



## #iwi al-Balkhi: A Comparative Study

Judah Rosenthal

*The Jewish Quarterly Review*, New Ser., Vol. 38, No. 3. (Jan., 1948), pp. 317-342.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0021-6682%28194801%292%3A38%3A3%3C317%3A%3E2.0.CO%3B2-R>

*The Jewish Quarterly Review* is currently published by University of Pennsylvania Press.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/upenn.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## ḤIWI AL-BALKHI

### A Comparative Study

By JUDAH ROSENTHAL

College of Jewish Studies, Chicago

OF THE many Jewish rationalists and heretics of the ninth century only one is known to us by name, Ḥiwi al-Balkhi.<sup>1</sup> Both the derivation and the spelling of this name are uncertain. The name Ḥiwi is transmitted by old sources in the following ways: חיווייה,<sup>2</sup> חיוויא,<sup>3</sup> חאווי,<sup>4</sup> חאווי and חיווי.<sup>5</sup> These names are not Hebrew.<sup>6</sup>

It is possible to explain חיווי as a nickname for "heretic," because חווי, חוויא or חיוויא in Aramaic, ܚܘܘܝܐ in Syriac and حوية in Arabic means a viper, serpent, and a mischievous

<sup>1</sup> See I. Davidson, *Saadia's Polemic against Hiwi al-Balkhi* New York, 1915 29 ff.; L. Ginzberg, *Genizah Studies* I (New York, 1928), 230; A. Marmorstein, "The Background of the Haggadah, *HUCA* (VI 1929), 157 ff.; Edmund Stein, *ספר קלוזנר* in חיוי הבלכי מרקיון היהודי (Tel-Aviv, 1937), 210 ff.; Judah Rosenthal, *חיוי הבלכי, א יידישער תנ"ך-קריטיקער פון* ניינטן יארהונדערט *Yivo-Bleter*, XXVI, 2 (New York, 1945), 240 ff.; idem. *לתולדות המינות בתקופת סעדיה Horeb*, IX (New York, 1946), 21 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Kitab al-anwar wal-maraqib* by Ya'kub al-Qirqisani, ed. by Leon Nemoy I (New York, 1939), p. 57 1.9.

<sup>3</sup> Saadia, *Amanat*, ed. Landauer (Leyden, 1880), p. 37.

<sup>4</sup> *Kitab ma'ani al-nafs*, ed. Goldziher (Berlin, 1907), p. 16: וקד רד ר'. סעדיה גאון ז"ל עלי חאווי אלבלכי. (Quoted by Davidson, *op. cit.* 98): וזו פי מסאיל חאווי אלבלכי.

<sup>5</sup> Salman ben Yeruḥam in his commentary on Ecclesiastes. Quoted by Davidson, *op. cit.* 95.; an Arabic commentary on Numbers, *ibid.* Saadia in his *Sefer Hagaluy* (Harkavy, A., *Studien und Mittheilungen*, V, 177).

<sup>6</sup> Hevia ܚܘܘܝܐ as the name of the father of the king Orhoe of Edessa occurs in the *Chronicon Edessenum* of the 6th century. See Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, I, 388.

man. Heretics were called in Syriac ܩܘܪܝܢܐ.<sup>7</sup> We have also to take into consideration the derivation from the Arabic حوى meaning "to gather something," corresponding to the Hebrew אסף.<sup>8</sup> We find Jewish scholars named אסף in the late Gaonic period<sup>9</sup> and Arabic books under the title كتاب الحاوکا, meaning compendium.<sup>10</sup> The name Asaph is also found among the Syrians during the period under consideration. There is hence sufficient reason to assume that the Hebrew name of Ḥiwi was אסף.<sup>11</sup>

The opponents of Ḥiwi in their polemics against him, even in books written in Hebrew, preferred the Arabic name because it sounded similar to חויי snake, heretic.<sup>12</sup>

The accepted spelling of Ḥiwi's name is Hayawaihi or Hayawayh.<sup>13</sup> The usual pronunciation "Ḥiwi" or "Ḥiwwi"

<sup>7</sup> See Jacob Levy, *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midrashim*, II, 19 s. v. חו, חויי, חויי, חויי; R. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus syriacus*, p. 1210 s. v. ܩܘܪܝܢܐ and Lane's *Arabic-English Lexicon*, p. 681 s. v. حوى.

<sup>8</sup> See Lane's *Arabic-English Lexicon*, p. 678 s. v. حوى.

<sup>9</sup> See Jacob Mann, *The Jews in Egypt I* (Oxford, 1920), 40 n. 1; idem, *Texts and Studies*, I (Cincinnati, 1931), 133. Steinschneider (*JQR* O. S. XIII, 131) and Poznanski (*l. c.*) are mistaken when they assert that we do not find the name אסף among Jews in postbiblical times.

<sup>10</sup> The Arabic physician Abu Bakr al-Razi (Razes) called his medical encyclopedia كتاب الحاوکی. See P. Kraus and S. Pintes, "Al-Razi" in *The Encyclopedia of Islam.*, III, 1134. Cf. M. Steinschneider, *Hebräische Uebersetzungen*, p. 723. Hai Gaon published a book under the title כתאב חאפ. See Harkavy, *ממורה ומערכ*, in (1896) III, 94–96; idem, *חדשים חדשים*, VII, 1 in *Gratz-Rabinowitz*, IV. B. Lewin, *Ginze Kedem*, III, 69 ff.

<sup>11</sup> A scholar named אסף is mentioned by Bar Hebraeus in his *Chronicon Syriacum*. See *Monatsschrift* VI, (1857), 277; Assemani, *Bibliotheca orientalis*, II, 313. On the legendary Jewish physician Asaf Judaeus, see L. Venetianer, *Asaf Judaeus*, Budapest, 1915. Cf. J. Derenbourg, *REJ*, XXV, 249; S. A. Poznanski, *Hagoren*, VII, p. 113.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Derenbourg, *l. c.*

<sup>13</sup> Poznanski in *Hagoren*, VII, 113 n. 3. He vocalizes חײי. This vocalization is accepted by Malter. See idem, *Saadia Gaon. His Life and works*, 384. Nemoy vocalizes חײי. See idem, *HUCA*, Cincinnati,

is based on an incorrect analogy to the biblical name of a Canaanite tribe.<sup>14</sup>

Hiwi al-Balkhi flourished in the second half of the ninth century in Balkh, Persia.<sup>15</sup> Few details of his life are known to us. We know that he was of Jewish origin,<sup>16</sup> but he belonged neither to the Rabbanites nor to the Karaites.<sup>17</sup> Both factions of that period condemned him. Our information about him is based on the writings of his opponents. We learn that he wrote a polemical work in rhyme against the Bible, containing two hundred questions and difficulties.<sup>18</sup>

1930, VII, 389 n. 322. Goldhizer vocalizes חַיְוִיָּה. See idem, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 1916, 125-126.

<sup>14</sup> Gen. 10.17; See Malter, *loc. cit.*; Davidson prefers the usual pronunciation Hiwi, which is accepted by the encyclopedias and therefore followed by the present writer.

<sup>15</sup> The period of Hiwi's life is derived from a passage in Saadia's *Sefer Hagaluy*. This work was written by Saadia in the years of his expulsion after having been removed from the Gaonate by the Exilarch David ben Zakkai (931-934). Saadia states that by that time Hiwi's book had already enjoyed popularity for more than sixty years, which would put the date of its compilation about 870. See Harkavy, *Studien und Mittheilungen*, V, 177. וכדלך אלרר עלי חייו אלבלכי אלדי אקאם כחאבה. פי מא אמאנתא סהין סנה. Cf. J. Mann, *HUCA*, XII-XIII, p. 412, note 3. Balkh is a city in Afghanistan not far from Buchara. It was a center of radical Manichaeism. Manichaeism, Nestorian Christianity, Buddhism and Islam exerted an influence on the city. See El-Mas'udi's Historical Encyclopedia entitled *Meadows of Gold and Mines of Gems* translated from the Arabic by A. Sprenger, I (1841), 241 ff. Cf. Flugel, Gustav L., *Mani und seine Lehre*, 98; *Enzyklopadie des Islam* s.v. Balkh; Walter J. Fischel, "The Jews of Central Asia," *Historia Judaica*, VII (1945) pp. 46-47.

<sup>16</sup> See Saadia *Sefer Hagaluy* (Harkavy, *loc. cit.*): פי מא אמאנתא.

<sup>17</sup> Rapaport noticed that Hiwi could not have been a follower of the Karaites. See, idem, חולדות רס"ג note 31 (p. 146); The heretical rationalism of Hiwi in his explanations of miracles, as quoted by Ibn Ezra, could not have originated among the Karaites.

<sup>18</sup> Saadia in his commentary on ספר יצירה quoted by Judah ben Barzilai (11th century): ובואח אמר חייו אלבלכי בספרו שכתב בו מאחים . . . טענות. See idem, פירוש על ספר יצירה, ed. Halberstamm, 21. Cf. further E. N. Adler and I. Broyde, "An Ancient Bookseller's Catalogue," *JQR* XIII, 54 (No. 71) where a כחאב חי בלכי is mentioned. Poznanski, *ibid.*, 329 (71) believes that it refers to Saadia's answer. Malter, *op. cit.* 387 argues against Poznanski, and holds that כחאב חייו בלכי can refer only

We do not know in what language the book of Ḥiwi was written; probably it was in Arabic, but the possibility should not be excluded that he wrote in an Aramaic dialect, since Aramaic was still used by Gentiles and Jews in Babylonia as late as the 11th century.<sup>19</sup>

Both, Karaites and Rabbanites wrote polemics against him. They saw in his work a menace to Judaism. Qirqisani relates that the Sectarian Musa al-Zafrani (ninth century) wrote a book of replies to questions submitted to him by Ḥiwi.<sup>20</sup> The Karaite exegete and polemist, Salman ben Yeruḥam, in his commentary on Ecclesiastes 7.16, rejects heretic charges made by Ḥiwi.<sup>21</sup> He does not fail to curse Ḥiwi on this occasion.<sup>22</sup> Old anonymous Arabic commentaries on the Bible, which cannot be dated, mention questions and charges raised by Ḥiwi against the Bible. They likewise do not fail to curse him.<sup>23</sup>

Of the Rabbanites, Saadia, more than sixty years after Ḥiwi wrote his book, resumed the fight against him.<sup>24</sup> The literary activity of Saadia was to a great extent dedicated

to Ḥiwi's book because of the missing of the word רר (Refutation) in the title of the book. From Saadia's answer we learn that Ḥiwi's book was written in rhymes. See *idem*, stanza 61: המיארך חרוזים.

<sup>19</sup> Saadia's *Polemic*, stanza 37: רבה הוצאה וצרחת בה לפני נכר. Cf. Pseudo-Bachya: *op. cit.*, 16 (Davidson, *op. cit.*, 99). *Pseudo-Bachya* gives a reason why Saadia did not answer Ḥiwi in Arabic. But if Ḥiwi became a Christian Gnostic, as proven, he would have written his book in the ninth century in Syriac. On Aramaic among Jews in Babylonia at the geonic period, see I. N. Epstein, *Der Gaonische Kommentar zur Ordnung Tohorot*, Berlin, 1915, 53 ff. רב האי גאון כותב כיון שבבל מאז מקום לשון ארמי ולשון כשדי ועדיין בכל העיריות בלשון ארמי וכשדי מספרין הכל בין ישראל בין הגויים אף במדינות שחרשו ישמעאלים רוב השמות ארמי מרוכך הוא Epstein writes: *Aramäische Dialekte waren über ganz Babylonien bis tief herab in die erste Hälfte des elften Jahrhunderts ziemlich verbreitet und gesprochen sowohl von Nichtjuden . . . als auch von Juden.*

<sup>20</sup> Qirqisani, *loc. cit.*: ונה جوابות مسائل ינסבהא אליו חיویه.  
Cf. *HUCA* VII, 389.

<sup>21</sup> Davidson, *op. cit.*, 94 f.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.* 95 ff.

<sup>24</sup> See note 15.

to combating the religious schism which menaced Judaism. He wrote polemical works not only against Karaites but also against other adversaries of Rabbinical Judaism. One of his polemical works was directed solely against Ḥiwi,<sup>25</sup> while he devoted much space to him also in other works.<sup>26</sup> A fragment of his polemical work against Ḥiwi was discovered in the Genizah of Cairo. It has been edited three times, by I. Davidson, S. Poznanski and S. A. Wertheimer.<sup>27</sup> It is impossible to determine the length of Saadia's work and we do not know if he replied to all of the two hundred questions which Ḥiwi propounded.<sup>28</sup> The Genizah fragment is written in rhymed prose, and it contains about seventy-three stanzas of four rhymes each. Saadia's authorship of the Genizah fragment is well established by a threefold acrostic, which reads: *שעיד בן יוסף שעיד אלוף סעיד ראש כל (ה)*.<sup>29</sup> It has been established that the Genizah fragment is a part of the polemical work which Saadia wrote against Ḥiwi, since many of the questions set forth in the Genizah fragment are ascribed to Ḥiwi by other sources as well as by Saadia himself in his other works.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Malter, *op. cit.* 260–271.

<sup>26</sup> For references to Ḥiwi in the work of Saadia, see Davidson, *op. cit.*; 82. On p. 82 n. 4 *כתאב אלחמיו* has to be corrected into *כתאב אלרד* עלי אבן סאקויה, see Malter, *op. cit.* (385 1.5). Already Gratz noticed that a part of Saadia's polemic in his philosophical work *Emunot* III (ed. Slutski, 72–74) was directed against Ḥiwi. See Gratz-Rabinowitz, III, 473–4.

<sup>27</sup> Israel Davidson, *Saadia's Polemic against Ḥiwi al-Balkhi*. A fragment edited from a Genizah Mss. New York, 1915; S. Poznanski, *חשובות רב סעריה נאון על שאלות חייו הבלני*, Warsaw, 1916; S. A. Wertheimer, *נאון הנאותים*, Jerusalem, 1925, 17–68.

<sup>28</sup> Davidson assumes that Saadia's work contained about 460 stanzas (*idem*, 34). It means that the published Genizah-fragment is only about one-sixth or one-seventh of the work. But Davidson's assumption is very vague. Saadia sometimes devotes five stanzas to one question and sometimes he deals with several questions in one stanza. Cf. stanza 21 and stanzas 36–40.

<sup>29</sup> Davidson, *op. cit.* 34. Cf. J. Mann, *Texts and Studies*, II, 117–118.

<sup>30</sup> See notes 44, 68, 71, 76.

Some Hebrew chronicles and philosophical works of the Middle Ages and Abraham ibn Ezra in his commentary on the Pentateuch have rescued the name of Ḥiwi from oblivion.<sup>31</sup>

According to Abraham ibn Daud, who wrote his chronicle about three hundred years after Ḥiwi, the influence of the latter on Eastern Jewry was very great, and a Bible expurgated by him was used as a textbook in schools.<sup>32</sup> והשיב סעדיה תשובות על המינים ועל הכופרים בתורה ואחד מהם חייו אלכלבי אשר ברה מלבו תורה והעיד רב סעדיה שהוא ראה מלמדי תינוקות מלמדים אותה בספרים ובלוחות עד שבא רב סעדיה ונצחם.

It is incredible that Ḥiwi's compilation of the two hundred biblical questions could have been used as a textbook in schools. We must take the words of ibn Daud *cum grano salis*.<sup>33</sup> We do not find in Saadia's writings the testimony to which ibn Daud refers. Besides, as will appear later, it is probable that Ḥiwi became a Gnostic Christian.<sup>34</sup> Therefore, the statement of ibn Daud lacks plausibility.

From the polemical material against Ḥiwi al-Balkhi available to us today, we see that his main concern was to question the authority of the Bible. Ḥiwi criticized the biblical conception of God, and the biblical command-

<sup>31</sup> *Pseudo-Bachya* (11th century), *op. cit.* The Ḥiwi passage is quoted by Davidson, *op. cit.* 99; Moses ibn Ezra (1070–1139) in his Arabic work ערוגת הבשם or כתאב אלחדיקה פי אלמנאז ואלחקיקה (Davidson, 99–100); Abraham ibn Ezra (1092–1167) in his commentary on Gen. 1.1; 3.9; Ex. 14.27; 16.13; 34.29. Abraham ibn Daud (1110–1180) in his ספר הקבלה, *Medieval Jewish Chronicles*, ed. A. Neubauer, I, 66. For later sources see Davidson, *op. cit.* 102 ff.

<sup>32</sup> See, A. Neubauer, *op. cit.* Cf. Saul Lieberman חמין מדרשי 28; B. M. Lewin, *Ginze Kedem* VI, 14.

<sup>33</sup> On the reliability of Ibn Daud as an historian see מרדכי קליין מדרכי קליין, הצופה לחכמת ישראל, וא"צ מילנר: הראב"ד בתור חוקר דברי הימים I. Elbogen, "Abraham ibn Daud als Geschichtsschreiber." *Festschrift zu J. Guttmanns 70. Geburtstag*, 1915, p. 199 sq.

<sup>34</sup> See below.

ments and stories. The charges and questions of Ḥiwi may be summarized and subdivided into the following groups:

A. *God is unjust, without affection and favors evil.*

1. He accepted the gift of Abel, but rejected without reason that of Cain.<sup>35</sup>
2. The people of the earth and all the animals were destroyed in the flood, although they were guiltless.<sup>36</sup>
3. Why does God never refrain from inflicting punishment on the world?<sup>37</sup>

<sup>35</sup> Stanza 5. The question why God did not accept the offerings of Cain was disputed in ancient times. The reason given in Gen. 4.7 is difficult to understand. The Septuagint offers here another text. Philo deals with this question, and his answer corresponds to that of the rabbis, namely that Abel brought his offerings from the best of his sheep while Cain brought his from the worst fruits of earth. See Philo, "De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini," 88 (*Loeb Classical Library*, II, 160) "Ἀβελ δὲ ἤνεγκεν οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ οὐδὲ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον, ἀλλ' ἀντὶ μὲν ἀψύχων ἔμψυχα, ἀντὶ δὲ νεωτέρων καὶ δευτερείων πρεσβύτερα καὶ πρῶτα, ἀντὶ δὲ ἡσθενηκότων ἐρρωμένα καὶ πιώτερα." Julian the Apostate discusses the same question in his book against the Christians. See *Κατὰ Γαλιλαίων* (*Loeb Classical Library*, III, 418) Saadia's answer: *corresponds to that of the Midrash. See Gen. r.22.5* (ed. Theodor-Albeck, 207–8): *... קין מפרי הארמה ונר' מן הפסולת ... והבל הביא גם הוא מבכורות צאנו ומחלבהן ... מן שמיניהן.*

<sup>36</sup> Stanza 25. Cf. *Pseudo Philo (Fragments, Philo, ed. Yonge, IV, 277)*: "Why is it that God when He threatens to extirpate mankind does also destroy the irrational animals?" The rabbis tried to justify the destruction of animals in the flood. See Sanhedrin 108a: *כי השחיה כל בשר את דרכו על הארץ. א'ר יוחנן מלמד שהרביעו בהמה על חיה וחיה על בהמה ... אם אדם חטא בהמה מה חטאה תנא משום רבי יהושע בן קרחה משל ... אף הקב"ה אמר כלום בראתי בהמה וחיה אלא בשביל אדם עכשו אדם חטא בהמה למה לי מאדם עד בהמה ר' יודן אמר למלך שמסר בנו לפרגו והוציאו. Cf. Gen. r. 28.6:* *לחרבות רעה כעס המלך על בנו והרגו אמר המלך כלום הוציא בני לחרבות רעה אלא זה בני אבד וזה קיים לפיכך מאדם עד בהמה ... רבי עוריה בשם רבי יהודה הכל קלקלו ... מעשיהם בדור המבול הכלב עם הזאב הרגל עם הטווס ...* Cf. L. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, V, 180, n. 32.

<sup>37</sup> Stanza 24. The question is based on rabbinic conceptions and interpretations. See *Mekilla*, מסכתא רשבחא (ed. Lauterbach, III, 205):



4. Why did God save Noah, who was no better than his contemporaries?<sup>38</sup>

5. Wherein was Sodom more iniquitous than other cities that it should have met with such severe punishment?<sup>39</sup>

6. Why did Jacob suffer so much?<sup>40</sup>

שבת ממחשבת עבודה או אף מן הדין ת"ל וינפש מינר שאין הדין בטל מלפניו לעולם. See also *Gen. r.* 11.10 . . . ממלאכה עולמו שבת ולא שבת לא ממלאכה רשעים. . . ומנין שפורענותן של רשעים קרויה מלאכה שנה' *Pes. r.* ch. 23, 41 (ed. Friedman, pp. 120b, 174a). Cf. *Monatsschrift* 44, 564.

<sup>38</sup> Stanzas 26–27: והוא לא חטא רגנת מדוע השאיר מורע מרעים פליטה למה לא ישיריך נח. According to Marcion Noah will not be redeemed at the Last Judgment. See Irenaeus, *Contra Haereses*, I, 27.3: *Marcion dicit, Cain et eos qui similes sunt ei . . . salvatos esse a domino . . . Abel autem et Enoch et Noe . . . non participasse salutem . . .* Cf. Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion; das Evangelium vom Fremden Gott. Eine Monograaphie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der katholischen Kirche*, 1921, p. 117. The conduct of Noah was criticized in ancient times. The Church-fathers tried to prove that Noah was not drunk. They allegorized the verses *Gen.* 9.21 ff. Cf. L. Diestel, *Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der christlichen Kirche*, 165. In the rabbinic literature there were different views about the piety of Noah. See *Sanh.* 108a: אלה תולדות נח נח איש צדיק תמים היה בדורותיו א"ר יוחנן בדורותיו ולא בדורות אחרים וריש לקיש אומר . . . בדורותיו וכ"ש בדורות אחרים. Cf. *Tanhuma* B. I, 32. The conception that Noah was a just man is to be found in the apocryphic literature. See the *Book of Jubilees*, 5.19. Cf. Ginzberg, *op. cit.* V, 178, n. 28.

<sup>39</sup> Stanzas 57–58: כסדרם שנאמר אברהם ישב בארץ כנען. סדרם ועמורה אמרתה מה גדלה אשמתם מחטאת כל האומות ומשפחתם ללשונותם. Marcion also criticized the destruction of Sodom by God. According to Marcion the Sodomites will be redeemed at the Last Judgment. See Irenaeus, *loc. cit.*: *Marcion dicit: . . . Sodomitas salvatos esse a domino.* Cf. Irenaeus, *op. cit.* IV, 28.1. Tertullian, *op. cit.* IV, 59 f. Cf. further Harnack, *op. cit.* 95, 117, 141. The Rabbis emphasized the sins of the Sodomites. See *Sanh.* 10.3: רעים אלו לאלו וירא ר' נהוראי אומר אין לך אדם בכל' *Tosefta Sabbat* 8 (end): וירא הכרכים מתון יותר מסדומיים וכן מצינו שחור לוט על כל המקומות ולא מצא מתונה . . . כסדרם שנאמר אברהם ישב בארץ כנען.

<sup>40</sup> Stanzas 70–73. The rabbis tried to give an answer to the question of the sufferings of Jacob. See *Gen. r.* 84.3: אמר ר' אחא בשעה שהצדיקים: אמר ר' אחא בשעה שהצדיקים: בא ומקטרג ואומר לא דיין שהוא מחוק להם למבקשים לישוב בשלוח בעולם הזה הסטן בא ומקטרג ואומר לא דיין שהוא מחוק להם לעתיד לבוא אלא שמבקשין לישוב בשלוח בעולם הזה תידע לך שכן אבינו יעקב על שביקש לישוב בשלוח בעולם הזה נדרונו לו סטנו של יוסף אשרי מי שמקבל יסורין מנעוריו למה שסופו נח . . . וכן את מוצא כל הצדיקים: 121: ובטעמו נח נהוראי אומר אין לך אדם בכל' *Tosefta Sabbat* 8 (end): וירא הכרכים מתון יותר מסדומיים וכן מצינו שחור לוט על כל המקומות ולא מצא מתונה . . . כסדרם שנאמר אברהם ישב בארץ כנען.

7. Why did God subject the innocent offspring of Abraham to bondage in Egypt?<sup>41</sup>

8. Why did God prohibit the descendants of Lot and his daughters, the Moabites and Ammonites, from being admitted into the assembly of the Lord? God caused Lot and his daughters to commit incest.<sup>42</sup>

9. Why is the life of man full of suffering?<sup>43</sup>

10. Why did not God make man live forever?<sup>44</sup>

<sup>41</sup> Stanzas 47–49. The question why God punishes the children for the sins of the parents is an old heretic charge. See Origen, *contra Celsum*, VIII, 40: Julian the Apostate, *op. cit.* 106 E (*Loeb Classical Library*, III, 345). The rabbis emphasized that God punishes the children only when they follow the course of their parents. See the addition of *Onkelos* to Ex. 20.5: כד משלמין בניא למחשי בטר אבתהון: See also Sanh. 27b: דתנו רבנן לא יומחו אבות על בנים . . . והכתיב פוקד אבות על בנים ההם כשאחיו: מעשי אבותיהם ביריהם Cf. L. Ginzberg, *die Haggada bei den Kirchen-vatern*. Exodus. *Poznanski Jubilee Volume 208–209*; *Idem, Legends of the Jews*, VI, 40 n. 217. The answer of Saadia that God repaid the children of Abraham for their sufferings corresponds to the opinion of the rabbis. See *Seder Eliyahu Zuta*, XI ישראל של שבתן של ישראל Cf. Saadia, *Emunot*, VI (Ed. Slutski, p. 100): ואם היסורים . . . לא הביאם: עליה אלא לגמלה תמורתם טובה כאשר אמר ולמען נסותך להטיבך באחריהך.

<sup>42</sup> Stanzas 59–60. Lot and his daughters found defenders among the rabbis and also in the church. See *Gen. r.* 51.8 and 10. חנינה בן פפא אמר מחחילת עבורו של מואב לא היה לשם ונות אלא לשם שמים Cf. *Yalkut Shimeoni* I, 808. Clemens of Alexandria blames the daughters of Lot for the sin of incest. See, *idem, Pedagogus*, II, 9 (*Ante Nicene Christian Library*, N. Y. 1890, II, 258). Lot is considered one of the just men in the apocryphic literature. See *Wisdom of Solomon*, 10.6. See also *Pseudo-Philo* in the edition of the works of Philo by C. C. Yonge, vol. IV, 278. Cf. Ginzberg, *op. cit.* V, 243 n. 288.

<sup>43</sup> Stanzas 10–11. One of the charges of Marcion was that God of the O. T. is the “conditor malorum” and enjoys the sufferings of men. See Harnack, *op. cit.* 85 ff. 95, 141. The rabbis justified the creation of sufferings as a medium of chastisement from sins. See *Sifre Deut.* 32: היא אדם שמח בייסורים יותר מן הטובה שאלו אדם בטובה כל ימיו אין נמחל לו עון שבידיו ובמה נמחל לו בייסורים נמחל לו . . . רבי יוסי בר' יהודה אומר חביבים יסורים לפני המקום שכבודו על מקום חל על מי שיסורים באין עליו The answer given by Saadia is based on the Sifre. Cf. however *Gen. r.* 9.10 where we find another reason for the creation of sufferings, namely: הנה טוב מאד זו מדה ייסורין וכי מדה ייסורין טובה מאד אחמקה: אלא שעל ידיה הבריות באין לחיי העולם הבא.

<sup>44</sup> Stanzas 12–15: לממה לא יחיה האדם לעד ולא ירד שאול. Cf. *Emunot*, IV

11. Why did not God make man holy and pure?<sup>45</sup>
12. Why did He implant evil in man?<sup>46</sup>
13. Why did not God destroy the evil spirit in man?<sup>47</sup>

### B. God is not omniscient.

14. He did not know where Adam was when he was hiding in the garden of Eden. (Gen. 3.9.)<sup>48</sup>

(ed. Slutski, 76-77) וחשבתי בענין ימי חייו ואמרתו למה לא יחיה תמיד Cf. note 43.

<sup>45</sup> Stanzas 16-18: קדוש איך לא יצרו . . . מבית ומחוץ. Marcion also called the human body "stercoribus infersa." See Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* I, 29, III, II, IV, 21. Cf. Harnack, *op. cit.* 97. The Manichaeans also held that the human body was not the creation of God but of Satan. Saadia, *Emunot* IV (76), VI (100). Cf. also notes 43-44.

<sup>46</sup> Stanza 19: ועוד אמרה מחשבות און בו ייסר. Here the problem of free will and justice is touched. Evidently Ḥiwi did not believe in free will. He deals with the same problem from the angle of foreknowledge of God. See below note 101. Philo wrote a special treatise on this subject "*Quod omnis probus liber sit*" (*Loeb Classical Library*, IX, 10 ff.). The question was dealt with by the Rabbis. See *Seder Elijahu Zuta*, 12 (ed. Friedman, 193): אם האמר מפני מה ברא הקב"ה יצר הרע. The Midrash permits Cain to defend his crime with the excuse that the evil spirit who was created by God prompted his deed. See *Tanhuma* בראשית 9: . . . אף קין כך אמר, אני הרגתי אוהו? בראת בני יצה"ר . . . הכל צפוי: אהרשוח נתונה.

<sup>47</sup> Stanza 30: על יצר הרע דרשח למה לא העבירו. Marcion called the Satan *angelus creatoris* and God *actor diabolis*. See Tertullian, *op. cit.* V, 16; II 10, cf. Davidson considers stanzas 19 and 30 one question. See Davidson, *Saadia's Polemic against Ḥiwi Al-Balkhi*, p. 24.8 where 20 in parenthesis is apparently a misprint for 30. In reality stanzas 19 and 30 contain two different questions. Stanza 19: ועוד אמרה מחשבות און בו ייסר refers to Gen. 6.5 and stanza 30 refers to Gen. 8.21. The question: תרשח למה לא העבירו על יצא הרע דרשח למה לא העבירו. 8.21 refers to the time after the deluge. Ḥiwi asked why God did not destroy Satan (evil spirit) in the deluge when He destroyed all who sinned. Cf. Poznanski, *ZHB* XIX (1916), 4.

<sup>48</sup> See Ibn Ezras commentary on Gen. 3.9. (In his longer commentary on Gen. ed. Friedlander, p. 39): ישחקו עצמות חוי הכלבי שאמר לולי שענה: אדם לא היה נמצא . . . רק דברה תורה בלשון בני אדם לפתחון דבר . . . The same charge was made by Marcion. See Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*,



### C. *God is not omnipotent*

18. He was afraid of Adam. He did not permit Adam to eat of the tree of life. (Gen. 3.22.)<sup>52</sup>

19. After Adam and Eve were driven out of Paradise, God placed at the east of it the Cherubim and the flaming sword. Why did He not use other means or why did He not make Adam forget the way to Paradise (Gen. 3.24.)?<sup>53</sup>

20. Why was He afraid of the builders of the Tower of Babel (Gen. 11.6.)?<sup>54</sup>

21. Why did He change the name of Abram to Abraham (Gen. 17.5.)? It indicates that He had to resort to magic since He Himself could not alter fate.<sup>55</sup>

<sup>52</sup> Stanzas 1–4. In these stanzas Ḥiwi points out two arguments to prove the fear of God. The first are the verses Gen. 2.17 and 3.22. The Gnostics proved from the prohibition of eating from the tree of knowledge and from the tree of life, the fear of God. See Origen, *Contra Celsum* IV, 40; Irenaeus, *Contra Haereses*, III, 23.6. Porphyry, related by Severianus, *de mundi creatione*, ed. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, 56, p. 494. For the second argument see the following note.

<sup>53</sup> Stanzas 2–4. Cf. Benjamin Lewin, *הערות לחשובות רס"ג על חיי הבלכי*, הקרות לחכמת ישראל III, 14. נגוי ירושלים in לקושים מספר חמאח החמדה; 159; הצופה להכמת ישראל VI, 159.

<sup>54</sup> Stanzas 31–34. Ḥiwi identified the builders of the Tower of Babel (Gen. XI) with the בני אלהים and נפילים of Gen. 6.2.4. This conception corresponds to that of *Pseudo-Eupolemus* (See Freudenthal, Jacob, *Alexander Polyhistor*, 92–93). The conception that the builders of the Tower wanted to fight against God is found in the Talmud. See Sanhedrin 109a: דור הפלגה אין להם חלק לעה"ב... מה עביר אמרי דבי ר' שילא. דור הפלגה אין להם חלק לעה"ב... נבנה מגדל ונעלה לרקיע ונכה אותו בקרדושות. Cf. *ספר הישר* ed. Goldschmidt, 28 f. The story of the Tower was criticised by contemporaries of Philo. See, Philo, *de confusione linguarum*, ch. 2. Cf. Origen, *Contra Celsum* IV, 21; Julian Apostate, *op. cit.* 135B. (*Loeb Classical Library*, III, 350) *φημι μὲν γὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ τοῦτο παραπλησίως ἐκείνω μὴθῶδες εἶναι.*

<sup>55</sup> Stanza 42. Ḥiwi proves the weakness of the biblical God from His inability to change the destiny of Abraham without changing his name. Philo wrote a special treatise on this subject. He mentions men who ridiculed the changing of the name of Abram to Abraham. See, *idem*, *de mutatione nominum*, 61 (*Loeb Classical Library*, V, 173): *καὶ πρῶην ἤκουσα χλευάζοντος καὶ κατακερτομμονυτος ἀνδρὸς ἀθῆου καὶ ἀσεβούς ὃς ἐτόλμα λέγειν*. Cf. Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Trypho*, chp. 113. *Ante Nicene Christian Library*, (New York, 1890) I, 255. The rabbis

D. *God changes His mind, which is a sign that He is neither omniscient nor consistent.*

22. Originally it was permissible to marry a sister, but later God forbade it.<sup>56</sup>
23. God did not punish Cain with death for the murder of his brother Abel. Nevertheless, He later commanded: "Who sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." (Gen. 4.12.)<sup>57</sup>
24. Originally everyone was permitted to offer sacrifices. Later, however, these were restricted to the priests.<sup>58</sup>
25. God forbade work on the Sabbath. Nevertheless, He permitted the offering of sacrifices on the Sabbath in the Temple.<sup>59</sup>

explained the change of the name of Abraham by other reasons. See b. Ber. 13a: אברם הוא אברהם בחלה נעשה אב לארם ולבסוף נעשה אב לכל העולם כולו. Cf. Tosefta Berakot 1.13. The Tosefta stresses that there was no difference between the names. אברם and אברהם: אף על פי שחזר: אברהם אברם אינו לנאי אלא לשבח . . . הוא אברם עד שלא נדבר עמו הוא וקורא אברהם אברם אינו לנאי אלא לשבח . . . הוא אברם עד שלא נדבר עמו הוא אברם משנודבר עמו. Cf. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* V, 232-3.

<sup>56</sup> *Emunot* III (ed. Slutski, p. 69) לקיחת בני אדם את אחיותיהם ואומרים זה בטול.

<sup>57</sup> *Emunot* III (ed. Slutski, p. 70) והשנית דן על קין בעבור הרגו הבל נע ונר. בלבד ורן אחרי כן בהריגה כל רוצח למה לא שמו ונינו לא? Cf. Stanza 7: נשחח? The meaning of this question is rather obscure. The subject in stanza 6 is Cain, but the question why God did not preserve Cain does not make sense. Davidson therefore refers the question to Abel. But his translation is forced and does not fit into the text. It would afford better sense, if we should eliminate the first לא so that it should read למה שמו ונינו לא נשחח? The Mss. shows many deleted passages and corrections. Benjamin Lewin saw the difficulty of this passage and he read: למה לא שמו ונינו לא נשחח? why did God not destroy Cain? See קהלת שלמה by A. S. Wertheimer, p. 69: איך נתן ארוכה לקין? Cf. Philo, *Questiones in Genesis*, 76 (Yonge, IV, 322). According to Marcion Cain will be redeemed at the Last Judgment, but not Abel. See Harnack, *op. cit.* 117.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*: והשלישית מה שצוה בקרבן כל אדם אחר כן מנעם כלם חוץ מאהרן ובניו.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*: והרביעית הקרבת הקרבן בשבת אחר אסור המעשה בו. The conception of the rabbis was that sacrifices are among the laws which are stronger

26. God first commanded Abraham to offer his son, but when Abraham was about to fulfill the command God prevented him from so doing.<sup>60</sup>
27. God first said to Balaam: "Don't go with them," but later the angel said to him: "Go with them." (Num. 22.12.20.)<sup>61</sup>
28. God first said to Hezekiah: "You will die and not live." Later, however, he said to him: "I will give you fifteen years more to live." (Isaiah 38.1.5.)<sup>62</sup>
29. God first chose the first-born as His servants, but later He changed His mind and chose the Levites in their stead. (Num. 8.18.)<sup>63</sup>
30. God forbade work on the sabbath, nevertheless, He

than the law which prohibits work on sabbath. עבודה דוחה שבת. See Shab. 132b, Yeb. 7a. Cf. Matthew 12.5. See *Das Evangelium nach Matthaus erlautert nach Talmud und Midrash*, von H. L. Strack und P. Billerbeck, 620 f. Cf. L. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, VI, 41.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.: . . . לעולה שם על יצחק והעלהו שם לעולה. והחמישית מה שאמר הבורא לאברהם על יצחק והעלהו שם לעולה. ואחרי כן אמר אל תשלח ירך אל הנוער אתמול אמרת לי כי ביצחק יקרא. See *Gen. r.* 56.7: לך זרע וחזרתה ואמרת לי קח את בנך את יחידך ועכשיו את אומר לי אל תשלח ירך אל הנוער. The answer of the Midrash to this charge is that Abraham misunderstood the command of God: כך אמרתי לך שחטמו לא העלהו: אסיקתינה אחתיה.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid.: . . . ואחר כן. והששית מה שאמר הבורא לבלעם על שלוחי בלק לא תלך עמהם ואחר כן. אמר לו לך עם האנשים בדרך שאדם רוצה לילך בה מוליכין אותו. This question was already dealt with in the rabbinic literature. See *Makkot* 10b: . . . מן התורה דכתיב לא תלך עמהם וכתיב קום לך אתם. Cf. *Tanhuma* B. IV, 139. The answer of Saadia was: אשר מנעו ללכת עמם אינם האנשים אשר צוה.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid. The rabbinic point of view was that penitence can change the verdict of God. See *R. H.* 17b: אר יוחנן גדולה תשובה שמקרעת גזר. Hiskia repented his sins, he prayed to God and practised charity, thereupon God prolonged his life, see *Y. Sanh* X, 2; *Lev. r.* 10.5. Cf. Tertullian *op. cit.* II, 17.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid. The opinion of the rabbis was that the firstborn forfeited their rights because of their sins. They were the first to offer sacrifices to the golden calf. See *Y. Meg.* 1.11. שבר ד' מטה רשעים אלו הבכורות. שהקריבו לעגל החילה.

permitted Joshua to fight on the sabbath when he besieged Jericho. (Joshua 6.)<sup>64</sup>

31. God first chose the Tabernacle as the place of His glory, but later God chose the Temple as His seat.<sup>65</sup>

32. God first blessed men with power to subdue the earth, but later destroyed them. (Gen. 1.28;7.23)<sup>66</sup>

33. God promised Palestine to Isaac. Nevertheless he permitted Hagar to give birth to Ishmael who annulled the promise to Isaac. (Gen. 16.15; 17.8.19; 26.3.)<sup>67</sup>

34. God blessed Jacob, but made the children of Esau more prosperous than the children of Jacob. (Gen. 28.13 f.)<sup>68</sup>

<sup>64</sup> The Church-Fathers derived from the violation of the Law of Sabbat by Joshua during the siege of Jericho the proof that the laws of the Torah were temporary and not eternal as held by the Jews. See Tertullian, *Adversus Judaeos*, IV. (*The Ante Nicene Christian Library* III, 155). The same charge was made by Marcion. See Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, II, 21. Cf. Harnack, *op. cit.* 93. The rabbis tried to justify the action of Joshua. See *Num. r.* 14.5: ר"א אפרים מעו ראשי: מדבר ביהושע שהיה משבט אפרים והוא עשה מלחמה בשבת.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.* According to the rabbis the temple was one of the objects the creation of which was planned even before the creation of the world. See *Pes.* 54a; *Gen. r.* I, 4 (ed. Theodor-Albeck, 6): שבעה דברים נבראו קודם שנברא העולם... וביה המקדש.

<sup>66</sup> Stanzas 22–23. מולדו חיו בירך מחילה הארץ לכבוש... איך דרכם לא. הצליח. Stanza 22 may be considered a continuation of stanza 20. Hiwi proved that God is not omniscient, because He first blessed the first generation and later destroyed it. This charge, like the following one, may be considered as the continuation of the previous. They deal with the problem, of God changing his mind.

<sup>67</sup> Stanza 50: מולד ישמעאל שעבוד ישראל הכפיל.

<sup>68</sup> Stanzas 66–68: אמרה כי ישראל עבדים היום בשעיר בשבי... טעיה כי החליף. האחר עשר שהוא: Cf. *Emunot* III (ed. Slutski, 74): אלהינו אח מאמרו להם... רואה האומה המחוקק בתורה הוא דלה ונקלה... Hiwi wanted to prove that God annulled His first blessing of the patriarchs. He brings two proofs: 1. Jacob was a wanderer. The blessings of his father Isaac were not fulfilled. 2. The Jews, the children of Jacob are slaves of the Romans, the descendants of Esau. We find the same argument in the book of Julian the Apostate, *op. cit.* 209D (*Loeb Classical Library*, III, 378–9). Cf. J. Guttmann, *Monatsschrift*, XXVIII, 298.



35. God promised Palestine to the children of Israel, but swore afterwards that He would not let them enter it. (Num. 14.29 ff.)<sup>69</sup>

E. *God likes blood and sacrifices.*

36. Fat and blood are accepted by God as sweet savor.<sup>70</sup>

37. God delights in candles, songs, shewbread, the smell of incense, the offering of flowers and wine, oil and fruit. He likes to dwell in a Temple.<sup>71</sup>

<sup>69</sup> From an Arabic commentary on Numbers 14.23. Davidson, 95–96. Cf. Poznanski, *Hagoren* VII, 123. See above note 67.

<sup>70</sup> Stanza 28: ושאלה על חלב ודם איך נרצו כמקחח. Cf. *Emunot* III (ed. Slutski 72) והרביעי אולי ימהר ממחר בעבור מצוח הקרבנות אם לשחוש הבהמות או: והחלב (משל ד) שמע בני וקח אמרי הרבה קיחות צייתי אהכם בשביל לכוזתכם אמרתי אליכם ויקחו אליך פרה אדומה תמימה שמה בשבילי אלא בשביל לטהר אתכם דכתיב . . . Another point of view was that sacrifices were a necessary concession to the low standard of the people freed from Egyptian slavery. See *Lev. r.* 22.5: לפי שהיו ישראל להוטים אחרי ע"ז במצרים והיו מביאים קרבניהם: לשעירים . . . והיו מקריבים קרבניהם באיסור במה . . . אמר הקב"ה יהיו מקריבין לפני דא בשעה שאמר הקב"ה למשה עשה לי משכן התחיל מתמה ואומר כבודו: *Ex. r.* 34.1: א"ל . . . של הקב"ה מלא עליונים ותחתונים והוא אומר עשה לי משכן . . . שלא יטעה: *ibid.* 5: והקב"ה לא שאני צריך לכם אלא שתאירו לי כדרך שהארתי לכם *Tanhuma* B. IV, 23b–24a: אותך יצרך לומר שהוא צריך לאורה . . . ולא אמרתי לך אלא להעלות אותך הקב"ה שכולו אורה הוא צריך לאורה שלכם. According to the rabbis the purpose of revealing to Ezekiel the heavenly throne was to demonstrate to him that God is not in need of the services performed in the Temple, since innumerable hosts of angels minister to Him in heaven; hence it is for Israel's sake that the Temple will be rebuilt. See *Seder Eliyahu Rabba*, 6, ed. Friedman, 34. Cf. *Ex. r.* 34.1.

<sup>71</sup> *Emunot*, III end (ed. Slutski, 73): והששי אולי יתמה ממעשה המשכן. Marcion and Mani made the same charges. See Harnack, *op. cit.* 93, 100. Alfarc, *op. cit.* II, 142. O. G. von Wesendonk, *die Lehre des Mani*, 43. For the rabbinic point of view see previous note. Cf. *Ex. r.* 34.1: א"ל . . . של הקב"ה מלא עליונים ותחתונים והוא אומר עשה לי משכן . . . שלא יטעה: *ibid.* 5: והקב"ה לא שאני צריך לכם אלא שתאירו לי כדרך שהארתי לכם אותך יצרך לומר שהוא צריך לאורה . . . ולא אמרתי לך אלא להעלות אותך הקב"ה שכולו אורה הוא צריך לאורה שלכם. According to the rabbis the purpose of revealing to Ezekiel the heavenly throne was to demonstrate to him that God is not in need of the services performed in the Temple, since innumerable hosts of angels minister to Him in heaven; hence it is for Israel's sake that the Temple will be rebuilt. See *Seder Eliyahu Rabba*, 6, ed. Friedman, 34. Cf. *Ex. r.* 34.1.

F. *The Bible is full of anthropomorphisms.*<sup>72</sup>

38. God rested after His work.<sup>73</sup>  
 39. God walked up and down.<sup>74</sup>  
 40. God renders women barren and likewise makes them give birth to children.<sup>75</sup>

<sup>72</sup> The entire criticism of Marcion of the biblical God is based on the anthropomorphisms ascribed to Him in the O. T. Marcion rejected the allegorical interpretation of the O. T. by the Church. He claimed *Mḡ deivn allaghergein tḡn graphḡn*. See Harnack, *op. cit.* 62, 84. Celsus and Porphyry also criticised the same anthropomorphisms. See Origen, *Contra Celsum* IV, 71 ff.: Celsus . . . ridicules those passages which speak of God's words of anger addressed to the sinners and of treatments delivered against sinners. Celsus criticised the resting of God in the seventh day. See Origen, *op. cit.*, VI, 61. Porphyry proved from Ex. 31.18 the admissibility of creating idols in the image of a man, since God is presented as having fingers. See Harnack, *Kritik des Neuen Testaments von einem griechischen Philosophen des 3. Jahrhunderts*, 88.

<sup>73</sup> Stanza 21: סיח שבה וינפש השביה והנפיש פתרונו. The problem of God resting occupied the minds of previous generations. Philo, as well as the Rabbis explained וינפשו and וישבו as causative verbs. It means God made the world rest. See Philo, *Legum allegoriae* I, 18 (*Loeb Classical Library* I, 156): *ἐδηλώσαμεν δὲ ὅτι παύσει ὁ θεὸς οὐ παύεται ποιῶν*, *Gen. r.* 10.8 (ed. Theodor-Albeck. 86): 'מלאכתו לא כן אמר ר' ברכיה . . . לא בעמל ולא בנייעה ברא הקב"ה את עולמו . . . ומה נברא בו לאחר ששבת שאנן נוחת ושלוה והשקט ר' לוי בשם ר' יוסי בר' נהוראי . . . כיון שנחו ידי קוניהן ניתן להם ניחה וינח לעולמו ביום השביעי וינח ביום השביעי וכי יש לפניו ייעה והלא כבר נאמר: (ed. Lauterbach, III 255) 'לא ייעף ולא ייע . . . ומה ת"ל וינח ביום השביעי אלא כביכול הכתיב על עצמו שברא השביח והנפיש פתרונו. The answer of Saadia: אה עולמו בששה ימים וינח בשביעי goes back to the Midrash. In his *Emunot* Saadia gives another explanation of וישבת וינח. See *Emunot*, ed. Slutski 54. וישבת לא מתנועה ולא מיגיעה אבל הוא עויבת המציא הדבר המחדש.

<sup>74</sup> Stanza 21: ויעל וירד העלה והוריד פשרונו. Cf. also *Emunot*, ed. Slutski, 53 where Saadia writes: ועל המצב כי הבורא יתברך אינו נשם ולא יתכן שיהיה לו: מצב מהמצבים לא משיבה ולא מעמידה והדומה לזה מועלם לא: God ever came down from heaven. See Suk. 5a: ירדה שכינה למטה.

<sup>75</sup> Stanza 64: וטעם לעצור ולהוליד. It may refer to Gen. 16.2, 20.18, Isa. 66.9. Hiwi probably wanted to prove from Isa. 66.9 the divine birth of Jesus. This passage is another proof that Hiwi was a Christian.

41. God is represented as having affections.<sup>76</sup>  
 42. God is represented as eating and accepting bribes.<sup>77</sup>

G. *God does not work miracles.*

43. There was nothing miraculous in the Israelites' crossing the Red Sea. The fact was that Moses knew the ebb and the flow of the tides while the Egyptians did not.<sup>78</sup>  
 44. Manna was not a miraculous food. It was the Persian plant Tarnjabin found in the deserts of the Near East.<sup>79</sup>

<sup>76</sup> Stanza 21: ישמח ויתעצב שימח והעצב פתרונו וכן אפו וקצפו וחיים ברצונו. See notes 51, 73, 74. Cf. *Emunot*, ed. Slutski, 51: ואחרי כן אדבר על האמת שהוא באמת לא יחנן שיקרהו מקרה. Saadia denies any attributes to God.

<sup>77</sup> Stanzas 51-56: גם אמרת כי אכל בשר ולחם... ושבת ואמרת חלילה לאל! ומלאכיו מאכל לחם. This charge is based on Gen. 18.8. Anastasius the Sinaite was asked the same question by an heretic. The rabbinic explanation of *ויאכל* is known. The angels made it appear as if they ate. See *Pseudo-Jonathan* s. l. *Gen. r.* 48.14 and *Baba Mez.* 86b: ראו כמו שאכלו.

<sup>78</sup> This explanation of the miracle by Ḥiwi is ascribed to him by the Karaite Joseph ben Abraham ha-Kohen al-Basir in his book *מחכימה פתי* (quoted by Davidson, 98) and by Abraham ibn Ezra in his commentary on Ex. 14.27. Artapanus, a Jewish Hellenist of Alexandria (second century B. C. E.) rationalised the crossing of the Red Sea. See C. Muller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* III, 223. *Μεμφίτας μὲν οὖν λέγειν, ἔμπειρον ὄντα τὸν Μῶυσσον τῆς χώρας τῆν ἄμπωτιν τηρήσαντα διὰ ξηρας τῆς θαλάσσης τὸ πλῆθος περαιῶσαι*. Cf. German translation by Paul Riessler in his *Altjüdisches Schrifttum*, p. 191. Cf. Judah Halevi's refutation of attempts to explain the miracles in a rationalistic way: אמר הכוזבי זהו הענין האלקי ראוי לקבלו כי אין ננסים בלב... ספק לא מאפיקורסים מכשפים ולא מתחבולה ולא מרמיון... וזה עקשות מאפיקורסים (*Kusari*, ed. Is. Metz, 14).

<sup>79</sup> Ibn Ezra on Ex. 16.13. Cf. the edition of Ibn Ezra's commentary on Ex. by J. Fleischer (Vienna, 1926) p. 108: ישחקו עצמות חייו הפושע וכל הזונים אחריו שאמר כי מנהג זה המן לדרת עד היום במדבר ואמרו כי כמהו הוא היורד עם השל בארץ מערב התכון הוא הנכנס במיני רפואות הנקרא תרנג'ין ולא התבישו אלה איפה ראה, Cf. Fleischer, *מקום ישוב*. L. Blau-Festschrift, Vienna, 1926, 241-243. Baidawi, one of the commentators of the Koran, also explains the miracle of Manna in a natural way. He identifies Manna with the plant *ترنجبین* (Baidawi on the Koran II, 54) See Lanes's *Arabic-English Dictionary*, I, 306. Cf. *Emunot*, introduction, ed. Slutski, 12: ואני רואה... כי ענין אוח המן יותר נפלאה מכולם כי הדבר המתמיד יותר נפלא מהנפסק... An

45. The face of Moses was "horny" when he came down from Mount Sinai because it was wizened by long fasting.<sup>80</sup>

H. *The Bible admits the existence of many gods.*<sup>80a</sup>

46. The Godhead is represented as three.<sup>81</sup>

47. God chose Israel as His own portion but gave the other nations into the care of the other gods.<sup>82</sup>

Irish monk of the seventh century tried to explain the miracle of Manna rationalistically. According to him Manna was hail. Augustine in his treatise *de mirabilibus scripturae sacrae libri tres*. See G. Diestel, *Bibel und Naturkunde*, in *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1863, 292.

<sup>80</sup> Ibn Ezra on Ex. 34.29: כִּי בַעֲבוּר שְׁלֵא אָכַל: שָׁבוּ פְּנֵי מֹשֶׁה יְבֻשׁוּת כְּמוֹ הַקָּרָן וְשֶׁעַם וַיִּירָאוּ מִפְּנֵי שֶׁהָיוּ פְּנֵי מְכוּעָרוֹת. It is missing in the commentary on Ex. ed. by J. Fleischer. See *ibid*, P. 333.

<sup>80a</sup> The pagan adversaries of monotheism held that both Judaism and Christianity admit the existence of many gods. Porphyry proved from the *θεός οὐ κακολογήσεις* traces of polytheism in the O. T. See Harnack, *Kritik des Neuen Testaments von einem griechischen Philosophen des 3. Jahrhunderts*, p. 90. Porphyry quoted also Deut. 13.3, Josh. 24.14 and Jer. 7.6 as a proof of polytheism in the Bible. See Harnack, *l. c.* According to the Talmud the gnostics and polytheists drew their criticism of Jewish monotheism also from other passages in the Bible. See Sanh. 38b: כָּל מְקוֹם שֶׁפָּקְרוּ הַמִּינִים תְּשׁוּבָתָם בְּצַדָּם: נַעֲשֶׂה אִדָּם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ וַיִּבְרָא . . . אֲנֹכִי ר' אֱלֹהֶיךָ הַמִּינִים שָׂאֵלוּ: 29: *Ex. r.* 8, ed. Theodor-Albeck, 61 ff. also *Ex. r.* 29: אַחַר ר' שְׁמַלְאִי אָמְרוּ לוֹ אֱלֹהוֹת הַרְבֵּה יֵשׁ בְּעוֹלָם אָמַר לָהֶם לְמָה אָמְרוּ לוֹ שֶׁהָרִי כְּתוּב . . . הִשְׁמַע עִם קוֹל אֱלֹהִים אָמַר לָהֶם שְׂמָא כְּתוּב מְדַבְּרִים אֱלֹהִים מְדַבֵּר . . . For discussions between rabbis and heretics about polytheistic passages in the Bible, see A. Büchler, "Ueber die Minim von Sephoris und Tiberias im zweiten und dritten Jahrhundert," in *Hermann-Cohen-Festschrift*, 271 ff. Cf. also *Pesikta de R. Kahana* ed. Buber, 188a: וַאֲנִי אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהֵי מְלָאכֵי הַשָּׁרָת: See notes 81-83.

<sup>81</sup> Stanza 50: אַחֲרֵי זֶה אֵצְתָה שְׂקָר לְהַטְפִּיל לְחֻצוֹת לְשִׁלְשָׁה אֵל מְרִים וּמִשְׁפִּיל . . . הִנֵּה קָצָה אָמְרוּ כִּי הֵשֶׁם נֶאֱמָר הוּא אֶחָד וְהוּא נֶאֱמָר וְלֹא . . . יִתְפַּרְדּוּ וְהִנֵּה שִׁכְחוּ וַיָּבֹאוּ שְׁנֵי הַמְּלָאכִים סְרַמָּה *cum Trypho*, chp. 56. In his discussion with the Jew Trypho, Justin wants to prove the Trinity from Gen 18. The rabbinic point of view is defended by Trypho and it is that the three men of Gen. 18.2 do not include God. See Shebu. 35b: חוּץ קִדְשׁ בְּאִבְרָהָם קִדְשׁ חוּץ מִזֶּה שֶׁהוּא חוֹל שְׁנֵאמַר וַיֹּאמֶר אֲדָנִי אִם נָא מִצְאֵתִי חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ . . . תֵּי ר' חִיָּא לְגִדּוּל *Gen. r.* 48.10.

<sup>82</sup> Stanzas 36-40: מֵה לָךְ לְסַפֵּר חֻקֵי אֱלֹהִים הַיִּשְׂרָאֵל וְלֵאמֹר כִּי אִישׁ חֵלֶק לָד' . . . הוֹשָׁאֵר לְשִׁרִים . . . כֵּן אַתָּה פְּנִית אֶל חֵלֶק וּנְחַלְהָ הַנְּקֻרָאִים וְהַנְּחָת הֵן לָד' אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם

48. God commanded sacrifices to be made on the Day of Atonement to a demon (i. e. Azazel).<sup>83</sup>

I. *The Bible contains contradictions.*<sup>84</sup>

49. Gen. 15.5 contradicts Deut. 7.7.<sup>85</sup>

50. II Sam. 24.9 contradicts I. Chron. 21.5.<sup>86</sup>

תבל ומלאם ועל הקנין כי כל הברואים הם בראוי ומעשיו . . . ואשר נראה בספרים ואומרים שעם מנולחו קנינו וחבלו . . . אין זה כי אם על דרך הגדול והכבוד See also the anonymous Arabic commentary on Deut. 32.9 quoted by Davidson (96–97). Julian the Apostate based his charge of polytheism in the O. T. on the same argument. See *idem*, *op. cit.* 99E (*Loeb Classical Library*, III, 340): τῶν δὲ ἄλλων ἐθνῶν, ὅπως ἢ ὑφ' οἰστισι διοικοῦνται θεοῖς, οὐδ' ἡγτινοῦν μείαν πεποίηται. According to rabbinic sources God appointed angels as rulers of all the nations after the building of the Tower of Babel but He preserved for Himself only the rule of the people of Israel. See *PRE*, Chp. 24: ומה מלאך על כל אומה ואומה וישראל נפל. בחלקו. See also *Pseudo-Jonathan* on Gen. 11.8 and Deut. 32.8–9. The official rabbinic writings contest the conception that Deut. 4.19 admits the justification of worship of the heavenly bodies and the angels. It is maintained that the sages who translated the Bible into Greek permitted themselves a very free rendering of Deut. 4.19 in order to obviate any misunderstanding. Cf. *Mekilta* פסחא (ed. Lauterbach I, 112); *Y. Meg.* I, 9; *B. Meg.* 9a; *Masseket Soferim* 5. Cf. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, V, 205.

<sup>83</sup> *Emunot* (ed. Slutski, 73) והתשיעי הקרבן אשר היו מקריבים לעואול ביום: הכפורים. It was also one of the charges of Julian the Apostate. See *idem*, *op. cit.* 299B (*Loeb Classical Library*, III, 402): Ὑπερ δὲ ἀποτροπαίων ἐπάκουσαν πάλιν ὅσα λεγεί. See also the edition of C. I. Neumann, *Julianus contra Christianos* (Leipzig, 1880), 217. Neumann quotes Cyrillus of Alexandria (Fifth Century), who held that according to Julian Moses sacrificed to the *di averrunci*, *deities who avert evil* in contradiction to idols as expressed in Ex. 22.19. Julian translated contrary to the LXX עוואול not with ἀποπομπαιος but with θεοὶ ἀποτροπαιοι. See also *Joma* 67b: ואלו שיהשטן משיב עליהם ואלו ושעיר המשחלח הם. *Lev. r.* 22; Maimonides, *More Nebukim* III, 32.

<sup>84</sup> Since very early times the harmonization of contradictions in the Bible was one of the hermeneutics. The rabbis and the Church tried to harmonize contradictions. In the Gaonic period the literature of harmonization of contradictions in the Bible was increasing, which was a sign of the challenge of the Bible by various heretics. See *HUCA* XIV (1939) 339; *Ginze Kedem*, V (1934) 145.

<sup>85</sup> Stanza 43: See also Saadia's translation of Deut. 7.7: כי אתם כי אתם מנועים. המעט בל אתם אקל מנהם מנועים. For other rabbinic interpretations of כי אתם see Hul. 89a and אליעזר. ed. Enelow, 181.

<sup>86</sup> *Emunot* III (ed. Slutski, 72): והשני אולי אחד מקצר מהחוק בו בעבור.

51. I Kings 7.13–14 contradicts II Chron. 2.13.<sup>87</sup>

52. II Kings 8.17 ff. contradicts II Chron. 29.2.<sup>88</sup>

J. *Many commandments, statements and stories of the Bible lack reason.*

53. Many commandments of the Bible lack detailed instructions as to how to fulfill them (פירושי המצוות). They lack also a rational motivation (טעמי המצוות).<sup>89</sup>

... שחושב שיש בו סחירה. See Saadia's commentary on the Barayta of R. Ishmael, ed. Muller (Oevres completes IX, 83). See also *Pesikta Rabbati* 44a; *Jalkut Shimeoni*, II, 165. Cf. L. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, VI, 270 n. 120.

<sup>87</sup> Ascribed to Hiwi by an anonymous Arabic commentary on I Kings (Davidson, 98). This contradiction was also dealt with by the rabbis and by the Church fathers. See Ginzberg, *op. cit.* 295, n. 61.

<sup>88</sup> *Emunot* III (ed. Slutski 72): השלישי אולי יביארו לזה מחשבו שיש בו הגדה שהיא שקר שיהיה הבן גדול מן האב שנתים 42 years at the death of his father, because the latter was only 40 years old when he died. This difficulty was already noticed by the rabbis. See *Tosefta Sota* 12.3; *Seder Olam Rabba* XVIII (ed. Ratner, 73). Cf. the "Oldest Collection of the Bible Difficulties by a Jew," *JQR* XIII (O.S.), 361.

<sup>89</sup> אולי קצת בני אדם מקצרים להחזיק בספר הזה בעבור שאין פרושי המצוות מבוארים בו. It is evident from the answer of Saadia that Hiwi made two criticisms of the Bible: one concerning the lack of the oral law and the other concerning the lack of the written law. Concerning the first charge it is known that the rabbis based on the lack of פירושי המצוות their contention that the oral law (חורה שבעל פה) is on an equal status with the written law (חורה שבכתב). See *Sifra* on Lev. 26.46: והחורה מלמד ששתי חורות נתנו להם לישראל א' בכתב וא' בעל פה... בהר סיני ביד משה מלמד שניתנה החורה חורה שבכתב. Cf. *Tanhuma*, Noah שכתב חורה שבעל פה פרשתו. Concerning the second charge, the lack of טעמי המצוות the rabbis were divided in the opinion if it is admissible to search after a rational motivation of the commandments. See *Sanh.* 21b: אר' יצחק מפני מה לא נתגלו טעמי חורי שהרי שתי מקראות נתגלו טעמן נכשל ולמכסה עתיק... זה המגלה דברים שכיסה: בהן גדול העולם תנו רבנן... את חוקותי חשמרו: *Yoma* 67b: עתיק יומין מאי ניהו טעמי חורה דברים שהשטן משיב עליהן ואלו הן אכילת חויר ולבישת שעמנו וחליצת יבמה וטהרת מצורע ושעיר המשתלח ושמאמר מעשי תהו הם ת'ל אני ד' אני ד' חקקתיו ואין לך רשות להרהר בהם. Cf. *Hag.* 13a; *Cant. r.* 1.17. See also *Bet ha-Midrasch* by A. Jellinek, V, 45: לעתיד לבוא מגלה הקב"ה טעמי חורה לישראל מפני מה: *Die Dikduke Ha-Teamim des Ahron ben Moscheh ben Ascher*... von S. Baer und H. L. Strack, 53: ... ואם ישאל השואל הדרוש מה טעם לזה שיהיו דבריו סתומים ולא מגולים.

54. What is the reason for the punishment inflicted on Cain?<sup>90</sup>

55. What was the meaning of the vision of Abraham during the "covenant of pieces?"<sup>91</sup>

56. Why does the Bible dedicate so much space to the story of Eleazar, the servant of Abraham?<sup>92</sup>

57. Why did Abraham accept the command of God to sacrifice his own son?<sup>93</sup>

58. Why did Jacob marry four wives? Would not the history of the Jewish people have had another course if he had married only one wife?<sup>94</sup>

59. Why should the ashes of a red heifer cleanse the unclean and *vice versa*?<sup>95</sup>

60. How could the breaking of the head of the heifer atone for the people when they committed no crime?<sup>96</sup>

השובתו אלו היה המקרא כולו מגולה לא היה שכר ולא כבוד ליגיעים בו. Cf. further Maimonides, *Mishne Torah*, *Hilkot Meila* 8.8; *Hilkot Mikvaot* 11.12.

<sup>90</sup> Stanza 6: על נקמו אל באף דודה. The active participle דודה has here the meaning of "a wanderer" and it refers to the punishment of Cain to be a wanderer (Gen. 4.14). Saadia holds that Cain was not punished for the murder of Abel but for his arrogance. See note 57. We find the same question in the collection of questions addressed to a Gaon. See קהלה שלמה by A. S. Wertheimer, 69: איך יהיה עונש הרציחה.

<sup>91</sup> Stanzas 44–46: טעמי המחזה והבתרים לא היבנו עניינם. The covenant of pieces is criticised here. See note 185.

<sup>92</sup> Stanza 35: ויצדקו עבדים רבים ולא יכתבו לנו דבריהם... ומעשה אב המון. כתב לנו להיטור בהם. The rabbis dealt with this question. See *Sifra Shemini* 5; *Gen. r.* 60.8 (ed. Theodor-Albeck, 650).

<sup>93</sup> Stanzas 61–62: ואיפשר לאדם כי ימיתהו אל בדברו ויתן לו נמול טוב שמה. התח מוסרו Davidson (p. 72, n. 235) holds that it refers to Isaac but Poznanski proved that it could refer only to Abraham. See *ZHB*, XIX, 7 and idem, *תשובות רס"ג על חיוי הבלכי*, 36, n. 3.

<sup>94</sup> Stanza 69: שבטים אם היו מאב אחד ואם אחת... לא קנאו זה בזה בתוכחת.

<sup>95</sup> *Emunot* III (ed. Slutski, 73): והשמני שיחשוב בענין הפרה. It is an old heretic question which the rabbis tried to answer. See *Tahnuma* B. IV, 116: ... ופרה... Cf. *Num. r.* 19(3).

<sup>96</sup> *Emunot* III (ed. Slutski, 74): והעשירי אומר על ענלה ערופה. The

61. Why did God make His light dwell among men, and leave His angels without light?<sup>97</sup>
62. Circumcision is without reason. It is simply mutilation.<sup>98</sup>
63. There is no mention of reward and punishment in the future world in the Bible.<sup>99</sup>
64. God did not create the world *ex nihilo*.<sup>100</sup>

rabbis dealt with this question. See Sifre on Deut. §210; Sota 46b. Cf. Ginzberg, *op. cit.* V, 357 n. 296.

<sup>97</sup> *Emunot* III (ed. Slutski 72): והחמישי אולי חשוב יחשוב איך השכין הבורא: אורו בין בני אדם והניח המלאכים המהורים בלא אור. See also Saadia's commentary on ספר היצירה (Quoted by Judah ben Barzilai in his commentary on ספר יצירה ed. Halberstamm, pp. 21, 234). Cf. אוצר הנאותים ed. Lewin, I, 17. This question occupied the minds of the rabbis. See *Tanhuma* B. II, 94: כיון ששמעו מלאכי השרת כן אמרו לפניו רבונו של עולם למה בשמם כיון ששמעו מלאכי השרת כן אמרו לפניו רבונו של עולם למה בשמם. אתה מניח עליונים ויורד לתחתונים שבחך הוא שחאה ב-29. Cf. *Hagoren*, VII, 120.

<sup>98</sup> Stanza 41: לעזת על הברית ורמית לשרטת: Cf. *Emunot* III (ed. Slutski 73): והשביעי שיחשוב בחלקי המצות איך יהיה האדם בעוד נופו בבריאותו השלמה: Circumcision was since ancient times a subject of criticism by the Gentiles against the Jews. See Strabo, *Geographie*, 16.2, 37; Apion, Josephus, *contra Apionem*, II, 13 (*Loeb Classical Library*, I, 346): *καὶ τὴν τῶν αἰδοίων χλευάζει περιτομῆν*. See Th. Reinach, *Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains*, index s.v. circumcision. Also the Church Fathers fought against circumcision. See Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Trypho*, 19.30. Cf. Ginzberg, *op. cit.* V, 268-269.

<sup>99</sup> *Emunot* III (ed. Slutski 74): והשנים עשר כי לא מצא בתורה גמול ולא עונש בעולם הבא. Gratz and J. Guttman are of the opinion that questions 11 and 12 of the 3rd chapter of *Emunot* are of Christian and Islamic origin respectively. E. Stein is of the opinion that these questions go back to Ḥiwi. See *Gratz-Rabinowitz*, III, 473; J. Guttman, *Monatschrift*, 28, 298; E. Stein in ספר קלוזר, 221. According to Josephus the Sadducees did not believe in a future life and in reward and punishment after death, see *Antiquities of the Jews* 18, 1, 3-4. Marcion also held that the Old Testament does not mention reward in the future life. See Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*: III, 24; *coeleste regnum non predicatum est apud creatorem*. The Manichaeans also maintained that the Scripture does not mention future life.

<sup>100</sup> *Pseudo Bächya*, *op. cit.* ed. Goldziher, 16.11.20-24. (Davidson 99). Ḥiwi explained מהו ובהו as the material from which God created the world. See Poznanski, *Hagoren*, VII, 116-117. Cf. *Emunot*, introduction, p. 20, where it is evident that Saadia disputes Ḥiwi's opinion of



65. Man has no free-will; everything is predestined.<sup>101</sup>

It must be admitted that of these sixty-five questions, not all can be referred with certainty to Ḥiwi's.<sup>102</sup> Some of those listed above as separate queries may really be duplicates of one another.<sup>103</sup> Davidson counted only forty-seven questions<sup>104</sup> and Poznanski only forty-four.<sup>105</sup> For our own part, we have included all hypothetical questions of Ḥiwi, and all those mentioned at the end of the third chapter of *Amanat* by Saadia.

An analysis of the questions and difficulties dealt with by Ḥiwi shows that the majority of them may be found in other non-Jewish and Jewish sources.

Injustice, wickedness, ignorance, weakness, falsity, fondness for blood, sacrifices, on the part of God, and anthropomorphism, polytheism, inconsistency and illogicality in the Bible were charges levelled previously by Marcion,

the creation of the world. It seems that Ḥiwi did not believe in *creatio ex nihilo*. Neither did Marcion believe in it. See Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* I, 155 *creator mundum ex aliqua materia subiacente molitus est*. Ibn ar-Ravendi, the Islamic heretic of Jewish origin, a contemporary of Ḥiwi also denied *creatio ex nihilo*.

<sup>101</sup> According to Moses ibn Ezra in his work *כתב מלחדיקה פי אלמנוא פי ואלחקיקה* (Quoted by Davidson, 99–100). Marcion also denied free will. Harnack *op. cit.* 97–98: *Si scivit non est in culpa is qui prescientiam dei vitare non potuit . . . sed ille qui talem condidit*. According to Moses ibn Ezra, Ḥiwi was under the influence of the Islamic sect of Gabariya which denied free will.

<sup>102</sup> Gratz (*l. c.*) and J. Guttmann (*l. c.*) do not ascribe the last two of the twelve questions in the 3rd chapter of *Emunot* III (ed. Slutski 73–74) to Ḥiwi. See above note 99. Poznanski ascribes to Ḥiwi only the questions 4, 7 and 11. See idem *על חייו הבלתי* 13 n. 2. Until recently no one has ascribed the ten questions dealing with the abrogation of the law to Ḥiwi *ואוהרה צווי בטול צווי* *Emunot*, III (ed. Slutski 69–70). See however above note 57 where we have evidence that one of the questions dealt with by Saadia goes back to Ḥiwi. We are entitled to ascribe the others also to him.

<sup>103</sup> The questions 9 and 11; 12, 13 and 64; 14, 15 and 53; 36 and 57; 38 and 40.

<sup>104</sup> Davidson, 26.

<sup>105</sup> Poznanski, *op. cit.* 13. n. 2.

Celsus, Porphyry, Julian the Apostate, the Gnostics and the Manichaeans.<sup>106</sup>

Rabbinic literature is full of allusions to criticisms of the Bible made by various heretics.<sup>107</sup> Indeed, the rabbis found it necessary to pay special attention to the reconciliation of seeming contradictions in the Scriptural text.<sup>108</sup>

It is therefore impossible to see any originality in most of Ḥiwi's charges. Even in the rationalistic explanation of miracles he was not original. The miracle of the crossing or the Red Sea was already rationalized by Artapanus, the Jewish Hellenistic writer of the second century B. C. E.<sup>109</sup> Similarly, the miracle of manna in the desert was explained rationalistically by an Irish monk of the seventh century C. E.;<sup>110</sup> while Saadia, ardent opponent of Ḥiwi, though he was, tried nevertheless to rationalize miracles.<sup>111</sup> It was, in fact, a common rationalism of the period which influenced Ḥiwi and Saadia alike.

<sup>106</sup> See Marmorstein, *op. cit.* E. Stein, *op. cit.*, Edward J. Young, Celsus and the Old Testament, *The Westminster Theological Journal*, VI, 2 (May 1944). See also the notes to the enumerated questions of Ḥiwi in the present paper and notes 138-143.

<sup>107</sup> See A. Marmorstein, "The Background of the Haggadah", *HUCA*, VI, 145 ff.

<sup>108</sup> See note 84.

<sup>109</sup> See note 78.

<sup>110</sup> See note 79. Rationalistic explanation of the miracles related in the Bible occupies the minds of scholars until today. For modern explanation of Manna see, F. S. Bodenheimer, The Manna of Sinai, *The Biblical Archaeologist*, X, 1 (1947), 2 ff. Major Claude S. Jarvis who was Governor of Sinai for fourteen years reported that he once witnessed the miracle of striking water from the rock in the desert. See C. S. Jarvis, *Yesterday and To-day in Sinai*, 1932, 174; idem, The Israelites in Sinai, *Antiquity*, VI (1932), 434 ff.

<sup>111</sup> See Ibn Ezra on Gen. 3.1: ויאמר רב סעדיה גאון אחר שהתברר לנו שאין דבור ודעת כי אם באדם לברו נצטרך לוטר כי הנחש גם האתון לא דברו. Cf. Abraham S. Halkin, "Saadia's Exegesis and Polemics," *Rab Saadia Gaon, Studies in His Honor*. Edited by Louis Finkelstein. New York, 1944, 117 ff.

The originality of Ḥiwi lies in his heresy. He is the only Jewish heretic known to us who compiled such a list of difficulties and queries. Many attempts have been made to trace the immediate sources from which he drew his arguments against the Bible.<sup>112</sup> The purpose of the present study is to call attention to parallels to Ḥiwi's attacks in the contemporary literature of various heretical origins.

*(To be continued)*

<sup>112</sup> See note 1.