

rejected the Pharisaic doctrine regarding the existence of angels and ministering spirits (Acts 23:8). Because of the strict adherence to the letter of the law, the Sadducees acted severely in cases involving the death penalty. The Mosaic principle of *Lex talionis*, for instance (Ex. 21:24), was interpreted literally rather than construed as monetary compensation – the view adopted by the Pharisees. They were opposed to changes and innovations and refused to accept the oral traditions with which the Pharisees supplemented the Written Law. It was never a question of whether certain laws were derived from tradition, but whether those laws that were admittedly derived from tradition were obligatory. Apart from differences between the Pharisees and the Sadducees as to the oral tradition and supernatural beliefs, there were numerous legal ritualistic details upon which these two parties differed, especially those connected with the Temple. On the whole, it can be said that while the Pharisees claimed the authority of piety and learning, the Sadducees claimed that of genealogy and position.

The rivalry between the Pharisees and the Sadducees was, in a sense, the renewal of a conflict between the prophets and priests of pre-Exilic times. Following the restoration of the Temple and its sacrificial cult, the priests were also restored to their former position as religious leaders. Priestly authority was, however, weakened by two factors: the rise of laymen and “scribes” who possessed a knowledge of the law; and the advent of Greek rule – since among the Greeks themselves priests were the servants not the leaders of the community.

Attitude Toward Prayer and Sacrifice

Josephus and the Talmud say little about the Sadducean position on prayer, but the Sadducees would naturally not favor a religious service consisting of prayer and study alone, as would the Pharisees. This would tend to lessen the importance of the sacrificial cult and thereby weaken their own position as priests.

Fate

On the problem of human conduct and activities, the Sadducees seemed to have believed that God is not concerned with man's affairs. As Josephus puts it: “As for the Sadducees they take away fate and say there is no such thing, and that the events of human affairs are not at its disposal, but they suppose that all our actions are in our own power, so that we ourselves are the cause of what is good and receive what is evil from our own folly” (Ant., 13:173). Unfortunately no statement has survived from the Sadducean side on their beliefs and principles. There are controversial references in rabbinical literature with regard to the Sadducean interpretation of the law. The Sadducees have been represented as lax and worldly-minded aristocrats, primarily interested in maintaining their own privileged position, and favoring Greco-Roman culture.

The Sadducees and the New Testament

In the New Testament, John the Baptist jointly condemned the Pharisees and the Sadducees, calling them a “generation of

vipers” and challenging them both to “bring forth fruits meet for repentance” (Matt. 3:7ff.). In his denunciation of their doctrines, Jesus, too, grouped Sadducees and Pharisees together (Matt. 16:6ff.) and both parties were said to have posed questions designed to perplex Jesus (Matt. 15:1). According to Acts (4:1ff., 5:17), Peter and John were imprisoned by them. Since many Christian doctrines have more in common with those of the Pharisees than with those of the Sadducees, it is clear why the Apostolic Church, in the first years of its existence, had most to fear from the Sadducees (Acts 4 and 5).

Historically the Sadducees came under the influence of Hellenism and later were in good standing with the Roman rulers, though unpopular with the common people, from whom they kept aloof. The Sadducean hierarchy had its stronghold in the Temple, and it was only during the last two decades of the Temple's existence that the Pharisees finally gained control. Since the whole power and *raison d'être* of the Sadducees were bound up with the Temple cult, the group ceased to exist after the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: E. Baneth, in: *MWJ*, 9 (1882), 1–37, 61–95; V. Eppstein, in: *JBL*, 85 (1966), 213–24. For further bibliography see *Pharisees.

[Menahem Mansoor]

ŠADE (Zādi; Heb. שָׂדֶה, שָׂדֶה; שָׂדֶה), the eighteenth letter of the Hebrew alphabet; its numerical value is 90. It is assumed that the earliest form of the *šade* was a pictograph of a blossom שָׂדֶה. In the late second and early first millennia B.C.E., the *šade* became שָׂדֶה. In the Hebrew script, from the eighth century B.C.E. onward, the downstroke was shortened and a hook was added on the letter's right side שָׂדֶה, which has been preserved in the Samaritan שָׂדֶה. The Phoenician and Aramaic scripts lengthened the downstroke שָׂדֶה and thus in the fifth century B.C.E. Aramaic script three forms developed: שָׂדֶה, שָׂדֶה, שָׂדֶה. While from the first form, through the Nabatean שָׂדֶה, the Arabic *šad* شَد evolved, the Jewish script adopted the third form, which was the ancestor of the medial שָׂ and final *šade* שָׂדֶה. See *Alphabet, Hebrew.

[Joseph Naveh]

SADEH, PINHAS (1929–1994), Israeli writer. Born in Lvov, Sadeh was taken to Palestine in 1934 and lived for a while in Tel Aviv. A radical individualist and autodidact, he then worked as a shepherd in the Jezreel valley, and later as a night watchman in Jerusalem. His first publications were a story in *Ba-Ma'aleh* (1945) and a poem in *Ittim* (1946). The first collection of poems, *Massa Dumah* (“Vision of Dumah”), positioned him in the tradition of Hebrew Expressionism and his first novel, *Ha-Hayyim ke-Mashal* (1958, 1968; *Life as a Parable*, 1966), foreshadows Expressionistic principles, mainly, the work of art as a cry of protest and an expression of the self. In confessional style, interweaving reflections and meditations on human existence and nature with personal experiences, Sadeh's autobiographical novel rejected the ubiquitous collective experience in favor of far-reaching individualism. The novel