

Jordan J. Ballor

Covenant, Causality, and Law

A Study in the Theology
of Wolfgang Musculus



Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht



Refo500 Academic Studies

Edited by
Herman J. Selderhuis

In co-operation with

Marianne Carbonnier, Günter Frank, Bruce Gordon,
Ute Lotz-Heumann, Mathijs Lamberigts, Barbara Mahlmann-
Bauer, Tarald Rasmussen, Johannes Schilling,
Günther Wassilowsky, Siegrid Westphal

Volume 3

Jordan J. Ballor

Covenant, Casuality, and Law

A Study in the Theology of Wolfgang Musculus

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

This work has been accepted as a dissertation by the Faculty of Theology
at the University of Zurich at the request of Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Emidio Campi in 2011.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche
Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data available online: <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

ISBN 978-3-525-55036-6

ISBN 978-3-647-55036-7 (E-Book)

© 2012, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen/
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht LLC, Bristol, CT, U.S.A.

www.v-r.de

All rights reserved. No part of his work may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by
any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any informa-
tion storage and retrieval system, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Typesetting by: SchwabScantechnik, Göttingen
Printed and bound in Germany by ☺ Hubert & Co, Göttingen

Printed on non-aging paper.

Laus eius permanet in sempiternum

Acknowledgements

Any significant exposure to the massive labors of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century reformers quickly disabuses the modern scholar of anything approaching superiority. And so in getting to know Wolfgang Musculus, I realized two things in short order. First, I had found an important and overlooked figure in the church's history. Second, I would never be able to do justice to the breadth and depth of his numerous accomplishments. I take some comfort in evaluating my own work not on the basis of its own merits and my own insights, however, but rather in the extent to which it points to Musculus himself. Whatever shortcomings are apparent in my own work (and surely they are legion), this study will have performed its service to the extent that it helps put Wolfgang Musculus back into the broader historiographical conversation.

It is a truism to say that, in the words of John Donne, "no man is an island." But it is a saying applicable especially in the case of a man writing a dissertation. These acknowledgments are merely a token signifying the debt of gratitude that I owe to so many, and serve only as a small down payment on my responsibility to, as Paul puts it, "let no debt remain outstanding" (Rom 13:8).

I thank Herman Selderhuis for his ongoing interest in this project on Musculus and his willingness to commend it for publication in this series. He has helped me to think through Musculus' complex ideas and provided me with significant opportunities to develop my work in various settings. In this regard I also thank Günther Frank, director of the Europäische Melanchthon-Akademie, for a chance to share some of my work on Musculus in the context of a colloquium held in Bretten. Christopher Burchill was kind enough to share some correspondence relating to Musculus with me after this colloquium concluded. The Sixteenth Century Society and Conference has also proved to be an important forum for vetting some of my research in public and receiving very helpful feedback, including discussions with Scott Manetsch and Craig Farmer.

Some other friends, namely Chad Gunnoe, Matthew Gaetano, Richard Oosterhoff, and Jason Zuidema, have assisted by providing some insights into their own research. Their generosity, insightfulness, and bibliographic knowledge have helped me immensely. Torrance Kirby provided some timely words of encouragement and was very forgiving when I impinged on his schedule after being late to a meeting with my supervisor. For those in the midst of doctoral

studies, there are many dark nights, both literally and spiritually. John Armstrong, Hunter Baker, Victor Claar, and Kyle Smith are among those who have provided wisdom and guidance to this oft-troubled soul.

There are a number of institutions and individuals that have either directly or indirectly provided me with support to pursue this research project. Mel Flikkema at Kuyper College in Grand Rapids has shown an interest in my development and proven to be a voice of comfort and encouragement. I thank the library at Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia for providing access to their copy of *Musculus'* commentary on Genesis some years back.

The Acton Institute for the Study of Religion & Liberty has been an institutional and intellectual home for my work for a number of years now. I especially thank colleagues in the research department, particularly Sam Gregg, Anthony Bradley, and Kevin Schmiesing, for their expertise and support on this and a variety of other projects. My colleagues and friends, Dave Cooper, John Couretas, Ray Nothstine, Jonathan Spalink, and Marc Vander Maas also took an interest in the development of my work on a (heretofore!) obscure reformer. Sometimes they even remembered his name properly! In addition to the research assistance provided by Charlie Capps and Joel Crevier, I have also lately been blessed by the work of a very capable colleague, Dylan Pahman, whose research abilities and diligence continue to impress. My mentor and friend Stephen Grabill has been an indispensable help for many years, in this as well as many other endeavors. His wisdom and encouragement have been a most significant blessing.

The H. Henry Meeter Center for Calvin Studies at Calvin College and Calvin Theological Seminary has provided me with generous access to sources and space, and for this I thank Karin Maag, Lugene Schemper, Paul Fields, and Ryan Knoppen, as well as the rest of the staff at Hekman Library. In one way or another, in the midst of pursuing one degree or another, Calvin Theological Seminary has been an institutional haven for me for over a decade. In that time I have come to know a number of outstanding Christian scholars, and am blessed to count many as my friends. I have learned a great deal through engagement with the active historical theology circles at the seminary, both more formally in the context of colloquia, as well as more informally in meetings at our now defunct extension campus. My friends Dariusz Bryćko, Albert Gootjes, Nathan Jacobs, James Joiner, Todd Rester, David Systma, Ted Van Raalte, have provided hours of stimulating conversation, helped me avoid numerous methodological, linguistic, and factual errors, and been generous with their time and patience. Other graduates of the Calvin doctoral program have been graciously supportive as well, in both word and deed, including Randy Blacketer, Brian Lee, Tom McCall, and Keith Stanglin.

The faculty and staff of the seminary also deserve my hearty thanks. Ina DeMoor has been a godsend to all those who embark on the long and treacherous journey of doctoral studies, myself included. Barb Blackmore always has a bright smile and kind words that lighten a student's burdens. I have learned a great deal from Ronald Feenstra and the rest of the seminary faculty, and I thank the entire faculty for support in my rather winding career path. Lyle Bierma was generous enough to recommend me as my application to study at the University of Zurich, and his efforts are greatly appreciated. No single individual has done more to shape my academic development than Richard Muller (as perhaps witnessed in the footnotes in the present volume). He has always been most generous with his time and unsurpassed expertise. I am honored and humbled to be counted among those who have benefitted from his most excellent labors.

I owe much to the Institut für Schweizerische Reformationsgeschichte and the Faculty of Theology at the University of Zurich. Luca Baschera, Reinhard Bodenmann, Rebecca Giselsbrecht, Christian Moser, and Peter Opitz have been most kind with their hospitality, encouragement, and support. Esther Schweizer's continual intercessions on my behalf made my study at Zurich possible. I am forever in her debt.

I had the privilege of being accepted into the doctoral program at the University of Zurich in the final semester before the retirement of my Doktorvater, Emidio Campi. It speaks to his liberality of spirit that he was willing to take on an American doctoral student at that time, whose project would end up taking perhaps longer than expected and would require many meetings and consultations across the continents. His supervision and guidance have helped me both to avoid many errors as well as to end up with a much more developed work than I could have ever hoped to produce with-out him.

My wife Amy is the one person whose sacrifice clearly outpaced my own in this undertaking. I took on this project, which in retrospect seems much more ambitious than prudent, in the hope of bringing back to our attention a voice from the past that has been lost. But doing so meant that I had to be absent to my loved ones for significant periods of time, sometimes physically half a world away, sometimes mentally half a millennium away. I hope she finds my work worthy of her sacrifice.

Contents

1. Introduction	15
1.1 Order and Structure of the Present Study	17
1.2 Covenant, Causality, and Law in Late-Medieval and Reformation Thought	23
1.2.1 Covenant in Late-Medieval and Reformation Thought	25
1.2.2 Causality in Late-Medieval and Reformation Thought	26
1.2.3 Law in Late-Medieval and Reformation Thought	30
1.3 Survey of Musculus' Works	32
1.3.1 Editions of Ancient and Patristic Authors	32
1.3.2 Commentaries	34
1.3.3 <i>Loci communes</i>	38
2. Covenant	43
2.1 <i>Loci communes</i>	46
2.1.1 <i>De fœdere ac testamento Dei</i>	46
2.1.2 <i>De discrimine veteris & novi Testamenti</i>	57
2.1.3 <i>De gratia Dei</i>	62
2.1.4 <i>De electione ac reprobatione</i>	68
2.2 <i>In Mosis Genesim plenissimi Commentarii</i>	79
2.2.1 Genesis 9:8–18 (The Noahic Covenant)	82
2.2.1.1 <i>Lectio</i>	82
2.2.1.2 <i>Explanatio</i>	82
2.2.1.3 <i>Quæstio</i>	84
2.2.1.4 <i>Observatio</i>	88
2.2.2 Genesis 17:1–8 (The Abrahamic Covenant)	94
2.2.2.1 <i>Lectio</i>	95
2.2.2.2 <i>Explanatio</i>	95
2.2.2.3 <i>Quæstio</i>	98
2.2.2.4 <i>Observatio</i>	100
2.3 Summary	107
3. Causality	111
3.1 <i>Loci communes</i>	115

3.1.1	<i>De voluntate Dei</i>	116
3.1.2	<i>De iusticia Dei</i>	125
3.1.3	<i>De libero arbitrio</i>	129
3.1.4	<i>De votis</i>	139
3.2	<i>In sacrosanctum Davidis Psalterium Commentarii</i>	142
3.2.1	Psalm 15 (Christian Righteousness)	144
3.2.1.1	The Appendix on Oaths	149
3.2.1.2	The Appendix on Usury	152
3.2.2	Psalm 19:7–11 (The Sweetness of the Law)	159
3.2.2.1	<i>Lectio</i>	160
3.2.2.2	<i>Explanatio</i>	161
3.2.2.3	<i>Observatio</i>	162
3.3	Summary	165
4.	Law	167
4.1	<i>Loci communes</i>	169
4.1.1	<i>De legibus</i>	169
4.1.2	<i>De praeceptis Decalogi</i>	174
4.1.3	<i>De abrogatione legis</i>	180
4.1.4	<i>De magistratibus</i>	183
4.2	<i>In Epistolam D. Apostoli Pauli ad Romanos Commentarii</i>	195
4.2.1	Romans 2:14–16 (Natural Law)	196
4.2.1.1	<i>De lege naturæ</i>	196
4.2.1.2	<i>Sedes doctrinae</i>	199
4.2.2	Romans 13:1–8 (Civil Magistrate)	201
4.2.2.1	<i>Quid magistratui debeatur a subditis</i>	201
4.2.2.2	<i>Rhetorica forma</i>	205
4.3	Summary	212
5.	Wolfgang Musculus and the Development of Reformed Theology ...	213
5.1	Federal Theology	217
5.2	Contingency, Choice, and Casuality	223
5.3	Doctrine and Order	226
5.4	Summary	237
	Bibliography	239
	Musculus' Works	239
	Ancient and Patristic	239
	Exegetical	239

Systematic	240
Occasional	240
Primary Sources	240
Ancient and Patristic	240
Medieval	241
Reformation and Post-Reformation	242
Secondary Sources	245
Index	263
Subjects	263
Names	269

1. Introduction

The theologian and reformer Wolfgang Musculus (1497–1563) was an influential figure in the sixteenth century, working predominantly in the prominent Reformation cities of Strasbourg, Augsburg, and Bern. His writings across a variety of genres enjoyed large-scale publication. In addition to the appreciation he received during his own time, Musculus was recognized as a significant figure as late as the beginning of the eighteenth century, when Pierre Bayle called him “one of the most celebrated Divines of the sixteenth century.”¹ But only recently have historians of the early modern period begun to rediscover Musculus’ importance for the second generation of the Reformation and beyond.²

In his magisterial theological system of 1560, the *Loci communes*, Musculus is perhaps the first Reformed theologian to give the doctrine of covenant its own *locus*, set between his treatments of law and redemptive grace. In taking our point of departure with the doctrine of covenant in this study of Musculus’ theology, two things become immediately apparent. First, this doctrine cannot be understood properly except within the context of his treatment of corollary and related topics in the *Loci communes*. Second, these *Loci communes* cannot be understood adequately without examining their exegetical background.

Musculus’ theological exposition of the covenantal *loci* leads us thematically to consideration of questions of metaphysics and causality, including the divine will and omnipotence and creaturely freedom and responsibility. These themes of covenant and causality are foundational for his broader doctrinal and ethical enterprise and find full concrete expression in Musculus’ conception of law. Musculus himself states rather cryptically that the law is a component of God’s covenant.³ The law thus functions as the determinative factor in what Musculus

¹ Pierre Bayle, *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, vol. 10, new edn (Paris: Desoer, 1820), s.v. “Musculus (Wolfgang),” 584; ET: *A General Dictionary, Historical and Critical*, vol. 7 (London: James Bettenbam, 1738), s.v. “Musculus, Wolfgang,” 698.

² See especially Richard A. Muller, “Wolfgang Musculus (1497–1563),” in *Encyclopedia of the Reformed Faith*, ed. Donald K. McKim (Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992), 248; and Hartmut Lohmann, *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexicon*, vol. 6 (Herzberg: Bautz, 1993), s.v. “MUSCULUS, (Müslin, Mäuslin), Wolfgang (Dusanus),” 381ff.

³ Wolfgang Musculus, *Loci communes in usus sacrae Theologiae candidatorum parati* (Basel: Johann Herwagen, 1564 [1560]), loc. 14, p. 141. On the *Loci* see Herman J. Selderhuis, “Die Loci Communes des Wolfgang Musculus: Reformierte Dogmatik anno 1560,” in *Wolfgang Musculus (1497–1563) und die*

identifies as covenant rooted in God's omnipotent will. This study traces a flow of thought present in Musculus' theology by moving from covenant, to issues of causality, and ultimately to law.

Our entrance to study in the theology of Wolfgang Musculus is thus made with the doctrine that has been the most recognized in secondary scholarship, Musculus' doctrine of the covenant. But even though Musculus is often cited in the history of scholarship on the covenant, his overall contribution to Reformed theology has been radically underappreciated, on this as well as other points. In his study of the history of the exegetical roots of federal theology, for instance, Brian J. Lee rightly acknowledges the critical innovation that the invention of a separate *locus* on the covenant represents. He writes, "The concept of covenant itself was not new in the sixteenth century; rather, the novel aspect was the development of a new, distinct locus '*de foedere*' in the system, and over time, the further use of covenant as an ordering principle for the system itself."⁴ But even though Lee and others have recognized the importance of this separate *locus* and have sought "the cause of the elevation of a traditional exegetical discussion to independent status," Musculus, who is by all accounts the first Reformed theologian to give the *locus de foedere* a separate and distinct place in a collection of commonplaces, has largely been ignored.⁵

But even in such cases where Musculus' doctrines have received scholarly attention, the treatment is typically quite short and wholly dependent on the explication of his *Loci*. We see this particularly in the discussions of Musculus on the general covenant.⁶ Musculus' *locus* on covenant is connected to its surrounding topics and begins a series of *loci* focused on soteriology that moves

oberdeutsche Reformation, ed. Rudolf Dellsperger / Rudolf Freudenberger / Wolfgang Weber (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1997), 311–30; and Richard A. Muller, *Christ and the Decree: Christology and Predestination in Reformed Theology from Calvin to Perkins* (Durham, NC: Labyrinth Press, 1986), 46–55.

⁴Brian J. Lee, *Johannes Cocceius and the Exegetical Roots of Federal Theology: Reformation Developments in the Interpretation of Hebrews 7–10* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 17. See also the response by Richard A. Muller to Derk Visser, "Discourse and Doctrine: The Covenant Concept and Christian Iconography in the Middle Ages," in *Calvin and the State: Papers and Responses presented at the Seventh and Eighth Colloquia on Calvin and Calvin Studies*, ed. Peter De Klerk (Grand Rapids: Calvin Studies Society, 1993), 15–19.

⁵Lee, *Johannes Cocceius and the Exegetical Roots of Federal Theology*, 17. Lee treats Bullinger's influential treatise *De testamento*, but this separate treatise does not exemplify the elevation of the covenantal discussion to the level of separate *locus* as is the case in Musculus' later *Loci communes*.

⁶An example is the two sentence long treatment of the general covenant in Ives, "The Theology of Wolfgang Musculus," 157. The brevity of this treatment may be due to the fact that Ives perceives that "covenant in Musculus is not a structure," but is rather "an idea discussed and dispensed with," 154. Letham consults Musculus' Genesis commentary, but does not address Musculus' distinction between general and special covenants. See Robert Letham, "The *Foedus Operum*: Some Factors Accounting for Its Development," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 14, no. 4 (Winter 1983): 462f.

inductively toward the *locus* on predestination. And so in order to properly orient Musculus' *locus* on covenant, and to overcome the methodological lacuna of focusing solely on his *locus de fœdere*, reference must be made to other thematically-related *loci*.

Another basic methodological assumption intended to address the problem of reading the *Loci* as the sole or most important source for Musculus' theology is the contention that Musculus' doctrinal theology ought to be read in the context of his exegetical works, which were themselves major sources for later generations of theologians. Indeed, the construction of Musculus' *Loci* is closely related to his exegetical work, as the *Loci* were written over a ten year period during which Musculus wrote the bulk of his commentaries, including the commentaries of particular concern in this study: Genesis (1554), Psalms (1551), and Romans (1555). Thus, for example, to come to a comprehensive understanding of Musculus' concept of the general covenant, reference must be made to his exegetical work, particularly in Genesis on the creation and fall of humankind and to the establishment of the Noahic covenant.⁷

It is fair to say that Musculus' *Loci* represent a summary of Musculus' theology. But it is only a summary, and not an exhaustive one at that. This summary nature of much of the topical treatments in Musculus' *Loci* necessitates appeal to his exegesis in order to provide a full and comprehensive picture of his theological work. Some distinctions that Musculus finds to be of relevance in his exegesis do not appear in his *Loci*, for instance, in part because in the latter work more care was taken to present doctrine in a summary and accessible fashion. Where the commentaries tend to wax verbose, the *Loci* tend to wane toward relative brevity.

1.1 Order and Structure of the Present Study

The complex relationship between covenant, causality, and law in Musculus' thought is worthy of special attention, and this study begins by introducing pivotal questions related to these themes in the thought of the late-medieval and Reformation eras as a background to the more expansive study of these themes in Musculus' own work. We proceed in three major parts, examining

⁷In this sense, this study shares a purpose with Lee's work in seeking "the cause of the elevation of a traditional exegetical discussion to independent status, and its further development and use particularly among the Reformed." See Lee, *Johannes Cocceius and the Exegetical Roots of Federal Theology*, 17f. Even so, this present study is limited in scope primarily to Musculus' work as an early and formative expression within this longer Reformed history of movement from exegesis to systematic articulation of doctrine.

the terminology and usage of the concepts of covenant, commandment, and law respectively. Each part consists of a study of four related *loci* and two sections of exegetical source material.

Given the vast amount of exegetical material contained in Musculus' literary corpus, this study uses the composition of the *Loci communes* as a methodological starting point, beginning with relevant *loci* (e.g. "covenant") and noting the usage and prominence of Scriptural citations. Such a treatment of the *Loci* provides a basis for determining which scriptural passages figure most prominently in Musculus' thinking, thereby allowing concentrated and focused forays into Musculus' exegetical work.⁸ These exegetical explorations might be seen as comparable to the practice of creating test shafts in archaeological excavation to determine the nature of artifacts at the various strata. In this case, since comprehensive survey of Musculus' vast corpus is not possible, the test shafts are aimed at the parts of the exegetical corpus judged most likely to yield relevant and significant material.

The importance of the relevant intellectual contexts, both chronologically proximate and remote, is addressed by the placement of Musculus' exegetical and doctrinal work in dialogue with a host of his contemporaries and predecessors. Except where explicitly noted, these dialogues are not attempts to trace out specific or concrete influences on Musculus' thought, but rather they are attempts to more accurately place him within the broader historical, theological, and intellectual contexts.⁹

⁸ The analogous procedure, despite differences in exegetical method, between the construction of Musculus' *Loci* and Calvin's *Institutes* legitimates a similar judgment regarding the explicit citations present in Musculus' *Loci*. See Muller, *The Unaccommodated Calvin*, 142: "...Calvin's very selective procedure of identifying certain texts and not others can, arguably, be attributed to his intention to alert readers not merely to particular texts, and not only to the texts that were particularly germane to his argument, but also to texts on which he and his contemporaries had commented on fairly extensively as the grounds or 'seats' of theological argumentation." See also Muller, *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics*, 4 vol. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 1:87. Hereinafter *PRRD*.

⁹ Especially with respect to the commentaries, it is my intention to follow the example of Farmer, who writes of his work, "It is not my concern to establish whether or not Musculus actually used each of the commentaries brought to bear on this study. The question of direct influence, however, is not completely ignored. When I can establish Musculus's reliance on another commentator, I do so; but I never assume that the similarity of an idea can serve alone as an adequate criterion for proving dependence." See Farmer, *The Gospel of John in the Sixteenth Century*, 9. The hope here is that where similarities and differences are found, whether they influence Musculus directly, indirectly, or not (evidently) at all, in any case "reading old commentaries will also evoke the *strangeness* of the past, even the Christian past.... We should hope to find writers in the past who argue with us, and with all our contemporaries." See John L. Thompson, *Reading the Bible with the Dead: What You Can Learn from the History of Exegesis that You Can't Learn Alone* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 222. On the broader importance of the history of exegesis, see Steinmetz, *Luther in Context*, 46: "The history of biblical interpretation is not incidental to European cultural history but central to it." See also Richard A. Muller / John L.

For the section of the *loci* on covenant (2.1.1–4), Musculus' thought is explored in conjunction with that of Calvin and Bullinger. This is justified given their respective importance, and often purported differences, on the doctrines of covenant and predestination. For the section on causality and related topics (3.1.1–4), the medieval collations of Lombard's *Sentences* and Gratian's *Decretum* come to the fore, given their prominence in the development of Musculus' own doctrinal argumentation.¹⁰ And in the section on law (4.1.1–4), Augustine of Hippo and Basil the Great serve as touchstones.¹¹

For each set of exegetical comments, Musculus' work is placed in dialogue with a representative from each of the preceding and contemporaneous major epochs in church history (patristic, medieval, and early modern).¹² These various interlocutors have been selected for their relevance to Musculus' work, often determined through direct citation, as well as for their ability to function as significant representative examples of their respective eras. In the discussion of Musculus' Genesis commentary (2.2.1–2), Ambrose of Milan, Nicholas of Lyra, and Conrad Pellicanus have been selected. Ambrose was chosen for his historical and theological influence on Augustine, as well as for the aptness of his works to compare and contrast with Musculus' exegesis *sui generis*.¹³ Moreover, it has been recently noted that Ambrose shares with Musculus an

Thompson, "The Significance of Precritical Exegesis: Retrospect and Prospect," in *Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation: Essays Presented to David C. Steinmetz in Honor of His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. Richard A. Muller / John L. Thompson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 334–45; and David C. Steinmetz, "The Superiority of Pre-Critical Exegesis," *Theology Today* (1980): 27–38.

¹⁰ See Peter Lombard, *Sententiarum Quatuor Libri*, 4 vol., in S. *Bonaventurae opera omnia*, ed. Collegii S. Bonaventura (Florence: Quaracchi, 1882–1889); ET: *The Sentences*, trans. Giulio Silano, 4 vol. (Toronto: Pontifical Institute for Mediaeval Studies, 2007–2010); and Gratian, *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, in *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, vol. 1 (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1959).

¹¹ For Musculus' work on Basil the Great, see Musculus, *Opera D. Basilii Magni Caesariae Cappadociae Episcopi Omnia* (Basel: Johann Herwagen, 1540).

¹² For a recent study on the importance of the history of exegesis that makes extended use of Musculus' work, see John L. Thompson, *Reading the Bible with the Dead*. For a study that makes use of Musculus' commentaries as well as his *Loci communes* in placing Calvin's exegesis in proper perspective, see Elsie Anne McKee, *Elders and the Plural Ministry: The Role of Exegetical History in Illuminating John Calvin's Theology* (Geneva: Droz, 1988). For works taking notice of Musculus' Genesis commentary, see Don Cameron Allen, *The Legend of Noah: Renaissance Rationalism in Art, Science, and Letters* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1949), 77; and Arnold Williams, *The Common Expositor: An Account of the Commentaries on Genesis, 1527–1633* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1948). On the general shift from the medieval to Reformation era, see Richard A. Muller, "Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation: The View from the Middle Ages," in *Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation*, 3–22.

¹³ It is difficult to find patristic commentaries on portions of the Genesis text other than those on the *Hexaemeron*, especially from well-known or especially noteworthy figures. Ambrose's work meets both criteria. See Ambrose of Milan, *De Noe et Arca*, in *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, ed. Carolus Schenkl, vol. 32, pt. 1 (Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1897), 411–497; and *De Abraham*,

appreciation for the use of Eastern Fathers, and that “Ambrose clearly helped to bring elements from the Eastern tradition into the West, both in a Christianized reading of Philo and in his use of Origen, Basil, and others.”¹⁴ Nicholas of Lyra was perhaps the preeminent exegete of the medieval era, and thus serves as an important representative figure of his period.¹⁵ And Pellicanus is an early Reformation figure who represents the Zurich school, and one who has also been severely understudied and underappreciated, and indeed whose influence has been hypothesized on the development of Reformed covenantal and political thought.¹⁶

Musculus’ Psalms commentary has been put into dialogue with the work of Augustine of Hippo, certainly the most explicitly cited church father throughout the corpus of Musculus’ work.¹⁷ Denis the Carthusian is another medieval exegete, renowned in the sixteenth century, who serves as an important representative example of the fullness of medieval exegesis.¹⁸ And John Calvin’s Psalms commentary shows perhaps the greatest methodological contrast with Musculus’ own effusive exegetical method.¹⁹

The choice of interlocutors for Musculus’ Romans exegesis is based in part on Musculus’ own citation. In addition to being an important figure in Mus-

in in *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, ed. Carolus Schenkl, vol. 32, pt. 1 (Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1897), 499–638. On Ambrose’s exegetical works, see Boniface Ramsey, *Ambrose* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 56–60.

¹⁴ M. Heintz, “Ambrose of Milan,” in *Dictionary of Major Biblical Interpreters*, ed. Donald K. McKim (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2007), 121.

¹⁵ See Nicholas of Lyra, *Postilla super Genesim* (Nuremberg: Anton Koburger, 1498). See also C. Carvalho, “Nicholas of Lyra, (c. 1270–1349),” in *Dictionary of Major Biblical Interpreters*, 770–776. On Lyra’s commentary on Genesis, see Corrine Patton, “Creation, Fall and Salvation: Lyra’s Commentary on Genesis 1–3,” in *Nicholas of Lyra: The Senses of Scripture*, ed. Philip D.W. Krey / Lesley Smith (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 19–44.

¹⁶ Ryan M. Reeves, “‘Ye Gods’: The Magistrate and Political Obedience in Humanism, Zürich and English Protestantism, c. 1525–1540” (paper, Sixteenth Century Society and Conference, Geneva, Switzerland, May 30, 2009). See Conrad Pellicanus, *Commentaria Bibliorum, tomus primus* (Zurich: C. Froschauer, 1536). On Pellicanus, see Christoph Zürcher, *Konrad Pellikans Wirken in Zurich, 1526–1556* (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1975). See also G. Bray, “Conrad Pellican (1478–1556),” in *Dictionary of Major Biblical Interpreters*, 812ff.

¹⁷ See Augustine of Hippo, *Ennarationes in Psalmos 1–32*, ed. Clemens Weidmann (Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2003).

¹⁸ See Denis the Carthusian, *In Psalmos omnes Davidicos* (Cologne: Petrum Quentell, 1531). See also L. A. Schoemaker, “Denys the Carthusian (1402 / 3–1471),” in *Dictionary of Major Biblical Interpreters*, 362ff. Johan Huizinga notes the popularity of Denis in the sixteenth century in the phrase coined at the time, “Whoever reads Denis leaves nothing unread” (*Qui Dionysium legit nihil non legit*). See Johan Huizinga, *The Autumn of the Middle Ages*, trans. Rodney J. Payton / Ulrich Mammitzsch (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), 218.

¹⁹ See John Calvin, *Commentary on the Book of Psalms*, vol. 1, trans. James Anderson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949).

culus' own theological thought and development, John Chrysostom is cited explicitly and approvingly by Musculus both in regard to his conception of natural law and the role of the civil magistrate.²⁰ Musculus also notes Thomas Aquinas, who becomes important for the question of supposed medieval antecedents in Musculus' theology.²¹ And finally Peter Martyr Vermigli is another major contemporary of Musculus whose position seems to have been developed independently and yet who nevertheless shows great accord with the views of Musculus on natural law and the civil magistrate.²²

The summary titles of each major section in this study, "Covenant," "Casuality," and "Law," are meant to be placeholders and significations of a variety of interrelated concepts rather than rigidly ordered classifications. There is a certain artificiality to the structure of this present study, and concerns about the so-called "mythology of coherence" that such a structure might imply should not be overlooked.²³ Even so, this thematic organization is justified for at least two reasons. First, this study does not claim to be comprehensive, either with respect to the teachings in Musculus' *Loci communes* or his exegetical work as a whole, and certainly not for the entirety of his thought. This study is a limited

²⁰ Musculus also produced a Latin edition of Chrysostom's commentaries on the Pauline epistles. See Musculus, *Ioannis Chrysostomi Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani in Omnes D. Pauli epistolas commentarij* (Basel: Johann Herwagen, 1536). See also John Chrysostom, *Hermeneia eis pasas tas tou hagiou Paulou epistolas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1849).

²¹ See Thomas Aquinas, *Super Epistolam ad Romanos Lectura*, in *Super Epistolas S. Pauli Lectura*, vol. 1, ed. Raphael Cai (Turin: Marietti, 1953), 5–230.

²² See Peter Martyr Vermigli, *In Epistolam S. Pauli Apostoli ad Romanos* (Basel: Petrum Pernam, 1558). See also Torrance Kirby, "Political Theology: The Godly Prince," in *A Companion to Peter Martyr Vermigli*, ed. Torrance Kirby / Emidio Campi / Frank A. James III (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 401–421, who points to the extensiveness of Vermigli's political writings: "If one is to seriously address Vermigli's thought as a whole, one simply cannot neglect his extensive writings on such topics as the authority of princes and magistrates, civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, exile and banishment, treason, sedition, tyranny, rebellion, and war," 421; and Frank A. James III, "Vermigli, Peter Martyr (1499–1562)," in *Dictionary of Major Biblical Interpreters*, 1010, who notes that Vermigli was, along with Musculus, part of "a coterie of theologians who tended to be associated with Swiss reform" that "gave shape not only to Reformed theology, but also to the Reformed interpretation of the Bible." On the unifying features of Musculus and Vermigli's work amidst diversity of geographical experience and theological background, see Rudolf Dellsperger / Marc van Wijnkoop Lüthi, "Peter Martyr Vermigli und Wolfgang Musculus," in *Peter Martyr Vermigli: Humanism, Republicanism, Reformation*, ed. Emidio Campi (Geneva: Droz, 2002), 111ff.

²³ See Quentin Skinner, "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas," in *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and His Critics*, ed. J. Tully (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), 29–67. On questions of historical interpretation related particularly to economic historiography, see Ross B. Emmett, "Exegesis, Hermeneutics, and Interpretation," in *A Companion to the History of Economic Thought*, ed. Warren J. Samuels / Jeff E. Biddle / John B. Davis (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2003), 523–37. Emmett (528) points in particular to Skinner's striking concern that the "myth of coherence" results in "histories 'not of ideas at all, but of abstractions: a history of thoughts which no one ever actually succeeded in thinking, at a level of coherence which no one ever actually attained.'"

foray into the much broader life and work of a significant Reformation figure with all the strengths and limitations thereof. Second, while there is an element of artificiality or interpretation that is unavoidable in this kind of approach, concerns about abstraction are mitigated to a certain extent by the clear textual and thematic links between the sections under study here. Language about God being “most free,” for instance, is important both for Musculus’ understating of issues related to covenant as well as to God’s omnipotence, and connections between covenant and law are explicit in Musculus’ own formulations.

With these caveats in mind, under the rubric of “Covenant” this study treats a series of *loci* beginning with *de fædere* and concluding with *de electione*, followed by selections from Musculus’ commentary on Genesis. Taken alone, this section might lead to the conclusion that Musculus embraces a particularly Scotist, or at least more generally Franciscan, theological program.

This conclusion underscores the need for a broader exploration of Musculus’ work, undertaken in the latter two major sections, “Causality” and “Law.” Moving inductively this study proceeds under the category of “Causality” to examine a series of *loci* related to divine causality, power, and will, as well as to human contingency, freedom, and responsibility, particularly as represented in the *loci de voluntate Dei, de iusticia Dei, de libero arbitrio, and de votis*. The exegetical background for these doctrinal discussions is provided by selections from Musculus’ Psalms commentary. The tendency from reading these sections in isolation from the others might lead one to favor a nominalistic, or again more broadly Franciscan, interpretation of Musculus’ theology.

The final major section is comprised of themes treated under the title “Law,” and focuses on Musculus’ *loci de legibus, de præceptis Decalogi, de abrogatione legis, and de magistratibus*. Portions of Musculus’ commentary on Romans provides background material especially with regard to Musculus’ view of natural law and the office of the magistrate. Having received a generally Franciscan reading of Musculus’ late medieval antecedents from the sections of “Covenant” and “Causality,” we find in this third section a reading of Musculus that, if taken independently of the others, could favor a Thomistic reading of Musculus’ theology, particularly with regard to the doctrine of natural law.²⁴

²⁴Muller provides an important caution regarding such characterizations. See Muller, *After Calvin: Studies in the Development of a Theological Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 39: “Thus, we need to ask whether the Protestant reappropriation of elements of ‘Thomism’ ought to be taken as a direct reading of Thomas, or as a reading of Thomas as understood by Johannes Capreolus or Cajetan – or, indeed, as not precisely Thomist but, rather, as an appropriation of elements of the medieval *via antiqua* by way of thinkers such as Giles of Rome and Thomas of Strasbourg (whose works were read and cited by Protestant scholastics). So, too, when we identify ‘Scotist’ or ‘Ockhamist’ ele-

1.2 Covenant, Causality, and Law in Late-Medieval and Reformation Thought

Over the last few decades a picture of the Reformation has been formed that stands in marked contrast to the received wisdom of the early twentieth century. A history of Christian doctrine that largely emphasizes the importance of the Reformation's leading men, especially Martin Luther and John Calvin (and to a lesser extent Philip Melancthon and Huldrych Zwingli), has been measured and found wanting.²⁵ In its place an approach that emphasizes texts and contexts rather than archetypal paradigms has provided a more sensitive and nuanced perspective on the transition from the late medieval to the early modern period. A figure such as Wolfgang Musculus (1497–1563) highlights the importance of this approach since, as shall become apparent, he does not fit neatly into two groups headed respectively by the nominalist Luther and the *via antiqua* of Zwingli.²⁶

Thus in recent decades it has become a commonplace of Reformation historiography to acknowledge both the continuities as well as the discontinuities between the late medieval era and the sixteenth century. Nowhere is this encouraging trend more evident than in historical theology and concerns related to the history of doctrine. As Richard A. Muller depicts the transition to the early modern era, "It is worth recognizing from the outset that the Reformation altered comparatively few of the major *loci* of theology: the doctrines of

ments in Protestant thought, we ought perhaps to pause and ask whether these are the result of direct reading of Scotus and Ockham or of encounters with the numerous Franciscan theologies of the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries."

²⁵Musculus is one important contributor among many to the development of Reformed orthodoxy. See Muller, *After Calvin*, 8: "Calvin was not the sole arbiter of Reformed confessional identity in his own lifetime – and he ought not to be arbitrarily selected as the arbiter of what was Reformed in the generations following his death." See also Emidio Campi, "Calvin, the Swiss Reformed Churches, and the European Reformation," in *Calvin and His Influence, 1509–2009* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 133: "Considering the current orientation of the historical literature, in which an increasing amount of attention is given to lesser known founding fathers of the Reformed churches, one must continue to ask: how much of what has been peddled under the label 'Calvinism' should really be attributed to the thought of Bucer, Zwingli, Oekolampadius, Farel, Viret, Musculus, à Lasco, or Vermigli?" Some of this contextualizing narrative is rehearsed in my contribution, "The *Loci Communes* of Wolfgang Musculus and Reformed Thought on Free Choice," in *Die Philosophie der Reformierten*, ed. Günther Frank / Herman J. Selderhuis (Stuttgart-Bad Canstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 2012).

²⁶This is a paradigm still apparent to some extent in the work of Oberman, especially with his interest in tracing the thought of traditionally-appreciated major reformers (e.g. Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin). See, for instance, Heiko A. Oberman, *The Reformation: Roots & Ramifications*, trans. Andrew Colin Gow (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 197ff. Compare the highly critical assessment of this kind of paradigm made by Daniel Bolliger, *Infiniti Contemplatio: Grundzüge der Scotus- und Scotismusrezeption im Werk Huldrych Zwinglis* (Brill: Leiden, 2003), 45–59.

justification, the sacraments, and the church received the greatest emphasis, while the doctrines of God, the trinity, creation, providence, predestination, and the last things were taken over by the magisterial Reformation virtually without alteration.”²⁷

In this way the work of lesser-known figures has begun to emerge from the shadows cast on the historical landscape by theologians like Luther and Calvin. This is as true for our understanding of controversial doctrines like the Lord’s Supper and justification as it is for the influence of the Reformation on political, economic, and ethical thought. These “minor” characters of the Reformation have been found to have made major, and heretofore largely unappreciated, contributions to the developments of the Protestant Reformation and post-Reformation eras.

Wolfgang Musculus, the sometime reformer of Augsburg and Bern, is one such overlooked figure. In his time he was a greatly influential exegete, pastor, and theologian, producing works in various genres that enjoyed editions published in many languages with numerous printings. But in the intervening centuries, Musculus’ contributions to sixteenth-century theology and to the Reformation have been overshadowed by attention to more prominent figures like Luther and Calvin.

In the Anglo-American world in particular the work of this second-generation reformer has suffered indefensible neglect. A handful of unpublished dissertations, along with only two published monographs, comprise the English-language literature focused on Musculus in the last century.²⁸ The bibliographic situation on the continent is rather better, however, and the publication of an anthology commemorating the five hundredth anniversary of Musculus’ birth stands as a major recent contribution to Musculus research.²⁹

²⁷ Richard A. Muller, *The Unaccommodated Calvin: Studies in the Foundation of a Theological Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 39.

²⁸ Among the former are James T. Ford, “Wolfgang Musculus and the Struggle for Confessional Hegemony in Reformation Augsburg, 1531–1548” (Ph.D. diss.: University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2000); and Robert B. Ives, “The Theology of Wolfgang Musculus, 1497–1563” (Ph.D. diss.: University of Manchester, 1965). The latter are Craig S. Farmer, *The Gospel of John in the Sixteenth Century: The Johannine Exegesis of Wolfgang Musculus* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997); and Paul Josiah Schwab, *The Attitude of Wolfgang Musculus toward Religious Tolerance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1933).

²⁹ Rudolf Dellspurger / Rudolf Freudenberger / Wolfgang Weber, ed., *Wolfgang Musculus (1497–1563) und die oberdeutsche Reformation* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1997). In addition, see Beat Hofmann, *Abendmahl und Kirchenzucht im Spannungsfeld zwischen Bern und Genf: Ein kirchengeschichtlicher und dogmatischer Vergleich zwischen Wolfgang Musculus und Johannes Calvin* (Akzessarbeit: Universität Bern, 1989); and Paul Gerhard Langenbruch, *Schriftvergleich und Schriftauslegung bei Wolfgang Musculus* (Magisterarbeit: Universität Göttingen, 1969).

1.2.1 Covenant in Late-Medieval and Reformation Thought

While not often found worthy of independent study, there is one area in particular in which the work of Wolfgang Musculus has been noticed by the secondary scholarship, and it lies in the complicated history of what has become known as “covenant” or “federal” theology. In his *Loci communes*, initially published in 1560, Wolfgang Musculus was perhaps the first reformer to grant the topic of covenant a separate treatment within the context of a major systematic contribution to sixteenth-century Reformed theology.³⁰ When nineteenth-century writers proposed covenant as a seventeenth-century alternative to the perceived central dogma of predestinarian Calvinistic theology, a discussion arose regarding the predecessors to the developments in covenant thought from Zacharius Ursinus (1534–1583) to Johannes Cocceius (1603–1669).

These discussions have taken some note of Musculus’ importance in the formation of covenantal thinking in Reformed theology. A characteristic feature of Musculus’ treatment of covenant in the *Loci* is his distinction between “general” and “special” covenants. Musculus’ attempts to articulate a doctrine of the general and special covenants evince concern both to show the stability of the divinely created world-order as well as the reliability and assurance of salvation accomplished in the work of Christ. On the one hand, this general / special distinction shows significant continuity between the two basic understandings of covenant communicated from the late-medieval period to the early-modern era, which William J. Courtenay summarizes well:

According to the first covenant, God commits himself to uphold his created universe and the laws that govern it, in spite of their contingent nature or the sinfulness of man. This is the area of natural causality. According to the second covenant, God commits himself to a process of salvation which, in spite of its contingent nature or the basic unacceptability of man, he will uphold. This is the area of theological causality. Therefore, both the order of nature and the order of salvation are covenants which apply to different situations and persons. All mankind stands under the covenant of creation; only those in the Church, that is, in a state of grace, stand under the covenant of salvation. These covenants, by their very nature, affirm that God’s will, and consequently God’s action, are bound by nothing except his own decision to act in particular ways. They also affirm, however, that

³⁰ See the topic “De foedere ac testamento Dei,” in Wolfgang Musculus, *Loci communes*, loc. 14, 141–46. On Musculus’ *Loci*, see especially Herman J. Selderhuis, “Die Loci Communes des Wolfgang Musculus: Reformierte Dogmatik anno 1560,” 311–330.

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Refo500 Academic Studies | Vol. 3

Jordan J. Ballor takes his point of departure in the doctrine of the covenant as it appears in the theology of the prominent second-generation reformer, Wolfgang Musculus (1497–1563). Musculus is perhaps the earliest reformed theologian to give the topic of the covenant a separate and distinct treatment in a collection of theological commonplaces. Ballor then traces developments in the doctrines of divine causality and human law. By focusing on Musculus' theology as found both in his *Loci communes* as well as in his extensive and voluminous exegetical work, this book is the first full-scale study to place Musculus' theology within its broader intellectual context.

The Author

Dr. theol. Jordan J. Ballor is a research fellow at the Acton Institute for the Study of Religion & Liberty, where he also serves as executive editor of the *Journal of Markets & Morality*.

ISBN 978-3-525-55036-6



9 783525 550366

www.v-r.de