

(1984) 28-33; E. S. Malbon, "Disciples/Crowds/Whoever: Markan Characters and Readers," *NovT* 28 (1986) 104-130; R. Meyer and H. Strathmann, "λαός," *TDNT* IV.29-57; R. Meyer and P. Katz, "ὄχλος," *TDNT* V.582-90; P. S. Minear, "Audience Criticism and Markan Ecclesiology," in *Neues Testament und Geschichte*, eds. H. Baltensweiler and B. Reicke (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1972) 79-89; idem, "The Disciples and the Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew," *ATR Supp. Ser.* 3 (1974) 28-44; idem, "Jesus' Audiences, According to Luke," *NovT* 16 (1974) 81-109; A. W. Mosley, "Jesus' Audiences in the Gospels of St Mark and St Luke," *NTS* 10 (1963/64) 139-49. D. F. Watson

PEOPLE OF THE LAND. See RICH AND POOR.

PESHER. See MIDRASH.

PETER. See DISCIPLES; DISCIPLESHIP.

PHARISEES

The Pharisees appear in our sources as a distinct party in Judaism of the late Second Temple period, with their own vision of what Israel's* standing as God's covenant people entailed. Characteristic of the Pharisaic position was their adherence to a body of traditional material (Gk *paradosis*) handed down "from the fathers," which defined correct behavior in a number of ways and which represented both an interpretation of and a supplement to Pentateuchal Law.* In the Gospels Pharisees are generally (though not quite universally) depicted as opponents of Jesus, critical of his behavior, hostile in their questions, malicious in their deliberations. In turn, their piety is attacked as hypocritical, their spiritual leadership is declared bankrupt, and they are charged with leading the nation to its doom. Through all the polemic the significant role played by the Pharisees in Jewish life in first-century Palestine is apparent.

1. Sources
2. Name and History
3. The Tradition of the Pharisees
4. Pharisees in the Gospels
5. Conclusion

1. Sources.

Historical reconstruction must begin with an awareness of the problems posed by the nature of our sources. The Gospels will be treated in a later section. Here we focus on Josephus* and rabbinic literature (see Rabbinic Traditions and Writings).

1.1. Josephus. In his autobiographical *Life* Josephus

claims that he acquired firsthand knowledge of various Jewish schools of thought, then chose to govern his life according to the norms of the Pharisees (*Life* 10-12 §2). This suggests that Josephus, as a Pharisee, can be counted on to provide an informed and sympathetic picture of the party. Unfortunately, matters are not so simple.

First, to a surprising extent what Josephus actually writes about the Pharisees is negative, at times sharply so. Such passages are commonly thought to have been uncritically reproduced from sources harboring ill will for the Pharisees (see Schwartz). An alternative explanation questions Josephus's claim to be a Pharisee, noting that his writings betray little evidence of support for peculiarly Pharisaic beliefs and practices. The problem remains unresolved (see Mason).

Second, Josephus describes the various Jewish parties (which he calls *haireseis*, or philosophical schools) in terms familiar to his Gentile readers. The Pharisees he compares with the Stoics (*Life* 12 §2). He notes their belief in the immortality of the soul (*Ant.* 18.1.3 §14), in the resurrection* of the righteous (*J.W.* 2.8.14 §163) and in a fate which determines some, but not all, human actions (so *Ant.* 13.5.9 §172; cf. 18.1.3 §13; *J.W.* 2.8.14 §162-163). Their simplicity of life and deference to elders are also noted (*Ant.* 18.1.3 §12). While Pharisaic belief in resurrection was certainly characteristic, Josephus's depiction misleads by focusing on matters readily comprehensible to his readers while omitting issues of legal observance which in fact marked the dividing lines between parties.

Third, some scholars (e.g., J. Neusner) have suggested that Josephus in his *Antiquities* (which, in this respect, is contrasted with his *Jewish War*) produced propaganda for the Pharisees, exaggerating their influence on the people in order to convince the Roman authorities that any government installed in Palestine needed Pharisaic support to survive. The suggestion, while a healthy reminder that Josephus's intentions must be taken into account, seems ill-founded. The evidence for considerable Pharisaic influence is not restricted to the *Antiquities*. Moreover, references to Pharisaic influence in the *Antiquities* are, considering the bulk of the work, few and confined to its later sections. Negative assessments of the Pharisees are also found (especially 17.2.4 §41-45). Had Josephus been motivated by the propagandistic purpose ascribed to him, he was singularly optimistic in hoping that the proper Roman officials would read the twenty books of his history with unflagging attention, ignore negative depictions of the Pharisees, link in their minds the few scattered references to Pharisaic influence in Books 13 and 18, and draw the

correct conclusions—without authorial prodding.

1.2. Rabbinic Literature. The use of rabbinic materials for our purposes is also problematic. Josephus's writings at least come from the first century; rabbinic literature from centuries later. Some of the references it contains to the *ḥarūšīm* clearly intend a party (rival to the Sadducees) in the years before A.D. 70, though the historical value of even these traditions is not assured. Other references to *ḥarūšīm* do not relate to the Pharisees.

Most vexed is the broad question of the relation between the Pharisees and subsequent rabbinic Judaism (see Judaism). A longstanding tradition interprets the post-70 period in Judaism as marking the triumph of Pharisaism over its rivals. The rabbis are seen as successors to the Pharisees, and rabbinic materials (often cited as the "Pharisaic-rabbinic tradition") are used to reconstruct Pharisaic positions. There are, to be sure, good reasons for positing substantial continuity between the Pharisees and the rabbis of the later period. Men called Pharisees in the NT and Josephus are recognized as authorities in rabbinic literature (Gamaliel; Simeon, son of Gamaliel). Pharisaic adherence to an extrabiblical "tradition from the fathers" corresponds nicely with rabbinic insistence on the validity of the oral as well as the written Torah. Belief in the resurrection is championed by both Pharisees and rabbis against opponents who deny it. When rabbinic literature juxtaposes positions of the Pharisees with those of the Sadducees (or others), the rabbis align themselves with the former. Nonetheless, it is an oversimplification to speak of the "Pharisaic-rabbinic tradition," nor can rabbinic literature be used uncritically as evidence for Pharisaic positions. In part, the question must be put to each tradition in the rabbinic texts whether it in fact preserves memories from the pre-70 period. If this is granted, we must still ask whether it is Pharisaic positions which are represented. Rabbinic Judaism was open to many influences not specifically Pharisaic, and it is perhaps significant that the rabbis did not choose to see themselves as Pharisees. According to Cohen the post-70 period marks not the triumph of Pharisaism but the end of sectarianism as it was known in the period prior to the destruction of Jerusalem (see Destruction of Jerusalem).

2. Name and History.

The derivation, force and use of the name "Pharisee" are all disputed. Commonly the name is traced to the Hebrew *ḥarūšīm* and taken to mean "separatist." It is then debated whether the term's connotations were good or bad, and whether it was first used by Phari-

sees of themselves or of Pharisees by opponents. Recently, Baumgarten, noting that an evident claim of the Pharisees was to be the party of *akribeia*, of scrupulous exactness in their observance of God's laws, has suggested that behind the name "Pharisee" may lie the Hebrew *pārōšīm*, "specifiers" (i.e., of the correct understanding of the divine requirements).

Typically, the circumstances surrounding the origin of the Pharisaic party are lost to the historian's view. Many scholars see them as spiritual descendants of the Hasidim, a group of pious Jews who attached themselves to the Maccabean opposition to the Seleucid King, Antiochus IV Epiphanes (see Kampen). In the narrative of Josephus, Pharisees first appear in connection with the reign of John Hyrcanus. They are presented as a group with a defined set of laws and views of punishment which are alternately espoused and abrogated by Hasmonean monarchs. Herod's wrath is said to have been roused by the Pharisees, many of whom he is purported to have killed.

The character of the Pharisaic movement after the time of Herod is, again, in dispute. Neusner, granting that the Pharisees were a political force until Herod's time, claims that they then evolved into a non-political group concerned primarily with the preservation of ritual purity for the eating of ordinary meals: a political party became a table-fellowship sect. Not unrelated is the observation, noted above, that Neusner believes Josephus in his *Antiquities* has grossly exaggerated the power of the Pharisees in the pre-70 period. In fact they did not, Neusner insists, control the religious or political institutions of pre-destruction Judaism. But the distinction between political party and table-fellowship (see Table Fellowship) sect is a false one. Pharisees committed themselves to the scrupulous observance of a particular understanding of Israel's Law (cf. Phil 3:5). Since requirements of tithing and ritual purity (see Clean and Unclean) form a part of Israel's sacred tradition, it is likely that Pharisees of all periods followed a distinctive view of these requirements and, in order to ensure their observance at mealtimes, were restrictive in the company they kept (a "separateness" reflected in the usual understanding of the name *Pharisee*). In all periods, then, Pharisaism would have functioned in part as a table-fellowship sect.

But a party acknowledged to be the most accurate interpreters of Israel's Law could hardly have confined its attention—in any period—to tithing and ritual purity. A more comprehensive agenda is both inherently likely and attested by the sources. Were the Pharisees, then, a political party? Again, the designation misleads. Pharisees were drawn from all classes

and professions of Jewish society; many would not have been involved in politics at all. On the other hand, since Pharisaism was based on a view of what Israel's responsibilities under the covenant entailed, those Pharisees who occupied positions of influence and power naturally did what they could to promote the acceptance of Pharisaic norms. In this sense Pharisees were involved in politics from Hasmonean times until the destruction of Jerusalem, though undoubtedly the effectiveness of their involvement underwent shifts.

In any case, given the diversity of first-century Jewish Palestine, Pharisees of necessity competed with rival groups for influence and power. Whereas they might at times succeed in influencing the proceedings of particular religious and political institutions, they controlled none. It is hard to believe, for example, that Sadducean priests would have taken directions from Pharisees in conducting Temple* worship. Nor should Pharisaic dominance of the Sanhedrin* or even the synagogues* be assumed. That the Sadducees could count on support from the priestly aristocracy underlines a further dilemma facing the Pharisees: with no certain power base, they needed to be aggressive both in attracting members and in promoting their views.

The evidence suggests that they achieved considerable success. Josephus describes the Pharisees as the leading sect (*J.W.* 2.8.14 §162). Both the rabbinic and Gospel materials appear to support the view that Pharisaic influence with the masses exceeded that of their rivals. Pharisaic claims of scrupulous piety and the preservation of ancestral laws were accorded wider circulation and support than any slogans the Sadducees or Essenes could devise (*Life* 191 §38; *J.W.* 1.5.2 §110; 2.8.14 §162; *Acts* 26:5). Indeed, the latter groups may have suffered in public estimation by their association, in the case of the Sadducees, with the Roman occupiers of the land (*see* Rome), and, in that of (some) Essenes, with none but themselves. Popular support was undoubtedly the main base of what influence the Pharisees possessed.

The Pharisees emerge then as an organized party of members committed to a particular understanding of Israel's Law, maintaining its practice themselves and advocating its adoption by others. Where rulers could be influenced, Pharisees lobbied for their views. Moreover, Pharisees were sufficiently schooled in the ways of the world to participate in councils and coalitions with rivals when the situation required it and common goals could be established (e.g., *J.W.* 2.17.3 §411; *Life* 20-23 §5). In this respect they functioned as a "political interest group" (Saldarini).

On the other hand, competition with rival groups was fierce and, fueled by the fervor of religious conviction, mutual denunciations were harsh. The tone of the pre-70 party debates found in rabbinic literature, the polemic against opponents found in the Dead Sea Scrolls (the Pharisees are apparently reproached as "seekers of smooth things"; *see* Dead Sea Scrolls), and the controversies and condemnations which fill the pages of the Gospels all attest to the bitter divisiveness which marked and (according to rabbinic literature) marred pre-destruction Judaism.

As far as we can tell, Pharisaism was a phenomenon of the pre-70 period. To depict the post-70 situation as the triumph of the Pharisees is oversimplistic and misleading. It was not until years later that the rabbis established effective leadership of the people; when they did so, they did not appear as Pharisees.

3. The Tradition of the Pharisees.

The adoption by Pharisees (and by later rabbis) of non-biblical prescriptions as binding law was on their part programmatic; for opponents, it served as an easy target for attack (*Ant.* 13.10.6 §297; *Mk* 7:6-13; perhaps 1QH 4:10). Much work remains to be done to define (where possible) the precise content of the Pharisaic tradition.

Particular attention was clearly given to matters of ritual purity and tithing, since the failure of the general populace to observe these laws according to Pharisaic norms compelled the Pharisees to regulate their own affairs in such a way as would ensure that their food was properly prepared. Many of the rulings preserved in rabbinic literature which can be traced with some confidence back to the Pharisees of the pre-70 era are in fact "party law" of this kind: not prescriptions thought to represent God's will for all Israel but necessary adaptations and applications of Pharisaic ideals to a situation in which the majority of Jews (the so-called people of the land) were, by Pharisaic standards, insufficiently observant. Rabbinic literature attests to distinctions drawn between the "people of the land," the "reliable" (i.e., people who could be trusted to observe certain requirements of purity and tithing), and full-fledged "associates" who had pledged to conform with defined standards, including the attempt to maintain ritual purity while eating ordinary meals. Relations between ordinary people and such associates inevitably required some definition. For example, the associate could not eat with outsiders. To some extent tithes had to be paid on what was purchased from a non-member, while foodstuff that was wet (and hence specially susceptible to impurity) could not be purchased from outsiders.

The state of the rules for associates in the time of Jesus is not known, nor can we be sure that all Pharisees were associates. But these rules do seem to reflect Pharisaic ideals and illustrate the Pharisaic goal of maintaining higher standards of ritual purity than were observed by ordinary Jews.

Generally, NT references are insufficiently specific to be of much help in defining Pharisaic legal positions. As exceptions we may note the use made of Mark 7:10-12 by A. I. Baumgarten and of Matthew 23:16-22 by S. Lieberman.

4. Pharisees in the Gospels.

In proclaiming to Israel the dawning reign of God, Jesus demanded a response quite different from that sought by the Pharisees, who summoned the nation to adhere to Torah's laws as interpreted by Pharisaic scribes. Since both were competing for the allegiance of the masses, conflict and mutual attempts to discredit might seem inevitable. Any perceived departure from Torah on the part of Jesus or his disciples was liable to be attacked by Pharisees. Disputes arising from apparent violations of Sabbath laws are especially frequent in the Gospels. Pharisees could be counted on to cite Deuteronomy 24 against Jesus' (widely attested) condemnation of divorce (Mk 10:2-9). Again, Jesus' open association (even at mealtimes) with notorious sinners could hardly have passed uncontested, providing as it did a stark contrast with Pharisaic efforts to cultivate careful adherence to the laws and Pharisaic scruples about mealtime company. In each of these cases, the Pharisees appear in the Gospels appropriately enough as the party advocating precision (*akribeia*) in the interpretation and performance of the Mosaic code.

The seriousness with which Pharisees would have regarded Jesus' departures from their norms is a matter of some debate. In a lengthy review of the issue E. P. Sanders (1990) has suggested that even if the conflict stories in the Gospels are historically reliable (and Sanders regards this as dubious), no significant conflict was involved. Disputes between groups within the Pharisaic movement, he suggests, were at least as substantial as were Pharisaic differences from the Sadducees. Yet the Pharisees had learned to tolerate those who did not share their views, worshiped with them at the Temple, and certainly did not regard those whose opinions on details of observance differed from their own as "sinners"* outside the pale of true Israel.* The latter category was restricted to those who lived in flagrant transgression of the fundamental laws of Israel's covenant. J. D. G. Dunn, responding to an earlier form of Sanders's position

(1985), thinks such a "quietistic" portrayal of Pharisees, absorbed in their own affairs and uncritical of others, highly unrealistic. And that Pharisees would have labelled outsiders to their ranks as "sinners" he finds plausible, given the evidence for contemporary usage of the term to disparage outsiders to one's faction.

On the latter point, and as far as the Gospel evidence is concerned, Sanders's position is to be favored. The "sinners" whose company Jesus kept were not so merely from a factional, Pharisaic viewpoint: It is not simply Pharisees, but "this generation," which reproaches his behavior (Mt 11:16-19). Furthermore, the use of the term for tax collectors (*see Taxes*) and prostitutes* (Mk 2:16; Lk 7:37; 19:7; etc.) and Jesus' acceptance of it as a designation of his companions (Mk 2:17; cf. Lk 7:47; Mt 21:31) make it clear that the notoriously wicked are intended.

On the other hand, there seems little point in attempting to establish how Pharisees would have responded to Jesus, or how accurately the Gospels portray their response, on the basis of the degree to which he departed from their norms. That would be a pressing issue only if deviation from Pharisaic standards constituted a crime for which Jesus was formally charged, but the Gospels do not suggest this happened. They do depict Jesus as rousing Pharisaic hostility by his actions, a claim which is not easy to dismiss. After all, the passion with which a person responds when their convictions are ignored and their sensibilities offended often says more about their personality, and even about other aspects of their relations with the offender, than about the seriousness of the offense. Moreover, the tolerance which Sanders finds characteristic of the Pharisees as a group (a tolerance which, incidentally, he believes they had only recently learned, and which he maintains without considering the behavior of Paul the Pharisee) can hardly be guaranteed of all its members.

Finally, tolerance, even if a part, is not the whole explanation for Pharisaic worship with Sadducees and others at the Temple: Their own commitment to the institution, combined with the impossibility of dictating its procedures, must surely be taken into account. The broad picture of Pharisees in conflict with Jesus seems well rooted in the Gospel tradition. It also seems consistent with, and inevitable in the light of, their different understandings of the divine will.

For Jesus' part the "old wineskins" could not contain "new wine" (Mk 2:22; *see Wine*). Believing that a new divine initiative had begun, the Jesus of the Gospels is exasperated by Pharisaic failure to discern and respond to the significance of the moment (Mk

2:19; 8:11-12; cf. Mt 21:28-32; 23:13). In the well-known parable* of the prodigal son (Lk 15:11-32) Jesus defends his association with "sinners" by arguing in effect that God is even now demonstrating his love to the most profligate of his people. Those of the Pharisaic ilk are represented in the figure of the sulking older brother, whose offended sensibilities keep him from partaking of the family feast.

The criticisms directed in the Gospels against the Pharisees go beyond their failure to respond to the message of the kingdom. Pharisaic claims of meticulous observance are depicted as leading both to pride (Mt 23:5-7; Lk 11:43; cf. *Ant.* 17.2.4 §41) and to contempt for the less observant—an unwarranted contempt, since the latter in turn are portrayed as more sensitive to their failings, more open to Jesus' proclamation of God's sovereignty and love* (Lk 7:37-50; 15:1-32; 18:9-14; 19:1-10). Again, the attention to the minutiae of tithing and ritual purity required by Pharisaic scruples would inevitably appear to an opponent with a different focus as evidence of distorted perspectives; hence the attack on those who tithe mint, dill and cummin while neglecting the essentials of the Law; the charge that cleansing cups is combined by Pharisees with inner corruption (Mt 23:23, 25-26; cf. the charge of corruption in *Ant.* 17.2.4 §41-45). Jesus' penchant for the striking picture and his attacks on expressions of Pharisaic piety are both to be recognized in the caricature of people who strain out gnats and swallow camels (Mt 23:24), or who turn the appointed hour of prayer* into a recitation of their merits (Lk 18:9-12).

Charges of this sort are rooted in different views of Israel's task and opportunity, and were certainly raised already in the lifetime of Jesus. That confrontation continued in the post-resurrection period can be seen in the attempts of the Pharisee Paul to show his "zeal" for his ancestral faith by persecuting the church (Phil 3:5-6; cf. Gal 1:13-14). The Gospels' depictions of Pharisees reflect both memories from the career of Jesus and subsequent developments in the Christian communities.

4.1. Mark. Mark's community was scarcely one which experienced Pharisaic opposition at firsthand; indeed, the Evangelist must explain Jewish customs for his readers (7:1-4). Part of the reason Pharisees are remembered may well be that some account had to be given, in a Gospel of the crucified Son of God (*see* Son of God), of how his appearance roused hostility. Conflicts arise over Jesus' association with sinners (2:16) and the failure of Jesus or his disciples to conform to norms of fasting* (2:18), Sabbath observance (2:24; 3:2) and purity (7:5). The propriety of

divorce* is also disputed (10:2-9). The confrontations are said to lead Pharisees to plot against Jesus (3:6). Further inquiries, with malicious intent, are brought to Jesus (8:11; 12:13). The Markan Jesus responds, sometimes sharply (cf. 7:6-13), to such queries, but otherwise he devotes no attention to Pharisees.

Clearly the teaching of the Pharisees represented no attraction for Mark's readers. On the contrary, the old order has passed for Mark (2:22). Its food laws, the subject of considerable controversy in parts of the early church, are perceived in Mark as irrelevant and unproblematic (7:19). Consequently, the Pharisaic endeavor can only be seen as serving no purpose. But the hostility which the Pharisees showed toward Jesus remains a part of the tradition and determines their portrayal as hypocrites, unfaithful to God's Word in the past (7:6-13) and insensitive to his dealings in the present (8:11-12). Worth noting, however, is Mark 12:28-34. Since the scribe who admired Jesus' reply to the Sadducees was probably a Pharisee, the passage suggests that there were Pharisees whose views of what is fundamental overlapped substantially with those of Jesus. But Mark himself makes no mention of the scribe's party affiliation.

4.2. Matthew. Matthew's community, which includes both Jewish and Gentile* Christians, clearly lives in an environment with a noticeable Jewish presence. Relations are tense, and the Matthean community perceives itself to be the object of persecution (cf. 5:10-12; 10:17-18; 23:34). Much in the Gospel is intended to support Matthew's claim, maintained in the teeth of Jewish counter-claims, that the appearance of Jesus represents the climax of Israel's sacred history (most emphatically, 5:17) and that followers of Jesus—Jews and Gentiles alike—have displaced the unbelieving and disobedient "sons of the kingdom" as the people of God (8:10-12; 21:43). Great emphasis is placed on the differences to be observed between the piety of those who follow Jesus and that of Jews who do not: The latter is portrayed as superficial, hypocritical (*see* Hypocrite) and ostentatious (5:20; 6:1-18). Pharisees, the epitome of such religiosity (23:4-7), are always hostile to Jesus in Matthew's Gospel, and the attention paid to their teaching witnesses to its relevance for Matthew's readers (especially chap. 23).

Though some would see in Matthew a Christian response to Pharisaic hegemony within Judaism of the post-70 period, it is unlikely that contemporaries perceived Judaism in those terms. The roots of the anti-Pharisaic polemic are better seen in the factiousness prevailing before the war. On the other hand, Garland has shown the Evangelist's intention in assembling the "woes" of Matthew 23 (*see* Blessing and

Woe): The chapter reaches its climax in verses 35-39 (see v. 38) and is deliberately juxtaposed with prophecies of Jerusalem's destruction in chapter 24. Thus the Evangelist is attributing Jerusalem's devastation to divine judgment* on the sins of the "scribes and Pharisees" as false leaders of the people.

4.3. Luke. Luke's Pharisees present a more complex picture. In part this is because they appear in Acts as well, where they are at times comparatively sympathetic to the Christian movement (Acts 5:33-39; 23:9; cf. 15:5). Paul's own Pharisaic ties are exploited and never explicitly renounced (23:6; 26:5; cf. 22:3). In Luke Jesus eats in the homes of Pharisees (7:36; 11:37; 14:1) and is warned by Pharisees of Herod's plots (13:31). On the other hand, conflicts remain (5:21, 30-35; 6:1-11; 15:2), as do the familiar charges of hypocrisy (11:38-41; 12:1), distorted perspectives (11:42), ostentation (11:43-44) and self-righteousness (18:9-14). To these, new accusations (16:14) and instances of ill-will (19:39) have been added. It is unlikely that Pharisaism had a contemporary relevance for Luke. The negative depiction which had become established in the tradition is preserved. Indeed, Pharisees serve Luke's purposes in providing a foil for Jesus' attitude toward sinners (cf. particularly the parable of the prodigal son, peculiar to Luke [15:11-32]). Still, the negative note is tempered somewhat by Luke's desire to show continuity between the Christian movement and its Jewish heritage (Lk 24:25-27; Acts 23:6; 25:14-15; 26:6-7, 22-23; 28:20).

4.4. John. As a rule, John paints Judaism with a broad brush. Jesus' opponents appear often simply as "Jews" without more specific identification (see John, Gospel of). Where Pharisees do figure, they are often represented as holding positions of power and acting in collaboration with other authorities (3:1; 7:32, 45; 11:47, 57; 12:42; 18:3). One at least is sympathetic toward Jesus (3:1; 7:50-51), but hostility predominates. The opposition of Pharisees is perceptively motivated in their own terms in 9:16; elsewhere it is attributed to spiritual obstinacy (9:39-41).

5. Conclusion.

Gospel texts depicting certain Pharisees, when detached from their historical context and seen as portraying Jewish piety as a whole, have prevented Christians from arriving at a sympathetic understanding of Judaism. The concern of much contemporary scholarship to portray Judaism (and Pharisaism) in its own terms represents an important corrective. But it must be combined with an insistence on reading the Gospels in their historical setting. Pharisees and the earliest followers of Jesus—all Jews—stood for alter-

native visions of the destiny and responsibilities of Israel. Doubtless there lie at the root of some of the mutual denunciations instances of abuse and the failure of behavior to match ideals. At a deeper level, however, lay the conflict of convictions deeply held about the course which Israel must pursue, and that from which they must turn, if they were to fulfill their divine calling (cf. Rom 10:2; the career of Paul saw him fervently maintain both sides of the dispute). First-century Judaism was the setting for many such disputes, the result of common convictions about Israel's past combined with different readings of what Israel's God now demanded of his people.

See also JUDAISM; LAW; RABBINIC TRADITIONS AND WRITINGS; SCRIBES.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. A. I. Baumgarten, "Korban and the Pharisaic Paradosis," *JANES* 16-17 (1984-85) 5-17; idem, "The Name of the Pharisees," *JBL* 102 (1983) 411-28; idem, "The Pharisaic Paradosis," *HTR* 80 (1987) 63-77; R. L. Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1987); S. J. D. Cohen, "The Significance of Yavneh: Pharisees, Rabbis, and the End of Jewish Sectarianism," *HUCA* 55 (1984) 27-53; D. E. Cook, "A Gospel Portrait of the Pharisees," *RevExp* 84 (1987) 221-33; J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul and the Law* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1990) 61-88; D. E. Garland, *The Intention of Matthew 23* (Leiden: Brill, 1979); J. Kampen, *The Hasideans and the Origin of Pharisaism* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1988); S. Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (New York: P. Feldheim, 1965) 115-43; S. N. Mason, "Was Josephus a Pharisee? A Re-Examination of Life 10-12," *JJS* 40 (1989) 31-45; J. Neusner, *From Politics to Piety* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1973); E. Rivkin, *A Hidden Revolution: The Pharisees' Search for the Kingdom Within* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1978); A. J. Saldañini, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1988); E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985); idem, *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990); D. R. Schwartz, "Josephus and Nicolaus on the Pharisees," *JSJ* 14 (1983) 157-71; S. Westerholm, *Jesus and Scribal Authority* (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1978).

S. Westerholm

PHILIP. See DISCIPLES.

PHILIP THE TETRARCH. See HERODIAN DYNASTY.

PIETY. See BENEFACITOR; JUSTICE, RIGHTEOUSNESS; PRAYER.