

a date as equivalent to "the brotherhood of believers," it should suffice simply to refer to Galatians i. 23.

BENJ. W. BACON.

PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES.

SOME fifty years ago the question of the Pharisees and Sadducees was discussed by Geiger and J. Wellhausen. Geiger was first to show that it was not justifiable to characterise the Pharisees and Sadducees as hypocrites and indifferents, as was usually done by Christian scholars, who referred to the New Testament and to Jesus. Geiger defended the theory that the Sadducees were the Jewish aristocracy and the Pharisees the democratic scholars and the lower classes supporting them. The Pharisees were supposed to have desired to educate the people by their religious teaching and the aristocratic Sadducees were said to have objected to this kind of religious emancipation, as they wished to rule on the ancient lines.

Wellhausen held the same view. His study *Pharisäer und Sadducäer* appeared in 1874. It influenced the opinion of scholars in various countries and his thesis, that the Pharisees were the party of the Scribes and that the priests and the aristocratic circles of Jerusalem were the Sadducees was assumed with the same readiness as his views about the analysis of the Hexateuch. This opinion disagrees with the New Testament.

In the New Testament the Pharisees and Sadducees are called "sects." St. Paul says in Acts xxvi. 5, "After the strictest sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee." It is generally accepted that the term "sect" is not well chosen, as "sect" implies a doctrine, a certain number of members and an organisation. The Pharisees and Sadducees, how-

ever, are supposed to have been parties, holding some general principles, without possessing the character of a sectarian organisation. Professor J. D. Prince has remarked that the rendering in the English Version in Acts xv. 5, xxvi. 5 is unfortunate, as *αἵρεσις* means here "a party which professes certain philosophical principles."

It is difficult to see how this view can be thought to give a good explanation of Acts xxvi. 5. "To live a Pharisee implies the observance of customs and regulations as were assumed by Pharisees. The observance of such customs and regulations is the character of a sect. We know these customs from the New Testament, the Mishna and Josephus.

It was against the rules of the Pharisees to eat with people not belonging to their sect, they used to wash their hands before eating (Matt. ix. 11 ; xv. 1), they fasted often (Matt. ix. 14), they were strict in keeping the Sabbath (Matt. xii. 2, 10) and observed many regulations as to tithes, oaths, etc. (Matt. xxiii. 5, 16, 23). The Pharisees and Sadducees profess a certain doctrine (Matt. xvi. 12 ; Acts xxiii. 8) and are always ready to defend their theories against each other. They have disciples (Matt. xxii. 16), hold meetings (ibid. v. 34, 41) and possess an organisation and rulers. In Luke xiv. 1 the house of one of the rulers of the Pharisees is mentioned. This seems to leave no doubt about the fact that at least the Pharisees were a "sect" in the proper sense of the word.

Nevertheless this view is generally supposed to be erroneous. Professor Prince says, "It is certainly an error to characterise the Pharisees as a religious sect because that word implies a divergence in creed from other followers of the same cult. This was distinctly not the position of the Pharisees, as they were really from their first development representations of orthodox Judaism, who distinguished themselves from the mass of their co-religionists rather

by the strictness of their observances than by any deviation from accepted doctrine" (*Enc. Bibl.* 4322). Here the customs of the Pharisees are explained as strict orthodoxy. The Sadducees, on the other hand, are supposed to have been not strict (H. Oort in *Theol. T.*, 1914, p. 219). The name Sadducee is said to be misleading as it seems to imply a sect, it really being only possible to become a Sadducee by birth. One was born a Sadducee, Kuenen says (*G. v. Isr.* II. 341); "only those belonging to the descendants of Aaron or to the aristocratic laity could be Sadducees."

The documents of Jewish sectaries, published by Professor Schechter in 1910 induced me to a renewed study of the problem. I found that I had been perfectly wrong in following the common view. The evidence of the New Testament is wholly confirmed by Flavius Josephus and the Mishna. The Pharisees and Sadducees are mentioned as religious sects, with a diverging creed. If we will apply the terms orthodoxy and liberalism, we should describe the Sadducees as the conservative orthodox and the Pharisees as the more liberal-minded people, adapting the old religion to new conditions.

We must refer in the first place to Josephus, *Vita*, i. 2. He is an important witness, as he was a Pharisee himself. Nineteen years of age he became a member of this sect and lived according to their regulations. He joined the Pharisees after having tried the various sects then existing, the Essenes, Sadducees and Pharisees. This first trial was disappointing and he decided to live with a hermit. After a period of three years he joined the Pharisees.

In another place we are told that the members of the sect numbered 6,000 (*Antiq.* xvii. 2, 4). They refused to swear obedience to the Emperor and therefore were fined. The fine was paid by the wife of Pheroras, a brother of Herodes. The whole Jewish people took the oath, but

the sect of the Pharisees did not swear (*οἷδε οἱ ἄνδρες οὐκ ὤμωσαν, ὄντες ὑπὲρ ἑξακισχίλιοι*). The term *οἷδε οἱ ἄνδρες* shows that the whole sect of the Pharisees refused to take the oath. We cannot understand how this place is to be explained by the common theory, that the Pharisees were no religious sect, but were a party formed by the orthodox Scribes and the lower classes. Sometimes the place is translated as referring to some 6,000 who did not swear (6,000 of them), but the term *οἷδε οἱ ἄνδρες* does not admit this translation. The Pharisees here evidently are a separate class of people. They cannot be supposed to be a party, containing the Scribes and the lower classes, for in this case we could not be told that the "whole Jewish people" took the oath except the Pharisees.

Josephus mentions in several places priests who were members of the sect of the Pharisees. *Vita xxxix.* mentions the Pharisaic priest Jozarus. *Ibid. xlv.* it appears that the high priest Ananus belongs to the sect of the Pharisees. Hölscher has shown in his study on Sadduceeism (*der Sadducäismus*, Leipsic, 1906) that at least seven of the high priests, who functioned since the beginning of the reign of Herodes, were no Sadducees.

This was not only the case in the period of Herodes but also at a much earlier date. In *Jos. Antiq. xiii. 10, 5* we find that the high priest John Hyrcan was a pupil (*μαθητής*) of the Pharisees. Being insulted by one of the older members of the sect he joined the sect of the Sadducees and withdrew the laws that agreed with the principles of the Pharisees. He even forbade the observance of their regulations.

From another place (*Antiq. xviii. 1, 4*) it is apparent that the Sadducees were by no means the ruling aristocracy, filling all the posts and objecting to the democratic opinions of the Pharisees. There we read that the number of the Sadducees was only small. They belonged to the better

classes but had no influence, for if they happened to serve a post they had to act in agreement to the views of the Pharisees, otherwise they would not have been able to keep up their position (*εἰς ὀλίγους τε ἄνδρας οὗτος ὁ λόγος ἀφίκετο, τοὺς μέντοι πρῶτους τοῖς ἀξιώμασι. πράσσεται τε ἀπ' αὐτῶν οὐδεν ὡς εἰπεῖν ὅποτε γὰρ ἐπ' ἀρχὰς παρέλθοιεν, ἀκουσίως μὲν καὶ κατ' ἀνάγκας, προχωροῦσι δ' οὖν οἷς ὁ Φαρισαῖος λέγει, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἄλλως ἀνεκτοὺς γενέσθαι τοῖς πλήθεσιν*).

Here we see that it was not at all common that the Sadducees held all the posts, and it appears that they had to give up their own views if they became public officers. So this place shows that the common view about a divergence of opinion between the aristocratic high functionaries (the supposed Sadducees) and the democratic Pharisees is highly improbable. We do not see how this divergence could originate if these functionaries were obliged to follow the principles of the Pharisees as soon as they came into offices.

It is also not true that the Sadducees opposed against orthodox opinions of the Scribes and Pharisees, being of a worldly and materialistic character. This accusation is very often lodged against them and is even mentioned in the excellent article on Sadducees by A. E. Cowley in the *Encycl. Biblica*, 4240. The ground for this charge is that they professed the doctrine of the free will and denied the doctrine of fate and predestination (Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8-14). This usually is explained as a proof of their worldliness. Hölscher, e.g., reproaches them that they deny every action of God in this world (l.c. p. 7). Cowley refers to "their tendency to keep to the simplest elements of faith, rejecting all admixture of the supernatural." It is certainly true that the Sadducees kept to faith but it is not correct to say that they objected to supernaturalism. They objected, on the contrary, to the

doctrine of fate (*είμαρμένη*), which is on no good terms with supernaturalism as found in the Old Testament. We could rather say that the Pharisees who professed the doctrine of the predestination of all human actions denied the action of God in the world than accuse the Sadducees of religious indifferentism. For the doctrine of fate implies that all things and occurrences exist and happen in consequence of a decree that was taken before the creation of the world or at least long ago. The characteristic feature of this doctrine is the view that these decrees must be executed. No human ruse, no penitence nor even prayer can induce God to alter His decree. The doctrine of the *είμαρμένη*, therefore, is the doctrine of the great mysterious power that is solid as rock and inexorable as a tyrant, that cannot be shaken nor softened, in which is no pity nor mercy, that only knows that everything that was predestined must happen. It is opposite to the doctrine of providence, but it is very often confused with it. Providence means that God provides. He rules the world as a God of righteousness but also as a God of mercy. He hears the prayers of mankind and decides what is going to happen according to His own free will. The God of providence is not bound by a decree that cannot be altered. He is the living God of the Old Testament, the God of love and mercy. The Sadducees held with the supernaturalism of the Old Testament and refused to accept any doctrines that were inconsistent with the holy tradition. The Pharisees thought it justified to deduce from the Old Testament doctrines of foreign origin to suit the requirements of the time, as the doctrine of a future life and the doctrine of fate. We cannot blame the Sadducees for objecting against this. Even their respect for the sacred Books of the Old Testament prevented them from professing this doctrine. They would not have been blamed by modern scholars, as

people of materialistic character, if the common error of confusing the doctrine of providence with the doctrine of fate had not given cause to regard the Sadducees as non-believers in the government of God.

On the same ground as the doctrine of fate was the doctrine of future life rejected by the Sadducees. They kept to the Old Testament view of the Sheol, and opposed against modern innovations of this doctrine, however common the new theories might be in their times. The doctrine of a future life with rewards and punishments is introduced into Jewish theology by the influence of the Persian religion. In the same way the Jewish theological system was enriched by numerous names of angels, spirits and demons. The Sadducees rejected all these things as they were inconsistent with their belief in the authority of the Thora and the Prophets. In doing so they are on the side of orthodoxy and not of liberalism.

If we accept the theory of Wellhausen we are unable to understand the various texts of the Mishna dealing with the controversies between the Pharisees and the Sadducees. In the Mishna the Sadducees are described as people who are in some cases stricter than the Pharisees. This does not agree with the view that they had a tendency to materialism and worldliness. Consequently Schürer persuades us not to believe the Mishna and to accept his theory that the communications of the Mishna are ironic. But if we read the various places, it is not easy to agree with this assertion of Schürer (*G.J.V.* II. 413).

In the treatise *Jadajim* we find the following points discussed (*Jud.* iv. 7). The Sadducees said : We disapprove of you Pharisees for holding that water poured out into a basin is clean. The Pharisees answered : We disapprove of you Sadducees for holding that a canal that passes through a cemetery is clean.

The Fragments published by Schechter are helpful for the understanding of this controversy. The Jewish sect in Damascus, that is described in this manuscript, taught that it was not allowed to wash oneself in a quantity of water that was insufficient to cover the whole body, that water poured out into a basin was unclean, that water springing from a rock was unclean if its quantity was insufficient to cover the whole body (MS. A, x. 10-13, cf. *Theol. Tijdschr.* 1912, 12).

Evidently the Sadducees of Jadajim hold the same view as the Zadokites of Damascus. Water poured out into a basin is unclean, but the water of a canal is clean as its quantity always is sufficient to cover the whole body. The Sadducees are here by no means less strict than the Pharisees, their opinion about clean and unclean is more rigorous than the theory of the Pharisees. It is not easy to see where the irony would come in here.

The text continues. The Sadducees said: We disapprove of you Pharisees for holding that you are liable to pay damages if your ox or your ass has caused harm, but that you are not liable if your slave or female slave has done harm. If I am liable in the case of an ox or an ass, towards which I am under no obligation, how should I not be liable in the case of harm done by a slave, towards whom I have obligations prescribed to me by the Thora? They answered: An ox and an ass have no intelligence; you cannot compare them to a slave, who has intelligence. If I offended them they could set fire to another man's corn and I would be obliged to pay the damages.

Here again the Sadducees are on the more rigorous side. According to Josephus the Sadducees generally belonged to the better classes. The poor have no slaves, but the Sadducees doubtless had. Nevertheless they put themselves under obligations, which they should have avoided

if their opinions were so worldly and materialistic as is usually assumed. They hardly can have done so ironically.

The next paragraph of Jadajim continues: A Sadducee from Galilee once said: I disapprove of you Pharisees in writing the name of the king and of Moses in the same bill of divorce. The Pharisees said: And we disapprove of you Sadducees from Galilee that you write the name of the king and the name of God in the same column and that you put the name of the King first and the Name of God afterwards. The respect for the name of Moses prevented the Sadducees in Galilee from mentioning his name with the name of a foreign king. This certainly is not consistent with the character of the Sadducees as seen by Wellhausen.

A very remarkable text is Jadajim iv. 6. It shows that one of the most famous Scribes, Johanan ben Zakkai, the founder of the rabbinic school of Yabne, was on the side of the Sadducees, and teaches us at the same time that the Sadducees had a larger collection of sacred books than the Pharisees. The Hebrew term for "canonic" is "making the hands unclean," the sacred books being supposed to communicate a certain unseen fluid to the hands that held the book. The text runs thus: The Sadducees said: We disapprove of you Pharisees for saying that the sacred books make the hands unclean but that the books hammeram do not. Rabban Johanan ben Zakkai said: Is this the only objection we have against the Pharisees? They assume that the bones of an ass are clean but that the bones of the high priest Johanan are unclean. They (the Pharisees) said unto him: Uncleanness is judged by the rate of affection, otherwise one could make spoons out of the bones of his father or mother. He answered them: the sacred character of the books is also judged by the rate of affection. The books hammeram, that are not

beloved, are not supposed to make the hands unclean.

It is uncertain what is meant by the term "books hammeram." Since Geiger the strange emendation "books of Homerus" was accepted by many scholars. I suppose that it is very improbable that the Pharisees and Sadducees have quarrelled about the books of Homerus, as every proof of their interest in and their knowledge of these books is missing. I suggest that we must read "hamminim" (the sectarians) instead of hammeram; Hebrew ך may have easily been corrupted into ך. But this is to remain uncertain. What is not uncertain is that Johanan ben Zakkai argues on the side of the Sadducees and gives a plea for a greater number of sacred books than is assumed by the Pharisees. As a matter of fact we now know by Schechter's publication that the Zadokite sect of Damascus had a sacred book besides the Old Testament, called "the book of recitation."

The text of *Jadajim* iv. 6 is perfectly clear and simple. It did not suit the common theory, and so translators very often made some small emendations. Schürer translates the words "is this the only objection we have against the Pharisees," thus: "is this the only thing one can object to?" and suppresses the "we" without even warning the reader in a note (*G.J.V.*³ II. 384). The words "the books hammeram that are not beloved" imply that there are books hammeram that are disliked, but the context demands at the same time that it is admitted that there are also books hammeram that are beloved. The argument of Johanan ben Zakkai is that the Pharisees are wrong in accepting that only the sacred books are canonic. Schürer leaves us perfectly in the dark in translating "as the books hammeram are not beloved, they do not make the hands unclean," again translating what is not in the Hebrew text,

In another place we find the views of the Sadducees mentioned as important for the sacred rites at the preparation of sacred water, the water of separation (Num. xix.). According to Para iii. 7 the Sadducees insisted on having the red cow burned by a priest who had been unclean, but who had taken his bath and had to wait until the evening for being clean again. Here again the text was often misinterpreted. But the facts are perfectly clear. The cow is burned by a priest who has taken his bath in the presence of the elders and who proceeds to this business immediately after his bath, and this is done in view of the Sadducees. In some manuscripts this respect for the Sadducees has led to alteration of the text. The words "this is done with regard to the Sadducees, who say that the cow must be burned by a priest, etc.," were altered into "with regard to the Sadducees, that they may not say that the cow must be burned by a priest, etc." The cow actually was burned by a priest, who had taken his bath. The context shows that the alteration corrupts the text. We shall have to admit that in Para iii. 7 the Sadducees have their own views as to the preparation of the sacred water and that the views once were supposed to be so important that the custom introduced by them remained in existence.

Hölscher has misunderstood this text, and therefore we look in vain in his study on "Sadducäismus" for an acknowledgement of the sectarian character of the Sadducees. He explains the text as a demonstration against the Sadducees, to whom he ascribes the opinion that the cow should be burned by a priest, who became clean by waiting until the evening. Here he follows a wrong interpretation of Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb.*, s.v. מערב. He assumes that the Pharisees held the view that the priest must have taken his bath, and supposes that such a man was called a יום טובל (who has taken a bath on the day) and that

the Sadducees said that the priest should be **מערב שמש**. He supposes that this term means a man who became clean by waiting until the evening. But he forgets that no man could become clean simply by waiting until the evening. He refers to Leviticus xxii. 7, but in this place a bath is demanded. **מערב שמש** means a man who has taken his bath and has to wait until the evening for being clean. The term is fully synonymous with **טביל יום**, as one may see if one takes the trouble of looking up the places of reference in Levy's *Neuhebr. Wb.* Levy gives the right explanation *sub voce* **מערב**, but in translating in that same article Para iii. 7 he meddles with the proper meaning, as the common translation would not suit the theory about the character of the Sadducees. We find here a remarkable proof of the influence of common theories even on scholars who are fully equipped to manage things in an independent way.

The Sadducees held other opinions than the Pharisees, but we cannot say that the customs of the Sadducees were less strict or on the worldly side. Josephus tells us that they were more severe when punishment was concerned (*Antiq.* xiii. 10, 6), and we have seen that their doctrine about clean and unclean, the liability of the master and the position of Moses, was by no means compromising with "the world."

Cowley seems inclined to find a means of reconciliation between the theory of Wellhausen and the data of the Mishna and Talmud. He warns us not to identify Sadducees and priests. "Whilst it appears to have been generally the case that Sadducean views were held by the aristocratic (i.e., primarily, the priestly) party, we must beware of regarding aristocrat, priest, and Sadducee as convertible terms. Many of the priests were Pharisees, as we see, e.g., from the names of doctors quoted in the Mishna with the title priest," but assures us at the same time that "the

separation between the higher and the lower classes of priests are as great as between the aristocratic party and the common people." But this statement does not fully explain the fact that several of the high priests belonged to the Pharisees, as Hölcher has shown, and that they had to yield to the principles of the Pharisees as Josephus tells us.

The theory of the aristocratic and priestly character of the Sadducees was strongly supported by the false identification of the family of Boëthus with the Sadducees. Herodes^{I.} appointed as high priests in Jerusalem a member of a Jewish family from Alexandria, called the family of Boëthus. Their customs and explanations of the Thora were sometimes different from the prevailing Pharisaic views. In the Talmud the tradition of these Boëthusians very often is discussed and disapproved of. But this is no sufficient ground for an identification of this Alexandrian family with the members of the sect of the Sadducees. In a single instance the customs of this family may have agreed with Sadducæan opinions (as seems to have been the case with the explanation of the difficult Sabbath in Leviticus xxiii. 11 as a real Sabbath-day), but the communications of Josephus and the discussions of divergent opinions in the Mishna show that the difference between Sadducees and Pharisees existed long before the time of Herodes.

The Sadducees and Pharisees are first mentioned in the reign of Jonathan (161–143 B.C.). It seems that the sects had originated not long before that period.

The name Sadducees is generally derived from the name Zadok, the priest of King David. Cowley calls the combination of Sadducees with the Bene Sadoq the least unlikely explanation of the name, and I think he is perfectly right. It seems not worth while to discuss other explanations of

no intrinsic value (as the combination with the Persian word *Zindik* (worshipper of Ahuro Mazda), as the Schechter-papyri have shown that the name of Zadok really was used by sects of this period. Not, however, as a name for a number of priests of Zadokitic origin, but as name for people living according to the commandments of Zadok.

We are told that 410 years after the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadrezzar a teacher of righteousness rose among Israel. Afterwards the descendants of the people, listening to his teaching, turned to Damascus and formed there a sect governed by overseers and observing the book of the law of Sadoq as explained by a "star." They oppose against another sect called "the builders of the wall" and in some instances the controversies between them appear to be parallel to the divergences between the Sadducees and Pharisees. The term builders of the wall reminds us of the Soferim. The Soferim are said to have built a wall round the Law (Pirke Aboth i. 1) and many of the Soferim belonged to the sect of the Pharisees. We have already seen from Josephus that the influence of the Pharisees among the Soferim was very strong, and find the Sadducees discussing with the Pharisees about the cleanness of water exactly in the same way as the sect of Damascus would have argued.

We find the sect of Damascus to possess a sacred book of recitation (Schechter, p. xlvi. (p. xi. 6)) and see that the Sadducees defend a theory for assuming books besides the Old Testament as sacred books.

The sect of Damascus derives its customs from Moses and Sadoq, the name Sadducees probably refers to the same Zadok and observes the commandments of Moses to the letter (cf. Makkoth i. 6).

The sect of Damascus was very severe in keeping the Sabbath. No man was allowed to carry anything from

the house to the outside or from the outside into the house (l.c., p. xi. 7). In Erubin vi. 2 we are told that the Sadducees also used to bring several things from their house into the yard before the beginning of the Sabbath in order to be able to use them on Sabbath.

The fragments of the so-called Zadokite work do not mention the future life nor the names of angels or demons. So there is sufficient ground for the theory that the community of Damascus may be supposed to be a shoot of the old sect of the Sadducees. This does not mean that the sect of the Sadducees, mentioned in the New Testament, must have been organised exactly on the same lines as the sect of Damascus, but opens the probability of connexion between the later sect and the views and principles of the Sadducees. As long as we are misled by the Wellhausen theory the origin of the sect of Damascus remains wholly in the dark; but if we read the texts of the Mishna just as they are, we understand that the New Testament and Josephus were perfectly right in calling the Sadducees a sect.

After all we have said about the Sadducees it is hardly necessary to show that the Pharisees, too, were a sect in the proper sense of the word. Referred already to their organisation under "rulers" (Luke xiv. 1) and to the number of 6,000. It remains to notice that they called themselves "friends" (haberim). The haberim are distinguished from the "people of the country" (am-haares), i.e., those who do not live according to the regulations of the "friends." In Demai vi. 9 we see that the "friends" are a sect, for there the case is discussed that one of the two sons of an "am-haares" is a "friend" and the other not. It is not sufficient for being a "friend" to give tithes, they must be given exactly in the way that is prescribed by them (Demai vi. 6). A "friend" does not sell fruit to an am-

haares, nor does he buy it from him ; he does not stay as a guest with him and does not receive him as a guest, when he wears his common garment (Demai ii. 3). The name of the sect supports the sectarian character. Perushim of Parishim is derived from parash, to separate, and means probably the "separated." The sect of the Babylonian Mandaics uses the word Pharishaia also, apparently in the sense of "learned." The verb parash had also the meaning "to teach" (viz., the sacred doctrine). Pharisee, therefore, might mean "the initiated." It is not possible to decide which of both meanings should be chosen. But in any case the name shows that the Pharisees were not only orthodox Jews, as Wellhausen, Schürer and many others suppose. They must have been a sect that was organised as a sect. If interpreters of the New Testament have difficulty in explaining Luke xiv. 1, this is not for Luke xiv. 1 but for the Wellhausen theory about the Pharisees, that does not agree with the texts.

It remains to say a few words about the probable origin of the sects. They are first mentioned in the beginning of the Maccabean period. The persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes and the struggle of the Maccabees gave rise to new hope. The book of Daniel shows that many Jews believed that the new kingdom of God was to come (Dan. vii. 18-27). This belief in a coming world (olam habba) we find repeatedly alluded to in the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic literature of this period. Of course the question rose as to what was to be done to become a member of the new kingdom that was promised by the leaders, but that did not come as soon as was expected. That Pharisees and Sadducees were looking forward to a Messianic age we see from Matthew iii. 7 (many of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees came to the baptism of John). The Sadducees expected a Messianic Kingdom as prophesied by the Old Testament "prophets."

Only those who lived in the time of the Messiah would see the glory of it. The Pharisees assumed that this new kingdom was in heaven, and that the righteous ones, who had died before it came, would be resurrected. This doctrine of future life was rejected by the Sadducees, and the Pharisees therefore held that no Sadducee would come into the *olam habba*, as he did not admit that resurrection could be proved from the *Thora* (*Sanhedrin* x. 1). The important question of the proper way of life in these last days of the present world was answered in various ways. The answer of the Sadducees was the most conservative one. They refused to yield to Hellenistic and Persian influences and were decided to remain "the old people" governed by the laws of Moses, as explained by their teachers, and believing in the prophetic books of the Old Testament. The Pharisees, on the contrary, were open to new theories. The book of Daniel was in their line, they accepted the doctrine of hell and of the resurrection of the body, believed in the existence of thousands of angels and spirits and are less separated from the popular belief of the time than their name seems to suggest. The origin of both sects is of eschatologic character. The Sadducees solved the problem on orthodox lines, the Pharisees had more liberal tendencies and tried to combine the religious belief of their ancestors with new opinions. But both of them failed in finding the way of life, as the New Testament clearly shows.

B. D. EERDMANS.

STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN ESCHATOLOGY.

IX. THE LIFE EVERLASTING.

We have seen that with regard to those who die in hostility to God a nearly complete agnosticism is imposed upon us by the nature of Christian faith. It does not at all follow,