflect either a break away from Israel or away from the Community. The attempt to neutralize CD XX,23 by stating that the House of Peleg was viewed favorably by the Qumran Community while it was both separate from that Community and within it, ignores the polemical tone of the passage and of the term itself.

¹⁸ Horgan characterizes the group as “Sadducee-sympathizers” (190) in 4QpNah but does not address the relevance of this identification in CD.

¹⁹ from the English translation of “חילדהיה,” 91, provided by the author. (He views the death of the Teacher of Righteousness as a particular point of crisis for the Community).

²⁰ Allegro associates רשעי חיליה (“the wicked ones of his army,” as he restores the lacuna at the beginning of IV,1 in 4QpNah) with CD XX,14–15, which features the men of war (אנשי מלחמה) who “returned (to be) with the Man of Lies” (“More Unpublished Pieces,” 308; DJD V, 42; cf. CD I,13–21).

If one is committed to reading CD as presenting a positive view of the “House of Peleg,” then פֶּלֶג would have to be taken as a standardized code-word only in a general way: i.e., an appellation for a group that detaches itself from a larger whole.²¹ Depending upon the nature of the larger group that they are rejecting, the separating group could be performing a desirable or a deplorable act.²²

However, the real key to the puzzle of “House of Peleg” is better sought in a re-reading of CD XX,21–25. In Rabin’s *Zadokite Fragments*, the text appears as follows:

... 22 בית פלג אשר יצאו מעיר הקדש
 23 וישענו על אל בקץ מעל ישראל ויטמאו את המקדש ושבו עד
 24 אל ו[יש]ך העם בדברים מעשנים כן[לם] אם לפי רוחו ישפטו בעצת הקדש

Rabin translated, “the house of Peleg who went out from the holy city and put their trust in God in the epoch when Israel sinned and made the sanctuary unclean, but they returned unto God. And let him [appease] the people in a [few] words; [they all], each man according to his spirit, shall be judged in the holy council.”

However, the correct reading of lines 23–24 yields an entirely different sense: ושבו עוד אל דרך העם. . . .²³ Thus, Daniel R. Schwartz translates,

(These verses refer to) the house of Peleg who went out of the city. And they depended upon God during the time of Israel’s trespass. But (although) they considered the sanctuary impure, they returned to the way of the people in some few ways. Each of them shall be judged according to his spirit in the holy council.²⁴

In this more plausible interpretation of CD, the House of Peleg assumes the shape of a group of people who had indeed previously acted properly in leaving Jerusalem. However, that did not earn them their epithet. The “separation” which led to the characterization

²¹ Cf. Maier, “Weitere Stücke,” 233.

²² Similarly, other terms for removing oneself from a parent group may indicate either a positive or negative act. The Community members pride themselves on having turned away from the general population (סור, CD VIII,16; 1QS^a I,2–3; 11QMelch 25), and yet fault Ephraim for departing (סור) from Judah (CD VII,11). Cf. A. Baumgarten, “The Name of the Pharisees,” 423–28, on “separatism” as a potentially positive attribute in sectarian self-designation.

²³ Cf. Broshi, “The Damascus Document Reconsidered,” (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992), 47.

²⁴ *Damascus Document*, ed. Charlesworth, p. 37. The translation of García-Martínez incorporates the new reading, and some of the adjusted punctuation.

of the group as “House of Peleg” was their (partial) rejection of the community’s way of life, and their return to non-Qumran Judaism, albeit in a limited fashion. The context of CD indicates that the author is troubled by the fate of lapsed Community members. The passage continues, “All who break out of the boundary of the law, from among those who have entered the covenant . . .” (lines 25–27) and then “all those who hold firmly to these precepts . . .” (lines 27–34). CD XX,20–22 cites Mal 3:18 and Ex 20:6 (= Deut 5:10; 7:9), assuring ultimate, appropriate, divine reward and punishment. CD XX,20–34 describe the fulfillment of these promises. Thus, lines 25–27 refer to the punishment of the wicked, and lines 27–34 describe the reward of the true penitents. CD XX,22–24 clearly deals with the problem of those who fall into the gray areas, who entered upon the path of repentance by joining the Community but have not remained members in good standing. Their lot is less clear to the author of CD, but he assures his audience that God will deal capably with these individuals, judging each according to his “spirit” (since actions are obviously insufficient evidence in these cases).²⁵

These backsliders and lapsed members of the Qumran Community are termed “House of Peleg.” Stegemann and Murphy O’Connor view the “House of Peleg” as a break-away group from the Qumran Community. It is possible that the “House of Peleg,” described in 4QpNah as aligned with Manasseh, is the same group as that described in CD, and that this group had maintained its cohesiveness for a number of decades.²⁶ However, it seems more likely that 4QpNah refers to a group that actually separated from the Community during the period with which the pesher is concerned. The “House of Peleg” is thus best viewed as a term applied successively to any bloc of defectors from the Community. In Gen 10:25 and Jub 8:8, Peleg

²⁵ It is perhaps ironic to refer to those whose spiritual alignment is unknown as “House of Peleg.” In 1QS, the root פלג is employed in outlining the dualistic system that is so central to Qumran determinism. Cf. IV,15–17, “In these (lies) the history of all men; according to their divisions (וּבְכַפְלֵיהֶן) they will inherit all their hosts for generations, and in their paths they will walk, and in all the works of their deeds in their divisions according to the inheritance of man. . . .” Perhaps the wording is in fact deliberate, with “House of Peleg” referring to those who fall through the cracks of the two camps, or try to have one foot in each, and who seem to exhibit a “split” personality.

²⁶ If Stegemann’s associations were to be accepted, and “House of Peleg” to be identified with “Ephraim,” and thus with the Pharisees, then 4QpNah would indicate that founders of the Pharisaic Community later became aligned with Sadducees in supporting Aristobulus.

is a figure named for the dispersion of humanity upon the earth.²⁷ Note that in Gen 11:7,8 this dispersion is described as preventing the people from “building a city.” Nitzan observes that the phrase “House of Peleg” exemplifies the use of building imagery in Qumran literature.²⁸ She refers to the word “House,” but the term resonates on an additional level, as demonstrated at length by White.²⁹ The epithet “House of Peleg” identifies individuals who abandon a community with a term that is employed in the Bible for those who failed to build a city.

The individual units of this pericope may be contextualized historically as follows. Unit 17 introduces the party of Manasseh, hinting at an aristocratic Sadduceean affiliation, by employing the words נכבדי and נדלי מנשה. Unit 18 presents the military nature of at least some members of the group, אגשי [ת] ילה נבורי [מ] לחמתה. The peshet in unit 19 has not survived, but some sort of sympathizers must have been mentioned. Unit 20 refers to sympathizers of the Sadducees.³⁰ Unit 21 relates to Aristobulus’s defeat: his military loss (נבוריו ונכבדיו בחרב . . .),³¹ the fall of the kingdom

²⁷ The naming of “Peleg” is attributed to the fact that “in his days the earth was divided” (הארץ נפלגה).

²⁸ Pp. 45–46.

²⁹ “House of Peleg,” 70, 76–77, 82–89. White provides a detailed analysis of the connotations of “Peleg” as related to building. Note the rabbinic appellation “generation of separation” (דור הפלגה) for the generation that built the Tower of Babel, since that event is associated with Peleg. White points to the association of “Peleg” with “building” in support of his proposal that the specific referent for the term in 4QpNah is Onias’s followers, the builders of the Temple at Leontopolis. However, in restricting the term’s associations with “building” to a concrete physical structure, his identification does not sufficiently attend to the pervasiveness of “building imagery” at Qumran and specifically to the symbolic value of such terminology for the representation of Communities. (Compare our comments, and especially the view of Flusser, regarding “city of Ephraim” in ch. 6). Qimron notes a possible relationship between the use of פלג to denote Community at Qumran, and the late BH פלך “district” (*Hebrew, Glossary, s.v.*).

³⁰ These affiliates may perhaps be understood as former members of the Qumran Community, particularly if the text is restored as “the evil [ones of Jud]ah,” (Licht, 455; Schiffman explains Licht’s reading thus, “Pharisees and Sadducees,” 286). But, even with that reading, Dupont-Sommer would take “Judah” as Judea here, rather than as a symbol for the Qumran Community. He restores רש, meaning chiefs (= ראש), citing 4QpPs^a 3:5, “chiefs and princes (רשים and שרים).” He would understand either רשי יהודה or רשי מנשה as indicating the Judean aristocracy who rallied to Manasseh (“Le Commentaire,” 83–84).

³¹ On the relevance of the death of influential military men to our proposed historical context for this pericope, cf. *Ant* 14 §73 in which Josephus states that “all those responsible for the war he [Pompey] executed by beheading.”

(תשפל מלכותו),³² and exile (גשו עילויו ושפו ילכו בשבי).³³ Unit 22 highlights the literary purpose of the description of Thebes/Manasseh, predicting that the Pharisees will also be defeated.³⁴ Unit 23 offers a specific aspect of that defeat, predicting the flight of the Pharisees. It seems likely that these latter units are truly predictive, and do not reflect an actual historical event known to the author. The pesher clearly treats Manasseh's downfall as an accomplished fact, but this still leaves some window for the date of composition. The defeat of Manasseh could be dated to 63 BCE when Aristobulus was imprisoned by Pompey (*Ant* 14 §57); to 61 BCE when he was taken to Rome in captivity (§79); to 56 BCE with his re-capture (§96), or to 49 BCE with his death (§124). In any case, this pericope reflects the mid-first century BCE. Its composition may be dated after Pompey's invasion of Judea and, in all likelihood, shortly before Hyrcanus's death.

8.2 LITERARY ANALYSIS OF PERICOPE 4

In the book of Nahum, verses 8–10 of ch. 3 describe the fate of No-Amon as a historical precedent for the collapse of a once seem-

³² Dupont-Sommer emphasizes that the pesher does not just refer to the reign of a particular king, but to kingship altogether (“royauté”). The defeat of Aristobulus II heralds the end of Manasseh's rulership; after him, Hyrcanus is High priest, but Israel no longer has its own monarch (“Observations, 218; “Lumieres Nouvelles” 33*; “Le Commentaire,” 85). When Pompey restored Hyrcanus in Aristobulus's stead in 63 BCE, Hyrcanus was only ethnarch and high priest, not king. When Aristobulus was exiled, he was displayed in Pompey's triumph as “Aristobulus, king of the Jews,” the last to hold that title.

³³ *Ant* 14 §79 describes the captivity of Aristobulus II and his children, two sons and two daughters. Cf. Dupont-Sommer, “Le Commentaire,” 85; Observations, 218. He also mentions the crushing of Aristobulus's subsequent attempt at revolt, and his re-capture, in 56 BCE, as recorded in *Ant* 14 §96, *Bj* 1 §171–74, although on that occasion the children were permitted to return to Judea (*ibid.*, 86).

³⁴ “הבוא כוסם אחר מנשה.” Brownlee considered the possibility that this “cup” of Ephraim, as the “doom” of the Pharisees, referred to the ousting of Hyrcanus II by Antigonus. It may be more likely that this general assertion had no particular historical analog, being predictive in nature. Dupont-Sommer, however, suggested an even more specific referent. He points to 1QpHab XI,10, which uses the image of a cup in describing the Wicked Priest. (“Le Commentaire,” 86; Observations, 219). Dupont-Sommer related this imagery to Hyrcanus's murder by poison in 30 BCE, though he stated that the pesher may have been authored before that time. His interpretation rests upon his identification of the Wicked Priest as Hyrcanus II, a designation that has not been widely accepted. He also suggested that this unit may refer to Hyrcanus's capture by the Parthians in 40 BCE.

ingly impregnable city. This cautionary example is intended to give credence to the prediction of the ruin of Nineveh, which is reiterated in vss. 11–15. In its adaptation of this section of Nahum, Peshet Nahum conforms to the base-text in both structure and content. The downfall of Manasseh is raised as precedent for the predicted destruction of Ephraim, which foreshadows the imminent downfall of Ephraim. Units 17–21 relate to Manasseh; unit 21 returns to the primary message concerning Ephraim. In historical terms, the peshet portrays a crushing Sadduceean setback as prefiguring Pharisaic ruin. The peshet points to the defeat of Aristobulus as an assurance of the imminent eradication of the Pharisees.

8.2.1 *Peshet Unit 17*

3–4 III, lines 8–9 on Nah 3:8a

Are you better than Am[on situated among] the rivers?

In 3:8, Nahum compares Nineveh to the defeated No-Amon. The peshet applies this biblical text to the destruction of the once mighty Manasseh as an example for the fate of the Pharisees. This simple peshet in unit 17 establishes the historical context, closely paraphrasing its lemma. The word הַחִיטְבִי is not repeated, but its comparative force is implied by the structure of the pericope.

Equivalents are charted as follows:

... הַחִיטְבִי (addressed to Nineveh) = (implied, addressed to Seekers-after-Smooth-Things)

<נו> אַמ[ון]	=	מַנְשֶׁה	symbol ³⁵
[הַחִיטְבִי ב]	=	ה[. . .] יָמֵי אֶת	‡ ³⁶
הַיַּרְדִּים	=	גַּד[ן] לִי מַנְשֶׁה; נִכְבְּדֵי ה[. . .]	symbol ³⁷

³⁵ The peshet adapts Nahum's typology of a former power that was superseded by a second mighty entity, which will in turn be defeated. No inherent exegetical connection is obvious between Amon and Manasseh, but Carmignac offers a potential link, in that Amon was the name of the son of the wicked King Manasseh of IJKi 21:2–17. It may be fruitful to extend Carmignac's idea a bit further. King Amon was killed by his own servants, but the populace (עַם הָאֲרָצָה) killed those conspirators, and installed Josiah as king instead (Isa 21:23–24). In implementing widespread religious reform, King Josiah cleansed the land of idols and abominations (23:4–24) and renewed the covenant with God through commitment to the Torah (23:2–3). This historical situation may be viewed as prefiguring the situation in the peshet. Amon's death at the hands of members of his own household parallels Aristobulus's ruin at the hands of his brother Hyrcanus; popular rejection of the

8.2.2 *Pesher Unit 18*

3–4 III, lines 8–9 on Nah 3:8b

which was surrounded by waters, whose rampart was the sea and whose walls were waters

The lemma of unit 18 continues to describe the former strength of Amon/Manasseh, which the pesher continues to apply to the Sadducees. Nah 3:8b lends itself to a number of possible translations and interpretations.³⁸ Our translation of the lemma in 4QpNah follows that of Allegro and Gaster. The pesher interpretation is very simple, offering only an identification of the defenders of Manasseh without further detail. As Amon had been defended by waters, Manasseh was defended by warriors.³⁹ The pesher features a variation upon the usual method in which building imagery is employed in the Qumran corpus. Typically, Qumran authors will use such imagery in constructing original forms of expression.⁴⁰ In this case, images of fortification appear in the base-text itself, and the pesher treats these images as metaphors for defenders of the Community of Manasseh. The pesher uses the language of the lemma, simply adjusting pronouns, and personifying the inanimate elements of the lemma. Equivalents may be mapped as follows:

conspirators may be analogous to a loss of support for Hyrcanus and the Pharisees, either in reality or as anticipated by the author of the pesher. The pesher predicts that the eradication of the Pharisees will herald the dawn of a new era, like that of Josiah but of greater scope, depth and, especially, duration (cf. esp., unit 15, above), as it will be the everlasting new world order.

Another possible exegetical connection is the common consonants *mem* and *nun* in אַמֹּן and מְנַשֶּׁה. (Cf. Knibb, p. 217. Cp. the *peh* and *resh* in אֲפֹרֹתִים/פְּרוּשִׁים).

³⁶ The pesher situates Manasseh amidst the honored ones, who are analogous to the rivers in the lemma. The paraphrase changes the syntax, with Manasseh as the object of a prepositional phrase rather than the subject of an active verb, but the sense is the same.

³⁷ For rivers as leaders, directing the flow of water, see ch. 3 on frags 1–2, line 3 [דְּנִהוּרֵי]. Schiffman observes that the statement that these honored ones “support” Manasseh “indicates that besides the Sadducees themselves, various others connected with the upper classes supported this group even while not being full-fledged members.”

³⁸ See above, ch. 2 on מַיִם/מֵיִם.

³⁹ There is thus no basis for Gaster’s view that “the commentator obviously took the prophet’s words to mean that the city’s ramparts had dissolved like water.” The pesher interpretation in this unit does not describe the destruction of the warriors, the analogs of the lemma’s ramparts; it simply identifies them.

⁴⁰ Cf. Nitzan, 45–54.

מים סביב לה = הם⁴¹
 אשר הילה ים = אנשי [ה] ילה personification, homonymy⁴²
 ומים חומותיה = נבור'י מן להמתה symbol (extended from previous unit)⁴³

This peshet unit is very unusual in that the interpretation consists purely of the substantive identification and the introductory pronoun with פשרו. Usual peshet form would involve some further information about these identified elements, placing them in a nominal sentence or as the head of a relative clause with אשר.⁴⁴ In this unit, the lemma itself includes the word אשר, but the peshet does not. The short identification almost seems to be a gloss on unit 17. Perhaps it is the word אשר in the lemma that prompted the exegetical use of this unit as an expansion of the one prior to it.

The third person sing. suffixes of היל[ה] and מן להמתה probably reflect the number and gender of Amon (Thebes) in the lemma.⁴⁵ Horgan supposes that the peshet's analog with Thebes would also have been a fem sing, and offers the possibility of "city . . . maybe Jerusalem as in 3-4 I,3." This does not have any apparent basis in the extant text. Most likely, the suffixes were simply reproduced automatically from the lemma.

⁴¹ Correspondence would be maximized by restoration of the previous peshet with Dupont-Sommer's מן נשה ים אה הסובב'ים. The pronoun in the introduction to this unit would then refer back to those great ones of Manasseh (the analogs of the rivers) who surround Manasseh, an apt equivalent for לה סביב לה.

⁴² חיל in Nahum is best understood as a rampart (cf. Isa 26:1; Lam 2:8). The term is adapted in the peshet to indicate warriors, with the altered sense communicated by the word "men of." Dupont-Sommer notes the parallelism of אנשי [ה] ילה and מן להמתה, pointing to the same usage in Nah 2:4, מן נבריהו מאדם אנשי, חיל מתלעים. He believes that this parallelism demonstrates that חיל in the lemma denotes "force." (Thus, LXX ἀρχαί, 8HēvXIIgr, ἰσχύς, and Peshitta; Vg treats the word as "wealth").

It seems more likely that the peshet reflects an exegetical adaptation, and does not indicate the sense of the word in its original context. The parallelism in the peshet would actually argue in favor of the equivalent relationship in the lemma, i.e., a parallel between חיל and חומותיה, with חיל denoting rampart. (Cathcart comments on the chiasmic structure of חיל and הילה ים (חומותיה ומים). Brooke (97) states that the peshet interprets this word as "power" but retained some sense of "rampart." חיל in the lemma is understood in this concrete sense by Brownlee and Maier.

⁴³ Note the auditory similarity of חומותיה and מן להמתה.

⁴⁴ See Horgan's outline of peshet formulations, pp. 239-43.

⁴⁵ Dupont-Sommer wonders whether the suffix may be masculine, in agreement with Manasseh. See his comments on חירה in 3-4 I,6, cited in ch. 2 above. So, Doudna, 525-26.

8.2.3 *Pesher Unit 19*

The pesher to Nah 3:9a “*Ethiopia was her might and Egypt, and it was without limit,*” has not survived.

The pesher probably identified the allies named in Nahum with supporters of Manasseh (as it does in unit 20). Egypt is mentioned in the possibly relevant context of 4QpHos^b 17 line 1, but insufficient text is preserved to be of assistance here.

8.2.4 *Pesher Unit 20*

3–4 IV, line 1 contains a brief comment upon Nah 3: 9b

Put and the Libyans were in your aid

In the biblical base-text, Nahum names additional allies of Thebes. Pesher Nahum associates these supporters with a sub-group of Manasseh, perhaps comprised of lapsed members of the Qumran Community, as may be hinted at in the word Peleg.

רשעי[...].ה בית פלג = פ[א]וש וה[ל]ובים	contemporizing analog with standard epithet; modified “ <i>gezera shawa</i> ”; acronym ⁴⁶
הגלויים על מנשה = היו בעזרתך	denomination, adaptational paraphrase ⁴⁷

⁴⁶ For “House of Peleg” as a stock epithet, see p. 271. The “*gezera shawa*” is described below. Additional factors may have influenced the use of the term “Peleg.” Gaster views פלג as a sort of acronym for פ[א]וש and לובים (in his words, “inspired by the initial letters of Put and Lubim.”) The choice of the term may also have been affected by the lemma’s concern with bodies of water—an implicit association with פלגי מים. Lastly, in 4Q385 6 II,6, where Dimant reads אין קץ לבריה[ו]תך, Kister (108) is probably correct in restoring the last word as בריה[ו]תך, based upon LXX “Ethiopia and Egypt, and there is no end to your flight” (αὐτὸ οὐκ ἔσται τέλος τῆς φυγῆς). Perhaps these texts reflect a variant פוש for פלט? If such a variant was known to the author of 4QpNah, then Peleg could reflect a word-play on that reading.

⁴⁷ The term גלויים again stresses that there were different levels of commitment among the adherents and supporters of the different groups in ancient Judaism. There is a probable word play on הגלויים/ה[ל]ובים, which is maximized in the lemma of the pesher by the inclusion of the article in this word, in contrast to MT. In Pericope 3, we observed the influence of Dan 11:31–35 upon Pesher Nahum. That passage in Daniel describes a number of afflictions associated with those who spoke smooth-things, and an invasion of a King from the North, followed by the repentance and relief of some of the people. 11:34 reads “when they stumble, they will be helped with a little help (עזרו עזר מעט), for many will join them (וגלוי עליהם). The coincidence of the terminology accounts at least for the lexical correspondence in this unit, and may be relevant contextually as well.

White argues for an association in the pesher between the House of Peleg and King Manasseh of II Kings on the basis of the fact that both were “Temple polluters.”⁴⁸ He further observes that the nations named in Nah 3:9, “Ethiopia, Egypt, Put, Lubim” are “virtually identical to the list of nations in Gen 10:6, “Ethiopia, Egypt, Put, and Canaan.” These nations are associated with the building of the Tower of Babel in ch. 11 of Genesis. White cites Genesis Rabba (Parsha 38 in Theodor-Albeck), “‘each one said to his fellow’ [Gen. 11:3]. Who said to whom? Said R. Berachiah: ‘Egypt said to Ethiopia.’” White is certainly correct in observing that the pesher relies upon the association later attributed to R. Berachiah. This may be constructed as a *gezera shawa*: Gen 10:6 mentions four nations, and the context of Gen 10–11 includes the word Peleg; Nah 3:9 names (nearly) the same four nations, and therefore is associated with Peleg.⁴⁹

8.2.5 *Pesher Unit 21*

3–4 IV, lines 1–4 on Nah 3:10

Yet even she w[ent] into exile [in captivity. Also] her young children were dashed to pieces at the top of every street. And they cast lots for her honored men and all [her g]reat men [were bound in fetters

Nah 3:10 concludes the description of Amon’s fate, the exile and massacre of its population. Much of the pesher follows the lemma very closely.⁵⁰ However, the inter-relationship of the elements in this unit, along with the imperfect preservation of the text, actually

⁴⁸ “House of Peleg,” 81. See Carmignac’s reference to King Manasseh in n. 000 above.

⁴⁹ For the adaptation of this rabbinic term in describing exegetical techniques employed in Qumran pesher, see Eliezer Slomovic, “Toward an Understanding of the Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *RevQ* 7 (1969): 5–10. Essentially, the term *gezera shawa* refers to an association of “Term A” in biblical verse “x” with “Term B,” on the basis of the joint appearance of term A with term B in biblical verse “y” (or in proximity to biblical verse “y”). In our case, the use of the term Peleg in 4QpNah 3–4 IV,1 commenting upon Nah 3:9 can be viewed as rooted in the appearance of the term “Peleg” elsewhere in the Bible, alongside elements present in Nah 3:9.

⁵⁰ Nitzan remarks upon the influence of Isa 13:16–18 on this section of Pesher Nahum. Given the strong overlap between the pesher and lemma, the similarity she observes is better explored as a function of the relationship between Isaiah and Nahum, than between Isaiah and Pesher Nahum (cf. the more creative use of Isa 13:17 in the pesher to Hab 1:17, in 1QpHab VI,10–12, as described by Nitzan, p. 63).

complicate the task of mapping correspondence. For example, in the phrase *נשיו עילוליו וטפו ילכו בשבי*, the word *עילוליו* corresponds to the lemma's *עילליה*; however, whereas the lemma describes the murder of these children with the word *ירוטשו*, the pesher depicts their exile, *ילכו בשבי*. The particular terminology used to express the exile in the pesher is an echo of a different phrase in the lemma, *ה[לכה בשבי]*. In the lemma, the subject of that phrase was “she,” i.e., No-Amon, generally, rather than particular members of the population.

Equivalents may be charted, tentatively, as follows:

נַם הִיא	= מַנְשָׁה	denomination ⁵¹
{No equivalent}	= לַקֵּץ הָאֲחֵרִים	temporal gloss ⁵²
בְּנוֹלָה ה[לכה בשבי]	= בִּי. [...?] יִלְכוּ בְּשָׁבִי	isolexism, repetition ⁵³
נַם עִילְלִיָּה	= נִשְׂיָו עִילּוּלָיו וּטְפּוֹ	repetition, and expansion ⁵⁴

⁵¹ By specifying Manasseh, the pesher clarifies that the subject remains the same as in the previous units. נַם might have implied a return to the focus upon Assyria/Ephraim.

⁵² Though *לַקֵּץ הָאֲחֵרִים* appears to be nearly identical to *בְּאַחֲרֵי הַקֵּץ*, which appeared in III,3, we suggest that its meaning is quite different. Unit 21 uses the term “the last time” to mean, the “previous period,” “recently.” Unit 15 used “the end of time” to indicate the final stage of the eschatological era. (See ch. 6.) The phrase is best viewed as an un-pegged temporal gloss.

⁵³ The tense and number of *הִלְכָה* are altered to accommodate the multiple subjects of the verb in the pesher, but the lemma's lexemes (*שָׁבִי* and *הִלְכָה*) are retained. The concept of exile may also be associated with the lemma's *ירוטשו*. In the lemma, this word denotes killing by smashing; however *רָטַשׁ* may also mean “abandoning, or “spreading out.” In *HALOT*, the root is related to *נָטַשׁ*, particularly in “Jewish Aramaic.” Since the subject of *ילכו בשבי* in the pesher is “his young children” and the subject of the lemma's *ירוטשו* is “her young children,” it follows that *ילכו בשבי* should be viewed as related to *ירוטשו*.

Instead of adopting the redundant phrasing of the lemma, which featured both “going into captivity” and “exile,” the pesher seems to have collapsed both of these into the single element “ילכו בשבי,” which we have associated with the captivity of Aristobulus and his family.

⁵⁴ Note the change to the sing. masc. suffix in the series of victims in the pesher. The “women/wives” have no apparent peg in the lemma. Carmignac observes that this term may be the subject of a lost verb that preceded it, or it may be a component in a compound subject, along with infants and children. The inclusion of women may have arisen under the influence of Isa 13:16 and/or Hos 10:14. Or, the pesher's specification of women may be a reflection of the feminine pronoun at the start of the lemma (*היא*), but *תָּךְ* has no apparent peg in the lemma. Perhaps that addition is rooted in the inclusive word *נַם*? Cp. the rabbinic technique of “*ribuy*” in which the use of the word *נַם* in biblical text is taken to indicate a broadened application of a halakhic stipulation (e.g. bBavaQamma 65b; bKidd 41b.)

ירוששו בראש כול הוצות	= — ⁵⁵	
ועל נכבדיה	= ונכבדיו	isolexism
יורו נורל	= אשר תשפל מלכותו בישראל	metaphor? ⁵⁶
וכול נ[דו]ל[יה]	= נבוריו	paraphrase ⁵⁷
רוחקו בזקים	= [בחרב].	paraphrase of a homonym ⁵⁸

8.2.6 *Pesher Unit 22*

3-4 IV, lines 4-6 on Nah 3:11a

You too will be drunken, you will be in a stupor

⁵⁵ Since members of the royal family were not killed, but only taken captive, the pesher apparently reconfigures the verse so that the “young children” are taken captive, rather than dashed to pieces. Nonetheless, ירוששו may be addressed in the pesher’s “captivity,” as we observed in n. 53 above. In light of the beheading of Aristobulus’s military leaders (see n. 31 above), we might have expected the pesher to incorporate some sort of treatment of ראש to that effect, but no such allusion is evident in the extant text.

⁵⁶ ממלכה שפלה appears in Ezek 17:14, 29:14-15. In both contexts, the prophet continues “and shall not rise up again.” Cf. Ezek 21:31 in which the wicked prince of Israel is to be brought low and is ordered to remove the royal turban and crown.

Perhaps the use of this expression was influenced by the lemma’s נורל, in relation to the portrayal of the vicissitudes of fate. The root שפל is often paired with נבה, as God raises the lowly and humbles the arrogant. For שפל at Qumran, cf. 1QS II,23, IV,9; 1QM XI,13; XIII,15; XIV,15; XVII,5. The latter examples roughly resemble our context in their focus upon the defeat of wicked enemies. 1QM XVII,5 is particularly relevant in associating this defeat with an ensuing enlightenment. In that context, it is Belial whose rule is to be overthrown. In the lemma, the “lot being cast” referred to the auctioning of captives into slavery (cf. Joel 4:3, Obad 11). The pesher seems to apply this scenario to the decline of a regime on two levels: a figurative adaptation of the physical image of being cast down; and a metaphorical adaptation of a conceptual image—i.e., their fate having befallen them, as is evidenced in their fall from power.

⁵⁷ In 3-4 II,11 the term נדוליו in the pesher represented the lemma’s “young lions,” apparently figures of a military nature. The use of the word נבוריו is probably an intentional echo of pesher unit 18, in order to highlight the downfall of these opponents.

⁵⁸ Whereas the lemma depicted captivity, the pesher recasts these words into a more violent military context. (Cf. Dupont-Sommer). This is an inversion of the pesher’s treatment of the first half of the lemma, in which the violent imagery of “children being dashed to pieces” was applied to the historical reality of captivity. The exegetical peg for the pesher’s “sword” is the lemma’s בזקים. Although זק in Nahum means “chains” (cf. the same sense in Ps 149:8, Isa 45:14, Job 36:8; 1QH XVI,35,37; אזקים in Jer 40:1), the pesher treats the word as though it indicates a type of weapon, as in Prov 26:18 (זקים הצים) and like זיקה in Isa 50:11, meaning “fire-arrow.” Cf. Sir 43:13 זיקה וזיקה, ברק זיקה וזיקה, CD V,13 זיקה וזיקה, 1QH IX,12 זקים וזקים, and 1QM VI,3... שלחובת הרב ברקת הנית. זיקי דם... שלחובת הרב ברקת הנית. Yadin *ad loc.* notes the parallelism of the terms).

Recall that this pericope is structured around the introduction of Manasseh as a counterpart to Thebes, in order to highlight the fact that Ephraim will suffer the fate of Assyria. As the text of Nahum re-focuses upon Assyria in verse 11, 4QpNah returns to Ephraim. The wording of the peshet emphasizes this understanding, “for their cup will come after Manasseh.”

Equivalents align as follows:

גם (implied: in addition to Thebes)	= אהר מנשה	adaptational paraphrase
אה (implied: Assyria)	= רשעי א[פרים]	denomination
חשכרי	= תבוא כוסם	symbol ⁵⁹
וחהי נעלמה	= [. . .] ⁶⁰	

8.2.7 *Peshet Unit 23*

3–4 IV, lines 6–8 on Nah 3:11b

you too will seek refuge in the city from the enemy

All that can be observed in this unit is the correspondence of בעיר מאוּיב = אוּיבִיהֶם בעיר, with a modified repetition of the words of the lemma. Neither the citation of the phrase [גם אה תבקשי מעת] nor its peshet interpretation has survived.

8.2.8 *Peshet Unit 24*

3–4 IV, lines 9—? on Nah 3:12

[All your fortresses will be] fig-trees with [their first-ripe fruits; if they are shaken, they will fall to the mouth of the eater

Similarly, in Nahum, רהק is used to denote placing in fetters (cf. IKi 6:21; Isa 40:19); however, we suggest that the peshet is reacting to an alternate sense of the root, attested in later Aramaic, which is “hitting” or “striking” (Cf. Jastrow; *HALOT*, Christian Palestinian Aramaic). The peshet is also likely to have been influenced by Hos 14:1 which juxtaposes falling by sword (בהרב יפול) with the killing of children (עולליהם ירוטשו). Cf. n. 54 above.

⁵⁹ W. Maier explicates the term שכר here as “mental, spiritual intoxication” (cf., for example, Jer 25:27, Lam 4:21, Hab 2:15). The image is adapted by the peshet to reflect the eschatological *symbol* of a cup filled with the wrath of God. Cf. Isa 51:17–23, Jer 25: 5–29, Hab 2:15 (and 1QpHab XI,8–15). Gaster renders, “whose cup (of doom).”

⁶⁰ The root עלם means “to be concealed.” Cf. *HALOT*, *ICC*, and *Cathcart*, for various interpretations of this word in Nahum, including, “to become unconscious” or “to be deranged.” W. Maier points to vs. 16 of Obadiah for an association

All that remains of this unit is the first two words of the lemma, **האנים עם**.

8.3 FRAGMENT 5: PESHER UNITS 25–26

Frag 5

]° ים [. . . 1
 לך . . .]° ול נבול ישראל [. . .]°ם . . . מי מצור שאבי לך 2
 . . . חזקי מבצ[ר]יך בואי בטי[ם] . . . 3

Frag 5: (line 2 is presumably a *peshet* to Nah 3:13; line 3 is a citation of 3:14)

1 []ym°[]

2 []wl the boundary of Israel[

3 [**strengthen**] **your fortresses, enter into the m[ud . . .**

8.3.1 *Peshet Unit 25*

Frag 5, lines 1–2 on Nah 3:13

*Behold your nation, women are in your midst, the gates of your land were opened to your enemies, fire has consumed your gate-bars*⁶¹

The word “border” is likely to correspond to the lemma’s “gate” (שער), and the *peshet*’s “Israel” probably reflects the lemma’s ארצך.

8.3.2 *Peshet Unit 26*

Frag 5, lines 2–? on Nah 3:14

*Draw for yourselves water for the siege, strengthen your fortresses, enter into the mud and trample the clay, take hold of the brick-mold*⁶²

None of the *peshet* interpretation has survived.

between drunkenness and eradication (“they will be as though they never had been”). The *peshet* interpretation has not survived.

⁶¹ The translation is presented on the basis of MT לאיביך בקרבך נשים עמד עמך נהנה עמך נפתחו נפתחו שערי ארצך אכלה אש בריחך.

⁶² The translation is presented on the basis of MT: לך חזקי מבצריך באי בטיש ורמסי בחמר החזיקי מלבן.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER NINE

CONCLUSION: TEXTUAL, HISTORICAL, AND LITERARY EVALUATION OF PESHER NAHUM

In our study of 4QpNah, we have examined components ranging in size from barely visible traces of ink, through carefully constructed “pesher units,” to pericopes reflecting specific historical contexts. This final chapter addresses the composition of 4QpNah as a whole. In this chapter, we offer a description of textual characteristics of the composition, summarize the historical subject matter of the pesher and its date of composition, and provide an overview of tendencies observed in our literary analyses.

9.1 TEXTUAL CHARACTERISTICS OF 4QpNah

9.1.1 “Qumranic” features: Orthographic, Morphological, and Semantic Observations

4QpNah generally features plene orthography. This is especially evident in a number of cases in which words that appear in MT with defective spelling are written plene in the lemmas of 4QpNah. Thus, in frags 1–2, line 3 ויִיב־שְׁהוּ; 3–4 I,4 טוֹרַף; I,4 נוֹרִי (the stem; in contrast to MT נִירוֹחִי); I,6 וּמַעֲנֹתוֹ (the stem; in contrast to MT וּמַעֲנֹתָיו); II,1 כּוֹלָה; II,4 וּרֹב; II,7 מְרֹב; III,1 שְׁקוּצִים; III,2 רוֹאֵךְ and כּוֹל; III,6 כּוֹל; IV,1 בְּנוֹלָה (rather than MT לְגֹלָה); IV,2 יְרוּשָׁשׁוּ and וְכוֹל.

The opposite phenomenon, in which 4QpNah features a defective variant of a word that is plene in MT, is rare. The only undisputed example is frags 1–2, line 5 לְבִנָּן (MT, לְבִנּוֹן), which we regard as a scribal error. We understand the suffix in 3–4 I,6 וּמַעֲנֹתוֹ as a defectively written plural, the equivalent of the plene ending of וּמַעֲנֹתָיו in MT.¹

¹ This may be a scribal error. It is possible to view the three occurrences of אָרִי in 3–4 I, lines 1 and 4, as defectively written variants of MT אֲרִיָּה, but it is preferable to attribute the form to more significant morphological variation.

There are a number of textual variants from MT that exhibit grammatical forms typical of Qumran Hebrew.² From a purely graphic perspective, they may be viewed as plene variants from consonantal MT: frags 3–4 II,3 להוב (for MT ולהב); II,4 וכבוד (for MT וכבר); III,10 עוצמה IV,2 (for MT עצמה); III,8 התשיבי (for MT התישבי); and IV,2 עילוליה (for MT עלליה).

On the basis of the tendency demonstrated above, we have assumed full orthography in our restorations, even if this entails a departure from MT. Thus, [החמוננן], [וכן], [יושבין] and [עמוד] in frags 1–2, lines 9–10; [מלאכיכה] in frags 3–4 II,10; and [היושבה] in III,8.³

Plene orthography is prevalent in the pesher interpretations of 4QpNah as well as in the lemmas, as evidenced by the following: ולכלוחם (1–2, line 4); ולמושליו (1–2, line 7); לבנון (twice in 1–2, line 7); ירושלים (I,2,11); דורשי החלקות⁴ (3–4 I,2,7; II,2,4; III,3,6); עמוד (I,3); מושלי (I,3); בנדוליו (I,5); רובכה (I,10); נדוליו (I,11); ורהור (II,5); כוהנים, ומוש[לים] (II,9); לכול (III,3); כול (frag. 5, line 2).⁵ Note also the spelling of בעוונם at 3–4 III,4.⁶

In the single occurrence of the term “Kittim” the spelling is כתיים (frags 3–4 I,3) without the ‘aleph occasionally found in this word at

² In II,4 קין is a morphological variant from MT (MT קצה) that is not ostensibly typical of Qumran tendencies. Similarly, III,10 חילה (MT חיל). In III,8 we read מני אמן with the former word as a preposition, rather than as מנו, which would be an orthographic variant from MT מנא.

³ However, note that a few defective spellings do appear in the lemmas of 4QpNah. Thus, בוקים in IV,3 (cp. 1QM VI,3 דם ויקי דם), and [ב]יארים in III,8 (cf. also ודיארים in the pesher interpretation in III,9). We also take דהר in II,3 as a defectively written participle.

The five occurrences of pl. זקים in MT feature defective spelling (though זיקה in Isa 50:11 is plene). Similarly, יאר is generally written without a *vav* in MT, with the exception of a few plene occurrences in Isaiah and Amos and one in Ezekiel.

We have noted that some scholars read וכפיריו in the pesher interpretation in II,10 with defective orthography, but we read וכפיריו.

⁴ In MT, Jerusalem is spelled without a *yod* preceding the final *mem*. See Charlesworth’s concordance for this spelling in some Qumran writings (e.g. 1QpHab IX,4, XII,7; 4Q176 frag 8 line 3). The spelling in 4QpNah, including the *yod*, is a bit more common at Qumran (e.g. 1QM I,3; III,11; XII,13; 4QpIsa^a frag 2 II 25, 29). See Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, pp. 5, 106–7.

⁵ Note, however, the defective form כל in frags 1–2, line 3, and in frags 3–4 IV,2.

⁶ In MT, the word is typically spelled with one *vav*; only 4 of 229 citations listed in the Even-Shoshan Concordance feature two *vavs*. At Qumran, עוון occurs widely in most non-biblical writings; the handful of occurrences in 4QpIsa^c, 4QpPs^a, and CD reflect עון. The former is dominant in 1QH, though the latter does occur as well (in one instance, the latter is corrected by the addition of a second *vav*). In 1QpHab, the word appears twice, once with the doubled *vav* and once with a single *vav*. Qimron characterizes the doubling in עוון as characteristic of later Hebrew (*Grammar*, 52).

Qumran. In 3–4 I,1; II,5, 7, and III,1 (and apparently in the partially preserved occurrence in II,1) נוי is consistently spelled with just one *yod*, and no *aleph*.⁷ הנלוי in 3–4 IV,1 is spelled normally, rather than with a second *vav*, as occurs occasionally in 1QIsa^a.⁸ The imperfect of the root נבר appears twice, and is written without an *aleph* on both occasions.⁹

In general, 4QpNah may be described as featuring some elements of “Qumran scribal practice,” but to a lesser degree than most of the “sectarian” Dead Sea Scrolls.¹⁰ Of the 15 categories used by Tov to evaluate “Qumran scribal practice” in compositions found at Qumran, evidence is preserved in 4QpNah for only eight.¹¹ The data in the relevant categories are mixed. In four categories, Peshet Nahum actually reflects “non-Qumran scribal practice”: (1) The negative particle appears four times as ל, and does not occur at all with the plene spelling typical of “Qumran” orthography.¹² (2) The word כ occurs twice with “normal” (BH and MH) spelling, and not at all as כיא.¹³ (3) The free-standing pronouns הו and הו appear with “normal” orthography, and not at all in lengthened forms.¹⁴ (4) Plural 2nd and 3rd pronominal suffixes appear frequently in “normal” form throughout the text, and not at all in lengthened forms. We would add the fact that the Tetragrammaton is written in ordinary square script (4QpNah II,10).¹⁵

⁷ For orthographic (and possibly phonetic) variety in these words at Qumran, see Qimron, *Hebrew*, 31–32; Horgan, *Pesharim*, 26 (on 1QpHab II,11–12).

⁸ See Qimron, *ibid.* on the form in 1QIsa^a.

⁹ וברו in frags 3–4 II,9; הובר in III,7. See Qimron, *Grammar*, 186, on the tendency toward this orthography at Qumran.

¹⁰ I.e., non-biblical texts found at Qumran, and believed to have been composed by the Community.

¹¹ See “Orthography and Language,” 31–57, esp. the table on p. 53. 4QpNah does not provide evidence for seven of Tov’s categories, as it does not feature relevant data. For example, the words נא and נשה do not appear at all in the scroll, whether in “Qumran form” or any other form.

¹² The occurrences are at frags 3–4 II,1; II,5; III,7; and III,8.

¹³ Cf. frags 1–2 line 6 and frags 3–4 I,8; II,12.

¹⁴ Thus, הו in frags 1–2, line 7 and frags 3–4 II,2; הו in 3–4 I,11. Tov does not include the use of the plural pronominal form הבה as a characteristic of Qumran orthography, presumably because this long form is equally common as בה in BH. Nonetheless, it seems noteworthy that 4QpNah does not employ הבה at all, but rather uses בה in all 9 occurrences of the pronoun. Cf. frags 1–2 line 3; frags 3–4 I,10 (2 times); II,1; III,9 (2 times); III,11; IV,1.

¹⁵ This was noted already by Licht, 455, who compared the use of the paleo-Hebrew script for the Tetragrammaton in 1QpHab (at VI,14; X,7,14; XI,10). Cf. Jonathan P. Siegel, “The Employment of Paleo-Hebrew Characters for the Divine

In four other categories, 4QpNah evidences some tendency to “Qumran practice.” (1) Tov records a figure of 60% for the use of כול (rather than כל) in 4QpNah.¹⁶ (2) According to Tov, the lengthened suffix -כה is attested in 20% of the cases in which 2nd person singular masculine possessive suffixes are found. We would revise this statistic to indicate that there are only two occurrences of such pronominal suffixes, and both are in lengthened “Qumran” form.¹⁷ (3) There are three cases of “pausal” forms for non-pausal *qal* imperfect verbs.¹⁸ (4) There is one occurrence of a lengthened first person imperfect (of the form אקטלכה).¹⁹

Perhaps the most curious morphological specimens in 4QpNah are the nouns with 3rd person sing. masc. poss. suffixes. Thus, in 3–4 I,4, we presume that נוריו is synonymous with MT נִירוֹתָיו, and that ללבייותיו is synonymous with MT ללביאותיו, but in both cases, the plural formation in the pesher differs from that in MT. In two other instances, scholars dispute whether “strange” forms in the pesher are synonymous with MT. Thus, in I,6 הירה (for MT הָרִי) and ומענתו (for MT מִנְתָּו).²⁰ In the pesher interpretation in II,1 צירו

Names at Qumran in the Light of Tannaitic Sources,” *HUCA* 42 (1971): 159–72; Patrick W. Skehan, “The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada Scroll, and in the Septuagint,” *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 13 (1980): 14–44.

¹⁶ Plene spelling of the word appears at III,2 and IV,2 in lemmas as variants from MT; at III,3; and at frag. 5 line 2, partially restored, but clearly written plene. Defective spelling appears in frags 1–2, line 3, and in the lemma at 3–4 IV,2.

¹⁷ Thus, frags 3–4 I,9 וכפירכה and I,10 רובכה. The other 80% of instances supposed by Tov are apparently the words addressing Nineveh in a number of lemmas. We believe that these suffixes reflect feminine suffixes, which do not have a typical “Qumran” form. Thus, II,10 אליך; II,11 קלתך; פניך; III,1 ושמתך; עלך; [ות]בלחך; ושמתך; III,2 במך; III,6 לך. The two examples that do exhibit the lengthened suffix, as typical of Qumran Hebrew, serve as the basis for our restoration of similarly lengthened suffixes in I,8 אליכה; I,9 רובכה; and I,10 מלאכיכה, all in the same pesher Unit 9. These words do not only exhibit lengthened suffixes, but also reflect the pesher’s substitution of masculine pronominal suffixes for the feminine suffixes of these words in MT, and, in the case of רובכה, lexical variation. See section 9.1.2.1 below.

¹⁸ In 3–4 II,6, the lengthened verbal forms יכשולו and יפולו are found, featuring a medial *vav*, as is quite common in the *qal* imperfect in Qumran Hebrew, but not in BH. יפולו is found again, at II,10. On this “pseudo-pausal form,” see Qimron, *Hebrew*, 51; Horgan, 31 (on 1QpHab IV,6 קו {ו} {ו}); Goshen-Gottstein, “Linguistic Structure,” 123–25.

¹⁹ Cf. frags 3–4 III,6 אבקשה, a lengthened variant as compared to MT.

²⁰ See ch. 2 for our discussion about whether the pesher and MT forms reflect the same number and/or person, and for the suggestion that scribal error accounts for the odd form(s) in the pesher.

a plural noun with a defective 3rd person masc. possessive suffix. The form of *בַּמְנוּחָה* in II,7, as compared to MT *בַּמְנוּחָה*, is to be noted as well.

We have observed that II,4 *וַנִּירָחֵם* may be understood as a scribal error for MT *בַּנִּירָחֵם*, or may simply exhibit stylistic variation.

Finally, we should note the following post-biblical expressions employed by the pesher in interpretations: *גְּדוּר* (3–4 I,1); *עַמּוּד* (I,3); *חַי* (I,8); *כִּלְל* (II,6); *בַּחֲלָמוֹד* (II,8), *כִּנְסָה* (III,7). The latter two may have particular “Pharisaic” valence.

9.1.2 *Textual Variants*

In his discussion of “exegetical variants” in Qumran texts, Brooke classifies his examples within the three categories of (1) syntactic variants (2) omissions and (3) plays on words.²¹ We will adapt this classification in our description of the textual variants in 4QpNah, but without limiting the discussion to “exegetical” variants.²² Purely orthographic variants were addressed in the previous section and do not bear repetition here. Some of the morphological variants mentioned above are relevant to the relationship between the lemma and its pesher interpretation and will be noted again in the appropriate

²¹ “Biblical Texts,” 88–93.

²² Brooke has suggested that textual variants found in Qumran texts may be classified according to the cause of their origin. He thus distinguishes between variants that are (1) results of scribal error, (2) products of “exegetical alteration,” and (3) reflections of “orthographic and stylistic” diversity. Cf. “Biblical Texts,” 85. This categorization is neater in theory than in application. One limitation of the construct, for example, is the fact that an exegete seeking to alter a text is likely to rely upon accepted “stylistic” variations in choosing *how* to alter the text. Also, scribal error may be viewed as related to, though not necessarily identical with, scribal indifference to certain stylistic details. Moreover, Brooke’s category of “exegetical variants” encompasses both pre-existing variants and those originating with the author of the text in question, implying a degree of textual/exegetical interrelatedness. Most significantly, the origin of a particular variant (whether intention, inattention, or tradition) cannot be ascertained definitively by the modern scholar. Note also the observations of Edward L. Greenstein regarding “errors of memory,” especially “contaminist errors” in which citation is influenced by a second, similar biblical source. Such inadvertent manipulation of the text is neither a “genuine variant” (i.e., a pre-existent alternative reading) nor a “deliberate exegetical adaptation of a source” (“Misquotation of Scripture in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*. Vol. 1. Edited by B. Walfish [Haifa: Haifa University Press, 1993], 74). Doudna argues against any deliberate exegetical variants in 4QpNah, or in fact in any of the pesharim (pp. 67–70).

context. Variants that are judged to be scribal errors will also be mentioned again.²³

9.1.2.1 *Syntactic Variants: change in person, number, or gender; verbal form; definite/indefinite*

(1) *person*

3–4 I,9 טרפה (MT טרפך). Two other variants are restored: Most scholars restore the citation of Nah 3:5 at II,10–11 with 2nd person verbs, instead of 1st person as in MT, הנני אליך נאם יהוה צ[בא]ת, על פניך והרא[ת]ת [נ]יום מערך [בעורתך] is restored in 3rd person, as compared to 2nd person בעורתך in MT.

(2) *number*

3–4 III,2 ידודו and III,5 ואמרו (MT ידוד, ואמר); III,10 ה'ומותיה (MT הומתה). The odd variant suffixes in I,6 הירד (MT חריו) and ומענתו (MT ומענתיו) have been explained as deliberate variants, substituting masculine singular suffixes for the plurals of MT. The former might be better understood as a variant sing. masc. form, or perhaps as scribal error; we view the latter as an orthographic variant.

(3) *gender*

Clear gender change is found in the citation of Nah 2:14. Thus, 3–4 I,9 וכפיריכה, and the following restored examples: I,8 א[לי]כה; I,9 [רובכ]ה;²⁵ and I,10 [מלאכיכה].

3–4 I,4 נריו and ללביותיו have been explained as differing in gender from MT, but we view these variants as synonymous with the MT forms.

(4) *verbal form*

We recognize variation in verbal forms in the following instances: II,3 ימוש (MT ימיש); II,4 וכשלו (= MT *qere*; MT *ketib* is יכשלו); II,7 הממכרת (MT המכרת, possibly scribal error); IV,2 יורו (MT ידו) and ירו, רותקו (MT רותקו). Of these variants, II,4 וכשלו and IV,2 יורו, רותקו are most noteworthy, in that they differ in tense from MT.

We read the following as orthographic variants from MT, but

²³ It is difficult to categorize the type of variation exhibited at III,8 in the word we read as מני, and this example is not included in the lists below.

²⁴ Recall that Brooke views this as a deliberate alteration, shifting blame from God to the opponents of the author.

²⁵ MT רכבה; see below on the metathesis.

they have been viewed by some as differing verbal forms: ויין[בשהו] in 1–2, line 3 (if read as *hiphil* ויין[בשהו]); 3–4 I,2, לביא (if read as לכוא); and II,3 דהר (if read with Strugnell as a perfect verb rather than a participle).

(5) omission or addition of the *definite article* or *conjunctive vav*

On two or three occasions, the pesher includes an article that is not found in MT. Thus II,1 הדמים; III,12 וה[לובים]; and perhaps frags 1–2, line 9, [ה]ה[ר]ים. The following words contain a conjunctive *vav* that is absent in MT. II,3 וקול; II,7 ובעלה כשפים; IV,5 ותהי; III,10 ומים (MT מים). Most of these variants are to be considered stylistic and insignificant. The first example, II,3 וקול, is most likely deliberate, and reflected in the pesher's division of the biblical verse in a different manner than MT. The last example is a significant semantic variant, the origin of which is indeterminate. We do not discern the omission of any definite article, but II,3 להוב lacks the conjunction of MT ולהב.²⁶

(6) divergent *prepositions*

There is one example of this sort, at IV,1, בנולה (MT לנלה).

9.1.2.2 *Omission and addition of words*

We do not discern any clearly exegetically motivated omissions or additions in 4QpNah, but rather a number of scribal errors, or perhaps scribal liberties.

(1) *omissions*

Although Allegro's original reconstruction assumed the omission of וכל הנהרות ההריב (in MT Nah 1:4), most scholars now restore this phrase at 1–2, line 4. At 3–4 II,3 להוב (MT הרב), the omission of הרב is best explained as an error caused by *homoioioteleuton*.

(2) *additions*

In 1–2, line 10 ממנו ומלפנין הבל (MT), the addition of ממנו is likely to reflect the influence of the previous biblical text (רעשו ממנו). In a similar vein, IV,7 בעיר is probably an accidental anticipation of the use of the word in the interpretation. It is more difficult to account for the plus of טרף at I,4.

²⁶ See above on the “Qumranic” form of the word in 4QpNah. Some read מדנק at I,4 without a conjunction but we read [ן]מדנק as MT.

9.1.2.3 *Word-play*

(1) *metathesis*

Both of the following cases are likely to reflect textual variants, perhaps pre-existing variants, rather than exegetical manipulation: II,9 *ה* [רובכ]ה (MT *רכבה*);²⁷ III,2 *כאורה* (MT *כראי*).

(2) *substitution of graphically similar letters*

We may place IV,2 *יורו* (MT *ידו*) in this category, but it must be noted that the words are also semantically interchangeable.

9.1.3 *Erasures and Corrections*

Strugnell maintains that a number of erasures in 4QpNah indicate attempts to bring the lemmas into line with MT. At III,6, Strugnell is probably correct in observing that 4QpNah has corrected a variant *לה* to agree with MT *לך*. However we disagree with his readings in two other cases. At II,9 *בנוחה* is poorly legible, but there is no clear basis for Strugnell's claim of a correction toward agreement with MT *בנוניה*. At III,8, we follow Allegro in reading *הרשיבי*, and do not accepting Strugnell's view that the form was corrected to *התישבי*, in agreement with MT.

Between *להמה* [מ] and *כוש* in III,11 the traces of an erased letter *ע* are visible. This seems to reflect an interrupted scribal error. We have explained the erasure in II,11 between *וממלכות* and *קלונך* in a similar fashion (though we differ from Strugnell regarding the source of the error). In IV,3 *פשרו*, the supralinear *vav* corrects an accidental omission of the letter.

9.1.4 *Relationship to MurXII*

There are a number of instances in which 4QpNah and MurXII overlap and in which they diverge from each other and/or from MT. MurXII agrees with 4QpNah over MT in the plene spelling of *שקוצים* in III,1 (MT *שקצים*). It is most likely that both texts use plene orthography in *ישבי* (restored in 1–2, line 10; defective in MT), and they may both include the article in *ה'הר'ים* (1–2, line 9; indefinite in MT).

In more cases, however, MurXII agrees with MT over 4QpNah. Thus, *ויבשו* in Nah 1:4; *אריה* (Nah 2:12–13; two of the extant occur-

²⁷ Restored with confidence on the basis of the re-citation in line 10.

rences are preserved in MurXII); ק[צ]ה (Nah 3:3); שרדה (Nah 3:7); עלליה (Nah 3:10). Mur XII does not feature a definite article in דמים (Nah 3:1) and it does not feature the variant masc. suffixes found in 4QpNah 3-4, I,9 (רובכ[ה]; אֱלִיכָה; וכפיריכה), nor the alternative ending of שרפה in that lemma (Mur XII has שרפך as in MT Nah 2:14). MurXII agrees with MT in the first person suffix of ונליתי (Nah 3:5); in the unsuffixed form of חיל (Nah 3:8); and in the preposition of לנגלה (Nah 3:10). Lastly, MurXII does not have the plus of שרף found in 4QpNah 3-4 I,5 (MT 2:13).

There are two cases in which all three witnesses diverge from each other, and in both cases MurXII is closer to MT than to 4QpNah. Thus, 4QpNah 3-4, I,4 נוריו (MT נורותיו; MurXII נורתיו); 4QpNah III,10 ומים חומותיה (MT חיל מים חומתה; MurXII חיל מים חומתה).

9.1.5 Agreement of Pronominal Identification Formulas

In “pronominal pesher formulas,” an element of the lemma is re-cited and associated with its corresponding element in the pesher by means of a pronoun: “x הוא y.” In many cases the two elements will agree in number and gender, but when they differ, it is interesting to observe what form of the pronoun is employed to link them.²⁸ There are not many preserved pronominal formulas in 4QpNah, and certainly not enough data to provide the basis for extrapolating a general rule, but the extant examples merit description.²⁹ The first group of examples is of the “x (pronoun) y” form. The second group consist of a pronoun directly following the lemma, without the re-citation of a particular element: “‘*pishro*’ (pronoun) y.”

I. “x (pronoun) y”

(1) 1-2, line 3 (Unit 2) . . .] הים הם כל ה[

masc. pl. pronoun; collective in re-citation and pesher

(2) 1-2, line 7 (Unit 4) . . .] ופרחה לבנון היא³⁰

fem. sing. pronoun; masc. sing. in re-citation; pesher not preserved.

It may be supposed that the pesher element was fem. sing.

²⁸ On the adaptation of gender and number in Qumran pesher, see Nitzan, 41; Horgan, 252 n. 44.

²⁹ In 3-4 III,12 כי השול[ן]ים looks like the remnant of a recitation with pronominal formula, but neither the pronoun nor the pesher equivalent has survived.

³⁰ Or, . . .] לבנון ופרחה לבנון היא. two masc. sings. in re-citation. See ch. 3.

(3) 3–4, I,10—II,1 (Unit 10) רובכּהּ הם נדודי חילו... וכפיריו הם נדוליו... ושרפו הוא ההון... ומלאכיו הם צירו

a) masc. pl. pronoun; masc. collective in re-citation, masc. pl. in pesher.

b) masc. pl. pronoun; masc. pl. in re-citation and pesher

c) masc. sing. pronoun; masc. sing. in re-citation and pesher

d) masc. pl. pronoun; masc. pl. in re-citation and pesher³¹

(4) 3–4 III,9 (Unit 17) פּשרו אמון הם מנשה והיארים הם נד[ן] לי מנשה

a) masc. pl. pronoun; fem. sing. place name in lemma could be understood as a collective; masc. sing. name in pesher is certainly understood so.

b) masc. pl. pronoun; masc. pl. in lemma and pesher

II. “*pishro*’ (pronoun) y.”

(1) 3–4 II,2 [י...ההלכו]... דורשי החלקות (Unit 11; the lemma refers to the “city of blood”)

fem. sing. pronoun; corresponding element in lemma is fem. sing.; the pesher features two terms in apposition to each other: the first is fem. sing.; the second is masc. pl., and the verbs in the interpretation are masc. pl.

(2) 3–4 III,10–11 [ה]ילה נבור[י מן] להמחה (Unit 18; the lemma refers to *ומים, הילה*).

masc. pl. pronoun in agreement with both pesher elements; both elements in the lemma are masc., and each may be considered collective.

(3) 3–4 IV,1 פּשרו הם רשע[י.....]ה בית פלנ הנלווים על מנשה (Unit 20; lemma referred to “Put and Libyans”)

masc. pl. pronoun, masc. pl. pesher element; agrees with sum total of fem. sing. but collective “Put” and masc. pl. “*Lubim*.”

In most of the cases above, the element in the pesher matches the element in the lemma and the pronoun thus agrees with both. In example I(4a) הם agrees with the element in the pesher rather than that of the lemma, and that is presumably the case in example I(2), although the element in the pesher is not extant.

³¹ The plural suffix of קולם demonstrates that צירו is plural.

9.1.6 *Vacats*

Pesher Nahum exhibits a tendency to set off the lemmas from the pesher citations by leaving some vacant space between the two, or by completing a citation at the end of a line. In order to examine this trend, we have compiled data concerning vacats in 4QpNah frags 1–4, as illustrated in Tables 9–1,2. The focus is upon vacats that frame the lemma. We employ the following abbreviations:

NL: the lemma begins in a New Line, and thus is automatically preceded by the “vacat” of the margin.

EL: the lemma Ends the Line, and is thus automatically followed by a “vacat.”

If there is insufficient evidence, because of damage to the text, the box is left blank. We indicate restored vacats (or lack thereof) in instances where we consider the restoration to be very secure in regard to the particular datum of the presence or absence of the vacat.

If there is a discernible vacat, the length of the space is indicated; (the sign “>” indicates that part of a vacat has been preserved, but the adjacent lacuna may have contained more blank space.)

If there is evidence that no vacat was left, i.e., if the preserved text is continuous, this is indicated as (–).

Table 9–1 Vacats before Lemma

UNIT #	Vacat before Lemma	
1		1–2, line 1
2	NL	1–2, line 3
3		1–2, line 4
4	[NL]	1–2, line 5
5	LONG > 3cm	1–2, line 9
6		
7	Short .3–.5 cm (leather is damaged)	3–4 I,1
8	Short or LONG > .5 cm	3–4 I,4
9		3–4 I,6

Table 9-1 (*cont.*)

UNIT #	Vacat before Lemma	
10	—	3-4 I,8
Note the vacat in the middle of this lemma		
11	Short .6 cm	3-4 II,1
12	NL	3-4 II,3
This was apparently deliberate. The initial word of the lemma, ꞑ , could easily have fit in the space at the end of the previous line.		
13	NL	3-4 II,7
14	LONG 5.7 cm	3-4 II,10
15	—	3-4 III,1
(leather is damaged, but there is clearly no vacat)		
16	—	3-4 III,5
17	LONG 2.3 cm	3-4 III,8
18	NL	3-4 III,10
19	an erased letter ꝛ is readily visible in the middle of a "vacat" of .6 cm that precedes this lemma	3-4 III,11
20		3-4 III,12
21	(leather is damaged: either a small vacat or no vacat)	3-4 IV,1
22		3-4 IV,4
23		3-4 IV,6
24		3-4 IV,8

Of 16 units with useful data, 4 appear not to have any vacat prior to the lemma. Another 5 lemmas start at the beginning of a line, and 6 are clearly preceded by a vacat. An additional case, unit 19, appears to have included a vacat, but there is an erased letter in the position. Of the 6 clear vacats, 2 are short, and 3 are long, while 1 (unit 8) is of indeterminate length. Perhaps it is relevant that the one very certain short vacat, prior to the lemma of unit 11, comes at a logical break, between “Pericope 2” and “Pericope 3” (or “Nahum ch. 2”/“ch. 3.” Cf. Doudna, 246; he notes the full line vacat at this juncture in Mur XII). A definite tendency to set off the lemma is visible in 4QpNah but, *pace* Doudna, no systematic pattern or rationale is evident to account for the instances when this does not occur.³²

Table 9-2 Vacats after Lemma

UNIT #	Vacat after Lemma
1	1-2, line 1
2	[? short or no vacat] 1-2, line 3
3	1-2, line 4
4	Short or LONG > .5 cm 1-2, line 5
5	1-2, line 12 (or next col.)
6	
7	3-4 I,2
8	3-4 I,4 (or 5)
9	Short .8 cm 3-4 I,6
10	[short] 3-4 I,10
Note the vacat in the middle of this lemma, at 3-4 I,9 EL + 1.4 cm	
11	EL 3-4 II,1

³² Doudna maintains that there is a pattern in 4QpNah in which every third unit features a long vacat prior to the lemma, whereas no vacat is found in the 1st and 2nd units of the sequence. However, the consistency of this pattern is dependent upon Doudna's textual reconstructions—which were engendered to conform with (or rather, to form) a pattern.

Table 9-2 (*cont.*)

UNIT #	Vacat before Lemma	
12	Short .6 cm	3-4 II,4
13	EL + > 1 cm	3-4 II,7
14		3-4 II,11
	Only .3 cm of empty space precedes the pesher formula. The final word of the lemma (קלינד) follows an erasure. This word may be viewed as occupying a former vacat of app. 1.5 cm.	
15	EL + app. 8 cm (1/2 line vacant)	3-4 III,2
16	Short 1 cm	3-4 III,6
17	EL +	3-4 III,8
18	EL + 5.7 cm (1/2 line vacant)	3-4 III,10
19	[EL]	3-4 III,11
20	[EL]	3-4 III,12
21	- (note corrected pesher formula פשר)	3-4 IV,3
22	LONG 2.4 cm	3-4 IV,5
23	Short .4 cm	3-4 IV,7
24		3-4 IV,9 (?)

There is a clear tendency to separation between the lemma and the ensuing pesher formula, either by means of a vacat or by completing the lemma at the end of a line. Doudna points out that 1QpHab exhibits a similar tendency. Until column 12, 1QpHab tends to distinguish between the lemma and pesher by means of a vacat of a few spaces, or an early line ending. Doudna calls this a “pattern” of short vacat between quotation and pesher, and a null vacat between pesher and quotation. 1QpSalms^a does not have vacats between quotation and pesher, but rather has some divisions between pesher

and quotation. Doudna calls these “long vacats” and frames this as a pattern containing anomalies. At this stage, it seems more useful to describe a tendency rather than to impose predictable rigid “patterns.”

9.2 THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Our research has confirmed the conventional dating of the events described in the “key Demetrius passage” of 4QpNah (3–4 I; “Pericope 2”) to the time of Alexander Jannaeus, c. 88 BCE. Pericope 1 was found to be too fragmentary, and too general, to allow for specific dating. We assessed Pericope 3 as most likely reflecting the time of Pompey’s takeover of Jerusalem in 63 BCE. Pericope 4 is taken to refer to the defeat of Aristobulus and his supporters in the mid-first century BCE. It may plausibly be understood as reflecting events of 63 BCE (Aristobulus’s imprisonment by Pompey), 61 BCE (his exile to Rome as a captive), 56 BCE (his recapture) or 49 BCE (his death). The end of Pericope 4 refers to the total rejection and eradication of the Pharisees and is likely to have been predictive (i.e., “wishful thinking”).³³ It is likely that the composition of this pesher pre-dates the apparent resurgence of the Pharisees later in Hyrcanus’s administration.

Determining the date of the pesher’s composition, or the dating of the events described in the pesher, is but one aspect of the historical analysis of a work of Qumran pesher. Pesher contributes even more of “historical” value in that it provides a particular perspective on the events addressed. For the members of the Qumran Community, pesher offered a way of imbuing experience with meaning. Through “contemporizing exegesis,” the realities of personal struggles, community politics, and national conflicts were lifted from the realm of the mundane and familiar and given a more exalted place in the divine cosmic scheme. For modern scholars, these texts provide insight into the esoteric theology and world-view of the Community. At the same time, the pesharim reveal aspects of actual ancient Jewish experience. By reading between the lines, historians can recover information that the originally intended audience would

³³ Thus Schiffman, “Pharisees and Sadducees” (284), observes that the author of the pesher expects the “Pharisaic followers” to “rejoin the true house of Israel, thought by the sect to be itself. . . . These dreams of the sect, of course, were never realized.”

have taken for granted. Interpreted with care, the Qumran pesharim can greatly illuminate data culled from other historical sources.

After early Qumran scholars attempted to treat the pesharim as ancient “newspaper articles,” and then progressed to mine these compositions as though they were ancient “editorials,” scholarship has now realized the benefits of approaching these works rather as religious sermons of a political bent. A previous generation of scholars already noted a shift from the use of Josephus as a tool for understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls, to the use of the scrolls in order to explain Josephus.³⁴ We have now progressed further, beyond the use of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Josephus to merely corroborate one another. These and other contemporary sources do not just serve as the bases for historians to re-create “authentic” report of events, though that is a worthwhile endeavor and the scrolls are useful tools toward that aim. Even more so, however, they enable us to understand the dynamic world of ancient Judaism and gain insight into the perspectives of a particular community.

The move towards appreciating the value of peshar’s *tendenz* and limited perspective, and away from bemoaning its subjectivity and insular concerns, may be discerned in Brooke’s comments in “Kittim and the Pesharim”: “We can learn little or nothing of the history of the Qumran Community from these texts [the pesharim], and little enough about the Romans. Rather . . . biblical and non-biblical texts [are] used intricately [in the pesharim] to show that the words of Habakkuk and others speak directly, if not always in great detail, to the author’s contemporary and eschatological generation.”³⁵ If peshar cannot identify the author’s enemy for us, it can nonetheless inform us tremendously about how the Qumran Community perceived that enemy, and the *meaning* it attached to the actions of the enemy. Brooke aptly referred to the words of B.J. Roberts who had noted that, “By becoming over-concerned about their ‘historicity’ we might be losing sight of the real significance of the scrolls.”³⁶ Today we have reached an appreciation that seeking this information is a worthwhile pursuit in its own right.

³⁴ Flusser credits this observation to “a scholar” in “פרושים, צדוקים,” 133.

³⁵ P. 159, publ. 1991.

³⁶ “Biblical Exegesis and Fulfillment in Qumran,” 199. He describes peshar as fulfillment literature relating to selective bits of history. See now, Charlesworth’s emphasis on the pesharim as “fulfillment literature” (*Pesharim*).

Flusser viewed the pesharim, and especially 4QpNah, as corroborating Josephus's tri-partite division of ancient Jewish society. For Flusser, Peshar Nahum makes it impossible to dismiss Josephus's description as a mere "schematic construct."³⁷ As noted above, Schwartz observes that the evidence does not necessarily prove the factual accuracy of the tri-partite division, and of Pharisaic dominance, but rather demonstrates the historicity of a general tendency among Second Temple Jewry to view its society in that way.³⁸ We have already stated our view that the tri-partite division, though useful to a degree, was surely an over-simplification, and that the Dead Sea Scrolls have been among the tools employed as correctives to the distortion. As an illustration of this development, it is worth examining the "conventional wisdom" regarding Second Temple sectarians, in relationship to 4QpNah. Our standard for the scholarly convention is the description found in SVM, 388–414; 562–74.

In general, conventional wisdom has viewed the Pharisees as the forerunners of rabbinic Judaism. The Pharisees were characterized as having been concerned with religious matters, particularly purity, and having been very rigorous in interpreting and observing the laws. The Sadducees were viewed as secularists. The Qumran Community was identified with the Essenes, and were understood to have been primarily occupied with spiritual, devotional activities. The following specific characteristics are also noteworthy.

- 1) *Theology*: Pharisees believed in immortality, angels, reward and punishment, and free will tempered by divine providence. Sadducees denied immortality, the existence of angels, and divine reward and punishment. Essenes/Qumran Community believed in angels, reward and punishment, and fate.
- 2) *Society*: Pharisees represented "normative" Judaism, and were particularly influential in urban centers. Sadducees were an elite few. Essenes/Qumran Community were ascetics and lived communally.
- 3) *Religious Authority*: Pharisees propagated an oral tradition, and held the Oral Law to be binding. Sadducees were literalists, accepting only the written Torah.

Current thinking recognizes the importance of *halakha* for all three of the major sects, at least at certain times, and among certain

³⁷ "פרושים, צדוקים" 133.

³⁸ Ch. 4, n. 000.

segments of these groups. In fact, Sadducee and Qumran *halakha* are recognized to have frequently been more stringent than Pharisaic *halakha*, for example in matters of purity, Sabbath observance, and penal law. The use of the expression *ההלכות* in Peshet Nahum is in consonance with this updated perspective.

The dualism and determinism of peshet generally, and of Peshet Nahum specifically, suits the theological views conventionally associated with Essenes, Qumran, and other apocalypticists. This includes the references to divine judgment in frags 1–2, and the observations/predictions of the suffering and downfall of “Ephraim” and “Manasseh” in the subsequent columns.

In terms of social distribution, 4QpNah corroborates the perception of Pharisaic dominance, in describing the influence of Ephraim over the masses, and the influence of the group over priests and rulers (and/or the threat posed by the group to these leaders). The urban concentration of Pharisaic power appears in the peshet as well. Sadducean demographics are more difficult to ascertain, but the presumed aristocratic nature of the Sadducees has been discerned in 4QpNah in such phrases as “the great ones of Manasseh.”

The sectarian debate over the legitimate derivation of religious authority is related to the question of revelation vs. biblical exegesis as discussed in ch. 1 above. For Brownlee, the stress upon exegetical approach as constitutive of peshet is related to an appreciation of what we today would call the “Biblio-centrism” of ancient Jews. The Dead Sea Scrolls, says Brownlee, “bear witness, not merely to the great importance attached to the study of Scriptures, but also to the technique of Biblical interpretation among the ancient Jews.”³⁹ Although this attachment to Bible was certainly common to all major Jewish sects in antiquity, variations in the nature of the relationship comprised a dividing factor among them. The significance of sectarian attitudes toward the text is borne out by Josephus, who sets Pharisaic acceptance of “ancestral tradition” against Sadducean acceptance of the “Written Law” alone. Of course, Pharisees engaged in textual exegesis and employed exegetical techniques, and the Sad-

³⁹ “Biblical Interpretation,” 54. Brownlee presents evidence from CD and 1QS supporting the centrality of Torah interpretation for the Community. Although Roth stressed content rather than method, he too elaborated on the connection between sectarian belief and practice, and the composition of the pesharim (in “Subject Matter”).

ducees undoubtedly developed traditions of their own.⁴⁰ Yet Josephus thought this was a useful description of sectarian differences. One of the clues to understanding Josephus's statement can be found in the distinction between "nigleh" and "nistar" in Qumran *halakha* as noted in ch. 1 above. It seems most reasonable to explain that the attitude of the Sadducees to the biblical text, like that of the members of the Qumran Community, was informed by a belief in ongoing revelation. For the Qumran Community, this would appear to be true in such areas as *aggada*, cosmology, and eschatology, with particular stress on esoterica. To this end, more research is required on such questions as: the possible biblical bases of *raz* as understood at Qumran; the origins of pseudepigraphic works, particularly apocalyptic texts; the relationship of the sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls to the "non-sectarian" non-biblical texts found in the Qumran caves. As noted already by Asher Finkel, there is a strong basis for associating the Qumran Community with the Essenes in relation to their common concern with biblically-derived foreknowledge of historical reality. Thus, he cites *Bj* 2 §159, "some of the Essenes profess to foreknow even things to come, being well-versed in sacred books . . . and utterances of Prophets."⁴¹

The historical value of 4QpNahum lies in its application of prophetic texts to describe the divine retribution of "Ephraim" and, to a lesser degree, "Manasseh." 4QpNahum does not reveal hitherto unknown information about the crucifixion of a Teacher of Righteousness (as initially claimed by Allegro).⁴² We may not rely upon the text as a definitive source for the origin of the epithet "Thrakidas," or even as evidence of a particular stance on the legitimacy of hanging as a means of execution in ancient Judaism. These old sensationalist claims of "revelations" now seem quaint as well as extravagant. Instead, more sober textual interpretation has allowed Peshet Nahum to serve its function in contributing to broader historical analysis. In terms of isolated historical data, it is true that 4QpNah allows us at best to recognize known events and personalities, rather than to recover

⁴⁰ This is demonstrated for example in mYad 4:6-8, which seems to indicate standardized "Sadduceean" *halakhic* positions.

⁴¹ Asher Finkel, "The Peshet of Dreams and Scriptures," *RevQ* 4 (1963-4): 357. On Josephus's reference to Essene interpretation of dreams he also cites *Bj* 2 §112-13.

⁴² See n. 53, ch. 4 above.

“lost” information. Far more significantly, 4QpNah, and all of the Qumran finds, are invaluable in providing tools for reconstructing the *Weltanschauung* of ancient Judaism.⁴³

9.3 LITERARY ANALYSIS

Concomitant with an appreciation of the theological perspective of peshet as related to its historical content, scholars have been acquiring greater sensitivity to the mechanics of peshet as reflected in its form and exegetical technique. The focus on lemma/peshet correspondence throughout this work reflects an approach toward the study of peshet that may be discerned in the works of a number of scholars in recent years. We have aimed to articulate that approach, which is both holistic and detail oriented, and to implement it systematically in our study of 4QpNah. Brownlee paved the way for us to think creatively, and to comb the biblical corpus, in seeking the links between individual lemmas and peshet elements. Nitzan demonstrated the importance of seeking larger scale structural correspondence between successive units of peshet and base-text. The aim of this work has been to follow both of these strategies, seeking exegetical sensitivity and ingenuity, while attending to literary structure; aiming to achieve an awareness of how the base-text elicited particular responses, as well as how the base-text was manipulated to reflect the concerns of the author.

The ease of dividing 4QpNah into pericopes demonstrates the overall structural correspondence of the composition to the biblical text of Nahum. The peshet interpretations in Pericope 1 describe the unleashing of God’s retributive might against opponents of the sect, in reaction to the words used by Nahum to describe the divine power that would be let loose against Assyria. In Pericope 2, the peshet focuses upon the corruption, violence, and downfall of the Jerusalem establishment, particularly Jannaeus’s crushing of the Pharisees; it adapts a passage in which the prophet employed a detailed metaphor, predicting the decline of the cruel and seemingly invincible Assyrian superpower. Pericope 3 describes a hostile takeover of Jerusalem (by Pompey, in our opinion), applying the words used by

⁴³ See now the discussion in Charlesworth, *The Pesharim*, pp. 70–83 on the methodological issues related to the historical analysis of peshet.

Nahum in his vivid picture of the anticipated sack of Nineveh. Pericope 4 develops Nahum's comparison of Nineveh to Thebes, and the prophet's assurances that both will be eradicated; the pesher certifies the imminent obliteration of Ephraim to follow that of Manasseh. In each of these cases, distinct biblical passages yield similarly cohesive treatments in 4QpNah.

The structural correspondence evident in these pericope divisions builds upon the "contextual" correspondence within each pesher unit. Throughout this work, we have demonstrated that the content of each pesher interpretation reflects the content of its respective lemma. Whether the interpretation is a simple paraphrase, a contemporized adaptation, a "concretization," or a symbolic rendering, it can be seen to retain the logical substance of the lemma. We have also charted "arithmetical" correspondence in each unit, by aligning "equivalent" terms in the lemma and pesher. Some particular alignments may be discerned more readily than others; some units included unaligned words of a particular sort we have termed "context markers"; some units exhibit a variation upon direct one-to-one proportionality, and have been described as "double" or "duplicated." Nonetheless, an overall systematization of equivalence is clearly operative.

The most challenging, and stimulating, aspect of investigating lemma/pesher correspondence consists of determining the underlying factor(s) motivating arithmetical equivalence. We have termed this "lexical" correspondence, and have identified various "midrash-like" techniques linking the words and phrases of the pesher to corresponding elements in the lemma. These have included symbols and stereotypes; synonymy; word-play such as paronomasia, isolexism, abbreviation, and auditory similarity. Of particular interest is the confirmation of Nitzan's hypothesis concerning secondary biblical allusions. Apparent "un-pegged pluses" in the pesher have consistently been found to contain language culled from biblical passages with direct bearing on the context of the pesher.

It is frequently stressed that the Qumran Community viewed the formation and formulation of pesher as rooted in both revelation and exegesis. Similarly, the attempt to uncover the bases of lemma/pesher correspondence is both an art and a science; it relies upon inspired intuition as much as it does upon the systematic isolation of particular literary and exegetical techniques. In offering our explanations of lemma/pesher correspondence in Pesher Nahum we have aimed to be comprehensive, but not exhaustive. The reader is heartily

invited to challenge, as well as to build upon, specific interpretations put forward in this work. In the interests of such further progress, we hope to have provided a model for an integrative approach to the study of Qumran pesher, building from letter to word and phrase; from unit to pericope, and to the composition as a whole.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aharoni, Yohanan. *Carta's Atlas of the Bible*. 3d ed. Revised A.F. Rainey. Jerusalem: Carta, 1995.
- Alexander, Philip S. "A Note on the Syntax of 4Q448." *JJS* 44 (1993): 301–302.
- Allegro, John Marco. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2nd ed. New York: Penguin, 1964.
- . "Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect." *JBL* 75 (1956): 89–95 and Plates 1–4.
- . "More Unpublished Pieces of a Qumran Commentary on Nahum (4QpNah)." *JSS* 7 (1962): 304–08 and plates I–III.
- . *Qumran Cave 4.I (4Q158–4Q186)*, *DJD* V. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- . "A Reply, [to J.L. Teicher, 'Spurious Texts from Qumran?']" *PEQ* 90 (1958): 64.
- . "*Thrakidan*, the 'Lion of Wrath' and Alexander Jannaeus." *PEQ* 91 (1959): 47–51.
- Amusin, Iosif Davidovich. "Éphraïm et Manassé dans le Pêshèr de Nahum (4 Q p Nahum)." *RevQ* 4 (1963–4): 389–96.
- . "Observatiunculæ Qumranææ." *RevQ* 7 (1969–71): 533–52.
- . "A propos de l'interprétation de 4Q161 (fragments 5–6 et 8)." *RevQ* 8 (1974): 381–392.
- . "The Reflection of Historical Events of the First Century BC in Qumran Commentaries (4Q161; 4Q169; 4Q166)." *HUCA* 48 (1977): 123–52.
- . *Teksty Kumrana*. Moscow: Akademia Nauk, 1971.
- Astin, Alan E., ed. *Rome and the Mediterranean to 133 BC* Vol. 8 of *The Cambridge Ancient History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Avigad, Nahman. "The Paleography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents." *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4 (1958): 56–87.
- Atkinson, Kenneth, "On the Herodian Origin of Militant Davidic Messianism at Qumran: New Light from Psalm of Solomon 17," *JBL* 18 (1999): 435–60.
- . Review of Gregory Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum: A Critical Edition*, in *Review of Biblical Literature*, 2003.
- Bacher, Wilhelm. *Die Exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur*. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1965.
- . ערכי מדרש. Jerusalem: Karmi'el, 1970.
- Baldick, Chris. *Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Bammel, Ernst. "Crucifixion as a Punishment in Palestine" in *The Trial of Jesus, Cambridge Studies in Honour of C.F.D. Moule*. Edited by Ernst Bammel. Naperville, Ill.: A.R. Allenson, 1970.
- Bardtke, Hans. *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer: Die Sekte von Qumrān* vol. II. Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1958.
- Barthélemy, Dominique and Józef T. Milik. *Qumran Cave 1. DJD* I. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.
- Basser, Herbert. "Pesher Hadavar: The Truth of the Matter." *RevQ* 13 (1988): 389–405.
- Baumgarten, Albert I. *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: an Interpretation*. Supplement to the *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, vol. 55. Brill: Leiden, 1997.
- . "The Name of the Pharisees." *JBL* 102 (1983): 411–28.

- . "Perception of the Past in the Damascus Document." Pages 1–15 in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery*. Edited by Joseph Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick. Brill: Leiden, 2000.
- . "Rabbinic Literature as a Source for the History of Jewish Sectarianism in the Second Temple Period." *DSD* 2 (1995): 14–57.
- . "The Zadokite Priests at Qumran." *DSD* 4 (1997): 137–56.
- . "מגילות מדבר יהודה: קומראן והכתובות ביהדות בתקופת בית שני." Pages 139–51 in *מגילות מדבר יהודה: קומראן והכתובות ביהדות בתקופת בית שני*. Edited by Magen Broshi, Shemaryahu Talmon, Sara Japhet, and Daniel R. Schwartz. Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1992.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. *Qumran Cave 4.XII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)*. DJD XVIII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- . "Does TLH in the Temple Scroll Refer to Crucifixion?" Pages 172–82 in *Studies in Qumran Law*. Leiden: Brill, 1977. Repr., *JBL* 91 (1972): 472–81.
- . "Hanging and Treason in Qumran and Roman Law." *EI* 16 (1982): 7–16.
- . "On the Nature of the Seductress in 4Q184." *RevQ* 15 (1991–92): 133–143.
- . Review of Yigal Yadin, *Megilat ha-Miqdaš, The Temple Scroll* (Hebrew ed.), *JBL* 97 (1978): 584–589.
- . "The Unwritten Law in the Pre-Rabbinic Period." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 3 (1972): 7–29.
- Benoit, Pierre, Józef T. Milik, and Roland de Vaux. "Rouleau des Douze Prophetes." Pages 181–205 in *Les Grottes de Murab'ât*. DJD II. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. "4Q252 i 2 לעולם רוחי לעולם לא ידור רוחי לעולם." *Biblical Text or Biblical Interpretation?* *RevQ* 16 (1993–94): 421–27.
- . "4Q452: From Re-written Bible to Biblical Commentary." *JJS* 45 (1994): 1–27.
- . "4Q252: Method and Context, Genre and Sources: A Response to George J. Brooke." *JQR* 85 (1994): 61–79.
- . "The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT: Preliminary Observations." Pages 29–51 in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. Edited by John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein. Atlanta: Scholars, 1996.
- . "Introductory Formulas for Citation and Re-citation of Biblical Verses in the Qumran Pesharim: Observations on a Peshet Technique." *DSD* 1 (1994): 30–70.
- . "Midrash Halakha at Qumran?" *Gesher* 7 (1979): 145–66.
- . "כי קללה אלהים חלוני." A study in Early Jewish Exegesis." *JQR* 74 (1983): 21–45.
- , and Eileen Schuller. "4QNarrative and Poetic Composition." Pages 151–205 in *Wadi Daliyeh II and Qumran Cave 4*. DJD XXVIII. Clarendon: Oxford, 2001.
- Berrin, Shani L., "4QpNah (4Q169, Peshet Nahum): A Critical Edition with Commentary, Historical Analysis, and In-Depth Study of Exegetical Method." Ph.D. diss., New York University, 2001.
- . "Pesharim." Pages 644–47 in vol. 2 of *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . "Peshet Nahum." Pages 653–54 in vol. 2 of *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . "Lemma/Peshet Correspondence in Peshet Nahum." Pages 341–50 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.
- . "Qumran Pesharim." in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Edited by Matthias Henze. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, forthcoming.
- . "Secondary Citations in Peshet Nahum," *DSD*, forthcoming.

- Betz, Otto. *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1960.
- . "Past Events and Last Events in the Qumran Interpretation of History." *WCJS* 6 (1977): 27–34.
- . "מותו של חנוני לאור מניחת המקדש מקומראן." Pages 95–97 in *Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period*, פרקים בתולדות ירושלים בימי בית שני, Edited by Aharon Oppenheimer, Uriel Rappaport and Menahem Stern. Jerusalem: Yad Itzhak Ben-Zvi, 1980. Repr., in German in *Jesus: Der Messias Israels-Aufsätze zur biblischen Theologie*. (1987): 71–74.
- Blinzler, Josef. *Der Prozess Jesu*. Regensburg: F. Pustet, 1969 [non-vid.]
- Bloch, Philipp. "Studien zur Aggadah." in *MGWJ* 34 (1884): 8–9.
- Boardman, John. *The Assyrian and Babylonian Empires and Other States of the Near East From the Eighth to the Sixth Centuries BC* 2d ed. Vol. 3, Part 2 of *The Cambridge Ancient History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Boccaccio, Petrus and Guido Berardi. "Interpretatio Nahum." Appendix I: Pages 36–37 in *Psr Hbqwq: Interpretatio Habacuc 1QpHab*. Fano: Seminario Piceno, 1958.
- Bonani, Georges and M. Broshi, I. Carmi, S. Ivy, J. Strugnell, and W. Wolfi. "Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Atiqot* 20 (1991): 27–32.
- Botterweck, G. Johannes and Helmer Ringgren, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Revised English edition. Translated by John T. Willis. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1977.
- Bronznick, Norman M., "לפשר מובנו של חנוני 'דורשי החלקות'." 60 תרביץ (1990–91): 653–57.
- Brooke, George J. "The Biblical Texts in the Qumran Commentaries: Scribal Errors or Exegetical Variants?" Pages 85–100 in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring. Atlanta: Scholars, 1987.
- . *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context*. JSOT Supp. 29. Sheffield: JSOT, 1985.
- . "The Genre of 4Q252: From Poetry to Peshet." *DSD* 1 (1994): 160–79.
- . "Isaiah 40:3 and the Wilderness Community" Pages 117–32 in *New Qumran Texts and Studies*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Florentino Garcia-Martinez. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- . "The Kittim in the Qumran Pesharim." Pages 135–59 in *Images of Empire*. Edited by Loveday Alexander. JSOT Supp. 122. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.
- . "The Pesharim and the Origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 339–353 in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Projects*. Edited by John J. Collins, Norman Golb, Dennis Pardee, and Michael Wise. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994.
- . "Qumran Peshet: Towards the Re-definition of a Genre." *Revue de Qumran* 10 (1981): 483–503.
- . "The Thematic Content of 4Q252." *JQR* 85 (1994): 33–59.
- Broshi, Magen. *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992.
- , and Esther Eshel. "The Greek King is Antiochus IV (4QHistorical Text = 4Q248)." *JJS* 48 (1997): 120–29.
- Brown, Francis, Samuel Rolles Driver and Charles A. Briggs, eds. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.
- Brownlee, William Hugh. "The Background of Biblical Interpretation at Qumran." Pages 188–93 in *Qumran: sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*. Edited by Mathias Delcor. Paris: Leuven University Press, 1978.
- . "Biblical Interpretation among the Scribes of the Dead Sea Scrolls." *BA* 14 (1951): 54–76. Summarized in "Twenty-Five Years Ago: William H. Brownlee

- Demonstrates Thirteen Principles for the Interpretation of Scripture Commentaries from Qumran." *BA* 39 (1976): 118–19.
- . "The Habakkuk Midrash and the Targum of Jonathan." *JJS* 7 (1956): 169–186.
- . "The Historical Allusions of the Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash." *BASOR* 126 (1950): 10–20.
- . *The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- . *The Midrash Peshet of Habakkuk*. SBL Monograph Series 24. Missoula, Montana: Scholars, 1979.
- . Review of Horgan, *Pesharim*, in *JBL* 102 (1983): 323–27.
- . *The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary to Habakkuk*. JBL Monograph Series 11. Philadelphia: SBL, 1959.
- . "The Wicked Priest, The Man of Lies, and the Teacher of Righteousness—The Problem of Identity." *JQR* 73 (1982): 1–37.
- Bruce, Frederick F. *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1959.
- Büchler, Adolf. "Die Todestrafen der Bibel und der judischnachbiblischen Zeit" *MGWJ*, vol. 50 (1906): 539–562, 664–706.
- . *The Political and Social Leaders of the Jewish Community of Sepphoris in the Second and Third Centuries*. Oxford: Printed by H. Hart at the University Press, 1909.
- Burrows, Millar. "The Ascent from Acco in 4QpIsa^a." *Vetus Testamentum* 7 (1957): 104–05.
- . *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Viking, 1958.
- . "Prophecy and the Prophets at Qumrân." Pages 223–232 in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenberg*. Edited by Bernhard W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson. New York: Harper, 1962.
- Bury, John Bagnell, Stanley Arthur Cook, Frank E. Adcock, eds. *Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. 3 of The Assyrian Empire*. London: Cambridge, 1925.
- Callaway, Phillip R. "Extending Divine Revelation: Micro-Compositional Strategies in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 149–162 in *Temple Scroll Studies*. Edited by George J. Brooke. Manchester: Sheffield, JSOT, 1987.
- Calvin, John. *A Commentary on the Twelve Minor Prophets*. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1986. (Translated from the Latin, 1st published 1559).
- . *The History of the Qumran Community: An Investigation*. Sheffield: JSOT, 1988.
- Carmignac, Jean. *Christ and the Teacher of Righteousness*. Translated from French by K.G. Pedley. Baltimore: Helicon, 1962.
- . "HRBYM: les 'Nombreux' ou les 'Notables'?" *RevQ* 7 (1971): 575–86.
- . "Interprétation de Nahum (4QpNah)." Pages 85–92 in Vol. 2. of *Les Textes de Qumrân Traduits et Annotés*. Edited by Jean Carmignac, Édouard Cothenet and Hubert Lignée. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1963.
- . "Le Document de Qumrân sur Melkisédek." *Revue de Qumran* 7 (1969–71): 343–378.
- . "Notes sur les Peshârîm." *Revue de Qumran* 3 (1961–2): 505–538.
- Carmy, Shalom. "Psalm 24 as the Key to the Problems of HaShem S-vaot." *Gesher* 5 (1976): 164–85.
- Cathcart, Kevin J. *Nahum in the Light of Northwest Semitic*. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1973.
- , and Robert P. Gordon. *The Targum of the Minor Prophets*. Vol. 14 of *The Aramaic Bible*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1987.
- Charles, Robert Henry. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, vol. II. Oxford: Clarendon, 1963.
- . *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel (ICC)*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1929.
- Charlesworth, James H. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with*

- English Translations*. 6 vols. PTSDDSP. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr; Paul Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994–2002.
- . et al. *A Graphic Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, Paul Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991.
- . *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?* Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 2002.
- Cohen, Chaim H. “התלוייה אף היא במזוזה בית דין?” *WCJS* 8/3 (1982): 19–28.
- Collins, John Joseph. “Jewish Apocalyptic Against its Hellenistic Near Eastern Environment.” *BASOR* 220 (1975): 27–36.
- . *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1998.
- Cross, Frank Moore. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. 3rd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- . “The Development of the Jewish Script.” Pages 147–172 in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of W.F. Albright*. Edited by George E. Wright. Garden City: Doubleday, 1961. Repr., “The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran.” *JBL* 74 (1955): 133–202.
- . “The Early History of the Qumran Community.” Pages 63–89 in *New Directions in Biblical Archaeology*. Edited by D.N. Freedman and J.C. Greenfield. New York: Doubleday, 1971.
- . “Paleography and the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 379–402 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years*. Vol. 1. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Cuddon, John Anthony. *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991.
- Dahood, Mitchell J., “Causal *Beth* and the Root NKR in Nahum 3,4.” *Biblica* 52, (1971): 395–96.
- Delcor, Mathias. “Contribution à l'étude de la législation des sectaires de Damas et de Qumran.” *RB* 61 (1954): 533–53.
- Diez Merino, Luis. “La crucifixión en la antigua literatura judía (Período intertestamental).” *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 51 (1976): 5–27. [non-vid]
- Dimant, Devorah. “Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha at Qumran.” *DSD* 1:2 (1994): 151–59.
- . “Pesharim, Qumran.” Pages 244–51 in Vol. 5 of *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- . “Qumran Sectarian Literature.” Page 483–550, esp. 503–514 in Vol. 2 of *The Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: CRIANT*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- . “A Quotation from Nahum 3:8–10 in 4Q385 6.” Pages 31–37 in *המקרא בראי קמין מפרשיו: ספר זכרון לשרה קמין (The Bible in the Light of Its Interpreters: Sarah Kamin Memorial Volume)*. Edited by Sara Japhet. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1994. [Hebrew]
- . Review of B. Nitzan, *Peshar Habakkuk*. *RevQ* 12 (1987): 597–600.
- Doudna, Gregory L. *4Q Peshar Nahum: A Critical Edition*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 35. London: Sheffield, 2001.
- Drazin, Nathan. *History of Jewish Education from 515 BCE to 220 CE*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1940.
- . “What Can ‘Betalmud’ Prove?” *JQR* 54 (1964): 333.
- Driver, Godfrey Rolles. *The Judean Scrolls*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.
- Driver, Samuel Rolles. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1966.
- . *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1969.
- Dupont-Sommer, André. “Communication: Observations sur le Commentaire de Nahum Découvert près de la Mer Morte.” *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et belles-lettres* (1963): 242–43.

- . *Essene Writings from Qumran*. Translated by Geza Vermes (from the French, *Les Écrits Esséniens Découverts Près de la Mer Morte*. Paris: Payot, 1st ed., 1959). Oxford: Blackwell, 1961.
- . “Le Commentaire de Nahum Découvert près de la Mer Morte (4QpNah): Traduction et Notes.” *Semítica* 13 (1963): 55–88.
- . “Lumières Nouvelles sur l’arrière-plan historique des écrits de Qoumran.” *EI* 8 (1967, *E.L. Sukenik Memorial Volume*): 25*–36*.
- . “Observations nouvelles sur l’expression ‘suspendu vivant sur le bois’ dans le Commentaire de Nahum (4Q pNah II 8) à la lumière du Rouleau du Temple (11Q Temple Scroll LXIV 6–13).” *Comptes rendus de l’Académie des Inscriptions et belles-lettres* (1972): 709–720.
- . “Observations sur le Commentaire de Nahum Découvert près de la Mer Morte.” *Journal des Savants* (October–December 1963): 201–226.
- . “Résumé des cours de 1969–70: Hébreu et Araméen.” *Annuaire du Collège de France* 70 (1970–71): 406–08.
- Dupriez, Bernard. *A Dictionary of Literary Devices, Gradus, A–Z*. Translated and adapted by Albert W. Halsall. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1991.
- Ehrlich, Arnold Bogumil. *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*. Vol. 5. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1912.
- Elliger, Karl. *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer*. BHT 15. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1953.
- Eshel, Esther and Hanan Eshel and Ada Yardeni. תרביץ” חיבור מקומראן ובו קטע 60 ממומור קנד והפילה לשלומי של ינתן המלך וממלכתו” “Qumran Composition Containing Part of Ps. 154 and a Prayer for the Welfare of King Jonathan and his Kingdom.” *IEJ* 42 (1992): 199–229].
- , and Menahem Kister. “A Polemical Qumran Fragment (4Q471)” *JJS* 43,2 (1992): 277–281.
- , and Hanan Eshel. “4Q448, Psalm 154 (Syriac), Sirach 48:20, and 4QpIsa^a,” *JBL* 119 (2000): 645–659.
- Eshel, Hanan. “The Historical background of the Peshet Interpreting Joshua’s Curse on the Rebuilder of Jericho.” *RevQ* 15 (1991–92): 409–20
“הרקע ההסטורי של 4QTest לאור התגלית [= הארכיולוגיה”
- . “The Kittim in the War Scroll and in the Pesharim.” Pages 29–44 in *Historical Perspectives from the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba on Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by David Goodblatt, Avital Pinnick, and Daniel R. Schwartz. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- . “The Meaning and Significance of CD 20:13–15.” Pages 330–36 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and reformulated Issues*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- . “תולדותיה של הקבוצה שישבה בקומראן והרמזים ההסטוריים שבמנילות” 30:2 (1997): 86–93.
- . “הפילה יוסף מקומראן, פפירוס ממצדה והמקדש השומרוני בהר נרזים” 56 (1991): 125–36.
- Eslinger, Lyle. “The Infinite in a Finite Organical Perception.” *VT* 45 (1995): 145–173.
- Even-Shoshan, Avraham. ed. *A New Concordance of the Bible*. Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1990.
- . *ha-Milon he-Hadash*. Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1966–1970.
- Finkel, Asher. “The Oraclaral Interpretation of the Torah and Prophets as Reflected in The Temple Scroll and Pesharim of Qumran.” *WCJS* 11 (1994): 179–84.
- . “The Peshet of Dreams and Scriptures.” *RevQ* 4 (1963–4): 357–70.
- Finkelstein, Louis. *Ha-Perushim ve-Anshe Kēneset Ha-Gedolah (The Pharisees and the Men of the Great Synagogue)*. Hebrew with English Summary. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950.

- Fishbane, Michael A. "The Qumran Peshar and traits of Ancient Hermeneutics." *WCJS* 6:1 (1977): 97–114.
- . "Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran." Page 339–77 in *Miqra: Text, Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Martin Jan Mulder, with Harry Sysling. *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* II. Assen/Mastricht: Van Gorcum, 1990.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "A Bibliographical Aid to the Study of the Qumran Texts 158–186." *CBQ* 31 (1969): 63–65.
- . "Crucifixion in Ancient Palestine, Qumran Literature, and the New Testament." *CBQ* 40 (1978): 493–513. Repr., *To Advance the Gospel: New Testament Studies*, New York: Crossroad/Herder & Herder, 1981, 125–46.
- . "The Matthean Divorce Texts and Some New Palestinian Evidence." *Theologica Studies* 37 (1976): 197–226.
- . "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament." Pages 3–58 in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*. Missoula: SBL, 1974. Revised from *New Testament Studies* 7 (1960–61): 297–333.
- . Review of John M. Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4 (DJD 5)* *CBQ* 31 (1969): 235–38.
- . in consultation with James VanderKam. *DJD XIX, Qumrân Cave 4. XIV. Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.
- Flusser, David, "Two Notes on the Midrash on 2Sam.vii." *IEJ* 9 (1959): 104–109.
- . *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988.
- . "הערה להפלה לשלומו של יונתן המלך." *הערה* 61 (1992–3): 297–300.
- . "כת מדבר יהודה והפרושים." *מולד* 19 (1961): 456–58.
- . "כת מדבר יהודה והשקפותיה." *ציון* 19 (1954): 84–105.
- . פרושים, צדוקים, ואסיים בפשר נהום. Pages 133–68 in *Essays in Jewish History and Philology, in Memory of Gedaliahu Alon*. Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 1970. Repr., "Pharisäer, Sadduzäer und Essener im Pescher Nahum" in *Qumran*. Edited by Karl Erich Grözinger et al. Translated by E. Grözinger; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1981.
- . Review of J.T. Milik. *Dix Ans de Découvertes dans le Désert de Juda*. in *קריה ספר* 33:4 (1958): 455–460.
- Fraade, Steven D. "Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran." *JJS* 44 (1993): 46–69.
- Freedman, David Noel, ed., *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 Vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Fröhlich, Ida. "Le Genre Littéraire des Pesharim du Qumran." *RevQ* 12 (1986): 383–98.
- . "Peshar, Apocalyptic Literature and Qumran." Pages 295–305 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991*. Edited by Julio C. Trebolle Barrera and L.V. Montaner. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . "Themes, Structure, and Genre of Peshar Genesis: A Response to George Brooke." *JQR* 85 (1994): 83–90.
- García-Martínez, Florentino. "4QpNah y la Crucifixión: Nueva hipótesis de reconstrucción de 4Q169, 3–4, I, 4–8." *Estudios Bíblicos* 38 (1978–80): 221–35.
- , and Adam S. van Der Woude. "A 'Groningen' Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History." *RevQ* 14 (1990): 521–41.
- , and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997. Occasional reference is made to the earlier English translation in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*. 2nd ed. Translated to English by W.G.E. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- , and Julio C. Trebolle Barrera. *People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: their Writings, Beliefs, and Practices*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

- , and Donald W. Parry. *A Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1970–95*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996.
- Gärtner, Bertil E. *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* (Society for New Testament Monograph Studies; Cambridge: University Press, 1965).
- Gaster, Theodore H. *The Dead Sea Scriptures*. New York: Anchor, Doubleday, 1976.
- Gelb, Ignace J. et al., eds., *Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1956–.
- Geller, Mark. “Alexander Jannaeus and the Pharisee Rift.” *JJS* 30 (1979): 202–11.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*. Edited by and enl. by E. Kautzsch. Revised by Arthur Ernest Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon, 1970.
- Goldstein, Jonathan A. *Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Goodman, Martin. “A Note on Josephus, the Pharisees, and Ancestral Tradition.” *JJS* 50 (1999): 17–20.
- Goranson, Stephen. “The Exclusion of Ephraim in Rev. 7: 4–8 and Essene Polemic Against the Pharisees.” *DSD* 2 (1995): 80–85.
- Gordis, Robert. “Virtual Quotations in Job, Sumer and Qumran.” *VT* 3 (1981): 410–27.
- . *The Word and the Book: Studies in Biblical Language and Literature*. New York: Ktav 1976.
- Gordon, Cyrus H. *Ugaritic Textbook*. Vol. 1. Grammar. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965.
- Gordon, Robert P. “The Targum to the Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Texts: Textual and Exegetical Notes.” *RevQ* 8 (1974): 425–9.
- Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H. “Bible Quotations in the Sectarial Dead Sea Scrolls.” *VT* 3 (1953): 79–82.
- . “Linguistic Structure and Tradition in the Qumran Documents.” *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4 (1958): 101–137.
- Greenstein, Edward L. “Misquotation of Scripture in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 71–83 in *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*. Vol. 1. Edited by B. Walfish. Haifa: Haifa University Press; University Press of New England in association with Brandeis University Press, 1993.
- Gruenwald, Ithamar. *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*. Leiden: Brill, 1980.
- Habermann, Abraham Meir. *מגילות מדבר יהודה*. Jerusalem: Machbaroth Lesifrut, 1959.
- Haldar, Alfred Ossian. *Studies in the Book of Nahum*. Uppsala: Lundequistska, 1947.
- Halperin, David J., “Crucifixion, the Nahum Pesher, and the Penalty of Strangulation.” *JJS* 32 (1981): 32–46.
- Hanhart, Robert, ed., *Septuaginta. Tobit*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1983.
- Harrington, Daniel J. and John Strugnell. “Qumran cave 4 Texts: A New Publication.” *JBL* 112 (1993): 498–99.
- Hatch, Edwin and Henry A. Redpath et al., *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (including the Apocryphal Books)*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: L Baker Books, 1998.
- Heinemann, Isaak. “לדחתחוח המונחים המקצועיים לפירוש המקרא” 16 (1948): 20–23.
- . “Altjüdische Allegoristik.” *Bericht des Jüdisch-Theologische Seminars Breslau* (1935).
- Heinemann, Joseph. “The Targum of Ex. 22:4 and the Ancient Halakha.” *הרבנין* 38 (1968/69): 294–97.
- Hengel, Martin. *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*. Translated and Revised from German by John Bowden. Phila.: Fortress, 1977.
- Hoening, Sidney B. “BeTalmud and Talmud.” *JQR* 54 (1963–4): 334–39.

- . “Dorshé Halakot in the Peshet Nahum Scrolls.” *JBL* 83 (1964): 119–38.
- . “The Peshet Nahum ‘Talmud’.” *JBL* 86 (1967): 441–45.
- . “Qumran Fantasies.” *JQR* 63 (1973): 264–65.
- . “What is the Explanation for the term ‘B’Talmud’ in the Scrolls?” *JQR* 53 (1962–3): 274–76.
- . “הבשויים אשר בתלמוד ואפרים בפשט נחום.” 55 סיני (1964): 326–28.
- Hogarth, David G. *The Ancient East*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1914.
- Holm-Nielsen, Svend. *Hodayot Psalms From Qumran*. Aarhus, Denmark: Universitetsforlaget, 1960.
- Horace. *Horace’s Satires and Epistles*. Translated by J. Fuchs. New York: Norton, 1977.
- Horgan, Maurya P. *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly; Monograph Series 8. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1979.
- Horton, Fred L. “Formulas of Introduction in the Qumran Literature.” *Revue de Qumran* 7 (1971): 505–14.
- Ilan, Tal. “Shelamzion in Qumran.” Pages 57–68 in *Historical Perspectives from the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by David Goodblatt, Avital Pinnick, and Daniel R. Schwartz. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Iwry, Samuel. “Was There a Migration to Damascus: The Problem of שבִי יִשְׂרָאֵל.” *EI* 9 (1969): 80–88.
- Jastrow, Marcus. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. New York: P. Shalom, 1967.
- Jeremias, Gert. *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1963.
- Josephus, Flavius, *Works*, English and Greek. 9 vols. LCL edition. Translated by Henry St. John Thackeray, Ralph Marcus, and Louis H. Feldman. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965.
- Joüon, Paul. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Translated by Takamitsu Muraoka. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1991.
- Jull, A.J. Timothy, Douglas J. Donahue, Magen Broshi and Emanuel Tov. “Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls and Linen Fragments from the Judean Desert.” *Atiqot* 28 (1996): 85–91. (= *Radiocarbon* 37,1 [1995]: 11–19).
- Kaufmann, Yehezkel. תולדות היהדות הירושלמית. Vol. 3, Book 2. Tel Aviv: Mosad Bialik, 1966.
- Kennedy, James M. “The root G’R in the Light of Semantic Analysis.” *JBL* 106 (1987): 47–64.
- Kister, Menahem. “Biblical Phrases and Hidden Biblical Interpretations and Pesharim.” Pages 27–39 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by D. Dimant and U. Rappaport. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . “A Common Heritage: Biblical Interpretation at Qumran and Its Implications.” Pages 101–11 in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature*. Edited by Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Knibb, Michael A. *The Qumran Community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Knobel, Peter S. “The Targum of Qohelet” in *The Aramaic Bible: The Targums*. Vol. 15. Minnesota: Liturgical, 1991.
- Kobelski, Paul J. *Melchizedek and Melchireša’*. Washington D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981.
- Koehler, Ludwig and Walter Baumgartner. *The Hebrew and Aramaic lexicon of the Old Testament (HALOT)*. 4 Vols. Revised by W. Baumgartner and J.J. Stamm, et al. Edited and transl. from the German, *Hebräisches und aramäisches lexicon zum Alten Testament* under the supervision of M.E.J. Richardson. Leiden; New York: E.J. Brill, 1994–1999.

- Krauss, Samuel. *Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum*. Berlin: S. Calvary and Co., 1898–99.
- Kselman, John S. "RB/KBD: A New Hebrew-Akkadian Formulaic Pair." *VT* 29 (1979): 110–114.
- Kugel, James L. *Early Biblical Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
- Kuhn, Karl G. *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1960.
- Kutschera, Edward Yechezkel. *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a)*. Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- Lange, Armin. *Biblica Qumranica* (unpub.).
- . "The Essene Position on Magic and Divination." Pages 377–435 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*. Edited by Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García-Martínez and John Kampen. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Leibel, Daniel. "הערת אחרות לפשר נחום" 27 תרבי"ג (1957): 12–16.
- Lévi, I. "Un Écrit Sadducéen antérieur à la ruine du Temple." *REJ* 61 (1911), 161–205.
- Levine, Étan. *The Aramaic Version of Qohelet*. New York: Sefpher-Hermon, 1978.
- . "Parallel to Deuteronomy of Ps.-Jon." in *Neophyti V*. Edited by A. Díez Macho. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1978.
- Levy, Jacob. *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim*. Berlin and Vienna: B. Harz, 1924.
- Licht, Jacob. "רפים נוספים לפשר נחום" 19 מולד (1961): 454–56.
- . "מנילה ההודיות ממנילות מדבר יהודה." Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1957.
- . "מנילה הסרכים ממנילות מדבר יהודה." Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1965.
- . "המונה נורל בכתיבה של כת מדבר יהודה." 1 בית מקרא (1955–56): 90–99.
- Lieberman, Saul. "Rabbinic Interpretation of Scripture." Pages 68–82 in *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950.
- Lieberman, Stephen. "A Mesopotamian Background for the So-Called *Aggadica* 'Measures' of Biblical Hermeneutics." *HUCA* 58 (1987): 157–225.
- Lim, Timothy H. *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.
- . *Pesharim, Companion to the Qumran Scrolls*. Sheffield, 2002.
- Lohse, Eduard (ed.) *Die Texte aus Qumran: hebräisch und deutsch, mit masoretischer Punctuation/Übersetzung, Einführung und Anmerkungen*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971; Repr., Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1964.
- Luckenbill, Daniel David. *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*. 2 vols. New York: Greenwood, 1968.
- Maier, Johann. *Die Texte der Höhle 4*. Vol. 2 in *Die Qumran-Essener. Die Texte vom Toten Meer*. Munich and Basel: E. Reinhardt, 1995.
- . "Weitere Stücke zum Nahumkommentar aus der Höhle 4 Von Qumran." *Judaica* 18 (1962): 215–250.
- Maier, Walter Arthur. *The Book of Nahum*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1959.
- Main, Emmanuelle. "For King Jonathan or Against? The Use of the Bible in 4Q448." Pages 113–35 in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Michael Stone and Esther Chazon. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Mandel, Paul. "Midrashic Exegesis and its Precedents in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *DSD* 8,2 (2001): 149–68.
- Merhaviva, Chen-Melekh. "בהלמוד בפשר נחום" סיני 55:1–2 (1964): 110–11.
- Metzger, Bruce M. "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah." *JBL* 70 (1951): 297–307.
- Michellini Tocci, Franco. *I manoscritti del Mar Morto: Introduzione, traduzione e commento*. Bari: Laterza, 1967.
- Milik, Józef T., *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.

- . "Milki-sedeq et Milki-reša' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens." *JJS* 23 (1972): 95–144.
- . *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea*. Pages 72–3 in *Dix Ans de découvertes dans le désert de Juda*. Translated by John Strugnell from French. London: SCM, 1959.
- , and Dominique Barthélemy. *Qumran Cave 1. DJD I: "Commentaire de Psaumes."* pp. 81–82, Pl. XV
- , Maurice Baillet and Roland de Vaux. *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân. DJD III*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.
- Miller, M.P. "The Function of Isa 61: 1–2 in 11QMelchizedek." *JBL* 88 (1969): 467–69.
- Moffat, James. *Grace in the New Testament*. London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd. 1932.
- Moraldi, Luigi. *I manoscritti de Qumrân*. Torino: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1971.
- Murphy, Catherine. *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls & in the Qumran Community*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "The Essenes and Their History." *RB* 81 (1974): 215–44.
- . "A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document VI." *RB* 78 (1971): 210–32.
- . "Princes of Judah." in *RB* 79 (1972): 200–16.
- Neusner, Jacob. *Ancient Judaism and Modern Category Formations*. Lanham: University Press of America, 1986.
- . *From Politics To Piety: the Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- . *The Pharisees*. Hoboken, N.J.: Ktav Publishing, 1973.
- New Interpreter's Bible* in 12 vols. Nashville: Abingdon, 1994–96.
- New Jewish Publication Society Translation of Tanakh*. Philadelphia: JPS, 1999.
- Newsom, Carol Ann. "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran." Page 167–87 in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters*. Edited by W.H. Propp, B. Halpern, and David Noel Freedman. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- . *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1985.
- Nickelsburg, George W.E. "Eschatology (Early Jewish)." in Vol. 2 of *ABD*. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Nitzan, Bilhah. *מגלה פשר הכתוב (IQpHab)*. Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1986.
- O'Collins, Gerald G. "Crucifixion." Page 1207 in Vol. 1 of *ABD*. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Oppenheim, A. Leo. *Letters from Mesopotamia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- . *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East*. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. 46 Part 3. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1956.
- Pardee, Dennis. "A Restudy of the Commentary on Psalm 37 from Qumran Cave 4 (Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan, vol V n° 171)." *RevQ* 8 (1973): 163–194.
- Patte, Daniel. *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine*. SBL, Dissertation Series, No. 22. Missoula, Montana: Scholars, 1975.
- Pearson, Birger A. "Hypostasis." Page 546 in *Encyclopedia of Religion*. Edited by Mircea Eliade. New York: Macmillan, 1987.
- Philo of Alexandria. *Works*. 10 vols. LCL edition. Translated by Francis Henry Colson and George Herbert Whitaker. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929–1962.
- Piepkorn, Arthur C. *Historical Prism Inscriptions of Ashurbanipal* (Assyriological Studies 5). Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1933.
- Ploeg, J.P.M. van der. *Bijbelverklaring te Qumran*. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij, 1960. [non-vid., cited in Brooke, "Redefinition", 486 n. 15.]

- Porton, Gary G. "Palestinian Jews and the Hebrew Bible in the Greco-Roman Period." Pages 103–138 in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* II:19.2. Edited by Hildegard Temporini. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1972.
- Puech, Emile. "Apocryphe de Daniel." Pages 183–84 in *Qumran Cave 4, Parabiblical Texts, Part 3. DJD XXII*. Edited by James VanderKam. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- . "Fragments du plus ancien exemplaire du Rouleau du Temple (4Q524)." Pages 19–64 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*. Edited by Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García-Martínez and J. Kampen. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . "Jonathan le Prêtre Impie et les Débuts de la Communauté de Qumrân, 4QJonathan (4Q523) et 4QPsAp (4Q448)." *RevQ* 17 (1996): 241–270.
- . "Notes sur 11Q19 LXIV 6–13 et 4Q524 14, 2–4. À propos de la crucifixion dans le Rouleau du Temple et dans le Judaïsme ancien." *RevQ* 18 (1997): 109–24.
- . *Qumran Cave 4, Textes Hébreux* (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–579). *DJD XXV* Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Qimron, Elisha. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1986.
- , and John Strugnell. *Qumran Cave 4. Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah. DJD X*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- . "ההבחנה בין ו"ו ליו"ד בתעודות מדבר יהודה." 52 בית מקרא (1973): 102–112.
- Rabin, Chaim. "Alexander Jannaeus and the Pharisees." *JJS* 7 (1956): 3–11.
- . "The Habakkuk Scroll and the Zadokite Documents." *VT* 5 (1955): 148–162.
- . "Hebrew D = 'HAND.'" *JJS* 6 (1955): 111–115.
- . *The Zadokite Documents*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1954.
- Rabinowitz, Isaac. "The Meaning of the Key ('Demetrius') Passage of the Qumran Nahum-Pesher." *JAOs* 98 (1978): 394–9.
- . "Pêsher/Pittârôn. Its Biblical Meaning and its Significance in the Qumran Literature." *Revue de Qumran* 8 (1973): 219–32.
- Reed, Stephen A. "What is a Fragment?" *JJS* 45 (1994): 123–25.
- Regev, Eyal. "How Did The Temple Mount Fall to Pompey?" *JJS* 48 (1997): 276–89.
- Reicke, B., "Die Ta'amire-Schriften und die Damskus Fragmenten," *Studia Theologica* 2 (1949): 60.
- Reif, Stefan C. "A Note on נַעַר." *VT* 21 (1971) 241–44.
- Roberts, B.J. "Bible Exegesis and Fulfillment in Qumran." Pages 195–207 in *Words and Meanings. Essays Presented to David Winton Thomas*. Edited by Peter R. Ackroyd and Barnabas Lindars. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- Ross, J.P. "Ja-hweh S-vaot in Samuel and in Psalms." *VT* 17 (1967): 76–92.
- Roth, Cecil. "The Subject Matter of Qumran Exegesis." *VT* 10 (1960): 51–68.
- . "A Talmudic Reference to the Qumran Sect?" *RevQ* 2 (1960): 261–65.
- Roth, W.M.W. "NBL." *VT* 10 (1960): 394–409.
- Roux, Georges. *Ancient Iraq*. 3d ed. London: Penguin, 1992.
- Rowley, Henry H. "4QpNahum and the Teacher of Righteousness." *JBL* 75 (1956): 188–193.
- . "The Kittim and the Dead Sea Scrolls." *PEQ* 88 (1956): 92–109.
- Russell, David Syme. *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964.
- Saldarini, Anthony J. "Pharisees." Pages 289–303 in Vol. 5 of *ABD*. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Sarna, Nahum. *Exploring Exodus*. New York: Schocken Books, 1986.
- Schaller, George B. *The Serengeti Lion*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1972.
- Schechter, Solomon. *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, Vol. I of *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*. Cambridge: University Press, 1910.
- Scheel, David and Craig Packer. "Variation in Predation by Lions: Tracking a Movable Feast." Pages 299–314 in *Serengeti II: Dynamics, Management, and Conservation*

- of an Ecosystem. Edited by Anthony Sinclair, Ronald Entrican and Peter Arcese. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of The Congregation*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1989.
- . "Essenes." Pages 163–66 in *Encyclopedia of Religion* 5. Edited by Mircea Eliade. New York: Macmillan, 1987.
- . *The Halakha at Qumran*. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- . "Jerusalem in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 73–88 in *The Centrality of Jerusalem, Historical Perspectives*. Edited by Marcel Poorthuis and Chana Safrai. Kampen, Netherlands: Kok Pharos, 1996.
- . "Mysteries." Pages 31–113 in *Qumran Cave 4 Sapiential Texts, Part 1. DJD XV*. Edited by Joseph Fitzmyer et al. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.
- . "Pharisees and Sadducees in Peshar Nahum." Pages 272–90 in *Minhah Le-Nahum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honor of His 70th Birthday*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 154. Edited by Marc Z. Brettler and Michael A. Fishbane. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.
- . *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- . *הליכה ומשיחיות בכת מדבר יהודה*. Jerusalem: Merkaz Zalman Shazar le-toldot Yisra'el, 1993.
- Scholem, Gershom. "Toward the Understanding of the Messianic Idea in Judaism" Pages 1–36 in *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays in Jewish Spirituality*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1971.
- Schonfield, Hugh Joseph. *Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Studies toward their Solution*. New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 1957.
- Schremer, Adiel. "The Name of the Boethusians: A Reconsideration of Suggested Explanations and Another One." *JJS* 48 (1997): 290–99.
- Schuller, Eileen M. "4Q372 1: A Text About Joseph." *RevQ* 14 (1990): 349–76.
- . "4Q381 Non-Canonical Psalm B" in *Discoveries in the Judean Desert (DJD)* vol. XI, *Poetical and Liturgical Texts*, Part 1. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. Revised and Edited by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Martin Goodman. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986–87.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. "Josephus and Nicolaus on the Pharisees." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 14 (1983): 157–71.
- . "MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees." Pages 67–80 in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. Edited by John Kampen and Moshe J. Bernstein. Atlanta: Scholars, 1996.
- . "Non-Joining Sympathizers." *Biblica* 64 (1983): 550–5.
- . *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1992.
- . "To Join Oneself to the House of Judah (Damascus Document IV: II)." *RevQ* 10 (1981): 435–46.
- Seeligman, Isaac Leo. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems*. Leiden: Brill, 1948.
- Segal, Moses Hirsch. "The Habakkuk 'Commentary' and the Damascus Fragments." *JBL* 70 (1951): 131–47.
- . "לבעיות של מנילות המערה." *EI* 1 (1951): 39–44.
- Sharvit, Baruch. "הפרושים לפי מנילות כת מדבר יהודה." *בית מקרא* 34 (1989): 142–48.
- . "מידת הענוה והיחס להון לפי תורה כת מדבר יהודה." *בית מקרא* 27 (1981): 22–28.
- Shemesh, Aharon. "Scriptural Interpretations in the Damascus Document and Their Parallels in Rabbinic Midrash." Pages 161–75 in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery*. Edited by Joseph Baumgarten, Esther Chazon, and Avital Pinnick. Brill: Leiden, 2000.
- Siegel, Jonathan P. "The Employment of Paleo-Hebrew Characters for the Divine Names at Qumran in the Light of Tannaitic Sources." *HUCA* 42 (1971): 159–72.

- Silberman, Lou H. "Unriddling the Riddle: A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Peshet (1 Q p Hab)." *Revue de Qumran* 3 (1961-2): 323-64.
- . "A note on 4Qflorilegium." *JBL* 88 (1959): 158-59.
- Silberman, Neil A. *The Hidden Scrolls*. New York: G.P. Putnam's, 1994.
- Skehan, Patrick W., "The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada Scroll, and in the Septuagint." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 13 (1980): 14-44.
- . "A New Translation of QumrânTexts." (Review of Geza Vermes *DSSE* 1962). *CBQ* 25 (1963): 119-123.
- Slomovic, Eliezer. "Toward an Understanding of the Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *RevQ* 7 (1969): 3-15.
- Smith, John Merlin Powis, and William Hayes Ward and Julius A. Bewer. *International Critical Commentary, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah and Joel (ICC)*. New York: Scribner's, 1911.
- Soden, Wolfram von. *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1966.
- Sokoloff, Michael. *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic*. Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1990.
- Sparks, Hedley Frederick Davis. "The Symbolical Interpretation of *Lebanon* in the Fathers." *JTS* New Series 10 (1959): 264-79.
- Speier, S. "Death by Hanging" in Targum Ruth 1:17." *40 הרבי"ן* (1971): 259.
- Sperber, Alexander. "Hebrew in Parallel Transmission." in *HUCA* 14 (1939): 153-249.
- Sperling, S. David. "Studies in Late Hebrew Lexicography in the Light of Akkadian." Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1973.
- Spronk, Klaas. *Historical Commentary on the Old Testament: Nahum*. The Netherlands: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1997.
- Stauffer, Ethelbert. *Jerusalem und Rom im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. Bern and Munich: Francke, 1957.
- Stegemann, Hartmut. *The Library of Qumran, On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1998.
- . "The Qumran-Essenes—Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times." Pages 83-166 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Vol. 1. Edited by Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . "Weitere Stücke von 4QpPsalm 37, von 4QPatriarchal Blessings und Hinweis auf eine unedierte Handschrift aus Höhle 4Q mit Excerpten aus dem Deuteronomium." *RevQ* 6 (1967): 193-227.
- Stern, Menahem., *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism (GLAJF)*. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1976.
- . "לכניויו של אלכסנדר ינא' אצל' וסיפוס וסינקלוס" *40 הרבי"ן* (1960): 207-209. Reprinted in Pages 125-27 in *Studies in Jewish History: The Second Temple Period*. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, (1991).
- Steucl, Annette. *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b})*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- . "Eschatological Interpretation in 4Q177." *RevQ* 14 (1990): 473-481.
- . "4QMidrEschat: A Midrash on Eschatology 4Q174 + 4Q177." Pages 531-541 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March 1991*. Edited by Julio C. Trebolle Barrera and L.V. Montaner. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . "אחרית הימים" in the Texts From Qumran." *RevQ* 16 (1993-94): 225-246.
- Stonehouse, George Gordon Vigor, *Nahum* in Vol. 21. of *The Books of the Prophets Zephaniah, Nahum, and Habakkuk*, Westminster Commentaries. Edited by George Stonehouse and George W. Wade. London: Methuen & Co., 1929.

- Strack, Hermann Leberecht and Günther Stemberger. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*. Translated to English by M. Bockmuehl. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
- Strugnell, John. "Notes en Marge du Volume V des "Discoveries in the Judean Desert." *RevQ* 7 (1970): 163–276. esp., "Notes sur le N° 169 des 'Discoveries,'" 204–210.
- , and Daniel J. Harrington, *DJD XXXIV. Sapiential Texts*, Part 2. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.
- Sutcliffe, Edmund Felix. "Hatred at Qumran." *RevQ* 2 (1959–60): 345–355.
- . *The Monks of Qumran as Depicted in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1960.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. "Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Hebrew Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts." Pages 95–132 in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Edited by Frank M. Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1975. Repr., from *Textus* 4 (1964): 95–132.
- Tantlevskij, Igor R. "The Reflection of the Political Situation in Judea in 88 B.C.E. in the Qumran Commentary of Nahum (4QpNah, Columns 1–4)." *St. Petersburg Journal of Oriental Studies* 6 (1994): 221–31.
- Thiering, Barbara Elizabeth. *Redating the Teacher of Righteousness*. Australian and New Zealand Studies in Theology and Religion. Sydney: Theological Explorations, 1979.
- Thomas, David Winton. "A Further Note on the Root מִכָּר in Hebrew." *JThS* N.S. 3 (1952) J: 214.
- . "The Root מִכָּר in Hebrew." *JThS* 37 (1936): 388–89.
- Toit Laubscher, F. "'Aharit Hayyamim in die Qumrângeskrifte." *JStJ* 5 (1974): 80–82. Summary of Ph.D. diss., University of Stellenbosch, 1972.
- Toorn, Karel van der, Bob Becking and Pieter W. van der Horst, eds. *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Tov, Emanuel. "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism." *JJS* 39 (1988): 5–37.
- . "The Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls Found at Qumran and the Origin of These Scrolls." *Textus* 13 (1986): 31–57.
- . *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. Jerusalem: Simor, 1997.
- . *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- , and Robert A. Kraft. *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)*, *DJD* VIII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1989.
- . ed., with Stephen J. Pfann. *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche. A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judean Desert and the Companion Volume*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993.
- Trevor, John C. "A Paleographic Study of the Jerusalem Scrolls." *BASOR* 113 (1949): 6–23.
- Urbach, Efraim Elimelech. "The Sanhedrin of Twenty-three and Capital Punishment." Pages 37–48 (English Summary, 248–49) in *Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies. Vol. 2*. Jerusalem, 1972.
- . "Yigael Yadin's Contribution to Judaic Studies." *Eretz Israel* 20, *Yigael Yadin Memorial Volume* (1989): xviii–xxiv.
- VanderKam, James C. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*. Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans, 1994.
- . "Those Who Look for Smooth Things, Pharisees, and Oral Law," Pages 465–477 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields. Brill: Leiden, 2003.
- Vermes, Geza. "Bible Interpretation at Qumran." *EI* 20 (1989): 184*–91*.
- . "'Car le Liban c'est le Conseil de la Communauté.' Notes sur Peshet d'Habacuc 12, 3–4." Pages 316–25 in *Mélanges Bibliques rédigés en l'honneur de André Robert*. Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1957.

- . *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English (CDSSE)*. New York: Allen Lane, Penguin, 1997. Earlier Editions of *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* were published in 1962, 1965, 1968, 1975, 1987, 1995.
- . "Interpretation, History of . . . at Qumran and in the Targums." Pages 438–43, esp. 438–39 in *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume*. Edited by Keith Crim. Nashville: Abingdon, 1976.
- . *Post-Biblical Jewish Studies*. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- . *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 1961.
- . "The So-called King Jonathan Fragment (4Q488)." *JJS* 44 (1993): 294–300.
- . "Symbolical Interpretation of *Lebanon* in the Targums: The Origin and Development of an Exegetical Tradition." *JTS* 9 (April 1958): 1–12.
- Vogt, Ernst. "Prima nomina historica in Qumrân (4QpNah)." *Biblica* 37 (1956): 530–32.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion. "A Qumran Attack on the Oral Exegesis? The Phrase *šr btlmwd šqm* in 4 Q Peshet Nahum." *RevQ* 5 (1966): 575–78.
- Wallenstein, Meir. "Some Lexical Material in the Judean Scrolls." *VT* 4 (1954): 211–14.
- Waltke, Bruce K. and Michael Patrick O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. "The Charge of Hypocrisy in Matthew 23 and in Jewish Sources." *Immanuel* 24/25 (1990): 52–58.
- Weise, Manfred. *Kultzeiten und kultischer Bundesschluss in der "ordensregel" vom Toten Meer*. Leiden: Brill, 1961.
- Weiss, Raphael. "A Comparison between the Masoretic and the Qumran Texts of Nahum III, 1–11." *Revue de Qumran* 4 (1963–64): 433–39.
- . "הערה לרפ"ם נוספים בפ"ש נחום." *בית מקרא* 7:2 (1962): 57–63.
- . "עוד לפ"ש נחום." *בית מקרא* 7:3 (1963): 61–62.
- . "כאורה (פ"ש נחום ב,ו)." *בית מקרא* 8:1 (1963): 156.
- White, Richard T. "The House of Peleg in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 67–98 in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History*. Edited by Philip R. Davies and Richard T. White. Sheffield: JSOT, 1990.
- Wieder, Naphtali. "The Dead Sea Scrolls Type of Biblical Exegesis among the Karaites." Pages 75–106 in *Between East and West: Essays Dedicated to the Memory of Bela Horowitz*. Edited by Alexander Altmann. London: East and West Library, 1958.
- . *The Judean Scrolls and Karaism*. London: East and West Library, 1962.
- . "Notes on the New Documents from the Fourth Cave of Qumran." *JJS* 7 (1956): 71–72.
- . "The Term קָן in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in Hebrew Liturgical Poetry." *JJS* 5 (1954): 22–31.
- Wilcox, Max. "'Upon the Tree.' Deut. 21:22–23 in the New Testament." *JBL* 96 (1977): 85–99.
- Winter, Paul. *On the Trial of Jesus*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1961.
- Wise, Michael Owen and Martin Abegg Jr. and Edward Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls, A New Translation*. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1996.
- . *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll From Qumran Cave 11*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990.
- . *Thunder in Gemini* JSPSup 15; Sheffield: JSOT, 1994, 208–211.
- Worrel, John E. "עצה: 'Counsel' or 'Council' at Qumran?" *VT* 20 (1970): 65–74.
- Woude, Adam S. van der. *Bijbelcommentaren en Bijbelse verhalen*. Die Handschriften van de Dode Zee in Nederlandse Vertaling; Amsterdam: Proost en Brandt, 1958 [non-vid].
- . "Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Commentary." *JJS* 33 (1982): 349–59.

- Yadin, Yigael. *The Message of the Scrolls*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1957.
- . “Peshet Nahum Re-considered.” *Israel Exploration Journal* 21 (1971) [= Pescher Nahum (4QpNahum) erneut untersucht,” Pages 167–84 in *Qumran*. Edited by Karl Erich Grözinger et al. Translated by E. Grözinger. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1981.
- . *The Temple Scroll*. 3 Vols. and Suppl. Transl. of המקדש, 1977. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 1983.
- . *War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness*. Translated from Hebrew by Batya and Chaim Rabin. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- . המנילות הנגזרות ממדבר יהודה. Tel Aviv: Schocken, 1957.
- . “חדשות מעולמן של המנילות.” Pages 40–54, esp. 42–46 in עיונים במנילות מדבר יהודה. Edited by Jacob Liver. Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1957.
- Yalon, Hanoah. מנילות מדבר יהודה: דברי לשון. Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1967. Ch. 6, “Peshet Habakkuk.” reprinted from *קריה ספר* 27 (1951): 172–75.
- Yardeni, Ada. *The Book of Hebrew Script: History, Paleography, Script styles, Calligraphy and Design*. Jerusalem: Carta, 1997.
- Young, Ian. “Observations on the Third Person Masculine Singular Pronominal Suffix—*H* in Hebrew Biblical Texts.” *Hebrew Studies* 42 (2001): 225–42.
- . “The Stabilization of the Biblical Text in the Light of Qumran and Masada: A Challenge For Conventional Qumran Chronology?” *DSD* 9:3 (2002): 364–390.
- J. Zangenberg, *Samareia. Antike Quellen zur Geschichte und Kultur der Samaritaner in deutscher Übersetzung*. Tübingen: Francke-Verlag, 1994.
- Zeitlin, Solomon. “The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Travesty on Scholarship.” *JQR* 47 (1956–7): 1–37.
- . “The Expression BeTalmud in the Scrolls Militates Against the Views of the Protagonists of Their Antiquity.” *JQR* 54 (1963): 89–97; and (1964): 340.
- . “The Word BeTalmud and the Method of Congruity of Words.” *JQR* 58 (1967–68): 78–80.
- Zertal, Adam. “The Pahwah of Samaria (Northern Israel) during the Persian Period. Types of Settlement, Economy, History and New Discoveries.” *Transeuphratène* 3 (1990): 1–30.
- Zias, Joseph. and James H. Charlesworth. “Crucifixion: Archaeology, Jesus, and the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 273–89 in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Ziegler, Joseph. *Duodecim prophetae. Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1943.

This page intentionally left blank

INDEX OF SCRIPTURAL CITATIONS AND ANCIENT SOURCES

BIBLE

Genesis		24:14	209
1:16	219n80	24:24	102, 217
1:18	219n80	25:4	172n24
6:7	40n10		
7:4	40n10	Deuteronomy	
10:6	281	2:14–15	241n19
10:25	274	4:30	209, 211, 212n55
10–11	281		274
11:3	281	5:10	41n10
11:7	275	6:15	274
11:8	275	7:9	274
27:40	237n7	11:16	200n22
29:31	259n88	17:4	54n66, 191
29:33	259n88	21:22	54n66, 156, 170n19, 172, 191
34:7	54n66		24, 54, 155, 171, 173, 175n33, 176, 178, 179, 180, 187, 188, 191
37:35	265n109	21:22–23	176n33, 177, 182, 183, 184n54, 190, 198n13
37–45	115		259n88
40:17	169		259n88
40:19	170n20	22:13	259n88
40:22	170n20	22:16	259n88
48:13–20	110, 111n74	24:3	259n88
49:1	209	25:10	211n53
		28:21	41n10
Exodus		28:22	242n24
20:6	274	28:26	139n32
22:4	183n52	30:1–3	212n55
22:15	200n21	31	213n56
23:7	235n2	31:29	209
23:24	259n86	32:15	259n88
24:10	74n3	32:15–43	211
32:12	41n10	32:21	113
Leviticus		32:26–42	211n54
7:24	191	32:28	260n92, 264n105
17:15	191		260n93
22:8	191	38:29	
26:6	139n32		
Numbers			
6:23	247n45		
6:25	246n41		
14:32–34	240n15, 243n30		
15:30	114n86		

Joshua		Isaiah	
5:4	129n128	2:2	209
5:6	129n128	2:11,17	42n18, 83n38
8:29	171n20	3:12	246n41
10:26	170n20	5:24	186n61
		5:29	132n6
Judges		6:12	261n98
14:16	259n88	7:17	111
15:2	259n88	7:18–23	207n47
16:25	153n71	8:7	78n15
		9:15	246n41
I Samuel		9:18–20	110
4:21	207n44	9:20	111n76,
4:22	207n44		269n5
8:8	259n86	10	81
9:9	175	10:20–27	207n47
14:11	52n56	10:33–34	81
20:8	157n85	11:3	111
23:10	90n7, 139n33	11:3–4	77n11
23:10–15	48n44	11:8	52n56
31:7	261n97	11:10	207n47
31:10	170n20	11:11	207n47
		13:16	69, 282n54
II Samuel		13:16–18	281n50
3:30	145n48	13:17	281n50
4:12	170n20	14:1	250n54
7:14	77n11	17:2	139n32
13:12	54n66	17:13	74n1
14:32	157n85	20:2–4	254n69
17:23	166	21:23–24	277n35
18:10	168n12	23:2–3	277n35
19:20	157n85	23:4–24	277n35
21:6	169n16	24:4	81n29, 82n31
21:9	169n16	26:1	279n42
21:13	169n16	27:12	207n47
21:10	169	27:18	207n47
21:12	170n20	28:3	122n108
22	74n3	28:11	204, 246n41
		28:14	197n11
I Kings		28:16–17	197n7
2:271	156n80	29:6	74n1
6:21	284n58	30:10	94
8:19	263n103	30:27	250n59
9:7	41n10	33:9	81n29
13:34	41n10	40:5	207, 208n48,
21:20	249n48		261n96
21:25	249n48	40:19	284n58
22:21–22	200n22	41:16	74n1
		41:26	174n28
II Kings		42:22	52n56
9:22	246	45:14	283n58
17:17	249n48	50:11	283n58,
21:2–17	277n35		288n3

51:17–23	284n59	Ezekiel	
51:18–19	263n101	1:4	74n2
52:7	207n46	6:8	241n21
54:6	261n97	12:24	94n20
55:7	261n97	13	246n41
60:13	80n25	13:8	254n70
60:15	259n88,	13:11, 13	74n1
	261n97	14:19	200n22
62:4	261n97	16:36–38	254n69
66:1	74n3	17:3,12	80n25
66:15	74n1	17:14	283n56
		19:2–6	104n52
		20:8	261n97
Jeremiah		21:32	283n56
1:16	259n86	22	197
2:15	132n6	22:2	35n1, 198n12
2:19	77n11	23:10	254n69
2:26	249n53	23:29	254n69,
4:9	207n47,		261n97
	249n53	24:6	35n1
4:29	261n97	24:6–14	198n12
7:33	139n32	24:9	35n1
13:22	254n69	27:20	55n71
13:26–27	254n69	29:14–15	283n56
18:16–17	259n89	32:2	132n6
23:13	246n41	34:18	139n32
23:19	74n1	34:28	139n32
23:20	209, 260n93	38:8	209
23:30–32	254n70	38:10	207n47
23:32	246n41	38:13	132n6
25:5–29	284n59	38:16	209
25:27	284n59	38:18	207n47
25:32	74n1	39:11	207n47
25:38	104n51	39:26	139n32
26:18	114n89	44:31	191
26:21	90n7		
28:8	63	Hosea	
30:8	207n47	2:5	254n69
30:10	139n32	2:12	254n69, 259n88
30:24	209	3:5	209
31:15	265n109	4:12	245n38
32:32	249n53	5:3	111
39:7	134n13	5:5	111
44:8	259n86	5:11–14	111
46:25	67	5:13	104, 106
46:27	139n32	5:13–14	105
48:47	209	5:14	104n51, 106
49:14	162n101	6:4	111n76
49:16–17	259n89	6:9–10	111n76
49:39	209	7:16	62, 252n64
50:4–5	262n100	10:5	207n44
50:6	246n41	10:14	282n54
51:38	132n6	14:1	284n58
51:58	146n49		

Joel			187n65, 188,
4:3	283n56		191, 254, 292
4:18	207n47	3:1	59n88, 60,
			166n3, 235,
			244, 295
Amos			237
1:14	74n1	3:1-3	29t1-1, 35,
2:4	201n26	3:1-3	235, 265
3:2	250n54	3:1-7	193
9:8	41n10	3:1-9	60
		3:2	166n3
Obadiah		3:2-3	295
1:1	162n101	3:3	60, 198, 244
		3:4	36
		3:4-5	62, 157n84,
Micah		3:5	159n91,
1:5	205n37		166n3, 189,
1:5-6	114, 115		254, 258n85,
3:5	246n41		292, 295
3:12	114		64n102
4:1	209		29t1-1, 64,
4:4	139n32	3:5-6	166n3
5:6	141n37	3:6	256
5:7	140	3:6-7	37
5:7-8	140	3:6-9	263n101, 262,
5:9	141n37	3:7	270, 295
7:10	122n108		66, 277, 278,
			295
Nahum		3:8	22, 276
1:1-3	39		268
1:2-6	39n1	3:8-10	267
1:3	39, 74	3:8-11	67, 68, 280,
1:3-6	29t1-1, 39,	3:8-12	281
	73	3:9	69, 123n112,
1:4	41, 75, 77,		281, 295
	79, 166n3,	3:10	38
	294		70, 283, 284
1:5	84n43, 166n3	3:10-12	70, 131n1,
1:5-6	44, 84	3:11	136n21, 284
1:6	104n51	3:12	70, 71
2:11	22		123n108
2:12	46, 46, 48,	3:13	
	133, 134,	3:14	
	143, 151		
2:12-13	19n63, 294		
2:12-14	29t1-1, 34,	Habakkuk	13
	46, 87, 131	1:5	45n29
		1:14	281n50
2:13	50n49, 55,	1:17	150n65
	143n40, 145,	2:3b	243n31
	146, 151,	2:8	114, 197n9,
	155, 184, 188	2:12	236n2
2:14	47n35, 57,		146n49
	59n88,	2:13	31, 284n59
	141n37, 158,	2:15	44n24, 80,
	160n93, 162,	2:17	197n11
	165, 176,		74n3
	185, 186n62,	3:5	

9:12	44n29	106:35	259n86
10:15	44n29	106:36	259n86
Zephaniah		116:6	200
1:3	41n10	119:2	247n45
2:4	261n97	119:84	40n9
3:13	139n32	119:130	200
		132:7	74n3
		136:24	237n7
Zechariah		149:8	283n58
6:7	90n7	149:9	40n9
9:14	74n1		
12:3	207n47	Proverbs	
12:9	90n7, 207n47	1:32	200
14:4	74n3	2:16	94n20
14:17	250n54	7:5	94n20
		7:21	94n20
Malachi		8:5	200
2:3	256n78	9:6	261n97
2:11	54n66, 191	10:17	261n97
3:5	246	14:15	200
3:18	274	14:18	200
		17:13	35n3
Psalms		19:12	104
2	222n91	20:2	105
5:10	94n20	22:3	200
7:3	237n7	26:18	283n58
9:5-6	77n11	26:28	94n20
12:3-4	94n20	27:12	200
17	222n91	28:23	94n20
18	74n3	30:32	259n88
19:8	200		
22:28	250n54	Job	
26:8	132n4	4:11	264n106
33	82	18:13	145
33:8	44n28, 82	31:9	200n21
34:11	133n9	36:8	283n58
36:3	94n20		
37:6	258n85	Ruth	
39:12	77n11	1:17	167
55:22	94n20	2:24	167n9
64:2	242n23	4:7	175
67:2	247n45		
68:6	132n4	Lamentations	
68:31	76	2:1	74n3
76:3	132n4	2:8	279n42
77:3	265n109	4:21	284n59
79:1	114	5:8	237n7
83:16	74n1		
84:11	132n5	Ecclesiastes	
92:10	264n106	9:11	247n45
96:7	250n54	10:12	247n45
98	82, 84n44		
98:9	82	Esther	
99:5	74n3	3:1	49n46
104	85n46	2:23	171n20

5:14	171n20	11:34	249n5,
7:10	171n20		262n100,
9:7–10	171n20		280n47
9:13	171n20	11:35	260n93
9:25	171n20	12:11	256n77
Daniel		Ezra	
2:28	209	2:63	119n101
2:38	132n5		
3:31	132n5	Nehemiah	
4:9	132n5	3:26	63n97
4:18	132n5	3:29	63n97
4:32	132n5	7:65	119n101
6:26	132n5	12:37	63n97
8:7	139n35		
8:21	89n2	I Chronicles	
9:27	256n77	5:41	206n41
10:14	209	25:8	204n33
10:20	89n2	27:23	263n103
11	94n20	28:2	74n3
11:2	89n2		
11:30	102	II Chronicles	
11:31	256n77,	18:19–21	200n22
	280n47	31:10	134n13
11:31–35	260n92	34:25	259n86
11:32–35	94n20, 238	36:15	132n4
11:33	241n20	36:21	156n80

APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

Jubilees		Pss Sol	222n9
8:8	274		
I Maccabees		Sirach	
1:1	102	40:9	242n24
8:5	102	43:13	283n58
8:12–15	103	Tobit	
25:4	169n16	3:8	166n6
		3:10	166
II Maccabees			
7	89n3		
9–10	89n3		
11:21–14:48	89n4		

SCROLLS FROM THE JUDEAN DESERT

Damascus Document	CD	I–VI	211
	26, 95n24,	I,2	76n10
	95n25, 117,	I,3	261n97
	208, 243n29,	I,8	260n92
	243n30, 272,	I,12	97, 212n55
	304	I,13–21	272n20

I,14-18	97	XXII,13	78n15
I,15	246n41, 249n51	XIII,7	83n39
I,18	94, 95, 97	XIII,23	111, 119n101
II,2-3	258n85	XIV,7	83n39
II,14-III,10	216	XIV,10	250n54
II,16	245	XIV,12	83n39
II,16-20	243n33	XV,8	83n39
II,17	174n28, 243n32	XV,11	
II,18-III,2	83n38	XV,15-17	200n23
II,19	174n28	XIX,15	206n40
III,9	264n105	XX	272
III,9-10	250n55	XX,1	119n101
III,11	261n97	XX,10	75n4
III,13-14	78n15, 259n87	XX,13	250n54
IV,1	272n20	XX,13-15	95n24, 241n19
IV,3	65n107, 205n38, 250n54	XX,14-15	249n51, 272n20
IV,11	206	XX,14-16	75n4
IV,14-V,11	245	XX,20-22	274
IV,15	198n12	XX,20-34	274
IV,17-18	161n96, 245	XX,21-25	273
V,3	174n27	XX,22	271, 272
V,5	119n101	XX,23	272
V,11	246	XX,22-24	271n17, 274
V,12	114n86	XX,25-26	75n4
V,13	283n58	XX,26-27	206n40
V,15	174n28		
V,17	174n28, 260n92, 264n105	1QS	Rule of the Community 78n15, 117, 243n29, 274n25, 304n39
V,19	174n28	I,4	257n79
V,20	246n41	I,10	257n79
VI,1	236n2	I,18	78n15, 219n81
VI,5	205n38	I,23	78n15, 219n81
VI,6	185n58	I,25	174n28
VI,7	93n16	II,1-18	213n56
VI,10	83n38	II,3	247
VI,12	174n28	II,5	243n29
VI,21	250n54	II,23	283n56
VII,10-14	206n40	III,17	78n15
VII,11	273n22	III,20	78n15
VII,12	111	III,23	243n29
VII,13	111, 249n51	III,24	243n32
VII,14-16	31	IV,9	83n38, 235n2, 283n56
VII,18	93n16	IV,11	114n86, 246
VIII,3	206n40	IV,15-17	274n25
VIII,12	260n92	IV,20	76n10, 78n15
VIII,16	273n22	IV,21	235n2
X,14	129n128	V,6	65n107, 250n54
XI,21	256n77	V,6-11	197
		V,11	94n18

V,13	76n10	II,3-6	184n56
V,15	235n2	II,5-6	212n55
V,20-21	93n16	II,7	212n55
VI,1-25	83n39	II,7-10	13
VI,7-8	93n16	II,8	3n39
VI,24	93n16	II,11-12	289n7
VII,10-25	83n39	III,2	184n56
VIII,12	93n16	III,4-5	150n63
VIII,13	207n46	III,5	53n59, 203
VIII,16	247n45	III,6	150n63
VIII,22	161n96	III,6-7	150n65
IX,5-6	197	III,10	53n59
IX,7	78n15	III,11	75
IX,19-20	207n46	III,12-13	150n63, 184n56
X,1	78n15	IV,2	250n53
X,19	161n96	IV,6	290n28
X,21-23	246	V,6	184n56
X,22	235n2, 249n51	VI,2	83n39
XI,8	197	VI,10-12	281n50
XI,21	132n5	VI,14	289n15
1QS ^a	Rule of the Congregation 208	IV,5	77n15
I,2-3	273n22	IV,6	102
I,9	250n54	IV,8	49n95
I,15	250n54	IV,10	77n15
I,19-22	200n23	IV,11	243n29, 243n34
I,21	250n54	IV,[12]	77n15
1QS ^b (1Q28 ^b)	Rule of the Blessings 213n56, 247n45	V,4	77n11, 83n37
V,27	122n108	V,10	147n57
V,28	78n15	VI,4	102n42
1QpHab	Pesher Habakkuk 9n26, 12, 13, 14n46, 17n60, 26, 28n85, 45n29, 63, 76, 78n15, 85n48, 95n24, 109n66, 117n98, 124n116, 127n123, 150, 161n96, 184n56, 197, 210n52, 215n66, 223n92, 288n6, 300	VI,6-7	150n63
I,6	203	VI,10	83n39
II,1-10	11n34, 81n31	VII,1	205
		VII,1-8	11n34, 13, 17n59
		VII,3-5	182n49
		VII,7	212n55
		VII,8	184n56
		VII, 8-14	150n65
		VII,12	184n56, 212n55
		VIII,1-3	110n71
		VIII,3	161n96
		VIII,8	108
		VIII,9	78n15
		VIII,10	83n38, 261n97
		VIII,11	128
		VIII,11-12	161n96
		VIII,12	128n125
		VIII,13	256n77
		VIII,16	51n49
		IX	128, 129
		IX,1	76n10
		IX,2	243n31
		IX,4	288n4
		IX,4-6	57
		IX,5-6	127, 128n126,

	160n95, 161n96,	X,24	76n10
	211n53	X,31-37	97
IX,7	184n56	X,32	95, 97
IX,9-12	228n112	X,36	261n97
X,3-5	76n10	XI,24-27	257n79
X,6	197n9	XII,7	97
X,6-10	157	XII,7-14	95
X,7	289n15	XII,7-20	97
X,9	246n41	XII,10	97
X,9-13	114, 236n2,	XII,14-16	97
	237n8	XII,16	203, 246
X,13	228n112	XII,20	76n10
X,14	289n15	XIII,7	133n9
X,16-17	75n4	XIII,9	133n9
XI,2	31	XIII,13	133n9
XI, 4	50n49	XIII,13-14	246
XI,4-6	228n112	XIII,19	133n9
XI,5-7	31	XIII,27	246
XI,6	221n87	XIV,5	98
XI,8	243n32	XIV,6	261n97
XI,8-15	284n59	XIV,15	82n34
XI,10	276n34, 289n15	XIV,25	197
XI,13	184n56	XIV,26	197n8
XI,17-XII,1	43n24	XV,21	69
XII,2-10	228n112	XV,22	129n128
XII,3-4	80	XV,34	98
XII,4	200, 205,	XVI,7	82n34
	261n96	XVI,35	283n58
XII,7	43n24, 197n11,	XVI,37	283n58
	288n4	XIV,32	243n33
XII,8	256n77	XVII,22	129n128
XII,9	205	IIXX,8	78n15
XII,10	161n96	XX,23	78n15
XIII,3	76n10, 184n56	XX,25-26	132n5
		XXV,7	83n38
1QH	Hymns		
	95n25, 243n29,	1QM	War Scroll
	261n97, 288n6		76n9, 85n48,
			205n38, 243n29,
			249n52
IV,22	75n4	I,3	288n4
VI,25	247n45	I,6	89n2
VI,26	197n8	I,8-14	75n4
VII,22	76n10	III,11	288n4
IX,11	78n15	VI,3	76n10, 283n58,
IX,12	283n58		288n3
IX,33	76n10	VI,17	243n29
X,9	200	XI,13	283n56, 288n4
X,10-15	97	XII,13	20n38
X,14	246n41	XIII,15	283n56
X,14-16	95	XIV	76
X,15	97	XIV,3	243n29
X,17	204n34	XIV,5	76n9
X,18-19	204n32	XIV,10	76n9
X,19	246		
X,20	249n51		

XIV,15	283n56	4QpIsa ^c (4Q163)	Peshar Isaiah ^c 197, 288n6
XVII,15	283n56		
XVIII,1	75n4		
XVIII,2	89n	4-6 I,20	111n76, 269n5
XVIII,9-10	75n4	6 II,6	248n47
XIX,5	205n38	6-7 II,2	83n38
1QIsa ^a	204, 263n101, 289n8	14, 5	104n50
		21 2,3	79n20, 81n28
		23 II,8	83n38
		23 II,10	96, 122n108, 141n36
XI,23	69		197n11
1QpMic (1Q14)	Peshar Micah 114, 115, 205n37	23 II,10-11	
		4QpIsa ^d (4Q164)	Peshar Isaiah ^d 17n60
17-18,5	212n55	1,3	45n27
1QpZeph (1Q15)	Peshar Zephaniah 205n38	4QpHos ^a (4Q166)	Peshar Hosea ^a 17n60
1,6		I,10	212n55
1QpPs (1Q16)	Peshar Psalms 85n48	II,5	246n41
2-4,9	76	4QpHos ^b (4Q167)	Peshar Hosea ^b 51n51, 106, 107, 116, 210n52
1Q27	1QMysteries 258n85		
1Q55		2,1-4	51n51, 104,105, 106, 107, 111
3	238n10	5-6, 3	111n76
4QXII ^g (4Q82)	Minor Prophets ^g 22	7,2	261n97
		10, 1	111n76
		17,1	280
4QpIsa ^{a-c,c} (4Q161, 162, 163, 165)	17n60	4QpNah (4Q169)	Peshar Nahum 4, 7, 20, 29t1-1, 33, 73, 74, 304
4QpIsa ^a (4Q161)	Peshar Isaiah ^a 19n63, 80, 81, 85n48	1-2,1	297, 299
		1-2,3	44n25, 287, 288n5, 293, 295, 297, 299
2 II,25	288n4	1-2,4	288, 293, 297, 299
2 II,29	288n4		
2-6 II,27	215n66	1-2,5	287, 297, 299
7-10 III,[2]	83n38	1-2,5a	49n94
7-10 III,[9]	83n38	1-2,5-9	258n83
7-10 III,20	78n15	1-2,6	185n56, 289n14
7-10 III,1-8	101n38	1-2,7	288, 289n14, 295
4QpIsa ^b (4Q162)	Peshar Isaiah ^b 186	1-2,8	250n55
2:7		1-2,9	166n3, 288, 293, 294, 297

1-2,9-10	288		289, 290n17,
1-2,10	292, 294		290n18, 298
1-2,12	299	3-4 II,10-11	292
1-2 II	39n1	3-4 II,10-III,1	159n91, 254
3-4	7, 8, 97, 98, 134	3-4 II,11	68n116, 283, 290n17, 294, 300
3-4 I	3, 6n15, 7n20, 9n27, 20, 34, 46, 88, 120n103, 214, 217, 226, 301	3-4 II,12	161, 184n56, 289n13
3-4 I,1	124n116, 289, 291, 297	3-4 II-IV	1n2, 217
3-4 I,1-3	134	3-4 III	37, 63, 85
3-4 I,2	19n63, 91n9, 96, 98, 157n83, 288, 293, 299	3-4 III,1	47n36, 166n3, 287, 289, 290n17, 294, 298
3-4 I,3	77n11, 96, 98, 279, 288, 291	3-4 III,1-5	256
3-4 I,4	287, 290, 292, 293, 295, 297, 299	3-4 III,2	41n11, 41n12, 287, 290n16, 290n17, 292, 294, 300
3-4 I,4-6	145	3-4 III,3	91n9, 96, 98, 166n3, 206, 212n55, 236n5, 288, 290n16
3-4 I,5	19n63, 104, 105, 124n116, 288, 295, 299	3-4 III,3-5	98
3-4 I,6	60, 104, 279n45, 287, 290, 292, 297, 299	3-4 III,4	98, 288
3-4 I,7	91n9, 288	3-4 III,5	47n36, 98, 109, 111n75, 115n91, 117, 12n116, 199, 292, 298
3-4 I,6-8	155, 237n8	3-4 III,5-8	116, 262, 263
3-4 I,8	4n12, 43n22, 183n53, 289n13, 290n17, 291, 292, 298	3-4 III,6	96, 98, 124n116, 287, 288, 290n17, 290n18, 294, 300
3-4 I,8-9	254	3-4 III,6-7	96
3-4 I,9	290n17, 292, 295	3-4 III,6-8	228n113
3-4 I,9-12	6n15	3-4 III,7	4n12, 41n14, 98, 124, 250n55, 291
3-4 I,10	44n25, 288, 289n14, 290n17, 292, 299	3-4 III,8	6n15, 288, 289n12, 292n23, 294, 298, 300
3-4 I,11	4n15, 104, 157n84, 288, 289n14	3-4 III,8-9	277, 278
3-4 I,12	68, 111n75, 117, 196	3-4 III,8-IV,8	20, 29t1-1
3-4 I,10-II,1	44n25, 296	3-4 III,8-IV,9	267
3-4 I-II,1	29t1-1, 87	3-4 III,9	7n19, 44n24, 44n25, 76n5, 123n112, 161, 288n3, 296
3-4 I-IV	8	3-4 III,10	7n19, 288, 292, 293, 298, 300
3-4 II,9-12	158	3-4 III,10-11	295, 296
3-4 II,10	41n12, 58n82, 189, 206, 288,	3-4 III,11	7n19, 294, 298, 300
		3-4 III,11-IV,1	236n3

3-4 III,12	6n15, 58, 68, 292, 293, 295n29, 298, 300	4QTanh (4Q176) 1-2, I,7 8,3	4QTanhumim 207n46 288n4
3-4 III-IV	8		
3-4 IV	7n19, 7n20, 38, 69, 85	4QCat ^a (4Q177)	4QCatena ^a 96n27, 97, 208
3-4 IV,1	280, 281n49, 287, 289, 293, 296, 298	14,3	22
3-4 IV,1-4	281	4QapLam ^a (4Q179)	4QApocLam ^a 261n97 132n5
3-4 IV,2	40n11, 67n114, 123n112, 287, 288, 290n16, 292, 294	II,6 II,9	
3-4 IV,2-4	62	4Q184	4QSeductress or 4QWiles of the Wicked Woman 96, 246n38
3-3 IV,3	288n3, 294, 300		
3-4 IV,4	271, 298		
3-4 IV,4-6	283		
3-4 IV,5	115n91, 293, 300	I,17	95
3-4 IV,6	298		
3-4 IV,6-8	284	4Q185	
3-4 IV,7	70n123, 293, 300		96
3-4 IV,8	298	1-2 II,14	95
3-4 IV,8-9	20		
3-4 IV,9	284, 300	4QTobit ^a (196)	
frag 5	7, 38, 122n108, 283		166n6
4QpPs ^a (4Q171)	4QPesher Psalms ^a 17n60, 76, 111, 117, 288n6	2, 1	35n10
1-10 I,6	258n85	4QTobit ^c (4Q200)	166
1-10 I,26	248n47		
1-10 I,26-27	252n64	4Q245	4QPseudo- Daniel ^c ar 24, 24n77
1-10 II,5	45n27	4Q246	Aramaic Apocalypse 100n32
1-10 II,14-16	205		
1-10 II, 17	111		
1-10 II,18	90n7, 139n33		
1-10 II,18-20	269n5	4Q248	4QHistorical Text 24n76
1-10 II,20	131n3		
1-10 III,5	45n27, 275n30		
1-10, IV, 7	35n10		
1-10 IV,10	83n38	4Q252	Genesis Commentary 89n2, 210n53, 263n103
1-10 IV,14	90n7, 139n33		
26	246n41		
4QFlor (4Q174)	4QFlorilegium 32n102, 208	4Q266	4QD ^a 52n57
I,4	205, 250n54		
I,11	93n16	4Q267	4QD ^b 220n20
II,7	205		

4QMyst ^a (4Q300) 3,5-6	Mysteries ^a 258n85	4Q501	Apocryphal Lam B 114n86, 247n44
4Q331-333	4QHistorical Texts C-E 24	4Q511	76n10
4Q339	4List of False Prophets ar 236n2	23 I,7	40n6
4Q371-72	Narrative and Poetic Composition 10n45, 112-15, 117n96	4Q523	4QJonathan 24, 25n77, 107n62
4Q385	Pseudo-Ezekiel 22, 67n109	4Q525 14 II,15	4QBeautitudes 204
6 II,4	67	11QPs ^b (11Q6) XIX, 14	247n45
6 II,6	280n46	11QMelch (11Q13)	11QMelchizedek 75n4, 208
6 II,8	69	2:16-22 25	207n47 273n22
4QMMT ^{a-f} (4Q394-399)		11QShirShabb (11Q17)	11QSongs of Sabbath Sacrifice 40n6 40n6
B 70	114n86	2-1-9,7 5-6 I,1	
C 12-14	212		
C 21-23	214		
4Q405	4QShirShabb, Sabbath Songs 40n6	11QT ^a (11Q19)	Temple Scroll 54, 172, 173, 174n27, 179n43, 180n44, 181, 182n46, 185n57, 188, 191
23 I,7			
4QInstr ^d (4Q418)	4QInstruction ^d 75n4	LXIV LXIV,6-13	176n33, 181 92n14, 180, 183n53
69,15	40n6	LXIV,12 LXX	198n13 176n33
4QBer ^a (422)	4QBerakhot ^a 213n56	Mur88 (XII)	22, 6n15, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 132n5, 294, 295, 299
4Q448	4QApocryphal Psalm and Prayer 24, 25n77, 107, 108, 109	8HevXII	22
4Q468e	4QHistorical Text F 24, 25n77		
4Q471	107n62, 129n128		

NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew		John	
11:25–30	200n20	19:6	179n40
27:22–23	179n40	19:15	179n40
		19:31–34	179n40
Mark		Galatians	
15:11–14	183n52	3:13	177n36, 179n41
15:13–14	179n40		
Luke		Revelation	
10:21–22	200n20	7:4–8	111n78
21:24	140n36	17–18	245n36
23:21–23	179n40		

CLASSICAL SOURCES

Apuleius		§410–11	218n75
Metamorphoses		§411	220n83
6.32.1	169n17	§414	220n83
		§415	220n83
Herodotus		§415–23	220n83
History		§416–17	220n83
7:33	172n24	§423	232
		§422	220n83
Horace		§428	232
Epistles			
1.16.46–48	169n17	Ant 14	
		§5	230n121
Josephus		§16	230n121
		§17	230n119
Antiquities		§18	230n119
12 §390–13 §61	89n3	§19–20	232
		§22	230n120
Ant 13		§22–24	229n118
§120–268	89n4	§30–32	230n119
§288	91n10	§32	230n122
§288–97	253n65	§34–35	230n119
§296	91nn10	§34–37	229
§297	204n34	§37	230n119
§298	220n83	§40	232
§372–416	89n5	§40–41	229
§379	226n104	§45	269n6
§380	226n105, 226n106	§57	276
		§67–68	269
§383	215n65, 226n104	§69–70	223, 231n125
		§70	230n123
§394	129n128	§71	224n96
§399–404	217n73	§72	223n93
§408–410	217	§73	231n126, 275n30
§409	218n73, 220n84, 221n85, 221n89	§73–79	270n11
		§77	231n127
§410	227n107	§79	223, 276

§96	276	§171-74	276n33
§124	276	§208-09	233n132
§163-65	233n132		
§168-79	233n132	<i>Bj</i> 2	
Ant 15		§112-13	305n41
§370	233n132	§139	257n79
		§159	305
		§162	248
Ant 17		Martial	
§41	232	On the Spectacles	
Ant 18		7	169n18
§15	99n29, 248	Petronius	
§417	220n83	Satyricon	
<i>Bj</i> 1		58.2	169n17
§92	89n5	126.9	169n17
§95	226n104	Philo	
§96	227n109	Posterity of Cain	
§§96-98	224n96	35	247n45
§98	226n104	41	247n45
§110	220	Confusion of Tongues	
§110-12	218n73	123	
§112	217	Plautus	
§113	220n83, 226n106	Aularia 522	169n17
§113-14	218n75	Bacchides 584	169n17
§121	230n121	Casina 416	169n17
§125	230n121	Persa 795	169n17
§129	230n122	Terence	
§148-51	269	Eunuch 383	169n17
§150	230n123, 231n125	Valerius Maximus 6.9	169n.17
§152	223n93		
§157	270n11		

RABBINIC SOURCES

mOhalot		bBavaQamma	
18:9-10	132n5	38	83n38
		65b	282n54
mSan (Sanhedrin)		bBer (Berakhot)	
6:4	171n20, 179n42	26b	247n45
		29a	247n45
mTa'an (Ta'anit)		33:1	247n45
3:8	229n118	48a	225n100
mYeb (Yevamot)		bNidda	
16:3	172n24	8b	247n45
mYad (Yadayim)		bQid (Qiddushin)	
4:6-8	305n40	41b	282n54

66a	91n10, 104n36, 225n100	bYoma 88a	247n45
bPes (Pesahim) 3:1	247n45	yTa'an 66d-67a	229n118
bSan (Sanhedrin) 46b	171n20, 172n22	Genesis Rabbah 41:1	124n115
bSota 22b	92, 217n73	Numbers Rabbah 11:6	247n45
bTa'an (Ta'anit) 23a	229n118	Sifre Numbers 6:25	247n45

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- Absalom, 26, 124, 168, 224
Acco, 19, 215
Aemilius, Marcus 24,
Ahitofel, 166
Alexander Jannaeus, 25, 55, 88–90,
91, 104–109, 112, 118–30, 131,
134, 136–137, 140, 142, 143,
146–155, 156–158, 162, 163,
165–166, 173, 178, 180–183,
187–191, 195, 210, 215, 217–222,
224–228, 232, 238, 253, 270, 301,
306 See also, “Lion of Wrath”
Alcimus, 90, 105, 166
Alexandria, 268
Amon, 29, 37, 44, 67, 85, 267, 260,
269, 276–279, 281, 282
Antigonus, 276
Antiochus, 24, 49, 87–88, 89, 100,
118–120, 139, 140, 144, 174
Antiochus III, 100
Antiochus IV, 24, 88, 100, 105, 119,
120, 144, 174
Antiochus X, 49
Antipater, 127, 162, 230, 232, 233
Aristobulus II, 58, 111, 123, 127, 195,
219, 220, 223–224, 227–233, 235,
253, 266, 269–271, 274–277, 282,
283, 301
Assyria, 13, 15, 84, 106, 134–135,
142, 145–146, 153, 156, 220, 237,
245, 254, 256, 257, 265, 266, 268,
269, 282, 284, 306
Atomization, 12–13, 28, 133, 140,
141, 157
Autograph, 1, 215–216
Bacchides, 90
Base-text, 9, 11, 12–18, 28–29, 43,
84–87, 106–107, 131, 133, 141,
277, 280
Bashan, 42, 79, 81–84
Belial, 78, 124, 161, 198, 205, 212,
219, 243, 245, 246, 260, 283
Bethoma, 90, 123, 125, 166, 226
Blasphemer, 171, 179, 246
Burial, 171, 178–179
Carmel, 43, 79, 81–84,
Citation formulas, 10, 12, 17, 44, 46,
82, 156, 157, 161, 184–186, 236,
255, 279, 295–296
City, cities, 63, 97–98, 111, 113, 114,
121, 125, 138, 141, 161, 162,
196–198, 205, 214, 230, 235–238,
244, 250–252, 264, 273, 275, 277,
284–285
Correspondence (of lemma and pesher),
17, 18–19, 28–29, 52, 75–86,
131–163, 186, 220–234, 235–266,
306–307
Contemporization, 10, 11, 13–16, 29,
76, 111, 244, 264, 301
Crucifixion (see also, “hanging”),
53–55, 90, 91, 100, 105, 126,
151–154, 165–192, 218, 225–227
Damascus Document (or CD), 25, 26,
94, 116, 119, 174, 206, 211, 216,
223, 271–274
“Demetrius”, 18, 23, 24, 47–48,
87–91, 92, 99, 100, 105, 106, 108,
118–19, 122, 124, 134–144,
146–149, 155, 156, 214, 215,
224–227, 301
Demetrius I Soter, 89, 90
Demetrius II Nicator, 89, 90, 119
Demetrius III Eukairos, 48, 88–91, 92,
105, 106, 108, 118–119, 122, 141,
144, 181, 224–227
“Deuteronomistic” cycle, 211–213
Diogenes, 218, 224, 227, 232
Dorshei Ha-halakhot see Seekers-after-
Smooth-Things
Egypt, 102, 119, 232, 254, 267–269,
280, 281
Elect, the, 11, 45, 81, 83, 138, 211
End of Days, 10–11, 13, 15–16, 43,
74, 83, 96, 111, 113, 122, 138, 141,
194, 195–196, 208–217, 228, 236,
282
Ephraim, 29, 51, 58, 66, 69, 70, 85,
87–88, 96, 105–108, 109–18, 121,

- 114, 115–118, 121, 122, 123, 124, 129, 135, 138, 143, 195–199, 201, 214, 217, 220, 223, 231, 235, 236, 245–246, 249, 252, 258, 260, 261, 264, 268–271, 273, 274, 276, 277, 282, 284, 304, 305, 307
- Epithets (see sobriquets)
- Equivalents, 18, 28, 75, 76–77, 78
- Eschatology, see “End of Days”,
- Essenes 25, 183, 206, 216, 257, 271, 303–304
- ex eventu* prophecy, 105, 121, 228, 301
- Fulfillment, 11, 13–16, 94, 103, 104, 120, 187, 190, 192, 208, 210, 213, 215–217, 228, 231, 237, 274, 302
- Genitive construct, 104, 115, 147, 181, 196, 198–199,
- Gentile(s), 23, 76, 80, 83, 87, 102, 107, 111, 118, 124, 131–136, 140, 161–162, 194, 220–223, 225–227, 230, 231, 239, 241–242, 250–251, 256
- gezera shawa*, 280–281
- “God-fearers”, 250
- Grace, 247, 248
- Greece (Ἑλλάς), 49, 87–88, 89, 103, 120, 132, 135
- “Groningen Hypothesis”, 26–27,
- halakha*, 17, 95, 99, 114, 117, 157, 174, 182–183, 190, 191, 204, 236, 245, 259, 270, 282, 303–305
- Hanging (see also, “crucifixion”), 53–54, 88–91, 105, 126, 152, 155–158, 165–192, 226
- Harlot, harlotry, 61, 135, 194, 200, 241, 245–251, 254, 259
- Hatred, 257
- Hasmoneans, 24, 27, 91, 108–109, 118, 127–129, 131, 195, 229, 232, 233, 251, 253, 270, 271
- Herod, 127, 222, 232, 233
- History, (peshar as a source of), 23–27, 76, 77, 88, 100, 105, 106, 112, 118, 152–154, 157, 167, 173, 181, 195, 196, 222, 224, 227, 271, 276, 301–306
- Hypocrisy, 92, 94, 197
- Hyrchanus I, see John Hyrchanus
- Hyrchanus II, 24, 58, 91, 111, 127, 195, 198, 217, 218, 219, 222–224, 230–233, 235, 253, 266, 276–278, 301
- Israel, 54–55, 59, 65, 70, 78, 87–88, 98, 104, 110, 117, 123, 132, 139, 174–175, 189, 194, 195, 200, 206, 211, 232, 233, 246, 254, 258–261, 273, 276, 301
- Jannaeus, Alexander (see Alexander Jannaeus)
- Jerusalem, 49, 57–59, 88, 96, 114, 118–22, 126–127, 131–144, 162, 163, 183, 186, 196–198, 201, 205, 208, 210, 218, 219, 222–224, 226, 229–231, 233, 238, 244, 246, 253, 260, 266, 271–273, 279, 301, 307
- John Hyrchanus, 91, 232, 236, 253
- “Jonathan”, 24, 27, 87–88, 107–109, 128, 232, 253
- Josephus, 23, 125–127, 151, 170, 178, 235, 248, 253, 257, 269, 275, 302–305
- “Judah” (as an epithet for a Jewish group), 108, 107–108, 110, 111, 113, 116–117, 122, 141, 194, 196, 200, 201, 205–208, 258, 269, 273, 275
- Judah Maccabeus, 91
- King(s) 49, 77–78, 80, 132, 136, 147, 153, 195, 232, 245, 249, 252–254, 275, 276, 280, 281
- Kittim, 19, 27, 40, 49, 58, 75–79, 83, 85, 87–88, 100, 101–104, 119–121, 127–129, 139, 140, 150, 210, 217, 238, 243
- Leontopolis, 271
- Lebanon, 43–44, 60, 79–84, 184, 295
- Lies (and deceit, falsehood), 95, 113–114, 123, 197, 200–204, 235, 236, 247, 249
- Lies, Man of, 26, 27, 95, 114–115, 138, 197, 223, 236, 249, 272
- Lies, Spouter of, 123, 246, 248, 260
- Lion of Wrath, 2, 19, 23–24, 49–50, 55, 87–88, 104–109, 122–126, 133, 146–151, 156–157, 159, 163, 173–174, 187, 192, 226, 237
- Lions, 29, 49–50, 57, 87–88, 131–138, 140–144, 145–147, 151–152, 158, 160, 264, 283
- Mannaseh, 29, 44, 67, 69, 76, 85, 110–11, 123, 138, 159, 223, 227, 253, 267–272, 274–282, 284, 305, 307

- Messiah and messianism, 19, 136, 208
 Multivalence, 11, 15–17, 95, 121
- Nabateans, 230, 232
 Nicanor, 90
 Nineveh, 29, 74, 75, 84, 85, 121, 131,
 134–135, 142, 145, 158, 195, 198,
 222, 227, 228, 235–238, 241, 244,
 245, 259, 262, 264, 265, 268, 269,
 277, 307
 No-Amon, see Amon
- Onias (“Honio the Circledrawer”),
 229–230
 Onias IV, 271
- Paleography, 8
 Paronomasia (or “wordplay”), 29, 32,
 47, 77, 78, 95, 152, 156–157, 190,
 242, 244, 250, 258, 259, 264, 265,
 291, 294
 Parthians, 276
 Peitholaus, 25
 Peleg, House of, 26, 268, 270–275,
 280, 281
 Pesharim, continuous, 1, 2, 10, 17, 25,
 51, 82, 97–99, 110–111, 116, 121,
 160, 162, 187, 208, 213, 215, 216,
 291, 302–304
 Peshet, definition, 9–12
 Peshet, double or duplicated, 81, 133,
 243, 248, 249, 250–251, 257–258,
 262
 Peshet Habakkuk, 2, 6, 13–14, 16, 26,
 44, 58, 75, 76, 77, 80, 83, 85, 108,
 114, 118, 124, 127–128, 150, 182,
 184, 197, 200, 205, 210, 212, 219,
 276, 300
 Pharisees, 25, 53, 88, 91–100, 103,
 106, 110–111, 114, 115–118, 121,
 123, 126, 129, 130, 131, 140, 141,
 144, 146–151, 162–163, 165, 181,
 183, 189–191, 195–199, 202–207,
 214–233, 235, 238, 242–244, 246,
 248, 249, 251–257, 261, 263–266,
 269–271, 273, 274, 276–278, 291,
 301, 303, 304, 306
 “plus” (or, “unpegged plus”; see also
 “citation of elements of adjacent
 lemmas), 32, 82, 84, 140, 236, 239,
 241, 260, 282
 Pompey, 24, 105, 118–121, 144, 218,
 222–224, 228–231, 233, 235, 238,
 244, 266, 269, 270, 275, 276, 306
 Predation, see prey
- Prey, 50, 55–56, 87–88, 145, 147,
 155–156, 158, 160–161, 169, 194,
 237–239, 241
 Priest(s), 13, 58, 91, 105, 107, 108,
 111, 127–128, 160, 200, 205, 210,
 219, 228, 229, 230, 232, 248, 252,
 269, 270, 276; See also Wicked
 Priest
 Prophecy and prophetic texts, 9, 10,
 13–16, 109, 121, 182, 192, 210,
 211, 213, 215, 231, 236, 246, 247,
 249, 251, 254, 305
 Proselytes, 232, 248, 250, 252
 Ptolemies, 101
 Ptolemy Latharus, 215
 Ptollas, 25
- Qumran Community, 10–11, 13, 16,
 25–27, 65, 74, 78, 80–81, 83,
 93–95, 101–103, 104, 107–109,
 110–111, 113, 114, 117, 121, 123,
 128, 141, 174, 179, 181, 189,
 195–197, 200, 205–207, 210, 211,
 219, 228, 232, 236, 243, 245, 246,
 250–251, 257, 260, 261, 263,
 271–275, 280, 289, 301–305
- Restoration, textual, 21, 23, 38–71, 83
 Retribution (or punishment), 10, 74,
 76–77, 83, 85, 97–99, 163, 187,
 192, 198, 211, 237, 238, 274, 304,
 306
 Revelation, 11, 12, 13–15, 150, 246,
 258, 259, 305
 Rome (and the Romans), 49, 76, 77,
 83, 100, 101–104, 118–22, 139, 140,
 143, 173, 210, 223, 224, 230, 276,
 301, 302
- Sabbath, 269–270, 304
 Sadducees, 25, 91, 107, 117, 123, 127,
 183, 199, 206, 217, 218, 220, 223,
 227–230, 232, 253, 268–272, 274,
 275, 277, 278, 303–305
 Salome Alexandria, 24, 91, 152–153,
 162, 191, 195, 215, 217–222, 224,
 227–230, 232, 233, 238, 253
 Samaritans, 103, 112–115, 116, 168,
 195
 Sanhedrin, 183, 233
 Scoffer, the, 123; 246
 Scoffers, the, 197, 246
 Scribal error, 33, 35, 44, 50, 53, 56,
 57, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 69, 147,
 287, 290, 291, 293, 294

- Script, 8
- Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, 19, 78,
79, 87–88, 90, 91–99, 105–106, 111,
121, 122, 124, 129, 135–137,
141–144, 149, 151, 153, 155–157,
159, 169, 173, 180–181, 187–192,
194–197, 199, 200, 208, 214, 217,
219, 221, 222, 224, 233, 235–239,
241, 242, 249, 258–260, 264–266,
277
- Seleucids, 49, 88–90, 101–103,
118–20, 136, 143, 156, 210, 225,
230
- Shechem, 123–124, 126, 226
- Shelamzion (see Salome Alexandra)
- Shrine of the Book, 9
- Simon, the Hasmonean, 24, 232, 253
- Simon ben Shetah, 183, 224
- Sobriquets, 25–27, 44, 94–95, 104,
109–111, 116, 196, 198, 200, 205,
206, 216, 271, 305
- Sorcery, 135, 194, 245, 246, 248, 249,
250
- “synagogue” (כְּנֶסֶת), 263, 264, 291
- Storm, 74–75,
- Strangulation, 125, 153, 165–168, 172,
188
- Talmud, 114, 196, 200–205, 229, 247,
249, 291
- Teacher of Righteousness, 13–14, 18,
26–27, 95, 105, 107, 110, 124, 182,
208, 221, 241, 269, 272, 305
- Temple, 80, 102, 113, 114, 121, 197,
210, 223, 230–231, 238–239, 245,
260, 269–271, 273, 281
- Tendenz*, 302
- Terror, 138–141, 239
- Tetragrammaton, 62, 65, 207–208,
289
- Thebes, 29, 268, 276, 279, 280, 284,
307
- Thrakides, 105, 305
- Titus, 105
- Torah, 94–95, 110, 122, 141, 259,
277, 304
- Transcription, of 4QpNah 33–38, 73,
87, 193, 267, 285
- Translation, English, of 4QpNah
pericope 1, 73
pericope 2, 87–88
pericope 3, 194–195
pericope 4, 267–268
frag 5, 285
- vacats, 21, 40, 41, 45, 46, 47–49, 52,
58–59, 61, 70, 161, 185–186,
297–301
- Variants, 22–23, 33–38, 56, 57, 59,
60, 62, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 132, 136,
161, 162, 238, 244, 258, 262,
287–295
- Water(s) (or sea, rivers), 75–76, 77–78,
95, 267, 277–280, 285
- Wealth, 127–128, 160, 162, 278, 279
- Wicked Priest, 18, 26–27, 78, 83, 107,
118, 128, 205, 221, 223, 243
- Women, 95, 151–153, 162, 188, 282,
285
- Wordplay (see paronomasia)
- Young Lion (of Wrath), see Lion of
Wrath

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

- Abegg, M.G. Jr., 4, 24n77, 109,
188n68
- Aharoni, Y., 79n20
- Alexander, P.S., 108n65, 127n122
- Allegro, J.M., 1, 3, 4, 6, 6n15,
18n63, 26n81, 35n10, 37n9, 37n12,
37n13, 38n7, 39n1, 39n2, 40, 41,
42, 43, 45n26, 46, 47n37, 48n43,
48n45, 49n45, 49n46, 50, 51n51,
53n61, 53n62, 54n66, 55n69, 55n70,
56, 57n77, 57n78, 58, 59, 60, 62,
63, 64n100, 65n103, 65n104,
65n105, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71n124,
75, 82n34, 83n38, 88, 104n49,
104n50, 105n53, 106n56, 107n60,
118n99, 119n101, 125n117, 127,
128, 129n128, 132n5, 136n18,
140n36, 145n47, 156n77, 160n95,
167, 168, 177, 178n40, 198n14,
199n15, 203, 236n6, 239n14,
242n26, 243n33, 249n48, 250n54,
272n20, 293, 305
- Amusin, I.D., 4, 5, 47n37, 48n44,
54n63, 62n94, 64n101, 93n15,
94n19, 98n28, 100n32, 106n56,
111n73, 116, 122n109, 145n47,
156n77, 195, 198n14, 199n18,
201n25, 201n26, 206n42, 206n43,
217n72, 218, 220, 221, 222n91,
227, 238n11, 242n26, 249n48,
269n4, 269n5, 269n6, 270, 271
- Anderson, B.W., 16n56
- Astin, A.E., 119n101
- Atkinson, K., 222n91
- Avigad, N., 8n26
- Bacher, W., 204n33
- Bardtke, H., 5, 47n38, 51n51, 145n47
- Barrera, J.C.T., 100n32, 215n66
- Baumgarten, A., 25n78, 93n17,
104n51, 109n67, 231n128, 273n22
- Baumgarten, J., 25n78, 52n57, 54,
108n63, 166n4, 167n10, 168,
172n24, 175n31, 177n36, 177n37,
179n41, 179n43, 180n43, 181n45,
188n69, 190n72
- Berardi, G., 3, 47n37, 49n45, 145n47
- Bernstein, M.J., 10n32, 89n2, 92n12,
167n10, 169n16, 171n20, 177,
178n38, 181n45, 181n46, 183n53,
187n63, 198n13, 210n53, 212n56
- Berrin, S.L., 3n9, 10n29, 16n58,
18n61, 51n49, 51n50, 51n51, 90n8,
134n11, 222n91
- Betz, O., 15
- Blinzler, J., 168n11
- Boccaccio, P., 3, 47n37, 49n45145n47
- Bonani, G., 8n26
- Botterweck, G.J., 135n15, 136n17
- Bronznick, N.M., 94
- Brooke, G., 6, 9n27, 10n30, 10n32,
34n4, 34n7, 37n4, 38n7, 50, 52,
56n72, 62, 64n102, 65, 76, 77n13,
77n15, 89n2, 101n35, 157n83, 162,
207n46, 247n45, 255n72, 279n42,
291n22, 292n23, 302
- Broshi, M., 24n75, 24n77, 100n32,
273n23
- Brownlee, W.H., 6, 11n34, 12n38,
27n82, 48n44, 66, 75n4, 80n24,
93n15, 95n23, 152, 153, 154, 165n2,
199n15, 208n48, 216n69, 241n23,
242n26, 279n42, 304, 306
- Bruce, F.F., 14, 15, 16n55
- Büchler, A., 124n115, 168n12
- Burrows, M., 4, 12n38, 14n46, 16n56,
19n63, 47n37, 95n23, 100n32,
145n47
- Carmignac, J., 2n3, 5, 10n31, 12n38,
15, 38n7, 47n37, 50, 51, 54n66, 58,
59, 63n97, 67n108, 68, 70, 83n38,
100n32, 105n55, 122, 123n110,
131n3, 145n47, 146, 148, 179n40,
179n43, 182n48, 183n51, 197n7,
206n42, 210n53, 212n55, 239n14,
242n26, 243n34, 248, 250n54,
258n82, 258n85, 269n4, 269n5,
270n9, 281n48, 282n54
- Cathcart, K.J., 22, 45n29, 55n71,
57n75, 58n79, 61n91, 145n47,
153n73, 154n73, 279n42
- Charlesworth, J.H., 2n4, 2n7, 6n14,
10n31, 10n32, 48n42, 57n78, 91n9,

- 109n70, 238n10, 271n16, 273n24, 306n43
- Chazon, E., 25n78, 108n65, 181n45
- Cohen, C.H., 181n45, 188n68
- Collins, J.J., 11n35, 17n60, 246n40
- Cook, E., 4, 42n15, 43n21, 47n38, 48n44, 50n49, 51n51, 53n61, 55, 62n94, 109, 116n93, 188n68, 199n15, 242n26, 249n48, 270n9
- Cross, F.M., 8, 19n63, 47n40, 93n15, 100n32, 118n99, 119n101, 177n35, 182, 216
- Dahood, M., 61n91
- Davies, P.R., 69n120, 243n33, 271n14
- Dimant, D., 67n109, 22106n58, 107n60
- Doudna, G.L., 1, 1n2, 2n8, 3, 6n16, 7n17, 8n26, 9n27, 9n28, 23, 24n75, 25n77, 27n84, 29n88, 38n6, 39n4, 40n7, 40n8, 42n14, 42n17, 43n19, 43n20, 44n23, 44n25, 45n27, 45n28, 46n31, 46n34, 47n37, 48n42, 48n43, 48n44, 49n47, 50n49, 51n49, 51n51, 52n57, 53, 56, 57n78, 58n79, 58n83, 59n86, 59n88, 62n92, 64n99, 64n101, 65, 66, 68, 69, 70, 71n124, 76, 88n1, 91n10, 105n54, 112n79, 116n94, 119n102, 121n105, 132n7, 134n13, 135n15, 135n16, 143n40, 146n50, 158n89, 159n90, 161n98, 174n27, 198n14, 204, 208n48, 208n49, 216n68, 249n48, 261n99, 279n42, 291n22, 299, 300
- Drazin, N., 202n28
- Driver, G.R., 88n1, 122n109, 169n16
- Dupont-Sommer, A., 1n3, 3, 3n9, 4, 5, 12n38, 14, 19n64, 39n1, 39n4, 41, 42, 43, 45, 47n36, 47n38, 49n45, 49n47, 52, 53n60, 53n61, 54n66, 55, 56, 58n82, 58n83, 59n86, 62n94, 63, 64, 65n104, 67, 69, 70, 78n17, 82n32, 92n14, 100n32, 101n34, 101n39, 102n42, 111n74, 112n80, 120, 122n109, 123, 126, 127, 128n124, 138n31, 139n33, 139n34, 142n38, 143, 144, 145n47, 145n48, 156n77, 166n3, 182, 183, 185n59, 186n62, 187n66, 195, 196, 198n14, 201n24, 204n42, 212n55, 218, 222, 223, 224, 228, 238n10, 239n14, 241n20, 242n26, 243n31, 244n34, 248n47, 250n54, 251n60, 261n99, 269n4, 270, 271, 275n30, 276n32, 279n41, 279n42, 279n45, 283n58
- Dupriez, B., 29n89, 30n90-93, 31n95, 31n97, 31n99, 31n100, 177n36
- Elledge, C.D., 10n32
- Elliger, K., 10n34, 11n36, 11n37, 12, 12n38, 27n82, 213, 265n108
- Eshel, E., 24n75, 107n62, 108n65, 109
- Eshel, H., 25n7, 95n24, 98n28, 100n32, 101, 103n45, 106, 107n60, 107n61, 108n65, 109, 112n81, 113n84, 120n104, 178, 190n71, 195n2, 215n64, 216, 243n30, 272, 129n128
- Evans, C.A., 23
- Feldman, L.H., 98n28
- Fields, W.W., 91n9, 204n35
- Finkel, A., 305
- Finkelstein, L., 263n104
- Fishbane, M., 14n46, 30n90
- Fitzmyer, J.A., 10n32, 24n77, 48n44, 55n68, 157, 166n6, 182n49, 185n57, 245n37
- Flint, P.W., 8n25
- Flusser, D. 3, 47n38, 48n44, 53n61, 92, 93n16, 98n28, 106n56, 107n60, 110n71, 111n73, 114n88, 116, 195, 197, 200n20, 201n24, 206n40, 206n42, 218, 225n100, 227, 238n11, 248, 250n54, 269n3, 269n7, 270, 271, 302n34, 303
- Fraade, S.D., 15n49
- Freedman, D.N., 107n60, 177n35, 182
- García-Martínez, G., 4, 10n31, 26n79, 27n82, 42n15, 43n21, 45n28, 47n38, 48n44, 53n61, 54n65, 54n66, 69n120, 83n38, 100n32, 122n109, 128n125, 145n47, 176n34, 204n34, 207n46, 212n56, 218n74, 273n24
- Gärtner, B., 80n24
- Gaster, T.H., 4, 26n81, 27, 40n7, 42n15, 47n36, 47n37, 49n45, 50, 57n77, 57n78, 69, 70, 76n5, 83n38, 100n32, 100n41, 102n44, 112n 79, 118n99, 122n109, 132n4, 132n6, 136n17, 145n46, 177n36, 179n42, 195n4, 198n14, 199n18, 212n55, 214n60, 219n80, 239n14, 242n6, 248, 250n54, 261n99, 263n104

- Gazow-Ginzberg, A.M., 260n96
 Geller, M., 91n10, 253n65
 Goldstein, J.A., 104n48
 Goodblatt, D., 101n36, 152n69
 Goodman, M., 99n31, 117n97, 204n34
 Goranson, S., 111n78
 Gordon, R.P., 22, 45n29,
 Goshen-Gottstein, 203, 204
 Greenfield, J.C., 107n60
 Greenstein, E.L., 291n22
 Gruenwald, I., 14n48
- Habermann, A.M., 4, 47n37, 48n44,
 49n47, 54n65, 56, 57n78, 59n86,
 100n32
 Habicht, C., 119n101
 Haldar, A.O., 158n89
 Halperin, D.J., 51n51152n67, 152n68,
 153n71, 153n73, 154, 165n2, 166n3,
 168, 172n24
 Halsall, 177n36
 Harrelson, W., 16n56
 Harrington, D., 109
 Heinemann, J., 167n8, 183n52
 Hengel, M., 169, 170, 172n25
 Hoening, S., 54n65, 95n23, 198n14,
 201, 202
- Horgan, M.P., 2, 4, 6n16, 10n31,
 10n32, 12, 12n38, 12n40, 14n46,
 34n3, 39n1, 39n4, 40n6, 40n7,
 44n25, 45n26, 46, 47n36, 47n38,
 48n41, 48n44, 50, 51n51, 52, 53,
 56n74, 57, 58n79, 58n80, 61,
 62n92, 62n94, 62n95, 63, 64n101,
 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 75n4, 75n5,
 79n20, 79n23, 81n28, 80n30, 83n37,
 84n43, 100n32, 104n50, 106n56,
 108n63, 111n77, 119, 123n111,
 124n114, 126n119, 127n121,
 127n123, 128n124, 132n5, 143n40,
 145n47, 147n57, 148n59, 159n92,
 161n98, 166n3, 177n36, 180n44,
 185n56, 185n59, 186, 195n1,
 198n14, 201n24, 201n26, 206, 214,
 218n74, 256n77, 258n85, 263,
 272n18, 290n18, 295n28
- Horton, F.L. Jr., 10n32
- Ilan, T., 152n69, 15n693
- Japhet, S., 22
 Jastrow, M., 65n103, 285n58
 Jeremias, G., 4, 5, 47n37, 49n45,
 51n51, 105n53
- Kampen, J., 92n12, 212n56
 Kister, M., 67n109, 106, 107n62,
 129n128, 206n40, 252n64, 280n46
 Knibb, M.A., 4, 47n38, 50n49,
 100n32, 101n39, 106n56, 123n111,
 132n5, 134n10, 139n34, 143n40,
 145n47, 182n49, 206n42, 214n60,
 249n48, 278n35
 Kraft, R.A., 91n9, 204n35
 Krauss, S., 49n46
 Kselman, J.S., 242n28
 Kuhn, K.J., 65n104, 243n33
 Kutscher, E.Y., 69n121
- Lange, A., 6, 46n31, 47n38, 47n39,
 212n56
 Leibel, D., 54n65, 104, 177n36,
 183n51
 Licht, J., 1n2, 62, 65, 67n110, 68,
 197n7, 204n33, 219n79, 219n81,
 246n43, 257n79, 269n3, 275n30,
 289n15
 Lim, T.H., 2n7, 57n74
 Lohse, E., 4, 5, 47n37, 53n61, 71,
 100n32, 145n47, 185n59
 Lowenstamm, S.A., 48n44, 100n32
- Maier, J., 2n3, 5, 47n37, 48n44,
 51n51, 54n63, 55n71, 65n103,
 65n106, 67n114, 91n11, 93n15,
 95n23, 96n25, 100n32, 145n47,
 185n59, 195n4, 201n24, 225n100,
 237n7, 243n31, 247n44, 252n63,
 270n9, 273n21, 279n42
- Maier, W.A., 5, 84n45, 238n9,
 256n78, 284n60
 Main, E., 108n65, 109
 Mandel, P., 16n58, 93n17
 Merhavaya, H., 203
 Metzger, B., 202n28
 Michelini Tocci, F., 5, 47n37, 100n32
 Milik, J.T., 12n38, 14n46, 47n39, 69,
 76n8, 92n13, 238n10
 Montaner, L.V., 215n66
 Moraldi, L., 5, 40n7, 47n37, 53n61,
 79n22
 Mulder, M.J., 14n46
- Neusner, J., 92n12, 229n114
 Newsom, C.A., 39n53
 Nitzan, B., 2, 5, 11n37, 12, 13n45, 14,
 14n47, 14n48, 16n55, 19n64, 28n85,
 28n86, 32n102, 44n24, 47n40,
 77n11, 79n22, 80n24, 82, 102n40,

- 107n60, 150n63, 157n83, 166n3,
189n69, 197n7, 217n71, 243n34,
258n85, 260n93, 281n50, 295n28,
307
- O'Collins, G.G., 169n17
- O'Connor, J.M., 69n120, 131n3, 271
- Oates, J., 28n87
- Parry, D.W., 95n24
- Patte, D., 14, 14n46, 14n47
- Paul, S.M., 91n9, 204n35
- Pearson, B.A., 31n98
- Petersen, D.L., 209
- Pfann, S.J., 9n28
- Pinnick, A., 25n78, 101n36, 152n69,
181n45
- Puech, 106n56, 108n65, 204n35
- Qimron, E., 242n26, 37n7, 56n74,
57n76, 61, 65n103, 69, 114n86,
242n27, 245n37, 275n29, 288n6,
289nn7-9, 290
- Rabin, C., 47n37, 49n47, 54n63,
83n38, 90n7, 91n10, 93n15, 94,
95n25, 103n46, 146n49, 179n42,
191n73, 216
- Rabinowitz, I., 10n32, 12, 48n41,
48n45, 88n1, 90n7, 90n8, 100n32,
136n18
- Reed, S.A., 7n17
- Regev, E., 269
- Reicke, B., 27n82
- Roberts, B.J., 302
- Roth, C., 95n22, 213, 304n39
- Roth, W.M.W., 191n75
- Rowley, H., 88n1, 100n32, 100n33,
105n54, 168n12, 174n27, 210n52
- Russel, D.S., 13n45, 14n46, 15, 16n55,
17n59, 217n71
- Saldarini, A.J., 92n12
- Schaller, G., 146n50, 154n73
- Schechter, S., 94n20
- Schiffman, L.H., 5, 12n38, 14n46,
16n5791n9, 47n38, 50, 61, 91n10,
93n15, 93n16, 95n23, 100n32,
110n72, 121n106, 128n127, 136n21,
195, 199, 200n23, 202n27, 204,
208n49, 214, 216, 218, 220n83,
224, 225, 226, 227, 236n6, 236n7,
244n34, 246n38, 247n45, 248,
249n53, 250n57, 251n61, 252n64,
270, 275, 301n33
- Scholem, G., 208n49
- Schonfield, H.J., 4, 47n37, 49n45,
51n51, 88n1, 105n54
- Schremer, A., 25n78
- Schuller, 103n45, 112n80, 112n82,
115
- Schürer, 90n6, 91n10, 151n66, 303
- Schwartz, D.R., 92n12, 101n36,
152n69, 179n43, 181n45, 181n46,
201, 229n115, 253n65, 273, 303
- Seebass, H., 83n37
- Shemesh, A., 181n45
- Siegel, J.P., 289n15
- Silberman, L.H., 12
- Silbernam, N.A., 1n3
- Skehan, P.W., 121n107, 185n59,
290n15
- Slomovic, E., 281n49
- Sparks, H.F.D., 80n24
- Speier, S., 182n52
- Spronk, K., 5, 6n113, 68n115, 68n117,
198n12, 259n88, 268n1
- Stegemann, H., 12n38, 69n167,
101n39, 102n44, 206, 228n113, 271
- Stendahl, K., 243n33
- Stern, M., 105n53, 223n93
- Stuedel, A., 11n34, 17n60, 210, 213,
214n63
- Stinespring, W.F., 23
- Stone, M.E., 22, 108n65
- Stonehouse, G.G.V., 84
- Strugnell, J., 1, 1n3, 1n3, 8, 37n10,
39n1, 40n7, 41n12, 42, 43, 44,
45n26, 45n28, 45n29, 47, 48n44,
56, 57, 58n79, 60, 61, 62, 63,
64n100, 64n101, 65, 66, 67n112,
67n113, 69n119, 70, 71, 79n22, 82,
104n50, 108n65, 109, 159n90,
186n63, 294
- Sutcliffe, E.F., 90n7, 257n79
- Sysling, H., 14n46
- Talmon, S., 47n40
- Tantlevskij, I.R., 53n61, 55n68,
100n32, 126n118, 126n119, 145n47,
195n4, 196n6, 218, 226, 227,
242n26
- Thiering, B.E., 169n13
- Thomas, D.W., 249n48
- Tigay, J. 211n54
- Tigchelaar, E.J.C., 4

- Tov, E., 9n28, 18n62, 24n77,
146n49
- Trevor, J.C. 8n26
- Ulrich, E., 95n24
- Urbach, E.E., 183n52
- Van Der Woude, A.S., 26n79, 27n82
- VanderKam, J.C., 8n25, 91n9,
128n127, 204n35
- Vermes, G., 4, 12n38, 14n46, 26n80,
47n38, 48n44, 51n51, 53n61, 57n77,
69n120, 79n23, 80, 101n39, 102n43,
102n44, 104n49, 106n56, 108n65,
109n66, 136n17, 145n47, 185n59,
235n1, 246n42, 250n54
- Vogt, E., 5, 46n84, 47n37, 100n32,
118n99, 145n47
- Wacholder, B.Z., 198n14, 204
- Wade, G.W., 84n45
- Wallenstein, M., 212n55
- Waltke, B.K., 131n3
- Weinfeld, M., 92n14
- Weise, M., 247n45
- Weiss, R., 34n1, 38n1, 38n4, 38n5,
45n29, 64n102, 67, 166n3, 202n27,
243n31, 264n105, 264n106
- Wellhausen, J., 132n5
- White, R.T., 69n120271
- Wieder, N., 14, 14n47, 93n15, 93n16,
124n115, 212n55, 245n37
- Wilcox, 177n36, 180n44, 185n57
- Winter, P., 169n18
- Wise, M.O., 4, 24n77, 109, 181n45,
181n46, 188n68
- Wolfson, E., 247n45
- Worrel, E., 136n18
- Wright, G.E., 8n25
- Yadin, Y., 4, 47n37, 48n44, 51n51,
54, 55, 103n47, 104n51, 105n53,
106n59, 107n60, 108n63, 109,
145n47, 156n77, 165n1, 167,
172n22, 173, 174, 175n31, 176n33.
179n43, 180n44, 181n45, 181n46,
182, 183, 186n62, 188n69, 192n78,
219n81, 249n52, 269n7
- Yalon, H., 136n18
- Yardeni, A., 108n65
- Young, I., 52n57, 56n73, 216n68
- Zangenberg, J., 112n79
- Zeitlin, S., 100n33, 105n53, 105n54,
201, 202n28
- Zertal, A., 125n117

This page intentionally left blank

STUDIES ON THE TEXTS OF THE DESERT OF JUDAH

1. Wernberg Møller, P. *The Manual of Discipline*. Translated and Annotated, with an Introduction. 1957. ISBN 90 04 02195 7
2. Ploeg, J. van der. *Le rouleau de la guerre*. Traduit et annoté, avec une introduction. 1959. ISBN 90 04 02196 5
3. Mansoor, M. *The Thanksgiving Hymns*. Translated and Annotated with an Introduction. 1961. ISBN 90 04 02197 3
5. Koffimahn, E. *Die Doppelurkunden aus der Wüste Juda*. Recht und Praxis der jüdischen Papyri des 1. und 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr. samt Übertragung der Texte und Deutscher Übersetzung. 1968. ISBN 90 04 03148 0
6. Kutscher, E.Y. *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1 QIsa^a)*. Transl. from the first (1959) Hebrew ed. With an obituary by H.B. Rosén. 1974. ISBN 90 04 04019 6
- 6a. Kutscher, E.Y. *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1 QIsa^a)*. Indices and Corrections by E. Qimron. Introduction by S. Morag. 1979. ISBN 90 04 05974 1
7. Jongeling, B. *A Classified Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah, 1958-1969*. 1971. ISBN 90 04 02200 7
8. Merrill, E.H. *Qumran and Predestination*. A Theological Study of the Thanksgiving Hymns. 1975. ISBN 90 04 04265 2
9. García Martínez, F. *Qumran and Apocalyptic*. Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09586 1
10. Dimant, D. & U. Rappaport (eds.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. Forty Years of Research. 1992. ISBN 90 04 09679 5
11. Trebelle Barrera, J. & L. Vegas Montaner (eds.). *The Madrid Qumran Congress*. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March 1991. 2 vols. 1993. ISBN 90 04 09771 6 set
12. Nitzan, B. *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* 1994. ISBN 90 04 09658 2
13. Steudel, A. *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a-b})*. Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 („Florilegium“) und 4Q177 („Catena A“) repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden. 1994. ISBN 90 04 09763 5
14. Swanson, D.D. *The Temple Scroll and the Bible*. The Methodology of 11QT. 1995. ISBN 90 04 09849 6
15. Brooke, G.J. (ed.). *New Qumran Texts and Studies*. Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992. With F. García Martínez. 1994. ISBN 90 04 10093 8
16. Dimant, D. & L.H. Schiffman. *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness*. Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989-1990. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10225 6
17. Flint, P.W. *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10341 4
18. Lange, A. *Weisheit und Prädestination*. Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran. 1995. ISBN 90 04 10432 1
19. García Martínez, F. & D.W. Parry. *A Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1970-95*. Arranged by Author with Citation and Subject Indexes. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10588 3

20. Parry, D.W. & S.D. Ricks (eds.). *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10662 6
21. Metso, S. *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10683 9
22. Herbert, E.D. *Reconstructing Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls*. A New Method applied to the Reconstruction of 4QSam^a. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10684 7
23. Bernstein, M., F. García Martínez & J. Kampen (eds.). *Legal texts and Legal Issues*. Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995. Published in honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10829 7
25. Lefkovits, J.K. *The Copper Scroll – 3Q15: A Reevaluation*. A new Reading, Translation, and Commentary. ISBN 90 04 10685 5
26. Muraoka, T. & J.F. Elwolde (eds.). *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls & Ben Sira*. Proceedings of a Symposium held at Leiden University, 11-14 December 1995. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10820 3
27. Falk, D.K. *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10817 3
28. Stone, M.E. & E.G. Chazon (eds.). *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 May, 1996. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10939 0
29. Hempel, C. *The Laws of the Damascus Document*. Sources, Tradition and Redaction. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11150 6
30. Parry, D.W. & E. Ulrich (eds.) *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11155 7
31. Chazon, E.G. & M. Stone (eds.) *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives*. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 January, 1997. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11164 6
32. Parry, D.W. & E. Qimron (eds.) *The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a)*. A New Edition. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11277 4
33. Muraoka, T. & Elwolde, J.F. (eds.) *Sirach, Scrolls, and Sages*. Proceedings of a Second International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Ben Sira, and the Mishnah, held at Leiden University, 15-17 December 1997. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11553 6
34. Baumgarten, J.M. & E.G. Chazon & A. Punnick (eds.) *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery*. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February, 1998. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11462 9
35. Falk, D.K., F. García Martínez & E.M. Schuller, *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran*. Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998. Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11684 2
36. Muraoka, T. & J.F. Elwolde (eds.), *Diggers at the Well*. Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira. 2000. ISBN 90 04 12002 5

37. Goodblatt, D., A. Pinnick & D.R. Schwartz (eds.), *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 27-31 January. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12007 6
38. Elgvin, T. *Wisdom and Apocalyptic in 4QInstruction*. ISBN 90 04 11424 6
(in preparation)
39. Brin, G. *The Concept of Time in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2001.
ISBN 90 04 12314 8
40. Murphy, C.M. *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community*. 2001.
ISBN 90 0411934 5
41. Pinnick, A. *The Orion Center Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls (1995-2000)*. 2001.
ISBN 90 04 12366 0
42. Fletcher-Louis, C.H.T. *All the Glory of Adam*. Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12326 1
43. Fincke, A. *The Samuel Scroll from Qumran*. 4QSam^a restored and compared to the Septuagint and 4QSam^c. 2001. ISBN 90 04 123709
44. Tigchelaar, E.J.C. *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones*. Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction. 2001.
ISBN 90 04 11678 8
45. Grossman, M.L. *Reading for History in the Damascus Document*. A Methodological Study. 2002. ISBN 90 04 122524
46. Davila, J.R. (ed.). *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity*. Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001. 2003.
ISBN 90 04 12678 3
47. Xeravits, G.G. *King, Priest, Prophet*. Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12892 1
48. Chazon, E.G. (ed.) (with the collaboration of R. Clements and A. Pinnick). *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19-23 January, 2000. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12162 5
49. Dahmen, U. *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum*. Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QP^s aus Qumran. 2003.
ISBN 90 04 13226 0
50. Goff, M.J. *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*. 2003.
ISBN 90 04 13591 X
51. Collins, J.J., G.E. Sterling & R.A. Clements. *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20-22 may, 2001. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13670 3
52. Newsom, C.A. *The Self as Symbolic Space*. Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13803 X
53. Berrin, S.L. *The Peshet Nahum Scroll from Qumran*. An Exegetical Study of 4Q169. 2004. ISBN 90 04 12484 5