

University of Groningen

Once Again

Woude, A.S. van der

Published in:
Revue de Qumran; (1996), afl. 65-68, pag. 375-384 (10) 1996

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
1996

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Woude, A. S. V. D. (1996). Once Again: The Wicked Priests in the Habakuk Pesher from Cave 1 of Qumran. *Revue de Qumran; (1996), afl. 65-68, pag. 375-384 (10) 1996, 65.*

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

ONCE AGAIN: THE WICKED PRIESTS IN THE *HABAKKUK PESHER* FROM CAVE 1 OF QUMRAN

MANY years ago the present writer argued for the identification of the wicked priest(s) of *1QpHab* VIII-XII with the Jerusalem high priests from Judas Maccabaeus to Alexander Jannaeus in sequential order (1). This thesis has been criticised by Timothy H. Lim in his article "The Wicked Priests of the Groningen Hypothesis", *JBL* 112 (1993), 415-425 (2), and implicitly by Igor R. Tantlevskij in his recent publication *The Two Wicked Priests in the Qumran Commentary on Habakkuk* (Kraków-St. Petersburg 1995). Because the said identification is one of the pillars of the so-called "Groningen hypothesis", it seems worth-while to deal with Lim's critical remarks and Tantlevsky's theory.

Lim admits that in *1QpHab* a plurality of figures for "the wicked priest" cannot be ruled out as a possibility. In his opinion such a plurality is even likely, given the irreconcilably different ways that the figure comes to an end (by bodily afflictions, at the hands of his enemies and through divine punishment) (3). This conclusion is an important step forward compared with the current and often uncritically reproduced identification of "the wicked priest" with only *one* Jerusalem high priest (in particular with Jonathan (4)). Lim does not, however, offer a sugges-

(1) "Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Commentary," *JJS* 33 (1982), 349-359 (*Yadin Festschrift*). For an explanation of the fact that Aristobulus I was not found, see p. 359.

(2) See also his article "The Qumran Scrolls: Two Hypotheses", *Studies in Religion: Sciences Religieuses* 21 (1992), 455-466, esp. pp. 464-466. As far as I am aware, Lim was the first to offer a detailed critique of the said part of the "Groningen hypothesis".

(3) "The Wicked Priests", p. 424.

(4) The identification of the wicked priest with Jonathan is widely accepted, cf. for example: J. T. Milik, *Dix ans de découvertes dans le désert de Juda*, Paris 1957, 55-58; G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*, Göttingen 1963, 36-78; H. Stegemann, *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde*, Diss. Bonn 1971, 198-246; —, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus. Ein Sachbuch*, Freiburg-Basel-Wien 1993, 149; G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*, London 1977, 150f., 1994³, 135; M. A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community*, Cambridge 1987, 9f., 235f. (with reservations).

tion regarding the identification of the figures he assumes. This is somewhat disappointing, because one would have welcomed an alternative to the hypothesis he criticises.

Lim passes strictures on three different parts of the present author's analysis in the Yadin *Festschrift*: *a*) the reconstruction of the sequence of six wicked priests; *b*) the suggestion that the pesherist shared a tradition about Judas Maccabaeus as (*de facto*) high priest; and *c*) the dissection of closely related passages of the *Habakkuk pesher*.

Ad a. The present writer argued in his contribution to the Yadin *Festschrift* that the relative clauses following the formula "Its interpretation concerns the (wicked) priest" define the priest in question, not another one mentioned previously. In the case of the sixth wicked priest (identified with Alexander Jannaeus) a definition by a relative clause is lacking in XII 2 (cf. also XII 8). This suggests that the sixth wicked priest is the high priest of the author's own day (5) who (since he was a contemporary) did not need further definition. This conclusion is in keeping with the fact that all statements relating to the first five wicked priests are made in the past tense (with two exceptions: IX 4-7 and X 3-5; see below), whereas the expected fate of the sixth priest is predicted by means of the future tense (XI 15; XII 5; implicitly in XII 2): apparently, the punishment of the latter had not yet occurred because he functioned as high priest during the time of the pesherist (6).

Regarding the use of the said relative clauses which define the immediately preceding antecedent, Lim (p. 416) objects that the relative pronoun is used in the same way with the (sixth) wicked priest in XII 2-5. This statement is hardly correct. The words "whom God will sentence to destruction" (XII 5) are not a definition of the wicked priest: they do not refer to an act of the person in question or to an event that happened to him, as is the case in the other instances (7), but to his future punishment. Furthermore, these words are separated from the formula "The interpretation of the word concerns the wicked priest" in XII 2 by a *kî*-clause explaining the meaning of Lebanon and Behemoth (XII 3-5). Consequently, *'ašær* in XII 5 is more easily read as a conjunctive ("for") than a relative. Lim's remark that "the position of the relative pronoun

(5) M. A. Knibb (*o.c.*, p. 236) suggests also that Alexander Jannaeus was a contemporary of the author of *IQpHab* and that "a date for the composition of the Habakkuk commentary in the last years of the reign of Alexander Jannaeus would make good sense of the material". See also Tantlevskij, *o.c.*, p. 12 ("The Commentary itself would have been composed at the second half of the 90s—the beginnings of the 80s B.C.E.").

(6) For details see the present author's article (note 1), pp. 350ff.

(7) Cf. W. H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk*, Missoula, Montana 1979, 198: "This (introduction) is strikingly different from other introductions, in which it is the Wicked Priest *who* did such and such".

and clause after some intervening comments in this sentence can be explained by the characteristically complex and intertwined thought of the pesherist (c.g. X, 9-13)", is a somewhat twisted reasoning, because the contents of XII 2-5 are hardly "some intervening comments", since they are an essential part of the explanation of the text quoted from *Habakkuk* 2:17. The words *l'shallem lo* in XII 2, in which *lo* refers to "the wicked priest", rather point to the "absolute" use of "the wicked priest" in this line, suggesting that he was a contemporary of the pesherist. As already said, this conclusion is in agreement with the fact that the latter uses the imperfect tense in describing the future fate of the (sixth) wicked priest (XI 15; XII 5; cf. also XII 2), whereas he uses the past tense when it comes to describing the experiences and practices of the other wicked priests.

Lim claims, however, that the different verbal tenses do not in any way support the present writer's case. In order to substantiate this thesis, he refers to IX 5 and IX 16- X 13 (8). Concerning IX 5 it must be said that in view of the interpreted text of *Hab.* 2:8 and the scope of the *Habakkuk pesher* nothing militates against taking *yiqbešû* in IX 5 as describing habitual action of the Hasmonaean high priests which lasts till the very day of the pesherist. Because the author apparently expects a speedy invasion of the Holy Land by the Kittim and the amassing of booty from foreign peoples by the Hasmonaean high priests had taken place since the latter came to power, it is most unlikely that the pesherist in IX 4f. had future high priests in mind. Comparison of *4QpHos^b*, fragm. 2, line 3 ("[Its interpretation conce]rns the *last priest* who will send forth his hand to strike Ephraim") with *4QpNahum* 3-4 I, lines 7-8, which mention the persecution of the "Seekers-after-Smooth-Things", elsewhere (*4QpNah* II 2) identified with "Ephraim", calls for an identification of "the last priest" with Alexander Jannaeus. This implies that "the last priests of Jerusalem", who "amass riches and wealth by plundering the nations", but whose booty in the last days will be delivered into the hands of the army of the Kittim (IX 4-7), refer to Alexander Jannaeus and a number of his predecessors. This indicates that *yiqbešû* in IX 5 should not be taken in the sense of actions still to be realised (9).

(8) I fail to understand the tenor of Lim's remark (p. 417) that divine judgment in one form or another is associated only with four of the six wicked priests ["There is no mention whatsoever of punishment for the first (8:8-13) or the fifth wicked priest (11:4-8)]. Why should the pesherist be compelled to allude to the punishment for all the wicked priests?

(9) Lim admits that *yiqbešû* can be taken as describing habitual action ("they continue to amass") but adds that this claim is by no means necessary. The fact, however, that Alexander Jannaeus is looked upon as "the last priest" excludes wicked deeds of *future* priests.

The present author easily admits that the explanation of X 3-5 is a bit more difficult. Lim suggests that in IX 16 the reading *ma[ttif]* instead of *ha[kkohen]* ("the priest", in my opinion referring to Simon Macca-baeus) must be preferred. It should be objected, however, that palaeo-graphical considerations make the reading of a (final) *mem* instead of a *he* at the beginning of the partially lost word in question almost impossible. The oldest photograph of the Habakkuk peshet shows traces of a final *nun* rather than of a final *pe* at the end of the word (10). More important is, however, that *matif* is virtually impossible in this case because in the formula "Its interpretation concerns ..." the definite article *ha-* before the following substantive is required (11) (*matif* means "a preacher", which is not in accordance with the wording of the interpretation formulae of *IQpHab*). Lim refers to the indefinite use of *matif* in *CD VIII 13* and *XIX 25*, but it should be noted that in *CD VIII 13* the indefinite use is required by the context and that in *CD XIX 25* *matif* functions as a participle, not as a substantive. Even more decisive in this connection is the interpretation of X 3-5. The present writer suggested that the peshet in these lines is speaking about the last judgment and Lim (p. 423) does not exclude this possibility. Therefore, I fail to understand his statement that I have "explained away the future punishment of the fourth wicked priest as being influenced by the concept of the last judgment" (p. 417). On the basis of *Jub. 10:5, 10; 22:22* I have proposed to interpret the "House of Judgment" as the abode in the netherworld where the sinners are kept till the day of the Last Judgment, and the following words as referring to the priest's final condemnation on that day (12) (an interpretation which of course requires imperfect verbal forms). To be more specific: following a suggestion made by Brownlee, אֱשֶׁר יִתֵּן אֱלֹהִים מִשְׁפָּטוֹ בְּתוֹךְ עַמִּים רַבִּים, may mean: "(the House of Judgment) where God puts His judgment in the midst of many peoples", thus implying that *yitten* (in analogy to the use of *yiqbešu* in IX 5) refers to a continuous work of God, i.e. the punishment of the unrighteous already in Sheol (cf. *1 En. 63:10; 99:10; 103:7f.; Luke 16:23; 2 Peter 2:9*) before the Last Judgment takes place (13). In that case, the text of X 3-5 suggests that the priest in question already dwells in the netherworld and consequently was not alive at the time of the author of *IQpHab*.

(10) The traces of the *nun* yet visible on the oldest photograph, published in M. Burrows e.a., *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, Volume I, New Haven 1950, Plate LIX, are not discernible any more on the later photograph of J. C. Trever, *Scrolls from Qumrân Cave I*, Jerusalem 1972, 159, because of an increased deterioration of the manuscript.

(11) The preserved text of the line excludes the reading *matif hakkazab*.

(12) See W. H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Peshet of Habakkuk*, Missoula, Montana 1979, 161ff.

(13) Cf. W. H. Brownlee, *o.c.*, 163.

It must be admitted that due to the lost text of column IX there are few indications which permit us to identify the priest of IX 16 with Simon Maccabaeus. But because X 1 alludes to building activities, so characteristic of Simon (cf. *1 Macc.* 13:10, 27-30, 33, 52; 14:10, 15, 33-34, 37), the peshet of IX 9-12 refers to the final fate of Simon's priestly predecessor Jonathan, and the text quoted from *Hab.* 2:9ff. suggests that Simon dwelled in a residence on a high spot (cf. *1 Macc.* 13:52), this identification does not seem to be far-fetched (14).

In conclusion, it seems to me that the use of the relative clause which follows the interpretation formula and characterises the priest in question, the mention of "the wicked priest" in XII 2 without further definition and the verbal tenses of the Habakkuk peshet help us to make a distinction between high priests of the past and the high priest who was a contemporary of the peshetist. That the latter priest should be identified with Alexander Jannaeus is practically certain and convincingly corroborated by the study of Tantlevsky. In view of the external evidence we have, it seems to be a reasonable assumption that IX 1-2 refers to the death of Alcimus (cf. *1 Macc.* 9: 54ff. and Josephus, *Ant.* XII § 413) and IX 9-12 to the murder of Jonathan (cf. *1 Macc.* 12: 48ff.; 13:23; Josephus, *Ant.* XIII § 192-209). Since "the place of his (= the Teacher of Righteousness's) exile" in XI 6 in all probability refers to the settlement at Qumran and this region apparently was not inhabited by the community before the reign of John Hyrcanus I, the peshet of XI 4-8 can be interpreted as a surprise attack by this high priest. Of course, Lim is right in saying that "there is no external evidence to suggest that John Hyrcanus I ventured to the region of Qumran, let alone persecuted the Teacher of Righteousness in exile on Yom Kippur". Evidence of this kind is not to be expected. But if it comes to the question which Jerusalem high priest is likely to have attacked the Teacher in Qumran, John

(14) Lim's remarks (p. 424) that the allusion to *'abanæha* ("her stones") in X 1 is more appropriate to Jonathan's than Simon's building activities ["While it is true that Simon was involved in the completion and fortification of the wall around Jerusalem (*1 Macc.* 13:10; 14:37), much of his building program was outside the city (*1 Macc.* 13:25-30, 33; *Ant.* 13.5.11 § 183). By contrast, Jonathan specifically directed the fortification of Jerusalem's wall with 'squared stones' (ἐκ λίθων τετραπόδων, *1 Macc.* 10:11) and the building of an additional wall inside the city (*Ant.* 13.5.11 §§ 181-82)": note 40]. It should be noted, however, that *'abanæha* is taken from *'abæen* in *Hab.* 2:11 and that the wording of this text does not point to the building of walls but to a fortress where the priest resided. Although it is not altogether certain that the suffix second pers. fem. sing. refers to the city of Jerusalem, this may well be the case: "his nest on high" (IX 13) suggests the residence of the high priest in question, apparently the castle north of the temple on the site of Nehemiah's Baris, afterwards called Antonia. According to *1 Macc.* 13:52, Simon improved the fortifications of the temple mount running along the Akra and began to dwell there with his retinue. If indeed this fortress is meant, the peshetist had Simon in mind (on *1 Macc.* 13:52 see also the remarks made by J. A. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, Garden City NY 1984, 483).

Hyrchanus I is certainly the best candidate (15). If "the place of his exile" is indeed a designation for the region of Qumran, John Hyrcanus' predecessors are ineligible because of archaeological reasons. *Pace* Lim, Aristobulus I cannot serve "as plausibly" as the fifth wicked priest because during his short reign (104-103 B.C.) he hardly can have influenced the history of the Qumran community and because the Teacher of Righteousness in all likelihood had died already before Aristobulus was in power (16). This leaves us with the first wicked priest. Can he be identified with Judas Maccabaeus?

Ad b. The question whether Judas Maccabaeus was held by the Habakkuk pesherist as a (wicked) high priest, cannot easily be answered. Clear is, however, that the problem bears on a *tradition*, not necessarily on real historical events during the lifetime of Judas. Josephus relates that the people gave the high-priesthood to Judas after the death of Alcimus (*Ant.* XII 414, 419, 434), but contradicts himself elsewhere (*Ant.* XX 237), asserting that after Alcimus' death there was no high priest in Jerusalem for seven years. However, his confused statements can best be explained by supposing that Josephus knew of a tradition that Judas had functioned as high priest in the temple of Jerusalem. It is not inconceivable that the members of the Qumran community in the earliest decades of the first century B.C. shared that tradition: Judas had purified the temple in 164 B.C., a fact that easily could give rise to the idea that he had usurped the functions of the high priest, since it was unthinkable that Menelaus acted *de facto* as high priest at that time (17). García Martínez (18) has argued that 2 *Macc.* 14:26 attests to the said tradition by describing Judas as *de facto* "successor" of the high priest Alcimus in the sense of his deputy. But even if García Martínez'

(15) It must be admitted that it is difficult to identify the wicked priest who according to 4*QpPsalms*^a (4*Q171*) sought to kill the Teacher of Righteousness after the latter had sent a "law" to him (4*QpPs*^a IV 8-9). In view of the fact that 4*QpPs*^a already knows of the rift between the Man of Lies and the Teacher of Righteousness, we may surmise that the commentary in col. IV refers to the last decades of the second century B.C. In that case, it is probable that John Hyrcanus I is meant.

(16) For an attempt to define the time when the Teacher of Righteousness lived, cf. our remarks made in the Yadin *Festschrift* (*JJS* 33 [1982], 357-358). Because he is not mentioned in connection with the sixth high priest (i.e. Alexander Jannaeus), it is most probable that he died during the reign of John Hyrcanus I, cf. also Tantlevskij, *o.c.*, 10ff. (despite the fact that his interpretation of XII 4-5 [translated by Tantlevskij: "the simple of Judah, the Law Doer", cf. also W. H. Brownlee, *o.c.*, 202] as referring to a successor of the Teacher is seriously open to doubt. It seems that "Judah" in this text is nothing else than a designation for the members of the community of Qumran).

(17) Cf. E. Schürer - G. Vermes - F. Millar, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ I*, Edinburgh 1973, 170, note 31.

(18) "¿Judas Macabeo sacerdote impío? Notas al margen de 1*Q* pHab viii, 8-13," in: A. Caquot, S. Légasse & M. Tardieu (éds.), *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Mathias Delcor*, Kevelaer/Neukirchen-Vluyn 1985, 169-181.

interpretation of the text is not accepted and αὐτοῦ διάδοχον is taken as *Nicanor's locum tenens* (19), it remains nevertheless possible that the tradition about Judas' high priesthood circulated already at the beginning of the first century B.C. Meanwhile, the whole problem is (despite Lim's suggestion) not vital to García Martínez' and the present author's identification of the first wicked priest with Judas Maccabaeus, because (as I have stated earlier (20)) one can doubt whether "wicked priest" necessarily refers to a *high* priest and our thesis is based essentially on a detailed interpretation of the peshet of VIII 8-13. Lim has limited his criticism to the tradition of Judas' high priesthood. He does not go into García Martínez' elaborate treatment of the said peshet nor deals with my own remarks on the passage in the Yadin *Festschrift*. Consequently, he has not disproved the arguments made by us for the identification of the first wicked priest with Judas Maccabaeus, let alone given an alternative view as to the identity of the priest in question.

Ad c. Lim charges that the present author unwarrantably dissects *IQpHab* IX-X into a section about the fourth wicked priest (IX 16-X 5) and another about the spouter of the lie (X 5ff.). In Lim's opinion "the exegetical continuity between the two sections rather represents a unity of thought and a similarity of subject closer than that which is being argued" (p. 423). He adds that "a harmonization of the comments from the two sections would describe a figure called the spouter of the lie, who was connected with the building of Jerusalem and who was himself initially judged and punished by God in the house of judgment" (21). The fact, however, that the punishment by eternal judgments of fire is a common element in both sections, does not (given the hermeneutical methods of the peshetist) automatically imply that the subjects of the sections are identical, less so because it is unlikely that "the spouter of the lie" should be identified with a Jerusalemic high priest (22). Furthermore, it is not said explicitly that the spouter of the lie will enter the judgments of fire: X 12-13 refers to those who were his victims. In the interest of his explanation Lim seems to combine both sections by assuming that we should read *ma[ḥḥf]* instead of *ha[kkohen]* in IX 16. As pointed out above, this reading is at least questionable. The punishment which according to the peshetist will be the fate of the priest and the victims of the spouter of the lie, cannot be called exceptional because judgment of sinners by hell-fire was a common and widely accepted notion

(19) So e.g. J. T. Nelis, *II Makkabeeën* (De Boeken van het Oude Testament VI/IB), Bussum 1975, 273.

(20) In the Yadin *Festschrift*, 354.

(21) *O.c.*, 423.

(22) Reasons for the identification of the high priest with Simon are given in note 12 above.

in the pesherist's day. In short, the (few) affinities between the sections IX 16-X 5 and X 6ff. are sufficiently explained by the lexical and semantic overlap of the two biblical lemmata. They hardly compel us to harmonise the two sections and to relate them to one and the same figure.

Lim's criticism cannot be said to shake the thesis that the *Habakkuk pesher* alludes to six wicked priests in sequential order, less so because he does not offer a convincing alternative. This is proposed by Tantlevskij in his recent booklet, to which we now turn.

In view of the present author's own conclusions it is gratifying to learn that Tantlevskij also holds the opinion that it is impossible to identify the wicked priest of the *Habakkuk pesher* with *one* representative of the Hasmonaean high priesthood (23). The reasons he advances, are largely the same as put forward by me in 1982, but in contradistinction to my view he finds only two wicked priests, i.e. Jonathan and Alexander Jannaeus. He argues that the author of the *Habakkuk pesher* VIII 3-XII 10 wanted to state that just as Jonathan, who persecuted the Teacher of Righteousness and his community, was soon punished by God, in exactly the same way the wicked priest of his own day (i.e. Alexander Jannaeus) who persecutes the covenanters headed by a successor of the Teacher (24), will be the victim of God's retribution in near future (25).

This is without doubt an interesting and attractive interpretation of the *Habakkuk* commentary. Because Tantlevskij convincingly argues that XI 10-XII 10 refer to Alexander Jannaeus as the "last (high) priest" and IX 9-12 cannot but be related to the fate of Jonathan, he has succeeded in proving that "the wicked priest" in the pesher is used as a generic term which should not be interpreted of one Hasmonaean high priest only.

Nevertheless, it is doubtful whether the different statements about the wicked priest(s) made in *IQpHab* can be restricted to Jonathan and Alexander Jannaeus only. The much debated expression *niqra' 'al šem ha' 'amæet* (VIII 9) is interpreted by Tantlevskij as "he was summoned (or: called) in the name of (or: for the sake of, for the cause of) Truth": "it seems that the very appointment to the high priestly office of the hero of the antihellenizing Maccabaeen movement... Jonathan could be considered by the Sectarians a calling "in the name of Truth", i.e. for the sake of the (re)establishment of a correct Temple service (pp. 4-5), after Alcimus had pulled down the wall of the inner court of the Sanctuary (*I Macc.* 9:54), thus obliterating according to Tantlevskij the religious

(23) *The Two Wicked Priests*, 1-2.

(24) In his opinion Judah, the Law doer (XII 4-5). See however our remarks in note 16.

(25) *O.c.*, 12.

differences between Israelites and gentiles, and after the so-called *intersacerdotium* broke the normal course of the Temple service. But Goldstein (26) opines that the issue of the wall in question must have been an internal Jewish controversy, not of introducing gentiles or Greek practices to the inner court. The *intersacerdotium* is a moot problem and can hardly serve as an argument. In addition, because *niqra cal šem* in the Old Testament means "reckoned to belong to" (*Gen.* 48:6; *1 Chron.* 23:14), Tantlevskij's interpretation of the expression is seriously open to doubt. As suggested by W. H. Brownlee (27), the priest was initially reckoned as belonging to the men of Truth, the doers of the Law, whose arms do not relax from the service of Truth (VII 10ff.). This does not mean that the priest in fact was a member of the party of the Truth's adherents whose reputation was later on claimed by the Qumran community, but that he was religiously acceptable to them when making his first appearance. The text implies that he was reckoned as belonging to the men of Truth in the time antedating the rift between the Hasmonaeans and the Qumran community. In view of IX 9ff., lines which refer to Jonathan's wickedness against the Teacher of Righteousness and the members of his council (thus presupposing the rift as existing already during the pontificate of Jonathan), it is extremely doubtful that the wicked priest of VIII 8ff. is to be equated with this high priest. As pointed out at length by García Martínez (28), the identification with Judas Maccabaeus can hardly be rebutted and is corroborated by the iniquities he is accused of "while he bore rule over Israel", especially the robbery of the (hellenising) apostates, an information which is remarkably well in accordance with the contents of the complaint directed to Antiochus V by these Hellenisers (*1 Macc.* 6:22-27). The word *mar^edu* ("they rebelled [against God]") found here evidently has philhellenic overtones and returns in VIII 17 in the next section to mention a (wicked high) priest. The "evil diseases" which befell the latter (IX 1f.), hardly refer to pain as a consequence of cruel treatment in captivity (as Tantlevskij suggests in the interest of his identification of the priest with Jonathan) but (in connection with "vengeful acts on his body of flesh") rather to a wasting illness. The text matches extremely well the information given by *1 Macc.* 9:54ff. and Josephus, *Ant.* XII § 413 about the last days of Alcimus. In any case, on the basis of the vocabulary which is used, our interpretation seems to be more natural than that of Tantlevskij.

We can pass over the passage IX 9-12 because all commentators agree that it refers to Jonathan who was murdered by Tryphon. The interpretation given by Tantlevskij of the next passage (IX 16- X 5) is a

(26) *1 Maccabees* (The Anchor Bible 41), Garden City, NY 1984, 392.

(27) *O.c.*, 135.

(28) *O.c.*

bit curious. He assumes that IX 2 which speaks of "the vengeance on his body of flesh", refers to the first burial of Jonathan by the *gentiles* which was regarded by the Jews (and probably by Tryphon himself) as a profanation. A profanation of a dead body in one way or another was considered a form of God's or human revenge on the deceased. Without considering the meaning of "the house of judgment" (X 3), Tantlevskij suggests that *miššam* in X 4 points to the sepulchral monument which Simon according to *1 Macc.* 13: 27-30 and Josephus *Ant.* XIII § 211-212 erected for his father and brothers in Modin. From there, God would according to the Qumran sectarians raise up him (in flesh) for the final judgment. We have dealt already with the passage and concluded that "the house of judgment" most probably should be interpreted as the netherworld.

Tantlevskij considers XI 4-8 as the last passage which deals with Jonathan. It speaks of a persecution of the Teacher of Righteousness at "the place of his exile". In Tantlevskij's opinion, *byt ghwtw* presupposes a clash outside Judaea, namely in (the land of) Damascus. He therefore dates the event to 144 B.C., the last year in which Jonathan according to *1 Macc.* 12:32 and Josephus, *Ant.* XIII § 179 visited the region of Damascus. As stated above, it is probable that "the place of his exile" in XI 6 refers to Qumran. If so, archaeological considerations exclude a settlement of the site before the time of Johannes Hyrcanus I. Consequently, the latter (not Jonathan) is the best candidate for the recorded raid against the Teacher and his community.

In conclusion, it is doubtful whether Lim and Tantlevskij have adduced good reasons for a rejection of the said part of the "Groningen hypothesis". At the risk of seeming to be stubborn, the present writer did not encounter an element in their expositions which forces us to abandon our hypothesis or to modify it. Nevertheless, it remains a hypothesis! We are grateful to Lim and Tantlevskij for having reopened the debate on the wicked priest(s) in the *Habakkuk commentary*, because the matter deserves serious attention. Our reconstruction of the Qumran community's earliest history depends largely on the data of *1QpHab*.

A. S. VAN DER WOUDE.