

*Beyond the
Essene Hypothesis*

• •
The Parting of the Ways between
Qumran and Enochic Judaism

GABRIELE BOCCACCINI

WILLIAM B. EERDMANS PUBLISHING COMPANY
GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN / CAMBRIDGE, U.K.

F-283

3. Pre-Maccabean Texts in the Qumran Library: Enochic and Zadokite Documents

The Dead Sea Scrolls contain a large number of documents that were composed before the Maccabean period. While we are accustomed to calling this literature "biblical," "apocryphal," and "pseudepigraphic," we should more properly, and less anachronistically, use the terms "Zadokite" and "Enochic."

(a) The Zadokite literature has a very complex history. It includes most of the so-called biblical texts, with the exception of the later Esther and Daniel, and also apocryphal texts such as the Epistle of Jeremiah, Tobit, and Sirach. From modern research in the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament we know that this literature was originally produced by different varieties of ancient Judaism, but during the Persian and early Hellenistic periods it was collected, edited, and transmitted by the religious authorities of the temple of Jerusalem, the high priesthood of the house of Zadok.²⁹ An analysis of the Dead Sea Scrolls demonstrates that during middle Judaism the Zadokite literature was not textually fixed but was still subjected, to some extent, to a process of growth that resulted in a plurality of texts and textual forms. None of the texts of Zadokite Judaism preserved at Qumran, however, presents evidence of explicit editing or interpolation that one could attribute specifically to the community of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The texts of Zadokite Judaism were quoted as authoritative in the sectarian scrolls, and these texts were preserved with respect and devotion in those forms in which they were then known: proto-Masoretic, proto-Samaritan, proto-Septuagintal, and others.³⁰

29. On the role of the house of Zadok in the early second temple period, see P. Sacchi, "Il periodo sadocita," in *Storia del Secondo Tempio*, 83-186; J. L. Berquist, *Judaism in Persia's Shadow: A Social and Historical Approach* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995); M. Smith, *Palestinian Parties and Politics That Shaped the Old Testament* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971).

30. E. Tov, "Groups of Biblical Texts Found at Qumran," in Dimant and Schiffman, eds., *Time to Prepare*, 85-102; E. C. Ulrich, "Pluriformity in the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon," in J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner, eds., *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18-21 March, 1991*, STDJ 11/1-2 (Leiden: Brill, 1992) 1.23-41; E. Tov, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism," in S. Talmon, ed., *Jewish Civilization in the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1991) 107-37.

I have used the phrase "explicit" editing or interpolation advisedly. The fluidity of the tradition allowed textual freedom, but, as attested by the presence of pseudo-Zadokite documents as well as of the targumim and *pesharim*, the community of the Dead Sea Scrolls had no compelling need to change the ancient Zadokite texts in order to infer their sectarian ideas.

The only possible example of an explicit sectarian interpolation in a text of Zadokite Judaism is Sir 15:14b, and, paradoxically, it does not come from the Qumran library but from some manuscripts of the lost Hebrew Sirach text discovered at the end of the last century in the Cairo Genizah, actually the attic storeroom of the ancient synagogue of Fustat (Old Cairo).³¹ As in the case of the Damascus Document, a copy of which was also found in the Cairo Genizah, the Qumran fragments of Sirach (2QSir) have proved that the medieval scribes employed as the basis for their manuscripts a text virtually identical to that known at Qumran.³² The Sirach Hebrew text discovered in the Cairo Genizah contains a significant addition unknown in the Greek and in all the other ancient versions: "In the beginning [God] created man — and placed him in the power of his abductor [Heb. *hwtpw*] — and made him subject to his own will [*yšrw*]" (Sir 15:14). This is a clear interpolation that breaks the rhythm of the verse and whose intent is through parallelism to give a negative connotation to the term *yešer*, which originally was a neutral term. The community of the Dead Sea Scrolls would have the strongest interest in modifying a text that contained the most explicit reference in Zadokite literature to the freedom of human choice. Conceptually, the gloss turns the original meaning of the

31. On Sirach as a Zadokite document, see E. Rivkin, "Ben Sira and Aaronide Hegemony," in *A Hidden Revolution: The Pharisees' Search for the Kingdom Within* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1978) 191-207. The first announcement of the identification of Sirach fragments in the Genizah manuscripts was made by S. Schechter, "A Fragment of the Original Texts of Ecclesiasticus," *Expositor*, 5th series, 4 (1896) 1-15. For the Hebrew text of Sirach, see Z. Ben-Hayyim, ed., *The Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language: The Book of Ben Sira: Text, Concordance, and an Analysis of the Vocabulary* (Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language and The Shrine of the Book, 1973); F. Vattioni, *Ecclesiastico: Testo ebraico con apparato critico e versioni greca, latina e siriana* (Naples: Istituto Orientale di Napoli, 1968).

32. T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde, eds., *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*, STDJ 26 (Leiden: Brill, 1997); M. Gilbert, "The Book of Ben Sira: Implications for Jewish and Christian Traditions," in Talmon, ed., *Jewish Civilization*, 81-91; A. A. Di Lella, *The Hebrew Text of Sirach: A Text-Critical and Historical Study* (The Hague: Mouton, 1966).

passage from a eulogy on human free will into a statement of God's moral predestination in line with the dualistic anthropology of the community of the Dead Sea Scrolls, "which explains *yešer* in terms of a principle of evil which dominates a man."³³ Although the evidence is not conclusive, a growing number of scholars agree that the interpolation in Sir 15:14b and possibly other additions to the Hebrew Sirach originated at Qumran.³⁴

(b) The case of the Enochic literature is parallel and analogous to that of the Zadokite literature. Before the publication of the Qumran fragments, it was customary to date 1 Enoch around and after the Maccabean crisis, even though the composite nature of the document, in particular regarding the Book of the Watchers, led some scholars to perceive a much older prehistory.³⁵ Milik's edition of the Aramaic fragments in 1976 made clear that the earliest parts of 1 Enoch (chs. 6–36, the Book of the Watchers; and chs. 73–82, the Astronomical Book) were pre-Maccabean.³⁶ The paleographic analysis showed that copies of these documents went back to the end of the third or the beginning of the second century BCE. The actual composition might have occurred even earlier. The Aramaic fragments also demonstrated that the Ethiopic version represents a text virtually identical to that of the Book of the Watchers, while the Ethiopic Astronomical Book is only an abbreviated, and rather confused, condensation of the original Aramaic composition. The pre-Maccabean dating of the earliest parts of

33. R. E. Murphy, "Yēšer in the Qumran Literature," *Bib* 39 (1958) 334–44 (quotation on p. 335); cf. J. Hadot, *Penchant mauvais et volonté libre dans la Sagesse de Ben Sira* (Brussels: Presses Universitaires, 1970) 94; G. Boccaccini, "Human Freedom and the Omnipotence of God," in *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 BCE to 200 CE* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991) 105–9. See also J. J. Collins: "The original Sirach had no place for a demonic spoiler" (*Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 35).

34. Cf. Gilbert, "Book of Ben Sira"; cf. also M. Philonenko, "Sur une interpolation éssénisante dans le Siracide (6,15–16)," *Orientalia Suecana* 33–35 (1984–86) 317–21. Di Lella warns that the gloss in Sir 15:14b might be a medieval retroversion from the Syriac text of 4:19b (*Hebrew Text of Sirach*, 119–25).

35. For a date around the Maccabean crisis, see H. H. Rowley, *Jewish Apocalyptic and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Athlone, 1957). Among those who perceived an older prehistory, see D. Dimant, "The Fallen Angels in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic Books Related to Them" (diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1974); G. Beer, "Das Buch Henoch," in E. Kautzsch, ed., *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, 2 vols. (Tübingen: Mohr, 1900) 2.224–26.

36. J. T. Milik with M. Black, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976).

1 Enoch also led scholars to recognize the antiquity of another ancient text that was produced by the same Enochic circles, the Aramaic Levi.³⁷ This document, several copies of which were preserved among the Dead Sea Scrolls, was already known through some medieval Greek manuscripts.³⁸

The high number of Enochic manuscripts found at Qumran suggests that the community of the Dead Sea Scrolls considered the Enochic texts to be as authoritative as the Zadokite documents and preserved them with equal respect and devotion. As in the case of the Zadokite literature, there is no evidence whatsoever that the ancient texts of the Enochic literature were submitted to explicit sectarian editing or interpolation.

(c) The importance of the Enochic literature lies in the fact that it testifies to the existence, during the Zadokite period, of a nonconformist priestly tradition. Zadokite Judaism was a society that clearly defined the lines of cosmic and social structure. The Priestly narrative tells that through creation God turned the primeval disorder into the divine order by organizing the whole cosmos according to the principle of division: light from darkness, the waters above from the waters below, water from dry land (Gen 1:1–2:4a). The refrain "God saw that it was good" repeats that everything was made according to God's will, until the climactic conclusion of the sixth day when "God saw that it was very good" (Gen 1:31).

The disruptive forces of the universe, evil and impurity, are not unleashed but caged within precise boundaries. As long as human beings dare not trespass the boundaries established by God, evil and impurity are controllable. Obedience to the moral laws allows one to avoid evil, which was primarily understood as a punishment from God for human transgressions, while following the purity laws brings impurity under control. The primeval history, as edited in the Zadokite torah (Gen 1–11), warns that any attempt to cross the boundary between humanity and the divine always results in disaster. Human beings have responsibility for, and the capability of, maintaining the distinction between good and evil, holy and profane, pure and impure. They can blame only themselves for their physical and moral failures.

In the Zadokite worldview, the Jerusalem temple — their temple —

37. M. E. Stone, "Enoch, Aramaic Levi, and Sectarian Origins," *JSJ* 19 (1988) 159–70.

38. On Aramaic Levi, see the detailed study by R. A. Kugler, *From Patriarchs to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*, SBLEJL 9 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

separated from the profane world around it, was a visual representation of the cosmos itself. As God's realm, heaven, is separate from the human realm, the earth, so the earthly dwelling of God produces around the temple a series of concentric circles of greater degrees of holiness separating the profane world from the most holy mountain of Jerusalem. The internal structure of the temple, with its series of concentric courts around the holy of holies, was intended to replicate the structure of the cosmos and the structure of the earth.³⁹

The Zadokite priests, who controlled the temple up to the Maccabean period, claimed to be the custodians of the good and uncorrupted order created by God. "The high priest . . . and his priestly kinsmen served as the human community that established and maintained connection between the various orders of being. Their labor in the temple preserved all other orders of being from collapse. Upon them, the people of Israel, the land of Israel, and, ultimately, the entire cosmos and its population all depended."⁴⁰ It was incumbent on the priesthood to be morally irreproachable and "to distinguish between the holy and the profane, and between the unclean and the clean" (Lev 10:10).

The ideology of the authors of the Enoch documents directly opposed that of the Zadokites. The catalyst was a particular concept of the origin of evil that portrayed a group of rebellious angels as ultimately responsible for the spread of evil and impurity on earth.⁴¹

39. J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, AB (New York: Doubleday, 1991); J. E. Hartley, *Leviticus*, WBC (Dallas: Word, 1992); M. S. Jaffee, "Ritual Space and Performance in Early Judaism," in *Early Judaism* (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1997) 164-212.

40. Jaffee, *Early Judaism*, 171.

41. On the centrality of the problem of the origin of evil in ancient apocalypticism, see J. J. Collins, "Creation and the Origin of Evil," in *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 30-51; P. Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History*, trans. W. J. Short, JSPSup 20 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997); M. Barker, "The Origin of Evil," in *The Lost Prophet: The Book of Enoch and Its Influence on Christianity* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1988) 33-48; C. Molenberg, "A Study of the Roles of Shemihazah and Asael in 1 Enoch 6-11," *JJS* 35 (1984) 136-46; P. Sacchi, "Riflessioni sull'essenza dell'apocalittica: Peccato d'origine e liberta' dell'uomo," *Hen* 5 (1983) 31-58; idem, "L'apocalittica e il problema del male," *PdV* 25 (1980) 325-47; P. D. Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven: Azazel and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6-11," *JBL* 96 (1977) 195-233; M. Delcor, "Le mythe de la chute des anges et de l'origine des géants comme explication du mal dans le monde dans l'apocalyphe juive: Histoire des traditions," *RHR* 189 (1976) 3-53.

While the Zadokites founded their legitimacy on their responsibility to be the faithful keepers of the cosmic order, the Enochians argued that this world had been corrupted by an original sin of angels, who had contaminated God's creation by crossing the boundary between heaven and earth and by revealing secret knowledge to human beings. Despite God's reaction and the subsequent flood, the original order was not, and could not be, restored. The good angels, led by Michael, defeated the evil angels, led by Semyaz and Azazel. The mortal bodies of the giants, the offspring of the evil union of angels and women, were killed, but their immortal souls survived as evil spirits (1 En 15:8-10) and continue to roam about the world in order to corrupt human beings and to destroy cosmic order. While Zadokite Judaism describes creation as a process from past disorder to current divine order, the Enochians claim that God's past order has been replaced by the current disorder. While Zadokite Judaism claims that there were no rebellious angels, the satan also being a member of the heavenly court (Job 1:6-12; 2:1-7; Zech 3:1-2; 1 Chr 21:1), Enochic Judaism would be ultimately responsible for the creation of the concept of the devil.⁴² While Zadokite Judaism struggles to separate evil and impurity from the demonic and makes their spread depend on human choice, Enochic Judaism removes control of these disruptive forces from humans. "Rebellion against the order of the Most High unleashes the forces of chaos . . . the defilement of the created order extending from humankind to birds to beasts to reptiles. This, in biblical metaphor, is a description of the collapse of the order of creation, with pugnacious forces unleashed in a vicious process of degeneration and decay."⁴³

As a result of angelic sin, human beings cannot control the spread of evil and impurity. Human beings are still held accountable for their actions, but they are victims of an evil that they have not caused and cannot resist. Impurity also spreads out of human control, the boundaries between the clean and the unclean having been disrupted by the angels' crossing over the boundaries between the holy and the profane. Although the concepts of impurity and evil remain conceptually separate in Enochic Judaism, impurity is now more closely connected with evil. The impurity produced by the fallen angels has weakened the human capability of resisting evil. The myth of the fallen angels was not merely a bizarre or folkloric

42. Sacchi, "The Devil in Jewish Traditions of the Second Temple Period (c. 500 BCE-100 CE)," in *Jewish Apocalyptic*, 211-32.

43. Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven," 199-200.

expansion of ancient legends; it disrupted the very foundations of Zadokite Judaism. Enochic Judaism directly challenged the legitimacy of the second temple and its priesthood. "We are witnessing a harsh indictment against the temple cult and its expository tradition, an indictment originating within the sectarian perspective of a highly developed apocalyptic eschatology."⁴⁴

For the Enochians, the power that the house of Zadok claims is mere illusion, if not the guilty pretentiousness of evil usurpers. Evil and impurity are uncontrollable, and human beings, including the proud priests of Jerusalem, are powerless. The only hope is in God's intervention. The Enochians completely ignore the Mosaic torah and the Jerusalem temple, that is, the two tenets of the order of the universe. In addition, the attribution to Enoch of priestly characteristics⁴⁵ suggests the existence of a pure prediluvian, and pre-fall, priesthood and disrupts the foundations of the Zadokite priesthood, which claimed its origin in Aaron at the time of the exodus, in an age that, for the Enochians, was already corrupted after the angelic sin and the flood.

Finally, the superiority of Enochic Judaism is guaranteed not only by its claimed antiquity but also by the superior status of their revealer, Enoch, who, unlike his rival Moses, lived before the angelic sin and never died but "was taken" by God (Gen 5:24), and being now in heaven has more direct access to God's revelation.

The anti-Zadokite character of Enochic Judaism and its priestly nature are confirmed by the Aramaic Levi, which endorses a pre-Zadokite ideal priesthood. "On one hand, the priests of the author's day . . . are implicitly indicted by the model of Levi that varies from the Pentateuchal norms, and . . . are explicitly accused by Levi's warnings about his apostate descendants. On the other hand there are priests who accept the norms established in Levi, the most ancient priest of all; they are the adherents to the author's views, those who prize purity, wisdom, and learning as traits proper to the priesthood. Aramaic Levi is a rejection of the former kind of priest, and a plea for acceptance of the latter type."⁴⁶

(d) While the terms of the opposition between the Enochians and the

44. Ibid., 226.

45. M. Himmelfarb, "Enoch as Priest and Scribe," in *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993) 23-25; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee," *JBL* 100 (1981) 575-600.

46. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 136-37.

Zadokites are clearly set, it is more difficult to reconstruct the chronology of the schism. The substantial consensus among scholars is that the Enochic literature is rooted in oral and literary traditions that predate the emergence of Enochic Judaism as an established movement. These traditions are as ancient as those preserved by Zadokite literature; they go back to the same Babylonian milieu of the exilic age and to the preexilic mythological heritage of ancient Israel.⁴⁷ But when did the schism between Enochians and Zadokites occur?

Ben Zion Wacholder takes Ezekiel as the forerunner of an anti-Zadokite opposition party, emphasizing the importance of the exiled prophet-priest for the development of Enochic Judaism, a role of founding father that scholars in Jewish mysticism and apocalypticism also attribute to Ezekiel.⁴⁸ In many ways, the pre-Maccabean Enochic literature, particularly chs. 21-36 of the Book of the Watchers, resembles Ezekiel.

Ezekiel was as important in Zadokite Judaism as in Enochic Judaism, however, and the same father-child relationship has been claimed between

47. Recent and less recent scholars have argued for the antiquity of Enochic traditions and their Babylonian roots; see J. C. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995); H. S. Kranvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*, WMANT 61 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1988); O. Neugebauer, "The Astronomical Chapters of the Ethiopic Book of Enoch (72 to 82)," in M. Black, et al., *The Book of Enoch, or, 1 Enoch*, SVTP 7 (Leiden: Brill, 1985) 387-88; J. C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*, CBQMS 16 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984); P. Grelot, "La géographie mytique d'Hénoch et ses sources orientales," *RB* 65 (1958) 33-69; idem, "La légende d'Hénoch dans les apocryphes et dans la Bible: Origine et signification," *RSR* 46 (1958) 5-26, 181-220.

48. B. Z. Wacholder, "Ezekiel and Ezekielianism as Progenitors of Essenianism," in Dimant and Rappaport, eds., *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 186-96. Cf. Himmelfarb, "From Ezekiel to the Book of the Watchers," in *Ascent to Heaven*, 9-28; D. J. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1988); J. E. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord*, WUNT 36 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1985); I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, AGJU 14 (Leiden: Brill, 1980); G. Quispel, "Ezekiel 1:26 in Jewish Mysticism and Gnosis," *VC* 34 (1980) 1-13; C. Rowland, "The Influence of the First Chapter of Ezekiel on Jewish and Early Christian Literature" (diss., Cambridge, 1974); R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, "The Temple and the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic," *VT* 20 (1970) 1-15; J. Maier, *Vom Kultus zur Gnosis* (Salzburg: O. Müller, 1964); G. G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken, 1941).

Ezekiel and Zadokite Judaism. Paul D. Hanson presents Ezekiel's vision of the new temple as "the fountainhead of the hierocratic tradition" and "the promulgation of a program of restoration."⁴⁹ More recently, Stephen L. Cook has convincingly demonstrated how "the school of Ezekiel is a starting point for elucidating both the Zadokite priesthood and Zadokite millennialism."⁵⁰

There is no reason to make the "pragmatic" Ezekiel clash with the "visionary" Ezekiel. In the context of the Babylonian exile, Ezekiel's dissociation of God's heavenly abode from the Jerusalem temple offered the common priestly background from which both Enochic and Zadokite traditions arose. The disagreement and therefore the emergence of two distinctive parties would occur only later, after the return from the exile, and would concern the modalities of the restoration. While the Zadokites claimed that God's order had been fully restored with the construction of the second temple,⁵¹ the Enochians still viewed restoration as a future event and gave cosmic dimensions to a crisis that for the Zadokites had momentarily affected only the historical relationships between God and Israel.

Paolo Sacchi argues that the schism between Enochians and Zadokites occurred at the beginning of the fourth century BCE. Studying the Book of the Watchers, he concludes that the complex stratification of the document implies a long redactional process that reaches back to the Persian period.⁵² He makes a strong case that the absence of the Enoch character in 1 Enoch 6-11 makes this section the oldest part of the Enochic collection, a section that in turn is based on earlier traditions, inasmuch as it combines two originally independent stories, the one centered on the sexual union of angels and women, the other on the spread of secret knowledge.⁵³ If Sacchi

49. P. D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*, rev. ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983).

50. S. L. Cook, *Prophecy and Apocalypticism: The Postexilic Social Setting* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995) 215.

51. P. R. Ackroyd, *Exile and Restoration*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968).

52. P. Sacchi, "Il Libro dei Vigilanti e l'apocalittica," *Hen* 1 (1979) 42-98; idem, "Ordine cosmico e prospettiva ultraterrena nel postesilio," *RivB* 30 (1982) 6-25. These articles are now available in English translation as "The Book of the Watchers and Apocalyptic," and "Cosmic Order and Otherworldly Perspectives in the Post-Exilic Period," in *Jewish Apocalyptic*, 32-71 and 72-87, respectively.

53. G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6-11," *JBL* 96 (1977) 383-405.

is correct, then the myth of the fallen angels would not be an expansion of Gen. 6:1-4, but rather a parallel development of the common mythological heritage shared by both the Enochians and the Zadokites.

The historical setting seems to support such a reconstruction of the origins of Enochic Judaism. Zadokite Judaism established itself only gradually through the reforms of Nehemiah and Ezra. The fifth century BCE seems still largely characterized by the conflict with the last representatives of the prophetic movements faithful to the heritage of the Davidic monarchy (Third Isaiah, Ruth, Jonah).⁵⁴ It was only in the fourth century BCE that Zadokite Judaism eventually triumphed and its opponents had to adjust themselves to the new situation and to define the terms of their opposition. While the Samaritans were excluded from the Jerusalem temple and founded a schismatic community, a priestly opposition party took shape in Judaea and coalesced around ancient myths with Enoch as their hero.⁵⁵

Michael E. Stone and David W. Suter share the view that the composition of the Book of the Watchers was the catalyst of the schism but point rather to the third century BCE. In their judgment, the process of the hellenization of the Zadokite priesthood gives the most likely setting.⁵⁶

Whether Enochic Judaism emerged in the fourth or third century BCE, one thing is certain: Enochic Judaism arose out of anti-Zadokite priestly circles that opposed the power of the priestly Zadokite establishment. The long debate in scholarship about whether the Enoch books come from priestly or antipriestly circles finds a consistent resolution when considering

54. P. Sacchi, "Il primo sadocitismo (520-400 circa a.C.)," in *Storia del Secondo Tempio*, 89-104; M. Smith, *Palestinian Parties and Politics*, e.g., 161-62.

55. See P. Sacchi, "La corrente enochica, le origini dell'apocalittica e il Libro dei Vigilanti," in *Storia del Secondo Tempio*, 148-55. On the Samaritans see idem, "I Samaritani," in *Storia del Secondo Tempio*, 127-34. Cf. A. D. Crown, ed., *The Samaritans* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1989); R. Pummer, *The Samaritans* (Leiden: Brill, 1987); R. J. Coggins, *Samaritans and Jews: The Origins of Samaritanism Reconsidered* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1975).

56. D. W. Suter, "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch 6-16," *HUCA* 50 (1979) 115-35; M. E. Stone, "The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century BCE," *CBQ* 40 (1978) 479-92 (repr. in M. E. Stone and D. Satran, eds., *Emerging Judaism* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989] 61-75); cf. M. E. Stone, *Scriptures, Sects and Visions: A Profile of Judaism from Ezra to the Jewish Revolt* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980); G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "Enoch, First Book of," *ABD* 2.508-16.

that the priestly nature of Enochic Judaism does not contradict its anti-priestly attitudes.⁵⁷ Enoch's "critique of the Jerusalem priestly establishment . . . takes seriously the priesthood's claim for itself and the importance of priestly duties and categories. This attitude is at once critical of the reality it sees in the temple and deeply devoted to the ideal of the temple understood in a quite concrete way."⁵⁸

At the roots of the Qumran community, therefore, is an ancient schism within the Jewish priesthood between Enochians and Zadokites. We do not know exactly who the Enochians were, whether they were genealogically related to the Zadokites or were members of rival priestly families. Unlike the situation with the Samaritans, we have no evidence that the Enochians formed a schismatic community, in Palestine or elsewhere. The Enochians were an opposition party within the temple elite, not a group of separatists. The words of Robert A. Kugler about Aramaic Levi apply to the entire Enochic literature in pre-Maccabean times: it testifies to "a period of time when there was a dispute regarding the proper character of the priestly office, but when the discussion was still quite tame, and there was yet room for differences of opinion."⁵⁹

In conclusion, the analysis of the ancient literature collected in the Dead Sea Scrolls leads to the striking discovery that the library of Qumran contained records of both pro-Zadokite and anti-Zadokite Judaism. The statements in Sirach supporting the freedom of human will (Sir 15:11-20) and polemically rejecting the idea of the devil (21:27) and the corruption of the universe (39:16-35) show that the conflict between Zadokite Judaism and Enochic Judaism did not belong to a remote past but was still unresolved at the beginning of the second century BCE.⁶⁰ Did the people of the Dead Sea Scrolls collect those ancient religious texts regardless of their

57. Hanson argued that the Enochic literature came from nonpriestly circles (*Dawn of Apocalyptic*).

58. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 27.

59. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest*, 135.

60. For a detailed analysis of the confrontation between Sirach and Enochic Judaism, see Boccaccini, "Ben Sira, Qohelet, and Apocalyptic," in *Middle Judaism*, 77-125; idem, "Origine del male, libertà dell'uomo e retribuzione nella sapienza di Ben Sira," *Hen* 8 (1986) 1-37. Comparing Sirach and 1 Enoch, Randall A. Argall has reached the same conclusion: "each tradition views the other among its rivals" (*1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation, and Judgment*, SBLEJL 8 [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995] 250).

ideological origins? Were they indifferent about the confrontation between Zadokites and Enochians? Or was there a logic in preserving the documents of both parties? The answer may be found in a series of documents that chronologically and ideologically lie between those ancient texts and the sectarian writings of the community of the Dead Sea Scrolls.