The Ideal of *Brevitas et Facilitas*: The Theological Hermeneutics of John Calvin[1]

Myung Jun Ahn
(Christian Theological University, Pyongtaek, Korea)

ABSTRACT

Calvin presented his own distinctive method of the hermeneutics of Scripture in his Commentary on the Epistle of Paul, the Apostle, to the Romans. It is called the ideal of brevitas et facilitas. Calvin was not satisfied with both Malanchthon's loci method and Bucer's prolixity commentary. He took a via media approach. Calvin's method was influenced by rhetoric of Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian and Chrysostom. Calvin, however, confirmed that his own principle came from Scripture itself. I deal with Calvin's view that the clarity of Scripture was related to the ideal of brevitas et facilitas. After analyzing Calvin's writing, I discovered ten component elements of the method of brevitas et facilitas.

1   INTRODUCTION

The history of Christian theology is the record of the interpretation of Scripture generation after generation[2]. In a certain sense, all Christian truths are the result of the vindication of those who have taken great pains to interpret the Word of God responsibly over against the deficient or one-sided interpretation of the heretics. C J Wethmar says the following:

> The dialogical development of theological truth in which opposing truth claims periodically confront each other is dependent on a criterion in terms of which these claims can be evaluated. In Protestant thinking Holy Scripture constitutes this criterion. This implies that theology is basically a hermeneutical discipline of which the primary aim is a historical, systematic and practical interpretation of the Biblical text as basic source and permanent foundation of Christian faith in God[3].

Sound theologizing is, therefore, intimately related to a legitimate understanding of Scripture[4]. The hermeneutical methodology employed by Calvin in gleaning the true meaning of a text has given rise to considerable contemporary debate. Calvin, like other Reformers, used the so-called historical-grammatical method in the interpretation of Scripture. Although Calvin showed similarity with the other Reformers' hermeneutics in

following this approach, he had a distinctive approach to Scriptural interpretation which other Reformers did not follow in all details. It included the principles of *brevitas et facilitas* as the central dimension of his herme-neutics. These principles, as the center of Calvin's hermeneutics, did not appear clearly in the exegetical writings of other Reformers like Luther, Melanchthon and Bucer. With regard to the nature of Calvin's hermeneutics, many scholars recognize that the hallmarks of Calvin's hermeneutical approach are the principles of *brevitas et facilitas*[5]. Even though they have regarded this method as the distinguishing feature of Calvin's hermeneutics, they have not investigated Calvin's exegetical writings from the perspective of these principles, and have not fathomed how Calvin practically and consistently implemented the principles of *brevitas et facilitas* as the central dimension of his hermeneutics. They have not revealed how Calvin handled the text of Scripture with these principles. They have not adequate-ly demonstrated how Calvin's principles of *brevitas et facilitas* are rooted in the rhetorical method of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, and also not that these hermeneutical principles are embedded in the basic motives of his theology. After analyzing Calvin's exegetical writings, I have discovered ten component elements of the method of *brevitas et facilitas*.

My purpose is not to explore all the principles Calvin used in his writings[6], but to establish the fact that the principles of *brevitas et facilitas* as the hallmark of Calvin's theological hermeneutics originated in his views on Holy Scripture, especially the principle *Scriptura sui ipsius interpres*.

Against the authority of the Roman Catholic church[7] and its method of Scriptural interpretation, Calvin, like Luther, stressed the principles of *sola Scriptura*[8] and *Scriptura sui ipsius interpres*. His theology played an important role in the development of the ideal of *brevitas et facilitas*. In order for his readers to understand the intention of the author of Scripture and the true meaning of the text easily and clearly, Calvin employed this distinctive principle in his own hermeneutics, which was different from that employed by the other Reformers. Calvin stated that the other Reformers failed in employing the hermeneutical principles that conveyed the simple and brief meaning of the text of Scripture to their readers.

Calvin clearly suggested the principles of *brevitas et facilitas* as a basic dimension of his theological hermeneutics in the dedicatory preface in his *Commentary on the Epistle of Paul, the Apostle, to the Romans*. There he agreed with his old friend Simon Grynaeus on the principles of *brevitas et facilitas*[9]. Calvin was completely confident of the superiority of

this method. He insisted on it as the only hermeneutical method which helped the readers understand Scripture. In other words, Calvin presented his readers with the ideal of *brevitas et facilitas* as distinctive principles for the interpretation of Scripture.

2   CALVIN'S   ATTITUDE   TOWARD   THE   OTHER INTERPRETERS

Calvin was not born a great interpreter, but his humanistic training made him not only the great theologian of the Reformation, but also made him one of the great interpreters in the history of Christianity. His humanistic training[10] helped him develop his biblical interpretation. Calvin was influenced by Chrysostom[11] who had already interpreted the plain, literal meaning of the text straightforwardly. Although he did not entirely agree with Chrysostom's interpretation because of his theological and grammatical mistakes, Calvin recognized him as a pioneer of the ideal of *brevitas et facilitas*. The fact that Calvin never rejected Budé's views and interpretations proves that Budé had strongly influenced Calvin[12].

Calvin pointed out the fundamental problem with Origen's allegorical interpretation of Scripture[13]. Calvin argued that Origen's allegorical method had started from the wrong presupposition of hermeneutics - a mistaken wrong hermeneutic based upon the terms letter and spirit. Calvin argued that the interpretation of Ambrose had been more ingenious than solid. Calvin sometimes agreed with him when his interpretation was suitable. But he stated that Ambrose's interpretation had generally focused on the doctrinal issues related to the passage. Calvin pointed out that Jerome had not sufficiently revealed the intention of the author simply, and had forced the meaning of the text. Although Augustine had a great influence on Calvin's theology, Calvin did not follow Augustine's biblical interpretation[14] from the perspective of the grammatical-historical approach and the intention of the author. He pointed out that Augustine had often understood the text as a doctrine which was not related to the relevant passage. Nevertheless, Calvin normally agreed with the doctrine of Augustine.

Calvin maintained that, in order to establish and to justify the doctrine and the tradition of the Roman Catholic church, the "Papists" interpreted the text with their own unacceptable methods. Calvin maintained that the basic problem of the Roman Catholic church was that they forced the text to support their own theological positions such as the system of indulgences, the rewards of works, the mass, and Purgatory.

Calvin argued that the Jewish interpreters failed to interpret the text of the Old Testament correctly because they did not accept Jesus as the Christ and the Messiah. For them the christological interpretation of the text of the Psalms was impossible.

Erasmus, breaking with the Middle Ages' interpretation, introduced the grammatical-historical method. Although Erasmus had a great influence upon the Reformers, Calvin often rejected the interpretation of Erasmus[15], because by inserting words, verbs, etcetera, into the original text, he did not get to the true meaning of the text, and did not reveal the intention of the author.

M Luther decisively rejected the Roman Catholic church as the only authority for interpreting Scripture, and proclaimed that Scripture was its own interpreter, *Scriptura sui ipsius interpres*. Luther's hermeneutical principle of Scripture[16] was christological because he always regarded Christ as the center of Scripture and the goal of the interpretation of the text. Calvin did not follow Luther's interpretation when Luther's view was frivolous and not solid.

Like Erasmus, Zwingli emphasized the moral aspect of Scripture. Showing a preference for Origen's allegorical method of interpretation, Zwingli extensively used the distinction between the natural and non-literal senses of Scripture. As the result of that, his method of Old Testament interpretation was allegorical.

Calvin noted that Melanchthon[17] only touched on major points when interpreting texts. But according to Calvin, Melanchthon did not sufficiently explain the meaning of important passages because he used the method of *loci*. Although in the interpretation of the text, Bucer[18] did not use the *loci* method of the Aristotelians, Calvin did not follow him entirely because his interpretation was too prolix and academic.

Calvin maintained that the Anabaptists denied the relationship between the Old and the New Testaments. That was their basic hermeneutical weakness. He pointed out that the Anabaptists emphasized the guidance of the Holy Spirit to the extreme. Calvin also said that the Libertines used allegorical interpretation, and forced the simple meaning of Scripture.

3   THE SOURCE OF THE IDEAL OF *BREVITAS ET FACILITAS*

For Calvin Scripture was not complicated, but simple. Scripture was simply the eloquent speech of the Holy Spirit for his simple people. Therefore, to vitiate the simplicity of Scripture was to destroy the whole of

Scripture. For Calvin the simplicity of Scripture was immediately connected with his hermeneutical method. This supplied Calvin with the foundation for the principles of *brevitas et facilitas* as his hermeneutical ideal. Calvin believed that Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel employed a simple and easy style in order for ordinary people to understand God's Word more easily. This made him believe that the style of Scripture had its orientation in *brevitas et facilitas*. Consequently Calvin, influenced by rhetoricians like Cicero and Quintilian in his ideal of *brevitas et facilitas,* confirmed that the authors of Scripture demonstrated this ideal. Calvin made this ideal a part of his own hermeneutical method.

4   THEOLOGICAL   PRESUPPOSITIONS   IN   CALVIN'S HERMENEUTICS

Calvin had his own theological presuppositions for establishing his own distinctive ideal of *brevitas et facilitas*. His method was related to the role of the Holy Spirit[19] and the principles *Scriptura sui ipsius interpres*. Firstly, Calvin regarded the role of the Holy Spirit as an important factor establishing the principles of *brevitas et facilitas*. According to Calvin's statement on the principles of *brevitas et facilitas*, the first work of this deal was to reveal the intention of the author of Scripture (*Et sane, quum hoc sit prope unicum illius officium mentem scriptoris quem explicandum sumpsit patefacere*)[20]. The intention of the author meant that of the Holy Spirit because he thought the Holy Spirit was the true author and interpreter of Scripture. For him to seek the intention of the Holy Spirit meant to interpret the plain or natural sense of the text. He maintained that the authors of Scripture had their own distinctive language and exhibited a biblical rhetoric through the wisdom and power of the Holy Spirit. Calvin derived his ideal of *brevitas et facilitas* from the fact that the Holy Spirit used both a rude and refined style, and the uncultivated and even barbarous language in which Amos, Jeremiah, and Zechariah spoke. The Holy Spirit worked in the authors who wrote the Holy Scriptures in the simple and common style. The foundation of the principles of *brevitas et facilitas* was based on the fact that in order for common people to understand easily, the Holy Spirit made the authors of Scripture employ the clear and simple style of language.

Secondly, Calvin showed us the relationship of the principle *Scriptura sui ipsius interpres* to the ideal of *brevitas et facilitas*. The clarity of Scripture offered the Reformers the principle *Scriptura sui ipsius interpres*. Calvin interpreted an expression in the light of the same meaning which it

has in another passage of Scripture. He interpreted an obscure passage with reference to a clear passage. The principle *Scriptura sui ipsius interpres* is closely related to the ideal of *brevitas et facilitas*. Since the ideal of *brevitas et facilitas* is to seek the meaning of a text with simplicity and naturalness, it is very important for an interpreter to use the principle *Scriptura sui ipsius interpres*. With this principles, Calvin correctly found the simple and natural view, the meaning of a passage becomes clear. Calvin also maintained that the interpretation of a passage be evident from the whole of Scripture or the whole context. By using the expression of the author and the common usage of Scripture, Calvin employed the principle *Scriptura sui ipsius interpres*.

The clarity of Scripture[21] offered the Reformers the principle *Scriptura sui ipsius interpres*. Calvin confirmed that the principles of *brevitas et facilitas* derived from the principle *Scriptura sui ipsius interpres*.

5 THE ELEMENTS OF THE IDEAL OF *BREVITAS ET FACILITAS*

My investigation delineated several elements in the ideal of *brevitas et facilitas* Calvin employed in his writings. Brevity meant to interpret the passage concisely. In order to make the interpretation of the text brief, Calvin avoided any disputation, argument, or controversy[22]. He also avoided the repetition of the same interpretation of various passages, and often suggested that the readers consult his other commentaries and the *Institutes* as well as other interpreters' writings[23].

Calvin, if possible, did not change the original text, but rather tried to retain it. Since he felt that inserting things into the original text was not natural and simple, Calvin dared to reject Erasmus' insertion of words, prepositions, etcetera[24]. Calvin had reasons for preferring retention to insertion. First, he thought that inserting something into the original text for purposes of interpretation forced the meaning of the text. Calvin always disliked the ambiguity caused by inserting words. The result of insertion was that the readers became confused and inept at understanding the genuine meaning of a passage.

Calvin limited the scope of his interpretation to the issues related to a particular passage of Scripture[25]. He tried not to depart from the center of the text, nor to wander outside the key subject of the text. Whenever he felt that he handled an issue not directly related to the text, Calvin tried to return to the relevant text. This showed that he did not attempt to interpret Scripture in a subjective fashion.

THE IDEAL OF

Calvin thought that the true meaning of the text was the suitable, obvious, and simple one rather than the twisted or ambiguous one. Over against "torturing" Scripture, Calvin stressed that the true interpretation of Scripture should be obvious and natural, not allegorical[26].

He refuted the use of conjecture in the interpretation of the text because it was not based on a solid and sound argument, but rather started from imagination[27]. On this point Calvin often criticized Erasmus for frivolous conjecture. Calvin thought that the purpose of simplicity was to let the readers easily understand the mind of the author.

The principle of simplicity was a reaction against ambiguity, perversion, and conjecture. He thought that the plain and simple sense of the words of Scripture agreed well with the author's mind[28]. For him to remove ambiguity meant to seek the natural and suitable meaning of the text. According to Calvin, the criterion of suitability was related to the intention of the author and the context of the present text.

One of the distinctive features of Calvin's hermeneutics was that he did not force the readers to accept his view, but gave them freedom to choose the interpretation which they preferred[29]. This shows that he recognized the imperfection of his own interpretation, and that, as an interpreter, he was humble.

Calvin criticized Christian interpreters for twisting the meaning of the text away from its simple sense. Calvin tried not to twist the meaning of the text, but rather with these principles tried to interpret it literally, simply, and clearly. Thus employing the principles of *brevitas et facilitas*, he broke with the allegorical and scholastic interpretation of preceding centuries. He warned that an interpreter should not pervert the words of Scripture by means of his own opinions and his own doctrines and experiences. Calvin emphasized the necessary objectivity in Scriptural interpretation, against subjective methods of interpretation.

6   CONCLUSION

Although Calvin used the theological interpretation of the text, unlike the Fathers, he was not dominated by doctrinal interpretations. Calvin recognized significant doctrines in the text, and sometimes explained subjects relating to doctrine. He, however, passed over the interpretation of doctrines which was not directly related to the passage. As the result of that, he did not get involved in meaningless arguments with other interpreters. He only attempted to interpret the true meaning of the text without exhausting his readers.

The fact that Calvin interpreted the text by means of the intention of the author of Scripture makes us recognize him as one of the great interpreters in the history of Protestant interpretation. One of the purposes of his hermeneutics was to help the readers understand the mind of the author of Scripture easily and briefly. In order to accomplish this goal, Calvin employed the principles of *brevitas et facilitas*. For Calvin to interpret the true meaning of the text was to understand the words of the author or the intention of the author. Calvin identified the genuine meaning of the text with the intention of the Holy Spirit.

Calvin's practical purpose with the interpretation of texts was to edify the people of God. Calvin challenged an interpreter to consider the Christian life and the church's edification, without falling into theoretical argument. He always interpreted the meaning of the passage practically for the readers to understand easily and briefly. Especially the interpretation used in Calvin's *Sermons from Job* proved the practical application to the Christian life.

NOTES:

1   This article is the result of research done for a doctoral dissertation under the supervision of professor C J Wethmar in the department of Systematic Theology at the University of Pretoria. The title of my dissertation is *"Brevitas et Facilitas*: A Study of a Vital Aspect in the Theological Hermeneutics of John Calvin".

2   Jaroslav Pelikan, *Luther the Expositor: Introduction to the Reformer's Exegetical Writings*, Saint Louis 1959, 5. See also Gerhard Ebeling, *Kirchengeschichte als Geschichte der Auslegung der Heiligen Schrift*, Tübingen 1947.

3   C J Wethmar, "Ecclesiology and Theological Education: A South African Reformed Perspective", 13. Unpublished Paper, Congress of the International Reformed Theological Institute held in Stellenbosch on June 12, 1997.

4   C J Wethmar, "Homologie en hermeneutiek", *HTS* 44 (1988), 540; Thomas F Torrance, *Divine Meaning: Studies in Patristic Hermeneutics*, Edinburgh 1995, 6; Walter C Kaiser, Jr, "Legitimate Hermeneutics", in: Donald K McKim (ed), *A Guide Contemporary Hermeneutics: Major Trends in Biblical Interpretation*, Grand Rapids 1986, 111-141. For the study of Calvin's view on the relationship between hermeneutics and theology, see Felicity Edwards, "The Relation between Biblical Hermeneutics and the Formulation of Dogmatic Theology: An Investigation in the Methodology of John Calvin" (PhD dissertation), Oxford University, 1968.

5   August F Tholuck, "The Merits of Calvin as an Interpreter of the Holy Scriptures", *The Biblical Repository* 2 (1832), 550; F W Gotch, "Calvin as a Commentator", *Journal of Sacred Literature* 3 (1949), 227; J Baumgartner, *Calvin Hébraïsant et interprète de l'Ancien Testament*, Paris 1889, 30; Irwin

Hoch De Long, "Calvin as an Interpreter of the Bible", *Reformed Church Review*, 13 (1909), 172-177; H R Mackintosh, "John Calvin: Expositor and Dogmatist", *RvEx* vol 7 (1910), 186; Karl Barth, *Die Theologie Calvins*, Zürich 531. Here Barth suggests that against Bucer's prolix exegesis Calvin held up *brevitas et facilitas* as the method of his hermeneutics. He says: "Die Auslegertugend, die Calvin selbst als Ziel vorschwebte, nannte er «perspicua brevitas». Genensatz zu Butzer: «Kum hat er einen Stoff ergriffen, so strömt die unglaubliche Fruchtbarkeit seines Geistes eine solche Fülle aus, daß er sich nicht mehr halten kann und kein Ende findet.» Warum *brevitas*? Charakter Calvins? Verhältnis von Exegese zum System. Grenzen fließend. *Institutio* ein Gefüge von Exegesen. Exegese als Stück der Wahrheitsbegründung bedarf dieser Kürze".; E P Groenewald, "Calvyn en die Heilige Skrif", *NGTT* 5/3 (1964), 132; Dieter Schellong, *Calvins Auslegung der synoptischen Evangelien*, München 1969, 13-15; Hans-Joachim Kraus, "Calvin's Exegetical Principles", *Int* 31 (1977), 12-13; Rudolphe Peter, "Rhétorique et prédication selon Calvin", *RHPR* 55 (1975), 250-72; T H L Parker, *Calvin's New Testament Commentaries*, Louisville 1993, 86-7; John Robert Walchenbach, "John Calvin as Biblical Commentator: An Investigation into Calvin's Use of John Chrysostom as an Exegetical Tutor" (PhD dissertation), University of Pittsburgh, 1974, 159; Richard Stauffer, *Interprètes de la Bible*, Paris 1980, 172; Donald K. McKim, ed., "Calvin's View of Scripture", in *Readings in Calvin's Theology*, Grand Rapids 1984, 66; Jack B Rogers ad Donald K McKim, *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach*, New York 1979, 115; L Floor, "The Hermeneutics of Calvin", in *Calvinus Reformator: His Contribution to Theology, Church, and Society*. ed. Institute for Reformational Studies, Potchefstroom 1982, 127; R. Gamble, "*Brevitas et Facilitas*: Toward an Understanding of Calvin's Hermeneutic", *WTJ* 47 (1985), 1-17; Brevard S Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible,* Minneapolis 1993, 47.

6   For the general treatment of Calvin's hermeneutics, see Paul Garnet, "Some Aspects of John Calvin's New Testament Exegesis as Seen in His Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans" (MA Thesis), University of Sheffield, 1963; Dean Greer McKee, "The Contribution of John Calvin to New Testament Exegesis" (STD dissertation), Biblical Seminary in New York, 1931; J P Newport, "An Investigation of the Factors Influencing John Calvin's Use of the Linguistic and Historical Principles of Biblical Exegesis" (PhD dissertation), University of Edinburgh, 1953; Clinton M Ashley, "John Calvin's Utilization of the Principle of Accommodation and Its Continuing Significance for an Understanding of Biblical Language" (ThD dissertation), Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1972; H H Wolf, "Die Einheit des Bundes: Das Verhältnis vom Altem und Neuem Testament bei Calvin" (PhD dissertation), Halle University, 1942; Paul Kertz, "Calvins Verständnis der Heiligen Schrift" (PhD dissertation), Göttingen University, 1939); Michael Carl Armour, "Calvin's Hermeneutic and the History of Christian Exegesis" (PhD dissertation), University of California, Los Angeles, 1992; Anthony G Baxter, "John Calvin's Use an Hermeneutics of the Old Testament" (PhD dissertation), University of Sheffield, 1987; W de Greef, *Calvijn en het Oude Testament*,

Groningen 1984; Peter Opitz, *Calvins theologische Hermeneutik*, Neukirchener 1994; Alexandre Ganoczy und Stefan Scheld, *Die Hermeneutik Calvins: Geistesgeschichtlicke Voraussetzungen und Grundzüge*, Wiesbaden 1983; Thomas F Torrance, *The Hermeneutics of John Calvin*, Edinburgh 1988; David L Puckett, *John Calvin's Exegesis of the Old Testament*, Louisville 1995.

7   The Roman Catholic church accepted the authority of Scripture, but put Scripture next to the church. Cf C J Wethmar, *Dogma en Verstaanshorison: 'n Histories-sistematiese ondersoek in verband met die hermeneutiese funksie van die kerklike dogma met besondere verwysing na die teologie van Gerhard Ebeling*, Amsterdam 1977, 177.

8   H Bavinck, *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek*, Bd. 1, Kampen 1928, 449.

9   CO 10.402-403.

10   For the studies of the humanistic formation of Calvin, see Josef Bohatec, *Budé und Calvin: Studien zur Gedankenwelt des französischen Frühhumanismus*, Graz 1950, 119-483, and *Calvin und das Recht,* Graz 1934, 1-93; Quirinus Breen, *John Calvin: A Study in French Humanism*, Grand Rapids 1931, 146-164. This book is the best to show how Calvin became a humanist and how, after his sudden conversion, he made progress in humanism. Cf A E McGrath, *A Life of John Calvin: A Study in the Shaping of Western Culture,* Oxford 1990, 51-67; F J M Potgieter, *De Verhouding tussen die teologie en die filosofie by Calvyn*, Kampen 1939; François Wendel, *Calvin et l'humanism*, Paris 1976, 7-34, and *Calvin: Origin and Development of His Religious Thought*, (translation Philip Mairet), Durham 1963, 27-45.

11   On the influence of Chrysostom upon Calvin's hermeneutics, see Alexandre Ganoczy und Klaus Müller, *Calvins Handschriftliche Annotationen zu Chrysostomus: Ein Beitrag zur Hermeneutik Calvins*, Wiesbaden 1981; Alexandre Ganoczy and Stefan Schell, *a w*, 118-9; Jack B Rogers and Donald K McKim, *a w*, 114-116; John Robert Walchenbach, *a w*.

12   Josef Bohatec, *a w*, 119-240.

13   For the studies of Origen's hermeneutics, see H de Lubac, *Histoire et Esprit: L'intelligence de l'Ecriture d'après Origène*, Paris 1950; Karen Jo Torjesen, *Hermeneutical Procedure and Theological Method in Origen's Exegesis*, Berlin 1986; R C Hanson, *Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture*, London 1959; S Lauchli, "Die Frage nach der Objecktivität der Exegese des Origenes", *ThZ* 10 (1954), 165-197; Jean Daniélou, "Les sources bibliques de la mystique d'Origene", *Revue d'Ascetique et de Mystique*, 23 (1947), 126-141.

14   For the studies of Augustine's hermeneutics, see J R Smith, "Augustine as an Exegete", *BSac* 61 (1904), 318-44; Maurice Pontet, *L'Exégètique de S. Augustin prédicateur*, Théologie 7, Paris 1945; Robert W Bernard, "The Rhetoric of God in the Figurative Exegesis of Augustine", in *Biblical Hermeneutics in Historical Perspective: Studies in Honor of Karlfried Froehlich on His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. Mark S Burrows and Paul Rorem, Grand Rapids 1991, 88-99; Bernard de Margerie, *Saint Augustine*, 3, Introduction à l'histoire de l'exégèse, Paris 1983; Jack B Rogers and Donald K McKim, *a w*, 22-43; Elaine Pagels, "The Politics of Paradise: Augustine's Exegesis of Genesis 1-3 versus that of John Chrysostom", *HTR* 78 (1985), 67-99.

15   For the studies of Erasmus' hermeneutics, see John William Aldridge, *The Hermeneutics of Erasmus*, Richmond 1966; John B Payne, "Toward the Hermeneutics of Erasmus", in: *Scrinium Erasmianum*, J Coppens (ed), Leiden 1969, 13-49 and *Erasmus: His Theology of the Sacraments*, 1970; T F Torrance, "The Hermeneutics of Erasmus", in *Probing the Reformed Tradition: Historical Studies in Honor of Edward A Dowey Jr*, eds. Elsie Anne McKee and Brian G Armstrong, Louisville 1989, 48-78; Manfred Hoffmann, *Erkenntnis und Verwirklichung der wahren theologie nach Erasmus von Rotterdam*, Tübingen 1972, 39-93; Andre Godin, "Fonction d'Origene dans la pratique exegetique d'Erasme: Les annotations sur l'epitre aux Romains", in *Histoire de l'exegese au XVI siecle*, Geneve 1978, 118-132; Henning Graf Reventlow, "Erasmus", in *The Authority of the Bible and the Rise of the Modern World*, Philadelphia 1985, 39-48.

16   For the studies of Luther's hermeneutics, see Warren A Quanbeck, "The Hermeneutical Principles of Luther's Early Writings" (ThD dissertation), Princeton Theological Seminary, 1948; Mark Ellingsen, "Luther as Narrative Exegete", *JR* 63 (1983), 394-413; Raymond E Surbury, "The Significance of Luther's Hermeneutics for the Protestant Reformation", *CTM* 24 (1953), 241-61; Gerhard Ebeling, "The New Hermeneutics and the Early Luther", *TToday* 21 (1964), 34-46; Ralph W Doermann, "Luther's Principles of Biblical Interpretation: Can We Still Use Them?" in *Interpretation Luther's Legacy*, Fred W Meuser and Stanley D Schneider (eds), Minneapolis 1969, 14-25; A Skevington Wood, *Luther's Principles of Biblical Interpretation*, London 1960; Raymond Larry Shelton, "Luther's Concept of Biblical Interpretation in Historical Perspective" (PhD dissertation), Fuller Theological Seminary, 1974; James S Preus, "Old Testament *Promissio* and Luther's New Hermeneutic", *HTR* 60 (1967), 145-61; Douglas Carter, "Luther as Exegete", *CTM* 32 (1961), 517-521; Friedrich Beisser, *Claritas Scripturae bei Martin Luther*, Göttingen 1966; Kurt Aland, "Luther as Exegete", *ExpTim* 69 (1957), 45-48; Rudolf Ficker, "*Ut Simplicissime Tractaretis Scripturas*: Martin Luther as Interpreter of Scripture", *BangaloreThF* 15 (1983), 175-196; Scott H Hendrix, "Luther against the Background of the History of Biblical Interpretation", *Int* 37 (1983), 229-239.

17   Martin Leiner, "Die Anfänge der protetantischen Hermeneutik bei Philipp Melanchthon", *ZThK* 94 (1997), 468-487.

18   Johannes Müller, *Martin Bucers Hermeneutik*, Heidelberg 1965.

19   For the studies of Calvin's view of the Holy Spirit, see Simon van der Linde, *De Leer van den Heiligen Geest bij Calvijn*, Wageningen 1943, and Calvijns leer van de Heilige Geest", *ThReformata* 14/1 (1971), 15-31: Werner Krusche, *Das Wirken des Heiligen Geistes nach Calvin*, Göttingen 1957.

20   CO 10.403.

21   Gregg Robert Allison, "The Protestant Doctrine of the Perspicuity of Scripture: A Reformulation on the Basis of Biblical Teaching" (PhD dissertation), Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1995; H W Rossouw, *Klaarheid en Interpretasie. Enkele probleemhistoriese gesigspunte in verband met die leer van die duidelikheid van die Heilige Skrif*, Amsterdam 1963.

22   CO 2.168, CO 41.79, CO 40.57.

23	CO 50.208, CO 50.226, CO 50.59.
24	CO 49.258.
25	CO 50.175.
26	CO 50.13, CO 36.446, CO 40.557.
27	CO 49.153, CO 49.553, CO 49.138.
28	CO 37.107, CO 50.186.
29	CO 50.52-3, CO 50.59.