
Confronting the Uncomfortable

Analyzing the Bible

Adam Teitcher

I. Introduction

The Bible contradicts itself, and that's OK. For centuries, students have studied the Bible in an attempt to peel away its many layers to discover some "truth" that lies beneath. Such in-depth textual analyses often gloss over the troubling predicament of the Bible – that there are many hundreds, if not thousands, of basic contradictions.

It is difficult to read the Bible, especially the first two chapters of Genesis, without uncovering the obvious difficulties in the text – verses that directly contradict one another. Sometimes these contradicting passages lie in a different chapters, or even different books of the Bible, and sometimes the difficulties lie within the very verse itself. Whatever the case may be, the fact that difficulties exist in the Bible is a reality that we must deal with.

There are two methods of mainstream Bible study. One is termed traditional exegesis, the other, modern Biblical scholarship. Both share the daunting task of explaining the Bible in a way that is both intellectually honest and satisfying, and yet the methodology of each is very different. While biblical scholarship applies the rules of modern literary analysis to the Bible, traditional exegesis strives to resolve discrepancies within the pre-established parameters of the text.

These differing methodologies stem from differing approaches toward the Bible, and each carries with it a theological significance. Traditional Bible

exegesis strives to explain the Bible in accordance with the belief that God gave the Bible to Moses, and that the Bible extant today is the same Bible received by Moses. In contradistinction, modern biblical scholarship inspects the Bible through a literary lens, analyzing the text with a scientific eye. This method of literary analysis is also known as higher textual criticism,¹ and it generally arrives at the conclusion that the Bible consists of different sections composed by different authors, which were compiled at some point, into the single corpus that we now know as the Bible. Despite the stark fundamental and theological differences, both methodologies attempt to resolve the difficulties presented in the Bible in order to construct a coherent, logical text.

Exegesis can be further categorized into two distinct camps: traditional medieval exegesis, and Modern Orthodox exegesis. While the former approaches the difficulties in the Bible with the goal of resolving them in such a way that they are no longer “actual” contradictions, the latter takes a decidedly different approach. Combining modern Bible scholarship and traditional medieval exegesis, the Modern Orthodox approach examines the Bible with a critical eye, acknowledging that the contradictions and difficulties in the Bible are valid and do, indeed, exist. These contradictions, say the Modern Orthodox, do not negate traditional Rabbinic Judaism, nor do they invalidate the Bible. On the contrary, they serve to enrich and enliven our understanding of the Bible.

While there are many examples of inconsistencies within the Bible, I will limit my discussion to the first two chapters of Genesis, dealing primarily with the conflicting accounts of creation. The first and second chapters of Genesis are discrepant in literary style, presentation of material, sequence of events, terminology, and overall theme. Since these chapters are the very first of the Bible, they carry special theological significance, and any result from an investigation of these two chapters can set a theological tone and precedent for the rest of the Bible. As such, the differences between these first two chapters must be examined closely and considered carefully.²

The first glaringly fundamental incongruity is that the two chapters

actually have very little in common aside from the fact that both discuss the creation of the world. This raises the possibility of a dual account of creation. The styles of the two chapters are also radically different—while the first chapter is written in a very rigid, tabular order, the second chapter is much looser, written more in the fashion of a narrative.³ In addition, there are blatant contradictions in the text itself, such as the inconsistent description of the creation of birds.⁴ An important inconsistency emerges with the discrepant use of God’s name in the two chapters. In the first chapter, God is exclusively called *Elohim*, but in the second account of creation, starting with Gen. 2:4b,⁵ the name *HASHEM Elohim* is exclusively used.⁶

But perhaps the most noticeable and difficult challenge lies in the description of the creation of man. In the first chapter, humans are created “in the image of God,” with both male and female created simultaneously.⁷ The second chapter, however, provides a radically different version, stating that man was created “from the dust of the ground,”⁸ and only after God declares it to be “not good” for man to be alone is woman created from the body of man. In the second version, man and woman are clearly created separately as distinct beings and at separate times.

II. Traditional Exegesis: Classic Resolution

The interpretation of these two chapters diverges depending on which camp of Bible study addresses the issue. Traditional medieval exegetes explain that the second chapter is an elaboration of the first, a mere elucidation of the creation story of the first chapter. The interpretation offered by many Bible scholars explains that the two chapters are actually different authors’ versions of precisely the same story of creation. The Modern Orthodox explanation is that the two chapters are actually the same story, but each chapter is intentionally distinct from the other, offering a different perspective on the story of creation.

The prevailing approach among the traditional medieval commentators,

explained more categorically, is that the first chapter discusses creation of the macrocosmic universe, while the second chapter provides the detail not included in the first.⁹ By explaining the first two chapters of Genesis in this way, medieval commentators, represented here by Rashi and Ramban, successfully solve the problems presented by the seemingly “dual” account of creation while preserving the traditional religious and theological philosophy of Rabbinic Judaism, defending both the divinity of the Bible and the truth of God.

Rashi, an eleventh century French commentator on the Bible, was one of the earliest traditional Rabbinic exegetes. He attempts to resolve the contradiction in many places throughout the first two chapters of Genesis. One example is in Gen. 2:5, which, in reference to the sixth day, states:

When no shrub in the field was yet on earth and no grasses of the field had yet sprouted, because HASHEM *Elohim* had not sent rain upon the earth and there was no man to work the ground.

In his commentary, Rashi points out the seeming inconsistency with the previous chapter, which explicitly states that the earth did, in fact, bring forth vegetation on the third day of creation:

The earth brought forth vegetation: seed-bearing plants of every kind, and trees of every kind bearing fruit with the seed in it, and God saw that this was good.¹⁰

Since Gen. 2:5 refers to the sixth day,¹¹ and Gen. 1:12 explicitly states that the earth brought forth vegetation on the third day, it would seem as though the Bible describes two different versions of creation: one with the creation of vegetation on the third day, the other with creation of vegetation on the sixth day.

To solve this difficulty, Rashi cites a passage in the Talmud,¹² which

explains that while the vegetation was indeed created on the third day, it did not sprout until the sixth. In the meantime it was “standing just beneath the surface of the ground.” By this interpretation, the second chapter serves to qualify the account of creation described in the first.

Rashi also addresses the basic validity of the claim of a dual creation. Gen. 1:27 describes the creation of man, “And God created man in His own image, in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them,” yet one chapter later, the creation of man is described again: “Then *HASHEM Elohim* formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.”¹³ (Gen. 2:7). In his commentary on Gen. 2:8, Rashi asks if it is even possible for the Bible to describe the creation of man twice. In order to preserve traditional Rabbinic Judaism’s understanding of a single, unified creation story, Rashi invokes a *Baraita*¹⁴ that lists the 32 hermeneutical rules of Rabbi Eliezer the son of Rabbi Yose the Galilean for expounding the Bible.¹⁵ Rashi asserts that this second account of creation employs the thirteenth of these principles, which states that in the instance of a general statement followed by a narrative, the narrative serves to elucidate the general statement.

In accordance with these rules, Rashi says, the verse in the first chapter of Genesis describes the creation of man as a general statement: “In the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.”¹⁶ This vague verse offers no details regarding the creation of man, and the reader is left to ponder – how was man actually created? From what material was he formed? How were man and woman created at the same time? What happened to man after he is created? Also in line with this thirteenth explanatory principle, the second chapter of Genesis serves as a narrative to elucidate the general statement, describing how man was created from the dust of the ground into which God blew “the breath of life,” and how woman was created from man’s rib. Much of the remainder of the chapter is dedicated to describing what happens to man after he is created, thereby completing the story of man’s creation in detail as

described in general by the first chapter.¹⁷

Ramban also offers an explanation for the second description of the creation of man. He explains that the second version refers to the creation of man as an exalted soul stemming from a mystical source.¹⁸ In chapter one, the basic, physical form of man was built, enabling him to move about and function. This was the same act of God that created the souls of animals and birds. All beings with the ability to move went through a similar process. In chapter two, however, man is given a supernal and rational soul that empowers him to think and act creatively, separating him from the animals. Ramban explains that it was this rational soul of man that required a separate act of creation. It is therefore fitting that the creative soul of man was created in the second chapter of Genesis, which deals with man and his relationship with the natural world. Man of Genesis one was a lump of clay, lifeless, but considered a living being nevertheless. Once Genesis chapter two comes, God “[blows] into his nostrils the soul of life,”¹⁹ transforming man into a *living* being with a soul.

While there is variability amongst the traditional medieval exegetes in the approach taken to the first two chapters of Genesis, the underlying principle is the same. The two chapters do not represent different stories of creation; rather, the second chapter elucidates the first, and we are able to preserve the tenets of traditional Rabbinic Judaism while resolving the obvious contradictions in the text.

III. Modern Bible Scholarship: Critical Analysis

In stark contrast to medieval exegesis, modern biblical scholarship takes a wholly new approach to understanding the first two chapters of Genesis. Discarding the notion of the divinity of the Bible, modern bible scholars employ literary techniques to probe the Bible for recurring themes, motifs, and styles, as well as numerous other literary elements, with the hope of finding some pattern or continuity in the different literary “strands” that run throughout

the text. Once such a pattern is discovered, different literary strands can be attributed to different authors.

Subscription to the non-divinity of the Bible necessarily creates internal problems in the text. If the Bible was written by the human hand and not the divine finger, it must, consequently, abide by some set of manmade literary rules. Since the first two chapters of Genesis clearly break all literary rules, modern Bible scholars are forced to attribute these two chapters to different authors. The dual account of creation, according to them, is best understood as varying descriptions of creation based on two different traditions of the story as inherited by different authors, with the variations merely reflecting each author's personal folklore. Since the two chapters diverge from one another so drastically in their literary styles, it would be simply illogical to posit singular human authorship.²⁰

While most biblical scholars share this fundamental premise, there is variation within this approach as well, reflected primarily in the methodologies of Norman Habel and Robert Alter.²¹ While both ascribe to the basic premise that the Bible was written by multiple authors, they disagree when it comes to understanding the synthesis of the authors' accounts.

Habel suggests that if not for the irreconcilable difference in the way God is represented in the two chapters, it would otherwise be possible to ascribe the literary differences in the texts to one writer's particular attitude towards life, nature, or mankind.²² However, the fact that the first chapter in Genesis refers to a "majestic transcendence of a powerful cosmic organizer," as Habel describes it, where God is a "being who stands outside of His cosmos and controls it with His mighty word,"²³ depicts a perception of God that is entirely different than the description of God in chapter two. According to Habel, the description of God in chapter one "[cannot] suggest the close proximity of a god who acts and looks like men."²⁴ Yet this is the very type of God described in chapter two, a God of "immanence, personal nearness, and local involvement on the human scene....Here is a God with whom man has ready contact and

immediate responsibility.” It is therefore impossible for Habel to accept that the same author wrote both chapters because of the fundamental difference in the description and understanding of God.

While Habel considers the differences in style, tone, terminology, and theological perspective between the first two chapters of Genesis to be overwhelming evidence of multiple authors, Robert Alter reads these chapters differently. Alter invokes the same literary devices as Habel to demonstrate the multiple authors of the Bible, but the conclusion that Alter reaches is radically different from that of Habel.

Accepting the theory that the two accounts of creation are based on two separate stories inherited by different authors, Alter explains that the Redactor, the individual who compiled the various creation stories, viewed *both* of these stories as canonical. This means that the Redactor considered it necessary to incorporate both accounts into his final work, despite the flagrant contradictions found in the separate stories.²⁵ Accordingly, this explains the inclusion of the numerous other inconsistencies in the Bible, not just the creation stories. Interestingly, Alter claims that the Redactor purposely juxtaposed these contrary accounts, a technique that Alter calls “Composite Artistry.” As he explains:

I would argue that there were compelling literary reasons for the Genesis author to take advantage of both documents at his disposal – perhaps also rejecting others about which we do not know – and to take advantage as well of the contradictions between his sources.²⁶

Due to the various stylistic elements that exist in chapter one, including the orderly sequence of creation as well as the repetition of the verb “to divide” and other words and phrases, Alter claims that this rigidly ordered account of creation reflects a particular vision of God, man, and the world. Alter points out that since “coherence is the keynote of creation,”²⁷ a progressive and numeric trend to creation generates a sense of relative importance to each creative act.

Man enters this saga of assigned sequence on the sixth day, the apex of creation, and is appropriately given “a clearly demarcated role of dominance in a grand hierarchy.”²⁸ This is evident in the charge given to man in Gen. 1:28 to subdue the earth and rule over all living creatures. According to Alter, P, the author of chapter one, describes God as the creator of a rigidly ordered and numerical macrocosmic universe, only interested in the large scheme of creation.

The author of the second chapter, J, however, is concerned with the humanistic aspect of creation. J focuses on that which P avoids – the divine concern for man, shifting the perspective of creation to a viewpoint that is microcosmic and personal.²⁹ Alter’s thesis is illustrated through the synthesis of the two stories of creation. As he explains:

[The Genesis author] chose to combine these two versions of creation precisely because he understood that his subject was essentially contradictory, essentially resistant to consistent linear formulation, and this was his way of giving it the most adequate literary expression...The creation story might have been more ‘consistent’ had it begun with Genesis 2:4b, but it would have lost much of its complexity as a satisfying account of a bewilderingly complex reality that involves the elusive interaction of God, man, and the natural world.³⁰

To achieve his intended goal, Alter argues, the Genesis author deliberately combined two divergent perspectives of creation, fully aware of the contradictions and difficulties created by their synthesis, in order to achieve the larger goal of providing a broad perspective of God, man, nature, and their interaction, thereby creating an elaborate and grander worldview.

Such a view of the creation of the universe demands a transcendent and imminent perspective of God. God, from this perspective, is authoritative, yet deeply empathetic and involved with His creations. This point of view generates a dichotomous view of the world as orderly and beautifully patterned,

yet chaotic and free flowing. This is a very natural perspective of the world, and still maintains a sense of divine order and purpose to that chaos.

Both Habel and Alter consider the Bible a human literary work, making it vulnerable to literary analysis, and both approach with the claim of (multiple) human authors to the Bible, but diverge in their assessment of this claim. Habel claims that the differences between the two chapters of Genesis are irreconcilable and therefore must simply be the result of multiple authors' versions of creation. Alter, taking Habel to another level, considers the inclusion of the variant stories in the final, "edited" version of the Bible to be calculated and purposefully inserted to draw the reader's attention to these differences, which ultimately provides grander view of man, his role within the natural world, and God.

IV. Modern Orthodox Interpretation: A Synthesis

A third methodology for understanding the Bible is introduced by Modern Orthodox scholarship, and is described primarily by Rabbi Joseph B. Soloveitchik in his book *The Lonely Man of Faith*, and Rabbi Mordechai Breuer's *Pirkei B'reishit*. With essentially the same goal as traditional medieval exegesis, this third approach strives to preserve the divinity of the Bible and the singularity of its authorship. After the common preconception in the divinity of the Bible, Modern Orthodox scholarship departs from traditional medieval exegesis in its treatment of textual contradictions. While medieval exegetes posit that these differences are elucidatory, Modern Orthodox scholarship accepts the differences within the text without attempting to fit the second chapter's account of creation into the original chapter one account. Instead, Modern Orthodox scholarship explains the two chapters as representative of the different aspects of man and the different attributes of God. Viewed separately, the two chapters discuss diametrically opposed values. But when considered together, it becomes clear to Modern Orthodox exegetes that they are, in fact, complementary. Together, they claim, these two chapters paint a decidedly

more complete picture of man and his relationship with the world and with God.

Rabbi Soloveitchik's explanation of the first two chapters of Genesis is famously known as the "Adam I, Adam II" approach. Chapter one discusses Adam I, referring to man's charismatic endowment as a creative being. As Rabbi Soloveitchik explains, "Man's likeness to God expresses itself in man's striving and ability to become creator...for creative activity."³¹ Adam I acts like God in his preoccupation with his intellect that enables him to exert control over creation as a creator. Viewed in this light, the first chapter of creation, which describes the creation of the cosmos in a rigid, tabular format, is set up this way purposefully to emphasize mankind's scientific-intellectual side, the "creator" side. Emphasis is placed on the *creation* of the world because Adam I, the purely intellectual man, strives to create a world of his own through mathematics, art, architecture, and beauty.³² This Adam I is Man, created "in the image of God."

Adam II, on the other hand, is a much more philosophical being. He yearns to understand the "why" of the world, a question that the purely rational Adam I effectively ignores.³³ In contrast to Adam I, Adam II does not attempt to emulate God as a creator; he simply desires to understand the world in which he lives.

He [Adam II] encounters the universe in all its colorfulness, splendor, and grandeur, and studies it with the naïveté, awe, and admiration of the child who seeks the unusual and wonderful in every ordinary thing and event.³⁴

Adam II explores the world and nurtures a bond with the land, plants, and animals, a relationship that is especially highlighted by his naming each of the animals.

By way of this understanding, it is perfectly appropriate for chapter one to focus on the macrocosmic order, whereas chapter two focuses on the

microcosmic arena of the individual. These two aspects are present in every individual. Each person's reality is composed with both the ideas. First, that he is created in "image of God," and is a creative, rational being, with a drive to dominate and conquer, asking no philosophical questions. Yet man is also created from the "dust of the ground," and each man is existentially different and "other" than every other man. Both of these concepts contribute to man's unique experience of the world, and both help to define him as an individual.³⁵

Rabbi Mordechai Breuer employs a strikingly different methodology from Rabbi Soloveitchik in that he accepts the *principles* of documentary hypothesis, but does not accept the claim that the Bible was written by different authors. Instead, he posits that the Bible was intentionally written with multiple voices, reflecting multiple attributes with which God rules the world. According to him, these voices illustrate a characteristic fundamental to the study of the Bible – the multiplicity of ideas, and the notion that only through synthesis of the various conflicts can "truth" emerge.

The methodologies introduced by Rabbi Breuer and Rabbi Soloveitchik offer a very different, and certainly a more modern, perspective than the medieval commentators. Nevertheless, both affirm that the Bible was divinely transmitted to Moses, preserving the framework of traditional Rabbinic Judaism. While the traditional medieval commentators explain the textual inconsistencies of the first two chapters of Genesis in a way that literally *removes* the contradictions from the text, Modern Orthodox scholarship not only accepts them, but places value and importance on these discrepancies. Taken together, both chapters contribute to a greater understanding of man, this world, and an understanding of God.

An understanding of higher textual criticism has serious implications for modern study of the Bible. The Bible student's approach to these problems is a matter of personal comfort and taste. As has been demonstrated, there are many different ways to deal with these issues, all of which have academic

and intellectual merit. But these problems cannot be disregarded or ignored if intellectual honesty is to be preserved. Indeed, there are people with very strong religious convictions who consider this type of Bible study to be heretical. But in light of the Modern Orthodox approach to Biblical studies, a critical study of the Bible should not be considered sacrilegious or profane. It should instead be acknowledged and considered valuable for the fresh perspective and insight that it offers, an additional means by which religious conviction is not questioned but is rather strengthened, providing a richer, fuller understanding of the Bible. Theologically, the contradictions in the Bible do not pose a threat to the Jewish tradition, nor should close investigation of these difficulties be considered tantamount to heresy. The Bible is a work that we can and should be able to learn from, but some people fail to realize that in order to learn from the Bible, it needs to be truly studied. Only then can these contradictions be appreciated. And only then will they seem acceptable.

Adam Teitcher is a junior in the College of Arts & Sciences and hails from Oceanside, NY. He is majoring in both Jewish Studies and Cognitive Science with a concentration in Neuroscience.

Appendix A

Please note that the following chart of differences between Gen. 1 & 2 is not exhaustive, although it is a fairly extensive chart, touching upon the major differences between the two chapters.

Difference	Genesis 1	Genesis 2
Style	Written in a very rigid, formal, majestic style	More natural, reads like a true narrative
	Repetitive, tabular	Flowing, no repetition
	“In the beginning when God created the heavens and earth...”	“On the day when God, <i>Elohim</i> was making earth and heaven”
	Describes the state of the world before creation as <i>tohu va’vohu</i> , a state of disorderly confusion and desolation	Describes the state of the world before the creation of man as orderly, though uncultivated and undeveloped, since God had not yet “brought rain upon the earth, and there was no man to work the ground.”
	Rigid, formal order of creation	Creation follows a more natural, interrelated process
	Creation of birds from water	Creation of birds from ground
	No rivers mentioned in Genesis 1	Rivers discussed and described in Genesis 2
	Man is created in the image of God	Man is formed from the ground; God “breathed into his nostrils the soul of life.”
	Man is commanded to “fill the earth and subdue it.”	Man is commanded to “cultivate and protect” the Garden of Eden, and is charged with the task of finding a wife
	Man is allowed to eat “every plant that reproduces seed...all trees that have fruit”	Man is allowed to eat everything except for the Tree of Knowledge, Good and Bad
Sequence of Events	Sequence of creation: Heavens and earth, light and darkness -> sky and sea -> land, vegetation -> luminaries -> creatures, birds, fish -> [blessing of the creatures] -> creation of animals, creation of man	Sequence of Creation: Man -> Trees, vegetation -> Animals -> Woman
	Creation of man and woman together, at the same time	Creation of man and woman separately, at different times
	<i>Bara</i> is used to describe creation	<i>Bara</i> is not used at all
	<i>Vaya’as</i> is used to describe creation of animals	<i>Vayitzer</i> to describe creation of animals

Difference**Genesis 1****Genesis 2**

	<i>Elohim</i> is used as the name of God	<i>HASHEM Elohim</i> is used as name of God.
	Use of repeated phrases – “And God saw that it was good,” “And it was so.”	No repetitive phrases are used
	Only uses the word “ <i>eretz</i> .”	Uses the word “ <i>sadeh</i> ” (field) and <i>adamah</i> .
	“Male and Female”	“Man and Woman”
Thematic elements	Discusses the creation of the cosmos, a macrocosmic perspective on the creation of the world.	Creation focuses primarily on Man and does not focus on the cosmos at all
	Supernatural intervention and involvement in Creation.	Natural process steer the creation of the world.
	Very little detail pertaining to the creation of man.	Primarily focuses on the details surrounding the creation of man.

Notes

1 Higher textual criticism refers to the critical study of the Bible, a study which treats the Bible as a text written by human beings. Its purpose is to determine who wrote the Bible, when it was written, what it means.

2 For a charted list of differences between the first and second chapters of Genesis, see Appendix A

3 see Appendix A.

4 for in the first chapter birds are described as created from water, which happened before the creation of man. The second chapter, however, states that birds were created from the dust of the ground, after the creation of man.

5 There is disagreement as to whether the first account of creation ends with Gen. 2:4a inclusive or exclusive. For this paper, I assume that the two accounts of creation can be divided between Gen. 1:1 and Gen. 2:4a. This division is based on stylistic elements, as well as the completion of an entire 7-day sequence of creation, which ends at Gen. 2:4a. The second account of creation would therefore begin at Gen. 2:4b. See Habel.

6 *HASHEM* denotes the Tetragrammaton as the name of God.

7 *Jewish Publication Society Bible, Second Edition*. (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2000).

8 Gen. 2:7.

9 For example, chapter two lists the purpose for which man was formed, namely to cultivate the earth and find a life partner, a wife. This can be understood as an elaboration of the commandment in Gen. 1:28 to “fill the earth and subdue it,” for man subdues the earth by gaining dominion over the animals and by domesticating the animals. See Rashi, Gen. 2:19.

10 Gen. 1:12.

11 This account of the creation of vegetation is considered to be on the sixth day because of the progression of verses and the content of Gen. 2:5, which states that no vegetation had sprouted because God had not brought rain up on the earth and man was not yet created to work the land. This would imply that once man was created on the sixth day, the vegetation was able to grow.

12 Babylonian Talmud, *Chullin 60b*.

13 Gen. 2:7.

14 A *baraita* is a Mishnaic teaching excluded from the Mishna of Rabbi Judah HaNasi.

15 It is important to note that in traditional Rabbinic Judaism, there are multiple ways of explaining how verses in the Bible should be understood and interpreted, and there are three main schools of hermeneutical principles: The 32 hermeneutical principles of Rabbi Yose the Galilean; The 13 principles of Rabbi Ishmael; and the 7 principles of Hillel.

16 Gen. 1:27.

17 see Gen. 2:7, 2:15-25.

18 Ramban, Gen. 2:7.

19 Gen. 2:7.

20 This theory is called the Documentary Hypothesis, which claims that the Bible was written by four authors, J, P, E, and D, and compiled by R, the Redactor.

21 Norman Habel, *Literary Criticism of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971) 18 – 27, and Robert Alter, *The Art of the Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981) 131-154.

22 Habel 24.

23 Ibid.

24 Ibid.

25 Alter 141.

26 Ibid. 142.

27 Ibid. 143.

28 Ibid. 144.

29 Ibid. 145.

30 Ibid. 145, 147.

31 Joseph B. Soloveitchik, *The Lonely Man of Faith*, Tradition: A Journal of Orthodox Thought. (New York: The Rabbinical Council of America, 1965) 11.

32 Ibid. 15.

33 Ibid. 16.

34 Ibid. 17.

35 Ibid. 25.