

RÉGIS BURNET

Exegesis and History of Reception

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament
455*

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament

Herausgeber / Editor
Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors
Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford) · James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)
Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg) · Janet Spittler (Charlottesville, VA)
J. Ross Wagner (Durham, NC)

455



Régis Burnet

Exegesis and History of Reception

Reading the New Testament Today
with the Readers of the Past

Mohr Siebeck

RÉGIS BURNET, 1995 MA in Philosophy; 2001 PhD in Religious Sciences; 2013 Habilitation; 2001–2011 Senior Lecturer at the University of Paris VIII (Saint-Denis); since 2011 Professor at the Catholic University of Leuven (Louvain-la-Neuve).
orcid.org/0000-0002-4496-4632

ISBN 978-3-16-159653-7 / eISBN 978-3-16-159654-4
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-159654-4

ISSN 0512-1604 / eISSN 2568-7476 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2021 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany. www.mohrsiebeck.com

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was typeset by Martin Fischer in Tübingen using Minion typeface, printed by Gulde Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

Contents

Acknowledgments	IX
Abbreviations	XI
<i>Introduction</i>	1
<i>Chapter 1: Exegesis: A Field Going From Rupture to Rupture</i>	7
I. The Critical Turn: The Figure of the Objective Reader	7
1. A Rupture Made of Ruptures	7
2. Thinking against Tradition	9
II. The Linguistic Turn: The Figure of the Reader Witnessing Himself Reading	12
III. The Postmodern Turn: The Figure of the Subjective Reader	15
IV. Illustration: History of the Interpretation of the Character of Judas	17
1. Judas in the Tradition: The Guilty Apostle	17
2. Judas in the Historical Turn: A Human Judas	19
3. The Narrative Figure: An “Extra” in the Story	21
4. Judas in Postmodernity	23
V. Summary and Question	24
<i>Chapter 2: The Tabula Rasa Illusion</i>	25
I. The Double Illusion of the <i>Tabula Rasa</i>	26
1. Illusion about the Newness of Accepted Ideas	26
2. Illusion about the Antiquity of Rejected Ideas	30
II. Tipping Points Are <i>Not</i> Where You Expect Them	37
1. Conceptual Definition: What is a “Tipping Point?”	37
2. First Test Case: Mary Magdalene	39
2.1. The Traditional Figure	39
2.2. Three Tipping Points for Three Deconstructions	42
3. Second Test Case: Bathsheba	47
3.1. Save the King at All Costs	48
3.2. Putting an End to the Woman-Object Prejudice	51
III. Summary and Implications	53

<i>Chapter 3: What Does “Reading with Tradition” Mean?</i>	59
I. A Part of the Hermeneutical Philosophy	59
1. The Historicity of Understanding	60
2. A Series of Operational Concepts	61
II. A Well-Known Undertaking in Biblical Studies	64
1. Taking the Wirkungsgeschichte into Account	64
2. Uses and Misuses of Wirkungsgeschichte	66
III. Proposal: Reading the Bible with the Readers of the Past	70
1. Conceptual Definition: Tradition	70
2. Why Read the New Testament with Tradition?	72
 <i>Chapter 4: Reading with Tradition to Be Aware of Prejudices</i>	 75
I. The Book Burning of Ephesus	75
1. Dismantling the Prejudice of the Fight Against Pagan Magic	75
2. Offering an Alternative Reading	81
II. Doubting Thomas	85
1. The “Doubt” of Saint Thomas as Prejudice	86
2. A Prejudice Based on a Long Tradition	90
3. ... But that Fails to Do Justice to the Complexity of the Text.	91
4. Seizing a Receding Body	95
III. Summary	99
 <i>Chapter 5: Tradition and the Historical-Critical Method</i>	 101
I. Textual Criticism: The Example of Lebbaeus	101
1. How Science Can Make a Name Disappear	102
2. Were Modern Scholars Right to Get Rid of Lebbaeus?	104
3. Is It Possible to Choose Between Thaddeus and Lebbaeus?	107
II. Historical Criticism: The Author of the “Note to the Hebrews”	111
1. Hebrews 13:19.22–25 Is a Separate Unit.	112
2. The Goals of the Final Addition	114
3. Dating the Letter Ending Thanks to Its Reception	116
III. Engaging in Contemporary Debates: Gamaliel and the Parting of the Ways	125
1. Gamaliel, a Well-Known Pharisee	125
1.1. The Rabbinic Reception of a Pharisee From Before 70	125
1.2. The First Christian Reception of a Pharisee	127
2. How Long can Christians Speak Favourably of a Jew?	129
2.1. A First Good Impression	129

2.2. In the Fifth Century, a Still Favourable Vision	130
2.3. The Tipping Point	132
3. A Slow Appropriation	133
3.1. A First Wave in Fourth Century Syria	133
3.2. A Christian Saint in the Greek World of the Fifth Century	134
3.3. The Appropriation of the Christian Saint by Bede the Venerable	135
4. Conclusion	137
IV. Summary and Perspectives	137
<i>Chapter 6: Tradition and Literary Methods</i>	139
I. Scrolls and Coats	140
1. A Brand-New Reading	143
2. Giving up the Effect of Reality	145
II. John’s Prolepsis	147
1. The Answer of Literary Analysis: A Prolepsis to Maintain Suspense ..	148
2. “This is not a Prolepsis”	149
3. Understanding the Prolepsis	151
III. Summary and Perspective	153
<i>Chapter 7: Reading with Tradition as Theology</i> <i>in the Reader’s Mirror</i>	155
I. What Is Our Relationship with Christ? – Barabbas	155
1. Eighteen Centuries of Flatness	156
2. The Rounding Out of the Figure of Barabbas	161
3. Lessons from the Thickening of the Barabbas Figure	165
II. What Is Our Relationship to Death? – Lazarus	167
1. The Very Optimistic Reading of Theologians	167
2. A Reading Contradicted by Writers and the Pop Culture	171
3. A Modern Reading That Goes Back to Antiquity	174
4. Conclusion: The Text That Confronts Modernity with Death	178
III. What Is Our Relationship to the Church? – The Temple of the Holy Spirit	181
1. A Rather Mysterious Passage	181
2. Contemporary Reading: The Temple of the Church	185
3. Contemporary Reading: The Temple of the Body	188
IV. Synthesis and Perspectives	194
<i>Finale</i>	195

Bibliography	197
Index of Studied Pericopes, Figures, and Concepts	231
Index of Sources	232
Old Testament	232
New Testament	232
Greek, Roman, and Jewish Literature	236
Early Christian and Medieval Literature	236
Authors since the 16 th Century	238

Acknowledgments

I have been carrying the ideas for this book around with me in my head for about fifteen years. I have had the opportunity to refine them in several books and articles. These have been synthesised, translated, and substantially modified for the occasion of this book.

I would like to thank my university, the Université catholique de Louvain, for having generously granted me a sabbatical so that I could write it. I am especially indebted to the Dean of the Faculty of Theology, Professor Éric Gaziaux, and the President of the Research Institute for Religions, Spiritualities, Cultures, Societies, Professor Geert van Oyen for their faithful support and their friendship. I also thank the École Biblique de Jérusalem for hosting me for valuable weeks. The conversations I was able to have there were very important to me, as well as the access to the wonderful library.

I also owe my gratitude to the editors of the series *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, in particular Jörg Frey for having accepted this book to this prestigious series and Tobias Nicklas for welcoming it, as well as to the Mohr Siebeck team for their work.

A very big thank you to Loïc Druenne and Teresa Burns for their suggestions to improve the style and grammar of this book: your help was extremely precious to me.

I dedicate this book to my colleagues at the Faculty of Theology of the Université catholique de Louvain. Without their friendship and the incredible generosity in sharing their ideas, knowledge, and questions with me, it would never have seen the light of day.

Louvain-la-Neuve, 30th September 2020

Régis Burnet

Abbreviations

AASS	<i>Acta Sanctorum Quotquot Toto Orbe Coluntur</i> . Antwerp, 1643–1925
AB	Anchor Bible
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
ACCS	Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture
ACW	Ancient Christian Writers
AJP	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
AnBib	<i>Analecta Biblica</i>
AnBoll	<i>Analecta Bollandiana</i>
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
BibInt	<i>Biblical Interpretation</i>
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BZ	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZNW	Beihefte zur <i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CCCM	Corpus Christianorum: Continuatio Mediaevalis
CCSG	Corpus Christianorum: Series Graeca
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum: Series Latina
CCT	Corpus Christianorum in Translation
CNT	Commentaire du Nouveau Testament
DACL	<i>Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie</i> . Edited by Fernand Cabrol. 15 vols. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1907–1953
EBib	Études bibliques
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
ETR	<i>Études théologiques et religieuses</i>
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
JAOC	Judaïsme antique et origines du christianisme
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
J ECS	<i>Journal of Early Christian Studies</i>
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JSNT	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series</i>
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
LD	Lectio Divina
MdB	Le Monde de la Bible
NIBCNT	New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament

NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGNTC	New International Greek New Testament Commentary
NovT	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NTS	New Testament Studies
PG	Patrologia Graeca [= <i>Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graeca</i>]. Edited by Jacques-Paul Migne. 162 vols. Paris, 1857–1886
PL	Patrologia Latina [= <i>Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Latina</i>]. Edited by Jacques-Paul Migne. 217 vols. Paris, 1844–1864
PO	<i>Patrologia Orientalis</i>
RB	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
RSR	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>
SBLHBS	Society of Biblical Literature History of Biblical Study
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SC	Sources chrétiennes. Paris: Cerf, 1943–
SP	Sacra Pagina
TAPA	Transactions of the American Philological Association
THKNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZPE	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>

Introduction

Since the end of the 20th century, a common understanding seems to have been emerging about the roles and missions of exegesis. Grant Osborne's introductory book *The Hermeneutical Spiral*, written in 1991 and reprinted several times,¹ declared peace between biblical methods; he proposed an "integrated" approach starting with the historical context (chap. 1) and progressing to biblical theology (chap. 15), systematic theology (chap. 16) and homiletics (chap. 17 and 18). He advocated for a continuity between historical-critical methods (included in what he called "general hermeneutics") and historical methods ("genre analysis"), between what is usually called exegesis and what is usually called theology ("applied hermeneutics"). In the Catholic world, the Pontifical Biblical Commission's document *The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church*² recommended the same harmonious dialogue between Bible reading methods (except for its fundamentalist interpretation, vigorously rejected).

The 2000s, however, challenged this beautiful and ecumenical consensus. Not only did the relationship of exegesis to history tend to become more problematic, but its divorce from theology became more pronounced.

A Problematic Relationship to Theology

Since the 19th century, exegesis has maintained complex and sometimes conflicting relationships with dogmatic discourse as well as with fundamental theology. Benoît Bourguine claims that both disciplines have conflicting interactions, despite all the assertions to the contrary and notwithstanding all irenic statements. "Whoever has any contact with exegetes and theologians knows that, in reality, their worlds are moving further apart every day, and their approaches have ever less in common. There is no reason to worry, they say, because exegesis explains the Bible with greater ease when it keeps

¹ Grant R. OSBORNE, *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2010).

² Available online: <http://catholic-resources.org>

its distance from theology, and theology continues its work successfully by leaving the Bible to the exegetes.”³

The reason for this divorce is twofold. The upsurge of fragmentary studies, the “division of labour” between the Old and New Testaments, the “specialisation” of the exegetical task has led the theologian to favour the relationships with philosophy.⁴ On the exegetes’ side, the constitution of their discipline led them to be wary of dialogue. Their historical-critical method was partly built in opposition to the theological tradition. Not to mention their attitude if they engage in a postmodern approach: to them, theology is the very name of oppression, since as a language it is still controlled by institutions seeking to ensure their supremacy, as well as the domination of a very select class of white and predominantly European men. Their rejection is widely explained by the founding act of these theories, inspired by Michel Foucault’s thought on social control through ideology. The mere fact that theological methods have been exercising absolute sovereignty over biblical studies for so many years is enough to make them symbols of domination.

Should they engage in a more literary approach, the exegetes abstain from any external interpretation. The famous “principle of immanence” has postulated since Hjemslev that meaning can only reside within the language itself, and therefore that the sense of the text must be found within itself. If a theological discourse is to exist, then it is up to the reader of the exegete to come up with it. Making a clear diagnosis of the situation, James Barr stated:

Literary scholars, far from supporting the theological use of the Bible, were interested in taking the Bible over as a basically literary body of material. It could be and should be read and understood “as literature,” and the doing of this, it often appeared, was something quite independent of what synagogues, churches or theologians might think or desire.⁵

A Problematic Relationship to History

If the relationship between exegesis and theology is problematic, the former’s relationship to history is not much better.

In a stunning resurgence, historical positivism, that seemingly disappeared in the mid-twentieth century, made a spectacular comeback from the late

³ Benoît BOURGINE, *Bible oblige, essai sur la théologie biblique*, LD 308 (Paris: Cerf, 2019), 9.

⁴ BOURGINE, *Bible oblige*, 15.

⁵ James BARR, *The Concept of Biblical Theology: An Old Testament Perspective* (London: SCM Press, 1999), 238.

1990s onwards. The distant origin of this revival may be the work of Ernst Käsemann. Contesting Bultmann's position,⁶ this German scholar held the following opinion: since the Christian community wanted to express its faith in the form of a narrative about Jesus' preaching and action in the world, the narrative elements provided necessarily have some historicity.⁷

In Käsemann's mind, this was a far cry from historical positivism. Rather than exploring the differences between the "Jesus of History" and the "Christ of Faith," he suggested looking for their continuity. However, as Pierre Gisel acknowledges,⁸ "shifts" were possible, and the temptation to come back to a certain form of positivism was strong. Käsemann's position facilitated the return of an aspiration for historical "irrefutability." The exegetical world tended to atomise, beginning a "Third quest of the historical Jesus" difficult to define with precision.⁹ The various aspects of this quest are so ramified that they completely escape characterisation. Nowadays, the scenery, gradually populated by *postmodern* approaches, would be even more complex. In such a confusing nexus, the surreptitious revitalisation of the idea inherited from the 19th century – that one can, on the model of physics, reach definitive knowledge – was possible.

Some of the clearest evidence of this rebirth is the return of the usage of "criteria of historicity." Their most famous advocate is John Paul Meier's celebrated book *A Marginal Jew*.¹⁰ There is no doubt J. Meier himself is very cautious, stating that "the use of the valid criteria is more an art than a science, requiring sensitivity to the individual case rather than mechanical implementation. It can never be said too many times that such an art usually yields only varying degrees of probability, not absolute certitude."¹¹ However, many scholars see this work as a kind of starting point for new reflections

⁶ For instance in Rudolf BULTMANN, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963).

⁷ Ernst KÄSEMANN, "Das Problem des historischen Jesus," in *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), 187–214. Ernst KÄSEMANN, "Sackgassen im Streit um den historischen Jesus," in *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968), 31–82.

⁸ Pierre GISEL, *Vérité et histoire*, *Théologie historique* 41 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1977), 120–22. Pierre GISEL, "La question du Jésus historique chez Ernst Käsemann revisitée à partir de la 'troisième quête'," *ETR* 79 (2004): 451–63.

⁹ Daniel MARGUERAT, "La 'Troisième Quête' du Jésus de l'histoire," in *Le Cas Jésus Christ: Exégètes, historiens et théologiens en confrontation*, ed. Pierre GIBERT and Christoph THEOBALD (Paris: Bayard, 2002), 105–40.

¹⁰ John Paul MEIER, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, ABRL (New York/New Haven: Doubleday/Yale University Press, 1991–2016).

¹¹ John Paul MEIER, *A Marginal Jew*, ABRL (vol. 1; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 184.

on Jesus:¹² its historical methodology being so “perfect,” how could its conclusions not reach an irrefutable historical truth?

This claim of “objectivity” may be a surprise. Admittedly, the consequences that some would like to draw from it to prove the “historicity” of the results of this method are appalling. With Joseph Moingt,¹³ we must recall the words of Jocelyn Benoist: the reality of history is only the “contingent, this weak being who is a power that is not to be,” a “being always ready to erase itself” that forces us to think of history as “irreducible to any universality, irremediably bound to the singular, and thus distant from any scientific truth.”¹⁴ What is the application of criteria, if not a desire to have a “strong discourse” on reality? What is this claim, if not a surprising return of the idea of objectivity in history, perhaps slightly watered down, yet widely asserted, notably by John Barton?

Biblical Criticism strives to be “objective” in the sense that it tries to attend to what the text actually says and not to read alien meanings into it. But it does not claim a degree of objectivity higher than is possible in humanistic study generally. Biblical critics have often been less objective than they have claimed to be, but this does not mean that all biblical criticism is hopelessly compromised. Equally, it does not mean that objectivity should not be an ideal at all.¹⁵

We should never tire of questioning this ideal of objectivity that the whole historical tradition of the 20th century – from Lucien Febvre to Stephen Greenblatt – tried to dismantle. Moreover, while J. Barton ingenuously proclaims this confidence in objectivity, which perhaps sounds somewhat like the certainty of holding the truth, postmodern approaches – feminist, postcolonial, queer, etc. – declare with no less candour that they have completely ceased to believe in it. In a provocative article, George Aichele, Peter Miscall, and Richard Walsh explained that historical-critical methods may seek to produce assertive and consensual theories about the author’s intention of the text, the original audience or references to actual historical events, no one cares, since postmodernism vigorously rejects the idea that an assured and consensual theory can exist.¹⁶

¹² See the critical remarks expressed by Dale Allison: Dale C. ALLISON, “It Don’t Come Easy: A History of Desillusionment,” in *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*, ed. Chris KEITH and Anthony LE DONNE (London: T&T Clark, 2012), 186–98.

¹³ Joseph MOINGT, “Note à l’issue du colloque de RSR,” *RSR* 99 (2011): 31–35.

¹⁴ Jocelyn BENOIST, “L’écriture de la contingence. Sur le sens et l’objet du discours historique,” *RSR* 84 (1996): 253–66 (here: 253–55).

¹⁵ John BARTON, *The Nature of Biblical Criticism* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007), 6.

¹⁶ George AICHELE, Peter MISCALL, and Richard WALSH, “An Elephant in the Room: Historical-Critical and Postmodern Interpretations of the Bible,” *JBL* 128 (2009): 383–404.

Among those who believe fairly too much in the results of history and those who declare in advance that they will not believe in them in the name of “anti-essentialism,”¹⁷ what nuanced position can one adopt?

Reading with the Readers of the Past to Overcome the Gap

The consequence of this double malaise is the isolation, even the confinement, of the exegesis surrounded by a gap. On the one hand, by cutting itself off from theology, exegesis deprives itself of the “natural” partner who stimulated it. Theologians’ interventions may have seemed annoying to exegetes, or even downright fatal to freedom, especially in the Catholic world, but they nevertheless allowed the latter to refine their ideas and to question the knowledge they were building. In epistemology, the ability to interact with its limits validates the scientificity of a theory. A theory’s ability to enter dialogue with what contests it is the proof of its solidity. On the other hand, by refusing to take history into account or by making history the place of absolute certainty, the exegete condemns himself to a kind of solitary dialogue with the text (if he rejects any relationship to history) or to construct an immobile image of the text because he considers it “true” (if he considers that history can produce certainty). Simply put, exegesis is condemned in the short term to become a self-referential and therefore hyperspecialised discipline, accessible to those who will accept to “enter exegesis” as one enters the monastery, i. e., in a closed world, governed by its own rules and customs, whose relations with the outside world are limited and codified.

The approach I am proposing consists of renewing the dialogue with tradition, i. e., with the readings of the past – from the Fathers of the Church to the 21st-century exegetes – with a definition of the term “reading” broad enough to include literary and poetic works, plastic works, music, and even popular culture.

My goal is twofold. First, reading the interpreters allows to find another person with whom one can enter into dialogue within the discipline itself. The distance between the previous interpreters and us is always greater than we think, as if their voices came from a foreign country. Second, considering the former readings opens up a world shared with the theologian, a common reference base, and thus the only way to foster dialogue.

A presentation of the debate generated by the article: William John LYONS, “Hope for a Troubled Discipline? Contributions to New Testament Studies from Reception History,” *JSNT* 33 (2010): 207–20.

¹⁷ AICHELE, MISCALL, and WALSH, “An Elephant,” 384.

To advocate for this option of reading in tradition, this book is composed of two parts. In the first theoretical part, I will begin by examining why there has been a break in tradition and why this suggestion of “reading in tradition” seems so iconoclastic nowadays. Then I will show that this claim to *tabula rasa* is utterly illusory and that we must revive Hans-Georg Gadamer’s proposal for hermeneutics rooted in history. The second part is more practical, insofar as it progresses with examples. I will start with a chapter directly inspired by Gadamer on the issue of preconceptions. The following two chapters will illustrate the complementarity of reading in tradition with historical reading, on the one hand, and with literary analysis on the other. Finally, I will show through three examples that reading in tradition is a way towards a theology genuinely reflective of readers.

This book is therefore not a textbook that would propose a new method which would be called “history of reception” or *Wirkungsgeschichte*. It makes use of a series of diverse and already tried and tested methods or methodologies and does not seek to forge new concepts. More modestly, it demonstrates that exegesis should take note of this impassable fact: the historicity of all understanding.

One last clarification. The subtitle of this book is *Reading the Bible Today with the Readers of the Past* and not *Reading the Bible*, because my field of competence is the New Testament. It seems to me that many elements might also concern the Old Testament, but I do not venture to elaborate on this theme.

Chapter 1

Exegesis: A Field Going From Rupture to Rupture

The fact that exegesis is at odds with tradition should be no surprise, the discipline owing its very existence to this rupture. Biblical criticism stemmed from a refusal of the reading tradition in order to offer a “new” interpretation. This conviction caused three successive separations, during which three interpretative theories were built against what preceded them.

I. The Critical Turn: The Figure of the Objective Reader

The first break in the interpretation of the Bible was the “critical turn” that gave rise to the so-called historical-critical method. Often traced back to the 19th century, its emergence is the result of a series of several ruptures with tradition.

1. *A Rupture Made of Ruptures*

Invented by historians for historians, the historical-critical method naturally brought about historians to create its history.¹ Georges Tavard² recalled that the consensus established since the patristic period, according to which predecessors’ opinions were stated before being synthesised and eventually endorsed, was challenged before the Reformation. As early as the 13th century, Henry of Ghent (1217–93), the *doctor solennis*, dared ask the question: “should we believe more in the authority [of Scripture] than in the one of the Church, or the other way round?”³ His answer is surprising: “although

¹ Henning GRAF REVENTLOW, *Epochen der Bibelauslegung* (vol. 1–4; München: C. H. Beck, 1990–2001). English transl.: Henning GRAF REVENTLOW, *History of Biblical Interpretation*, Resources for Biblical Study 50, 61, 62, 63 (Leiden: Brill, 2010–2011).

² George H. TAVARD, *Holy Writ or Holy Church: The Crisis of the Protestant Reformation* (London: Burns & Oates, 1959).

³ *Utrus magis credendum est auctoritate huius scientiæ quam ecclesiæ, aut e converso?* HENRICUS A GANDANO, *Summæ quæstionum ordinarium*, art. 10, q. 1, f. 73^r in HENRICUS A GANDANO, *Summæ quæstionum ordinarium*, Republication of the edition from 1520 (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 1953).

both of them are in perfect accord, we must nevertheless identify which of the two we should prefer to believe in matters of faith, should it happen that the community held to be the Church disagree on any aspect with the Scripture.⁴ He explained that, naturally, the Church and the Scripture always agree, but the weaknesses of the human spirit may create “a community held to be the Church”, disconnected from Scripture. In this case, “it is simpler and more appropriate to believe the Scripture rather than the Church, for the truth is preserved more steadfastly and immutably in Scripture and no one is allowed to remove or change anything from it.”⁵ Considering that these arguments would be used by the Reformers to reject the ecclesial institution they repute guilty of conflict with the Gospel, Henry of Ghent launches a sort of premonitory reflection.

Hypothesized in the 13th century, the possibility of revoking the legacy of the Church in case of doubt became effective two centuries later. As Anne-Marie Pelletier pointed out,⁶ the organic link between Scripture, Tradition and the Institution entails that when one is challenged, the others are contested. Thus, protesters slipped imperceptibly from denunciation of “indulgences” to this alleged abuse of power: confiscating a text and appropriating its meaning. Under the early slogan *sola scriptura* lies a brand-new understanding of the act of reading, now perceived as an individual face-to-face of a subject with the text, which implies three presuppositions. (1) the uselessness (even harmfulness) of institutional regulations, and thus the rejection of tradition. (2) the affirmation of the transparency of the text based on the confidence that everyone can access it personally. (3) the construction of a new figure of the reader, henceforth alone and no longer collective, universal and no more an elite legitimised by the institution (the Church and, its extension, the University).

The 16th century was far from the objective 19th-century reader: many nuances exist from Luther to Sebastian Franck, Calvin, Melanchthon, and Zwingli.⁷ Two centuries of various definitions and formulations made it pos-

⁴ Videndum est ergo cui eorum magis in eis quæ sunt fidei credendum sit, quamvis omnino concordent, ut si forte communitatem quæ reputabitur fore ecclesia et sacram scripturam discordare in aliquo aliquando contingeret, scire poterimus cui eorum securius adhærendum sit. HENRICUS A GANDANO, *ibid.*, f. 73^r.

⁵ Secundo autem modo dicendum quod simpliciter et absolute magis credendum est sacra scripturæ quam ecclesiæ, quia veritas ipsa in scriptura immobiliter et impermutabiliter semper custoditur, nec permittitur cuiquam addere subtrahere vel mutare, HENRICUS A GANDANO, *ibid.*, f. 73^r.

⁶ Anne-Marie PELLETIER, *Lectures du Cantique des cantiques: De l'énigme du sens aux figures du lecteur*, AnBib 121 (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1989), 82.

⁷ Henning GRAF REVENTLOW, *History of Biblical Interpretation III*, Resources for Biblical Study 62 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 65–98.

sible to specify a hermeneutic method. The milestones were diverse, starting with Matthias Flaccius Illyricus,⁸ then Richard Simon and Baruch Spinoza,⁹ continuing with the pietists and the German *Aufklärung* (Reimarus, Lessing, Herder)¹⁰ until the foundation in Germany of “biblical studies” (de Wette, Strauss).¹¹

2. Thinking against Tradition

Barthold Georg Niebuhr (1776–1831), Leopold von Ranke (1795–1886), and Johann Gustav Droysen (1808–1884) distinguished themselves in this school of biblical studies. Their conceptions are summarised in the famous words from the young Ranke, repeated *ad nauseam*: “to history was given the task of judging the past, of instructing the present for the benefit of future times. The present endeavour does not strive for such high tasks: it only wants to say what really happened.”¹²

Repeating the quotation in its entirety, and not only the phrase “*wie es eigentlich gewesen*”, allows for a little more nuance. Ranke is indeed issuing a warning. He is trying to confine history to a humble task (*bloß*). History should not be a lesson to be learned. However, this modesty pairs up with a certain presumption: Ranke is contending that history can strive for objectivity in order to tell what really (*eigentlich*) happened.

The conceptions of the historicist school are clear. Since its purpose is to elevate history to the rank of “rigorous” science, it rejects subjectivity: the historian must establish the facts as they happened, without any value judgement. He needs to banish generalisations and intend to grasp the past events in their singularity, separately from other periods and giving priority to the search for their immediate causes. In this way, he must apply Schleiermacher’s words, according to whom no artwork can be understood without its context of production: “an artwork is therefore truly rooted in its soil and its terrain, in its environment. It already loses its meaning when it is torn from this environment and put into circulation: it is like something that

⁸ GRAF REVENTLOW, *History of Biblical Interpretation IV*, 3–12.

⁹ GRAF REVENTLOW, *History IV*, 83–109.

¹⁰ GRAF REVENTLOW, *History IV*, 155–201.

¹¹ GRAF REVENTLOW, *History IV*, 231–334.

¹² Man hat der Historie das Amt, die Vergangenheit zu richten, die Mitwelt zum Nutzen zukünftiger Jahre zu belehren beygemessen: so hoher Ämter unterwindet sich gegenwärtiger Versuch nicht: er will bloß sagen, wie es eigentlich gewesen. Leopold von RANKE, *Geschichten der romanischen und germanischen Völker von 1494 bis 1535* (Leipzig: Reimer, 1894), v–vi.

has been saved from fire and now bears the mark of its burns.”¹³ Rejecting any teleological philosophy of history *à la* Hegel,¹⁴ historicism is nothing more than the extension of the positivist method to history. It is one of the various facets of what Karl Popper labelled “scientism,” i.e., the naive use of the methods of exact sciences in human sciences by people who only perceive limited practical application to them.¹⁵ Conceived by German-speaking thinkers, this method succeeded in Germany, especially in Prussia.¹⁶ Historism was initially a Prussian positivism, as evidenced by the most representative work of the movement, Theodor Mommsen’s *Römische Geschichte*. It later extended its influence to Great Britain, Italy, and Poland, thereby becoming a “European phenomenon.”¹⁷

In the world of texts, where do the facts come from? The application of the historicist method to biblical texts could not be done without a general theory of meaning. As Hans W. Frei has shown, this theory was based on identification between the meaning of the text and its reference. Referring back to the English philosopher Anthony Collins (1676–1729), Frei shows that this identification is part of the debate on typological meaning, present since the Church Fathers. When Isaiah announces the birth of the Messiah by a young woman (Is 7:14), does it mean the birth of an heir in the house of Ahaz or the birth of Christ? Collins replies that there can be no other meaning to this text and that it is to be found in the words and grammar: “to suppose passages cited, explained and argued from in any other method, seems very extraordinary and difficult to understand, and to reduce to rules.”¹⁸ This presupposes, says Frei, the rejection of the primacy of explanation over historical meaning, the conviction that grammatical and log-

¹³ So also ist eigentlich ein Kunstwerk auch eingewurzelt in seinem Grund und Boden, in seine Umgebung. Es verliert schon seine Bedeutung, wenn es aus dieser Umgebung herausgerissen wird und in den Verkehr übergeht. Es ist wie etwas, das aus dem Feuer gerettet ist und nun Brandflecken trägt. Friedrich Daniel Ernst SCHLEIERMACHER, *Ästhetik* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1931), 86.

¹⁴ Christophe BOUTON, *Le Procès de l’histoire: Fondements et postérité de l’idéologie historique de Hegel*, Bibliothèque d’histoire de la philosophie temps modernes (Paris: J. Vrin, 2004), 254.

¹⁵ Robert NADEAU, “Contre le scientisme. Pour l’ouverture d’un nouveau front,” *Philosophiques* 13 (1986): 353–68.

¹⁶ Friedrich JAEGER and Jörn RÜSEN, *Geschichte des Historismus: Eine Einführung* (München: C. H. Beck, 1992), 86–90.

¹⁷ JAEGER and RÜSEN, *Historismus*, 79.

¹⁸ Anthony COLLINS, *A Discourse of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion* (London: [n.c.], 1737), 45. Cited in Hans W. FREI, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1974), 84.

Index of Studied Pericopes, Figures, and Concepts

- Aesthetic of Reception 62–63, 68–69
Art History 19, 36, 70, 86, 193
Barabbas 155–167
Bathsheba 47–53
Body 22, 33, 40, 55–56, 94–99, 123, 163,
164, 168–177, 183–194
Book Burning of Ephesus 75–85
Doubt 85–95, 98–99, 156, 164
Femininity 42–47, 51–52, 190–193
Gadamerian Theory 11, 59–75
Gamaliel 125–137
Hebrews (Ending of) 111–125
Historicism 10, 63
Historicity 6, 15–18, 49, 72, 82, 113, 157,
207
Horizon 62–63, 65, 68–69
John 11:2 (Prolepsis) 147–153
Judas 17–23
Judeo-Christian 26–30
Lazarus (raised) 55–57, 167–181
Lebbaeus 101–110
Mary Magdalene 39–47
Parting of the Ways 116, 125, 132–137
Paul's Scroll and Coat 140–147
Pharisee 125–127, 150
Pop Culture 5, 148–149, 156, 166–167, 171,
173, 180–182
Prejudice 23, 37, 63, 72–74, 83, 87–93,
94–111, 179
Prolepsis 147–153
Sun-Clad Woman (Ap 12) 30–36
Temple of Holy Spirit 181–193
Thaddaeus 101–110
Thomas (Doubt) 85–99
Tipping Point 37–57, 132, 196
Tradition 6–8, 11–22, 37, 71–72
Wirkungsgeschichte 62, 64–71, 170, 210,
215, 218
Woman (social construction) 42–47,
51–52, 190–193

Index of Sources

Old Testament

<i>Exodus</i>		<i>2 Samuel</i>	
8:17	47	11	47–53
		11:25	48
<i>Numbers</i>		11:27	48
10:29	109		
		<i>Psalms</i>	
<i>Deuteronomy</i>		15/16:10	57
11:10–15	48	42	171
24:1	149		
24:21	159		

New Testament

<i>Matthew</i>		<i>John</i>	
7:16	73	1:27	17, 18
10:3	101–111	2:24–25	88
26:14–16	17	4:46–54	88
27:3–10	17, 155–167	6:70	17
27:5	18	7:25	39
27:16	156	8:11–18	40
3:18	101	11	55–57, 87, 167–181
		11:2	147–153
<i>Mark</i>		11:1–13	169
5:1–13	20	11:26	168
15:7	155–167	11:35	55
		11:36	55
<i>Luke</i>		11:39	55, 175
6:16	101	12:1–8	40
7:36–50	40	12:6	17
8:1–3	39	13:2	17
10:38–42	40	14:5	88
22:2	17	14:22	101
23:19	155–167	18:40	155–167
24	90	20:3–10	95
		20:9	95
		20:19–29	85–99

<i>Acts</i>		<i>1 Thessalonians</i>	
1:13	17, 101	2:14	114
4:34–35	29	3:6	114
5:34–42	125–137	5:26–27	114
8	82	3:6–11	114
16:1	114	<i>2 Thessalonians</i>	
16:8	140	2:16	114
19:17–20	75–85	3:17	114
20:4	115	<i>1 Timothy</i>	
20:5	140	4:13	140–147
22:3	127	4:19–21	114
<i>Romans</i>		<i>Titus</i>	
15:22–29	114	3:15	114
16:3–16	114	<i>Philemon</i>	
16:21	115	21	114
3:5–15	183, 185	23	114
4:17	115	<i>Hebrews</i>	
6:15	187	2:3	113
6:18–19	181–193	3:1	113
12:27	183	1:2	113
16:19–21	114	2:1	113
<i>2 Corinthians</i>		4:2	113
1:19	115	6:4–6	118
2:11	140	10	123
11:14	49	10:20–21	118
13:1–10	114	10:34	121
13:11	114	11:32	121
13:12	114	12:22	119
<i>Galatians</i>		13:9	118
1:22	128	13:19,22–25	111–124
2:9	29	<i>1 John</i>	
2:10	29	3:11–17	22
6:10	114	<i>Revelation</i>	
<i>Ephesians</i>		12:1–8	30–36
6:21	114	21:5	25
<i>Philippians</i>			
4:18	114		
4:21–22	114		
<i>Colossians</i>			
4:7–9	114		
4:10–18	114		

Greek, Roman and Jewish Literature

Rabbinic Literature

<i>M. Gittin</i> 4:2–3	126
<i>M. Ketuboth</i> 13:3–5	126
<i>M. Rosh Hashana</i> 2:5	126
<i>M. Sotah</i> 9:15	126
<i>M. Yebamoth</i> 16:7	126
<i>Pirque Avot</i> 1:4	128
<i>Pirque Avot</i> 4:11	127
<i>T. Bav. Berakhot</i> 34b	126
<i>T. Bav. Shabbat</i> 115a	126
<i>T. Yer. Shabbat</i> 16:1	126
<i>Tos. Avodah Zarah</i> 3:10	126
<i>Tos. Shabbat</i> 13:2	126

Second Temple Jewish Literature

Flavius Josephus	
<i>Bell. J.</i> vi, 9, § 158	125
<i>Vita</i> 38, § 189; 60, § 309	125

Roman Sources

Ælianus	
<i>Historia varia</i> 2	83
Fragment 89	84
Appianus	
<i>Romana Historia</i> 4	97
Apuleius	
<i>Apologia</i> 10	83
Eustathius Thessalonicensis	
<i>In Homeri Illiadem</i> 17	83
Livius	
<i>Ab Urbe Condita</i> 39	84
Plinius	
<i>Historia naturalis</i> 7,14	83
Suetonius	
<i>Augustus</i> 31	84

Early Christian and medieval Literature

Ælredus Rievallensis		Ambrosius Mediolanensis	
<i>Sermo 75 in natiuitate sanctæ Mariæ</i>	36	<i>Apologia David</i>	49
Albertus Magnus		<i>Expositio Euangelii secundum Lucam</i>	49
<i>Commentarii in secundum librum Sententiarum</i>	36	<i>De Patriarchis</i> iv	123
Alcuinus		Andreas Cæsariensis	
<i>Commentaria in sacri Iohannis Evangelium</i>	136	<i>Commentarius in Apocalypsin</i>	32
Alexander Alexandrinus		Anselmus Laudunensis	
<i>Epistula de Arii Depositione</i> 2	133	<i>Glossæ super Iohannem</i> 11	150
Ambrosiaster		Aphraates	
<i>Commentaria in Epistolam ad Timotheum Secundam</i> 4	144	<i>Demonstrationes</i> 1	121
		Augustinus Hipponensis	
		<i>Contra Faustum</i> 22	49
		<i>De Civitate Dei</i> 16	124
		<i>De consensu euangelistarum</i> 2	109, 150

<i>De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo parvulorum</i> 1	124	Clemens Alexandrinus <i>Stromata</i> i	79, 174
<i>Enarratio in Psalmum</i> 50	49	<i>Codex Iustinianus</i> 285	
<i>Enarrationes in Psalmum</i> 147	131	<i>Codex Theodosianus</i> 16	85
<i>Epistula ad Parthos</i> 7	18	Egeria <i>Itinerarium</i>	92
<i>In Iohannem tractatus</i> 49	175	Ephræm Syrus <i>Carmen Nisibena</i> 42	92
<i>In Iohannis euangelium tractatus</i> 116	156	<i>Commentarii in epistolas D. Pauli</i>	121
<i>Sermo</i> 128	175	<i>Commentarius in concordantes evangelios</i>	174
<i>Sermo</i> 162	192	Epiphanius Salamis <i>Panarion</i>	
<i>Tractatus in Iohannem</i> 62	18	2,4,2	32, 130
Autor Incertus		4,34	119
<i>Acta Thomæ</i> 108–112	93	78,11,4	32
<i>Didache</i> 2:2	190	Eucherius Lugdunensis <i>Instructionum ad Salonium</i> 2	110
<i>Doctrina Addai</i> 4	107	Eusebius Cæsarensis <i>Demonstratio euangelica</i> 3,6	77
<i>Liber Thomæ Athletæ</i>	93	<i>Historia Ecclesiastica</i>	
Barnabas apostolus (Pseudo)		1,12	106
<i>Epistula Barnabæ</i>		3,1	92
19:4	190	3,3	122
Basilius Seleucensis		4,14	118
<i>Homilia de Lazaro</i> 11–12	174	6,20	120
Beatus Liebanensis		6,25	119
<i>Tractatus de Apocalypsin</i>	32	6,41	121
Beda Venerabilis		Franciscus Assisiensis <i>Regula non bullata</i>	192
<i>De temporum ratione liber</i> 66	136	Freculphus Lexovens <i>Historiarum</i> 2	136
<i>Explanatio Apocalypsis</i>	32	Gaudentius Brixensis <i>Sermones</i> 1	123
<i>Expositio actuum apostolorum</i> 19	81	Godefridus Admontensis <i>Homiliae dominicales</i> 68	50
<i>Homeliarum evangelii</i> 2	136	Gregorius Magnus <i>Homilia</i> 26	91
<i>Retractatio in Actus Apostolorum</i> 5–7	135, 136	<i>Homiliae in euangelia</i> 25	41, 42
Bernardus Claræuallensis			
<i>Sermones in dedicatione ecclesie</i> 5	186		
<i>Epistola clxxiv ad canonicos lugdunenses</i>	35		
Bonaventura			
<i>Commentarius in Euangelium sancti Iohannis</i> 11	150		
<i>Sermones "De Diversis"</i>	36		
Cæsarius Arelatensis			
<i>Sermo</i> 227	186		

<i>Homiliae in euangelia</i> 33	40, 41	Iacobus de Voragine	
<i>Moralia in Iob</i>		<i>Legenda aurea</i>	
3,28	49	155	111
21,8	49	112	136
Haymo Halberstatensis		Ignatius Antiochus	
<i>In Epistolam II</i>		IgnMagn 8, 1	118
<i>ad timotheum</i> 4	144	IgnPh 9:1	118
		IgnEp 16:2	118
Heiricus Autissiodorensis		Irenæus Lugdunensis	
<i>Homiliae per circulum anni</i>		<i>Aversus Hæreses</i>	174
<i>par hiemalis</i> 54	150	<i>Demonstration apostolicæ</i>	
		<i>prædicationis</i> 95	158
Henricus a Gandano		Innocentius I papa	
<i>Summæ quæstionum</i>		<i>Consulenti tibi</i>	123
<i>ordinarium</i>	7		
Hieronymus Stridonensis		Innocentius III papa	
<i>Adversus libros Rufini</i> 1	131	<i>Sermo</i> 28	186
<i>Commentarii epistulæ</i>			
<i>ad Galatas</i> ii	131	Ioannes Chrysostomus	
<i>Commentarii epistulæ</i>		<i>De pænitentia</i> 1	82
<i>ad Titum</i>	131	<i>Adversus Iudæos</i>	131
<i>Commentarii in Abacuc</i> i, 2	131	<i>Homiliae</i> 87	91
<i>Commentarii in euangelium</i>		<i>In Acta apostolorum</i>	
<i>Matthæi</i> 1	108	14,1	131
<i>Commentarii in Isaiam</i> xvi,		16,1	131
<i>Præf.</i>	131	<i>In diem natalem</i>	131
<i>Commentarii in secundam</i>		<i>In Epistolam ad Philippenses</i>	
<i>epistolam ad timotheum</i> 4	143	9	143
<i>Dialogus contra Pelagianos</i> 3	143	<i>In Epistolam I ad Timotheum</i>	
<i>Epistula</i>		3,2	132
36 <i>ad Damasum</i>	144	<i>In Epistolam II ad Timotheum</i>	
53 <i>ad Paulinum</i>	124, 130	10	143
120 <i>ad Hedibiam</i>	130	<i>In Genesim</i> 39	132
<i>In Amos</i> 3, 8	124		
<i>In Isaiam</i> 3, 6	124	Iulianus Toletanus	
<i>Liber interpretationis</i>		<i>De comprobatione sextæ ætatis</i>	
<i>hebraicorum nominum</i>	109	<i>libri tres</i> 2	132
Hilarius Pictaviensi		Iustinus Martyrus	
<i>Commentarius in psalmos</i>		<i>Dialogus cum Tryphone</i> 19	118
xiv,5.	122		
<i>Commentarius in</i>		Laurentius a Brundusio	
<i>Matthæum</i> 33	159	<i>Sermones in uisionem</i>	
<i>De Trinite</i> iv,11;	122	<i>s. Iohannis</i> 3,2	186
<i>Fragmenta</i> 3	85	<i>Liber questionum in euangelis</i>	50
Hippolytus Romanus		Leo Magnus	
<i>Super Apocalypsin</i>	90	<i>Sermo</i> 52	18

Ludolphus Cartusiensis <i>Vita</i> 2,17	178	Pseudo Clemens Romanus <i>Recognitiones</i> 1,65–66	133
Methodius Olympius <i>Symposium</i> 4	32, 122	Pseudo-Cyprianus <i>Epistula</i> 4 <i>ad Turasium</i>	178
Nicolaus Lyranus <i>Postillæ</i>	34	Quodvultdeus <i>De Symbolo</i> 3,1	33
Æcumenius Triccanus <i>Commentarius in Apocalypsin</i>	33	Romanus Melodus <i>Cantica</i>	174
Origenes Adamantius <i>Contra Celsum</i>	1,57 7,29	Rupertus Tuitiensis <i>Commentaria in Apocalypsim</i>	33
<i>Epistulam Pauli ad Romanos</i> <i>explanationum libri</i> 1,2	105	<i>De Sancta Trinitate et operibus eius</i>	50
<i>In Euangelium Ioannis</i> 27	175	Stephanus Leodiensis <i>Officium sancti Stephani</i> <i>protomartyris</i>	136
<i>In Matthæum</i> 14,19	159		
Paschasius Radbertus <i>Expositio in Matheo</i> 1	50	Sedulius <i>Carmen Paschale</i>	174
Paulinus a Nola <i>Carmen</i> 31,150	91	Tertullianus <i>Ad Uxorem</i> 2	
Petrus Alexandrinus <i>Epistula canonica</i> 9	121	<i>Adv. Marcionem</i> 5,6	189
Petrus Chrysologus <i>Sermon</i> 44	174	<i>De Anima</i>	94
		17,14	184
		53,4	184
		<i>De Cultu feminarum</i> 1,1	190
		<i>De Pudicitia</i> 20	120
Petrus Vallium Monachus <i>Historia Albigensis</i> 2	45	Theodoretus Episcopus Cyri <i>Eranistes</i> 3,14	90
Philastrius Brixensis, <i>Diversarum hereseon liber</i>	88–89	Thomas Aquinas <i>Catena aurea in Iohannem</i> 11	150
	122, 123	<i>Catena aurea in Matthæum</i> 10	110
Photius <i>Bibliotheca</i>	121	<i>Super Ad Galatas reportatio</i>	29
	232	<i>Super Euangelium Iohannis</i> <i>reportatio</i>	136
		2	30
		20	30
Potamius Lisbonensis <i>De Lazaro</i>	176	Tyconius Afer <i>Commentarius in Apocalypsin</i>	32
Primasius Adrumetanensis <i>Commentaria in epistola</i> <i>ad timotheum secunda</i>	144	Victorinus Poetovionensis <i>Commentarii in Apocalypsin</i>	9–12
			32

Authors since the 16th Century

- Abasili, A. I. 53
Abbott, S. 180
Abrami, L. M. 126
Aichele, G. 4, 5, 15
Aland, K. 102, 106, 175
Aletti, J.-N. 127
Allen, W. C. 103
Allison Jr, D. 4
Alter, R. 48, 57, 59, 139
Ambrose, I. 159–160
Amphoux, C.-B. 104
Anderson, A. 16
Andreyev, L. 20, 173
Apollinaire, G. 172
Attridge, H. W. 114
Atwood, R. 39
Auld, A. 47
Aune, D. 31, 83
Aus, R. 157
- Baigent, M. 45
Bailey, R. C. 48, 52
Ball, D. M. 168
Barr, J. 2
Barrett, C. K. 76, 81, 87, 94, 125, 151, 169, 171, 182
Barthes, R. 12–13, 142, 146
Barton, G. A. 116
Barton, J. 4
Barton, S. C. 188
Bauckham, R. 39, 125, 129
Bauer, B. 166
Bauernfeind, O. 76, 127
Baur, F. C. 26–28, 57
Beal, B. 71
Beasley-Murray, G. 31, 88
Bedoin, B. 117
Benay, E. E. 86
Bennema, C. 167
Benoist, C. 160
- Benoist, J. 4
Benoit, P. 87–88
Beutler, J. 171
Beylot, R. 134
Bieringer, R. 96
Billerbeck, P. 126, 128
Bishop, K. 180
Blaß, F. 103
Blic (de), J. 34
Blomberg, C. L. 193
Bloy, L. 89
Bockmuehl, M. 67–68, 71
Bohak, G. 79
Boismard, M.-É. 88, 104, 151
Bojorge, H. 142
Bonner, C. 80
Bonney, W. 87
Bonwetsch, G. N. 31
Bossuyt, P. 76
Böttrich, C. 23
Bougerol, J.-G. 36
Bourgine, B. 1, 2, 155, 194
Bouton, C. 10
Bovo, S. 33
Bowden, J. 46
Boyarin, D. 26, 191
Bradshaw, P. F. 107
Brandon, S. G. F. 167
Brawley, R. L. 128
Breed, B. W. 196
Bremmer, J. 94
Brodie, T. L. 152–153, 170
Brown, D. 45
Brown, J. 189
Brown, P. 191
Brown, R. E. 87
Brownson, J. V. 22
Brox, N. 142
Bruce, F. F. 76, 116, 125, 127
Bruce, S. 54

- Bruner, F.D. 94
 Bultmann, R. 3, 16, 57, 88–89, 94, 128,
 169, 187
 Burggaller, E. 113
 Burkert, W. 79
 Burnet, R. 17, 19, 21, 39, 47, 70, 91, 92, 95,
 101, 111, 112, 115, 125, 140, 147, 155
 Byrne, B. 186

 Cadbury, H.J. 75
 Cahana, J. 17
 Caignet, A. 177
 Caird, G.B. 167
 Calmet, A. 51, 141, 145, 151
 Čapek, K. 172
 Carrington, V. 181
 Carroll, E. 45
 Carson, D. 153
 Cartledge, T.W. 47
 Cayrol, J. 180
 Cerfaux, L. 185
 Chaliar, C. 98
 Charles, R.H. 25
 Chavel, C.B. 157
 Cheever, G.B. 160
 Cheong, Y.-G. 149
 Chilton, B. 125–126
 Clifford, C.E. 201
 Colin, J. 157
 Collins, A. 10
 Collins, A.Y. 31
 Collins, R.F. 181–182
 Conzelmann, H. 128, 141, 157, 184, 185
 Corelli, M. 162–166
 Cornelius a Lapide 77–78, 83, 186
 Courcelle, P. 184
 Courtès, J. 139
 Courtray, R. 47, 108
 Crippa, S. 79
 Crosnier, A.-J. 187
 Crowley, P.R. 86
 Culpepper, R.A. 22, 86, 139, 168–169
 Cunningham, M.B. 174
 Cuvillier, É. 171

 d'Alatri, M. 36
 D'Ror, J. 47
 Dalman, G.H. 103
 Daniélou, J. 26
 Darr, J. 128

 Dassance, P.-N. 186
 Dauzat, P.-E. 40
 Davidson, R.M. 52
 Davies, E.W. 14
 Davis, S. 189
 De Boer, E. 46
 de Boor, F. 72
 De Conick, A.D. 46
 de Ena, J.E. 55
 Deißmann, A. 80, 157
 Delitzsch, F. 51
 Delobel, J. 104
 Den Boeff, J. 94
 Derkson, D. 181
 DeSilva, D.A. 114
 Desreumaux, A. 107
 Devillers, L. 95
 Dibelius, M. 127
 Dijkstra, R. 91
 Dodd, C.H. 168
 Dods, M. 193
 Doignon, J. 159
 Donfried, K.P. 117
 Dubois, J.-D. 93
 Du Champs, C. 155
 Duchêne, H. 182
 Duckworth, G.E. 152
 Dulaey, M. 32, 48
 Dunn, J.D. 66

 Ebeling, G. 72, 196
 Edelstein, E. 84
 Ehling, K.A. 80
 Ehrman, B.D. 117
 Eldon Jay, E. 158
 Ellingworth, P. 117
 Elliott, M.W. 65
 Engelmann, M. 145
 Erasmus, D. 77, 192
 Esler, P.F. 167
 Estienne, H. 43, 77, 89
 Estius, G. 145, 151
 Evans, R.C. 68, 69
 Exum, J.C. 52

 Faillon, É.-M. 43
 Farrar, F.W. 68
 Febvre, L. 4, 69
 Fee, G.D. 182
 Fewell, D.N. 14

- Fiedrowicz, M. 41
 Fischer, B. 108
 Fishburn, M. 85
 Fléchier, E. 192
 Fletcher, R.A. 83
 Fontaine, M.-M. 42
 Forbes, C.A. 83, 84
 Forster, E.M. 156, 161
 Fournée, J. 36
 Fournié, É. 35, 36
 Frazer, J.G. 82
 Fredriksen, P. 167
 Frei, H.W. 10, 11, 13
 Frey, J. 28, 31, 35
 Fried, M. 86
 Froehlich, K. 34, 72
 Funk, R.W. 114

 Gadamer, H.G. 6, 11, 59–64, 67, 68–70, 72, 75
 Gaillardetz, R.R. 201
 Gardner, L. 45
 Garland, D.E. 52
 Garrett, S.R. 76
 Genette, G. 140, 153
 Gill, D.W. 76
 Gisel, P. 3
 Given, J. 92
 Gnilka, J. 64–66
 Godo, E. 162
 Gombrich, E.H. 37, 210
 Goodspeed, E.J. 116
 Gouhier, H. 152
 Graf Reventlow, H. 7–9
 Gräßer, E. 113–115
 Greimas, A.-J. 13, 139
 Grodzins, M. 38
 Grondin, J. 59
 Gryson, R. 32
 Guarienti, A. 110
 Guéranger, P. 186

 Haacker, K. 128
 Haenchen, E. 76, 81, 88, 89, 128
 Hakola, R. 169, 172, 180
 Hammond Bammel, C. P. 105
 Hanson, A. T. 142
 Hanson, K. 167
 Harnack (von), A. 120
 Harper, K. 190

 Harrington, D. J. 30
 Harstine, S. 97
 Hegel, G. W. F. 10, 60, 200
 Heidegger, M. 59–61
 Henderson, A. 189
 Hengel, M. 167
 Hertzberg, H.W. 51–52
 Hilhorst, A. 94
 Hoennicke, G. 26–27
 Høgenhaven, J. 66
 Holmén, T. 167
 Holt, C. 189
 Holtzmann, H. J. 95
 Hooker, M. D. 183
 Horner, G.W. 109
 Horrell, D.G. 191
 Horsley, G. H. 82
 Hort, F. J.A. 26, 27, 103
 Houtin, A. 187
 Hubner, H. 129
 Hufstader, A. 43
 Hugo, V. 161, 162, 165, 166
 Hurd, J. C. 182
 Hurst, D. 167
 Huttar, C.A. 50
 Hvalvik, R. 118

 Isaacs, M. E. 183, 188
 Iser, W. 139, 148

 Jablonka, I. 146
 Jackson, M. 180
 Jackson-McCabe, M. 28
 Jacquier, E. 81, 82
 Jaeger, F. 10
 Jastrow, J. 37
 Jauss, H. R. 63, 63, 68, 69
 Jennifer, K. B. 157
 Jeremias, K. 128, 142
 Jervell, J. 82
 Jewett, R. 114
 Johnson, L. T. 128, 142
 Jones, F. S. 27–28, 104
 Jonsson, R. 136
 Jordan, D. 80
 Judge, P.J. 88
 Jülicher, A. 26, 106, 174, 175

 Kahn, C. H. 152
 Kamionkowski, S. 16

- Kapparis, K.A. 185
 Käsemann, E. 3, 182, 187
 Kazantzakis, N. 21
 Keener, Craig S. 76, 151, 170, 182
 Keil, C. F. 51
 Kelly, J.N.D. 141
 King, K. L. 46
 Kingsford, A. B. 44
 Kintsch, C. 149
 Kirk-Duggan, C.A. 52
 Klancher, N. 68
 Klauck, H.-J. 76
 Klee, H. 148
 Klein, G. 83
 Klein, L. R. 52
 Klijn, A. J. F. 27
 Kloppenborg, J.S. 146
 Knight, Mark. 66
 Knuth, R. 85
 Koch, M. 31
 Kodell, J. 75
 Koester, C.R. 113, 114
 Koskenniemi, J. 112
 Kovacs, J.L. 68
 Kremer, J. 170, 174
 Kuhn, T. S. 37–38, 54
 Kuhnert, E. 79

 La Rue (de), C. 159
 Lacau, P. 134
 Laeuchli, S. 17
 Lafleur, D. 108
 Lafon, G. 179
 Lagarde (de), P. 31, 109
 Lagerkvist, P. 163–165
 Lagrange, M.-J. 51, 135
 Lamouille, A. 88, 104, 151
 Lampe, P. 66, 80, 81
 Langton, E. 39
 Laurant, J.-P. 43
 Lawn, C. 59
 Layton, B. 92
 Le Breton, D. 98
 Le Goff, J. 41
 Le Nain de Tillemont, L.-S. 115
 Leclerc, G. 12
 Leclercq, H. 135
 Leclercq, J. 186
 Lee, D.A. 101, 102
 Lefèvre, A. 162

 Lefèvre d'Étaples 42
 Lehmann, K. 64, 65
 Leigh, R. 45
 Lemke, H. 28
 Léon-Dufour, X. 94–95, 170–171, 179
 Leon, H. J. 117
 León, J.C. 177
 Leroy, M. 140
 Lincicum, D. 27
 Lincoln, H. 45
 Lindars, B. 88, 103–104, 116
 Loisy, A. 128
 Longenecker, C. O. 53
 Löwy, M. 195
 Lubac (de), H. 35
 Ludwig, D.C. 53
 Lurbe, P. 28
 Luttenberger, J. 142, 145
 Luz, U. 65–66, 68, 71
 Lycan, W.G. 37
 Lyons, W.J. 5, 128

 Maccoby, H.Z. 157
 Maitland, E. 44
 Malina, B. 185
 Malinowski, B. 82
 Mannheim, K. 63
 Manns, F. 104
 Mansi, G. D. 121
 Marchadour, A. 87, 89, 168, 169, 170, 179
 Margain, J. 104
 Marguerat, D. 3, 76, 127
 Marin, L. 158
 Martin, D.B. 182
 Martin, M.W. 22
 Martin, N. 177
 Martyn, J. L. 94
 Massillon, J.-B. 177
 Mathewson, D. L. 157
 Matter, E.A. 33
 Mattheeuws, A. 187
 Matthews, J. F. 141
 May, A. S. 183, 184
 Mayordomo, M. 25, 71
 McCarter, P. 48
 McCown, C.C. 79
 Meier, J. P. 3, 102, 169
 Merkel, J. 157
 Merleau-Ponty, M. 97
 Merritt, R. L. 157

- Meslin, M. 176
 Messadié, G. 166
 Metzger, B. M. 102, 103, 108
 Meye Thompson, M. 179
 Miélot, J. 36
 Millet, O. 50
 Mimouni, S. C. 26
 Mingana, A. 134
 Mohammed, K. 50
 Moingt, J. 4
 Moloney, F. 148
 Moore, S. D. 15, 16, 55, 56
 Moreira, A. M. 176
 Morgan, J. F. 189
 Morris, L. 151
 Morton, S. E. 126
 Moses, R. E. 157
 Most, G. W. 96, 98
 Moulton, J. H. 140
 Muecke, F. 152
 Mukařovský, J. 62
 Myllykoski, M. 28

 Nadeau, R. 10
 Nancy, J.-L. 98
 Naselli, A. D. 192
 Nestle, E. 89, 102–104
 Neusner, J. 125–126
 Newman, J. H. 185
 Nicholls, R. 68
 Nicol, G. G. 48, 52
 Nodet, É. 157
 Notopoulos, J. A. 152
 Notter, A. 78
 Noy, D. 117

 O’Kane, M. 70
 Oakman, D. E. 167
 Oatley, K. 149
 Oberlinner, L. 141
 Odenstedt, A. 60
 Ollivier, É. 160
 Opelt, I. 110
 Osborne, G. R. 1
 Østenstad, G. 152
 Overbeck, G. 113

 Pagels, E. H. 94
 Parizet, S. 65
 Parris, D. P. 59, 68

 Paul, A. 179
 Paulus, H. E. G. 19
 Pease, A. S. 84
 Pellegrini, S. 168, 170
 Pelletier, A.-M. 8
 Perdelwitz, R. 113
 Pervo, R. I. 81, 83, 127
 Pesch, R. 76, 144
 Peters, E. 45
 Piper, R. A. 167
 Poirier, P.-H. 93
 Polastron, L. X. 85
 Pontille, D. 12
 Porter, S. E. 82, 167
 Preizendanz, K. 79
 Price, T. L. 53
 Prigent, P. 31, 32, 35
 Prior, M. 142
 Puech, É. 135

 Radermakers, J. 76
 Radford Ruether, R. 47
 Räisänen, H. 71
 Rancière, J. 145
 Ranke (von), L. 9
 Raven, J. 85
 Raynaud-Teychenné, J. 19
 Redalié, Y. 142
 Reimer, A. M. 83
 Renan, E. 20, 76, 77
 Resnick, I. M. 147
 Resseguie, J. L. 14, 139
 Revillout, E. 134
 Rhenferd, J. 28, 29
 Rhoads, D. M. 139
 Ricœur, P. 63, 64, 72, 153, 166
 Rigaux, B. 95
 Rigg, H. A. 157
 Riley, G. J. 94
 Rilliet, F. 159
 Ritchie, J. 189
 Roberts, C. H. 147
 Roberts, J. 78
 Robinson, J. A. T. 116, 183, 187
 Rockwood, G. L. 160
 Rohmann, D. 85
 Roloff, J. 76
 Rondet, H. 83
 Rossiter, F. M. 188
 Rothschild (de), J. 50

- Rothschild, C. K. 112, 116
 Rouzier, L. J. 186
 Rowland, C. 65, 68
- Sabbe, M. 153
 Sandage, S. J. 189
 Sanders, J. N. 171
 Sandy, G. N. 152
 Sarefield, D. 84
 Satake, A. 31
 Schermann, T. 102, 110
 Schleiermacher, F. D. E. 9–10
 Schließer, B. 90, 99
 Schmeller, T. 65
 Schmidt, J. C. 27, 29
 Schmithals, W. 116, 120, 121, 129
 Schnackenburg, R. 88, 169
 Schneiders, S. M. 168–169
 Schnelle, U. 94
 Schoeps, H. J. 26
 Schrage, W. 184
 Schuré, E. 44
 Schüssler Fiorenza, E. 15, 45, 46
 Schwartz, D. R. 116
 Segovia, F. F. 16
 Semler, J. S. 27
 Shanks, H. 126
 Shauf, S. 82, 84
 Shemin, D. 189
 Simms, K. 59
 Simon, M. 26
 Simpson, E. K. 141
 Skarsaune, O. 118
 Skeat, T. C. 147, 223
 Smith, H. P. 51
 Smith, J. 165
 Smith, L. 34
 Spicq, C. 116, 140, 141
 Spielman, L. W. 52
 Sproston North, W. E. 168, 169
 Staab, K. 191
 Stancati, S. T. 132
 Stanley, K. 152
 Starbird, M. 44
 Steenbrink, K. 50
 Steyn, G. J. 121
 Stock, A. 64, 65
 Story, C. I. K. 171
 Stowers, S. K. 112
 Strack, H. L. 126, 128
- Strobel, A. 142
 Struthers Malbon, E. 139
 Swanson, R. J. 102
 Szondi, P. 154
- Talbert, C. H. 76
 Tavard, G. H. 7
 Thiselton, A. C. 67, 182
 Thomaskutty, J. 88, 91, 167
 Thomassen, E. 17
 Thyen, H. 113
 Tischendorf, K. 89, 103
 Todorov, T. 152
 Toland, J. 27–29
 Tosches, N. 193
 Tovey, D. M. 169
 Trebilco, P. R. 81
 Tregelles, S. P. 89
 Trocmé, É. 127
 Trummer, P. 141
 Turcan, M. 190
- Ueberschlag, G. 164
- Valastro Canale, A. 33
 Van Belle, G. 157
 Van den Oudenrijn, M. 134
 Van Heyst, D. 27
 Vanderlinden, S. 135
 Vanhoozer, K. J. 73
 Vanhoye, A. 112–114
 Vásquez, V. M. M. 69
 Verheyden, J. 104, 120
 Vigarello, G. 53
 Vignolo, R. 87, 88, 90
 Vodička, F. 62–63
 Vogels, H. J. 191
 von Wahlde, U. C. 170
- Walsh, R. G. 4, 5, 23, 197
 Ward, B. 42
 Warner, J. C. 188–189
 Waszink, J. H. 184
 Waterlot, G. 38
 Weaver, J. B. 127
 Weiser, A. 141, 142
 Weiss, Z. 116
 Wenschkewitz, H. 188
 Wessely, C. 80
 West, C. 187

- Westcott, B. F. 102, 103, 104, 122, 123
White, E. 166
White, J. L. 112
Whybray, R. N. 51–52
Wielockx, R. 34
Wilde, O. 171–173
Wilmart, A. 176
Wilson, R. R. 152
Wimsatt, W.K. 13, 139
Windisch, H. 113
Winkett, L. 46
Winter, B. W. 76
Witetschek, S. 157
Witherington, B. 170
Wittgenstein, L. 12, 37, 217
Wolter, M. 113
Wouters, P. 149
Wrede, W. 113, 115
Wrege, H.-T. 67
Wright, N. T. 193
Wünsch, R. 80
Yearley, S. 54
Yeats, W.C. 139, 179, 180
Young, M. 149
Zahn, T. 87, 151
Zamagni, C. 115
Zarader, M. 59
Zeitlin, S. 126
Zeltchenko, V.V. 144
Žižek, S. 21
Zumstein, J. 87, 151, 153