A NEW PERSPECTIVE ON RASHI OF TROYES IN LIGHT OF BRUNO THE CARTHUSIAN: EXPLORING JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN BIBLE INTERPRETATION IN ELEVENTH-CENTURY NORTHERN FRANCE

Mordechai Z. Cohen[*]

Abstract: Departing from the norm in eleventh-century Ashkenazic learning, Rashi advanced *peshat* (plain sense) interpretation as a yardstick to evaluate midrashic readings of scripture. While he drew upon Jewish sources such as the ancient Aramaic Targums and the lexicographic works of the tenth-century Andalusian linguists Menaham ben Saruq and Dunash Ibn Labrat, important aspects of Rashi's exegesis are best understood in light of contemporaneous Christian interpretation, especially as manifested in the Psalms commentary of Bruno, master at the Rheims cathedral school. Following the model of Remigius of Auxerre, Bruno developed a grammatical method of analyzing King David's words as classical grammarians had glossed Virgil, a standard by which Bruno critically selected patristic interpretations that best reflect David's prophetic intentions, which he naturally assumed to be Christological. Rashi developed similar analytic criteria, perhaps through his training as a glossator of the Talmud in the Rhineland rabbinic academies. It is conceivable that he was aware of Bruno's grammatically sophisticated method and that this could have spurred Rashi to devise an analogous one to bolster a traditional Jewish understanding of scripture.

Key words: Rashi, Bruno the Carthusian, eleventh century, *grammatica*, *peshat*, midrash, literal sense, mystical sense, *allegoria*, Bible, Holy Spirit.

Rashi (Rabbi Solomon Yiṣhaki, 1040–1105) was the most influential Jewish Bible commentator of all time. Born in Troyes in the Champagne district of France, Rashi travelled c. 1060 to study in the Rhineland, then the intellectual center of the Ashkenazic (Franco-German) Jewish world.[1] He first studied at Mainz with R. Jacob ben Yaqar (c. 990–1064), a key disciple of the seminal talmudic master Rabbenu ("our Rabbi, Master") Gershom, "Luminary of the Diaspora" (c. 960–1028), founder of the Mainz academy.[2] R. Jacob, renowned for his remarkable piety and humility, was credited by Rashi as the most formative influence on his scholarship, analytic abilities, and religious persona.[3] After R. Jacob's death, Rashi continued at the Mainz academy, then headed by R. Isaac ben Judah (c. 1010–c. 1090), who played a key role in consolidating Rabbenu Gershom's talmudic interpretations.[4] A year or two later, Rashi transferred to the more recently established Worms academy to study under R. Isaac ben Eliezer ha-Levi (c. 1000–c. 1080), a disciple of Rabbenu Gershom who was also deeply involved

---

[1] See Avraham Grossman, *Rashi*, trans. Joel A. Linsider (Oxford 2012) 12–19.

[2] See Avraham Grossman, *The Early Sages of France* (Hebrew; Jerusalem 1995) 126, disputing the earlier view that Rashi first studied with R. Jacob in Worms. On R. Gershom, see Avraham Grossman, *The Early Sages of Ashkenaz: Their lives, leadership and works (900-1096)* (Hebrew; Jerusalem 1981) 106–174.

[3] See Grossman, *France* (n. 2 above) 127–128; idem, *Ashkenaz* (n. 2 above) 233–257.

[4] See Grossman, *France* (n. 2 above) 128; idem, *Ashkenaz* (n. 2 above) 298–321. See also below, n. 6.

in communal affairs as the spiritual leader of the Worms community—a model Rashi would later emulate in Troyes.[5]

Rabbinic literature, chiefly the Babylonian Talmud—a work created and composed in the renowned academies of Sura and Pumbedita and transmitted by rabbinic scholars there in the Muslim period known as geonim—was the primary subject of study in the Rhineland academies. An ambitious, wide-ranging Talmud commentary, based on the teachings of Rabbenu Gershom, was composed by his students and their students, with a notable role in this project played by Rashi's teacher R. Isaac ben Judah.[6] Whereas the direct successors of the geonim, R. Hananel ben Hushiel (990–1053) and R. Isaac Alfasi (1013–1103), working in North Africa and al-Andalus (Muslim Spain), penned commentaries that summarized and abridged the Talmud, the followers of Rabbenu Gershom in the Rhineland labored to elucidate its often enigmatic text completely in the first comprehensive set of line-by-line commentary-glosses on the Talmud.[7] The revolutionary aim of their exegetical project was to "grasp… [the Talmudic text] in its entirety," powered by a presumption that its "every nook and cranny… had to be illuminated; every thought and interpretation, however briefly entertained… had to be understood in all its detail."[8] Educated in this intellectual workshop, Rashi returned to Troyes c. 1070 as an accomplished talmudist. Always acknowledging the importance of his education in Rhineland, Rashi continued to correspond with his teachers there from Troyes, as illustrated by a series of twelve queries Rashi sent to R. Isaac ben Judah on Talmud exegesis.[9] He also returned to Worms at least once (c. 1075) to visit R. Isaac ben Eliezer.[10]

Yet Rashi forged his own path both as an intellectual pioneer and communal leader.[11] In matters of Talmud interpretation and *halakhah* (Jewish law), he boldly disagreed at times with his Rhineland teachers. In fact, he records that, at one meeting during his return visit to Worms, R. Isaac ben Eliezer conceded that Rashi was correct in a halakhic matter the two had debated.[12] Most importantly, the Troyes master composed his own monumental line-by-line commentary on virtually the entire Talmud, which distilled and refined the best features of the commentaries produced by the school of Rabbenu Gershom. In fact, the Rhineland commentaries were largely lost (now surviving on only a few tractates), as they were eclipsed by Rashi's, which became a standard accompaniment of the talmudic text unrivaled until the modern period.[13] Rashi's Troyes academy would draw the best and brightest students from France and even Germany, among whom would be the leading Ashkenazic talmudic scholars of the twelfth century and founders of the Tosafist movement.[14]

The Troyes master also pioneered a new discipline in the Ashkenazic world: departing from the older rabbinic midrashic modes of reading scripture still dominant in

---

[5] See Grossman, *France* (n. 2 above) 128–129; idem, *Ashkenaz* (n. 2 above) 266–292.

[6] See Haym Soloveitchik, *Collected Essays II* (Oxford 2014) 42–43, 50; Grossman, *Ashkenaz* (n. 2 above) 316–318.

[7] See Israel M. Ta-Shma, *Talmudic Commentary in Europe and North Africa, Part I: 1000-1200* (Hebrew; Jerusalem 1999) 35–40.

[8] Soloveitchik, *Collected Essays II* (n. 6 above) 159, 63.

[9] Ibid. 50.

[10] See Grossman, *France* (n. 2 above) 129.

[11] Ibid. 25–27, 149–158, 289–296.

[12] Ibid. 129.

[13] See Grossman, *Rashi* (n. 1 above) 133–148; Ta-Shma, *Talmudic Commentary* (n. 7 above) 36–56; Soloveitchik, *Collected Essays II* (n. 6 above) 32–35, 62–64.

[14] See Grossman, *France* (n. 2 above) 166–174. See also Ephraim Kanarfogel, *The Intellectual History and Rabbinic Culture of Medieval Ashkenaz* (Detroit 2013) 1–35.

his Franco-German intellectual milieu, Rashi developed a distinctive brand of *peshat*, i.e., plain-sense Bible exegesis, refined by his students Joseph Qara (1055–1125) and Rashbam (1080–1160; Rashi's grandson).[15] Whereas Rashi's Talmud commentary often employs phraseology acknowledging Rhineland interpretive traditions, his Bible commentary is suffused with the expression "I say," highlighting his own interpretive voice, in which he critically evaluates, and offers *peshat* alternatives to, traditional midrashic interpretations.[16] Rashi manifested interest in biblical grammar and philology unprecedented in Ashkenazic circles. For this purpose, he drew upon the works of the tenth-century Andalusian Hebraists Menahem ben Saruq and Dunash Ibn Labrat,[17] the ancient Aramaic Targums (Bible translations), and medieval Jewish Old French glosses known as *le'azim* (sing. *la'az*).[18] Yet Rashi's novel exegetical program went beyond philological analysis of individual words. Aiming to account for the sequence and arrangement of the biblical text, Rashi exhibited interest in its literary dimensions and the ancient historical events its narrative conveys.[19] Rashi's commentary quickly spread throughout the Ashkenazic world, though its penetration among Jews in Muslim lands would be more gradual.[20] Even within the Christian world, in which the literal-historical sense was increasingly privileged in the High and Late Middle Ages, Rashi became an important exegetical resource. His commentaries are cited by Nicholas of Lyra (d.

---

[15] See Avraham Grossman, "The School of Literal Jewish Exegesis in Northern France," *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation* (henceforth: *HBOT*), vol. I/2, *The Middle Ages*, ed. Magne Sæbø, Menahem Haran and Chris Brekelmans (Göttingen 2000) 321–371. As a working definition, the term *peshat* is perhaps best rendered *the plain sense* or *plain sense exegesis* (see below, n. 80), though the correspondence is not exact, and key *pashtanim* (practitioners of *peshat*) devised different conceptions of *peshat*. See Mordechai Z. Cohen, "Emergence of the Rule of *Peshat* in Jewish Bible Exegesis," *Interpreting Scriptures in Judaism, Christianity and Islam: Overlapping Inquiries*, ed. Mordechai Z. Cohen and Adele Berlin (Cambridge, UK 2016) 204–223. The common translation of *peshat* as *the literal sense*, while workable in many cases, is problematic because *peshat* readings are at times figurative, in accordance with contextual factors. See, e.g., below, n. 77. The term *mashma'*, on the other hand, can be said to connote *the literal sense*, and Rashi does at times acknowledge its correlation with *peshat*. See below, n. 103. Midrash or *derash*, which characterizes virtually all rabbinic exegesis, connotes a reading that departs from the plain sense or *peshat*. Working with the assumption that the biblical text is written as a sort of cipher that hints to its hidden "true" meaning, midrashic exegesis often violates the rules of grammar and philology, as well as historical-scientific sensibility, all of which guide *peshat* exegesis. See below, nn. 81, 82, and David Weiss-Halivni, *Peshat & Derash* (New York 1991).

[16] Benjamin Gelles, *Peshat and Derash in the Exegesis of Rashi* (Leiden 1981) 13–14. See also below, at n. 59.

[17] See Joseph Pereira-Mendoza, *Rashi As Philologist* (Manchester 1940); Menahem Zohory, *Grammarians and Their Writings in Rashi's Commentaries* (Hebrew; Jerusalem 1994).

[18] On Rashi's use of the Targums, see Eran Viezel, "Targum Onkelos in Rashi's Exegetical Consciousness," *Review of Rabbinic Judaism* 15 (2012) 1–19. On the Old French glosses, see Menahem Banitt, "*Les Poterim*," *Revue des Etudes Juives* 125 (1966) 21–33; Kirsten Fudeman, *Vernacular Voices: Language and Identity in Medieval French Jewish Communities* (Philadelphia 2010) 103–104; Hanna Liss, *Creating Fictional Worlds: Peshaṭ-Exegesis and Narrativity in Rashbam's Commentary on the Torah* (Leiden 2011) 21–22. There were also Old French glosses on the Talmud. See Louis Brandin, *Les gloses françaises (Loazim) de Gerschom de Metz* (Paris 1902).

[19] These aspects of Rashi's commentary will be discussed at length below.

[20] See Grossman, *Rashi* (n. 1 above) 42–49. See also Avraham Gross, "Spanish Jewry and Rashi's Commentary on the Pentateuch" (Hebrew), *Rashi Studies*, ed. Z. A. Steinfeld (Ramat Gan 1993) 27–56; Eric Lawee, "The Reception of Rashi's *Commentary on the Torah* in Spain: The Case of Adam's Mating with the Animals," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 97 (2007) 33–66.

1349),[21] were evidently utilized by Andrew of St. Victor (c. 1110–1175)[22] and Herbert of Bosham (1120–1194),[23] and may have even been known to Hugh of St. Victor (c. 1096–1141).[24]

Given the enormous influence Rashi's Bible commentaries would exert, it is natural that scholarship has largely viewed his accomplishments in light of the subsequent development of the concept of *peshat*—and, in parallel, the "literal sense" in Christian interpretation. The aim of this study, on the other hand, is to explore Rashi within his eleventh-century intellectual setting, taking into consideration developments within Latin learning and Bible interpretation just prior to what has been termed "the twelfth-century Renaissance." The argument it puts forth is that a comparative study of Rashi and contemporaneous trends in Christian interpretation—as represented by Bruno of Cologne (c. 1030–1101), master at the cathedral school of Rheims (just under 70 miles from Troyes) from the mid-1050s until c. 1080 (after which he would go on to found the Carthusian order and become best known to later generations as Bruno the Carthusian)[25]—can offer a fresh account of Rashi's innovative *peshat* model by revealing common features of how Jews and Christians in the second half of the eleventh century in northern France developed new strategies of reading sacred scripture.

Beryl Smalley's influential work, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, highlights the twelfth-century school of St. Victor, which Smalley cast as a pivotal turning point in Christian exegesis that led to the triumph of literal sense exegesis. Scholars of Jewish interpretation, in turn, built upon Smalley's work, together with other studies of what has been termed "the twelfth-century Renaissance," to explain the origins and nature of Rashi's *peshat* revolution.[26] This would seem to be a classic case of what Stephen Jaeger terms "the logic of looking for something where there is light even when you have lost it in the dark."[27] Rashi lived in the eleventh century, not the twelfth—and it is thus questionable to illuminate his work by comparison with the

---

[21] See Deanna Klepper, *The Insight of Unbelievers: Nicholas of Lyra and Christian Readings of Jewish Texts in the Later Middle Ages* (Philadelphia 2007); Herman Hailperin, *Rashi and the Christian Scholars* (Pittsburgh 1963). For an overview of medieval Christian exegetes who drew upon Jewish sources, see Gilbert Dahan, *Les intellectuels chrétiens et les juifs au Moyen Age* (Paris 1990) 289–322; idem, "La connaissance de l'exégèse juive par les chrétiens du XIIe au XIVe siècle," *Rashi et la culture juive en France du Nord au moyen âge*, ed. Gilbert Dahan, Gérard Nahon, and Elie Nicolas (Paris 1997) 343–359.

[22] See Frans van Liere, "Andrew of St. Victor, Jerome, and the Jews: Biblical Scholarship in the Twelfth-Century Renaissance," *Scripture and Pluralism: Reading the Bible in the Religiously Plural Worlds of the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, ed. Thomas J. Heffernan and Thomas E. Burman (Leiden 2005) 59–75; Montse Leyra, "Joseph Qara and the 'in hebreo' interpretations in Hugh and Andrew of St. Victor's commentaries on Genesis, Judges and 1-2 Samuel" *La Revue des études juives* 174 (2015) 111–143; Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. 3rd edition (Notre Dame 1983) 149–156; Ineke van 't Spijker, "The Literal and the Spiritual: Richard of Saint-Victor and the Multiple Meaning of Scripture," *The multiple meaning of scripture the role of exegesis in early-Christian and medieval culture*, ed. Ineke van 't Spijker (Leiden 2009) 225–247.

[23] See Deborah Goodwin, *Take Hold of the Robe of a Jew: Herbert of Bosham's Christian Hebraism* (Leiden 2006); Beryl Smalley, "A Commentary on the Hebraica by Herbert of Bosham," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiéval* 18 (1951) 29–65; Eva de Visscher, *Reading the Rabbis: Christian Hebraism in the Works of Herbert of Bosham* (Boston 2014).

[24] See Smalley, *Study of the Bible* (n. 22 above) 102–105, 364–366; Hailperin, *Rashi and the Christian Scholars* (n. 22 above) 105–110; Leyra, "Hebreo" (n. 22 above). Cf. Rivka Basch, "*Peshuto shel miqra* and *Sensus litteralis*: A Comparative Examination of Jewish and Christian Interpretations in the Twelfth Century," MA Thesis (Hebrew), Baltimore Hebrew University, 2003.

[25] See below, n. 48.

[26] This will be discussed at length below.

[27] C. Stephen Jaeger, *The Envy of Angels: Cathedral Schools and Social Ideals in Medieval Europe, 950-1200* (Philadelphia 1994) 1.

school of St Victor. Smalley's "grand narrative" of the triumph of the literal sense has also been challenged in recent scholarship, which charts a more gradual and nuanced picture of its increasing valuation in the High and Late Middle Ages.[28] Furthermore, the very notion of the "renaissance" of the twelfth century has been questioned in recent scholarship, which emphasizes the continuous vitality of Latin learning in the tenth and eleventh centuries.[29]

Despite the relative paucity of the literary output of the cathedral schools of the eleventh century (a subject of Jaeger's monograph, *The Envy of Angels*), it would seem that Bible interpretation played an important role in their courses of study. It is to this period that we can trace the roots of the *Glossa Ordinaria*, for which Anselm of Laon (d. 1117), master of the cathedral school of Laon from c. 1080, "the founding figure" of the scholastic exegetical tradition,[30] seems to have been largely responsible. Assembled after Anselm's death largely by his students and based on his teachings, the *Gloss* signals a new mode of learning, presenting discrete patristic and medieval interpretations of individual verses of scripture in a readily accessible, easily referenced way.[31] Though the *Gloss* was produced in the twelfth century, it reflects the exegetical activity of Anselm and probably also that of his teachers.[32] As Cédric Giraud notes in his recent monograph, the search for the influences on Master Anselm proves elusive. A tradition that Anselm studied at the abbey of Bec under Anselm of Bec (1033–1109, later archbishop of Canterbury) and under the inspiration of Lanfranc of Bec (1005/10–1089), proves to have little basis.[33] Evidence is likewise lacking for the theory that Anselm of Laon was a student of Manegold of Lautenbach (1030–1103).[34] Giraud concludes that Anselm, in fact, studied in the 1070s at Rheims under Bruno.[35]

This exercise has yielded the prominent names of Christian interpreters in Rashi's time and geographic vicinity: Lanfranc of Bec, Anselm of Canterbury, Manegold of Lautenbach (believed to have worked in the Rhineland), and Bruno the Carthusian. For the first three of these figures we do not have Bible commentaries that can readily be compared with Rashi's.[36] Bruno, however, composed a commentary on the Psalms—

---

[28] See Alastair Minnis, "Figuring the Letter: Making Sense of *Sensus litteralis* in Late-Medieval Christian Exegesis," *Interpreting Scriptures in Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (n. 15 above) 159–182.

[29] See C. Stephen Jaeger, "Pessimism in the Twelfth-Century 'Renaissance.'" *Speculum* 78.4 (2003) 1151–1183, and, more broadly, Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable, *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, Mass. 1982).

[30] Cédric Giraud, *Per verba magistri: Anselme de Laon et son école au XIIe siècle* (Turnhout 2010) 8.

[31] For recent scholarship on the *Gloss*, see Lesley Smith, *The Glossa Ordinaria: The Making of a Medieval Bible Commentary* (Leiden 2009). For a critique of that work, see Alexander Andrée, "Laon Revisited: Master Anselm and the Creation of a Theological School in the Twelfth Century," *Journal of Medieval Latin* 22 (2012) 257–281.

[32] See Gillian R. Evans, *The Language and Logic of the Bible: The Earlier Middle Ages* (Cambridge UK 1984) 38.

[33] Giraud, *Per Verba Magistri* (n. 30 above) 40–42.

[34] Ibid. 42–47.

[35] Ibid. 47–49 (n. 30 above) citing John R. Williams, "The Cathedral School of Rheims in the Eleventh Century" *Speculum* 29 (1954) 669. See also André, "Laon Revisited" (n. 31 above) 260.

[36] Lanfranc composed a commentary on the Pauline Epistles that draws substantially upon the arts of the *trivium*, especially dialectic and rhetoric. See Margaret Gibson, "Lanfranc's Commentary on the Pauline Epistles," *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 22 (1971) 86–112; Ann Ryan Collins, *Teacher in Faith: and Virtue Lanfranc of Bec's Commentary on Saint Paul* (Leiden 2007), and below, n. 143. (A doubt about the attribution of the commentary has been raised; see Hartmut Hoffmann, *Die Würzburger Paulinenkommentare der Ottonenzeit* (Hanover 2009).) But it is difficult to compare that commentary with those of Rashi on the Hebrew Bible. Some believe that Lanfranc composed a Psalms commentary, but it is not known to have survived. See Collins, *Teacher in Faith*, 25. Anselm of Canterbury seems to have devoted attention to

"the book of the Old Testament most beloved by patristic and medieval exegetes" because it was understood "as a guide to the Christian life and as a prophecy of Christ and his church."[37] The commentary survives in a single manuscript, from La Grande Chartreuse, now Grenoble, Bibliothèque municipale, 341 (240), copied in the first third of the twelfth century.[38] Yet the interpretive method it embodies occupies a pivotal place in a tradition of Christian interpretation that linked the study of the liberal arts and the Bible.[39] Andrew Kraebel and Constant Mews have shown that Bruno applied a grammatical-literary approach in his interpretation of the Psalms, using methods typically applied to pagan poetry, in *enarratio poetarum* (interpreting, lit. "narrating out," the poets).[40] In doing so, Bruno refined a trend that can be traced to Remigius of Auxerre (d. 908), Carolingian-era master at Rheims expert in *grammatica* and its application to Bible exegesis, whose teachings remained influential there well into the eleventh century.[41] Bruno's methods, in turn, influenced the later Bible commentators Roscellinus of Compiegne (d. c. 1125), John of Rheims (d. c. 1125), Gilbertus Universalis (d. 1134)—and perhaps Anselm of Laon.[42]

---

questions of interpretive theory; but he did not write commentaries per se. See Jean Châtillon, "Sainte Anselm et l'ecrtiture," *Les Mutations Socio-Culturelles Au Tournant Des Xie-Xiie Siècles*, ed. Raymonde Foreville (Paris 1984) 431–442; Jean Leclercq, "Monastic Commentary on Biblical and Ecclesiastical Literature from Late Antiquity to the Twelfth Century," trans. A.B. Kraebel, *The Medieval Journal* 2:2 (2012) 41–42; Eileen C. Sweeney, *Anselm of Canterbury and the Desire for the Word* (Washington DC 2012) 175–181; Evans, *Language and Logic* (n. 32 above) 17–24. (A similar observation can be made about Anselm's younger colleague Gilbert Crispin; see Evans, *Language and Logic*, 25–26. See also Anna Sapir Abulafia and G. R. Evans, *The works of Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster* (London 1986) xxxiii–xxxv.) On the controversies surrounding the Bible commentaries attributed to Manegold (in any event mostly not extant), see Robert Ziomkowski, *Manegold of Lautenbach: Liber Contra Wolfelmum* (Paris 2002).

[37] Marcia L. Colish, "*Psalterium Scholasticorum*: Peter Lombard and the Emergence of Scholastic Psalms Exegesis," *Speculum* 67 (1992) 531. Bruno also composed a commentary on the Pauline Epistles. See Ian Christopher Levy, "Bruno the Carthusian: theology and reform in his commentary on the Pauline Epistles," *Analecta cartusiana 300*, ed. James Hogg, Alain Girard, and Daniel Le Blévec (Salzburg 2013) 5–61 and below, n. 143.

[38] The commentary was published in 1611 and reprinted in PL 152. Though its attribution to Bruno was questioned in the 1950s, his authorship has been reconfirmed by recent scholarship. See Williams, "Cathedral School" (n. 35) 668; A. B. Kraebel, "*Grammatica* and the authenticity of the Psalms-commentary attributed to Bruno the Carthusian," *Mediaeval Studies* 71 (2009) 63–97; Constant Mews, "Bruno of Reims and the Evolution of Scholastic Culture in Northern France, 1050–1100," *Bruno the Carthusian and His Mortuary Roll: Studies, Text, and Translations*, ed. Hartmut Beyer, Gabriela Signori, and Sita Steckel (Turnhout 2014) 52; Levy, "Bruno on the Pauline Epistles" (n. 37 above) 13–16 (also addressing questions raised regarding the authenticity of the commentary on the Pauline Epistles). Bruno's commentaries on Psalms 119–133 (Psalms 120–134 in the Masoretic text) have been translated into French by Pascal Pradié, *Le commentaire des Psaumes des montées: une échelle de vie intérieure* (Paris 2006). The entire Psalms commentary has just been translated into French. See *Commentaire des Psaumes attribué à saint Bruno*, trans. André Aniorté (Le Barroux 2017).

[39] On that tradition in Western Christian learning, see Rita Copeland and I. Sluiter, *Medieval Grammar and Rhetoric: Language Arts and Literary Theory, AD 300–1475* (Oxford 2009).

[40] See A. B. Kraebel, "The place of allegory in the Psalter-commentary of Bruno the Carthusian," *Mediaeval Studies* 73 (2011) 207–216; idem, "Prophecy and poetry in the Psalms-commentaries of St. Bruno and the pre-scholastics," *Sacris Erudiri* 50 (2011) 413–459; idem, "*Grammatica*" (n. 38 above); Mews, "Scholastic Culture" (n. 38 above). On *enarratio poetarum*, see below, n. 130.

[41] See A. B. Kraebel, "Poetry and Commentary in the Medieval School of Rheims: Reading Virgil, Reading David," *Interpreting Scriptures in Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (n. 15 above) 227–248. See also Mews, "Scholastic Culture" (n. 38 above) 56.

[42] See Williams, "Cathedral School" (n. 35 above) 668–669; A. B. Kraebel, "John of Rheims and the Psalter Commentary attributed to Ivo II of Chartres," *Revue bénédictine* 122 (2012) 252–293; idem, "*Grammatica*" (n. 38 above) 84–85; Constant Mews, "Bruno of Reims and Roscelin of Compiègne on the Psalms," *Latin Culture in the Eleventh Century*, ed. Michael Herren et al. (Turnhout 2002) 129–152; Levy,

Bruno represents an important moment in eleventh-century Latin learning—heralding a trend to critically evaluate the interpretations of the Church Fathers based upon the philological and literary sensibilities fostered by the study of classical grammar and rhetoric. As Constant Mews remarks:

> Bruno was heir to the renewal of classical learning promoted in late tenth-century Reims…. While only a single copy is known today of his commentary on the Psalms… the work was innovative in its approach… At Reims, Bruno had access to the great commentaries on both the liberal arts and on the Bible by predecessors like Remigius of Auxerre, who came to Reims… in the late ninth century. Bruno was able to tap into that tradition, and take it into a new direction. Bruno's commentary may not have been widely copied, but it did have an influence on certain teachers of the next generation….[43]

Furthermore,

> …the originality of Bruno's commentary is evident when it is compared to that of another Bruno, bishop of Wurzburg (1005–45). This latter commentary provides relevant extracts from the Fathers on the Psalms (in particular Cassiodorus, Augustine and Jerome), in an essentially derivative compilation, derived from a Carolingian pattern. Bruno's commentary is based on a similar range of sources, but provides sustained argument in favour of a historical reading of the Psalms, often rejecting the allegorical interpretations of particular passages proposed by Augustine. Bruno certainly followed the core teaching of these patristic authors that the Psalms illuminated Christian teaching, but interprets them in such a way as to emphasize their 'literal' sense and the meaning of individual words.[44]

Bruno's tendency to utilize his grammatical expertise to critically evaluate patristic interpretive traditions bears a striking resemblance to Rashi's pioneering exegetical program that likewise invokes grammar, philology, and literary sequence—key elements of what he termed "the *peshat* of scripture" (*peshuto shel miqra*)—to critically evaluate midrashic interpretive traditions.

There is also a striking biographic parallel between Bruno and Rashi. Initially educated in his native Cologne, Bruno's thought was shaped within a still vibrant Carolingian intellectual milieu that combined Christian and classical ideals under imperial patronage.[45] He moved to Rheims in the late 1040s—just under the age of 20—likely attracted by the strong tradition of classical learning in the cathedral school there, especially in grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic.[46] Bruno would ultimately reinvigorate learning at the Rheims cathedral, achieving renown as a teacher of the liberal arts and the Psalms.[47] Like Bruno, Rashi left a vibrant intellectual center in Germany—the Rhineland talmudic academies where he studied in the 1060s—to stake his intellectual career in France, with his school at Troyes ultimately rivaling the academies of Mainz and Worms (which were also devastated during the First Crusade). It is not implausible that Rashi's bold *peshat* program, which directly engages the biblical text, reflects an

---

"Bruno on the Pauline Epistles" (n. 37 above) 14 (citing Smalley). Regarding Bruno's possible influence on Anselm, see above, n. 35 and Mews, "Scholastic Culture" (n. 38 above) 80.

[43] Mews, "Scholastic Culture" (n. 38 above) 79.

[44] Ibid. 71.

[45] Ibid. 52–53.

[46] Ibid. 53–57.

[47] See the discussion below of Bruno's mortuary roll.

endeavor, whether conscious or unconscious, to advance a unique and novel agenda in his Troyes academy, differentiating it from the more established Rhineland academies.

There are, of course, significant differences between the two scholars. Achieving scholarly renown, Bruno reanimated learning within the well-established cathedral school at Rheims, which was already centuries old by his time; but it was Rashi who put the Troyes academy on the intellectual map of Ashkenazic Jewry, transforming the small Jewish community into a great center of rabbinic learning. Until his death, Rashi remained active as a master and communal leader in Troyes and would exert enormous influence in subsequent Jewish tradition. Bruno, on the other hand, departed from Rheims (after a dispute with Archbishop Manassas I) in 1080 or 1081 to live as a hermit, initially in the forest of Colan. By 1084 he had moved to La Grande Chartreuse, where he established the Carthusian order of cloistered monastics. He was summoned to Rome in 1090 by his former student Pope Urban II (1088–1099) to become archbishop of Reggio in Calabria. Bruno declined the invitation and instead established a hermitage at La Torre, where he stayed until his death in 1101.[48] It seems that Bruno's withdrawal from academic life as a cathedral master limited the direct influence he exerted upon later Latin learning. Unlike Rashi within Jewish tradition, Bruno's name did not feature widely in the canon of authorities for Christian Bible interpreters in later centuries, as would the name of Anselm of Laon, for example.[49]

Yet in his own time Bruno seems to have achieved deep and broad renown as a teacher of the liberal arts and interpreter of the Psalms. When he died, monks from his hermitage in Calabria travelled widely in Western Europe to collect testimonies about Bruno. The resulting mortuary roll features nearly 180 eulogy entries from religious communities throughout northern France, Italy, Germany, and England attesting to his reputation as a great teacher.[50] We must, of course, allow for exaggeration within this celebratory genre.[51] Yet Bruno is recalled vividly as "the teacher of many grammarians," "learned psalmist, most clear and sophistic" who "embodied the knowledge and prudence of the liberal arts… [and was the] supreme teacher of the Church of Rheims, most clear in the Psalter and in other sciences."[52] Even though Bruno's Psalms commentary does not seem to have been copied much, and he is best known in later tradition as founder of the Carthusian order, rather than a Bible interpreter, these descriptions suggest that during his lifetime Bruno's teachings on the Psalms informed by grammatical learning made an impact upon his many devoted students.

Capitalizing on the clearer picture of Bruno's interpretive work and its place within Christian learning that recent scholarship offers, this study will advance the following three inter-related arguments regarding Rashi within his eleventh-century Latin intellectual milieu:

1. There are significant methodological parallels between Rashi and Bruno.
2. These parallels raise the possibility that Rashi was influenced (consciously or unconsciously) by Bruno.

---

[48] See Levy, "Bruno on the Pauline Epistles" (n. 37 above) 5; Mews, "Scholastic Culture" (n. 38 above) 49, 60–62.

[49] See Mews, "Scholastic Culture" (n. 38 above) 79–81.

[50] An annotated edition of the mortuary roll with English and German is now available. See Hartmut Beyer, Gabriela Signori, and Sita Steckel, eds., *Bruno the Carthusian and His Mortuary Roll: Studies, Text, and Translations* (Turnhout 2014).

[51] See Sita Steckel, "*Doctor Doctorum*: Changing concepts of 'teaching' in the mortuary roll of Bruno the Carthusian (d. 1101)," *Bruno and His Mortuary Roll*, ed. Beyer, Signori, and Steckel (n. 50 above) 88–89.

[52] See Steckel, "*Doctor Doctorum*" (n. 51 above) 89–116; Mews, "Scholastic Culture" (n. 38 above) 50–51; Williams, "Cathedral School" (n. 35 above) 667–668; Kraebel, *Grammatica* (n. 38 above) 66–68.

3. Independent of the question of influence, an understanding of the distinctive strategy of reading Bruno applied to the Psalms and the dynamic it represents in Christian tradition sheds valuable new light on Rashi's interpretive aims in his novel exegetical program.

A few words are in order about the relationship among these three arguments. The first is based on an empirical comparative investigation of interpretive methods, as we demonstrate that Rashi and Bruno adopted similar strategies toward the biblical text that relate analogously to earlier Jewish and Christian commentary, respectively. The second, by contrast, entails a more speculative historical investigation, as there is no evidence that Rashi knew of Bruno. But this possibility should not be discounted. The latter's influence seems to have extended to Troyes and its environs, as suggested by three entries in his 1101 mortuary roll.[53] Rashi's writings reveal a degree of familiarity with Christian interpretation (as discussed below), and there is evidence that he conversed with Christians about the Bible. It is not historically impossible for Rashi to have met the master of Rheims himself (especially since both travelled between northern France and the Rhineland); but Rashi could have also learned of his interpretations from one of Bruno's students. The third argument would seem to be most meaningful if one posits that Rashi was, in fact, aware of Bruno's interpretive strategies. Yet, as we shall see, this investigation is actually independently valuable, as a clearer understanding of contemporaneous Latin Bible exegesis, particularly at the school of Rheims, in any case provides insight into Rashi's distinctive interpretive objectives, by contrast with those manifested in other Jewish exegetical schools. Even without assuming that Rashi knew of Bruno, the comparison of their respective strategies of reading reveals shared assumptions underlying the Jewish and Christian encounters with scripture as part of the prevailing *Zeitgeist* in eleventh-century northern France.

1. RASHI'S *PESHAT* PROGRAM

Important building blocks of Rashi's Bible exegesis were undoubtedly acquired during his years in the Rhineland. The Aramaic Targums were a standard accompaniment to the Bible in rabbinic circles and would have been part of the curriculum at Mainz and Worms. It is conceivable that Rashi first encountered the linguistic works of Menahem and Dunash in the Rhineland, where international trade brought literature from the far ends of the Jewish world in the tenth and eleventh centuries.[54] Avraham Grossman has gathered a number of examples of philological interpretations of specific biblical expressions by R. Jacob ben Yaqar and other eleventh-century Rhineland scholars recorded by Rashi.[55] Yet there is no evidence that these isolated interpretations were part of an exegetical program comparable to Rashi's ambitious Bible commentary project.

Rashi's Bible exegesis is distinguished by the attention he pays to methodological criteria, regularly invoking the maxim that "a biblical verse does not leave the realm of

---

[53] One entry is from Saint-Pierre Cathedral of Troyes, another from the nearby Benedictine monastery at Montier la-Celle, and a third from the nearby Benedictine monastery Saint-Pierre at Montiéramey. See *Bruno and His Mortuary Roll* (n. 50 above) 171–172.

[54] See Soloveitchik, *Collected Essays II* (n. 6 above) 127–141.

[55] See Grossman, *France* (n. 2 above) 462–466. Grossman's argument that these interpretations represent a trend in the Rhineland academies to interpret the Bible philologically—and thus can be considered a precedent for Rashi's *peshat* project—is questionable. See David Berger, "Study of the Early Ashkenazic Rabbinate" (Hebrew), *Tarbiz* 53 (1984) 484, n. 7.

its *peshat*."[56] The maxim itself is talmudic; however, it is actually quite marginal in rabbinic literature, cited only three times in the entire Talmud, and rabbinic exegesis, as a rule, is midrashic.[57] Rashi, on the other hand, made "the *peshat* of scripture" the touchstone of his exegetical method.[58] The Troyes master invests his comments about the *peshat* with personal urgency, in prefaces such as "…but I have come to say," "…but I wish to explain," "…but I wish to say" that differentiate his interpretations from midrashic ones.[59]

We can illustrate Rashi's *peshat* program with the following examples, each of which represents another paradigm within his commentary.[60]

(i) In a small but noticeable number of instances, Rashi will state his own adherence to "the *peshat* of scripture," and either explicitly or implicitly exclude the midrash. For example, Rashi makes a point of differentiating his *peshat* interpretation from what was an evidently well-known midrashic one in his gloss on the word *lahaṭ* in Gen 3:24 ("So [the Lord] drove out the man; and He placed at the east of the Garden of Eden Cherubim and the *lahaṭ* of the sword turning itself to guard the way of the tree of life"):

> *The sword turning itself*—and it had a *lahaṭ* to threaten him [i.e., Adam] so as not to enter the Garden again. The Aramaic Targum of *lahaṭ* is *shenan* (blade)… and in *la'az* (the vernacular, i.e., Old French): *lame* [blade]. And there are aggadic *midrashim*, but I relate only (lit. have come only for) the *peshat* of [scripture] (*li-peshuto*).[61]

---

[56] See Sarah Kamin, *Rashi's Exegetical Categorization in Respect to the Distinction Between Peshat and Derash* (Hebrew; Jerusalem 1986) 122–130; Gelles, *Rashi* (n. 16 above) 9–12.

[57] See BT (=Babylonian Talmud) *Shabbat* 63a, *Yevamot* 11b, 24a. See also Weiss-Halivni (n. 15 above) 52–79.

[58] See Kamin, *Categorization* (n. 56 above) 57–59.

[59] See Gelles, *Rashi* (n. 16 above) 13.

[60] The problematic state of the text of Rashi's Bible commentaries in the standard printed editions, e.g., in the Rabbinic Bible (*Miqra'ot Gedolot*), is an issue discussed at length in modern scholarship. We mention the relevant points on this matter here only briefly. Manuscript evidence indicates that the text of Rashi's commentaries published in the Rabbinic Bible, especially his supremely influential Pentateuch commentary, had been altered, primarily by additions that were introduced into the original work. A major advance was made by Abraham Berliner, who published a critical edition of Rashi's Pentateuch commentary (*Raschi: der Kommentar des Salomo B. Isak über den Pentateuch*, ed. A. Berliner, 2d ed. (Frankfurt A/M 1905) based on manuscripts and on the 1475 Reggio di Calabria printed edition, the earliest dated printed text of the commentary, which enabled Berliner to identify many later interpolations. But the endeavor to accurately isolate the original text penned by Rashi is particularly challenging because there are no extant autographs and the earliest manuscripts of his commentaries date from the second third of the thirteenth century, over one hundred years after his death. In a provocative study published in 1987, Eleazar Touitou argued that the *majority* of the printed text of Rashi's Pentateuch commentary, even in Berliner's edition, is not the work of the master himself, but rather consists of interpolated commentaries by Rashi's students and by scribes already in the twelfth century. (See Eleazar Touitou, "Concerning the Presumed Original Version of Rashi's Commentary on the Pentateuch" [Hebrew] *Tarbiz* 56 (1987) 211–242.) Touitou's radical theory, however, was challenged by Avraham Grossman, largely on the basis of evidence from MS Leipzig Universitätsbibliothek B.H. 1, which contains Rashi's commentaries on the Pentateuch and other sections of the Bible read in the synagogue. This manuscript was transcribed by a certain Makhir in the thirteenth century—but Makhir attests the he copied a manuscript penned by Rashi's own scribe Shemaiah. Grossman thus argues that MS Leipzig 1 can reasonably be regarded as a close replica of Rashi's original commentary. Yet even this manuscript is not free of revisions, as Makhir notes at times that he is including Shemaiah's additions and corrections, though some were made at Rashi's request. For further details on this subject, see Grossman, *Rashi* (n. 1 above) 75–78. Citations from Rashi's Pentateuch commentary are cited in this study based on Berliner's edition, checked against MS Leipzig 1. His commentaries on other biblical books are based on critical editions where available, as indicated in the notes below.

[61] Berliner ed., 9. For a detailed analysis of this passage, see Kamin, *Categorization* (n. 56 above) 75–77.

Rendering *lahaṭ* as *blade* (and thus "the blade of the sword" in Gen 3:24), Rashi diverges from its midrashic construal as *a flame* ("a flaming sword") based on the parallel to Ps 104:4, "His ministers are a fire that burns (*lohet*)."[62] That ancient midrashic tradition is attested also in the Vulgate: *et conlocavit ante paradisum… flammeum gladium* ("and He placed before the paradise… a flaming sword"). In both rabbinic and patristic tradition, this was a miraculous flaming sword; but Rashi's reading renders it in a naturalistic, mundane way, a common characteristic of *peshat* by contrast with midrash. Rashi supports his *peshat* reading through philological analysis, based on the Aramaic Targum, for which he provides an Old French equivalent.[63] This sort of example illustrates Rashi's commitment to "the *peshat* of scripture" most forcefully.[64]

(ii) In a paradigm only slightly different, Rashi sometimes actually cites the midrashic interpretation he disqualifies. This is illustrated in his commentary on Exod 6:1–9, a passage that follows Moses' initial failed confrontation with Pharaoh, in which God recounts to Moses "I appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as El Shaddai, but by my name YHWH I was not known to them. I also established my covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan…" (vv. 2–4), after which God reacts to the current situation: "And I have also heard the groaning of the children of Israel, whom the Egyptians keep in bondage; and I have remembered my covenant" (v. 5). After offering his interpretation, Rashi records a midrashic reading that construes God's words in vv. 2–4 as a rebuke to Moses for questioning his mission (Exod 5:22) and for asking God His name (Exod 3:13). The forefathers, on the other hand, had perfect faith: they never questioned God's covenant "to give them the land of Canaan," even though they always remained "strangers" there (v. 4); nor did they ever ask God His name, even when He identified himself to them simply as "God Almighty" (El Shaddai; v. 3). Rashi registers the following objection: "But this midrashic exposition does not settle well on (lit. is not settled after) the verse for several reasons."[65] He notes, firstly, that it does not correspond to the language of the biblical text: "[scripture] does not say 'They did not ask me My name,'" rather, God is recorded as saying "by my name YHWH I was not known to them."[66] Furthermore, the midrashic reading takes the verses out of their literary context; as Rashi remarks: "How does the juxtaposition follow (*ha-semikhah nismekhet*) in the words with which he continues?"[67] In other words, vv. 2–4 would seem to serve as a preface to report that He now "remembers" (v. 5), which, in turn, prompts Him to send Moses to free Israel from bondage in Egypt and bring them to the Promised Land (vv. 6–9). Having cited these exegetical considerations, Rashi concludes:

---

[62] *Genesis Rabbah* §21.

[63] Menahem Banitt argues that when Rashi offers *la'az*, he intends to negate an earlier Old French rendering. It is thus conceivable that a previous Old French rendering here followed the midrashic reading or even the Vulgate, thought by some scholars to have been the basis for Jewish vernacular glosses. See Menahem Banitt, *Rashi, Interpreter of the Biblical Letter* (Tel-Aviv 1985) 6–7. On Christian vernacular glosses on the Bible, see Paolo Vaciago, *Glossae Biblicae* (Turnhout 2004). On the Old French language as an intellectual "meeting ground" between Jewish and Christian scholars, see below at n. 209.

[64] For other examples, see, Gelles, *Rashi* (n. 16 above) 9–14, including, most famously, Rashi's programmatic statement on Gen 3:8, cited below. See also Rashi on Ps 51:7, cited below at n. 258.

[65] Comm. on Exod 6:9, Berliner ed., 112. On Rashi's frequently used expression "to settle (on, after) the (language of the) verse" to connote a fitting interpretation, see below, nn. 100, 101, 102.

[66] Comm. on Exod 6:9, Berliner ed., 112.

[67] Ibid.

Let the verse (*miqra*) be settled according to its *peshat* (*peshuto*), though the midrashic reading can be expounded as such (*ha-derashah tiddaresh*).[68]

For Rashi, this verse can be "settled," i.e., interpreted philologically within its context, only "according to its *peshat*."[69] By this standard, the midrashic reading is excluded, though Rashi allows for its legitimacy *qua* midrash.[70]

(iii) At times Rashi's commentary includes both his own *peshat* interpretation and the midrashic interpretation—which he does not disqualify. Distinctive of this paradigm, which Sarah Kamin has dubbed "the double commentary," is Rashi's use of methodological labels ("this is its *peshat*" [*zehu peshuto*] and/or "this is its *derash*" [*zehu midrasho*]) to distinguish between the two methods that he juxtaposed in his commentary.[71] A fine example of this paradigm is Rashi's commentary on the "covenant between the parts" (*berit bein ha-betarim*) recounted in Genesis 15, in which Abraham was told by God to gather three animals (a heifer, a goat and a ram) and two birds (a turtledove and a pigeon). Abraham then cut the animals in half to confirm his covenant with God. To explain this curious ritual, Rashi cites the typological midrashic interpretation according to which the animals symbolize the animal sacrifices that Israel would later offer to God in the Temple, or, alternatively, to prophetically foretell how various nations will oppress Israel but will ultimately be destroyed ("cut to pieces"), whereas Israel herself (represented by the undivided birds) will survive eternally.[72] Yet Rashi also remarks:

But the biblical verse does not leave the realm of its *peshat*. Since God was making a covenant with him to keep His promise to give the land to his progeny, as it says, "On that day the Lord made a covenant with Abraham saying" and so on (Gen 15:18), and the manner of those who made covenants in biblical times was to split an animal and to pass between its parts, as it says further in scripture: "[the people of the land,] who passed between the parts of the calf" (Jer 34:19). So too here: "A smoking oven and a flaming torch which passed between those pieces" (Gen 15:17)—that was the agent of the divine presence, which is fire.[73]

Invoking the talmudic *peshat* maxim, Rashi elucidates "the *peshat* of scripture" by accounting for these events within their historical context, citing Jer 34:19 as evidence that the cutting of animals was a normal way of making a covenant in biblical times. *Peshat* here entails a historical sensibility found later in twelfth-century literal sense exegesis and even more so in Lyra's in the thirteenth.[74]

---

[68] Ibid. For a detailed study of Rashi's commentary on this passage, see Baruch Schwartz, "Rashi's Commentary on Exodus 6:1–9: Reconsideration" (Hebrew), *To Settle the Plain Sense of Scripture*, ed. Sara Japhet and Eran Viezel (Jerusalem 2010) 100–112.

[69] For other examples of this paradigm, see Rashi on Gen 33:20; Exod 11:4, 23:2, 33:13; Ps 16:7 (cited below, at n. 257).

[70] On this evaluation of midrash within Rashi's system, see Gelles, *Rashi* (n. 16 above) 66, 141.

[71] See Kamin, *Categorization* (n. 56 above) 158–208. See also Amnon Shapira, "Rashi's Twofold Interpretations (*Peshuto and midrasho*): A Dualistic Approach?" (Hebrew), *The Bible in Light of Its Interpreters: Sarah Kamin Memorial Volume* (Jerusalem 1994) 287–311.

[72] See Rashi on Gen 15:10, Berliner ed., 27, drawing upon *Pirqe de-Rabbi Eliezer* §27.

[73] Rashi on Gen 15:10, Berliner ed., 27.

[74] See Michael Signer, "Vision and history: Nicholas of Lyra on the prophet Ezechiel," *Nicholas of Lyra; the Senses of Scripture*, ed. Philip D.W. Krey and Lesley Smith (Leiden 2000) 147–171. For other examples of this *peshat-derash* paradigm in Rashi, see the references in n. 71 above, and Gelles, *Rashi* (n. 16 above) 20–26.

Another useful example is Rashi's gloss on a verse in the episode in Genesis telling of the victory of Abraham and his servants over the "four kings," which features the bizarre locution "the night was divided upon them" (Gen 14:15). This slavishly literal, almost mechanical, word-for word rendering of the locution is the basis of a midrashic comment that Rashi cites:

> The aggadic midrash expounds that the night was divided: during its first half a miracle was done for him, and the second half was saved for the midnight of the Exodus in Egypt.[75]

This midrash is typical, looking beyond the story at hand to seek "instruction" about God's future intervention in Israel's history.[76] It uses the strict word-for-word literal reading in order to discover an allusion in this story to an unrelated biblical episode—making a connection that highlights the miraculous nature of both.

But Rashi proposes a different solution of his own that integrates this locution into the remainder of the verse ("…he and his servants, and they struck them and pursued them"):

> According to its *peshat*, you must invert the order of the verse (*sares ha-miqra*): "He and his servants divided themselves upon them at night," as is the manner of those who pursue… enemies fleeing in different directions.[77]

Positing the syntactic flexibility of the Bible's language, Rashi understands that it is grammatically legitimate to rearrange or "invert" this verse and thus posit that "he and his servants" (and not "the night") is the subject of the verb *divided*, with *night* being an adverb (i.e., at night). To explain why Abraham's forces "divided," i.e., split in different directions, Rashi cites "the manner of those who pursue"—a common battle practice he would have known from his own time. Instead of relating this verse to divine miraculous interventions in other epochs, the *peshat* reading views the event in mundane terms in its ancient historical context. The notion of an "inverted verse" (*miqra mesoras*) appears already in rabbinic literature. But Rashi uses this strategy in a new way within the framework of his systematic endeavor to explicate "the *peshat* of scripture," which includes accounting for its literary sequence, elsewhere termed *seder ha-miqra'ot* ("the sequence of the verses") or *seder ha-devarim* ("the sequence of the words").[78]

A reasonably clear demarcation between the methods of *peshat* (i.e., ascertaining *peshuto shel miqra*) and *derash(ah)* (i.e., midrashic interpretation) emerges from Rashi's commentaries that follow these three paradigms. Though much ink has been spilled in modern scholarship on differentiating between these two hermeneutical categories, for the purpose of the current study we need not arrive at a universally applicable definition, but rather, we must aim to understand how Rashi defined the

---

[75] Rashi on Gen 14:15, Berliner ed., 26. Rashi's midrashic source is *Genesis Rabbah* §42.

[76] See below at n. 82.

[77] Rashi on Gen 14:15, Berliner ed., 26. This is a good example of the *peshat* interpretation being opposed to a strictly literal midrashic one. See above, n. 15.

[78] For Rashi's use of the term *miqra mesoras*, see, e.g., his commentaries on Lev 1:15, I Kgs 7:18 (note especially his locution "the sequence of the sense of the verse" [*seder mashma' ha-miqra*]), Ps 22:30. See also Esra Shereshevsky, "Inversions in Rashi's commentary ("*mikrah mesoras*")," *Gratz College Anniversary Volume; on the Occasion of the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the Founding of the College, 1895-1970*, ed. Isidore David Passow and Samuel Tobias Lachs (Philadelphia 1971) 263–268. The expression *seder ha-miqra'ot* and its significance in Rashi's exegetical program will be discussed below. See below, nn. 105, 109, 110.

dichotomy.[79] Sarah Kamin, in her study of Rashi, defines *peshat* as an interpretation of a biblical verse according to its language and syntactic structure, and in consideration of its literary context and genre.[80] James Kugel notes that midrashic interpretation, by contrast, is predicated on the assumption that the Bible is a cryptic document, the true meaning of which lies beneath the surface, and merely hinted at by the language of the text.[81] Midrashic interpretation also assumes that the Bible is not is not *essentially* a record of things that happened in the past but rather is a "Book of Instruction" that applies to present-day readers.[82] Rashi's intuitive application of this *peshat-derash* dichotomy is manifested in the three paradigms described above, in which the interpretations he labels *peshuto shel miqra* manifest historically sensitive philological-contextual analysis, whereas those labeled midrashic take interpretive liberties to highlight theological directives and themes.

(iv) It is therefore perplexing that the majority of Rashi's Bible commentaries overstep the bounds of what would seem to be his own definition of *peshuto shel miqra* and instead manifest the characteristics of what he himself defines elsewhere as midrash, in what we must identify as a fourth paradigm: interpretations given by Rashi without any methodological labels whatsoever that manifest features of what he elsewhere defines as midrash. For example, in an early Genesis episode regarding Abraham (when he was still referred to as Abram) we read of the capture of his nephew Lot, which prompts the following reaction on his uncle's part: "When Abram heard that his kinsman had been taken captive, he mustered his trained men, who numbered three hundred and eighteen, and went in pursuit as far as Dan" (Gen 14:14). Rashi's commentary on this verse does feature a philological analysis characteristic of his *peshat* program:

> "His trained men (*ḥanikhayw*)"—whom he trained to observe the commandments (*miṣwot*). The Hebrew root *ḥ-n-kh* means to initiate a person or utensil for the skill or function that he/it will have in the future. As in these verses: "Train (*ḥanokh*; i.e., initiate) the lad…" (Prov 22:6), "…initiation (*ḥanukkah*) of the altar" (Num 7:11), "…initiation (*ḥanukkah*) of the house" (Ps 30:1). In the vernacular (i.e., Old French): *enseigner* (lit. to instruct).[83]

Based on its other occurrences in Biblical Hebrew, Rashi determines that the root *ḥ-n-kh* means *to initiate a person or object*. He provides an equivalent term in Old French for the contextually indicated sense of this term here: *enseigner*. Hence, *ḥanikhayw* would mean *the ones he instructed or trained*. Given that Abram was a man of God, not a warrior, Rashi presumes that the "instruction" and "training" he imparted was to keep the divine commandments. But who were these "trained men"? To answer this question, Rashi relies on the Midrash:

---

[79] Indeed, one could argue that methodological flaws plague the endeavor to define these terms in a universal way, and that scholarly precision calls for their definition according to the different ways they are actually used by the various interpreters. See Mordechai Z. Cohen, *Opening the Gates of Interpretation: Maimonides' Biblical Hermeneutics in Light of His Geonic-Andalusian Heritage and Muslim Milieu* (Leiden 2011) 15–16; idem, "Emergence" (n. 15 above).

[80] Kamin, *Categorization* (n. 56 above) 14. This definition is often cited in subsequent scholarship.

[81] James L. Kugel, *The Bible as it Was* (Cambridge, MA 1997) 18.

[82] Ibid. 19–20. As Kugel notes, these midrashic assumptions are shared by early Christian interpretation of the Bible, which thus aims to uncover its "spiritual" (as opposed to "literal") sense. See below, sec. 2.

[83] Rashi on Gen 14:14, Berliner ed., 25–26. As Berliner notes, part of the text of Rashi's commentary appearing in the standard texts of the *Miqra'ot Gedolot* seems not to be original to Rashi, as it does not appear in the *editio princeps*. The translation here is based on the shorter text of the commentary attested in MS Leipzig 1 (see n. 60 above).

> "Three hundred and eighteen"—Our Rabbis said that it was Eliezer alone, whose name adds up to 318 in *gematria* (=numerical value of the letters).[84]

According to the literal sense of the text, Abram went to save Lot with a large force of three hundred and eighteen "trained men." Yet the Rabbis, cited by Rashi, take this number as a *gematria*, a numerological reference to none other than Eliezer, Abram's faithful servant (see Gen 15:2). In a strategy characteristic of Midrash, the Rabbis thus amplified the miraculous nature of his victory.

This interpretation was sharply rejected by Abraham Ibn Ezra (1089–1164), who epitomized the philologically-oriented Andalusian *peshat* school and took a dim view of *gematria*, as it opens the door to exegetical anarchy.[85] Rashi, it is true, did not rely exclusively upon *gematria*, to which he added a philological analysis of the Hebrew root *ḥ-n-kh*. Yet ultimately his reading of the verse is at odds with the *peshat* program of Ibn Ezra, for whom "three hundred and eighteen men" should be taken literally. Not surprisingly, Ibn Ezra elsewhere speaks in dismissive terms about Rashi's commitment to *peshat*: "Rabbi Solomon, of blessed memory, interpreted scripture by way of *derash*. He thought that it is by way of *peshat*, but the *peshat* in his book is less than one in a thousand."[86] Surprisingly, Rashi on Gen 14:14, in relying on *gematria*, seems to ignore his own strongly stated commitment to *peshat* elsewhere.

We can cite another example of this widespread paradigm in Rashi. Notwithstanding the historical *peshat* sensibilities he manifests at times, Rashi more frequently follows in the footsteps of the Rabbis, reading into scripture eternal messages for the Jewish people—especially his own downtrodden coreligionists in the diaspora of medieval Europe. For example, Psalm 42 would appear to be the lament of an ancient Israelite in exile, perhaps in Babylonia, grieving over his inability to visit the Holy Temple in Jerusalem—a joyful experience this psalm recalls. Indeed, this was the opinion of the eleventh-century Andalusian exegete Moses Ibn Chiquitilla, cited by Ibn Ezra.[87] For Rashi, however, the psalmist

> prophesied about the three kingdoms that will bring the worship in the Temple to an end: Babylonia, Greece and Rome. And Israel cries in anguish [suffering from all three], but will be rescued.[88]

A later verse in this psalm reads:

---

[84] Rashi on Gen 14:14, Berliner ed., 26. This midrashic tradition can be found in Genesis Rabbah §43. Every Hebrew letter has a numerical value. The use of these values for interpretive purposes is a common midrashic endeavor known as *gematria*.

[85] Ibn Ezra on Gen 14:14, A. Weiser ed. (Jerusalem 1977) 1.55. See Aharon Mondschein, "On the Attitude of R. Abraham Ibn Ezra to the Exegetical Use of the Hermeneutic Norm *Gematria*" (Hebrew), *Te'uda 8: Studies in the Works of Abraham Ibn Ezra*, ed. Israel Levin (Tel-Aviv 1992) 137–161. On Ibn Ezra's *peshat* method, see Uriel Simon, *The Ear Discerns Words: Studies in Ibn Ezra's Exegetical Methodology* (Hebrew; Ramat Gan 2013); Cohen, *Gates of Interpretation* (n. 79 above) 74–82; 365–375, both with further references.

[86] *Safah Berurah*, ed. M. Wilensky, *Devir* 2 (1924) 288. On this passage and on Ibn Ezra's implied critique of Rashi throughout his commentaries, see Aharon Mondschein, "'Only One in A Thousand of his Comments May Be Called *Peshat*': Toward Ibn Ezra's View of Rashi's Commentary to the Torah" (Hebrew), *Studies in Bible and Exegesis V: Presented to Uriel Simon*, ed. Moshe Garsiel et al (Ramat Gan 2000) 221–248.

[87] See Ibn Ezra on Ps 42:1.

[88] Rashi on Ps 42:3, ed. Mayer Gruber (Leiden 2004) 825. Rashi evidently drew this from a midrashic source no longer extant, or perhaps devised his own midrashically inspired reading. On this possibility, see Sarah Kamin, *Jews and Christians Interpret the Bible*, ed. Sara Japhet, 2d ed (Jerusalem 2008) 24.

> O my God, my soul is downcast: therefore I think of You in this land of Jordan and of Hermon, in Mount Mizar. Deep calls to deep in the roar of your waterspouts: all Your waves and billows have swept over me. By day the Lord vouchsafes His faithful care, and in the night a song to Him shall be with me, a prayer to the God of my life.
>   (Ps 42:7–9)

Ibn Ezra here manifests the historical and literary-contextual sensibilities typical of the Andalusian *peshat* approach and renders these verses a description the psalmist's recollections of his travels on pilgrimage through the countryside from northern Israel (Mount Hermon, down to the Jordan Valley), during which he and his fellow pilgrims would refresh themselves from the hot sun in the cool, deep streams ("waterspouts") that flow from the mountains.[89] Perhaps taking aim at Rashi who follows the midrashic approach and renders this psalm a collective lament by the "Congregation of Israel," Ibn Ezra adds a methodological critique of the typological reading:

> But one who interprets this verse about the matter of the exile disconnects it from the context (lit. what comes before and after it).[90]

Ibn Ezra, by contrast, goes on to say that v. 9 is the psalmist's joyous recollection of how the pilgrims traveled by day with the security of God's grace, and at night sang hymns of prayer.[91]

Rashi, on the other hand, adopts a midrashic agenda and reads these verses as a reflection of Israel's suffering in exile:

> Deep calls to deep—One calamity invites another, pouring suffering upon me like gushing water, and so "all Your waves and billows have swept over me"…
> By day may the Lord vouchsafe His faithful care—i.e., may the light of redemption arrive.
> And in the night – in the darkness of exile and suffering…[92]

For Rashi, the violent water imagery symbolizes calamities, the night exile and suffering, and the day redemption—all for the Jewish people in his time, far removed from the experiences of the ancient psalmist.

The question of how to reconcile Rashi's prevailingly midrashic exegetical practice with his stated *peshat* program is an old one. A venerable tradition of supercommentaries on Rashi's Pentateuch commentary diligently endeavored to show how each and every midrashic reading offered by the master of Troyes was motivated by compelling philological-literary considerations and is not simply a whimsical or gratuitous midrashic elaboration. Elijah Mizrahi (Constantinople, 1455–1526), author of the most celebrated of these works, commonly employs this strategy and remarks that Rashi's commentaries are therefore "close to the *peshat* of scripture."[93] In the twentieth

---

[89] See Ibn Ezra on Ps 42:8.

[90] Ibid.

[91] See Ibn Ezra on Ps 42:9. Ibn Ezra seems to refer to Rashi in his remark at the opening of this psalm: "Some say that [the psalmist] speaks in the name of the people of the current exile" (Ibn Ezra on Ps 42:1). On Ibn Ezra's implicit critique of Rashi throughout his commentaries, see Mondschein, "One in a Thousand" (n. 86).

[92] Rashi, comm. on Ps. 42:7–9, Gruber ed. (n. 88 above) 826. This midrashic style reading is not found in extant rabbinic literature, but may have been drawn by Rashi from earlier sources.

[93] Mizrahi's work is known simply as "the Mizrahi commentary." On that and other Rashi supercommentaries, as well as their methodology, see Nehama Leibowitz, "Rashi's Method in Bringing

century, this approach was refined by Nehama Leibowitz, who drew upon modern literary analytic methods to show that Rashi engages in what is now called "close reading," which—in Leibowitz's view—can be classified as *peshat*.[94] Yet this approach works in only some cases, whereas in others Rashi seems to exceed the boundaries of "the *peshat* of scripture"—as exemplified by the very interpretations that Rashi labels as such (paradigms i, ii, iii above), in which he offers historically sensitive, contextual-philological interpretations.[95]

Seeking to address this incongruity, Benjamin Gelles turned to a remark by Rashi on Gen 3:8, which seems to be a definitive programmatic statement:

> There are many midrashic *aggadot* and our Rabbis have already arranged them in their appropriate place in *Genesis Rabbah* and other *midrashim*. But I relate only the *peshat* of scripture and the *aggadah* [i.e., midrash] that settles the words of scripture, "each word in its proper place" (Prov 25:1).[96]

Based on a comprehensive analysis of his writings, Gelles concluded that Rashi employed the term *peshuto shel miqra* and the notion of "settling" the text (the Hebrew root *y-sh-b* in the *pi'el* form[97]) to connote historically sensitive, philological-contextual analysis of scripture. But since most of his interpretations are, in fact, midrashic, Gelles concluded that Rashi "had not yet reached the modern finality of evaluation which allocates to each sense a realm of its own."[98] Thus, "when Rashi composed his commentary on scripture he had not yet come to a clear recognition of *peshat* and *derash* as belonging to two unconnected realms of interpretation"[99]—an echo of Ibn Ezra's assessment.

Kamin, however, reopened this question and concluded that Rashi's notion of "settling" the text is not identical to his conception of *peshat*.[100] When Rashi promised to limit himself to (a) *peshuto shel miqra* and (b) the sort of *aggadah* that "settles" (or: "is settled upon/after") the language of scripture, he was actually speaking of two distinct interpretive categories that fulfill separate goals. The latter category is not identical to "the *peshat* of scripture," but rather represents a critical selection of midrashic interpretations that "settle," i.e., fit well with and explain, the language of scripture.[101] Rashi's criteria of "settling" scripture are looser than those of strict *peshat* exegesis, though they share some basic features:

Midrashim in his Commentary on the Torah" (Hebrew), *Iyyunim Ḥadashim be-Sefer Shemot* (Jerusalem 1975); English trans. in: Moshe Sokolow, *Nehama Leibowitz on Teaching Tanakh: Three Essays* (New York 1986).

[94] See Mordechai Z. Cohen, "Reproduction of the Text: Traditional Biblical Exegesis in Light of the Literary Theory of Ludwig Strauss," *The Torah U-Madda Journal* 17 (2015/6) 1–33.

[95] Rashi's philological-contextual sensibilities are manifested, e.g., in his *peshat* commentary (explicitly labeled as such), cited above at n. 61; for his historical sensibility, see above, at n. 73.

[96] Rashi on Gen 3:8, Berliner ed., 8. On this and similar programmatic statements in Rashi's exegesis, see Kamin, *Categorization* (n. 56 above) 57–110.

[97] Either with scripture as the direct object ("to settle the verse"), or indirect object prefaced by a preposition ("settled upon the verse," "settled after the verse"). See above n. 65 and below, nn. 105, 109, 110.

[98] Gelles, *Rashi* (n. 16 above) 33.

[99] Ibid. 42.

[100] See Kamin, *Categorization* (n. 56 above) 57–157.

[101] Ibid. 109–110. See also Kamin's review of Gelles' book in *Jews and Christians* (n. 88 above) lxxviii–lxxx. See also Sara Japhet, *Collected Studies in Bible Exegesis* (Hebrew; Jerusalem 2008) 26–27.

> The root "to settle" in its exegetical use by Rashi expresses a conception of sequence, mutual correspondence among the components of the commentary, and organization of the details on "their place" within the complete context. Rashi's intention, expressed in the term "to settle"… is the creation of a commentary that manifests internal unity and sequential coherence of its contents that corresponds to the language of scripture as a syntactic and contextual unit.[102]

According to Kamin, Rashi distinguished between *peshat* and *derash*, but never intended to limit himself to the former exegetical category. His goals were: (1) to preserve the integrity of "the *peshat* of scripture," and (2) to select midrashic interpretations that meet methodological criteria that are analogous—but not identical— to the criteria of *peshat* exegesis.

This dual goal is evident in Rashi's introduction to the Song of Songs, in which he carefully discusses the relationship between what he sees as the two layers of scriptural signification:

> "One thing God has spoken; two things have I heard" (Ps 62:12)—"One verse can have (lit. goes out to) a number of meanings" (BT [=Babylonian Talmud] *Sanhedrin* 34a), but in the end a biblical verse does not leave the realm of its literal sense (*mashma'*)[103]… Although the prophets uttered their words in allegory (*dugma*),[104] one must settle the allegorical meaning (*dugma*) on its basis and sequence, according to the sequence (*seder*) of the verses. Now I have seen many aggadic *midrashim* on this book... that are not settled upon the language of scripture, nor the sequence of the verses. I therefore decided to establish the literal sense (*mashma'*) of the verses, in order to settle their interpretation according to their sequence (*seder*), and the rabbinic *midrashim* I shall set, one by one, each in its place.[105]

Rashi boldly introduces what in his milieu was a revolutionary contextual-philological analysis of the literal love tale of the Song of Songs, termed here "its *mashma'* (literal sense)," and which he refers to elsewhere in this commentary as "its *peshat*" (*peshuto*).[106] To justify this endeavor, Rashi invokes two separate talmudic statements:

---

[102] Kamin, *Categorization* (n. 56 above) 109.

[103] Although the text in the standard printed edition of the Rabbinic Bible (*Miqra'ot Gedolot*) reads here "..the realm of its *peshat*," the text is cited here according to the two important manuscripts—MS Leipzig 1 (see above, n. 60) and MS Lutski 778 (see below, n. 105). Even so, this is clearly an adaption of the talmudic *peshat* maxim, "a biblical verse does not leave the realm of its *peshat*." The term *mashma'* is used by Rashi occasionally as an equivalent of the term *peshat* because of the overlap between the two hermeneutical markers, even though at times they are divergent, as Rashi's sense of *peshat* exegesis often calls for non-literal interpretation (see above, nn. 15, 77). Compare Rashi's commentaries on Gen 8:7; Lev 25:14 with his commentaries on Gen 24:10, 32:14. See also Gelles, *Rashi* (n. 16 above) 119–120; Viezel, "Onkelos in Rashi's consciousness" (n. 18 above) 6–7. In his Song of Songs commentary in particular, the terms seem to be used interchangeably, as Rashi at times refers to his interpretations of the literal love tale as "its *peshat* (*peshuto*)" and at other times "its *mashma'* (*mashma'o*)." See below, n. 106 and Kamin, *Categorization* (n. 56 above) 119–212.

[104] The term *dugma* (borrowed from Greek *deigma*) appears in rabbinic literature, where it connotes *a sample, example* or an *illustration by example*. Yet Rashi endows it with new meaning as a technical hermeneutical term to connote *the allegorical meaning of a text*—perhaps drawing upon the term *exemplum* as used in Latin interpretation. See Kamin, *Jews and Christians* (n. 88 above) 69–88.

[105] Rashi on the Song of Songs, Introduction, as attested in MS Luzki 778, Kamin and Saltman ed. (Ramat Gan 1989), 81 (Hebrew section). On MS Lutzki 778, see ibid., 37. For further discussion of this passage, including the textual variants, see Cohen, *Gates* (n. 79 above) 205; Kamin, *Categorization* (n. 56 above) 79–86, 123–124.

[106] See, e.g., his glosses on Song 1:2, 1:4, 2:2, 2:13 (cited below), 5:10. To be sure, the Rabbis of antiquity were aware of the literal sense of the individual words and verses that make up the Song of Songs—even though they interpreted it allegorically. See Tamar Kadari, "Rabbinic and Christian models of interaction on the Song of Songs," *Interaction between Judaism and Christianity in History, Religion, Art and Literature*,

"one verse can have a number of meanings"—supported by Ps 62:12, which teaches that God's word can teach "two things"—and the maxim that "a biblical verse does not leave the realm of its *peshat*."[107] Rashi accepts the midrashic allegorical reading as the essential meaning of the Song of Songs, reflecting the assumption of the Rabbis that the ultimate meaning of the biblical text is beneath the surface. But the talmudic dicta and the verse from Psalms enable Rashi to posit that scripture must be interpreted on two methodological planes: (a) in its plain sense, i.e., according to its *peshat/mashma'*; and (b) midrashically.

Drawing upon midrashic sources, Rashi interprets the Song of Songs as a national allegory reflecting the relationship between God (the lover) and Israel (the beloved).[108] However, in contrast to the midrashic works known to him, Rashi compiled a continuous and coherent commentary by selecting among midrashic interpretations those that are "settled" upon the language and sequence of the verses, as he expounds the text as a collection of love-songs in his analysis of "its *peshat/mashma'*." Using his literal sense, philological-contextual analysis (=*peshat/mashma'*) as a baseline upon which he constructs his midrashic reading, Rashi excludes from his commentary those "aggadic *midrashim*... that not settled upon the language of scripture, nor the sequence of the verses"—as stated in his introduction.[109] As he reiterates in his commentary on Song 2:7, in the following programmatic statement:

> There are many midrashic *aggadot* (homilies), and they are not settled upon the sequence of the words (*seder ha-devarim*), for I maintain that Solomon prophesied and spoke about the exodus from Egypt, the giving of the Torah, the construction of the Tabernacle, entry into the Land of Israel, the Temple, the Babylonian exile, the Second Temple and its destruction.[110]

Repeating the criterion of "sequence" mentioned in the introduction, Rashi maps out the chronology of his allegorical interpretation, which guides his selection of midrashic readings.[111]

2. CHRISTIAN "LITERAL SENSE" EXEGESIS IN COMPARISON TO PESHAT

---

ed. Marcel Poorthuis, Joshua Schwartz, Joseph Turner (Leiden 2009) 65–82. The truly innovative aspect of Rashi's treatment—discussed in this section and in section 5 below—is the close attention he pays to the human love story that, in his view, runs throughout the Song and makes up the *peshat* narrative that serves as a foundation for his allegorical reading.

[107] See Kamin, *Jews and Christians* (n. 88 above) xxxii.

[108] Ibid. 24.

[109] See also Rashi on Jer. 33:25 and Lam 4:6, where he disqualifies midrashic interpretations because they are "not settled upon (*meyushav 'al*) the sequence of the verses." See also Rashi on Zech 1:8.

[110] Rashi on the Song of Songs, Kamin and Saltman ed. (n. 105 above) 85.

[111] Notwithstanding Rashi's stated standards of midrashic selection in his Bible commentaries, scholars have noted that he at times adopts midrashic interpretations that seem to violate even the criteria of "settling" the biblical text and adhering to its sequence. See Grossman, "Literal Exegesis" (n. 15 above) 335–336; Jonathan Jacobs, "The Plain Meaning of the Text" (Hebrew), *Shnaton: An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 22 (2013) 264–267. It is beyond the scope of this study to address that problem in Rashi comprehensively. It should be stated, however, that Kamin's expansion of how Rashi framed his standards of midrashic selection greatly reduces the number of such "problematic" cases. In other words, while the vast majority of Rashi's commentaries exceed the narrow boundaries of "the *peshat* of scripture" (even as he defined it), most of those can be shown to adhere to the looser standard of "settling" the biblical text and adhering to its sequence, the exceptional cases notwithstanding.

As mentioned briefly above, there have been attempts in recent scholarship to explain Rashi's revolutionary turn to *peshat* in light of the increasingly privileged status of the *sensus litteralis* in medieval Christian interpretation. Eleazar Touitou, in a study published in 1982, followed by Kamin in a 1988 study, argued that Rashi's novel approach to Bible interpretation was inspired by this Christian trend, which would emerge more robustly during the "twelfth-century Renaissance."[112] Both Touitou and Kamin (whose views were accepted by scholars of Jewish interpretation) relied on Beryl Smalley's seminal *Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (published in 1941 and republished in several later editions until 1983). Developments in the study of the history of Christian interpretation over the last three decades, however, call for an adjustment of their theory.[113]

Smalley valorized the emerging interest in the literal sense of scripture in the school of St. Victor at Paris. She highlighted the work of Hugh of St. Victor, followed by his student Andrew, and the new value they placed on the *sensus litteralis* in their "scientific study" of the Bible historically and philologically,[114] beginning a process that reaches fuller definition in St. Thomas Aquinas (c. 1225–1274).[115] Prior Christian interpretation focused on the Bible's "spiritual senses," prompting medieval readers to "not look at the text, but through it."[116] "Spiritual exposition," as Smalley characterized it, "generally consists of pious meditations or religious teaching for which the text is used merely as a convenient starting-point."[117] Touitou and Kamin thus saw in Hugh a perfect parallel to the *peshat* revolution in Rashi's school, which departed from the "pious meditations" and "religious teachings" of midrash, which likewise uses "the text… merely as a convenient starting-point."

There is an obvious chronological problem with this theory: Rashi died in 1105, before Hugh was active. To be sure, neither Touitou nor Kamin posited a direct line of influence from Hugh to any particular Jewish interpreter, even, say, on Rashbam, which would be less problematic chronologically.[118] Their claim, rather, was that the

---

[112] Elazar Touitou, "*Shiṭato ha-Parshanit shel Rashbam ʿal Reqaʿ ha-Meṣiʾut ha-Hisṭorit shel Zemano*" (="The exegetical method of Rashbam in the context of the historical reality of his time"), *Studies In Rabbinic Literature, Bible and Jewish History [Dedicated to Professor Ezra Zion Melammed]*, ed. Y. D. Gilat, Ch. Levine, Z. M. Rabinowitz (Ramat Gan 1982) 48–74; Sarah Kamin, "Affinities Between Jewish and Christian Exegesis in 12th Century Northern France," *Proceedings of the World Congress of Jewish Studies 9, Panel Sessions: Bible Studies and Ancient Near East* (Jerusalem 1988) 141–155, reprinted in *Jews and Christians* (n. 88 above) xxi–xxxv. Citations below are from the reprinted version.

[113] Our aim in this section is to offer a very brief sketch of the distinction between the literal and spiritual senses of scripture in Christian Bible interpretation that will allow us to evaluate Rashi's *peshat* project and recent scholarly opinions about it. It is beyond the scope of this study to address Christian Bible interpretation in detail or comprehensively. Hence, we will mention—but not dwell upon—distinctions within the "spiritual sense" of scripture emphasized differently by various church fathers. See below, at nn. 120, 122.

[114] Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 3rd ed (Notre Dame 1983) 41, 83–106, 112–196. There has been much further research done on the Victorines. See Rainer Berndt, *André de Saint-Victor ([d.] 1175): exégète et théologien* (Paris 1991); Boyd Taylor Coolman, "*Pulchrum Esse*: The Beauty of Scripture, the Beauty of the Soul, and the Art of Exegesis in Hugh of St. Victor" *Traditio* 58 (2003) 175–200; Franklin T. Harkins, Fran van Liere, *Interpretation of Scripture: Theory: A Selection of Works of Hugh, Andrew, Richard and Godfrey of St Victor, and of Robert Melun* (Hyde Park, NY 2013).

[115] Smalley, *Study* (n. 114 above) 300–302. For more recent scholarship regarding Aquinas' view of the literal sense of scripture, see Jon Whitman, "The Literal Sense of Christian Scripture: Redefinition and Revolution," *Interpreting Scriptures in Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (n. 15 above) 140–150.

[116] Smalley, *Study* (n. 114 above) 2.

[117] Ibid.

[118] See Kamin, "Affinities" (n. 112 above) xxxiv; Touitou, "*Shitato ha-Parshanit*" (n. 112 above) 62. It is possible that Hugh could have influenced Rashbam (or vice versa), who is known to have spent some time in Paris (see his comm. on Gen 11:35), especially since his commentary seems to have been written late in his

intellectual environment of the "twelfth-century Renaissance" that fostered the new Christian interest in the literal sense was shared by Jewish interpreters. Yet the problem remains that the manifestation of this new interest in Christianity (Hugh) comes well after its manifestation in Judaism (Rashi).

Furthermore, Smalley's "grand narrative" of literal-sense exegesis in Christianity has been challenged. The distinction between the literal and "spiritual" (or "mystical") senses was a well-established one in Christianity, discussed at length by early Church Fathers such as Origen, Jerome, and Augustine.[119] To be sure, those authorities privileged the spiritual senses, which they subdivided further into more specific categories. Augustine, for example, highlighted *allegoria*, aiming to demonstrate how the Old Testament narrative foreshadows that of the New Testament.[120] The importance of the literal sense would be emphasized occasionally, for example, in Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Job*; but it was generally marginalized, with the preponderance of attention directed toward the spiritual sense.[121] Gregory himself adopted a three-fold pattern in which the literal-historical sense was a first step, leading to the allegorical sense, and ultimately to the third and highest level of understanding, the moral sense, which serves as a guide to the practice of a Christian life.[122] Latin Bible exegesis in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, as seen, e.g., in the writings of Hugh of St. Victor and Aquinas, continued to be dominated by the spiritual senses rather than the literal sense, a trend Smalley has been criticized for failing to acknowledge adequately.[123]

Alastair Minnis has argued that the growing Christian interest in the literal sense, albeit as a minor note, manifested itself largely in a renewed focus on the literary intentions of the human authors of scripture.[124] This conception was sharply formulated by Aquinas, for whom "the literal sense is that which the author intends,"[125] though it had been adumbrated by Hugh of St. Victor.[126] The emphasis on authorial intention put pressure on a long-existing tension between two attitudes: (i) the Bible is a *sui generis* divine work unlike secular literary works, which therefore requires a different mode of analysis that aims to uncover its recondite spiritual senses, as expounded by the Church

---

life, between 1150 and 1160. Itamar Kislev, "'Exegesis in Perpetual Motion': The Short Commentary of Ibn Ezra as a Source for Rashbam in his Commentary on the Pentateuch" (Hebrew), *Tarbiz* 79 (2010) 413–438. Smalley, *Study* (n. 114 above) 104, remarks that a conversation between the two exegetes, historically speaking, is not implausible.

[119] See J. N. B. Carleton Paget, "Christian Exegesis in the Alexandrian Tradition," *HBOT* volume I/1: Antiquity, ed. Magne Sæbø, Menahem Haran and Chris Brekelmans (Göttingen 1996) 521–526; David Wright, "Augustine: His Exegesis and Hermeneutics," *HBOT* I/1.704–707, 722–727.

[120] See Paula Fredrickson, "Allegory and Reading God's Book: Paul and Augustine on the Destiny of Israel," *Interpretation and Allegory: Antiquity to the Modern Period*, ed. Jon Whitman (Leiden 2000) 139–149.

[121] See Smalley, *Study* (n. 114 above) 33–35; Alastair Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes* (Philadelphia 2008) 37–38.

[122] See Stephan Ch. Kessler, "Gregory the Great: A Figure of Tradition and Transition in Church Exegesis," *HBOT* volume I/2, *The Middle Ages* (n. 16 above) 140–142 and below at n. 236.

[123] See Henri de Lubac, *Exégèse médiéval: les quatre sens de l'écriture* (Paris 1961) II/1.238–262, II/2.334–367. See also Franklin T. Harkins, *Reading and the Work of Restoration: History and Scripture in the Theology of Hugh of St. Victor* (Toronto 2009) 188–189; Minnis, "Figuring the Letter" (n. 28 above).

[124] This is the general argument made in Minnis, *Authorship* (n. 121). See also Judson B. Allen, *The Friar As Critic: Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages* (Nashville 1971). For a different view, see Ocker, Christopher. *Biblical Poetics Before Humanism and Reformation* (Cambridge, UK 2002).

[125] *Quia vero sensus litteralis est, quem auctor intendit* (*Summa theologiae* I.9). See Whitman, "Redefinition" (n. 115 above) 140–142.

[126] See Smalley, *Study* (n. 114 above) 101; Alastair Minnis and A.B. Scott, *Medieval Literary Theory and Criticism c.1100-c.1375: The Commentary Tradition*, 2nd ed (Oxford 1991) 67.

Fathers; (ii) the Bible is an essentially literary work, penned by human authors (divinely inspired, of course), and therefore subject to the sort of analysis typical of other literary works. The introduction of the Aristotelian conception of causality—specifically the notion of the "twofold efficient cause" (*duplex causa efficiens*)—into Latin learning in the thirteenth century helped diffuse this tension by allowing these two perspectives to co-exist. God was deemed the first *auctor* of the Bible, its "primary efficient cause," whereas its human authors were considered "instrumental efficient causes."[127] This allowed the medieval schoolmen to focus attention on the individual human *auctor* and his intended meaning, i.e., the "literal sense." The spiritual or "mystical" senses of scripture, on the other hand, were attributed to the Holy Spirit.[128] The implications of these distinctions would emerge in Aquinas' interpretive theory and practice, and would be more fully realized in the literal expositions of Nicholas of Lyra[129]—trends that post-date Rashi by one to two centuries.

3. BRUNO AND THE SCHOOL OF RHEIMS

To assess Rashi's *peshat* innovation in its broader non-Jewish intellectual context, of course, it is necessary to return to the eleventh century. The neat delineation of the roles of the Bible's human authors and the Holy Spirit, associated with the literal and spiritual senses, respectively, was the product of later Latin learning. But the use of the techniques of grammar and rhetoric—the language arts of Classical learning—had long played an integral role in Christian Bible interpretation and were thus a central part of the curriculum of the cathedral schools. Grammar, the first of the liberal arts, encompassed a range of reading skills and prominently included *enarratio poetarum*.[130] As the important Carolingian theologian and Bible interpreter Rabanus Maurus remarked, "grammar (*grammatica*) is the science of interpreting the poets" and it is "the origin and foundation of the liberal arts."[131] The language arts of grammar and rhetoric flourished anew in the eleventh century in the cathedral schools of northern France, a wave of learning in which Bruno participated.[132]

Arriving at Rheims in the 1040s, Bruno studied under Herimann (d. c. 1075), who was a distinguished teacher of grammar and rhetoric and seems to have brought renewed prominence to the Rheims cathedral school.[133] In Bruno's time, the scholarship of the

---

[127] Minnis, *Authorship* (n. 121 above) 79.

[128] Ibid. 81–85.

[129] Ibid. 86–90. See also Rita Copeland, "Rhetoric and the Politics of the Literal Sense in Medieval Literary Theory: Aquinas, Wyclif, and the Lollards," *Rhetoric and Hermeneutics in Our Time*, ed. Michael Hyde and Walter Jost (New Haven 1997) 335–357; Robert George Kennedy, *Thomas Aquinas and the Literal Sense of Sacred Scripture* (PhD dissertation, Notre Dame 1985); Klepper, *Insight of Unbelievers* (n. 21 above).

[130] See Martin Irvine, *The Making of Textual Culture: "Grammatica" and Literary Theory, 350-1100* (Cambridge, UK 2006) 1–22; Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*, ed. David E. Orton and R. Dean Anderson (Leiden 1997) 9–15; James J. Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance* (Berkeley 1974) 24–29, and below, n. 138.

[131] PL 107:395. English translation from Levy, "Bruno on the Pauline Epistles" (n. 37 above) 18–19. In Hebrew and Arabic, by contrast, the discipline of grammar proper—termed *diqduq/dayyaqut* and *al-naḥw*, respectively—was more sharply circumscribed and focused on phonology, morphology, and syntax. See David Tene, "Hebrew Linguistic Tradition," *Concise History of the Language Sciences, from the Sumerians to the Cognitivists*, ed. E.F.K. Koerner and R.E. Asher (Oxford 1995) 21–28; Jonathan Owens, *The Foundations of Grammar: An Introduction to Medieval Arabic Grammatical Theory* (Amsterdam 1988).

[132] See Margaret Gibson, "The *Artes* in the Eleventh Century," *Arts libéraux et philosophie au moyen âge* (Paris 1969) 121–126, 148–153 and above at n. 52.

[133] See Williams, "Cathedral School" (n. 35 above) 663–666; Levy, "Bruno on the Pauline Epistles" (n. 37 above) 6–7.

late Carolingian master Remigius also still exerted influence at Rheims, as evident from the copies of his writings produced there, and citations of his work by later authors in the city in the tenth and eleventh centuries.[134] Remigius had developed a new sort of "grammatical" analysis of the Psalms by drawing upon his expertise in the liberal arts. Hence, adopting a strategy sometimes required in commentary on classical poetry, Remigius would occasionally supply a more idiomatic order for the words of scripture, as he does, for example, on Ps. 17:42 (MT [=Masoretic Text] 18:42), "*They cried, but there was no one to save them, to the Lord.* The order of the words (*ordo verborum*) is: They cried to the Lord, but there was no one to save them."[135] This was the sort of grammatical commentary commonly applied to Virgil's *Aeneid* by the early fifth-century grammarian Servius,[136] whereas earlier patristic Bible commentaries focused instead on the spiritual sense of the Psalms rather than their poetic form.[137] Being well-versed in the commentaries on classical poetry, such as that of Virgil, Remigius himself wrote commentaries on the grammatical works of Donatus and on Martianus Capella's *On the Marriage of Philology and Mercury*. Commentary on the classical poets entailed a study of the language divided into small units, with a focus on grammatical forms, syntax, literal vs. figurative language, historical and geographic references, all typically prefaced by a biographical study of the author, as well as a general exposition of his intention and the subject matter of his book.[138] Notwithstanding the disparity between the Bible—with its recondite spiritual senses—and secular poetry, Remigius employed some of the same grammatical techniques of analysis to the Psalms that he used in glossing the classical poets.[139]

Bruno developed Remigius' grammatical interpretive method further,[140] and, in turn, trained students who penned their own Bible commentaries in the last third of the eleventh century.[141] These interpreters analyzed the Psalms as poems, treating their author, David, as a prophetic poet. Considering the Psalms as poetry allowed them to bring the analytical techniques taught in the arts curriculum, especially *grammatica*, to bear on their understanding of the biblical text.[142] In parallel, Bruno's commentaries on the Pauline Epistles, like those of Lanfranc of Bec, utilize principles from the discipline

---

[134] See Colette Jeudy, "L'œuvre de Remi d'Auxerre," *L'école carolingienne d'Auxerre: De Murethach à Remi, 830-908*, ed. Dominique Iogna-Prat et al. (Paris 1991) 373–396; Kraebel, "Poetry and Commentary" (n. 41 above).

[135] MS Rheims 132, f. 26rb: "*Clamauerunt, nec erat qui saluos faceret, ad Dominum.* Ordo uerborum est: Clamauerunt ad Dominum, nec erat qui faceret," cited in Kraebel, "Poetry and Commentary" (n. 41 above) 232. Rashi, in his commentary on the virtually identical verse, II Sam 18:42, writes similarly: "This is an inverted verse (*miqra mesoras*): 'they call out to God, and he does not answer them, and there is no savior.'" See n. 78 above and at n. 150 below.

[136] See Kraebel, "Poetry and Commentary" (n. 41 above) 232.

[137] Remigius' gloss on Ps 17:42 has no antecedent, e.g., in Cassiodorus's commentary here. See Cassiodorus, *Expositio in Psalterium* in *Magni Aurelii Cassiodori senatoris opera* (Turnholt 1958) 1.165.

[138] See Copeland and Sluiter, *Medieval Grammar* (n. 39 above) 125–147.

[139] See Kraebel, "*Grammatica*" (n. 38 above) 75.

[140] Bruno mentions Remigius by name in his commentary on Ps 47:8; but he borrowed from Remigius elsewhere without acknowledgement. See Kraebel, "*Grammatica*" (n. 38 above) 75–78; Mews, "Scholastic Culture" (n. 38 above) 72. See also Pradié, *Psaumes des Montées* (n. 38 above) 38–39.

[141] See above, at nn. 42, 43.

[142] Kraebel, "Prophecy and Poetry" (n. 40 above) 418–419; Mews, "Scholastic Culture" (n. 38 above) 71–76.

of rhetoric, derived principally from the works of Cicero and the pseudo-Ciceronian work *Ad Herennium*.[143]

To be sure, the Psalms had long been classified as poetry in Christian tradition. Cassiodorus (c. 485–c. 585) and Bede (672/3–735) cited biblical examples in their Psalms commentaries to illustrate the figures and tropes (metaphor, synecdoche, hendiadys, prolepsis, etc.) employed in classical poetry.[144] Yet the Psalms were a source of Christian inspiration for a separate reason: their "mystical," "spiritual" sense was assumed to be about Christ—his passion, resurrection, divinity, etc.—and the Psalms' Christological content was therefore the focus of patristic interpretation.[145] In any case, these two perspectives—the grammatical and the mystical—initially remained largely separate, and authors like Cassiodorus and Bede simply cited examples of poetic techniques in the Psalms as an ancillary part of their commentaries. As Kraebel has shown, it was Bruno who applied grammatical analysis in a more essential way—to discover King David's Christological intentions in the Psalms.[146]

The *ordo*-style gloss found in Remigius was applied more regularly by Bruno. For example, on Ps. 40:3 (MT 41:3), "May the Lord preserve him and give him life," Bruno remarks: "the order is backwards" (*praeposterus ordo*), as one must first be alive before one's life can be "preserved."[147] Occasionally, Bruno's concern for the logical sequence of the biblical text prompts him to apply this strategy more dramatically. Hence, in his gloss on Ps. 67:10 (MT 68:10), he effectively "rearranges" the five preceding verses:

> And all of this, beginning where it says *God in his holy place* (v.6), is the same (*aequipollens est*) as if it were said in this order (*ordo*): Therefore the people *will be troubled* (v.5), since *the heavens* (v. 9) will drop *rain* (v.10), by which *the earth* (v.9) will be moved, i.e., it will be troubled with a good disturbance, *when you will go forth in the face of your people* (v.8) and *you will pass through into the desert* (v.8). And then *you will lead out the bound* (v.7) and *those who dwell in tombs* (v.7), and thus *you will make them dwell in a house* (v.7).[148]

Adopting a strategy typically used by Servius in commenting on Latin poetry, Bruno employs the technical phrase *aequipollens est* (is the same as) to argue that entire sentences of this psalm—composed in poetic form—are out of their more proper prosaic order.[149] Bruno's interest in the syntactic arrangement of scripture as displayed in his *ordo* and *aequipollens* glosses finds a parallel in the exegetical concerns Rashi displayed in using the expression *miqra mesoras*.[150] The two eleventh-century northern French interpreters thus shared grammatical-style concerns for the syntactic arrangement of scripture, and developed similar commentarial strategies to arrive at a proper understanding of its logical sequence.

---

[143] See Levy, "Bruno on the Pauline Epistles" (n. 37 above) 19–26. As Levy notes, the application of the discipline of rhetoric to the analysis of the Pauline Epistles appears already in the Epistles commentaries of Lanfranc of Bec, believed to have been written c. 1055–1060, though they may have been written as early as 1042.

[144] See Copeland and Sluiter, *Medieval Grammar* (n. 39 above) 63–64; James L. Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History* (New Haven 1981) 164–167.

[145] See above, n. 37.

[146] See Kraebel, "*Grammatica*" (n. 38 above) 75; idem, "Prophecy and Poetry" (n. 40 above) 453.

[147] PL 152:810a. For similar examples, see PL 152:734d, 1196d, 1924c.

[148] PL 152, 954cd.

[149] See Kraebel, "Poetry and Commentary" (n. 41 above) 239. On the term *aequipollens* and its usage in late-eleventh-century Bible commentary and in the liberal arts curriculum, see Gibson, "Lanfranc's Commentary" (n. 36 above) 104–105 and 105 n. 1.

[150] See n. 78 above.

A traditional Christian distinction among three senses of scripture—as enumerated, for example, by Gregory the Great—informs Bruno's Bible commentaries in general, as he differentiates among the literal/historical, the allegorical, and the moral senses.[151] In his commentary on the eight-fold alphabetic acrostic Psalm 118 (MT 119), Bruno associates the alphabet, being rudimentary for children's education, with the literal sense, which is a foundation for the moral instruction (*moralis instructio*) that leads to "blessedness" (*beatitudinem*), the topic of this psalm.[152] Bruno offers a conventional definition of allegory in his commentary on Gal 4:24: "some other understanding than what the literal sense here conveys" (*per allegoriam, id est per alium intellectum quam sit litteralis hic habendum*).[153]

Bruno highlights the distinction between the literal/historical and allegorical/mystical senses in his commentary on Psalm 77 (MT 78), which recounts the history of Israel, from the exodus from Egypt to the sojourn in the desert to the selection of Zion as God's holy place. Bruno begins by explaining the title, "A Psalm of understanding for Asaph":

> Of understanding (*intellectus*)… —in which a mystical understanding is contained…
> Asaph—[a teaching] by the perfectly faithful Synagogue [i.e., the Church] to Asaph, [i.e.,] the [synagogue of the Jews, which is] less perfect in faith.[154]

The heading *intellectus* indicates that this psalm has a "mystical" or spiritual sense distinct from its surface meaning—a point already made by Jerome and Augustine, and reiterated by Remigius in their commentaries on this verse.[155] Elaborating on this foundation, Bruno places a great deal of emphasis on the next lines of this psalm:

> Attend, O my people, to my law: incline your ears to the words of my mouth. I will open my mouth in parables: I will utter propositions from the beginning. (Ps 77:1–2 [MT 78:1–2])

---

[151] See PL 153:126c, 393c; Levy, "Bruno on the Pauline Epistles" (n. 37 above) 24. On Gregory, see above, n. 122.

[152] PL 152:1258B.

[153] PL 153:306D. Translation from Levy, "Bruno on the Pauline Epistles" (n. 37 above) 24.

[154] PL 152:1029D–1030A. The interpretation of Asaph as "synagogue" was common in the patristic tradition upon which Bruno relied. Cassiodorus writes: "Asaph in Hebrew means 'synagogue,' or in Latin *collection*, a gathering" (*Expositio in Psalterium* (n. 137 above) 709; Walsh translation (New York 1990) 2.250). Cassiodorus, in turn, probably relied on Jerome or Augustine. Jerome writes "Asaf – congregans" (*Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum*, ed. Paul de Lagarde (Turnhout 1959) 118). Compare Augustine's similar remark in his commentary on Ps 72:1. Although Asaph is a proper name, the Hebrew root *'-s-f (asaf)* means "to gather" and can thus be construed as "synagogue" (i.e., a congregation, assembly, a "gathering" of people).

[155] Jerome comments on the similar heading of Psalm 73 (MT 74): "The title '*intellectus*' is designated beforehand, because a twofold captivity follows, i.e., literal (carnal) and spiritual" (*Ideo intellectus in titulo praenotatur, quia duplex captivitas sequitur, et carnalis videlicet et spiritalis*; *Commentarioli in Psalmos* ed. Paul de Lagarde (Turnhout 1959) 217). Augustine remarks similarly on the heading of our psalm: "For it is not without reason inscribed, 'Understanding of Asaph': but it is perchance because these words require a reader who does perceive not the voice which the surface utters, but some inward sense" (comm. on Ps 77:1 [MT 78:1], *St. Augustine: Exposition on the Book of Psalms*, trans. A. Cleveland Coxe (Edinburgh 1886) 730). Compare with the gloss of Remigius on this title: "*Sane quod in titulo intellectus praemittitur, innuitur omnia quae iuxta historiam narrantur spiritualiter esse intellegenda*" ("Indeed, that which is announced in the title '*intellectus*' indicates that everything that is narrated historically must be understood spiritually"; MS Rheims 132, folio 127va, cited in Kraebel, "Place of Allegory" (n. 40 above) 211n.). Cassiodorus does not interpret the heading *intellectus* in this vein.

On these lines, he remarks:

> Narrating the former benefits God bestowed upon their fathers in ancient times, the beginning of this psalm adjur[es] the same less perfect Asaph that he attentively and diligently hear the things which are said to him in "parables" and "propositions," i.e., that he understand those benefits mystically, not so much according to the letter, as their incredulous fathers did, who neglected them and, understanding only the letter, perished. Therefore he narrates those benefits to teach them history, in so far as these things happened to an earlier people, and to teach them in figures, in so far as these things likewise come to pass in the Church.[156]

For Bruno, the opening lines of this psalm reveal that it is to be interpreted mystically and not only literally. The basic distinction Bruno makes here between the mystical and literal ("according to the letter") understanding of the history of ancient Israel was, of course, standard in Christian interpretation.[157]

Bruno, however, goes on to make a telling remark about the precise relationship between the two ways of reading the psalm:

> [A]lthough this psalm, which is to be read continuously for its history (*continuatim juxta historiam*), contains within it an allegory (*allegoriam*), it does not everywhere contain an allegory that can be read continuously (*juxta allegoriam continuatim*)… [T]his psalm, like the rest [of the Psalms], contains prophecy, although not when it is read historically (*ad historiam*).[158]

Only the literal reading yields a coherent, "continuous" narrative, whereas the allegorical reading is discontinuous and can be read into the text of the psalm only sporadically.[159] Tellingly, there is no precedent in Bruno's sources for this distinction.[160]

Bruno follows through on this prefatory remark throughout his commentary on this psalm, in a way that departs from earlier Christian commentaries from which he drew, e.g., those of Augustine, Cassiodorus, and Remigius. This long psalm, comprised of 72 verses, recounts the history of Israel—beginning with the exodus from Egypt and the sojourn in the desert—the details of which were traditionally interpreted allegorically. Bruno certainly highlights this allegorical dimension; but he shows greater respect than his predecessors did for the literal-historical sense. For example, the last phrase of v.12, "Wonderful things did He do in the sight of their fathers, in the land of Egypt, in the field of Tanis" was interpreted thus by Cassiodorus (who adapted a similar comment by Augustine on this verse):

> The expression *in the field of Tanis* is not idle, for Tanis means a humble instruction, which Christ when on earth is known to have taught when he said: *Learn of me, for I am meek and humble of heart, and your will find rest for your souls* (Matt 11:29).[161]

---

[156] PL 152:1030A.

[157] See above, nn. 151, 155.

[158] PL 152:1030A–B.

[159] Kraebel, "Place of Allegory" (n. 40 above) 212. It is worth considering Rashi's parallel concern with the sequence of the biblical narrative in his introduction to the Song of Songs (above at n. 105).

[160] Kraebel, "Place of Allegory" (n. 40 above) 211.

[161] Cassiodorus, *Expositio in Psalterium* (n. 137 above) 713–714; Walsh trans. (n. 154 above) 2.256. Augustine writes similarly: "'The plain of Thanis' is the smooth surface of lowly commandment. For lowly commandment is the interpretation of Thanis. In this world, therefore, let us receive the commandment of humility" (*Enarrationes in Psalmos*, ed. Eligius Dekkers (Turnholti 1956) 1078; Coxe trans. (n. 155 above) 739). This interpretation of Tanis seems to be taken from Jerome's *Liber interpretationis hebraicorum nominum* (*Book of the interpretation of Hebrew names*). See Walsh, *Cassiodorus* (n. 154 above) 2.487 n. 35.

This interpretation is given by Bruno as well.[162] However, he first gives a full historical interpretation of this verse within the context of a contiguous literal reading of vv. 9–13, which he takes to be a single literary unit. It is only upon conclusion of that literal reading does Bruno turn to allegory, which he prefaces in the following way:

> Thus should all the rest of the benefits, all the way to the end of the psalm, be read according to the letter, and we will expound all of these things continuously (*continue*) according to the letter in their proper place. But since allegories appear to be contained in individual events, it seems best to expound the individual allegorical mysteries one at a time, either to avoid tedium, or because the allegory is difficult, or because it would be impossible to read the psalm continuously according to these allegories. And therefore we will now turn to the allegories contained in what we have just read according to the letter, beginning where it says, *The sons of Ephraim* (v.9) and thus we will continue to expound verses in turn historically and then allegorically.[163]

In accordance with this programmatic statement, Bruno interprets—and marks off as independent literary units—large sections of this psalm historically before turning, after each section, to the allegorical meanings.[164] The notion of dividing this psalm into sections is not Bruno's innovation, as it was already done by Cassiodorus.[165] But Bruno makes the point that the psalm's literary division and sequential reading are features of the literal-historical sense alone.

We will speak at greater length below about the parallels between Bruno and Rashi; but we should already note two important ways in which these eleventh-century exegetes relate similarly to the biblical text. Rashi emphasized his adherence to the "sequence of the words / verses" (*seder ha-devarim / miqra'ot*) of scripture and sought to explain their logical arrangement, at times employing the term *miqra mesoras*. Bruno, likewise, manifests concern for the sequence and literary ordering (*ordo*) of the biblical text. As Bruno notes on Psalm 77, it is only on the literal level that this biblical text can be read in a sequential way, which he evidently regarded as a literary value. Additionally, just as Rashi on the Song of Songs determines the *peshat/mashma'* as a prerequisite for establishing the midrashic reading, Bruno on Psalm 77 systematically expounds the historical sense before moving on to the allegory.

Although Bruno's methodological preface and commentary on Psalm 77 demonstrate his ability to distinguish between the literal-historical and allegorical readings, that demarcation is actually atypical in his Psalm commentary. Yet there is another important related novel dimension of Bruno's exegesis, as he places new emphasis on the Christological intentions of King David as the author of the Psalms. Since David was a prophetic writer, Bruno's reasoning goes, he was able to incorporate his foreknowledge

---

[162] PL 152:1035B: "And '*In the field [of] Taneos*' …i.e., in the plain of the humble precept/commandment … Since a 'field' is a plain land. Properly, Taphnis means 'humble precept.'"

[163] PL 152:1034AB.

[164] Consider the following comments by Bruno throughout this psalm: "The allegory should be related to that which the letter of these twelve verses investigates…. Once the succession of these seventeen verses has been explained on a literal level, the allegorical sense must be rendered… Therefore, once the letter of these fourteen verses has been explained, let us occupy ourselves with the allegory" (PL 152:1043B, 1047C, 1054C).

[165] See Cassiodorus, *Expositio in Psalterium* (n. 137 above) 709; Walsh trans. (n. 154 above) 2.250–251.

of the life of Christ into his poetry—and this, then, is his proper intention.[166] That intention had to be discovered though grammatical analysis, and Bruno—followed by other interpreters emanating from the school of Rheims—therefore interpreted the Psalms using analytic techniques used by commentators on pagan poetry, which was naturally interpreted only "according to the letter." Hence, the grammatical methods that Servius, for example, had used to uncover meaning in the works of Virgil were applied by the Remois exegetes on the Psalms to uncover the intentions of David as a historical author.[167]

This application of grammatical rigor led Bruno to be more selective than his predecessors in adopting patristic interpretations.[168] Accordingly, he will at times point out allegorical interpretations that do not seem consistent with David's intention as expressed in the language of the Psalms. For example, the superscription of Psalm 50 (MT 51), "A Psalm of David, when Nathan the prophet came unto him, after he had gone in to Bathsheba," was interpreted typologically by Cassiodorus, on the authority of Jerome and Augustine, making David a "type" (i.e., typological symbol) of Christ, and Bathsheba a type of the Church:

> …Blessed Jerome among others points out that Bathsheba manifested a type of the church or of human flesh, and says that David bore the mark of Christ; this is clearly apt at many points. Just as Bathsheba when washing herself unclothed in the brook of Cedron delighted David and deserved to attain the Royal embraces, and her husband was slain at the prince's command, so too the church, the assembly of the faithful, once she has cleansed herself of the foulness of sins by the bath of sacred baptism, is known to be joined to Christ the Lord.… Augustine, in the books which he wrote against the Manichee Faustus, discussed this typology of David and Bathsheba amongst other subjects most carefully.[169]

Remigius added further details to this reading, interpreting Uriah (whose death David had arranged, as described in II Samuel 11), as a type of the devil—and he was therefore justly put to death.[170] This patristic reading was not uncommon, and it was too strong to be ignored by exegetes in the eleventh and early-twelfth centuries.[171] Bruno's different treatment is revealing. He opens his interpretation of the psalm's superscription with a detailed discussion of the historical circumstances to which it refers: Nathan's rebuke of David for his adultery with Bathsheba. Bruno cites the account in II Samuel 11, which records how David coveted Bathsheba after watching her bathe from his roof. Upon concluding that discussion, he remarks:

> In this history a figure is involved (*continetur*), which, even though it does not appear to pertain to the intention of this psalm, still has something useful to offer to the audience.[172]

---

[166] As Kraebel notes, Bruno and his followers in the school of Rheims "include what might otherwise be seen as pertaining to the realm of the spiritual senses within their literal interpretation." See Kraebel "Prophecy and Poetry" (n. 40 above) 419, 446. It is important to note, however, that Bruno does not actually regard the Christological sense as part of the literal sense—a move that would be made in the late-medieval Latin interpretive tradition. See Whitman, "Redefinition" (n. 115 above).

[167] Kraebel, "Poetry and Commentary" (n. 41 above) 247.

[168] See above, n. 44.

[169] Cassiodorus, *Expositio in Psalterium* (n. 137 above) 452–453; Walsh trans. (n. 154 above) 1.493.

[170] See Kraebel, "Prophecy and Poetry" (n. 40 above) 444.

[171] See Minnis, *Authorship* (n. 121 above) 105.

[172] PL 152:860C: *In hac historia figura continetur, quae, tametsi ad huius intentionem psalmi non videtur attinere, non tamen dicenda est audientium utilitate carere*. See Kraebel, "Place of Allegory" (n. 40 above) 210.

Although he proceeds to record Remigius' reading in all of its detail, this preface reveals Bruno's reservations. Whereas in other psalms Bruno was prepared to accept the traditional typological interpretation, in this case he resists doing so because it is so far from the language of the psalm that it cannot reasonably be construed as David's intention, even though he acknowledges its "usefulness" (Christian inspirational value, presumably) for the audience. This can be compared with Rashi's observation that the traditional midrashic reading of Exod 6:2–9 does not adhere to the language or sequence of scripture, though he allows for its legitimacy qua midrash.[173]

Bruno's treatment of the heading of Psalm 141 (MT 142), "Of understanding (*intellectus*) for David, A prayer when he was in the cave" manifests a similar critical attitude toward earlier patristic interpretation. Cassiodorus writes the following regarding this heading:

> The theme of the Psalm is contained in this heading, but an apposite indication of a spiritual meaning is revealed to us through physical parallels. David, the son of Jesse, fled from the Prince Saul, and when he lay hidden in a cave he uttered a prayer in which he revealed that the Lord Christ would make in the flesh before his passion. When *understanding* (*intellectus*) prefaces this prayer, the comparison is shown to refer to him (i.e., Jesus Christ) who avoided his persecutors as he prayed and hid himself by moving to various places. This was so that the son of God could fulfill the promise which he had made about himself through the prophets, and revealed the truth of the incarnation which he had assumed; for this psalm includes the words of the Lord Savior when he sought to avoid the most wicked madness of the Jews. So the flight of David was rightly placed in the heading to point to the persecution by the Jews, for David, as we have often said, denotes both that earthly king and the kingdom of heaven.[174]

For Cassiodorus, the historical background of David's flight from Saul is merely a "pointer" indicating the true reference of this heading to the prayer of "the Lord Savior" for God's protection from the persecution of the Jews. Bruno, on the other hand, interprets the heading of this psalm historically (*juxta historiam*), describing the circumstances in which it was uttered: when David was hiding in a cave, which Saul entered but did not see him, as described in I Samuel 24.[175] Following this, Bruno does cite an allegorical reading in the spirit of the one preferred by Cassiodorus, but with the following proviso:

> The allegory of this history, not altogether worth pursuing, is as follows.[176]

Although he dutifully elaborates on the allegorical potential of this psalm to indicate the Passion of Christ and his prayer to God, Bruno clearly has reservations about this reading, evidently because it is not borne out by the language of the psalm, unlike the historical reading, which is well-supported by the biblical evidence.

By contrast with earlier patristic commentators, such as Augustine and Cassiodorus, who typically interpreted individual verses of the Psalms separately and atomistically (resembling the midrashic mode of interpretation), Bruno and other Remois

---

[173] See above, n. 70.
[174] Cassiodorus, *Expositio in Psalterium* (n. 137 above) 1268; Walsh trans. (n. 154 above) 3.399–400. On this reading of the term *intellectus* in the patristic tradition, see above, n. 155.
[175] PL 152:1380B.
[176] PL 152:1380B–C: *Allegoria autem hujus historiae, non usquequaque persequenda, talis est*.

commentators following his lead regularly sought to explain how consecutive verses within each psalm fit together, adopting what Kraebel has termed a "coherent, poetic hermeneutic."[177] This interpretive concern, which follows the model of how the grammarians interpreted secular poetry, is attested, for example, in Bruno's *ordo*-gloss on Ps 67:5–10 and his concern for the "continuous" reading of Psalm 77, as we have seen.[178]

The value that Bruno placed on literary coherence also motivated him to evaluate allegorical readings critically, as evident in his treatment of Ps 97:3 (MT 98:3). In Bruno's view, this psalm relates how David prophetically foretells that "all the faithful who will live in the time of God's fullness will sing a new song to God the Father." He goes on to say that the psalm's second and third verses, "He has revealed in the sight of the peoples" (*revelavit in conspectu gentium*) and "all the ends of the earth have seen" (*viderunt omnes termini terrae*) speak of the fulfilled faith of the gentiles, as opposed to the Jews' imperfect faith. But then he cites what he characterizes as an "allegorical" alternative reading:

> Or this can be read allegorically [*allegorice legi*]:… *the ends of the earth*, that is, all those who restrain their earthly qualities…[179]

The characterization of this interpretation as allegorical is probably based on the fact that the Latin term *termini* ("ends") is taken figuratively rather than literally. Bruno, however, remarks that he prefers the first reading:

> Yet, according to the letter (*ad litteram*), what follows (*sequentia*) seems to accord better with the earlier meaning (*priori sententiae*).[180]

In other words, the literal reading of v. 3 is to be preferred over the allegorical reading, because it best accords with the "sequence," i.e., the verse that follows. Admittedly, this case is somewhat exceptional, as Bruno does not regularly differentiate between the literal and spiritual senses (a trend more pronounced in the school of St. Victor). Yet he manifests new and consistent interest in the literary construction of the Psalms and their analysis according to the discipline of *grammatica* in order to select the mystical/allegorical readings that best reflect King David's intentions.[181]

4. COMPARING RASHI AND BRUNO

The methodological parallels between Bruno and Rashi, each exegete in his own tradition, are striking. Bruno's consistent distinction in Psalm 77 between the literal and mystical senses is comparable to Rashi's distinction between *derash* and *peshat* in his "double commentaries," especially his consistent distinction between the love story

---

[177] Kraebel, "Prophecy and Poetry" (n. 40 above) 450.

[178] See above, at nn. 148, 158.

[179] PL 152:1153C: *Vel potest hoc allegorice legi...* omnes termini terrae*, id est omnes terminantes in se terrenitatem*. This interpretation is cited neither by Augustine nor by Cassiodorus in their Psalms commentaries on this verse.

[180] PL 152:1153D: *Caeterum priori sententiae ad litteram melius videntur sequentia concordare*. See Kraebel, "Place of Allegory" (n. 40 above) 215–216. I am grateful to Andrew Kraebel for the translation above. It may also be possible to render this line, "Yet what follows (or: the sequence; *sequentia*) seems to agree better with the prior sentence (*priori sententiae*) according to the literal sense (*ad litteram*)." I am grateful to Montse Leyra for her assistance in clarifying this line of Bruno's commentary.

[181] See Kraebel, "Prophecy and Poetry" (n. 40 above) 456–459; Mews, "Scholastic Culture" (n. 38 above) 73, 78.

(*peshat*) and historical allegory (*midrash, dugma*) in the Song of Songs. But the distinction fades into the background in most cases, where both Rashi and Bruno expound only the deeper sense of scripture (midrashic, mystical) within the new theoretical frameworks they construct. Both Rashi and Bruno inherited traditions of interpretation that they incorporated into their commentaries selectively: Rashi the midrashic readings of the Rabbis, Bruno the mystical readings of the Church Fathers. And both Rashi and Bruno explicitly challenge the cogency of earlier readings that do not meet their exegetical criteria, namely, adherence to the language and sequence/continuity (Hebrew *seder/semikhah*; Latin *sequentia/ continuitas*).

Bruno's exegetical criteria, as we have seen, stemmed from his grammatical training, which he applied critically in his Psalms commentary—following a tradition attested in Remigius. What could have brought Rashi to engage in a similarly critical selection of midrashic interpretations? Rashi did not have exposure to the liberal arts or the Latin grammatical tradition. Yet he developed a literary sense that led him to select only those midrashic interpretations that "settled" the text of scripture, "each word in its proper place" in accordance with "the… sequence of the verses."[182] It is conceivable that Rashi developed these sensibilities through his extensive work in the detailed sort of line-by-line Talmud exegesis that had emerged earlier in the eleventh century as a distinct and rigorous discipline in the Rhineland academies, in Rashi's intellectual persona was shaped.[183]

In a recent study, Haym Soloveitchik emphasizes just how innovative this discipline devised by R. Gershom and his students was:

> They introduced line-by-line exegesis.… No summary but a phrase-by-phrase explication of all the winding… [discussions] of the Talmud with almost no expression left unexplained.
> They equally did not distinguish in their exegetical enterprise between halakhah [=law] and aggadah [=lore, tales]. Every line of aggadah had to be explicated in as precise a fashion as the halakhic passages…. [We must] not blunt our sensitivity to [the] radical originality [of this move]…. The halakhic portions of the Talmud are strongly formulaic… If one knows some thirty or forty idiomatic phrases in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, most halakhic passages will pose few linguistic problems. (Understanding their legal content is a different matter.) However, the aggadic narratives entail a wide-ranging and detailed knowledge of the Aramaic language—all the terms of different household utensils, farm equipment, agricultural practices, domestic animals, flora and fauna, to mention just a few areas of life that are reflected in the [talmudic] narratives… We are talking about a vocabulary of some 10,000 to 12,000 words if not more.[184]

The great linguistic prowess of R. Gershom's school is reflected by the fact that Rashi's Italian contemporary, R. Nathan ben Jehiel of Rome (c. 1035–1106), drew heavily upon the "the sages of Magentsa (=Mainz)" in his talmudic lexicon, *Sefer ha-'Arukh*. Soloveitchik notes how remarkable this is, given the fact that R. Nathan had access to the teachings of R. Hai Gaon (c. 939–1038), a direct inheritor of the living talmudic traditions of Babylonia:

> Why this fuss of the interpretations of Magentsa? What tradition could anyone form Mainz possess that would explain gnomic terms and obscure references in the Talmud? How could

[182] See above, nn. 65, 96, 105, 109, 110.
[183] See above, nn. 7, 8.
[184] Soloveitchik, *Collected Essays II* (n. 6 above) 159.

R. Natan possibly view them as a source of talmudic lexicography on a par with Rav Hai Gaon?[185]

In answering these questions, Soloveitchik advances the bold theory that the forerunners of the Mainz academy were tenth-century immigrants to the Rhineland from Babylonia, where they had participated in the very process of the formulation of the Talmud in an academy other than the two well-known ones of Sura and Pumbedita.[186] In addition to being native Aramaic speakers, these transplanted scholars could thus transmit living interpretive traditions of the Talmud to R. Gershom's teacher, a certain R. Leontin (about whom precious little is known).[187] David Berger considers this to be an intriguing but highly speculative suggestion and argues that the phenomena to which Soloveitchik points could be accounted for in other ways. For example, a thorough command of the Aramaic Targums on the twenty-four books of the Hebrew Bible could have enabled the scholars in R. Gershom's circle to determine the meaning of very many difficult words in the Talmud.[188] This philological analytic approach to the Talmud could have been augmented by an interpretive tradition that did not depend on the survival of Aramaic as a spoken language.[189]

In any case, both Berger and Soloveitchik agree that the sages of the Mainz school displayed a remarkable ambition to engage in a comprehensive philological analysis of the talmudic text, and that they displayed extraordinary linguistic facility in Aramaic in fulfilling that ambition. Unlike the Bible, perceived as an esoteric divine text possessing a hidden "deeper" meaning expounded through ancient midrashic traditions,[190] the Talmud had no "midrashic" commentary tradition. Its interpretation had to be entirely philological and contextual, based exclusively on what is evident from the text itself, just as pagan poetry was glossed by the classical grammarians. This Rhineland tradition of *enarratio talmudae*—analogous to *enarratio poetarum* in the classical discipline of *grammatica*—was the foundation of Rashi's education.

Rashi's innovation, then, was to apply these very same philological skills to the Bible. Indeed, Benjamin Gelles has observed a terminological link between the two projects: in his Talmud commentary Rashi also uses the term "to settle" the text in describing his exegetical goal, i.e., to interpret the language of the Talmud contextually and philologically.[191] As Rashi remarks, for example, regarding a difficult passage of the Talmud: "I have labored since my youth [to understand it], taking into consideration all aspects of the manner (*shiṭṭah*) of the Talmud, to settle it properly in accordance with my teachers' words."[192] Rashi endeavored "to settle" the text by adducing evidence from "the manner of the Talmud," i.e., its attested linguistic usage and stylistic conventions—akin to "grammatical" analysis in the classical tradition.[193] In his Bible commentary,

---

[185] Ibid. 161.

[186] Ibid. 157–194.

[187] On R. Leontin, see Grossman, *Ashkenaz* (n. 2 above) 80–86.

[188] Soloveitchik, *Collected Essays II* (n. 6 above) 207–213.

[189] I am grateful to David Berger for clarifying this point—and his approach to this matter in general—in an email communication. Apart from the summary by Soloveitchik (see the previous note), Berger's response to Soloveitchik's theory is unavailable in published form.

[190] See above, n. 81.

[191] See Gelles, *Rashi* (n. 16 above) 17–19, 136–138.

[192] Rashi, commentary on BT *Sukkah* 40a.

[193] Rashi uses the term *shiṭṭah* a number of times in his Talmud commentary in this sense. He does not use the term *peshat* in connection with his talmudic exegesis, as there is no counterpart "midrashic" interpretation of the Talmud.

likewise, Rashi sought to "settle the text" according to "the manner of scripture,"[194] which led to his focus on *peshat* and critical assessment of midrashic readings accordingly.

The theory that Rashi's *peshat* project grew out of his Talmud commentary was already raised in the 1940s; but it was challenged by Avraham Grossman, who reasoned that if a *peshat* approach to scripture were a natural result of intensive talmudic exegesis, then it should have already emerged in the Rhineland academies before Rashi's time.[195] Here is where consideration of the Latin intellectual milieu in general, and the proximate school of Rheims in particular, is instructive. As mentioned above, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the emerging interest in the "literal sense" went hand in hand with an increasing focus on the common features of scripture and human literary works— which had to contend with the traditional uneasiness about equating the Bible, understood to be God's word, and human literary compositions. Bruno provides an important precedent for this development in the eleventh century. While there were examples of grammatical commentary on scripture from much earlier, Bruno represents the blossoming of this trend as a widespread teaching regime across the cathedral schools of northern France.[196] As part of this outlook, Bruno boldly used his grammatical training to critically evaluate the inherited allegorical interpretations of the Church Fathers.

This phenomenon in Christian learning can help us appreciate Rashi's hermeneutical innovation. The transfer of exegetical tools from Talmud to Bible would not have been a natural one in Rashi's Ashkenazic milieu. The Talmud, a human literary composition, is not comparable to the Bible, which is divinely authored and therefore subject to a quite different interpretive mode, as embodied in the authoritative tradition of midrashic interpretation, which, as Rashbam attests, was the sole focus of Ashkenazic Bible interpretation.[197] Rashi's innovative move—analogous to what Bruno does in Christian tradition—was to transfer of the tools of Talmud commentary to Bible commentary.[198] Mirroring the trend of Christian learning exemplified by Bruno, Rashi used "grammatical" skills he had perfected for interpreting a human literary composition— the Talmud (as Bruno did with classical literature)—to develop criteria for evaluating midrashic interpretations (analogous to patristic interpretation) of the Bible. Neither

---

[194] See his commentaries on Ps 16:1 ("the manner [*shiṭṭah*] of scripture does not accord with this midrash"); Lam 3:20 ("this is its *peshat* according to the sense and manner [*shiṭṭah*] of scripture"); Qoh 8:14 ("our Rabbis interpreted it midrashically in another way… and it is not settled for me according to the manner [*shiṭṭah*] of the language"). See also Gila Prebor, "The Use of Midrash in Rashi's Commentary on Ecclesiastes" (Hebrew), *Shnaton: An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 19 (2009): 213–221.

[195] See Grossman, *France* (n. 2 above) 459. Even though he identifies sporadic philological interpretations of biblical words and phrases that can be attributed to Rashi's Rhineland teachers, Grossman evidently recognizes that these do not amount to a robust *peshat* program of the sort found in Rashi. See above, n. 55.

[196] See above, n. 132.

[197] As Rashbam remarks: "the early generations, because of their piety, tended to delve into the *derashot*, since they are essential (*'iqqar*), and therefore were not accustomed to the deep *peshat* of scripture" (comm. on Gen 37:2). See also Kamin, *Categorization* (n. 56 above) 272–273.

[198] The chronology of Rashi's works is not known with certainty. It is assumed that the talmudic commentaries were written first (even though they were subject to revision and even re-writing throughout Rashi's career), with the biblical commentaries coming later, but this cannot be proven. See Gelles, *Rashi* (n. 16 above) 136–143; Haym Soloveitchik, *Collected Essays I* (Oxford, UK 2013) 186–189. In any case, it is certain that Talmud commentary was part and parcel of Rashi's earliest studies, inherited from his Rhineland teachers, whereas Bible commentary, in the distinctive mode he would go on to develop independently, represents a subsequent phase in his scholarly career.

Bruno nor Rashi aimed to supplant their predecessors' interpretations. Instead, they sought to select among them those that could reasonably be construed as reflecting the intent of the biblical authors based on a close "correspondence" to the language and sequence of the text.

Given the striking methodological parallels between Rashi and Bruno, we must consider whether the great Bible exegete-talmudist of Troyes could have actually known about the Bible interpretation of the older cathedral master of Rheims, around 70 miles away. Bruno was an active and influential teacher of *grammatica* and the Psalms during Rashi's formative years.[199] Furthermore, Rheims was an important intellectual and cultural center of the Champagne region of France, in which Troyes was a vibrant commercial hub that hosted markets, and perhaps even large fairs, that drew merchants and other travelers from far and wide.[200] Troyes itself had a large Christian clerical population, with the Abbey of Saint-Loup, the Cathedral of Saint-Pierre (where Peter Comestor would serve as dean from 1147 to 1164), and the collegiate Church of Saint-Étienne all in close proximity to one another—and to the Jewish section of the city which housed the synagogue, and presumably Rashi's school.[201] An entry in Bruno's mortuary roll from the Troyes Cathedral of Saint-Pierre suggests that he was known in the city,[202] and it is therefore quite conceivable that his teachings circulated there as well, especially given the frequency of travel between the two Champenois centers.

The question we must consider is whether Rashi could or would have availed himself of Bruno's scholarship, even if it circulated among his Christian neighbors. Here we encounter the thorny social-historical problem of Jewish-Christian relations in medieval France, where Jews and Christians, as elsewhere in Europe, regarded one another as religious adversaries. Rashi termed Christians *minim* ("heretics") and, throughout his writings, emphasized their wickedness and even the danger of conversing with them.[203] Christians, likewise, regarded the Jews as enemies of God, blind to His truth, and guilty for the murder of Christ.[204] In addition, a language barrier divided Jewish and Christian scholars, since the former wrote in Hebrew, the latter in Latin—making the works of one religious community effectively inaccessible to the other. Although Rashbam seems to have known some Latin, there is no indication that Rashi did.[205] But Rashi could have learned about Christian Bible interpretation by conversing with Christian scholars in Old French, a language he knew well, and used extensively in his writings.[206] Evidence

---

[199] See at nn. 50, 52 above.

[200] See Urban T. Holmes and M. Amelia Klenke, *Chrétien, Troyes, and the Grail* (Chapel Hill 1959) 9. On the scope of the Troyes fairs in Rashi's time, see Emily Taitz, *The Jews of Medieval France: The Community of Champagne* (Westport, CT 1994) 96, 246, n. 82.

[201] See Holmes and Klenke, *Chrétien* (n. 200 above) 12–17.

[202] See n. 53 above.

[203] Judah Rosenthal, "Anti-Christian polemic in Rashi on the Bible" (Hebrew), *Studies and Texts in Jewish History, Literature and Religion* (Jerusalem 1967) 105–106; Shaye D. Cohen, "Does Rashi's Torah Commentary Respond to Christianity?" *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*, ed. Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman (Leiden 2004) 450–461. In his commentary on BT *Rosh ha-Shanah* 17a, Rashi glosses the talmudic term *minim* with the following remark: "*minim* are the students of Jesus the Nazarene, who wickedly violated the words of the living God."

[204] The literature on this subject is vast. For a review of approaches to medieval Christian anti-Semitic attitudes, see David Berger, "From Crusades to Blood Libels to Expulsions: Some New Approaches to Medieval Anti-Semitism," *Persecution, Polemic, and Dialogue* (Boston 2010) 15–39. On the negative attitudes of Christians toward Jews in and around medieval Troyes, see Holmes and Klenke, *Chrétien* (n. 200 above) 71, 120–122.

[205] See Sara Japhet, "Did Rashbam Know the Vulgate Latin Translation of the Song of Songs" (Hebrew), *Collected Studies in Biblical Exegesis* (Hebrew; Jerusalem 2008) 294–319.

[206] See n. 63 above.

for precisely such an intellectual exchange is provided in a remarkable account of collaborative work initiated by Stephen Harding, among the founders of Cîteaux Abbey (just over 100 miles from Troyes) in Burgundy in 1098, and who became Abbot in 1109.[207] That year saw the completion of Stephen's Cîteaux Bible, based on the Vulgate—with corrections in accordance with the original Hebrew and Aramaic.[208] In his introduction to the work, Stephen describes how, in order to access those ancient texts, he "resorted to certain Jews expert in their scripture, and… interrogated them most diligently in romance speech (i.e., Old French)." As he recounts, "opening many of their books before us, they explained the Hebrew or Chaldean scripture to us in romance speech."[209]

It is not unlikely that the Jewish experts Stephen consulted were from Rashi's school—and it is conceivable that Stephen had forged a connection a few years earlier with the master himself. The trouble, of course, is that we lack written records of the many other oral exchanges that must have taken place between Jews and Christians. Yet we occasionally can get glimpses of such exchanges from the writings of Rashi and his students. Rashbam, for example, records debates of his with Christians in his commentaries on Exod 20:13 (where he also notes an error in the Vulgate translation of a biblical term) and Lev 19:19.[210] And an interpretation that can be traced to Jerome appears in Rashi's commentary on Ez 2:1, with the following comment, presumably added by a student: "This was told to our master Rashi by a *min* ("heretic"; i.e., a Christian) and it pleased him."[211] Rashi's willingness to learn from a Christian is not out of character, since, as Grossman has noted, Rashi was intellectually curious and open to

---

[207] Claudio Stercal, *Stephen Harding: A Biographical Sketch and Texts*, trans. Martha F. Krieg (Trappist, KY 2008) 1–3, 18–20.
[208] Stercal, *Harding* (n. 207 above) 39–50.
[209] Ibid. 54–55. See also Aryeh Grabois, "The *Hebraica Veritas* and Jewish-Christian Intellectual Relations in the Twelfth Century," *Speculum* 50.4 (1975) 617–618.
[210] See his comm. on Exod 20:13, Lev 19:19.
[211] In Rashi's commentary on Ez 2:1 we find the following remark:

> Given the fact that he gazed upon the heavenly chariot and walked amongst heavenly beings and interacted with angels, Ezekiel is called "son of man" as if to say, "there is no one born of woman here except for this one." This was told to our master Rashi by a *min* (heretic"; i.e., a Christian) and it pleased him. But to me it seems that he was called "son of man" so that he would not become arrogant, since he had become accustomed to seeing the divine chariot and the heavenly angels.

It is evident that at least part of this gloss is a report by one of Rashi's students, who are otherwise known to have had a hand in the revision of his commentary on Ezekiel. See Jordan Penkower, "Rashi's commentary on Ezekiel: on the occasion of its new edition in *Miqra'ot Gedolot Haketer*" (Hebrew), *Studies in Bible and Exegesis VII: Presented to Menachem Cohen*, ed. Shmuel Vargon, Yosef Ofer, Jordan S. Penkower, Jacob Klein (Ramat Gan 2005) 425–474. On this gloss, see Abraham Levy, *Rashi's Commentary on Ezekiel 40-48. Edited on the Basis of Eleven Manuscripts* (Philadelphia 1931) 6–7. Jerome's gloss on Dan 8:17 seems to be the one told to Rashi:

> Inasmuch as Ezekiel and Daniel and Zechariah behold themselves to be often in the company of angels, they were reminded of their frailty, lest they should be lifted up in pride and imagine themselves to partake of the nature or dignity of angels. Therefore they are addressed as sons of men, in order that they might realize that they are but human beings" (*Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*, trans. Gleason L. Archer (Grand Rapids 1958) 88).

This interpretation underwent some adaptation either in the Christian's oral report to Rashi, or by Rashi himself who recorded it only partially. The interpretation given by Rashi's student, on the other hand, comes closer to Jerome's.

Jewish learning traditions unfamiliar to him (which may have been brought to his awareness by travelers to Troyes) to a greater extent than his more conservative Rhineland teachers were.[212]

Yet Rashi's interest in Christian interpretation would not have been motivated primarily by intellectual curiosity. A key concern of Rashi's, manifested throughout his commentaries, is the need to protect the Jewish community from the enticement of Christian doctrines.[213] This seems to have been a realistic concern, as some Jews exposed to Latin learning were swayed by it and ultimately converted to Christianity.[214] A remarkable gloss on a line of liturgical poetry (*piyyuṭ*) thought to be penned by Joseph Qara suggests the attractiveness of Christian "words," perhaps a reference to Latin learning.[215] This would be borne out in the case of Herman the Jew of Cologne (c. 1107– 1181), who reports in his autobiography that discussions with Christian clerics, including the renowned Rupert of Deutz (1075–1129), set the stage for his ultimate conversion to Christianity.[216] In an endeavor to bolster Jewish faith under these conditions, Rashi frequently engages in anti-Christian polemics in his Bible commentaries, undercutting Christian doctrines and interpretations of the Bible.[217] These polemical passages (some of which have been removed from the printed editions of Rashi and are found in only some medieval manuscripts) most clearly manifest Rashi's awareness of Christian interpretations and doctrines.

Anti-Christian polemical motifs have been identified in Rashi's commentaries on the Pentateuch, Isaiah, Proverbs, Song of Songs, and Daniel;[218] but his most apparent polemical program emerges in Psalms.[219] On Ps 2:1, for example, Rashi remarks:

> Many of the students of Jesus interpreted the matter regarding the King Messiah. And as a refutation of the *minim* ("heretics"; i.e., Christians) it would be correct to interpret it about David himself.[220]

---

[212] See Grossman, *Rashi* (n. 1 above) 56–63.

[213] See Eleazar Touitou, "Rashi's Commentary on Genesis 1–6 in the Context of Judeo-Christian Controversy," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 61 (1990) 163.

[214] See David Berger, "Mission to the Jews and Jewish-Christian contacts in the polemical literature of the High Middle Ages," *Persecution, Polemic, and Dialogue* (n. 204 above) 177–198. (Originally appeared in *American Historical Review* 91 (1986) 576–591.)

[215] See Efraim Elimelech Urbach, *Arugat ha-bosem: kolel perushim le-piyutim* (Jerusalem 1939) 2.220.

[216] See Jean-Claude Schmitt and Alex J. Novikoff, *The Conversion of Herman the Jew Autobiography, History, and Fiction in the Twelfth Cenutry* (Philadelphia 2003) 20, 11–43, 204–211, including deliberations regarding the historicity of Herman's autobiography.

[217] See references in nn. 218, 219.

[218] See Robert Chazan, "Rashi's commentary on the Book of Daniel: messianic speculation and polemical argumentation," *Rashi et la culture juive en France du Nord au moyen âge*, ed. Gilbert Dahan, Gérard Nahon, and Elie Nicolas (Paris 1997) 111–121; Avraham Grossman, "The Commentary of Rashi on Isaiah and the Jewish-Christian Debate," *Studies in Medieval Jewish Intellectual and Social History; Festschrift in Honor of Robert Chazan*, ed. David Engel, Lawrence H. Schiffman, Elliot R. Wolfson (Leiden 2012) 47–62; Kamin, *Jews and Christians* (n. 88 above) 22–57; Touitou, "Genesis 1–6" (n. 213 above). Cohen, "Comparison" (n. 203 above) questions the existence of a polemical motive in Rashi on the Pentateuch, but recognizes it as a key factor elsewhere in his commentaries.

[219] See Cohen, Cohen, "Comparison" (n. 203 above) 459; Hayyim Gevaryahu, "The text of Rashi on Psalms and Censorship" (Hebrew), *Sefer Prof. H.M.Y. Gevaryahu*, ed. Ben Zion Luria (Jerusalem 1989) 248– 261; Avraham Grossman, "Rashi's Commentary on Psalms and the Jewish-Christian Debate" (Hebrew), *Mehkarim ba-Mikra uve-hinukh*, ed. Dov Rappel (Jerusalem 1996) 59–74; Esra Shereshevsky, "Rashi's and Christian interpretations," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 61 (1970) 76–86.

[220] See Gevaryahu, "Psalms" (n. 219 above) 253. As Gevaryahu documents, the text in a number of manuscripts, as well as in the standard printed edition of the *Miqra'ot Gedolot*, was altered, probably for fear of censorship. On the expression "as a response to the *minim*," see Cohen, "Torah Commentary" (n. 203 above) 454 and further references cited there.

Esra Shereshevsky has identified a number of other instances in which Rashi's interpretations are opposed to Jerome's, and may have been devised to refute them.[221] While in some of the examples that Shereshevsky adduces Rashi's interpretations may not have been motivated by polemical considerations but stemmed, rather, from Rashi's own exegetical sensibilities, the possibility that he was aware of Jerome's interpretations cannot be ruled out. Indeed, if Rashi did discuss the Bible with Christian clerics, it is likely that he knew of the special standing the book of Psalms held for Christians—and this may have motivated him to engage in anti-Christian polemics most vigorously on the Psalms.

In first posing the theory that Rashi's innovative *peshat* program is best understood in the context of the Judeo-Christian conflict, Touitou formulated the following key questions:

> What happened at the end of the 11th century which stimulated the change in the educations curriculum of Franco-German Jewry [manifested in Rashi's commentary]? What were the new needs that were not satisfied by the existing curriculum? ….What is the nature and basic approach of Rashi's commentary, and how does it meet its society's new needs? …Why did Rashi give his commentary the form which it bears?[222]

The parallels we noted between Bruno and Rashi suggest a fitting response to these questions. If Rashi became aware of Bruno's Psalms commentary, it would have posed a special danger because the patristic readings cited therein were selected critically according to the rigorous criteria of *grammatica*. Given Rashi's stated concern with the perceived threat of Christian learning enticing a potential Jewish audience, this sort of commentary would have called for a sophisticated response. We need not presume that Rashi had a detailed knowledge of Bruno's commentary, nor that he intended to refute it psalm-by-psalm. It would have been sufficient for Rashi to have grasped the gist of Bruno's exegetical project—the aim to demonstrate, through grammatical analysis, that the Christological readings of the Psalms accurately reflect David's prophetic intentions.[223] This would have caused Rashi to regard the traditional midrashic commentaries on the Psalms as inadequate and impelled him to devise a new commentary that draws upon midrashic interpretation selectively in order to demonstrate the cogency of the Jewish reading of the Psalms.

5. REFRAMING RASHI'S PESHAT PROGRAM IN ITS CHRISTIAN MILIEU

The preceding study of the parallels to Bruno's exegetical project has important implications for two key questions that have long occupied scholars of Rashi's Bible exegesis: 1. Since Rashi at times demonstrates a clear conception of *peshat* exegesis,

---

[221] Shereshevsky, "Rashi's and Christian Interpretations" (n. 219 above). Daniel J. Lasker, "Rashi and Maimonides on Christianity," *Between Rashi and Maimonides: Themes in Medieval Jewish Thought, Literature and Exegesis*, ed. E. Kanarfogel and M. Sokolow (New York 2010) 3–14, rejects Shereshevsky's conclusions. Even if Shereshevsky's argument is not proven by the evidence, the scenario he posits is plausible. See above, n. 211.

[222] Touitou, "Genesis 1–6" (n. 213 above) 160.

[223] Indeed, Rashi need not have spoken with Bruno himself to have become acquainted with the latter's method of interpretation—exposure to one of Bruno's students could have been sufficient to familiarize Rashi with the master's methodology, which seems to have had a number of adherents during his lifetime. See above, n. 42.

why did he, in fact, still rely so heavily on midrashic interpretation rather than composing a consistent *peshat* commentary as his grandson, Rashbam, for example went on to do? As Moshe Ahrend remarked, "Rashi… resembles an artist who perfected a new and original technique, but set it aside to display to his audience a haphazard collection of works by his predecessors."[224] 2. What could have motivated Rashi to engage in his novel *peshat* program in the first place—without any real precedent in his Franco-German Jewish intellectual heritage?

We will begin by discussing the second question, and then return to the first. The theory that Rashi, in his innovative emphasis on *peshuto shel miqra*, was drawing upon, and reacting to, intellectual trends in his Christian milieu, is given greater specificity— and thus bolstered—by the striking parallels to Rashi in Bruno's exegesis. Other theories have been raised to answer this question by positing that Rashi was drawing upon earlier streams of Jewish Bible interpretation outside of the Ashkenazic orbit, either the vibrant tradition of philological-contextual Bible exegesis that had reached its apex in the eleventh century in al-Andalus (the tradition later epitomized by Abraham Ibn Ezra) or the nascent—but curiously stark—mode of philological-contextual exegesis that had emerged by the early eleventh century in Byzantine lands.[225] There are, however, difficulties with both of those theories. It is true that Rashi had, and extensively used, the linguistic works of Menahem and Dunash.[226] But those works, which manifest a narrow philological focus, are not *peshat* commentaries; nor do Menahem or Dunash ever characterize their analysis as *peshuto shel miqra*.[227] The robust Andalusian *peshat* school would emerge only two generations later in the foundational work of the eleventh-century grammarian Jonah Ibn Janah, and its application in the commentaries of Moses Ibn Chiquitilla and Judah Ibn Bal'am.[228] Unlike Menahem and Dunash, who wrote in Hebrew, those eleventh-century authors wrote in Judeo-Arabic, a language Rashi did not read. Although the Byzantine commentaries (which we now possess only in fragmentary form) were written in Hebrew and thus could have been read and understood by Rashi, there is no evidence he had access to, or was even aware of, them.[229]

To be sure, there is also no evidence that Rashi was aware of Bruno's exegesis, nor of any specifically grammatical or literal sense Christian interpretations, for that matter. If so, one may ask why this conjecture is any better than the theories that Rashi was inspired by other centers of Jewish learning. Two answers can be given. To begin with,

---

[224] Moshe Ahrend, "The Concept *Peshuto Shellamiqra'* in the Making" [Hebrew], *The Bible In Light of Its Interpreters: Sarah Kamin Memorial Volume*, ed. Sara Japhet (Jerusalem 1994) 245–246.

[225] See Israel M. Ta-Shma, "Hebrew-Byzantine Bible Exegesis ca. 1000, From the Cairo Genizah" (Hebrew), *Tarbiz* 69 (2000) 253–256. See also Richard C. Steiner, "The 'Lemma Complement' in Hebrew Commentaries from Byzantium and Its Diffusion to Northern France and Germany," *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 18 (2011) 367–379.

[226] See above, n. 17.

[227] This is discussed in Chapter 2 of my forthcoming monograph *The Rule of Peshat: Jewish Constructions of the Plain Sense of Scripture in Their Christian and Muslim Contexts, c. 900–1300*, to be published by the University of Pennsylvania Press.

[228] See Cohen, *Gates* (n. 79 above) 57–85, 360–362.

[229] See Avraham Grossman, "The Impact of Rabbi Samuel of Spain and Reuel of Byzantium on Rashi's School" (Hebrew), *Tarbiz* 82 (2014) 447–467. Furthermore, pre-twelfth-century Byzantine commentaries manifest neither a well-defined notion of *peshat*, nor a systematic attempt to delineate the inter-relation between *peshat* and midrash, as found in Rashi. This subject is discussed further in Chapter 5 of my forthcoming monograph *The Rule of Peshat* (n. 227 above).

we would have expected Rashi to quote earlier *peshat* interpreters if he knew of any.[230] On the other hand, it is perfectly understandable Rashi would not have cited Bruno's commentary, even if it inspired him to engage in his novel exegetical program to counter the threat posed by Bruno's sophisticated interpretive method. Under these circumstances, Rashi would hardly have credited Bruno as an authority or source of his mode of Bible interpretation.

More significantly, the methodological parallels between the commentarial modes of Rashi and Bruno are actually closer than those of Rashi to the other Jewish exegetical streams. The Andalusian and early Byzantine commentaries treated contextual-philological interpretation as an end unto itself, implying that it represents the full and proper exegesis of the biblical text.[231] Rashi posited a different hermeneutical hierarchy: his interest in *peshuto shel miqra* was part of a larger program to compose a commentary critically drawn from midrashic sources that adhere to systematic criteria, much as Bruno composed a Christological Psalms commentary featuring a critical selection of patristic interpretations that fulfill the criteria of the discipline of *grammatica*.

The parallels to Bruno thus point to an answer to the first question mentioned above (at n. 224): Given that Rashi knew how to determine *peshuto shel miqra*, why did he not make it his exclusive aim? The assumption underlying the question betrays the modern bias in favor of *peshuto shel miqra*, which characterized other streams of Jewish interpretation, e.g., as represented by Ibn Ezra.[232] But Rashi did not share this perspective. Both he and his Christian neighbors, as much as they disagreed about the "true" meaning of the Bible, adhered to the traditional view—manifested in early Jewish and Christian Bible interpretation—that its essential meaning and import is not to be found at the surface, but rather in its deeper sense, which was thought to convey messages directly relevant to their respective religious experiences.[233] Within this framework, it makes sense that Rashi's goal was not simply to compose a *peshat* commentary, but rather to do so as part of a selective reworking of midrashic exegesis.

Indeed, the parallels to Bruno, as a representative of medieval Christian exegesis at large, may also help to clarify how Rashi perceived the relationship between *peshuto shel miqra* and the midrashic interpretations that "settle" / "are settled upon" the language and sequence of the verses. These stated criteria would seem to be predicated on an ability to establish the correct reading of *peshuto shel miqra*, which thus functions as a sort of base-line or "control" for Rashi's selection of midrashic readings. This is reminiscent of the traditional Christian depiction of the literal sense as the "foundation" (*fundamentum*) upon which the spiritual sense is to be constructed. This metaphor is famously articulated by Hugh of St. Victor:

---

[230] Rashbam considers Rashi's *peshat* program to be unprecedented (see above, n. 197), which further suggests that neither of them were aware of other streams of *peshat* exegesis.

[231] Later Byzantine commentaries, on the other hand, such as Leqaḥ Ṭov of Tobiah ben Eliezer, reverted to a more midrashic stance. These distinctions of orientation among exegetes engaged in *peshat* interpretation are discussed at length in my forthcoming monograph *The Rule of Peshat* (n. 227 above). See also Cohen, "Emergence" (n. 15 above).

[232] See Cohen, "Emergence" (n. 15 above) 204–205, 216–219; idem, *Gates* (n. 79 above) 57–85; Ta-Shma, "Hebrew-Byzantine Exegesis" (n. 225 above).

[233] See above, at nn. 81, 82. Even Rashbam accepted this hierarchy in principle. Though his commentary is dedicated exclusively to *peshuto shel miqra*, he refers to midrashic interpretation as "the essence" of Scripture. See, e.g., his comm. on Gen 37:2 and Exod 21:1. See also Cohen, "Emergence" (n. 15 above) 213–216.

[I]t is necessary that the reader of the divine writings carefully consider the order that is required in the disciplines—among history, allegory, and tropology…. I do not think that you can be perfectly perspicacious with regard to allegory unless you have first been grounded in history…. Just as you see that no building without a foundation can be stable, so too it is in learning. The foundation and beginning of sacred learning is history, from which the truth of allegory is extracted like honey from the honeycomb.[234]

"[H]istory" is not only the narrative of things having been done but also the first meaning of any narrative that signifies according to the proper nature of the words. According to this broader understanding of the word "history," I think that all the books of both Testaments… pertain to this reading according to the literal sense.[235]

Although Hugh was much younger than Rashi, this conception of the literal/historical sense are drawn from a much older source, Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Job*, which Hugh cites (albeit without explicit attribution) in the following lines:

When you are ready to build, "first lay the foundation of history; next, by means of figurative interpretation, build a structure in your mind to be a fortress of faith. Last of all, through the loveliness of morality, paint the structure as with the most beautiful color."[236]

Gregory's work was highly influential, and his characterization of the historical sense as the "foundation" for the spiritual senses was often repeated, e.g., by Bede (673–735), Rabanus Maurus (780–856), and Rupert of Deutz (1075–1129).[237] The recurrence of this hermeneutical conception in the Latin tradition before and during Rashi's time makes it more likely that it would have been known to him if he discussed Bible interpretation with learned Christians. Although Rashi does not explicitly refer to *peshuto shel miqra* as a "foundation" for midrashic interpretation, he implicitly treats it as such in his interpretive program.

Beyond the general metaphor of the literal sense as a foundation, Bruno's strategy for establishing the cogency of the Christological mystical sense of the Psalms can illuminate the theoretical underpinnings of Rashi's innovative exegetical project. Bruno seems to have been a pioneer in adapting to biblical commentary the so-called "type C" prologue form traditionally associated with philosophical texts, as classified by R.W. Hunt.[238] This prologue form seems to be a development of what Hunt termed the "type B" form that is found in late antique glosses, including Servius' prologue to the works of Virgil, and which was used elaborately in Remigius' secular commentaries.[239] These prologues typically addressed a variety of general questions about the work being

---

[234] Hugh, *Didascalicon*, Book Six, Chapters 2–3; Harkins trans. (Harkins et al, *Interpretation* (n. 114 above) 164–167). For discussion of the implications of this passage and the metaphors it contains, see Coolman, "*Pulchrum Esse*" (n. 114 above) 189–194; Harkins, *Reading* (n. 123 above) 137–196.

[235] Hugh, *Didascalicon*, Book Six, Chapter 3, Harkins trans. (Harkins et al, *Interpretation* (n. 114 above) 166).

[236] Hugh, *Didascalicon*, Book Six, Chapter 3, Harkins trans. (Harkins et al, *Interpretation* (n. 114 above) 166–167). The citation from Gregory's *Moralia in Job* is from section iii of the dedicatory epistle to Leander. See Harkins, *Reading* (n. 123 above) 139–140.

[237] See de Lubac, *Exégèse* (n. 123 above) 1.434–439, who traces this image to Origen and Jerome.

[238] See Gilbert Dahan, *Lire la Bible au moyen âge: essais d'herméneutique médiévale* (Geneva 2009) 64–66, 395, who suggests that Bruno's Psalms commentary is the first documented application of the type-C form to Bible exegesis. On the type-C and type-B forms, see R.W. Hunt, "The Introductions to the 'Artes' in the Twelfth Century," *Studia Mediaevalia in Honorem Admodum Reverendi Patris Raymundi Josephi Martin, Ordinis Praedicatorum S. Theologiae Magistri LXXUM Natalem Diem Agentis* (Brugis Flandrorum 1948) 94–97. On their application to Bible interpretation, see Minnis, *Authorship* (n. 121 above) 18–25, 40–72.

[239] See Hunt, "Introductions" (n. 238 above) 94; Cora Lutz, "One Formula of *Accessus* in Remigius' Works," *Latomus* 19 (1960) 774–780; Minnis, *Authorship* (n. 121 above) 15–19, 26–27.

glossed. The "type C" prologue included, among other things, the *materia libri* (subject-matter) and the *ordo libri* (structure). In his general prologue to the Psalms, Bruno takes two other elements from the "type C" form, the *intentio auctoris* (authorial intention) and the question *cui parti philosophiae supponitur* (to which part of philosophy does it pertain), and applies them to the Psalms. According to Bruno:

> The intention of this work is shown to be various through the diversity of its individual titles [i.e., the superscriptions]. For he [i.e., David] sometimes intends to prophesy of the Incarnation, the Nativity, the Passion, the Resurrection, and the other acts of Christ, and at other times of the salvation of the good and the damnation of the wicked.[240]

Bruno also discusses in detail the *pars philosophie* (part of philosophy) to which the Psalms can be associated:

> Just as, among secular books, some pertain to physics, some to ethics, and some to logic, so too may we speak of divine books. Some pertain to physics, although in this case the natural phenomena serve as figures—as in Genesis, where the origin of the world is described…. Others, in place of logic, pertain to ethics, e.g., Job, *Blessed are the undefiled* (see Ps 119:1), and certain other psalms. Others, in place of logic and ethics, pertain to speculation or contemplation—those, that is, which contain the sublime mysteries of God, far removed from comprehension. These include the Song of Songs, in which God is shown speaking with wondrous mystery to the Church, as a Bridegroom to his Bride. This book [i.e., the Psalter], although in part pertaining to ethics, principally pertains to contemplation, since he [i.e., the psalmist] intends mysteriously to speak in particular about the Incarnation, Nativity, and the rest of the acts of Christ.[241]

Bruno here draws upon the categories typically used to discuss non-biblical literature to enumerate the three parts of philosophy to which a biblical book may pertain. He adapts the traditional Hellenistic division of philosophy into physics, ethics, and logic to the classification of biblical books by replacing logic with contemplation. Indeed, for Bruno, most psalms pertain to contemplation, since David, as a prophet, contemplates and then writes about future events "far removed from the ordinary comprehension" of his contemporaries.[242]

Kraebel has noted that Bruno will typically provide an individual preface to each psalm in which he sets forth its authorial intention, and then goes on, in his commentary, to demonstrate how that intention is borne out by the psalm's language and structure.[243] On Psalm 18 (MT 19), for example, Bruno writes:

> Foreseeing the preachers who will be sent by God for the instruction of the Church, and foreseeing too that, by their wondrous office, the Law will be expounded through the Holy Spirit for the instruction of their successors, making it immaculate and holy, the Prophet, in his joy, intends, through the activity of the Holy Spirit, to prophesy all of these future events as though they were happening in the present.[244]

---

[240] PL 152:638a. English translation from Kraebel, "Poetry and Commentary" (n. 41 above) 242.

[241] PL 152:638b–639a. English translation from Kraebel, "Poetry and Commentary" (n. 41 above) 242.

[242] Kraebel, "Poetry and Commentary" (n. 41 above) 242. See also Levy, "Bruno on the Pauline Epistles" (n. 37 above) 17–18.

[243] Kraebel, "Poetry and Commentary" (n. 41 above) 243; idem, "*Grammatica*" (n. 39 above) 89.

[244] PL 152:708bc. Translation from Kraebel, "Poetry and Commentary" (n. 41 above) 243.

Accordingly, in his commentary on v. 2, Bruno writes, "*The heavens show forth [enarrant] the glory of God*, i.e., the Apostles, who, according to the loftiness of their virtues, ought to be called *heavens*. They will tell out (*extra narrabunt*), i.e., in the open, the glorious essence of the Son of God."[245] The Christological interpretation of "the heavens" as the Apostles is drawn from Augustine, followed by Cassiodorus.[246] But Bruno, both in his introduction to the psalm and in the commentary, makes a distinctive effort to demonstrate how this reading can be construed as David's intention in the psalm. He thus emphasizes that David foresaw prophetically the preaching activity of the Apostles. Hence, although the psalm is written in the present tense ("the heavens show forth") it can be construed to describe future events ("they will tell out")—echoing a point Bruno had already made in his general prologue to the Psalms.[247]

The strategies that Bruno employs to demonstrate the cogency of his interpretation of King David's prophetic Christological intentions in the Psalms illuminate the strategy Rashi employed to interpret the Psalms as prophecies regarding the later history of the Jewish people. On the superscription of Psalm 42, for example, Rashi remarks:

> *A Maskil by the sons of Korah*—Assir and Elkanah and Aviasaph (Exod 6:24). They were originally part of their father's conspiracy, but at the time of his revolt they disassociated themselves. When all those who were around them were swallowed up when the earth opened its mouth, their place remained in the Earth's mouth in accord with what is stated in the Bible, "the sons of Korah did not die" (Num. 26:11). It was there that they sang a hymn of thanksgiving and they ascended and it was there that they composed these Psalms [attributed to them: Psalms 42–43, 44–49, 84, 85, 87, 88]. The Holy Spirit rested upon them, and they prophesied concerning the exiles and concerning the destruction of the Temple and concerning the kingship of the Davidic dynasty.[248]

As mentioned above (in section 2), Rashi interprets Psalm 42 (and its continuation in Psalm 43) as a national lament of the Jewish people in the Diaspora extending to his own time, even though it might seem more reasonable (from a historical-critical perspective) to assume that the psalm was composed by an ancient Israelite sadly reflecting upon his own inability to go on a pilgrimage as he had done previously. The latter interpretation was indeed given by Rashi's much older Andalusian contemporary Moses Ibn Chiquitilla, and his view is cited by Ibn Ezra, who also criticizes Rashi for adopting a midrashic approach inconsistent with the language of the Psalm.[249] In his gloss on the superscription of Psalm 42, however, Rashi provides a foundation for his national typological reading of the psalm by positing that it was composed through "the Holy Spirit," which provided the author with insight into the future and the ability to speak in the voice of the Jewish people in later historical epochs.[250] Rashi thus offers the following gloss on the anguished lament by the psalmist later in this psalm:

---

[245] PL 152:708c. Translation from Kraebel, "Poetry and Commentary" (n. 41 above) 243.

[246] See Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, Coxe trans. (n. 155 above) 121; Cassiodorus, *Expositio in Psalterium*, Walsh trans. (n. 154 above) 1.196.

[247] See PL 152:639b–c and Kraebel, "Poetry and Commentary" (n. 41 above) 243; see also Levy, "Bruno on the Pauline Epistles" (n. 37 above) 18.

[248] Gruber ed. (n. 88 above) 825; English translation, 335 (with slight adjustment).

[249] See above, at nn. 87, 90.

[250] To be sure, Ibn Ezra was prepared to invoke the notion that David and other authors in the Psalms spoke with the aid of the "Holy Spirit," which enabled them to speak of events far in the future. However, Ibn Ezra applies this conception only where it is necessitated by compelling evidence in the biblical text, for example, in Psalms 126 and 137. He does so in response to the view of Ibn Chiquitilla, that these psalms were composed much later than David's time, e.g., during the Babylonian exile or the subsequent return to Zion,

"O when will I come to appear before God?"—i.e., to make a pilgrimage [to Jerusalem] for the festival. [The psalmist] prophesied here concerning the destruction of the Temple, and the utterance three times "Why are you so downcast [my soul]?" (42:6, 12; 43:5) corresponds to the three kingdoms that will in the future put an end to the Temple service. [In each instance] Israel cries out [to God], and they are redeemed: from the kingdom of Babylon, of Greece, and of Edom (i.e., Rome) [respectively].[251]

With this framework in place, Rashi proceeds to interpret the despair expressed in this psalm as the national despair of Israel in the Diaspora longing for God's salvation and a return to Zion in messianic times.[252]

King David (rather than the Sons of Korah) is the usual vehicle of the Holy Spirit in the Psalms, as Rashi notes regularly, typically to explain how David could refer to events in the far future. For example, in the opening of his commentary on Psalm 14 (which serves as a sort of mini-preface), Rashi writes:

There are two [virtually identical] psalms that David said in this book about one matter: the first was said about Nebuchadnezzar (Psalm 14), and the second (Psalm 53) about Titus the wicked. He prophesied that Nebuchadnezzar would barge into the Temple and destroy it [and it is in reference to him that David says:] "The fool has said in his heart: there is no God" (14:1).[253]

Rashi again invokes the notion of David's prophecy in the course of interpreting Psalm 149, which he takes to be a thanksgiving to God that that will be uttered by the Jews in the messianic era. Seeking to identify "the judgment that is written" (v. 9) that will be meted out to those who had oppressed Israel, Rashi refers to a verse in Ezekiel, "I shall wreak my vengeance on Edom" (Ezek 25:14). According to the classic rabbinic typology that equates Edom with Rome, Rashi would have taken this to be a reference to the Christian oppressors of Israel.[254] But, this identification requires the following historical deliberation by Rashi:

---

and are prayers uttered in the historical circumstances that they described. See Uriel Simon, *Four Approaches to the Book of Psalms: From Saadiah Gaon to Abraham Ibn Ezra* (Albany 1991), 126–137, 187–216. By contrast, Rashi, reflecting a distinctively midrashic outlook , applies the concept of the "Holy Spirit" much more broadly—even without compelling textual evidence—to read the Psalms as prayers relevant to the circumstances of the Jewish people in postbiblical times.

[251] Comm. on v. 2, Gruber ed. (n. 88 above) 825; English translation, 335–336 (with slight adjustment).

[252] See, e.g., his glosses on Ps 42:3,5,9; 42:3. For other instances in which Rashi introduces the concept of "the Holy Spirit" or prophecy in order to interpret a psalm as being relevant for a later point in Jewish history, see, e.g., his glosses on 74:9, 97:1, and the examples cited below.

[253] Comm. on Ps 14:1. The first part of this comment is omitted in Gruber's edition (and is cited here based on the text appearing in the *Keter* edition of the *Miqra'ot Gedolot*), because it does not appear in MS Vienna 220, Gruber's base text. It stands to reason that this comment was actually penned by Rashi, but later removed (either by Christian censors or by Jewish scribes fearful of censorship), since it refers disparagingly to a Roman Emperor, and Rome was a typological symbol for Christianity in medieval Jewish thought. See Grossman, "Rashi on Isaiah" (n. 218 above) 48–49, 57, 60–61; Michael T. Walton, "In Defense of the Church Militant: The Censorship of the Rashi Commentary in the *Magna Biblia Rabbinica*," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 21 (1990) 396–397. See also the following note.

[254] See Gerson D. Cohen, "Esau as Symbol in Early Medieval Thought," *Jewish Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, ed. Alexander Altmann (Cambridge, MA 1967) 19–48; Grossman, "Rashi on Isaiah" (n. 218 above) 52–62.

Now should you object: But Ezekiel was not yet born when David composed this Psalm! I would respond: David here prophesied concerning the eschatological redemption. Therefore, when the eschaton will have arrived, this "judgment" will already have been "written" for a long time.[255]

The association of "the judgment that is written" with another prophetic verse can be found in midrashic sources.[256] Rashi's innovation is to explain rationally how King David could refer to such a verse, as he lived well before the era of the literary prophet Ezekiel.

The idea that King David and other authors composed the Psalms inspired by "the Holy Spirit" grants Rashi wide latitude to read into the Psalms depictions of events and sentiments relevant to the long course of Jewish history far beyond the biblical period. Yet Rashi expresses concern for methodological rigor in applying this notion in order to be certain that he has accurately interpreted David's authorial intention. On Ps 16:7, for example, he accepts one midrashic interpretation he can attribute to King David—as a recipient of prophecy—while rejecting another midrashic reading that, in his view, does not conform to the language:

Until this point, David prophesied about the Congregation of Israel [in the far future], who will utter this [psalm of thanksgiving to God]. And now he says [about himself]: "As for me, I too shall praise God…" But our Rabbis interpreted it about our father Abraham… However, we [do not follow their interpretation, as we] must settle the verses according to their sequence.[257]

Although Rashi was prepared to apply a midrashic mode of reading to the first part of this psalm, he does not accept the midrashic reading of its second part, which, in his view, does not "settle the verses according to their sequence." He therefore assumes that David refers to his own circumstances, as a straightforward reading of this psalm would suggest, rather than accepting the rabbinic interpretation uncritically. The implications of this reservation are spelled out in Rashi's comment on Ps 51:7, where he remarks: "There are midrashim on this verse, but they are not settled upon the matter of which this psalm speaks."[258] Rashi's goal is to ascertain the matter of which scripture "speaks,"[259] i.e., what the intention of the author was, for which he seeks empirical evidence: an interpretation that "settles" or "is settled upon" the language and sequence of the biblical text.[260] Interpretations that do not meet these criteria cannot be what David—or other biblical authors—intended to express, either literally or allegorically. In such cases, as already noted, Rashi will specify that the midrashic interpretations lack exegetical cogency—a point he makes often in his commentaries, as we have seen in his introduction to the Song of Songs, and his commentaries on Song 2:7 and on Exod 6:2–9.[261] This is comparable to the striking challenge that Bruno raises with respect to certain far-fetched allegorical readings in his commentary on Ps 97:3 and on the

---

[255] Gruber ed. (n. 88 above) 860; English translation, 762 (with slight adjustment).

[256] See *Midrash Tehillim* on Ps 149:9, citing Mal 3:19, Isa 66:24.

[257] Gruber ed. (n. 88 above) 816; English translation, 227 (with slight adjustments).

[258] Gruber ed. (n. 88 above) 829; English translation, 385 (with slight adjustments).

[259] See n. 194 above.

[260] We are speaking here about how Rashi perceived his exegetical project. Naturally, this sort of "conformity" would not satisfy modern historical-critical scholars; nor did it impress Ibn Ezra, a scion of the Andalusian *peshat* school. See above, nn. 85, 86, 90, 91.

[261] See above, nn. 68, 105, 110.

headings of Psalms 50 and 141.[262] Both eleventh-century northern French exegetes applied what they regarded as rigorous exegetical standards to accurately ascertain the authorial intention of the prophetic poets who composed the words of scripture guided by the Holy Spirit.

Nowhere is Rashi more systematic in his analysis of prophetic intention as in his introduction to the Song of Songs, which merits some further remarks here. As already discussed above (in section 2), the first part of that introduction establishes the importance of "the *peshat/mashma'* (plain/literal sense) of scripture" as well as Rashi's exegetical criteria for selecting interpretations drawn from midrashic tradition. Rashi goes on to explicate, in a strikingly methodical way, the subject-matter and literary structure of the Song of Songs, as well as the intention of its author, King Solomon:

> Now I say that Solomon saw with the Holy Spirit that Israel will be exiled, exile after exile, destruction after destruction, and will mourn in this exile over their original glory, and will remember the first love [of God toward them], which made them His chosen among all nations… and they will recall His kindness and their transgression, and the good things that He promised to bestow upon them at the end of days.

> And he [Solomon] composed this book with the Holy Spirit in the language of a woman stuck in living widowhood, longing for her husband, pining over her lover, recalling to him the love of their youth, and admitting her sin. Likewise, her lover suffers over her pain, and recalls the goodness of her youth and her beauty, and the excellence of her deeds, through which he was tied to her in powerful love, to say to them that… she is still his wife and he is her husband, who will ultimately return to her.[263]

The notion that King Solomon wrote the Song of Songs guided by "the Holy Spirit" is an ancient rabbinic one.[264] But Rashi uses this concept in a new way to specify Solomon's intention in the biblical text that is articulated through a particular literary style—a complex love story that he outlines in this introduction, followed by further detail in the commentary itself. For Rashi, the human love story about an older woman and man recalling their youthful love relationship comprises the *peshat* of this biblical text, which, in turn, represents the relationship between Israel and God throughout the ages that King Solomon foresaw with the Holy Spirit.[265]

The themes laid out in Rashi's introduction to the Song of Songs can be compared productively to Bruno's preface to the Psalms. In this introduction, Rashi presents his view of the *materia libri* (subject-matter), *ordo libri* (structure), and the *intentio auctoris* (authorial intention) manifested in the Song of Songs. Furthermore, much as Bruno invoked the notion of the Holy Spirit granting David prophetic knowledge of the future that guided him in composing the Psalms, Rashi ascribes such prophetic knowledge to

---

[262] See above, nn. 172, 176, 180.

[263] Rashi on the Song of Songs, Kamin and Saltman ed. (n. 105 above) 81. For analysis of this text, see Kamin, *Categorization* (n. 56 above) 247–249.

[264] See, e.g., Tamar Kadari, "'Friends hearken to your voice': Rabbinic interpretations of the Song of Songs," *Approaches to Literary Readings of Ancient Jewish Writings*, ed. K. A. D. Smelik and Karolien Vermeulen (Leiden 2014) 188.

[265] Rashi's investigation of the literary format of the Song inspired subsequent northern French *pashtanim* to ascribe it to Solomon's own creative spirit, by contrast with the prophetic content relayed in the book, which Solomon received only with the aid of the Holy Spirit. See Mordechai Z. Cohen, "Hebrew Aesthetics and Jewish Biblical Exegesis," *The Edinburgh Companion to the Bible and the Arts*, ed. Stephen Prickett (Edinburgh 2014) 36–39.

Solomon in the Song of Songs. Rashi, like Bruno, implicitly draws an analogy between biblical and secular literature. In a later commentary that emerged from Rashi's school (considered by many scholars to be the work of Rashbam) that is modeled in many respects after that of Rashi, we find an explicit comparison of the literary format of this biblical text with a poetic genre known from contemporaneous secular French culture:

> And still nowadays the convention of the *meshorerim* (singers, poets, *trouvères*) is to sing a song that recounts (*mesapper*) the narrative of the love of a couple, with love songs (*shirei ahava = chant d'amour*) as is the practice of all people (*minhag ha-'olam*).[266]

It is not unreasonable to suggest that Rashi had this model in mind when describing the literary King Solomon's literary design and intention.

The parallels between Bruno and Rashi in applying the concept of the "Holy Spirit" in order to establish, in as systematic and rational away as possible, the intentions of the prophetic biblical authors, again raise the question: Could it be that Rashi became aware of—and sought to replicate in a Jewish format in his commentaries on the Psalms and the Song of Songs—the critical grammatical methodology Bruno used to better establish patristic Christological readings of the Psalms? The need to respond to Christian interpretation was undoubtedly on Rashi's mind in his commentaries on both of these biblical books. Rashi's endeavor to refute Christian interpretations is explicit in his Psalms commentary.[267] In his Song of Songs commentary this program, while not stated explicitly, lies just beneath the surface. As Sarah Kamin has noted, Rashi's allegorical interpretation of the Song of Songs reworks older midrashic material into a decidedly new reading of this biblical text that was relevant for the Jewish people in "this exile," i.e., in medieval Christian Europe.[268] Rashi read the Song of Songs as an affirmation that God has not abandoned Israel, using this text to rebut the Christian argument that Israel's prolonged exile is evidence that she has been rejected by God. According to Kamin, this is precisely why Rashi interpreted the love-story in the Song as a recollection of youthful love story told retrospectively by an older woman who, though separated from her husband, continues to express her devotion to him, as he does for her—a representation of Israel and God, who may seem to be separated in the dark exile of medieval Christian Europe, but in actuality remain connected spiritually.[269] Kamin adduces evidence that Rashi's Song of Songs commentary responds to a traditional Christian reading attested most clearly in Origen's commentary, according to which the book speaks allegorically of the marriage between Christ and the Church.[270] Rashi could

---

[266] Rashbam on Song 3:5, ed. Sara Japhet (Jerusalem 2008) 250. On the questions raised in recent scholarship regarding the attribution of this commentary to Rashbam, see Hanna Liss, "The commentary on the Song of Songs attributed to R. Samuel ben Meïr (Rashbam)," *Medieval Jewish Studies* 1 (2007) 1–8. On the references here to French love songs sung by the *trouvères*, see ibid., 23–24. On the *trouvères*, see Mary J. O'Neill, *Courtly Love Songs of Medieval France Transmission and Style in the Trouvère Repertoire* (Oxford, UK 2006).

[267] See n. 219 above.

[268] Nicholas of Lyre would take Rashi's midrashic reading to be the literal sense of the Song of Songs, superseded by the Christian allegorical sense. See Mary Dove, "Literal Senses in the Song of Songs," *Nicholas of Lyra: The Senses of Scripture*, ed. Philip D Krey and Lesley Smith (Leiden 2000), 129–146; Kamin, *Jews and Christians* (n. 88 above) 58–68.

[269] See Kamin, *Jews and Christians* (n. 88 above) 22–35.

[270] Kamin, *Jews and Christians* (n. 88 above) 35–57. On Origen's Song of Songs commentary, see Christopher J. King, *Origen on the Song of Songs As the Spirit of Scripture: The Bridegroom's Perfect Marriage-Song* (Oxford 2005); Richard Layton, "Hearing Love's Language: The Letter of the Text in Origen's Commentary on the Song of Songs," *The Reception And Interpretation Of The Bible In Late*

have become aware of this reading by being informed of the interpretation of one of the subsequent Latin commentators who adopted his approach, such as Gregory the Great or Haimo of Auxerre (d. 855), as their commentaries on the Song of Songs circulated widely in the tenth and eleventh centuries.[271] The same avenue of intellectual exchange by which Rashi might have learned of this Christian reading of the Song of Songs could have also exposed him to Bruno's interpretations of the Psalms. In that case, it is conceivable that Rashi became aware of Bruno's distinctive type-C Psalms prologue (which became well-known among subsequent Christian scholars, as attested by other late eleventh-century Remois Psalms commentaries[272]), and this may have spurred him to employ a comparable theoretical mode of discussion (otherwise unprecedented in Ashkenazic Jewish scholarship) in his introduction to the Song of Songs and his prologues to some of the Psalms.

<p style="text-align:center">***</p>

This study has catalogued a number of important methodological parallels between the Bible exegesis of Rashi of Troyes and Bruno the Carthusian. It also raises the conjectural possibility that Rashi was aware of, and influenced by, Bruno. Of course, any such "influence" must be put into perspective. Unlike Bruno, Rashi was an expert in Biblical Hebrew and also drew heavily upon the expanse of earlier Jewish learning. While Rashi's primary source was rabbinic literature, he had access to important post-rabbinic linguistic-philological sources, such as the works of Menahem ben Saruq and Dunash Ibn Labrat, as well as the Old French glosses of the Bible. It is also possible (though I believe unlikely) that he knew of further exegetical developments in al-Andalus and perhaps even the philologically-oriented Byzantine commentaries. However, Rashi uses his Jewish sources in a new way and offers innovations of his own within a unique program that integrates a contextual-philological *peshat* program with a critical selection of midrashic interpretation. The possibility of Bruno's "influence" raised in this study amounts to the inspiration that would have motivated Rashi to adopt this program. The scenario we are considering is that Rashi became aware of Bruno's endeavor to support a Christological reading of the Psalms through "grammatical" analysis, and that he sought to bolster the Jewish reading of the Bible in a similar way using analogous methods of literary analysis he developed in his talmudic exegesis.

While our hypothesis regarding Bruno's influence on Rashi remains conjectural, the methodological parallels between them do, nonetheless, shed light on the thinking of the Jewish Troyes master within his eleventh-century northern French cultural framework. Even if, historically speaking, Rashi knew of the development of philological-contextual interpretation in the Andalusian or Byzantine schools, he would have recast it within his characteristically Ashkenazic cultural framework and the hermeneutical hierarchy it entailed. Here the resemblance to the Christian hermeneutical model that emerged in the school of Rheims proves significant, since it provides a closer

---

Antiquity: Proceedings Of The Montréal Colloquium In Honour Of Charles Kannengiesser, 11-13 October 2006, ed. Lucian Turcescu, Lorenzo DiTommaso, and Charles Kannengiesser (Leiden 2008) 287–315.

[271] See E. Ann Matter, *The Voice of My Beloved: The Song of Songs in Western Medieval Christianity* (Philadelphia 1990) 34–41; King, *Origen* (n. 270 above) 13–14. Origen's commentary itself, translated into Latin by Rufinus, does not seem to have circulated widely until the twelfth century, when there was a revival of interest in his work. See Jean Leclercq, "Origèn au XIIe siècle," *Irenikon Irenikon* 24 (1951) 425–439.

[272] See Kraebel, "John of Rheims" (n. 42 above).

parallel to the way that Rashi negotiated the newly developed philological methods and the midrashic interpretive tradition. Just as Bruno developed a distinctive method of interpreting the Psalms based on the Latin discipline of *grammatica*, Rashi appropriated for Bible exegesis the grammatical tools of Talmud exegesis that had been developed dramatically in the Rhineland academies by R. Gershom and his students, who were Rashi's teachers. Furthermore, like his Christian neighbors in the cathedral schools of northern France who followed Bruno's grammatical hermeneutic, which selectively drew upon patristic interpretations, Rashi did not regard philological-contextual analysis of the Bible as an end unto itself, but rather as a stepping stone for engaging in a systematic, selective commentary drawn from midrashic sources. Both Rashi and his Christian neighbors, as much as they disagreed about the "true" meaning of the Hebrew Bible, shared the traditional view that its essence is not to be found at the surface, but rather in its deeper sense, which was believed to convey messages directly relevant to their respective religious experiences. Within this framework, it makes sense that Rashi's goal was not simply to compose a *peshat* commentary but rather to do so as a foundation for a selective use of midrash that appropriately "settles the words of scripture."