

ARTHUR E. PALUMBO, JR.

A NEW INTERPRETATION OF THE NAHUM COMMENTARY

The Nahum Commentary (4QpNah) is very important in scroll research, because it is one of only a few Qumran documents which gives actual names, i.e. Antiochus and Demetrius. As historical markers, these names are presumably useful in our endeavor to discover the historical setting of the scrolls, but scholars have not taken into consideration the fact that each segment of this commentary may not be referring to the same historical period. The Pesharim can be described as "atomizing", in that although the structure of the biblical book which is being interpreted could not be changed (the "given" of the scribe), each verse could be associated with a different historical event, which were sometimes widely separated from each other in time. The connection was made only because of some similarity between the events.¹ This seems to be especially true of 4QpNah. Scholars have tended to force all the segments (and therefore the historical allusions) of 4QpNah into the same period of history. Another interpretation is required to make sense of the allusions. Let me first quote the relevant section of the commentary:²

(1:1) [The interpretation of it concerns Jerusalem, which has become] a dwelling for the wicked ones of the nations [or Gentiles].

WHERE THE LION WENT TO ENTER, THE LIONS CUB [(1:2) AND NO ONE TO DISTURB (Nah. 2:12b). The interpretation of it concerns Deme]trius, King of Greece, who sought to enter Jerusalem on the advice of the Seekers-After-Smooth-Things, (1:3) but God did not give Jerusalem] into the power of the kings of Greece from Antiochus until the rise of the rulers of the Kittim; but afterwards [the city] will be trampled (1:4)[and will be given into the hand of the rulers of the Kittim]

THE LION TEARS ENOUGH FOR HIS CUBS AND STRANGLES PREY FOR HIS LIONESSES (Nah. 2:13a).

[(1:5)The interpretation of it concerns ...] against the Lion of Wrath, who would strike with his great ones and his partisans, [(1:6) ... AND IT FILLS UP] ITS CAVE (?) [WITH PREY,] AND ITS DEN WITH TORN FLESH (Nah. 2:13b).

The interpretation of it concerns the Lion of Wrath, [(1:7)who brings about a sentence of] death³ on the Seekers-After-Smooth Things; when he hangs men up alive [(1:8)upon the tree, but this sentence is not according to the Law] in Israel as of old.⁴ For (in respect of) the one hanged alive upon the tree [it] reads:⁵

BEHOLD I AM AGAINST YO[U] (1:9) SAY[S YAHWEH OF HOSTS. I SHALL BURN UP YO]UR [ABUNDANCE IN SMOKE,] AND THE SWORD WILL DEVOUR YOUR LIONS. AND [I] SHALL CUT OFF ITS [PR]EY [FROM THE EARTH,] (1:10) AND [THE VOICE OF YOUR MESSENGERS] WILL NO [LONGER BE HEARD (Nah. 2:14). The inter]pretation of it: "your abundance" — they are the detachments of his army th[at are in Jerusale]m; and "his lions" — they are (1:11) his great ones [and his partisans, who perished by the sword;] and "his prey" — that is the wealth that the [prie]sts of Jerusalem have amas[ed,] which (1:12) they [will] give [... E]phraim Israel will be given [...] (2:1) and "his messengers" are his envoys, whose voice will no longer be heeded by the nations [or Gentiles] (Fragments 3-4, cols.1:1—2:1).

There is almost unanimous agreement that the "Antiochus" mentioned in the scroll is the Syrian king Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175—164 BC), who endeavored from 167 BC to destroy the Jewish religion. Apollonius, who was sent by him to Judea as the chief tax collector, massacred many people, looted the temple, prohibited the practice of the Jewish religion; and finally, he erected a heathen altar in the temple (this is the "abomination of desolation" mentioned in Dan. 11:31, 12:11). It was because of the heroism of Jewish rebels under the leadership of Mattathias, and then Judas Maccabee, that the temple was rededicated in 164 BC. It was from this event that the Feast of the Dedication of the temple (Hannukkah) originated.⁶ However, we can't exclude the possibility that the reference is to Antiochus VII Sidetes, who attacked Judea at the beginning of John Hyrcanus' rule (135/4 BC), devastated the land, and destroyed the walls of Jerusalem.⁷

The "Demetrius" of the scroll has been thought to be either Demetrius I Soter (162—150 BC) or Demetrius III Eucerus (ca. 95—88/7 BC). In 161 BC, the pro-Greek party, with the high priest Alcimus at its head, corresponded with Demetrius I, asking him for help against Judas Maccabee and his party. Demetrius I sent his general, named Nicanor, with a large army to Judea. After an unsuccessful battle with Judas at Capharsalama, Nicanor marched to Jerusalem and threatened to burn down the temple if Judas and his army were not surrendered to him. Judas, however, was eventually able to defeat Nicanor in a decisive battle north-west of Jerusalem. Nicanor was killed in the conflict. Thereafter, the battle was celebrated annually as Nicanor's Day (March 13th).⁸

In 88 BC, the Pharisees initiated a treasonable correspondence with Demetrius III against the Jewish king Alexander Jannaeus (103—76 BC). Demetrius came with an army, the Jewish rebels joined him, and together they defeated Alexander Jannaeus at Shechem. But then, preferring to be ruled by a Jewish king instead of by a Syrian, a large number of Jews returned to Jannaeus, and Demetrius III was forced to return to Syria. After capturing the remaining rebel Pharisees, Jannaeus had eight hundred of them crucified in full view of the city while he was feasting with his concubines; and while they were still alive, he had the throats of their wives and children cut in front of them!⁹

The designation "Seekers-After-Smooth-Things" is being applied as a derogatory title for all Jews by birth, who interpreted the precepts of the Torah in

a more lenient fashion from the point of view of the writer of this scroll. This "smooth" exegesis produced different degrees of interpretation. Some of these individuals merely interpreted various precepts of the Torah in a less severe manner than their opponents, others did not accept all the precepts as being genuine, and others abandoned the Torah altogether. As a result of their interpretations, many of them tended to make concessions in some way with Gentiles. An example of this attitude can be seen in the description of the Hellenizing party in the days of Antiochus IV Epiphanes: "Lawless men came forth from Israel, and misled many, saying, 'Let us go and make a covenant with the Gentiles round about us, for since we separated from them many evils have come upon us'" (I Macc. 1:11). Along with this went their acceptance (tacit or otherwise) of foreign rule. The actions of the pro-Greek party headed by Alcimus, who asked for help from Demetrius I; and of the Pharisees, who asked for help from Demetrius III can be very appropriately be seen in this way as "Seekers-After-Smooth-Things."

According to the commentary, the statement that "Demetrius, King of Greece ... sought to enter Jerusalem", could be applied reasonably well to either Demetrius I or III. Although it was not Demetrius I himself, but his general Nicanor who came to Judea, it could be said that the superior is always responsible for the actions of his subordinate. Furthermore, Nicanor was not able to take control of Jerusalem for the pro-Greek party, since he was defeated and killed by Judas Maccabee in battle. It could therefore be said that Demetrius/Nicanor only "sought" to enter Jerusalem, but were unable to actually do so.¹⁰

With regard to Demetrius III, when a large number of Jews went over to Jannaeus, he had no choice but to return to Syria. There is no evidence that Demetrius III had ever tried to enter Jerusalem; but it is possible that when he had beaten Jannaeus at Shechem, he then decided to march to Jerusalem; and this is the real reason why the large number of Jews (six thousand according to Josephus) went over to Jannaeus, forcing Demetrius III to leave the country.¹¹

Since the passage from Nahum, which is being interpreted by the scribe is "where the lion went to enter, the lion's cub and no one to disturb", it is reasonable to think that the "lion's cub" should appear soon after the "lion";¹² therefore, if it is Antiochus IV Epiphanes who is being referred to, then Demetrius I is probably the other; and alternatively, if it is Antiochus VII Sidetes who is being referred to, then Demetrius III is probably the other.

One thing seems clear. The events about "Antiochus" and "Demetrius" which are alluded to in the commentary would be best located in the distant past, but at the same time still events which were long remembered by the people. The fact that proper names could be used as opposed to cryptic titles that are used in some scrolls (e.g., the "Lion of Wrath," the "Wicked Priest," the "Man of the Lie," etc.) is evidence that the individuals mentioned were from the remote past, since it would have been unwise and possibly dangerous to use proper names of enemies when referring to contemporary or near contemporary events.¹³ The events relating to Antiochus IV Epiphanes and Demetrius I would have been long remembered by later Jews, because both

rulers had a festival associated with him (Hannukkah with Antiochus and Nicanor's Day with Demetrius).¹⁴ Therefore, these rulers are most likely the ones that are referred to in this part of the commentary.

Several individuals have been identified with the "Lion of Wrath" — Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175—164 BC);¹⁵ the Roman governor Pontius Pilate (AD 26—36);¹⁶ Titus, the Roman general during the siege and capture of Jerusalem in AD 70;¹⁷ and John of Gischala, a leader of one of the rebel factions in Jerusalem during the war (AD 66—70).¹⁸ However, the view that has gained the consensus of scholars is that Alexander Jannaeus¹⁹ is being referred to.

Let me first state in commenting on these identifications that for the commentary to be consistent, the "Lion of Wrath" should be a Gentile also, since the "lion" has been identified with Antiochus IV Epiphanes (a Gentile), and the "lion's cub" has been identified with Demetrius I (also a Gentile).²⁰

Second, the 4QpNah states that "Jerusalem ... has become a dwelling for the wicked ones of the nations (or Gentiles)" (1:1), and further, that "... God did not give Jerusalem into the power of the kings of Greece from Antiochus until the rise of the rulers of the Kittim" (1:3). The phrase "until the rise of the rulers of the Kittim" takes us down to the capture of Jerusalem by general Pompey in 63 BC. Since the "Lion of Wrath" is first mentioned in the commentary *after* the Romans have already arrived (1:5), this would mean that he was not only a Gentile, but that he came after the arrival of the Romans also. Because only Roman Gentiles are recorded to have carried out crucifixions from the period 63 BC to AD 70, the "Lion of Wrath" must have been a Roman himself.²¹ This would therefore exclude Antiochus IV Epiphanes, John of Gischala, and Alexander Jannaeus from consideration as the "Lion of Wrath", because none of them were Romans.

What we have been able to conclude is that the "Lion of Wrath" was a Gentile and a Roman. Since the first recorded instance of crucifixions being carried out in Palestine was by Varus, the legate of Syria (4 BC),²² and since crucifixions continued to occur throughout the first century AD,²³ the "Lion of Wrath" should be placed in this period also. Therefore, he would probably have been one of the Roman governors of Judea.

The Roman general Titus did in fact carry out numerous crucifixions during the siege of Jerusalem (AD 70);²⁴ but this date would seem to be too late for the composition of the commentary, since it would have been difficult getting the scroll out of Jerusalem by the summer of AD 68.²⁵

It has been suggested that Pontius Pilate is the "Lion of Wrath." However, I will attempt to show later in this study that there are clear historical allusions, which place the setting of 4QpNah in the period from AD 64-7. This means that the commentary is not referring to the period of Pilate's governorship.

Although none of these earlier theories appears to have identified the "Lion of Wrath," a precise identification is certainly possible.

Josephus characterizes Gessius Florus, the last governor of Judea (AD 64—66), as the most corrupt and violent of all the previous governors:

Gessius ... ostentatiously paraded his outrages upon the nation, and, as though he had been sent as hangman of condemned criminals, abstained from no form of robbery or violence. Was there a call for compassion, he was the most cruel of men; for shame, none more shameless than he. No man ever poured greater contempt on truth; none invented more crafty methods of crime. To make gain out of individuals seemed beneath him: he stripped whole cities, ruined entire populations, and almost went the length of proclaiming throughout the country that all were at liberty to practice brigandage on the condition that he received his share of the spoils.²⁶

In May AD 66, Florus robbed the temple treasury of 17 talents. Because of this and his handling of the riots in Caesarea, the patience of the Jews came to an end; and they raised an uproar against his rule, hurling insults at him, and ridiculing his greed by passing a basket around asking for donations for the poor soul.²⁷

The next day, despite the supplications of the chief priests and notable citizens, he delivered the city over to his soldiers for plunder and murder. The troops entered houses and slaughtered everyone within, they killed those who were running through the streets, and they pillaged everything in sight. Many were brought before Florus; and after first being scourged, they were crucified. Josephus states that about 3600 people (including women and children) were massacred.²⁸ Most important for our purpose, however, is the following statement of Josephus:

The calamity was aggravated by the unprecedented character of the Roman cruelty. For Florus ventured that day to do what none had ever done before, namely, *to scourge before his tribunal and nail to the cross men of equestrian rank, men who, if Jews by birth, were at least invested with the Roman dignity.*" (emphasis mine).²⁹

These Jews, who were of the equestrian rank, were the "Seekers-After-Smooth-Things", who were crucified by the "Lion of Wrath," who was Gessius Florus. In fact, this is an excellent designation for him, as can be seen clearly from Josephus' description of him (quoted above). The equestrian order was the second order in Roman society (the order of rank was the senatorial nobility, the equestrians or knights, the freedmen, and the plebs). This order was open to all Roman citizens of eighteen years of age, of free birth, and of good character. The individual had to possess a census rating of 400,000 sesterces (\$20,000), and admission to the order was controlled by the emperor. Entrance into it carried with it the right to wear certain insignia, which included a gold ring and a narrow purple stripe on your tunic. Most importantly, individuals in the order usually filled the civil and military posts of the emperor. Almost all of the governors of Judea were of the equestrian rank.³⁰

These "Jews by birth," who were crucified by Florus, had not only made concessions with Gentiles (the Romans in this case), but had even (at least in the eyes of the writer of this document) *become* Gentiles! They deserved to be punished because they were traitors to the Torah. They did what the Hellenizers did in Maccabean times: "they joined with the Gentiles and sold

themselves to do evil" (1 Macc. 1:15). An excellent example of this type of individual is Tiberius Iulius Alexander, who was the sole governor of Judea from AD 46—8. Josephus states that he was an Alexandrian of Jewish ancestry, who nevertheless "did not stand by the practices of his people."³¹

4QpNah, frags. 3—4, 1:9—2:1 refers to the "Lion of Wrath," and can be explained as follows:

1. The commentary states that "'his prey'-that is the wealth that the [prie]sts of Jerusalem have amas[sed]" (Fragments 3—4, col. 1:11). As mentioned above, Florus did, in fact, rob the temple treasury of seventeen talents, and Josephus later states that he desired to get even more.³²

2. Also mentioned are "'your abundance'-they are the detachments of his army th[at are in Jerusale]m; and 'his lions'-they are his great ones [and his partisans (or the men of his council), who perished by the sword]" (Fragments 3—4, col. 1:10-1). This may have been an allusion to the fate of the Roman cohort left by Florus on his withdrawal to Caesarea. It was massacred by the Jewish rebels in August/September of AD 66.³³

3. There is finally a mention of "'his messengers'", and they are identified as "his envoys, whose voice will no longer be heeded by the nations" (Fragments 3—4, col. 2:1). These individuals could have been envoys in Florus' army or members of his staff handling correspondence.³⁴

I believe that the writer of this document was a Jewish-Christian. He was trying to relate the following ideas. The "Seekers-After-Smooth-Things," who he equates with "torn flesh" (i.e., unclean food or pigs!),³⁵ he clearly believed deserved punishment. However, the method should not have been crucifixion (i.e., hanging alive upon the tree). The writer first attempts to prove his case by alluding to the Old Testament, specifically Deut. 21:23. I would suggest that verse 1:8 should be completed something like, "[... this sentence is not according to the Law] in Israel as of old." The word translated as "as of old" actually refers to Old Testament times. This means that the verse is not alluding to a specific event which occurred in the past, but to Scripture.³⁶ Deut. 21:23 does allow hanging upon a tree *after* death, but does not allow it as the means of death. It appears that this procedure was acceptable to our writer, but not hanging alive upon the tree, i.e., crucifixion. This is precisely why hanging *alive* upon the tree is stressed throughout the document. Incidentally, because of this understanding, the Temple Scroll (11QT) is being repudiated by our writer, because it *does* allow hanging alive upon the tree for certain offenses (col. 64:7—13).³⁷ Scholars must begin to realize that although the sectarian scrolls originated from the same "tree," they did not necessarily originate from the same "branch" of that tree; and the various "branches" were sometimes in disagreement or even conflict with each other. Our writer approves of the Old Testament but not the Temple Scroll.

He utilizes a second means of showing his disapproval of crucifixion. It can be noticed in the second half of verse 1:8 by the statement that "for (in respect of) the one hanged alive upon the tree, [it] reads: Behold I am against yo[u] say[s Yahweh of Hosts]." While it is clear that the subject from "behold I am against you ... "(1:8) to "... no longer heeded by the nations [or Gentiles]"

(2:1) is still the "Lion of Wrath,"³⁸ who is being referred to by "the one hanged alive upon the tree"? If the subject was the "Seekers-After-Smooth-Things," who were crucified by Florus (verse 1:7), then this phrase would have been plural as well. It would have stated, "for *those* hung alive upon the tree," but it does not. If the writer was a Jewish-Christian, as a believe he was, the answer is not far to see. It refers to the Messiah Jesus.³⁹ However, Florus did not crucify Jesus, so why should he be condemned in this passage? The answer is because he used crucifixion as a method of execution. Our writer believes that out of respect for the Messiah, who suffered in this very manner, crucifixion should not have been used by Florus (i.e., the "Lion of Wrath"). Interestingly enough, by implication, he disallows the use of crucifixion by everyone else as well; the subject just happens to be the "Lion of Wrath" in this particular case. All of the Roman governors are condemned, as well as Alexander Jannaeus for crucifying his enemies in 88 BC. However, let me repeat that Jannaeus would not have been chastised for *punishing* the "Seekers-After-Smooth-Things" of his time, but only for *crucifying* them.

The date of the composition of the commentary can be quite accurately dated. A passage in 4QpNah states (if the completion of the lacuna is accepted) that sometime after the "Kittim" have arrived, "[the city] will be trampled [and will be given into the hand of the rulers of the Kittim]" (Fragments 3—4, col. 1:3—4). Since this passage is referring to a future event, it can only make sense, if it were written sometime before the Romans were expected to attack Jerusalem. Since the "rulers of the Kittim" have already come in 63 BC and continued on until AD 66, and if we take into consideration the allusions to the historical events, which I have discussed above, 4QpNah was probably composed not long after the defeat of Cestius Gallus in Nov., AD 66.

The following passage from 4QpNah, which I quote below, gives us additional evidence for this date of composition:

(4:1)YET SHE TOO W[ENT] INTO EXILE, [INTO CAPTIVITY. EVEN] (4:2)HER CHILDREN, TOO, ARE DASHED TO PIECES ON EVERY STREET CORNER, AND FOR HER HONORED ONES THEY WILL CAST LOTS, AND ALL [HER] G[REA]T [ONES WERE BOUND] (4:3)IN FETTERS (Nah. 3:10).

The interpretation of it concerns Manasseh at the last time, whose reign over Is[rael] will be brought down [lacuna]

(4:4)his wives, his children, and his infants will go into captivity. His warriors and his honored ones (will perish] by the sword.

[YOU TOO WILL BE DRUNK] (4:5)AND YOU WILL BE HIDDEN (Nah. 3:11a).

The interpretation of it concerns the wicked ones of E[phraim, lacuna] (4:6)whose cup will come after Manasseh [lacuna] (4QpNah, fragments 3—4, 4:1—6).

4QpPs^a, which I believe to be an earlier document than 4QpNah, refers to the "wicked ones of Ephraim and Manasseh" (2:18),⁴⁰ as apparently one group. 4QpNah now splits them into two separate groups: "Manasseh," which receives its due first, followed by "Ephraim." Therefore, what was originally

perceived as one group, was later perceived as divided into two separate groups. A careful examination of Josephus' statements during the early war period can identify the events that are being alluded to in the above quoted passage from 4QpNah. The designation "Manasseh" refers to the peace party, including Herod Agrippa II, his family members, his generals, as well as other establishment people, who left Jerusalem by force or otherwise in the period from AD 64–6.⁴¹ As the passage states, their rule over Israel was ended, and they went into "captivity" with their "wives," "children," and "infants." Furthermore, their "warriors" and "honored ones" were killed during the fierce fighting between the peace party and the rebels that occurred in that same period.⁴² After the defeat of Cestius Gallus (Nov. AD 66), the people assembled in the temple to appoint new leaders and generals to conduct the war.⁴³ This new leadership is what goes under the designation "Ephraim whose cup will come after Manasseh" (4QpNah, frags. 3–4, 2:2). They are also called the "Seekers-After-Smooth-Things at the end of days" (4QpNah, frags. 3–4, 2:2). In the same way as the past "Seekers-After-Smooth-Things" were accused of having made treasonable communications with the Gentiles, so "Ephraim" is now accused of secretly desiring to do the same thing with the Romans.⁴⁴ This is why the Zealots and the Idumaeans endeavored to execute all the leaders and notable individuals towards the end of AD 67 and early in AD 68.⁴⁵

4QpNah was probably written shortly after the selection of this new leadership in early AD 67. It is "predicted" that under the present "dominion of the "Seekers-After-Smooth-Things" (4QpNah, frags. 3–4, 2:4), i.e., "Ephraim," "the sword of the nations [or Gentiles] will not depart from the midst of their congregation," and "there will be no end to the sum-total of their slain" (2:5–6). Jerusalem is called the "city of Ephraim" (2:2),⁴⁶ and there appears to be a significant international component, which is lobbying for the interests of "Ephraim" throughout the world (2:8–10). Our writer and his supporters are awaiting the coming of the "glory of Judah" (4QpNah, frags. 3–4, col. 3:4),⁴⁷ i.e., the Messiah Jesus. Many will realize the error they had made in supporting "Ephraim" (2:3–4), and, as a result, the "simple ones of Ephraim" will be converted into the faith (3:5).⁴⁸ Finally, the Messiah Jesus will lead the all faithful in the final war at the end of time (4QpNah, frags. 1–2, 2:1–9).⁴⁹

FOOTNOTES

The version of the works of Flavius Josephus which will be utilized for all the references and quotations in this study will be taken from the following source: Flavius Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, *The Jewish War*, *The Life*, *Against Apion*, trans. by H. St. J. Thackeray, R. Marcus, and L. H. Feldman, (Loeb Classical Library) 10 vols. (Cambridge University Press, 1925–65). References will be given by the book number and the paragraph number(s).

¹ Barbara Thiering, *Redating the Teacher of Righteousness* (Sydney: Theological Explorations, 1979), pp. 10–11, 23.

² Except where noted I have utilized the translation by Maurya P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Assoc. of America, 1979), p. 163.

³ Idem, p. 176 ("sentence of death").

⁴ This is my own suggestion for filling in the lacuna here. Horgan translates the word which I translated "as of old," as "before" (Idem, 163). I believe my translation more accurately gives the meaning of this word.

⁵ Horgan translates the phrase as "for regarding one hanged alive upon the tree [it] reads: ..." (Idem).

⁶ 1 Macc. 1:20–4:61; 2 Macc. 5:11–10:9; Josephus XII, 233–360; idem I, 27–43.

⁷ Idem XII, 236–51; idem I, 59–61.

⁸ 1 Macc. 7:26–50; 2 Macc. 14:12–15:36; Josephus XII, 402–12. It should be noted here that shortly after Nicanor's defeat, Demetrius I sent Bacchides and another army, which did defeat and kill Judas Maccabeus (161 BC). The pro-Greek party was then in control until Jonathan (Judas' brother) was made high priest (152 BC). However, although the Syrians were actually in control during this time (and even later), they stayed out of Judea, and let the pro-Greek party run the country (and later the pro-Maccabean party when Jonathan became high priest); 1 Macc. 8:1–10:21; Josephus XII, 413–XIII, 4. For an excellent summary of the history of this period from 167 BC to 152 BC, see Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, rev. and ed. by G. Vermes, et al. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973/87), vol. I, pp. 155–78.

⁹ Josephus XII, 376–84; idem I, 89–100.

¹⁰ Thiering, p. 25.

¹¹ John M. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reappraisal* (New York: Penguin Books, 1975), pp. 107–8.

¹² Thiering, p. 24–5.

¹³ Robert Eisenman, *James the Just in the Habakkuk Peshier* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1986), pp. 15–6.

¹⁴ Thiering p. 25; Schürer, vol. I, pp. 162–3, 169–70.

¹⁵ H. H. Rowley, *The Teacher of Righteousness and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1957), p. 140.

¹⁶ Thiering, pp. 22–32, 164, 187, 213; idem, *The Gospels and Qumran* (Sydney: Theological Explorations, 1981), pp. 70, 217–8; idem, *The Qumran Origins of the Christian Church* (Sydney: Theological Explorations, 1983), pp. 188–9, 217.

¹⁷ H. Schonfield, *Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Jewish Chronicle Publications, 1956), pp. 95–7.

¹⁸ G. R. Driver, *The Judaean Scrolls* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965), pp. 289–92.

¹⁹ Schürer vol. I, pp. 224–5; idem, vol. III.1, pp. 430–33.

²⁰ Thiering, *Redating the Teacher of Righteousness*, p. 27. Even if Antiochus VII and Demetrius III are being referred to, they are still Gentiles.

²¹ Ibid., pp. 26–7.

²² Josephus XVII, 291–5; idem II, 72–5.

²³ Idem XX, 99–101, 127–9; idem II, 236–40, 253–7, 307–11; idem V, 448–52.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Idem IV, 486–90.

²⁶ Idem II, 277–9.

²⁷ Ibid., 290–9.

²⁸ Ibid., 301–11.

²⁹ Ibid., 307–8.

³⁰ S. A. Cook, ed., et al., *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. X (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1952), pp. 185–8, 215–7; H. Mattingly, *Roman Imperial Civilization* (London: Edward Arnold, 1959), pp. 13, 40, 76, 120, 125 ff., 151, 204; W. S. Davis, *A Day in Old Rome* (New York: Biblio and Tannen, 1963), pp. 139–59; Schürer, vol. I, pp. 357–61.

³¹ Josephus XX, 100–1.

³² *Idem* II, 329—32.³³ *Ibid.*, 329—32, 449—56.³⁴ Schürer, vol. I, p. 370.³⁵ Thiering, p. 30.³⁶ *Idem*, p. 28.³⁷ G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (New York: Penguin, 1987), p. 156.³⁸ Thiering believes that "the one hanged alive upon the tree" (1:8) refers to Jesus (see note 39), and that Jesus and his supporters continue to be referred to all the way to the end of verse 2:1 (Thiering, pp. 30, 164). However her explanation of how these verses could refer to Christians is unconvincing (*Idem*, pp. 150, 187). The passage from "behold I am against you ..." (1:8) in the biblical portion to the end of verse 2:1 in the commentary portion continues to refer to the "Lion of Wrath," as has been the case as far back as verse (1:4).³⁹ I do agree with Thiering that the "one hanged alive upon the tree" (1:8) is refers to Jesus, but I interpret it in a different way than she does (see note 38).⁴⁰ Horgan, p. 196.⁴¹ Josephus II, 277—9, 406—7, 556—8.⁴² *Ibid.*, 417—24, 523—6.⁴³ *Ibid.*, 562—68.⁴⁴ *Idem* IV, 244—58.⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 305—17, 326—44, 353—65.⁴⁶ Horgan, p. 163.⁴⁷ *Idem*, p. 164—5.⁴⁸ *Ibid.*⁴⁹ *Idem*, p. 162.

ZDZISŁAW PAWŁOWSKI

THE REALITY OF DEATH AND THE FACT OF PRAYER:
PSALM 88

There say this is one of the most tragic songs in the Psalter but it is rather very realistic one in its approach to the most tragic fact of life, namely the death. Paradoxically the term "death/*mwt*" does not appear in the Psalm at all. Unique mode of speaking of death is just imagery developed in many features throughout the Song. However along with images of death there stand also a fact of prayer: it is not so much the content of prayer but simply its fact. Thus two elements constitute a structure of the Psalm: the imagery of death and the fact of prayer.

I. GENRE AND COMPOSITION

1. Genre

Usually Ps 88 is seen as belonging to the larger group of the psalms qualified as individual supplication¹ and analyzed according to their form-critical structure established in a most discerning way by C. Westermann². He has distinguished the following principal components of the individual supplication³:

A. Address to God or invocation of the divine name which tend to be intimate and personal⁴ but in some places they may also contain a description of God as the helper and protector⁵.

B. Complaint or description of distress which bring about prayer. There may be many different situations like sickness, social isolation, oppression or inner sorrow and despair caused by sin which stand behind them. The psalmist intends here to turn his problem into a problem for Yahwe for it is he who is both able and responsible for doing something about it⁶.

C. Petition, expressed often in bold imperatives which aims to obtain something from God. The suppliant asks Yahwe for attentive compassion or deliverance but he also insists on his rights and requests God for his protection⁷.

D. Confession of trust in Yahwe which often attempts to give reasons for answering the prayer⁸.

E. Assurance of being heard which expresses the certainty that a prayer is now heard and then a situation of the psalmist is about to be changed⁹.

F. Vow of praise which often comes at the end of the psalm and contains the suppliant's promise of praise and thanksgiving towards God¹⁰.