

THE STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT
IN THE DUTCH UNIVERSITIES,
1575–1700

Henk J. de Jonge

The first universities in the Northern Netherlands were founded as a direct result of the Dutch struggle for greater political, intellectual and religious independence from Spain in the sixteenth century.* The University of Leiden was established in 1575,¹ the University of Franeker in Friesland in 1585.² In both cases, one of the foremost goals of the founders was to train ministers for the Reformed Church, and so maintain and build up the Protestant cause which until very recently had been forbidden and persecuted.³

The typically 'Reformation' character of the Faculty of Theology at Leiden is clearly expressed in the earliest curriculum of the University, the so-called *Institutionis formae Hypotyposis*, which dates from 1575.⁴ In traditional faculties of theology in Catholic universities such as Louvain, lectures were of two sorts, depending on their subject: either on the Bible or on dogmatic theology, which was generally taught from the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard or from the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas.⁵ In Leiden, on the other hand, it was proposed that, besides practice in preaching and theological debate (*conciones* and *disputationes*), the course should only consist of exegetical lectures on the Old and New Testament. These lectures had to be based on the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Bible. Courses in systematic theology were specifically rejected. The depreciatory terms in which authors of works on dogmatic theology were excluded from the programme of the new university are worth quoting.

'In order that the student can learn theology here, the lectures given are not upon torturers and sophists, unaccustomed to the truth [i.e., dogmatists], but on those two heavenly and divine suns, the Old Testament in Hebrew, the New Testament in Greek. (...)'⁶

In this rejection of systematic theology, Leiden followed the still young, but strong, tradition of the Reformation. Higher theological education at Basel, Tübingen, Wittenberg, Zürich, Geneva and Heidelberg had already been remodelled to exclude, for longer or

shorter periods, lectures on dogmatics and to confine the course to the study of the Scriptures.

It is true that until about 1600 the lectures announced by the Leiden theology professors were only concerned with particular books of the Bible. This is evident from the lecture programmes which have been preserved.⁷ We must, however, be careful not to assume that this meant the abolition of all teaching of dogma. In fact, dogma simply found its way into the lectures on biblical exegesis. The recasting of the contents of the Bible into the theses of a modern systematic doctrinal theology was indeed the normal exegetical method of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century theologians, not only at Leiden, but also at Franeker and other Dutch universities: Groningen, founded in 1614,⁸ Utrecht in 1636,⁹ and Harderwijk founded in 1648.¹⁰ The predominance of dogmatic interest in the exposition of the New Testament can be seen in the commentaries of such outstanding theologians as Franciscus Junius (at Leiden from 1592 to 1602),¹¹ Franciscus Gomarus (at Leiden from 1594 to 1611 and at Groningen from 1618 to 1641),¹² Johannes Coccejus (at Franeker from 1636 to 1650 and at Leiden from 1650 to 1669),¹³ Jacobus Altling (at Groningen from 1642 to 1679)¹⁴ and Hermannus Witsius (at Franeker from 1675 to 1680, at Utrecht from 1680 to 1698, and at Leiden from 1698 to 1709).¹⁵

In seventeenth-century Dutch divinity faculties the result of the reformation principle, that truth could not be derived from ecclesiastical authors, but only from the Scriptures (*sola scriptura*) was that the Scriptures came to be regarded as a source book for dogma,¹⁶ the point of departure for the elaboration of doctrinal theories to be applied to the seventeenth-century audience. When in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries reformed orthodoxy slowly but surely lost ground to rationalism and the Enlightenment, reformed scholastic exegesis disappeared at the same time.¹⁷

It is often argued that the path to the modern critical historical study of the Bible was prepared by the Copernican revolution and by the theories of Descartes and Spinoza.¹⁸ In my view, it would be more accurate to say that although those ideas contributed to the decline of older ideologies, the actual renewal of biblical scholarship was not a product of rationalism, but of trilingual philology, itself one of the fruits of humanism. Philologists were under no obligation to make the Bible fit the terms of a sixteenth- or seventeenth-century doctrine. They were therefore free to concentrate on the investigation of what the writings of the Bible had meant to their original audience at the time of their composition. While the crisis of the European mind vanquished the older systems of theology with their associated exegeses, philologists were laying foundations on which the nineteenth-century historical-critical study of the Bible could be built. This is the theme which I hope to illustrate here.

For a time, little progress was made in the field of textual criticism. True, Joseph Scaliger, an honorary professor at Leiden from 1593 to his death in 1609,¹⁹ confided to his students that the manuscripts of the Greek New Testament available in his day were ‘very corrupt’²⁰ and that an older and better text could be found in the biblical citations of the Fathers. About 1615 the Leiden Hebrew Professor, W. Coddæus, did in fact plan an edition of New Testament citations from patristic authors, intended to bring together early variant readings.²¹ But the official University Printers, Raphelengius and the Elzeviers, continued to print editions of the New Testament—eight of them up to 1650—which were all indirectly derived from either the Complutensian Polyglot or Erasmus’ editions,²² all of which had contained a late and degenerate Byzantine recension of the text.²³ Daniel Heinsius, the professor of history at the University of Leiden (1612–1655; before this he had been professor of poetry, 1603–1605, and of Greek, 1605–1612),²⁴ believed that variants found in the study of New Testament manuscripts should never be incorporated into the text, but only placed in the margin.²⁵ Heinsius in fact believed that the ‘legitimus verusque contextus’ of the New Testament had been so well reconstructed by the scholars of the Renaissance that New Testament textual criticism could be considered a closed chapter of science.²⁶ No one but Scaliger had yet realised that the *textus receptus* (this term was used for the first time by Heinsius in the preface to the Elzevier Greek Testament of 1633) was not to be patched up with a few variant readings from preceding editions whose texts were just as bad, but had to be completely abandoned in favour of a new recension from early textual witnesses. Confidence in the current text, fed by religious scruples, had not been adequately put to the test. Far more variants would have to be collected and published before the idea could take root that the *textus receptus* as a whole would have to go.

It was a step in the right direction when in 1658 a new edition of the Greek New Testament appeared at Amsterdam, prepared by Stephanus Curcellæus, a professor at the Arminian College (or Remonstrant Seminary) there. This institution had been established in 1634 to train Arminian preachers, after Arminian theologians had been excluded from the University of Leiden in 1619.²⁷ In Curcellæus’ edition the *textus receptus* is accompanied by a critical apparatus which contains a respectable number of variants, drawn from other editions and manuscripts.²⁸ Unfortunately, however, Curcellæus did not quote the authorities for his variants, so that his critical labours were of little use for later editors. The marginal collection of parallel passages in his edition is valuable and has been used by other compilers of such lists. Curcellæus’ edition was reprinted five times up to 1693.²⁹

Another professor at the Arminian College was Jean Le Clerc (Clericus) who taught Greek, Hebrew, philosophy, church history and other subjects there for almost fifty years from 1684 to 1731 (he

died in 1736).³⁰ He displayed a more radically critical attitude to the text of the New Testament than any of his predecessors. In his *Ars Critica* of 1696 he assumed as axiomatic that the New Testament had been transmitted with the same risks of corruption as any other ancient text, and must therefore be reconstructed according to the same critical laws.³¹ Clericus stated in the preface to his own French translation of the New Testament that he would not have based it on the *textus receptus* but on the old Codex Alexandrinus, which had reached England in 1627, if that had been published.³²

Finally, several editions of early oriental translations were of great importance for the textual criticism of the New Testament.³³ In 1616 the Leiden Arabist Thomas Erpenius published the first complete New Testament in Arabic.³⁴ In 1627 Louis de Dieu, a reformed minister and later a Regent of the Walloon College at Leiden (the training school for preachers in the French language)³⁵ published the Apocalypse in the seventh-century Syriac recension of Thomas of Heraclea.³⁶ Johan Leusden, professor of Greek and Hebrew at Utrecht (1650–1699) and Carolus Schaaf, reader in oriental languages at Leiden (1680–1720; professor to 1729), collaborated on a useful edition of the fourth-century Syro-Peshitta, which appeared in 1708 (reissue 1717).³⁷ These and other ancient translations³⁸ made it plain that at an early stage of textual transmission, the text of the New Testament had differed from the *textus receptus*, and thus they contributed to the supersession of the *textus receptus* by a more critical text in the nineteenth century.

From the second quarter of the seventeenth century the Reformed Church required all students who intended to become ministers to prove an ability to read and understand the New Testament in Greek.³⁹ In all Dutch universities, therefore, the professor of Greek in the faculty of arts, who was very often also the professor of Hebrew, gave tuition in Greek for students of theology. This is the background against which we have to see the work of Georg Pasor, professor of Greek at Franeker from 1626 to 1637. He was the author of a detailed grammar of New Testament Greek, the first ever published, and a very good one which devoted much attention to syntax.⁴⁰ Pasor was also the founder of New Testament lexicography. He compiled his important dictionaries of the New Testament, in both their detailed⁴¹ and abridged version,⁴² before he came to the Netherlands, but continued to issue them in revised and frequently reprinted editions when he became a professor at Franeker. Pasor's works had a didactic purpose, but by virtue of their soundness they made a first-rate contribution to the philological study of the New Testament.⁴³

The language of the New Testament also became the subject of heated scholarly dispute. Around 1640 two of the greatest names in the university of Leiden, Daniel Heinsius and Claudius Salmasius (who filled the honorary post formerly created for Scaliger from 1633

to 1653), with their respective supporters, engaged each other in a vehement polemic. In his *Exercitationes Sacrae* of 1639, Heinsius had described the language of the New Testament as a *dialectus Hellenistica*, being a language of Greek words with Hebrew (or at least Semitic) meanings. Salmasius denied that this form of Greek was a 'dialect', for according to him it was not the regional speech of a tribe or nation. Salmasius also believed that it was mistaken to characterise it as 'Hellenistic', for there had never been a 'Hellenistic' people, as there had for example been Ionians and Dorians. According to Salmasius, New Testament Greek was simply one form of the widely disseminated world language which Greek had become by the first century.⁴⁴ He explained the Semitic turns of phrase, which Heinsius regarded as the characteristics of the dialect of Greek-speaking Jews (= Hellenists), partly as over-literal renderings of the Hebrew and Aramaic originals from which, in his view, most of the New Testament writings had been translated, and partly as the result of the bilingualism with which he credited Paul and Luke.

It has often been argued that this controversy between Heinsius and Salmasius was no more than a battle about the terms 'dialect' and 'Hellenistic'. But Salmasius himself already denied this, and rightly, I think. The question at issue was a very serious and highly important one, even for the twentieth-century student of the New Testament, namely whether the Greek of the Gospels has ever really existed as a language by itself, spoken by a certain group of people during a certain lapse of time, or is no more than an incidental 'Momentbildung' which only took shape when the Gospel tradition was recorded in Greek. This is by no means an insignificant problem and it testifies to Heinsius' and Salmasius' intellectual sense that they succeeded in sublimating their heart-felt envy and hatred into a scholarly dispute on this topic. — It is true that Heinsius had drawn too sharp a distinction between New Testament Greek and normal post-classical Greek. Salmasius was right to maintain that the Greek of the New Testament was organically connected with the rest of the language. He understood better than Heinsius that the language of the New Testament displayed the hallmarks of a nonliterary colloquial speech, and that written documents of daily life, such as letters and accounts, if they had been preserved, would have provided very important illustrations of such biblical Greek.⁴⁵ But his objections against Heinsius' terms 'dialect' and 'Hellenistic' have little foundation when seen with hindsight, while his contention that the Semitisms in the Greek New Testament are the result of over-literal translation and of bilingualism is in general untenable and requires substantial modification.

Another battle, fought in other countries as well as in the Netherlands, arose from a rather false premise, but still produced some useful results.⁴⁶ Sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century scholars, such as Erasmus, H. Stephanus, Beza, and J. Drusius⁴⁷

were not blind to the fact that the Greek New Testament contains a great many solecisms and Hebraisms. When the doctrine of the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures gained ground in seventeenth-century Protestantism, many were faced with a problem: how could the Bible, if it were God's verbally inspired Word, contain grammatical impurities? Most of them solved the problem by admitting the presence of Hebraisms but declaring them to be beauties of language without which the full force and depth of religious meaning could not have been expressed: normal Greek would have been inadequate. This was the view of the so-called Hebraists, among whom were Heinsius, De Dieu and Salmasius at Leiden, Leusden at Utrecht,⁴⁸ and Martinus Schoockius, professor of logic and ethics at Groningen (1641–1669).⁴⁹ Ranged against the Hebraists were the Purists who denied that the New Testament was disfigured by any barbarisms or grammatical irregularities. So far as possible they tried to explain the Hebraisms which their opponents pointed out, as correct Greek, by adducing parallels from non-biblical Greek sources. The first Purist was Sebastian Pfochen, a student of Pasor at Franeker. Pfochen seems to have been inspired by his mentor Pasor to write his *Diatribae de linguae Graecae puritate* against Johannes Coccejus, then his fellow student at Franeker.⁵⁰ In the eighteenth century a more moderate form of Purism produced a new, characteristic and prolific genre of scholarly literature, the so-called *Observationes*. Dozens of books were published, especially in Germany, collecting parallels between the language of the New Testament and other ancient Greek writings.⁵¹ They often bore such titles as *Observationes in Novum Testamentum e* (for example) *Flavio Josepho*,⁵² and contained both worthwhile and useless information. Perhaps the earliest specimen of this copious literature was the work of Lambertus Bos, reader (1697–1704) and later professor of Greek (1704–1717) at Franeker,⁵³ entitled *Exercitationes philologicae in quibus Novi Foederis loca nonnulla e... auctoribus Graecis illustrantur* (Franeker, 1700).⁵⁴ In its moderate form, Purism thus became a strong and influential tradition: in the twentieth century it is represented by leading New Testament dictionaries, such as that of Walter Bauer,⁵⁵ and grammars, such as that of Friedrich Blass and Albert Debrunner.⁵⁶

The new perspectives opened up in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century biblical exegesis are clearly seen in a number of philological commentaries of the period. They no longer twisted ancient documents to fit a modern doctrine, by means of logical and dialectical distinctions drawn from Aristotelian tradition, but instead considered the writings of the New Testament as ancient texts which had to be understood in the context of the period in which they were composed. This approach was founded by Erasmus, and its fundamental method was comparison—comparison with other works of ancient literature. Three complexes of ancient sources had to be employed in this

comparison.

Firstly, ancient Jewish literature, that is, the Old Testament in Hebrew and Greek, Philo, Josephus, and the immense rabbinical literature. The first scholar to present a fairly extensive collection of illustrations from this source was Johannes Drusius, professor of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Syriac at Oxford (1572–6), later at Leiden (1577–85) and finally at Franeker (1585–1616), in his numerous commentaries on all the books of the Bible.⁵⁷ Drusius rightly enjoys the honour of having almost all his exegetical works and monographs on biblical subjects, together with his biography and bibliography, incorporated in the *Critici Sacri*, that great seventeenth-century collection of the best philological exegetes of the Bible from Valla to Grotius.⁵⁸

A second source of comparative material was formed by the ancient versions of the New Testament. Their importance lay in the fact that they revealed, often in very fine detail, the nuances of meaning attached to the words of the New Testament in antiquity. The specialist in this field was the Leiden orientalist Louis de Dieu, Regent of the Walloon College there from 1637 to 1642.⁵⁹ He published commentaries in the form of *Animadversiones* on selected passages of the whole New Testament, systematically comparing its text with the ancient translations into Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic and Latin. For the Gospel of Matthew he also compared the more recent versions into Hebrew. The access to his commentaries is facilitated by the edition of his collected exegetical works which appeared more than fifty years after his death, in 1693.⁶⁰

The third mine of useful exegetical information was found in the writings of the Fathers. They often made observations and suggested interpretations which are worth consideration. The examination of patristic exegesis was one of the elements of Daniel Heinsius' *Exercitationes Sacrae*,⁶¹ published in 1639.

It would be far from true to say that these three fields were strictly divided between Drusius, De Dieu and Heinsius. All three of them moved freely in each of these areas, as well as drawing on pagan Latin and Greek authors. One example of the many benefits of this philological approach may be given here. Citing passages from Homer, Aristotle, the Septuagint, Hesychius and Jerome, Heinsius rightly pointed out that the adjective *agapetos*, 'beloved,' was frequently used of an *only* child.⁶² To translate as 'beloved' the adjective in the account of Jesus' baptism, 'this is my beloved son,'⁶³ was in Heinsius' opinion inadequate. His translation was 'this is my only son.' In various twentieth-century versions⁶⁴ the sentence is in fact rendered as 'this is my only son' or 'my dear and only son.'⁶⁵

However useful the works of Drusius, De Dieu and Heinsius were by virtue of their method and content, they were far excelled in utility by the New Testament commentary of another Netherlander, the

Annotationes in Novum Testamentum of Hugo Grotius. These were published in three parts with different publishers in Amsterdam and Paris over a period of nine years, from 1641 to 1650.⁶⁶ Grotius' classical learning, his masterly good sense, his brevity, independence, and incomparable lucidity make his annotations the best biblical commentary produced in seventeenth-century Europe.⁶⁷ They are often referred to up to the present day. Regrettably, I can do no more than mention this in passing, for Grotius was never able to hold a position at any academic institution in his own country.

We can scarcely speak of literary and historical criticism of the New Testament in the seventeenth century. True, Scaliger denied, with reason, the authenticity of no fewer than eight of the New Testament writings,⁶⁸ and more importantly he fundamentally rejected any attempt to harmonise contradictory accounts given in the New Testament. For example, he saw more clearly than anyone else in his time, or than many in ours, that Mark's narrative of the death of John the Baptist cannot possibly be reconciled with the corresponding passage in Josephus.⁶⁹ But he could find no other explanation for these discrepancies than to attribute them to later additions in the manuscripts of the Gospel. Thus he confused historical criticism with textual criticism. His successor Salmasius also showed signs of a penetrating insight into these problems. Faced with the contradictory accounts of the death of Judas in Matthew 27: 3–10 and Acts 1: 16–20, he remarked that the then customary attempts to harmonise them would have to be abandoned; the different versions were to be seen as the result of two different traditions, which had been able to take root because nothing had originally been known about the nature of Judas' death.⁷⁰ This was indeed an unusually perceptive and modern insight, which Clericus had still not reached half a century later. In 1699 he published the Gospels in Greek, in four parallel columns with passages of corresponding content placed next to each other.⁷¹ This was the first Greek synopsis of the Gospels.⁷² In so far as the corresponding narratives agreed with each other, Clericus regarded them, as he explained in an appendix, as reports of a single historical event; he saw the discrepancies as variants which would naturally arise whenever several people gave an account of the same event. Clericus thus accepted that the Gospels presented differences which could not be reconciled, but he still sought a common historical core. He showed some sign of a rationalist source criticism, but failed to follow the radical approach of Salmasius. In any case, these are isolated high points, and in general the dominant tendency was still to regard the Bible as a narrative of historical events, and to harmonise its discrepancies.

'Tradition' and 'innovation' are categories which will serve very well to describe the history of New Testament scholarship in the Dutch universities and the Arminian College before 1700. Tradition

showed its vitality in an exegesis conditioned by dogmatic theology, in the prominence of the *textus receptus*, and in the ingrained desire to treat the Gospels as historical narratives capable of being harmonised. Innovation made itself felt in efforts to collect variant readings, in the attention devoted to the grammar of New Testament Greek, in the publication and study of ancient oriental versions, and above all in the illumination of the New Testament by means of comparison with Jewish, pagan, and early Christian sources. In the nineteenth century the philological study of the New Testament ousted dogmatic exegesis from theological faculties. Nowadays, the critical study of the Bible continues within the faculties of theology the work which sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Hellenists, Semitists, and historians began outside them.

*Zeemanlaan 47
2313 SW Leiden
The Netherlands*

Appendix An official view of the Leiden Theological Faculty concerning the nature of New Testament Greek (1637)

On 26 May 1637 all four theology professors at Leiden, as well as the professor of Hebrew C. L'Empereur and the orientalist L. de Dieu, the Regent of the Walloon College, signed a testimonial in favour of a certain German, Samuel Heucherus. In this document they declared that Heucherus' work in the field of Hebrew lexicography was of great importance, and that he deserved to be considered for financial support.¹

This statement, which has not been published, contains a short but interesting passage in which the Leiden theologians and orientalist gave their joint opinion of the nature of New Testament Greek. Eight years earlier Sebastian Pfochen, a pupil of Georg Pasor at Franeker, had claimed in his *Diatriba de linguae Graecae Novi Testamenti puritate* (which was reprinted in 1633) that there were no Hebraisms in the New Testament, yet despite this the Leiden scholars chose to adopt the contrary view, that every page of the New Testament contained various Hebrew turns of phrase, albeit in Greek. The testimonial says: 'Hebrew holds the place of honour above all other languages, for it contains more utterances of God than any other tongue. And as far as the Greek of the New Testament is concerned,

there is not a page in it which does not contain various Hebrew turns of phrase (*phrases*), albeit in Greek words (*voces*).¹

This sentence was of course written to recommend Heucherius' Hebrew studies; we cannot consider it as proof of a conscious and explicit statement of a position in the Hebraist-Purist controversy inaugurated by Pfochen's *Diatribes*. But this sentence about the New Testament could have been omitted without detracting from the value of the testimonial on behalf of the Hebraist. It is therefore worthy of note that the six influential signatories spontaneously joined in expressing the view that the New Testament contained Hebrew expressions in the guise of Greek words. By Hebrew *phrases* they meant, without doubt, to refer to expressions which may have derived certain external characteristics and certainly took their meaning and connotations, from Hebrew equivalents. Hugo Grotius described the phenomenon clearly shortly afterwards in his commentary on Matthew 11: 21, 'Greek-speaking Jews used a Hebrew word in its Hebrew sense, even in Greek', *Hellenistae Hebraeam vocem sensu Hebraico usurparunt etiam in Graeco sermone*.

The view of New Testament Greek adopted in the testimonial for Heucherius was not exceptional; for most of the signatories it is easy to find cases in which they clearly reveal their support for this view.² What is interesting is that the theology professors acting together with the Hebraist and a Regent of one of the theological colleges, adopted a more or less official standpoint. Moreover, the Leiden theology faculty had in 1625 already stated a similar official view on New Testament Greek in the *Synopsis purioris theologiae*.³ In this work professor Antonius Thysius had maintained that the language of the New Testament was, apart from the Hebrew and Aramaic words which it included, Greek 'as it was current in East and West, but of a style which was partly vulgar and partly Hebraeo-Greek, as used by Greek-speaking Jews.'

The opening passage and the conclusion of the testimonial for Heucherius read, in the sometimes questionable Latin (*quod . . . concernit* in the sense 'as far as . . . is concerned?') as follows:

Prae reliquis linguis palmam obtinet Hebraea: quandoquidem non datur alia, quae plura Dei eloquia continet. Et quod Graecam Novi Testamenti concernit, nulla ibi pagina, quin plures phrases Ebraeas contineat, vocibus licet Graecis.

. . .
. . .

Lugduni Batavorum, 7 Cal. Jun., Anno partae salutis 1637.

Johannes Polyander,
Antonius Thysius,
Antonius Walaeus,
Jacobus Triglandus,
Constantinus L'Empereur,
Louis de Dieu.

REFERENCES

*The author owes a debt of gratitude to Dr J.C. Grayson (London) who bestowed great care on the English of this contribution. For any deficiency of wording or style, however, the author remains responsible.

1 For extensive recent bibliographies on the universities at Leiden and Franeker, see R E O Ekkart's contributions in *Bibliographie internationale de l'histoire des universités* (Geneva Droz, 1976) 2 83–140 and in Th H Lunsingh Scheurleer and G H M Posthumus Meyjes (eds), *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century An Exchange of Learning* (Leiden Brill, 1975), pp 467–79. On the foundation of Leiden University, see M W Jurriaense, *The Founding of Leyden University* (Leiden Brill, 1965), J J Woltjer's Introduction to *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century, Leidse Universiteit 400 Stichting en eerste bloei 1575 – ca 1650* [Leiden University 400 Founding and earliest flourishing, 1575 – ca 1650] (Amsterdam Rijksmuseum, 1975), p 76, nos A 131–2, H J Witkam, *De financiën van de Leidse universiteit in de 16de eeuw* (Leiden Witkam, 1979) 1 chap 3 'Religionis ergo'

2 W B S Boeles, *Friesland's Hoogeschool en het Rijks Athenaeum te Franeker*, 2 vols (Leeuwarden Kuipers, 1878–89), 1 5–14, A Hallema, 'De stichting der voormalige Friesche Hoogeschool te Franeker en de vaderlandse kerk' [The founding of the former university of Friesland at Franeker and the national Church], *Stemmen des Tijds* 24 (1935) 124–38

3 This is an established fact for Leiden and Franeker, but less so for later Dutch universities, see H H Kuyper, *De opleiding tot den dienst des Woords bij de Gereformeerden* [The education for the ministry of God's Word among the Reformed protestants] (The Hague Nijhoff, 1891), pp 430–44, *Leidse Universiteit 400*, p 76 — J A van Dorsten, *Poets, Patrons, and Professors* (Leiden Universitaire Pers, 1962), pp 7–8, and idem and P A M Geurts, 'Drie redevoeringen van B Vulcanius over de stichting van de Leidse universiteit' [Three addresses by Vulcanius on the founding of Leiden University], *Bydragen en Mededelingen van het Historisch Genootschap* 79 (1965) 387–413, do not take full account of all evidence and thereby underestimate the importance attached to the training of preachers as a motive for the founding of Leiden university

4 For its text, see P C Molhuysen, ed, *Bronnen tot de geschiedenis der Leidse universiteit* [Sources for the history of Leiden university], 7 vols (The Hague Nijhoff, 1913–24) 1 39*–43* This curriculum has never been officially adopted, but as far as the exclusion of systematic theology is concerned, the Leiden practice until ca 1595 reflected exactly the principle laid down in the *Hypotyposis*

5 E J M van Eijl, 'De theologische faculteit te Leuven in de XV^e en XVI^e eeuw' in E J M van Eijl, ed, *Facultas S Theologiae Lovaniensis 1432–1797*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 45 (Louvain University Press, 1977), pp 69–153, esp 111–5

6 'Hic, ut theologiam discere queat, non quaestionarii aut sophistae ventatis insolentes proponuntur, sed soles illi duo caelestes ac divini, alter Testamenti veteris Hebraice alter novi Graece exponuntur, ()'

7 Molhuysen, *Bronnen*, 1 157* (for the year 1587), 192* (for 1592), and 362* (for 1595) The earliest theology professor known to have read courses on systematic dogmatic theology at Leiden is Lucas Trelocatus senior, who taught *loci communes* in 1595, see *ibidem* 362* In 1599 he read *de libero arbitrio* (*ibidem* 384*) and in 1601 *de persona et officio Christi* (*ibidem* 400*)

8 W J A Jonckbloet, *Gedenkboek der Hoogeschool te Groningen* (Groningen Wolters, 1864), *Academia Groningana MDCXIV–MCMXIV* (Groningen Noordhof, 1914), J B F Heerspink, *De godgeleerdheid en hare beoefenaars aan de Hoogeschool te Groningen* (Groningen Van Zweedden, 1864)

124 *History of Universities*

- 9 G W Kernkamp, ed, *Acta et decreta Senatus, Vroedschapsresolutien en andere bescheiden betreffende de Utrechtse Academie*, 3 vols (Utrecht Broekhoff, 1936–1940) idem et al., *De Utrechtse Universiteit 1636–1936*, 2 vols (Utrecht Oosthoek 1936), J A Cramer, *De Theologische Faculteit te Utrecht ten tijde van Voetus* (Utrecht Kemink, 1932)
- 10 H Bouman *Geschiedenis van de voormalige Geldersche Hoogeschool en hare Hoogleraren*, 2 vols (Utrecht Terveen, 1844–7)
- 11 F W Cuno, *Franciscus Junius der Altere, Professor der Theologie und Pastor (1545–1602)* (Amsterdam Scheffer, 1891), J P de Bie and J Loosjes, eds., *Biographisch Woordenboek van Protestantische Godgeleerden in Nederland*, 6 vols (The Hague Nijhoff, n d –1949) s v 'Junius, Franciscus', with bibliography
- 12 G P van Itterzon, *Franciscus Gomarus* (The Hague Nijhoff, 1930), esp pp 325–368 on Gomarus biblical exegesis, De Bie and Loosjes, *Biographisch Woordenboek*, s v Gomarus Franciscus'
- 13 De Bie and Loosjes, *Biographisch Woordenboek*, s v 'Coccejus, Johannes', G van Gorkom, *Specimen theologicum inaugurale de Joanne Coccejo, S Codicis interprete* (doctoral thesis Utrecht) (Utrecht Kemink, 1856)
- 14 P H Roessingh, *Jacobus Alting, een bijbelsch godgeleerde uit het midden der 17de eeuw* (doctoral thesis Groningen) (Groningen Van Zweeken, 1864), De Bie and Loosjes, *Biographisch Woordenboek*, s v 'Alting, Jacobus'
- 15 J van Genderen, *Herman Witsius Bydrage tot de kennis der gereformeerde theologie* (doctoral thesis Utrecht) (The Hague Guido de Bres, 1953), esp pp 108–123 on Witsius exegesis — To the selective bibliographical information on the Dutch divinity faculties provided in the preceding notes there may be added a reference to the main source publication on the theological faculty of Leiden by A Eekhof, *De theologische faculteit te Leiden in de 17de eeuw* (Utrecht Ruys, 1921) and another to an ever useful, admirably well-informed, broad and detailed survey of the history of theology teaching in the Northern Netherlands by C Sepp, *Het godgeleerd onderwijs in Nederland gedurende de 16e en 17e eeuw*, 2 vols (Leiden De Breuk en Smits, 1873–4)
- 16 In the widely used and authoritative text-book of orthodox reformed dogmatics published by the Leiden professors of theology in 1625, the *Synopsis purioris theologiae* for instance, the Bible is designated as 'theologiae causa instrumentalis' (I, 14) and as 'omnium sacrorum dogmatum supernaturale principium' (II, 33), see Joh Polyander et al., *Synopsis purioris theologiae*, 6th ed., ed H Bavincq (Leiden Donner, 1881), pp 4 and 16
- 17 There is no satisfactory recent monograph on the history of New Testament scholarship the best accounts antedate the rise of scientific New Testament criticism in the 19th century, Richard Simon, *Histoire critique des principaux commentateurs du Nouveau Testament* (Rotterdam Leers, 1693) and Gottlob Wilhelm Meyer, *Geschichte der Schrifterklärung* 5 vols (Göttingen Rowel, 1802–9) Later treatments of the subject are, each in its way, disappointing, e g A Hilgenfeld, *Der Kanon und die Kritik des Neuen Testaments in ihrer geschichtlichen Ausbildung und Gestaltung* (Halle Pfeffer, 1863), F W Farrar, *History of Interpretation* (London Macmillan, 1886), Eduard Reuss, *Die Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften Neuen Testaments*, 6th ed (Brunswick Schwetschke, 1887), pp 574–679, Werner Georg Kummel, *Das Neue Testament Geschichte der Erforschung seiner Probleme*, 2nd ed (Freiburg Karl Alber 1958), B Hall, 'Biblical Scholarship Editions and Commentaries, in S L Greenslade, ed, *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, 3 vols (Cambridge At the University Press, 1963–70, vol 3 1963) 3 39–93, H J Genthe, *Kleine Geschichte der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft* (Göttingen Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1977) See also n 18
- 18 This view is followed in one way or another by Robert M Grant, *The Bible in the Church A Short History of Interpretation* (New York Macmillan Co., 1948, revised

ed as *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible*, 1965), W F Howard, *The Romance of New Testament Scholarship* (London Epworth Press, 1949), J D Wood, *The Interpretation of the Bible* (London G Duckworth and Co., 1958), Klaus Scholder, *Ursprünge und Probleme der Bibelkritik im 17. Jahrhundert*, Forschungen zur Geschichte und Lehre des Protestantismus, series 10, vol 33 (Munich Chr Kaiser, 1966), Victor Paul Furnish, 'The Historical Criticism of the New Testament A Survey of Origins,' *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 56 (1974) 336-70

19 The chief bibliographical data concerning Scaliger are recorded in Rudolf Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from 1300 to 1850* (Oxford Clarendon Press, 1976), pp 114-120, *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 2nd ed., s v 'Scaliger, Joseph Justus' (a brief but good article)

20 *Scaligerana*, ed P des Maizeaux (Amsterdam Covens & Mortier, 1740), p 589 This judgment was mainly based on Scaliger's correct observation that in many cases the different versions of identical episodes related in two or more Gospels and in other contemporary sources, can not possibly be reconciled with each other without doing violence to the narratives themselves as found in the New Testament In Scaliger's opinion, such discrepancies were due to textual corruption and extensive interpolations in the Gospels (and Acts) 'Les chrestiens anciens ont beaucoup adjousté au Nouveau Testament,' *ibid* 398, 'Il y a plus de 50 additions ou mutations au Nouveau Testament,' *ibid* 399

21 See Ioa Meursius, *Athenae Batavae* (Leiden Cloucqius et Elsevirii, 1625), p 284

22 Eduardus Reuss, *Bibliotheca Novi Testamenti Graeci* (Brunswick Schwetschke, 1872), pp 77, 78 109, 111, 114-5

23 For the history of the text in early editions of the New Testament, see Reuss, *Bibliotheca*, H C Hoskier, *A Full Account and Collation of the Greek Cursive Cod Evangelium 604* (London Nutt, 1890), Appendices B and C S P Tregelles, *An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament* (London Bagster, 1854), Bruce M Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 2nd ed (Oxford At the Clarendon Press, 1968)

24 The literature on Heinsius mentioned in Ekkart's bibliographies (see n 1) can be supplemented with the selected bibliography of B Becker-Cantaino *Daniel Heinsius*, Twayne's World Authors Series 477 (Boston Twayne Publishers, 1978), pp 171-176 In my *Daniel Heinsius and the Textus Receptus of the New Testament* (Leiden Brill, 1971), I proved that the famous but anonymous preface to the Elzevier Greek Testament of 1633 has been written by Heinsius, but I was wrong in arguing that Heinsius was also likely to have been the editor of the 1633 text See my correction of this thesis in 'Jeremias Hoelzlin Editor of the 'Textus Receptus' Printed by the Elzeviers Leiden 1633', in T Baarda et al., eds, *Miscellanea Neotestamentica*, 2 vols., Supplements to Novum Testamentum 47-8 (Leiden Brill, 1978) 1 105-128

25 Daniel Heinsius, *Exercitationes Sacrae* (Leiden Elzevier, 1639), pp (5)-(6) of the Prolegomena

26 *Ibid*, p (3), lines 10-17, and p (6), lines 5-10 For further information on Heinsius' criticism and exegesis of the New Testament, see Lunsingh Scheurleer, *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century*, pp 87-100

27 Sepp, *Godgeleerd Onderwijs* 2 185-216, Abraham des Amorie van der Hoeven, *Het tweede Eeuwfeest van het Seminarium der Remonstranten* (Leeuwarden Suringar, 1840), Joa Tideman, *De Remonstrantsche Broederschap Biographische Naamlyst*, 2nd ed by H C Rogge and B Tideman (Amsterdam Rogge, 1905)

28 Stephanus Curcellaeus ed., *Novum Testamentum* (Amsterdam Elzevier, 1658), see on this edition C R Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments* (Leipzig Hinrichs, 1900-9), pp 942-3

29 Reuss, *Bibliotheca*, pp 129-31

- 30 Annie Barnes, *Jean Le Clerc (1657–1736) et la République des lettres* (Paris Droz, 1938), De Bie and Loosjes, *Biographisch Woordenboek*, s v 'Clerc, (Jean le)', Samuel Golden, *Jean LeClerc*, Twayne's World Authors Series 209 (New York Twayne Publishers, 1972)
- 31 Joannes Clericus, *Ars Critica* (Amsterdam Huguetani, 1696), there are numerous later editions
- 32 J Le Clerc, ed, *Le Nouveau Testament traduit sur l'original grec Avec des remarques* (Amsterdam De Lorme, 1703)
- 33 Bruce M Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament* (Oxford Clarendon Press, 1977), see Index s v 'Erpe,' 'Dieu, L de,' and 'Leusden' For a useful survey of the history of oriental (especially Arabic) studies in the Northern Netherlands during the 17th century, see W M C Juynbol, *Zeventiende-eeuwsche beoefenaars van het Arabisch in Nederland* [17th-century students of Arabic in the Netherlands] (Utrecht Kemink, [1931])
- 34 Thomas Erpenius, ed, *D N Iesu Christi Testamentum Arabice, Ex bibliotheca Leidensi* (Leiden Erpenius, 1616) See on this edition Lunsingh Scheurleer, *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century*, pp 70 (with the notes) and 209
- 35 G H M Posthumus Meyjes, *Geschiedenis van het Waalse College te Leiden, 1606–1699* (Leiden Universitaire Pers, 1975) On De Dieu, *ibidem*, pp 78–97, and De Bie and Loosjes, *Biographisch Woordenboek*, s v 'Dieu, Louis de' See also nn 59–60 below
- 36 Ludovicus de Dieu, ed, *Apocalypsis Sancti Johannis ex Manuscripto exemplari è Bibliotheca Clariss Viri Josephi Scaligeri deprompto, edita Characteres Syro, et Ebraeo, cum versione Latina, et Notis* (Leiden Elzevier, 1627) See *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century*, pp 71–2 Wilhelm Bousset, in his excellent 'Geschichte der Auslegung der Apokalypse' (in his *Die Offenbarung Johannis*, 6th ed (Göttingen Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1906), pp 49–119, esp p 97) rightly classifies De Dieu's *Apocalypsis* and Drusus' *Adnotationes* as 'wissenschaftliche Auslegung', in contradistinction to the later Leiden commentaries on the Apocalypse by Coccejus and J a Marck
- 37 Joh Leusden and Car Schaaf, eds, *Novum Testamentum Syriacum Variis Lectionibus adornatum* (Leiden Luchtman and Muller, 1708, some copies dated 1709, reissue Leiden Muller, Boutesteyn and Luchtman, 1717)
- 38 For example, the *editio princeps* of the Epistle to Titus in Arabic was edited by the Leiden reader of Arabic Johannes Ant(h)onides in 1612 *D Pauli Apostoli Epistola ad Titum, Arabicè Cum Ioannis Antonidae Alemariani versione Latinâ ad verbum* (Leiden Officina Plantiniana Raphelengii, 1612) See H F Wijnman, 'Jan Theunisz alias Joannes Antonides (1569–1637),' *Jaarboek Amstelodamum* 25 (1928) 29–122, *idem*, 'De Hebraicus Jan Theuniszoon als lector van het Arabisch aan de Leidse universiteit (1612–1613),' *Studia Rosenthaliana* 2 (1968) 1–29, 149–176
- 39 See Lunsingh Scheurleer, *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century*, pp 67–68
- 40 Georgius Pasor, *Grammatica Graeca Sacra Novi Testamenti* (Groningen Collens, 1655) See H Schlosser, 'Die erste Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch', in A Deissmann and H Windisch, eds, *Neutestamentliche Studien Georg Heinrich zu seinem 70 Geburtstag dargebracht* (Leipzig J C Hinrichs, 1914), pp 254–258, Gerhard Friedrich in Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, eds, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, 10 vols (Stuttgart Kohlhammer, 1933–78) 10 8–10
- 41 Georgius Pasor, *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum in Novum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi Testamentum* (Herborn [Corvinus], 1619), see A Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, 4th ed (Tübingen Mohr, 1923), pp 346–7, Gerhard Dellling, 'Das erste griechisch-lateinische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament', *Novum Testamentum* 18 (1976) 213–240

42. Georgius Pasor, *Manuale Graecarum vocum N. Testamenti* (Herborn: Corvinus, 1624); see Delling, 'Das erste Wörterbuch', pp. 224–5.
43. Sepp, *Godgeleerd onderwijs*, Index s.v. 'Pasor'; Boeles, *Frieslands Hoogeschool*, 2: 128–131; J. Ros, *De Studie van het bijbelgrieksch van Hugo Grotius tot Adolf Deissmann* (Nijmegen and Utrecht: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1940), pp. 10, 58–9; G. Delling, 'Georg Pasor als Lexikograph', *Novum Testamentum* 22 (1980): 184–92.
44. See the preface to Salmasius' *De modo usurarum* (Leiden: Elzevier, 1639); idem, *De Hellenistica commentarius* (Leiden: Elzevier, 1643) and [idem], *Funus linguae Hellenisticae* (Leiden: Maire, 1643).
45. Salmasius, *De Hellenistica commentarius*, p. 107: 'si omnes (auctores qui Graece scripserunt) extarent, nulla vox tam monerès in nova et vetere pagina reperiretur, quin chrèsis eius ex aliquo auctore qui periit, confirmari posset. Praecipue si illi extarent, qui plebeio stilo et idiotico res ac vitas privatorum scripserunt,' already quoted by Ros, *Bijbelgrieksch*, p. 15.
46. Richard Simon, *Histoire critique du texte du Nouveau Testament* (Rotterdam: Leers, 1689), pp. 303–35; Ros, *Bijbelgrieksch*, pp. 11–33; J. Irmscher, 'Der Streit um das Bibelgriechisch,' *Acta antiqua academiae scientiarum Hungaricae* 7 (1959): 127–134; Aem. Springhetti, *Introductio historica-grammatica in graecitatem Novi Testamenti* (Rome: pontificia università Gregoriana, 1966), pp. 33–46; G. Friedrich in Kittel and Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. 10, pp. 23–7.
47. *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, 1: 753–7; De Bie and Loosjes, *Biographisch Woordenboek*, s.v. 'Drusius, Johannes'; see also nn. 57–8 below.
48. See for instance his *Philologus Hebraeo-Graecus* (Utrecht: Smytegelt, 1670).
49. See his *Exercitatio prima de Hellenistis et lingua Hellenistica ad... D. Heinsium et C. Salmasium*, which appeared anonymously at Utrecht in 1641. The only copy of this book that I know is in the British Library (622.b.12 (4)).
50. Ros, *Bijbelgrieksch*, pp. 12, 50. Sebastianus Pfochenius, *Diatribe de linguae Graecae Novi Testamenti puritate...* (Amsterdam: Jansonius, 1629; repr. *ibid.*: Blaeu, 1633). For Coccejus' reply, published only much later, see Jacobus Rhenferdius, *Dissertationum philologico-theologicarum de stylo Novi Testamenti syntagma* (Leeuwarden: H. Nautae, 1701; reissue *ibid.*, 1702), between pp. 236 and 237; see also the Praefatio, fols. *3r.–*3v.
51. For (not exhaustive) lists of such *Observationes* collections, see Ros, *Bijbelgrieksch*, pp. 47–56 and *passim*; Springhetti, *Introductio*, pp. 45–47.
52. Ioa. Tobias Krebsius, *Observationes... e Flavio Josepho* (Leipzig: J. Wendlerus, 1755).
53. On Bos, see Boeles, *Frieslands Hoogeschool*, 2: 353–356; Jan Gerard Gerretzen, *Schola Hemsterhusiana* (doctoral thesis Nijmegen) (Nijmegen and Utrecht: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1940), pp. 45–55.
54. (Franecker: Gyzelaar, 1700). A second edition appeared under the title *Exercitationes philologicae, in quibus Novi Foederis loca nonnulla ex auctoribus graecis illustrantur et exponuntur...* (Franecker: Bleck, 1713).
55. E. Preuschen, *Vollständiges Griechisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments...* (Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1910; 2nd ed. by Walter Bauer, *ibid.*, 1928; since 3rd ed., 1936, with Bauer's name only); Walter Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*, 3rd ed. (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1936; 5th ed., *ibid.*, 1958, revised 1963); adapted English translation of the 4th edition by W.F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature* (Cambridge: University Press; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957).
56. Friedrich Blass, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1896); 4th edition revised by Albert Debrunner (*ibid.*, 1913); 12th ed.

(Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965) English translation and revision of the 9th–10th ed by Robert W Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature with Supplementary Notes* (Cambridge University Press, Chicago University of Chicago Press, 1961)

57 On Drusus, see n 47 above, Boelens, *Frieslands Hoogeschool* 2 46–52, J C H Lebram, 'Hebraische Studien an der Universitat Leiden 1575–1619,' *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 56 (1975) 317–57

58 Jo Pearson et al., eds, *Critici Sacri*, 9 vols (London Flesher, 1660, 2nd ed., Frankfurt, 1695, 3rd ed., Amsterdam, 1698)

59 On De Dieu, see nn 35–6 above and the Appendix, Juynbol, *Zeventiende-eeuwse beoefenaars*, pp 200–4

60 Ludovicus de Dieu, *Critica Sacra, sive Animadversiones in loca quaedam difficiliora Veteris et Novi Testamenti* (Amsterdam Borstius, 1693)

61 Daniel Heinsius, *Sacrarum Exercitationum ad Novum Testamentum libri XX* (Leiden Elzevier, 1639), a second edition (Cambridge Roger Daniel, 1640) appeared 'ex suasu Virorum doctorum Cantabrigiae,' see Paul R Sellin, *Daniel Heinsius and Stuart England* (Leiden Universitaire Pers, 1968), pp 41–42

62 *Sacrae Exercitationes* (Leiden Elzevier, 1639), pp 102–3 and 119, lines 3–7, see also p 67, line 8

63 Matthew 3 17, cf Mark 1 11 and Luke 3 22

64 *The New Testament*, a new translation by William Barclay (London Collins, 1968) has 'This is my Son, the Beloved and Only One', *The Translator's New Testament* (London British and Foreign Bible Society, 1973) has 'This is my dear and only Son' (Matthew 3 17) The New Testament in Today's Dutch reads 'Hij is mijn enige zoon' ('He is my only son')

65 For a discussion of the point at issue, see C H Turner, 'Ho hyios mou ho agapetos,' *Journal of Theological Studies* 27 (1926) 113–129

66 *Annotationes in libros Evangeliorum* (Amsterdam Blaeu, 1641), *Annotationum in Novum Testamentum, tomus secundus Annotationes in Acta Apostolorum, et Epistolas Apostolicas* (Paris Pele, 1646), *Annotationum in Novum Testamentum pars tertia ac ultima* (Paris Pepingué & Maucroy, 1650) The collected *Annotationes* were included in the *Critici Sacri*, see n 58 above

67 Farrar, *History of Interpretation*, pp 379–80, W C van Unnik, 'Hugo Grotius als uitlegger van het Nieuwe Testament' [H G as an exegete of the NT], *Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis*, new series, 25 (1932) 1–48, Van Unnik criticizes Grotius' exegesis for dogmatic reasons For a brief, but more adequate assessment, see Kummel, *Das Neue Testament*, pp 28–36

68 See Lunsingh Scheurleer, *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century*, p 84, Joh Leopoldt, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, 2 vols (Leipzig Hinrichs, 1907–8, reprint Leipzig Zentralantiquariat der D D R., 1974) 2 157–8

69 Mark 6 17–29, Josephus *Ant* 18 116–9 *Scaligerana*, p 398 'Cela d'Herodias, femme d'Herode, qui est autrement dans Josephpe, est une chose terrible, car qui l'auroit induit à mentir [sc Josephhe] Les Chrestiens anciens ont beaucoup adjousté au Nouveau Testament Ils peuvent aussi avoir changé celui là'

70 See Balduinus Walaeus, *Novi Testamenti libri historici* (Leiden Wyngaerden, 1653), pp 316–317

71 J Clericus, *Harmonia Evangelica* (Amsterdam Huguétani, 1699, reissue 1700)

72 A similar tool for the study of the relationships between the Gospels, composed by Ammonius of Alexandria in the 3rd century A D, has been lost A Latin synopsis was compiled by the famous cartographer Geardus Mercator, *Evangelicae historiae quadripartita Monas, sive Harmonia quatuor Evangelistarum* (Duisburg [no publisher], 1592), a copy is in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris (A 3274)

REFERENCES TO APPENDIX

- 1 Testimonial of the Leiden theology professors (Johannes Polyander et al) for Samuel Heucherius, 26 May 1637, fols 203r – 204r of Cod Lat 10 415, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich I am grateful to Dr A J Lamping (Leiden) for bringing this document to my attention
- 2 Salmasius wrote in 1643 ‘Semper inter omnes constitit, verba [Novi Testamenti] esse Graeca, phrasim Hebraicam’ See Ros, *Bybelgrieksch*, p 60
- 3 See n 16 above, the passage referred to is Dissertatio III, thesis 10