

26^u
15

THE SECTS DURING THE
— SECOND COMMONWEALTH

THESIS FOR GRADUATION

LOUIS WOLSEY

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE
LIBRARY
CINCINNATI

mic. 2/81

To
My Parents.

mic. 2/81

Contents

Preface	page 3
Introduction	
<u>Part I.... The Pharisees</u>	

Chapter I... Their Name, Origin, and Development.....	page 13
Chapter II... Their Character-the Relation to Jesus.....	42
Chapter III... Their Tenets and Practices.....	58

Part II... The Sadducees

Chapter I... Their Name, Origin and History.....	70
Chapter II... Their Character and Tenets.....	83

Part III... Differences between Pharisees and Sadducees.

Chapter I... Legal Differences.....	94
Chapter II... Ritual Differences.....	103

Part IV... The Essenes.

(Contents - continued)

Chapter I --- Their Name and Origin ----- page. 119

Chapter II --- The Community of the Essenes --- 173

 Their Customs and Tenets -----

Preface.

This thesis contains no new inductions or conclusions. I have made no attempts at being original save in the method of presentation. I preferred to study the subject matter carefully and conscientiously, to gather the results of the best scholarship, and to make this thesis represent merely the work I have done, and to show in how far I have grasped the subject in its historical and religious bearings. It is with the attitude of one anxious to learn, that I have approached the study of these sects, and my endeavor has been to make this thesis reflect that attitude. In so far as I have realized these aims, must the merit of this thesis be judged. I have pursued

the study of these sects as methodically as I have been able; and have tried to ascertain the results of the most modern investigations. I have been somewhat handicapped by my inability to read German, and particularly is this the case with the subject of the Essenes; the most important literature of which is in German and untranslated. This handicap has been offset somewhat by the translation of the histories of Schiirer, Graetz, Ewald, and Kuener, and some aid has been extended to me by my colleagues in translating Geiger and Jost; as well as the references made to German works, which I have carefully studied. As to all references, I may say that I have verified every one. In verifying the Talmudical references, my especial thanks are due Dr. Mel

ziner for his assistance as well as for his kindness in suggesting to me the subject of this thesis. I wish also to acknowledge my thanks to Dr. Deutsch and Dr. Grossmann for their aid.

The following is the list of authorities whose works I have consulted. This list does not include those quoted references which I have at all times verified and those works which I have read, passim. I have also studied the sources most carefully.

List of authorities

Graetz — History of the Jews.*

Geiger — Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel.

— Pharisäer und Sadducäer

Ewald — History of Israel *

Jost — Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten

articles, P. S. & E. in Johnson's, International
and Millinton's Dictionary Encyclopedias.

Ginsburg - articles, "Pharisees," "Sadducees"
"Essenes" in Kitt's Cyclopaedia of
Biblical Literature

Trivetteton - art. P. S. & E. in Smith's Dictionary
of Bible Antiquities

Kuenen - Religion of Israel*

Wellhausen - Die Sadducäer
und Phariseer

Art. "Israel" in Enaycl. Brit.

Schürer - The Jewish People * in the
time of Jesus Christ.

Hamburger - art. Sadducäer etc. in Real-ency.
- Die Nichtjuden und die Juden in
talmudischen Schriften

Deutsch - Philosophy of Jewish History

Montefiore - Religion of the Ancient Hebrews
(Hebert Lectures 1892.)

Renan - History of the People of Israel *

Lucius - Essenism in the Middle
of the 1st Century *

- Historical Origin of Essenism*
(in Hebrew Review for 1881-82)

Wise - History of the Second Commonwealth
 Weander - General History of the Christian
 Religion and Church.

Emanuel Deutsch - The Talmud.

Ernest de Bunsen - The angel-Messiah,
 Chayne - Jewish Religious Life after the
 Exile.

Hirsch - The Crucifixion.

Gaster - Jewish Sects (a monograph;
 in the Jewish Chronicle Jan 13, 1899)

Leopold Loew - The Great Synod. Its
 Origin and Influence (translated
 by the American Israelite 1859)

Koller (art) a Jewish Synod
 (published in the Jewish Exponent
 in Dec. 1898)

* References in this thesis are at
 ways to the English translation.

Introduction

The history of the Second Commonwealth of the Judean nation, is the history of its sects. Its growth, its literature, its struggles for existence, its downfall and all the children begotten of the strife of the sects. Nay more the very condition of Judaism of the nation, out of which Christianity took its inception, is founded on the existence of these sects. Their importance, therefore, cannot be underrated in history. They are our historical illustrations of the common thought that out of conflicting opinions comes a mental progress. And this is absolutely true when we come to consider the history of the Jewish religion. True it is that these sects are responsible primarily for the destruction of the nation. Internal dissensions, humbled the City of Zion before the

conqueror; but no less true is it that Judaism has been the gainer. Out of confusion came order and the struggles and pains of the parties accompanied the birth of a new unity.

Chief among these sects, are the Pharisees and Sadducees. Their disputes form the center toward which all the events of this period of history gravitate. And for this reason, they have been treated with some attempt at completeness in this thesis. All other sects are secondary consideration in this period of history.

The Essenes have also been presented here though not so fully as is the case with the other two parties because they are intimately connected with Pharisaism in their origin, also because the Essenes form an anomalous element in Judaism, and therefore deserve some attention, when we consider

the religious forces at work during this time. Furthermore there seems to be a feeling of the necessity, possibly a popular sentiment - of always suffixing the Essenes to the Pharisees and Sadducees, and though the Essenes never had any influence upon the historical development of Judea, we feel in duty bound to discuss this sect.

And as to this matter of sects in Judaism, there is no necessity of making any apology regarding it. Judaism has always welcomed differences of opinion. It has advocated the utmost freedom of thought because it recognizes in this the only possible way to know the truth of things. If therefore, there have been sects in Judaism, it redounds to the glory of this religion, for out of these stripes between Sadducees and

Pharisees, we have the triumphant principle of democracy in religion. And again it must be remembered that the Sadducees and Pharisees were not too diametrically opposed parties; they had some things in common, and one of these things was the Law. This they all recognized as of equal authority. Its place was acknowledged equally by Sadducees and Pharisees.

This thesis has not attempted to speak of the sects of the Second Commonwealth in general, but rather to treat of the three most prominent parties of this period and to tell what they stand for, and to determine their place in the history of their day. Probably this explanation may suffice to justify the method employed.

Part I.

The Pharisees.

Chapter I

The Pharisees—

A. The Name.

The name, Pharisee, occurs in the New Testament and in Josephus as *φαιοῖται*, (in Latin version, *Pharisæi*) which form of the name is supposed to be a literal transcription of the Hebrew, פרושיי^(vide note), one of the names by which this party or sect was known. This name, פרושיי, has been subject to various interpretations, two of which are of importance.⁽¹⁾ The first view derives the name from פרש 'to interpret', to expound⁽²⁾ basing this exegesis upon the reputed skill of the Pharisees in interpreting the Bible and deriving new laws therefrom.⁽³⁾

(Note) Cf. Geiger, *Isra. & Phar.* p. 13.

(1) The view of Renan (*Hist. 40-41*) is interesting because of its originality and unscientific character. After tracing the Pharisees back to the Hasidim or pious Israelites who were known for their

This view, however is untenable, because the form פרושין is a passive form of the verb פרש. To be grammatical, the "interpreters" would have been called פירשין.

The second view, which is the more plausible one, derives the name from פרש, "to separate," therefore translating the form פרושין, "those who are separated": Now to verify this theory, we must inquire wherein this idea of separation was applicable to the Pharisees.

Josephus states that the Pharisees were a small part of the whole people (Ant. XVII²⁻⁴) calling them, "μικρίον τι Ἰουδαίων ἀνθρώπων", a sect of about six thousand in number. There must have been, therefore, a definite line dividing the Pharisees from the people, and this line of division was Levitical impurity and Levitical

separatism. (cf. Ἀμείβια, 2 Macc. 14^{3,38}, Jos. 13-13, Tacitus Hist. V 5 separate, 'epulis') and called 'nibdalim', he says, "when the Aramæan language had made considerable progress in Judea, the word, peris or pheris, was used instead, having the

impure food (cf. Shagiga 18b, Sabbath 13a). The term פריש as used in the Mishna and Talmud (Barot) means a separation from uncleanness (cf. Shabbat 102a, Sota IX-15; Abot III-13) from which follows of necessity, a separation from unclean persons. And here, we see the precise meaning of the term, Pharisees (according to Schürer ^{Dr II vol II} [p. 20]) i.e. a fractional portion of the people who because of their own strict views of the idea of cleanness, separated from the great body of the nation.

same meaning." (Egra IX-1, X-11-16)

(2) פריש same as ἐξηγητής τοῦ νόμου κατ' ἐξοχήν, a title claimed by the Pharisees, according to Josephus. Cf. Antiquities

(3) Cf. Wars I-5-2 also John VII-48-9, Acts 2-2-3, Phil. 3-5, Wars II-8-14, 12-24

* Josephus does not present this record of Phar. characteristics, but the Latin sources all agree in making the Phar. a sect separated from the rest of the people. Cf. Pseudo-Tertullian, Adversus Hereses Chap. 2, Epiphanius haer. 16, 1, 20 Origen and Hieronymus. Nathan b. Jehiel in the Aruch, defines a פריש as one separated from all uncleanness, from unclean food and from the עם הארץ who are not careful as to what they eat. See

They were therefore "the separatists". Of this, there seems to be no doubt. Graetz is the only modern scholar of any eminence who holds the first view. The name of the Pharisees, then, is derived from the idea of their isolation from Levitically unclean persons.

The name was given to them by their opponents, and very naturally, therefore, it is found but seldom in the oldest Pharisaic literature, that is, the Mishna; in only three passages* does this name occur and this fact is significant in that the designation, Pharisees, though applied in a reproachful sense, was eventually accepted by the members of the sect because of its prevalent usage. The name, "separatists", could not have originated among the Pharisees themselves, as the designation does not bear a sufficiently

also Bertinoro's commentary to Jadayim 4-6

* Jadayim IV^o 8, Chagiga II-7, Sota III-4

positive meaning, and it could not, therefore, be self-applied. Their peculiar characteristic of separatism must have attracted the attention, perhaps, reproach of their adversaries and the name was thus applied to them. Our literature shows a striking recurrence of the designations *תלמידי חכמים or חכמים and more particularly חברים, "associates," who were banded together to separate from the unclean persons, namely the עמ הארץ (cf. Chagiga II-7 and Bertinoro to Yodajim IV-6) and these were the names by which they called themselves, expressive of their own conception of their order. That חברים, as used in the Mishna, is the same as the Pharisee, or rather a designation of, the sect, may be seen by comparing Chagiga II-7 with Demai II-3. In the former, the עמ הארץ and the סרוס are contrasted; similarly the עמ הארץ and the חבר in the latter, the עמ הארץ in

* So Schürer, Kuenen Ginsburg, etc.

both passages being represented as unclean, contact with whom the פרוש and חבר become defiled. Therefore they are identical. If, we go to later sources, we find another confirmation of this theory in that the Aruch defines the חבר and Obadya from Bertinoro, the פרוש*, in almost the same language: (or אוכלי חוליהם בטהרת חולין) (בטהרה) (Jost I-260 adopts ^{the derivation} this given by the Aruch**) [Notes]

*

Chagiga II-7, and Yadayim II-6

**

cf Levy's Chald. Neuhebr. Wörterb. חבר

[Note] This identity bet. the Chaber and the Pharisee and the עם הארץ as a contrast, the people of the land "in whom no strict observance of the law can be assumed", is the opinion of many scholars, particularly Schüerer (II II-22 ff). Montefiore (Stibbert Lectures 1892 p 498-9) takes exception to this theory, claiming that Schüerer makes the question "too easy", that "this view is a grave mistake", and says that the Chaber, far from being a Pharisee, was a member of a special order of rigorists. "They determined to observe the laws of

Another name, applied to this sect according to Schiirer,⁽¹⁾ Wellhausen,⁽²⁾ Ewald⁽³⁾ and Geiger⁽⁴⁾, was חסידים. This was undoubtedly the name of a party of Maccabean days, but these authorities claim the identity between them and the Pharisees. Other writers, more conservative, claim that the Pharisees were the descendants of the Chassidim. But such a discussion is unimportant except in so far as it applies to the historical development of the Pharisaic movement and in this case, both ideas become virtually one, the former theory identifying the Chassidim with the Pharisees, the latter making the Chassidim either a root of the Pharisees or a link in the chain of Pharisaic growth.

clean and unclean in their fullest possible development." Deprecating the whole discussion as wearing "a very academic air," he consistently refrains from citing authorities that make his objections to Schiirer's view serious.

(1) 26-7, (2) 78-86, (3) VII 369, (4) Utschrift 103.

B. Their Origin and Development

The origin of the Pharisees has always been a mooted question, and the ancient writers from Josephus on, have had very hazy ideas on the subject. Josephus says merely that the Pharisees had existed for a long time (Ant. 18¹⁻²) and the Talmud says absolutely nothing. The Abbot de Rabbi Nathan and later, Saadiah and Maimonides made some attempts at ascertaining their origin but further than giving us an explanation of the name, Perushim, they have been unsuccessful. It has remained for modern investigators to give us something authoritative on the subject.

Most writers do not go farther back than the Maccabean age to account for the origin of the Pharisees; in fact there seems to be an almost uniform sentiment among scholars.

that the Pharisees originated in the time of the Syrian troubles and arose in the ranks of the scribes. But Geiger and Ginsburg, who follows him closely, find the germs of Pharisaism in the times of Ezra and Nehemiah. There were members of the children of Israel, who after the return from exile, observed strictly the various Levitical laws such as intermarriage, the Sabbath year, the Temple taxes and tithes, ~~the~~ the three pilgrim festivals etc.⁽¹⁾ and the people who thus observed these various laws are spoken of as those who separated from the

* Cf. Gen. 8. 13, Urschrift 103. However the first Biblical references we have, to a separation of any kind is in the laws of the Nazirite (Nm. VI.) The expression in Nm. 23-9 is significant.

(1) Ezra VI-19-22, Neh. X^{28, 31, 33, 36} VIII¹⁴, XII¹⁹ also Tobit I-6, II-1, Judith XI-13, Eccles VII-31, XLY-20, I Macc. III-49.

"uncleanness of the nations of the land" (Ezra 9-21),
 from the עמי הארץ (Neh. X-28), and thus appear
 as a sort of national party. Geiger
 here takes this separation from the
 heathens and the עמי הארץ as implying
 Levitical impurity in general, and
 states that these separatists were
 called-בבליים* (cf. Ezra VI-21, IX-1, X-11, Neh. IX-2
 X-28). The opposing party contended a-
 gainst this piety and separatism of the
 Nibdalim by going over to the heathen,
 mingling with them and persuading
 many to follow them (cf. I Macc. I-11, II Macc. VII-35).
 This latter book, Geiger claims to possess
 Pharisaic elements)

* To this Hamburger makes objection (cf. Real-Encycl. II Sad-
 ducaer u. Pharisäer, and Die Nichtjuden und die Sekten p. 15 ff.)
 claiming that the books of Ezra and Neh. know nothing of the
 Pharisees; that the expressions בבליים or בבלי in these writings
 mean a separation from those Israelites who were opposed
 to the law of intermarriage with the heathen while
 the Pharisees as a party separated from ^{what was allowed by law.} ~~the Israelites, contact~~
~~with whom was permitted~~

Undoubtedly we have here the elements of the Pharisaic as well as the Sadducean parties though their aspect changes somewhat in their development. These parties did not spring into existence Minerva-like in the times of Ezra and Nehemiah but the germs must have been there. It is certain from the literature of the Maccabean period that there must have been a movement of long duration, aiming at nationality and the strengthening of the religion which had been vitiated somewhat by the invasion of Persian elements during the Exile, and foreign, particularly Grecian, elements after the Restoration. The Pharisees represent, in the beginning, the people who clung to the ancient Levitical injunctions, and who aimed at preserving the religion and the establishment of the nation upon this religious basis, while the opposing party rejected this strict observance

of the laws of cleanness and uncleanness, and sought to form alliances with the heathen (I Macc. I-11)*

The position at this time of the high-priestly families and of the scribes, is particularly significant. The former because of their extraction, formed an aristocracy and the latter were initially an association of students of the Law. During the Grecian period, questions of state arose out of the conditions and demanded solution. The sopherim or scribes who were anything but politicians based their conceptions upon the Jewish idea of a theocracy which was necessarily

Schürer represents the Pharisees and Sadducees as coming from the scribes and priests, who were virtually the same in Ezra's time but who gradually separated during the Grecian period, until they developed into two distinct parties at the time of the Maccabean wars (Diss. II vol II p. 9)

an unworldly—almost intolerant—idea, and holding that Israel should "dwell alone and not be reckoned among the nations" (Nm. 23.9) This extreme, the priests avoided believing that the council of the nations should be heeded when compatible with the national interests which with them, meant their own selfish interests for their social position rested on the nation's existence. Thus a difference arose, and the people prejudiced against the aristocracy, took sides with the Sophists. This made the tendency of the scribes, democratic and religious, and the priests represented a worldly aristocratic tendency, the former arising from a legal position, the latter from a social position*. Out of these two tendencies arose the two great parties whose history, is the history of the Jewish state to its very destruction. Out of the first

* The views of Kuenen and Wellhausen.

tendency arose the sect of the Pharisees, out of the latter, the Sadducees, whose further origin, we shall discuss in Part II.

The Pharisaic movement, however, does not appear in history until the beginning of the Maccabean conflict and then they are known as *אֲסִידֵי תּוֹרָה*, or Assideans, who devoted themselves to the Law. From I Macc. II-42, we see that they took sides with the Maccabees, thus rendering service to the nation in its conflict with the Syrians. Here they evidently appear as opposed to Hellenism, not as part and parcel of the Asmonean following (cf. Wellhausen *Phar. and Sadd.* 78-86) but as their supporters in time of national troubles, withdrawing from the Maccabean party when the nation regained a firm footing and as we shall see, absolutely opposing them in the last days of Hyrcan's reign. They withdrew

from public life evidently because in
 their struggle for the nation, they saw
 in its success, a conservation of the
 law and the national religion which
 received its first revival in the first
 sacrifice offered in the Temple. The
 enemy had been expelled and the
 Pharisees having nothing more to
 fight for, felt no inclination to
 extend Israel's dominion, which
 Judas was anxious to do. This be-
 came apparent when Alcimus, one
 of the priestly aristocracy, came to
 Jerusalem under the protection of a
 Syrian army, commanded by Bacchides,
 and demanded the high-priestly office.
 Judas refused but these scribes or
 Assideans, sided with Alcimus, saying
 "one that is a priest of the seed-
 of Aaron, is come with this army
 and he will do us no wrong." (1 Macc. ii. 23)
 And Alcimus gained his end.

Although he slew many of the scribes, still they did not go over to Judas because of their antagonism to the Asmonean policy of expansion. When Jonathan, after his assumption of the high-priesthood (152 B.C.) showed democratic ideas, then the Sopherim or Asideans ceased from their opposition, and the parties during his and Simon's reign preserved peace, though the party ideas still prevailed, causing open warfare during Hyrcan's reign. After the account of Jonathon's victory at Kadesh, Josephus mentions the sects for the first time (Ant. XIII-V-9), but it is not to give account of any of their movements, so there must evidently have ~~been present~~ ^{been present} in the state.

Most modern writers assert that the name of Pharisee and Sadducee were applied to these parties at this time, most probably following the tradition

of Josephus. Under John Hyrcan (135-106 B.C.) they appear to be on friendly terms with the Maccabean dynasty as well as with ~~with~~ their opponents the Sadducees.* Evidently it was due to the efforts of Hyrcan that a feeling of amity was established, as he divided the offices between them according to their respective desires, awarding to the Sadducees, positions in the army and in the diplomatic service, while he assigned to the Pharisees, the business of teaching the Law and acting in the capacity of judges and civil officers. But Hyrcan, as well as his brothers, preceding him, had combined the offices of priest and political head of the nation. Their ambitions, however, lay in the direction of politics and national expansion, and religion was

* Josephus remarks that Hyrcan was a disciple of the Pharisees (Ant. xii. x.) He therefore must have found favor with them.

relegated to secondary importance. To this, the Pharisees could not but object; their very *raison d'être* was the scrupulous observance of the Law and carefulness in legal purity - therefore a division between the Maccabees and the Pharisees was bound to occur.

This division is related by Josephus (*ant.* ~~XIII~~ ^{XV}) through the medium of an anecdote that may be partly historical, partly legendary, perhaps apocryphal - at least in some features it is so. This story tells of a feast given by Hyrcanus to which he invited both the Pharisees and Sadducees. Desiring to know whether he had been at fault in any of his actions, he asked the Pharisees whether he deserved their commendation or not? They expressed themselves as pleased with his conduct; however one of their number, Eleazer by name, took advantage of the opportunity, to suggest

to Hyrcan that he lay down the high-priesthood, because of the fact that his mother had been a captive during the Syrian war. This being false, Hyrcan became justly indignant, while his friend, a certain Jonathon belonging to the Sadducean party, only kindled the flame by telling him that Eleazer had expressed the sentiment common to all the Pharisees, this could be proven if Hyrcan would but ask the Pharisees their opinion as to the punishment Eleazer deserved. The Pharisees in reply to the question thus put to them, answered that he should be whipped and put in chains, but not to be put to death. — This judgment was thoroughly Pharisaic in principle as they were usually merciful in judgment.* — Hyrcan took this mild decision as a sign of their approval of the action of Eleazer.

* Cf. Baba Kama 83b, 84a, b, Tosepta Sanh. 6.

and in consequence withdrew from the Pharisees and joined the Sadducees.

Whatever there may be of legendary character in this story, this much is historical,* that it represents an actual rupture between Hyrcan and the Pharisees. And from this time on, we hear of those stripes between the Pharisees and Sadducees that eventually culminated in the destruction of the Jewish state. Hereafter there is open strife between the Pharisees and the Maccabees, and though the beginning of this strife seems thus to have ~~been~~ ^{begun} - according to Josephus - in a more incident, there must certainly have been a strong undercurrent at work

* Authorities differ as to the historical value of this story; however, the preponderance of opinion is in favor of giving it a legendary character with the nucleus of truth as represented in the division between Hyrcan and the Pharisees. Graetz regards the story as historical. Cf. Vol. II. p. 31-32.

bringing about this separation, and this may possibly have been lying dormant in the desires of the Pharisees and the Asmonean princes to be free from restraint. Such a restraint must have existed in the authority which they exercised over each other, the one in religious and ritual matters, the other in political and diplomatic affairs.

Hyrcan, therefore, deposed the Pharisees giving their positions in the courts and the high Council to the Sadducees. The accounts of his persecutions of the Pharisees are, however, slightly exaggerated, still it is true that he was in open enmity with them, and party lines became more sharply drawn than ever. Under Alexander Janai, (128 or 129-78 B.C. ascended the throne 104 B.C.) the strife between the Pharisees and Sadducees became fairly violent. The king in spite of the Pharisaic tendencies of his wife Salome,

in spite of the influence brought to bear upon him by her brother, *Simon b. She-tach, a noted Pharisee, he opposed that party which had won his father's ill-will; however, his misfortunes in war, made him unpopular and this served to strengthen the Pharisees in their antagonism to him.

The first outbreak occurred at the Succoth festival. ** While Alexander was officiating as high-priest, he disobeyed the Pharisaic injunction of pouring water - the symbol of fruitfulness - upon the altar, and poured it rather on the ground. This was the signal for the outraged Pharisees and their followers to pelt him with the citrons (etrog) and palms (lulab) which they had brought with them in obedience

* Cf. Ant. XIII - XIII^o w. Succoth 48.5.

** So says tradition. However Renan says this relationship cannot be taken seriously.

to the Levitical law, to celebrate the feast. They also taunted him with the accusation that he was descended from a woman who had been a captive, evidently referring to the charge made by Eleazer against John Hyrcan. He set his soldiers loose upon the populace and they killed over six thousand persons. The result of this act, was a civil war, the Pharisees arrayed against the king, which lasted six years and cost fifty thousand lives (according to Josephus, Ant. XIII-XIII⁵). The king was willing to make peace after these conflicts but the Pharisees said that nothing but his death would satisfy them. In consequence, they sought an alliance with Eucærus, king of Syria who in an encounter at Shechem, defeated Alexander and drove him to the mountains of Ephraim. Here the Pharisees in the Syrian camp, moved to pity by Alexander's flight, deserted the Syrian

king, thus compassing the retreat of Eucæmus from Judea. However a few remaining Pharisees, still opposed Alexander and took the field against him, but unsuccessfully. They betook themselves to the fortress of Bethome where they ^{were} finally compelled to surrender. Here Alexander committed a most barbarous act by crucifying about eight hundred of these Pharisees. Thus he terrorized his opponents who fled the country.

Throughout all these conflicts, Alexander must have realized the power and importance of the Pharisees, for on his death-bed, he advised his wife, Salome Alexandra to put the Pharisees in power and to seek their counsel at all times.* (Ant. ~~XIII~~ ^{XV}, Iota 223)

* Regarding this fact, Renan (Hist. of Israel, p. 115) remarks that this story has come down to us "filtered through Pharisaic hate. Clerical parties always like to make out that their enemies were driven to repentance on their death-beds. They see in these belated conversions a proof that their own position is sound at bottom - that no

Thus the Pharisees gained an official recognition of their influence and position in the nation, and during the whole reign of Salome, they were her chief advisers & administrators, in fact her reign was the reign of the Pharisees.* The Law once more obtained the prestige for which the Pharisees had striven so long. However despite this narrow partisanship, the country in the time of Salome regained its lost power, and once more was in a prosperous condition. The high priesthood, with Hyrcanus in office, was separated from the royalty, the exiled Pharisees returned, religious customs were again inaugurated, and by the energy of those "Restorers of the Law", Simon b. She-tach and Juda b. Tabai, the Nasi, the man deserts them unless he has lost his wife." Whether true or not, this view is interesting and illustrates quite well the ingeniousness and brilliancy of the mind of Renan.

* Ant. XIII - XVI²

administration of all civil regulations, and the reorganization of the Courts and Synedrium were effected. The Sadducees were placed in the background, their ideas of religious observances were replaced by Pharisaic exposition of the Law. The liberal conception of the Mosaic legislation made way for the traditional methods of interpretation. The Pharisees held the power, and the Sadducees were uneasy. Their fear was only increased when the Sadducean leaders who had advised Alexander to kill the eight hundred Pharisees at the fortress of Bethome, were put to death. In consequence, they asked Salome to give them the protection of some fortress not under the dominion of the Pharisees. This she did, granting them all the fortresses save Alexandrius, Hyrcanus and Macherus - where the royal treasures were kept,

and which were reserved for the soldiers of the queen.

The reign of Salome was wholly peaceful, and this is the greatest tribute that can be paid her. But she compassed the end of the Asmonean dynasty. She entrusted the power to the Pharisees who were the enemies of her house, and while they praised her and called her reign an age of gold. (*Megillah Taanith* 23a) they held such a position as to wholly undermine the Asmonean party and hence the military power of the nation. She valued the present too much and failed to foresee the results of her actions.* To this befriending of the Pharisees, can be traced all the future struggles within the nation, and finally its destruction.

Following Salome's death (69 B. C.) her two sons, Hyrcan II and Aristobol II

* Ant. XIII-XVI⁶

41
were rival claimants for the throne. The result was a civil war which ended with the arrival of Pompey and the subjection of Judea to the Roman rule. Aristobul was captured and taken to Rome, the leaders of the struggle beheaded and Hyrcan confirmed in the high priesthood, though all secular power was taken from him. Thus ended the Asmonean dynasty as rulers of Judea.)

We relate this portion of the history because it brings into prominence the Pharisees idea of government. They had no use for the Asmoneans and objected to a royal house within the nation. So when Pompey came to Jerusalem, they did not care to offer any resistance, on the contrary they welcomed the Roman rule. They preferred to leave the temporal power in the hands of others, and be

41

allowed to have untrammelled power
in matters religious. * This, they knew
the Romans would grant, and they felt
perfectly easy at the prospect of the
downfall of the Asmoneans and of sub-
jection to the rule of Rome. The fact
that the event of the siege of Pompey,
is not mentioned in the Talmud, shows
how little affected the Pharisees were.**

The history of the Pharisees from
now on, is the history of the people,
τὸ ἔθνος, as Josephus terms them. There-
fore the struggles and wars, in fact
the whole career of Israel henceforth
is identified with the doings and
movements of the Pharisees.

* cf. Aboth 1-9

** So Renan II-131

Chapter II.

The Character of the Pharisees,

Their Relation to Jesus.

The contents of this chapter will explain in a large measure the principles underlying the doctrines ^{and} practices of the Pharisees, the ^{material} ~~matters~~ of which will be treated in detail in the chapter following. We have not pursued the inductive method here, of first stating Pharisaic tenets and then deriving general principles therefrom. That work has already been done for us. Our task will merely be to state the results of modern scholarship on the subject and proceed rather from the general to the particular.

One of our most important sources for ascertaining the character of the Pharisees as well as of the other sects, is the history of Josephus. But here

it might be well to remark that his statements are not all ^{entirely} perfectly reliable, and we must, therefore, take him reservedly. It must be remembered that Josephus was writing for Roman readers and he desired to represent to them that there were three schools of philosophy ($\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\sigma\sigma\phi\iota\alpha\iota$) in the Jewish nation corresponding to the three Greek schools of philosophy, namely, the Stoic (Pharisees) the Epicurean (Saducees) and Pythagorean (Essenes)*. His object, thus, was to give the Romans an exalted idea of Judean culture. As a result, he is given to exaggeration and continually imparts to the views of these parties a certain amount of Greek coloring. There were no systems of philosophy in Judaism and Josephus in making philosophic sects of these parties has

*

Cf. Vita 2, fin; Ant. ~~XX~~ - X⁴

deliberated^{ly} falsified matters. This may be seen in the doctrine of free-will^{and} Providence. He makes the Essenes believe in fate*, and the Sadducees deny the teaching*. The Pharisees adopt a middle path by saying that "to do what is right or the contrary is principally in men's own power, although fate co-operates in every action.*" Apart from the fact that the idea of fate is wholly un-Jewish,^(note) it looks very suspicious that there should have been any such systematizing. As Shürer says, "this systematizing is the weakest point in the representation of Josephus.^{14*}" A Greek coloring may, therefore adequately characterize his accounts, and he must

* Ant. XIII-V⁹

* Wars. II-VIII-14

** Wars II-VIII-14 also XVIII-I³

Div. II, Vol. II p. 16 [English Edition]

(Note) Ewald, however, says this word "fate" is the philosophical equivalent for God.

be judged accordingly.

The Pharisees are essentially the "rigidly legal" party, standing as they did at the very summit of legal Judaism. They spring from the scribes, who were always students of the Law, and in consequence take their main characteristics from these Sopherim. This fact must always be taken into account in forming any conception of the Pharisees. The tendency of the Pharisees from the very beginning was strictly legal, that is, their business was concerned with the studying of the Law and applying themselves to its interpretation.* They are esteemed most skillful in the exact interpretation of their

* Their law meant perfect truth for them, and in its service they were willing to endure hardships. (cf. Epistle to the Romans 7-7ff.) In this regard, the Sadducees honored them saying "they (the Pharisees) denied themselves in this world, but would hardly receive a reward in a future world."

laws".* As descendants of the scribes, they took upon themselves to continue their work and to observe such interpretations as they had made. These interpretations are known as "oral law"* upon which the Pharisees laid so much stress, and the observance and development of which distinguished them in a great degree from the Sadducees, who maintained, as binding, only the strict letter of the Mosaic Law.

In interpretation, therefore, the Pharisees were essentially the party of progress. No dead letter could be presumed to shackle their intellects; the needs of the times demanded newer and fuller interpretations and the Pharisees, as students of the Law occupied themselves in this work. They based these interpreta-

* Wars II-VIII¹⁴

* This "oral law" (παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων) was absolutely binding - the foremost authority.

G. Sanhedrin 11³

tions upon tradition, or accepted decisions, the Halacha*. Thus they made additions to the Law. To these "addimenta", Tertullian (on Heretics) ascribes the reason of their "separatism" and also the derivation of their name. To this study of the Law, is connected a scrupulous observance of all its details. They were very careful lest they should become Levitically impure, and for this purpose, they would keep closely together, eating their meals with those of their own number, and forming for such purposes small fraternities (חברות). This strict regard for Levitical impurity in their personal, family & Temple life brought upon them the ridicule of their opponents. It is related (Jer. Chagiga 79d) that once the Pharisees immersed the golden candlestick after one of the festival services, lest some

* Cf. Aboth III-11, II-8, Sanhedrin XI-3

unclean priest may have defiled it. The Sadducees, thereupon, taunted them with the remark, "behold the Pharisees will at last also purify the sun."

So far we have stated the fundamental principles dividing the Pharisees from all other parties, that is, their extraction from the scribes ^{and} in consequence their busying themselves with the Law, secondly their close observance of the Levitical regulations regarding purity ^{and} impurity. Their further marks of division ^{and} differences of opinion, are the result of historical evolution, brought about by opposition to the Sadducees.

This opposition to the priestly and aristocratic Sadducees was of such a nature as to enable us to call them the democratic party, the party of the people, the party of progress, the

47

party in which the Reformation finds its "full reflection",* that is, national in politics^{and} progressive in religious matters. The Pharisees, evidently believed in the practical realization of Israel being "a kingdom of priests^{and} a holy nation" (Ex. ~~xix~~ - 6) for they held that every Israelite was a priest and that his priesthood was as sacred as that of the Sadducee who officiated in the Temple.* He was to wear a garment (the Talith) to show his priesthood unto the Lord. Likewise the phylacteries corresponded to the headgear of the priest, the Mezuzah, a sign that every house was a Temple, the family meal, or the meal of the אֵין עֵין stood for the sacrificial meal of the priests. They also made many interpretations of the

* cf. Geiger P. u. S. 25

* In this connection II Macc. 2-17 is a very interesting reflection of this idea. See Geiger *ibid.* p. 25 & note.

the Law, all with this one idea in view, the uplifting of the people, removal of oppressive burdens ^{and} encouraging of their religious aspirations. With respect to the priests the Pharisees adopted such a position as ^{to} to undermine the power of this aristocratic order. They depreciated the Temple ^{and} the special privileges of the priests, not because they did not believe them divinely ordained for just the contrary was the case, but because they desired to make more of their religion than the offering of sacrifices, in other words, they were for "a greater spirituality" * in the Temple worship. The priestly aristocracy had only too often violated every moral law, every interest of the religion, ^{and} the nation for its own material gain. A reform was therefore necessary, according to the views of the Pharisees. They wished to do away with the

* Cf. Deutsch-Philosophy of Jewish History p. 42.

temporal power of the priesthood, and to eliminate as far as possible all distinctions between priest^s and people, and for this purpose they put peculiar interpretations on scripture, as they did not dare to declare openly for an abrogation of the priestly rights. Therefore many of the differences of opinion between Pharisees^s and Sadducees, will be clarified, if this unifying principle of democracy versus aristocracy be kept in mind.*

* This idea was first advanced by Geiger (cf. P. u. S. pp. 13-14) though Wellhausen^s and Schürer, while accepting the democracy principle as fundamental in P. development, deny that this idea explains all their differences of opinion. This is undoubtedly true; some such differences appear to be prompted by no other motive than that of opposition. For instance, the P. are considered to be more lenient in judgment (Ant. XIII-19) yet as regards the law of the false witness (Deut. 19¹⁶⁻²⁰) the P. say that he is to be executed ^{even} before the falsey accused is killed, and through anxiety to do away with all Sadducean interpretation, Judah b. Tabai had a witness put to death simply to carry out

50

The Pharisees were the better educated element, representing the aristocracy of intellect; they were patriotic, self-sacrificing, lived in the simplest fashion and were the most popular, their authority being held in high esteem. The Sadducean officers, according to Josephus were compelled to obey Pharisaic ordinances* and even when the Pharisees say "anything against the king or the high-priest, they are at once believed."* They were also a pious and moral people, whose judgment was "according to the scale of merit",** with whom personal worth counted for much. They were upright, merciful in judgment, men of high moral ideals. They the Pharisaic teaching though he happened at the same time to be breaking another Pharisaic law. (cf. *Tracts II-53*) There seems to be the spite or opposition element here.

* Ant. XIII-X⁵⁶, XVII-II⁴, XVIII-I³⁻⁴

* Ant. XIII-X⁵

** a Pharisaic expression cf. Abot 1^o

were not dissemblers nor self-righteous, nor hypocrites, as we are told in the New Testament. Very true is the remark of Graetz that "it is altogether preposterous to stigmatize a whole class of men as dissemblers."* Especially when Pharisaism stands for genuinely true Judaism, for a spirit that is thoroughly Jewish,* a spirit that is synonymous with righteousness. The 23rd Chapter of Matthew is a falsification of fact if it is intended, thereby, to convey the meaning that Pharisaism is equivalent to hypocrisy. There is only this much truth in the chapter, namely, that there were some pharisees who were a disgrace to their order ^{as} the description of them alluded to, may be perfectly true in that case. Deceivers and pious frauds have existed in every moral community, and it was probably against such as these

*

Histon II-20

*

Shirer Div. II vol. II. Article "Pharisees."

that Jesus delivered his fierce invectives. The Talmud condemns these kind of Pharisees in language no milder than that of Jesus. In a famous passage (Sota 22b. also Jer. Berachoth Chap. ix) we have enumerated seven kinds of Pharisees, which we will cite here merely to illustrate what the Pharisees themselves thought of the hypocrites and formalists of their own number.

I. The Schechemite Pharisees (פְּרִישֵׁי שְׁכֶמֶת) whose object in keeping the law for material gain, just as Schechem submitted to the rite of circumcision to be permitted to marry Dinah.

II. The tumbling Pharisees (פְּרִישֵׁי נִקְפִי) who in order to appear humble, hang his head and does not lift up his feet when he walks so that he constantly tumbles.

III. The bleeding Pharisees (פְּרִישֵׁי קִיּוּצָא) who in order not to look at a woman walks about with his eyes closed and hence injures his head frequently, so that he

has bleeding wounds.

IV. The mortar Pharisees (פרוש מדוכיא) who wears a cap in the form of a mortar to cover his eyes that he may not see any impurities or indecencies.

V. The what-am-I-yet-to-do Pharisees (פרוש
אדעה מה חובתי) who not knowing much about the Law, as soon as he has done one thing asks, "what is my duty now?" (cf. Matt. II 23)

VI. The Pharisee from fear (פ" מיראה) who keeps the law because he is afraid of a future judgment.

VII. The Pharisee from love (פרוש מאהבה) who obeys the Lord because he loves him with all his heart.

This quotation from the Talmud is ample justification for the ideal of right that existed among the Pharisees, though the Pharisaic literature of the period of the Second Commonwealth (Mishnah, Psalms of Solomon, II Macc. etc) fairly teems with ethical sayings and sentiments. (See note on next page)

* Further it should be remembered that Jesus himself was a Pharisee. The results of the best of modern scholarship, have proven this. Many of his remarks are so thoroughly Pharisaic that we are forced to accept such a conclusion; take for instance, his idea on the Sabbath. (cf. Mark II-27 with Goma 85b)

Note Dr. Hirsch in his "Crucifixion" p. 23 asserts that this passage "dates from a time when the name (P.) had become a mere matter of etymological speculation and had passed out of consciousness of the people". He founds this on the view of Joel that "the N. T. writings influenced in more than one regard, the traditions of the rabbis".

* The remark made by Janai on his death-bed according to Sota 22b ("Do not fear those hypocritical Pharisees who act like Gimri and seek the reward of Pinchas.") shows how the Talmud singles out those formalists, those make-believe pious, from the main body of the Pharisees who were worthy of giving Queen Salome advice on the conduct of the government.

Therefore it is very possible that Jesus could not have lashed his own party so severely as the chapter in Matthew indicates. This book was written at a late date when an incorrect conception of the Pharisees prevailed; hence this "un-gainly portraiture"; this gross mis-judgment

Chapter III.

The Tenets & Practices of the Pharisees.

A. Political Views.

The Pharisees as regards statecraft, held the good old Jewish notion of theocracy: in government, they viewed everything from a religious standpoint, and conceived all their political affairs, both at home and abroad to be in the hands of God, or "fate" as Josephus styles it.*

Their only object, politically considered, was religious liberty; for this they fought ^{and} when this object was accomplished, they resumed their studies in the Law. Under Jonathon, the whole object of the war, viz., the cause of God and religious freedom had been accomplished ^{and} hence the scribes ^{and} As-sideans withdrew from the army, especially as Jonathon seemed bent on a policy of expansion, an idea with which these Pharisees could have no sympathy; their

* Wars II-VIII ¹⁴ Ant. XIII-V⁹, XVIII-I⁴

whole world was comprised in that one word, "religion," not in territory or in temporal power. Their fatherland was religious, not earthly, and if the theocracy was under the temporal rule of heathens, they ^{were} content, as long as they could worship God and engage in the study of the Law. There is a certain fatalistic element in this last view. They were under the rule of the Romans, and this they considered as an inevitable necessity, for it was the will of God*; they were suffering punishment for their sins, and this foreign domination must not be resisted. According to this standpoint, the idea of Divine Providence is the fundamental conception in their political scheme.

But there was no absolute unity in the Pharisaic party; on the contrary, there were two well-defined factions,

*

Cf. Schürer *Dev. II* Vol. II - p. 18.

the one representing the above view in politics, the other representing a view which placed, not Divine Providence, but the idea of Israel's election as basic in their political conception.

According to this last idea, the rule of the Romans was objectionable, as Israel should be an independent nation with only the anointed of God i.e. of the House of David, as ruler, and God as their only Lord.* Accordingly a revolutionary party grew up out of this idea, a party that counselled resistance to Rome, and defiance to the census-taking, which meant a certain poll-tax.* Knowing these facts, we can explain certain incidents in the reign of Herod. Two Pharisees, Simeon and

* Ant. XVIII - 1

* This was a mooted question during the second Commonwealth especially in the days of the Procurator, Gessius Florus. The New Testament reveals partly the opposition this tribute encountered (cf. Matt. 22-17ff. Mark 12-14ff. Luke 20-22ff) and the word for census-taking (CENSUS) in the Talmud acquired the meaning of "fine".

Pollio advised the citizens of Jerusalem to receive Herod and to submit to his rule*. These men evidently held the first view stated above, i.e. Divine Providence. However there were about six thousand Pharisees who refused to swear allegiance to Herod, on account of which they were fined†. These Pharisees comprised the revolutionary element of the party; they advised resistance to Herod, and for this end, they tried many methods. Josephus relates of their conspiring even with the sister-in-law of Herod to place her husband Pheroras on the throne,‡ on account of which their leaders suffered death. Therefore it seems that there were

* ant. XV-I', XIV-IX⁴ Compare XV-I' with XV-X⁴ where Sameas and Pollio refuse to take the oath. Hence we have a strange contradiction of facts.

† Ant. XVII-II⁴

‡ Ant. XVII-II-⁴

two divisions in the Pharisaic party*, one seeking political freedom, the other engrossed in the study of the Law, not troubling themselves about the conflicts and intrigues that were taking place within the nation. They labored in the interpretation of their oral ^{and} written law, while the nation was being disrupted by internal dissensions ^{and} rebellions against authority*. Their views on legalism were irreconcilable with the worldly ideas of government. Soon we shall see a more decided "separation" in the views of the Essenes.

As far as the Sanhedrin is concerned, it must be remembered that Pharisees were never at its head; the Sadducean High-priests presided over it and made

* Though Josephus (Ant. ~~XVIII~~ - 1.6) makes of the second division (as we have stated it) a "fourth sect of Jewish philosophy (sic)"

* Cf. Kuenen - Religion of Israel Vol. III p. 241 ff. Wellhausen's article on Israel in Encyc. Brit.

of it the "municipal council" of Jerusalem, though under Salome, a great many scribes and Pharisees must have been members of that body. Under Hyrcan, there were only a very few scribes in it. This fact only is of importance, that in ordinances, laws and in all legislation, the Sadducees "addict themselves to the notions of the Pharisees because the people would not otherwise put up with them" (Ant. XIII-I⁴). Therefore in the government, it was the influence of Pharisean customs and traditions, that determined legislation, and not the Pharisees themselves, for they held aloof from government; they were real separatists.

B. Doctrinal Views.

Our main source for this section, is Josephus, in fact he is the only source, but here as no where else, he colors the party beliefs with Greek philosophy and we must take him very reservedly.

The first of their doctrines is immortality. "They (the Pharisees) think that all souls are immortal, but that the souls of good men only are removed into other bodies, while the souls of bad men are punished with eternal punishment." (Wars. II. III. 14) "They also believe that souls have an immortal power in them ^{and} that there will be under the earth, rewards or punishments, according as men have lived virtuously or viciously in this life; and the latter, souls are to be detained in an everlasting prison, but the former will have power to live again." (Ant. VIII. I. 9) This immortality doctrine is further amplified by their belief in the resurrection of the dead,* and this, they proved from the Torah. So much importance did they place on this teaching that they said of anyone who denied its truth, "he has no part in the world."

* This doctrine must have come to them from the Pharisees, when the Israelites were in exile.

to come.* According to II Mace XII 40-45, they must have believed in a resurrection of both the righteous and the wicked, an idea seemingly contradictory in part to the statements of Josephus in Ant. XVIII 1st and Wars. II-VIII 14.

The doctrine was fundamental in their eschatology, and provided for differences in the party itself. The Pharisees also believed in angels, if we may trust the testimony of the New Testament. Acts XXIII 8 is the only source we have in this connection. Schürer professes to believe that this testimony is thoroughly trustworthy as it accords with the entire picture of the Pharisees.*

As for the doctrine of free-will and Pre-

* Sanhedrin II = 1. See Sanh. 90b. for an interesting controversy on this subject.

† Cf. Deutsch - Ph. of J. History. p. 43

‡ Div. 2 - Vol II, p. 14.

vidence, Josephus presents the Pharisees as having a regular philosophic system. He represents them as ascribing "all things to fate ^{and} God, and yet allow that to do what is right or the contrary, is principally in men's own power, although fate co-operates in every action".* "They say that some but not all actions are the work of fate, and some are in our own power either to do or not to do."† "And when they say that all things happen by fate, they do not take away from men the freedom of acting as they think fit; since their notion is that it has pleased God to mix up the decrees of fate ^{and} man's will, so that man can act virtuously or viciously".‡ Here we have a picture which if not inconsistent, is at least highly colored. Fate is un-Jewish and is

* Wars II VIII 14

† Ant. XIII V-9

‡ Ant. XVIII I-3

9
questions are closely connected with the
views of the Sadducees, we shall post-pone
this part of our inquiry until we have
discussed the Sadducean party.

Part II

The Sadducees.

Chapter I

Their Name, Origin ^{and} History.

There are very few documents extant regarding the Sadducees, and this coupled with the fact that the party is a "compound" phenomenon leaves room for a great variety of conjectures. It is true the Sadducees had some literature of their own* but this has been lost, and what we know of them, we must gather from Josephus, the New Testament (where they receive but slight mention) and the Talmud (which is the literature of their opponents.)

One of the oldest conjectures as to their name and origin, we find in the Aboth de Rabbi Nathan. A story

* See Sanh. 100b The phrase ספרי בדוקים indicates this; and the ספרי חיצוניים, the reading of which deprives one of immortal life, according to Akiba, are the books of the Sadducees—so says a Baitha.

is here told of the disciples of Antigonus of Socho, who interpreted a saying of their teacher (Aboth I-3) to mean that there was no future world. Hence two parties arose, the Zaddukim^{and} the Boethusians, calling their name from these two disciples of Antigonus, viz: Zadok^{and} Boethus.*

This story was taken up by Saadia^{and} Maimonides^{and} related as historical.

And this derivation seemed to have gained credence throughout all the centuries, until modern times when several defects were found in this theory of the origin^{and} name of the Sadducees. In the first place, the *Abot de Rabbi Nathan* were written much later than the days of Nathan Ha-Babli (Horapoch 13b) the supposed author of the book. Therefore this book has no historical authority for the period of the Second Commonwealth. Secondly, this theory is not

*

For full translation of Geiger. *Urschrift*, p. 105.

mentioned either in Josephus or the Talmud. Again the account mentions the disciples of Antigonus ^{and} not Zadok ^{and} Boethus themselves, as misunderstanding his saying; neither does it state that Zadok and Boethus were the chiefs of these two sects. And besides there is no tradition given us here, only "a learned combination, the Sadducees who denied the immortality of the soul, being said to have embraced this heresy through a misunderstanding of the saying of Antigonus, that we ought to do good without regard for future reward." * So this account is unhistorical as regards the origin of the Sadducees. Concerning the derivation of the name, we are on somewhat secure ground, for most of all modern authorities agree that the name, Sadducees (Σαδδουκαῖοι as in Joe. ^{and the New Test.}) is derived from a proper name, Zadok. There is an old theory, now exploded

that their name צדקים is derived from the adjective צדיק, "righteous."* This opinion was put forth based on an analogy, that as the Pharisees "derived their name from their virtue of isolation, so the Sadducees derived theirs from their own special virtue of righteousness"† Those who hold this view seem convinced that the name was formed so as to correspond to the name Perushim. In the first place, it must be remembered that the Pharisees did not call themselves by this name - at least, not at first, - and again, it is very difficult to make a transit from the adjective צדיק to the proper name צדקים, though Loew thinks צדקים was their original name and their opponents changed it to its permanent form‡

* For ancient opinions on this derivation cf. Epiphanius² Haer. 14 - Hieronymus Comm. Mat. 22²

† Cf. Dean Stanley - The History of the Jewish Church - vol. III p. 335

‡ Modern scholars holding this opinion are Hamburger (Real. Ency. p. 102) Loew (in his article "the Great Synod" as translated in the Israelite 1857) and Derenbourg (Histoire p. 78)

§ This opinion has been bolstered up by the invention of an adj. צדיק^{the correctness of} which is very uncertain

That this name is derived from צדק is now thoroughly agreed upon by the best authorities. To which Zadok, however must we attribute this name Zadukim or Sadducees? If we answer this question, we have explained their origin as well. The Abot & Rabbi Nathan have given an answer to this question, but as stated above, the view is open to many objections.

Kienlen (the Religion of Israel vol. II p. 122) says that we have no historical data concerning this Zadok, his unknown character and is probably a contemporary of Jonathon. Grätz ^{says} merely in his History vol. II p. 29 that this Zadok was one of the leaders of the Sadducees. Geiger (Wann 104 ff. S. u. P. p. 11) has given the most interesting conjecture of all, and his opinion is seconded by the most prominent scholars. He traces this Zadok to the priest of that name living in the time of David, the founder

* Hitzig, Reim, Stitzgenfeld, Curt, Perles, G. W. Ellhausen (S. u. P. 45 ff)

* Cf. II Sam 8-17 ff, 15-24-26, 18¹⁹, 22, 27 I K. I-8, 32, 24

of the priestly class, known by Ezekiel as קִהָּנָה יְדִיד (40-46; 43-19; 44-15; 48-11) This line of priests is traced to Eleazar, the oldest son of Aaron (I Chron. V 30-41); they were therefore the aristocratic element in the Jewish state and were probably called in Maccabean days the Zadokites or Sadducees, and as this party was composed mainly of aristocratic priests, this conjecture of Geiger is most probable.

It is at any rate most ingenious.*

These priests were by the very nature of their position, the political heads of the nation; they governed its internal affairs and by extension of these powers, they guided its foreign policy.

After the exile they were the officers

* It might be well to make mention here of another name by which the Sadd. were known. They were called סִדְרָאִים i.e. Scripturalists, adherents to the written law (cf. Megilla 24b. Jer. Meg. IV-9) This name, probably late in origin, and used by their opponents

describes well their fundamental standpoint, their opposition to the Phar.

of the army, the delegates to foreign countries, and as priests, who were supported by the tithes of the people, they were the most wealthy class. They were a worldly set of men, coming in contact with foreign peoples, they had learned some of their customs ^{and} philosophy. When Alexander, the Great, had brought Greek learning and habits with him into his conquered countries, the Sadducees were the most ready to lend themselves to this Hellenistic influence. They saw it, possibly, the acquisition of Alexander's good will, and his favor was necessary for the welfare of the Judean nation. This was part of their diplomacy. They argued that the political interests were of first consideration ^{and} as this idea gained greater prominence among them, the interests of religion were relegated more ^{and} more

to the background.* This was the Sadducean state of mind prior to the Maccabean revolution. The triumph, however, of Judas's arms, meant triumph for the Chassidim, the religious element, and as the latter party gained popular favor, and infused into the people a greater zeal for religious life, the aristocratic priesthood lost favor and importance, so that under Judas, Jonathan and Simon, the interests of religion were in the foreground despite the ambition schemes of the Maccabees who as the new high priests were forced to conform to Pharisaic views of the Law. The Pharisees took to the study of the Law, made new interpretations, enforced the observance of

* The people were heart and soul in favor of strict religious observances and because of their laxity, the Sadducees became unpopular. In the beginning, they sought the interests of the people. Thus they grew into a powerful class and assuming the independence that goes with power, they turned their backs to the people and depended on their own strength. It is due partly to this attitude that they became worldly men; diplomats, and in the days of Antiochus, counselled compromise and submission instead of resistance.

of the traditions, and the Sadducees remained in the back-ground. Thus the exaltation of the Law aroused the opposition to the priestly party, and here we see the origin of their ideas on legal and ritual questions. They were verily provoked into existence by the opposition of the Pharisees. They opposed legality because it was incompatible with intellectual culture as they saw it. So that during the rule of the first three of the Maccabees, much of the legal and ritual differences between Sadducees and Pharisees were developed.

During the last years of John Hyrcan, the Sadducees again came to the front. This happened on account of a rupture between Hyrcan and the Pharisees.* The Sadducees maintained their supremacy under Hyrcan's successors, Aristobol and Alexander Janai, until the time

* Cf. above, Part I Chap I p. 18.

of Salome when the Pharisees again came into power.* But during all this time, internal dissension continued, and finally paved the way for the Romans who placed Herod on the throne (40 B.C.)

Under Herod, these Sadducean priests were compelled to play a new rôle, namely that of slavish servants to the tyrant. Herod pursued such courses as would give him the most power, yet such as would not endanger this power. He first made an alliance with the popular Asmonean dynasty by marrying Mariamne, the daughter of Salome, and sought to gain the favor of the Sadducees[†] by appointing Hananel, (an obscure Babylonian, of priestly extraction) to the high-priestly office. This man:

* The Sadducees during a part of her reign, were severely persecuted. We have related an instance of this in Part II. p. 26.

† The priests of all this period prior to the destruction, were Sadducees. Cf. Ant. IX. ix. also Acts V. 17.

owing his position to Herod, would not seek to undermine his power. But on account of the demands of the people, Herod deposed Hananel after a time, and placed Aristobul, the brother of his wife in the office of high-priest. But Aristobul was too popular, and Herod had him killed. Herod continued deposing and appointing high-priests all with the idea of securing his power. Thus the priests became the victims of his caprice and lost all their political power. But now there appears a very strange break in Herod's policy. He determined to ally himself with the priestly party, and for this reason, he married Mariamne, the daughter of Simon b. Boethus, a priest,* and he made his father-in-law, high priest. The family of Boethus was thus raised to a place of

* He has already killed his first wife, Mariamne in pursuit of his policy of exterminating the popular Asmonaeans.

distinction, and it is noteworthy that five members of this family were placed in this office.* Thus was created the party of the Boethusians who are referred in the New Testament as Herodians, and the leaven of the Sadducees†. In the Talmud, the Boethusians and Sadduceans are identical. Possibly this distinction might be made (and we quote here the views of Kuenen who has first made plain this distinction)‡. The Sadducees proper had lost all political power, and were victimized by Herod. They therefore pursued the even tenor of their way and remained true to their history and ideas; no change took place in their ranks. This was inevitable, as the King on one

* Viz. Joazer (twice high-priest 4 B.C. and 6 A.C.) Eleazar (3 B.C.), Simon b. Boethus (twice

41 and 44 A.C. cf. Ant. XIII-VI²), Elionene (43) and Joseph Kabi (61)

† Cf. Mark III-6, XII-13, Comp. Matt. XVI⁹ w. Mark VIII-15

‡ Religion of Israel III-232 ff Cf. also Geiger P. u. d. pp. 29-30.

side was a thorn to them, and the people on the other, were heart and soul with their opponents, the Pharisees. The Boethusians were priests and remained true to the convictions of the Sadducees. They differed from the Sadducees only in being the creatures of Herod. No new spirit was imported into their midst. They were true Sadduceans. The Talmud in identifying them with the Sadducees proves this. The Sadducees and Boethusians simply held their place in the Sanhedrin, where they were obliged to adhere to the teachings of the Pharisees.*

After the destruction of the State, the Sadducees appear no longer in history, and it so happens that in the Talmud and Midrashim, very little is known of them. In the 7th century, their origin is completely forgotten, only a mythical story being written about them in the Aboth de Rabbi Nathan.

* A. T. XVIII - I " See note on this passage in Eiger's Uebersicht p. 101

Chapter II.

The Character ^{and} Tenets of the Sadducees.

The Sadducees were essentially and initially the aristocratic and political party. It was their position in the Judean Commonwealth that determined their growth. They proceeded from the ranks of the priests who were the heads of the nation, and this consequent aristocratic character i.e. as priests,* was further reinforced by the addition of generals, army officials, statesmen, men whose learning was broad and worldly, and the wealthy. Initially the champions of the people, they became proud and independent and formed a haughty aristocracy. Power turned their heads and they no longer recognized the people by whose will they had been enabled to wield a vast influence. Their pride turned about the point of their noble extraction. They

* Cf. Jos. Vita I.

were never a popular party, and it may be added that even their wives sided with their opponents, the Pharisees. "They influence none, but the rich and have not the populace on their side". (Ant. XIII. 8^o) They busied themselves with matters of ^{state} and in a period when efforts were directed in the interests of religion, they ^{career was damaged} ~~suffered a checked career~~. They were patriotic, they were thorough nationalists, however it was just their interest for the political welfare of the nation that provided the germ of disagreement between them and the Pharisees. These first differences then, arose out of a political and social condition. In many of their views, they take a negative standpoint i.e. a rejection of the Pharisean tradition. Especially is this the case in laws regarding the Sabbath holidays. The same principle also applies to ritual questions. As priests, they furthered

their own interests and resisted any encroachments made upon their rights^{and} privileges. To them, the making of all Israel, a kingdom of priests, meant a sort of competition and their selfish interests opposed any legislation as tended to promote this democratic end.*

Regarding their political tenets, they made as fundamental, the belief that man has control over his own destiny; he must use his own energy to realize his welfare; they assert that the condition of the State is such as men make it, that it is not preserved by mere trust in God's care, nor by religious practices^{and} customs. They, therefore, resort to human ingenuity and statecraft in their political affairs; they advocate the formation of foreign

* All priests were not Sadducees. There were some exceptions e.g. Josephus was a priest and still belonged to the Phar. party (Vita I). In Aboth (III-2) we read of R. Chanina הנהנין 320. In Eduyoth (VIII-2) and Aboth (II-8) we read of R. Jose Hato².

alliances, contending that this means, national security*. Connected with this doctrine, is their belief in man's free-will; this teaching is, as we have remarked, the very basis of their political views. They believed man could dispose of himself, as he pleased, rejecting the Pharisean idea that there is a co-operation of God in human actions. They laid emphasis on the human factor in men's lives. They "suppose that God is not the cause of our doing or not doing what is bad, and they say that to do what is good or bad lies, is men's own choice, and that the one or the other, so belongs to everyone that they may act as they please". They "suppose that all our actions are in our own power, so that we ourselves are the authors of what is good, and bring our troubles on ourselves by our own folly".* Regarding the

* Cf. Grätz - Hist. Vol II p. 21.

+ War II - VIII¹⁴

* Ant. XIII - V⁹

picture, Josephus gives us of the sects, we have had occasion to remark in Part I. Chap. And in these two quotations from him on this particular doctrine of the Sadducees, the spirit of their belief may perhaps be appreciated if we divest this and all other teachings (as presented by Josephus) of the philosophical and Hellenistic coloring spoken of before. We see here not a philosophy but the actual belief of the Sadducees in our working out our own salvation—a rejection, in other words of an implicit faith in God, such as Josephus attributes to the Essenes. It is upon the human the worldly element that they laid greatest stress. One of the most interesting features of their doctrinal teaching is their non-belief in immortality. They deny a future judgment, assert that the soul perishes with the body, that there is no resurrection, and they therefore reject the belief in immortality*. (See bottom of p. 55)

So reason most modern authorities. Kuenen in a note, remarks that on this teaching, Josephus, the Talmud, and the New Testament are unanimous.* This teaching is probably due to the character of the Sadducees, in being so interesting in this world, and making piety and religiousness a matter of secondary consideration. As we know, they were conservative and finding no basis for the doctrine of immortality in the Torah, they rejected it.† Their standpoint may also be due to the fact, as Kuenen contends, that the doctrine had not become a popular belief when the Sadducees appeared in history, *quod*

* For the sources see *Wass II. VIII*¹⁴, *Ant. III. I*⁴, *Matt. 22-23*, *Mark 12-18*, *Luke 20. 27*, *Acts 23. 8*. See also *Sanh. 90b*.

† *Religion of Israel* vol. III. p. 145.

However some differ, and assert the Sadducees do not deny immortality outright; they simply rejected the belief in a future judgment. (Cf. *Goetz Hist. vol. II. p. 21* - also *Ginsburg's Ant. Sad. in Kittel's Cyclopedia*)

* Cf. *Sanh. 90b*.

they were the champions of the people in the beginning, they refused to accept the belief, maintaining a consistent stand in this matter throughout all their history, no matter how they were affected by circumstances. ^(note) As for the Pharisaic belief in angels, it is only necessary to say that they rejected it.*

The special characteristic of the Sadducees is their strict adherence to the letter of the written Torah, and a rejection of the Pharisaic

[Note] The Rev. Dr. Gaster in an article on "Jewish sects" (Jewish Chronicle Jan 13-1899) remarks ^{of the S.} that their rejection of the belief in the resurrection of the dead, arose out of their rejection of the Messianic idea - that is, of the idea that the throne of Judaea would be occupied by a descendant of the House of David; for the resurrection of the dead, and the dispensing of reward and punishment after death, were all implied in the Messianic belief - they were to take place at the coming ^{of the Messiah}

* Cf. Schürer Div. II vol. II p. 14. However it is hard to reconcile this belief with their views regarding the Law. It is possible that they have explained the various appearances of angels in the Bible as

traditions and interpretations, the παράδοσις
 τῶν προβυτέρων. They upheld the written Law
 and denied the תורה שבעל פה. They "say that we
 are to esteem those observances, obligatory
 that are in the written word, but are not
 to observe what is derived from the tra-
 dition of our forefathers." * And their habit
 throughout all their history of referring
 to the Law and making it a basis for
 their views, has originated the idea that
 the Sadducees rejected the Prophets and Hagi-
 graphy. † But this is perhaps due to a con-
 fusion with the Samaritans; the Church
 fathers evidently labored under a misconception

[the continues]

For we have a record from Justin Martyr (Dialog. c. Tryphon, Jud.
 f. 35-8 ed. Colon) mentioning a sect of Jews denying personal angels,
 and explaining all appearances as temporary forms existing as
 some revelation of God.

*

Ant XIII-X⁶

†

Cf. Epiphanius, Adv. Haer. 14, Jerome, Comment. on Matt. 22²¹⁻²³.

Orosius, de tribus sectis Iudaeorum III⁹

for this opinion is not substantiated by proper evidence. This much is certain, they insisted on the written letter of the Law as their authority and rejected every interpretation that seemed out of harmony with the plain meaning. To make this standpoint secure, they considered it virtuous to dispute with their teachers* thus contradicting flatly the maxim of the Pharisees, who did not allow themselves to oppose the imputations of those who preceded them in age†.

They were, therefore, a conservative party; they believed in binding Judaism strictly to the letter of the Law, no additions, no innovations, no "novelties", but a simple 'treading in the beaten path'. They, therefore, restricted growth and opposed religious progress. It is very possible that this standpoint grew out of their selfishness.

* Ant. XVIII - I⁴

† Ant. XVIII - I⁵

As we have already said, their opinions were provoked into existence by opposition to the Pharisees, and as Pharisaic rules attacked the rights and privileges of the priests, a doctrinal standpoint must have been formed, from which they could fight, the strict adherence to the letter of the law.

Kuenen says that they did not reject entirely the oral tradition. Whether this be true or not, their disputes as related in the Talmud show in some cases, an exegesis, somewhat different from the vs. Examples of this fact will follow in Part III of this thesis.

The Sadducees generally speaking, were orthodox; they represented the ancient tradition; they permitted dead generations to legislate for them, although they gladly did so for it was to their interests; but they attacked the validity of the Pharisaic tradition, because they could then justify their political claims.

Part III.

Legal & Ritual Differences between the
Pharisees & Sadducees.

Chapter I

Legal Differences.

A. The Levirate Law.

This law, found in Deut. 25-5 ff, states that if a man die without issue, his brother is in duty bound to marry the widow of the deceased, and the first born of this marriage shall succeed to the name of the brother that is dead, that his name be not blotted out of Israel. The Sadducees hold this law to be binding only when there is a case of betrothal, that after the marriage is consummated, the brother of the deceased is no longer bound to marry this woman. This interpretation may possibly refer to the incident stated in Gen. ~~xxxviii~~ 7-10 where it is assumed that Er had not yet married Tamar*. The sentence

* Cf. Geiger-Jüdische Zeitschrift 1-30 Breslau 1862, also Yebarnoth. 34b, Bereschith Raba Chap. 88.

לֹא תִהְיֶה אִשְׁתּוֹ הַחַיָּה לְאִישׁ אֲחֵר (Deut 25-5) was probably translated: the wife of the deceased who is outside (i.e. the consummation of the marriage) is not to be for another man.

Knowing this interpretation of the Sadducees, the meaning of the question they put to Jesus* becomes plain. They knew that he was one of the Pharisees who evidently took this verse according to its plain meaning. They therefore questioned him partly in sarcastic, partly in dialectic fashion. If a man die having no children, his brother shall marry his wife and raise up seed unto his brother. Now there were seven brethren, and the first married, and died, and having no seed, left his wife unto his brother; in like manner all the remaining brothers, and after them all, the woman died. In the resurrection therefore, whose wife shall she be of the seven? For they all

* Matt. 22-23ff. Mark 12-13ff. Luke 20-27ff.

'had her.

This was a problematic question in tending to invalidate the idea that a man must marry his brother's widow. This question, as well as their interpretation of the Levirate law, illustrates the fact that the Sadducees were not entirely free from palpulism, nor from an artificial method of exegesis, the salient features of the Pharisees.* This thought impresses itself upon us as we note more of these differences.

(B) Immediately connected with this law is the difference in interpretation between the Pharisees and Sadducees, of the law of חליצה. This law states (Deut. 25:9) that in case the brother upon whom devolved the duty of marrying the wife of the deceased, refuse to raise up to his brother a name in Israel, then

* Cf. Geiger P. u. S. p. 19-14

shall his brother's wife come unto him in the presence of the elders and loose his shoe from off his foot and spit in his face and say - 'so shall it be done unto that man that will not build up his brother's house'. The Sadducees interpret the word ^{וּפָנָו} literally i.e. "in his face". The Pharisees say, "before his face". * Kuenen says that this was probably "a part of a more important difference" namely that of the Pharisees making the law include those male relatives next of kin, while the Sadducees restricted the law to the brothers only. "Thus it was very natural that the Sadducees should deem the refusal to marry more culpable than the Pharisees who, precisely because they interpreted the law more broadly, were obliged to show themselves ready to

* Megillath Taanith Chap IV

consider reasonable objections to its observance[†]

c. The *lex talionis*[†] was interpreted literally by the Sadducees. They believed in punishing according to rule of "eye for eye" and tooth for tooth." The Pharisees interpreted this law with mercy. They said that a pecuniary compensation is satisfactory. Connected with this law, is the law regarding the false witness.[‡] In this one case, the Pharisees are more severe in their interpretation than are the Sadducees. The Pharisees, according to Josephus[§] are as a general rule, lenient in judgment, while the Sadducees are very severe. The *lex talionis* shows this. As regards the false witness, the Sadducees hold that he is to be executed.

* Reliq. of Isr. Vol. III p. 237-8

† Exodus 21²³⁻²⁵ Dent. 19²¹ Levit. 24²⁰

‡ Cf. B. Kama 83b, 84a, b. Megill. Taanith Chap 4.2 Tosephta

§ Dent. 19¹⁶⁻²⁰ ‡ Ant. XIII-X⁶ = XX-IX¹

"only when the person against whom he has testified, is put to death, adducing for the truth of their interpretation the phrase נפש הרהר נפש. The Pharisees say that the false witness is to be executed ^{only} ~~first~~ before, and to back this view, they cite v. 19. "ye shall do unto him as he had thought to have done unto his brother" *

D. Law of inheritance. In num. 27th, we learn that if a man die and have no son, then his daughter inherits his property. The Pharisees and Sadducees were confronted with the problem, not considered here in the Pentateuch, of a man leaving, besides his daughter, a grand-daughter, the child of a deceased son. In this case, to whom is the property to revert. The Sadducees say that the property is to be divided between the daughter and the grand-daughter urging that the daughter is 1st degree while the grand-daughter is 2nd degree.

* Cf. Maccoth I. 6 Talmudic Arab. 5.

The Pharisees assert that the whole property is to revert to the grand-daughter because she is the child of one who is sole heir, on account of whose very existence, the daughters have no inheritance.*

(E) The Sadducees claimed that a man was responsible for damage committed by his servants, for the reason that he was liable for damage committed by his ox or ass.[†] They based this legislation on the fact that he has no legal obligations to his ox or ass, while he is so bound to his man- and maid-servant. The Pharisees say that he is not responsible for damages committed by his servants. The analogy, they claim, does not hold, for the man and the maid-servant possess reason while the ox and ass do not,[‡] that his servants could do damage for spite, and then make him pay the cost.

* Megillah Taanith 8-2 Baba Bathra 8-2, 115b, 116

[†] Exodus 21/32, 35

[‡] Jadayim 4-7

Geiger holds that these last two questions possess a political significance, and that they refer to the relationship existing between Herod and the Asmoneans.*

The motives underlying the views of these two parties on these questions, are patent when we consider that the Sadducees or Boethusians or Herodians (all the same party, as we have shown) were interested in establishing the right of Herod and his family to the throne.

While the Pharisees endeavored to invalidate the legitimacy of these "servants of the House of the Asmoneans" (עֲבָדֵי בֵּית הַשְּׁמֹנִי),[†] the appellation applied to the House of Antipater, and also the fact that the Sadducees claimed the right of Herod to the throne by his marriage with Mariamne, the daughter of Salome (the daughter of Hyrcan II) provide the material for

* Uebersicht u. Uebersetzung der Bibel p. 142-4

†

B. Baxha 3. b.

Geiger's hypothesis of the political mean-
ing of these two laws.

Chapter II.

Ritual Differences

A. Cleanness and Uncleanness

The Pharisees, as we have had occasion to remark before, were very strict regarding matters of Levitical purity. Their literature (the Mishna in particular)* fairly teems with laws and regulations whereby a man is clean or unclean. In fact, they had various degrees of cleanness and uncleanness, based on a ritual degree of Levitical impurity. This strictness was the occasion of ridicule by the Sadducees who once said "behold, the Pharisees will at last, also purify the face of the sun." (Jer. Chagiga 79d)

However it might be interesting to mention that the Sadducees were also very careful regarding these

* Cf. Jadayim IV-67 Chagiga II-7 Para III-7 Demai II-3
Gittin V-9, Tohoroth, passim, VII 34 Matt. XXIII-25-26
also Numbers, 19"-22

laws of ritual purity when it concerned the officiating high-priest.

Particularly was this the case with regard to the burning of the ashes of the red heifer* and the preparation of the water of absolution. They were very careful that this function should be performed by an undefiled priest. They exceeded even the requirements of the Pharisees in this regard, who purposely declared the officiating priest unclean.* Here we perceive the motives underlying each conception. With the Sadducees, it was a case of exalting the priestly office, with the Pharisees a case of making priest and people equally "clean."

In regard to a carcass, the Sadducees declared that contact with

* Numbers 19²⁻¹⁰

* Cf. Para III-7.

* Lev. 11^{32, 40}

any of its parts, e.g. skin, flesh, bones, etc. renders a person unclean. This shows their literal interpretation. The Pharisees said that contact with the flesh only rendered one unclean. Here the Pharisees show their general tendency to lighten the laws which affect the people. The bearing of this law becomes apparent when we realize the uses to which the bones, and the skin of animals were put to in the manufacture of various articles. And in this connection, the interpretations put upon Lev. vii-24 are interesting. The Sadducees translated the word חַי to mean an animal dangerously ill, so that it must be killed such an animal may be slaughtered before it dies; this reconciles their prohibition to use parts of the animal for articles of

* Lev. 11:39, 40

of manufacture, with the permission in the verse to use it for any purpose except for eating. The Pharisees were not compelled to put this unnatural interpretation upon the word **חַלָּל**, though in Chulin 37a.b, they make it include an animal killed before it is about to die a natural death. So also, the Talmud (Chulin 44b) in commenting upon Ezek. 4:14 asserts that the prophet must have referred to the animal about to die and which was killed to allow of its being eaten.*

Bearing in mind these facts, we can understand the debate in Jadayim 4-6, where the Pharisees are blamed for saying that the bones of an ass are clean and those of the high-priest are unclean. The fact relating to **ספרי הקדוש** and **כתבי הקודש** is also

* The syriac translation renders **חַלָּל** in the verse, "sick weak animal."

debated upon in Sabbath 108a. where the Pharisees contend that the skin of a clean or unclean animal, may be used for parchment, but that the Bible is to be written on parchment made of the skin of a clean animal, hence we see the meaning of the phrase *כתבי הקודש כתיבין את הידים. The Sadducees say that the Scriptures must be written on parchment made of a properly slaughtered, and clean animal.

The standpoint of the Pharisees, shows their democratic tendency of lightening the burdens that the law of cleanness entail; while the Sadducees were consistent in putting upon the people as many restraints as possible.

13. The ערוב* This is a Sabbath regulation whereby the Pharisees could have

* Jerusalem 4.6

+ Cf. Mishna Erubin, - Rosh Hash. II 5, Erubin 56b 5/10.

their fraternity (חברים) gatherings for the Sabbath meal just as did the priests.

As they lived far from each other, and as the תחום סבת allowed them to go only 2000 cubits from their own houses; they could not very well assemble in these little bands for the purpose of this meal. Therefore they made the ^{מלגמה}, i.e. the ideal joining of premises, by which one whole district could be made into one house, and then they go out 2000 cubits distant from the border of this district. This "malgamating the distances" was formed by the erection of posts or gates etc.* The Sadducees opposed this scheme—their antagonism to the people makes this seem perfectly natural and they made no matter inconvenient if any of them happened to live in such

* Cf. Gerubin I

a district laid off by the Pharisees, for

* מִי שֶׁאֵינוֹ בְּעֶרְוָה אֵינוֹ עָרוֹב

C. According to Lev. 12⁴⁻⁸, a woman is unclean for one week after giving birth to a male child, and two weeks, if ^{she gives birth to} a female child. This same passage makes her impurity last for thirty-three days more in the first case, and sixty-six in the second. The Sadducees claim that this continuance of the unclean period prohibits not alone the touching of holy things, but also sexual intercourse. The Pharisees while forbidding her the things of the temple, permitted connubial intercourse, and to base this interpretation on the verse in question (v. 4) they read the phrase דָּמִי טָהוֹרָה without a mappik in the ה, thus translating it pure blood and not, the blood of her

* See Erubin III-2 Also VI-1-2 and Berachin 31b, 68b.

purifying as it ought to read. Our
 Massoretic text is Pharisaic, hence the
 reading without a mappis.* Geiger
 calls this a sleight of hand exegesis
 (Exegese ohne Künstlichkeit) made as a con-
 cession to humanity, - so as not to an-
 nul the Biblical Command (P. u. S. p. 22)
 d. In Deut. 22 17, we read in regard
 to a woman suspected by her husband
 of ante-nuptial unchastity, that
 she be brought unto the elders and
 her father to prove her innocence,
 shall show the tokens of her vir-
 ginity, and "they shall spread the
 cloth before the elders of the City".
 The Sadducees take this literally,
 while the Pharisees assert that
 this act means that her inno-
 cence shall be clearly proven.

(c) The Sadducean priests deduced from
 Numbers 28⁴ that the daily morning ^{and}

* Geiger's Zeitschrift 1851, II, 27.

evening burnt offerings were to be paid for by the contributions of every Jew in the Pharisees' derived from vs. 2 that these sacrifices were national and should be paid for out of the temple treasury, since the priests considered the treasury as their property and fund for their support, they objected strenuously but without avail. The Pharisees gained the victory after a struggle of eight days, and in honor of this victory, they made these eight days half holidays during which no mourning should take place.

This victory was another leveler of priest and people. The democratic motives of the Pharisees can be seen plainly as can the motives of the aristocratic Sadducees.

The same principle applies to the burnt offering (Nm 15²⁻¹⁶) which the Sadducees maintained the priests

* Cf. Menachoth 65a.

could eat, but which the Pharisees contended, must be burnt on the Altar.

And the decision again went to the Pharisees. The Sadducean priests claimed this meat offering to be the symbol of their ministry and this innovation evidently lowered their dignity.

(D) On the Succoth festival, the Pharisees held to the custom of pouring water on the altar, while the Sadducees reject it. This difference of opinion led to disastrous results on one occasion. While Alexander Janai was officiating as high-priest on this particular festival, he wished to show his contempt for the Pharisean views, and instead of pouring the water (the symbol of fruitfulness) upon the altar, he poured it at his feet. Thereupon the people pelted him.

* Kuenen - Relig. of J. III 235

with the citrons and palms which they carried in their hands that day.

Alexander, then, ordered his troops to fall on the Congregation and thus 6000 persons were put to death.*

Concerning this same feast, the Sadducees held that the fruit, branches and willows mentioned in Lev. 23-40 were to be used in the construction of booths. They adduced as proof the identity of the leaves of the various trees (in Hebrew) which were used for booths, with the boughs etc. mentioned in the Command (Lev. 23-40). The Pharisees said that the word סוכות meant the carrying of these boughs as symbols of the festival and not the making of the booths, especially as vs. 42 commanding the dwelling in booths is distinct from vs. 40 the command to "take the boughs". Furthermore the Sadducees objected

* A.T. 200-200^o, Succa 48b, Berachy 16b, p. 40

to the processions around the altar, during the whole seven days, carrying willow branches. The Pharisees, however, claimed the validity of the custom.*

(G) Another interesting point of difference and one most commonly known, is the date of Shabuoth. The fixing of this date according to Leviticus 23^{15, 16} is as follows: and ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave offerings; seven sabbaths shall be complete, even unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath, shall ye number fifty days. So reads the verse. The different interpretations caused many disputes between Sadducees and Pharisees. The Sadducees took the verse literally. They translated סמחרת השבת "the day following the weekly sabbath" i.e. the

* Yoma 43b; Graetz vol. II p. 23; Ginsburg, art. Sadd. Kittos Cyclopedia.

Sabbath following Passover, and maintained that the Omer should be offered then, and Shebnoth, counted seven weeks later, would always fall on Sunday.*

The Pharisees interpreted - and rightly so - the word שבוע to mean the first day of Passover, which was a rest day; hence they fixed Shebnoth fifty days from the first day of Pesach i.e. seven weeks from the sixteenth of Nisan. This view is partly proven by the fact that the word שבוע does not always mean the weekly sabbath.* Again we know that after six even periods, there always comes a Sabbath, e.g. the Sabbath of day, comes after the sixth day. So after six years comes the Sabbath of years; similarly after six sabbath years, comes the Sabbath

* cf. Menachoth 65a. Mishna M. 5, Megillath Taanith I.

* Levitic 23 24, 32, 38

of Sabbath year, after six festivals come the Sabbath of Sabbath holiday (Yom Kippur) and so the Sabbath of Weeks could occur only in case we counted from the first day of Pesach*.

(H.) Concerning the incense that the priest uses in the Yom Kippur service (Lev. 16^{12, 19}) the Sadducees say that he must light it outside the sanctuary because according to vs 2, the Lord appears unto him בֶּעָנָן, in a cloud, and if he did not light the incense outside, he would see God undimmed by the cloud of smoke, and then he would die (ibid.). The Pharisees contend that he must light the incense inside the Sanctuary in accordance with the 12^{*} and 13^{*} verses which command that the incense must be put on the coals inside the קֹדֶשׁ קְדָשִׁים.

*₉

Cf. Rosh Hashana 6b, Sabbath 57b.

* Cf. Siphra אֲחֵרֵי מֹות Chap II, Josephus Yoma c. 1, Jer. Yoma 1-5, Bab. Yoma 19b, 53c.

These include the most important points of difference between the Pharisees and Sadducees, though we have ^{not} enumerated everyone of their differences. As to the general principle underlying these differences, it would be hard to lay down any hard and fast rule in this regard.

However, there are several characteristics noticeable and these, we have already shown, viz., with the Sadducees an advocacy of priestly interests, an aversion to innovations, ^{*}an aptitude to put restraints upon the people and an antagonism to Pharisaic ordinances; with the Pharisees, we see, democratic tendencies, liberal, though sometimes and somewhat pilpulistic interpretations of the Law and a desire to eliminate distinctions between priest and people.

Cf. Kuenen Vol. III p. 286-7

⁺ Levit. 23²⁴, 32, 33

Part IV.

The Essenes.

Chapter I

Their Name ^{and} Origin.

The meaning and etymology of the name, Essene, have been subject to the wildest sorts of guesses, scholars have used all their wits to make ^{some} kind of derivation, but all have admitted their inability to give anything that may at all be accepted with certitude. The first derivation that we know of, is that of Philo. - He derives the name 'Εσσαῖοι from the Greek ἅγιοι "holys" but this has been rejected by all scholars. Jost⁺ ascribes to Josephus the derivation ἄσπ, to be quiet or mysterious, referring it to ἱσπ, the high-priests breast-plate, translated by the Septuagint λυγέρον "gifted with prophecy". Epiphanius (adv. H. ch. 19) derives it from the Hebrew

* Quod omnis probus liber, sec 13

+ Geschichte des Judenthums I-207 note q.v. Jost, however gives no opinion of his own, satisfying himself with those derivations already given.

יָוֹסֵף meaning εἰσβαρὴν νέρος "the slout-
 The Aramaic יָוֹסֵף "physician" has been
 accepted by many,* evidently confusing
 the Greek word for physician θεραπεύς
 with the expression in Philo (R. O. P. 12-13)
 θεραπεύται θεοῦ (servant of God), perhaps
 referring to their healing powers.

Frankel* puts forth בְּנֵי יִסְרָאֵל "the retired"
 Ewald יָוֹסֵף "servant", both of which
 Jost finds objectionable. Gatz (Vol. p. 2)
 has יָוֹסֵף to bathe, a shorter form, by
 metathesis, of יָוֹסֵף יָוֹסֵף - חַמְצוֹת-
 baptists, because they bathed themselves
 early in the morning. Läv (Gen. Chama
 I - 352) makes the name, Essene, come
 from its founder a certain יָוֹסֵף, a disci-
 ple of Joshua b. Perachja; some refer
 this Jesse to the father of David. Hebrew

* Dei Rossi (Meir Encim c. III) & Fröres (Philo, in dial. Theophrast. II p. 10)

Dähne (in Enchiridion Gumbel's Encycl.) Nork (Real-Wörterb. d. j. u. l. u. s. 1846)

Hertzfeld (Geschichte des Volkes Israel II p. 395)

* Jüdische Zeit. 1846, p. 249

(Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theol. vol. ~~XXX~~ (1882) p. 208) derives the name from a town called Essa, west of the Dead Sea, where he asserts, they first settled.* Jellinek (ber. Chananya 4:374) derives it from עֲסָא the "aprior" or $\pi\epsilon\pi\lambda\epsilon\gamma\mu\alpha$, that the Essenes were. Schürer advocates the derivation עֲסָא "pious", maintained by Ewald, Hitzig and Lucius, from $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\upsilon\sigma\iota$ corresponding to the absolute state of the word עֲסָא, and $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\sigma\iota$ with the imperative state $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha$, $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha$ "pious", $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha$ "doing" or "performing" (the Law) $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha$ "to unite" (to keep the Law) $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha$ "to be strong" $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha$, "an associate", are other opinions offered by various writers of greater or less authority.

The correct derivation of this name is still under dispute, though the most plausible—at least, the most natural and the opinions of Jellinek and Lucius

* Schürer says this name has been fabricated by Hilgenfeld as heretical.
p. 207

Their Origin.

Our only literature concerning the origin of the Essenes as also concerning the Essenic Community itself is contained in the writings of Josephus, Philo^{us} Pliny, and these writers have mystified mankind for us. Josephus^{us} Philo.* present to us a Pythagorean Society, the Essenes appear as Greek philosophers. And that this philosophy, that in fact any Greek ideas should have found a way into Essenism, is almost ridiculous, as this sect was almost narrow-minded in its beliefs. But it might be well to add the view of a writer (International Cycl. art. E.) that the Essenes of Josephus are to the real Essenes what the Germans in the Germania of Tacitus are to the real Germans. Further Pliny tells

* and we can include only the remarks in his *Deuotio* *libet*. "The Treatise on a contemplative life ought not to be used as a document of any authority in an account of the Essenes. It is an composition of no authority in an exposition of facts." Renan. *H. J. d. v. l. p. 102*.

us, regarding their origin, that "through thousands of ages, this people eternally prolong its existence" (Natural History, Berch. 15). So that we are completely in the dark so long as we rely on our ancient sources. It has remained for the scholars of this century to give us anything like a satisfactory explanation, and withal this, the matter of their origin is still undetermined.*

Previous to Frankel (1801-1875) scholars groped their way in the dark, so it remained for this Jewish scholar to show that the Essenes were an order of the Pharisees and Chassidim. After this conjecture seemed established, the scholars of Frankel's day and since, have worked along this line. So much then seems

(note continued) And besides, the authorship of this treatise is very much disputed. Some claim that it was written by a Christian monk three centuries after Philo, to apologize for and to praise monastic life.

* Notably Jett, Graetz, Sklar, Ewald, Reuss, Kussner, Ritach, Luzzatto, and others.

settled that Essenism finds its roots in Chassidic Judaism.

It will be remembered that we traced the origin of the Pharisees through the rise of the Essideans of the Greek period. The Essenes also as belonging to Pharisaic Judaism, owe their origin to various elements in this sect of the Chassidim. ^(note) There were among these "pious," certain members that opposed Hellenism, and refused to recognize Alkimos as High-priest, and in consequence the temple worship.

* However there is a view received with more or less favor that the Essenes are an exotic growth, and come in some way either from India, that they are connected indirectly with Buddhist religions. This view has adduced the proof that Philo after telling about certain classes of Indians viz. the Magi, and gymnosophists, called the third class of Brahmins, continues his account of the Essenes preceded by the remark, "moreover Palestine & Syria too are not barren of exemplary wisdom and virtue" (D.O.P.L. VI-VII) Cf. The Crucifixion Sketch p. 27-28 The angel-messiah - Ernest de Bunsen p. 77-78.

They were zealous of the Law and their religion, and eager to oppose Antiochus in his measures against the Jews, and desirous of fulfilling all the laws of Levitical purity. And later on, they grew to detect war. Their ideal was a life of peace and as a result of these ideas and desires, they separated from the world. They formed the party we know under the name of Essenes. Here we find the beginning of the movement towards asceticism, in the time of the Syrian troubles. So reasons Lucius, one of the chief authorities on this subject. Ritschl finds another motive to which to ascribe their origin, namely the idea expressed in Exodus 19⁶, of making the whole people, a kingdom of priests (viewed again in Schürer *Der II. vol. II* p. 206). Their object was to

* See his essay on the Historical Origin of Essenism, in the *Halber review*, vol II (1881-2) p. 135 ff. See also Kuenen *R. o. J.* vol. II p. 130-1, *Exeget.* vol II pp. 23-24, *Just. S. de J.* pp. 207 ff.

(note) Some writers have tried to confirm this teaching by even deriving the name from the Hebrew *Chasidim* (1077), but this is an erroneous and far-fetched derivation.

make of themselves a community of priests. Hilgenfeld sees yet another motive, and that is their desire to receive visions, and to be able to interpret them. "It was the higher illumination, the reception of revelations especially by dream-visions, which they sought in this way to attain". In other words, they were Jewish apocalypticists.* Another motive recently put forth is that they were opposed to the ecclesiasticism and ritualism of the Pharisees (to which party they belonged) and withdrew believing that seclusion and meditation promoted more than all this, the "sanctification of the daily life".†

So far we have found Essenism on Jewish soil, and its roots in purely Jewish movements. And yet when we consider Essenism according to all that we know of it through our sources,

* Cf. Die jüdische apokalyptik, p. 260ff.

† Cf. Deutscher's Phil. of J. Hist. p. 42-43.

we find we have much to account for that is not Jewish. These theories concerning the origin of the Essenes, do not explain everything. For example, their repudiation of marriage, oaths, slavery, trading and animal sacrifices, is somewhat incompatible with the explanation of their origin given in the preceding paragraph; these theories do not explain the rise of these strange features of a Jewish sect. What is missing in the chain?

Schiirer propounds this question and answers it somewhat satisfactorily. He says that "foreign influences have co-operated in its origin and development" that it is more than a "peculiar offshoot of Pharisaism", and these "foreign influences", he specifies as Buddhism, Persicism, Syro-Palestinian heathenism and the Pythagorean teaching.

of the Greeks*. Wander calls the Essenes
a mystical sect, "a mingling of Judaism
with the old Oriental theosophy (Mystic
Christian Religion & Church). That many of the
characteristics of the Essenes are taken
from Pharisaism, is undisputed. A com-
parison of Essenism and Pharisaism, as we
know them through our sources, will
reveal to us striking points of resem-
blance. E.g. There were four classes of
priests in both sects (Comp. Wars II-III¹⁰ v.
Chagiga II-7) Ten persons formed a con-
gregation, among the Pharisees as
well as the Essenes. (Comp. Wars II-III⁹ v.
Baba both 54a) Neither sect believed in
oaths (Comp. Wars II-III⁶ v. Sheboth 394) They

* The discovery of these separate elements belongs to
Hilgenfeld (Zetterschrift 1867 p. 97ff, 1868 p. 343ff, 1871 p. 50ff) for Paracletism
and Gnosticism; to Lightfoot, also for Paracletism (St. Paul's Epistles to the
Colossians and to Philemon 2nd Ed. p. 355-396); to Lipsius for
Syro-Palestinian-heathenism; and to Zeller for Pytha-
goricism (Die Philosophen der Griechen 1844-45 p. 211)

both observed the custom of bathing before meals (Comp. Wars II-III⁵ w. Chagiga 10b) Similarly the custom not to spit in the presence of an assembly or to the right (Comp. Wars III⁹ w. Jer. Berachoth III⁷) They both observed the Levitical injunction of bathing after performing duties of nature (Wars II-III⁹ w. Joma 28a) etc.

A few instances like these show in how far the Essenes resembled the Pharisees. But a close examination of Essenic customs and beliefs reveal to us some very un-Jewish characteristics, even of an element of radicalism despite the fact that they adhered most closely to Pharisaic ordinances and traditions e.g. Their rejection of the sacrificial rites of the Temple, their devotional exercises, which according to Schürer show a "break with Judaism".

* These customs have been defended as Jewish. The first seems to be in true accord with the teachings of the prophets. The second is the 1st commandment before men.

All such elements have been attributed to those foreign influences named above. And the possibility of these influences, is proved by history. As for Parseeism, we know that Judaism proper, let alone the Essenes, was affected by this oriental religion during the exile, and as regards our special inquiry just now, we note points of resemblance between Parseeism and Essenism in their frequency of ablutions, their white garments, their mysticism. We would also include sun-worship though it remains to be proved (cf. Lucian. *De Syria* 103) that this is actually a characteristic of the Essenes.

Pythagoreanism and its relation to Essenism is a wide field for the laborer. Geller is the pioneer here, and the subject is far from exhausted. Parseeism shares the aspirations of Essenism "for bodily purity and sanctity, its austere life, its simple habits of

life apart from all sensual enjoyment, its high estimation (if not exactly its requirement) of celibacy, its white garments, repudiation of oaths, and especially its rejection of bloody sacrifice, also the invocation of the sun, and the scrupulosity with which all that was unclean (such as human excrement) was hidden from it, and the dualistic view of the relation of soul to body* (Schürer Dio. II. Vol. II. p. 217). It is this with Pythagoreanism that Schürer claims Essenism has its greatest affinity (among its non-Jewish elements).

We cannot conclude this discussion on the origin of the Essenes better than by insisting upon a point, somewhat overshadowed by this statement of the foreign influences at work in

* This last point Essenism has for its authority the account of Josephus. We are inclined to think that this is only another philosophical idea attributed to the Essenes Schürer in this & has no other Josephus as authority.

the movement, that Essenismes springs initially from a Jewish sect, on Jewish soil, and is chiefly of Jewish formation. This fact must be borne in mind even though it be true that the Essenes lived apart from their brethren and differed in some respects from them, though their influence on the history of the Jews is almost nil, and form only a part in the history of religion and archaeology, still they are Jews and this must not be forgotten. Some writers consider them Buddhists, or Magi or Egyptian Therapeutae,* who in some way or other emigrated to Palestine.

* Their connection with these Therapeutae has not been discussed here chiefly because we find this connection treated in *De Vita Contemplativa*, always of doubtful origin, and also because this is a subject that has not been worked up as yet by scholars, and we would not presume to enter upon this unploughed field.

Chapter II

The Community of the Essenes— Their Customs and Tenets.

For information as to the matter of this chapter, we must look to Josephus who describes to us the community of the Essenes as it existed in his day. There is traced no evolution, no internal changes. He gives us contemporaneous history, the state of their final development. So it is, therefore, impossible to state when this Essenic community separated from the nation, and lived alone. They evidently still moved among the people in the days of Aristobulus (105-4 B.C.) for Josephus speaks of a certain Judas, an Essene who prophesied the death of Antigonus, during the reign of Aristobulus.* He also speaks of a certain Essene, Menahem by name, who predicted the

* Ant. XIII - XI - Wars I - II - 5

Herod the crown of Judea.* These two instances coupled with the fact that Herod held the Essenes in high esteem† and also the fact of a gate having been named after them (Ἑσσηνῶν πόλη‡) make it safe to assume that the Essenes still mingled with the people before 35 B.C. After their separation, they lived in various villages of Palestine, principally in the desert of Engadda, west of Asphaltites (Dead Sea)§, and their whole number was about 4000. (a)

(b) As a community, they dwelt together

* Ant XV-X⁵

† Ant XV-X⁴

‡ Wars V-IV² Philo (L. O. P. L. 5/2 - Jos. Wars II-VIII¹⁴ Philo, Nat. Hist. Lib. 12)

(a) Ant XVIII-I⁵, Philo. L. O. P. L. XII Schürer thinks that Josephus has taken this number from Philo (Dev. II Vol II p. 192 note)

(b) The following account is that of Josephus and Philo, sometimes I have used their language when occasions seem to demand it. The sources for this account and also for those points that may have been omitted are: Philo - Deos omnis probus Liber - ch. 12. Jos. Wars II-VIII²⁻¹³ Ant. XVIII-I⁵

in small bands and their houses were open to each other, and they formed a single, complete organization under the control of managers whom they all implicitly obeyed. Their daily life was a monotonous affair; they pursued the same tasks, performed the same customs and ceremonies at the same hours, all the time. The daily program was somewhat as follows; they awoke before sunrise, refrained from uttering anything worldly and said their prayers. They are then dismissed by their managers to their work, which was mainly agriculture and the arts of peace. At the fifth hour (Eleven o'clock) they ceased work, taking a bath in cold water, and then attiring themselves in white linen, after which they would assemble in a hall sacred to the order, to partake of their meal. This meal was a holy affair; though it all, they maintained a mysterious silence. First a priest would offer a prayer,

followed by praise of God as the giver of food, and the meal is ended in like manner. The meal seemed to take on a sacrificial character, evidently substituting the sacrifices of the Temple in which they took no part.* They then put on their working clothes, and resumed their tasks, and at evening, they come to their meal again, which is eaten with the same ceremonies as before. On Sabbath, they observe a true rest, spending the day in their synagogues, reading and studying the Law.†

As regards their government, we may characterize it in the one word, communal. Their property is the common possession of all. No one possesses more than another. For it is a law among them that those who join their sect, must let what they have, be common to the whole body, in so much

* The Essenes had little regard for the sacrifices, offered in the Temple. They showed this regard in their prayers by facing the East and not the Temple. They did not believe in the atoning power of these sacrifices but preferred their own atonements.

that among them all, there is no appearance of abject poverty or excess of riches, but everyone's property forms a common stock, and is as it were one patrimony for all the brethren." (Wass. II-VIII³) They despise trading, have no such thing as a medium of exchange, but each receives what he needs from the managers appointed to distribute and guard their common property. This property belongs to the whole community; there is no such thing as private property and neither have they any slaves for they object to slavery. Their wages go to the common fund which is to be used for all cases of individual needs. This applies particularly to the sick and feeble.

Candidates for admission to the order, were subjected to a novitiate of three years. Their additions were recruited from these candidates for they did not believe in marriage. So no-essences were born among them.

The candidate cast all his property into the Common Treasury and in return, received the three badges of the order, viz. a spade ($\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\iota\omicron\nu$. Its use is mentioned in Deut 23¹²⁻¹⁵) an apron ($\pi\epsilon\pi\iota\phi\omega\nu\alpha$ ^{was used} for use in bathing, and a white robe ($\chi\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\iota\eta\nu\ \epsilon\omicron\omicron\theta\eta\tau\alpha$) yet he cannot live with them; he must first prove his worthiness to join the order. This is the first stage, lasting twelve months. In the second stage, fasting two years, he shared the waters of purification, but not the common meal. After this period of probation was over, he was admitted into the society with all its privileges ^{and secrets} but with terrible oaths. This was the only occasion that the Essenes ever used oaths. They did not believe in them, for they said that that which does not deserve belief without an appeal to God is already condemned. We will quote this oath from

^(Curious page)
Josephus, however, mentions one branch of Essenes who permitted marriage (Nas. II. vii¹³)

Josephus (Wars II-VIII?) in as much as it shows their practices. The candidate swears "that he will exercise piety toward God, that he will observe justice towards men, and that he will do no harm to anyone, either of his own accord or at the command of others and that he will always hate the wicked and help the righteous and that he will ever show fidelity to all men and especially to those in authority, because no one rules without the will of God, and that if he be in authority, he will at no time whatever abuse his authority, or endeavor to outshine his subjects, either in dress or any other finery, and that he will ever be a lover of truth, and propose to himself to reprove those who tell lies, and that he will keep his hands clean from theft, and his soul from unlawful gain; and that he will neither conceal anything from those

of his own sect, nor discovers any of their doctrines to others, no, not though anyone should try to compel to do so, at the risk of his life. Moreover, he swears to communicate their doctrines to no one, in any other way than as he received them himself, and that he will abstain from robbery, and will equally preserve the books belonging to their sect, and the names of their angels. In this last condition, their mystical character is shown.

We have seen in part of this oath, their conception of morality. It was of a high standard - that much is certain, and probably comes from the Old Testament. Josephus calls them $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\tau\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\iota$, $\alpha\upsilon\sigma\pi\epsilon\tau\omicron\nu$ $\tau\acute{\rho}\omicron\tau\omicron\nu$ (ant. XVIII-1) so their name for right doing must have been wide spread.

* These "books of the sect" and "the names of the angels" are probably connected with the gift of prophecy which it is said, they possessed. Cf. ant. XIII

XI-2 and XV-8 Wars I-III and II-721^o | Cf. Ex. 33^{15, 16}, Ex. 19^o Ps. 115 to 24

And as to their manner of life, the words simple and unpretending may best serve as fit to describe the ^{the} Essenes. They were devoted to all that was peaceful and temperate. They despised war, and they never busied themselves in making military implements. They were averse to trading or to anything that promoted greed and selfishness, and believed in perfect freedom. There was a real socialistic state, - an idealistic condition for the radical sociologists and economists of our day, that is, if we may attribute any truth to Philo's characterization.

The Tenets.

The Essenes believed that everything was in the hands of Providence. This is the real truth of the statement of Josephus that the Essenes made everything depend upon fate.* They therefore denied free will.

* Cf. Schürer, *Das Judentum*, p. 402. * *Test. Antiq.* - 29

and laid great stress on the worship of God, and on the sacredness of his Law which they studied most eagerly. We see then how natural it was for them to pay such great homage to Moses. "Next to God, the name of the Lawgiver is with them an object of the greatest reverence, and whoever blasphemes, it is punished with death" (Wars II-VIII 9)

They also believe that the bodies are corruptible... and that the souls are immortal and continue forever and that they come out of the middle thin air, - are united to bodies as to prisons... when they are set free from the bonds of flesh, they then rejoice to mount upwards as if released from a long bondage. The good will inherit a life beyond the ocean, - a place refreshed by the gentle breathing of the west-wind; the bad have allotted to them, a murky and cold den

full of never ceasing punishments? (Wars. II. VIII") Such according to Josephus is their teaching regarding the soul and immortality.

The degrees in one's development as an Essene are as follows: After being admitted and given the badges of Essenism, viz. the spade, the white garment, and apion, the candidate attains to (1) the state of outward or bodily purity. (מבצח מביא לידי נקיות);

Then (2) Abstinence from sexual intercourse (מבצח מביא לידי צניעות).

Then (3) Inward or spiritual purity (מבצח מביא לידי טהרה).

Then (4) Banishing of anger and a lowly spirit (מבצח מביא לידי ענוה).

Then (5) Holiness (מבצח מביא לידי צדיקות).

* It is difficult to say whether Jos. is trustworthy here. The doctrine and peculiar religious views of the Essenes were kept secret, so it is questionable whether Josephus knew.

* From Ginsburg's art. Essenes in Hatto's Cyclopaedia.

- (6) A Temple of Holy Spirit. מִסֵּד מִבְּיָאָה לִידֵי רוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ.
 (7) Miraculous cures^{and} ability to raise from the dead. רָחָק מִבְּיָאָה לִידֵי תַחַד"כ".
 (8) and last- The position of Elijah, the prophet, the forerunner of the Messiah.
 תַּחַד"כ" מִלִּידֵי אֱלֹהִים

(Cf. Jer. Sabbath C. 1. Midrash Shir Hashirim at the beginning - See also Ben Chananiah II 374)

To sum up briefly, these beliefs^{and} practices reveal to us the ascetic character of the Essenes. They were ascetics, mystics^{and} divine healers and they may be compared in this respect to the monks of the Mediaeval ages, ^{and} the institution of Essenism to Monasticism.