



Центр "Петербургское Востоковедение"
St.Petersburg Centre for Oriental Studies

ПЕТЕРБУРГСКОЕ ВОСТОКОВЕДЕНИЕ

St.Petersburg Journal of Oriental Studies

**выпуск 6
volume 6**

Центр
"Петербургское Востоковедение"

Санкт-Петербург
1994

The Reflection of the Political Situation in Judaea in 88 B.C.E. in the Qumran Commentary on Nahum (4QPNAH, Columns 1—4)

Igor R. Tantlevskij

(St. Petersburg Institute of Oriental Studies)

The Qumran Commentary on the prophet Nahum¹ is the only Qumran Essene composition hitherto discovered, in which, apart from other conventionally designated persons and groups, there are two real names of the Hellenistic historic characters to be found in a more or less coherent historical context², *videlicet* the "Kings of Greece (Yāwān [יָוָן]; lit. Ionia)" (*i. e.* the Seleucids) Antiochus (4QPNAH 1:3; it is likely to refer to Antiochus III the Great³) and Demetrius. Of the latter one it is said in 4QPNAH 1:2 that "he sought to enter Jerusalem on the counsel of the expounders of smooth things (בְּעֵצַת דּוֹרְשֵׁי הַחִלְקוֹת)". In this passage, most of the scholars perceive an allusion to the Pharisees (= דּוֹרְשֵׁי הַחִלְקוֹת), who assumed leadership of the insurrection against the Judaeen king Alexander Jannaeus (103—76 B.C.E.) in 94/93—88 and invited the Syrian king Demetrius III Eucuerus (95—88/87 B.C.E.) to help⁴. (See: Josephus, *The Jewish War*, I, 92; *idem*, *Jewish Antiquities*, XIII, 376). Based upon this, it is believed that in the text of the first column and in the first line of the second column of the Commentary on Nahum there are some circumstances of the mentioned rebellion attested⁵. With the text of columns 2 (first line excluded)—4, there are reflected, according to a widely adopted opinion originally suggested by J. D. Amusin, D. Flusser and Y. Yadin, the events that took place during the reign of the queen Alexandra Salome (76—67 B.C.E.), Jannaeus' widow⁶. At the same time, the year 63 B.C.E., when Judaea was captured by Pompey the Great, is considered by the hypothesis' advocates as the *terminus post quem* of the Commentary's composition. Note also A. Dupont-Sommer's assumption that in 4QPNAH 2:2—4:9 certain events of the reign of Salome's sons, Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II, particularly collisions of their internecine war, are depicted⁷ (60—50 B.C.E.)⁸.

In the following, we shall try to show that the Commentary on Nahum could be compiled *only* in 88 B.C.E. (and, consequently, is the sole Qumran composition hitherto discovered which can be dated to within a year), and that in its text, *in all of the four columns*, the situation was reflected which had emerged in Judaea in the very same year as a result of the

defeat inflicted by Demetrius III on Alexander Jannaeus' troops near Shechem (located some 2 km east of present Nablus in the valley between Ebal and Gerizim Mountains).

In the opinion of the overwhelming majority of researchers, the king Alexander has been mentioned twice in the text of 4QPNAH 1:4—8 conditionally designated as "the Furious Young Lion"⁹. (See also 4QP^{HOS}^b (The Commentary on Hosea) fr. 2, 2—3). This passage reads as follows: «"The lion (ארי) tears enough for its cubs (and) it chokes prey for its lioness (NAHUM 2:13a)... [Its interpretation concerns] the Furious (or: the "Fierce". — *I. T.*) Young Lion (כפיר החרוץ) who strikes (יכה); or: "beats", "defeats". — *I. T.*) his great men and the men of his Council... ["And it fills] its cave [with prey] and its den with torn flesh" (NAHUM 2:13b). Its interpretation concerns the Furious Young Lion [who has executed (or: "executes") reve]nge (נתק[מות]) on the expounders of smooth things and who hangs (יתלה) men alive [on the tree(s), as this is the law] in Israel as of old (בישראל מלפנים [על העץ כי זאת התורה])¹⁰ (or: "[...a thing done] long since in Israel [אשר יעשה כן בישראל מלפנים]). — *I. T.*)...» This passage of 4QPNAH is usually correlated with Josephus Flavius' account of "blasphemy" committed by Alexander Jannaeus (= Furious Young Lion in 4QPNAH 1:5—6) towards the end of the civil war, in 88 B.C.E., when, "boozing" in Jerusalem "in a conspicuous place with his concubines, he ordered that some eight hundred (of "the most powerful" rebels, *i. e.* apparently the Pharisees for the most part, who, prior to the uprising, had occupied high posts in the state and had a majority in the Sanhedrin (= "the expounders of smooth things", "great men", "men of the Council" in 4QPNAH 1:2—8). — *I. T.*) be crucified (ἀνασταυρωσά), and, while they were still alive, killed their wives and children before their very eyes" (Josephus, Antiquities, XIII, 380 (see also XIII, 381—383); *idem*, War, I, 97, 113). It was the most savagely cruel and over-sophisticated "complex" execution Jannaeus had ever subjected insurgents to (cf.: Josephus, Antiquities, XII, 256(!)), but probably by no means the only case of the death penalty by crucifixion (or simply "hanging men alive") during the 94/93—88 uprising, in the course of the suppression of which (according to the "War" (I, 91) and "Antiquities" (XIII, 376) texts) no less than 50,000 Jews were killed by the Judaean king and high-priest. (Cf. 4QPNAH 1:7: "...The Furious Young Lion... hangs (יתלה); here, the *imperfectum* presupposes a *repeated* (or usual, habitual) action. — *I. T.*) men alive [on the trees...]"). Note, in the context of this assumption, that, judging from 4QPNAH 1:7—8, the law of crucifixion of state criminals (and particularly traitors who had communicated to foreigners) was not specifi-

⁹ We first expressed this idea in our lecture delivered at the University of Moscow in Jan. 1989. (See also: NAA I (1990), p. 161).

cally Qumranic (cf. 11QT 64:6—13; cf. also DEUTERONOMY 21:22—33) but state. (Cf. *e. g.* EZRA 6:11, 4QAHA = 4QTESTLEVI^d, fr. 24, i—ii, 4—6, the TESTAMENTS OF LEVI 4:4 (Greek, Armenian, and Slavonic versions) and BENJAMIN 9:2—5, the WISDOM OF SOLOMON 2:12—20; BERESHIT RABBA 65:22; M. Sanhedrin, VI, 4, J. T. Hagigah, 77d—78a, J. T. Sanhedrin, 23c, SIFRE DEVARIM 21:22; cf. also JOHN 18:31—32, 19:7, 15—16. Note also that in Republican Rome the death sentence by crucifixion was pronounced even on the Roman citizens who had taken an enemy's part in war).

Special attention should be given to the verbs הִכָּה ("to strike", "to beat", "to defeat") and תָּלָה ("to hang") used in the above text of 4QPNAH 1:4—8 in the imperfect that serves here to denote repeated actions (begun in the past and still occurring in the period when the Commentary was being compiled). Since the agent in this passage is the Furious Young Lion, it may be said that this character *was alive* at the time of the composition of the Commentary on Nahum. (Cf. also 4QP^{HOS}^b fr. 2, 3). We think that this assumption is favoured also by the fact that the author of the text substituted in his "interpretation" of NAHUM 2:13 the term כַּפִּיר ("young lion") for the word אַרִי ("lion") used here as if striving to stress the cruel hero being young. Hardly would it have been appropriate to do so, had the Commentary on Nahum been composed *on the person's death, ex hypothesi* that of Alexander Jannaeus who died in 76 B.C.E. at the age of 49. As to the frightening image itself, it seems to have emerged under the influence of EZEKIEL 19, where the word כַּפִּיר ("young lion") is used to denote young bloodthirsty and impious Judaeans kings of the pre-Captivity period — Jehoahaz (608 B.C.E.) who died at the age of 23, and Jehoiakim (608—598 B.C.E.) who passed away at the age of 25.

We now turn to the next text of the Commentary (4QPNAH 1:8—2:1) which reads about the Furious Young Lion as follows: «"Behold I am against [you says the Lord of Hosts. I will burn up] your [multitude in smoke], and the sword shall devour your young lions. I will cut [off from the land the p]reying on others. And [the voice of your messengers] shall no [more be heard]"» (NAHUM 2:14). Its [interpretation] is: "your multitude" — they are the bands of his (*sc.* of the Furious Young Lion. — *I. T.*) army (גְּדוּדֵי חֵילוֹ), tha[t he has lost in Shechem (אֲשֶׁר אֲבָדָם בְּשֵׁכֶם) (?); and "his young lions" — they are his great men ("nobles"), [...] and "his prey" — it is the wealth which the [Pri]ests of Jerusalem have amas[sed], which they [have gi]ven away [...It is through the fault of E]phraim (*i. e.* probably the Pharisees, since the designation "Ephraim" has been used in the Commentary as a synonym of "the expounders of smooth things". — *I. T.*) that Israel shall be delivered [in the hand of foreigners]... And "his messengers" — they are his envoys whose voice shall no more be heard

among the nations». It seems plausible to suppose that the commentator has hinted, in the given text, at the shattering defeat which the Syrian king Demetrius III inflicted in 88 B.C.E. on Alexander Jannaeus' soldiery near Shechem (See: Josephus, War, I, 92—95; *idem*, Antiquities, XIII, 377—378). The Pharisees were on side of the Seleucid in the battle. Jannaeus lost most of "the bands of his army", and, together with his spared partisans, particularly with those representing the aristocratic, priestly "party" of the Sadducees, was forced to scuttle away to the Ephraim Mountains. (See: Josephus, War, I, 95; *idem*, Antiquities, XIII, 379). In Jerusalem the power was temporarily seized by the Pharisees supported by thousands of their adherents (Cf.: Josephus, War, I, 98; *idem*, Antiquities, XIII, 383). We believe, it is this that the next passage of the Commentary — 4QPNAH 2:2—6 — seems to relate about: «"Woe to the city of blood (Nahum refers to Nineveh, the capital of the Assyrian kingdom. — *I. T.*); it is full of [lies and rapi]ne" (NAHUM 3:1). Its interpretation: it is the city of Ephraim (*i. e.* probably Jerusalem captured by the Pharisees. — *I. T.*), the expounders of smooth things in the last days (lit.: "towards the End of Days". — *I. T.*), who walk in lies and falsehood. "The prowler is not wanting (in Nineveh. — *I. T.*), noise of whip and noise of rattling wheel, prancing horse and jolting chariot, mounting horsemen, a blade and glittering spear, a multitude of slain and a heap of carcasses. There is no end to the corpses; they stumble upon their corpses" (NAHUM 3:1—3). Its interpretation: this concerns the *power* (or: "rule", "dominion". — *I. T.*) of the expounders of smooth things (ממשלת דורשי החלקות; italics ours. — *I. T.*), from the midst of whose assembly the sword of Gentiles (or: "foreigners". — *I. T.*) is not wanting (apparently this phrase hints at Demetrius III being invited by the rebellious Pharisees to help. — *I. T.*), captivity, looting, and rousing (lit.: "enkindling") of internecine war (והרחור בינותם¹), and exile from the dread of the enemy (here, the commentator is likely to remind of the Pharisees' activities during the civil war. — *I. T.*); a multitude of guilty corpses fall in their days (*i. e.* in the time of their temporary victory. — *I. T.*); there is no end to the sum of their slain. They even stumble upon their body of flesh because of their guilty counsel (here, it seems to be a hint at the reprisals the Pharisees carried out in the capital and territories under their control over their opponents who had failed to flee. — *I. T.*)». Before proceeding to the next passage from 4QPNAH, we call attention to the fact that it is the phrase "the power ("rule", "dominion") of the expounders of smooth things" (4QPNAH 2:4) that serves as the principal argument of those who think that the text of the Commentary's second (first line excluded), third and fourth columns refers to the events that took place in Judaea after Jannaeus' death, in the reign of Alexandra Salome or Hyrcanus II, since the latter ones leaned

upon the Pharisees in their activities. Further on, we shall turn back to this question; here we should note that, following the text above, the Commentary's author cites verses 5 through 7 of chapter 3 of Nahum's book, where the prophet has foretold Nineveh's ruin and devastation, and extrapolates this prophecy over "Ephraim", "the expounders of smooth things", *i. e.* the Pharisees. Furthermore, from the 7th line of the 3rd column of the Commentary on Nahum to the end of the manuscript, the text reads about the destiny of the "Manasseh" group opposed to the groups mentioned in the Commentary under the conventional terms "Ephraim" (*i. e.* the Pharisees) and "Judah" (*i. e.* the Qumranites-Essenes)¹². As most of the scholars believe, the "Manasseh" sect members characterized in 4QPNAH 3:9 as "the great men" and "honourable men" are those representing the aristocratic, priestly sect of the Sadducees whom Alexander Jannaeus leaned upon and who fought on his side against the Pharisees. Commenting on the verse 8 of Nahum's 3rd chapter, where the prophet speaks of No-Amon (*i. e.* Thebes) having been routed by the Assyrians in 663 B.C.E., the author of 4QPNAH likens this Egyptian city and its defenders to the "mighty men of war" (גבורי מלחמה) of "Manasseh", *i. e.* to the Sadducean warriors, and goes on to "interpret" this verse as being related to the defeat of this group's "army" (חיל). As to "Ephraim", *i. e.* the Pharisees who took the side of Demetrius III in the battle near Shechem in 88 B.C.E., they are correlated in the given passage with the Assyrians. In the context of the aforementioned, it would be worthwhile to remind that it was in 88 B.C.E. that Thebes (which took part in the people's uprising) was seized after a three-year siege and exposed to devastation by the Egyptian king Ptolemy IX Soter II (Latir). If this event fell within the Qumranites' view, so the comparison of the defeated Sadducees with Egyptian Thebes assumed a peculiar sound in that year.

Of fundamental importance for the identification and dating of the events reflected in the Commentary on Nahum is the text 4QPNAH 4:1—4 which reads: «"Yet she (Nahum refers here to Thebes. — *I. T.*) was exiled, she went into captivity; and her children are crushed at the corners of all the streets, they cast lots for her honourable men, and all her great men are bound with chains" (NAHUM 3:10). Interpretation of this concerns Manasseh in the final (or: "last". — *I. T.*) period, when his kingdom (or: "reign"; מלכות — *I. T.*) falls (תשפל; lit. "becomes low", "is abased". — *I. T.*) in Is[rael]... his wives, his children, and his little ones go (ילכו) into captivity, his mighty men and honourable men [perish] by the sword». Judging from the verbs שפל ("to be or become low", "be abased") and הלך ("to go", "walk", "come"; "to go off", "depart") being used here in the imperfect, one can say that the "kingdom" of "Manasseh", *i. e.* of the court, aristocratic

party of the Sadducees whom the *king* Alexander leaned upon (see *e. g.*: Josephus, War, I, 113—114; *idem*, Antiquities, XIII, 411—414; cf. 4Q448 2:8, 3:6 (!)), *had not fallen down* by the time of the Commentary's composition, though severely shaken. By the way, this fact contradicts the position of those who suppose the text of columns two (first line excluded) through four inclusive to reflect the events of the period of the Pharisees' *absolute rule*, undivided authority that distinguished the times of Alexandra Salome and her son Hyrcanus II (67; 63—40 B.C.E.).

In the following text — 4QPNAH 4:4—9 — the sagacious commentator predicts that, in spite of fortune's smile, the lot of "Ephraim", *i. e.* the Pharisees, will not differ from that of "Manasseh"; and even Jerusalem's powerful fortifications will not rescue them.

Truly, the Pharisees' triumph proved to be short-lived. We have learned from "The Jewish War" (I, 95) and "Jewish Antiquities" (XIII, 379) by Josephus Flavius that in due course after the Shechem battle, in the same 88 B.C.E., 6,000 of the rebels (evidently, of the Pharisees for the most part) deserted unexpectedly, for reasons unknown (perhaps, out of fear that the Gentile king Demetrius Eucærus would take possession of the holy city of Jerusalem), to Jannæus and the Sadducees still faithful to him. Probably, it is this very event that the Commentary's author hints at in the text 4QPNAH 3:12—4:1, which runs as follows: «[... "Put and the Lybians came to you (Nahum means the city of Thebes. — *I. T.*) to help"] (NAHUM 3:9). Its interpretation: these are the wicked on[es], the house of Peleg (בַּת פֶּלֶג; cf. GENESIS 10:25, JUBILEES 8:8 (lit. "the house of division"); cf. CD 20:22—24, wherein this designation evidently refers to the Pharisees. — *I. T.*), who have joined themselves to Manasseh (הַנְּלוּיִים עַל מְנַשֶּׁה)». It is also known that soon after this event Demetrius III Eucærus had to escape from Judæa because of the internecine dissensions started in Syria. This permitted Alexander Jannæus to utterly defeat the insurgents at the end (?) of 88 B.C.E., to capture Jerusalem and to conclusively punish those rebels who failed to flee from Judæa. But these events seem to *have escaped* the commentator's view. The situation in the country depicted in the Qumran Commentary of Nahum can be characterized as the *diarchy* of the Pharisees and the Sadducees headed by the king Alexander — the situation which lasted for only a few months (?) of 88 B.C.E. Consequently, we think that this work could be composed only in the same year — 88 B.C.E.

Of crucial importance for dating the Commentary on Nahum and identifying the person hidden under the designation of the Furious Young Lion is the text 4QPNAH 2:8—9, which reads that through "Ephraim's" (*i. e.* the Pharisees') fault "the cities and clans, the *kings* (מְלָכִים), superiors, honourable men and rules, the priests and the people along with the adherent

proselytes will perish (יִוָּבְדוּ)". Since in the Qumran texts the notions "king", "kingdom", "reign" and "rule", "ruler" are differentiated¹³, it is possible, in the light of the passage cited above, to say that the head of the Judaeian state, contemporary to the author of 4QPNAH (and such was undoubtedly the Furious Young Lion, as the cited texts of 4QPNAH show (cf. also 4QP^{HOS}^b fr. 2)), bore the title of "king". Until 63 B.C.E., that is prior to the time when Pompey seized Judaea and deprived it of the right to have a king, there had been five people in the country thus entitled (during the Hellenistic period, of course): Aristobulus I (104—103), Alexander Jannaeus (103—76), Alexandra Salome (76—67), Hyrcanus II (for three months in 67 B.C.E.), and Aristobulus II (67—63). Evidently, the short-term reigns of both Aristobulus and Hyrcanus can be ignored because, firstly, deeds of these persons do not fit at all in what is said in the Commentary on Nahum about the Furious Young Lion, and, secondly, because no one of the persons mentioned was a contemporary of Demetrius III Eucerus who died in 88/87 B.C.E. Consequently, the only candidate for the Furious Young Lion "role" is likely to be the king and high-priest Alexander Jannaeus who was 32 years old by the time when the mass violent reprisals against the rebels were begun (and when this nickname is likely to have arisen). We should note here that the assumption of the year 63 B.C.E. being the *terminus ante quem* of the Commentary on Nahum's composition is also favoured, apart of the aforementioned passage of 4QPNAH 2:8—10, by the fragment 4QPNAH 1:3—4: "...from Antiochus to the time when the rulers of the Kittim will appear, and then (וְאַחַר) [the land (הָאֶרֶץ) (or: "Jerusalem"; cf. 4QPNAH 1:1—2 (!). — *I. T.*)] will be trodden down (תִּרְמַס)...". The context (and the adverb אַחַר ("then", "afterwards") above all) presupposes that the imperfect of the verb נִרְמַס (niph. sing. *fem.*; der. from רָמַס ("to tread down", "to trample")) is consistent here with the future tense, and the agent will be the Kittim, *i. e.* the Romans of the Republican period. Consequently, the appearance of the host of the Kittim-Romans in Judaea is regarded by the Commentary's author as the event of the time to come.

According to 4QPNAH 2:2, 3:3, 4:3, the events reflected in the Commentary on Nahum are thought by its author to take place "in the last days" (לְאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים; lit.: "towards the End of Days"), "at the end" of the "last (or, "final") period" immediately preceding the coming of the Eschaton. In this connection let us mention also that in the Qumran Commentary on Hosea a synonym of the "Furious Young Lion" (*i. e.* Alexander Jannaeus), "who stretches out (יִשְׁלַח) his hand in order to strike Ephraim (*sc.* the Pharisees)", is the designation "the Last Priest" (כֹּהֵן הָאַחֲרוֹן)¹⁴ (see 4QP^{HOS}^b fr. 2, 2—3; cf. also 1QP^{HAB} 9:4—5). In our view, the eschatological background of

the 4QPNH text, as well as the existence of the conviction among the Qumranites at a certain historical stage that Jannaeus would be the last of the wicked Judaeen high-priests and kings can be explained proceeding from the Community's messianic and eschatological chronology. So, judging by the so-called Midrash Melchizedek (11QMELCH 2:7—8), Second-Ezekiel (4Q390 1:7—8) and the Damascus Document (see esp. 1:5—12, 20:13—15), the Sectarials expected originally the coming of the End of Days and the advent of the Messiah to take place after the expiration of the "ten jubilees" (10 × 49), *i. e.* 490 years, from the time of Nebuchadnezzar's capture of Judaea (in 587/586 B.C.E.), *viz.* in *ca.* 97/96 B.C.E. (Cf. TEST LEVI 17:1—18:2). In this relation, let us note that a tradition, in conformity with which Alexander Jannaeus was considered at a certain historical stage the *last* Hasmonaean high-priest and king, appears to be attested also in Josephus' "Antiquities", XIII, 301. According to the chronology presented here, the last, 70th "heptad" (7 years) of DANIEL 9:26—27, preceding the triumph of the Messiah and the coming of the Eschaton, begins with the accession of Jannaeus in 103 B.C.E. (Cf. DANIEL 9:24—27 and TEST LEVI 16:1, 17:1; cf. also 1ENOCH 89:59). Besides, let us point out "Demonstratio Evangelica", VIII, 2, 87—88, where Eusebius refers to an exegesis of DANIEL 9:26 (apparently a Jewish one taken over into Christianity), in which "an anointed one" mentioned here, who "shall be cut off" after 69 "heptads" (elapsed from the time of the Babylonians' destruction of Jerusalem) is interpreted of the line of Judaeen high-priests from Jeshua to *Alexander Jannaeus*.

The Qumranites' disappointment connected with the fact of the non-advent of the Messiah and the failed coming of the Eschaton in the originally expected time found its reflection in the Sectarials' Commentary on Habakkuk (1QPHAB) 7:1—14. But at the same time, the author of the composition keeps believing that the End of Days is *at hand* (cf. 1QPHAB 2:5—6, 5:7—8; cf. also 9:6). And what is more, in the text 1QPHAB 7:5—6, 9—10, 13—14 we read the following: «... "For the vision is yet for the appointed time; it speaks of the End and does not lie" (HABAKKUK 2:3a)... " If he (in the Qumranites' interpretation evidently the Messiah — the "Elect One" of God (see 1QPHAB 5:4; cf. 9:12). — *I. T.*) tarries, wait for him; for he shall surely come and shall not delay" (HABAKKUK 2:3b). Its interpretation concerns the men of truth who observe the Law (*sc.* the Sectarials. — *I. T.*), whose hands do not slacken in the service of truth when to them the last ("final") period (seems) to be delayed (or, "prolonged") (בהמשך עליהם הק האחרון); for all the periods of God come to pass *at their appointed times* (italics ours. — *I. T.*) as He decreed for them in the mysteries of His Providence". How can one interpret the last phases of the Commentary on Habakkuk?

Answering this question, let us remind, first of all, that in "The Jewish War", I, 70 (cf. "Antiquities", XIII, 301) and the "Jewish Antiquities", XII, 322 Josephus Flavius uses the eschatological chronology, according to which the coming of the End of Days was expected to take place *ca.* 86 B.C.E. (This chronology is connected by the historian with Daniel's prophesy about the "seventy heptads", *i. e.* 490 years (see DANIEL 9:24—27)). This date of the coming of the Eschaton could be determined by those Jews who expected the beginning of metahistory after the lapse of the ten jubilees on the destruction of the First Temple (as, for instance, the Qumranites did; see: Second-Ezekiel (4Q390), 11QMELCH 2) and saw fit (on the basis of LEVITICUS 25:10—11) to consider a jubilee a period of time consisting of 50 years, not of 49. (Note that a 50-year jubilee was generally supposed by rabbis for the period of the First Temple)¹⁵. The eschatological chronology based on a 50-year jubilee (10 × 50) could be "correlated" with the one presented in DANIEL 9:24—27 by means of the assumption that God's "word" about the future restoration of Jerusalem (DANIEL 9:25) was not the one proclaimed by Jeremiah *ca.* 587/586 B.C.E. (JEREMIAH 32), but that recorded in JEREMIAH 50 or/and in the deuterocanonical EPISTLE OF JEREMIAH 1:3 (composed before the 1st century B.C.E.; cf. 7Q2). The context of the last two passages allowed some interpreters to suppose that Lord's "word" recorded in them (*sc.* the "word" about the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity and the restoration of the Land) was uttered in the first years (say, ten) after the destruction of the First Temple. It is not impossible that after a ruin of their hopes *ca.* 96 B.C.E., the Qumranites could use both of the above-mentioned methods of the chronological reinterpretation of Second-Ezekiel's (4Q390; cf. 11QMELCH 2:7—8) and Daniel's (DANIEL 9:24—27) visions on the time of the End of Days.

In the light of all the above-said one can suppose that at the beginning of the 1st century B.C.E. the Qumranites held Alexander Jannaeus to be the *last* (wicked) Judaeon high-priest and king because they believed that they lived on the eve of the Eschaton and the advent of the priestly and lay Messiah. And that is why the author of the Commentary on Nahum, compiling it (*ex hypothesi*) in 88 B.C.E., is sure that the events being depicted by him in the composition take place "*in the last days*" before the Eschaton.

Notes

1. The Book of the prophet Nahum the Elkoshite was composed between 663/662 and 612 (or 609) B.C.E. See, for instance: I. M. Diakonov. *Istoria Midii ot drevnejshikh vremjon do kontsa IV v. do n. e.* Moscow-Leningrad, 1956, pp. 15, 297, 303 (*Russian*); O. Eissfeldt. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 3. neubearbeitete Aufl., Tübingen, 1964, SS. 559—61; J. D. Amusin. *Teksty Qumrana*. Moscow, 1971, pp. 203f (*Russian*).

2. In the fragments of 4QMishm there are met (off the context) the names of Si[mon] (*sc.* Simon Maccabaeus (?); C^a, fr. 3, 2), Johanan (*sc.* Johanan (John) Hyrcanus I; C^c, fr. 2, 4—5), Salome (*sc.* Alexandra Salome, Jannaeus' wife; C^a, fr. 2, 4, C^c, fr. 1, 5), Hyrcanus (*sc.* Hyrcanus II; C^a, fr. 2, 6), Ar[istobulus] (*sc.* Aristobulus II (?); C^b, fr. 3, 6), Aemilius (*sc.* Aemilius Scaurus — Roman governor in Syria in 62 B.C.E.; C^d, fr. 2, 4). As to the text 4Q448 ("A Prayer for King Jonathan and His Kingdom"), it was probably composed by one of King Jonathan's (*i. e.* Alexander Jannaeus') followers and brought to Qumran by one of the sectarians (possibly, for the purpose of acquaintance).

3. See also: H. H. Rowley. 4QpNanum and the Teacher of Righteousness. — JBL 75 (1956), pp. 188—193; Sh. A. Loewenstamm. The Commentary on Nahum: War with the Pharisees. Haarez (Tarbut wesifrut), 3. VIII. 1956, p. 1 (*Hebrew*).

For the most part, scholars identify "Antiochus" mentioned in 4QpNah 1:3 with Antiochus IV Epiphanes. (See, for instance: J. M. Allegro. Further Light on the History of Qumran Sect. — JBL 75 (1956), pp. 89—93; A. Dupont-Sommer. Les écrits esséniens découverts près de la mer Morte. 4 éd., Paris 1980, pp. 280f., n. 3; Amusin. Teskty..., p. 219, n. 10). F. Cross accepts the identification of this person with Antiochus VII Sidetes. (The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies, New York, 1958, p. 92). And I. Levy is of the opinion that this passage deals with Antiochus, brother of the Syrian king Demetrius III Eucærus. (See: Demetrius and Antiochus in the Commentary on Nahum. נשׁמ 35 (1956), p. 2 (*Hebrew*)).

4. See, for instance: J. M. Allegro. THRAKIDAN, The "Lion of Wrath" and Alexander Jannaeus. — PEQ 91 (1959), pp. 47—51; Cross. Library..., pp. 91—94; G. Jeremias. Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit. Göttingen, 1963, SS. 127—39; Dupon-Sommer. Écrits..., pp. 280ff; Amusin. Teksty..., pp. 208—10; H. Stegemann. Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde. Bonn, 1971, SS. 120—128; *idem*. Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus. Freiburg, 1993, SS. 182—184; P. H. Callaway. The History of the Qumran Community. Sheffield, 1988, pp. 164—168.

It is H. H. Rowley's opinion that "Demetrius" of the text 4QpNah 1:2 is the Seleucid king Demetrius I Soter (162—150 B.C.E.) who was provoked by an intrigue of the Judæan high-priest Alcimus to dispatch in 161 B.C.E. his strategists Bacchides and Nicanor against Jerusalem. As to "the expounders of smooth things" mentioned in this passage, these are, according to Rowley, members of the hellenizing party of Alcimus. (See: 4QpNah..., pp. 188—93; see also: I. Rabinowitz. The Meaning of the Key ("Demetrius") Passage of the Qumran Nahum-Pesher. — JAOS 98 (1978), pp. 394—9).

5. See, for instance, the works listed in the preceding note (those by H. H. Rowley and I. Rabinowitz excluded).

6. See *e. g.*: J. D. Amusin. Qumranskij kommentarij na Nauma. — VDI 4 (1962), pp. 101—10 (*Russian*); *idem*. Éphraïm et Manassé dans le Peshèr de Nahum (4QpNahum), RQ 15 (1963), pp. 389—396; *idem*. The Reflection of the Historical Events of the First Century B.C. in Qumran Commentaries (4Q161; 4Q169; 4Q166). — HUCA 48 (1978), pp. 123—152; D. Flusser. Kat Midbar Yehuda. — M 19 (1961), pp. 456—458 (*Hebrew*); *idem*. Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes in Peshèr Nahum, G. Alon Memorial Volume, Tel-Aviv, 1970, pp. 133—168 (*Hebrew*); Y. Yadin. Peshèr Nahum. — (4QpNahum) Reconsidered. — IEJ 21 (1971), pp. 1—12. See also: M. Horgan. Pesharim: Qumran Interpretation of Biblical Books. Washington, 1979, pp. 7f.; I. Fröhlich. Le genre littéraire des Pesharim de Qumrân, RQ 47 (1986), p. 391. Cf.: Stegemann. Entstehung..., SS. 76—79, 120—128; Callaway. History..., pp. 164—171.

7. See *e. g.*: Le Commentaire de Nahum découvert près de la mer Morte (4QpNah): Traduction et notes. — Semitica XIII (1963), pp. 55—88.

8. Cf.: Stegemann. Essener..., SS. 182—4.

9. See, for instance: Allegro. THRAKIDAN..., pp. 47—57; Cross. Library..., pp. 91—94; Jeremias. Lehrer..., SS. 127—139; Dupont-Sommer. Écrits..., pp. 280—282; Stegemann. Entstehung..., SS. 120—128.

H. H. Rowley supposes that the designation "Furious Young Lion" in 4QpNah implies either the high-priest Alcimus or the king Antiochus IV Epiphanes (4QpNahum..., pp. 192f.). H. J. Schonfield identifies this person with the Roman Emperor Titus (39—81 C.E.) (Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Studies towards their Solution. London, 1956, pp. 96f.), while G. R. Driver — with one of the leaders of the 66—74 Judaeen uprising against Roman domination Simon bar Giora (The Judaeen Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution. Oxford, 1965, pp. 291f.).

10. Reconstruction by Y. Yadin. (Peshar Nahum..., p. 12).

11. In regard to this translation see, for instance: Amusin. Teksty..., p. 225.

12. Cf. Isaiah 9:18—20; cf. also Judges 8:1—3, 12:1—6.

13. See, for instance: J. T. Milik. Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea, transl. by J. Strugnell. London, 1959, pp. 65f.; Stegemann. Entstehung..., SS. 100—106, 120—127, 204.

14. The imperfect of the verb נָשַׁט (here: to "stretch out") employed in 4QpHos^b fr. 2, 3 for the designation of the action of the Last Priest shows that he was alive at the time of the composition of the Commentary. The denomination "the Last Priest" itself corroborates this conclusion as well, for it would be meaningless, if the Commentary on Hosea was being composed on the person's death, in the period of the pontificate of one of the next Judaeen high-priests.

15. A jubilee was held to be a cycle of time consisting of 49 years by the author(s) of the Book of Jubilees, by some rabbis (see *e. g.*: Arakhin, 12b, Nedarim, 61a (R. Jehudah); cf. the Seder Olam, 15) and the Samaritans.

Abbreviations

HUCA	—	Hebrew Union College Annual
IEJ	—	Israel Exploration Journal
JAOS	—	Journal of the Americal Oriental Society
JBL	—	Journal of Biblical Literature
M	—	Molad
NAA	—	Narody Azii i Afriki
PEQ	—	Palestine Exploration Quarterly
RQ	—	Revue de Qumrân
VDI	—	Vestnik drevnej istorii