

SADDUCEE AND PHARISEE—THE ORIGIN AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE NAMES.^{1, 2}

By T. W. MANSON, M.A., D.LITT., D.D.

RYLANDS PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM AND EXEGESIS IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER.

IT will be convenient to begin with the name Sadducee and with the only explanation of it which seems to command any degree of confidence at the present time. The commonly accepted view is that *Σαδδουκαῖος* (Rabb. צדוקי) is derived from the proper name צדוק, *Ṣadoḳ* being the real or supposed founder of the party. There are two theories concerning the identity of this *Ṣadoḳ*. On the one he is the *Ṣadoḳ* who was high-priest in the reign of Solomon; on the other he is the person who actually founded the party or was an outstanding member of it at some time in the Greek period. Unfortunately, unlike the high-priest of Solomon's day, nothing is known about this second *Ṣadoḳ* except that his name has been preserved in the party name, for the Rabbinic account of the origins of the Sadducees and Boethosians may safely be dismissed as legendary. This latter explanation certainly avoids one of the difficulties attaching to the derivation from *Ṣadoḳ*, the high-priest of Solomon's time; but apart from this negative virtue it must, even though it is backed by the great authority of Ed. Meyer,³ be deemed to explain *ignotum per ignotius*.

The difficulties in the way of the current theory are serious.

(i) There is the fact that the reigning high-priestly family in the period with which we are concerned were not descended

¹ A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on the 10th of November, 1937.

² In collecting the materials for this paper I have had most generous help from Mr. M. N. Tod. He is, of course, not responsible for my conclusions.

³ *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, ii. 291.

from Şadok. The Hasmoneans belonged to the priestly course of Jojarib, and traced their descent to Aaron through a different line from the descendants of Şadok.¹

(ii) The natural way to describe the descendants of Şadok is not צַדִּיקִים but כְּנִי צַדִּיק ; and this is the form which is in fact used in Ecclesiasticus (li, 12, Heb.) and the Damascus document (f. 2a, l. 21 ; f. 2b, l. 3).²

(iii) The form Σαδδουκαῖος presupposes a doubled ט in the Hebrew or Aramaic original, and this is confirmed by the Rabbinic צַדִּיקִי, whereas in קִצְּ the ט is undoubled. Schürer (*G.J.V.*³ ii, 477 ff.) made a strong attempt to overcome this objection by showing that in MSS. of the Septuagint the name קִצְּ is frequently rendered by Σαδδουκ and the like. Against this it must be pointed out that we are concerned with the pronunciation of the names among Jews, and that here the variant readings of Christian copies of the Greek Bible do not really help us.³ The Rabbis knew that Sadducee was pronounced with a double ט and that קִצְּ was not.⁴ That is the vital fact.

Before going on to offer an explanation of the name Sadducee, which seems to avoid these difficulties, it may be well to reiterate one or two points which are well enough known but not always well enough remembered in discussing the Sadducees.

(i) The Sadducees are not to be identified simply with the whole body of the priesthood. Probably most, if not all, Sadducees were priests ; but certainly not all, or even most, of the priests were Sadducees. On the contrary many priests, we know for certain, were Pharisees.⁵

(ii) In matters of religion the leading characteristic of the Sadducees is a determined resistance to all innovations ; and,

¹ 1 *Macc.* ii, 1 ; xiv, 29.

² In Charles's division of the text : v, 7 ; vi, 2.

³ It is, for example, possible that the spelling Σαδδουκ is influenced by reminiscences of Σαδδουκαῖος.

⁴ So did Josephus. With him Sadducee is Σαδδουκαῖος ; but the high-priest, Şadok, is not Σάδδουκος but Σάδωκος (*Ant.*, viii, 11).

⁵ Josephus himself (*Vita*, 1 f., 12) ; Hananiah סִנְי דְבַרְנִים ; R. Jose, the priest, a disciple of Johanan b. Zakkai. We may also note the presence of Synagogue ritual in the Temple (*Tamid*, iv, 3 ; v, 1).

while stubborn conservatism is a common enough ecclesiastical phenomenon, it is not the stuff of which new sects are made. The matter has been well put by Meyer: 'So halten auch bei den Juden die besitzenden Klassen in Staat und Kirche an den alten Anschauungen fest und wollen von den Neuerungen nichts wissen. Aber eben dadurch sind sie zur Stagnation und schliesslich zum Absterben verurteilt; es fehlt ihnen ein lebendiges, schöpferisches Prinzip, sie können lediglich negieren.'¹

(iii) While the religious position of the Sadducees has to be defined in terms of the doctrines which they rejected, the positive characteristics of the party belong to another sphere. They are the wealthy (εὐποροὶ)² and the people of high social standing (πρῶτοι τοῖς ἀξιώμασιν).³ Their manners are stiff to the point of rudeness, and that even among themselves.⁴ In the administration of justice they are harsh and severe.⁵ These traits are all well known, and it is important to keep them in mind. The positive qualities of the Sadducees are just those most likely to be developed in a class that has had the responsibilities and the opportunities of political leadership in a period of almost continuous political crisis.

These considerations suggest that it is probably a mistake to look about for some historical person who may have laid down the Sadducean programme or embodied the Sadducean ideal; for there is no such ideal or programme. The Sadducees of history are a body of practical men running the affairs of their nation on what would nowadays be called common-sense lines, making the best bargain they can for their people—and incidentally for themselves—in the existing circumstances. For ideals and programmes we must look elsewhere, to the men who wrote the Apocalypses, codified the Law and the Tradition, or founded the community of the Essenes.

That being so we ought to look for the origin of the party name in the sphere in which the Sadducees lived and worked

¹ *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, ii, 293 f.

² Josephus, *Ant.*, xiii, 298.

³ *Ibid.*, xviii, 17. For the force of ἀξίωμα here, we may compare *Monumentum Ancyranum*, 34, 3: ἀξιώματι πάντων δόξενεγκα where ἀξιώματι renders the Latin *auctoritate*.

⁴ Josephus, *B.J.*, ii, 166.

⁵ *Ibid.*, *Ant.*, xx, 199.

—international politics. And in this sphere we come upon what is at least a possible explanation.

In the bilingual tariff inscription of Palmyra¹ (A.D. 137), line 11, we have mention of a body of officials who bear the name אִקְדֹס. The corresponding line (12) of the Greek version gives as the equivalent *ΣΥΝΔΙΚΟΥΣ*. These Syndics appear along with the Archons for the time being and the Ten; and, along with these persons, they are made responsible for the enforcement of the provisions of the fiscal decree. The possibility that the *Σαδδουκαῖοι* derive through אִקְדֹס from an original *σύνδικοι* seems worth investigation. There are several considerations which favour the hypothesis.

(i) It accounts satisfactorily for the doubled D, by assimilation of the N. Parallels can be found in Aramaic for Greek loan-words ending in *-os*, being provided with an Aramaic termination *ai* (Heb. *ī*).² An obvious difficulty is that the Palmyrene inscription spells the word with a *ס*, while the Rabbinical literature uses a *צ*. But this difficulty is not insuperable. For (a) there is evidence of the use of *צ* rather than *ס* for *σ* in the transliteration of Greek words;³ and (b) *צ* and *ס* appear as interchangeable equivalents of *σ* in transliteration of the same word in the same Aramaic dialect.⁴ Further, even if our supposed Aramaic transliteration of *σύνδικος* had been originally spelt with a *ס*, it is quite possible that popular etymology would substitute the *צ*, once the derivation of the word was forgotten.⁵ Indeed it would not be incredible that the

¹ *C.I.S. Aram.* 3913 (Pt. II, vol. iii, fasc. 1 (1926), pp. 33-73). The inscription is given also in Lidzbarski's *Handbuch*, pp. 463 ff. and (with commentary) in G. A. Cooke, *N.S.I.*, No. 147. The relevant part is given in the Appendix to Bevan's Commentary on Daniel.

² Dalman, *Gram.*,² p. 185.

³ E.g. *στόμωμα*, Aram. אַמְמָצָ, *σάπων*, Aram. קָסָצָ, Syr. ܟܥܣܝܢܐ; *προσωπον*, Aram. פְּרָצָפָ, Syr. ܦܪܥܝܢܐ.

⁴ *συμφωνία*, Bibl. Aram. סוּמְפִנְיָא, Syr. ܟܥܣܝܢܐ; *λησταί*, Chr. Pal. Aram. ܠܥܣܝܢܐ and ܠܥܣܝܢܐ; *στολή*, Aram. ܠܥܣܝܢܐ, ܠܥܣܝܢܐ, and ܠܥܣܝܢܐ; examples in Mandaic, Nöldeke, *Gram.*, p. 45.

⁵ An instructive display of the workings of popular etymology is given in *The Folk and their Word-lore*, by A. Smythe Palmer. We all know that Jerusalem artichokes do not derive, in any sense, from Jerusalem; but it may be a surprise to learn that the word 'belfry' has nothing to do with bells, and that 'arbours' did not originate from trees.

Sadducees themselves should have made the connection between their name and the root קצצ.¹

(ii) The hypothesis of a Greek origin of the name fits in with the fact that in the sphere of political administration, both military and civil, the infiltration of Greek terms is most marked.²

(iii) What we otherwise know about the functions of the *σύνδικοι* agrees very well with what we know or may reasonably conjecture about the activities of the Sadducees.

The *σύνδικοι*³ appear in Athenian history in the fourth century B.C. in connection with the annual *ἐπιχειροτομία νόμων*. They are five in number, and their business is to defend the existing laws against innovation or amendment. In the speeches of Lysias they seem to be the persons appointed to look after the interests of the State in judicial cases. Again the *σύνδικοι* are the representatives of the community in international disputes of a legal character. In the Imperial period there are numerous references to *σύνδικοι*, both of cities and of corporate bodies. In the case of these latter the syndics are generally permanent officials. In the case of cities they are usually appointed *ad hoc* to represent their city in a case before the Emperor or his deputy.

Further light is thrown on the office of the *σύνδικος* by the Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods. According to Seidl he has three main duties: (a) to give legal advice to the *βουλή* and the assembly of his community; (b) to represent them in dealings with the Roman authorities; and (c) to look after the fiscal interests of the community as against private

¹ Later in this paper it will be argued that the Pharisaic explanation of the name Pharisee by means of the root פרש is a piece of false etymology. Another example of the same kind of thing is the word אפיקורוס, אפיקורא, Greek Ἐπικούρειος, or (as I prefer to think) ἐπικουρος. This word is later connected with the root פקר, 'to be uncontrolled' or 'licentious' (Levy, *N.H.W.B.*, i, 143a).

² See the collection in Schürer, *G.J.V.*⁴, ii, 59 f.

³ The information here summarised is drawn mainly from the articles on *σύνδικος*, by Kahrstedt and Seidl, in Pauly-Wissowa (II, R., IV, 2 cols. 1331-3), and by Chapot in Daremberg and Saglio. Cf. also Liebenam, *Städteverwaltung im Römischen Kaiserreiche*, pp. 303 f.; Le Bas-Waddington, *Voyage Archéologique*, iii, 2, pp. 286 f.; J. G. Février, *Essai sur l'Histoire Politique et Economique de Palmyre*, p. 44.

individuals. Often, perhaps usually, the *σύνδικος* is also a *βουλευτής*.

It is worth noting that the *סִדְקָא* of the Palmyrene inscription appear as exercising the third of these functions; and Février conjectures that they may also have had the task of obtaining Roman approval for the fiscal changes before they were put into force, i.e. they may also have exercised the second function of representing the Palmyrene community in its relations with the Roman authorities.¹ How far does this description tally with the history of the ruling class in Judaea?

We are accustomed to think of the rise to power of the Hasmonaeans in terms of armed rebellion against the Seleucid empire; and this is a true view—up to the death of Judas Maccabaeus. After that the story is a different one. 'When Judas led them, they confronted a single central government, and won what they won by the sword from the royal forces. But from now the Seleucid house was with rare intervals represented by rival claimants, and the gains of the Jews were concessions from one or other of the kings, whose quarrels the astute Hasmonaeans knew how to turn to their own advantage.'² It is they who treat with successive overlords as the representatives of the Jewish community.

Further, for the greater part of this period they are the official interpreters of the law. It is true that later the Pharisees obtained a voice in the Jewish courts; but that was a concession only grudgingly granted when the Pharisees had got the support of a large body of public opinion behind them.

Again the system of direct taxation in the Jewish community

¹ One other example of the word *σύνδικος* is perhaps worth mentioning, though the interpretation of the evidence is matter of dispute. In the *Publications of an American Archaeological Expedition to Syria in 1899-1900*, Pt. III, p. 303, W. K. Prentice publishes an inscription (No. 383) found at Mushennef:

ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥΚΥΝ
ΔΙΚΟΥ ΝΟΜΑ
ΔΩΝ

and suggests that *σύνδικος* is the title of an Arab sheikh recognised in some degree as vassal of the Roman Empire. This suggestion is rejected by Chapot; and I am content merely to note the existence of the inscription.

² E. R. Bevan, *Jerusalem under the High Priests*, p. 100.

was intimately bound up with the Temple and the priesthood. It was therefore inevitable that the Sadducees, established in the upper ranks of the priesthood, should exercise control of the fiscal system.

In the three essential points the activities of the Sadducees agree with the description of the *σύνδικοι*. It is perhaps worth adding that their character as stubborn opponents of any innovation reminds one of the function of the original Athenian *σύνδικοι*.

There are a few other matters which must be at least touched upon before we leave the Syndics of the Jews.

First, and perhaps most important, are the Boethosians. Like the Sadducees they are commonly thought to derive their name from a person, that *Βοηθός*, who is said by Josephus to have been the father of Simon the high-priest. Simon was appointed to that office by Herod the Great in order that he might be of sufficient standing to be a suitable father-in-law for the king.¹ The family of Boethus produced a number of subsequent high-priests; and it is natural to suppose that this dynasty with their associates are referred to under the name of Boethosians. There are, however, some considerations that make one doubtful.

(i) In one early and clear reference to the dynasty of Boethus (b. Pes. 57a Abba Saul b. Batnith in the name of Abba Jose b. Hanin) the name given is not בִּיתוֹסִין but, as we should expect, בֵּית בִּיתוֹס.

(ii) If the Boethosians got their name from the Boethus who was the ancestor of the high-priestly dynasty, it is curious that Jewish legend should pass over the obvious and trace the Boethosians back to a mythical disciple of Antigonus of Sokho.

(iii) *Βοηθός* is not only a proper name: it is also an official term corresponding to the Latin *adiutor*.² As a technical term it appears in the Syriac ܒܘܬܘܫܘܬܐ where it is the equivalent of our word adjutant.³ *Βοηθός* is frequent in the ostraca for

¹ Jos., *Ant.*, xv, 320; cf. xvii, 78, 339; xviii, 3.

² Dittenberger, *O.G.I.S.*, 526¹; Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverwaltung*, II, p. 215, n. 1.

³ *Sev. Ant. Vit.*, 43, 8, cited in Payne-Smith, *Thes. Syr.*, Suppl. 44b.

the 'assistants' of the *πράκτορες* or tax-collectors, and less frequently for other assistant officers.¹ In a papyrus of the time of Hadrian the Praefect is described as *ὁ τοῦ νομοῦ βοηθός*—the helper of the district.²

In the light of this we may at least entertain the possibility that the Boethosians were originally the *βοηθοὶ τῶν συνδίκων*, the assistants of the men who administered the affairs of Judaea in the last two centuries B.C. It is noteworthy that all that is recorded of them in Rabbinical literature suggests that they are just a group within the Sadducean party.³ Indeed in the passages cited by Billerbeck⁴ the names Sadducee and Boethosian could be freely interchanged without creating any confusion.⁵ Further, it may be added that if this view of the origin of the Boethosians is correct, it will at least explain why the account in *Aboth de R. Nathan* (5) makes the rise of both Sadducees and Boethosians take place at the same time, and that a time in the second century B.C.⁶

It may also be permissible to cast a passing glance at another party mentioned in our Jewish sources the *אפיִקורוסין*, usually translated 'the Epicureans.' The impression left by the accounts of them is not that of a body of philosophers, but rather that they were 'lewd fellows of the baser sort,' who made rude remarks about the Law and shouted insults at passing Rabbis.⁷ I do not wish to indulge in too many rash hypotheses, and merely note the fact that *ἐπίκουροι* is a technical term for mercenary troops, and that foreign mercenaries were employed by the Hasmonaeans from John Hyrcanus onwards.⁸

Lastly, it may be suggested that the interpretation of the name Sadducee here proposed gains some support from the coins

¹ Cf. Wilcken, *Ostr.*, i, 171, 558, 618; *P. Fay*, 34² (A.D. 161) and the Editors' note; Mitteis-Wilcken, *Papyruskunde*, i, 84; *P. Oxy.*, 1469¹⁰ (A.D. 298), β. τοῦ στρατηγοῦ, the 'assistant of the strategus.'

² *P. Giss.*, i, 46.¹¹

³ Cf. Billerbeck, *Komm.*, iv, 341.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, iv, 345 ff.

⁵ Cf. Suidas (ed. Bernhardt), ii, col. 961. *ὅταν πλείονες βοηθοὶ καὶ συνήγοροι τῷ πράγματι παρῶσι, σύνδικοι καλοῦνται.*

⁶ For the passage from *Aboth de R. Nathan* see Billerbeck, iv, 343.

⁷ Cf., for example, p. *Sanh.*, x, 27d.

⁸ *Jos.*, *Ant.*, xiii, 249, 374; *B.J.*, i, 88.

of the Hasmonaeans, on what seems to be the most probable interpretation of the superscriptions. On coins of John Hyrcanus, Aristobulus I, Alexander Jannaeus, and Antigonus we get the phrases חבר היהודים or ראש חבר היהודים .¹ The second phrase makes it fairly clear that חבר is a collective noun; and two interpretations of the word seem possible: either it means the whole community of the Jews, or it means a smaller group within the community, the ruling body or executive of the people. The former view appears to be most in favour with scholars; but there are two considerations which incline one to prefer the latter.

(i) In the tariff inscription of Marseilles² we find that the regulations there made are made by the authority of the two שפטם and certain other persons described as חברנם 'their colleagues.'³ These colleagues must be councillors or senators of some kind.

(ii) Professor A. R. S. Kennedy⁴ suggests that חבר on the Jewish coins = $\tau\acute{o}$ *κοινόν*. He goes on to show that in Josephus' *Vita* 'the *κοινόν* must have been a body with functions resembling those of an executive of the *δημος*, and that the former is to be taken as synonymous with *οἱ τῶν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν πρῶτοι*, by which expression, at the first mention of his appointment as governor-general of Galilee (§ 9), Josephus designates the nominating body, which in all succeeding references he names $\tau\acute{o}$ *κοινόν τῶν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν*.'

One is accordingly inclined to see in the חבר of the Jewish coins the collective term for all those men who managed the affairs of the Jewish people in those troublesome times, and to regard חבר היהודים as the Hebrew equivalent of *οἱ σύνδικοι τῶν Ἰουδαίων*, just as later in Josephus the *κοινόν* is the equivalent of *οἱ τῶν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν πρῶτοι*.

¹ The essential facts are in Schürer, *G.J.V.*⁴, I, 268 ff., 275, 284 f., 355; more fully in G. F. Hill's *Catalogue of the British Museum Collection, Palestine volume* (1914).

² *C.I.S.*, I, 165; Cooke, *N.S.I.*, No. 42; Lagrange, *Études sur les Religions Sémitiques*, Appendix.

³ The phrasing of the Marseilles inscription reminds one of the official titles in the Aramaic letters in Ezra iv, 9, 17, 23; v, 3, 6; vi, 6, 13.

⁴ *H.D.B.*, iii, 425.

The conclusion which I should draw from this discussion is this: the Sadducees were originally the body of leading men in the Jewish nation, who under the leadership of the Hasmonaeans formed an executive and administrative council. This council appears in *Judith* and *Macc.* I, II, III as the *γερονσία*, on Jewish coins as *חבר היהודים*, and at a later date as the *סנהדרין*. One name for its members was *σύνδικος*, and from this Greek word came an Aramaic form *סדקאי*. When the origin of the name had been forgotten, it was explained by false etymology as derived from the root *צדק*, just as 'Epicurean' was connected with the root *פקר* and 'Pharisee' with the root *פרש*. The Aramaic form explains the new Greek *Σαδδουκαῖος*, and the popular etymology the Rabbinic Hebrew *צדוקי*. It is, I think, likely that the connection with the root *צדק* was made by the Sadducees themselves.¹

We turn now to the name Pharisee, and begin with the opposition between the Pharisees and Sadducees. The differences between the two parties are recorded in Josephus and in the Rabbinical literature: there is also information on some points of difference given in the New Testament. The material is collected by Schürer² and Billerbeck,³ and it has recently been carefully discussed by Finkelstein⁴ and Lauterbach.⁵ In the light of their treatment it is probably a mistake to describe any of the matters in dispute between Pharisees and Sadducees as unimportant. But there are issues that emerge as having

¹ In this connection I should draw attention to Lk. xvi, 14 f. I cannot help thinking that *οἱ Φαρισαῖοι* in v. 14 is a mistake. It is the Sadducees who are *φιλάργυροι*, who are proud (*τὸ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὑψηλόν*) and scornful (*ἐξεμυκτήριζον αὐτόν*). And if the saying was originally addressed to the Sadducees, the phrase *ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ δικαιοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς* becomes highly significant: 'you are the people who call themselves *צדקאי*.' This conjecture, which I worked out in some detail in *The Mission and Message of Jesus*, pp. 587 f., gains some support from the recently published Greek text of the last chapters of Enoch (*Studies and Documents*, VIII). There, in Enoch, cii, 10, we read: *ἴδετε οὖν, οἱ δικαιοῦντες [ἑαυ]τοὺς, ὅποια ἐγένετο αὐτῶν ἢ κατασ[τρο]φή κτλ.* This passage is held by Charles to be addressed by the author of the book to the Sadducees.

² *G.J.V.*,⁴ ii, 449 ff.

³ *Kommentar*, iv, 344 ff.

⁴ *Harvard Theological Review*, xxii (1929), 185-261.

⁵ *Hebrew Union College Annual*, VI (1929), 69-139.

been generally felt to be of critical importance. They are marked by the fact that in each case the Pharisees put forward a positive doctrine which the Sadducees simply reject.

(i) The Pharisees believe in a divine purpose in history. The course of events is overruled by divine providence in accordance with God's plan. Josephus¹ translates this doctrine for his Gentile readers into : *είμαρμένη τε καὶ θεῶ προσάπτουσι πάντα*. The Sadducees deny this.

(ii) The Pharisees believe in a future life where men are rewarded or punished according to their behaviour in this.² The Sadducees hold fast to the old doctrine of Sheol and reject this innovation.³

(iii) The Pharisees have a developed angelology and demonology, which the Sadducees reject.⁴

(iv) The Pharisees recognise as the supreme authority in religion the Scripture plus Tradition. The Sadducees recognise Scripture only.

The last of the four points is not directly important for our purpose. It is sufficient to say that it gives the fundamental position taken by the Sadducees in rejecting the characteristic teaching of the Pharisees : sound Biblical doctrine and no beliefs for which there is not clear warrant in Holy Writ.

With regard to the other three points we must go further.

¹ *B.J.*, ii, 162.

² In Josephus this doctrine becomes—again for the benefit of Gentile readers—the immortality of the soul and its reincarnation in another body (*Ibid.*, 163). But behind the sophisticated terminology the Pharisaic doctrine of the resurrection is plain enough.

³ In this the Sadducees hold fast to Scripture and reject tradition. For Sheol is the doctrine of the Old Testament. In holding fast to the 'Biblical' doctrine the Sadducees show themselves true Semites. We may recall the derision with which Mohammed's teaching about resurrection and judgment was received by the Arabs in the early stages of his prophetic career. Cf. Muir, *Life of Mohammad* (1923), pp. 78, 97. The Sadducean belief in Sheol is transformed, and in some measure misrepresented by Josephus (*B.J.*, ii, 165 ; *Ant.*, xviii, 16).

⁴ Acts xxiii, 8. This is the only *testimonium* for this article of Sadducean disbelief. Cf. Moore, *Judaism*, i, 68 ; Meyer, *op. cit.*, ii, 297. It is unlikely that the Sadducees denied outright the existence of angels and demons ; for such beings are mentioned in Scripture. What they rejected was the developed doctrine of the two kingdoms with their hierarchies of good and evil spirits.

The second and third are best disposed of in the careful words of G. F. Moore.¹

'The eschatology of Judaism has an unmistakable affinity to that of the Zoroastrian religion in the separation of the souls of righteous and wicked at death, and their happy or miserable lot between death and the resurrection, and in the doctrine of a general resurrection and the last judgment with its issues. The resemblances are so striking that many scholars are convinced that this whole system of ideas was appropriated by the Jews from the Zoroastrians, as well as that Jewish angelology and demonology were developed under Babylonian and Persian influence.'

The first point, providence and free-will, demands a closer examination. And it is important to see clearly what it is that the Sadducees are concerned to deny. Josephus says :²

'The Sadducees, the second of the orders, do away with Fate altogether, and remove God beyond, not merely the commission, but the very sight (*ἐφορᾶν*), of evil. They maintain that man has the free choice of good or evil, and that it rests with each man's will whether he follows the one or the other.'

It does not seem to me that the Sadducees are here attempting to deny Providence altogether and to remove God from all contact with the world after the manner of Epicureanism. It is the problem of evil with which they are concerned. They would allow that God is the cause of the good things that happen in the world. They could do no other, for Scripture asserted it plainly enough. What they would not allow was that God was in any sense the cause of evil, either by direct action or by toleration.³ They maintained that good and evil are matters of free human choice and, we may suppose, that man in choosing chooses the consequences that will follow from his decision. In other words the Sadducees, in dealing with the problem of evil, are still maintaining the positions adopted

¹ *Judaism*, ii, 394.

² *B. J.*, ii, 164 f. (Thackeray's translation).

³ This I take to be the meaning of *ἐφορᾶν*. It is not mere 'seeing,' but 'looking upon' in the pregnant sense in which the word is used of God in the LXX—looking upon with approval or toleration, seeing things as included in his own purpose.

by Job's comforters. At the same time they are rejecting another solution of the problem which explained evil by means of the demons and their prince. It was involved in this explanation that God had either created these evil forces or, at least, tolerated their existence; and this meant that the theology based on the explanation was dualistic, even if the dualism was qualified by the fact that the toleration of evil was only for the time being.

But here again we cannot but notice the resemblances between the doctrine rejected by the Sadducees and the doctrines of Zoroastrianism.

The result is that with regard to the most characteristic doctrines of the Pharisees the captious Sadducean critic could say with no little plausibility: 'This is not the religion of Israel as set forth in our Scriptures; it is the religion of Persia.' And that, I suggest, is what they did say. The word *Φαρισαῖος* is the Graecised form of the Aramaic פִּרְסָאָה Persian; and it was applied to the innovators in theology in much the same way that the term 'Romaniser' is used in theological controversy in our own day. The name stuck,¹ and at a later date was furnished with an edifying etymology. It was explained that it was really connected with the root פִּרַשׁ, and meant that those who bore it were separated from all that is abominable in God's sight. So we get the final form of the name in Rabbinic Hebrew—פִּרְוִשִׁי with its clear indication of the *Hebrew* passive participle.

Philologically the equation *Φαρισαῖος* = פִּרְסָאָה does not seem to present any difficulties. Hebrew or Aramaic פ may be transliterated by π or φ: and φ is rather the more frequent of the two. Quite often π and φ occur as alternative renderings in the same word. For example Hebrew פִּרְשׁ appears in Greek dress as *πάσχα*, *φάσεκ*, or *φάσεχ*,² and the proper name פִּתְחִיָּה is rendered by *Παθαῖος* and *Φαθαῖος*.

Further, the termination *-aios* is perfectly normal. The

¹ It is to be noted that the Pharisees in the early period do not use the name of themselves. It does not appear, for example, in *Ps. Sol.*, *Test. XII Patr.*, or the Greek portion of *Enoch*.

² Thackeray, *Grammar*, i, 32.

vast majority of words in *-aios* listed in Hatch and Redpath, vol. iii. are gentile names corresponding to Hebrew words with the ending יָ (= Aram. הַאֲרָם). The real difficulty is to account for the ending *-aios* on the common explanation of *Φαρισαῖος* as derived from an Aramaic Passive Participle פְּרִישָׁא. I cannot find any word ending in *-aios* in Hatch and Redpath derived from an Aramaic Passive Participle. The nearest analogy would be *Ἀσιδαῖος* (= Heb. אֲסִידָא), *Ναζειραῖος* (= Heb. נְזִיר), and *Ναθιναῖου* (= Heb. נְתִינָיִם). In that case *Φαρισαῖος* would presuppose a Hebrew word פְּרִישׁ; but the extant Hebrew equivalent of *Φαρισαῖος* is פְּרוּשִׁי, and there would have been no need to produce this word if there had been a word פְּרִישׁ already in existence.

It may be objected to our explanation of the term Pharisee that, if it were correct, one would have expected that פֶּרְסָאָה would have been translated by *Πέρσης* or *Περσικός* instead of being transliterated by *Φαρισαῖος*. The answer to that is that, by the time that a Greek equivalent of פֶּרְסָאָה came to be required, the origin of the name was already forgotten. (How many Englishmen, who use the word 'Tory' in ordinary conversation, know its original meaning and derivation?) The word had become a label, and the only thing to be done with it was to transliterate it.

And it may be added that the transliteration tends to confirm our hypothesis. Why is φ used in preference to π? I think the answer is to be found in the Greek versions of Daniel.¹

In the story of Belshazzar's feast the writing on the wall is given in Aramaic (v. 25):

מִנָּא מִנָּא תִּקְל וּפְרָסִין

In the version of Theodotion (v. 25) the inscription is transliterated

Μανη θεκελ φαρης

In v. 28 of the Aramaic the inscription is thus explained:

פְּרָס פְּרִיסַת מְלִכּוּתְךָ וַיְהִיבַת לְמַדֵּי וּפְרָס :

¹ I am indebted to Mr. Tod for the reminder that this point was worth investigation.

This is rendered by Theodotion :

φαρες, διήρηται ἡ βασιλεία σου καὶ ἐδόθη Μήδοις καὶ Πέρσαις.

With this we may compare the passage which appears at the beginning of ch. v in the LXX :

ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ νυκτὶ ἐξῆλθον δάκτυλοι ὡσεὶ ἀνθρώπου καὶ ἐπέγραψαν ἐπὶ τοῦ τοίχου οἴκου αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ κονιάματος κατέναντι τοῦ λύχνου Μανη φαρες θεκελ. ἔστι δὲ ἡ ἐρμηνεία αὐτῶν · μανη ἠρίθμηται, φαρες ἐξῆγραι, θεκελ ἔσταται.

The fact that the Aramaic gives the two forms פִּרְסָא and פִּרְסָא is a clear indication that in the mind of the writer (or, more probably, of a subsequent editor or glossator) there was a double word-play involving both the verb פָּרַס 'to divide' and the noun פִּרְסָא 'the Persian land or nation.' Now the pronunciation of the word written on the wall is given in both Greek versions as *φαρες*. If, then, there was to be a play on the word פִּרְסָא (or פִּרְסָא), 'Persia' (or 'Persian'), it seems likely that פִּרְסָא and פִּרְסָא will have been pronounced in such a way that φ would be the most natural transliteration for the initial פ. In that case *Φαρισαῖος* preserves the Palestinian pronunciation of פִּרְסָא, and the φ is satisfactorily accounted for.

If the theories put forward in this paper are sound, they bring into prominence certain points which are highly significant.

The Sadducees appear more definitely than ever as a political order. Their influence on the development of the Jewish faith is seen to be negligible. In theology they are the representatives of an ossified orthodoxy with no guiding principle except *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. Consequently when the Jewish state ceased to exist as a political entity and the Temple, the centre of the traditional ritual, was destroyed, the Sadducees simply faded out of the picture.

The living branch of Judaism was the Pharisaic. The Pharisees were doubtless orthodox in the sense of holding to the old ways and the central doctrines of the religion of Israel; but they were also receptive to new ideas. I am not concerned to decide the question whether their characteristic doctrines

were derived from Persia or were the development—under Persian influence—of ideas already implicit in Hebrew religion. The point is that the new ideas were developed, and developed by the Pharisees. They were the upholders of ‘tradition’; but the *παράδοσις* of the Pharisees was a living growing thing, and the future of Judaism as a religion lay with them. And finally their characteristic doctrines—the doctrines which, on my view, earned them their nick-name—became the background for the earliest Christian theology.