

# THE OLD TESTAMENT: JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN BIBLE

---

ROLF RENDTORFF

## I

First of all, I have to query the title of my own lecture. Can the 'Old Testament' be called 'Jewish and Christian Bible'? Of course, in a strict sense it cannot. 'Old Testament' is an exclusively Christian term. There can only be an 'Old' Testament if there is also a 'New,' and only both Testaments together form the Christian 'Bible.' This is true even if the term 'Old Testament' is commonly used in different contexts, also where Jews are included; but obviously this usage is not correct.

But what term shall be used instead? In the scholarly field there is now frequently spoken of 'Hebrew Scriptures.' This is an interesting term, and I want to look at it in some more detail. One of the traditional names for the Jewish Bible is the Holy Scriptures, which were written in Hebrew anyhow. So Hebrew Scriptures seems to be a specifically Jewish term. But this is only half the truth. The term 'the Scripture,' ἡ γραφή, or, 'the scriptures,' ἀγγραφαί, appears frequently in the New Testament, referring to what was the 'Bible' of the writers and readers of the New Testament, that is to the Jewish Bible, the Holy Scriptures (cf. Rom. 1:2). In whatever language the people of the New Testament times might have read their Bible, it is obvious that 'Scriptures' is a common Jewish and Christian term.

The first Christians were Jews, Jesus included, and they quoted from their Bible, that is, from the Jewish Bible. But after the separation of the Christian community from the majority of the Jews, the Christian Bible was no longer simply the Jewish Bible. It became something else, a two-part Bible whose first part was more or less in accordance with the Jewish Bible. At this point our specific problem begins. First, the Christian Bible was no longer in Hebrew, but in Greek. Of course, also the majority of Jews in the world of Late Antiquity lived in Greek speaking contexts, so the language must not have been a reason for conflict or antagonism. But since the

---

*This article was delivered as part of the 1998 Ryan Academic Lectureship Series on the campus of Asbury Theological Seminary. Rolf Rendtorff is professor emeritus at the University of Heidelberg. He is also a visiting professor at Hebrew University—Jerusalem, Chicago Divinity School, and the University of Pretoria.*

THE ASBURY THEOLOGICAL JOURNAL

SPRING 1999 • VOL. 54 • NO. 1

Christians had adopted the first Greek translation of the Bible, the Septuagint, many Jews ceased to use this translation. So the Septuagint became the first Christian 'Old Testament.'<sup>1</sup> One of the main consequences was the fact that now both parts of the Christian Bible were written in the same language, in Greek. So it seemed to be really *one* Bible.

Later in the Western churches the Latin translation, the Vulgate, dominated, which is still in liturgical use in the Roman-Catholic Church. But the Reformation turned to the study of the original languages of the Bible. One very important result of this change was the fact that from now on the Old Testament and New Testament appeared to be two different books, written in two different languages. The consequences are obvious when, in particular, the Enlightenment theologians concentrated more and more on the biblical texts in their original language. The final step was the almost complete separation of Old Testament and New Testament studies in the academic world.

One might imagine that now the scholarly study of the Hebrew part of the Bible would have become a common effort of Jewish and Christian scholars. Obviously, this was not the case, and for different reasons. Here one very important aspect of the above mentioned problem of naming the 'Old Testament' becomes visible: Jewish scholars were *de facto* excluded from the academic study of their own Bible because these studies were exclusively executed as 'Old Testament studies' in the framework of confessional Christian theological faculties.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, this kind of biblical studies did not belong to the main interests of Jewish studies, so that even in Jewish scholarly institutions in the nineteenth and early twentieth century there was not too much endeavor in this field.

Reflecting on the reasons why in the meantime things have changed I think that one of the actual causes is the fact that the center of biblical studies moved from Europe to North America with its different system of higher education. Here Bible studies and Bible teaching are now executed in a great variety of different universities, schools, seminaries, etc., most of them in one way or the other being involved in the development of "the modern secular university...in the United States."<sup>3</sup> The opportunities for Jewish students to study Bible in a modern context are much better than ever before, and likewise the chances for Jewish scholars to get a teaching position in this field.

The second important development is the gradual change of Christian-Jewish relations. Today many Christians, in particular Christian Bible scholars, are aware of the fact that the first part of their Bible had been the Jewish Bible before Christianity came into being, and that it still *is* the Jewish Bible. Through the centuries much too often Christian theologians were not aware of this or even denied any Jewish claim upon the Old Testament after Christ. Since at least the majority of Christian Bible scholars have given up this kind of supersessionism there is now room for new reflections. Recently, there is a discussion among Christians who are engaged in Christian-Jewish relations about using any other term instead of 'Old Testament' because some feel that even the term Old Testament itself includes an element of expropriating the Bible from the Jews. Some prefer the term 'First Testament' in order to avoid the word 'old' which could be—and often is—understood as 'outdated.' Others speak about 'the Jewish Bible' or 'Israel's Bible.'

Anyhow, since among Christian Bible scholars the idea of having a monopoly of the Old Testament is not adhered to any longer it is much easier to use a common language as, e.g., Hebrew Bible or Hebrew Scriptures. But now we are back to our question from

the beginning: In what sense are the Hebrew Scriptures part of the Christian Bible? Along with the above mentioned question of the different languages there is the problem of the structure of the canon. The different versions of Christian Bibles do not reflect the tripartite canon of the Hebrew Bible, the Tanakh. The main change is the position of the prophetic books. As you know, in the Hebrew Bible the prophetic books follow the books of Samuel and Kings while in the Christian Bibles they are put at the end of the canon. Also a number of other books have different positions in both canons, such as Ruth, Chronicles, Ezra/Nehemiah, Esther, Threni, and Daniel. Finally in the Roman-Catholic canon the so-called Apocrypha are included. Whatever the particular reasons for those changes might have been, the theological 'message' of the canon(s) of the Christian Bible(s) seems to be different from that of the Hebrew Bible.

What does this mean for the approach of Christian scholars to the Hebrew Scriptures? Surprisingly enough, the majority of Christian Bible scholars actually work in the framework of the canon of the Hebrew Bible. This is particularly evident with the classical works on the 'Introduction to the Old Testament' by Otto Eissfeldt,<sup>4</sup> Rudolf Smend,<sup>5</sup> Brevard S. Childs,<sup>6</sup> and others, my own included.<sup>7</sup> These scholars arrange their books according to the tripartite Hebrew canon, even using the Hebrew titles Torah, Former Prophets, Latter Prophets, and Writings. Here it becomes evident that notwithstanding the divergent theological traditions the textual basis for the studies of Jewish and Christian Bible scholars is actually the same. This is particularly visible in the common use of the *Biblia Hebraica*, first *Kittel* and then *Stuttgartensia*, presenting the text of the Hebrew Bible according to the Jewish Masora, worked out by German Protestant scholars.

So far there is a broad and solid textual basis for common scholarly work of Jews and Christians with the Hebrew Scriptures. In many fields of exegesis, philology, history, etc., there developed in the last decades a fruitful interchange between Jewish and Christian scholars, in many cases without any consideration of religious or confessional background.

## II

But the moment we enter the field of theology things become complicated. The first reason for that is the fact that 'theology' is a central Christian term while it is not in use in Jewish religious tradition. In the famous *Encyclopaedia Ioudaica* from 1972 we read, "Therefore it has been frequently asserted that Judaism has no theology."<sup>8</sup> In a 1992 volume on *The Flowering of Old Testament Theology* there appears only one Jewish scholar, Jon D. Levenson, who is quoted from a 1985 publication saying: "the sad fact, however, is that the endeavor known as 'Old Testament theology' has been, as its name suggests, an almost exclusively Gentile affair."<sup>9</sup> 'Gentile' obviously means 'Christian,' in particular, 'Protestant.' In 1987 Levenson published an essay entitled *Why Jews Are Not Interested in Biblical Theology*.<sup>10</sup> In this essay he is going to explore why there is no Jewish equivalent of Walther Eichrodt's or Gerhard von Rad's well-known works. In 1987 Moshe Goshen-Gottstein published an article "on the possibility and necessity of a hitherto nonexistent area of academic study in the field of biblical religion: the theology of Tanakh."<sup>11</sup>

In recent years on the Jewish side things are beginning to change. But what about Christian theology of the Old Testament? Is it as close to Jewish studies as are many of the other fields of biblical studies? Obviously not. It is sometimes disturbing to realize that

the same Christian Bible scholars who are using the Hebrew Scriptures every day in their exegetical work turn to a totally different direction of thinking the moment they speak about theology of the Old Testament. I want to quote a quite recent example. The well-established *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie* published in its 1997 volume an article by Hermann Spieckermann from Hamburg on 'Die Verbindlichkeit des Alten Testaments' (The Normativity of the Old Testament). The essay is summarized by a series of theses which begin with the sentence: "Theology of the Old Testament is a Christian discipline." Then the third thesis says: "Both Testaments bear witness to Jesus Christ, each according to their own ways.... The basis of cognition (*Erkenntnisgrund*) of the one truth of both testaments lies in the New Testament." The author does not even mention the fact that there does exist a Jewish religious community whose Bible is the same as the Christian Old Testament. It is obvious that for this kind of Christian theologian the Old Testament has no other theological message than a Christian one. In other words, the Old Testament has no individual message at all because there is only "one truth" witnessed by both Testaments.<sup>12</sup> This is just one most recent example of a long Christian tradition of a total theological monopolizing of the Old Testament.

A much more differentiated position is presented by Brevard Childs.<sup>13</sup> He is also of the opinion that it is the "fundamental goal" of biblical theology "to understand the various voices within the whole Christian Bible, New and Old Testament alike, as a witness to the Lord Jesus Christ, the selfsame divine reality."<sup>14</sup> But the way he chooses to explain such an understanding concedes much more theological relevance to the Old Testament. The first main part of his book, covering more than one hundred pages, is dedicated to "The discrete witness of the Old Testament."<sup>15</sup> Then follows the second main part on "The discrete witness of the New Testament" and finally the third main part on "Theological reflection on the Christian Bible." This third part deals with a number of thematic topics always leading up to dogmatics. But even in this part each of the individual chapters begin with a paragraph on the Old Testament witness on specific topics such as "The Identity of God," "God the Creator," etc. So the voice and message of the Old Testament in its own right is heard throughout the book, even if it is finally included in the common testimony to Jesus Christ.

Childs' book makes obvious two basic elements in this kind of Christian biblical theology. First, in this context there is no independent theology of the Hebrew Bible or Old Testament because the theological reflection on the Old Testament is from the outset part and parcel of a Christian 'biblical theology' which embraces both parts of the Christian Bible. Secondly, Old Testament theology is finally part of Christian dogmatics. This becomes quite clear from the overall structure of the Childs' book. This is of particular interest because almost every account of the history of 'biblical theology' begins with Johann Philipp Gabler's famous *oratio* from 1787 about the discrimination between biblical and dogmatic theology.<sup>16</sup> This has always been taken as the beginning of liberation of biblical theology from dogmatic preconditions and of the development of an independent biblical theology. Now Childs explicitly revokes this separation pleading for "a return to pre-Gabler position"<sup>17</sup> and leaving the final words to dogmatics.

But this is only one side of the present situation in the field of Christian Old Testament theology. Already the often mentioned theologians by Walther Eichrodt and Gerhard von Rad were far from any supersedionist attitude and also did not concede any role for dog-

matics in unfolding the theology of the Old Testament. Of course, in particular von Rad was fully aware of the fact that the Old Testament is only one part of the Christian Bible. Therefore in the last main part of his *Old Testament Theologie* he drew, very carefully, certain lines from the Old Testament to the New, but he did so only after he had finished his explication of the message of the Old Testament in its own right.<sup>18</sup> In general, the same could be said about the majority of other works on Old Testament theology in the period before and after von Rad. Most of the authors do not subjugate the Old Testament to theological criteria taken from Christian theology, be it the New Testament or dogmatics. Some do not at all deal explicitly with the relationship of the Old Testament to Christianity, as e.g., Eichrodt,<sup>19</sup> Zimmerli,<sup>20</sup> etc. Others are treating these problems more explicitly as e.g., Terrien,<sup>21</sup> Westermann,<sup>22</sup> and most recently Brueggemann.<sup>23</sup> But all of them are emphasizing the independent theological relevance of the Old Testament while at the same time reflecting its relationship to the New Testament in different ways.

### III

I believe that the basic precondition for a fruitful working together of Christians and Jews towards a theological reading of the Hebrew Scriptures is the full acknowledgment by the Christians that these Scriptures are the Holy Scriptures of Judaism as well as of Christianity. Therefore it would be impossible to speak about the theological relevance of the Hebrew Scriptures exclusively under Christian aspects. I mentioned before that in my view the majority of Christian Bible scholars have given up the traditional Christian supersessionism. Unfortunately, when speaking about theology many of them fall back into a kind of exclusivism. Possibly they would not explicitly deny any theological relevance of the Hebrew Scriptures for Judaism. But they are not interested in this question because they do not understand that this would have any importance for themselves.

In my view, the problems lie still deeper. Christian theologians often forget that Christianity grew out of Judaism and that therefore Christian interpretation of the common Hebrew Holy Scriptures is always the second in order. Judaism has its own interpretation which is much more immediate to the Hebrew text,<sup>24</sup> while Christian interpretation is mediated through another collection of writings, the New Testament. But the question is how this mediation works and what the consequences are for a Christian understanding of the theology of the Hebrew Scriptures.

I believe that at this point the traditional Christian interpretation of the Bible is committing a bad mistake. Usually the New Testament is taken as the starting point for comparing the two Testaments and for asking the question of the relevance of the Old Testament for Christian belief. By this procedure only a very small sector of the message of the Hebrew Scriptures comes in view. But such an approach, to quote Childs, is "highly misleading and one-sided in the extreme," because in the early church "the Jewish scriptures were held as the authoritative voice of God.... The problem of the early church was not what to do with the Old Testament in the light of the gospel, which was Luther's concern, but rather the reverse. In the light of the Jewish scriptures which were acknowledged to be the true oracles of God, how were Christians to understand the good new of Jesus Christ?"<sup>25</sup>

I am quoting Childs because he himself could have contributed to such a misleading view by saying in the same context that "it is basic to emphasize that something totally

new began with the resurrection, and this sharp discontinuity in Israel's tradition is rightly reflected in the formation of two separate and distinct testaments. The old came to an end; the new began." But then he shows in many details the fundamental relevance of the Old Testament for Christian belief. Let me just refer to one basic point: the understanding of God as creator was simply assumed and largely taken for granted as true. ... In a word, large portions of the New Testament reflect an unbroken continuity with the Old Testament trajectory of creation traditions.<sup>26</sup> And for Christians it is the First Article of the Apostolic Creed, speaking about God the creator, that is only understandable on the basis of the witness of the Hebrew Scriptures.

#### IV

What does this mean for a Christian approach to the Hebrew Scriptures? First of all, there is no reason to approach the Hebrew Bible from a specific 'Christian' point of view. The customary way by many Christian theologians to approach the Hebrew Bible backwards from the New Testament or Christian dogmatics fails to do justice to the actual relevance of main theological topics of the Hebrew Bible for Christian thinking and belief without any specifically Christian interpretation. That God is *one*, and that there is no other God, early Christians knew from their own Jewish tradition, and they "continued as good Jews...to worship the one God of the Old Testament" (Childs),<sup>27</sup> that is, of their own Bible. The same is true for other topics such as God the creator and the whole understanding of human life within the creation including the responsibility of humans for the preservation of the created world. Just today this is a specifically important point when many Christians are reflecting upon ecological problems. They will not find too much help from the New Testament, but will find much from the Hebrew Scriptures.

Another important field are the Psalms. Nowhere in the Bible will the Christian reader find that much guidance and instruction for prayer, individually and in common, as in the Hebrew Scriptures. But even more: Christian religious service is not imaginable without Psalms. Even at very specific points of Christian liturgy certain Psalms are indispensable as, e.g., Psalm 103 for unfolding God's merciful behavior towards sinful humans:

The Lord is merciful and gracious  
 slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love.  
 He will not always accuse,  
 nor will he keep his anger forever.  
 He does not deal with us according to our sins,  
 nor repay us according to our iniquities.

No Christian pastor or priest would tell his congregation they should not understand what they are praying or listening to according to the wording from the Old Testament, the Hebrew Bible, but in any different 'Christian' way. That God is merciful and that humans could not live without being conscious of that is one of the fundamental elements of the message of the Hebrew Scripture from its very beginning. Already after the flood God said:

I will never again curse the ground because of humankind, for the inclination of the human heart is evil from youth; nor will I ever again destroy every living creature as I have done.

I could continue to name basic elements of the Hebrew Scriptures that are more or less self-evident parts of Christian thinking and belief. There are other elements that need additional reflection. As a major example I choose the concept of divine election. The election of Abraham and his descendants meant first of all the separation of one group of humans to the exclusive service of the *one* God. Insofar as all those who are staying in this line of worship of the one God are included in this election. In a more specific sense the election of Abraham meant the election of the Jewish people. At this point there arose a problem for the Christian community. At the beginning, the followers of Jesus formed a group of Jews who adhered to a peculiar messianic belief, but remained members of the Jewish people. Later more and more non-Jews joined this group and finally became the majority. From that point on the now so-called 'Christians' (cf. Acts. 11:26) progressively became a community different and separated from the Jewish people. Now from a theological point of view the question arose whether and how this new community could claim belonging to the addressees of the divine promises given in the Hebrew Scriptures to the people of Israel.

Unfortunately, to quote Krister Stendahl, "something went wrong in the beginning,"<sup>28</sup> because this problem was not reflected in a way that could have done justice to both sides. Instead the Christians declared themselves to be the only legitimate heirs of Abraham's election. They occupied not only titles like 'People of God' or 'the Chosen People,' but even called themselves 'the New Israel' or 'the True Israel' and the like. It is important to realize that this had not yet happened in the times of the New Testament itself. In particular the apostle Paul clearly spoke about 'Israel' in its original sense, even emphasizing his own membership in this people (Rom. 11:1, cf. 9:3). But nevertheless, things developed in the wrong direction. Therefore, as we learned from Krister Stendahl and others, at this point we need a new departure. Certainly, something has been achieved in this field during the last few decades, but we are still far from a commonly accepted Christian position without the traditional supersessionism.

## V

But back to the Hebrew Scriptures. Let me try to summarize some points that are basic in my eyes.

First: for Christians the Hebrew Scriptures are part of their Bible. That means that the Christian interpreter need not justify his or her using these scriptures. He or she stands in a long tradition of reading this part of the Bible which includes a broad spectrum of theological and social implications that shape his or her approach. I feel it to be important to emphasize a certain self-evidence of a Christian approach to the Hebrew Scriptures.

Secondly: the Christian interpreter of the Hebrew Scriptures has always to be aware of the fact that there is still another approach from the Jewish side. This awareness should include the realization that this part of the Bible was written and composed by Jews at a time and in a context when Christianity did not yet exist. Therefore the Jewish interpreta-

tion is much more immediate to the Hebrew Scriptures. In broad fields of biblical topics this awareness must not actually influence or even alter the way of reading and interpreting; but it should be a kind of warning sign not to bring in, perhaps unconsciously, certain elements of Christian interpretation that only could have developed after the conclusion of the canon of the Hebrew Scriptures.

Thirdly: one particular problem are those traditions in the Hebrew Scriptures that are immediately addressed to the Jewish people. Of particular relevance are the already mentioned ideas of Israel's divine election and of God's covenant with the people of Israel as well as the promise of the land. In these fields Christians have to be particularly careful not to occupy those ideas in a way that actually would mean an expropriation from the Jews. By such an interpretation Christians would simply get themselves in the wrong, even if there might be a long Christian tradition of this kind of interpretation. Yet even these points are of particular relevance for a new self-identification of Christianity towards Judaism. The relation of the Christian church to the Jewish people in view of the biblical ideas of election and covenant are in my view among the most important topics to be reflected by Christians in order to properly define their position in the religious world marked by biblical traditions. As far as I can see there has not yet been enough theological work done on this topic.<sup>29</sup>

Fourthly: there is a number of fields where Christian theology developed ideas that explicitly go beyond the Hebrew Scriptures. The major field is, of course, the question of messianism. But I do not feel that this must be a really controversial field as far as Christian interpreters would make a clear distinction between the words of the Hebrew Bible that express a messianic expectation. Others include certain elements that could be interpreted in a messianic way even if the interpretation remains controversial. But all these texts speak about the future by expressing promises, expectations and hopes. Christians would say that certain of these promises are fulfilled in the appearance of Jesus Christ. But in my view they could never claim that such a Christian interpretation is *the* correct or even the only possible interpretation. Even less could they argue that the texts of the Hebrew Bible themselves speak about Jesus Christ. Here things have to be clearly kept apart. The pattern of 'promise and fulfillment' in this field can only be a Christian one which goes beyond the exegesis of the Hebrew Scriptures.

There are other fields where things are more problematic. As an example I mention the topics of sin and atonement. The Hebrew Bible presents a full system of cultic performances for atonement while one of the basic elements of Christian theology is the idea that through Jesus Christ for the believers sin is forgiven once and for all. But this confrontation is an extreme narrowing of the problems because actually in both contexts things are much more differentiated. The Hebrew Bible includes a wide range of texts speaking about divine forgiveness of sins in a non-cultic way, beginning from Primeval History through the Sinai story, texts in the Book of Isaiah, and many psalms, to mention just some of them. All these texts are open to Christian interpretation and adaptation. On the other hand there are in the Christian tradition many elements of cultic or quasi-cultic handling of atonement and forgiveness that are, of course, different from that in the Hebrew Bible but nevertheless not fundamentally contradictory.

I could continue speaking about the often declared antithesis of 'law' and 'gospel.'

Here the same is true: a simple confrontation fails to do justice to both the Hebrew Bible and Christian belief. The Hebrew Bible is full of 'gospel,' and the Christian tradition, not only Catholic but also Protestant, is far from being without 'law.' Nevertheless, here we are entering a complex field of theological interpretation. But when going into detail it will become quite clear that there are not only differences between Jews and Christians but also within the two communities and in particular between scholars belonging to one or the other of the two. It would go beyond the scope of this lecture to enter this field of discussion. But it is important not to introduce post-biblical dogmatic alternatives into the interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures.

## VI

To come to an end, it is my conviction that the Christian Bible scholar first of all has to interpret the Hebrew Scriptures in their own right. This includes explaining the *theology* of these Scriptures. The Bible scholar has to read and interpret the Hebrew Scriptures very carefully before making the step beyond these scriptures into the realm of his or her religious tradition. In this respect the task of the Bible scholar is limited, but highly necessary.

The next step would be to reflect methodologically on the reception and interpretation of "the discrete witness of the Old Testament" (to use Childs' terminology) in early Christianity. Earlier I mentioned the mistake only to look at those elements of the Old Testament tradition that are explicitly received and interpreted in the New Testament. We have to overcome this narrowing of our view and to recover the wide field of Old Testament traditions which have shaped basic elements of our Christian belief. In this field we would really need a close cooperation between scholars of the Hebrew Bible and of the New Testament who are strongly committed to understand and to explain the 'biblical' religion of the early Christians, i.e., their being rooted in their Jewish scriptures, be it in Hebrew or Greek. Only out of such a basis would it be meaningful to point out the divergences of certain Christian views and beliefs from the common Jewish understanding of the Scriptures. But looking from such a starting point the evaluation of those differences and its further developments would become different.

To understand our Old Testament not only as part of our Christian Bible but at the same time as part of the Jewish Bible, and to respect the right of our elder brothers and sisters to read their Bible in its own right, could be an important contribution to a peaceful living together of the two communities of biblical tradition and by that also of the whole of humankind whose creator is the *one* God who in the beginning created the heavens and the earth.

## NOTES

1. See E. Tov, "The Septuagint," in M.J. Mulder, ed., *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, section 2, part 1 (Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum and Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), pp. 161-88, quotation from p. 163.

2. For these developments see in particular M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Christianity, Judaism and Modern Bible Study," *Congress Volume Edinburgh 1974*. VTSuppl. 28(1975): 69-88.

3. E.S. Frenichs, "Introduction: The Jewish School of Biblical Studies" in *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel* (see note 2), pp. 1-6, quotation from p. 5.

4. O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965).
5. R. Smend, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1978, 1989).
6. B.S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testaments as Scripture* (London: SCM Press, 1979).
7. R. Rendtorff, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986).
8. Encyclopaedia Judaica, vol. 15, col. 1103.
9. B.C. Ollenburger, E.A. Martens, G.F. Hasel, eds., *The Flowering of Old Testament Theology: A Reader in Twentieth-Century Old Testament Theology, 1930-1990* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992), p. 429.
10. J. Neusner, B.A. Levine, E.S. Frerichs, eds., *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), pp. 281-307.
11. M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Tanakh Theology: The Religion of the Old Testament and the Place of Jewish Biblical Theology," in P.D. Miller, et. al (eds.), *Ancient Israelite Religion, Festschrift F.M. Cross* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), pp. 617-644.
12. H. Spieckermann, "Die Verbindlichkeit des Alten Testaments: Unzeitgemäße Betrachtungen zu einem ungeliebten Thema," in *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie*, vol. 12, 1997 (Hermeneutik, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1998), pp. 25-51, quotations from pp. 46, 47, 49.
13. B.S. Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992).
14. *Ibid.*, p. 85.
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 95-207.
16. See now R. Knierim, "On Cabler," *The Task of Old Testament Theology: Substance, Method, and Cases* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), pp. 495-556.
17. Childs is here quoting an earlier essay by G. Ebeling, "The Meaning of 'Biblical Theology,'" *Word and Faith* (London and Philadelphia, 1963) pp. 79-97.
18. G.V. Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 2 vols. (New York: Harper & Row, 1962-1965).
19. W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961/67).
20. W. Zimmerli, *Old Testament Theology in Outline* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1978).
21. S. Terrien, *The Elusive Presence: Toward a New Biblical Theology* (New York: Harper & Row, 1978).
22. C. Westermann, *Elements of Old Testament Theology* (Atlanta, 1982).
23. W. Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997).
24. It is not my task here to speak about the relevance of post-biblical interpretation of Scripture for Judaism. I think that my rather general formulation 'much more immediate' will do justice to the relation between Jewish and Christian interpretation of Scripture.
25. Childs, *Biblical Theology*, pp. 225-226. Childs is here referring to H.V. Campenhausen, *The Formation of the Christian Bible* (Philadelphia and London, 1972), p. 64f.
26. Childs, *Biblical Theology*, p. 391.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 365.
28. Krister Stendahl, "Judaism and Christianity II: A Plea for a New Relationship," *Harvard Divinity Bulletin*, New Series 1:1 (1967), pp. 2-9; reprinted in K. Stendahl, *Meanings: The Bible as Document and as Guide* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), pp. 217-232, quotation p. 224.
29. In Germany this discussion began in the last few years, among others in the journal *Kirche und Israel* since 1991.