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Introduction

Dualism is the theological view that sees an eternal conflict between the warring powers of good and evil. The rabbis refer to the doctrine of two powers as סיבת רעותיה (Hag.15a, Gen. R. I, Eccl. R. 2:12). In Rabbinic literature the rabbis rejected the dualism of groups such as the Manicheans, Christians, Gnostics, and Zoroastrians. The religion of Zoroaster assigns all that is good to Ahuramazda (Ormuzd) and all that is evil to אנגרמאיןיש (Ahriman). According to the Jewish Encyclopedia of 1901, Zoroastrianism, Phalonic theosophy, Manicheanism, and gnosticism were the dualistic phenomena opposed by the rabbis. However the Essenes embraced dualism and in the Manual of Discipline of the Dead Sea Scrolls ethical dualism is boldly outlined. Gaster for instance sees Qumran as the Jewish form of Zoroastrianism.

I. Rejection of Dualism in the Liturgy

Dualism is refuted by passages such as Isaiah 45:7 where we read that the Lord "formed the light and created darkness," that He is the Maker of peace and Creator of evil which found itself into the daily liturgy. We say ברוך אתה אנחנו orbit מלךトリ על צפור עון רע וברוך אתה עון שלום ברוך אתה. In the liturgy the change of the word "ra" into "hakol" is prompted by an aversion to having "evil" directly associated with God's name. This benediction is justified by Berakot 1:4 that specifies that one must preface the Shema with two benedictions and follow it with one. We read ברוך אתה על שפתה אלהים לבריאת העולם עב מברך אתה על שפתה הים על שפתה_land שפתה הים. The first benedictions are named for their beginnings, "Creator of Light". Aversion to dualism is further seen by the rabbis in their explanation that the yezer-ha-ra is an agency working for the good (Gen Rabbah 9).

II. Rejection of Dualism in mishnaic prohibitions against unorthodox Prayer

In Berakahot we read והאמר על כל כפר והוא מתמנות על כל כפר שבוכרכן מודים מפיין. Since the eighteenth benediction begins with היום מודים to repeat this term twice would be tantamount to a belief in a dual divinity. In the gemara of Berakhot 33b we read that we understand why he is silenced if he says "We give thanks, we give thanks" because he is manifesting a belief like two powers. The Essenes did not silence such practice as is apparent from the Thanksgiving Psalm which reads, "I thank Thee my God for Thou hast dealt wondrously to dust and mightily towards a creature of clay! I thank Thee, I thank Thee." Elbogen comments on the rejection of repeated use of מדרים when he writes, Einschube in diesen Text scheinen schon früh üblich gewesen zu sein, die Mischna erwähnt und verpont zwei, deren Sinn und Zweck uns nicht mehr verständlich sind, weil sie wahrscheinlich mit gnostischen Anschauungen im Zusammenhang stehen, nämlich die Wiederholung des Wortes am Anfange und die Satze על כל כפר אין רחמי על נאה כקרני החיים בדיל המדרים או של בדיל שלא קם, die jedenfalls ans Ende gestellt wurden. Das Verbot hat nicht verhindert, daß auch nach 300 einzelne Vorbeter sich die Freiheit nahmen, ähnliche Satze einzufügen (Ber 33b).

The gemara in Berakhot goes on to say also that if he says "Be your name mentioned for the good" because this implies for the good only and not for the bad, and we have learnt a man must bless God for the evil as he blesses Him for the good. This tag remark is similar in content to Megillah 4:9 where we read זאomer עםכק טניבת והרי זך.
Similarly Jerushalmi Megillah 4:10 directly states that he who says "May the good bless you- this is two powers." Repeatedly liturgical language that suggests two powers is rejected by the rabbis.

III. Rejection of Dualism in Hagigah 14b- Elisha b Abuya led into Dualistic heresy

The relationship between Aher's apostasy and "two powers in heaven" is based on Hagigah 15a. There we read: Aher קץני בנתיעות עליה כהנה אבר לא תני אבר פּלטיא אבר בשת נמי היה זה מפי תורא דאתה להו בחיתת לממדת חומסה דרשיאל אמר גמרא דמלעשהו אל חיות אל ישבון אלה החיה אלografía ואל עיפר שלום אל שלום בניו ברכיה: ונאפקות למידרהו חותא עתים פולס דormsgי אמרי מימי כהחיית אל קפפור בהמה ח NOTHING דא בנו קול אפיה בורנו בינינו בורנו והמחים. Having successfully avoided the dangers of ascent to Pardes, Aher arrives at the Pardes and sees the angel Metatron enthroned in heaven. Astounded Aher asks whether there are two powers in heaven and becomes a heretic when he returns to earth. The rabbis themselves associated "two powers in heaven" with Aher who had travelled to heaven and seen the angel metatron in a posture that suggested two powers. Aher's observation that Metatron's seated posture gives the impression that there are two powers is not illogical. It stands to reason that divine and exalted creatures seated in heaven are enthroned. The rabbis are determined to refute the whole idea of heavenly enthronement by stating that such things as sitting, and other anthropomorphic activities are unthinkable for a pure conception of heaven. Only Rabbi Akiva of the four who ascended to Pardes ascended and descended in peace.

Reports of two powers in heaven were seen by Graetz as extreme gnosticism within Judaism, a tendency exemplified by Aher and characterized by a rejection of those aspects of Judaism which were difficult or dangerous to observe in the Hadrian persecutions. Trevers Hereford believes that the two powers in heaven were gnostic Christians who argued that the plural form of אֱלֹהִים suggested two powers. R. Simlai and R. Yohanan are credited with a principle for defeating heretics who based their belief on the plurality of divinities on scripture. For instance some heretics used statements like "Let us make man in our image (Gen.1:26)," as positive proof that there is more than one God. Either R. Yonanan or R. Simlai simply observed that wherever God is described in plural terms a singular form follows closely in scripture, disproving the heretical exegesis. Frank Cross in his book Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic has shown that the plural form of God's name was a common title, not a plural name, also prevalent in Canaanite language.

IV. Rejection of Dualism in the Mekilta and Pesikta Rabbati

In the Mekilta of R. Ishmael in section Bahodesh 5, Shrita 4 the contrast between God revealed at the crossing of the Reed Sea as a young mighty warrior and the appearance of God at Sinai as an old man full of mercy is made. However less scripture give an opportunity to the nations of the world to say "there are two powers" the verse in Shemot, "I am the Lord your God." is asserted. We read אתנו טבון ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה אתנו חכמה ואתنو חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה אתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה אתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה אתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה אתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנו חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכמה ואתנה חכ
In this passage we find two manifestations of God. In the first He is a young warrior. In the second He is an old man at Sinai. The passage allows the interpretation that God changes aspects. The citation of Dan 7:9 opens up the possibility of heretical application of dualism to God. However the rabbis forbid that no doctrine of "two powers in heaven" should be derived from the passage. Exodus 15:3: the verse being commented upon, is itself the proof-text that repudiates the false doctrine. At the end of the section there is a peroration which articulates implications present already in the designation "two powers in heaven" by directly stating that the doctrine is a threat to monotheism and condemning it roundly with the biblical texts from Isaiah and Deuteronomy.

In Pesikta Rabbati there is a similar passage where the two manifestation of God as a young warrior at the Reed Sea and God as an old man at Sinai is observed. In regard to God's guises we are told that R. Hiyya bar Abba says, "If a whoreson should say to you, There are two gods’, quote God as saying in reply: I am the One of the Sea and I am the One of Sinai. We read..." God reads...The portion goes on to have Rabbi Levi teach about God's different faces. Again R. Hiyya bar Abba says that if should a whoreson say to you 'there are two gods' reply to him scripture does not say 'The gods have spoken...face after face' but The Lord has spoken with you face after face. We read...Rabbi Levi (290-320 C.E.) first contributes the midrash that God appears in whatever form is appropriate to His action. R. Hiyya b. Abba answers in Aramaic that a heretic says there are two gods. The rabbinic tradition cited in the name of R. Akiba that God has two aspects of mercy and justice associate with His tetragramaton and the plural form of His name respectively that are activated on Yom Kippur as God moves from the throne of forgiveness to the throne of justice does not justify belief in two gods. It just suggests that God has the attributes of mercy and justice that are evoked by either use of the tetragramaton or the plural form of His name. God is still the same entity as he moves from one throne to the other. Deuteronomy 32, Isaiah 44, and Exodus 20:2 remain rabbinic proof texts for the unity of God.

In the continuation of our passage from the Mekilta Rabbi Nathan offers a refutation of the heretics who say "there are two powers." We read...Rabbi Nathan directs his remarks against the minim or sectarians, who are obviously
viewed as heretics by the rabbis.

V. Dualism refuted in Sifre

In Sifre Deuteronomy 379 we find an anonymous midrashic warning against "two powers." We read: "דכו את היה זין אחר ושם אחר ואמר להם אין זה נשא הרדס. האמור שחיission לוחם אחד לוחם אחר כולם לוחמים שניים." The Sifre suggests that the two powers are not equal, as one power is superior to the other. The dualism is refuted by the statement that there is only one power, and the other is nothing but a shadow of the first. This is in contrast to the view of some heretics who believed in two gods, one good and one evil.

Those who believe in "two powers" in heaven are refuted with the continuation of the same verse. Those who believe in God but deny His ability to kill or resurrect are refuted by Isaiah 44:6. Also asserted in the midrash is the power of God to ressurect and meet out reward and punishment. Some hypothetical heresy could have believed that one god did not supervise such activities leaving the immanent functions to another god, or that one god was the author of evil and one of good. The "two powers" argument is brought up because the Hebrew word NY is repeated twice, possibly implying two speakers. The charge that one god might be thought to be in charge of killing while another in ressurrection is countered by the use of Hosea 6:2 where God says that He has struck down and will heal. From this pericope we can conclude that Deuteronomy 32:39 became a favorite scripture- like Exodus 20:2, Deuteronomy 6:4, and Isaiah 44-47 to defeat heretical notions of a dualistic godhead.

VI. Dualism refuted in Saadia Gaon's Emunot we-Deot

In Emunot we-Deot Saadia demonstrates the untenability of dualistic definitions of the Godhead. Saadia rejects the hypothesis that there were two creators, only with the help of the other could each create, and therefore neither is omnipotent. Saadia reasons that light and darkness do not prove the contrary for darkness is only a negation of light. In chapter 2 of Treatise II Saadia writes, "After listing these three proofs, no in favor of God's oneness, I say that every argument refuting the existence of two gods constitutes an argument in favor of the one. Our previously mentioned reply to the proponents of this theory of dualism has already been noted by thee. I shall, therefore, add here the fact that I have found that when these Dualists are asked, "Why do you relate all existing things to two sources only and why don't you maintain that each species of them has a separate source?" they reply, "According to our observation, even thought they fall into many classifications, they may all be subsumed under the two divisions of the useful and harmful, there being no third possibility other than these. That is why we related all existing things to two sources." Saadia proceeds systematically by applying Aristotle's analysis of the Categories of being, to refute the dualists. Saadia shows that when we speak of the monotheis of God we imply His uniqueness.