

This article is published in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery* Volume II (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov and James C. VanderKam), Israel Exploration Society, Jerusalem 2000, p.486-496. This essay helpful in understanding the confusing accounts of Israel's history 175 - 134 BCE. I have typed the important phrases in *italics* to help bring even more clarity. **Jackson Snyder, Vero Essene Yahad, Editor. June 16, 2025**

The War Scroll, the Hasidim, and the Maccabean Conflict, [Russel Gmirkin](#) (bio at link).
It is important for readers to note that Gmirkin is writing as a speculative historian and not as a theologian.

Some of the Contents

[The History of the Hasidim & Hasmoneans](#) [Animal Apocalypse](#) [Identity of the DSS Sectarials](#)
[Animal Apocalypse Identities](#) [Onias III Last Zadokite](#) [The Sect of the Scrolls](#) [Wicked Priest](#)
[The Start of the 70th Week](#) [The Wicked Era](#) [The Man of Lies](#) [The Big Disappointment](#) [Summary](#)

Footnotes

[Notes 1 - 10](#) [Notes 11 - 20](#) [Notes 21 - 33](#) [Notes 34 - 49](#) [Notes 50 - 63](#) [Notes 64 - 77](#)

For the past fifty years, investigations into the historical background of the Dead Sea Scrolls have been hampered by the assumption that these scrolls are somehow linked to the archaeological site of Qumran. It has been frequently asserted, without any real archaeological evidence, that the Teacher of Righteousness founded Qumran sometime after 150 BCE, that Qumran served as the religious center of the sect, and that the scrolls were written by scribes living at Qumran.

Today there is a growing recognition in the field that the archaeology of Qumran is ultimately irrelevant to the question of sectarian origins. More recent views question whether Qumran functioned as either a religious or scribal center, and propose that the scrolls were brought there from elsewhere, possibly Jerusalem.¹ When and where the scrolls were originally written is an open question. We are therefore free to consider whether the Dead Sea Scrolls may not as a whole predate Qumran. This article proposes that *the group responsible for authoring the major sectarian texts was the Hasidim*, the militant enemies of Hellenism in the 170s and later supporters of Judas Maccabaeus in the mid-160s BCE.

The History of the Hasidim and Hasmoneans

The Hasidim are mentioned only three times in the relevant historical sources, 1 and 2 Maccabees. From these three passages we learn that the Hasidim were the main military supporters of Judas Maccabaeus from 166 to 162 BCE, but that they had already gained a reputation as “mighty warriors of Israel” prior to placing themselves under his command.² We may infer that the Hasidim were, like Judas Maccabaeus, opponents of the Seleucids in control of Judea and the Hellenized apostate Jews in control of Jerusalem and its temple during this period.

That is what the external historical sources tell us. Fortunately, we also possess writings by the Hasidim themselves which give us a more complete historical picture. Methodologically, if an ancient text can be ascertained to have been written in the period 166–162 BCE and strongly supports the Maccabean uprising, then we may reasonably identify it as a Hasidic text.³ *The book of Jubilees can be identified as a Hasidic writing*, since it contains historical allusions to Maccabean victories down to the years 163 or perhaps 161 BCE.⁴ *The Animal Apocalypse* is a Hasidic text which outlines the entire history of the movement- its inception around 200 BCE, its struggle against the Hellenists in the 170s BCE, its military victories under Judas Maccabaeus

down to the year 163 BCE.⁵

Of crucial importance for our purposes, the War Scroll from cave 11 can also be identified as a Hasidic composition. In my article, “The War Scroll and Roman Weaponry Reconsidered,” I demonstrated that the tactics and weaponry of the War Scroll are modeled on those of the Roman legions of the second century BCE, and probably reflect the historical practices of the Maccabean army after 164 BCE.⁶ In my article “Historical Allusions in the War Scroll,” I established a more precise date of the War Scroll’s final redaction to the summer of 163 BCE.⁷ Like most eschatological literature, the War Scroll is partly historical and partly futuristic, and by the usual methodology can be dated by its latest historical allusions. Column 2 refers to the restoration of the temple cult in a land sabbath year, an unmistakable allusion to the rededication of the temple in the land sabbath year 164/163 BCE.⁸ This shows that at least seven years of the projected forty year war were already in the past. Column 1 alludes to military campaigns in the same locations and same sequence as those of Judas Maccabaeus in spring and early summer of 163 BCE.⁹ The final eschatological battle against the assembled forces of Belial appears to look forward to the Maccabean *battle against Lysias* and his mercenary forces shortly afterwards, in late summer 163 BCE.¹⁰ The Maccabean army met with defeat, contrary to the War Scroll’s prediction, which implies *the scroll was written prior to this battle*. The foreign conquests of the last 33 years of the war are another example of a failed prophecy. Hence internal evidence shows the War Scroll was written in summer 163 BCE, in the seventh year of the war. The sectarians thus dated the start of their struggle to liberate Judea to 170 BCE.

Notes 1 - 10

Both the historical allusions of columns 1–2 and the data on tactics and weaponry of columns 3–9 point to an identification of the War Scroll as the official war manual of the Maccabean army as of summer 163 BCE. It directly follows that its authors, *our Dead Sea Scrolls sectarians, were the Hasidim*, the military supporters of Judas Maccabaeus at this historical juncture. If the War Scroll was indeed a Hasidic composition, this suggests that the Hasidim may be responsible for related texts, including such major scrolls as the Damascus Document and the Community Rule. These documents describe the sectarians as living in wilderness camps under the command of priests, all those of fighting age organized into military units of 10s, 50s, 100s and 1000s, exactly as in the War Scroll and in 1 Maccabees.¹¹ Indeed, the Maccabean period provides the only historical example of the precise military and social structure mandated in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Hence it is historically reasonable to propose that the Damascus Document and related texts are a product of the wilderness camps of the Hasidim.

The *identification of the Dead Sea Scrolls sect with the Hasidim* is a hypothesis that is easily tested by comparing the known history of the Hasidim with that found in the scrolls. As this article will demonstrate, the histories correlate remarkably well. Moreover, such figures as the Teacher of Righteousness, Wicked Priest and Man of Lies are easily identified against the historical background of the Hellenistic Crisis and the rise of the Hasidim.

The first step in our analysis is to develop as detailed a history of the Hasidim as possible without reference to the Dead Sea Scrolls. The major external source here is the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85–90). In the Animal Apocalypse, all of human history, from creation down to the Maccabean uprising, is described in symbolic but highly transparent imagery. The

last section covers the period when Judea was ruled by the Seleucids.¹² The Animal Apocalypse dates the rise of the Hasidim to the start of this historical period, i.e. shortly after 200 BCE, when Antiochus the Great conquered Judea.¹³

The first two decades of the Hasidim, from the early 190s BCE to the early 170s BCE, are relatively obscure and presumably uneventful. It was only in the late 170s that the *Hasidim rose to public prominence as defenders of traditional Judaism* against the Hellenists led by Judas Maccabaeus. In 175 BCE, the high priest *Onias III*, son of Simon the Just, *retired into exile at Antioch when his brother Jason bought the office of high priest* with a substantial bribe. Jason obtained permission from Antiochus IV to transform Jerusalem into a Hellenistic city, complete with a gymnasium for athletic events, with athletes competing naked after the Greek custom.¹⁴ Menelaus, who outbid Jason for the office of high priest in 172 BCE,¹⁵ continued the Hellenist innovations begun under Jason.

In the Animal Apocalypse, *the Hasidim are symbolized by newborn sighted lambs*, while their opponents, the Hellenists, are symbolized by the rest of the flock, which were both deaf and blind.¹⁶ The newborn lambs are said to have cried out to the rest of the sheep, but the other sheep could not hear.¹⁷ Then ravens, symbolizing the Seleucids, swooped down and seized one lamb, killing and consuming it. *This slain lamb is identified* by all commentators as the *exiled high priest Onias III*,¹⁸ assassinated in 170 BCE at the instigation of his rival the Hellenist high priest Menelaus.¹⁹ The other lambs began to grow horns, but were attacked by the ravens, until a valorous ram, symbolizing Judas Maccabaeus, began to defend the lambs against the birds of prey.²⁰ Various historical allusions to Maccabean victories take us down to summer, 163 BCE, when the Animal Apocalypse (like the War Scroll) expected a final apocalyptic battle, with Maccabean forces victorious.

Notes 11 - 20

The Animal Apocalypse gives us great insight into Hasidic origins. Though we may date Hasidic beginnings to around 200–195 BCE, the Animal Apocalypse reports nothing significant about the Hasidim until they first came into conflict with the Hellenists around 175 BCE. The Hasidim only emerge as a highly visible, sharply defined group, even in the Animal Apocalypse, when they took on the role as the vocal opponents of the Hellenists after 175 BCE.²¹ The book of Jubilees contains polemics against public nudity, the abandonment of circumcision, and Gentiles in general, reflecting Hasidic concerns during this period.²²

The late 170s were dominated by conflict between the Hasidim and Hellenists, with the setbacks of the Hasidim culminating in the assassination of their early leader Onias III. That *Onias III, the last legitimate Zadokite high priest*, was considered a prominent figure in their movement is of great significance in reconstructing the early history of the Hasidim. The conflict between the sighted lambs and the blind sheep in the Animal Apocalypse probably reflects in large part the historical struggle between the conservative Oniad supporters and the Hellenist supporters of Jason and Menelaus over control of the temple and the office of high priest. To describe the Hasidim of the late 170s as the Onias faction is probably not too inaccurate.

There is no evidence that the Hasidim boycotted the temple during this period. Quite the contrary, their conflict with the Hellenists manifested itself primarily in the struggle for control of the high priesthood. The Hasidim thus appear to have been centered at Jerusalem, and their

religious and political objectives coincided with that of Onias III and his priestly supporters. A *major objective of the Hasidim* during this period, besides the overthrow of the Hellenists, *must have been the restoration of the exiled Onias III* to the office of high priest.

The year 170 BCE signaled a major turning point for the Hasidim. Their leader, Onias III, living in exile at Antioch, publicly denounced his opponent Menelaus for stealing sacred gold vessels from the temple. *Menelaus in turn bribed Andronicus, temporary governor of Antioch, to assassinate Onias.*²³ Meanwhile, in Jerusalem riots broke out over news of the sacrilegious theft, and the deputy high priest, *Menelaus' brother Lysimachus, was killed at the temple treasury.*²⁴ *The Hasidic followers of Onias III were most plausibly the instigators of the temple riots.*

These events signaled a decisive change in the political climate of Judea. The inner-temple bureaucratic struggle over the control of the temple had now broken out into open violence. The Jerusalem riots show that the Hasidic movement had taken on a militant character. When three more opponents of Menelaus denounced him at Tyre, Menelaus bribed the judge to execute them.²⁵ We may presume that many prominent *Hasidic priests* left Jerusalem at this time, both for their own safety, and because *they chose not to continue serving in a temple run by their leader's murderers.* What is certain is that *by 166 BCE, the Hasidim were living in exile from Jerusalem, boycotting the temple, and achieving a reputation for their militant opposition to the Hellenists.*²⁶ In 166 BCE, the Hasidim rallied around Judas Maccabaeus, and from 166 to 162 BCE their history roughly coincides with that of the Maccabean army. *After 162 BCE the Hasidim may have withdrawn their support from Judas Maccabaeus.*²⁷ We hear nothing of them afterwards. This is what is known of the Hasidim from outside sources.

The Sect of the Scrolls

We now turn our attention to the history of the Dead Sea Scrolls sect, comparing it to that of the Hasidim. The origin of the sect is explicitly mentioned only in the Damascus Document, which states that the sectarians had “groped like blind men” for two decades before coming under the guidance of the Teacher of Righteousness.²⁸ If the sectarians are the group known in Maccabees as the Hasidim, then these twenty years represent the uneventful period from the birth of the Hasidim around 200–195 BCE to the beginning of the Hellenistic Crisis around 180–175 BCE. *The rise of the Teacher of Righteousness as leader of the Hasidim* thus took place against the historical background of the beginning of the Hellenistic Crisis in the mid-170s BCE.

The Hasidic involvement in inner-temple conflicts during the early Hellenistic Crisis appears to be reflected in the conflict between the Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest described in the pesharim.²⁹ The *Teacher of Righteousness* was certainly a priest,³⁰ and the prominence of the Sons of Zadok among the sectarians³¹ suggests he was of Zadokite lineage. His opponent, the Wicked Priest, not only drove the Teacher of Righteousness from Jerusalem, but conspired against and attacked him in his house of exile.³² This behavior is hard to explain except if these two figures were rivals for the office of high priest. *All this points to the identification of the Teacher of Righteousness as Onias III, the leader of the Hasidim and the last legitimate Zadokite high priest, who was assassinated at Antioch in 170 BCE.*³³

Notes 21 - 33

It naturally follows that *the Wicked Priest must be Menelaus.*³⁴ The *Habakkuk Pesher* indicates

that the Wicked Priest possessed a good reputation prior to attaining the office of high priest, when his greed and corruption became evident to all.³⁵ This was exactly the case with Menelaus. Menelaus came from a prominent priestly family. His brother Simon was captain of the temple in the 170s,³⁶ and Menelaus himself served as chief financial officer under Jason.³⁷ Hence his reputation appears to have been excellent prior to his assuming office in 172 BCE, after which his behavior became increasingly scandalous. His subsequent catalog of crimes are highly reminiscent of those of the Wicked Priest in the pesharim. He embezzled temple funds and instigated the assassination of Onias III living in exile in Antioch. *Later Menelaus presided over the temple during the infamous period when the Jewish religion was banned and the temple was defiled by idolatrous Graeco-Syrian cult apparatus and even temple prostitutes.*³⁸ Menelaus was the only high priest history records as having assaulted an exiled rival. And as the most reviled high priest in second temple history,³⁹ *Menelaus makes an excellent candidate for Wicked Priest.*

The violent death of Onias III signaled the start of a dark new era for those loyal to traditional Judaism. This troubled period was given several names in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the most common being the Wicked Era and the Era of the Dominion of Belial. We have already seen that the Animal Apocalypse takes note of the murder of Onias in 170 BCE. *The book of Daniel similarly dates the start of the climactic seventieth week with the death of Onias, the Anointed Prince in 170 BCE.*⁴⁰ The War Scroll's forty years war against the Sons of Darkness may also be calculated to start in 170 BCE, and suggests that the Hasidim began engaging in acts of violence against the Hellenistic apostates from this early date.⁴¹ The *Damascus Document* dates the forty year Wicked Era, or Era of the Dominion of Belial, with the death of the Teacher of Righteousness.⁴² The *Damascus Document* indicates that the sectarians would remain in exile in the wilderness throughout this Wicked Era;⁴³ indeed *it insists on a total boycott of the corrupt Jerusalem temple by the exiled sectarians during the Wicked Era.*⁴⁴ The renewed covenant in the land of Damascus was to hold throughout this period.⁴⁵ *One may therefore date the start of the wilderness phase of the Hasidim to about 170 BCE.*

Such relevant texts as the *Damascus Document* and *Community Rule* were written by Hasidim scribes to provide guidance under these urgent new circumstances. The *Community Rule* may be considered the official constitution of the Hasidim, outlining the social structure and regulations governing the sect for the duration of the Wicked Era. The *Damascus Document*, though clearly composite, need not have taken long to evolve to its present form. The legislation for the Wicked Era in these documents covered, among other topics, the conscription and mustering of troops,⁴⁶ and various purity rules for the encampments. *The sons of Zadok*, i.e. the former priestly supporters of Onias III, naturally have a prominent position in the formal bureaucratic structure of the camps.⁴⁷ The organization of the camps into formal units of 10s, 50s, 100s and 1000s show that the Hasidim, our sectarians, planned from the outset for war against the Hellenists in power in Jerusalem. The belief that angels were present necessitated special legislation for elevated standards of purity in the camps; this same concept of angelic participation in holy war is also seen in Maccabees.⁴⁸ Likewise, the formal oaths to uphold the precepts of the Torah, so central in the sectarian literature, are paralleled by similar oaths to the Torah alluded to in *1 Maccabees*.⁴⁹ The *Damascus Document* and *Community Rule* thus gain great historical significance as key Hasidic documents from the outset of the militant phase against the Hellenists.

The dating of the *Damascus Document* early in the Wicked Era, before the Hasidim joined with Judas Maccabaeus, has important historical implications. The *Damascus Document* refers to the main enemies of the sectarians as the *Seekers of Smooth Things, or the violators of the covenant, led by a figure called the Man of Lies*.⁵⁰ In *Daniel*, the same phrase “the violators of the covenant,” is used to describe the Jewish faction that supported Antiochus IV,⁵¹ who is twice described as having attained his office by means of “smooth things,” *i.e.* lies.⁵² Hence the Seekers of Smooth Things may be equated with the Hellenists. It follows that the Man of Lies was an important Hellenist figure from around 170 BCE who succeeded in leading astray some of the Hasidim living in exile in the wilderness. This leads to an identification of *the Man of Lies as Jason*, the founder of the Hellenist party,⁵³ who was nevertheless living in exile in the wilds of Transjordan from 172 to 168 BCE, when he led an abortive attempt to conquer Jerusalem.⁵⁴

The career of Jason matches that of the Man of Lies in all essential details. In the pesharim, the Man of Lies is portrayed not only as a leader of the Seekers of Smooth Things, but as a prominent personal enemy of the Teacher of Righteousness.⁵⁵ This makes the Man of Lies a contemporary and enemy of Onias, which Jason, the successor of Onias, certainly was. The *Damascus Document* portrays the Man of Lies as both an apostate⁵⁶ and a military leader.⁵⁷ The description of the followers of the Man of Lies as “men of war”⁵⁸ suggests that the Man of Lies may have been recruiting soldiers into his army rather than forming a new splinter group as is commonly assumed.

All this data fits Jason’s misguided attempt to conquer Jerusalem described in 2 Maccabees.⁵⁹ In 168 BCE, when Antiochus IV was campaigning in Egypt, a false report spread in Judea that Antiochus had died.⁶⁰ Without Antiochus to fear, Jason felt free to launch a military assault against his rival Menelaus in Jerusalem. Raising an army of 3000 in Transjordan, he besieged Menelaus and inflicted many casualties against his enemies before the news arrived that Antiochus was still alive. Jason abandoned his siege of the Seleucid forces in the Acra and retreated to Amman. The citizens of Jerusalem, meanwhile, were brutally punished by Antiochus⁶¹ and within a year the forcible Hellenization of the Jews had begun.⁶² *2 Maccabees* blames Jason for all the woes that subsequently befell the Jews.⁶³

Notes 50 - 63

The *Damascus Document* appears to provide evidence that Jason recruited part of his army from the Hasidim, but that the leadership of the Hasidim had strongly condemned Jason’s military venture and had predicted its failure. The *Damascus Document* predicts that the Man of Lies would cause Él’s curses to cleave to Israel,⁶⁴ and those who took up arms with him would perish by the sword.⁶⁵ Any who survived would not be readmitted into the community.⁶⁶ This last legislation exactly foreshadows the fate of Jason, who upon returning to Transjordan was refused exile and subsequently fled to Egypt and Sparta, where he died.⁶⁷

The *Damascus Document* and related documents thus reflect historical circumstances at the very outset of the Wicked Era, before the rise of Judas Maccabaeus. For subsequent historical developments we must turn to the War Scroll. The oldest portions of the War Scroll, 1QM 10–15, are preoccupied with hymns before and after battle and similar liturgical concerns, and contain no data at all on weaponry and little on tactics.⁶⁸ This older material reflects the earliest,

religious phase of the Maccabean War, before the professional reorganization of the Maccabean army in 164 BCE after the restoration of the temple. The latest portion of the War Scroll, the military manual at columns 2–9 and the introduction in column 1, were added in 163 BCE. Historical allusions pin down the date of the final edition of the War Scroll to summer 163 BCE, just before the apocalyptic battle between the Maccabeans and the massive Seleucid army under Lysias and Antiochus V. By 163 BCE, the Jerusalem temple was under the central control of Judas Maccabaeus and the Hasidim.⁶⁹

Significantly, the *War Scroll* pictures the sectarians headquartered at Jerusalem and presiding over the temple.⁷⁰ Clearly the exile from Jerusalem and the boycott of the temple were not essential, defining features of the sect, but temporary measures occupying very brief historical period, from 170 to 164 BCE, when Hellenists controlled the temple cult.⁷¹

The disappointing defeat of Judas Maccabaeus in 163 BCE and the return of the temple to the control of the Seleucids appears to have temporarily discredited apocalypticism. The Maccabees were not invincible after all. Apocalyptic speculations such as those found in the *War Scroll*, the *Animal Apocalypse*, and the book of *Daniel* came to an abrupt end.⁷² The Hasidim also pass from the scene about this time. The Jewish temple and ancestral religion had been restored in 164 BCE, and the wicked high priest Menelaus had been executed in 162 BCE.⁷³ *Onias IV, the last of the Oniads in Judea, took refuge in Egypt that same year.*⁷⁴ Little reason remained for the Hasidim to exist as a social movement or formal community. In 162 BCE, leading Hasidim were prepared to abandon Judas Maccabaeus and negotiate for peace with the Seleucids. After this date, the Hasidim are not heard of again.

Summary

To summarize this investigation, the history of the Dead Sea Scrolls sect dovetails almost effortlessly with the history of the Hasidim as found in *Maccabees* and the *Animal Apocalypse*. All our sources tell the same story of mainstream Judaism versus Hellenism, of Onias III versus Jason and Menelaus. *The Dead Sea Scrolls sect was not an obscure, insignificant splinter group operating invisibly at the margins of history.* Rather, the history of the Dead Sea Scrolls sect is written large and plain in conventional historical sources, if one only looks in the proper period.

In conclusion, then, such major sectarian texts as the *Damascus Document*, the *War Scroll* and others appear to be Hasidic writings composed during the Hellenistic Crisis, passed down through succeeding generations, and at a relatively late date arriving at Qumran. The archaeological site of Qumran, of course, has no connection at all with the history of the Hasidim. Who, then, deposited the Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran? This older Hasidic literature was probably revered by the Essenes, given the well-known similarities between the sectarian practices and those of the Essenes as described by Josephus.⁷⁵ Hence it is possible that the scrolls as a whole constitute a late Essene library. *But other groups in Judea also doubtless claimed spiritual descent from the heroic Hasidim and preserved their literature.* Significantly, several early first century BCE texts found at Qumran, such as *MMT*, the *Hymn to King Jonathan*, and certain calendar texts, are considered by some to be of Sadducean* origin.⁷⁶

* **Editor's note:** For "Sadducean" (from Greek "Sadoq") in the text, read "Zadokite" (from Hebrew "Tzadok") - they both mean the same thing; the difference for many of us lay people is this time period - we call the Hellenist priests **Sadducees**, those **not** from the proper line of Zadok, after the Greek language, and the Onian priests, those priests of the line of Zadok, today we call **Zadokites**, preferring the Hebrew. However, the author of this essay makes no distinction between the two parties with the naming convention.

This raises a second possibility that the Dead Sea Scrolls may constitute a late Sadducee, not Essene, library. It is possible that many or most of these texts, both Sadducee and Hasidic, arrived at Qumran during the period 76–63 BCE, when Sadducee former supporters of King Jannaeus were exiled from Jerusalem.⁷⁷

Notes 64 - 77

In any case, it is important to distinguish between the original authors of the sectarian texts, the Hasidim, and the later copyists and collectors of these texts, who left them in the caves at Qumran.

End Notes

1. See generally N. Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? - The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (New York- Simon and Schuster, 1995); M. Wise, M. Abegg, and E. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls- A New Translation* (New York- HarperCollins Publications, 1996) 16–34.
2. 1 Macc 1-42; 7-13; 2 Macc 14-6.
3. By this criterion, for example, the book of Daniel cannot be identified as Hasidic, since it lacks favorable references to the Maccabees. Cf. the critique of Daniel as a Hasidic document by P. Davies, "Hasidim in the Maccabean Period," *JJS* 28 (1977) 129–131.
4. J. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (Missoula, Montana; Scholars Press, 1977) 230–58.
5. On the Hasidic authorship of the Animal Apocalypse, see P. A. Tillier, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of I Enoch* (Scholars Press- Atlanta, Georgia, 1993) 74–73, 354–55; J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch- Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford Clarendon Press, 1976) 43–44; F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic- Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (Leiden- E. J. Brill, 1992) 77; J. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (Catholic Biblical Association of America- Washington, DC, 1984) 161–63; R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford, 1912) 207–8; J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination- An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity* (New York- Crossroad, 1984) 55.
6. R. Gmirkin, "The War Scroll and Roman Weaponry Reconsidered," *DSD* 3 (1996) 89–129.
7. R. Gmirkin, "Historical Allusions in the War Scroll," *DSD* 5 (1998) 72–214.
8. 1QM 2-5–6; cf. 1 Macc 6-49, 53.
9. The order of campaigns in 1 Macc 5-3–8 (Edom, Moab, and Ammon), 14–21 (Ptolemais, Tyre, and Sidon in Philistia), 65–68 (Azotus in Philistia), 6-18–20 (forces of the Acra, i.e. the wicked of the covenant) preserves the same order as 1QM 1-1–2. The return of the exiled sons of light from the desert of the nations to Jerusalem (1QM 1-2–3) may refer to the rescue of Jews from Transjordan in spring, 163 BCE (1 Macc 5-24–52; 2 Macc 12-10–31).
10. 1QM 1-4–7; cf. 1 Macc 6-28–60.
-
11. War camps, see 1QM 3-4, 13; 6-9; 7-1, 3, 7; 14-2; CD 7-6; 10-23; 12-22–23; 13-1–4, 7, 13, 20; 14-3, 8–9; 19-2–3; 1QSa 1-6, 21, 26; 2-15; cf. 1 Macc 2-27–31, 42–44; 5-24–29, 35–36; 9-33; under command of priests, see 1QM 7-9–18; 8-1–19; 9-1–9; 16-2–12; CD 13-2–4; 10-5; 14-3–7; 1QS 2-19; 5-1–3, 8–9, 21; 1QSa 1-2, 22–24; 2-2; cf. 1 Macc 2-1; 3-46–49; 5-67; ranks of 1000s, 100s, 50s and 10s, see 1QM 2-16; 3-15–18; 4-2–3; CD 12-22–13-4; 1QS 2-19–22; 1QSa 1-13–15; 2-1; cf. 1 Macc 3-55.
12. Charles, 201; Tillier, 55; Milik, 234.
13. Josephus, *Ant.* 12.129–136.
14. 2 Macc 4-7–10.
15. 2 Macc 4-23–24.
16. See Milik, 43; Charles, 206–7; Collins, 62–63; VanderKam, *Enoch*, 161 n. 56; cf. Tillier, 109–15, 226, on newborn lambs as Hasidim; see Tillier, 101–102; 352–54; Martínez, 77; Milik, 43, 253; Charles 208; VanderKam, *Enoch*, 161 on the blind sheep as Hellenists.
17. 1 En. 90-6–7.
18. On Onias as the lamb (reformer) slain by ravens (Seleucids) see Tillier, 354; Collins, 55; VanderKam, *Enoch* 161; Milik, 43, 253; Charles 207–208.
19. On the death of Onias III in 170 BCE, see J. Goldstein, *II Maccabees* (AB 41A; Garden City, New York- Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1983) 238–239.
20. 1 Enoch 90-8–12.
-
21. After the lambs are born and gain their sight, their first significant actions are "crying out" against to the blind sheep.
22. On public nudity, see Jub. 3-30–31; cf. 1 Macc 1-14–15; 2 Macc 4-9, 12–15; circumcision, see Jub. 15-25–34; 16-14, 25; 20-3, cf. 1 Macc 1-15; Gentiles, see Jub. 20-4; 22-16–18, 20; 30-5–15; 41-2; cf. VanderKam, *Textual Studies*, 241–46.
23. 2 Macc 4-33–34.
24. 2 Macc 4-39–42.
25. 2 Macc 4-43–48.
26. 1 Macc 1-42.
27. 1 Macc 7-13; 2 Macc 14-6.

28. CD 1-9-11.
29. 1QpHab 9-9-12; 11-4-8.
30. 4QpPsa 3-15.
31. 1QS 5-1-2, 9; 9-14; 1QSa 1-2, 24; 2-3.
32. 1QpHab 11-4-5.
33. 2 Macc 4-33-34.
-
34. Onias III as the Teacher of Righteousness and Menelaus as Wicked Priest was first suggested by H. H. Rowley, *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford- Basil Blackwell, 1955) 67-69.
35. 1QpHab 8-9.
36. 2 Macc 3-4.
37. 2 Macc 4-23.
38. 2 Macc 6-1-6.
39. 2 Macc 4-25, 39, 50.
40. Dan 9-25-26.
41. If the seventh year of the War of the Sons of Light was the land sabbath year 164/163 BCE, then the first year of the war was 170/169 BCE. This was the year when riots broke out in Jerusalem against Menelaus and Lysimachus (2 Macc 4-39-42), in which the Hasidim may have played a role.
42. CD 20-13-14.
43. CD 6-4-5, 11-16.
44. CD 6-11-14.
45. The legislation in the Damascus Document was supposed to have effect throughout the Wicked Era (CD 6-8-11, 14, 12-22-13-4; 15-7-10), when the faithful would live in exile in the Land of Damascus (CD 6-14-19; 8-21); the "eschatological" legislation of the Community Rule was to hold throughout the Dominion of Belial (1QS 1-16-18; 2-19-22); the Rule of the Congregation was to hold throughout the final days of Wicked Era (1QSa 1-1-3).
46. CD 12-22-13-2; 1QS 2-19-23.
47. 1QS 5-1-2, 9; 9-14; 1QSa 1-2, 24; 2-3.
48. 1QM 1-11-12; 4-1-2; 11-17; 12-4-5; 15-14; 17-6; cf. 1 Macc 7-14; 2 Macc 10-29, 11-6; Dan 10-3; 12-1.
49. CD 15-6-10; 16-1-5; 1QS 1-16-17; 5-8-9; 9-21-23; cf. 1 Macc 2-42.
-
50. CD 1-14-21.
51. At Dan 11-32, the "violators of the covenant" are "seduced by flatteries"; cf. CD 1-18, 20, where those who "sought smooth things... violated the covenant."
52. Dan 11-32, 34.
53. 2 Macc 4-9-17.
54. 2 Macc 5-10.
55. 1QpHab 5-10-11.
56. CD 1-14-15; 1QpHab 2-1-4; 5-11-12; 4QpPsa 1-26-27.
57. CD 20-14-15.
58. CD 20-14-15.
59. See generally 2 Macc 5-1-19.
60. 2 Macc 5-5.
61. 2 Macc 5-11-14.
62. 1 Macc 1-29-61; 2 Macc 6-1-11.
63. 2 Macc 1-7-8.
-
64. CD 1-14-18; cf. 2 Macc 1-7-8.
65. CD 7-13; 8-1-2; 19-13-14, 25-26; according to 19-22-24, their destruction would come at the hands of the king of Greece, perhaps an allusion to Antiochus IV.
66. CD 19-13-14, 33-35; 20-10-13.
67. 2 Macc 5-7-10.
68. 1QM 10-14 contains pre-militant or very early militant material, dominated by liturgical concerns. 1QM 15 is a little later and shows a primitive tactical awareness.
69. 1 Macc 4-36-60; 2 Macc 10-1-8.
70. See 1QM 1-3; 2-4; 3-11; 7-4; 12-16 on Jerusalem as the base of the Sons of Light; see 1QM 2-1-6 on their control of the temple cult.
71. VanderKam, *Textual Studies*, 280-83, 288, believes that Jubilees was not a sectarian writing, despite the clear use of the sectarian calendar, citing the acceptance of the temple cult in Jubilees, a concern for the whole nation of Israel, and the lack of allusion to a sectarian exile. But compare for instance 1QM 2-1-9, which shows all Israel worshipping at Jerusalem and supplying troops for foreign campaigns. The War Scroll shows the boycott of the temple and exile of the sectarians was a temporary phenomenon.
72. By independent lines of evidence, the final editions of the War Scroll, Daniel, and the Animal Apocalypse may all three be

dated to summer, 163 BCE.

73. 2 Macc 13-3-8.

74. Josephus, Ant. 12.387; 13.62-63, 65.

75. See generally T. Beale, *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Cambridge- Cambridge University Press, 1988).

76. On MMT as Sadducean see E. Qimron, *Qumran Cave 4 Vol V- Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah* (Clarendon Press- Oxford, 1994) 106-107, 175-177, 188-189; at 200 Sussman suggests the Sadducean halakhot of MMT was shared by the Essenes. On the Hymn to King Jonathan as Sadducean see E. Eshel, H. Eshel, A. Yardeni, "Who Was He?- Rare Dead Sea Scrolls Text Mentions King Jonathan," BAR 75-78. On 4QMishC see M. Wise, *Thunder in Gemini* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 15; Sheffield- JSOT Press, 1994) 219-220, who attributes this text to the partisans of Aristobulus II (who is linked to the Sadducees).

77. Josephus, Ant. 13.410-417. That the Hymn to King Jonathan was found at Qumran suggests a connection between the exiled Jannaeus partisans and the scrolls collection.