

ALLUSIONS TO THE END OF THE HASMONEAN DYNASTY  
IN *PESHER NAHUM* (4Q169)

GREGORY L. DOUDNA  
Bellingham, Washington

Through the accident of the early editorial selections Allegro was assigned most of the pesharim, which have produced much speculation. Historical scenario proposals have a notorious track record of being wrong. Nevertheless I would like to suggest a new framework for an historical context for these texts that I hope will advance discussion, with a revisiting of several elements of *Pesher Nahum*.

COLUMN I

(1) As can be seen in fragments 3–4, column I, line 1, Jerusalem is a dwelling for the nations. The theme of conquest by gentiles runs throughout these columns and is the most basic theme in this text. In lines 1–2 in the quotation there are two lions. The second lion may be a lion whelp or cub as commonly translated, a גֹּר אֲרִי, but this does not mean he is the cub of the first lion or subordinate to the first lion. גֹּר אֲרִי is used in Biblical Hebrew for a young lion fearsome and active in its own right. The tribe of Judah is called a גֹּר אֲרִיָּה at Gen 49:9 and Dan is called a גֹּר אֲרִיָּה at Deut 33:22. The גֹּר אֲרִי, the lion whelp, simply names a second active independent lion.

As I read it, the ancient authors interpreted the first lion as Demetrius and the second lion as the Lion of Wrath. The authors seem to have interpreted the two lions in terms of a contrast between two foreign powers. Demetrius represents the kings of Yavan of the past and the Lion of Wrath represents the Kittim of the present. The first lion, Demetrius, of the past, failed to conquer Jerusalem. The second lion, the Lion of Wrath, of the present, does conquer Jerusalem.

(2) In col. I, line 5, “his great men and his men of counsel” refers to the regime of a doomed Israelite ruler. These pronouns, “his great men” and “his men of counsel,” refer to the same figure as do the pronouns at lines 10–11 and II, 1, “his army detachments,” “his great men,” “his envoys.” All of these pronouns, in line 5 and again at lines

10 and 11 and II, 1, refer to the same figure in the world of the text, a doomed ruler of Israel who is different from the Lion of Wrath and who is the Lion of Wrath's victim.

Later in cols. III and IV the identical pronouns and language appear as in col. I. It is the same doomed ruler of Israel, the same warriors and great men and armies. In cols. III and IV this figure is named "Manasseh." The real uncertainty is not whether there was a doomed Israelite ruler in col. I who is the same figure as in the later columns, but how the wording worked exactly in the lacunae.

(3) In line 8 the reference to something that happened in Israel in the past, בִּישְׂרָאֵל מִלְּפָנַיִם, is likely to be an allusion to the crucifixions by Alexander Jannaeus, since the Demetrius episode in which those crucifixions occurred has been named in the immediate context as the past event of interest to the text, in lines 2–3. (We know that the Demetrius episode is in the text's past because it is expressed with a perfect verb and is situated by the text temporally prior to the Kittim. By contrast, the text never situates the Lion of Wrath or other of its conquest images in its past.)

(4) The final words of the pesher in line 8, בִּי לְתֹלֵי חַי עַל הָעֵץ [יִקְרָא], are ungrammatical as they stand. Either there was a missing expression, "accursed of God," finishing the sentence or else the text is not mistaken in which case it is a continuous reading and the following lemma or quotation provides the expected imprecation or curse from God. This is not a choice between two ways of reading the existing text. The existing text as it stands can only be read grammatically as the continuous reading. The question is whether to emend the text on the assumption that a scribal mistake or intentional omission has made the text ungrammatical. But there are three good reasons that support reading the text at line 8 as it stands. First, the continuous reading is grammatical. Second, it fulfills the exact expected words of a curse from God. And third, it introduces the ruler of Israel of the next pesher as hung up alive to die, and this makes very good sense in the larger context of the pesharim.

This last point might sound surprising in light of all the speculation in earlier times concerning a mysterious crucified Teacher of Righteousness. But that is not what is being said here. First of all, as Shani Tzoref has pointed out, if the closing words of the pesher in line 8 are read with only the first phrase of the following quotation and then one stops there, the phrase reads as an indefinite and generic comment concerning the accursedness of all of the ones hung alive of line 7,

without referring to any one of them specifically.<sup>1</sup> But if the line 8 words are read as continuous with the full following quotation and peshet, the text makes the same point while at the same time alluding to a specific case illustrating the point, namely the wicked ruler of lines 10 to II, 1, who is hung up alive and accursed. And that reading—of line 8 as continuous with the next peshet of lines 10 to II, 1—makes the best sense for this reason: it provides a fate for the wicked ruler himself of lines 10 to II, 1, which otherwise is missing from that unit.

The important point is that *textually* there is nothing surprising or unusual in an image of the ruler of Israel himself being hung up alive, because that is parallel to the depictions in *Peshet Habakkuk* and *Peshet Psalms A* of the fate of the wicked rulers of Israel in those texts. *Peshet Habakkuk* and *Peshet Psalms A* are very graphic in their depictions of torture and death at the hands of gentiles for their wicked ruler of Israel. This would simply be *Peshet Nahum's* allusion to the same theme.

The major objection raised in secondary literature to this reading of *Peshet Nahum*, as alluding to a doomed ruler of Israel hung up alive, has actually been a non-textual reason: a perception that nothing corresponds with such an image in known history. Was there ever a Jewish ruler, a Hasmonean king or high priest, in the era of these texts who was hung up alive? Actually, there was. But first it is necessary to consider some other matters.

#### READING PESHER NAHUM AS ALLUDING TO CONTEMPORARY EVENTS

Usually the sobriquet-bearing figures of the pesharim are assumed to be situated in or drawn from the dim past with respect to the time of the authors. But is that a sound reading of these texts? Early voices such as André Dupont-Sommer, J. P. M. van der Ploeg, Jean Carmignac, Karl Elliger, and others, read the contexts and sobriquet-bearing figures in these texts as contemporary with these texts' authors. That insight of those early voices came to be ignored for non-textual reasons but was never really refuted. The key point is this: if the pesharim

---

<sup>1</sup> Shani Berrin (Tzoref), *The Peshet Nahum Scroll from Qumran* (STDJ 53; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 185–8.

are read without extraneous assumptions, on their own terms, their sobriquet-bearing figures read as if they are contemporary with the world of the texts.

And this raises the question: why insist on reading the temporal settings of the sobriquet-bearing figures of these texts differently than the texts present them? What happens if the figures and settings in these texts *are* read as contemporary with the world of the authors, in keeping with the apparent intentions of these texts? Perhaps some things might make better sense. For example, an historical Wicked Priest of *Pesher Habakkuk*, if there was one, would be active before Herod, because this figure is portrayed as ruling over Israel, but not much before Herod, because the Wicked Priest's regime is portrayed as falling in the context of a Kittim or Roman invasion, and the Romans are not in Judea until the middle of the first century BCE. The texts read as if they allude to first century BCE contexts, with the Kittim as part of a larger landscape or setting which includes the sobriquet-bearing figures, and that landscape as contemporary with the authors of the texts. In this light the Wicked Priest would be situated within a fairly narrow window of time in the world of the texts—between the time of Roman arrival and Herod, which is to say, somewhere between about the 60s and 30s BCE.

And it is important to interject here that in the world of these texts there seems to be only one Wicked Priest. There is no alternative Wicked Priest dying from disease in *Pesher Habakkuk* as is sometimes claimed; that is a misunderstanding. It is all death by torture for this figure in the texts, divine justice carried out at the hands of gentiles.<sup>2</sup> Nor do the “last priests of Jerusalem” of 1QpHab IX, 4 carry an implication of multiple high priest regimes in succession. They are the same as “the priests of Jerusalem” in the parallel pesher at 4QpNah 3–4 I, 11, a collective term for a regime of priests, and the expression reads well as alternative language for the wicked ruler's regime.

In the world of the texts the Wicked Priest is killed by gentiles. In *Pesher Psalms A* this is explicit: God gives the Wicked Priest “into the hand of the ruthless ones of the nations to execute [vengeance] upon him” (4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1–10 IV, 8–10). *Pesher Habakkuk*'s columns VIII and IX refer to “vengeful acts on his fleshly body” and being “delivered into

---

<sup>2</sup> Gregory L. Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum: A Critical Edition* (JSPSup 35; Copenhagen International Series 8; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 621–2.

the hands of his enemies” in the context of foreign invasion and in parallel with *Pesher Psalms A*. And *Pesher Habakkuk* col. X may allude to this figure’s death happening outside Judea among the nations.

There is only one context in the first century BCE with which this portrayal of violent death at the hands of gentiles for a ruler of Israel corresponds, and that is the Roman invasion which ended the Hasmonean dynasty in 37 BCE. That Roman invasion was an army sent by Mark Antony to install Herod as king, and it brought a violent and horrific end to the regime of the last Hasmonean king and high priest, Antigonus Mattathias. There was a siege and a massacre in Jerusalem and the temple was looted by Roman soldiers. Antigonus Mattathias was captured in Jerusalem and killed by gentiles in a foreign country. And of particular interest in light of the allusion in *Pesher Nahum* is the fact that Cassius Dio, the Roman historian, says that Antigonus Mattathias was hung up alive on a cross and tortured in the process of being executed by Mark Antony.<sup>3</sup> In his death at the hands of gentiles Antigonus Mattathias corresponds with the portrayal of the death of the Wicked Priest, and Antigonus Mattathias is the only Hasmonean ruler of the first century BCE who does.

And so it seems to me that the wicked ruler of these texts reflects Antigonus Mattathias, and that the Lion of Wrath alludes to Mark Antony who hung up alive Antigonus and perhaps other members of Antigonus’s regime similarly unremarked in Josephus, and that key Qumran pesharim such as *Pesher Habakkuk*, *Pesher Psalms A*, *Pesher Nahum*, *Pesher Hosea B* and others all allude in their various ways to the downfall of this last Hasmonean ruler, Antigonus Mattathias. And it is surprising to me that this suggestion seems to be new. Despite the striking correspondences between Antigonus Mattathias and the Wicked Priest just named and no obvious counter-indication, so far as I have been able to discover there has never previously been a scholarly suggestion that the Wicked Priest might allude to Antigonus Mattathias. And in asking how Antigonus Mattathias was missed I am including myself, for I too missed this in my study of *Pesher Nahum* of 2001. Now let us return to *Pesher Nahum* again.

---

<sup>3</sup> Cassius Dio, *Roman History* 5.49, 22.

## COLUMNS II–IV

(5) In column II, line 8, Shani Tzoref is correct that grammatically the expression *מתעי אפרים*, “leaders-astay of Ephraim,” which is another term for the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, is a partitive genitive.<sup>4</sup> That is, the text is calling the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things Ephraimites. In the world of the biblical and Qumran texts Israel consists of Judah and Ephraim, and Ephraim is more or less everyone of Israel from north of Judah. The image in *Pesher Nahum* is that these Seekers-after-Smooth-Things are non-Judeans. In col. II, line 2, the “city of Ephraim” is Jerusalem controlled by the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, and reads as an image of Jerusalem as a city of non-Judeans, that is, a city dominated or ruled over by Ephraimites. At the same time the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things in *Pesher Nahum* seem to correspond with Josephus’s Pharisees who may have been more widespread and diverse than just in Judea.

It can indirectly be argued that Antigonus Mattathias had the support of Pharisees and the Sanhedrin. Josephus says Herod killed the entire Sanhedrin when he came to power.<sup>5</sup> This Sanhedrin functioned under Antigonus after Antigonus deposed Hyrcanus II. Meanwhile, Shani Tzoref has argued that there was hostility from the Pharisees towards Hyrcanus II in the later years of Hyrcanus’s high priesthood over the issue of his protection of Herod from their prosecution, which could reinforce a motive for their support of Antigonus Mattathias in accomplishing the removal of Hyrcanus II and Herod.<sup>6</sup>

Antigonus Mattathias lived most of his life away from Judea and raised his army from outside Judea. When Antigonus entered and took control of Jerusalem the upheaval in power may have involved non-Judeans arriving in significant numbers with Antigonus to Jerusalem. The non-Judean components of Antigonus’s regime could be alluded to in *Pesher Nahum* as “Ephraim.”

(6) Starting in col. III, line 9, the wicked ruler of Israel of the pronouns of col. I appears again, named “Manasseh.” Manasseh’s name is taken from the name of the famous wicked king Manasseh of Jerusalem of the Bible, who is credited with having brought about the ancient

<sup>4</sup> Berrin, *Pesher Nahum Scroll*, 198–9.

<sup>5</sup> *Ant.* 14.9.4 (175).

<sup>6</sup> Berrin, *Pesher Nahum Scroll*, 233 n. 132.

destruction of Judah through his wickedness. The text is comparing the current ruler of Israel with king Manasseh of old.

The most common geographical description of Israel in both biblical and Qumran texts is two-part, Judah and Ephraim. In fact there is no use of Manasseh as a third geographical or ethnic term in any Qumran sectarian text with the sole exception of *Pesher Psalms A* where there are wicked ones of Manasseh named along with wicked ones of Ephraim, Judah, and Israel, that is, wicked ones from all Israel (4QpPs<sup>a</sup> 1–10 II, 14–16; 18–20; III, 12). But Israel in the world of *Pesher Nahum* should be understood in terms of the more basic two-part scheme in which Israel consists of Judah and Ephraim. *Pesher Nahum* adds the name “Manasseh” not as a third ethnic component but as its name for the wicked ruler of Israel.

#### THE TEACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

An accurate identification of the wicked ruler of these texts could also potentially help identify the wicked ruler’s contemporary in the world of the texts, the elusive Teacher of Righteousness, the *מורה הצדק* or True Lawgiver. For a lot of reasons, including his titles and functions, the Teacher of Righteousness reads as a high priest figure in the world of the texts, even though the texts portray him as in exile. The high priest was the “lawgiver” or one who decided halakhic matters, and as John Reeves and others have shown, that is what *מורה הצדק* means: law-interpreter or halakhic interpreter.<sup>7</sup> All of the Teacher’s titles, the Unique Teacher, the Interpreter of the Law, the Priest, and so on, evoke a high priest. George Wesley Buchanan noted that the Teacher of CD XX, 27–34 leads the people in confessing sins and receiving atonement from God, which is what the high priest did. Buchanan concluded that the Teacher of CD was regarded as a high priest, and that the expression *מורה הצדק* which in later centuries uncontroversially is used as a term for high priest was another way of saying “high priest” in these earlier texts as well.<sup>8</sup> The high priest may have gone to heaven mystically in certain rites, and in some Qumran texts the

<sup>7</sup> John C. Reeves, “The Meaning of Moreh Sedeq in the Light of 11QTorah,” *RevQ* 13/49–52 (1988): 287–98.

<sup>8</sup> George Wesley Buchanan, “The Priestly Teacher of Righteousness,” *RevQ* 6/24 (1969): 553–6.

Teacher seems to have gone to heaven mystically. There is much more that supports this high priestly identification.

In short, when all the text allusions are put together, the characterization of the Teacher is as a high priest figure. The texts talk about this figure as if he is a high priest, but he is not in the temple in Jerusalem functioning as a high priest in the world of the texts. What is to be made of this? Why is this figure portrayed in this way? Some scholars long ago including the late Hartmut Stegemann gave a solution which has been accepted by many: the reason this figure is so much like a high priest is because he *was* a high priest, *had been* high priest before he became the exiled figure whose followers regard him still as the legitimate high priest. As noted, this solution is not new. It already has a wide circulation in Qumran scholarship. What *is* new is combining that valid insight with the first century BCE dating, which has rarely been done before. And if this is correct—that the Teacher was both a former high priest *and* contemporary with the authors—then the Teacher, instead of being an *unknown* high priest of the second century BCE, might become one of the *known* high priests of the first century BCE. Is it possible that the mysterious Teacher of the Qumran texts, so ethereal and reified in his anonymity in scholarly portrayals, has been visible and unnoticed all this time in plain view, so to speak?

Was there a contemporary ex-high priest in exile whose supporters would have reason to portray Antigonus Mattathias in the worst possible light?

There was. By 40 BCE Hyrcanus II, the oldest son of Alexander Jannaeus, had been high priest in Jerusalem for over thirty years. But in that year Antigonus Mattathias, who from Hyrcanus's point of view was his evil nephew, overthrew Hyrcanus with the help of a Parthian army, took over as king and high priest and, as told by Josephus, unkindly cut off Hyrcanus's ears, thereby disqualifying Hyrcanus from being high priest and no doubt further straining the family relationship. Hyrcanus was then exiled to Babylon, where Josephus says he was regarded with honor and acclaimed as the legitimate high priest by the Jews of Babylon.<sup>9</sup> That is, Hyrcanus II in exile was regarded as

---

<sup>9</sup> "When Hyrcanus was brought there, the Parthian king Phraates treated him very leniently because he had learned of his distinguished and noble lineage. For this reason he released him from his bonds and permitted him to settle in Babylon, where there was a great number of Jews. These men honoured Hyrcanus as their high priest



the legitimate lawgiver at the same time that he was opposed to the Hasmonean high priest ruling in Jerusalem.

If this sounds familiar, perhaps it is because this is the picture evoked by the traditional portrayal of the Teacher of Righteousness as so often described. After his overthrow by Antigonus Mattathias, Hyrcanus II echoes the basic features of the Teacher of Righteousness in being an ex-high priest, expelled from the temple, cast into exile and opposed to a regime in Jerusalem which fell in a brutal Roman conquest.

But just as was the case with Antigonus Mattathias as the wicked figure, there is no sign in the history of scholarship that Hyrcanus II ever was considered an even hypothetically possible candidate for identification as the Teacher. Why was this?

There was of course a chronological presupposition which is part of the explanation: many scholars have held a notion over these past decades that the buildings at Qumran were built on the orders of the Teacher of Righteousness around 150 BCE. It is doubtful that many today still adhere to this particular reason, since the rebuilding at Qumran is now generally believed to have started in the first century BCE, and since even more fundamentally there never has been any evidence that the dating of the Teacher had anything to do with constructing buildings at Qumran. But even as an historical explanation this is not a full explanation, since there were a number of scholars in earlier years who did read the pesharim as alluding to contemporary contexts, who were looking at figures and settings in the 1st century BCE, and without exception *they too* never considered Hyrcanus II as a possible identity for the Teacher. Why was that?

One reason may have been that it has sometimes been thought that Hyrcanus II was pro-Pharisee whereas the Qumran texts are anti-Pharisee. But a close reading of Josephus shows no evidence that Hyrcanus II favored the Pharisees, as distinguished from relating to the Pharisees as rivals to the Hasmonean family fortunes.<sup>10</sup>

---

and king, as did all of the Jewish nation occupying the region as far as the Euphrates" (Josephus, *Ant.* 15.2.2 (14–15); trans. Marcus).

<sup>10</sup> Jean Le Moyné's 1972 *Les Sadducées* saw no Hyrcanus II/Pharisee alignment. Nor did Anthony Saldarini in his 1997 *Pharisees, Scribes, and Sadducees in Palestinian Society*. James VanderKam notes that "the sources say nothing" about Pharisees exercising influence on Hyrcanus II (*From Joshua to Caiaphas. High Priests after the Exile* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004], 338). And so on. Hyrcanus II's sectarian orientation is now generally understood to have been Sadducee: e.g., Rachel Bar-Nathan: "it is known that the Hasmonean rulers, with the exception of Queen Alexandra,

There also used to be an idea that the Hasmonean priests were non-Zadokites who had replaced the Zadokite Oniads in the 160s BCE, whereas the Zadokite priests of the Qumran texts were from the earlier Oniad line and opposed to the non-Zadokite Hasmoneans. But there never was any evidence for that construction either—either that the Hasmoneans did not claim to be Zadokites or that the Oniads did. No ancient text or inscription attests to either of those notions, and a number of studies in recent years, from Liver 1967 (the Hasmonean course of Joiarib was Zadokite), DeQueker 1986 (the Hasmoneans understood themselves to be Zadokites), Hjelm 2000 (the Hasmoneans identified themselves as Zadokites), Grabbe 2004 (no evidence the Oniads were Zadokites), Schofield and VanderKam 2005 (considerable reason to believe the Hasmoneans were Zadokites, no evidence to the contrary), Hunt 2006 (the Oniads were not Zadokites), and others have put an end to this idea as well. This means that when the Qumran *Rule of the Community* texts refer to its priests as sons of Zadok, there is no indication in that expression of a difference between those priests and priests of the temple in the era of the Hasmoneans. And any assumptions that the people of the Qumran texts used a different calendar than that of Hyrcanus II are no more well-founded than these other notions, since there is no independent knowledge of the calendar practices of any of the Hasmonean high priests, and therefore no basis for assuming Hyrcanus II would have been on the opposite side of the calendar disputes in the Qumran texts, as opposed to on the same side.<sup>11</sup>

---

who leaned toward the Pharisees, belonged to the Sadducee sect” (*Hasmonean and Herodian Palaces at Jericho. Final Reports of the 1972–1987 Excavations. Volume III. The Pottery* [Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2002], 186). Bar-Nathan noted similarities in material remains associated with the Hasmonean high priests and Qumran but deflected the question of whether this reflected similar sectarian practices and identity: “[T]he great resemblance of the pottery in Hasmonean Jericho to that of Qumran Period Ib is notable...we shall not discuss whether this similarity indicates a similar sect in both sites, or common Jewish laws and habits, which were practiced throughout Judea” (*Hasmonean and Herodian Palaces at Jericho*, III, 197–8). David Stacey, who excavated with Bar-Nathan, argues that Qumran was “an integral, though outlying” part of the Hasmonean estate at Jericho (David Stacey, “Archaeological Observations on the Aqueducts of Qumran,” *DSD* 14 [2007]: 237). That is, for much of Qumran’s 1st century BCE history, the site and its workers may have been directly or indirectly answerable to Hyrcanus II.

<sup>11</sup> At 1QpHab XI, 4–8, I believe the two sentences in this pesher allude to two distinct events in the world of the text, not one as commonly read. The first is a murder-

## 1QS AND THE ESSENES

However, the biggest factor in the background of everything, shaping thinking and consciousness whether expressed or not, is surely the Essene identification itself. The correspondences between details in the *Rule of the Community* texts and the classical descriptions of the Essenes are striking to most people including me. And so in the back of some people's minds may be this question: how could Hyrcanus II as Teacher of Righteousness be compatible with the identification of the sect of the Qumran texts as Essenes?

To put this question into a larger context: a number of studies of Qumran legal texts have shown "Sadducee" affinities, whereas another substantial set of arguments situates the Qumran texts in the context of an "Essene" identification. While everyone agrees both Sadducees and Essenes are sects, they evoke significantly different phenomena—the one sect associated with ruling Hasmonean high priests in power; the other sect removed from power and separated from the rest of society. The dilemma is that these two lines of textual argument each appear compelling if viewed in isolation, yet if considered together they appear contradictory. The resolution of these two lines of argument is one of the fundamental unresolved scholarly puzzles in understanding the Qumran texts. Here is my attempt at making better sense of this picture.

There is nothing in 1QS concerning any of the sobriquet-bearing figures of the pesharim. Nor is there anything in 1QS which is opposed to the temple. 1QS reads as rules of a religious order, a Hellenistic association, a communally structured association of lay people, ruled over by priests. I suggest considering that 1QS might reflect in its origins something like a ruling regime in Jerusalem sponsoring local party organizations in the countryside. The *yahad* groups of 1QS are subject to the control of priests at every turn. The priests get to eat first, decide things, they have the highest status, and so on. There is

---

ous pursuit by the Wicked Priest of the Teacher driving the Teacher to a place of exile. The second takes place in Jerusalem, in the temple, where the Wicked Priest appears in glory on the Day of Atonement and casts the righteous into disarray. The issue, from the point of view of the text, is a usurpation of the high priesthood by the Wicked Priest. The Wicked Priest drives the Teacher into exile, and then the Wicked Priest assumes the office of high priest vacated by the Teacher. If this reading is correct, the issue at 1QpHab XI, 4–8 is not a calendar dispute but rather a legitimate high priest and usurpation dispute.

no known reason to assume the priests of Zadok of 1QS to be other than priests of the temple in Jerusalem in the world of the text. The *yahad* groups of 1QS are not portrayed as a grassroots lay movement. Lay people are forbidden in 1QS from having meetings of over ten people unless a priest or party officer or commissar is present. That sounds like a rule that priests wrote, not lay people. The formation of the 1QS *yahad* groups may correspond with what the *Damascus Document* calls the revival of Israel, likened to a plant coming back to life (CD I, 5–8). If that is the sense of that allusion, then according to that text's chronological scheme the 1QS *yahad* groups started a couple of decades before the Teacher of Righteousness arose.

So let us imagine that the 1QS rule and *yahad* groups began before the Teacher of Righteousness and were sponsored by priests in power in Jerusalem—perhaps beginning in the time of Alexander Jannaeus, perhaps associated with Alexander Jannaeus's conquests and expansion of the Jerusalem state to areas which he turned into "Israel" again, reviving Israel to its former status of old, as at least a possible context for this. The *yahad* groups might represent a means by which a ruling elite in Jerusalem, a priestly sect in power, extended its influence and control, and projected its practices and ideology, into the countryside and outlying areas.

Hyrchanus II, then, in this picture would have come to the high priesthood with the 1QS *yahad* groups already in existence. According to the *Damascus Document* these groups recognized the leadership of the Teacher when he arose twenty years after Israel revived back to life again. But according to the picture in Josephus, for the first nine years of Hyrchanus II's high priesthood, even though he controlled the temple, Hyrchanus and the priests with him were a minority party and did not control the state or the larger society outside the temple. That is, the picture during this early period is that although Hyrchanus II controlled the temple he was actually not in power. In fact Hyrchanus II never in his life held unchallenged civil power directly, although during the later years of his high priesthood he became revered and influential throughout the eastern Mediterranean world as the nation's most highly respected religious leader or lawgiver. But throughout Hyrchanus II's ups and downs as high priest during these turbulent decades he would have been the leading priest of Zadok, and regarded as the moral authority and lawgiver within the *yahad* groups scattered throughout the countryside.

And so by this reconstruction 1QS *does* describe a sect, but it was an extension of the ruling sect in Jerusalem.<sup>12</sup>

But when Hyrcanus II lost power to Antigonus Mattathias and then Antigonus was killed and Hasmonean rule was no more, what would have happened to these *yahad* groups? Many of these groups might be more or less orphaned, rudderless, without leadership. And that is exactly the way the *Damascus Document* Manuscript B closes, with a picture of the Teacher dead, no replacement Teacher or leader, everyone on their own. The B text of the *Damascus Document* alludes to the recent death of the Teacher and the new situation of the righteous ones being without their Teacher and lawgiver, like the scattered sheep of Zechariah that the B text quotes. In 30 BCE the aged, deposed Hyrcanus II, the longest-serving high priest of the first century BCE, having suffered exile and betrayal, was executed by Herod. Josephus says Herod then attempted to exterminate the remaining members of the Hasmonean dynasty. Some of the orphaned S-groups may have come to terms at this time with living under Herod who agreed to let them practice their ways. These surviving *yahad* groups, now existing independently, might then turn up as the idealized, glorified Essenes of the classical sources.

And so in this way there would be a direct S-Essene connection or continuity, but without any notion that S reflects opposition to the priests of the temple, for nothing in the S texts calls for that notion. In the *Damascus Document* there *is* separation from the priests of the temple, an adversarial relationship, but that text postdates the Teacher and the Teacher's expulsion from the temple. But none of those developments are alluded to or assumed in the world of 1QS, which is explained very simply if 1QS is in fact from earlier, before those events. The key insight here is that when 1QS refers to a separation from the "way of the people," that can be read as a sectarian orientation *held by priests of the temple*. 1QS *extends* the ideology of priestly separateness to selected lay initiates, but nothing in

---

<sup>12</sup> Compare Jutta Jokiranta's discussion of the terms "sect" and "sectarian": "the use of the term 'sect'—if insisted—of a group behind the Scrolls should be free of presuppositions such as that this group had a very marginal position... or that it protested against the Temple establishment" (Jutta Jokiranta, "'Sectarianism' of the Qumran 'Sect': Sociological Notes," *RevQ* 20/78 [2001]: 239 n. 48).

1QS requires reading that as meaning *rejection* of the priests or the temple.

#### CHRONOLOGY OF THE DAMASCUS DOCUMENT

It is often suggested that there is a 490-year chronological scheme, so basic to other Qumran texts, underlying the *Damascus Document* as well: 390 plus 20 to the rise of the Teacher (CD I, 3–11), 40 for the Teacher, and then a final 40 after the death of the Teacher until the new age (CD XIX, 35–XX, 1/XX, 13–15): 490 in total.<sup>13</sup>

The first number, the 390 years, is widely acknowledged to be of no historical usefulness since there is no reason to suppose the authors knew the true date of Nebuchadnezzar or the length of the Persian period.<sup>14</sup> But the other numbers of the scheme from the authors' own time or recent memory could be approximately correct. The revival of Israel like a dead plant coming back to life of CD I, 5–8 might allude to the conquests and expansions of Alexander Jannaeus viewed favorably by the authors of the Qumran texts.<sup>15</sup> The rise of the Teacher twenty

<sup>13</sup> For example Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (5th ed.; New York: Penguin, 1998), 58.

<sup>14</sup> Well summarized by Michael Wise: "The year 587 [for Nebuchadnezzar] is a date modern scholars have deduced only because they have cuneiform writings to combine with the biblical clues. Ancient Jewish chronographers were less fortunate. Indeed, no one in the time of the scrolls was quite sure how long the Persian period had been... Second Temple Jews calculated the length of the Persian period using the 490 years of Dan 9:24–27. Standard practice was first to decide when those 490 years had ended or shortly would end (i.e. when Daniel's prophecies would be fulfilled). Then one reckoned backwards from that very debatable standpoint... Since, therefore, the author of the *Damascus Document* cannot be presumed to have posited the year 587 BCE for Nebuchadnezzar's siege of Jerusalem, the only proper methodology for understanding CD 1:3–11 is to turn the usual approach on its head. One must first determine when the Teacher lived, then work backwards from that point to calculate when the author believed Nebuchadnezzar was on the scene" (Michael Wise, "Dating the Teacher of Righteousness and the *Floruit* of his Movement," *JBL* 122 [2003]: 63–4).

<sup>15</sup> Seth Schwartz: "By the death of Alexander Jannaeus... all of Palestine except for the territory of Ascalon and much of Transjordan were under Hasmonean control... Jerusalem changed from a small hill-country town far from the main trade routes, whose chief distinction was a not very distinguished temple, to the capital city of one of the largest of the kingdoms which succeeded the Seleucid Empire. Alexander's grandfather had been a village priest, low-level rebel leader and brigand; Alexander was an important king. Palestine had been a mosaic of Greek cities and little Hellenized semitic tribal and ethnic units, of which the Judeans were only one, and possibly not the largest; now it was almost entirely 'Jewish'..." (Seth Schwartz, "Israel

years later (CD I, 8–11) might allude to the start of Hyrcanus II as high priest. Josephus gives a figure for Hyrcanus II as in office for “forty years” after Pompey at *Antiquities* 15.6.4 (180). Either that is some sort of round number—Hyrcanus II was high priest for about thirty-two years in total, only twenty-three of which were after Pompey, according to Josephus’s account otherwise—or it is a garbled tradition of a calculation of some actual year-span of Hyrcanus II.<sup>16</sup> In any case that is what Josephus says: forty years for Hyrcanus II. The death of the Teacher would be the death of Hyrcanus II in 30 BCE. The authors’ “present” in the *Damascus Document* B text, meanwhile, is probably about year 450 or 460 or so into the 490, not too long after the death of the Teacher, somewhere in the final forty, which would be not long after 30 BCE.

Not long after the death of Hyrcanus II the lights go out completely in the texts found in the caves at Qumran. It has long been noted that there is not a single name, event, ruler, battle, or allusion to anything later than the first century BCE in any of the texts found in the Qumran caves, or indeed any text known to have been composed later than the 1st century BCE among the finds. The deposits of the texts in the caves around Qumran may also have ended at this time instead of at the First Revolt as commonly supposed. The reason for the end of the texts at this time is unknown but could be related to what Josephus says was Herod’s attempt to exterminate the remaining family and partisans of Hyrcanus II. As Josephus puts it, “None was left alive of the family of Hyrcanus, and the kingdom was wholly in Herod’s power” (*Ant.* 15.8.10 (266)).

In conclusion, the Qumran texts being revised for the new DJD V may echo the final and tragic collapse of the Hasmonean dynasty in ways that have not yet been adequately recognized.

---

and the Nations Roundabout: 1 Maccabees and the Hasmonean Expansion,” *JJS* 42 [1991]: 16–7).

<sup>16</sup> If the c. 4 years Hyrcanus II was in Babylon and regarded as legitimate high priest during Antigonus’s usurpation before Hyrcanus’s return to Jerusalem, and the earlier 4 years of Aristobulus II’s usurpation, are included, the total number of years for Hyrcanus II as high priest as his supporters might interpret it could come out to about 40 years.

REVISED PESHER NAHUM IN ENGLISH WITH SOME POSSIBLE  
RECONSTRUCTIONS

*4QpNah Frags. 3–4*

[... WHERE IS THE LIONS' PLACE? THE PASTURE FREQUENTED BY YOUNG LIONS?  
<vacat> Its interpretation ... ]

- Col. I 1 [ \_\_\_\_\_ ] a dwelling  
for the wicked of the nations. WHERE THE OLD LION  
WOULD GO, THERE WAS A LION WHELP
- 2 [FRIGHTENED OF NOTHING. <vacat> Its interpretation: the 'old  
lion'—this is Deme]trius, king of Yavan, who sought to come  
to Jerusalem in the conspiracy of the Seekers-after-  
Smooth-Things
- 3 [before. But God did not choose to give the city into] the hand of the kings of  
Yavan from the time of Antiochus until the standing of  
the rulers of the Kittim. And after that it is trampled
- 4 [by the Lion of Divine Wrath, for he is the 'lion whelp'. <long vaca>]t> THE LION  
PROVIDING A MEAT SUPPLY FOR HIS CUBS, [AND]  
STRANGLING PREY FOR HIS LIONESSES.
- 5 [Its interpretation concerns the Lion of Divine Wrath who tears Manasseh in pieces. And its  
interpretation] concerns the Lion of Divine Wrath who smites  
his great men and his men of counsel
- 6 [ \_\_\_\_\_ ] AND  
FILLING] HIDEOUT (*sic*) [<sup>WITH PREY</sup>] AND HIS PLACE  
WITH TORN FLESH. <vacat> Its interpretation  
concerns the Lion of Divine Wrath
- 7 [the one coming upon Israel in the last days to execute ven]geance upon the  
Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, whom he hangs up as  
living men
- 8 [to be a horror and a curse, as it was with the traitors] against Israel before. For  
to the one hanged up alive on [a stake is procl]aimed:  
“BEHOLD I AM AGAINST [YOU!”]
- 9 SA[YS YAHWEH OF HOSTS. “I WILL BURN UP  
IN SMOKE YOUR HORDE!] THE SWORD WILL  
DEVOUR YOUR YOUNG LIONS! [I] WILL CUT  
[FROM THE LAND] THE (*sic*) PREY! <vacat>



- 10 [AND THE VOICE OF YOUR MESSENGERS]  
WILL NO [LONGER BE HEARD <sup>IN IT</sup>.” <vacat>] Its  
[interpretation:] ‘your horde’—these are his army  
detachments [<sup>which are overthrown</sup>]. And his ‘young lions’—these  
are
- 11 his great men [<sup>and his warriors who are destroyed</sup>. And] his ‘prey’—this  
is [the weal]th which [the prie]sts of Jerusalem have  
a[mass]ed which
- 12 they give in[<sup>to the hand of the army of the Kittim, for because of their plundering the simple  
ones of E</sup>]phraim Israel is given [to be a spoil. <l>ong vacat>].
- Col. II 1 And his ‘messengers’—these are his envoys whose call is  
no longer heeded by the nations. <vacat> ALAS, CITY  
OF BLOODSHED! FILLED [WITH DECEIT!] FIL[L]ED  
[WITH VIOLENCE!]
- 2 Its interpretation: this is the city of Ephraim, the Seekers-  
after-Smooth-Things in the last days who in deceit and fal[sehoods] conduct themselves. <vacat>
- 3 VIOLENCE DOES NOT CEASE—THE CRACK OF  
THE WHIP, THE TREMBLING SOUND OF EARTH  
SHAKING FROM WHEELS, THE DASHING HORSE,  
THE JOLTING CHARIOT, THE H[ORSE]MAN  
CHARGING, THE BLADE,
- 4 THE GLITTERING POINT OF THE SPEAR. MANY  
ARE SLAIN AND THERE ARE MASSES OF CORPSES,  
NO END TO DEAD BODIES—THEY STUMBLE OVER  
THEIR OWN DEAD BODIES. <vacat> Its interpretation  
concerns the dominion of the Seekers-after-Smooth-  
Things.
- 5 The sword of the nations, captivity, and plunder do not  
cease from the midst of their congregation. Violence is in  
their midst, and exile from terror of the enemy. Many
- 6 guilty corpses fall in th[eir] days. There is no end to  
counting their slain. They trip over their own dead  
carcasses as a result of their wicked conspiracies.

- 7 BECAUSE OF THE MA[NY] FORNICATIONS OF THE HARLOT, BEAUTIFUL IN CHARM [AND] MISTRESS OF SORCERIES, WHO DELIVERS NATIONS TO DESTRUCTION BY HER FORNI[CAT]ION, AND CLANS THROUGH HER [SORCER]IES. <vacat>
- 8 [Its] interpretation con[cerns] the leaders-astroy of Ephraim <vacat> who by their false teaching, their lying tongue, and treacherous lip they lead many astray—
- 9 kings, officers, priests and people, along with the joined stranger. Cities and clans are destroyed because of their counsel. No[bl]es and rul[ers]
- 10 fall [because of] their insol[ent] tongue. <extra long vacat> “BEHOLD, I AM AGAINST YOU!”, SAYS YAHWEH OF H[OSTS]. “YOU WILL RAISE
- 11 [YOUR] SKIRTS OVER YOUR FACE. [YOU] WILL DISPLAY TO [THE NAT]IONS [YOUR] PRI[VATE] PARTS, AND YOUR] SHA[ME] TO KINGDOMS.” <vacat> Its interpretation: [<sup>this is their assembly</sup>] wh[ich]
- 12 [<sup>is become a byword in all</sup>] the cities of the east, for the ‘sk[irts]’—<sup>this is the glory of their rulers which is taken away. And they become an object of scorn in the eyes of</sup>
- Col. III 1 the nations because of their im[p]urity [and because of] their [fil]thy abominations. “AND I SHALL FLING EXCREMENT UPON YOU [AND] I [SHALL TREAT] YOU [WITH CONT]EMPT. I WILL MAKE YOU
- 2 LOATHSOME. AND IT WILL COME TO PASS THAT EVERY ONE WHO LOOKS AT YOU WILL RUN AWAY FROM YOU.” <long vacat>
- 3 Its interpretation concerns the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things whose wicked deeds are revealed to all Israel at the last time.
- 4 Many discern their sin, hate them, and loathe them on account of their guilty insolence. When the glory of Judah is [t]aken away

- 5 the simple ones of Ephraim flee from the midst of their assembly. They abandon the ones leading them astray and become joined to [the God of Is]rael. AND THEY WILL SAY:
- 6 “NINEVEH IS DEVASTATED. WHO WILL MOURN FOR HER? FROM WHERE SHALL I SEEK COMFORTERS FOR YOU?” <*vacat*> Its interpretation [concerns the S]eekers-after-
- 7 Smooth Things whose counsel is destroyed, and whose government is disbanded. They no longer lead astray [the] assembly. The sim[ple ones]
- 8 no longer strengthen their counsel. [*long vacat*] WILL YOU [DO B]ETTER THAN A[MON, SITUATED ON] RIVERS? [*vacat*]
- 9 Its interpretation: ‘Amon’—these (*sic*) are Manasseh. And the ‘rivers’—these are the gr[ea]t [men of] Manasseh, the nobles of [the city, the ones strengthen]ing Ma[nasseh.]
- 10 WATER SURROUNDING HER, WHOSE RAMPART WAS THE SEA, AND THE WATER, HER WALLS. <*long vacat*>]
- 11 Its [interpretation:] these are her (*sic*) men of [ar]ms, her (*sic*) m[en of w]ar. [CU]SH WAS [HER] STRENGTH, [AND SO WAS EGYPT, WITHOUT LIMIT. <*vacat*> Its interpretation: <sup>this is the assembly of</sup>]
- 12 [wi]ck[<sup>ed ones aiding Manasseh,</sup>] the [ones joi]n[<sup>ed together to ex</sup>]alt [Manasseh. P]UT AND [THE LIBYANS WERE HER ALLIES. <*vacat*>]
- Col. IV 1 Its interpretation: these are the wick[<sup>ed ones united,</sup>] the house of Peleg, the ones joined to Manass[eh]. EVEN SHE W[ENT] INTO EXILE, [INTO CAPTIVITY. AND]
- 2 HER INFANTS WERE DASHED TO PIECES AT THE HEAD OF EVERY WALL. THEY CAST LOTS FOR HER NOBLES. ALL OF [HER] G[REA]T [MEN WERE BOUND]

- 3 IN CHAINS. Its interpretation concerns Manasseh at the last time. His reign over I[srael] is brought low [\_\_\_\_\_]
- 4 His women, his infants, and his children go into captivity. His warriors and his nobles [<sup>are destroyed</sup>] by the sw[ord]. YOU TOO WILL BE DRUNK]
- 5 AND YOU WILL BE DAZED. <long vacat> Its interpretation concerns the wicked ones of E[phraim \_\_\_\_\_]
- 6 whose cup comes af[ter] Manass[eh and his grea]t [<sup>men. <long vacat></sup> YOU TOO WILL SEEK]
- 7 A STRONGHOLD IN THE CITY FROM THE ENEMY. <vacat> [Its] interpreta[tion con]cerns [<sup>the wicked ones of Ephraim who seek a stronghold against</sup>]
- 8 their enemies in the ci[ty,  
but \_\_\_\_\_]. ALL  
YOUR FORTRESSES]
- 9 ARE AS F[IG TREES WITH RIPE FRUIT. <vacat> Its interpretation concerns \_\_\_\_\_]

*4QpHos B Frag. 2*

[... \_\_\_\_\_  
EPHRAIM WENT TO ASSYRIA, AND HE SENT TO]

- 1 [KING JAREB. BUT HE WAS NOT ABLE TO HEAL YOU, NOR CURE YOUR] WOUND. <vacat> [<sup>Its interpretation</sup> \_\_\_\_\_]
- 2 [\_\_\_\_\_]  
the Lion of Divine Wrath. FOR I AM [LIKE A YOUNG LION TO EPHRAIM AND LIKE A LION TO THE HOUSE]
- 3 [OF JUDAH. <vacat> Its interpretation concerns the Lion of Divine Wrath, the one coming to destroy the assemb]ly of the Last [P]riest, which he stretches forth his hand to smite in Ephraim
- 4 [and in the house of Judah. For because of the violence they did against his chosen ones God delivers them into] his [ha]nd. <long vacat>