

PHAR'ISEES

(Farisaii: *Pharisaei*), a religious party or school amongst the Jews at the time of Christ, so called from *Perîshîn*, the Aramaic form of the Hebrew word *Perûshîm*, "separated." The name does not occur either in the Old Testament or in the Apocrypha; but it is usually considered that the Pharisees were essentially the same with the Assideans (i. e. *chasîdîm* = godly men, saints) mentioned in the 1st Book of Maccabees ii. 42, vii. 13-17, and in the 2d Book xiv. 6. And those who admit the existence of Maccabean Psalms find allusions to the Assideans in (# [Psalms lxxix:2, xcvi:10, cxxxii:9, 16, cxlix:9](#)), where *chasîdîm* is translated "saints" in the A. V. (See Fürst's *Handwörterbuch*, i. 420 b.) In the 2d Book of Maccabees, supposed by Geiger to have been written by a Pharisee (*Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, p. 226), there are two passages which tend to illustrate the meaning of the word "separated;" one in xiv. 3, where Alcimus, who had been high-priest, is described as having defiled himself willfully "in the times of the mingling"—*en toiv thv epimixiav cronoiv*, —and another in xiv. 38, where the zealous Razis is said to have been accused of Judaism, "in the former times when there was no mingling," *en toiv emprosyen cronoiv thv amixiav*. In both cases the expression "mingling" refers to the time when Antiochus Epiphanes had partially succeeded in breaking down the barrier which divided the Jews from his other subjects; and it was in the resolute determination to resist the adoption of Grecian customs, and the slightest departure from the requirements of their own Law, that the "Separated" took their rise as a party. Compare (# [APC 1Ma i:13-15, 41-49, 62, 63](#)). Subsequently, however, (and perhaps not wholly at first), this by no means exhausted the meaning of the word "Pharisees."

A knowledge of the opinions and practices of this party at the time of Christ is of great importance for entering deeply into the genius of the Christian religion. A cursory perusal of the Gospels is sufficient to show that Christ's teaching was in some respects thoroughly antagonistic to theirs. He denounced them in the bitterest language; and in the sweeping charges of hypocrisy which He made against them as a class, He might even, at first sight, seem to have departed from that spirit of meekness, {a} of gentleness in judging others, and of abstinence from the imputation of improper motives, which is one of the most characteristic and original charms of his own precepts. See (# [Mt xv:7, 8, xxiii:5, 13, 14, 15, 23; Mr vii:6; Lu xi:42-44](#)), and compare (# [Mt vii:1-5, xi:29, xii:19, 20, Lu vi:28, 37-42](#)). Indeed it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that his repeated denunciations of the Pharisees mainly exasperated them into taking measures for causing his death; so that in one sense He may be said to have shed his blood, and to have laid down his life in protesting against their practice and spirit. (See especially verses 53, 54 in the 11th chapter of Luke, which follow immediately upon the narration of what he said while dining with a Pharisee.) Hence to understand the Pharisees is, by contrast, an aid towards understanding the spirit of uncorrupted Christianity.

Authorities.—The sources of information respecting the Pharisees are mainly threefold. 1st. The writings of Josephus, who was himself a Pharisee (*Vit.* p. 2), and who in each of his great works professes to give a direct account of their opinions (*B. J.* ii. 8, 2-14; *Ant.* xviii. 1, 2, and compare xiii. 10, 5-6, xvii. 2, 4, xiii. 16, 2, and *Vit.* p. 38). The value of Josephus's accounts would be much greater, if he had not accommodated them, more or less, to Greek ideas, so that in order to arrive at the exact truth, not only much must be added, but likewise much of what he has written must be retranslated, as it were into Hebrew conceptions. 2dly. The New Testament, including St. Paul's epistles, in addition to the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. St. Paul had been instructed by an illustrious Rabbi (# *Ac* xxii:3); he had been a rigid Pharisee (xxiii 6, xxvi. 5), and the remembrance of the galling bondage from which he had escaped (# *Ga* iv:9, 10, v:1) was probably a human element in that deep spirituality, and that uncompromising opposition to Jewish ceremonial observances, by which he preeminently contributed to make Christianity the religion of the civilized world. 3dly. The first portion of the Talmud, called the Mishna, or "second law." This is by far the most important source of information respecting the Pharisees and it may safely be asserted that it is nearly impossible to have adequate conceptions respecting them, without consulting that work. It is a digest of the Jewish traditions, and a compendium of the whole ritual law, reduced to writing in its present form by Rabbi Jehudah the Holy, a Jew of great wealth and influence, who flourished in the 2d century. He succeeded his father Simeon as patriarch of Tiberias, and held that office at least thirty years. The precise date of his death is disputed; some placing it in a year somewhat antecedent to 194, a. d. (see Graetz. *Geschichte der Juden*, iv. 251), while others place it as late as 220 a. d., when he would have been about 81 years old (Jost's *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Sekten*, ii. 118). The Mishna is very concisely written, and requires notes. This circumstance led to the Commentaries called Gemara {b} (*i. e.* Supplement, Completion, according to Buxtorf), which form the second part of the Talmud, and which are very commonly meant when the word "Talmud" is used by itself. The language of the Mishna is that of the later Hebrew, purely written on the whole, though with a few grammatical Aramaisms, and interspersed with Greek, Latin, and Aramaic words which had become naturalized. The work is distributed into six great divisions or orders. The first (*Zeraim*) relates to "seeds," or productions of the land, and it embraces all matters connected with the cultivation of the soil, and the disposal of its produce in offerings or tithes. It is preceded by a treatise on "Blessings" (*Beracoth*). The 2d (*Moed*) relates to festivals and their observances. The 3d (*Nashîm*) to women, and includes regulations respecting betrothals, marriages, and divorces. The 4th (*Nezikin*) relates to damages sustained by means of man, beasts, or things; with decisions on points at issue between man and man in commercial dealings and compacts. The 5th (*Kodashîm*) treats of holy things, of offerings, and of the temple-service. The 6th (*Toharôth*) treats of what is clean and unclean. These 6 Orders are subdivided into 61 Treatises, as reckoned by Maimonides; but want of space precludes describing their contents; and the mention of the titles would give little information without such

description. For obtaining accurate knowledge on these points, the reader is referred to Surenhusius's admirable edition of the *Mishna* in 6 vols. folio, Amsterdam, 1698-1703, which contains not only a Latin translation of the text, but likewise ample prefaces and explanatory notes, including those of the celebrated Maimonides. Others may prefer the German translation of Jost, in an edition of the *Mishna* wherein the Hebrew text is pointed; but the German is in Hebrew letters, 3 vols. 4to, Berlin. [1832-34. There is also a German translation, with notes, by J. J. Rabe, in 6 vols. 4to, Onolzb. 1760-63, a copy of which is in the library of Yale College.—A.] And an English reader may obtain an excellent idea of the whole work from an English translation of 18 of its Treatises by De Sola and Raphall, London, 1843. There is no reasonable doubt, that although it may include a few passages of a later date, the *Mishna* was composed, as a whole, in the 2d century, and represents the traditions which were current amongst the Pharisees at the time of Christ. This may be shown in the following way. 1st. Josephus, whose autobiography was apparently not written later than a. d. 100, the third year of the reign of Trajan, is an authority to show that up to that period no important change had been introduced since Christ's death; and the general facts of Jewish history render it morally impossible that there should have been any essential alteration either in the reign of Trajan, the epoch of the great Jewish revolts in Egypt, Cyrene, and Cyprus; or in the reign of Hadrian, during which there was the disastrous second rebellion in Judaea. And it was at the time of the suppression of this rebellion that Rabbi Jehudah was born; the tradition being that his birth was on the very same day that Rabbi Akiba was flayed alive and put to death, a. d. 136-137. 2dly. There is frequent reference in the *Mishna* to the sayings and decisions of Hillel and Shammai, the celebrated leaders of two schools among the Pharisees, differing from each other on what would seem to Christians to be comparatively unimportant points. But Hillel and Shammai flourished somewhat before the birth of Christ; and, except on the incredible supposition of forgeries or mistakes on a very large scale, their decisions conclusively furnish particulars of the general system in force among the Pharisees during the period of Christ's teaching. There is likewise occasional reference to the opinion of Rabbi Gamaliel, the grandson of Hillel, and the teacher of St. Paul, 3dly. The *Mishna* contains numerous ceremonial regulations, especially in the 5th Order, which presuppose that the Temple-service is still subsisting, and it cannot be supposed that these were invented after the destruction of the Temple by Titus. But these breathe the same general spirit as the other traditions, and there is no sufficient reason for assuming any difference of date between the one kind and the other. Hence for *facts* concerning the system of the Pharisees, as distinguished from an appreciation of its merits or defects, the value of the *Mishna* as an authority is greater than that of all other sources of information put together.

Referring to the *Mishna* for details, it is proposed in this article to give a general view of the peculiarities of the Pharisees; afterwards to notice their opinions on a future life and on free-will; and finally, to make some remarks on the proselytizing spirit attributed to them at the time of Christ. Points noticed elsewhere in this

Dictionary will be as far as possible avoided. Hence information respecting Corban and Phylacteries, which in the New Testament are peculiarly associated with the Pharisees, must be sought for under the appropriate titles. See Corban and Frontlets.

1. The fundamental principle of the Pharisees common to them with all orthodox modern Jews is, that by the side of the written Law regarded as a summary of the principles and general laws of the Hebrew people, there was an oral law to complete and to explain the written Law. It was an article of faith that in the Pentateuch there was no precept, and no regulation, ceremonial, doctrinal, or legal, of which God had not given to Moses all explanations necessary for their application, with the order to transmit them by word of mouth (Klein's *Vérité sur le Talmud*, p. 9). The classical passage in the Mishna on this subject is the following: "Moses received the (oral) law from Sinai, and delivered it to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the prophets, and the prophets to the men of the Great Synagogue" (*Pirke Abôth*, i.). This remarkable statement is so destitute of what would at the present day be deemed historical evidence, and would, it might be supposed, have been rendered so incredible to a Jew by the absence of any distinct allusion {c} to the fact in the Old Testament, that it is interesting to consider by what process of argument the principle could ever have won acceptance. It may be conceived in the following way. The Pentateuch, according to the Rabbins, contains 613 laws, including 248 commands, and 365 prohibitions; but whatever may be the number of the laws, however, minutely they may be anatomized, or into whatever form they may be thrown, there is nowhere an allusion to the duty of prayer, or to the doctrine of a future life. The absence of the doctrine of a future life has been made familiar to English theologians by the author of "The Divine Legation of Moses;" and the fact is so undeniable, that it is needless to dwell upon it farther. The absence of any injunction to pray has not attracted equal attention, but seems to be almost equally certain. The only passage which by any ingenuity has ever been interpreted to enjoin prayer is in (# Ex xxiii:25), where the words are used, "And ye shall serve Jehovah your God." But as the Pentateuch abounds with specific injunctions as to the *mode* of serving Jehovah; by sacrifices, by meat-offerings, by drink-offerings, by the rite of circumcision, by observing festivals, such as the Sabbath, the Passover, the feast of weeks, and the feast of tabernacles, by obeying all his ceremonial and moral commands, and by loving him, it is contrary to sound rules of construction to import into the general word "serve" Jehovah the specific meaning "pray to" Jehovah, when that particular mode of service is nowhere distinctly commanded in the Law. There being then thus no mention either of a future life, or of prayer as a duty, {d} it would be easy for the Pharisees at a time when prayer was universally practiced, and a future life was generally believed in or desired, to argue from the supposed inconceivability of a true revelation not commanding prayer, or not asserting a future life, to the necessity of Moses having treated of both orally. And when the principle of an oral tradition in two such important points was once admitted, it was easy for a skillful controversialist to carry the application of the principle much farther by insisting that there was precisely the

same evidence for numerous other traditions having come from Moses as for those two; and that it was illogical, as well as presumptuous, to admit the two only, and to exercise the right of selection and private judgment respecting the rest.

It is not to be supposed that all the traditions which bound the Pharisees were believed to be direct revelations to Moses on Mount Sinai. In addition to such revelations, which were not disputed, although there was no proof from the written Law to support them, and in addition to interpretations received from Moses, which were either implied in the written Law or to be elicited from them by reasoning, there were three other classes of traditions. 1st. Opinions on disputed points, which were the result of a majority of votes. To this class belonged the secondary questions on which there was a difference between the schools of Hillel and Shammai. 2dly. Decrees made by prophets and wise men in different ages, in conformity with a saying attributed to the men of the Great Synagogue, "Be deliberate in judgment; train up many disciples; and *make a fence for the Law*." These carried prohibitions farther than the written Law or oral law of Moses, in order to protect the Jewish people from temptations to sin or pollution. For example, the injunction, "Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk," {e} (# Ex xxiii:19, xxxiv:26, De xiv:21); was interpreted by the oral law to mean that the flesh of quadrupeds might not be cooked, or in any way mixed with milk for food; so that even now amongst the orthodox Jews milk may not be eaten for some hours after meat. But this was extended by the wise men to the flesh of birds; and now, owing to this "fence to the Law," the admixture of *poultry* with any milk, or its preparations, is rigorously forbidden. When once a decree of this kind has been passed, it could not be reversed; and it was subsequently said that not even Elijah himself could take away anything from the 18 points which had been determined on by the school of Shammai and the school of Hillel. 3dly. Legal decisions of proper ecclesiastical authorities on disputed questions. Some of these were attributed to Moses, some to Joshua, and some to Ezra. Some likewise to Rabbis of later date, such as Hillel and Gamaliel. However, although in these several ways, *all* the traditions of the Pharisees were not deemed direct revelations from Jehovah, there is no doubt that all became invested, more or less, with a peculiar sanctity; so that, regarded collectively, the study of them and the observance of them became as imperative as the study and observance of the precepts in the Bible.

Viewed as a whole, they treated men like children, formalizing and defining the minutest particulars of ritual observances. The expressions of "bondage," of "weak and beggarly elements," and of "burdens too heavy for men to bear," faithfully represent the impression produced by their multiplicity. An elaborate argument might be advanced for many of them individually, but the sting of them consisted in their aggregate number, which would have a tendency to quench the fervor and the freshness of a spiritual religion. They varied in character, and the following instances may be given of three different classes: 1st, of those which, admitting certain principles, were points reasonable to define; 2dly, of points defined which were superfluously particularized; and 3dly, of points defined where the discussion of

them at all was superstitious and puerile. Of the first class the very first decision in the Mishna is a specimen. It defines the period up to which a Jew is bound, as his evening service, to repeat the Shema. The Shema is the celebrated passage in (# De vi:4-9), commencing, "Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord, and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." It is a tradition that every Israelite is bound to recite this passage twice in the twenty-four hours, morning and evening—for which authority is supposed to be found in verse 7, where it is said of these words, "Thou shalt talk of them when thou liest down and when thou risest up." The compulsory recitation of even these words twice a day might be objected to as leading to formalism; but, accepting the recitation as a religious duty, it might not be unreasonable that the range of time permitted for the recitation should be defined. The following is the decision on this point in the Mishna, *Beracoth* i.: "From what time do they recite the Shema in the evening? From the time that the priests are admitted to eat their oblations till the end of the first watch. The words of Rabbi Eliezer: but the wise men say, up to midnight. Rabban Gamaliel says, until the column of dawn has arisen. Case: His sons returning from a house of entertainment said, We have not yet recited the Shema; to whom he said, if the column of dawn has not yet arisen, you are bound to recite it. But not this alone; but wherever the wise men have said 'to midnight,' their injunction is in force until the column of dawn has arisen. If so, why did the wise men say till midnight? In order to keep men far from transgression." The following is an instance of the second class. It relates to the lighting candles on the even of the Sabbath, which is the duty of every Jew: it is found in the Mishna, in the treatise *Shabbath*, c. ii., and is printed in the Hebrew and English Prayer-Book, according to the form of the German and Polish Jews, p. 66, from which to avoid objections, this translation, and others, where it is possible, are taken. "With what sort of wick and oil are the candles of the Sabbath to be lighted, and with what are they not to be lighted? They are not to be lighted with the woolly substance that grows upon cedars, nor with undressed flax, nor with silk, nor with rushes, nor with leaves out of the wilderness, nor with moss that grows on the surface of water, nor with pitch, nor with wax, nor with oil made of cottonseed, nor with the fat of the tail or the entrails of beasts. Nathan Hamody saith it may be lighted with boiled suet; but the wise men say, be it boiled or not boiled, it may not be lighted with it. It may not be lighted with burnt oil on festival-days. Rabbi Ishmael says it may not be lighted with train-oil because of honor to the Sabbath; but the wise men allow of all sorts of oil: with mixed oil, with oil of nuts, oil of radish-seed, oil of fish, oil of gourd-seed, of resin and gum. Rabbi Tarphun saith they are not to be lighted but with oil of olives. Nothing that grows out of the woods is used for lighting but flax, and nothing that grows out of woods doth not pollute by the pollution of a tent but flax: the wick of cloth that is doubled, and has not been singed, Rabbi Eleazar saith it is unclean, and may not be lighted withal; Rabbi Akibah saith it is clean, and may be lighted withal. A man may not split a shell of an egg and fill it with oil and put it in the socket of a candlestick, because it shall blaze, though the candlestick be of earthenware; but Rabbi Jehudah permits it: if the potter made it with a hole through at first, it is allowed, because it is the same vessel. No man shall fill a platter with oil, and give it

place next to the lamp, and put the head of the wick in a platter to make it drop the oil; but Rabbi Jehudah permits it." Now in regard to details of this kind, admitting it was not unreasonable to make some regulations concerning lighting candles, it certainly seems that the above particulars are too minute, and that all which was really essential would have been brought within a much smaller compass. 3dly. A specimen of the 3d class may be pointed out in the beginning of the treatise on festivals (*Moed*), entitled *Beitzah*, an *Egg*, from the following case of the egg being the first point discussed in it. We are gravely informed that an egg laid on a festival may be eaten, according to the school of Shammai; but the school of Hillel says it must not be eaten. In order to understand this important controversy, which reminds us of the two parties in a well-known work, who took their names from the end on which each held that an egg ought to be broken, it must be observed that, for a reason into which it is unnecessary to enter at present, it was admitted on all hands, both by the school of Hillel and the school of Shammai, that if a bird which was neither to be eaten nor killed laid an egg on a festival, the egg was not to be eaten. The only point of controversy was respecting an egg laid by a hen that would be afterwards eaten. Now the school of Hillel interdicted the eating of such an egg, on account of a passage in the 5th verse of the 16th chapter of Exodus, wherein Jehovah said to Moses respecting the people who gathered manna, "on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in." For it was inferred from these words that on a common day of the week a man might "prepare" for the Sabbath, or prepare for a feast-day, but that he might not prepare for the Sabbath on a feast-day, nor for a feast-day on the Sabbath. Now, as an egg laid on any particular day was deemed to have been "prepared" the day before, an egg laid on a feast-day following a Sabbath might not be eaten, because it was *prepared* on the Sabbath, and the eating of it would involve a breach of the Sabbath. And although *all* feast-days did not fall on a day following the Sabbath, yet as many did, it was deemed better, *ex majori cautelâ*, "as a fence to the Law," to interdict the eating of an egg which had been laid on any feast-day, whether such day was or was not the day after the Sabbath (see Surenhusius's *Mishna*, ii. 282). In a world wherein the objects of human interest and wonder are nearly endless, it certainly does seem a degradation of human intelligence to exercise it on matters so trifling and petty.

In order, however, to observe regulations on points of this kind, mixed with others less objectionable, and with some which, regarded from a certain point of view, were in themselves individually not unreasonable, the Pharisees formed a kind of society. A member was called a *châbêr* (רַבֵּן), and those among the middle and lower classes who were not members were called "the people of the land," or the vulgar. Each member undertook, in the presence of three other members, that he would remain true to the laws of the association. The conditions were various. One of transcendent importance was that a member should refrain from everything that was not tithed comp. (# Mt xxiii:23), and (# Lu xviii:12). The Mishna says, "He who undertakes to be *trustworthy* (a word with a technical Pharisaical meaning) tithes whatever he eats, and whatever he sells, and whatever he buys, and *does not eat and drink with the people of the land*." This was a point of peculiar delicacy, for the

portion of produce reserved as tithes for the priests and Levites was *holy*, and the enjoyment of what was holy was a deadly sin. Hence a Pharisee was bound, not only to ascertain as a buyer whether the articles which he purchased had been duly tithed, but to have the same certainty in regard to what he eat in his own house and when taking his meals with others. And thus Christ, in eating with publicans and sinners, ran counter to the first principles, and shocked the most deeply-rooted prejudices, of Pharisaism; for, independently of other obvious considerations, He ate and drank with "the people of the land," and it would have been assumed as undoubted that He partook on such occasions of food which had not been duly tithed.

Perhaps some of the most characteristic laws of the Pharisees related to what was clean (*tâhôr*) and unclean (*tâmê*). Among all oriental nations there has been a certain tendency to symbolism in religion; and if any symbolism is admitted on such a subject, nothing is more natural than to symbolize purity and cleanliness of thought by cleanliness of person, dress, and actions. Again, in all climates, but especially in warm climates, the sanitary advantages of such cleanliness would tend to confirm and perpetuate this kind of symbolism; and when once the principle was conceded, superstition would be certain to attach an intrinsic moral value to the rigid observance of the symbol. In addition to what might be explained in this manner, there arose among the Jews—partly from opposition to idolatrous practices, or to what savored of idolatry, partly from causes which it is difficult at the present day even to conjecture, possibly from mere prejudice, individual antipathy, or strained fanciful analogies—peculiar ideas concerning what was clean and unclean, which at first sight might appear purely conventional. But, whether their origin was symbolical, sanitary, religious, fanciful, or conventional, it was a matter of vital importance to a Pharisee that he should be well acquainted with the Pharisaical regulations concerning what was clean and what was unclean; for, as among the modern Hindoos (some of whose customs are very similar to those of the Pharisees), every one technically unclean is cut off from almost every religious ceremony, so, according to the Levitical Law, every unclean person was cut off from all religious privileges, and was regarded as defiling the sanctuary of Jehovah (# Nu xix:20); compare Ward's *Hindoo History, Literature, and Religion*, ii. 147. On principles precisely similar to those of the Levitical laws (# Le xx:25, xxii:4-7), it was possible to incur these awful religious penalties either by *eating* or by *touching* what was unclean in the Pharisaical sense. In reference to *eating*, independently of the slaughtering of holy sacrifices, which is the subject of two other treatises, the Mishna contains one treatise called *Cholin*, which is specially devoted to the slaughtering of fowls and cattle for domestic use (see Surenhusius, v. 114; and De Sola and Raphall, p. 325). One point in its very first section is by itself vitally distinctive; and if the treatise had contained no other regulation, it would still have raised an insuperable barrier between the free social intercourse of Jews and other nations. This point is, "that *any thing* slaughtered by a heathen should be deemed unfit to be eaten, like the carcase of an animal that had died of itself and like such carcase should pollute the person who carried it." {f} On the reasonable assumption that

under such circumstances animals used for food would be killed by Jewish slaughterers, regulations the most minute are laid down for their guidance. In reference likewise to *touching* what is unclean, the Mishna abounds with prohibitions and distinctions no less minute; and by far the greatest portion of the 6th and last "Order" relates to impurities contracted in this manner. Referring to that "Order" for details, it may be observed that to any one fresh from the perusal of them, and of others already adverted to, the words "Touch not, taste not, handle not," seem a correct but almost a pale summary of their drift and purpose (# Col ii:21); and the stern antagonism becomes vividly visible between them and Him who proclaimed boldly that a man was defiled not by anything he ate, but by the bad thoughts of the heart alone (# Mt xv:11); and who, even when the guest of a Pharisee, pointedly abstained from washing his hands before a meal, in order to rebuke the superstition which attached a moral value to such a ceremonial act. See (# Lu xi:37-40); and compare the Mishna vi. 480, where there is a distinct treatise, *Yadaim*, on the washing of hands. {g}

It is proper to add that it would be a great mistake to suppose that the Pharisees were wealthy and luxurious, much more that they had degenerated into the vices which were imputed to some of the Roman popes and cardinals during the 200 years preceding the Reformation. Josephus compared the Pharisees to the sect of the Stoics. He says that they lived frugally, in no respect giving in to luxury, but that they followed the leadership of reason in what it had selected and transmitted as a good (*Ant.* xviii. 1, 3). With this agrees what he states in another passage, that the Pharisees had so much weight with the multitude, that if they said anything against a king or a high-priest they were at once believed (xiii. 10, 5); for this kind of influence is more likely to be obtained by a religious body over the people, through austerity and self-denial, than through wealth, luxury, and self-indulgence. Although there would be hypocrites among them, it would be unreasonable to charge all the Pharisees as a body with hypocrisy, in the sense wherein we at the present day use the word. A learned Jew, now living, charges against them rather the holiness of works than hypocritical holiness—*Werkheiligkeit, nicht Scheinheiligkeit* (Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 359). At any rate they must be regarded as having been some of the most intense *formalists* whom the world has ever seen; and looking at the average standard of excellence among mankind, it is nearly certain that men whose lives were spent in the ceremonial observances of the Mishna, would cherish feelings of self-complacency and spiritual pride not justified by intrinsic moral excellence. The supercilious contempt towards the poor publican, and towards the tender penitent love that bathed Christ's feet with tears, would be the natural result of such a system of life.

It was alleged against them, on the highest spiritual authority, that they "made the word of God of none effect by their traditions." This would be true in the largest sense, from the purest form of religion in the Old Testament being almost incompatible with such endless forms (# Mic vi:8); but it was true in another sense, from some of the traditions being decidedly at variance with genuine religion. The

evasions connected with Corban are well known. To this may be added the following instances: it is a plain precept of morality and religion that a man shall pay his debts (# Ps xxxvii:21); but, according to the treatise of the Mishna called *Avodah zarah*, i. 1, a Jew was prohibited from paying money to a heathen three days before any heathen festival, just as if a debtor had any business to meddle with the question of how his creditor might spend his own money. In this way, Cato or Cicero might have been kept for a while out of his legal rights by an ignoble Jewish money-dealer in the Transtiberine district. In some instances, such a delay in the payment of debts might have ruined a heathen merchant. Again, it was an injunction of the Pentateuch that an Israelite should "love his neighbor as himself" (# Le xix:18); and although in this particular passage it might be argued that by "neighbor" was meant a brother Israelite, it is evident that the spirit of the precept went much farther (# Lu x:27-29), &c.. In plain violation of it, however, a Jewish midwife is forbidden, in the *Avodah zarah*, ii. 1, to assist a heathen mother in the labors of childbirth, so that through this prohibition a heathen mother and child might have been left to perish for want of a Pharisee's professional assistance. A great Roman satirist, in holding up to view the unsocial customs of the Roman Jews, specifies as two of their traditions that they were not to show the way, or point out springs of water to any but the circumcised.

"Tradidit arcano quodcunque volumine Moses,
Non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti,
Quaesitum ad fontem solos deducere verpos."
Juvenal, xiv. 102-4.

Now the truth of this statement has in our times been formally denied, and it seems certain that neither of these particular prohibitions is found in the Mishna; but the regulation respecting the Jewish midwives was more unsocial and cruel than the two practices referred to in the satirist's lines; and individual Pharisees, while the spirit of antagonism to the Romans was at its height, may have supplied instances of the imputed churlishness, although not justified by the letter of their traditions. In fact, Juvenal did really somewhat *understate* what was true in principle, not of the Jews universally, but of the most important religious party among the Jews, at the time when he wrote.

An analogy has been pointed out by Geiger (p. 104) between the Pharisees and our own Puritans; and in some points there are undoubted features of similarity, beginning even with their names. Both were innovators: the one against the legal orthodoxy of the Sadducees, the others against Episcopacy. Both of them had republican tendencies; the Pharisees glorifying the office of rabbi, which depended on learning and personal merit, rather than that of priest, which, being hereditary, depended on the accident of birth; while the Puritans in England abolished monarchy and the right of hereditary legislation. Even in their zeal for religious

education there was some resemblance: the Pharisees exerting themselves to instruct disciples in their schools with an earnestness never equaled in Rome or Greece; while in Scotland the Puritans set the most brilliant example to modern Europe of parochial schools for the common people. But here comparison ceases. In the most essential points of religion they were not only not alike, but they were directly antagonistic. The Pharisees were under the bondage of forms in the manner already described; while, except in the strict observance of the Sabbath, the religion of the Puritans was in theory purely spiritual, and they assailed even the ordinary forms of Popery and Prelacy with a bitterness of language copied from the denunciations of Christ against the Pharisees.

II. In regard to a future state, Josephus presents the ideas of the Pharisees in such a light to his Greek readers, that whatever interpretation his ambiguous language might possibly admit, he obviously would have produced the impression on Greeks that the Pharisees believed in the transmigration of souls. Thus his statement respecting them is, "They say that every soul is imperishable, but that the soul of good men only passes over (or transmigrates) into another body—*metabainein eiv eteron swma*—while the soul of bad men is chastised by eternal punishment" (*B. J.* ii. 8, 14; compare iii. 8, 5, and *Ant.* xviii. 1, 3, and Boettcher, *De Inferis*, pp. 519, 552). And there are two passages in the Gospels which might countenance this idea: one in (# Mt xiv:2), where Herod the tetrarch is represented as thinking that Jesus was John the Baptist risen from the dead though a different color is given to Herod's thoughts in the corresponding passage, (# Lu ix:7-9); and another in (# Joh ix:2), where the question is put to Jesus whether the blind man himself {h} had sinned, or his parents, that he was born blind? Notwithstanding these passages, however, there does not appear to be sufficient reason for doubting that the Pharisees believed in a resurrection of the dead very much in the same sense as the early Christians. This is most in accordance with St. Paul's statement to the chief priests and council (# Ac xxiii:6), that he was a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee, and that he was called in question for the hope and resurrection of the dead—a statement which would have been peculiarly disingenuous, if the Pharisees had merely believed in the transmigration of souls; and it is likewise almost implied in Christ's teaching, which does not insist on the doctrine of a future life as anything new, but assumes it as already adopted by his hearers, except by the Sadducees, although he condemns some unspiritual conceptions of its nature as erroneous (# Mt xxii:30; Mr xii:25; Lu xx:34-36). On this head the Mishna is an illustration of the ideas in the Gospels, as distinguished from any mere transmigration of souls; and the peculiar phrase, "the world to come," of which *olam ha ba* was undoubtedly only the translation, frequently occurs in it (*Abh. M. S.* i. 11, 12; comp. (# Mr x:30; Lu xviii:30). This phrase of Christians, which is anterior to Christianity, but which does not occur in the O. T., though fully justified by certain passages to be found in some of its latest books, {i} is essentially different from Greek conceptions on the same subject; and generally, in contradistinction to the purely temporal blessings of the Mosaic legislation, the Christian ideas that this world is a state of probation, and that every one after death

will have to render a strict account of his actions, were expressed by Pharisees in language which it is impossible to misunderstand: "This world may be likened to a court-yard in comparison of the world to come; therefore prepare thyself in the antechamber that thou mayest enter into the diningroom" (*Avoth*, iv. 16). "Everything is given to man on security, and a net is spread over every living creature; the shop is open, and the merchant credits; the book is open, and the hand records; and whosoever chooses to borrow may come and borrow: for the collectors are continually going round daily, and obtain payment of man, whether with his consent or without it: and the judgment is true justice; and all are prepared for the feast" (*Avoth*, iii. 16). "Those who are born are doomed to die, the dead to live, and the quick to be judged; to make us know, understand, and be informed that He is God: He is the Former, Creator, Intelligent Being, Judge, Witness, and suing Party, and will Judge thee hereafter. Blessed be He; for in his presence there is no unrighteousness, forgetfulness, respect of persons, nor acceptance of a bribe; for everything is his. Know also that everything is done according to the account, and let not thine evil imagination persuade thee that the grave is a place of refuge for thee: for against thy will wast thou formed, and against thy will wast thou born; and against thy will dost thou live, and against thy will wilt thou die; and against thy will must thou hereafter render an account, and receive judgment in the presence of the Supreme King of kings, the Holy God, blessed is He" (*Avoth*, iv. 22). Still it must be borne in mind that the actions of which such a strict account was to be rendered were not merely those referred to by the spiritual prophets Isaiah and Micah (# [Isa i:16, 17](#); [Mic vi:8](#)), nor even those enjoined in the Pentateuch, but included those fabulously supposed to have been orally transmitted by Moses on Mount Sinai, and the whole body of the traditions of the elders. They included, in fact, all those ceremonial "works," against the efficacy of which, in the deliverance of the human soul, St. Paul so emphatically protested.

III. In reference to the opinions of the Pharisees concerning the freedom of the will, a difficulty arises from the very prominent position which they occupy in the accounts of Josephus, whereas nothing vitally essential to the peculiar doctrines of the Pharisees seems to depend on those opinions, and some of his expressions are Greek, rather than Hebrew. "There were three sects of the Jews," he says, "which had different conceptions respecting human affairs, of which one was called Pharisees, the second Sadducees, and the third Essenes. The Pharisees say that some things, and not all things, are the work of fate; but that some things are in our own power to be and not to be. But the Essenes declare that Fate rules all things, and that nothing happens to man except by its decree. The Sadducees, on the other hand, take away Fate, holding that it is a thing of nought, and that human affairs do not depend upon it; but in their estimate all things are in the power of ourselves, as being ourselves the causes of our good things, and meeting with evils through our own inconsiderateness" (comp. xviii. 1, 3, and *B. J.* ii. 8, 14). On reading this passage, and the others which bear on the same subject in Josephus's works, the suspicion naturally arises that he was biassed by a desire to make the Greeks believe that, like the Greeks, the Jews had philosophical sects amongst themselves.

At any rate his words do not represent the opinions as they were really held by the three religious parties. We may feel certain, that the influence of *fate* was not the point on which discussions respecting free-will turned, though there may have been differences as to the way in which the interposition of *God* in human affairs was to be regarded. Thus the ideas of the Essenes are likely to have been expressed in language approaching to the words of Christ (# Mt x:29, 30, vi:25-34), and it is very difficult to believe that the Sadducees, who accepted the authority of the Pentateuch and other books of the Old Testament, excluded God, in their conceptions, from all influence on human actions. On the whole, in reference to this point, the opinion of Graetz (*Geschichte der Juden*, iii. 509) seems not improbable, that the real difference between the Pharisees and Sadducees was at first practical and political. He conjectures that the wealthy and aristocratical Sadducees in their wars and negotiations with the Syrians entered into matters of policy and calculations of prudence, while the zealous Pharisees, disdaining worldly wisdom, laid stress on doing what seemed right, and on leaving the event to God: and that this led to differences in formal theories and metaphysical statements. The precise nature of those differences we do not certainly know, as no writing of a Sadducee on the subject has been preserved by the Jews, and on matters of this kind it is unsafe to trust unreservedly the statements of an adversary. [Sadducees.]

IV In reference to the spirit of proselytism among the Pharisees, there is undisputable authority for the statement that it prevailed to a very great extent at the time of Christ (# Mt xxiii:15); and attention is now called to it on account of its probable importance in having paved the way for the early diffusion of Christianity. The district of Palestine, which was long in proportion to its breadth, and which yet, from Dan to Beersheba, was only 160 Roman miles, or not quite 148 English miles long, and which is represented as having been civilized, wealthy, and populous 1,000 years before Christ, would under any circumstances have been too small to continue maintaining the whole growing population of its children. But, through kidnapping (# Joe iii:6), through leading into captivity by military incursions and victorious enemies (#2Ki xvii:6, xviii:11, xxiv:15; Am i:6, 9), through flight (# Jer xliii:4-7), through commerce (Joseph. *Ant.* xx. 2, 3), and probably through ordinary emigration, Jews at the time of Christ had become scattered over the fairest portions of the civilized world. On the day of Pentecost, that great festival on which the Jews suppose Moses to have brought the perfect Law down from heaven (*Festival Prayers for Pentecost*, p. 6), Jews are said to have been assembled with one accord in one place at Jerusalem, "from every region under heaven." Admitting that this was an oriental hyperbole comp. (# Joh xxi:25), there must have been some foundation for it in fact; and the enumeration of the various countries from which Jews are said to have been present gives a vivid idea of the widely-spread existence of Jewish communities. Now it is not unlikely, though it cannot be *proved* from Josephus (*Ant.* xx. 2, 3), that missions and organized attempts to produce conversions, although unknown to Greek philosophers, existed among the Pharisees De Wette, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, (# Mt xxiii:15). But, at any rate, the then existing regulations or customs of synagogues afforded facilities which do not

exist now either in synagogues or Christian churches for presenting new views to a congregation (# Ac xvii:2; Lu iv:16). Under such auspices the proselytizing spirit of the Pharisees inevitably stimulated a thirst for inquiry, and accustomed the Jews to theological controversies. Thus there existed precedents and favoring circumstances for efforts to make proselytes, when the greatest of all missionaries, a Jew by race, a Pharisee by education, a Greek by language, and a Roman citizen by birth, preaching the resurrection of Jesus to those who for the most part already believed in the resurrection of the dead, confronted the elaborate ritual-system of the written and oral law by a pure spiritual religion: and thus obtained the cooperation of many Jews themselves in breaking down every barrier between Jew, Pharisee, Greek, and Roman, and in endeavoring to unite all mankind by the brotherhood of a common Christianity.

Literature.—In addition to the New Testament, Josephus, and the Mishna, it is proper to read Epiphanius *Adversus Haereses*, lib. I. xvi.; and the notes of Jerome to (# Mt xxii:23, xxiii:8), &c., though the information given by both these writers is very imperfect.

In modern literature, see several treatises in Ugoiino's *Thesaurus*, vol. xxii.; and Lightfoot's *Horae Hebraicae* on (# Mt iii:7), where a curious rabbinical description is given of seven sects of Pharisees which, from its being destitute of any intrinsic value, is not inserted in this article. See likewise Brucker's *Historia Critica Philosophiae*, ii. 744-759; Milman's *History of the Jews*, ii. 71; Ewald's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, iv. 415-419; and the *Jahrhundert des Heils*, p. 5, &c. of Gfrörer, who has insisted strongly on the importance of the Mishna, and has made great use of the Talmud generally. See also the following works by modern learned Jews: Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Sekten*, i. 196; Graetz, *Geschichte des Juden*, iii. 508-518; Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 358-362; and Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, p. 103, &c. E. T.

* *Additional Literature.*—See Grossmann, *De Judaerum Disciplina Arcani*, Part. 1, 2, Lips. 1833-34; *De Pharisaismo Judaeorum Alexandrino Commentatio*, Part. 1-3, *ibid.* 1846-50; *De Collegio Pharisaeorum*, *ibid.* 1851. Biedermann, *Pharisäer u. Sadducäer*, Zürich, 1854. Reuss, art. *Pharisäer*, in Herzog's *Real-Encykl.* xi. 496-509. Geiger, *Sadducäer u. Pharisäer*, from the *Jüd. Zeitschr. f. Wiss. u. Leben*, Breslau, 1863; see also his *Das Judenthum u. seine Geschichte*, 2e Aufl. *ibid.* 1865. Delitzsch, *Jesus u. Hillel* (against Renan and Geiger), Erlangen, 1866. Ginsburg, art. *Pharisees* in Kitto's *Cycl. of Bibl. Lit.*, 3d ed., 1866. T. Keim, *Gesch. Jesu von Nazara*, Zurich, 1867, i. 251-272. J. Derenbourg, *Essai sur l'hist. et la geogr. de la Palestine*, Paris, 1867, i. 119-144, 452 ff. A. Hausrath, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, Heidelb. 1868, i. 117-133. A

{a} This is thus noticed by Milton, from the point of view of his own peculiar ecclesiastical opinions: "The invincible warrior Zeal, shaking loosely the slack

reins, drives over the heads of scarlet prelates, and such as are insolent to maintain traditions bruising their stiff necks under his flaming wheels. Thus did the true prophets of old combat with the false. *Thus Christ Himself, the fountain of meekness, found acrimony enough to be still galling and vexing the prelatical Pharisees.*"—Apology for Smectymnuus.

{b} There are two Gemaras: one of Jerusalem, in which there is said to be no passage which can be proved to be later than the first half of the 4th century; and the other of Babylon, completed about 500 a. d. The latter is the most important, and by far the longest. It was estimated by Chiarini to be fifteen times as long as the Mishna. The *whole* of the Gemaras has never been translated; though a proposal to make such a translation was brought before the public by Chiarini (*Théorie du Judaïsme appliquée à la R, forme des Israelites* a. d. 1830). But Chiarini died in 1832. Fifteen treatises of the Jerusalem Gemara, and two of the Babylonian, are given, accompanied by a Latin translation, in Ugolino's *Thesaurus*, vols xvii.-xx. some interpret Gemara to be identical in meaning with Talmud, signifying "doctrine." * Ugolini's *Thesaurus* contain *twenty* treatises of the Jerusalem Gemara with a Latin translation, and *three* of the Babylonian; see, in addition to the vols referred to above, vols. xxv. and xxx. Chiarini (*Le Talmud de Babylone trad. en langue française*, vols. i., ii., Leipz. 1831) has translated both the Mishna and Gemara of the first treatise in the Talmud (*Beracoth*, "Blessings"), and prefixed to it a full account of the Talmud by way of introduction. The treatise *Beracoth* has also been published in the original with a German translation, notes, etc., by E. M. Pinner, Berlin, 1842, fol., who has likewise prefixed to it an Introduction to the Talmud. For an account of the various books of the Talmud in English one may see the art. *Talmud* by S. Davidson in Kitto's *Cyclopaedia of Bibl. Lit.*, 3d ed. (1866), iii. 938-945; the appendix to Robt. Young's translation of *The Ethics of the Fathers* (Pirke Aboth), Edinb. 1862; or Dr. I. Nord heimer's article, *The Talmud and the Rabbies*, in the *Amer. Bibl. Repository* for Oct. 1839. For fuller information about the Talmud, see Wolf, *Bibl. Hebraea* ii. 657-993, and Pressel's art. *Thalmud* in Herzog's *Real-Encykl.* xv. 615-665; also the famous art, on the Talmud by E. Deutsch in the *Quarterly Review* for Oct. 1867, and an art, by M. Grunbaum in the *North Amer. Review* for April, 1869. There is a brief popular account of the Talmud, by Dr. C. E. Stowe, in the *Atlantic Monthly* for June, 1868. A.

{c} A passage in Deuteronomy (# [De xviii:8-11](#)) has been interpreted so as to serve as a basis for an oral law. But that passage seems merely to prescribe obedience to the priests, the Levites, and to the judges in civil and criminal matters of controversy between man and man. A fanciful application of the words *yp- l e* in ver. 11 has favored the rabbinical interpretation. In the "Festival Prayers" of the English Jews, p. 69, for Pentecost, it is stated, of

God, in a prayer, "He explained it (the Law) to his people *face to face*, and on every point are ninety-eight explanations."

- {d} Mohammed was preceded both by Christianity and by the latest developments of Judaism from both of which he borrowed much. See, as to Judaism, Geiger's essay, *Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthum aufvenommen?* Still, one of the most marked characteristics of the Korân is the unwearied reiteration of the duty of prayer, and of the certainty of a future state of vetribution.
- {e} Although this prohibition occurs three times, no light is thrown upon its meaning by the context. The most probable conjecture is that given under the hold of Idolatry (ii. 1129 a), that it was aimed against some practice of idolaters. Mr. Laing gives a similar explanation of the Christian prohibition in Scandinavia against eating horse-flesh.
- {f} At the present day a strict orthodox Jew may not eat meat of any animal, unless it has been killed by a Jewish butcher. According to Mr. I. Disraeli (*The Genius of Judaism*, p. 154), the butcher searches the animal for any blemish, and, on his approval, causes a leaden seal, stamped with the Hebrew word *câshîsr* (lawful), to be attached to the meat, attesting its "cleanness." Mr. Disraeli likewise points out that in Herodotus (ii. 38) appeal is recorded to have been used for a similar purpose by Egyptian priests, to attest that a bull about to be sacrificed was "clean," *kayarov*. The Greek and Hebrew words are perhaps akin in origin, *s* and *th* being frequently interchanged in language.
- {g} The Egyptians appear to have had ideas of "uncleanness" through tasting, touching, and handling, precisely analogous to those of the Levitical Law and of the Pharisees. The priests would not endure even to look at beans, deeming them not *clean*. *nomizontev ou kayaron min einai ospion kayarov* is he Greek word in the LXX. for *tîshôr*. "No Egyptian," says Herodotus, "would salute a Greek with a kiss, nor use a Greek knife, or spits, or cauldron; or taste the meat of an ox which had been cut by a Greek knife. They drank out of bronze vessels, *rinsing them perpetually*. And if any one accidentally touched a pig, he would plunge into the Nile, without stopping to undress" (*Herodot.* ii. 37, 41, 47). Just as the Jews regarded all other nations, the Egyptians regarded all other nations, including the Jews: namely, as unclean.
- {h} At least five different explanations have been suggested of the passage (# [Joh ix:2](#)) 1st. That it alludes to a Jewish doctrine of the transmigration of souls. 2dly. That it refers to an Alexandrine doctrine of the preexistence of souls, but not to their transmigration. 3dly. That the words mean, "Did this man sin, as *the Greeks say*, or did his parents sin as *we say*, that he was born blind?" 4thly. That it involves the Rabbinical idea of the possibility of an infant's sinning in his

mother's womb. 5thly. That it is founded on the predestinarian notion that the blindness from birth was a *preceding* punishment for sins which the blind man afterwards committed: just as it has been suggested, in a remarkable passage, that the death before 1688 of the Princess Anne's infant children (three in number) was a preceding punishment for her subsequent abandonment of her father, James II. See Stewart's *Philosophy*, vol. ii. App. vi., and the Commentaries of De Wette and Lucxe, *ad locum*.

{i} The earliest text in support of the expression "the new heavens and the new earth" promised by Isaiah (# [Isa lxxv:17- 22](#)). Compare (# [Da vii:2; ii:44; Isa xxvi:19](#))