

Jannaeus, His Brother Absalom, and Judah the Essene

Stephen Goranson

3 August 2005 copyright

goranson "at" duke "dot" edu

Confluence of evidence is rising to identify three contemporary, historical individuals mentioned in Qumran Essene texts. Alexander Jannaeus was described in Qumran texts as the "Wicked Priest." The name Absalom in Peshar Habakkuk 8: 9 refers to the brother of Jannaeus with that name. Judah the Essene, known from Josephus (War 1:78-80; Ant. 15:371-9), was described as the "Teacher of Righteousness."¹ This article will provide evidence for these identifications. This subject may be worth pursuing not merely as a puzzle potentially solved, but for the possibility that these identifications may lead to further research and a better understanding of a significant time in history of religion that would influence later Judaism as well as Christian origins. The following five sections treat each individual in turn, then the three together, and finally a conclusion.

Jannaeus

It is widely, and properly, agreed that the Wicked Priest best candidate will be a Hasmonean who served as High Priest as well as the political and military leader of Judaea. Queen Salome Alexandra is excluded by gender; Aristobulus I ruled too briefly to be plausible; the two sons of Jannaeus and Salome, Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II, are probably too late and too small. I take as given, or a working assumption if you like, that the Essene writers who mention the "Wicked Priest" referred to an historical, not fictional, individual, even if described with great bias, because the sectarian writers believed they

saw scripture being fulfilled in history as they experienced it. Though fiction, theoretically, could be considered in this case, that option has little to commend it, and it would slight the reliable connections with history already observed in the scrolls, for instance the 88 BCE crucifixions (War 1:97; Ant. 13:380) mentioned in Peshet Nahum. Similarly, I treat this Priest and this Teacher as single individuals, rather than as offices, because I find no clear distinguishing markers of multiple officeholders; there are no relevant plural references. Surely, many candidates have been proposed. But most of them appear to be either too early or too late to fit the evidence, as discussed below. Here I will focus primarily on the evidence that favors Jannaeus, also called Jonathan (I will refer to him as Jannaeus, except when quoting a text that does otherwise), whose reign was from 103 to 76 BCE, but I will also consider the earlier Jonathan (152-142 BCE). These two High Priests, after all, are the two candidates that have been most often proposed since the initial Qumran discoveries. Admittedly, the earlier Jonathan appears to have more proponents today, but the latter has had many proponents as well,² and I suggest he will prevail, for a number of reasons. We can claim that the arguments from the character of Jannaeus and from his known actions are stronger. Also the Jannaeus proposal better fits the available sectarian chronological data.

But let's briefly consider the case for the earlier Jonathan. Several of the arguments in support of Jonathan have been seriously questioned, including in the handy recent survey of the Post-Exilic High Priests by James VanderKam.³ In his typically excellent work--though VanderKam there mildly still expresses support for the first Jonathan as Wicked Priest ("an inference that seems to be correct"⁴)--I suggest his research actually reveals just how remarkably weak the case is. For example, VanderKam

examines and dismisses the arguments that the Teacher of Righteousness had served as High Priest in the Intersacerdotum, the seven years before Jonathan took office in 152, thereby removing a major claim that these two individuals (one of them nameless, a putative individual, rather than a rotation of priests, an individual unknown to historians) can thus be shown as contemporaries.⁵ Leaving the Qumran matter in question aside, VanderKam adduces no evidence that Jonathan fought internal dissent, as the Wicked Priest is described as doing, ruthlessly. The Wicked Priest is a reputed heavy drinker (1QpHab 11:12-15); Jannaeus is a reputed heavy drinker (War 1:98; Ant. 13:398); VanderKam offers of Jonathan: “there is no reason to think he was a teetotaler.”⁶ Fair enough; but hardly compelling.

What then is left of the case for Jonathan? Apparently, three of the remaining claims concern the manner of the Wicked Priest’s death; his relationship with Alexander Balas; and—if we consult another work by VanderKam--speculation about the role of calendar change. We consider these in sequence.

It is often claimed that the scrolls inform us that the Wicked Priest was killed by Gentiles. But the fragmentary Scrolls do not say that. The Wicked Priest reportedly had many enemies, both foreign and fellow-countrymen—as Jannaeus surely did—but neither group managed directly to kill him, and certainly not twice. Each group succeeded in providing him with close calls: in effect, he was, for a time, in their hand, under their power. They both *sought* to kill him, but, to revisit one of the supposed war death texts, we are merely told that God gave him “into the hand of the ruthless ones of the Gentiles to do [...] against him.”⁷ But he more probably died of disease (angels “inflicted evil diseases,” 1QpHab 9:2; cf. 9:11)—as did Jannaeus. Josephus, Antiquities 13:375-6

recounts close calls by both sets of enemies: We should focus on the long tenure of the Wicked Priest as High Priest and leader, moreso than on his death; he was called wicked for his life.

“Then [Jannaeus] engaged in battle with Obedas, the king of the Arabs, and falling into an ambush in a rough and difficult region, he was pushed by a multitude of camels into a deep ravine near Gaulanis, and barely escaped with his own life, and fleeing from there, came to Jerusalem. But when the nation attacked him upon his misfortune, he made war on it and within six years slew no fewer than fifty thousand Jews. And so when he urged them to make an end of their hostility toward him, they only hated him the more on account of what had happened. And when he asked what he ought to do and what they wanted of him, they all cried out, ‘to die’; and they sent to Demetrius Akairos, asking him to come to their assistance.”⁸ And in that account of close calls from foreign and domestic enemies, we end with Demetrius, a figure known from Peshet Nahum. In other words, Jannaeus can be both a Lion in Peshet Nahum, and the Wicked Priest. The Scrolls describe a process whereby somehow these close calls are regarded as contributing to his disease; but he died of disease, including in Qumran accounts, as various scholars have recognized over the years.⁹ Additionally, it is claimed that Jannaeus told his wife near the end of his life, while ill, to offer his corpse to the Pharisees, which she supposedly did. If that story is true, then it is further unlikely that he died on a battlefield, as his wife in that case probably would not have his corpse (Ant. 13:403-6).¹⁰

However on evaluates the accounts of the suffering and death of the Wicked Priest, accounts that may be tinged with wishful thinking, the identity of this individual

should be determined more, after all from his life than his death: from his actions as priest and leader that were regarded as wicked.

Jozef Milik suggested that Alexander Balas is mentioned as Balakros in 4Q243 fragment 21.¹¹ If so, that might strengthen the impression that he was important to Qumran, because of giving the priesthood to someone unqualified, a non-Zadokite. But Peter Flint has pointed out that there are various other possible referents, and that Alexander Balas is just one of many possibilities.¹² Additionally, Milik's proposal that the Aramaic "son of god" text 4Q246 refers to Alexander Balas, the patron of Jonathan, has garnered little support. So there is little reason to link Balas with the Wicked Priest. Balas provides no evidence for Jonathan as that priest.

Alison Schofield and VanderKam have recently published a study claiming the Hasmoneans were, after all, Zadokite priests; if that is so, then Jonathan was not the first of a line of genealogically-disqualified priests, thereby removing one major argument for him as Wicked Priest.¹³

Sometimes it appears that the scrolls are squeezed into a worldview they don't share, using ancient texts absent at Qumran, in this case 1, 2 Maccabees. The Essenes are not the Asidaioi of these books; nor is 1QM, in my view, a Maccabee War Manual.¹⁴ A useful corrective, I suggest, is provided by Albert Baumgarten in "Invented Traditions of the Maccabean Era."¹⁵ This contribution reminds us that different groups accepted or rejected certain traditions or changes, for instance, the change—probably made by Jannaeus-- from a once-in-a-lifetime temple fee to an annual fee. If all the scrolls had come from Jerusalem libraries—and the many scribal hands mean it is unlikely they

came from *any* one place, in addition to those produced at Qumran—would we not expect to see a fragment of 1 Maccabees in Hebrew? Or, among the texts practically obsessed with calendar matters, a single mention of Hanukkah?

In his fine book on Scrolls calendars, VanderKam presents “A Hypothetical Sketch of the Role of the Calendar in Qumran Origins.”¹⁶ The book is quite clear and helpful in setting out the calendar disputes that ineluctably are indeed a significant issue in the sectarian differences. But proposed links with Wicked Priest identity remain speculative. Let’s say, for conversation’s sake, that we knew that Jonathan retained a Seleucid-influenced calendar change. Even then, we don’t know that the Teacher of Righteousness arose at that moment.

In fact, if we try again to test whether the Damascus Document number of 390 years is even approximately usable for history, we are reminded that the group wandered for twenty years before the teacher arose. The cause of disagreements—calendrical or otherwise-- may have arisen before the leadership to address the concerns. In other words, the Wicked Priest need not be the first one to use a calendar that the Qumran texts disapprove.

Further, I suggest that if 390 years was a serious approximate measurement, which is uncertain, it would have its start time in 538 BCE, because that is when the Jews were no longer in the hand of Babylon. If I asked a convict: How long has it been since you were in prison? I would expect an answer measured not from the first incarceration date but from the release date. Similarly, if one asks How long has it been since World War II? One typically counts from the war end. Or how long since you ate?—from the last meal end. Being in the hands of Babylon is not a punctiliar event, but one with

duration. I think that H. H. Rowley made a good contribution to the discussion of the grammar of לְחִיָּתוֹ in CD 1:6.¹⁷ He asked the question whether the 390 years come before or after the event, and settled on afterward. He didn't ask the beginning or end of captivity question, but did helpfully render the odd grammar as "in relation to His giving them," which I suggest, can be measured from the date of captivity end, 538 BCE. Minus 390 and minus 20 more years brings the rise of the Teacher to 128 BCE, after the time of Jonathan, who died in 142 BCE.

Since Essenes are first mentioned during the reign of Jonathan, in 146 BCE, some may assume that this somehow supports his Wicked Priest candidacy. But the account in Antiquities 13:171-2 is not connected to any event in the narrative. It is placed there because Josephus' source at the point, Strabo, and his source Posidonius, both started their histories where Polybius left off, in 146 BCE, at which time they picked up the status of the Jews, as I have discussed elsewhere.¹⁸ Those who posit active three-sect strife this early will need to offer other evidence.

All in all, not a lot of support is left for Jonathan (152-142) as Wicked Priest.

I recognize that, for some undetermined number of years in the first centuries BCE and CE, Essenes lived at Qumran and elsewhere. This has been adequately demonstrated elsewhere, e.g., by Jodi Magness.¹⁹ Emblematic of the view rejecting Essenes at Qumran is the cover of Yizhar Hirschfeld's new Qumran book. On its cover and in a full page color Figure 102 inside²⁰ are—not scrolls—but two combs, presumably intended to look luxurious, though combs were used to remove lice, including by men. But quite remarkably, these combs are not from Qumran! They are from Wadi Murabba'at caves.²¹ And the cover shows beads; but those beads are from Qumran

burials that postdate the second temple period.²² The text is not much more reliable. For example: “Before the discovery of the scrolls, there were no doubts among scholars that the Essenes should be located in the Ein Gedi Area....”²³ But C. D. Ginsburg, for example, in 1870 wrote that Essenes “settled on the north-west shore of the Dead Sea (Pliny, Hist. Nat. v, 17)...”²⁴ F. de Saulcy in 1853 located a “pays des Esséniens” between Wadi en-Nar or Qidron and Ain el-Ghuweir.²⁵ Strack in 1853 translated Pliny on Essenes: “Südlich von ihnen lag sonst die Stadt Engadda,”²⁶ as was cited by Bardtke in 1958,²⁷ and, importantly, by de Vaux in 1973.²⁸ Those who criticize de Vaux owe it to their readers to have first carefully read de Vaux. Edward Gibbon wrote: “The Laura, and monastery of St. Sabas, could not be far distant from this [Pliny-mentioned Essene] place.”²⁹ And Joan Taylor wrote on William Hepworth Dixon’s account, which “...states—somewhat prophetically—in 1866 that the ‘chief seats of this sect [of the Essenes] were pitched on the western shores of the Dead Sea, about the present Ras al Feshka....”³⁰ The dismissal of Pliny as referring to Qumran/Feshkha is deeply flawed.³¹

Also Hirschfeld wrote that “By suggesting that Jerusalem is the source of the scrolls, we liberate Qumran from the burden of religious significance that has clung to it.”³² Though one may wonder whether historians have this specific power retroactively to liberate, at least the reader can see a modern agenda at work. For the purposes of this paper it is important to characterize Qumran as accurately as possible in order to help determine their reasons for calling someone Wicked Priest.

According to Peshar Habakkuk 8:9 the Wicked Priest, when he first arose to office, was “called by the name of truth.”³³ This has been interpreted in many ways.³⁴ After Aristobulus I died, his widow released his three half-brothers from prison, and she

“placed on the throne Alexander [Jannaeus] who had the double advantage over the others of seniority and apparent moderation of character. However, on coming to power he put to death one brother,” and let one other brother live (War 1:85). Though his rule became remarkably violent, that was not the reported expectation of the one who released and chose him.

In a dream, of interest to Pesharim readers, Jannaeus’s father John Hyrcanus reportedly (Ant. 13:320-3; War 1:68-9) was informed that it was the destiny of Jannaeus, who his father had shunted away to frontier Galilee (perhaps to Sepphoris), to be his successor, even though John preferred his sons by his first wife to Jannaeus and his two brothers born of his second wife. This reputed divine revelation could readily be seen as being called by the name of truth, in other words, by haShem Himself. Jannaeus, with reputed Divine predestination—a matter of great interest to Essenes-- is someone who could have, early on, been sent MMT, a cordial plea to adhere to Essene interpretation of Torah, as is possibly alluded to in 4QpPs^a 1-10 iv 8-9. Even if this dream may not be assuredly the source of the phrase concerning truth, as Brownlee showed, there are many ways to read the phrase, and no reason to exclude Essenes at first thinking and hoping that Jannaeus would be receptive to their Torah interpretations.

4Q448, it has been claimed, is praise, even a “Paeon” or a “panegyric”³⁵ to King Jonathan,³⁶ Alexander Jannaeus. But nothing whatever about King Jonathan is there praised! It is not a hymn of praise; nor is שיר the first word of Column B, though Eisenman and Wise read thus, perhaps following the bold assertion by Norman Golb that such was the case, and that the original editors were insufficiently experienced in paleography to read correctly.³⁷ (Prof. Golb’s estimate of the abilities of editor Ada

Yardeni—who, after all, was the first to read Jonathan in 4Q448--was soon after quite transformed, when he agreed with her that an ostrakon from Qumran should be read without the word *היחזק*.) Several scholars have recognized that 4Q448 Columns B and C provide a prayer *against* Jonathan that begins: “Rise up-- עור --O Holy One, against Jonathan the King.” One of the good publications that make this clear is an online work by Ken Penner³⁸ that deserves to be read along with the other publications.³⁹ Penner does an excellent job with Columns B and C, but I would differ concerning Column A. There is a significant relationship between the three columns; and Column A is sectarian, too. All columns reflect a dualistic worldview in a time of war crisis. There is a good and an evil. Also in Column A (partly restored) we read of Divine action against those who are *wicked* רשע. And, in the lower columns the leader of the evil does not go unnamed: he is King Jonathan. The Psalm 154 version in Column A should of course be compared to the version in 11QPsalms. Before the publication of 4Q448 it was often remarked of Psalm 154, with, for one thing, mention (154:4) of creating a *יהוה*, that it was either “Essene” or “Proto-Essene.”⁴⁰

4Q523, a text that also mentions Jonathan, could fit in this time and worldview, too.⁴¹ Though quite fragmentary, it appears to involve a dualistic, endtime war, and Gog and Magog. As an aside, here are two, both quite uncertain, guesses concerning the uncertain name גלויקה or גלויקה in 4Q523 1-2 10, offered more to stimulate further research than to claim either one is persuasive. First, Bat Gallim בת גלים, the location north of Mt. Carmel, quoted from Isaiah 10:30 and involved in war “when he goes up from the Valley of Acco” in 4QpIsa^a 2-6 23 and 27.⁴² This text (4Q161), according to Joseph Amusin [Amoussine], relates to war during the reign of Jannaeus.⁴³ Second,

Caius Servilius Glaucia, murdered in 100 BCE. In any case, though Puech argues strongly that 4Q523 should be associated with Jonathan (152-142 BCE), I suggest that it may relate to the time of Jannaeus. At least, the option merits consideration.

Jannaeus is presented in an especially negative light by the Stoic Strabo, who was following Posidonius, in Geography 16.2.34-46, and who may be a source on Essenes.. They believed that Moses was a good and admirable teacher, but that recently “superstitious men were appointed to the priesthood, and then tyrannical people” (37) Jannaeus is specifically named as pivotal in this unfortunate change: “...when now Judaea was under the rule of tyrants, Alexander [Jannaeus] was first to declare himself king instead of priest...” (40).⁴⁴

Jannaeus is what the Wicked Priest also is: seen as warlike, greedy, a drinker, known for “excessive cruelty” (Ant. 13.388), having a long tenure, a heavy taxer, and widely hated. They are identical.

Absalom

According to Peshar Habakkuk 5:10, the House of Absalom kept quiet and failed to help the Teacher when he was aggrieved. Maurya Horgan translates 5:8-12 (footnotes omitted), starting with Hab 1:13b: **“Why do you heed traitors, but are silent when a wicked one swallows up one more righteous than he?”** (VACAT) Its interpretation concerns the House of Absalom and the men of their counsel, who were quiet at the rebuke of the Righteous Teacher and did not support him against the Man of the Lie (VACAT) who rejected the Torah in the midst of all their counsel.”⁴⁵

William Brownlee, the first editor of Peshar Habakkuk, gave the following note: “A cryptic reference. The commentator does not give us the real name of a rebel [sic] leader. He refers to a party which lived up to the name of Absalom who rebelled against his own father.”⁴⁶ This note, the first analysis of the passage, is in several respects unsatisfactory. The Absalom of the Peshar—quite unlike David’s son Absalom—is not shown as rebelling, much less against his father. Rather, he is shown as acquiescing, rebellion’s antithesis. As it happens, Jannaeus’s sole surviving brother is also described precisely as acquiescent: his brother, “the survivor, who was content with a quiet life” (War 1:84). Hence Jannaeus didn’t kill him; he was no rival for power. Similarly, this was Jannaeus’s “brother who preferred to live without taking part in public affairs” (Ant. 13:323).

David Noel Freedman responded to Brownlee in *BASOR* the following year, suggesting that Absalom was more likely not a symbolic name but an historical one, and, as such, it could serve as an important peg for dating the events described in the Qumran texts.⁴⁷ Freedman was quite right in principle, but missed the identification specifically, for reasons understandable in retrospect. André Dupont-Sommer briefly suggested that “our” Absalom might be the referent, but merely in relation to his proposal that the too-late Hyrcanus II might have been the Wicked Priest.⁴⁸ The fact that the name Absalom appears only in a separate section of Josephus than the descriptions of him as acquiescent towards his brother the ruler—as suits Peshar Habakkuk, as Absalom was prominent—probably obscured the relationship of this individual and this pesher.

That Absalom is the name of Jannaeus’s sole surviving brother is given in Antiquities 14.71, where Absalom is identified as the uncle and father-in-law of

Aristobulus II, when both were under siege in Jerusalem, then taken prisoner (War 1: 154). Absalom was not a common name, perhaps because David's son Absalom did rebel, appearing only eleven times in Tal Ilan's vast corpus of names, but it *was* a name used repeatedly by Hasmoneans.⁴⁹ Partly because Josephus knows of a brother of Jannaeus who could be that paternal uncle, but does not mention a brother of Queen Salome Alexandra, who could be a maternal uncle, scholars have concluded that Absalom was that paternal uncle. Of course, rabbinic literature (e.g. b.Berakot 29a) provides a possible brother for her, but then, his Hebrew name is not Absalom, but Simon ben Shetah.⁵⁰ Also, Absalom was in Jerusalem with Aristobulus II, the more conservative brother, favoring the status quo, compared to Hyrcanus II. That Absalom was the name of Jannaeus' only surviving brother was concluded by many scholars, including by Nikos Kokkinos in his careful genealogical study,⁵¹ and by the two Loeb editors who addressed the matter, H. St. J. Thackeray,⁵² and Ralph Marcus,⁵³ as well as by Freedman,⁵⁴ and Paul Winter.⁵⁵ Winter also agreed with Freedman that Absalom in Peshier Habakkuk was a "non-allegorical expression."

The only argument I have seen attempting to read the uncle of Aristobulus in Antiquities 14:71 as a brother of Queen Salome Alexandra is by Yiphtah Zur,⁵⁶ who attempts to bring Simon ben Shetah into the Peshier Habakkuk discussion. But that presentation is problematic. Zur presents Absalom and Simon as "maternal uncles of Aristobulos II," but neither Josephus nor rabbinic literature is adduced to support the claims, despite the fact that there are abundant rabbinic accounts of Shimon.⁵⁷ Zur states that the "primary meaning of *θειος* is maternal uncle, but may mean any uncle when the distinction is not important. Josephus was defining here a kinship in the royal family in a

matrilinear society, which makes understanding ‘maternal uncle’ preferable.” But Zur neglects or downplays the fact that Josephus used *θεῖος* for a paternal uncle, including in a royal family—for example in Antiquities 20:145: “After the death of Herod [of Chalcis, brother of Agrippa, her father], who had been her uncle [*θεῖος*] and husband, Berenice lived for a long time as a widow.”⁵⁸ And Zur neglects the unusual prevalence of the name Absalom among Hasmonians. Further, the claim of a “matrilinear” society is anachronistic by perhaps two or more centuries. It should suffice to refer to the learned and persuasive treatment of “The Matrilineal Principle” by Shaye Cohen: “I conclude that the matrilineal principle was not yet known in second temple times....The matrilineal principle is first attested in the Mishnah.”⁵⁹

Absalom was quiet; he, as a Hasmonian, could have helped the Teacher if if chose, but did not. The brother of Jannaeus, Absalom, is the Absalom in Peshar Habakkuk.

Judah the Essene

Once the Wicked Priest and Absalom have been identified, the Teacher of Righteousness is not far to seek. He must be their contemporary. He must be an Essene. Even the name Judah is provided in Peshar Habakkuk! Peshar Habakkuk 8:1: “Its interpretation [that is, the theologically important verse Habakkuk 2:4b, “And the righteous will live by his faithfulness”] concerns all those who observe Torah [that is, in this writer’s view, Essenes] in the House of Judah [here with double meaning], whom God will save from the house of judgement on account of their tribulation and their fidelity to the Righteous Teacher.”⁶⁰ In the same passage: Judah, the Righteous Teacher.

Judah the Essene is the earliest known Essene individual. It would be illogical were one to say that Josephus does not mention the individual who is the Teacher of Righteousness, unless one first determined who that individual is, and then checked to see if he appears. Similarly, it would be illogical to assert that the original Hebrew spelling of the various Greek spellings that come into English as Essenes and Ossenes is absent from the Qumran texts, unless one has the acceptable spellings in mind, and then looks to see if they are absent or present. In fact, the origin of the name is there, in precisely certain scrolls already known as Essene on other grounds, scrolls that mention all three individuals under consideration: עושי התורה.⁶¹

Judah the Essene was a Teacher (War 1:78-80; Ant. 13: 311-313). He was in Jerusalem. He was, reportedly, a prophet. From the account, it would not seem amiss if his followers thought him righteous. He was concerned with the two elder half-brothers of Jannaeus and Absalom. The details in the two accounts in Joseph of Judah the Essene merit further study, as Carmignac long ago advised. For this paper it suffices to recognize him as the Essene Teacher of Righteousness.

Additionally, I will at least mention the possibility that our Judah may be Judah son of Gedidiah in b.Qiddushin 66a, the famous, and famously fascinating though difficult account of sectarian strife at dinner supposedly hosted by Jannaeus after returning from victories in Kohalit, כהלית. This dinner is retroactively described with the later sense of the Hebrew word for heresy, מינות.⁶² On the possible relevance of this Judah, one may see, for instance, Brownlee⁶³ and Bruce⁶⁴; on the possible relevance of the Kohalit region to Essenes, see my articles on the Kohalit in the Qumran Copper Scroll.⁶⁵

These matters may provide additional circumstantial evidence, but, whether they do or no, Judah the Essene was regarded as the Teacher of Righteousness.

Three Contemporaries at the Right Time

When publication of 4QMMT was first making news, we were informed of “six copies transcribed more than a half a century later. It was common practice for the sect to make several copies of important documents....”⁶⁶ This was reported under the assumption that the so-called “Halakhic Letter”⁶⁷ had been sent to Jonathan. But, as more and more texts became available, it seems somewhat embarrassing to that hypothesis that none of the texts with the Wicked Priest or the Teacher of Righteousness securely predate 100 BCE. At some point, it becomes reasonable to question gratuitous declarations that with Peshar Nahum, we move to a later time than the Wicked Priest, such as the following: “Whilst the theory advanced by some scholars [M. Delcor; M.H. Segal; F.F. Bruce; J. van der Ploeg] concerning the identity of the Wicked Priest and Alexander Jannaeus is seriously weakened by the findings of archaeology [viz., the Qumran community was founded 30 to 40 years before the time of Jannaeus] most scholars recognize in him the villain of the Nahum Commentary....”⁶⁸ The Nahum Commentary identification remains sure, but that Qumran was founded as early as 133 or 143 BCE is increasingly doubted.⁶⁹ Peshar Nahum is securely pegged to a crucifixion event in 88 CE.

Philip Callaway’s estimate that we should look for the events of the Wicked Priest and Teacher of Righteousness sometime before about 75 BCE⁷⁰ remains a good estimate. How long before? The earlier one goes, the less evidence there is from date-estimated (admittedly, only estimated) manuscripts.

I have long been in favor of additional C14 testing.⁷¹ The tests so far have been helpful, but more data would be welcomed. And two problems merit mention. First, and this should be easily fixed: each published report should specify which fragment or column (i.e., which sheet of skin or papyrus) was tested. Except in the case of 1QIsaiah^a, this was not previously done. We were helpfully informed that the Zürich and Arizona labs both tested material from that scroll's Column 39.⁷² The different sheets, especially replacement sheets in one scroll (such as 11QT's first sheet) can have different dates. Plus, to be able to compare DNA studies of fragments, this information should be recorded and published.⁷³ Another caution on overreliance on so-far available C14 data is the unfortunate possibility that some who pay for C14 tests, for whatever reasons, do not always publish all of it; though one cannot know how widespread this practice is, it is a factor.

Secondly, there has been a fair amount of misunderstanding about how to interpret the data, some of it published in peer-reviewed publications, more than one might have hoped. Gregory Doudna's essay "Dating the Scrolls on the Basis of Radiocarbon Analysis" provides much useful information.⁷⁴ But a few its pages should be read with considerable caution.⁷⁵ Doudna offers an analogy of a single "shotgun blast" around a single true date.⁷⁶ That analogy does not suit the 900 or so Qumran manuscripts; though it could relatively better apply to tests of one manuscript. Doudna offers comparisons of the Qumran case with cases of a single battle and of a single volcano eruption, "single events."⁷⁷ But it is misleading to presume regarding circa 900 Qumran manuscripts (surfaces prepared then written on) plus their subsequent deposits in 11 caves as a single event, especially when such an image is used in a "single generation"

hypothesis to disregard, as part of “measurement scatter” outlier date ranges. In other words, that is data being excluded because of an *a priori* hypothesis. A.J.T. Jull, of the Arizona C14 lab, and now *Radiocarbon* journal editor, addressed this problematic practice of disregarding some date ranges. On Orion Dead Sea Scrolls discussion list Doudna wrote concerning rejecting one date range, “The principle is a sound one: in any battery of lab data, data points at one end or the other of distributions must be regarded skeptically.”⁷⁸ Dr. Jull responded to this: “In a series of data on the same sample, this assertion is correct, but one cannot apply it to a series of different samples and just reject the ones which appear inconsistent with some other hypothesis.”⁷⁹ By “the same sample” here, Jull means, for instance, material from a single piece of skin. Dr. Jull, in my view, is quite right on the science. Another example of a need for caution on a dating proposal, I suggest, is the subsequent publication by Doudna supporting an end of Qumran scroll deposits in 63 BCE—a proposal later withdrawn or modified by the author in subsequent writings. Doudna wrote: “Datable internal historical names and allusions in the Qumran texts *flourish* up to c. 63 BCE but then stop. The end of internal references after 63 BCE is total and *permanent*, without exception [my italics].” One can question whether such references can be said to “flourish” in Qumran-mentioned time period; such securely-datable markers are precious few. And what is the most widely-accepted instance in 88 BCE, Doudna has rejected.⁸⁰ The use of “permanent” here is remarkably non-scientific, foreclosing new insights. Dating proposals that follow such missteps cannot be relied upon. On the other hand, Doudna has encouraged the gathering of more data, and that is constructive.

“Jannes and his brother” make an appearance in the Damascus Document. Louis Ginzberg wrote a learned and significant observation on the name Jannes in CD 5:1.⁸¹ Here’s the passage, including its footnote 54:

" יחנה (5, 18) name of a sorcerer contemporary with Moses. In talmudical sources (Exodus Rabba, 9,4; Menahoth 85a) he is called יוחני, in NT (II Timothy 3:8) and in the Pseudepigrapha: Iannes. The mentioning of Moses’ opponent by name may be a disguised attack on (King Alexander) Jannaeus or on King [sic] Ioannes [note 54] (Hyrcanus)” Note 54: “יחנה respectively יוחני or יוחנא are abbreviated forms of יוחנן or יהוחנן. Since the vernacular pronounced the ה in יחנה as hardly audible, the differences between ינאי – יהונתן and יחנה = יחני = יהוחנן was scarcely perceptible. In the Talmud we find ינאי for both Alexander Jannaeus and his father John Hyrcanus, cf. above, p. 273, note 6, (and our *Legends of the Jews* VI, p. 144.)”

It is important to add that we now know that Alexander was called Jannaeus or Yannai, but that John Hyrcanus was not.⁸² Talmudic literature includes discussion of this confusion. The accounts in Josephus (Ant. 13.288-98) and Talmud (b.Qid. 66a) about sectarian-upset dinners of John Hyrcanus and Jannaeus (or one dinner twice assigned) are complex. It does appear that there is less sectarian strife attested in John Hyrcanus’ reign than in that of Jannaeus, when such strife was extreme. Perhaps John was more tolerant; additionally or more likely, the sectarian differences had probably not yet hardened as much as they would later. It is interesting that Raba reportedly said (b.Ber. 29a):

“Johanai and Jannai are different [i.e., John Hyrcanus was not Jannai—correct]; Jannai was originally wicked [רשע] and Johanai was originally righteous.” Possibly, this reflects Essene and Pharisee/Rabbinic polemic. In the Essene view Jannaeus was at first “called

by the name of truth” (1QpHab 8:9) and then became wicked, the Wicked הרשע Priest. For Raba the opposite obtained.

To be brief, Ginzberg was right. This passage in CD 5 and in 4Q266 3 ii 6 and 4Q267 2:2 draws a parallel between the time that Belial raised most wicked and powerful opponents against Moses and his brother and the writer’s present-day when the Teacher of Righteousness was opposed by the Wicked Priest, Jannaeus. In the Pseudepigrapha, Jannes and Jambres (or Mambres) are sometimes given with both names—with several spelling variants.⁸³ In D we have “Jannes and his brother.” That brother, his only surviving brother, was Absalom, but the name didn’t match the tradition, and he was the lesser character, so he was merely recorded as “his brother.” The three figures, Jannaeus, his brother Absalom, and Judah the Essene were contemporaries in history, and together also in the Qumran scrolls.

Conclusion

These three previously-known individuals, Jannaeus, Absalom, and Judah, can now be better understood through their additional descriptions in Qumran Essene texts. Some influential history of religion may be better understood through study of these accounts in their confluence.

¹ Jean Carmignac is among those who have proposed that Judah the Essene was Teacher of Righteousness. See, e.g., his “Qui était le Docteur de Justice?” *RQ* 10 (1980) 235-46. In a steamroller-reminiscent rebuttal J. Murphy-O’Connor, “Judah the Essene and the Teacher of Righteousness,” *RQ* 40 (1981) 579-85 focussed largely on the manner in which Carmignac presented his proposal rather than whether Judah merits consideration and offered that Judah could be a candidate for the Liar. In the interest of avoiding

unnecessary multiplication of entities, it could be mentioned that the Liar might be identical with the Wicked Priest. Carmignac replied with “Précisions,” *RQ* 40 (1981) 585-6.

² For one, e.g., M.H. Segal, “The Habakkuk ‘Commentary’ and the Damascus Fragments (A Historical Study),” *JBL* 70 (1952) 131-47. Others include M. Delcor, *Le Midrash d’Habacuc* (Paris: editions du Cerf, 1951); F.F. Bruce, *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956); J. Carmignac, *Les Textes de Qumran II* (1963) 48-57; J. van der Ploeg, *The Excavations at Qumran : A Survey of the Judaean Brotherhood and Its Ideas* (London: Longmans, Green, 1958); B. Nitzan, *Pesher Habakkuk: a Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* [in Hebrew] (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1986) 132-36, 178; J. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1956); W.H. Brownlee, “Biblical Interpretation among the Dead Sea Sectaries,” *BA* 14 (1951) 54-76; R. de Vaux, *RB* 59 (1950) 417-29; G. Molin, *Die Söhne des Lichtes* (Vienna: Herold, 1954); Also worth recalling, for the Wicked Priest, are the responses to S. Schechter’s 1910 publication of the Zadokite Fragments, later known as the Damascus Document; for instance, L. Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (Moreshet 1; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1976) found the Jannaeus reign a most probable time; that is a revised and updated translation of a work he finished in 1916, *Eine unbekante jüdische Sekte* (New York: Im Selbsteverlage des Verfassers, 1922). M.O. Wise, “Dating the Teacher of Righteousness and the *Floruit* of His Movement,” *JBL* 122 (2003) 53-87 includes some useful indications that the time of the Wicked Priest—a more useful starting place than the Teacher, as the former’s history was more public—is later than the time of Jonathan (152-142 BCE): but the article, in my

view, inadequately distinguishes between references to these two figures and proposed later events, leading to a focus on the time of the too-small, too- later brothers, the sons of Jannaeus,

³ J.C. VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004). Without implying endorsement, I thank James VanderKam for helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

⁴ VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 267.

⁵ VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 244-50.

⁶ VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 269.

⁷ A rather significant lacuna. 4QPs^a 1-10 iv 10. M. Horgan in J.H. Charlesworth ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translation: 6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries and Related Documents* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2002) 18-19.

⁸ R. Marcus, *Josephus, Jewish Antiquities* (LCL 7; Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1965) 415.

⁹ E.g., P.R. Callaway, *The History of the Qumran Community: An Investigation* (JSPSS 3; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988) 205. And more recently, with additional relevant bibliography, R. van de Water, "The Punishment of the Wicked Priest and the Death of Judas," *DSD* 10 (2003) 395-419. Also questioning various aspects of related history reconstructions, see J.J. Collins, "The Origin of the Qumran Community: A Review of the Evidence," *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honour of Joseph A. Fitzmyer*, S.J. (eds. M.P. Horgan and P. Kobelski; New York: Crossroad, 1989) 159-79.

-
- ¹⁰ VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 330-32; and J.C. VanderKam, “Peshet Nahum and Josephus,” *When Judaism and Christianity Began: Essays in Memory of Anthony J. Saldarini* (eds. A.J. Avery-Peck et al.; Leiden; Brill, 2004) 299-311.
- ¹¹ J. Milik “‘Prière de Nabonide’ et autres écrits d’un cycle de Daniel. Fragments araméens de Qumran 4,” *RB* 63 (1956) 407-15.
- ¹² P.W. Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” *Eschatology. Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. C.A. Evans and P.W. Flint; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997) 41-60, here 49-50.
- ¹³ A. Schofield and J. VanderKam, “Were the Hasmoneans Zadokites?” *JBL* 124 (2005) 73-87.
- ¹⁴ R. Gmirkin, “Historical Allusions in the War Scroll,” *DSD* 5 (1998) 172-214.
- ¹⁵ A.I. Baumgarten, “Invented Traditions of the Maccabean Era,” *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion* (M. Hengel Festschrift; eds. H. Cancik et al.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1996) 1:197-210. Additionally, if we try to apply the sociological analysis of Baumgarten in *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (SJSJ 55; Leiden: Brill, 1997), we need to allow sufficient time for the transition, in some communities, from a victorious millenarianism of triumph to one of despair; disappointment took time: again, Jonathan (152-142 BCE) appears too soon to be “Wicked Priest.”
- ¹⁶ J. VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time* (London/New York: Routledge, 1998) 113-16.
- ¹⁷ H.H. Rowley, “The 390 Years of the Zadokite Work,” *Mélanges bibliques rédigés en l’honneur de André Robert* (Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1957) 341-7.

-
- ¹⁸ S. Goranson, "Posidonius, Strabo, and Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa as Sources on Essenes," *JJS* 45 (1994) 295-8.
- ¹⁹ J. Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).
- ²⁰ Y. Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence* (Peabody MA: Hendrikson, 2004).
- ²¹ P. Benoit, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux (eds.). *Les grottes de Murabba'at* (DJD 2; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), part 2, Planches, pl. XIV.8 and XIV.9.
- ²² J. Zias, "The Cemeteries of Qumran and Celibacy: Confusion Laid to Rest?" *DSD* 7 (2000) 220-53. Also, C. Clamer, "Jewellery Finds from the Cemetery," *Études d'anthropologie, de physique et de chimie, Studies of Anthropology, Physics and Chemistry* (eds. J.-B. Humbert and J. Gunneweg; Khirbet Qumrân et Aïn Feshkha 2; NTOA, Series Archaeologica 3; Fribourg: Academic Press—Éditions Saint-Paul; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003) 171-84.
- ²³ Hirschfeld, *Qumran*, 232, n.82.
- ²⁴ C.D. Ginsburg, *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature* (eds. J. M'Clintock and J. Strong; New York: Harper, 1870) 3: 304.. The article on Essenes may have appeared in earlier editions edited by J. Kitto as well.
- ²⁵ F. de Saulcy, *Voyage autour de la mer Morte* (Paris: Pouget-Coulon, 1858) 24-33, 201 and *Atlas*; E. Puech, "The Necropolises of Khirbet Qumrân and Ain el Ghuweir and the Essene Belief in Afterlife," *BASOR* 312 (1998) 21-36, here 32, n.23.
- ²⁶ C.F.L. Strack, *Cajus Plinius Secundus Naturgeschichte* (ed. M. Strack; Bremen: Johan Georg Hense, 1853).

²⁷ H. Bardtke, *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer: Die Sekte von Qumran* (Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1958) 39, n.2.

²⁸ R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Schweich Lectures, British Academy 1959; London: British Academy. 1973) 134-35, n.3.

²⁹ E. Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, (Dublin: W. Hallhead, 1776), chapter 37.

³⁰ J. Taylor, "Khirbet Qumran in the Nineteenth Century and the Name of the Site," PEQ 134 (2002) 144-64, here 156, citing W.H. Dixon, *The Holy Land* (2nd ed; London: Chapman and Hall, 1866) 179-80.

³¹ For more, see my "Rereading Pliny on the Essenes: Some Bibliographic Notes," in the Orion Centre papers:

<http://orion.mscc.huji.ac.il/symposiums/programs/Goranson98.shtml>

To the bibliography there, one should add: M. Dulaey, "La notice de Pline sur les esséniens (*HN* 5, 17, 73," *Helmantica* 38 (1987) 283-93--also published in *Pline l'Ancien témoin de son temps: Conventus Pliniani Internationalis, Namenti 22-26 Oct. 1985 habiti* (eds. J. Pigeaud and J. Oroz Reta; Salamanca and Nantes: Universidad Pontifica, 1987). 599-609. Dulaey's study, which I read afterward, nicely supports my study "Posidonius, Strabo," 295-98, that M. Agrippa, circa 15 BCE, was Pliny's source on Essenes. M. Beagon, *Roman Nature: The Thought of Pliny the Elder* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992) esp. 196, on personified good Jordan water assisting all as it meanders, reluctantly moving downstream into Dead bad water; then Essenes, Ein Gedi, Masada, Judaea boundry—five in a row. Also, for a different view, in press, G.W. Bowersock, "The East-West Orientation of Mediterranean Studies and the Meaning of North and South in

Antiquity, *Mediterraneanisms* {Columbia Conference on the Mediterranean, 22 September, 2001).

³² Hirschfeld, *Qumran*, 5. By the end of the book, though, in the Conclusion section (242-43), Hirschfeld, having moved Essenes out of Qumran, moves Sadducees in. But would Sadducees have several copies of Daniel, with named angels and resurrection? And what is a known Sadducee book?—a Book of Decrees, ספר גזירותא, possibly, from Megillath Taanith; but it is not at Qumran. For more on Hirschfeld’s published stated intentions on Qumran, see interviews in A.D. Marcus, “A Past up for Grabs,” *Wall Street Journal* (June 22, 1998) A-20; A.D. Marcus, *The View from Nebo* (Boston: Little, Brown, 2000) 244-48; D. Horan, “Archaeological find disputes theory on Dead Sea Scrolls: a Site believed to be Essenes’ renews debate,” *Houston Chronicle* (March 8, 1998) A-27.

³³ M. Horgan here translated “who was called by the name of truth,” and notes that this “probably indicates that the Wicked Priest was a legitimate priest. Also possible is ‘was summoned in the name of truth.’” I disagree with this note, because something changed about his relationship to truth, rather than to genealogical legitimacy, which would not change. Horgan, *Pesharim 6B* (2002) 175.

³⁴ W. Brownlee, *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk* (MSSBL 24; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979) 134-37 details nine interpretations.

³⁵ R. Eisenman and M. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (Shaftesbury, Dorset: Element, 1992) 273 and 274, respectively.

³⁶ Any claim that this text refers to the earlier Jonathan (152-142 BCE) tends to undercut another claim sometimes used to support that Jonathan as Wicked Priest: that a reliable guide to dating is the usage of the roots מלך and משל

³⁷ N. Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (New York: Scribner, 1995) 262-70.

³⁸ K. Penner, "The Peculiar Prayer of 4QPsAp (4Q448)," (June 30, 2000)
<http://s91279732.onlinehome.us/papers/4Q448.pdf>

³⁹ E. Main, "For King Jonathan or Against? The Use of the Bible in 4Q448," *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 28; eds. M.E. Stone and E.G. Chazon; Leiden: Brill, 1998) 113-35; A. Lemaire, "Le Roi Jonathan à Qoumrân (4Q448, B-C)," *Qoumrân et les Manuscrits de la mer Morte: un cinquantenaire* (ed. E.-M. Laperrousaz; Paris: Cerf, 1997) 57-70, D. Harrington and J. Strugnell, "Qumran Cave 4 Texts: A New Publication," *JBL* 112 (1993) 491-99, here 498-9; G.W. Lorein, "4Q448: een gebed tegen Jonathan de Makkabeeër," *Nederlands Theologische Tijdschrift* 53 (1999) 265-73.

⁴⁰ E.g., M. Delcor, "Cinq nouveaux psaumes esséniens? *RQ* 1 (1958) 85-102; J.A. Sanders, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1967) 109.

⁴¹ E. Puech, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIII. Textes Araméens première partie* (DJD 31: Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001) 75-83.

⁴² Horgan, *Pesharim 6B*, 90-91.

⁴³ J.D. Amusin, "The Reflection of Historical Events of the First Century B.C. in Qumran Commentaries (4Q161; 4Q169; 4Q166)," *HUCA* 48 (1977) 123-52. On the wars of Jannaeus, see M. Stern, "Judaea and her Neighbors in the Days of Alexander Jannaeus," *The Jerusalem Cathedra* (ed. L. Levine; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi) 1: 22-46.

-
- ⁴⁴ M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1976) 1:295-302; Goranson, “Posidonius and Strabo.”
- ⁴⁵ M. Horgan, *Pesharim 6B* (2002) 169.
- ⁴⁶ W. Brownlee, “The Jerusalem Habakkuk Scroll (1QpH),” *BASOR* 112 (1948) 8-18, here 17, n.36.
- ⁴⁷ D.N. Freedman, “The ‘House of Absalom’ in the Habakkuk Scroll,” *BASOR* 114 (1949) 11-13.
- ⁴⁸ A. Dupont-Sommer, *Observations sur le commentaire d’habacuc découvert près de la mer morte: communication lue devant l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres le 26 Mai 1950* (Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1950).
- ⁴⁹ T. Ilan, *Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity: Part I: Palestine 330 BCE-200 CE* (TSAJ 91; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002) 60-61.
- ⁵⁰ A minor curiosity is that S. Talmon, according to a transcript of his talk, “The Session Moderator’s Introduction,” *Biblical Archaeology Today, 1990 Proceedings of the Second International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem June-July 1990*, (ed. A. Biran and J. Aviram; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society; Israel Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1993) 377 said: “There are a few cases in which historical figures are mentioned. Some of the texts in which the names Shlomzion, Amelius [sic; Aemilius misspelled] (possibly Shim’on ben Shetah), and veiled references to other known figures of the time occur, have not yet been published.” But in a June 19, 1994 letter Prof. Talmon wrote that he did not recall mentioning that Shime’on ben Shetach’s name appeared in the scrolls, though he is aware of speculation reading him in (at least, I add,

the right general time period). So I assume that the (oddly punctuated—as if suggesting Aemilius was Shetach?) transcript of his talk is not accurate.

⁵¹ N. Kokkinos, *The Herodian Dynasty: Origins, Role in Society and Eclipse* (JSPSS 30; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998) e.g., 115.

⁵² H.St.J. Thackeray, *Josephus, Jewish War* [1:158] (LCL 2; Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1967) 72, note a.

⁵³ R. Marcus, *Josephus, Jewish Antiquities* [13:323] (LCL 7; Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1966) 390, note a.

⁵⁴ Freedman, “House of Absalom,” 12 n.7. “This was an important ‘house’ which later achieved additional prominence through the marriage of Absalom’s great-granddaughter Mariamme to Herod the Great.” Freedman also (11 n.3) wrote; “Prof. H.L. Ginsberg expresses the same opinion in a private communication: ‘I entirely agree with you that ‘the house of Absalom’ is not a figure of speech but designates an influential family or party contemporary with the ‘Teacher of Righteousness.’”

⁵⁵ P. Winter, “Two Non-Allegorical Expressions in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *PEQ* 91 (1959) 38-46, here 39, n.3: “He was a son of John Hyrcanus and survived his brother Alexander Jannaeus.”

⁵⁶ Y. Zur, “Shimon ben Shetah as the Preacher of Deceit,” *RB* 108 (2001) 360-75.

⁵⁷ Zur, “Shimon,” 362.

⁵⁸ L.H. Feldman, *Josephus, Jewish Antiquities* (LCL 7; Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1966) 466-67.

⁵⁹ S. Cohen, “Chapter 9: The Matrilineal Principle,” *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999) 263-307, here 273.

⁶⁰ Horgan, *Pesharim 6B*, 178.

⁶¹ S. Goranson, “Others and Intra-Jewish Polemic as Reflected in Qumran Texts,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (eds. P. Flint and J.C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 2.534-51 [a printing error on page 535 replaced with “T2” the words “The negative sense of each term.”]; J.C. VanderKam, “Identity and History of the Community,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*, 2: 487-551. Several scholars recognized this origin before the Qumran discoveries. E.g. P. Melanchthon in J. Carion, *Chronica* (Wittenberg, 1532) folio 68 verso: “Essei / das ist / Operarii / vom vort Assa / das ist wirken.” N Serarius cited D. Chytraeus [Kochhaffe], *Onomasticon*, as deriving Essenes from the Hebrew root ‘asah and calling Essenes “factores legis” in J. Triglandius, *Trium scriptorium illustrium de tribus judaeorum sectis syntagma* (Delft: A. Berman, 1703) 107. An example of a scholar who included this among the possibilities soon before the Qumran discoveries is H.M.J. Loewe, “Essenes,” *Encyclopedia Britannica* (14th ed. 1938) 718. Before 1948, many scholars preferred an Aramaic hypothesis; some of them thought that Hebrew was little used, outside liturgy, in the second temple period. But now the prominence of Hebrew is plain: see, e.g., W. Schneidewind, “Qumran Hebrew as an Anti-Language,” *JBL* 118 (1999) 235-52; S. Weitzman, “Why Did the Qumran Community Write in Hebrew?” *JAOS* 119 (1999) 35-45; S. Segert, “Hebrew Essenes—Aramaic Christians,” *Mogilany 1985: papers on the*

Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Aleksy Klawek (ed. Z. Kapera: Qumranica Mogilanensia 15; Krakow: Enigma, 1998). 169-84.

⁶² On *minut*, see Goranson, Others.

⁶³ W.H. Brownlee, “The Historical Allusions of the Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash,” *BASOR* 136 (1952) 10-19.

⁶⁴ F.F. Bruce, *Second Thoughts*; and *The Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran Texts* (London: Tyndale 1957).

⁶⁵ S. Goranson, “Sectarianism, Geography, and the Copper Scroll,” *JJS* (1992) 282-7; “Further Reflections on the Copper Scroll,” *Copper Scroll Studies* (JSPSS 40: eds. G.J. Brooke and P.R. Davies, 2002) 226-32. Kohalit, a region, is most probably located either in TransJordan (perhaps compare the “Land of Damascus”) or in the wilderness of Judah, rather than in Samaria, as in B. Zissu, “The Identification of the Copper Scroll’s ‘Kahelet’ at ‘Ein Samiya in the Samaritan Desert,” *PEQ* 133 (2001) 145-58. See, e.g. J.K. Lefkovits, *The Copper Scroll 3Q15: a Reevaluation: a New Reading, Translation, and Commentary* (STDJ 25; Leiden, Brill, 2000) 74-76.

⁶⁶ A. Rabinovich, “Words of Light,” *The Jerusalem Post Magazine* (June 14, 1985) 6.

⁶⁷ It bears repeating that there is no “halakha” in Qumran text, but rather legal views which reject halakha as the determinations of another group. The article by J.P. Meier, “Is There *Halaka* (The Noun) at Qumran?” *JBL* 122 (2003) 150-55 in an apparently distorting way brackets off directly-relevant evidence: “I do not intend to engage the larger question of whether the ‘seekers of smooth things’ should be identified with the Pharisees [154, n.20].” But then, nevertheless, he goes on to offer supposed “problems with this reasoning,” [154]—allowing only a negative conclusion. Unless I

misunderstand, and unlike various of his other fine publications, Meier here sets up an effective Catch-22 type exclusion of this view whether the noun is considered attested or not. In other words, if a certain word is attested, then it's accepted, so how could they pun against it; and if a word is not attested, then how could they know to pun against it? Of course they knew the root, and the pun is not far to seek; that's the third, here disallowed, option. I prefer the quite informative and history-accepting and illuminating research in J. VanderKam, "Those Who Look for Smooth Things, Pharisees, and Oral Law," *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. S. Paul et al.; SuppVT 94; Leiden" Brill, 2003)

⁶⁸ E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* (ed. G. Vermes et al.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973) 1:224,n.22.

⁶⁹ Magness, *Archaeology*.

⁷⁰ Callaway, *The History*, 201.

⁷¹ S. Goranson, "Radiocarbon Dating the Dead Sea Scrolls," *BA* 54 (1991) 172.

⁷² A.J.T. Jull, D.J. Donahue, M. Broshi, E. Tov, "Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls and Linen Fragments from the Judean Desert," *Radiocarbon* 27 (1995) 11-19, here 15.

⁷³ I have requested this information from the Shrine of the Book, and have not yet received it, though I was told they will look for it.

⁷⁴ G. Doudna, "Dating the Scrolls on the Basis of Radiocarbon Analysis," *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1998) 1:430-471.

⁷⁵ Doudna, *Dating*, 461 and 463-64. (Figure 3 on page 462 is quite good, and, by itself invalidates some of Doudna's dating proposals.)

⁷⁶ Doudna, Dating, 461 n.92.

⁷⁷ Doudna, Dating, 463, n.94.

⁷⁸ G. Doudna, quoted in "Radiocarbon discussion," orion-list (19 Aug 1999)

<http://orion.mscc.huji.ac.il/orion/archives/1999b/msg00187.html>

⁷⁹ A.J.T. Jull, "Radiocarbon discussion," orion-list (19 Aug. 1999)

<http://orion.mscc.huji.ac.il/orion/archives/1999b/msg00187.html>

⁸⁰ G. Doudna, *4QPeshar Nahum: A Critical Edition* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

⁸¹ Ginzberg, *Unknown*, 288.

⁸² T. Ilan, *Lexicon*, 33-34 and 147.

⁸³ A. Pietersma and R.T. Lutz, "Jannes and Jambres," *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Garden City NY: Doubleday, 1985) 2 427-42; M. McNamara, *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966) 82-96.

{Addendum] Philo on Sadducees and Pharisees.

As is well known, Philo wrote about Essenes in three extant works, but his extant works do not include the names Sadducees or Pharisees. But is it possible that, in one work that is quite favorable to Essenes, Philo shared an Essene view of certain rulers, viewed quite unfavorably, who were influenced by Sadducees and Pharisees?

In *Every Good Man is Free*, Philo discusses this Stoic saying. In section 74 he praises various groups "in which deeds are held in higher esteem than words." This is the reading by F.H. Colson in Loeb Philo IX p.52.1; compare his Preface and Introduction and the praise on the volume and specifically on this reading by A.D. Nock in *Classical Studies* 52 (1943) 77-81. Philo names Magi and Gymnosophists. Strabo, influenced by Posidonius, also brought up Magi and Gymnosophists in his *Geography* section on Jews 16.2.34f; this text is explicitly negative on Alexander Jannaeus; would that Strabo's longer book, *History*, were fully extant, with its mentions of Essenes, partly used by Josephus, e.g. Ant. 13; see Goranson, "Posidonius, Strabo, and Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa as Sources on Essenes," *JJS* 1994, 295-8.

Then Philo (75) brings up Essenes in "Palestinian Syria." He praises them in several sections.

Recall, that from the Qumran Essene point of view, the Wicked Priest is a High Priest, a Hasmonean. 4QNpesharNahum, as many of us think, and as brilliantly supported and extended by J. VanderKam in the E. Tov and A.

Saldarini Festschriften and in his 2004 High Priests book, Alexander Jannaeus appears as a Lion who killed his own people, and Pharisees appear as Seekers of Smooth Things/Flattery, a pun against Pharisee Halakha. Pharisees are also called Ephraim; an individual or a group can have two names in Qumran texts. E.g., the Lion can also be the Wicked Priest.

The following is Colson's Loeb translation of sections 88-91. Two types of rulers are discussed, both quite disapproved by Philo here and by Essenes. Can you tell which type sounds more like the Essene view of Sadducee-influenced rulers and which the Essene view of Pharisee-influenced rulers?

"Such are the athletes of virtue produced by a philosophy free from the pedantry of Greek wordiness, a philosophy which sets its pupils to practice themselves in laudable actions, by which the liberty which can never be enslaved is firmly established. Here we have a proof. Many are the potentates who at various occasions have raised themselves to power over the country. They differed both in nature and the line of conduct which they followed. Some of them carried their zest for outdoing wild beasts in ferocity to the point of savagery. They left no form of cruelty untried. They slaughtered their subjects wholesale, or like cooks carved them piecemeal and limb from limb whilst still alive, and did not stay their hands till justice who surveys human affairs visited them with the same calamities. Others transformed this wild frenzy into another kind of viciousness. Their conduct showed intense bitterness, but they talked with calmness, though the mask of their milder language failed to conceal their rancorous disposition. They fawned like venomous hounds yet wrought evils irremediable and left behind them throughout the cities the unforgettable sufferings of their victims as monuments of their impiety and inhumanity. Yet none of these, neither the extremely ferocious nor the deep-eyed treacherous dissemblers, were able to lay a charge against this congregation of Essenes or holy ones [osion] here described...."

The young Philo in this biased, partisan account describes rulers influenced by Sadducees and Pharisees.