**Zion in the Book of Nahum**

The term ‘Zion’ appears ninety three times in the Prophetic literature. The term ‘Jerusalem’ appears 229 times in this corpus.[[1]](#footnote-1) However, the book of Nahum is not included in this list.[[2]](#footnote-2) Neither Zion nor Jerusalem is mentioned in Nahum. If we accept the view that Nahum was born in Jerusalem,[[3]](#footnote-3) the puzzle is even greater.

One cannot find in Nahum motifs from the Zion tradition.[[4]](#footnote-4) It has no palace or Ark or Davidic King or a war between Israel and its neighbors, and Zion is not elected.

While it is true that neither Zion nor Jerusalem are explicitly referred to in Nahum, there are various points in Nahum where allusions to Zion are made implicitly. It is the purpose of this paper to uncover these allusions and provide an explanation for their presence.

Several scholars pointed out the non-mention of Zion in the Book of Nahum.[[5]](#footnote-5) Such is the case with Frederik Poulsen, noting the Zion does not occur in Nahum. He offers no explanation for this absence.

Others tried to explain this lack of mention.[[6]](#footnote-6) Van der Woude considers the mention of Bashan, Carmel and Lebanon; Nahum’s knowledge of Assyria and Nineveh; and the lack of comment regarding Jerusalem as evidence that Nahum came from the Northern Kingdom, and possibly was in exile, i.e. Assyria.[[7]](#footnote-7) Jerusalem and Zion are not in the foreground because Nahum lived in Elkosh, a town in northern Galilee near the Assyrian border.

However, this is unlikely, since the only prophet who prophesized in exile is Ezekiel and the text mentions this explicitly. In the case of Nahum, however, there is no hint that he was at exile while writing his book.[[8]](#footnote-8) In addition, the identification of Elkosh is far from being a consensus.

Laurel Lanner[[9]](#footnote-9) argues that

The lack of any Zion/Jerusalem mention seems to be a textual absence in Nahum that points to a third desire. This desire could be the elimination of all power connected with any city, foreign or domestic, or perhaps, more likely, the decentralization of that power.

Yet, as we shall see below, one needs to be more precise in this regard. Rather than speaking of the lack of Zion and Jerusalem from Nahum, one should speak instead of the implicit reference to Zion and Jerusalem in the Book of Nahum.

Jacob Wöhrle has an original view of Nahum: Nahum’s original oracles were addressed against Judah and Jerusalem and were then later reworked as oracles against the foreign enemy of Nineveh.[[10]](#footnote-10) Here are some points he mentions in this regard:

1. Nahum 1.14 refers to the Jerusalem Temple 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 that a radical reinterpretation of the primary layer of Nahum took place after the Exile.[[11]](#footnote-11) Wöhrles' proposal is highly speculative since we cannot possibly know what was the original prophecy. Instead, we should deal with what lies in front of us.

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

Bob Becking[[12]](#footnote-12) says that the question “Is it possible to discern any order at all in the enigmatic and at first sight corrupt textual unit Nah. 1:9–14?” is one of the basic issues that an approach to Nahum should address.

In this unit, there are changes of addressees, so it is sometimes difficult to identify the addressees. Nahum 2.1 mentions the addressee, Judah, in the second person. Is it the addressee of verses 9-14 as well?

Renaud[[13]](#footnote-13) supports the view that it is the failure of the siege of Sennacherib that is referred to in verses 9-13. He suggests that there is a complete coherence in the passage 1:9-13. In v. 9, the prophet reproaches the Judaeans for their lack of faith in divine power, then in v. 10 he announces that the enemies are ready for punishment. In v. 11, he reminds the people that God had not long ago delivered them and ends with a promise of salvation in vv. 12-13.

The first to understand verse 12 as referring to Jerusalem is Targum Jonathan:[[14]](#footnote-14) “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-15) supports the view that the address is to a personification, probably of Jerusalem. Roberts also believes that because 1.12-13 can only be understood as referring to Judah or Jerusalem, so must 1.11. The "one who goes out," therefore, is one who leaves *Israelite* territory.[[16]](#footnote-16) This could be an Assyrian leader, perhaps Sennacherib, leaving the city after the failed siege of Jerusalem. Smith also assigns the allusion to Sennacherib's departure from Jerusalem,[[17]](#footnote-17)

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, but the similar references in vs. 12-13 can only be understood as referring to Judah or Jerusalem, so the reference in v. 11 should also be understood as addressing God's own people. Since the verses both before and after v. 11 appear to identify God's enemy with Judah's oppressors, the one who plotted evil against God should probably be identified with the Assyrian king or his representative.

It follows, then, that the ‘going out’ of this one from Judah or Jerusalem refers not to his point of origin, but to his 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 again see this evil oppressor.

De Vries[[18]](#footnote-18) thinks that Nahum 1.11, 14, employing the second person masculine singular, should be understood as an invective and threat against the king of Assyria, whose fall is imminently expected, while the verses in this chapter employing 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, 3: 18-19, also has the second masculine singular, mocking the king of Assyria in his downfall.[[19]](#footnote-19)

Let us dwell on Second Kings 18-20 (with its parallels in Isaiah and Chronicles).[[20]](#footnote-20) This story narrates the narrative of Sennacherib's campaign against Judah and Jerusalem. In this story, the Assyrians put a siege upon Jerusalem but eventually fail to conquer it. Nahum's use of many technical terms relating to siege may be deemed allusions.[[21]](#footnote-21) In this case, the prophet may be using this allusion to promote the idea of measure for measure: the same Assyrians who threatened Jerusalem in 701 BCE are now under the same threat themselves.

According to Rudolph and Cogan, "counselor of Belial" in Nahum 1.11 is Sennacherib. Floyd[[22]](#footnote-22) suggests that God is reminding the community of the departure of Sennacherib 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, to remind his audience of the Siloam pool in 2 Kings 18.17.

To sum up this point: In Nahum 1.1-9-14 one may find allusions to the Sennacherib's campaign against Judah, where Zion was in danger. This campaign is used as an evidence of God's power that can intervene again against Assyria.

*Nahum 2.1 (English Bibles: 1.15)*

Another verse in Nahum that may be deemed an allusion to Zion is found in Nahum 2.1 (in the English Bibles 1.15). Gunkel [[23]](#footnote-23) adds here ‘Jerusalem’ as subject, reading שלמי ירושלים נדרך. (‘fulfill your vows, O Jerusalem’). However, this emendation is not necessary. Nahum's audience probably understood that the prophet is referring to Jerusalem.

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 Nahum sees are probably those surrounding Zion (Cf. Psa. 125).[[24]](#footnote-24) The mention of festivals and vows in the same verse relates probably 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 normally held post-exilic, while Nahum's historical background is debated.[[25]](#footnote-25) If we accept that Nahum was composed in the seventh Century BCE, then the direction of borrowing is from Nahum to Deutero-Isaiah.[[26]](#footnote-26) However, Jeremias[[27]](#footnote-27) interprets Nah. 2.1 as a late post-exilic interpolation into an oracle originally directed towards 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-28)

Are both prophets using a stock sentence?[[29]](#footnote-29) It is not certain who borrowed from whom, but it is obvious that the writer of Isaiah 52 has elaborated, or that Nahum has reduced this verse.[[30]](#footnote-30)

Coggins[[31]](#footnote-31) 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.” Studying them together however makes for interesting reading. [[32]](#footnote-32)

There is a reversal in Nahum:[[33]](#footnote-33) Nahum transforms several points 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 in a salvation announcement to Judah; Nahum's watchman appears in an announcement of judgment against 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 this foreign nation. Jerusalem's watchman shouts for joy to celebrate victory; Nineveh's sounds the alarm out of fear.

*Is Nahum Referring to a Judean King?*

Carly Crouch[[34]](#footnote-34) finds 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 thinks that the king 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-35)

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-36)

To conclude this point: there is no reference in Nahum to a Judean King, either specifically or generically.

*Allusions to Lamentations*

Julia O'Brien showed the many similarities between Nahum and the Book of Lamentations. On the level 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 yet 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 in progress. Just as Nahum describes advancing armies and the resultant chaos in chs. 2 and 3, so too Lamentations 2, 3, and 5 depict the present suffering of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Both show the dead lying in the streets (Nah. 3.3; Lam. 2.21) and the body's response to anguish (Nah. 2.10; Lam. 2.11). Both describe the destruction of the city as the humiliation of a woman.

 However, she concludes that Nahum is using Nineveh for Judah, and on this point I disagree. When describing destruction and death, the prophet is referring to Nineveh, while the author of Lamentations switched it to refer to Jerusalem.

If we assume a dating of the seventh century for Nahum, the direction of borrowing should be that the Book of Lamentations borrowed expressions from Nahum. While in Lamentations, the reader takes side with Jerusalem and feels sympathy for her, this cannot be said of Nahum where no sympathy for Nineveh is expressed.

*Nahum 3*

The opening uses the phrase ‘עיר דמים’ "city of blood (NIV) or bloodshed (NRSV)". This expression appears also 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-37) However, Nahum transformed Ezekiel's negative view of Jerusalem into a negative view of Nineveh, the city who represents merciless bloodshed, as presented on their wall paintings, depicting the killing of their opponents. Nahum does not think that Zion is as bad as Ezekiel painted it.[[38]](#footnote-38)

Spronk[[39]](#footnote-39) suggests that Ezekiel may have been inspired in this matter by Nahum and may have intended to indicate 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, the question arises: why did Nahum not mention explicitly Zion/Jerusalem?

Here we can only speculate that Nahum focused on the fall of Nineveh and thus Jerusalem became secondary to it. In fact, Nahum has no criticism against Zion, a fact that is also unusual. Since the prophets are considered orators, they may choose to mention or avoid mentioning things according to their rhetorical aim.

We may cite Sweeney's assertion in this regard:[[40]](#footnote-40)

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.

*Conclusion*

Zion is indeed not mentioned explicitly in Nahum as scholars pointed out. However, the prophet does allude to Zion in an implicit way. The reason for his doing so is probably rhetorical: the need to focus on Nineveh. Dealing with Zion explicitly could have turned the focus from Nineveh to Zion. Therefore, Nahum preferred not to mention Zion, even though he was probably a Jerusalemite and knew some earlier Jerusalemite materials.

On the other hand, we should perhaps rethink our expectations from the prophets. Not every prophet has to enhance the ‘Zion Theology’, even if he is a Judean prophet.

At a broader level, these findings may be related to the on-going debate regarding the unity of the Twelve.[[41]](#footnote-41) Zion is not a unifying factor but rather a dividing factor. Nahum bypasses any involvement of a Davidic king 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. In Nahum, there are only implicit allusions to it.
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