

was to have great influence on the early church, particularly the Alexandrian fathers Clement and Origen.

Mickelsen believes that it was through contact with Greek thought at Alexandria that the allegorical methods of biblical interpretation came into Jewish exegetical practice. But probably allegorism (along with typology) found its place in Jewish exegesis independently of Greek influence. Clearly it was already used by the Qumran covenanters (see D.J. Moo, The Use of the Old Testament in the Passion Texts of the Gospels [Diss. Univ. of St. Andrews, 1979], pp. 35-40).

2. Approaches to Exegesis--here you may profitably consult Richard Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period (Eerdmans, 1975).

- a. Literalist interpretation--the Jewish authors could, and often did interpret the Bible quite literally or even hyperliterally. Longenecker cites the following example of the latter, an interpretation of the legislation regarding a "stubborn and rebellious son" in Deut. 21: 18ff.:

*This misses the whole intent of the paragraph*

If either of them [his parents] was maimed in the hand, or lame or dumb or blind or deaf, he cannot be condemned as a stubborn and rebellious son, for it is written, "Then shall his father and his mother lay hold of him"--so they were not maimed in the hand; "and bring him out"--so they were not lame; "and they shall say"--so they were not dumb; "this is our son"--so they were not blind; "he will not obey our voice"--so they were not deaf.

This is not to suggest that Jewish authors did not frequently interpret the Bible in a rather straightforward literal or "normal" sense.

- b. Midrashic interpretation--the central concept in rabbinic exegesis. Longenecker states: "Midrashic interpretation, in effect, ostensibly takes its point of departure from the biblical text itself (though psychologically it may be motivated by other factors) and seeks to explicate the hidden meanings contained therein by means of agreed upon hermeneutical rules in order to contemporize the revelation of God for the people of God" (p. 37).

In its early stages midrash was probably not sharply distinguished from the more literal approach to exegesis. Of the seven basic laws of rabbinic exegesis formulated by Hillel, three of the rules have to do just with logical processes. The other four stress the use of verbal associations. Moo states: "Already in these midrash, there can be seen exemplified the two most characteristic hermeneutical techniques of Judaism: comparison and combination of texts, and an emphasis on single words in isolation" (p. 28).

Later the seven rules of Hillel were elaborated into thirteen by Rabbi Ishmael ben Elisha, and later still, came the thirty-two rules formulated by Rabbi Eliezer ben Jose ha-Galili. This expansion reflects a movement in rabbinic exegesis toward more