**Zion in the Book of Nahum**

In the prophetic literature, the name “Zion” appears ninety-three times and the term “Jerusalem” 229.[[1]](#footnote-1) However, the book of Nahum is not included in this list;[[2]](#footnote-2) neither Zion nor Jerusalem are mentioned in Nahum. If we accept the view that Nahum was born in Jerusalem,[[3]](#footnote-3) his omission of the city from his work is even more puzzling.

Other motifs from the Zion tradition are also absent from Nahum.[[4]](#footnote-4) The book mentions no palace, no Ark of the Covenant, and no Davidic monarch. A war between Israel and its neighbors is left unmentioned as is Zion’s election by God. However, while neither Zion nor Jerusalem are referred to explicitly in Nahum, in various places they are alluded to implicitly. It is the purpose of this paper to identify these allusions and provide an explanation for their presence.

Several scholars have discussed the omission of Zion from the Book of Nahum,[[5]](#footnote-6) for example, Frederik Poulsen who while noting Zion’s absence, offers no explanation for it. Other scholars have proffered explanations.[[6]](#footnote-7) Van der Woude, for example, maintains that Nahum hailed from the Northern Kingdom of Israel and possibly wrote in exile, i.e. in Assyria. As evidence of this he cites Nahum’s mention of Bashan, Carmel and Lebanon, Nahum’s familiarity with Assyria and Nineveh, and the lack of comment on Jerusalem.[[7]](#footnote-8) According to this, Jerusalem and Zion are absent from the foreground of the book, because Nahum lived in Elkosh, a town in northern Galilee near the Assyrian border. However, this seems unlikely, since the only prophet who prophesized in exile is Ezekiel a fact mentioned explicitly. In the case of Nahum there is no indication that he resided in exile while writing his book,[[8]](#footnote-9) and the identification of Elkosh as Nahum’s place of residence is far from being a matter of consensus.

Laurel Lanner[[9]](#footnote-10) argues that the omission of Zion and Jerusalem from Nahum may point to an overall different orientation in relation to other prophets. Nahum may have desired to eliminate the concept of a power associated with any city, foreign or domestic, or more likely, advocated the decentralization of power, in general.

As we shall demonstrate below, scholars must be more precise in this regard. Rather than characterizing Zion and Jerusalem as elements absent from Nahum, they should instead be treated as present but not explicit.

Jacob Wöhrle has expressed an original understanding of Nahum: Nahum’s oracles were originally addressed to Judah and Jerusalem and were then later reworked as oracles against the foreign enemy of Nineveh.[[10]](#footnote-11) He adduces the following proofs for this claim:

1. Nahum 1:14 refers to the temple in Jerusalem rather than the Assyrian temple.
2. He brings Nahum 2:1-2 as proof for his argument that Nahum originally addressed Jerusalem.
3. Nahum 3:14 refers to the walls of Jerusalem and not to the walls of Nineveh.

The greatest difficulty with this proposal is that it requires a radical reinterpretation of the primary layer of Nahum which would place it chronologically after the exile.[[11]](#footnote-12) Wöhrles’ proposal is highly speculative since the original form of the prophecy is impossible to know. We should deal with what we have—not what may or may not have been.

*Who is the addressee in Nah 1.9-14?*

According to Bob Becking,[[12]](#footnote-13) one of the basic issues any approach to Nahum should address is the following question: “Is it possible to discern any order at all in the enigmatic and at first sight corrupt textual unit Nah. 1:9–14?” In this unit, the addressees are changed, sometimes making difficult to identify who, in any given verse, is being addressed. Nahum 2:1 mentions the addressee, Judah, in the second person. Is this the addressee of verses 9–14 as well?

Renaud[[13]](#footnote-14) upholds the view that Sennacherib’s failed siege of Jerusalem is being referred to in verses 9–13, suggesting that the section represents a complete and coherent textual unit. In v. 9, the prophet reproaches the Judaeans for their lack of faith in divine power, in v. 10 he announces that the enemies are ready for punishment, and in v. 11, he reminds the people that not long ago God delivered them from their enemies and ends with a promise of salvation in vv. 12–13.

The first to understand verse 12 as referring to Jerusalem is Targum Jonathan who translates as follows:[[14]](#footnote-15) “Thus said the Lord: Though the nations which assemble to oppress, you, *O Jerusalem*, are perfect in counsel and in number, […] I shall not enslave you again.” Floyd[[15]](#footnote-16) advocates the view that the prophecy is being addressed to a personified city, probably of Jerusalem. Likewise, Roberts maintains that because 1:12–13 can only be understood as referring to Judah or Jerusalem, 1:11 must as well. The “one who goes out,” therefore, is one who leaves *Israelite* territory.[[16]](#footnote-17) This could be an Assyrian leader, perhaps Sennacherib, leaving Jerusalem after a failed siege. Smith also understands the allusion to be referring to Sennacherib’s departure from Jerusalem.[[17]](#footnote-18)

Roberts writes that “The feminine singular ‘you’ in v. 11, taken by itself, could be interpreted as a reference either to Nineveh or to Judah or Jerusalem. However, because similar references in vv. 12–13 can only be understood as referring to Judah or Jerusalem, the reference in v. 11 should also be understood as God’s address to his own people. Since the verses both before and after v. 11 appear to identify God’s enemy with Judah’s oppressors, the one to plot evil against God should probably be identified with the Assyrian king or his representative.

It follows, then, that the “going out” from Judah or Jerusalem refers not to a point of origin, but to a departure from Judean territory. Taking the verb as a prophetic perfect, the sense of the verse is that the Assyrian will shortly depart from Judah. God will destroy Assyrian hegemony over Judah, and Judah will never see this evil oppressor again.

De Vries[[18]](#footnote-19) maintains that Nahum 1:11 and 14, employing the second person masculine singular, should be understood as an invective and threat against the king of Assyria, whose fall is expected to be imminent, while the verses in this chapter which employ the feminine are to be understood as referring to Judah or Jerusalem. Elsewhere in the book the second person feminine singular refers, of course, to Nineveh. The conclusion of the book, 3:18–19, also employs the second masculine singular, using it to mock the king of Assyria for his downfall.[[19]](#footnote-20)

In this context, it is worth dwelling on 2 Kings 18–20 (with its parallels in Isaiah and Chronicles)[[20]](#footnote-21) which narrates Sennacherib’s campaign against Judah and Jerusalem. In this story, the Assyrians besiege Jerusalem but ultimately fail to conquer it. Nahum’s use of many technical terms relating to siege can be understood as allusions to this account.[[21]](#footnote-22) In this case, the prophet may be using the allusion to promote the idea of “measure for measure”: the same Assyrians who threatened Jerusalem in 701 BCE are now the ones being threatened.

According to Rudolph and Cogan, the “counselor of Belial” in Nahum 1:11 refers to Sennacherib. Floyd[[22]](#footnote-23) suggests that God is reminding the community of Sennacherib’s departure from the gates of Jerusalem in 701.

In Nahum 2:8 we read: “Nineveh is like a pool whose waters run away. ‘Halt! Halt!’— but no one turns back.” The reference to the pool may be again intentional, an attempt to remind his audience of the Siloam pool described in 2 Kings 18:17.

To sum up this point: In Nahum 1:1-9–14 one can identify allusions to the Sennacherib’s campaign against Judah, where Zion was in danger. This campaign is adduced as evidence of the power of God who can intervene against Assyria again.

*Nahum 2:1 (English Bibles: 1:15)*

Another verse in Nahum that may be deemed an allusion to Zion appears in 2:1 (in the English Bibles 1:15). Gunkel [[23]](#footnote-24) emends the verse, adding the word “Jerusalem” as the addressee, and providing the following reading שלמי ירושלים נדרך (“fulfill your vows, O Jerusalem”). However, this emendation is unnecessary. Nahum’s audience probably understood the reference to be referring to Jerusalem regardless.

The opening verse of Nahum 2 has a close parallel in Isa. 52.7:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Nahum 2:1 (Eng. 1:15) | Isa. 52:7 |
| Look! On the mountains the feet of one who brings good tidings, who proclaims peace! Celebrate your festivals, O Judah, fulfill your vows, for never again shall the wicked invade you; they are utterly cut off. | How lovely on the mountains are the feet of him who brings good news, who announces peace, and brings good news of happiness, who announces salvation, and says to Zion, “Your god reigns.” |

And also:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Nahum 2:1 (Eng. 1:15) | Isa. 52:1b |
| Look! On the mountains the feet of one who brings good tidings, who proclaims peace! Celebrate your festivals, O Judah, fulfill your vows, *for never again shall the wicked invade you*; they are utterly cut off. | Jerusalem, the holy city! For the uncircumcised and the *unclean will never again enter you* |

The mountains envisioned by Nahum are likely those surrounding Zion (Cf. Psa. 125).[[24]](#footnote-25) The mention of festivals and vows in the same verse likely refers to the pilgrimage to Zion. A clear link to Zion is made through Ps. 65:2: “Praise is due to you, O God, in Zion; and to you shall vows be performed.”

Isaiah 52 is generally considered post-exilic, while Nahum’s historical background is debated.[[25]](#footnote-26) If we accept that Nahum was composed in the Seventh Century BCE, then the direction of influence is from Nahum to Deutero-Isaiah.[[26]](#footnote-27) However, Jeremias[[27]](#footnote-28) considers Nah. 2:1 a late, post-exilic interpolation into an oracle originally directed at Judah (2:2–3).

Klaas Spronk argues that Nahum depended heavily on Isaiah: “A third source of inspiration — next to the Assyrian literature and the cultic texts — were the words of Isaiah, who had lived and worked in Jerusalem at the end of the previous century […] the words of Nahum can often be read as a reinterpretation of oracles in, for instance, Isa. 5:24-30; 10:5-19; 14:24-27; and 30:27-33.”[[28]](#footnote-29)

Are both prophets using a stock sentence?[[29]](#footnote-30) It is not certain who borrowed from whom, but it is obvious that either the writer of Isaiah 52 has expanded on the formula, or Nahum has abridged it.[[30]](#footnote-31)

Coggins[[31]](#footnote-32) writes that “Speculation whether one prophetic collection may have borrowed from the other is not very profitable […] rather, it is more probable that there was a stock of oracular material which might be used as appropriate in the particular circumstances of each collection.” One cannot deny, however, that reading them together proves interesting.[[32]](#footnote-33)

A reversal of themes is apparent here:[[33]](#footnote-34) Nahum inverts several aspects of Isaiah’s imagery of the watchman. Isaiah’s watchman announces deliverance for Judah (Isa. 52:8-9); Nahum's anticipates Assyria's destruction (Nah. 2:2). Isaiah’s watchman appears to announce Judah’s salvation; Nahum’s watchman appears to pronounce judgment on Assyria. Isaiah’s watchman sees the divine warrior approaching Jerusalem following a victorious battle over the nations; Nahum’s sees the divine warrior approaching Nineveh before the battle, ready to destroy the foreign nation. Jerusalem’s watchman shouts in joy to celebrate victory; Nineveh’s watchman sounds the alarm out of fear.

*Is Nahum Referring to a Judean King?*

Carly Crouch[[34]](#footnote-35) identifies in Nahum a reference to a Judean king:

The synergy of the king and Yahweh in the destruction wrought on Nineveh is evident from the framing of the description of the king’s destruction with references to Yahweh’s involvement (2.3, 14) as well as in the king’s control over the waters (2.7; cf. Ps. 89.26). The identity of this royal figure is of course a relevant question for our purposes, given the importance of the royal figure as mediator of the divine-human military synergy and the possibilities which such synergy allows in terms of military practice.

Sweeney maintains that the king in question is Josiah: “the book of Nahum attempts to convince its audience—the people of Jerusalem and Judah—to support Josiah’s efforts to reform the religious establishment dedicated to Yahweh and to restore the state.”[[35]](#footnote-36)

However, we concur with Daniel Timmer who claims that “the book ignores the Judean king; it does not promote the worldwide extension of Judah's or any other state's borders; and it does not envision the elimination of all nations that are ‘other’.”[[36]](#footnote-38)

To conclude this point: there is no reference to a specific or generic Judean King in Nahum.

*Allusions to Lamentations*

Julia O’Brien has identified many similarities between Nahum and the Book of Lamentations. First, in terms of vocabulary:

1. Lam. 2:13 questions whether Jerusalem’s “break” (שֶבֶר) might be incurable, and Nah. 3:19 taunts the king of Assyria with the same: “your wound (שבר) is incurable.”
2. Both attribute to Yahweh anger (Nah. 1:6; Lam. 1.12; 2:1, 3, 21, 22; 3:43; 4:11), while also affirming that he is “good” (טוב; Lam. 3:25; Nah. 1:7);
3. Both reveal that the fallen city has no comforters (verbal root נחם, Lam. 1:2, 9, 16, 17; 2:13; Nah. 3:7).

In terms of style, both books describe the city’s fall as an event taking place in the present. Just as Nahum describes advancing armies and the ensuing chaos in chapters 2 and 3, so too Lamentations 2, 3, and 5 depict the present suffering of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Both portray the dead as lying in the streets (Nah. 3:3; Lam. 2:21) and describe the body’s response to anguish (Nah. 2:10; Lam. 2:11). Both allegorize the destruction of the city as the humiliation of a woman.

 O’Brian concludes that Nahum is using Nineveh to refer to Judah, and on this point, I disagree. When describing destruction and death, the prophet is referring to Nineveh, while the author of Lamentations adapted the formula to refer to Jerusalem.

If we assume a seventh century dating for Nahum, then the Book of Lamentations borrowed expressions from Nahum and not vice versa. While in Lamentations, the reader takes side with Jerusalem and feels sympathy for her, this cannot be said of Nahum who expresses no sympathy for Nineveh.

*Nahum 3*

The opening of chapter 3 uses the phrase “עיר דמים” (“city of blood [NIV] or bloodshed [NRSV]).” This expression also appears in Ezekiel’s oracle on Jerusalem in Ezek. 22:4 and 14:6, 9. We may assume that Ezekiel borrowed it from Nahum.[[37]](#footnote-39) However, Nahum transformed Ezekiel’s negative depiction of Jerusalem into a negative depiction of Nineveh, the city which represents merciless bloodshed, as reflected by their wall paintings, which showcase the slaying of their opponents. Nahum does not regard Zion in as negative of a light as does Ezekiel.[[38]](#footnote-40)

Spronk[[39]](#footnote-41) suggests that Ezekiel may have been inspired in this respect by Nahum and may have wished to imply that Jerusalem has become like the former capital of the Assyrians, with whom Israel had committed adultery.

*Why Implicit Allusions?*

After reviewing the allusions to Zion in Nahum, we may re-raise the question: why did Nahum not mention Zion/Jerusalem explicitly?

Here we can only speculate that, focused as he was on the fall of Nineveh, Nahum subordinated his discussion of Jerusalem. In fact, Nahum contains no criticisms of Zion, a fact which is also unusual. As orators, prophets may choose to include or exclude subjects depending on their rhetorical aim.

We may cite Sweeney’s assertion in this regard:

Nahum is frequently identified as a so-called “cult prophet” of the Jerusalem Temple, in large part because he condemns Judah's enemies rather than Judah itself, but such a contention is based upon a very narrow view of the social role of prophets that maintains that true prophets in the pre-exilic period would only speak messages of judgment against Israel and Judah. Prophets are not defined by their criticism of Israel or Judah; they are defined by their ability to speak on behalf of God regardless of whether they criticize or support Israel and Judah.

This is the reason why sin is not mentioned in the book of Nahum. The historical circumstances change from prophet to prophet and they have to deliver the message that is most relevant to their audience.[[40]](#footnote-43)

*Conclusion*

It is true that Zion is not mentioned explicitly in Nahum as has been discussed by scholars. However, the prophet does allude to Zion implicitly. The reason for this is probably rhetorical: the need to focus on Nineveh. Dealing with Zion explicitly would have diverted the focus from Nineveh to Zion. Therefore, Nahum preferred not to mention Zion at all, even though he was probably a Jerusalemite himself and was familiar with some earlier Jerusalemite materials.

In general, we should consider rethinking our expectations from the prophets. Not every prophet was obligated to enhance the “Zion theology,” even if he was a Judean.

At a broader level, these findings may be related to an ongoing debate regarding the unity of the Book of Twelve.[[41]](#footnote-44) Discussions of Zion represents a point of divergence between the books not a commonality. Nahum avoids mentioning the involvement of a Davidic monarch in Judah’s deliverance. As far as Zion is concerned, the Book of Twelve may be regarded as containing twelve separate books. Zion is missing in Hosea, Jonah, Habakkuk, Haggai and Malachi, Jerusalem is missing in Hosea, Jonah, Habakkuk and Haggai, and both, in Nahum, are only alluded to implicitly.
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