

Studies in the History of Exegesis

Edited by
MARK W. ELLIOTT,
RALEIGH C. HETH,
and ANGELA ZAUTCKE

History of Biblical Exegesis

2

Mohr Siebeck

History of Biblical Exegesis

Editors

Mark W. Elliott (Glasgow)
Jennie Grillo (Notre Dame, IN)
David Lincicum (Notre Dame, IN)
Benjamin Schliesser (Bern, CH)

2



Studies in the History of Exegesis

Edited by

Mark W. Elliott, Raleigh C. Heth,
and Angela Zautcke

Mohr Siebeck

Mark W. Elliott is Professor of Divinity and Biblical Criticism at Glasgow University and Professorial Fellow at Wycliffe College, University of Toronto.

Raleigh C. Heth is Presidential Fellow at the University of Notre Dame, pursuing a PhD in the university's Theology Department.
orcid.org/0000-0002-7235-6749

Angela Zautcke is pursuing a dual degree program at the University of Notre Dame that includes a PhD in Theology and an MA in Classics.

ISBN 978-3-16-161101-8 / eISBN 978-3-16-161161-2
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-161161-2

ISSN 2748-0313 / eISSN 2748-0321 (History of Biblical Exegesis)

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

© 2022 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 on non-aging paper by Laupp & Göbel in Gomaringen, and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

Preface

The vision of this volume and the series History of Biblical Exegesis (HBE) as a whole is not quite new. The Mohr Siebeck Verlag published the *Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese*, which ran from 1959 (when the first volume appeared) to 1998, amounting to 34 volumes. The long hiatus means that this new series is not simply reviving the former things. BGBE was a series of monographs, and this HBE is more open in genre (such as multi-authored volumes like the present one, editions, etc.). So while being mindful of that history, we are also thankful that the last generation has seen an upsurge of interest in the history of the bible and its interpretation. Just like the BGBE, however, the operative word for this new series remains 'Exegesis'. More recent initiatives have attempted to show how ideological standpoints have determined particular readings of the bible or at least how biblical interpretation and theological or ideological *partis pris* work together. Quite often in these recent studies of 'reception,' attention to the text and the attempt of historical exegetes to understand it in its range of plausible meanings gets lost. Of course, not every historical exegete or exegetical movement will act any differently, thus with bias, whatever their best intentions. Nevertheless, even where claims to false objectivity redound, one can find the historical exegetes attempting to show how the text says what these interpreters think it says. A close inspection calls into question the too-ready claim that all exegetical results are "foregone conclusions." (The present writer recalls his interest in Byzantine readings of James 4:13–17 being dismissed at another SBL session on the grounds that people who were 'in power' could have no spiritual insight into New Testament texts.) If recent books, which as biblical theologies purport to build on exegetical work can be called *AFTER Exegesis (Feminist Biblical Theology in Honor of Carol A. Newsom*, eds. Patricia K. Tull and Jacqueline E. Lapsley [Waco: Baylor University Press, 2015]), the idea is that feminist bible scholars should move beyond exegesis (as something which the editors say can be done with a variety of tools), towards the goal of a biblical theology. Yet all the chapters stick with creative feminist readings of discrete biblical texts: one might just about speak of a patchwork biblical theology made from the various chapters, yet little more. However, in the historical tradition of exegesis (a 'tradition of interpretation' implies a continuous yet developing hermeneutic applied to the textual meaning), there is a dialectical relationship between biblical theology and the exegesis of a text, especially as the latter discourse moves into proclamation and more broadly performance (e.g. sacred art and music, canon law) in churches.

So, history of exegesis it is. Also, a brief word in defence of a charge of ‘elitism’. Most writers in the previous centuries (and to some extent still today) belonged to an elite, by virtue of being literate and lettered. It should not be thought that this was a disadvantage, not least when they are famous for being in the forefront (or the engine room) of the reform of church and society, as many of the better-known exegetes were. Yet they also represented the families, towns and societies which spawned them and to a large degree felt themselves accountable and under authority to the church of their people as well as to scripture. They taught lay people or at least taught their teachers. Those others who painted, versified and composed were arguably more ‘elite’ – was Bach less elite than Calov whose bible commentary he used? – just as is the case with the university academic today, who reads the standard accounts of the meaning of biblical and theological texts and feels called to go further, to work interstitially, to work the frontiers, to be creative. Of course, good exegesis is fresh exegesis, in whatever generation. Yet it often has power to go on inspiring and (almost, sometimes) persuade beyond its own time where it is somewhat ‘faithful’ to text and tradition.

This multi-authored volume expresses many projects in the history of exegesis. Some will be more small-scale, others a broader sweep or comparison. Exegesis is not to be found only in commentaries, although those will often be where the biblical theologian does his or her most careful work, anxious to keep the supply line to the historical sources as taut as possible. What follows comes out of SBL Annual Meeting “History of Interpretation” sessions between 2016 and 2018.

The first two essays, namely DAVID LINCICUM (with MARK W. ELLIOTT and MICHAEL LEGASPI), “Does the Present Threaten the Past? Historiographical Reflections on the Problem of Teleology in Writing the History of Exegesis” and ERIC COVINGTON, “*Wirkungsgeschichte* and Trilateration: A Methodological Analogy for Understanding the Role of Reception-History in New Testament Exegesis,” both offer a theoretical and methodological perspective born out of reflection on the state of our understanding of the nature and purpose of the study of Scripture (HB-OT and NT) throughout history. That by LINCICUM comes out of some years of reflection on how Histories of Exegesis have offered much and sometimes delivered, but otherwise often have not. In some ways this is a ‘literature’ review which sets the stage for an implicit manifesto, viz, that history of exegesis (as distinct from reception-history) needs to be done more, more carefully, but also done with more confidence. For his part, Covington offers the interesting theory of text, history of interpretation, and current reader as a way to a rounded, careful yet theologically meaningful and instructive interpretation which is actually more likely to be ‘accurate’. Exegesis includes interpretation but cares to follow the biblical text as it does so.

What then follows appears in some sort of chronological sequence. Arising out of a SBL “History of Interpretation” session that focused on the ongoing spur of Jewish exegesis to both Jewish, Christian, and other readings, BETH

A. BERKOWITZ, “Interpretation in the Anthropocene: Reading the Animal Family Laws of the Pentateuch Temple Scroll Mishnah,” offers something that seems pleasingly familiar even in what might seem unfamiliar to the non-Jewish reader. This essay moves, after a consideration of a network of texts, especially Leviticus 22 and Exodus 22, to an account of their reception in the Temple scroll and Mishnah, and it gives one a flavour of the indispensability of understanding the trajectories and turning points in Late Antique Jewish interpretative history.

Some of the treatments that follow focus in on one scriptural passage. SIMEON R. BURKE, “The Hermeneutical Benefits of *Wirkungsgeschichte*: Patristic Applications of the Command to ‘Render to Caesar and to God’ as Case Study,” relates how patristic, especially early patristic interpretations, can be privileged in that the interpreters breathe similar air or were party to traditions which complemented the biblical writing in question – here Matthew 22:20–22. Again a ‘manageable’ text is dealt with in ATHANASIOS DESPOTIS, “A Neglected Perspective on Matthew 28:18–20.” This has been a key text for ‘world mission’, but it mattered for the Eastern Patristic interpreters in a distinctively different way. The Greek tradition of interpretation emphasised the mysteriousness of mission in that the content of it is initiation into a nuptial mystery. Taking a single text, Jn 9:34 and its reference to blood and water, STEFANO SALEMI, “The Wounded Christ of the Fourth Gospel: New Testament Interpretation in Alexandrian Tradition,” specifically allows space for the interpretation of Clement, Origen and the *Pistis Sophia* as well as the later, Armenian Elissh, for whom there was symbolic value in giving the observer of the sacramental re-presentation of that which offers saving knowledge. For DAN BATOVICI, “Reception and Marginal Texts: Notes on the Reception of 1 Peter 5:1–4,” arising out of his work for the *Novum Testamentum Patristicum* series, these few verses seem very appropriate to the job description of church leaders, but their employment is rather scarce: usually to emphasise the humility that should go with the office. They are important in and through what they represent, not least Christ’s priesthood in the eucharist.

The volume then ‘jumps’ to the Reformation, due to a need in 2017 to honour Luther in the year of his Jubilee. ODA WISCHMEYER, “Luther’s Prefaces to the New Testament in Their Hermeneutical and Philological Dimension, Read from an Exegetical Perspective,” usefully pays attention to what Luther said he thought he was doing as an exegete. Luther was consistently philological in his theology of the gospel (*evangelion*). He was determined to evaluate texts strictly in terms of textual evidence rather than dogmatic principle. This meant *inter alia* that not all texts proposed Christ, nor should they be forced to. Accordingly, MARK W. ELLIOTT, “Behind the Bible in the Reformation: Luther and Biblical Revelation,” observes that there is a reflection on interpreting Luther interpreting Scripture in light of what concerned him in terms of the Christian life. Rather than decide whether Luther had some sort of ‘Wordontology’ to put

in place of a 'being-ontology', it is his actualism combined with his scholarship that aimed to stress the moments of reception of the external Word, in a way that ensured that the believer continues to be a 'debtor'.

Moving into the Early Modern period, PAUL K.-K. CHO, "Biblical Samson, Milton's *Samson Agonistes*, and Modern Terrorism," offers a fascinating attempt to criticize the critique. Milton's presentation of Samson was to privilege the action of his final hours as the work of a freedom fighter. Cheryl Exum has seen Samson's 'suicide attack' as a disproportionate act of terrorism. However, Judges 16 viewed in Milton's way can be read as showing how the audience provoked the Lord's Anointed and how these were not innocent people but the worst of the tyrannical elite, while the leitmotif of 'peg' links Delilah to Jael, as Milton helps us see in his even-handed account. In terms of influence of philosophical thinkers on biblical hermeneutics, JEFFREY L. MORROW, "Methods of Interpreting Scripture and Nature: The Influence of the Baconian Method on Spinoza's Biblical Criticism," argues for the debt of Spinoza to the late Elizabethan natural philosopher, Francis Bacon. Just as the history of Nature became valued as a way into natural scientific study, the history of Scripture became crucial for understanding Scriptural texts, and this was indebted to Francis Bacon's *Novum Organum*. This is as important an influence on Spinoza, the father of biblical criticism, as those of Hobbes and Descartes. The aim was to interpret Scripture on its own terms and not impose foreign concepts on it, even though the Bible ended up looking even more like a political work in the image of its interpreter. Almost a counterpoint to Spinoza can be found in BRANDON D. CROWE, "Reading the Acts of the Apostles with Francis Turretin: Continuity and Discontinuity." Here is an attempt to describe and analyse in its intellectual historical setting the exegetical work of a doctrinal theologian but also to move beyond this to dialogue with modern critical commentaries. The elder Turretin brings a continuity of law and Holy Spirit across the testaments, but Trinitarian theology also provides a challenge to modern emphasis on 'narrative' and action.

An attempt to cultivate a neglected area of study is essayed in KEITH D. STANGLIN, "Dutch Contributions to Modern Exegesis: The Case of the Remonstrants." A fusion of Erasmian humanism and Reformed theology with a lively interest in culture made the Arminian tradition not necessarily just a conduit to rationalistic interpretation of the Eighteenth Century but a thoughtful method that mixed principle with appreciation of linguistic nuance. Likewise a fascinating coming-together of general Reformed orthodoxy with humanist philosophical leanings is to be found in STEVEN EDWARD HARRIS, "Locke Reads the Bible for Himself – With Others: The Influence of Socinian Exegesis on Locke's Interpretation of Resurrection." Drawing on the Socinian Crell, albeit without acknowledgement, Locke was able to promote a doctrine of the resurrection that would be more philosophically than theologically orthodox. This is in the sense that what is risen is in many ways discontinuous with Jesus's lived-in body.

It was a delight to attend, chair, and participate in these SBL “History of Interpretation” sessions from 2016–18. We tried to engage a selection of younger and older scholars, with a representation of a number of traditions. We do not feel that the air of these sessions nor their final form as written articles in this volume has anything of the antiquarian or recondite. The pathway is an inductive one. More could be learned from a variety of sources, the better to prevent the sweeping ‘The Catholic Reformation view of the Old Testament prophets was x’, but also to afford a way of how to ‘reverently hear’ texts, even while seeing them as gateways into insight and truth that allows Scripture to be itself. In this light we very much look forward to going forward (in partnership with the delightfully helpful Mohr Siebeck Verlag, namely Elena Müller), towards a series of works which will expand this moving tent or tabernacle.

Mark W. Elliott

Table of Contents

Preface	V
---------------	---

Matters of Approach

DAVID LINCICUM (with MARK W. ELLIOTT and MICHAEL LEGASPI) Does the Present Threaten the Past? Historiographical Reflections on the Problem of Teleology in Writing the History of Exegesis	3
--	---

ERIC COVINGTON <i>Wirkungsgeschichte</i> and Trilateration: A Methodological Analogy for Understanding the Role of Reception-History in New Testament Exegesis	21
--	----

Exegetical Cases

BETH A. BERKOWITZ Interpretation in the Anthropocene: Reading the Animal Family Laws of the Pentateuch	39
--	----

SIMEON R. BURKE The Hermeneutical Benefits of <i>Wirkungsgeschichte</i> : Patristic Applications of the Command to 'Render to Caesar and to God' as Case Study	53
--	----

ATHANASIOS DESPOTIS A Neglected Perspective on Matthew 28:18–20	69
--	----

STEFANO SALEMI The Wounded Christ of the Fourth Gospel: New Testament Interpretation in Alexandrian Tradition	81
---	----

DAN BATOVICI Reception and Marginal Texts: Notes on the Reception of 1 Peter 5:1–4	95
--	----

Luther's Exegesis 500 Years On

ODA WISCHMEYER

Luther's Prefaces to the New Testament in Their Hermeneutical and
Philological Dimension, Read from an Exegetical Perspective 109

MARK W. ELLIOT

Behind the Bible in the Reformation: Luther and Biblical Revelation 123

Early Modern Concurrences and Tensions in Exegesis

PAUL K.-K. CHO

Biblical Samson, Milton's *Samson Agonistes*, and Modern Terrorism 141

JEFFREY L. MORROW

Methods of Interpreting Scripture and Nature: The Influence
of the Baconian Method on Spinoza's Biblical Criticism 157

BRANDON D. CROWE

Reading the Acts of the Apostles with Francis Turretin:
Continuity and Discontinuity 175

KEITH D. STANGLIN

Dutch Contributions to Modern Exegesis: The Case of the Remonstrants 189

STEVEN EDWARD HARRIS

Locke Reads the Bible for Himself – With Others: The Influence
of Socinian Exegesis on Locke's Interpretation of Resurrection 203

Index of References 219

Index of Modern Authors 225

Index of Subjects 230

Matters of Approach

Does the Present Threaten the Past?

Historiographical Reflections on the Problem of Teleology in Writing the History of Exegesis

David Lincicum

(with *Mark W. Elliott* and *Michael Legaspi*)

Can the history of biblical interpretation be written? Is there some kind of unity to the discipline of the history of interpretation? Or does it fragment endlessly into local case studies unable to be combined into some greater whole? This is a historiographical question that itself bundles together a number of subsidiary questions that need to be addressed by anyone undertaking a large-scale work in the history of interpretation. What should be the scope of such a history? Should it include Hebrew Bible/Old Testament, New Testament, or both? Undertaken by a single author with a unified perspective, or by a team of experts in various epochs and figures, but with the attendant threat to coherence? And what constitutes “interpretation” to begin with? Is the subject of the “history of interpretation”, the substantive of which a narrative account is to be rendered, a consistent activity over time, or simply a loose assemblage of reading strategies with no perduring identity through the centuries? What does Tübingen have to do with Alexandria?

The question about what is under the microscope opens out into the task of this introductory essay. I hope to pose a question about the degree to which ideas about what constitutes “interpretation” have exercised a determinative influence in structuring some large-scale histories of interpretation. Those works on which I will comment have been selected precisely because they are excellent, and any criticisms I might make will, I hope, be understood as an act of critical gratitude, which is, after all, the most sincere type of academic thanksgiving.

In the past few decades, we have learned to draw a distinction between *Auslegungsgeschichte* and *Wirkungsgeschichte*, the history of interpretation and the history of effects. I understand the former to be a subset of the latter, but the line between an *Auslegung* and a *Wirkung* is not always easy to determine. It is, properly speaking, the former of these that is the concern of the history of interpretation, but the range of genres and texts that involve interpretation is much broader than, say, lemmatized philological commentaries or critical academic

monographs. Sermons, popular devotional writings, constructive theological or philosophical treatises, all arguably involve sustained acts of interpretation that would render them possible candidates for the history of interpretation. But as a general rule, as histories of interpretation move toward the present, the focus becomes more and more narrowly centered on the historical critical method and its roots, to the exclusion of other forms of interpretation now judged insufficiently scientific to be included.

This suggests, at least to me, that histories of interpretation tend to operate with a conception of what valid interpretation is, and then seek precursors to that in the tradition. Historians of interpretation will differ, as we shall see, on how explicitly this comes to the fore, but this suggests there is a major concern to be addressed here: what historiographers and historians of science have referred to as the problem of “presentist” or Whig history.

The most famous treatment of this historiographical thorn is Herbert Butterfield’s. “It is part and parcel of the whig interpretation of history,” he argued, “that it studies the past with reference to the present; and though there may be a sense in which this is unobjectionable if its implications are carefully considered, and there may be a sense in which it is inescapable, it has often been an obstruction to historical understanding because it has been taken to mean the study of the past with direct and perpetual reference to the present.”¹ It is a theory whose utility is evident: after all, inquiry into the past without any reference to the present threatens to resolve into a fruitless antiquarianism. As Butterfield points out, this view “is really introduced for the purpose of facilitating the abridgment of history; and its effect is to provide us with a handy rule of thumb by which we can easily discover what was important in the past, for the simple reason that, by definition, we mean what is important ‘from our point of view.’”² Histories of interpretation are very evidently abridging in character, attempting to reduce the vast and diffuse traces of a sprawling exegetical past to some manageable narrative journey. But as Butterfield cautions: “There is a danger that abridgements may be based more or less consciously upon some selective principle.”³

Butterfield spawned a long series of historiographers in his wake who decried the presentism of anachronistic judgments and pointed to the ideologically freighted teleology inherent in certain tendentious histories of everything from politics to science. But not all critics have been happy with the proliferation of accusations of Whiggism. In particular, some historians of science have noted that to proceed in a Rankean fashion in attempting to describe, say, geological investigations in England in the 1830s with no evaluative judgment or description

¹ Herbert Butterfield, *The Whig Interpretation of History* (New York: Norton, 1965 [orig. 1931]), 11.

² Butterfield, *Whig Interpretation*, 24.

³ Butterfield, *Whig Interpretation*, 101.

of the significance of such investigations in the progress of the discipline of geology, will only fail to supply answers to the questions that motivate historians of science in the first place. Ernst Mayr, for example, has contended “that Butterfield was ill advised in his literal transfer of the whig label from political history to history of science. It was based on the erroneous assumption that a sequence of theory changes in science is of the same nature as a sequence of political changes.”⁴ Or as David Alvargonzález suggests: “history in the field of techniques and technologies will always have an essentially Whig component because the achievements of the past are inevitably included in a progressive succession which continues up to the present.”⁵

If we step back from this debate and ask about its application to the history of exegesis, we are faced with the question: is this history more like a series of shifting political views, which may come and go depending on societal circumstances, or more like a developing tradition of scientific inquiry, in which one discovery or theory may serve as the foundation for the next?

Closely related to this is the question of whether there is progress in the history of exegesis, or indeed in history more generally. Mandell Creighton had famously opined that, “we are bound to assume, as the scientific hypothesis on which history is to be written, a progress in human affairs.”⁶ On the other hand, R. G. Collingwood remarked that, “The idea of historical progress, then, if it refers to anything, refers to the coming into existence not merely of new actions or thoughts or situations belonging to the same specific type, but of new specific types. It therefore presupposes such specific novelties, and consists in the conception of these as improvements But from whose point of view is it an improvement?”⁷ The heady optimism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries has naturally long faded, but the native conviction of a teleological progression in history, of which we stand at the provisional end, is difficult to escape.

There are evidently different ways in which one’s status as future from the vantage points of the subjects of one’s historical research may play into the writing of a history of exegesis. To adopt and modify a typology first proposed by my colleague, the historian of science Evan Ragland,⁸ one might speak of at least four stances:

⁴ Ernst Mayr, “When is Historiography Whiggish?” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 51 (1990): 301–309, here 302.

⁵ David Alvargonzález, “Is the History of Science Essentially Whiggish?,” *History of Science* 51 (2013): 85–99, here 91.

⁶ Mandell Creighton, “Introductory Note,” in *The Cambridge Modern History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902), 1:4, quoted in E. H. Carr, *What Is History?* (London: Penguin, 1964 [1961]), 111, but erroneously ascribed to Lord Acton.

⁷ R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956 [1946]), 324–325.

⁸ My thanks are due to Dr. Raglund for sharing his unpublished paper with me. See also

1. Future Presentism. Because we live later in time than the exegetes on whose work we reflect, we have unreflective access to information, discoveries, and historical circumstances unavailable to them. It is virtually impossible to think ourselves out of our historically effected consciousness but we can become aware of it and so think about the ways in which our futurity may impinge on the categories of interpretation and judgments we bring to bear in the historiographical task.
2. Unavoidable Teleology of Abridgment. All historical writing involves critical abridgement, which includes selecting topics or examples judged most relevant to a developing argument or line of research, while excluding all others. Because of the vastness of the exegetical tradition and the limitations of the individual historian, the problem of abridgement is particularly severe for the history of exegesis, and so we should pay careful attention to the architectural judgments involved in how histories of interpretation are structured, including what they include and what they pass over, and what role this may play in prejudicing the results in one direction or another.
3. Genealogical Self-Understanding. Histories of technical disciplines like science or historical criticism may take as their specific questions how the regnant approaches in their own day came to arise in the history of the discipline. This approach asks a genealogical question of the exegetical tradition and so is naturally invested in discovering precursors to current practice, though the risks of distorting positions or judging them according to standards inoperative in their own day begins to increase in genealogical approaches.
4. Progressive Teleology. Finally, we find a stronger form in which the exegetical tradition is depicted as tending ineluctably toward some telos, which is, usually after much struggle with traditional orthodoxies, triumphantly achieved. This strongly teleological approach takes a partisan view of the tradition by depicting it as the march of a progress in knowledge in particular.

With these rough sensitivities to the varieties of presentist or teleological concern in place, we turn now to consider briefly in turn a number of significant histories of biblical interpretation to gauge how they negotiate these matters. It is worth stressing that I am only attempting to call attention to the stances in play on this question, rather than passing judgment on the projects as a whole.

Hasok Chang, "We Have Never Been Whiggish (About Phlogiston)," *Centaurus* 51 (2009): 239–264.

1. Stephen Neill's *Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861–1961*⁹

Bishop Stephen Neill's lively account of the interpretation of the New Testament over the course of a fateful hundred years proceeds from the threat to orthodoxy in the early nineteenth century to the establishment of a sane, British criticism by the middle of the twentieth. In his telling, figures in the history of New Testament exegesis spring to life, but his account throughout is marked by a strongly evaluative presentist tone. In speaking of Michaelis, Neill writes, "His own views were generally conservative; but, as we shall see again and again in this study, what matters is not so much the particular views that any scholar holds as the validity of the methods which he uses, and the integrity of his devotion to them."¹⁰ The language chosen is striking: it is the "validity" of the methods used, and the "integrity" of the scholar's devotion to them, qualities that Neill no doubt finds himself adept at judging. But he goes further than this. In the concluding chapter to the original edition (understandably replaced by Tom Wright in his 1986 revision), Neill posed a series of questions:

Is there any real progress? Is there any solid ground underfoot at all, or is all nothing more than the fruit of misplaced human ingenuity? Physical science goes on from strength to strength, through its endlessly cautious checking of data, its constant use of the principle of verifiability, its building on established results as the starting-point for progress in the future. Is there anything comparable in theology? Has it any claim at all to be regarded as scientific in method and achievement?¹¹

He went on to enumerate twelve assured results, as marks of progress – which included, among other less objectionable matters, the view that "it is universally agreed that New Testament study must begin with the Epistles of Paul," that "there is no valid reason for thinking that [the Gospel of Mark] was written later than A.D. 70," and that Matthew and Luke used a written collection of the sayings of Jesus, i. e., Q, in addition to Mark. The fact that he could point to an assured minimum of critical results as proof of progress in the 1960s that today seem no longer so assured, arguably highlights elements of a progressive teleology in his presentation. Which is to say that the story Neill tells arrives with some muted tones of triumph at the results of his British contemporaries.

⁹ Stephen Neill, *The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861–1961* (London: Oxford University Press, 1964). A revised edition was produced by Tom Wright: Stephen Neill and Tom Wright, *The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861–1986*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988).

¹⁰ *Interpretation of the New Testament*, original ed., p. 6, and rev. ed., p. 6. Cf. Neill's prefatory statement: "I have tried to feel the movement of thought over a century, to concentrate on a small number of writers rather than to expatiate over many, and at the risk of over-simplification to draw attention to what seems to me to be of permanent significance" (original ed., p. v).

¹¹ *Interpretation of the New Testament* (orig. ed.), 336.

2. W.G. Kümmel's *The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of its Problems*¹²

Kümmel's work, a monument of erudition and a gateway for many to the history of interpretation, may serve as a prime example of the unavoidable teleology of abridgement in service of a genealogical self-understanding. Although the title of his work might indicate a broader scope, he speaks explicitly of ancient and medieval interpretation as *Vorgeschichte* ("prehistory"), noting in the first sentence of the book that "It is impossible to speak of a scientific view of the New Testament until the New Testament became the object of investigation as an independent body of literature with historical interest, as a collection of writings that could be considered apart from the Old Testament and without dogmatic or creedal basis."¹³ Kümmel's interests are admittedly in the "scientific" understanding of the New Testament, and it is the critical historical science of the late Enlightenment that supplies his points of orientation. With a few notable exceptions – particularly C. H. Dodd, Maurice Goguel, Edwin Hatch, J. B. Lightfoot, and a handful of others – the cast of characters is significantly German-speaking and Protestant in character. The organization of the story also proceeds in a self-consciously genealogical manner: the subtitle specifies that this treats "the history of the investigation of [the New Testament's] problems," and Kümmel's preface is remarkably clear about the aims of the book: it "does not present the entire history of New Testament study, but limits itself deliberately to the delineation of the lines of inquiry and the methods which have proved to be of permanent significance or to anticipate future developments."¹⁴ While one might reasonably ask how one should determine "permanent significance," it is certainly fair for Kümmel to approach the history of critical questions arising in the study of the New Testament in a selective and genealogical manner (focusing on what "anticipate[s] future developments").

3. Henning Graf Reventlow's *History of Biblical Interpretation*¹⁵

The German title of Reventlow's work, *Epochen der Bibelauslegung*, is a nearer indication of his approach than the broader English title. His work, however, for all its striking erudition and fascinating introduction of figures not usually

¹² London: SCM, 1973; ET of *Das neue Testament: Geschichte der Erforschung seiner Probleme* trans. S. McLean Gilmour and Howard C. Kee (Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1970).

¹³ *New Testament*, 13.

¹⁴ *New Testament*, 7.

¹⁵ *The History of Biblical Interpretation*, 4 vols., trans. Leo G. Purdue and James O. Duke (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2009–2010).

featuring in histories of exegesis, presents another example of a highly selective abridgement of the historical tradition. Indeed, he does admit that the chronological periodization he chooses is only applicable in a limited sense.¹⁶ But there is a telling trajectory as his history proceeds. He excludes not just the Eastern traditions in Coptic, Syriac, Armenian and other such languages, but even the Byzantine Greek tradition, citing as justification the fact that “advances of knowledge in understanding the Bible took place chiefly in the western part of the former Roman Empire from the early Middle Ages on.”¹⁷ After the Middle Ages, the figures become increasingly Germanic. In fact, the most recent Anglophone interpreter treated at any length is the Deist John Toland, born 1670. This may in part be due to the biographical nature of his presentation, but it is hard to escape the impression that he is privileging the Western, and particularly the German, tradition by an a priori judgment about the strength of its accomplishment which teleologically shapes his presentation to that end. Even more clearly than in Kümmel, we find the strong influence of genealogical self-understanding, where the “self” is here understood as modern German academic biblical interpretation, whose roots are then sought by traversing the tradition from back to front.

4. William Baird’s *History of New Testament Research*¹⁸

Baird’s monumental account of the history and development of research on the New Testament is staggeringly well-researched. He proceeds mostly biographically but occasionally thematically to present and briefly evaluate the major movements and contributions of New Testament *Wissenschaft* from the late eighteenth century to Hans Dieter Betz. The periodization is self-consciously chosen. He writes in the introduction to his first volume that he will focus on the “study of the New Testament from the period of the Enlightenment through the first two-thirds of the twentieth century. This historical segment has an integrity of its own. It encompasses the era of the modern world – the era in which the scientific method of inquiry has been applied to all fields of learning.”¹⁹ The brief survey of the early church, the Middle Ages, and the Reformation that follows, seeks for evidence of precursorship, adumbrations in embryonic form of the historical critical consciousness. He focuses in his project on “research”,

¹⁶ See, e.g., *History of Biblical Interpretation*, 2:1–2.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 2:1–2.

¹⁸ Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992–2013.

¹⁹ *History of New Testament Research*, 1:xiii. In the preface to the final volume of the series, however, we do find this acknowledgement: “The title *History of New Testament Research* is an overstatement. This is a history of NT research in *some* places by *some* scholars” (3:2, italics original).

though it is conceived in “broad terms, that is, as the whole field of the study of the NT,”²⁰ focusing particularly on “those scholars whose work is most influential in the ongoing development of NT research.”²¹ In contradistinction to Kümmel, Baird wants not simply to offer a problem-oriented approach, but to offer a broader coverage of the field. So, this seems to be motivated, in part at least, by genealogical self-understanding. Baird does present some evaluation, though he is up-front about this. For example, he suggests of some conservative scholars, that “presuppositions determine their results.”²² In this sense, Baird is explicitly and in a chastened fashion attempting to apply present sensibilities to the evaluation of historical work, as a means of assessing the permanent gain from past scholarship. While there is necessarily significant abridgment, the scope of Baird’s work allows him to offer a broad selection of interpreters whom he judges to be important for the development of New Testament research.

5. Magne Sæbø’s *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*²³

The major project that is probably least susceptible to the charge of anachronism or presentism is Sæbø’s massive three volumes in five parts surveying the long history of interpretation of the Hebrew Bible. Even here, with 4,000 dense pages, one can point to victims of abridgment: the volumes curiously miss “Gnostic” exegesis, the reception of the Bible among “pagan” authors, Byzantine study of the Bible, and developments within Orthodoxy. Nevertheless, the contributors respect the particularities of each given figure or movement, and so the volumes as a whole have a strongly non-teleological feel to them. Conversely, one sometimes feels a lack of coherence, or at least the reader is left to sketch the lines of development between the various learned sketches – though Sæbø himself traces briefly some such lines at the beginning and end of some of the volumes. His introductory essay identifies various historiographical challenges facing the historian of exegesis, showing himself aware of various historiographical choices that confront the historian of exegesis, including the distinction between the impact of the Bible in broad terms and the history of exegesis in particular, the relationship between part and whole, the rationale for periodizations, and the

²⁰ *History of New Testament Research* 1:xix.

²¹ *History of New Testament Research* 1:xx.

²² *History of New Testament Research* 2:395.

²³ 5 parts in 3 vols.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996–2014. The other major multi-volume recent treatment which could be considered is the four-volume *New Cambridge History of the Bible*, which includes more treatment of versions and the Bible as text rather than only as interpreted – apart from the question of the scope of the volumes (Hebrew Bible/Old Testament vs. the entire Christian canon).

Index of References

Hebrew Bible

<i>Genesis</i>		5:24	151
1:27	62	13	144
8:8–12	76	13–16	154
		14–15	144–145
<i>Exodus</i>		14:2	144
12:46	92	14:3	144
19	143	14:14	144
22	vii	14:19	144–146
22:29	39, 42	15:4–5	145
23:19	39	15:8	145
34:26	39	15:14	146
		15:15	145
<i>Leviticus</i>		16	142–145
14	85	16:5	145
14:1–8	86	16:8	145
22	vii	16:9	145
22:17–25	41	16:12	145
22:27	39	16:13	152
22:27–28	40–42, 45	16:14	145, 152–153
22:28	39, 41, 44	16:18	145
24:20	146	16:20	145
		16:23	153
<i>Numbers</i>		16:24	143, 145, 147, 153
9:12	92	16:25	146
13:23–24	84	16:27	146, 148
20	84	16:28	146
		16:30	143, 146–148
<i>Deuteronomy</i>		<i>1 Samuel</i>	
14:21	39	6:7–14	49
21	47	6:12	49
22:6	46		
22:10	125	<i>Isaiah</i>	
22:6–7	39	7:14	195
26:1–22	14	28:19	136
		48:16	123
<i>Judges</i>		52–53	195
4:9	151	54	76
4:17	151	62	76
4:21	151–152		

<i>Jeremiah</i>		13:1	92
2-3	76	14:8	92
31	76	14:9	92
<i>Ezekiel</i>		<i>Psalms</i>	
16	76	2:7	187
23	76	17	133
47:1-2	92	119	135
47:9	92	120:4	127
<i>Hosea</i>		<i>Proverbs</i>	
1-3	76	20:29	101
11:1	195		
<i>Joel</i>		<i>Song of Songs</i>	
2:16	101	1:3-4	77
		2:12	76
		4:14	77
<i>Zechariah</i>		5:1	78
8:4-5	101	5:2-8	77
12:10	92	8:2	77

New Testament

<i>Matthew</i>		25:1-13	77
1:18	75, 78	26:6-7	77
2:15	195	26:26	78
2:38-42	72	26:61	77
3:1-12	74	27:52	213
3:3	73	28	69, 74
3:16	73, 89	28:16	69
5:8	74	28:16-20	69
5:19	72	28:19	70-71
6:3	72		
8:37	72	<i>Mark</i>	
9:15-17	77	3:15	76
10:6	69	10:42-44	102
10:36	77	12:13-17	54
11:29	73	16:15	69
18:20	78		
22	76	<i>Luke</i>	
22:1-13	77	1:1-4	185
22:1-14	78	1:15	185
22:15-22	54, 59	1:35	185
22:20-22	vii	1:41	185
24	77	1:67	185
25	76	1:80	185

2:25–27	185	12:2–5	186
10:23–24	183	12:11	186
12:49	89	12:23	186
12:50	89	12:24	186
14:15–24	76	13:12	179
20:19–26	54	13:33	187
20:20	61	13:38–39	180–181, 183
20:27	213	13:39	178, 183
24:31–32	213	14:16–17	180
24:39	212	15	177, 181, 187
24:41	213	15:8	181
24:44–47	185	15:8–11	180
24:46–48	69	15:9	181–182
		15:10	181–182
<i>John</i>		15:11	181–183, 185
1:1	131	15:28–29	181
1:14	135	15:20	177, 181
3:33	73	17:28–31	180
3:34	179	17:30	178
4	90	19	180
4:19	89	20:17	102
19:33	92	20:27–28	180
19:34	81, 83–84, 87, 91–92	20:28	102
19:35	88	22:16	180
20:14	213	23:6	185
20:21	69	26:6–8	185
		26:16–18	69
<i>Acts</i>		26:18	180
1:8	186	26:22	183
1:16	185	28:20	185
1:18–19	69	28:25	185
1:21–22	186		
2:23	180	<i>Romans</i>	
2:36	178	1:4	187
2:38–39	180, 183	1:22	135
3:21	180	3:28	134
3:25–26	183–184	7	187
4:12	180, 182, 185	14:14	177
4:25	185		
4:28	180	<i>1 Corinthians</i>	
5:2–3	102	1–10	2–8
7:51	185	1:20	135
8	186	2	73
10:35	178	6:12–20	215
10:38	179	6:13–14	215
10:43	178, 180, 183–184	8:8	177
12:1	186	9:1	69
12:2	186	10:27	177

15	206, 208–209, 212–214,	<i>Philippians</i>	
	216	2:13	134
15:13	206		
15:20–23	213	<i>Colossians</i>	
15:22–23	214	2:21	177
15:35	203, 207, 210		
15:35–38	208	<i>1 Thessalonians</i>	
15:36	209	4:14	213
15:36–38	207		
15:42	205, 207	<i>1 Timothy</i>	
15:42–43	206	4:3	177
15:49	64	5:23	83
15:50	206–207		
15:50–51	207	<i>James</i>	
15:53	210	4:13–17	v
<i>2 Corinthians</i>		<i>1 Peter</i>	
3:5	134	5	101–102
3:6	125	5:1	100–102
4:5	102	5:1–4	95, 100–102
<i>Galatians</i>		<i>2 Peter</i>	
1:16	69	1:20	196
2:20	134		
3	132	<i>1 John</i>	
5	128	5:6	86
		5:8	8

Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

<i>4 Ezra</i>		<i>Gospel of Thomas</i>	
10:45–48	77	100	54
<i>Epistula Apostolorum</i>			
25	212		

Qumran

<i>4QMMT(B)</i>		<i>11QTa</i>	
1	44	52	43
30–33	43		
<i>4Q270 (frag. 9)</i>			
2:13–15	43		

Philo and Josephus

Josephus		Philo	
<i>Antiquities</i>		<i>De Somniis</i>	
3.9:4.236–237	48	II.259	84

Rabbinic Texts

<i>m.Bekhorot</i>		<i>b.Hullin</i>	
7:7	47	78b	46
<i>m.Hullin</i>		<i>Sifra Emor Parashah</i>	
5:1–2	47	1	46
5:3	47	2	46–47
<i>t.Hullin</i>			
5:6	47		
5:6–8	47		

Early Christian Authors

Ambrose of Milan		Gregory of Nyssa	
<i>FonChr</i>		<i>Hom. In Cant.</i>	
3.158–160	78	10	78
3.165	78		
3.167	76	Ignatius	
3.230–236	76	<i>Epistle to the Magnesians</i>	
3.232	76	8:2	182
3.252	78	<i>Epistle to the Smyrnaeans</i>	
<i>Myst.</i>		2	212
7.35–41	76		
7.37	76	Jerome	
9.57–58	78	<i>Epistles</i>	
<i>Sacr.</i>		53.9	119
5.15	78		
5.3.17	76	John Chrysostom	
5.25	78	<i>Catecheses</i>	
Clement of Alexandria		1, PG 49, 234	76
<i>Paedagogus</i>		2/1.3 Sc 366, 118	74
PG 8, II, 2 409B	83	2/3, Sc 266, 212	76
		2/3.3, Sc 366, 222	75

<i>Homilies on John</i>		<i>Homilies on Luke</i>	
24.2	73	39	57, 64
John of Jerusalem		Tertullian	
2,2 Sc 126	76	<i>De Fuga</i>	
3,1 Sc 126	75	12.10–13	
4,2 Sc 126, 136	76	Theodore of Mopsuestia	
4,3 Sc 126, 136	78	<i>FonChr</i>	
Origin		17.109–110	
<i>Commentary on Matthew</i>		17.110	
17.25	63	17.381–382	
17.25–26	56–57	<i>Homilies</i>	
17.26	58	3.9	
17.27	56–57	14.23	
<i>Fragm. In Evang. Joannis 36</i>			
512 ^{12–23}	71		

Index of Modern Authors

- Abrams, K. 48
Ackerman, S. 152
Adams, C.J. 40
Alastair, R. 75–76
Albiac, G. 162
Albrecht, O. 113
Alkier, S. 109
Allison, D.C. 120, 175
Alter, R. 49
Alvargonzález, D. 5
Arnaldez, R. 162
Asad, T. 40
Assaël, J. 110
Azar, M.G. 59
- Bacon, F. 164–168
Baird, W. 9–10
Balla, A. 141, 149
Bandala, M. 26
Bar-Efrat, S. 49
Barclay, J.M.G. 59–60, 129
Barkley, G.W. 86
Barrett, C.K. 73, 181, 187
Batovici, D. 96
Batten, A.J. 110
Baumgarten, J.M. 44–45
Baumgartner, W. 41
Bavinck, H. 182–185, 187
Bayer, O. 129–130, 135–136
Benz, E. 56–57, 62–63
Bercot, D.W. 90
Berger, K. 69
Berger, S. 112
Berman, J. 130, 161
Bernstein, M.J. 44
Berthelot, K. 40
Beutel, A. 109
Beyssade, M. 162
Bianchi, D. 211
Biderman, S. 160
Bietenholz, P.G. 206
Blancke, H. 113
- Bluhm, H. 127
Bock, D.L. 181
Bockmuehl, M. 21, 30, 32
Bori, P.C. 54
Bornkamm, H. 125, 135
Boyle, R. 207–210
Bray, G. 190
Breed, B.W. 31
Brettler, M.Z. 144
Brice, L.L. 142–143, 146
Brown, D.B. 141
Brox, N. 99
Burke, S.R. 54, 56, 58–59
Buth, R. 72
Butterfield, H. 4
Butts, A. 97
Bynum, C.W. 208
- Calvin, J. 176, 181–183, 208–209
Carey, J. 141, 146
Carr, E.H. 5
Cattenoz, J.-P. 77
Chang, H. 6
Charlesworth, S.D. 99
Chávez, A.E. 49
Cheney, P. 96
Chernaik, W. 141
Chester, S. 129
Cho, P.K.-K. 154
Collingwood, R.G. 5
Collins, A.Y. 61, 63, 65
Collins, J.J. 157
Colson, F.H. 43
Cooper, A. 40
Copeland, R. 96
Cotera, P. 26
Courcelles, É. de 192, 199–201
Cramer, J.A. 100
Creighton, M. 5
Crell, J. 208–210
Crouzel, H. 57, 64
Cruz, D. 26

- Curley, E. 162–163, 165
 Cuvillier, É. 110

 Dacome, L. 204
 Dahan, G. 124
 Daniélou, J. 75
 Daugirdas, K. 189–192, 197, 199
 de Bruyne, D. 112
 Dekkers, E. 55
 Della Puppa, F. 49
 Della Rocca, M. 162
 Dennison, J. T. 176
 Descartes, R. 193
 Deun, P. van 98
 Dibelius, M. 118, 120
 Djedi, Y. 162
 Donagan, A. 163
 Doutreleau, L. 101

 Ebeling, G. 126
 Elliott, M. W. 25, 30–33, 53–54, 66,
 129
 Ellis, M. A. 191
 England, E. 21
 Enns, P. 76
 Episcopius, S. 191–192, 194
 Erasmus 206
 Evans, R. 21–22, 24, 30, 32
 Exum, C. J. 142, 144, 146–147

 Felber, S. 118
 Ferguson, E. 70
 Feudenthal, J. 167
 Fish, S. 141
 Fitzmyer, J. A. 181
 Förster, N. 54
 Forstrom, J. K. 204, 207, 209–210
 Foucault, M. 48
 Fournier, F. 57, 64
 Fraenkel, C. 162–163
 Frampton, T. L. 158
 Francisco, J. M. C. 163
 Freedman, R. D. 161
 Freitag, A. 127
 Freudenthal, K. 161, 167
 Froehlich, K. 125–127
 Früchtel, L. 98

 Gabbey, A. 163
 Gadamer, H.-G. 22–24, 95
 Gathercole, S. 96, 99
 Gibert, P. 157
 Gilson, É. 167
 Given, J. G. 97
 Grappone, A. 85
 Gregory, B. S. 169
 Gregory, T. 141, 149
 Grotius, H. 207
 Guerrero, R. R. 162
 Gunn, D. M. 153
 Guttenplan, D. D. 154
 Gwon, G. 182

 Hahn, S. W. 160–161, 163, 169
 Hamm, B. 131
 Hammill, G. 169
 Hans, J. 90
 Haran, M. 40
 Hardie, P. 96
 Hardwick, L. 96
 Hartvigsen, K. M. 74–75
 Hauser, A. J. 12, 17, 157
 Heine, R. E. 56–58, 63
 Helmer, C. 21
 Hermle, S. 110
 Herms, E. 128
 Hilberg, I. 101
 Holtzmann, J. 110
 Hopkins, D. 96
 Hort, F. J. A. 97
 Howe, T. 142–143
 Hubbard, B. 69
 Hughes, M. Y. 143
 Hunter, D. G. 101
 Hurst, D. 102
 Hurtak, D. 88
 Hurtak, J. J. 88
 Hurtado, L. W. 97, 99

 Iacopini, G. 88
 Israel, J. I. 159

 James, S. 162
 Jauss, H. R. 22, 25, 30–31
 Jeter, J. R. 142

- Johnson, D.E. 186
 Jolley, N. 204–205

 Kaden, D.A. 70
 Kaplan, Y. 159
 Kasher, A. 160
 Kaufman, D. 203–204
 Kaufmann, T. 109
 Kawerau, G. 110–111
 Keel, O. 49
 Keener, C.S. 69, 75, 181–186
 Kettling, S. 133
 Klajnman, A. 163
 Klostermann, E. 56–57, 62–63
 Koen, E.M. 159
 Köhler, L. 41
 Konradt, M. 73
 Korsch, D. 132
 Köstenberger, A.J. 175
 Knight, M. 22, 53, 95
 Knupp, J. 73
 Kratzert, A.H. 128
 Kugel, J.L. 43–44
 Kugler, R.A. 44
 Kümmel, W.G. 8–9

 Lacoste, J.-Y. 134
 Laistner, M.L.W. 102
 Lane, J.D. 118–119
 Lange, J. 69
 Lauster, J. 129
 Law, D.R. 53
 Layton, B. 90
 Lazarus-Yafeh, H. 161
 Leclercq, J. 168, 206–207
 Legaspi, M.C. 169
 Leipoldt, J. 119
 Leppin, V. 127, 131
 Levenson, J.D. 160
 Levine, B. 39
 Levy, I.C. 112
 Lieb, M. 21
 Lied, L.I. 97
 Limborch, P. van 190, 193–198
 Lincicum, D. 96
 Locke, J. 198, 203–207, 210–215
 Lohse, B. 128, 135
 Longman, T. 76

 Loscocco, P. 151–152
 Lubac, H. de 195
 Luijendijk, A. 99
 Lundhaug, H. 77, 97
 Luther, M. 114, 126, 133–134
 Luz, U. 54, 56, 59, 65
 Lyons, W.J. 21, 29

 Macaskill, G. 60
 MacDermot, V. 88–89
 Machiavelli, N. 161
 Maddox, M.L. 132
 Madigan, K. 123
 Mailer, N. 142
 Malik, P. 97
 Marshall, D.G. 95
 Marshall, J. 204–205, 207, 209, 211
 Martens, P.W. 62
 Martin, F. 187
 Martindale, C. 96
 Martinez, E.R. 92
 Martinez, F.G. 43–44
 Mason, E. 21
 Maastricht, Petrus van 182, 187
 Maxfield, J. 132
 Mayer, W. 70
 Mayr, E. 5
 McNally, R.E. 98
 Mead, G.R.S. 88
 Mellerin, L. 16
 Merkt, A. 15–16
 Meyer, L. 166
 Miert, D. van 189, 201
 Mildemberger, F. 134
 Milgrom, J. 40, 42
 Milton, J. 48, 149–150
 Mohamed, F.G. 141–142
 Morgan, T. 55
 Morrow, J.L. 157, 162
 Mortimer, S. 211
 Muller, R.A. 201
 Mulsow, M. 205, 209

 Nadler, S. 158, 161
 Nasch, R. 84
 Nautin, P. 85
 Neill, S. 7
 Nellen, H.J.M. 200

- Neuschäfer, B. 62
 Newberry, R. C. 50
 Nicklas, T. 15–16, 32
 Niehoff, M. 63
 Ntezley, R. 141
 Nünlist, R. 63
- O’Kane, M. 95
 Oberman, H. 130
 Ocker, C. 123
 Oldman, E. O. 142
- Parker, D. C. 97
 Parris, D. P. 21, 24–25, 35
 Pearson, B. A. 88
 Pelikan, J. 126, 132
 Périchon, P. 57, 64
 Pesch, R. 181
 Peterson, D. G. 181, 187
 Piacenti, R. K. 48
 Piotrowski, N. 77
 Piovaneli, P. 96
 Pitassi, M.-C. 205–206, 210, 214
 Poel, M. van der 97
 Polyander, J. 191
 Popkin, R. H. 158, 162
 Preus, J. S. 163, 166
- Quack, J. 112–114
- Raeder, S. 128
 Rapallo, U. 85
 Reinbold, W. 70
 Reinmuth, E. 109
 Renoux, C. 98, 100
 Rester, T. M. 182
 Reventlow, H. G. von 126, 128, 157, 200
 Révah, I. S. 159
 Ricciardo, S. 208, 211
 Richardson, E. 96
 Rif’at, N. 161
 Rizzi, M. 54
 Roberts, J. 21
 Roessli, J.-M. 16
 Rogers, J. 153
 Rose, E. 96
 Rosen-Zvi, I. 47
 Rosenblum, J. 40
- Rosenthal, M. A. 160
 Rowe, C. Kavin 178
 Rothschild, C. K. 96
 Ruane, N. J. 41–42
 Rudrum, A. 141
 Runia, D. T. 84
- Sæbø, M. 10–12, 157
 Salomon, H. P. 159
 Savinel, P. 84
 Schäfer, P. 74
 Schiffman, L. H. 40, 43, 45, 48
 Schild, M. E. 111–113
 Schironi, F. 63
 Schlatter, A. 175
 Schmidt, C. 88
 Scholer, D. M. 84
 Schulz, H.-J. 70–71, 75
 Schwartz, B. J. 39
 Schwarz, R. 109
 Schwöbel, C. 131
 Scobie, C. H. H. 186
 Scotus, D. 130
 Sheehan, J. 169–170
 Shuve, K. 59, 65
 Sider, R. D. 64
 Simonutti, L. 206
 Ska, J.-L. 157
 Smith, J. Z. 66
 Smith, L. 124
 Spinoza, B. de 165–168, 201
 Stählin, O. 98
 Stanglin, K. D. 189–191, 195, 197, 205
 Staupitz, J. 129
 Stead, G. C. 85
 Stegmüller, F. 112
 Steinmetz, D. C. 125
 Stendahl, K. 133
 Stolt, B. 126
 Strawbridge, J. R. 21
 Stray, C. 96
 Streiff, S. 135
 Swanson, J. C. 50
- Tavard, G. H. 133
 Thomson, R. W. 91
 Thompson, A. J. 186
 Thompson, R. B. 26

- Tigay, J.H. 39
Tigchelaar, E.J.C. 43–44
Treu, U. 98
Turner, J. 200
Turretin, F. 176–184
Tzvetkova-Glaser, A. 60
- van Bunge, W. 162
van Eijk, A.H.C. 212
van Rooijen, A.J. Servaas 161
Verheyden, J. 15
Vidal, F. 204
Villeneuve, A. 73, 76–77, 79
Vlessing, O. 159–160
Vuković, M. 96
- Wallace, D.B. 72
Walther, M. 162
Waters, G.P. 181
Watson, D.F. 12, 17, 157
Weinrich, W.C. 73
Weinsheimer, J. 95
- Welborn, L. 73
Werrett, I.C. 44
Westcott, B.F. 97
Weston, C. 49
White, B.L. 70
Wiker, B. 160–161, 163, 169
Williamson, R. 84
Wischmeyer, O. 111
Witkamp, N. 75, 77–78
Wolfe, D.N. 149
Wolfson, H.A. 162
Wright, T. 7
- Young, F.M. 90
Yovel, Y. 169
- Zac, S. 163
Zachmann, R. 133
Zaragoza, J. Garrido 160
Zelyck, L.R. 97
Zoepfl, F. 98, 101

Index of Subjects

- I Peter 98–102
- Abrams, Kerry 48
- Ad Euangelum presbyterum* 101
- Acts, Book of
- Acts 15 177–178
 - Scholarship on 175–176, 185–187
- Alastair, Roberts 75–76
- Alvargonzález, David 5
- Allison, Dale 120, 175
- Alter, Robert 49
- Ambrose of Milan 71, 76–78
- Anabaptist(s) 110, 185
- Anagogy 125
- Analysis, Synchronous 25, 69
- Analysis, Diachronic 25, 69
- Anfechtung* 132, 136
- animal, flock 41–43
- Apocrypha *see* literature, apocryphal
- Apostolic Fathers 96
- approaches, contemporary 40, 53–54, 58–61, 110, 175
- approaches, genealogical 6, 8–11, 15
- approaches, reception-historical 60, 95–98
- Aristotelianism 128
- Armenian Language 9, 91
- Arminius, Jacobus 189
- Arnold, Bill 18
- Ascension 178, 198
- Asceticism 54, 56–57, 60
- Ashdod 151
- Ashkelon 144–145, 147
- atonement, day of 45
- Augustine 117, 125, 128
- Augustus, Duke 134
- Auslegungsgeschichte* 3, 15, 32
- Bacon, Francis 157–158, 163–169
- Interpretation of Nature 163–164
 - Interpretation of Scripture 165–168
- Baird, William 9–10
- Baptism 70–74, 77–79, 82, 85–87, 91, 136, 177–179, 183, 185
- of Christ 73–77, 89
 - Rebaptism 179
- Barbelo 89–90
- Barclay, John 59–60
- Batten, Alicia 110
- Baur, F. C. 18
- Bayer, Oswald 133, 135
- Beck, J. T. 14
- Bestiality 47
- Betz, Hans Dieter 9
- Beychlag 111
- Beza, Theodore 205
- Bibliindex 16, 99
- blemish, animal *see* imperfection, animal
- Bluhm, Heinz 126, 135
- Bondage of the Will* 127
- bonds, family 41, 45, 50
- border, U.S.–Mexico 49
- Bouwmeester, Johannes 163
- Boyle, Robert 206–211
- Brice, Lee L. 142–143, 146–147
- Bultmann, R. 62
- Butterfield, Herbert 4–5
- Caesar 53–58, 62–64
- calf/calves 47–49
- Cappel, Louis 206
- Carey, John 141, 146
- Carr, David 14
- Cartesian Philosophy 162, 166
- catena, Armenian 98, 100
- catena, Greek 100–101
- catchword(s) 62, 64, 116
- Charles I 149
- Chávez, Alex 49
- Childs, Brevard, 14
- Christianity, early 69, 96
- Christology 110
- Bridegroom 75–77
 - Dyophistic 75

- Chrysostom, John 71–78, 100
 Circumcision 70, 178, 186
Claritas scriptura 116, 135
 Classics *see* Studies, Classical
 Clement of Alexandria 40, 81–85, 91–92, 98
 Collingwood, R. G. 5
 Collins, Adela Yarbro 61–66
 commentators, medieval 40, 48
 Community, Messianic 72–73
Confession of the Remonstrants 191
 Continuity of Memory 204, 215
 Converts, non-Jewish 72–77
 Coptic Language 9
 Covenant 13, 42, 78, 89, 175, 182, 184
 – Discontinuity 177–178
 – New 91–92, 101, 124, 176, 178–183, 185
 – Nuptial 79
 – Old 101, 176, 178–183, 185
 cow(s) 43, 45, 47, 49
 Cramer, J. A. 100
 Creighton, Mandell 5
 Crell, Jan 205–206, 208–213, 216
 criticism, literary 62–63
 criticism, text 65
 Crown of glory 100–101
 Crucifixion 213–214
- da Costa, Uriel 162
 Dagon 145–146
 Dahan, Gilbert 124
 Daugirdas, Kestutis 191–192, 197, 199
 de Courcelles, Étienne 190, 192, 199, 200, 205
 de Prado, Juan 162
De servo arbitrio 109, 135
De somniis 84
De viris illustribus 111
 Deacons 101
 Deborah, song of 151
 Deist(s) 9, 197
 Descartes, René 162–163, 167, 192–193, 200
 Delilah 144–145, 147, 150–153
 Della Puppa, F. 49
 Department of Defense, U. S. 26
 Dibelius, Martin 110–111, 120–121
 Didymus the Blind 101
- Discourse on Method* 193
 Docetism 82, 91
 Dunn, J. D. G. 18
- Ecclesiasticus 113
 Eglon 149
 Ehud 149
 Ekron 151
 Elijah 133
 Elisha 133
 Elishe, historian 81, 90–91
 Empire, Roman 9, 23, 58
 Ephraim, Mount 151
 Episcopus, Simon 190–192, 194, 205
 epistles, Catholic 98, 101, 111
 epistles, Pauline 7, 205, 211–212
 Erasmus 112–113, 119, 123, 131, 135, 190, 200, 206
Erwartungshorizont 24
 Etienne, Saint *see* Stephen, Archbishop of Canterbury
Euangelum presbyterum 101
 Eucharist 71–72, 78, 82–83, 91, 101
 Eusebius 69
 Evangelist, the 59, 70, 76
 Evans, G. R. 17
 Evans, Robert 23, 32
 Exegesis 17, 59–60
 – Gnostic 10
 – Medieval 125–126, 195
 – New Testament 7, 20–21, 25, 28–29, 32–35, 53–55, 58, 60–61, 65–67
 – Oriental 16
 – Socinian 12
 – Theological 123
 Exum, C. viii, 146
 “eye for an eye” 146
- firstborn, animal 43, 213–214
 Fish, Stanley 141
 Fisher, Samuel 162
Flight from Persecution 55, 183
 Forgiveness 89–90, 181, 183
Formalprinzip 130
 Formula, Trinitarian 69
 Forster, Johann 128
 four laws 39–40
 Freitag, Albert 126

- fruits, first *see* firstborn
 “Fusion of Horizons” 23–24
- Gadamer, H.-G. 22–25, 28–29, 95, 125
 Gaza 144–145, 151
 gender, grammatical 42–43
 Gentile(s) 75, 177, 180–192
 Global Positioning Systems *see* GPS
 Gnosticism 16, 90
 goat(s) 41, 43, 45
 gospels, apocryphal 96, 99
 gospels, synoptic 54, 115, 190
 GPS 22, 25–28
 grace
 – Augustinian 128
 – baptism 86–87
 – Pauline 59–60
 Great Commission 69–70, 74, 78
 Greek 90, 100, 112, 117, 128, 130, 152,
 194, 200
 – Byzantine 9
 – Koine 23
 Gregory of Nyssa 17
 Grotius, Hugo 12, 190, 199–200,
 206–207
- habits, scribal 97
 hagiography 96
 Hamann 135
 Hammond, Henry 205–206
 Hansen’s Disease 85–87
 Haran, Menahem 39–40
 Harris, Robbie 17
 Heidegger, Martin 23
 Heidelberg 14, 24
Heilsgeschichtlich 125
 Hermeneutics 12, 25, 29, 60–66, 89,
 109–111, 116–118, 169
 Herod Agrippa I 186
 Herodians 56–57, 59, 62–63
 Hexapla 111
 Hirsch, Emmanuel 127
 Historiography 4, 190
 Holy Spirit 75–76, 89–90, 131, 135, 177,
 179, 181, 184–185, 191, 193, 197
Horizontverschmelzung 23
 Hort, F. J. A. 97
 Howe, Timothy 142
- Hubbard, Benjamin 69
 Husserl, Edmund 23
- Ibn Ezra 48
 Ibn Hazm 161
 Iconography 96
 ideology, terrorist *see* terrorism
 Immigration 48
 imperfection, animal 43
 imperial authority 58
Institutes of Elenctic Theology 175–176
 interpretive horizons 25, 33–34
 Intertextuality 70
 Irenaeus 54
 Israelite(s) 13, 49, 142, 149–151, 153
- Jael viii, 151–153
 James, Brother of John 119, 177, 186
 James, Epistle 109–121, 175
 Janowski, Bernd 14
 Jauss, H. R. 12, 22–26, 28–31
 Jerome 85, 101–102, 111–115, 118, 128
 Jerusalem Council 177–178, 180–182
 John, Gospel 73, 81–82, 85–92, 98, 115,
 118–119
 John of Jerusalem 71, 77–78
 John the Baptist 74, 76, 133, 178, 183
 Jongkind, Dirk 18
 Josephus 48, 63
 Justification 9, 116, 119, 121, 129–130, 134,
 181, 184
 – Paul and 119, 183
- Kenites 151
Kerygma 115
 Keuss Jeffrey 18
 Korsch, Dietrich 132
 Köstenberger, Andreas 175
 Kümmel, W. G. 8–10, 15
- La Peyrère, Isaac 162
 Lange, Joachim 69
Larger Catechism 131
 Latinos 49
 Lauster, Jörg 129
 Law 56, 114–116, 119, 124–125, 131, 146, 184,
 211
 – Animal 39–50

- Ceremonial 177, 182
- moral 180–181
- Mosaic 70
- violation of 177
- Lazarus 214
- Le Clerc, Jean 190, 206
- Legaspi, Michael 18
- Legislation, Holiness 41, 45, 86
- Leprosy *see* Hansen's Disease
- Lehi 145, 147
- Leiden Theologians 191, 194
- Leppin, Volker 127
- Leviticus 40–47, 85, 87
- literature, apocryphal 96
- literature, patristic 96, 98
- Locke, John 190, 203–216
 - and 1 Corinthians 15 206–209
 - and contemporaries 209–211
 - and Paul 211–215
 - Hermeneutics 204–206
- Logos 56–57, 83, 87–88, 91, 131, 136
- Lohse, Bernard 126, 135
- Luther, Martin 109–138
 - and Aristotelianism 128
 - and Dibelius 120–121
 - and James 118–119
 - and philology 116–118
 - and prefaces 111–121
 - and Ockham 128
 - and Word of God Theology 132–136
- Luz, Ulrich 59, 65
- Lyra *see* Nicholas of Lyra

- Magi 74–75
- Maimonides 40, 48, 166
- Manicheism 16
- manuscript(s) 69, 96–97, 99, 111–112
- marginalia *see* text(s), marginal
- Marriage, Divine 75–79
- Marshall, John 207
- Martyrdom 54–56, 59–60, 62, 92
- Materialprinzip* 130
- Mattox, Mickey L. 132
- Maxfield, John 132
- Mayr, Ernst 5
- Melanchthon, Philip 128, 130–131
- Metaphysics 133

- Method, Historical-Critical, 30, 53, 57, 61–62, 120, 175, 189, 199
- methods, literary *see* criticism, literary
- Meyer, Lodewijk 162, 166
- Michaelis 7
- midrash, legal *see* Sifra
- Milgrom, Jacob 39–40, 48
- Milton, John 141–154
- Mishnah 47–48
- MMT 44–45
- Murray-Jones, Christopher 74
- Moses 84, 92, 160–161, 183
- mother's milk 39–40, 42
- murder 144–145, 186
- Mysticism 74, 123, 135
- Mystagogy 71

- Nadler, Steven 161
- Nag Hammadi 88
- Nahmanides 48
- Naturae Interpretationem* 164
- Nazirite(s) 145–146, 152
- Neill, Stephen 7, 15
- New bodies 205, 209, 211, 215
- Nicholas of Lyra 124
- Niehoff, Maren 63
- Nietzsche, F. 23
- Noth, Martin 14
- Nöther, I.
- Novum Organum* 163–165
- Nünlist, René 63

- Oberman, Heiko 130
- Occamists 130
- Ocker, Christopher 17, 123
- Ockham 128
- Of Reformation* 149
- offering, animal *see* sacrifice, animal
- Olbricht, Thomas 18
- Oldenburg, Henry 163
- Opera Latina* 131
- Origen 54–66, 71, 81, 85–88, 92, 125
 - and asceticism 57, 62
 - *Commentary on Matthew* 56–58
- Ostorodt, Krzysztof 191
- Ox(en) 41, 43

- Paedagogus* 83, 85
 papyri, apocryphal 99
 papyri, Greek 98
Paradise Regained 149–150, 153
 Parousia 72–73
 Passover 76–77
 Paul, apostle 70, 73, 83, 85, 111, 115, 119,
 132–136, 183, 185, 187, 205, 207–210,
 212–216
 Paulinus of Nola 112, 118
 Pentecost 72, 184–185
 Pentateuch 39–50, 92, 113, 161, 190
 pericope(s) 54, 63–64, 69
 persecution 55, 149
 Pesch, O. H. 127
 Peter, apostle 100–102, 181–182
 Pharisee(s) 56–57, 59, 62–63, 132
 Philip, Gospel of 77
 Philistines 49, 143–153
 Philo of Alexandria 40, 43, 47–48, 84
 philology, material 97
 philology, new 97
 Philosophy of Identity 204
 Piacenti, R. Kent 48–49
 Pisidian Antioch 183
 Pistis Sophia 81, 88–90
 Pitassi, Maria-Cristina 204–205
 Polyander, Johannes 191
 Presbyters 100–102
 Presentism 4, 6, 10–11
 priest(s) 47, 148, 194
 purity 57

 Q, Gospel 7
 Qumran 40

 Rabbis 40, 45
 Raeder, Siegfried 126, 135
 Ragland, Evan 5
 Rashi 17, 48
 reception, Classical *see* Studies, Classical
 reception, modern 96
 Reformation 9, 112, 123–136
 – era 17, 199
 “render” command 53–67
 relations, church-state 65
 relations, parent-child 39, 45, 48
 Remonstrants 190–193, 197–201

 Resurrection 89, 115, 118, 134, 178, 185, 187,
 198, 203–216
 Reuchlin, Johann 128
 Reventlow, H. G. 8, 12, 15
 Rogerson, J. W. 18
 Röhrer, Georg 134
 Romanist(s) 185
 Romanos the Melodist 17
 Romans, Book of 98, 115, 128
 Rowland, Christopher 74
 Rufinus 85

 Sacrifice, animal 41–45, 47
 Sæbø, Magne 10–12, 17
 Salvation 79, 83–87, 90, 92, 114–116, 124,
 127–128, 130–131, 133, 136, 153, 175–176,
 182, 184, 185, 192–194, 198
 Samson 141–154
 Sanders, James 18
 Satan 149–150
 satellite(s) 25–30, 34
 Schaper, Joachim 14
 Schiffman, Lawrence 44
 Schironi, Francesca 63
 Schlatter, Adolf 175
 Schleiermacher, Friedrich 19, 135
 Scholion 100
 Schreiner, David 18
Schrifttheologie 109, 116
 Schulz, Hans Joachim 70
 Schwartz, Baruch 39
 Schwöbel, Christoph 131
 Seed Metaphor 207–210
 September 11th 141, 153
 Sethians 89
 seven-day rule 44
Shepherd of Hermas 98–99
 Shuve, Karl 65
 Sifra 45–47
 signs, lectional 99
 Sisera 151–153
 slaughter, animal *see* sacrifice, animal
 slaughter, profane 42, 45
 Smend, R. 14
 Smith, Lesley 124
 Smith, J. Z. 65–66
 Spinoza, Baruch 12, 18, 157–169, 189, 201
 – excommunication 158–160

- Influences 161–168
- and the Jewish Community 159–160
- and Political Exegesis 158–161
- Socinian(ism) 177, 185, 191, 203, 205–206, 208–211, 215–216
- Sola fide* 119, 130–131, 134
- Song of Songs 75–78
- Sozzini, Lelio 191, 199, 208
- Staupitz, Johann 127, 129
- Stendahl, Krister 133
- Stephen, Archbishop of Canterbury 124
- Stillingfleet, Lord Edward 203–204, 206, 210, 212, 215–216
- Studies, Classical 96
- suffering, Christ's 100, 102
- Synchrony *see* Analysis, Synchronus
- Synderesis* 126

- Talmud, Babylonian 46, 48, 124
- Targum(s) 47–48
 - Targum Jonathan 124
- Tavard, George 133
- tax(es) 56–58, 62–63
- Teleology 4–7, 9–11, 19
- Temple, Dagan 144–146
- Temple, Jerusalem 77, 143, 147–149, 151–152
- Temple Scroll 43–45
- Ten Commandments 186
- Terrorism 141–154
 - revolutionary terrorism 143
 - terrorist act 143–144, 146–148, 153
- Tertullian 54–56, 59–66
- Testimonia 15, 99
- “testing inquiry” 62
- text(s), para-biblical 98
- text(s), marginal 95–102
- text-criticism *see* criticism, text
- Theodore of Mopsuetia 71–72, 75, 77–78
- Theology
 - Narrative 186
 - Reformed 185
 - Trinitarian viii
 - Word of God 133–136
- theory, humanitarian 39–40
- Thomas, Gospel of 98–99
- Tigay, Jeffrey 39
- Timnah/Timnite(s) 144–145, 147

- Toland, John 9
- Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* 160–163, 165, 169, 189
- transmitter(s), radio 26
- Trent, Council of 183
- Tropology 125
- Trilateration 22, 25–33
- Trinitarian Formula *see* Formula, Trinitarian
- Turretin, Francis 175–187
 - and the Holy Spirit 184, 179–180
 - and modern scholarship 185–187
 - and the work of Christ 178–179, 182–183
- Twesten, August 130
- Tyranny 149–150
 - Tyrannicide 150

- uprisings, Jewish 63
- Uro, Risto 70

- Valentinian Tradition 88
- Valla, Lorenzo 130–131
- van Liere, Franz 124
- van Limborch, Philip 190, 193
- Venerable Bede 98, 102, 187
- Vetus Latina* 112
- Vidal, Fernando 204
- Violence 143, 146, 149–150
- Vlessing, Odette 159
- von Rad, Gerhard 14
- Vorgeschichte* 8
- Vorurteil* 24
- Vulgate, the 111–113, 118, 124

- Weihnachtspostille* 126–127
- Westcott, B. F. 97
- Whiggism 4–5, 17, 19
- Whitby, Daniel 205
- Wirkungsgeschichte* 21–35, 53, 66, 95
 - *wirkungsgeschichtliches Bewusstsein* 22, 25
- Wisdom 16, 73–74, 76, 79, 124, 131, 134–135
- Wittenberg New Testament 119
- Word-mysticism 135
- Wyclif Bible 113

- Zac, Sylvain 163