THE SPRINGFIELDER

October 1974
Volume 38, Number 4

The Presuppositions of the Historical-Grammatical Method as Employed by Historic Lutheranism

RAYMOND F. SURBURG

THE HISTORICAL-GRAMMATICAL METHOD is primarily a product of the Reformation and post-Reformation periods of Western European Christianity.[1] While certain aspects of it were known and occasionally spasmotically utilized prior to Luther, the historical-grammatical method is a development of Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, John Knox and other Protestant reformers.[2] After Luther's death it was the method used during the 17th and 18th centuries in Lutheranism, Calvinism and Arminianism.

The historical-grammatical method came out of the context of Western European Christianity and was developed in reaction to the allegorical method which had more or less dominated the history of the Church of Latin Christianity for over a thousand years.

Those theologians and exegetes that developed, propounded and defended the historical-grammatical method brought with them a number of presuppositions which had controlled previous methodology in the church. These they kept but other presuppositions were also adopted whose acceptance made necessary a new interpretative methodology, which in many respects was radically different from the method that controlled the Roman Catholic Church during the first decades of the 16th century and in the centuries prior to 1517.[3]

Before giving the main presuppositions of the historical-grammatical method, it is necessary to describe how it operates and what its goals are. The majority of books that contain a history of Biblical hermeneutics do not have a special section dealing with the historical-grammatical method.[4] During the time that the Christian Church has been in existence, which has been over 1900 years, different methods of interpretation have been in vogue.[5] In the course of that long history a number of different kinds of schools of interpretation have arisen upon the scene utilizing methods which were significantly different from each other. The consequence of this situation resulted in different understandings and promulgations of what the Holy Scriptures truly taught and intended to teach.

Allegory, taken over from Greek secular literary interpretation, invaded the church already in the pre-Nicene age as well as in the centuries following Nicene Council.[6] Both Origen and St. Augustine were proponents of a manifold-sense of Scriptures concept. Eventually a fourfold sense was practiced in both the Eastern and Western branches of Asiatic and European Christendom respectively. After Augustine's death allegorism came to be the controlling method of Biblical interpretation. In addition to its use, there developed the claim by the Bishop of Rome that only the Church has the God-given right to interpret the Scriptures and that the Church alone had the

privilege and ability to interpret Scriptures and determine its true meaning. The Roman Catholic believer was to believe a doctrine or dogma not because it was taught in the Scriptures but because the Church determined a doctrine or belief. All Christians were to recognize the teaching magisterium of the Church; although a dogma was not in the Scriptures it was nevertheless to be accepted. In addition, the Vulgate of Jerome, in many respects a fine translation, yet containing mistakes in translation, was made the definitive text, when matters of doctrine and ethics were concerned.[6] Furthermore, the Old Testament canon was enlarged to include ten of the fourteen books regarded as apocryphal by both the Jewish synagogue and the Protestant Churches.[7]

The allegorical method had been opposed by the School of Antioch which stressed a historical interpretation as opposed to the allegorical.[8] In Paris the school of the Victorines emphasized a methodology not in sympathy with allegorical method.[9] Nicholas of Lyra also sponsored hermeneutical views that were contradictory of what was standard hermeneutical procedure in his day. Luther was influenced by Nicholas of Lyra.[10]

However, it was in the 16th century that there occurred a hermeneutical revolution or revolt which Luther initiated and fostered, a revolution that changed the course of Western European history. The Protestant Reformation would have been impossible apart from this change in the hermeneutics that was employed to interpret the Holy Scriptures of both the Old and New Testaments. [11] Luther, Calvin, Zwingli and other reformers rejected the fourfold meaning of a Biblical text or pericope. Luther realized that permitting the Scriptures to be interpreted by this method was to make of the Bible a waxen nose, which would be twisted to give any meaning any way that an interpreter desired to give a passage. It was declared that a passage had only one intended meaning. Furthermore, it was the contention of Luther and other reformers that only the Scripture determined the meaning of a text and not the Church, and if church doctrine or dogma contradicted the Bible, the church teaching was to be rejected.[12] For the 16th century that truly was revolutionary. The Protestant movement which made great inroads on the numerical strength of the Roman See and resulted in the loss of millions of adherents was made possible by the adoption of a new system of Biblical interpretation by the Reformer. A system of hermeneutics was developed and utilized that differed radically in many points from the systems in use in both the Eastern and Western branches of Christianity as represented by the Roman Catholic and the Greek Orthodox Churches.[13]

Luther became the proponent of a methodology which in essence was the historical-grammatical method. Melanchthon employed it in his teaching at the University of Wittenberg. Since Luther and Melanchthon wrote the majority of the Lutheran Confessions—the Large and Small Catechisms and the Smalcald Articles (Luther), the Augsburg Confession and the Apology of the Augsburg Confession (Melanchthon)—the Formula of Concord was the only book not authored by these two professors of the University of Wittenberg.

A perusal of the hermeneutics of the Formula of Concord reveals that it also uses the principles of the historical-grammatical method.[14]

In the post-Reformation period, during the 17th and 18th and 19th centuries the historical-grammatical method was employed by the Lutheran theologians. A number of scholars refined the method and defined some of its aspects more clearly. Professor Terry, who lived most of his life prior to the twentieth century, and did not witness the development of the newer sub-methods of the historical-critical method, which was to develop from a radical type of literary criticism into form criticism, tradition criticism, redaction criticism and content criticism, described in his 1890 *Biblical Hermeneutics* the historical-grammatical method as follows:

> In distinction from all the above-mentioned methods of interpretation, we may name the Grammatico-Historical as the method which most fully commends itself to the judgment and conscience of Christian scholars. Its fundamental principle is to gather from the Scriptures themselves the precise meaning which the writers intended to convey. It applies to the sacred books the same principles, the same grammatical process and exercise of common sense and reason, which we apply to other books. The grammatico-historical exegete, furnished with suitable qualifications, intellectual, educational, and moral, will accept the claims of the Bible without prejudice or adverse prepossession, and, with no ambition to prove them false, will investigate the language and import of each book with fearless independence. He will master the language of the writer, the particular dialect which he used, and his peculiar style and manner of expression. He will inquire into the circumstances under which he wrote, the manners and customs of his age, and the purpose or object which he had in view. He has a right to assume that no sensible author will be knowingly inconsistent with himself, or seek to bewilder and mislead his readers.[15]

THE PRESUPPOSITIONS OF THE HISTORICAL-GRAMMATICAL METHOD

Some of the presuppositions that were used by the developers and promoters of the historical-grammatical method had been used in the interpretation of the Bible according to the allegorical method and because they were valid were not abandoned. Yet other presuppositions were adopted in order truly to justify the elimination and rejection of the past weakness and errors in the exegesis of Holy Scriptures.

1. A basic presupposition kept by Luther, Calvin and many other reformers was the historic position of Latin Western and Eastern Greek Christianity that the Bible was the Word of God in its entirety.[16] Even though the Roman Church of Luther's day held that there were two sources for revelation, Scripture and tradition, they did teach that the Bible in its entirety was the inspired, inerrant Word of God. Christian scholars down through the centuries have held it a presupposition that the Bible is a unique book because the

Holy Spirit was its author. In the *Table Talk* Luther is reported as saying: "We ought not to criticize the Scriptures, or judge the Scriptures by our mere reason, but diligently, with prayer, meditate thereon, and seek their meaning."[17]

2. Another presupposition of the developers of the historical-grammatical method was the recognition of only those canonical books which were employed as Scripture by the Jewish synagogue and are also reflected in the New Testament, neither one of which gives any evidence of having acknowledged any of the apocryphal books, now a part of the official Old Testament canon of Roman Catholicism and of Eastern orthodoxy.[18] The rejection of books like Maccabees, Tobit, the Wisdom of Solomon and other writings had implications for the establishment of the kind of doctrines which were to be placed into a systematic theology as true doctrine God would have His people hold and teach. The elimination of ten of the fourteen apocryphal writings as given in Protestant apocryphal lists, has implications for Biblical interpretation, especially when the principle is used, namely, that Scripture alone is the source for the formulation of divine truth.

3. A third presupposition of the Luther and the other Protestant Reformers was that only the text in the original languages was the determinative one. This meant the non-recognition of the Vulgate, a translation in Latin, as the Scriptural text that decided the meaning of a certain text. The mistranslation of the pronoun *hu'* in the Hebrew text of Gen. 3:15, in the Protevangelium, as *hi*, "she," was utilized to support Mariolatry. Both the Council of Trent and the Vatican Council of 1870 affirmed the authoritative character of the Latin Vulgate as the deciding authority in establishing doctrine and morals. The Reformers' insistence on the use of the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament made possible a scholarly exegesis of the Biblical text and fostered the philological method of the interpretation of the Bible which came to characterize the historical-grammatical method. Only by the use of the original text could exegesis truly be scholarly and grammatical.[19]

4. A fourth presupposition was the conviction, based on the Word of God itself, that the supreme and final authority in theological matters was the Bible, Ramm stated Luther's position as follows: "The Bible is the supreme and final authority in theological authority. Its teaching cannot be countermanded nor qualified nor subordinated to ecclesiastical authority whether of persons or documents."[20]

5. A fifth important presupposition of the historical-grammatical method as developed by the Protestant Reformers was the principle that the literal meaning was the usual and normal one. The Scholastics had developed their hermeneutics into two divisions: literal and spiritual. The Spiritual was divided into allegorical, anagogical, and tropological. Luther contended for the primacy of the literal meaning of a text. Dean Farrar quoted Luther as holding: "The literal sense of Scripture alone is the whole essence of Christian faith and of Christian theology."[21] C. A. Briggs cites Luther as writing: "Every word should be allowed to stand in its natural

meaning and that should not be abandoned unless faith forces us to it."[22]

The literal meaning could only be adequately attained by the use of the original text in Hebrew and Greek. Luther gave the following advice: "While the preacher may preach Christ with edification though he may be unable to read the Scriptures in the originals, he cannot expound or maintain their teaching against heretics without this indispensible knowledge."[23] It is generally acknowledged that Luther played an important role in sponsoring the revival of Hebrew and Greek studies.

6. The proponents of the historical-grammatical method operate with the presupposition that the *autographic* text is the authoritative text and that since errors have crept into the transmission of the text, it is necessary to practice textual criticism, also known as lower criticism. Part I of Fuerbringer's little hermeneutical manual, by means of which thousands of Lutheran Missouri Synod pastors were introduced to the science of Biblical hermeneutics, deals with Biblical Criticism, establishing the text of the Bible. Dr. Fuerbringer wrote: "The exegete must for this reason, first of all, endeavor to ascertain the original form of the text. (Textual criticism, verbal criticism, lower criticism.)"[24] Fuerbringer calls attention to the fact that Luther already realized the necessity of textual criticism, and sites IX, 1086; VIII, 1719, 1849, 1852; XIV, 600.[25] Historical Lutheranism has not opposed the proper use of lower criticism and not rejected the legitimate findings of a reliable type of textual criticism.

7. Another presupposition of the employers of the historical-grammatical method was the recognition that the Bibilcal books were literary documents and therefore there was a proper place for literary criticism.[26] After the textual critic has either determined the text himself or else is persuaded that the text of printed critical editions substantially contains the correct text, he then on the basis of such a text as an exegete studies a Biblical book in terms of authorship, time of writing, place of writing, purpose of writing, integrity and historical background. Sometimes these isagogical questions are answered clearly by the text of the book, sometimes they are not. The literary critic uses both internal evidence and external evidence in dealing with these questions which often determine the interpretation of a given book or books. For example, the rejection of Mosaic authorship in favor of the documentary hypothesis has many implications for the interpretation of the first five books of the Old Testament and sometimes also for the book of Joshua (Hexateuch theory). The unity of Isaiah versus multiple authorship of Isaiah again has implications as to where in the progress of Old Testament revelation the 66 chapters of this book are to be placed, how chapter 13 and 14 and 39 are to be understood, chapters which the text assigns to Isaiah but denied by historical-critical proponents to the prophet Isaiah. There are New Testament statements in which there are quotations from chapters 1-39, 40-55, and 56-66, and they are all ascribed to Isaiah the prophet.

8. Another assumption of the users of the historical-grammatical method as employed by Luther, the Lutheran Confessions and

those who have remained faithful to the hermeneutics of the Lutheran Confessions is the assumption of the unity of the Holy Scriptures.[27] God ultimately is the Author of the 66 canonical books. The Old and New Testaments are one complete revelation of God and are not to be separated; the Old Testament is not to be treated as if there were no New Testament for which it was preparatory. Luther cited the ancient maxim: Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet, Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet (Luther III, 1882, 1884).[28] The New Testament is hidden in the Old and the Old Testament is revealed in the New. Sometimes the true intended meaning of a given Old Testament text is first made explicit by the New Testament where the Author, the Holy Spirit, reveals what had been the intended meaning of a given Old Testament text. Psalm 110 would be an example, where David speaks about Yahweh's Messiah. Jesus and other New Testament writers clearly state that David wrote Ps. 110, a view which commentaries written by proponents of the historical-critical method do not accept; instead they claim this psalm was used at the coronation of a new king in Judah or Israel and in no way was predictive of the Messiah.

9. Related to the presupposition of the unity of the Scriptures is the presupposition that Scripture can be used to interpret Scripture. This presupposition is found in the New Testament and for this reason Luther, the authors of the Lutheran Confessions, and later Lutheran theologians and pastors who accepted the hermeneutical principles practiced and employed what the theologians described as "*Scriptura Scripturam interpretatur.*"[29] The Old Testament frequently receives clarification, as to its God-intended meaning, from the New. By virtue of the validity of this presupposition which is employed as an interpretative principle, the Biblical interpreter uses parallel passages to understand given passages. This rule is also useful in dealing with dark passages or those that are susceptible of more than one meaning, because to our age there are factors unknown that were known to the original recipients. The classical formulation of *Scriptura Sacra sui ipsius interpres* is already evident in Luther's writings as early as 1519.[30] This was a principle that was employed by various writers before Luther's time. In a general way, the principle that an interpreter uses the writings of a given author to explain statements in a book is a principle of general literature. That Scripture can and does interpret Scripture is also related to the fact of the clarity of the Holy Scripture and to the fact that God is the ultimate Author of all books comprising the Biblical canon and that the Scriptures are the only source and norm of doctrine and morals. Dr. Ralph Bohlmann wrote concerning this matter:

> The fact that the Scriptures were authored by God suggests that this principle is ultimately an extension of the general hermeneutical principle that any passage must be considered and explained in terms of its context. Thus the context of any Bible passage is the entire Scripture, since all Scripture is authored by the same Holy Spirit. That the "context" of Scripture can give a *true* explanation of any passage rests on the fact of its *divine* authorship, by virtue of which Scripture is held to be in agreement with itself.[31]

10. It was and is an assumption of the Lutheran exegetes following the teachings of the Bible that the Scriptures in their autographic text are inerrant and do not contain contradictions as they employ the historical-grammatical method. Because God is the author of the Scriptures Luther and the Lutheran Confessions held that they did not have errors or contradictions. In the Large Catechism Luther wrote "that God does not lie" (IV, 57) and "God's Word cannot err" (IV, 57). Therefore Luther urges: "Believe the Scriptures. They will not lie to you" (LC V, 76). The Formula of Concord rejects as an opinion the errancy of Scripture because "In this way it would be taught that God, who is the eternal Truth, contradicts himself" (SD XI, 35). The preface to the Book of Concord describes the Scripture as "the pure, infallible, and unalterable Word of God."[32]

Frederick C. Grant, a well known critical scholar, in *An Introduction to New Testament Thought* stated that the Scriptures testify about themselves as follows:

> Everywhere it is taken for granted that what is written in scripture is the work of divine inspiration, and is therefore trustworthy, infallible, and inerrant. The scripture must be "fulfilled" (Luke 22:37). What was written there was "written for our instruction" (Rom. 15:4; I Cor. 10:11). What is described or related in the Old Testament is unquestionably true. No New Testament writer would dream of questioning a statement contained in the Old Testament, though the exact manner or mode of its inspiration is nowhere stated explicitly.[33]

11. A fundamental and basic presupposition of the Lutheran exegete employing the historical-grammatical method is the centrality of justification by faith as the chief article of the Biblical revelation.[34] No interpretation of the Bible dare violate or be in disagreement with this Biblical teaching. This has been called the *Hauptartikel* Principle.[35] We may say of it that it is a presupposition as well as a hermeneutical principle. The *Hauptartikel* presupposition or principle is referred to often in the Lutheran Confessions. In Apology IV, 79-80 we read: "We prove the minor premise as follows. Since Christ is set forth to be the propitiator, through whom the Father is reconciled, we cannot appease God's wrath by setting forth our own works. For it is only by faith that Christ is accepted as mediator. By faith alone, therefore, we obtain the forgiveness of sins when we comfort our hearts with trust in the mercy promised for Christ's sake." In Apology IV, 2 (German text) Melanchthon calls the doctrine of justification by faith "der vornehmste Artikel (praecipuus locus)," an article valuable for determining the clear, correct understanding of the entire Holy Scriptures, and alone able to point the way to the unspeakable treasures and right knowledge of Christ; thus, it alone shows the true meaning of all of the Bible. In the Smalcald Articles the Wittenberg Reformer calls Christ and faith in Him "the first and chief article."

12. A presupposition closely allied with this *Hauptartikel* for the Lutheran exegete is the Christocentricity of the entire Bible.[36]

This Christocentricity of the Scriptures of the Old Testament is regarded as basic by interpreters who do not question the reliability of the Biblical text. For Luther Christ permeates the Old Testament Scriptures and this fact was emphasized by Luther in his writings as well as throughout the Lutheran Confessions. One does not truly understand the message of the Old Testament, if with modern exegetes one does not find Christ there as many of the New Testament writers do. Luther stated that all the promises of the Old Testament find their ultimate fulfillment in Jesus. The Angel of the Lord who comes to the patriarchs of the Old Testament and blessed them was Christ. When Yahweh is depicted in the Old Testament times as redeeming His people, the reader must think of Christ, so Luther contends. The Old Testament saints were not merely saved by implicit trust in the mercy and grace of God but by Christ, who was the object of the faith of the Old Testament believers. Commenting on Gen. 3:15, Luther says: "Here it is written that Adam was a Christian long before the birth of Christ. For he had the same faith in Christ that we have. For in matters of faith, time makes no difference. Faith is of the same nature from the beginning to the end of the world. Therefore he, through his faith, received the same that I receive. He did not see Christ with his eyes, neither did we, but he had Him in the Word. The only difference is this: at that time it was to come to pass, now it has come to pass. Accordingly all the Fathers were justified in the same manner as we are, through the Word and through faith and in this faith they also died." When Luther finds Christ in the Old Testament he is not allegorizing as some might contend, but merely reading the Old Testament in the light of the New and thus finding a deeper meaning than an exegete does who ignores the New Testament. This would also be an application of the use of the analogy of faith. In response to the objection to Luther's Christological interpretation that he was making a text utter something not originally intended by the text, Luther would reply that the New Testament fulfillment of the Old Testament promise is a part of the larger historical context of Old Testament passages, because God, the Author of all Biblical books, therefore can set forth what the true, intended meaning of Old Testament passages was by means of the New Testament.

13. A fundamental presupposition of the Lutheran exegete employing the historical-grammatical method is the belief that in the Holy Scriptures God speaks a word of Law and a word of Gospel, a word of condemnation and a word of forgiveness.[37] It is a fundamental presupposition that these two doctrines must not be confused but their messages kept distinct from each other. Without the proper distinction between Law and Gospel the central message of Holy Scripture cannot be ascertained. Melanchthon's whole argument in the Apology is closely bound up with the recognition and use of the Law/Gospel dichotomy. The Formula of Concord stated: "The distinction between Law and Gospel is an especially brilliant light which serves the purpose that Word of God may be rightly divided and the writings of the holy apostles may be explained and understood correctly."[38] This Law/Gospel distinction is no Lutheran invention,

for "since the beginning of the world these two proclamations have continually been set forth side by side in the church of God with proper distinction."[39] The patriarchs knew this distinction as did David.

14. Another important presupposition of the historical-grammatical method is the Spirit principle, namely, that the Holy Spirit is the true interpreter of the Bible. The Holy Scriptures were inspired and written under the guidance of the Holy Spirit; every true interpreter needs the enlightenment of the Spirit of God. The Spirit principle is one that pervades the Lutheran Confessions.[40] Thus R. Preus asserted: "Scripture is clear not only because of its own coherent and consistent nature but because God's Holy Spirit has authored it."[41] In the Apology this fact was stated by Melanchthon as follows: "It is surely amazing that our opponents are unmoved by the many passages in the Scriptures that clearly attribute justification to faith and specifically deny it to works . . . Do they suppose that these words fell from the Holy Spirit unawares?"[42] The Holy Scriptures are clear and purposeful soteriologically because their ultimate author is God the Holy Spirit.

The Spirit principle also involves the necessity of the enlightenment of the Holy Ghost. St. Paul reminded the Corinthian Christians of the important fact that "the natural men receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness to him; neither can he know them because they must be spiritually discerned" (I Cor. 2:14). Man by nature is alienated from God; his life is termed by the Apostle "enmity against God," and no amount of education and learning can change that condition in an unregenerate expositor. Unless the exegete is born from above, the Bible will remain a sealed book. To Timothy Paul wrote: "Consider what I say, and the Lord give thee understanding in all things" (2 Tim. 2:7).

The gift of the Spirit is necessary for the interpretation of the Bible. Just as the Spirit must convert a person, so He must open the heart to accept and believe the Word of God. Thus the Formula of Concord declares: "He opens the intellect and the heart to understand the Scriptures and to heed the Word, as we read in Luke 24:45, 'Then he opened their minds to understand the Scriptures.' "[43]

This guidance of the Holy Spirit does not mean that the interpreter can depart from the literal sense of the Bible and is given a new and different meaning than that set forth in the words of Scripture, or that the expositor need not follow a sound historical and grammatical interpretation of the text of the Scriptures, but it means that the Spirit of Truth aids the interpreter to grasp the God-intended meaning of the text. Otherwise this would amount to enthusiasm or Schwaermerei.[44]

Despite the clearness of the Scriptures on this matter, Colwell wrote: "The student who uses the historical method of interpreting the Bible relies upon no supernatural aids."[45] Again the same scholar said: "The plea for some special endowment as a prerequisite for biblical study seems rather out of place in such areas as textual criticism and the study of Biblical languages."[46] To expect an unconverted individual adequately to interpret the Scriptures or any

part thereof is as unreasonable as to suppose that a blind person can appreciate a sunset, or some deaf person respond to the music of the great masters.[17] The spiritual mind may be said to be the key that adequately unlocks the treasure house of God's riches contained in the Word.[18]

The Spirit principle is in harmony with other principles of Biblical and Lutheran interpretation. The Holy Spirit, the ultimate Author of the Books of the Old and New Testaments, works through Law and Gospel upon all those who hear and read the written revelation of God.[19]

15. It is an important presupposition of the historical-grammatical method as employed by Lutherans that the Holy Scriptures are profitable "for teaching, for refutation, for correction, and for training in righteousness, so that the man of God may himself be complete, and completely equipped for every good work."[50] Included under this presupposition is what Robert Preus has called the "eschatological principle."[51] The Bible has an eschatological burden, expressed in Romans 15:4: "Whatever was written in former days was written for our instruction, that by steadfastness and by encouragement of the Scriptures we might have hope." The Formula of Concord in commenting on this particular passage asserts: "But this is certain that any interpretation of the Scriptures which weakens or even removes this comfort and hope is contrary to the Holy Spirit's will and intent [*Meinung*]."[52]

FOOTNOTES

1. L. Berkhof, *Principles of Biblical Interpretation (Sacred Hermeneutics)* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1950), p. 27.
2. Bernard Ramm, *Protestant Biblical Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1970), pp. 48-51.
3. Raymond F. Surburg, "The Significance of Luther's Hermeneutics for the Protestant Reformation," *Concordia Theological Monthly,* 24:241-261, April, 1953.
4. Cf. James D. Wood, *The Interpretation of the Bible* (London: Gerald Duckworth, 1958); Frederick W. Farrar, *History of Interpretation* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1886).
5. E. C. Blackman, *Biblical Interpretation* (London: Independent Press, 1957), pp. 65-158; Henry Preserved Smith, *Essays in Biblical Interpretation* (Boston: Marshall Jones and Company, 1924), pp. 33-167; George Holley Gilbert, *Interpretation of the Bible. A Short History* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908), pp. 1-292.
6. Farrar, *op. cit.,* pp. 127-158.
7. Cf. *Biblia Sacra Juxta Vulgatam Clementinam* (Romae-Tornaci-Parisiis: Typis Societatis S. Joannis Evang., 1956), pp. ix-xii.
8. Ramm, *op. cit.,* pp. 48-51.
9. *Ibid.,* p. 51.
10. Farrar, *op. cit.,* p. 277.
11. Surburg, *op. cit.,* p. 242.
12. Ramm, *op. cit.,* p. 55.
13. Cf. Farrar, *op. cit.,* p. 325ff.
14. Ralph A. Bohlmann, *Principles of Biblical Interpretation in the Lutheran Confessions* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1968).
15. Milton S. Terry, *Biblical Hermeneutics. A Treatise on the Interpretation of the Old and New Testaments* (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1890), p. 70.
16. Ramm, *op. cit.,* pp. 55, 58.
17. As cited by Ramm, *op. cit.,* p. 54.

18. Dr. M. Reu, *Luther and the Scriptures* (Columbus: The Wartburg Press, 1944), pp. 13-48; Rupert E. Davies, *The Problem of Authority in the Continental Reformers* (London: Epworth Press, 1946), p. 107.
19. Henry Preserved Smith, *Essays in Biblical Interpretation* (Boston: Marshall Jones Company, 1921), p. 80.
20. Ramm, *op. cit.*, p. 53.
21. Farrar, *op. cit.*, p. 327.
22. C. A. Briggs, *History of the Study of Theology* (New York: Charles Scribners and Sons, 1916), II, p. 107.
23. As cited by Ramm, *op. cit.*, p. 54.
24. L. Fuerbringer, *Theological Hermeneutics* (St. Louis: CPH, 1924), pp. 4-8.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 3.
26. A. Berkeley Mickelsen, *Interpreting the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1963), pp. 99-337; Charles Augustus Briggs, *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scriptures*, Revised Edition (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1970, reprinted from revised edition of 1900), pp. 293ff.
27. L. Fuerbringer, *op. cit.*, pp. 14 (par. 28), 30 (par. 29 & 30), p. 17.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 15; Wm. Dallman, W. H. T. Dau and Th. Engelder, *Walther and the Church* (St. Louis, CPH, 1938), pp. 124, 125.
30. Bohlmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 99-100.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 108.
32. Tappert, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
33. Frederick Grant, *An Introduction to New Testament Thought* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1950), p. 75.
34. Robert David Preus, "How is The Lutheran Church to Interpret and Use the Old and New Testaments?" *The Lutheran Synod Quarterly*, 14:23-24 (Fall, 1973).
35. *Ibid.*, p. 23.
36. Preus, *op. cit.*, p. 29.
37. Holsten Fagerberg, *Die Theologie der lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften von 1529 bis 1537*, trans. Gerhard Klose (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), pp. 91-96; Edmund Schlink, *Theology of the Lutheran Confessions*, trans. by P. F. Koehneke and H. J. A. Boumann (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961), pp. 136-137.
38. Theodore G. Tappert, *The Book of Concord* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), p. 558.
39. *Ibid*, p. 562.
40. Preus, *Op. cit.*, p. 34.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 34.
42. Apol. IV, 107-108. Tappert, *op. cit.*, p. 122.
43. FC SD, II, 26, Tappert, p. 526.
44. Raymond F. Surburg, "The Moral and Spiritual Qualifications of the Biblical Interpreter," *Concordia Theological Monthly*, 22:483 (July 1951).
45. Ernst Cadman Colwell, *The Study of the Bible* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937), p. 125.
46. *Ibid.*, p. 125.
47. George Dahl, "The Modern Approach to the Old Testament," in *Education for Christian Service, By Members of the Faculty of Yale University* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1922), p. 52.
48. R. A. Torrey, *To Show Thyself Approved* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1921), pp. 30-31; L. Fuerbringer, *Theologische Hermeneutik* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1912), p. 4.
49. FC SD, V, 11, Tappert, *op. cit.*, p. 560.
50. Helen Barrett Montgomery, *The New Testament in Modern English, The Centenary Translation* (Philadelphia: The Judson Press, 1924), p. 578.
51. Preus, *op. cit.*, p. 35.
52. FC SD, XI, 92, Tappert, *op. cit.*, p. 632.