

The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow, edited by Harold R. Willoughby  
(The University of Chicago Press) 1947

"Contemporary Trends in Jewish Bible Study" by Felix A. Levy  
Emmanuel Congregation, Chicago

p. 99 The first reaction, therefore, of Jewish scholars to biblical criticism that sought to prove the inferiority of Judaism was natural resentment. They felt that they were best fitted to understand their own literature; and they rejected almost entirely the findings of the dominant school of biblical criticism of a half-century ago. . .

These students did not accept generally the division of the Hexateuch into J, E, D, P, and R, or the theory of a "straight-line development"<sup>4</sup> of Israel's culture and religion.

They did not put prophecy before Torah and make the latter a deterioration of the former, nor did they agree to the statement that all Israel's prehistory is fiction<sup>5</sup> and that its recording was late because ancient Israel was analphabetic. A Jewish scholar, Siegmund Jampel,<sup>6</sup> has given the best summary of what might be called the

"Jewish" point of view by his analysis of the theories of Wellhausen and Eduard Meyer<sup>p.100</sup> and his proof of their untenability. He supports his own arguments by drawing / upon the work of Gressmann<sup>7</sup> and Gunkel,<sup>8</sup> who have gone a long way from their teachers. In general, Jewish study has attacked the theory of development, particularly the claim that anything of a high ethical or religious character must be late, post-Exilic; the documentary hypothesis, or the possibility of recovering the original sources; and the late dating of the books.<sup>9</sup>

4. Championed by Wellhausen

5. Propounded by Eduard Meyer

6. Vorgeschichte des israelitischen Volkes und seiner Religion, I (1928), 11

7 Who asks: "Whether knowledge gains ((by such methodology)) and whether this discipline can claim to be a science." "What one cannot define, is regarded as post-exilic" ("The Task of Old Testament Investigation," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLII, 1924, 5ff.)

8 Ideas expressed in the prophets and in Gen., ch. 1, can be very old, even though they may have been written down in the Babylonian Exile (Schöpfung und Chaos (Göttingen, 1895), pp. 135 ff.)

9 Jews, of course, have not been alone in their refusal to accept currently popular theories. One has but to recall the various "fashions" in biblical criticism and the reactions to the sweeping explanations of the various "pan"schools. . . .