

altogether hostile to Pharisaism. In the last decades preceding the destruction of the Temple and the first decades following it, there were a number of priests who themselves belonged to the Pharisees.⁷ Their opponents were accordingly not the priests as such, but only the chief priests and the patrician laity, those who by virtue of their wealth and office held an influential position in civil life.

In view of these facts, it is reasonable to suppose that the Sadducees derived their name צדוקים,⁸ Σαδδουκαῖοι,⁹ from the priest Zadok whose descendants had held the priestly office in Jerusalem since Solomon's time. At all events, it may be considered certain that the name does not spring, as was often thought, from the adjective צדיק.¹⁰ Instead, most scholars now prefer to connect it with the proper name צדוק.¹¹ For in the first derivation the change from 'i' to 'u' remains unexplained,¹² whereas the pronunciation of the proper name Zadok as Zadduk (Σαδδούκ, צדוק) is vouched for by the common testimony of the

Levite an Israelite'. Precedence was also given to priests in the reading of Scripture in the synagogue (mGit. 5:8).

7. It is attested already of Yose b. Yoezer that he was a כהן in the priesthood (mHag. 2:7). A certain Yoezer, who was a Temple official and a priest, belonged to the school of Shammai (mOrl. 2:12). In Josephus we find a Ἰωάλαρος (Γολαρος) ἱερατικοῦ γένους, Φαρισαῖος καὶ αὐτός, *Vita* 39 (197); cf. 63 (324). Josephus himself was a priest and a Pharisee, *Vita* 1 (2). There is also mention of a R. Judah ha-Kohen (mEdu. 8:2) and a R. Yose ha-Kohen (mEdu. 8:2; mAb. 2:8). Most renowned among the priestly Torah scholars are Hananiah (see above p. 371) and R. Eleazar ben Azariah (see p. 375). R. Ishmael and R. Tarphon are also said to have been priests (see pp. 376, 378).

8. On this designation see mYad. 4:6-7; mErub. 6:2; mMak. 1:6; mPar. 3:7; mNid. 4:2. The singular is in mErub. 6:2.

9. Cf. Josephus and the N.T.

10. Thus many of the Church Fathers, e.g. Epiphanius, *Haer.* 14, 2: ἐπὶ νομαζοῦσι δὲ οὗτοι ἐάν τοις Σαδδουκαίοις, δέχθεν ἀπὸ δικαιοσύνης τῆς ἐπικλησέως ὀρρωμένους. Σεδὲκ γὰρ ἐρμηνεύεται δικαιοσύνη. Jerome, *In Mt.* 22:23 (CCL lxxvii, p. 205): 'Sadducaei autem, quod interpretantur iusti'. The derivation from צדק was advocated by Derenbourg, *Essai*, p. 78.

11. See the fully documented statement of the *status quaestionis* in Le Moyne, pp. 157-63, and on the history of the hypothesis, L. Finkelstein, *The Pharisees* II, p. 663, n. 20. The suggestion of T. W. Manson that the origin of the name is to be sought in the Greek σύνδικος, appearing in a bilingual Palmyrene inscription as סדוקים ('Sadducees and Pharisees: the Origin and Significance of the Names', BJRL 22 (1938), pp. 1-18), is classified by Le Moyne among the 'solutions fantaisistes' (*op. cit.*, p. 159) on the grounds that it does not satisfactorily account for either consonants or vowels of the New Testament or Josephan form.

12. Cf. however, R. North, 'The Qumran "Sadducees"', CBQ 17 (1955), pp. 165-6 who, on the basis of Accadian *šaduk* ('right', 'just'), interprets 'Sadducees' of a person 'administering justice'. See also Le Moyne, *op. cit.* p. 162. The explanation still fails to account for the doubling of the dalet. See further n. 13 below.

Septuagint,¹³ Josephus,¹⁴ and a vocalized manuscript of the Mishnah.¹⁵ Thus the party named צדוקים is related to צדוק as ברייתים is to Boethus and אפיקורוסים to Epicurus. Less sure is the identity of the Zadok from whom the Sadducees took their name. A legend in Aboth de R. Nathan traces them to a Zadok, disciple of Antigonus,¹⁶ but the account is historically unreliable, (1) because Aboth de R. Nathan is of late origin; (2) because its information on the Boethusians is wrong (see n. 16); and (3) because the legend is based not on tradition but on scholarly deduction: i.e., that the Sadducees, who denied the immortality of the soul, arrived at their heresy through misunderstanding a saying of

13. The name Zadok occurs in the Old Testament fifty-three times. Among these ten passages in Ezekiel, Ezra, and Nehemiah (Ezek. 40:46; 43:19; 44:15; 48:11; Ezr. 7:2; Neh. 2:4, 29; 10:21; 11:11; 13:13) where the LXX has the form Σαδδούκ. The Lucianic recension has almost always Σαδδούκ in the other passages; cf. also the Greek text of the Ascension of Isaiah 2:5 (Amherst Papyri, ed. Grenfell and Hunt (1908), p. 4), though the editor wrongly corrected the Σαδδούκ of the MS. to Σαδούκ. Cf. similar statistics from Hatch-Redpath, and see Le Moyne, p. 158, n. 2: the spelling Σαδούκ(χ) (which one would expect for סדוק) does appear to be the rare exception, e.g., 1 Chron. 29:22 Σαδωχ (Luc. Σαδδουκ). T. W. Manson argues (*op. cit.*, p. 145, n. 4) that the Greek form of the name has been influenced by the form of Σαδδουκαίου. Cf. also Le Moyne, p. 158 and n. 9.

14. A Pharisee, Σαδδουκος (Niese: Σαδδουκος) is mentioned in *Ant.* xviii 1, 1 (4). See also 'Αναβας Σαδδουκι in *B.J.* ii 17, 10 (451); 21, 7 (628), where Σαδδουκι cannot mean 'Sadducee', the person in question according to *Vita* 39 (197) being a Pharisee. Cf. G. R. Driver, *The Judaean Scrolls* (1965), pp. 229 ff.

15. In the Cod. de Rossi 138, the name of Rabbi Zadok is pointed in only a minority of passages, and where it is, usually reads *Ṣaddūḳ* or *Ṣaddūḳ*. See also mPea. 2:4; mTer. 10:9; mShab. 24:5; mPes. 3:6; 7:2; 10:3. See however, Le Moyne, *op. cit.*, pp. 157-8. The Albeck-Yalon edition of the Mishnah always points the name as *Ṣaddōḳ*.

16. Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan (ed. Schechter, p. 26): 'Antigonus of Sokho took over from Simeon the Righteous. He used to say: Be not like slaves that serve their master for the sake of reward; be rather like slaves who serve their master with no thought of reward; and let the fear of heaven be upon you, so that your reward may be doubled in the world to come. Antigonus of Sokho had two disciples who used to study his words. They taught them to their disciples, and their disciples to their disciples. These latter scrutinized the words and said, "What were our fathers thinking of that they spoke thus? Is it possible that a labourer should work all day and not take his reward in the evening? If our fathers had known that there is another world and a resurrection of the dead, they would not have spoken in this manner". Then they arose and broke away from the Torah and split into two sects, the Sadducees and the Boethusians: the Sadducees after the name of Zadok, the Boethusians after the name of Boethus.' For an annotated translation, see A. J. Saldarini, *The Fathers according to Rabbi Nathan* (1975), pp. 85-6. See also A. Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 105; J. Wellhausen, *Pharisäer und Sadducäer*, p. 46; C. Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, 1877, p. 126. The Boethusians, ברייתים, who are also mentioned once in the Mishnah (mMen. 10:3), derived their name from the High-Priestly family of Boethus in the time of Herod (see above, p. 234). Thus they are in any case related to the Sadducees. See also however, Le Moyne, *op. cit.*, pp. 113-15, 160-2.

Antigonus of Sokho, viz. that man should do good without regard to future reward.¹⁷ Accordingly, the only remaining choice is either to derive the name Sadducee from some unknown Zadok who at some unknown time founded the party of aristocrats, or to trace it back to the priestly line of the Zadokites. The former is possible but the latter more probable.¹⁸ The descendants of Zadok performed the priestly duties in the Temple at Jerusalem from the time of Solomon. Since the Deuteronomic reform, which forbade all sacrifice outside Jerusalem, only the rites performed there were lawful. Hence Ezekiel, in his ideal image of a theocracy, grants the privilege to the 'Zadokites' (בני צדוק) alone to officiate as priests in the Temple at Jerusalem (Ezek. 40:46; 43:19; 44:15; 48:11). When worship was restored after the exile, Ezekiel's demand was not wholly carried out inasmuch as some of the other priestly clans were able to uphold their rights.¹⁹ The Zadokites nevertheless formed the nucleus and main body of the priesthood in the post-exilic age. This is most clearly to be seen from the fact that the Chronicler in his genealogy traces back the house of Zadok to Eleazar, the elder son of Aaron, thereby implying that the Zadokites had, if not the only, at any rate the first and nearest claim to the priesthood (1 Chron. 5:30-41). This procedure of the Chronicler proves at the same time that the name of the ancestor of this clan was still vividly remembered in the epoch of Chronicles, in the fourth century B.C. Jesus ben Sira also praises God that he 'has chosen the sons of Zadok to be priest': חורר לבחור בבני צדוק לכהן (Ecclus. 51:12, line 9 of a hymn missing from the Greek and Syriac).²⁰ A party associated with the chief priests could therefore well be called Zadokite or Sadducean. For although these priests constituted but a fraction of the בני צדוק, they were nevertheless their authoritative representatives. Their orientation was Zadokite.²¹

In addition to their aristocratic status, a further distinctive characteristic of the Sadducees is that they acknowledged only the written

17. Cf. Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 46. For the saying of Antigonus of Sokho, see mAb. 1:3. See above, p. 357.

18. Cf. Le Moyne, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

19. This may be inferred from the fact that in Chronicles, in addition to the line of Eleazar (i.e. the Zadokites), that of Ithamar appears authorized to perform the priestly offices (1 Chron. 24). See above, p. 252, n. 56.

20. S. Schechter, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (1899), pp. (22) and li; H. L. Strack, *Die Sprüche Jesus', des Sohnes Sirachs* (1903), p. 55; *The Book of Ben Sira*, edited by the Academy of the Hebrew Language (1973), p. 65.

21. Cf. especially Wellhausen, *Pharisäer und Sadducäer*, pp. 47-50; Leszynsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 96 ff.; Le Moyne, *op. cit.*, pp. 350 ff. The structure of the Qumran community provides a convincing parallel. It consists of 'the sons of Zadok; the Priests . . . and the multitude of the men of the community' (1QS 5:2-3; 1QSa 1:2). Cf. G. Vermes, *Discovery in the Judean Desert* (1956), pp. 74-76; *DSS*, pp. 16-33; *DSS*, pp. 87-115.

Torah as binding, and rejected the entire body of traditional interpretation and further development formed during the course of the centuries by the Torah scholars. 'The Sadducean group say that only the written regulations are to be esteemed as lawful, and that those which derive from the tradition of the fathers are not to be observed.'²² So remote were they from the Pharisee principle of absolute authority that they actually believed it commendable to contradict their teachers.²³ It was a question, as is evident, of rejecting the *παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*, the whole accumulation of legal rulings developed by the Pharisaic Torah scholars in their supplementation and classification of the written law. The opinion of many of the Church Fathers that the Sadducees acknowledged only the Pentateuch but rejected the Prophets,²⁴ has no support in Josephus and is therefore regarded as erroneous by most modern scholars.²⁵ A real rejection of the Prophets

22. *Ant.* xiii 10, 6 (297), cf. xviii 1, 4 (16). Commenting on the latter passage in the Loeb edition, L. H. Feldman points out that the Sadducees nevertheless had their own traditions. But these were decrees or *gezerot* (cf. mMak. 1:6), proclaimed by virtue of priestly authority, and not presented as an oral Torah revealed by God to Moses and transmitted via an uninterrupted chain of tradition.

23. *Ant.* xviii 1, 4 (16). Daube has suggested that the Sadducees took over this method of argumentation from the Hellenistic schools of philosophy ('Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric', *HUCA* 22 (1949), p. 243, but Feldman, *loc. cit.* (above, n. 22) notes that there is no evidence of contact between the Sadducees and Hellenistic schools.

24. Origen, *Contra Celsum* i 49 (ed. Lommatzsch XVIII, p. 93): οἱ μόνου δὲ Μωσέως παραδεχόμενοι τὰς βίβλους Σαμαρεῖς ἢ Σαδδουκαῖοι. *Idem*, *In Mt.* 22:29 (Lommatzsch IV, 166): τοῖς Σαδδουκαίοις μὴ προσιεμένοις ἄλλην γραφὴν ἢ τὴν νομικὴν . . . τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους δὲ μὴ προσιεμένοι τὰς ἐξ ἡς τῷ νόμῳ γραφὰς πλανῶνται. *Ibid.* vol. xvii, ch. 36 (on Mt. 22:31-32). (Lommatzsch IV, p. 169): καὶ εἰς τοῦτο δὲ φήσομεν δτι μύρια δυνάμενος περὶ τοῦ ὑπάρχοντος τὴν μέλλονσαν ζωὴν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις παραθέσθαι ἀπὸ προφητῶν ὁ Σωτὴρ· τοῦτο οὐ πεποίηκεν διὰ τὸ τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους μόνην προσέσθαι τὴν Μωσέως γραφὴν ἀφ' ἧς ἐβουλήθη αὐτοὺς συλλογισμῷ δυνασκῆσαι. Jerome, *In Mt.* 22:31-2: 'Hi quinque tantum libros Moysis recipiebant, prophetarum vaticinia respuentes. Stultum ergo erat inde proferre testimonia, cuius auctoritatem non sequebantur'. Hippolytus, *Adv. Haer.* ix 29: προφήταις δὲ οὐ προσέχουσιν ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐτέροις τισὶ σοφοῖς. Πλὴν μόνῳ τῷ διὰ Μωσέως νόμῳ, μηδὲν ἐρμηνεύοντες. Ps.-Tertullian, *De praescriptione haereticorum* (Migne, PL II, col. 61): 'taceo enim Iudaismi haereticos, Dositheum inquam Samaritanum, qui primus ausus est prophetas quasi non in spiritu sancto locutus repudiare, taceo Sadducaeos, qui ex huius erroris radice surgentes ausi sunt ad hanc haeresim etiam resurrectionem carnis negare'. The Pseudo-Tertullian tractate, in addition to the genuine *De praescriptione haereticorum*, probably belongs to the first half of the third century, see B. Altaner, *Patrology*, p. 172. Cf. S. J. Isser, *The Dositheans* (1976), pp. 33-8. Jerome has the same, almost word for word, in his *Contra Luciferianos* 23 (Migne, PL XXIII, col. 178): 'taceo de Iudaismi haereticis, qui ante adventum Christi legem traditam dissiparunt: quod Dosithaeus Samaritanorum princeps prophetas repudiavit: quod Sadducaei ex illius radice nascentes etiam resurrectionem carnis negaverunt'.

25. Cf. Le Moynes, *op. cit.*, pp. 358-9; the Prophets and Writings may have been regarded as less authoritative than the Torah by Sadducees and Pharisees alike. Leszynsky (*op. cit.*, p. 165) argues that this exclusive acceptance of the Torah

is unthinkable, but it is quite possible that the Sadducees considered only the Pentateuch as canonical in the strict sense of the word.²⁶

In the face of the opposition of principles which the Sadducees raised against the whole Pharisaic tradition, the individual legal differences between the two parties possess but a secondary interest. A number are mentioned in rabbinic literature,²⁷ but the relevant notices cannot in the main be accepted as wholly historical, especially the statements contained in the medieval commentary on *Megillath Taanith*. But as far as they are trustworthy, they are so scattered and disconnected that it is impossible to discern in them any unifying principle, such as the defence of priestly interests by the Sadducees. In penal legislation the Sadducees were more severe and the Pharisees more mild, according to Josephus.²⁸ This may have been due to the Sadducees' strict adherence to the letter of the law, while the Pharisees did all in their power to mitigate its severity by interpretation and adaptation. In one of the points mentioned by the *Mishnah*, the Sadducees went even beyond the demands of the Torah: they required compensation not only for injury caused by a man's ox or ass (as in *Exod.* 21:32, 35 f.), but also by his manservant or maidservant.²⁹ On the other hand, they insisted that false witnesses should be put to death only when the accused, as a result of their testimony, had already been executed (*Dt.* 19:19-21), whereas the Pharisees asked for this to be done even if only judgement had been pronounced.³⁰ In this case, therefore, the Pharisees were more severe. These differences were obviously not really differences of principle. Similarly, in questions of ritual it is possible to speak of a difference of principle only in so far as the Sadducees did not regard as binding the Pharisaic rulings on, for example, cleanness and uncleanness. They derided their Pharisaic opponents because of the oddities and inconsistencies that resulted

can have been confined only to certain 'Sadducean' sects who shared this attitude with the Samaritans. On the Church Fathers' confusion of Sadducees and Samaritans, cf. Le Moyne, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

26. So K. Budde, *Der Kanon des Alten Testaments* (1900), pp. 42-3. Cf. Le Moyne, *op. cit.*, pp. 357-9.

27. A. Geiger, *Urschrift*, pp. 134 ff.; J. Derenbourg, *Essai*, pp. 132 ff.; J. Wellhausen, *Pharisäer*, pp. 56-75; J. Z. Lauterbach, *art. cit.*, HUCA 6 (1929), pp. 69-139; the material is collected in Str.-B., IV, pp. 344 ff.; the rabbinic sources are discussed by Leszynsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-141, and Le Moyne, *op. cit.*, pp. 167-239. See also S. Zeitlin, *Studies in the Early History of Judaism* II (1974), pp. 259-91.

28. *Ant.* xx 9, 1 (199); cf. xiii 10, 6 (294).

29. *mYad.* 4:7. Cf. pp. 384 f. above.

30. *mMak.* 1:6. On juridical differences, see G. Hölscher, *Der Sadduzäismus*, pp. 22-4 and 30-2, where the Sadducean view is attributed to Roman influence. Cf. also Le Moyne, *op. cit.*, pp. 227-9.

from their laws of purity.³¹ The Pharisees in their turn declared all Sadducee women unclean, 'if they follow after the ways of their fathers'.³² Yet it is evident that the Sadducees were far from renouncing the principle of Levitical purity in itself, since they demanded an even higher degree of purity than did the Pharisees for priests who burned the Red Heifer.³³ This is at the same time the only point on which a definite priestly concern is apparent, namely, that of priestly ritual cleanness. With regard to festival laws, it is mentioned that the 'Boethusians' (who appear to have been a branch of the Sadducees) held that the sheaf of first-fruits at the Passover should not be offered on the second day of the feast, but on the day following the Sabbath in the festival week,³⁴ and that the Feast of Weeks falling seven weeks later (Lev. 23:11) should correspondingly always be celebrated on the day following the Sabbath.³⁵ This difference, however, is so purely technical that it merely gives expression to the exegetical outlook of the

31. The attacks of the Sadducees on the Pharisees mentioned in mYad. 4:6, 7 can only have been intended as mockery, for the Sadducees would surely not agree that 'heretical books' soiled the hands (mYad. 4:6), or that the 'stream' should be declared unclean when poured from a clean vessel to an unclean (mYad. 4:7). But they wished to ridicule the peculiarities of the Pharisees. See Le Moyne, *op. cit.*, pp. 209 ff., 212 ff.

32. mNid. 4:2.

33. mPar. 3:7. The Torah lays down that the priest should take a bath of purification after the burning of the Heifer; he then remained unclean until the evening (Num. 19:3-8). The Sadducees wished him to burn the Heifer after he had become clean at sunset. Their view was therefore more demanding. Cf. Le Moyne, *op. cit.*, pp. 266 ff.

34. mMén. 10:3. That is, they understood by the מחר (Lev. 23:11), not the first day of the feast, but the weekly Sabbath. The traditional interpretation which takes it to be the first day of the feast, and 'the morrow of the Sabbath' to be the second day, is attested by the LXX ($\tau\eta\ \epsilon\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\omicron\nu\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \pi\rho\acute{o\tau\eta\varsigma$), Philo, *Spec. Leg.* ii 29 (162), and Josephus, *Ant.* iii 10, 5 (248). On the history of the interpretation, and especially on Sadducean opinion, see Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, pp. 59 f. and 67; D. Chwolson, *Das letzte Passahmahl Christi* (1892), pp. 60-7; G. Hölscher, *Der Sadduzäismus*, pp. 24-6; Leszynsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 57 ff.; Str.-B., pp. 850 ff.; Finkelstein, *Pharisees* II, pp. 641-54; Le Moyne, *op. cit.*, pp. 177-90. According to the Book of Jubilees 15:1; 16:13; 44:4-5, the Festival of Harvest (identical with the Feast of Weeks, see 6:21; 22:1) must have been celebrated 'in the middle' of the third month. This dating follows neither the Pharisaic nor Sadducean exposition of Lev. 23:11 and 15, but is based on a solar calendar, adopted also in the Qumran community (cf. vol. I, pp. 596-601), in which Passover (15 Nisan) is always celebrated on a Wednesday. If the count of the fifty days begins on 'the morrow of the Sabbath', i.e. a Sunday, in the week following Passover (that is on 26 Nisan), the Feast of Weeks falls on Sunday 15 Sivan, in 'the middle' of the third month, instead of on 6 Sivan of the traditional Jewish calendar. Cf. A. Jaubert, *La date de la Cène* (1957), pp. 20-4; J. van Goudoever, *Biblical Calendars* (1961), pp. 15-29.

35. mHag. 2:4. The words $\text{עֲשֵׂה חֲמִשָּׁה יָמִים אַחֲרֵי הַשַּׁבָּת}$ 'The Feast of Weeks falls on the day after the Sabbath', are given in mHag. 2:4 as an erroneous view attributed in mMén. 10:3 to the Sadducees (Boethusians).

Sadducees with its non-acceptance of tradition. It is not an issue of principle. The one difference that mattered in the law of festivals, particularly in the interpretation of the Sabbath commandment, was that the Sadducees did not acknowledge the Pharisaic rules as binding.³⁶ Thus the difference in principle between the two parties is confined to this general denial by the Sadducees of the body of tradition held by the Pharisees to be compulsory. All the rest are differences which necessarily arise when one school of thought refuses to acknowledge as an obligation the exegetical tradition of the other. Moreover, it should not be concluded that the Sadducees rejected every tradition held by the Pharisees. Quite apart from the fact that from the time of Alexandra they were no longer the exclusive leaders, they agreed in theory with some, perhaps with much, of the Pharisaic tradition. They denied only its general authority, and reserved the right to their own opinion.

In this rejection of the Pharisaic legal tradition, the Sadducees represented an older viewpoint: they stood by the written Torah. For them, none of the subsequent development was binding. Their religious outlook was similarly very conservative. Its essential features have already been discussed (cf. pp. 391-4 above). (1) They rejected belief in bodily resurrection and in reward in a life to come, and indeed in any kind of personal survival whatever. (2) They also denied the existence of angels and spirits. (3) They maintained finally 'that good and evil are in the choice of man and he can do the one or the other as he wishes'; that God therefore exercises no influence upon human actions and that man is himself the cause of his own fortune and misfortune.³⁷

There is no doubt that in regard to the first two points the Sadducees represented the original doctrine of the Old Testament as distinct from that of later Judaism. For with the exception of the Book of Daniel, the Old Testament knows little of the resurrection of the body or of retribution in a future life, of personal salvation of the individual or future punishment for the sins of this life, but only of a shadowy continuation of existence in Sheol. Likewise, belief in angels and demons in the form in which it later developed is foreign to the Old Testament. The Sadducees were thus faithful to the earlier outlook in both these respects.

The Sadducees laid an emphasis on human freedom in which, if the

36. From mEru. 6:2, it might be thought that the Sadducees also observed certain Pharisaic decrees regarding the Sabbath. In fact, however, the context shows that the Sadducees 'did not acknowledge (the law of) 'erub' (mEru. 6:1). The Sadducee's intention can therefore only have been to annoy his Pharisee neighbour. Cf. Le Moyne, *op. cit.*, p. 204.

37. J. Halévy, 'Traces d'aggadot sadducéennes dans le Talmud', REJ 8 (1884), pp. 38-56.

relevant statements of Josephus are to be believed, it is possible to catch sight of a lessening of the religious motive. They wished to think of man as relying on himself and rejected the idea that God also played a part in human affairs.

These last remarks may in part indicate how the aristocracy came to adopt the course known as 'Sadducean'. To understand the origin of this school of thought, it is necessary to proceed from the fact that already in the Persian, but particularly in the Greek period, the priestly upper classes were in charge of the conduct of political affairs. The High Priest was the head of state; leading priests without doubt directed the *Gerousia* (the subsequent Sanhedrin). The duties of the priestly aristocracy were therefore as much political as religious. As a result, political issues and interests radically affected their whole attitude. But the more these took precedence, the more those of religion fell behind. This seems to have been particularly true in the Hellenistic period, the reason being that political interests were linked to the interests of Greek culture. Whoever wished to achieve something politically in the world of that time had to be on a more or less friendly footing with Hellenism. So Hellenism gained increasing ground even among the leading priests in Jerusalem. And in a corresponding measure the latter became estranged from Jewish religious interests.³⁸ It is therefore understandable that it was precisely in these circles that Antiochus Epiphanes found readiest acceptance. Some of the high-ranking priests were even prepared without further ado to exchange Jewish rites for Greek. This full-scale Hellenization was admittedly not of long duration; the Maccabaeen rising quickly put an end to it. But the tendencies of the priestly aristocracy nevertheless remained essentially the same. Though there was no more talk of a pagan cult, and though the professed Hellenizers were either expelled or silenced, there was still among the priestly aristocracy the same worldly-mindedness and the same comparative laxity in matters of religion.³⁹ The Maccabaeen rising, however, resulted in a revival and strengthening of traditional religious life. The tendency of the Hasidim towards strict observance of the Torah gained more and more influence. And with it, their claims also mounted. He alone was a true Israelite who observed the law in accordance with the interpretation given by the Torah scholars. But the more pressing these demands became, the more decisively did the aristocracy reject them. It therefore appears that it

38. Cf. M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* I (1974), pp. 47-57.

39. For the Hellenization of the Maccabaeen-Hasmonaeen priestly dynasty, see Hengel, *op. cit.* I, p. 76; II, p. 150, n. 753. Concerning the secularization of the ruling priestly autocracy according to the Qumran community, see in particular 1QpHab. 8:8-13; 9:4-7.

was the religious revival itself of the Maccabaeian period that led to a consolidation of the parties. A largely lay section of the Hasidim followed their principles to their conclusion and became 'Pharisees'. The ruling priestly aristocracy and leading laity refused to be bound by the achievements of the previous few centuries in regard to both the interpretation of the Torah and the development of religious views. They saw in the *παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων* an unnecessary limitation of their hereditary, judicial and doctrinal authority. Their conservative and autocratic tendencies on the one hand, and their secular culture on the other, inclined them to hold as either superfluous or unacceptable the progressive religious ideas of the Pharisees. As many of the leaders of this party belonged to the ancient priestly family of Zadokites, they and their whole following were known as Sadducees.⁴⁰

A second group of Hasidim under the priestly leadership of other 'sons of Zadok' distinct from and opposed to the Hasmonaeian dynasty is thought to have founded the Essene/Qumran community. These appear to have combined the 'Sadducean' concept of priestly supremacy with the Pharisaic emphasis on doctrinal and legal renewal and re-adaptation by means of biblical exegesis.⁴¹

Under the first Maccabees (Judas, Jonathan and Simon), the allied 'Zadokite' aristocracy retreated of necessity into the background. The ancient pontifical family, some of whose members at least were pro-Greek, was dismissed. The office of High Priest remained vacant for a time. Then in 153/152 B.C., Jonathan Maccabaeus was appointed High Priest and thereby founded a new High-Priestly dynasty, that of the Hasmonaeans, whose whole past inclined them at first to support the Assidaean/Pharisaic party. Nevertheless, under Jonathan and Simon, the Sadducees were not totally ousted from the scene. The old aristocracy was certainly purged of its extreme phil-Hellenic elements but it did not disappear once and for all. The newly risen Hasmonaeans therefore had to come to some sort of understanding with it and to concede to it at least some of the seats in the *Gerousia*. Such was the situation until the time of John Hyrcanus. From then on, however, the Sadducees became once more the real ruling party. John Hyrcanus, Aristobulus I and Alexander Jannaeus all depended on them (see above, pp. 401-2). The reaction under Alexandra saw a return to power of the Pharisees, but politically their domination did not last long. Despite the growth of Pharisee spiritual authority, in politics the Sadducean aristocracy was able to retain their hold, and that notwithstanding the fall of the Hasmonaeans and notwithstanding Herod's proscription of the old pro-Hasmonaeian nobility. In the Herodian-Roman period, some

40. Cf. Le Moyne, *op. cit.*, pp. 381 ff.

41. Cf. G. Vermes, *Discovery*, pp. 73-6; *DSSE*, pp. 61-5; *DSS*, pp. 150-6; M. Hengel, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 224-7. For fuller details, see below, pp. 579-87.