

Luke Murray

# Jesuit Biblical Studies after Trent

Franciscus Toletus & Cornelius A Lapide



Academic Studies

64



# Refo500 Academic Studies

Edited by  
Herman J. Selderhuis

In co-operation with  
Christopher B. Brown (Boston), Günter Frank (Bretten),  
Bruce Gordon (New Haven), Barbara Mahlmann-Bauer (Bern),  
Tarald Rasmussen (Oslo), Violet Soen (Leuven),  
Zsombor Tóth (Budapest), Günther Wassilowsky (Frankfurt),  
Siegrid Westphal (Osnabrück)

Volume 64

Luke Murray

# **Jesuit Biblical Studies after Trent**

Franciscus Toletus & Cornelius A Lapide

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

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

© 2019, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Theaterstraße 13, D-37073 Göttingen  
All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means,  
electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage and  
retrieval system, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Typesetting: 3w+p, Rimpär  
Printed and bound: Hubert & Co. BuchPartner, Göttingen  
Printed in the EU

**Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Verlage | [www.vandenhoeck-ruprecht-verlage.com](http://www.vandenhoeck-ruprecht-verlage.com)**

ISSN 2197-0165  
ISBN 978-3-647-56473-9

*For Kate, Juliette and Alice*



## Acknowledgments

This work is the fruit of working at two institutions, Ave Maria University and KU Leuven. Beginning at Ave Maria, my work benefited from the initial support and encouragement of Drs. Gregory Vall, Steven Long, Matthew Lamb, and Roger Nutt. I am especially grateful to Dr. Michael Waldstein, my co-Promoter, for first introducing me to Franciscus Toletus and getting me excited about early modern Catholic biblical studies. After being invited to come to Leuven, I am also grateful to Dr. Michael Dauphinais, then the Academic Dean of Ave Maria, for allowing me to come to Leuven to complete a second doctorate. Finally, I am also grateful to Susan Nutt for her help communicating between the two institutions and especially her assistance in finalizing this joint dissertation.

At Leuven, I am most grateful to my promoter, Prof. Dr. Wim François for bringing me over and for his constant guidance and support in completing the work. Having only a year and a half to complete KU Leuven's program and write the dissertation, his expertise, assistance, and patience were invaluable for completing the project. I am also grateful for the close and critical reviews of Prof. Dr. Mark Elliott, Prof. Dr. Rob Faesen, and Prof. Dr. Marcel Gielis. Their remarks and suggestions greatly improved the final version of the text. In addition, the staff at KU Leuven was exceptionally helpful with the logistics in helping my family move to a foreign country. In this regard, I am grateful to Evelien De-necker, Ingrid Wouters, Anne Demoulin, Martine Van Beeck, and Ed Guzman. The advice and experience of my colleague Els Agten was also appreciated during the final stages of the work.

Finally, I am thankful for the constant support of my wife, Kate, and especially for her willingness to leave her job and follow me across an ocean to Belgium, and back again.





## Preface

In 2016 Dr. Luke Murray defended his doctoral dissertation on *Jesuit Biblical Studies after Trent: Franciscus Toletus & Cornelius a Lapide* which earned him a double degree of doctor in Theology at KU Leuven (Belgium) and Ave Maria University (Florida, USA). The work has been accepted for publication in the book series Refo500 Academic Studies, where it will serve a wide group of scholarly readers. And indeed: the work may rightly be called a key contribution in the history of early modern Catholic biblical scholarship, an area on which there is still a great void in contemporary research. Taking as a guiding principle that humanist studies of Scripture had not ended with Trent but that, instead, Catholic biblical scholarship continued to prosper and flourish, Dr. Murray's book is elaborated according to a clear structure. In a first chapter a sketch is given on the context, namely the interest for biblical studies among the Jesuits and its development in the wake of the Council of Trent. Chapters two and three are, more specifically, devoted to Franciscus Toletus and Cornelius a Lapide, respectively. Both chapters have a similar structure: After dealing with the biography, the backgrounds and the (exegetical) works produced by both Jesuits, closer attention is paid to their biblical hermeneutics.

Chapter four deals with Toletus' and A Lapide's commentary on John 17, a pivotal text which allows Dr. Murray to diagnosticate their own theological accents and nuances, especially in the field of predestination, grace and freewill, the topics that dominated theological controversy in the period under scrutiny, not only between Protestants and Catholics, but also among Catholics themselves (and even within the Jesuit Order). One of the most interesting findings that Dr. Murray elaborates in his book and which is largely unexplored up till today, is the link between the theory of biblical inspiration, on the one hand, and that of predestination, grace and freewill, on the other. Authors who tend to emphasize the role of God's grace in the process of salvation (and minimize man's contribution) are inclined to accept that the Bible is a book largely dictated by God. Authors who are prepared to accept a large part of the human person's contribution in the process of salvation, equally agree upon more participation of the

human authors in the coming into being of the biblical texts. It is a link that Dr. Murray points out in Toletus, who appeals in this regard to Aquinas' view on prophecy, but which needs further and broader consideration in the scholarly community.

In chapter four of his book, Dr. Murray also pays attention to the patristic, medieval and contemporary authorities whom Toletus and A Lapide allowed to substantiate their theological claims. The Fathers especially are the constitutively authoritative readers of the canon of texts, who enter the Jesuits' commentaries as a multitude of tributaries or as a variegated stream of distinctive voices, at times with considerable tensions between them. The specific preferences the Jesuit exegetes show in their appeal to some patristic authors above others, is also a field where Dr. Murray makes a meaningful contribution to research.

In the last chapter of this book Dr. Murray brings the conclusions of his research together in a very useful overview, determining points of difference as well as of likeness between both Jesuits, while also adding his own evaluation. This brings us to a peculiar characteristic of this work, viz. its very synthetic character, in the sense that most chapters search for a concise and readable presentation of the subject matter. This point is very interesting, since it distinguishes Dr. Murray's approach, to a certain degree, from the more analytical method, which is characteristic for the Louvain research tradition in which he was only immersed in the last phase of the elaboration of his work.

In sum, the insistency upon the contribution of Toletus and A Lapide to qualitative post-Tridentine Catholic biblical scholarship, its emphasis upon the Jesuits' highlighting of human agency both in the coming into being of the biblical books and in the economy of salvation, as well as their appeal to authoritative patristic, medieval and early modern authors, are only some aspects amongst many others that make Dr. Murray's book worth reading, from beginning to end.

Wim François

## Abbreviations

CCSL	Corpus Christianorum Series Latina
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
PL	Patrologia Latina
PG	Patrologia Graeca
SC	Sources Chrétiennes



## Contents

Acknowledgments . . . . .	7
Preface . . . . .	9
Abbreviations . . . . .	11
Introduction . . . . .	17
1. Jesuit Biblical Studies after Trent . . . . .	27
1.1 Secondary Literature . . . . .	27
1.2 The Council of Trent . . . . .	41
1.3 The Jesuit Order . . . . .	47
1.3.1 Rules for the Professor of Sacred Scripture . . . . .	51
1.3.2 Rules for the Professor of Hebrew . . . . .	52
1.4 The Galileo Affair and Jesuit Exegesis . . . . .	53
2. Franciscus Toletus . . . . .	59
2.1 A Short Biography . . . . .	59
2.2 Biographical Literature . . . . .	62
2.3 Toletus' Works and Secondary Literature . . . . .	65
2.3.1 Philosophical Works . . . . .	65
2.3.2 Theological Works . . . . .	67
2.3.3 Biblical Works . . . . .	68
2.4 Toletus' Biblical Hermeneutics . . . . .	72
2.4.1 The Inspiration of Scripture . . . . .	72
2.4.1.1 Aquinas on Prophecy . . . . .	75
2.4.2 The Nature of Scripture . . . . .	85
2.4.3 Toletus' Approach to Exegesis . . . . .	89
2.4.3.1 The Four-Fold Sense . . . . .	94
2.4.3.2 Toletus and the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate . . . . .	101

2.4.4	Concluding Words . . . . .	104
3.	Cornelius A Lapide . . . . .	105
3.1	A Short Biography . . . . .	105
3.2	A Lapide's Biblical Works . . . . .	108
3.2.1	Secondary Literature on A Lapide's Hermeneutics . . . . .	109
3.3	A Lapide's Biblical Hermeneutics . . . . .	129
3.3.1	The Inspiration of Scripture . . . . .	129
3.3.2	The Nature of Scripture . . . . .	135
3.3.3	Scripture and Traditions . . . . .	139
3.3.4	A Lapide's Approach to Exegesis . . . . .	141
3.3.5	The Vulgate and the Original Texts/Languages of Scripture . . . . .	145
3.3.6	The Senses of Scripture . . . . .	150
3.3.7	Concluding Words . . . . .	153
4.	Two Commentaries on John 17 . . . . .	155
4.1	Toletus and A Lapide on John 17 . . . . .	155
4.1.1	Two Introductions to the Gospel of John . . . . .	156
4.1.2	Jn 17:1 The Glory of Christ . . . . .	159
4.1.2.1	Toletus on 17:1 . . . . .	159
4.1.2.2	A Lapide on 17:1 . . . . .	161
4.1.3	Grace, Free-Will & Predestination 1: Jn 17:2 . . . . .	162
4.1.3.1	Toletus on 17:2b . . . . .	162
4.1.3.2	A Lapide on 17:2 . . . . .	163
4.1.4	Arianism & the Divinity of the Holy Spirit: 17:3 . . . . .	164
4.1.4.1	Toletus on 17:3 . . . . .	164
4.1.4.2	A Lapide on 17:3 . . . . .	165
4.1.5	Chalcedon Christology: 17:5 . . . . .	167
4.1.5.1	Toletus on 17:5 . . . . .	167
4.1.6	Grace, Free-Will & Predestination 2: 17:6 . . . . .	170
4.1.6.1	Toletus on 17:6 . . . . .	170
4.1.6.2	A Lapide on 17:6 . . . . .	171
4.1.7	Grace, Free-Will & Predestination 3: 17:9-10 . . . . .	171
4.1.7.1	Toletus on 17:9-10 . . . . .	172
4.1.7.2	A Lapide on 17:9-10 . . . . .	173
4.1.8	Unity & Eucharist: 17:11 . . . . .	174
4.1.8.1	Toletus on 17:11 . . . . .	174
4.1.8.2	A Lapide on 17:11 . . . . .	176
4.1.9	Grace, Free-Will, & Predestination 4: 17:12 . . . . .	177
4.1.9.1	Toletus on 17:12 . . . . .	177

4.1.9.2 A Lapide on 17:12 . . . . .	180
4.1.10 Stapleton, Estius, and Cornelius Jansen “of Ghent” . . . . .	183
4.2 Authorities and Sources . . . . .	187
4.2.1 Toletus’ Sources . . . . .	188
4.2.2 A Lapide’s Sources . . . . .	191
Concluding Remarks . . . . .	195
Bibliography . . . . .	203
1. Primary Sources . . . . .	203
2. Secondary Sources . . . . .	206





## Introduction

In the field of biblical hermeneutics, one area which scholarship has neglected is Catholic biblical scholarship during the late sixteenth century. A brief look through a standard textbook on hermeneutics reveals the all-too-common jump from Luther, Calvin and the other Reformers straight to Spinoza and the pioneers of the historical critical method. Catholic figures during late sixteenth century often are considered too reliant on tradition, too entrenched in dogmatic disputes, and just too conservative to be regarded as serious scholars of Scripture. If Catholic hermeneutics are considered, the most common topics addressed include the church's rebuttal of the Protestants' *sola scriptura*, Erasmus and the battle between humanism and scholasticism, and the Council of Trent's affirmation of the traditional canon and the authenticity of the Vulgate; little to no attention is paid to Catholic exegesis itself. Even Louis Pascoe's influential 1966 article, "The Council of Trent and Bible Study: Humanism and Scripture," gives vent to the prejudices that may be at the origin of this lack of interest, viz. that Catholic biblical studies after Trent abandoned their work in Hebrew and Greek and took refuge in the Vulgate and scholastic philosophy. Pascoe's article provides an excellent timeline and summary of the fourth and fifth sessions that addressed the interpretation of Scripture but gives the tendentious impression that Catholic humanistic studies of Scripture nearly ended after Trent, being vanquished by Domingo de Soto's (1494–1560) scholasticism and the fear of Protestantism.

In the final analysis, the failure of the bishops to make the required institutional changes in the education of the clergy rendered the biblical movement at Trent ineffective. By the time the council had finally decreed the establishment of seminaries in 1563, humanism as a factor in theology had run its course; a renascent scholasticism dominated theological studies. What the role of the Word of God might have been in the post-Tridentine Church had the new institutional changes been successfully combined with humanistic methodology is the realm of pure conjecture.<sup>1</sup>

---

1 Louis B. Pascoe, "The Council of Trent and Bible Study: Humanism and Scripture," *The*

In addition to Pascoe, Norbert Lohfink, while acknowledging a “Golden Age” in Catholic biblical studies during the period (especially in Spain), nevertheless denies that this flourishing of Catholic biblical scholarship was the result of the Council of Trent.<sup>2</sup> While Lohfink and Pascoe may have been influenced by the spirit of the sixties that saw too sharp a dichotomy between the renewal after Vatican II and the “step backwards” the Tridentine church was alleged to have taken, Gerald Bray, in his work *Biblical Interpretation: Past & Present*, reveals that this attitude was alive and well in 1996:

By the time a distinctive Catholic theology emerged, after the Council of Trent (1545–63), it was anti-humanistic and ultra-traditional. Later Catholic writers repudiated their predecessors such as Cajetan, and they turned back more and more to patristic and medieval interpretation. This conservatism was coupled with a defensive mentality which ensured that any originality of thought would be suspected of heresy. In such a climate, biblical scholarship was a dangerous activity, and it was more successful than many people would like to think, but it was not creative. There was no Catholic equivalent of covenant theology, and no real encouragement to read the Scriptures, even among the clergy.<sup>3</sup>

Of course, there is also the other extreme. Although less common today, there was a time when Catholic biblical scholarship after Trent was considered to be the greatest biblical era in the history of the church. For example, commenting on the church’s scholarship after Trent, Matthias Joseph Scheeben describes the theological work done during the years 1570–1660 as the “time of flowering” and speaks with tremendous praise for the work done by Catholic scholars, especially Catholic exegetes.

---

*Catholic Historical Review* 52, no. 1 (1966): 18–38, 38. See also Arthur Geoffrey Dickens’ negative treatment of Trent’s decrees on the humanist study of Scripture: A. G. Dickens, *The Counter Reformation* (London: Thames, 1977), 115. Although they will be discussed later, the terms “humanism” and “scholasticism” play a prominent role in this work and therefore deserve a quick word. In the early modern world, those who followed a “humanist” approach usually focused sorely on the letters or words of a text together with a study of its historical context and other factors that shaped the text’s historical development. Those who preferred the “scholastic” method generally preferred starting with the meaning of words, usually drawing on an established authority’s definition, and then systematically connecting these meanings together in a clear and organized manner. As we will see, the methods were not necessarily opposed, and I argue that the Jesuits attempted to harmonize both approaches in their work on Scripture.

2 Norbert Lohfink, “Die Katholische Bibelwissenschaft,” in *Abschied von Trient: Theologie am ende des kirchlichen Mittelalters*, Josef Bielmeier, ed. (Regensburg: Pustet, 1969), 63–73. See especially 63: “So ist, vor allem für Spanien, die Zeit zwischen 1500 und 1650 oft geradezu als das ‘goldene Zeitalter’ der katholischen Exegese bezeichnet worden. Es wäre sicher falsch, in dieser Blüte der Exegese eine Auswirkung des Reformkonzils von Trient zu sehen.”

3 Gerald Bray, *Biblical Interpretation: Past & Present* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1996), 209.

Immediately after the end of the Council of Trent, and stimulated by its discussions and decrees, the true flowering of this period began. In wealth and scope of its achievements, *it has no equal in the history of the Church* (emphasis mine).<sup>4</sup>

Writing during the late nineteenth century, Scheeben boldly states that the theological and exegetical work done after Trent “has no equal in the history of the Church.” These are surprising and strong words from such a prominent and well-read Catholic theologian. Scheeben summarizes the scholarship that was being done after Trent, holding that its great strength and fecundity came from its interdisciplinary character.

According to content and form, the main theological works, as distinct from the purely moral, historical, and canonist works, can be divided into five groups: exegetical, polemical, scholastic, mystical, and patristic. The distinctive mark of the period was that these groups reach, in many ways, mutually into each other. For it is precisely in this that the greatness of this period consists. All sides of theology were cultivated in a most intimate communion and had mutual influence on each other.<sup>5</sup>

Unlike the modern, segregated study of Scripture, Scheeben lauds the “intimate communion” between the different branches of theology, including biblical studies. Scheeben explains that Catholic biblical scholars during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries drew on philological, critical, scholastic, and patristic sources to study Scripture with the goal of aiding the church.

Exegesis was not merely philological and critical but made use of what was valuable in the achievements of scholasticism and patristic studies for a deeper understanding of, and fuller reasoning for, Catholic teaching. The great controversialists had their strength in the connection between scholastic speculative judgment and thorough exegetical knowledge.<sup>6</sup>

A little further in the work, Scheeben mentions Alfonso Salmerón (1515–85), Juan Maldonado (1533–83), Nicolaus Serarius (1555–1609), and Franciscus Toletus (1532–96) as the great lights of Catholic biblical scholarship of the era.

From the very beginning, exegesis, especially in Spain and among the Jesuits, underwent such a grandiose development that little seemed to remain to do in the following period and centuries nourished themselves by the fruits produced at that time. Protestant worshippers of the Bible did not produce anything close to it, neither at that time, nor afterwards. The great exegetes begin with Alfonso Salmerón and his works on the New Testament. They are not a running commentary, but a theologically ordered account of the books of the New Testament, roughly what we call biblical theology today, although they have been too little used and known in this respect... Next to him, as the main

4 Matthias Scheeben, *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik*, 6 vols (Freiburg: Herder, 1882), 1:1083–1085.

5 Scheeben, *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik*, 1:1083–1085.

6 Scheeben, *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik*, 1:1084.

founders of classical interpretation of Scripture, one must mention his fellow Jesuits, Maldonado, a Spaniard in Paris, Franciscus Toletus, a Spaniard in Rome, and Nicolaus Serarius, from Lorraine.<sup>7</sup>

With an apologetic tone characteristic of the nineteenth century, Scheeben states that the quality of Catholic biblical studies was vastly superior to their separated brethren's work. Regardless of the accuracy of his remarks, it is striking how unusual Scheeben's comments appear amid modern biblical studies. Unlike many modern works that have a very precise and narrow scope, Scheeben praises the interdisciplinary character of the biblical work produced during the period.

With these two extreme viewpoints, one rather negative, the other overly positive, I will attempt to navigate a middle course that acknowledges this era's shortcomings but also does not ignore its positive aspects. I hope to show that while there was a conservative reaction against Protestantism, there was also a flourishing of post-Tridentine biblical scholarship and, regardless of its success, a high degree of integration between Catholic theological and biblical studies—something that is largely foreign in contemporary biblical studies. I plan to do this by studying two influential Jesuits from the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries: Franciscus Toletus (1532–96) and Cornelius a Lapide (1567–1637).<sup>8</sup> Studying the two figures will help fill this void in scholarship since they provide a look into Catholic biblical studies during the period. They show, among other things, that Catholics were not mere slaves to the Vulgate and scholastic theology after Trent but were attempting to incorporate the humanist movement into a hermeneutics that could remain faithful to the tradition and magisterium of the church. Their work provides an insightful glimpse into early modern Catholicism and can help grow our knowledge of the history of biblical hermeneutics. The thesis will proceed as follows:

In chapter one, my project will provide the context for studying the biblical hermeneutics of Toletus and A Lapide. It will begin by examining the relevant literature in order to position them within the broader “Golden Age” of biblical scholarship in the post-Tridentine era. Although there are a few encyclopaedic entries and journal articles from the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, little has been written on the two figures since 1940. Despite this vacuum of scholarship, there appears to be a modest growth in the field today. In particular, two monographs should be mentioned, Victor Baroni's “La Contre-Réforme devant la Bible: la question biblique” and Jean-Pierre's Delville's *L'Europe de l'exégèse au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle: Interprétations de la parabole des ouvriers à la vigne*

7 Scheeben, *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik*, 1:1085.

8 Not to be confused with the sixteenth-century Spanish Viceroy of Peru from 1569–1581. Cf. Catherine Julien, “Francisco de Toledo and His Campaign against the Incas,” *Colonial Latin American Review* 16, no. 2 (2007): 243–72.

(*Matthieu 20,1–16*).<sup>9</sup> In addition, publications from Wim François has increased our knowledge of the Louvain/Douai biblical milieu during this “Golden age.”<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, the second volume of *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament, The History of its Interpretation: From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*, edited by Magne Sæbø, has made substantial progress in the field.<sup>11</sup> While briefly discussing the older works, I will primarily draw on the few contemporary works to present the two figures within their historical context.

After examining the secondary literature, the second part of chapter one will study a key influence on Toletus and A Lapide’s biblical hermeneutics: the Council of Trent, and in particular, its fourth and fifth sessions that dealt with Scripture. Here, I will examine the actual documents and relevant literature paying special attention to the recent work of John W. O’Malley as well as older works such Hubert Jedin’s classic studies on the role and development of the Vulgate and the establishment of lectureships in Scripture.<sup>12</sup> After reviewing the

- 
- 9 Jean–Pierre Delville, *L’Europe de l’exégèse au XVIe siècle: Interprétations de la parabole des ouvriers à la vigne (Matthieu 20,1–16)* (Leuven: Peeters, 2004); Victor Baroni, “La Contre–Réforme devant la Bible: la question biblique,” PhD dissertation, Université de Lausanne. (Lausanne: Éditions La Concorde, 1943). Due to a lack of literature on the topic, Baroni’s work was republished in 1986 by Slatkine Reprints at Genève.
- 10 Cf. Wim François, “Augustine and the Golden Age of Biblical Scholarship in Louvain (1550–1650),” in *Shaping the Bible in the Reformation: Books, Scholars and Their Readers in the Sixteenth Century*, Bruce Gordon and Matthew McLean, eds. (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 235–89.
- 11 Magne Sæbø, ed. *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament. The History of Its Interpretation. Vol. II. From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2008). See in particular: Jared Wicks, “Catholic Old Testament Interpretation in the Reformation and Early Confessional Eras,” in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament. The History of Its Interpretation. Vol. II. From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*, ed. Magne Sæbø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2008), 617–48; John Rogerson, “Early Old Testament Critics in the Roman Catholic Church: Focusing on the Pentateuch,” in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament. The History of Its Interpretation. Vol. II. From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*, ed. Magne Sæbø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2008), 837–50; Henk Nellen, “Growing Tension between Church Doctrines and Critical Exegesis of the Old Testament,” in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament. The History of Its Interpretation. Vol. II. From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*, ed. Magne Sæbø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2008), 802–26; Emilia Tejero and Natalio Marcos, “Scriptural Interpretation in Renaissance Spain,” in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament. The History of Its Interpretation. Vol. II. From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*, ed. Magne Sæbø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2008), 231–53; Erika Rummel, “The Textual and Hermeneutic Work of Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam,” in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament. The History of Its Interpretation. Vol. II. From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*, ed. Magne Sæbø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2008), 215–30; Magne Sæbø, “From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment – Aspects of the Cultural and Ideological Framework of Scriptural Interpretation,” in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament. The History of Its Interpretation. Vol. II. From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*, ed. Magne Sæbø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2008), 21–48.
- 12 John O’Malley, *Trent What Happened at the Council* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2013); Hubert Jedin, *A History of the Council of Trent*. 2 vols. (London: T. Nelson, 1961); Baroni, “La Contre–Réforme devant la Bible: la question biblique,” 81–132.

literature, I will examine the debates at the council regarding the humanist study of Scripture and the relationship of the Vulgate to the Greek and Hebrew texts. I will look to advance the position that Trent had a more positive influence on Catholic biblical studies than has been previously thought.

Next, in the third part of chapter one, I will examine the Jesuit Order and its influence on the biblical hermeneutics of Toletus and A Lapide. Beginning with Ignatius and the first Jesuits, I will study the Jesuit order's approach to humanist studies and how they were careful in applying humanist tools to the study of Scripture. Following O'Malley, William Bangert, Carlos Sommervogel and others, I will explain that, while the early Jesuits were formed in scholasticism, they were also enthusiastic supporters of humanist studies, especially rhetoric, since it fit with their mystical theology that sought to incorporate the emotions into one's spiritual life.<sup>13</sup> In other words, the Jesuits drew on the new methods in order to foster a more intimate spirituality among believers, one which encouraged them to draw on their emotions while meditating and studying Scripture. In their academic endeavours, the early Jesuits also sought to present scholastic thought "in new garments," frequently availing themselves of the fruits of the humanist movement.<sup>14</sup> However, since their schools relied on the generosity of the local population they were also cautious when applying humanist tools to church doctrine or to the study of the Vulgate since they wanted to avoid the controversial label of "grammarians." My goal in this section is to show the delicate relationship the Jesuits had between humanist studies and their loyalty to the church's interpretative tradition.

In chapter two, the life and biblical hermeneutics of Franciscus Toletus will be examined in five parts. The first part will be a brief summary of his life, looking at how a poor boy from Córdoba, Spain would become the first Jesuit Cardinal. The second part will review the relevant secondary literature on his life and career. After addressing the major events of his life and the scant literature, the third part of the chapter will list his philosophical, theological, and biblical works in the order of their publication and will discuss the relevant secondary literature for each type of work. I will show how most modern literature focuses primarily on his philosophy, secondarily on his theology, and hardly at all on his biblical hermeneutics, as there are only two works that directly examine Toletus' approach, Richard Simon's 1678 *Histoire Critique* and Romualdo Galdós' 1940

13 John O'Malley, *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993); William Bangert, *A History of the Society of Jesus* (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1972); Carlos Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus: nouvelle édition*, 12 vols. (Brussels: Oscar Schepens and Alphonse Picard, 1890); Baroni, "La Contre-Réforme devant la Bible: la question biblique," 245–87.

14 O'Malley, *Jesuits*, 254–55.

essay “Meritos Escriturísticos del Cardenal Francisco De Toledo S.I.”<sup>15</sup> The fourth part of this chapter will then turn directly to Toletus’ biblical hermeneutics by bringing forward relevant passages from his commentaries on John, Luke, and Paul’s letters. This part will also show how Toletus’ position on the inspiration and nature of Scripture were influenced by Thomas Aquinas’ understanding of prophecy and the prophetic mechanism whereby God elevated the mind of the prophet to know and communicate supernatural truth. The latter sections will study Toletus’ general approach to exegesis, his views on the “four-fold sense” of Scripture, and his role in the production of the “Sixto-Clementine Vulgate.” The chapter will conclude by affirming the importance of Toletus in the history of Catholic and Jesuit biblical scholarship and appeal for further studies into his theological and biblical works.

With a similar structure to chapter two, chapter three will examine the life, works, and biblical hermeneutics of Cornelius A Lapide, as well as relevant secondary literature. It will begin by providing a brief summary of his life and career and touch on the key sources for studying his biography. Next, it will provide a list of A Lapide’s biblical works in the order of their publication and examine the relevant secondary literature on his biblical hermeneutics. Summarizing the relevant literature, this section will focus on the important works of Henry Koren, Romualdo Galdós, Sebastiano Pagano, and the excellent work of Raymund Noll in his book on A Lapide’s Mariology. In addition, Pierre Gibert’s brief treatment in the *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament* and Jean-Pierre Delville’s work (among others) will be addressed.<sup>16</sup> In the third and final part of the chapter, I will turn to programmatic passages where A Lapide’s approach to

15 Richard Simon, *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament* (Paris: Suivant la copie imprimée à Paris, 1680); Romualdo Galdós, “Meritos Escriturísticos del Cardenal Francisco De Toledo S.I.,” *Archivio Teologico Granadino* 3 (1940): 19–33.

16 Henry Koren, “De Inspiratione Sacrae Scripturae secundum doctrinam Cornelii a Lapide,” PhD dissertation, Catholic University of America, (Washington, D.C.: University Press, 1942); Romualdo Galdós, “De canonibus exegeticis apud P. Cornelium a Lapide,” *Verbum Domini* 17 (1937): 146–52; Romualdo Galdós, “De scripturasticis meritis Patris Cornelii a Lapide I,” *Verbum Domini* 17 (1937): 39–44; Romualdo Galdós, “De scripturasticis meritis Patris Cornelii a Lapide II,” *Verbum Domini* 17 (1937): 88–96; Sebastiano Pagano, “Analysis Notionis Inspirationis S. Scripturae apud Cornelium a Lapide,” *Revue de l’Université d’Ottawa* 15 (1945): 65–85; Gerhard Boss, *Die Rechtfertigungslehre in den Bibelkommentaren des Cornelius a Lapide* (Munich: Aschendorff, 1962); Raymund Noll, *Die mariologischen Grundlinien im exegetischen Werk des Cornelius a Lapide (1567–1637)* (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 2003); Pierre Gibert, “The Catholic Counterpart and Response to the Protestant Orthodoxy,” in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament. The History of Its Interpretation. Vol. II. From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*, ed. Magne Sæbø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2008), 758–73; Jean-Pierre Delville, “La lettre de Jacques aux XVIe–XVIIe siècles chez les exégètes catholiques en particulier Érasme, Guillaume Estius et Cornelius à Lapide,” in *L’épître de Jacques dans sa tradition d’exégèse*, ed. A. Noblesse-Rocher, G. Dahan, and M. Arnold (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2012), 119–45.



Scripture can be identified. In particular, I will draw especially from his introductions to his commentaries on the Pentateuch, on the Prophets, and on Paul's letters. One of the benefits of studying A Lapeire is that he often begins each of his commentaries with a section labelled "canons" in which he lays out particular points to aid in one's interpretation. These "canons" provide an informative glimpse into his views regarding Scripture and its interpretation. In addition to studying his views of the inspiration and nature of Scripture, his general approach to exegesis will be examined, including his views on different senses of Scripture and the relationship of the Vulgate to the original Greek and Hebrew texts. Chapter three will conclude by discussing Gibert's assertion that A Lapeire was "a sort of transition" between the humanist / medieval commentators of Scripture and the more critical work of later commentators.

After detailing the hermeneutics of the two Jesuits, chapter four will compare Toletus and A Lapeire's commentaries on John 17:1–12 in order to showcase their different approaches and to ascertain their positions on the key issues of their day, namely, grace, free-will, and predestination.<sup>17</sup> While A Lapeire's commentary on John has already been translated into English, Toletus' biblical commentaries have never been translated and so my study will provide an insightful glimpse into his biblical hermeneutics and worldview. In regard to their views on the explosive issues of grace, free-will, predestination, the chapter will reveal that Toletus favors the thought of Cyril of Alexandria and leans toward a more "molinist" approach that emphasized the importance of cooperating with grace, while A Lapeire was more "moderate" in his views, generally preferring the views of Augustine and affirming the primacy of predestination. In order to better situate Toletus and A Lapeire within their historical context on these important theological issues, the next section will examine the positions of three Catholic scholars from different theological schools. By comparing and contrasting the views of Toletus and A Lapeire on John 17:12 and the fall of Judas with those of Thomas Stapleton (1535–98), Cornelius Jansen "of Ghent" (1510–76), and Guilielmus Estius (1542–1613), the work will reveal the broad range of positions on grace, free-will, and predestination among Catholic scholars during the early modern era.

Finally, in addition to a study of their general hermeneutics and historical context, this chapter will provide an analysis of the authorities and sources cited by Toletus and A Lapeire in their commentaries on John 17:1–12 and other important passages. It will become obvious that the patristic fathers play a large

17 Cornelius a Lapeire, *Commentarii in IV Evangelia: in duo volumina divisi* (Lyon: Boissat and Associates, 1638). Franciscus Toletus, *Doctoris Francisci Toleti Cordubensis E Societate Iesu, In Sacrosanctum Ioannis Evangelium Commentarii: Adiecti Sunt Tres Indices* (Rome: Tornerius, 1588).

role for both Jesuits. While Toletus distances himself from contemporaries, or at least does not mention them by name, A Lapide takes great care to reference both ancient and contemporary scholars, both Catholic and Protestant. Both seem to point to the interpretations of the patristic fathers, supposed authorities, in order to refute Protestant positions, showing the importance of Scripture in the life and history of the Catholic Church.

My project will conclude in chapter five by summarizing the work and returning to the two different views regarding Catholic and Jesuit exegesis, offering a new judgment on Catholic biblical scholarship in the post-Tridentine Era. Both positions have merit but need to be nuanced in order to explain how a conservative reaction against Protestantism was combined with a real appreciation for humanist studies and the belief that all available resources (historical, humanist, theological, dogmatic, etc.) should be integrated in one's biblical hermeneutics. I also hope to argue that the Council of Trent had a more positive influence on Catholic biblical studies than what has generally been believed. Finally, I will explain how Catholic, and especially Jesuit, scholars were using the church's dogmas as lights to aid them in their interpretation of Scripture and viewed the "literal sense" in a slightly different way than is common today.