

THE OXFORD HANDBOOK OF

JEWISH
STUDIES

Edited by

MARTIN GOODMAN

Associate Editors

JEREMY COHEN

AND

DAVID SORKIN

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

2002

CHAPTER 2

BIBLICAL STUDIES AND JEWISH STUDIES

ALAN COOPER

TWO COMMENTARIES ON LEVITICUS

ONE way to gauge the relationship between Biblical studies and Jewish studies is to examine two key moments in the development of academic Jewish biblical scholarship.¹ As a starting-point, we might note that the twentieth century was framed by two magisterial Jewish commentaries on the Book of Leviticus, the first by David Zevi Hoffmann (2 vols.; 1905/6), and the second by Jacob Milgrom (3 vols.; 1991–2000). These commentaries stand out not only because of their

¹ I use this awkward phrase in order to acknowledge that there is an increasing flow of non-academic Jewish biblical scholarship, intended for the popular audience and the synagogue pew. This trend is well exemplified by the ArtScroll biblical commentaries, written for the Orthodox market. For an evaluation, see Levy (1983). One of most successful ArtScroll publications is their *Chumash* (1994), which may be found in many Orthodox synagogues and homes. The commentary is a compendium of traditional interpretations, and avoids engagement with critical issues. The two largest liberal movements in Judaism, the Reform and the Conservative, have produced Torah commentaries for home and synagogue use that do attempt to synthesize traditional and modern scholarship. See Plaut (1981) and Lieber *et al.* (2001), respectively. Both of those commentaries were intended to supersede the Hertz Pentateuch, which had been a mainstay of synagogue life in English-speaking countries for almost three-quarters of a century. For an evaluation of Hertz, see Meirovich (1998).

excellence, but also because they exemplify significant trends in Jewish biblical scholarship.

By the time Hoffmann undertook to write his Leviticus commentary, he already had gained renown for critical studies of rabbinic literature that raised the ire of some Orthodox scholars (see Herr 1971: viii. 808–10; Levine 1999: i. 513). Yet far from bringing his critical sensibility to bear on the Bible, Hoffmann produced a work that, for all its learning and philological acumen, was unabashedly apologetic. His dual aim was to repudiate the ‘higher-critical’² analysis of Leviticus that was prevalent in mainstream (Protestant) biblical scholarship, and also to demonstrate that the rabbinic understanding of the laws of Leviticus not only was authoritative for Jews, but also reflected the correct interpretation of the biblical text.

In his Preface to the Hebrew translation of Hoffmann’s commentary, his son, Moses Hoffmann, singles out his father’s discussion of Leviticus 6: 12–16 as characteristic. Christian scholars, he writes, could not understand the passage because they were ignorant of the rabbinic tradition, ‘so they broke the pericope into pieces and invented the notion that it was composed of different layers from different eras, the final addition having been added only after the Babylonian Exile’. Hoffmann, in contrast, was able to demonstrate not only the unity and antiquity of the passage, but also the fact that ‘the rabbinic tradition conforms perfectly to the plain sense of the text’.³

The Protestant biblical scholars of Hoffmann’s time generally were antipathetic to Leviticus, as well as ignorant of the rabbinic tradition.⁴ According to the regnant critical view, the book’s cultic prescriptions reflected a late, decadent phase of Israelite religion, far removed from the noble teachings of the prophets and all but devoid of theological interest. In this view, Leviticus adumbrated the oppressive legalism of Pharisaic Judaism, from which the Christian dispensation provided relief. As Ernest Frerichs comments in his introduction to an important collection of essays by Jewish biblical scholars: ‘The least acceptable element in the Wellhausen program for Jewish biblical scholars was the denigration of Jewish history, the elevation of the preexilic period to a prime status and the corresponding reading of the postexilic period as one of darkness and decline.’⁵

² ‘Higher criticism’ comprises source criticism, which divides the text into multiple sources on the presumption of composite authorship, and historical criticism, which locates the sources in their particular historical contexts. A higher-critical approach therefore militates against both unitary authorship, and against the traditional attributions and dating of the biblical books.

³ Hoffmann (1976): second page of the unpaginated Preface by Moses Hoffmann.

⁴ In a letter that Abraham Geiger wrote to the great Semitist Theodor Nöldeke in 1872, Geiger remarked that while Jews cannot expect Christians to be scholars of Rabbinics, ‘we do have the right to ask that those who are not familiar with this literature should either refrain from passing judgment on it or, at least, be circumspect in expressing their opinions’. See Wiener (1962: 135).

⁵ Frerichs (1987: 3). See also Levenson (1987: 281–307). For a more general overview by a leading Jewish biblical scholar, see Greenstein (1990: 23–46).

No wonder, then, that a traditionally educated Jewish scholar would recoil from biblical criticism. In fact, in 1903, the year that Solomon Schechter memorably dubbed the so-called higher criticism the 'higher anti-semitism',⁶ Hoffmann published the first volume of a trenchant polemic against biblical criticism under the cumbersome title, *Die wichtigsten Instanzen gegen die Graf-Wellhausenschen Hypothese* ('The Leading Arguments Against the Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis').⁷ In fact, though, the apologetics and objectionism⁸ that characterized Hoffmann's biblical writings were the outcome of more than a century of uneasy Jewish engagement with (or avoidance of) biblical criticism.

As Edward Breuer has shown in his study of Jewish biblical scholarship in the Haskalah ('Enlightenment'), the eighteenth-century Jewish maskilim ('enlighteners') were almost totally in sympathy with the intellectual goals and pursuits of the German Enlightenment. The maskilim drew the line, however, where the study of the Bible was concerned. The lower-critical⁹ study of the Hebrew text of the Bible in relation to other ancient versions raised doubts about the authenticity and accuracy of the Masoretic Text, which was normative for Jews. The higher criticism generated a reconstruction of the history of Israel that was imbued with anti-Jewish animus. The equivocal Jewish response, as Breuer puts it, was to 'embrace... eighteenth-century standards of literary and interpretative analysis', but 'to resist those aspects of European culture that were deemed incompatible with fundamental elements of traditional Judaism' (Breuer 1996: 228).

Hoffmann's work clearly embodied that equivocal attitude. There also were three other factors at work throughout the nineteenth century that furthered the alienation of Jewish scholars from biblical criticism. First, the anti-traditional and anti-Jewish tendencies of such criticism were compounded by the virtual exclusion of Jews from academic discourse on the topic. Biblical criticism was at home in the theological faculties of the European universities, to which no Jews were appointed. Hoffmann, for example, was mainly yeshiva- and seminary-educated. He never held a university appointment, although the German government did award him the title 'professor' on the occasion of his seventy-fifth birthday. He achieved his eminence

⁶ See Schechter (1959: 35–9). The address was delivered at a banquet honouring Kaufman Kohler on the occasion of his election to the presidency of Hebrew Union College. Even that most liberal of Jewish institutions had a legacy of opposition to biblical criticism, dating back to the anti-critical attitude of its founder, Isaac Mayer Wise.

⁷ The scholars Karl Heinrich Graf (1815–69) and Julius Wellhausen (1844–1918) were the most influential proponents of the Documentary Hypothesis. They identified the four Pentateuchal sources, and arranged them in what became their accepted chronological order: J, E, D, P, for (J)ahwist, (E)lohist, (D)euteronomist, and (P)riestly, respectively. Leviticus was considered to be the work of the post-exilic Priestly author.

⁸ Baruch Levine applies this felicitous term to Hoffmann.

⁹ 'Lower criticism' refers to the effort to establish the most accurate text of the Bible. The principal tools of lower criticism are philological analysis, and careful comparison of the standard Hebrew text (the Masoretic Text) with other texts, such as the Qumran Scrolls and the ancient Greek translation known as the Septuagint.

as a scholar of Bible and Rabbinics while teaching in a rabbinical seminary and serving as a communal rabbi in Berlin.

Second, the development of the progressive streams in Judaism encouraged the retrenchment of traditional Jewish scholars in an anti-critical position. Tentative movement in the direction of a more critical view in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries tended to be reversed later as a result of Orthodox antagonism towards Reform. The two editions of Jacob Zevi Meklenburg's great commentary, *Ha-ketav ve-ha-qabbala* ('Scripture and Tradition', 1839 and 1852 respectively) offer a case in point. As Breuer has demonstrated, in the later edition, because of his 'apparently growing concern for the integrity of rabbinic traditions', Meklenburg 'was propelled towards a more articulate and programmatic position, one that affirmed as a matter of Orthodox creed the Sinaitic origin of the Oral Law' (Breuer 1995: 287).

By the turn of the twentieth century the apologetic tendencies that are so well exemplified by Hoffmann's Leviticus were a given of Orthodox scholarship. The resultant hermeneutic embodied five characteristics that may be termed 'anti-critical': (1) the entire Torah was given at Sinai; (2) the Torah was divinely authored and dictated to Moses; (3) the biblical text has been transmitted accurately; (4) the rabbinic interpretation of the laws is correct; (5) only traditional Jewish sources are required for the proper understanding of Scripture.¹⁰

A third factor that kept Jewish studies apart from Biblical studies in the nineteenth century was that even progressive Jewish scholars who advocated the 'Scientific Study of Judaism' (*Wissenschaft des Judentums*) tended to eschew biblical criticism (see Soloweitschik and Rubascheff 1925: 122–43; Levine 1992: 15–32). The few isolated instances of Jewish critical scholarship dealt mainly with the later biblical books, thus avoiding the problems of Pentateuchal criticism. In some cases they provided striking anticipations of subsequent developments in biblical scholarship, and lead one to wonder what would have happened had serious interaction been possible between Jewish and Christian scholars, or between the progressives and traditionalists within the Jewish scholarly community.

The first chapter of Leopold Zunz's epoch-making work *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden historisch entwickelt* ('The Religious Discourse of the Jews Historically Explained', 1832) provides a case in point. Zunz takes up the question of the authorship and dating of the Books of Chronicles, and concludes that Chronicles represents a reworking of earlier biblical historiography that reflects the concerns of the Second Temple period, specifically the third century BCE. In the course of the discussion, he also argues that the composition of the Book of Psalms

¹⁰ See Levy (1996: 39–80; 1992: 159–204). I should add that one of my own teachers, Sid (Shnayer) Z. Leiman (now at Brooklyn College and Yeshiva University), is an Orthodox Jew who is thoroughly conversant with biblical criticism. See Leiman (1996: 181–7).

(traditionally assigned to King David) was contemporary with that of Chronicles, and that it included psalms of the exilic and post-exilic periods along with earlier material.

Zunz's views on these matters were compatible with those held by the biblical critics of his time, but in his subsequent work he confined himself to the study of post-biblical Jewish literature almost exclusively. He seemed to believe that his Christian contemporaries were doing adequate critical work on the Bible, so he focused his attention on corpora that had not yet received critical attention. Only near the end of his life, when he published a remarkable series of brief critical studies of several biblical books, did it become clear that Zunz had kept up with biblical criticism all along.

Abraham Geiger, perhaps the greatest of the liberal Jewish scholars after Zunz, offered an even more radical programme for biblical study in his *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der inneren Entwicklung des Judenthums* ('The Original Text and Translations of the Bible in Relation to the Internal Development of Judaism', 1857). Building on Zunz's work, Geiger attempted to show how the growth and redaction of biblical traditions reflected later authors' ideologically driven reworking of earlier material. Since the authors of the Second Temple period were priests, their work naturally exhibited a priestly, pro-Temple orientation.

Geiger argued that the processes that these authors used to transform their sources were exegetical in character, and could be compared with similar processes that were evident both in the ancient translations of the Bible and in rabbinic interpretation. 'In the days before the final redaction of the Bible,' he wrote, 'that which in later eras was accomplished by exegesis was achieved by means of textual revision' (Wiener 1963: 261). This aspect of Geiger's work anticipated a major development in biblical scholarship that took place more than a century after the publication of *Urschrift*, which I will discuss below. In its own day, however, despite the approbation that it received from both Jewish and Christian scholars, it spawned no successors.

When we turn from the world that produced Hoffmann's *Leviticus* to the intellectual environment of Milgrom's commentary, we may discern a few similarities but even more pronounced differences. Milgrom received his college education at a public university, but earned both rabbinical ordination and all of his graduate degrees at the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York City (see Hayes' article about Milgrom in Hayes 1999: ii. 157–8; also Sperling 1992: 103–4). Before taking up a full-time academic career, he served for many years as a congregational rabbi while also teaching at a local university. In that dual capacity, he began his scholarly research. He has said, in fact, that what prompted him to devote himself to the study of *Leviticus* was the difficulty of preaching on that most recondite book of the Torah! When it proved impossible for Milgrom to keep up both his academic and

rabbinical work,¹¹ he secured a professorship at the University of California. At the time (1965, when he was already 42 years old), he was one of a tiny number of Jewish scholars teaching Bible in North American secular universities—a situation that would not change until the late 1970s.

If Hoffmann's *Leviticus* is a high-water mark of conservative, anti-critical Jewish biblical scholarship at the turn of the twentieth century, Milgrom's commentary epitomizes the eclectic and accommodating mood at the dawn of the twenty-first. Aside from a profound devotion to his subject-matter, undoubtedly motivated by personal religious concerns as well as academic interests, Milgrom's work shares two features with Hoffmann's. First, the bedrock of both commentaries is sound Hebrew philology. Intimate familiarity with the Hebrew language and great reluctance to alter the received text have been distinguishing traits of most Jewish biblical commentators, who carry on the legacy of the great medieval exegetes in that respect.¹²

Second, Milgrom cites traditional Jewish commentary exhaustively, although he does not share Hoffmann's apologetic reasons for doing so. Milgrom's position, rather, is that rabbinic and medieval interpretations often are philologically sound. The rabbinic tradition, moreover, is chronologically and ideologically continuous with the biblical material, and for that reason it may contain accurate understandings and elaborations of the biblical text. This view is a far cry from the dogmatic acceptance of the authority of the rabbinic interpretation, but it is equally remote from the earlier critical insistence on a radical break between Israelite (i.e. biblical) religion and post-biblical Judaism, and it rejects the notion that traditional interpretation can be dismissed out of hand because it is 'non-critical' or 'pre-modern'.

In addition to bringing both philological analysis and traditional exegesis to bear on the text, Milgrom's commentary draws on resources that were unavailable to Hoffmann, including artifactual and textual evidence yielded by archaeological excavations, and social-scientific models for understanding the religious phenomena described in *Leviticus*. The archaeological evidence was just beginning to make an impact on biblical scholarship in Hoffmann's time, although it had not yet had a discernible effect on Jewish scholarship. The same may be said for the social-scientific approach: Hoffmann's works evince no sympathy for the groundbreaking work in comparative religion that was appearing during his lifetime. In

¹¹ Milgrom has commented that his role-model was Robert Gordis, his teacher at the Jewish Theological Seminary. Gordis 'successfully divided his time among communal concerns, seminary teaching, and pulpit' (Sperling 1999: i. 456).

¹² On this trait of Jewish biblical scholarship, see Greenberg (1995: 3–8). An exception to the rule was H. L. Ginsberg of the Jewish Theological Seminary, unquestionably one of the greatest Hebrew philologists of the twentieth century, but notorious for freely emending the biblical text. It used to be said in jest that Ginsberg's many emendations in the Book of Isaiah were justified by the fact that his Hebrew was better than Isaiah's.

the century that has passed since that time, of course, archaeological discoveries and social-scientific research have contributed immeasurably to Biblical studies.

Finally, Milgrom embraces the higher-critical approach to Leviticus, taking up precisely those questions about authorship, dating, and social location that were anathema to Hoffmann. He develops his critical model on the basis of his meticulous analysis, and in dialogue with the relevant modern scholarship.¹³ In so doing, Milgrom also stands the older critical approach on its head. Instead of 'proving' that Leviticus represents a late, decadent offshoot of biblical religion, Milgrom shows that the book offers a coherent and sophisticated world-view as well as profound theological insight. The book's 'Jewishness', therefore, is not a deficiency, but the source of its strength.

Just as Hoffmann represented the culmination of several cultural and intellectual developments of the century prior to his writing, the same may be said of Milgrom. In the remainder of this essay I will concentrate on three twentieth-century developments that have drawn Biblical studies and Jewish studies together in ways undreamt of in Hoffmann's time.

JEWIS IN THE MAINSTREAM

Hoffmann's era was characterized by the exclusion of Jewish scholars from the mainstream of academic Biblical studies. Milgrom's, on the other hand, witnessed the wholesale entry of Jewish scholars into the guild, including the appointment of Jews to the biblical faculties of several Protestant seminaries.¹⁴ One factor contributing to the growth of academic Jewish biblical scholarship was the rapid growth of the university system itself, with an emphasis on the diversification of both faculty and student bodies to include previously under-represented groups (Sperling 1992: 115–17). This expansion had a profound effect on Biblical studies.

In 1976 the Society of Biblical Literature (the SBL) held its annual meeting at Stouffer's Riverfront Towers in St Louis, Missouri. The programme was divided among thirty-four sections, seminars, and groups. All of the chairs and co-chairs of those sections, seminars, and groups were male, as were all of the officers of the Society. Two Jewish men served on the Society's executive council.

¹³ It is worth noting that Milgrom hardly takes up critical issues at all in his commentary on the Book of Numbers (1990). The Numbers commentary is part of a Torah commentary directed at a popular Jewish audience; the Leviticus commentary is in the Anchor Bible series, which is intended for both scholars and educated laity of all religious persuasions.

¹⁴ This phenomenon is yet to be documented in full, although the Jewish media have taken note of it (see Cattan 2002). Among biblical scholars, one thinks of Alan Cooper at Union Theological Seminary,

Jewish scholars chaired five of the sections, but the picture becomes murkier when we look at the details. Two of the Jewish chairs represented affiliated societies, the International Organization for Masoretic Studies and the National Association of Professors of Hebrew. Another two chaired sections in areas that clearly were on the periphery of Biblical studies—'Early Rabbinic Studies' and 'Art and the Bible'. The remaining Jewish chair was Milgrom, who led the section called 'Worship and Cult in Ancient Israel'. That section was a well-known ghetto for Jewish presenters, the rubric being of scant interest to most non-Jewish biblical scholars at that time. In 1976, in fact, the presenters included H. L. Ginsberg, Baruch Levine, Jack Sasson, and Ziony Zevit, along with Milgrom himself. Milgrom (University of California, now emeritus), Levine (New York University, now emeritus), and Sasson (University of North Carolina, now at Vanderbilt Divinity School) belonged to the tiny coterie of Jewish biblical scholars then holding appointments in Biblical studies in North American secular universities.¹⁵

By 1999 the situation had changed dramatically: the 1999 programme lists ninety-five sections, groups, seminars, and consultations—almost three times as many as there were in 1976 (the programme book itself grew from 126 pages to 378). Of those ninety-five programme units, thirty-four were chaired or co-chaired by women, an increase from 0 per cent in 1976 to about 36 per cent in 1999. The proliferation of new programme units also manifested the tremendous diversification of the field. The Jewish presence was diffused throughout the programme, not confined to a few special-interest groups. Some Jews were active in relatively *outré* sections, but a Jewish woman co-chaired the Matthew group, which is about as mainstream as one can get, while a non-Jewish woman co-chaired the section dealing with 'Early Rabbinic Judaism'—an interesting turn of events.

In 1976 anyone looking over the list of sections (the largest programme units) could distinguish the centre of Biblical studies—the hard core—from the mushy stuff around the edges. Firmly ensconced at the centre were 'Form Criticism', 'Old Testament Theology', 'Israelite History', and 'Hebrew Scriptures and Cognate Literatures'. At the periphery were the most recent additions to the list of sections, including 'Art and the Bible', 'The Bible and the Humanities', and 'Biblical Criticism

Michael Fishbane and Tikva Frymer-Kensky at the University of Chicago Divinity School, Jon Levenson at Harvard Divinity School, Jack Sasson at Vanderbilt Divinity School, and Marvin Sweeney at Claremont Divinity School.

¹⁵ There were only three Jewish senior professors teaching Bible in secular universities in 1976 (the year I earned my doctorate): Levine, Milgrom, and Nahum Sarna at Brandeis University (now emeritus). There also were a number of Jewish professors involved in Biblical studies whose appointments and research interests were primarily in the area of ancient Near Eastern languages and cultures. These included two of my teachers at Columbia University, David Marcus (now at the Jewish Theological Seminary) and the late Moshe Held, and two of my teachers at Yale University, William W. Hallo and the late J. J. Finkelstein. Sperling notes that most of the Jewish biblical scholars in North America who belonged to what he terms the 'second wave' (that is, those who completed their doctorates in the years 1942–65) were, in fact, specialists in ancient Near Eastern studies (1992: 89–113).

and Literary Criticism'. Somewhere between the centre and the periphery, one could locate Milgrom's section on 'Worship and Cult', among others.

In 1999 one would be hard pressed to distinguish the centre of Biblical studies from the periphery on the basis of the conference programme. The list of sections now was arranged in alphabetical rather than chronological order, so that there was no way of knowing which sub-fields were of long standing and which were more recent additions. Equal time was given to wildly divergent fields of interest—everything from 'Bible in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Caribbean' to 'Biblical Lexicography'. Another striking change was that the term 'Old Testament' appeared to have been banished from the programme, probably in deference to Jewish sensibilities. ('New Testament' was alive and well, however.)

It seems clear that the decentring and diversification of Biblical studies during the past quarter-century are directly related to the entry of Jews and women (and, more recently, other visible minorities) into the guild. The fact is that the field is irrevocably changed from what it was. One can express the situation diagrammatically in two different ways: either the centre has become capacious enough to accommodate people and subject-matter that once were excluded or, perhaps, there no longer is a centre at all. There is a direct correlation between diversity and decentring: the more diverse the practitioners are in a given field, the more the alleged core of the field is likely to be problematized and devalued. The assault from the margins, furthermore, is most likely to succeed when it is truly interdisciplinary, as has been the case with the integration of Biblical studies with Jewish studies.

A paradoxical aspect of the present state of affairs is that, while during the last quarter of the twentieth century Jews had notable success in breaking down the barriers of institutionalized Biblical studies, Jewish biblicists did not make comparable headway within organized Jewish studies. Although Jewish studies programmes were on the rise, few of them appointed biblical scholars to their faculties. The reasoning was reminiscent of Zunz's a century-and-a-half earlier: the Bible was covered well enough already by faculty in divinity schools and Religious studies departments, so there was no need to expend Jewish studies resources on it. More than a few Jewish biblicists were disappointed by job advertisements that sought applicants in practically any area of Judaica, as long as it was *post-biblical*.

By 1998 the programme of the Association for Jewish Studies—the largest and most important scholarly society for Jewish studies in North America—had expanded to eighty-four sessions, but only two were devoted to Bible. As one scholar who has been prominent in the Association since its founding wryly commented, 'as long as there are plenty of sessions on the use of the Bible as subtext, pretext, and intertext, I suppose it is safe to ignore the text'. In terms of the *institutional* relationship between Biblical studies and Jewish studies, then, not much has changed since the 1970s, when the application of a Jewish doctoral candidate in Bible for a fellowship in Jewish studies was turned down because Bible did not fall

within the purview of Jewish studies. (That particular situation, fortunately, *has* changed.) The *intellectual* relationship between the two areas, however, is another matter, and to that we now turn.

BIBLICAL VERSUS POST-BIBLICAL

One of the most trenchant assaults against older forms of biblical criticism in recent years has been the blurring of distinctions between the biblical and post-biblical periods, or, to put it another way, between Israelite religion and Judaism. It is now generally recognized that there is a linguistic continuum between the Bible and post-biblical rabbinic literature: Late Biblical Hebrew is a transitional dialect between Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew,¹⁶ and the picture of continuity and organic development is confirmed by the evidence of the Qumran Scrolls as well. That linguistic continuity is complemented by cultural continuity. There is no longer a simple way of distinguishing between what is 'Israelite' and what is 'Jewish'. A consideration of recent scholarship on the Book of Psalms provides a case in point.¹⁷

One of the axioms of earlier critical scholarship was that the Davidic attribution of the psalms was untenable, but there were many irreconcilable theories concerning the origin and dating of the psalms, and their ultimate compilation into the present collection of 150. Most critical scholars saw the majority of the psalms as post-exilic, which created a logical dilemma for them. Late biblical religion (the priestly religion of Leviticus) was supposed to have been entirely legalistic and spiritually bankrupt. How, then, could it have produced (or even compiled) such noble expressions of piety as the psalms? That question elicited some remarkably absurd answers, such as this one, published in 1907: '[The psalms] mark the reaction of the pious feeling characteristic of old Israel against Judaism, affording a clear proof that the religious genius of Israel was not killed by Ezra and Pharisaism, and thus form in a quite unique sense and degree the building link between the Old and New Testaments' (Cornill 1907: 399). It is amazing that anyone can have taken such nonsense seriously, but in fact the Book of Psalms is a 'building link'—not primarily between the Old and New Testaments, however, but between Israelite religion and *Judaism*.

The individual psalms are diverse compositions from diverse times and places, spanning at least five or six centuries, and perhaps longer than that. But the Book of

¹⁶ The pioneering work of Avi Hurvitz deserves special mention, especially his 1972 book.

¹⁷ The following comments are based on my own work in progress on the Book of Psalms. On the Qumran psalters, see the definitive study by Flint (1997).

Psalms in its present form, in contrast to many of the psalms that it comprises, is a product of the Hellenistic period at the earliest, as evidenced by the psalters found among the Qumran Scrolls. Those collections show that the contents and order of the Book of Psalms—especially Psalms 90–150—were still in flux between c.150 BCE and 70 CE.

The standard scholarly view concerning the individual psalms is that originally they were used to accompany rituals that took place in Israelite and Judean temples, especially the Temple in Jerusalem. The Book of Psalms, on the other hand, seems to presuppose a Jewish environment in which the psalms were disused as Temple liturgies. Instead of being discarded, the psalms survived as texts for contemplation and study, adaptable for use in all sorts of private and public worship settings. During the same period in which the Book of Psalms was stabilized, the first ‘post-biblical’ interpretations of psalms were being authored, including the Qumran exegetical texts known as *pesharim*, as well as the interpretations that are implicit in the citations of psalms in Christian Scripture.

Some readers might find it disorienting to learn that ‘post-biblical’ literature was being written while biblical books were still being composed, but that appears to have been precisely the case. A startling implication of that situation is that careful study of the earliest interpretations of psalms most likely provides a key to the motives behind the final redaction of the Book of Psalms itself. If all of the earliest interpretations are eschatological, then it seems reasonable to assume that the Book of Psalms owes its present shape to eschatological concerns.¹⁸

The larger point is that there is seamless continuity between the creation of the individual psalms, the compilation of the Book of Psalms, and the beginning of psalms interpretation. In order for scholars to treat the biblical book competently in its historical dimension, they must employ not only the standard methodological tools of biblical scholarship, but must also be competent to work with the Qumran texts, and with early Jewish and Christian psalms interpretation. The biblical and post-biblical corpora cannot be isolated from one another.

The case of Psalms is not unique. Milgrom’s Leviticus commentary demonstrates that rabbinic literature preserves data that facilitate an understanding of the Bible’s sometimes elliptical and recondite cultic formulations.¹⁹ A similar claim may be made for biblical civil law as well: in a learned study, Samuel Greengus has explored legislation that may be found in ancient Babylonian law and in the Mishnah, but is for some reason absent from the Bible.²⁰ Once again, establishing

¹⁸ See Wacholder (1988: 23–72). With due caution, I would apply many of Wacholder’s observations about this Qumran Psalms Scroll to the Book of Psalms itself.

¹⁹ In a similar vein, Baruch Levine’s doctoral dissertation showed that the Mishnah preserved elements of second-millennium BCE Canaanite literature that are not found in the Bible (1962).

²⁰ Greengus (1991: 149–71). Greengus, who is a Professor at Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, Ohio, is primarily a scholar of the ancient Near East, but prior to embarking on his scholarly career he spent much of his youth and young adulthood learning in a yeshiva.

arbitrary dividing-lines between disciplines would serve only to impede the growth of knowledge.

Recognition of the continuity between biblical and rabbinic literature has led to another important development in Biblical Studies—one that was adumbrated by Geiger in his *Urschrift*. That is the notion that the processes that are evident in the rabbinic interpretation of Scripture may also have been formative of Scripture itself. Geiger’s work lay fallow for a century until a professor at Hebrew Union College, Samuel Sandmel, put it back on the scholarly agenda in an article that he provocatively titled ‘The Haggada Within Scripture’ (Sandmel 1961: 105–22). Sandmel was perfectly suited to the task that he set himself, a successor to Geiger as one of the most prominent scholars of Reform Judaism, and an expert in rabbinic and early Christian literature as well as Bible.

Without actually mentioning Geiger by name, Sandmel advocated Geiger’s approach as an alternative to the Documentary Hypothesis. With his typical wry wit, he wrote: ‘This essay may seem to some an effort to drive still another nail into the coffin of the Graf Wellhausen hypothesis, but that would be an indirect result rather than a deliberate purpose’ (Sandmel 1961: 105). Instead of seeing the growth of Scripture as the result of the compilation and redaction of written sources, Sandmel argued for a continuous organic process of revision by reinterpretation—Scripture interpreting Scripture, in effect, or inner-biblical exegesis, as it came to be called (Zakovitch 1992). Midrash-style hermeneutics, in this view, do not require a closed and fixed scriptural canon, but are substantially responsible for generating that canon in the first place.

Sandmel’s work inspired a flood of scholarship, much of it produced by Jewish scholars who were comfortable with the Bible’s contiguity with rabbinic literature, and pleased to work with a critical theory untainted by the anti-Judaism of the standard Documentary Hypothesis. The culmination of the trend inaugurated by Sandmel’s work was the extraordinary book by Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Fishbane 1985), a comprehensive and methodical presentation of the varieties of proto-rabbinic exegesis that may be found within the Bible. Fishbane, in turn, inspired a number of other important works, further cultivation of this common ground of Biblical and Jewish studies. Two excellent examples started out as dissertations that Fishbane supervised (although Fishbane himself has worked almost exclusively in the areas of midrash and mystical literature in recent years). In one, Bernard Levinson probes the hermeneutics of the author of Deuteronomy as a reviser of the Covenant Code in Exodus (Levinson 1997); in the other, Benjamin Sommer offers a highly nuanced account of the way the author of Isaiah 40–66 reworks earlier biblical material (Sommer 1998).

PRE-CRITICAL, CRITICAL, AND POST-CRITICAL

The integration of Biblical studies and Jewish studies depends on overcoming the bifurcation of biblical and post-biblical literature. There is also another dichotomy that must be addressed, namely that of pre-critical versus critical biblical scholarship. Until recently, the training of biblical scholars entailed the cultivation of a specific set of philological and methodological skills, usually the biblical languages (Biblical Hebrew,²¹ Aramaic, and Greek), other ancient Near Eastern languages (especially Akkadian and Ugaritic, as well as Comparative Semitics), a range of lower- and higher-critical methods (source criticism, form criticism, etc.), and some ancillary disciplines, especially archaeology.

Knowledge of the history of biblical interpretation was presumed as well, but that meant knowledge of the history of *critical* interpretation, usually from Spinoza to the present, but often considerably foreshortened. In this context, traditional Jewish and Christian interpretation was evaluated on a scale that ran from quaint to worthless, when it was not simply ignored altogether. Rashi or Ibn Ezra might be cited on some point of philology, but it was only because their insights happened to jibe with the findings of modern scholars.

In North America, the Protestant scholar Brevard Childs's commentary on the Book of Exodus, which was published in 1974, signalled the beginning of a broad change in attitude. In his Preface, Childs (now Professor Emeritus at the Yale Divinity School) wrote that while he was preparing his commentary, 'I discovered that Calvin and Drusus, Rashi and Ibn Ezra, belong among the giants. I have tried to show why these great expositors—the term "pre-critical" is both naive and arrogant—need to be heard in concert with Wellhausen and Gunkel' (Childs 1974: p. x). True to his word, Childs incorporated traditional exegesis into his commentary in a way that emphasized its continuing value and relevance for modern biblical scholarship.

I was a student of Childs at Yale in the early 1970s, and was both impressed and influenced by him. In my own subsequent work, I suggested that the *full* history of interpretation served as an indispensable bridge between the modern reader and the ancient text, and that modern commentators ought to adopt three hermeneutical principles of traditional interpretation: 'the assumption that the text is meaningful;

²¹ That is, vocalized Biblical Hebrew, as distinct from the unvocalized post-biblical dialects. Very few doctoral programmes outside Israel other than the ones based in Jewish seminaries require students in Bible to have knowledge of post-biblical Hebrew. The standard required research languages remain English, French, and German, despite the general recognition that Israel is a major centre of biblical scholarship. Many doctoral programmes now encourage students to study in Israel, but that is no guarantee that they will learn Hebrew, since the Israeli universities offer English-language programmes that cater to foreign students.

the demand that interpretation be answerable to the text; and the principle that all interpretations merely realize the text's possibilities: "new" interpretations, if they adhere to the first two principles, then add to the repository of ideas that is the history of interpretation.²²

Childs's deference towards traditional interpretation was part of a larger goal to validate the activity of communities of faith as preservers and authentic interpreters of Scripture. From the Jewish side, the most successful attempt to realize that aim has been the work of James Kugel. In two remarkably learned books (actually popular and scholarly versions of the same book), Kugel has attempted to show how the Bible was read and understood in the formative period of Jewish and Christian biblical interpretation at the turn of the Common Era (Kugel 1997 and 1998). While in his earlier work Kugel occasionally showed an explicit anti-critical tendency, here he permits the ancient interpreters to speak for themselves, allowing his readers to draw their own conclusions about where interpretative merit lies.

Kugel's approach, unlike Childs's, is not integrative: he does not attempt to juxtapose traditional interpretation with modern critical commentary. Some of his students, however, have been moving in the direction of such a synthesis. Steven Weitzman, for example, produced an outstanding dissertation on the placement of poems within biblical narrative (Weitzman 1997b); in subsequent work, Weitzman has widened his scope to take in issues in 'rewritten Bible', as well as exegetical elements in late biblical and post-biblical texts (see e.g. Weitzman 1994, 1996, 1997a).

The most thoroughgoing attempt at integration, and the one that has had the greatest influence on Biblical studies, has taken place in the Israeli academy, exemplified by the Department of Bible of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. The present-day Bible faculty in Jerusalem is the heir to a grand tradition of Biblical studies going back to the founding of the university. The development that concerns us here, however, occurred subsequent to the arrival of Moshe Greenberg at the Hebrew University in 1970 (he retired in 1996.) (On Greenberg, see Tigay's article in Hayes 1999: i. 464–5; Sperling 1992: 92–4; Cogan, Eichler, and Tigay 1997: pp. ix–xxi.)

Greenberg, who established himself at the University of Pennsylvania as one of the leading biblical scholars of his generation, had made a systematic effort to bring both ancient Near Eastern and Jewish sources to bear on the Bible. He naturally sought to achieve a similar synthesis in the work of his department. The controversial issue was: what is the proper location of traditional Jewish interpretation (*parshanut*) in the university? While some argued that *parshanut* was properly a part of Jewish intellectual history, and therefore ought to be under the auspices of the department of Jewish Thought, Greenberg argued successfully that *parshanut* belonged under the aegis of Bible (*miqra*).

²² Cooper (1987: 72). For applications of the methods that I advocate, see e.g. Cooper 1988: 1–22; 1990: 26–44 (text); 188–198 (notes).

The result of Greenberg's success was that the Hebrew University was able to offer an integrated doctoral programme in Bible that placed *parshanut* on a par with philological-critical and historical-critical studies as an essential component of Biblical studies. During the past three decades the department has produced a roster of scholars of extraordinary breadth and versatility, for whom the boundary between Biblical and Jewish studies has been all but obliterated.

A few examples will illustrate the point: Greenberg's first Hebrew University doctoral student, the late Sarah Kamin, wrote her dissertation on Rashi's understanding of literal interpretation (Kamin 1986), but she was a thoroughly trained critical biblical scholar as well; Sara Japhet's dissertation was on the Book of Chronicles,²³ but she has since produced critical editions of medieval commentaries (most recently Japhet 2000); Yair Zakovitch is a prolific master of the literary-critical study of biblical literature (e.g. Zakovitch 1982, 1991), but he also has collaborated with a specialist in midrash to produce a fine series of studies in the history of Jewish biblical interpretation;²⁴ two outstanding practitioners of latter-day source criticism,²⁵ Israel Knohl²⁶ and Baruch Schwartz,²⁷ also have expertise in Rabbinics.²⁸

The Hebrew University has long been a popular destination for foreign scholars—Jews and Christians alike—who wish to gain mastery of Hebrew, and to benefit from the outstanding faculty in Bible, Semitics, Archaeology, and all areas of

²³ Japhet (1989). The Hebrew original of this work was published in 1977, and was based on a dissertation directed by I. L. Seeligmann.

²⁴ For example, Zakovitch and Shinan (1992). This volume is one of a series of studies of narratives in Genesis.

²⁵ Israeli source criticism tends to be anchored not so much in the Graf-Wellhausen model as in the dissident approach advocated by Yehezkel Kaufmann, who taught at the Hebrew University from 1949 until his death in 1963 (see Kaufmann 1960). Greenberg's translation and abridgment of Kaufmann's prolix and polemical Hebrew original was a tremendous service to scholarship, making Kaufmann's work accessible to the non-Hebrew-speaking scholarly community. Unfortunately, as J. H. Hayes comments, 'knowledge and use of his work have been rare among Christian commentators' (see Hayes 1999: ii. 16-17).

²⁶ Knohl (1995). The book is an English translation of a work published in Hebrew in 1992, which was, in turn, based on Knohl's doctoral dissertation (1988), supervised by Moshe Greenberg.

²⁷ Schwartz (1999). This work evolved out of Schwartz's doctoral dissertation (1987), which was directed by the late Meir Weiss. Weiss favoured a New-Critical approach to the study of biblical literature, which he called 'Total-Interpretation', and he staunchly opposed source-critical analysis. Schwartz adroitly combines Weiss's close reading with a source-critical approach that he learned from another eminent Hebrew University professor, Menahem Haran.

²⁸ I do not wish to suggest that this breadth of competence is unique to the graduates of the Hebrew University, only that it is systemic there. North American scholars who embody such breadth usually had a combination of seminary and university training, and/or spent considerable time studying in Israel. Some outstanding examples are Adele Berlin (University of Maryland), Marc Brettler (Brandeis University), Stephen A. Kaufman (Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati), Michael V. Fox (University of Wisconsin), Richard Elliott Friedman (University of California at San Diego), Tikva Frymer-Kensky (University of Chicago Divinity School), Edward L. Greenstein (formerly of Jewish Theological Seminary, now at Tel Aviv University), David Sperling (Hebrew Union College, New York), and Jeffrey H. Tigay (University of Pennsylvania).

Judaica. Observing the integration of Biblical and Jewish studies that has been achieved there, some have tried to achieve similar integration on a smaller scale in their own institutions.

A case in point is the Hebrew Union College (HUC) School of Graduate Studies in Cincinnati, Ohio. Until the late 1980s, the doctoral programme in Bible at HUC was exclusively philological-critical in character, with strong emphases on Semitic languages and text criticism. At that time several faculty members with expertise in Judaeo-Hellenistic and Patristic literature, midrash, and *parshanut* joined their colleagues in biblical and ancient Near Eastern studies to create a new doctoral track in Bible, which they dubbed 'History of Biblical Interpretation'. This programme was formally approved by HUC in 1989, and it has since become one of the institution's biggest attractions for prospective graduate students.

HUC's literature describes the course of study as 'an integrated Ph.D. program in the history of biblical interpretation as a sub-discipline of biblical studies', effecting a shift of a prior programmatic focus 'on the so-called "lower criticism" to broader historical, philological, exegetical, and hermeneutical aspects of the history of interpretation (including comparative Jewish and Christian exegesis)'. Students who enroll in the programme are expected to be proficient in Hebrew (biblical and rabbinic), Aramaic (Targumic and Syriac), and Greek, and they must have reading knowledge of Israeli Hebrew, French, and German (as well as other ancient and modern languages as needed).

The programme demands 'general competence in the standard philological and critical disciplines of biblical scholarship', and specifies various course requirements, including seminars on the History of Interpretation, at least four semesters of Targum, midrash, and *parshanut*, surveys of early Christian and Qumran literature, ancient history, and a range of Hebrew and Greek text courses. Students are expected to pass comprehensive examinations in three areas: '(1) Ancient Languages (normally, Hebrew, Greek, and Aramaic); (2) Bible (on the philological and critical disciplines of biblical scholarship); (3) Central Issues in the History of Interpretation.' Finally, dissertation topics generally treat 'historical, philological, exegetical, and hermeneutical issues that arise in the texts of the Greco-Roman period (Alexander to the Islamic Conquest)', especially 'in the area of comparative Jewish and Christian interpretation'.

Many other institutions with faculty strength in both Biblical studies and Jewish studies are developing this sort of programme—not limited to Jewish institutions. It is easy to see how, in contrast to 'traditional' graduate programmes in Bible, it de-emphasizes such subjects as Semitics and archaeology in favour of areas that are usually associated with Jewish studies, such as midrash and *parshanut*. The point that I wish to stress is that the programme demands that students of History of Interpretation be anchored in the 'philological and critical disciplines of biblical scholarship'. Although the HUC programme was designed in response to the burgeoning interest in traditional interpretation, it still seeks to centre that interest

within Biblical studies. It unabashedly asserts that History of Interpretation is not a byway of Biblical studies, but one of its highways.

This last notion has found both powerful expression and theoretical justification in the concept of post-critical interpretation which was developed by Peter Ochs in the introduction to a collection of essays that he edited in 1993 (Ochs 1993). Ochs defines what he terms 'postcritical scriptural interpretation' as 'an emergent tendency among Jewish and Christian text scholars and theologians to give rabbinic and ecclesial traditions of interpretation both the benefit of the doubt and the benefit of doubt' (ibid. 3). This stance is *post*-critical, and not merely *anti*-critical, because it seeks an accommodation between traditional hermeneutics and modernist criticism: dimensions of meaning revealed by the former may be 'clarified', as Ochs puts it, by the latter. It is not obvious in this context what such clarification entails, but at least it signals the post-critical scholar's intention to be inclusive, in contrast to the critical scholar's inclination to dismiss traditional interpretation as 'pre-critical' or 'non-critical'.

From a pragmatic standpoint, post-critical interpreters eschew the historicist agenda that originated with Spinoza and dominated critical biblical scholarship until about thirty years ago. Instead of locating the meaning of the text in external referents, such as historical events or authorial intention, they locate it 'within the text' and 'in the relation between the text and its community of interpreters' (ibid. 8). Cut loose from its historicist moorings, the concept of the 'literal meaning' of the text is a lot harder to pin down than it used to be. One no longer can think of 'meaning' as an artefact that may be recovered from the text the way a potsherd is excavated from the ground. Literal meaning in its linguistic/grammatical sense (cf. Ibn Ezra and Rashbam) does provide a check on exegetical fancy, but the authentic meaning of the text, according to Ochs, 'is its meaning for the authoritative community of interpreters' (ibid. 9).

One of the most perspicacious and influential advocates of a post-critical approach to biblical interpretation is Jon Levenson, a Jewish scholar who holds a professorial chair at the Harvard Divinity School. In 1993 Levenson revised and drew together six previously published essays that stake out his position on the relationship between the traditional and historical-critical modes of biblical study (Levenson 1993). His goal, which is to offer a critique of biblical criticism from the standpoint of traditional hermeneutics, is encapsulated in the following two quotations:

[T]he results of the historical-critical study of the Hebrew Bible have rather generally been at odds with the underlying method. The *method* is historical and therefore privileges the period of composition at the expense of all later recontextualizations. The *results* have been skewed toward one of those recontextualizations, the Christian church, as Christian categories, preferences, and priorities have been restated and occasionally re-energized by historical-critical study. (Ibid. 96).

Historical criticism has long posed a major challenge to people with biblical commitments, and for good reason. What I hope to have shown is that the reverse is also the case: the Bible poses a major challenge to people with historical-critical commitments. (Ibid. 126).

Levenson advocates a method of interpretation that has 'operational' (as opposed to 'theological') affinities with traditional Jewish commentary. On the one hand, he rejects fundamentalism by acknowledging that the Bible was a product of historical processes. On the other hand, he would 'relativize' historical investigation, recognizing 'that the cost of restoring textual units to their *historical* context can only be some loss of their *literary* context'. The historical-critical enterprise, he argues, 'must be dialectically checked by a continual awareness of the need to put the text back together in a way that makes it available and in its entirety—not merely in the past and in the form of historically contextualized fragments' (ibid. 78–9).

At first glance, Levenson might appear to be advocating an emphasis on synchronic or holistic analysis at the expense of historical criticism, but that is not the case. Rather, in true post-critical fashion, he sees each of the two modes of interpretation offering checks on each other. Synchronic approaches, he writes, 'are restoring the Bible to Biblical studies'. On the other hand, what is 'emerging nowadays is a scene of rich methodological pluralism', in which more sophisticated forms of diachronic investigation are becoming the norm (Levenson 1990: 52). This attempt to strike a balance, to reconcile the apparently irreconcilable, strikes me as quintessentially Jewish, in the spirit of the famous rabbinic dictum, *eilu ve-eilu divrei elohim hayyim* ('Both the one and the other are the words of the living God').²⁹

CONCLUSIONS

In the 'Concluding Extremely Unscientific Postscript' to his valuable history of Jewish biblical scholarship in North America, David Sperling remarks, 'the relocation of Jewish Bible study to the university and the simultaneous diminution of the role of the seminaries in the formative Bible training of Jewish scholars has increased the chances that future Jewish biblical scholarship will be no different than any other' (Sperling 1992: 206). That statement is true, in my view, but it is also one-sided, for it fails to reckon with the changes that Jewish scholars already have wrought within biblical scholarship. It may be fair to say that as Jewish biblical

²⁹ B. Eruvin 13b; B. Gittin 6b.

scholarship progresses (Orthodox scholarship excepted), it no longer will have to maintain its former distinctiveness because mainstream biblical scholarship will have a more Jewish character, or will at least be increasingly congenial to Jewish interests. The world of Biblical studies that was so alien to David Zevi Hoffmann a century ago has evolved to the point that it welcomes Jacob Milgrom with open arms, and prizes the contributions of the Israeli academy.

As I remarked before, the admission of previously marginalized groups to the guild, and the movement of their special interests from the periphery of Biblical studies to its increasingly capacious centre, have altered the field in dramatic fashion. From the Jewish point of view, the Society of Biblical Literature's renaming the object of study 'Hebrew Bible' instead of 'Old Testament' is more than cosmetic: it acknowledges the integrity of the Jewish Bible as scripture in its own right, not subsumed to the Christian canon. That acknowledgement, in turn, leads naturally to the recognition of continuity between Israelite religion and Judaism, earlier critical prejudices notwithstanding.

In this essay I have described two particular developments within Biblical studies that may be ascribed to the influence of Jewish biblical scholarship. Both of them, broadly speaking, entail the recognition that the Bible (that is, the Tanakh) is a Jewish book, and both therefore legitimate the study of the Bible in its Jewish contexts. This view of the Bible is both a point of entry for Jewish scholars into critical biblical scholarship, and also the potential meeting-ground for biblical scholars with their colleagues in Jewish studies. In the coming years I expect that interaction between specialists in those fields will yield important new insights into the formation of the Jewish Bible, and into the way the Bible, in turn, serves to shape Jewish mentalities and communities throughout the ages.

SUGGESTED READING

A splendid treatment of the Haskalah's encounter with biblical criticism is found in Breuer (1996). Carmy (1996) has a stimulating discussion of recent attempts by Orthodox scholars to come to grips with biblical criticism. Fishbane (1985) is a classic of biblical scholarship, demonstrating that interpretative processes characteristic of post-biblical literature may also be found within the Bible itself. An excellent introduction to source criticism is that by Friedman (1987). Greenberg (1995) is a superb anthology of scholarly essays. Greenberg (1984) is a wonderful collection, including scholarly articles, writings on Jewish education, and personal reflections. Hayes (1999) contains excellent short biographies of notable biblical scholars, and good surveys of major topics in biblical interpretation. Holtz (1984) is an outstanding popular introduction to the 'great books of the Jewish tradition'. I particularly recommend the following essays: Joel Rosenberg, 'Biblical Narrative' (31–81); Edward L. Greenstein, 'Biblical Law' (83–103); Murray H. Lichtenstein, 'Biblical Poetry' (105–27); Edward L. Greenstein, 'Medieval Bible Commentaries' (213–59). All of these essays have excellent bibliographies. The JPS Torah Commentary (1989–96) is an outstanding series

of commentaries that synthesizes traditional learning and modern scholarship for a general Jewish audience. The commentaries on Genesis and Exodus are by Nahum Sarna; Leviticus is by Baruch Levine; Numbers is by Jacob Milgrom; and Deuteronomy is by Jeffrey Tigay. Kugel (1997 and 1998) explores the way the Bible was read and understood in the formative era of Judaism and Christianity. Levenson (1993) contains probing discussions of problems in historical criticism in relation to traditional approaches to interpretation. A valuable collection of essays by leading Jewish biblical scholars is found in Neusner (1987). A stimulating collection of essays on the relationship between traditional and critical modes of biblical interpretation may be found in Ochs (1993). Sarna (2000) is an excellent collection of the writings of a great and influential scholar and teacher. Soloweitschik and Rubascheff (1925) contains a fascinating account with a Jewish slant. Sperling (1992) is a comprehensive and well-written survey of the field both past and present.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BREUER, E. 1995. 'Between Haskalah and Orthodoxy: The Writings of Rabbi Jacob Zvi Meklenburg.' *Hebrew Union College Annual* 66: 259–87.
 ——— 1996. *The Limits of Enlightenment: Jews, Germans, and the Eighteenth-Century*. Cambridge, Mass.
 CARMY, S. ed. 1996. *Modern Scholarship in the Study of Torah: Contributions and Limitations*. Northvale, NJ.
 CATTAN, N. 2002. 'When Jewish Studies Find a Niche at Christian Campuses.' *Forward*, 18 Jan., 2002. (online: <http://www.forward.com/issues/2002/02.01.18/education3.html>).
 CHUMASH 1994. 2nd edn. (Stone Edition). Brooklyn, NY.
 CHILDS, B. S. 1974. *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary*. Philadelphia.
 COGAN, M., EICHLER, B. L., and TIGAY, J. H. 1997. 'Moshe Greenberg: An Appreciation', In *Tehillah le-Moshe: Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg*. pp. ix–xxi. Cogan et al. eds. Winona Lake, Ind.
 COHEN, S. J. D. and GREENSTEIN, E. eds. 1990. *The State of Jewish Studies*. Detroit.
 COOPER, A. 1987. 'On Reading the Bible Critically and Otherwise.' In Friedman and Williamson (1997): 61–79.
 ——— 1988. 'The Plain Sense of Exodus 23:5.' *Hebrew Union College Annual* 59: 1–22.
 ——— 1990. 'Imagining Prophecy.' In *Poetry and Prophecy: The Beginnings of a Literary Tradition*. 26–44. J. Kugel ed. Ithaca, NY.
 CORNILL, C. H. 1907. *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament*. London.
 FISHBANE, M. 1985. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford.
 FLINT, P. 1997. *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 17. Leiden.
 FRERICHS, E. S. 1987. 'Introduction: The Jewish School of Biblical Studies.' In Neusner (1987): 1–6.
 FRIEDMAN, R. E. 1987. *Who Wrote the Bible?* New York.
 ——— and WILLIAMSON, H. G. M. eds. 1987. *The Future of Biblical Studies*. Semeia Studies. Atlanta, Ga.
 GREENBERG, M. 1984. *Al ha-miqra ve-al ha-yahadut: qovets ketavim* (English title: *On the Bible and Judaism: A Collection of Writings*) Tel Aviv.

- GREENBERG, M. 1995a. *Studies in the Bible and Jewish Thought*. Philadelphia.
- 1995b. 'Can Modern Critical Bible Scholarship Have a Jewish Character?' In Greenberg (1995a): 3–8.
- GREENGUS, S. 1991. 'Filling Gaps: Laws Found in Babylonia and in the Mishna But Absent in the Hebrew Bible.' *Maarav* 7: 149–71.
- GREENSTEIN, E. L. 1990. 'Biblical Studies in a State.' In *The State of Jewish Studies*. 23–46. S. J. D. Cohen and E. L. Greenstein eds. Detroit.
- HAYES, J. H. ed. 1999. *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*. 2 vols. Nashville.
- HERR, M. D. 1971. 'Hoffmann, David Zevi.' In *Encyclopedia Judaica*. viii. 808–10. Jerusalem.
- HOFFMANN, D. Z. 1976. *Sefer va-yiqra* ('The Book of Leviticus.'). Trans. Z. H. Shefer and A. Lieberman). 2nd edn. Jerusalem.
- HOLTZ, B. W. ed. 1984. *Back to the Sources: Reading the Classic Jewish Texts*. New York.
- HURVITZ, A. 1972. *Bein lashon le-lashon* (*The Transition Period in Biblical Hebrew*). Jerusalem.
- JAPHET, S. 1989. *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought*. Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentums 9. Frankfurt am Main. (Hebrew original 1977).
- 2000. *Peirush Rabbi Shemuel ben Meir (Rashbam) le-sefer Iyyov*. (*The Commentary of Rabbi Samuel ben Meir [Rashbam] On the Book of Job*.) Jerusalem.
- KAMIN, S. 1986. *Rashi: peshto shel miqra u-midrasho shel miqra*. (*Rashi's Exegetical Categorization in Respect to the Distinction Between Peshat and Derash*.) Jerusalem.
- KAUFMAN, Y. 1960. *The Religion of Israel From Its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile*. Trans. and abridged by M. Greenberg. Chicago.
- KNOHL, I. 1995. *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School*. Minneapolis. (Hebrew original 1992).
- KUGEL, J. 1997. *The Bible As It Was*. Cambridge, Mass.
- 1998. *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era*. Cambridge, Mass.
- LEIMAN, Z. 1996. 'Response to Rabbi Breuer.' In Carmy (1996): 181–7.
- LEVENSON, J. D. 1987. 'Why Jews Are Not Interested in Biblical Theology.' In *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel*. 281–307. Neusner et al. eds. Philadelphia.
- 1990. 'Response.' In Cohen and Greenstein (1990): 47–54.
- 1993. *The Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament, and Historical Criticism: Jews and Christians in Biblical Studies*. Louisville, Ky.
- LEVINE, B. A. 1962. 'Survivals of Ancient Canaanite in the Mishnah.' Doctoral thesis submitted to Brandeis University.
- 1992. 'The European Background.' In Sperling (1992): 15–32.
- LEVINSON, B. M. 1997. *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation*. New York.
- LEVY, B. B. 1983. 'Artscroll: An Overview.' In *Approaches to Modern Judaism*. Brown Judaic Studies 49: 111–62. Chico, Cal.
- 1992. 'On the Periphery: North American Orthodox Judaism and Contemporary Scholarship.' In Sperling (1992): 159–204.
- 1996. 'The State and Direction of Orthodox Bible Study.' In *Modern Scholarship in the Study of Torah: Contributions and Limitations*. 39–80. S. Carmy ed. Northvale, NJ.
- LIEBER, D. L. et al. *Etz Hayim: Torah and Commentary*. Philadelphia.
- MEIROVICH, H. 1998. *A Vindication of Judaism: The Polemics of the Hertz Pentateuch*. New York.

- MILGROM, J. 1990. *Numbers: The Traditional Hebrew Text With the New JPS Translation*. Philadelphia.
- NEUSNER, J. et al. eds. 1987. *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel*. Philadelphia.
- OCHS, P. ed. 1993. *The Return to Scripture in Judaism and Christianity: Essays in Postcritical Scriptural Interpretation*. New York.
- PLAUT, W. G. ed. 1981. *The Torah: A Modern Commentary*. New York.
- RAPHAEL, M. L. ed. 1983. *Approaches to Modern Judaism*. Brown Judaic Studies 49. Chico, Cal.
- SANDMEL, S. 1961. 'The Haggada Within Scripture.' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 80: 105–22.
- SARNA, N. 2000. *Studies in Biblical Interpretation*. Philadelphia.
- SCHWARTZ, B. 1999. *Torat ha-qedusha: iyyunim ba-huqqa ha-kohanit she-ba-tora*. (*The Holiness Legislation: Studies in the Priestly Code*.) Jerusalem.
- SCHECHTER, S. 1959. *Seminary Addresses and Other Papers*. New York.
- SOLOWEITSCHIK, M. and RUBASCHEFF, S. 1925. *Toledot biqoret ha-miqra* (*History of Biblical Criticism*.) Berlin.
- SOMMER, B. D. 1998. *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66*. Stanford.
- SPEHLING, S. D. ed. 1992. *Students of the Covenant: A History of Jewish Biblical Scholarship in North America*. Atlanta, Ga.
- TIGAY, J. H. 1999. 'Greenberg, Moshe (1928–)'. In Hayes (1999): i. 464–5.
- WACHOLDER, B. Z. 1988. 'David's Eschatological Psalter: 115ALMS^a.' *Hebrew Union College Annual* 59: 23–72.
- WIENER, M. 1962. *Abraham Geiger and Liberal Judaism: The Challenge of the Nineteenth Century*. Philadelphia.
- WEITZMAN, S. 1994. 'The Song of Abraham.' *Hebrew Union College Annual* 65: 21–33.
- 1996. 'Allusion, Artifice, and Exile in the Hymn of Tobit.' *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115: 49–61.
- 1997a. 'Revisiting Myth and Ritual in Early Judaism.' *Dead Sea Discoveries* 4: 21–54.
- 1997b. *Song and Story in Biblical Narrative: the History of a Literary Convention in Ancient Israel*. Bloomington, Ind.
- ZAKOVITCH, Y. 1982. *Hayei Shimshon (Shofetim 13–16): mittuah sifrut-biqorti*. (*The Life of Samson [Judges 13–16]: A Critical-Literary Analysis*.) Jerusalem.
- 1991. *And You Shall Tell Your Son . . . : The Concept of the Exodus in the Bible*. Jerusalem.
- 1992. *Mavo le-farshanut penim-miqra'it* (*An Introduction to Inner-Biblical Interpretation*.) Even-Yehuda.
- and SHINAN, A. 1992. *Ma'ase Yehuda ve-Tamar: Bereshit 38 ba-miqra, ba-targumim ha-attiqim, u-va-sifrut ha-yehudit ha-qeduma le sugeha*. (*The Story of Judah and Tamar: Genesis 38 in the Bible, the Old Versions, and the Ancient Jewish Literature*.) Jerusalem.