





Biblical Interpretation in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries



BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION FROM THE EARLY SIXTEENTH THROUGH the late seventeenth century is separated from medieval exegesis by the philological advances associated with the Renaissance and by the theological and ecclesiological developments associated with the Reformation. In relative contrast with patristic and medieval exegesis, the exegetical efforts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries rested on a profound recourse to the biblical text in its original languages and on an increased focus on the literal sense of the text. Still, the interpretive efforts of the Reformers (their successors) and their Roman Catholic contemporaries belong to the so-called precritical model. Medieval interest in the meaning of the text for faith, love and hope (the three spiritual directions of the *quadriga* or allegorical method) finds parallels in the sermons and commentaries of the Reformers, as does the traditional sense of the unity of the scriptural message as grounded in the inspiration of the prophets and apostles by the divine Author. Even so, the exegetical work of the Reformers cannot easily be detached from the work of their successors: there is continuity of interpretive principles and of textual assumptions, just as there is continuity in exegetical result between the commentators of the sixteenth and those of the seventeenth century.



The Era of the Reformation

The era of the Reformation (c. 1500-1565) is one of the great eras of biblical interpretation in the history of the church. The biblical commentary received even greater emphasis than it had during the Middle Ages. This was particularly so given an increased emphasis on and mastery of classical languages and given the impetus toward exegesis created by the understanding of Scripture alone as the final norm for Christian doctrine. Nonetheless, the time is past when scholarship could ignore the significant continuities between the exegetical and hermeneutical patterns typical of the Reformation and the biblical interpretation of preceding eras. The time is also past when scholarship could identify Reformation-era biblical interpretation as the beginning of the modern, critical address to the text.

The exegetical mind of the sixteenth century was precritical, at least in the sense that it was pre-historical-critical. Biblical criticism in the sixteenth century was textual and theological. The historical sense of the text was identified with its literal, grammatical meaning. If a brief comparison with the higher-critical method can be drawn, the Reformation (like the preceding centuries) was concerned to find the meaning of the Bible in the received, canonical text rather than behind or under it in hypothetical predecessor-documents or in hypothetically reconstructed life situations of individual pericopes. In its sense of the integrity of the text and of the relationship of individual portions of the text to the meaning of the whole of the canon, the Reformation and the post-Reformation period had more in common with medieval and



patristic exegesis than with the modern higher-critical interpretation of the Bible.

The Reformers drew heavily on the textual and philological skills of Renaissance humanism and also on the exegetical tradition of the church reaching back through the Middle Ages to the patristic period. Nor is it possible to separate the efforts of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century commentators from the major effort of the age to establish a critical text of Scripture and to render the original languages into adequate translations, whether into the vernacular or into Latin. Many of the commentators understood it as an integral part of their task to offer either a critical examination of an extant translation, like the Vulgate or Erasmus's New Testament, or to provide a new translation in their commentaries. Both among the Lutherans and the Reformed we can now discern fairly intense programs designed to produce commentaries on the major portions of Scripture.

Nor were Roman Catholic exegetes negligent in applying the new philological skills of the Renaissance to the establishment of the text and to its interpretation. What separates exegesis in the Reformation and post-Reformation eras from their past is their union of renewed emphases on the ancient languages and rhetorical analysis with an increasing sense of the location of meaning in the literal sense of the text. Yet even in this emphasis, the potential breadth of the literal sense, as guaranteed by the intention of its divine author and defined by the scope of the canon, there is a degree of continuity with the older exegetical tradition.

The full history of biblical interpretation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries remains to be written. Whereas there are significant essays on the work of individual exegetes and major surveys and collections of essays on various themes and issues in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century biblical interpretation, there is no exhaustive study that surveys the exegetes, catalogues their works and assesses the content and impact of their exegesis. Until this detailed work has been done, it will be possible only to offer an outline of the method and import of early Protestant exegesis (not to mention the major Roman Catholic expositors) and an initial prospectus of the commentators and their writings. The dates of commentaries given in this essay identify the earliest editions found, which are not necessarily first editions in all cases.

The text and versions of Scripture. Although it is customary to speak of the Renaissance as a distinct movement that began perhaps two centuries before the Reformation, it is nevertheless impossible to separate the Reformation of the sixteenth century from the development of Renaissance humanism, particularly when humanism is understood as the application of revised theories of logic and rhetoric and of vastly increased philological skills to the critical examination of ancient texts. Recognition that the text of the Vulgate as well as its translation of the Hebrew and Greek originals was imperfect had brought about massive editorial work, including detailed comparison of the Latin with Hebrew and Greek texts as early as the thirteenth-century Dominican correctories. But the two keys to establishment and the widespread accessibility of a critical text of Scripture, in the original languages and in a revised translation, were the printing press and the broad revival of skills in ancient languages in the fifteenth century. Increased access to Hebrew was often made possible through recourse to the linguistic skills of Jewish converts to Christianity.

At the foundation of Reformation-era exegesis were the efforts of Renaissance editors of the biblical text in the last decades of the fifteenth and the first decades of the sixteenth century. These included editors of the Soncino and Bomberg Bibles, Lorenzo Valla (1405-1457), Jacques *Lefèvre d'Étaples (c. 1455-1536), Cardinal Ximenes de Cisneros (1436-1517), Desiderius *Erasmus, and later Robert Estienne or Stephanus (1503-1559), Sebastian Münster

(1489-1552) and Sebastian Castellio (1515-1563). A Psalter in Hebrew was printed at Bologna in 1477, and the entire Hebrew Old Testament appeared at Soncino in 1488. Jean *Gerson (1363-1429) superintended an edition published at Brescia in 1494 that was subsequently used by Martin *Luther (1483-1546) in the preparation of his German translation.

Independent of these editions was the Hebrew text of the *Complutensian Polyglott* (printed 1513-1517; published 1520 with permission from Leo X), superintended by Ximenes, priest-confessor to Isabella of Aragon and founder of the University of Alcalá, where he saw to the installation of four professors in Hebrew and Greek. The Complutensian text (so called from Complutum, the old Roman name of Alcalá) included the Hebrew Old Testament (vocalized but not accented), the Targum of Onqelos to the Pentateuch, the Septuagint and the Vulgate, plus Latin translations of both the Targum and the Septuagint. The Hebrew text and the Targum were edited by Alphonso of Alcalá, Alphonso of Zamora and Paul Coronel, all converts from Judaism. This was the first publication of a printed Septuagint, made less significant by editorial work conforming the Greek text to the Vulgate. For all his interest in the establishment of the text in its ancient languages, Ximenes remained an adamant opponent of translation into the vernacular. The Hebrew-Chaldee (i.e., Hebrew-Aramaic) lexicon and grammar of Zamora, initially the sixth volume of the Polyglott, was frequently reprinted in the sixteenth century.

A great critical advance was made with the *Biblia rabbinica* published by Bomberg (Venice, 1517-1518; 1525-1526). The second of these Bomberg Bibles marked a major textual advance: in it the vowel points and the Masora (Ben Asher) were included in full, the text was corrected from the Masora, and the Aramaic paraphrases and rabbinic commentaries were added. This second edition was frequently reissued during the sixteenth century.

The Greek text of the New Testament did not appear in print until several decades after the Soncino Hebrew Old Testament. Erasmus and his publisher, Froben of Basel, raced their Greek text of the New Testament to print in 1516 in order to precede the publication of the text in the final volume of Ximenes's *Complutensian Polyglott* (dated 1514 but printed in 1520). Subsequent editions of Erasmus's New Testament (1519, 1522, 1527 and 1535) improved the text by removing many typographical errors of the first edition—although the third edition is famous for its insertion, under pressure, of the disputed Johannine comma (1 Jn 5:7). Valla did not produce an edition of the New Testament, but his *Adnotationes* (1505) remained significant in the first half of the sixteenth century for the examination and establishment of the New Testament text.

The great Stephanus Bibles (Paris, 1546, 1549, 1550; Geneva, 1551) are typographically superior and, albeit heavily reliant on Erasmus and Ximenes, rest on a better text-critical apparatus than do earlier editions of the New Testament. Stephanus, himself a linguist, used a series of codices in Paris that Erasmus had not consulted. He established the text for the sixteenth century in the basic form of the *Textus Receptus*, which was followed with minor emendations, until the nineteenth century. Stephanus also introduced a pattern of enumeration of verses in his 1551 New Testament and 1555 Old Testament that rapidly became standard and that remains virtually unchanged in the Bibles of the twentieth century. This versification passed over into English in Whittingham's New Testament (1557) and in the Geneva Bible (1560).

This pattern of versification also was taken over into the New Testament text prepared by Theodore *Beza (1519-1605) and published by Stephanus in 1556 and incorporated into the Stephanus Bible in 1557. Beza drew on several more codices than Stephanus had, including

the so-called Codex Bezae and Codex Claromontanus, still cited in modern editions of the text. Beza's text became the basis for his most significant work, the *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum*. The text and the running commentary of the *Annotationes* in turn had a major impact on the Geneva Bible (1560), the marginalia of which are often summaries of Beza's running commentary, minus its text-critical remarks.

Throughout the era of the Reformation, Latin versions of Scripture, including the Vulgate, retained a significant place in scholarly (as distinct from popular) exegesis. The first Bibles to be printed in the fifteenth century were editions of the Vulgate. A revision of the Vulgate was made for the *Complutensian Polyglott*, and further corrections were introduced by Stephanus in his editions of 1528 and 1540. The Council of Trent also demanded revision of the text, culminating in the edition issued by Pope Sixtus V in 1590 and then revised by Clement VIII and published in 1592. Independent Latin translations of the New Testament were published by Erasmus (1516, reprinted many times), Cardinal *Cajetan (1530), Beza (1556) and Castellio (1551); the Old Testament appeared in new Latin translations by Münster (1534-1535) and Leo Jud, the latter assisted by Theodor Bibliander, Petrus Cholinus and Robert Gwalther (1543). Various parts of the Bible were also rendered into Latin by the major commentators; thus much of the Old Testament was retranslated in the commentaries of Johann *Oecolampadius and nearly the entire Bible in John *Calvin's commentaries. Conrad *Pellikan's (1478-1556) commentary on the whole Bible (1523-1535) offered a corrected Vulgate.

Hermeneutical issues. The era of the Reformation produced, in addition to biblical texts and commentaries, a number of significant discussions of biblical interpretation, including Luther's prefaces to all the books of the Bible and his *Open Letter on Translating*, Ulrich *Zwingli's (1484-1531) *On the Clarity and Certainty of the Word*, Martin *Bucer's (1491-1551) short treatise on the method of reading Scripture, sections of Wolfgang *Musculus's (1497-1563) *Loci communes*, and Heinrich *Bullinger's (1504-1575) *Decades*. Bucer's treatise stresses the necessity of beginning with the Gospels and moving on to the Pauline epistles as the core of Scripture before the reading of the Old Testament. Bullinger's *Ratio studiorum* (1527) details a course of biblical study, with heavy reliance on linguistic tools.

Reformation exegesis cannot be understood apart from a sense of the relative continuity of development of exegesis from the patristic period to the eighteenth century. There were several basic assumptions concerning the text of Scripture held in common by the Fathers, the medieval doctors, the Reformers and their seventeenth-century successors that unite all ages of precritical exegesis in their distinction from modern, so-called critical exegesis. These assumptions are that the historical import of the text was found in and not under its literal, grammatical meaning; that the primary intention of the text was to offer a divinely inspired message to the ongoing community of faith and not to recount the sentiments of the dead; that the meaning of a passage is governed not by a hypothetically isolable unit of text that has its own *Sitz im Leben* distinct from surrounding texts or from the biblical book in which it is lodged but by the scope and goal of the biblical book in the context of the scope and goal of the canonical revelation of God; and that the primary intention of the text demanded a churchly locus of interpretation and a reading of the text in conversation with the exegetical tradition rather than an isolated, scholarly encounter in the confines of an academic study.

As implied by this approach to the meaning of the text, Reformation-era exegesis assumed the inspiration of the text and the divine illumination of its human authors. Despite the intensity of Reformation debate over the relationship between biblical and churchly authority, there

was virtually no disagreement between Protestants and Roman Catholics over the inspiration of the text and the identification of God as the primary author and of the prophets and apostles as the secondary authors of the text, on the analogy of dictation. Most theologians and exegetes of the era assumed that the prophets and apostles spoke in their own words and out of their own contexts in history but that their words and, more importantly, the sense of their words was guaranteed by the Holy Spirit as the Word of God. Protestant insistence on the authority of the original languages of the text rested on the assumption that the words of the text in these languages alone were finally and ultimately authoritative.

In addition to these shared assumptions that link its exegesis to the tradition, a host of specific interpretive issues mark continuity as well as discontinuity between the Reformation and the exegetical patterns of the Middle Ages. In contrast to the major theological shifts that took place in the exegesis of individual verses of Scripture, such as Romans 3:20-27 and Romans 4:1-4 (on justification) or Luke 22:19-20 (the Lord's Supper), the hermeneutical change had been gradual. In the first place, the *quadriga* or fourfold exegetical model of the late patristic and medieval eras was not at all inimical to a powerful interest in the literal meaning of the text. Not only did the three spiritual senses (allegory, tropology and anagogy, referring to doctrine, morals and Christian hope, respectively) presume a foundation in the literal sense, there was, beginning in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, an increasing interest in the literal meaning as the primary meaning of the text—an interest evidenced in the commentaries of *Thomas Aquinas (c. 1224-1274) and later in the work of *Nicholas of Lyra (c. 1270-1349). Lyra departed from a fourfold sense and argued a twofold literal-spiritual sense of the text founded on a model of promise and fulfillment. Second, in the textual efforts of thirteenth-century Dominicans and in the work of Lyra, there is an interest in the establishment of an accurate text of Scripture for the sake of accurate interpretation.

The common ground between medieval exegesis, including the *quadriga*, and the exegetical work of the Reformers can be seen in the constant movement, not only in sermons but also in commentaries, from the literal sense of the words of the text to doctrinal, moral and eschatological understandings of the implication of the text for the church. A tendency toward tropology is evident in Luther's exegesis, even in his last lectures on Genesis. Calvin's commentaries consistently raise doctrinal issues and, for example, when the topic of the kingdom of God is broached in the text of the Old Testament, point not only to the obvious christological and eschatological topics but also to the work of the kingdom in Calvin's own time.

The literal or historical sense of the text argued by Reformation-era exegetes was not therefore a bare literal understanding of the text but rather an understanding that took into consideration the larger theological context and specifically the meaning of the divine author as presented in the Bible as a whole. Thus the literal meaning of a prophetic text was understood as the fulfillment of the prophecy. So too the literal sense was understood as the thing signified by a figurative or metaphorical passage. The doctrinal, moral and eschatological dimensions of the *quadriga* were not lost but rather were found more precisely lodged in the literal sense. Thus a distinct allegorical and anagogical sense was often scorned by the Reformers at the same time that the immediate reference of the text for Christian doctrine or Christian hope was emphasized. So too a separate tropological sense was set aside, but the moral issues and demands raised in the text for Israel and the early Christian community were understood as directly raised for the ongoing community of belief.

Given the strong emphasis of the Renaissance on the study of formal rhetoric, sixteenth-

century exegetes were attuned to the identification of forms of argument and figures of speech. They also emphasized the identification of the scope or focus of the text, usually in extended discussions of the argument or disposition of a book or chapter in Scripture. Exegetes pointed to the scope of individual chapters and of entire biblical books or of Scripture as a whole as integral to the interpretive task. In the latter sense, the scope or foundation of Scripture was often identified as Christ, the saving work of Christ or God's covenant with human beings.

Exegetes of the Reformation era differed considerably in their application of this understanding of the larger scope of Scripture. Whereas Luther and Johannes *Brenz assumed a profound trinitarian and christological content throughout the Old Testament, particularly in the Psalter, Calvin is remembered for his restraint. Calvin's commentary on Psalms hesitates to find a type of Christ in every mention of David and tends to reserve christological readings for the most clearly messianic psalms. So too Calvin refused to argue a trinitarian reading of Genesis 1. Other Reformed exegetes, however, such as Peter Martyr *Vermigli (1499-1562) and Musculus, retained the more trinitarian and christological patterns of interpretation.

If an increasing medieval emphasis on the letter and the text provided a context for the beginnings of Reformation exegesis, so did the textual, rhetorical and philological emphases of Renaissance humanism. Reformation-era commentaries were not only rooted in the Hebrew and Greek text, made available in increasingly finely edited editions, but were also directed toward the establishment of valid and serviceable translations of text in the vernacular and in Latin. Characteristic of the era is the gradual replacement, among Protestants, of the Vulgate by more accurate translations, notably those of Münster (Old Testament) and Beza (New Testament).

The gradual movement away from the forms and methods of medieval exegesis is nowhere more evident than in the style of commentaries. Whereas the medieval commentary had been largely theological, the Reformation-era commentary added to the theological dimension significant interests in rhetoric and philology. Thus the recasting of logic and rhetoric that occurred in the Renaissance led exegetes like Philipp *Melanchthon (1497-1560) and Bullinger to emphasize the rhetorical forms, such as the larger patterns of introduction, exposition and presentation of standard topics or *loci* in disputations or digressions throughout the text. In addition, these exegetes brought a highly detailed sense of figures of speech and forms of argument, such as the syllogism and enthymeme, to their understanding of the flow of biblical discourse. So too do Oecolampadius, Calvin, and others well versed in the biblical languages offer detailed examination of problems of text and translation.

Among Protestants in particular, commentaries tended to move away from the medieval form of gloss and *scholion* to forms dictated more closely by the text itself or by the movement from text to theology. Thus the medieval pattern of interlinear gloss was set aside as commentaries moved away from the Vulgate text and the more extensive pattern of running commentary found in the *Glossa ordinaria* was replaced by a more individualized and discursive comment. In some cases, notably Beza's *Annotationes*, the philological interest of the exegete nearly entirely governed the form of the commentary. The *scholia* were replaced by the identification of loci or *topoi*, either in the context of the running commentary appended to the analysis of chapters of a book, or (in the case of Melanchthon) a rhetorically governed analysis of an entire book in terms of the loci found in it, without any attempt to offer a gloss or running comment on every verse.

Exegetes and their commentaries. G. Ebeling's famous remark that the history of theology is in fact the history of New Testament exegesis, when emended to remove its somewhat Marcionite tendency, well reflects the theological mind of the Reformation. The theology of the Reformation was profoundly exegetical, and the written efforts of the great Reformers took with greatest regularity the form of the biblical commentary. From the purely dogmatic perspective, the Reformation altered a precious few theological topics—notably the doctrines of justification, the Lord's Supper and the church—but from an exegetical perspective it marked a renewed interest in the entire text of Scripture that resulted in a wealth of commentaries on every book of the Bible and a revision of the whole of theology in view of the exegetical result. Major commentators of the era, like Luther, Oecolampadius, Musculus, Brenz and Calvin, are notable for the balance of their interest in both Old Testament and New Testament.

Luther's work as a Reformer rested squarely on his primary vocation as a biblical exegete. His reformatory work assumed his calling to be a doctor or a teacher of the church in the specific role of professor of biblical interpretation. Although he is famous for his lectures on Romans (1515-1516) and Galatians (1516-1517/1531), it was also as an Old Testament exegete that Luther left his mark on his times. Luther's style changed considerably over the course of his life: his early commentaries, notably those on the Psalter, Hebrews and Romans, reflect precisely the medieval model of gloss or running comment followed by *scholia* or detailed notes on the more significant theological issues raised by the text. Later commentaries, beginning with the second lectures on Psalms, follow the more discursive style of *enarratio* or *lectio continua*. In addition to the lectures already noted, Luther also commented on the Catholic Epistles, the Gospel of John, Genesis, Deuteronomy, Judges, Ecclesiastes, Isaiah and the Minor Prophets.

Melanchthon's contribution to Reformation-era exegesis was primarily a rhetorical analysis of the biblical text designed to elucidate both the structure of a book and its main theological topics. Once he had offered a rhetorical analysis of an entire biblical book, Melanchthon moved on to examine only the major topics or loci found in the text rather than move through the text verse by verse. Inasmuch as Luther's lectures on Romans were not published until the twentieth century, it is the several versions of Melanchthon's commentary on Romans that represented the Lutheran exegesis of the early Reformation. Melanchthon also labored at length on Colossians and John. He also commented on portions of Genesis (1523), select psalms, Proverbs (1524), Daniel (1543) and Ecclesiastes (1550).

Johannes Brenz (1499-1570), the Lutheran Reformer of Swabia, also stands out as a major early Lutheran exegete who commented on the Pentateuch (1539-1551), Judges and Ruth (1535), the Psalter (1565-1571), Job (1527), Hosea (1530), Amos (1530), Isaiah (1550), Ezra and Nehemiah (1565), the Synoptic Gospels (1537-1560), the Gospel of John (1527), Acts (1530), Galatians (1527), Philippians (1548) and Romans (1565). Brenz understood the Psalter as a prayerful conversation between God and his people and Job as belonging to the genre of tragedy. His commentaries are characterized by dogmatic and practical interests.

Johannes Bugenhagen (1485-1558), the Reformer of Brunswick, Lübeck and Pomerania, collaborated in the publication of a Low German version of Luther's New Testament and wrote an exposition of the Psalter (1524), characterized by strong christological and typological emphases. He also wrote annotations on Deuteronomy and Samuel (1524) and on 1 and 2 Kings (1525), a commentary on Job (1526) and annotations on the Pauline epistles (1525). Among the other early Lutherans, Erasmus Sarcerius (1501-1559), the Reformer of Nassau, remem-

bered for his *Loci communes*, commented on the Gospel of John (1540), and Andreas Osiander (1498-1552), an associate of Luther and one of the Reformers of Nürnberg, lectured on 1 John and produced an annotated harmony of the Gospels (1537). Georg Maior (d. 1574), the follower of Melanchthon and professor at Wittenberg, produced commentaries on the Pauline epistles that followed the Melanchthonian pattern of detailed structural and rhetorical analysis.

Numbered among the earlier Reformed commentators are Johann Oecolampadius (1482-1531), Ulrich Zwingli (1484-1531), Conrad Pellikan, Sebastian Münster (1489-1552), Martin Bucer (1491-1551) and Wolfgang Capito (1478-1541). Oecolampadius, the Reformer of Basel, was trained in theology and languages and is remembered for his philologically and theologically detailed work on all the Major and Minor Prophets (1525-1535) as well as 1 John (1524), Romans (1525), Job (1532), John (1533), Hebrews (1534), Matthew (1536), Genesis (1536) and Colossians (1546). Zwingli produced expositions of Genesis, Exodus (as far as chapter 24), Isaiah and Jeremiah, and annotations on the four Evangelists. His exegesis is characterized by rejection of allegory but also by frequent recourse to nominally allegorical readings of the text and a strong practical bent. Zwingli attempted to distinguish carefully between figures found in the text and figurative meanings imposed on it.

The humanistically trained Pellikan served as professor of Hebrew and Greek in Zürich and was known in his day as the author of the first (1501) Christian textbook on Hebrew: Reuchlin's more famous textbook appeared in 1506. Pellikan published a lucid running commentary on the entire text of Scripture (5 vols., 1532-1535), noted for its concise argument, absence of digression and attention to the grammatical sense of the text. The New Testament commentary is, unfortunately, highly derivative of the works of others. Münster was a student of Pellikan who followed in the steps of his master by publishing the first Aramaic grammar (1527) written by a Protestant. Münster also published the grammatical works of the Jewish scholar Elias Levita in Latin editions and edited the text of the Hebrew Bible with his own Latin translation (Basel, 1535). Münster's Hebrew Bible, notable for its annotations on the text and its continuous use of rabbinic materials, became the standard tool of Protestant Old Testament exegetes in the sixteenth century. Münster also echoed the ancient tradition of a Hebrew original for the Gospel of Matthew by translating the Gospel into Hebrew (1537).

Bucer is remembered for his weighty, often digressive, theological examination of central books of the New Testament, notably the Synoptic Gospels (1527), Romans (1536), Ephesians (1527) and the Gospel of John (1528), and his translation of Bugenhagen's Psalter (1529). Bucer also commented on Psalms (1554) and Judges (1554). Bucer's associate Capito commented on Habakkuk (1526), Hosea (1528) and the first chapter of Genesis (1539).

On the English scene, William *Tyndale (c. 1494-1536), Miles *Coverdale (c. 1487-1569), William Whittingham (1524-1579), Anthony Gilby (d. c. 1584) and Christopher Goodman (1519-1602) were less notable as commentators and interpreters than they were as translators. Tyndale and Coverdale collaborated on the first two English Bibles, the Matthew (1535) and the Great Bible (1537). While they were exiled at Geneva, Whittingham, Gilby, Goodman, Coverdale and others prepared a translation of the New Testament (1557) and subsequently the Geneva Bible (1560). Gilby, an expert Hebraist, commented on Micah (1551). David Whitehead (d. 1571), chaplain to Anne Boleyn, published his homilies on the Pauline epistles. The tenure of such continental exegetes as Bucer and Vermigli at Oxford, however, brought models of technical exegesis to Protestant England early in the Reformation. The Scottish

theologian Alexander Alesius (1500-1565), briefly professor at Cambridge, later at Frankfurt-on-Oder and Leipzig, and a friend of Melancthon, wrote a series of commentaries, notably on the Gospel of John (1553).

Calvin was surely the most eminent Reformed commentator of the sixteenth century. He took the work of exegesis as his central task and with incredible single-mindedness preached, lectured and commented through nearly the entire Bible, omitting only Revelation from his work on the New Testament and, if the sermons are considered as well as the commentaries, only Ruth, 1 Chronicles and 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs from his work on the Old Testament. In his preface to the posthumous lectures on Ezekiel, Beza indicated that had Calvin lived longer, he would have completed commentaries on the entire Bible. Calvin is significant not only for his own efforts but also for the influence he exerted on several trajectories of Reformed interpretation. He offered models for the running textual and theological commentary and for the homiletical commentary. He also provided a precedent for a highly literal reading of the Old Testament, according to which christological and trinitarian themes were invoked only in the context of clearly prophetic and messianic passages. His sermons on Job, for example, respect the Gentile location and characters of the book and are notable for the virtual absence of christological and trinitarian themes. It is true, however, that in general his Old Testament sermons tend to be more christological than his commentaries. Calvin also collaborated in the translation of the entire Bible into French, and an independent translation of nearly the entire Bible into Latin can be culled from his commentaries.

Among Calvin's Reformed contemporaries, Bullinger, Musculus and Vermigli also were eminent as commentators. Bullinger was particularly prolific, writing formal commentaries on all of the books of the New Testament except Revelation (Matthew [1542], Mark [1545], Luke [1546], John [1543], Acts [1533], the Pauline Epistles [1537], 1-2 Peter [1534], 1 John [1532]), an exposition of Lamentations (1561), and massive collections of sermons on Daniel (1565), Jeremiah (1575), Isaiah (1567) and Revelation (1557). His commentaries typically offer a running comment on the entire text and theological loci on specific problems. Nearly forgotten in the twentieth century, Musculus was one of the eminent theologians and exegetes of his time, known for his ability in Hebrew and also for his rather prolix style: his commentaries are massive and consistently examine textual and philological matters as well as theological issues. Musculus commented on Matthew (1548), John (1545), Psalms (2 vols., 1551), the Decalogue (1553), Genesis (1554), Romans (1555), Isaiah (1557), 1 and 2 Corinthians (1559), Galatians and Ephesians (1561), and Ephesians, Colossians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians and 1 Timothy (1565). Calvin stated of Musculus's *Psalms* that, had he seen it before he began his work on the Psalter, he would not have needed to publish his own.

Among Calvin's contemporaries, Vermigli was probably the most erudite of the Hebraists. His commentaries on 1 Corinthians (1551), Romans (1558), Judges (1561), Jeremiah (1562), 1 and 2 Samuel (1564), Genesis (1569) and 1 and 2 Kings (1571) all evidence profound study of not only the Christian but also the rabbinic tradition of biblical interpretation. Two of Vermigli's commentaries, Judges (1564) and Romans (1568), were translated into English in the sixteenth century. By way of contrast, Rudolph Gualther (1519-1586), pastor of St. Peter's in Zürich, assistant and eventually successor to Bullinger, produced a series of homiletical meditations: Acts (1557), Matthew (1583-1584), Mark (1561), John (1565), Luke (1570), Romans (1566), the Minor Prophets (1566), 1 and 2 Corinthians (1572), Galatians (1576) and the

Catholic Epistles (1588). Of these, the homilies on Old Testament books and on Acts were all translated into English in the sixteenth century. His meditations are characterized by a formal, discursive eloquence and are sometimes contrasted with the more extemporaneous style of earlier works in the same genre.

Nor was it only the Protestant exegetes who stressed the need to return to the Hebrew and Greek texts: Tomasso de Vio, Cardinal Cajetan (1469-1534), master general of the Dominican order, bishop of Gaeta and a major exponent of Thomism, devoted the last decade of his life to exegesis, producing a new translation of Psalms from Hebrew as well as commentaries on the Gospels and Acts (1527-1528), the Epistles (1528-1529), the Pentateuch (1530-1531), the Old Testament histories (1531-1532), Job (1533), and Ecclesiastes (1534). Cajetan's exegetical method, although it did not oppose the *quadriga*, emphasized the literal sense. He shared with Luther and many others of the age a distinction between *homologoumena* (fully agreed on books) and *antilegomena* (questioned books) in the New Testament, viewing Hebrews, James, 2 Peter, 2 John, 3 John and Jude as being of doubtful authorship, and he questioned the validity of such texts as Mark 16:9-20 and John 8:1-11 on the basis of collations of Greek codices.

Also eminent among the early sixteenth-century Roman Catholic commentators were Ambrosius Catharinus Politus (1483-1553); Jacopo Sadoletto (1477-1547), bishop of Carpentras, a noted humanist, reformer and opponent of Calvin; Jean de Gagnée (d. 1549), rector of the University of Paris who wrote a significant commentary on the Pauline epistles (1539) and the four Gospels and Acts (1552); and Isidorus Clarius (d. 1555), who revised the Vulgate New Testament on the basis of the Greek text (1542). Catharinus produced major commentaries on the Pauline and Catholic Epistles (1546), de Gagnée wrote a series of *scholia* on the text of the Gospels and Acts (1552), and Sadoletto commented on the Psalms and Romans (1536).

Among the Roman Catholic exegetes of the post-Tridentine era, Sixtus Senensis (1520-1569), a convert from Judaism, stands as the preeminent linguist and exegete. His *Bibliotheca sancta* (1566), also published as *Ars interpretandi sacras Scripturas*, discusses the canon and authority of Scripture, the individual biblical authors and their writings, the interpretation of the text in its various senses, and offers comments on passages of theological and critical interest in both Testaments. Sixtus's work is noteworthy for its critical and hermeneutical dimensions, such as its argument for the multiple authorship of the Psalter, its assumption of a twofold literal sense much like that taught by Nicholas of Lyra, and its advocacy of the use of original texts and multilingual tools like the *Complutensian Polyglott*.

The Post-Reformation Era

When examined from the perspective of the history of exegesis, the era of Protestant orthodoxy (c. 1565-1700) must be regarded not only as a continuation of the philological and interpretive development of the Renaissance and Reformation but also as the great era of Protestant linguistic study, whether in the biblical or in the cognate languages. Since it has so often been implied that the Reformation was a time of exegesis, virtually without dogma, and the era of orthodoxy was a time of dogmatic system without exegesis, it must be added that at no time before or since the era of orthodoxy was systematic theology so closely wedded to the textual and linguistic work of the exegete. The loci of the theological system arose directly out of meditation on specific texts and issues in Scripture and continued throughout the seventeenth century to be understood in that relationship. Thus if the theological works of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are characterized by a great deal of proof texting, it is also the case

that these citations of texts point the readers of theological works directly toward the work of exegesis being done in the era, often by the same writers. The post-Reformation era ought not, however, to be viewed as a time during which the intimate connection between exegesis and theology rendered exegesis an ancillary discipline. The flowering of hermeneutical, philological and text-critical work in the post-Reformation era argues the opposite case.

The text and versions of Scripture. If Beza is to be regarded as one of the founding fathers of Protestant orthodoxy, his prominence in that development was in no small measure due to the textual and theological achievement of his *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum* (1556; much augmented, 1582, 1589, 1598), which remained a touchstone of Protestant exegesis for more than a century. Beza collated the best codices available to him, two of which—the Codex Bezae and Codex Claromontanus—remain significant to the textual analysis of the New Testament; he examined previous translations, notably the Vulgate, Erasmus, Calvin and Castellio; he presented a philological analysis that justified his own version of the text; and he presented a running set of theological glosses on the meaning and import of the text. Beza also engaged in controversy with Castellio over the latter’s highly literary translation of the New Testament into Latin (1561) on the ground that it distorted the theology of the text.

The era of orthodoxy also saw the production of a series of great polyglot Bibles. The first of these, the Antwerp Polyglot, funded by Philip II of Spain and therefore also called the *Biblia regia*, represents the flowering of sixteenth-century Roman Catholic philology. It was published in eight folio volumes by Plantin between 1569 and 1572 under the editorial supervision of Benedictus Arias Montanus (1527-1598). Volumes 1 through 4 offer the Old Testament in Hebrew accompanied by the Vulgate, the Septuagint with Latin translation, and the Targums with Latin translation. Volume 5 offers the New Testament in Greek accompanied by the Vulgate, and Peshitta (or Syriac New Testament) in both Hebrew and Syriac characters with Latin translation. Volumes 6 and 7 contain the apparatus, including critical notes, a Hebrew lexicon by Paginus, a Syriac-Chaldee (i.e., Syriac-Aramaic) lexicon by Guy le Fèvre, a Syriac grammar by Masius and a Greek lexicon and grammar by Arias Montanus. The final volume offered the original texts of the Old Testament and New Testament with interlinear translation into Latin—Paginus’s Latin of the Old Testament and the Vulgate of the New Testament.

The Paris Polyglot, published in ten volumes between 1629 and 1645, reprinted the Antwerp Old Testament without alteration and the Antwerp New Testament with texts of the Syriac antilegomena (2 Peter, 2 John, 3 John, Jude and the Apocalypse), lacking in the original Antwerp printing, and with an Arabic version and its Latin translation. The remaining volumes presented the text of the Samaritan Pentateuch and an Arabic Old Testament. Editorial work on the new sections of text was done by Jean Morin (1591-1659), priest of the Oratory and a student of the linguist Simeon de Muis, and Gabriel Sionita (1578-1648), a Maronite and professor of Arabic in the Collège de France.

Four polyglot Bibles appeared from Protestant editors: the *Polyglotta sanctandreana* in Heidelberg (5 vols., 1586-1599), based largely on the Antwerp Polyglot; the Hamburg Polyglot (6 vols. 1596); the Nürnberg Polyglot (5 vols., 1599-1602); and the great London Polyglot (8 vols., 1657-1669). The Hamburg Polyglot, edited by David Wolder, marks a significant departure from the Roman Catholic polyglot Bibles with its replacement of the Vulgate New Testament with Beza’s Latin and its inclusion of Luther’s German translation of both Testaments. Its Hebrew Old Testament is the 1587 text of Elias Hutter (1553-c. 1609). Hutter’s own polyglot edition, published in Nürnberg, offered the Old Testament from Genesis to Ruth (in Hebrew,

Chaldee, Greek, Latin and German, with some passages rendered into French, Italian and Slavic), plus the Psalter (in Hebrew, Greek, Latin and German). Hutter's New Testament included, in addition to the traditional texts and translations, versions in Italian, Spanish, French, English, German, Danish and Polish.

The London Polyglot, edited by Brian Walton, has the greatest critical and textual significance of all the polyglot Bibles of the era. Walton gathered together such impressive philologists of the day as John *Lightfoot (1602-1675), Edmund Castell (1606-1685), Thomas Hyde (1636-1703), Dudley Loftus (1619-1695), Abraham Wheelocke (1593-1653), Thomas Greaves (1612-1670), Samuel Clarke (1625-1669) and Edward Pococke (1604-1691). Lightfoot was responsible for the critical edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch, while Pococke's contribution to the Polyglot was a critical edition of the Arabic version of the Pentateuch together with an appendix analyzing the variant Arabic readings.

In addition, the London Polyglot contained a pointed Hebrew text of the Old Testament, the Greek New Testament, a corrected Vulgate, the extant fragments of the Old Latin or Itala, the Septuagint with variant readings from the Codex Alexandrinus, the Peshitta, the Targums, a Persian Pentateuch and Gospels, and Ethiopic versions of the Psalms, Song of Songs and the New Testament—each accompanied by an independent Latin translation. Castell is known for his *Lexicon heptaglotton* (1669), a dictionary of Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Samaritan, Ethiopic and Arabic, published as the final two volumes of the Polyglot's apparatus. Of the editors of the Polyglot, Lightfoot was also a major commentator in his own right, producing a commentary, based on Judaica, on the New Testament as far as 1 Corinthians (1658-1674), a harmony of the Gospels (1644-1650) and a commentary on the Acts (1645). Textual and philological expertise also characterize the work of Pococke, who served as professor of Hebrew, Arabic and cognate languages at Oxford. Pococke commented on Micah and Malachi (1677), Hosea (1685), and Joel (1691). His *Specimen historiae Arabum* (1648) was one of the first books issued with Arabic font in England.

Hermeneutical issues. The era of orthodoxy also saw the production of such significant interpretive essays as Matthias *Flacius Illyricus's (1520-1575) *Clavis Scripturae* (1567), William Whitaker's (1548-1595) *Disputation on Holy Scripture* (1588), Andreas Rivetus's (1572-1651) *Isagoge in Novum Testamentum* (1616), Johannes Drusius's (1550-1616) *Ad voces Ebraeas N.T. commentarius duplex* (1606) and his critical annotations on the Old Testament, printed in *Critici sacri* (1660), John Weemes's (1579-1636) *Christian Synagogue* (1623), Salomon Glassius's (1593-1656) *Philologia sacra* (1626) and Benjamin Keach's (1640-1704) *Tropologia, a Key to Open Scripture Metaphors* (1682).

Separate notice needs also to be given to the great *Critici sacri . . . in Vetus ac Novum Testamentum* (9 vols., 1660; repr. 1695, 1698-1732), in which essays on biblical interpretation, antiquities, text criticism and exegesis gathered from the most significant theologians of the era were compiled under the direction of John Pearson (1612-1686), Anthony Scattergood (1611-1687) and Francis Gouldman (d. 1688). Illyricus's and Whittaker's guides to biblical interpretation are notable for their emphasis on the literal, historical sense of the text as the source of doctrinal, moral and eschatological meaning and for their careful examination of texts used by Roman Catholic polemicists to undermine the Protestant understanding of the literal sense. Illyricus ought also to be remembered for his commentary on the New Testament in the form of a gloss (1570). Drusius, who served as professor of Hebrew at Oxford, Leiden and Franeker, and Weemes, who served as minister in Berwickshire and afterward as prebend of

Durham, were pioneers in the attempt to understand the Bible in the light of Jewish sources.

The hermeneutic described in works of Whitaker, Rivetus and Glassius built on the Reformers' work by stressing use of the original languages and emphasizing the literal, historical sense of the text. Whitaker and Rivetus after him were concerned to argue the source of all theological conclusions in the literal sense of the text but also to recognize that the literal sense included the various figures and types in the text. Allegories, tropes and anagogy were understood as false readings, therefore, only when they were grafted onto the text rather than identified as integral to it. Glassius, professor of theology at Jena, continued this line of argument and provided both a critical and historical introduction to Scripture and a discussion of interpretive principles notable in particular for its ability to draw on the terminology of classical rhetoric to identify the wide variety of rhetorical figures present in the text. By building on his analysis of figures and types, Glassius was able to argue a double sense, literal and spiritual, of the text of Scripture and to insist that the spiritual sense be identified in terms of the New Testament fulfillment of Old Testament promise and prophecy. Keach, an English Particular Baptist minister, followed Glassius's work closely and offers an instance of the vitality of the orthodox Protestant hermeneutic in the late seventeenth century.

Rather than a turn away from Renaissance and Reformation developments, the post-Reformation era should be seen as a time of intensification of Protestant interest in the original languages of the text to the inclusion of cognate Semitic languages in the curriculum of major universities. It was typical of seventeenth-century exegesis to examine closely such ancient versions as the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Targums both as aids to the critical establishment of the text and as guides to the nuances of Hebrew meaning. Thus the work of the Johannes Buxtorf Sr. and Johannes Buxtorf Jr. and Louis *Cappel (1585-1658) contributed to a massive development of interest in Judaica.

The elder Buxtorf is remembered for his vast *Biblia Hebraica cum paraphrasi Chaldaica et commentariis rabbinorum* (4 vols., 1618-1619), in which he made the resources of the Jewish interpretive tradition obvious and available to his Christian contemporaries, for his edition of the Masorah (1620) and for his various linguistic tools: a grammar (1602) and a lexicon (1607) of Hebrew and Aramaic, a study of Hebrew abbreviations (1613), two posthumous works, both completed by his son, a concordance to the Hebrew and Chaldee Bible (1632), and a lexicon of Chaldean and of Talmudic and rabbinic Hebrew (1639). The younger Buxtorf, a superb scholar in his own right, published a lexicon of Aramaic and Syriac at the age of twenty-three (1622) and devoted much of his later energy to the defense of his father's view of the vowel points against the work of Cappel. Cappel's most significant exegetical and text-critical efforts are found in his *Critica sacra* (1650) and his commentary with critical notes on the Old Testament (posthumous 1689), but he is most famous for his early work *Arcanum punctationis revelatum* (1623) on the origin of the vowel points in the Hebrew Bible, in which he disputed the findings of Johannes Buxtorf Sr.

Cappel's work on the vowel points advanced no new theories. A Masoretic origin of the punctuation marks (c. 500-600) had been argued by Elias Levita as early as 1538 and had been advocated by Roman Catholic exegetes like Gilbertus Genebrardus (1537-1597) at the end of the sixteenth century. What made Cappel appear revolutionary is that he was a Protestant biblical theologian who not only held forth in detail against the views of the revered elder Buxtorf but also espoused a position that was then used by Roman Catholic exegetes to argue a human element in the text of Scripture. Cappel's insight into the historical nature of the re-

daction of the Old Testament identifies him as a precursor of the historical criticism of the eighteenth century. His work unleashed one of the major debates of the seventeenth century and brought to the fore a question that was not resolved for nearly two hundred years.

Adumbrations of the historical-critical method also appear in the works of Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), Richard *Simon (1638-1712) and others in the era—often either misinterpreted or rejected by more traditional exegetes. Thus, because of his highly critical stance on numerous texts, Grotius's *Annotationes* on the Old Testament and New Testament (1645) frequently disagreed with the exegetical tradition and were often linked by the orthodox exegetes and theologians of the day with the Socinian efforts, notably in his identification of the Servant Songs in Isaiah as prophetic references to the sufferings of Jeremiah. His argument for Matthean priority and the use of Matthew's Gospel, perhaps a Hebrew version, by the other Synoptists, however, has its parallels in the orthodox exegetes of the day. The form of Grotius's annotations can be viewed as a descendant of the gloss, combining shorter running comment with longer *scholia* as needed. The *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* (1678-1685), *Historie critique* of the New Testament text (1689), versions (1690) and commentators (1693) of Simon mark a watershed in the critical reading of Scripture, particularly in the use of literary and historical analysis to establish the original forms of texts. Simon, a Roman Catholic associated with the Oratorians, could argue that the superscriptions of the Gospels and Hebrews and the ending of the Gospel of Mark were not original to the text. Elements of historical-critical method also appear in Baruch Spinoza's (1632-1677) *Theological-Political Treatise* (1670), in which Spinoza insisted that Scripture does not offer knowledge of God so much as religious devotion, and devotion, moreover, presented in the forms given it by an ancient people in which customary teachings were mingled with eternal truths.

The hermeneutics of Protestant orthodoxy, like that of the Reformation era, was bound to a high view of the inspiration of Scripture. Moreover, just as there is a clear continuity between the Reformation and post-Reformation eras in their view of the literal sense of the text—their emphasis on linguistics and philology and their location of the work of biblical interpretation in the believing community—so also is there a clear continuity in their approach to the inspiration of the text. The orthodox Protestant assumption of inspiration on the analogy of dictation in no way undercut but rather supported the text-critical efforts of the age, given the churchly and theological importance of the establishment of an authoritative text as the basis of exegesis.

Exegetes and their commentaries. The era of early orthodoxy (c. 1565-1640) perpetuated all of the various genres of Reformation-era exegesis. It also maintained the diversity of hermeneutical patterns found in the era of the Reformation, with the result that even among the Reformed, Calvin's christologically reserved approach to the Old Testament represented only one line of development. Reformed ancestors of the federal school, such as Piscator, produced highly typological and christological readings of the Old Testament, whereas others, like Ainsworth, retained Calvin's reserve.

Augustine Marlorat, who provided the first Scripture index to Calvin's 1559 *Institutes*, perpetuated the medieval catena style in commentaries in a finely chosen gathering of the thoughts of major Reformers woven into a seamless web of theological comment. Marlorat commented on the entire New Testament (1561), several volumes of which appeared separately in English: Matthew (1570), Mark and Luke (1583), John (1575), 2 and 3 John (1578) and Revelation (1574). He also produced a topical *Thesaurus* or concordance to the Bible. Mar-

lorat's contemporary Pierre Merlin commented on Esther (1599). Among their continental contemporaries, Jerome *Zanchi (1516-1590), Ursinus's successor in Heidelberg, wrote theological commentaries on Hosea and Ephesians in which he followed each chapter with a series of theological loci. Lambert Daneau (1530-1595), who studied in Geneva during Calvin's final years and subsequently served as professor of theology at Leiden, commented on Matthew (1583), Philemon (1577), 1 Timothy (1577), the Gospel of John (1585), the epistles of John and Jude (1585), and the Minor Prophets (1578). Daneau's *Methodus sacrae Scripturae* (1570) proposed a method for moving from the text of Scripture to preaching, illustrated from the text of Philemon. Daneau, like Melancthon, stressed the identification of rhetorical forms and of logical argumentation in the text, the elicitation of theological loci, and the careful delineation of the sections or units of the text in their interrelationships.

The prolific Louis Lavater (1527-1586), Bullinger's associate and successor in Zürich, produced commentaries on Genesis (1579), Proverbs (1562), 1 and 2 Chronicles (1573), Ruth (1578), Job (1577), Esther (1585) and Ecclesiastes (1584), as well as homiletical expositions of Joshua (1565), Ezekiel (1571), Judges (1585), Ezra (1586) and Nehemiah (1586). Benedictus Aretius (1505-1574), professor of theology in Bern, a classical scholar who wrote a treatise on Pindar, was known for his set of theological loci and also for a series of major posthumous commentaries on the four Gospels (1580), the Gospel of John (1578), Acts (1590), Romans (1583), 1 Corinthians, Ephesians (1579), 1 and 2 Thessalonians (1580) and Philippians and Colossians (1580). David Paraeus (1548-1622), the pupil of Ursinus and editor of his theology, commented on Matthew (1631), Romans (1609) and Revelation (1618) and wrote series of loci on Mark and Luke. Paraeus was also known in his day as the editor of the Neustadt Bible (1587), a printing, for the German Reformed church, of Luther's translation, accompanied by Paraeus's annotations—a point of considerable contention with the Lutherans and a strong indication of the need for a German Reformed Bible. Several Reformed exegetes of the era also translated the Bible into German, at least in part to offer the German Reformed an alternative to Luther's version: Amandus Polanus (1561-1610) produced a German Old Testament, and Johannes Piscator (1546-1626) translated the entire Bible into German.

Among the Reformed, several major running commentaries on the entire text of the Bible appeared in the early seventeenth century. Jean Diodati (1576-1649) and Daniel Tossanus (1541-1602) wrote annotations on the entire Bible. Tossanus's work is notable as following the pattern of the *Glossa ordinaria*, offering a text with gloss and *scholia*. Piscator commented on the entire Old Testament (1612-1618) and New Testament (1595-1609) and also wrote a series of Ramistic logical analyses of the New Testament; Louis de Dieu (d. 1642) produced a commentary on the New Testament (1631) and a massive analysis of the critical problems of the New Testament text *Critica sacra* (posthumous 1693). Johann Grynaeus, professor at Heidelberg, commented on Galatians (1583). Francisus Junius (1545-1602), professor of theology at Heidelberg and Leiden, commented on the Gospel of Mark; his work on Revelation was the basis of the revised annotations to the last book of the Geneva Bible of 1602. Associated also with the names of Beza and Junius was Johannes Immanuel Tremellius (1510-1580), who converted to Christianity from Judaism before 1540, converted to Protestantism and served as professor of Old Testament at Heidelberg and Sedan. Tremellius's Latin New Testament (1569) never rivaled Beza's Latin translation, but his Latin Old Testament (1575-1579), based on Hebrew, Aramaic and Syriac texts, became the standard Reformed version. He also published an Aramaic and Syriac grammar (1569). Junius's more famous opponent in debate, Jacob Armin-

ius (1559-1608), commented at length on Romans 7 and 9, providing highly technical theological analyses of both texts.

Of the theologians who sat at the synod of Dort (1618-1619), there were several notable exegetes: Antonius Walaeus (1573-1639) wrote a commentary on the entire New Testament (1653); the English delegate, John Davenant (1570-1641), produced a theological commentary on Colossians (1627); Francis Gomarus (1563-1644), professor of theology at Leiden, published a series of topical loci on the four Gospels and Philippians, prefaced by an interpretive treatise on the covenants. He also commented on Hebrews (1644).

Meinardus Schotanus (d. 1644), professor of theology at Utrecht, commented on Philippians (1637). A commentary on the Gospel of John (1627) came from the pen of Daniel Heinsius (1580-1655). Heinsius, himself a major classical scholar of the age, also wrote a study of the language and meaning of the New Testament in the light of his study of patristic exegesis. Henry Airay (d. 1616), provost of Queens College, Oxford, lectured through Philippians; his commentary was published posthumously (1618). His contemporary, William Attersoll, commented on Numbers (1618) and Philemon (1612) and wrote a treatise on the conversion of Nineveh (1632). The London minister Thomas Taylor (d. 1632) commented on Philemon (1659). The Scottish covenant theologian Robert Rollock wrote notable commentaries on the Gospel of John (1599) and Galatians (1602); and Conrad Vorstius (d. 1629), a professor at the academy of Steinfurt, renowned in his day for his questioning of the doctrine of divine simplicity, wrote a *Commentary on all the Apostolic Epistles, Excepting 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon and Hebrews* (1631). The theological and homiletical commentary was represented by John Cameron's (d. 1625) three volumes of loci on the New Testament (1626-1628).

Among the major Lutheran exegetical productions of the era are the commentaries of Nicolas Selnecker (1530-1592) on the Psalter (2 vols., 1564), Acts (1567), the Pauline epistles (1595) and Revelation (1567); David Chytraeus (d. 1600) on Matthew (1594), the Gospel of John (1588) and Galatians (1567). Chytraeus carried forward the Melanchthonian emphasis on loci and mirrored the older tradition by identifying his topical comments as *scholia*. Aegidius Hunnius (1550-1603) wrote commentaries on Genesis (1589), the Evangelists, Acts, the epistles and Revelation. Hunnius's views on the trinitarian and christological content of Old Testament exegesis led to his famous polemic against Calvin, *Calvinus Judaisans*. The Danish Lutheran theologian Nicholas Hemmingsen (1513-1600), professor in Copenhagen, remembered for his soteriological synergism, commented on the Gospel of John (1591). Joachim Camerarius (1500-1574), professor of Greek at Leipzig, analyzed the four Gospels and the Pauline epistles (1572) in a philological commentary emphasizing the figures of speech found in the text. Another controversial Lutheran figure of the day, Georg Calixt (1586-1656), the syncretistic professor of theology at Helmstedt, followed out the Melanchthonian approach to the text in a harmony of the Gospels in which he worked through the difficult theological loci (1624).

A majority of the dogmatic theologians of the era were also accomplished exegetes. Thus the Reformed scholastic Amandus Polanus (1561-1610) began his career as a professor of Old Testament and was noted as a commentator on Malachi (1597), Daniel (1599), Hosea (1601) and Ezekiel (1608), and as translator of the Old Testament before he gained renown as author of the dogmatic *Syntagma theologiae*. On the Lutheran side, the Melanchthonian synergist of Wittenberg, Victorin Strigel (d. 1569), wrote annotations on the entire New Testament (1565), and Johannes Tarnovius (d. 1629), professor at Rostock, wrote four books of loci on difficult

texts throughout Scripture (1619) and a commentary on the Minor Prophets. Like other Lutheran exegetes of his day, he emphasized a christological reading of the Old Testament. Polycarp Leyser (1552-1610), the editor of Chemnitz's posthumous *Loci theologici*, produced commentaries on Genesis (1604) and Galatians (1586). The great dogmatician Johann Gerhard (1582-1637) completed Chemnitz's commentary on the harmony of the Evangelists (3 vols., 1626-1627); commented on Genesis (1637), Amos and Jonah (1663), and Hebrews (1661); wrote annotations on Matthew (1663) and Revelation (1643); and wrote a significant study of theological method (1620) in which he emphasized the study of Scripture as the basis for all other theological efforts. His exegesis manifests an interest in the interpretive use of ancient versions, notably the Targums and the Septuagint.

The English homiletical commentary was notably represented in this era by Thomas Cartwright (1535-1603) on the harmony of the Gospels and Colossians (1612), William *Perkins (1558-1602) on Hebrews 11, and Nicholas Byfield (1579-1622) on Colossians (1615) and 1 Peter (1637). All three commentators are notable for their practical emphasis and, in the cases of Cartwright and Perkins, were recognized by Reformed contemporaries on the Continent as significant theological commentators. Of considerable importance for the development of millennial theology are the analysis (1627) and commentary (1632) on Revelation by Joseph Mede (1586-1638), fellow of Christ College, Cambridge.

Among the more technical commentaries of the early seventeenth century, the works of Andrew Willet (1562-1621), fellow of Christ College, Oxford, offer evidence of the breadth of the method and scope of the older commentary. His *Hexapla* on Genesis (1605), Exodus (1608), Leviticus (1631), Daniel (1610) and Romans (1620) attempt to offer, as it were, full coverage of all issues confronting commentators of the day. The term *hexapla* refers not to the text but to the sixfold pattern of comment on each chapter: Willet offers a rhetorical analysis of each chapter, verse-by-verse technical discussion of the text and translations, exegetical analysis of difficulties in interpretation, a discussion of theological topics related to the text, a resolution of theological debates and a final section of practical application. Willet thus not only summarizes the state of discussion of the texts on which he comments but also presents a synopsis of the various styles or genres of Protestant commentary in his day. Willet also commented in briefer form on Jude (1602).

An example of the marriage of technical annotation to more practical interests is seen in the work of Henry Ainsworth (1560-1623), whose *Annotations on the Psalms* provided an independent translation of the Psalter, a metrical version with musical settings and a fairly technical series of comments on text and translation in which Ainsworth drew explicitly on ancient sources, notably the Targums, in order to elucidate the text. Ainsworth continued his work with a series of annotations on the Pentateuch in which he continued to emphasize use of the Targums. Throughout these works Ainsworth attempted to echo Hebrew syntax and even to create compound words, such as "earthy-man" and "mighty-man" to render *adam* and *geber* with reference to their connotation. Ainsworth's sense of the hermeneutical importance of the Targums was echoed by Weemes and developed by Christopher Cartwright in his targumico-rabbinic commentaries on Genesis (1648) and Exodus (1658). A similar interest in rabbinics characterizes the work of Constantijn L'Empereur (1591-1648), professor of Hebrew and theology at Leiden.

Despite the intense doctrinal polemics, mutual respect between Protestant and Roman Catholic exegetes can be detected even in the era of orthodoxy. Among the major Roman

Catholic exegetes were Alfonso Salmeron (1515-1585), whose massive homiletical commentary on the New Testament (16 vols., 1598-1601) cultivated a popular style and also defended the teachings of Trent, and Johannes Maldonatus (1534-1583), known for his commentaries on the four Gospels (2 vols., 1596-1597) and on the Major Prophets (1609). Vast Hebraic learning coupled with a strong interest in rabbinic exegesis was characteristic of the work of Genebrardus, a Benedictine who wrote a treatise on the pronunciation of unpointed Hebrew (1563), a commentary on Joel that included the Targum text and rabbinic exegesis (1563), a response to Beza's paraphrase of the Song of Songs (1585), a commentary on the Psalter (1577) and numerous treatises on philological matters. Also among the major Hebraists of the age was Arias Montanus, who supervised the production of the Antwerp Polyglot (1571-1580), wrote the annotations on the Evangelists for the polyglot and produced a significant treatise on Jewish antiquities (1593). François Lucas (d. 1619), dean of St. Omer, produced a two-volume commentary on the Evangelists (1606). Gulielmus Estius's (1542-1613) commentary on the Pauline epistles (1613-1614) offered both a masterful literal exegesis and an urbane response to Protestant interpretation of key texts. Juan de Mariana (1536-1604) adopted the theological genre of the older exegesis in his *Scholia in Vetus et Novum Testamentum* (1613). Gaspar Sanchez (d. 1628), a Jesuit professor of Scripture at Alcalá, published a commentary on Acts (1616). The Antwerp Jesuit Johannes Tirinus (d. 1636) wrote a two-volume commentary on the entire Bible (1645).

A vast theological commentary on the entire Bible, excepting only Job and Psalms, came from the pen of Cornelius à *Lapide (1567-1637) between 1614 and 1645 (later editions of his works are augmented by commentaries on Job and Psalms by de Pineda and Bellarmine respectively). His work is notable for its grasp of patristic and medieval exegesis and its ability to sum up the tradition by offering not only literal but also allegorical, moral and anagogical meanings and by engaging more contemporary developments in the examination of the Hebrew and Greek texts. The Jesuit exegete Balthasar Corderius (d. 1650) translated the catena of Greek fathers on Matthew (1647) by Nicetas and published a similar catena on Luke (1628). His fellow Jesuit Giovanni Menochio (d. 1655) produced a three-volume commentary on the Bible emphasizing the literal sense of the text (1630) and an analysis of Acts (1634). Protestant exegetes of the seventeenth century were concerned to respond to Estius, and they often cited Maldonatus, Arias Montanus and Sixtus Senensis with approval.

The era of high orthodoxy (c. 1640-1700) was also notably productive in the genre of commentary—so productive that discussion of its achievement must recognize a series of sub-genres in the field of exegesis. First, there was the running theological commentary on all of Scripture—Matthew *Poole's *Annotations on the Holy Bible* (2 vols., 1683-1685), Calovius's *Biblia illustrata*, the so-called Dutch and Westminster Commentaries—that received heavy use throughout the period as normative readings of the text for laity and clergy. Second were numerous highly textual commentaries of a technical nature, in the tradition of Beza, notably Grotius's annotations on the Old Testament and New Testament and Poole's *Synopsis criticorum* (5 vols., 1669-1674). Whereas Poole's work was highly revered among the Protestant orthodox, Grotius's annotations were used primarily by the Arminians and viewed with considerable suspicion by the orthodox. Third were technical theological commentaries on specific books, often produced first in the form of lectures, a form pioneered for the Reformed tradition by Calvin and carried forward in great detail by later Reformed theologians. Fourth were homiletical commentaries that carried the theological tradition to the pulpit and the pew.

Johannes *Cocceius (1603-1669), who is remembered for his analysis of the covenantal history of the Bible, the *Summa doctrinae de foedere et testamento Dei* (1648), was a linguist and philologist as well as a theologian. His works include a lexical study of Hebrew and Syriac and commentaries on Job, Psalms, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, Jeremiah, Malachi, John, Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, Hebrews, Jude and Revelation. Among the later Cocceians, Franz Burman (1628-1679) produced Dutch-language commentaries on the historical books of the Old Testament and Campegius Vitringa (1659-1722) wrote on biblical chronology (1698) and geography (1723) and commented on Revelation (1705), Romans (posthumous 1729), the Song of Moses (posthumous 1734), the first four chapters of Zechariah (posthumous 1734) and Isaiah (2 vols., 1714-1720). Vitringa also wrote six volumes of critical-exegetical observations (1683-1708) and a posthumously published work on interpretive difficulties in 1 Corinthians. His importance as an exegete lay in his philological skills and his examination of historical and geographical background in the interpretation of texts. He stands in the tradition of seventeenth-century chronologists and chorographers, among whom Ussher and Lightfoot are also to be numbered.

Herman Witsius (1636-1708), a student of Gisbert Voetius (1589-1676) and sometime opponent of the Cocceians, wrote both an “economy of the covenants” from an orthodox perspective and a series of significant essays on textual and theological themes, primarily from the Old Testament. Johannes Suicerus, professor of Greek at Heidelberg, commented on Colossians (1699). Salomon Van Til (d. 1713), professor at Leiden, wrote commentaries on Matthew (Dutch, 1683); Romans and Philippians (Dutch, 1721); and 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians (Latin, 1726). The younger Francis Spanheim (d. 1707), professor of theology at Leiden, wrote three volumes of loci on disputed passages in the Gospels (1663-1685). Lambertus Bos (d. 1717), professor of Greek at Franeker, wrote two volumes of philological studies on the New Testament (1700, 1707), both of which are notable for their examination of non-Christian Greek literature for the sake of understanding the syntax and meaning of the New Testament. Their contemporary, the Arminian professor of theology at Amsterdam, Philip van Limborch (1633-1712), produced a commentary on Acts, Romans and Hebrews (1711).

Among the Lutheran efforts of the late seventeenth century, Abraham Calovius’s *Biblia illustrata* stands out as a most influential example of the running commentary on the entire text of the Bible. It functioned both as a somewhat polemical textual response to Grotius’s *Annotationes* and as a highly respected devotional Bible, treasured well into the next century, by J. S. Bach most notably. Calovius also commented on Genesis. His opponent in the synergistic controversy, Georg Calixt (1586-1656), also wrote widely on both the Old Testament and New Testament. The vast posthumous biblical commentary of the Finnish Lutheran bishops, Johannes Gezelius Sr. (1615-1690) and Johannes Gezelius Jr. (1647-1718), published in 1711 to 1713 (New Testament) and 1724 to 1728 (Old Testament), also deserves mention as a pastoral and homiletical effort, despite the vehement anti-Pietist sentiments of both its authors.

Perhaps the greatest Lutheran commentator of the century, Sebastian Schmidt (1617-1696), is remembered for his *Collegium Biblicum* (1671), in which he attempted to gather significant theological loci from his efforts as a commentator and thereby make the transition between exegesis and dogmatics. Schmidt commented extensively on the text of Scripture: annotations on Genesis, Joshua 1—8, Ruth and 1 and 2 Kings (1692); paraphrases of the prophetic Psalms, Titus and Jude; commentaries on Judges (1684), Ruth (1696), 1 and 2 Samuel (1687-1689),

Job (1680), Ecclesiastes (1691), Isaiah (1693), Jeremiah (1685), Hosea (1687), the Gospel of John (1685), Romans 1–6, 1 Corinthians (1691), Galatians (1690), Ephesians (1684), Colossians (1691), 1 and 2 Thessalonians (1691), Philemon (1691), 1 Timothy (1691), Hebrews (1680) and 1 John (1687), with an emphasis on philological problems. He also translated the entire Bible into Latin (1696) in a rigorous word-equivalent version. His exegesis stressed the grammatical sense of the text but also evidenced profound interest in the work of the Fathers, notably *Jerome (c. 340-420), and of rabbinic exegetes like David Kimchi, Aben Ezra and Salomon ben Melekh. Like other exegetes of the age, Schmid stressed the use of ancient versions like the Targums and the Septuagint.

Balthasar Stollberg (1640-1684), professor of Greek at Wittenberg, commented on Galatians (1667) and entered the fray of philological debate over the text of the New Testament in a treatise arguing against barbarisms or solecisms in the Greek. Michael Walther (1593-1662), professor of theology at Helmstedt, commented on Hebrews (1646), argued the theological harmony of the Old Testament and New Testament (1649), wrote a homiletical commentary on select Psalms (1647) and a treatise on the tetragrammaton (1660). Johannes Kromayer (1610-1670), remembered primarily as a dogmatician, wrote on the importance of Arabic for the interpretation of Hebrew and produced commentaries on Galatians (1670) and Revelation (1662). Augustus Varen (d. 1684), professor of theology at Rostock, commented on the epistle to the Romans (1696).

Theologians of the so-called Dutch Second Reformation, a movement of piety and theology that drew on both the orthodox and federal schools, were also prolific commentators—and like the Lutheran Pietists, were profoundly interested in biblical philology. Theodorus Akerloot (1645-1721) wrote a Dutch commentary on 1 Corinthians (1706). Hieronymus van Alphen (1665-1742) commented on Galatians (1695), Hebrews (1699), Colossians (1706), 1 and 2 Corinthians (1708), 1 Peter (1734), select psalms (1745), 1 Thessalonians (1741) and Galatians (1742). His commentary on 1 Peter is significant in its attempt to explain the Petrine theology in terms of a detailed harmony of themes from the Pentateuch, Psalms and Prophets. A similar hermeneutical interest was evident in van Alphen's dissertation of the relationship between Moses and Christ (1715). Abraham Hellenbroeck (1658-1731), whose work is notable for its combination of philological, theological and devotional interests, commented on the Song of Songs (1718-1720) and Isaiah (1718-1721).

Although the focus of this essay is on the two traditions of the magisterial Reformation, no examination of seventeenth-century exegesis can omit mention of the commentaries by Johann Crell (d. 1633), a teacher in Cracow; Jonas Schlichting (d. 1664) and Johann Wolzogen (d. 1661), located in the Socinian *Bibliotheca fratrum Polonorum* (1656). Crell wrote a critical commentary on the entire New Testament (posthumous 1656), and Wolzogen commented on the four Evangelists (posthumous 1668) and Acts. Schlichting completed Crell's commentary on Hebrews (1634). The Socinian exegetes were masters of New Testament philology and pressed hard on the question of textual variants such as the Johannine comma and 1 Timothy 3:16.

The erudition of the precritical exegete, however, was generally directed toward text-critical, philological or theological ends. Thus Thomas Adams's (fl. 1614-1653) massive commentary on 2 Peter (1633) illustrates the closely argued homiletical-doctrinal commentary of the age. It begins and concludes the exposition of each chapter with summaries of contents and analyses of argument or scope and proceeds to a detailed examination of each verse, beginning with an identification of the topic of the verse in its several parts, followed by an exposition of each

part, statements of problems, objections and observations—the latter usually of a hortatory nature. The hermeneutic employed by Adams rests on the analogy of Scripture and the use of juxtaposed texts as a basis for drawing doctrinal conclusions. A similar erudition in the biblical languages and in the use of classical allusions is found throughout John Trapp's (1601-1669) five-volume commentary on the Old and New Testaments (1654-1662)—Trapp's eloquence, grasp of the text and often pithy style have identified him as one of the best of the Puritan commentators. Noteworthy too from this era is the *Annotations upon all the Books of the Old and New Testament, wherein the Text is Explained, Doubts Resolved, Scriptures Paralleled and Various Readings Observed*, by the Joynt-Labour of certain Learned Divines (1645), often called the *Westminster Annotations* because of the significant number of commentators enlisted for the project from the Westminster Assembly.

Edward Leigh (1602-1671), remembered primarily for his massive *System or Body of Divinity* (1654), evidenced strong philological interests in his *Annotations upon the New Testament* (1650) and his volume of *Critica sacra* (1639). William Gouge (d. 1653) produced a homiletical commentary on Hebrews (2 vols., 1655). Thomas Gataker's (1574-1654) expositions of Isaiah, Jeremiah and Lamentations (1645) are found in the so-called *Westminster Annotations*. A volume of Gataker's critical works, including his essays on the tetragrammaton and the style of New Testament Greek, was published at Utrecht in 1698. In the latter he disputed a German philologist, Pfochenius, who had argued that Hebrew, Greek, Latin and German were original tongues not derived from earlier languages. Gataker argued against the easy identification of such languages, definitively denied such status to Latin on the basis of cognates to Greek and other ancient languages and demonstrated that New Testament Greek was not only different from classical Greek but also contained numerous Hebraisms and Syriasm.

Several English commentators of the late seventeenth century should be noted as typical of the era. William Greenhill's (1581-1671) exposition of Ezekiel (5 vols., 1645-1667) illustrates the erudition of the seventeenth-century commentator in its consistent reference to the Hebrew text and its consultation of the Syriac, the Vulgate and the Septuagint, as well as its frequent citation of the views of Protestant translators and commentators (Calvin, Beza, Oecolampadius, Polanus, Junius, Castellio, Rivetus, Ainsworth, Diodati, Lavater, Weemes, Buxtorf, Grotius), rabbis (Rashi, David Kimchi), church fathers (*Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius, Leo, Jerome, *Theodoret of Cyrus, *Gregory the Great) and eminent Roman Catholic scholars (Aquinas, Arias Montanus, Lapede, Mariana, Maldonatus, Vatable), in arguing the meaning of words and phrases.

Similar erudition coupled with interest in the scope and structure of the text and its theological content is evident in Jeremiah Burrows's (1599-1646) exposition of Hosea (4 vols., 1643-1651). John *Owen's (1616-1683) single commentary, a massive exposition of the epistle to the Hebrews (4 vols., 1668-1684), is a synthesis of the textual, philological style of the seventeenth century, with an interest in the interpretive use of Judaica and with a highly technical theological apparatus that evidences significant ties to the federal school and strong interest as well in the cultural background of temple ritual in both Old Testament and New Testament eras. Similar interest in the cultural life of ancient peoples as background for exegesis and theology is evident as well in Owen's *Theologoumena pantodapa* (1661), or introduction to the history and character of theology.

The textual emphasis of Beza, the Buxtorfs and Cappel continued through the era of orthodoxy in the production of such tools as the London Polyglot Bible, the multivolume *Critica*

sacra, edited by John Pearson (1613-1686), and Matthew Poole's *Synopsis Criticorum*—paralleled among the Lutherans by the work of Sebastian Schmidt. John Mayer's (1583-1664) seven volumes of comment on the whole Bible—Pentateuch (1653), historical books (1647), Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs (1653), the Prophets (1652), the Evangelists and Acts (1631), the Pauline epistles (1631), the Catholic Epistles and Revelation (1627)—are children of Melancthon's locus method with strong philological overtones. Mayer avoids running commentary and examines only textual and theological problems. A similar technique is found in the work of Samuel Clarke (d. 1701), not to be confused with the orientalist of the same name who contributed to the London Polyglot. Clarke's paraphrase and annotations on the Bible (1690) attend primarily to the difficult passages.

Among the homiletical commentaries of the era, those of the English Puritans are most eminent. Thomas Manton (1620-1677) published a two-volume commentary on Psalm 119, as well as single volumes on James and Jude and the Lord's Prayer. The prolific David Dickson (1583-1662) commented on Hebrews (1631), Matthew (1651), the Psalter (1656) and the epistles (1645/59), all in a largely homiletical vein. Richard Baxter (1615-1691), noted for his works on practical piety, also published a paraphrase of the New Testament with annotations (1685). George Hutcheson (1626-1674) commented on the Minor Prophets (1654), John (1657) and Job (1669), and wrote an exposition in forty-five sermons of Psalm 130 (posthumous 1691). His work on John is stylistically notable for its perpetuation of a model like that used in the sixteenth century by Zanchi, namely, the inclusion of a series of doctrinal loci at the end of his exposition of each pericope. Matthew *Henry's (1662-1714) commentary on the entire Bible evidences the pastoral strength of the older exegesis in its ability to preach with relevance to the congregation on virtually every text of the Bible. This was accomplished in Henry's case through a consistent christological and covenantal interest throughout the Old Testament. The tenacity of the older or precritical exegesis is seen in John *Gill's (1697-1771) massive commentary on the entire Bible. Here the traditional theological exegesis is supported by a continuation of the seventeenth-century emphasis on Judaica.

In sum, the Protestant exegetical tradition of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries evidences a fairly continuous and highly variegated development. In theological content and in their use of textual, philological, homiletical and dogmatic styles, the commentaries of the seventeenth-century exegetes follow the models and the substance of their sixteenth-century predecessors. Notable developments in approach include the increasing Protestant interest in Judaica and in so-called oriental languages, namely, the cognate languages of the ancient Near East plus Ethiopic and Persian. Immersion in textual and philological study was characteristic of the era of orthodoxy. It also produced, in such authors as Cappel, Grotius and Simon, the first stirrings of what would become the historical-critical method.

Bibliography

Biographical essays on most of the exegetes can be found in the *RETK*, *NSHERK* and *DNB* (for Protestant exegetes) and *DTC*, *NCE* or *Biographie Universelle* (for Roman Catholic exegetes).

Studies. J.-R. Armogathe, ed., *Bible de tous les temps*, vol. 6, *Le Grand Siècle de la Bible* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1989); I. D. Backus and F. M. Higman, *Théorie et pratique de l'exégèse: Actes du troisième Colloque international sur l'histoire de l'exégèse biblique au XVIe siècle, Genève, 31 août-2 septembre 1988* (Geneva: Droz, 1990); G. Bedouelle and B. Roussel, eds., *Bible de tous les temps*, vol. 5, *Le temps des Réformes et la Bible* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1989); J. H. Bentley, *Humanists and Holy Writ: New Testa-*

ment Scholarship in the Renaissance (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983); S. G. Burnett, "The Christian Hebraism of Johann Buxtorf (1564-1629)" (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 1990); idem, "The Educational Roots of Reformed Scholasticism: Dialectic and Scriptural Exegesis in the Sixteenth Century," *Nederlandsch Archief Voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 84 (2004) 299-317; B. S. Childs, "The *Sensus Literalis* of Scripture: An Ancient and Modern Problem," in *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie: Festschrift für Walther Zimmerli zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. H. Donner, R. Hanhart and R. Smend (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977) 80-93; L. Diestel, *Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der christlichen Kirche* (Jena: Mauke's Verlag, 1869); C. S. Farmer, *The Gospel of John in the Sixteenth Century: The Johannine Exegesis of Wolfgang Musculus* (Oxford Studies in Historical Theology; New York: Oxford University Press, 1997); O. Fatio and P. Fraenkel, eds., *Histoire de l'exégèse au XVI^e siècle: textes du colloqui international tenu à Genève en 1976* (Geneva: Droz, 1978); *The Geneva Bible (The Annotated New Testament, 1602 Edition)*, ed. G. T. Sheppard with introductory essays by G. T. Sheppard, M. W. Anderson, J. H. Augustine, N. W. S. Cranfield (Pilgrim Classic Commentaries; New York: Pilgrim, 1989) vol. 1; R. Griffiths, *The Bible in the Renaissance: Essays on Biblical Commentary and Translation in the Fifteenth and the Sixteenth Centuries* (St. Andrews Studies in Reformation History; Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2001); C. Hill, *The English Bible and the Seventeenth-Century Revolution* (London: Allen Lane, 1993); F. Laplanche, *L'Écriture, le sacré et l'histoire: Érudits politiques protestants devant la bible en France au XVII^e siècle* (Amsterdam and Maarssen: APA-Holland University Press/Lille: Presses Universitaires, 1986); E. Mangenot, "Correctoires de La Bible," in *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, 2, pt. 1, cols. 1022-26; R. A. Muller, "The Debate Over the Vowel Points and the Crisis in Orthodox Hermeneutics," *JMRS* 10, 1 (1980) 53-72; idem, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, vol. 2, *Holy Scripture: The Cognitive Foundation of Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993); R. A. Muller and J. L. Thompson, eds., *Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation: Essays Presented to David C. Steinmetz* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996); W. Perkins, *A Commentary on Galatians*, ed. G. T. Sheppard with introductory essays by B. S. Childs, G. T. Sheppard and J. H. Augustine (Pilgrim Classic Commentaries; New York: Pilgrim, 1989) vol. 2; idem, *A Commentary on Hebrews 11 (1609 Edition)*, ed. J. H. Augustine with introductory essays by J. H. Augustine, D. K. McKim, G. T. Sheppard and R. A. Muller (Pilgrim Classic Commentaries; New York: Pilgrim, 1991) vol. 3; G. Reedy, *The Bible and Reason: Anglicans and Scripture in Late Seventeenth-Century England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985); P. T. van Rooden, *Theology, Biblical Scholarship and Rabbinical Studies in the Seventeenth Century: Constantijn L'Empereur (1591-1648), Professor of Hebrew and Theology at Leiden* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1989); K. Scholder, *The Birth of Modern Critical Theology: Origins and Problems of Biblical Criticism in the Seventeenth Century* (London: SCM, 1990); R. Stauffer, *Interprètes de la Bible: Études sur les réformateurs du XVI^e siècle* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1980); D. C. Steinmetz, ed., *The Bible in the Sixteenth Century* (Second International Colloquy on the History of Biblical Exegesis in the Sixteenth Century; Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1990); idem, *Calvin in Context* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1995); idem, "The Superiority of Pre-Critical Exegesis," *TTs* 37 (1980) 27-38 (repr. D. K. McKim, ed., *A Guide to Contemporary Hermeneutics* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986] 65-77); W. P. Stephens and J. Atkinson, eds., *The Bible, the Reformation and the Church: Essays in Honor of James Atkinson* (JSNTSup 105; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); R. H. Worth, *Church, Monarch and Bible in Sixteenth-Century England: The Political Context of Biblical Translation* (Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland, 2000).

R. A. Muller