

Consensus

Volume 19

Issue 1 *Martin Luther and Spirituality*

Article 7

5-1-1993

Luther and Tamar

David C. Steinmetz

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholars.wlu.ca/consensus>

Recommended Citation

Steinmetz, David C. (1993) "Luther and Tamar," *Consensus*: Vol. 19 : Iss. 1 , Article 7.

Available at: <http://scholars.wlu.ca/consensus/vol19/iss1/7>

This Studies and Observations is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Consensus by an authorized editor of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.

Luther and Tamar

The 1992 Lutheran Life Lecture
Waterloo Lutheran Seminary

David C. Steinmetz

*The Divinity School, Duke University,
Durham, North Carolina*

In late 1543 or early 1544, Martin Luther, who had been lecturing on the book of Genesis for several years, reached the story of Judah and Tamar in Genesis 38. Judah was the fourth son of Jacob by his first wife Leah. Tamar was not Judah's wife or even his concubine. She was his daughter-in-law and the widow of his two sons, Er and Onan. But it is not the relationship of Tamar to Judah's sons but to Judah himself that gives the story its primary significance. Judah becomes the unwitting father by Tamar of twin boys, Perez and Zerah, in what Christian tradition regards as one of the most famous cases of incest in the Bible.

The main elements of the story can be quickly summarized. Tamar was a Canaanite woman, who was given in marriage to Er, Judah's eldest son. According to the biblical text, Er was so wicked (the precise nature of his wickedness remains unspecified in the text) that God brought his miserable life to an end. Judah then commanded his second son, Onan, to marry Tamar with the understanding that the first born child of this union would be regarded as the child of Er rather than of Onan. Onan was willing to sleep with Tamar, but he was unwilling to impregnate her. At the very last moment, he interrupted his sexual relations with her so that she could not bear a child. For this offense against the unwritten law, God took Onan's life as he had taken the life of Onan's brother Er.

Note: This article is reprinted by permission from the *Lutheran Theological Seminary Bulletin*, 73/1 (Winter 1993).

Not surprisingly, Judah was disturbed by the loss of two sons and, fearing that Tamar was somehow to blame, postponed a marriage with his youngest son, Shelah. Judah sent Tamar back to her father's house to live as widow. He promised that he would eventually send for her to become Shelah's wife. However, time passed, Shelah matured, and Judah made no move to fulfil his promise to Tamar.

After waiting in vain for Judah to act, Tamar decided to take matters into her own hand. She heard that her father-in-law was going to Timnath to shear his flocks of sheep. She removed the clothing that marked her as a widow, put on a veil, perfumed herself, and sat where the road to Timnath forks in two directions. When Judah, himself newly widowed, sees Tamar at the side of the road, he assumes that she is a prostitute (perhaps a temple-prostitute) and attempts to engage her services. She agrees to accept a kid as payment for her sexual favors. However, since Judah has not yet reached his flocks, she asks for his staff, as well as his seal and its cord, as a pledge for the payment owed. Judah agrees and the bargain is concluded.

When Judah reaches his flocks, he sends a friend back to the cross-roads with the promised payment. But Tamar has disappeared. When he asks people in the vicinity whether they have seen a temple-prostitute, they deny having seen anyone like that ply her trade at the fork in the road. So Judah's friend returns with the kid to Judah, who decides to drop the matter and let the unknown prostitute keep the pledge he gave her.

Three months later, Judah is notified that Tamar is pregnant. Judah is outraged and condemns her to be executed by fire. Before sentence can be carried out, Tamar produces Judah's staff, cord, and seal and claims that the father of her child is the owner of these articles. Judah instantly realizes what has transpired and cancels the sentence against her. "She is more in the right than I am," confesses Judah, "because I did not give her to my son Shelah."

The story ends with the account of the difficult birth of twin boys, Perez and Zerah. Tamar has successfully tricked Judah into redeeming his dead son Er. It is not clear whether Tamar was ever given to Shelah as a wife. The narrative only asserts that Judah never had intercourse with Tamar again.

Commentaries on Genesis

Luther's lectures on this story were delivered at a time when very few new commentaries on Genesis had been written. By 1545, the year Luther completed his nine year cycle of lectures on Genesis, Thomas Cardinal Cajetan had completed a commentary on Genesis (1531)¹ as had Huldrych Zwingli at Zurich (1527)², Conrad Pellikan at Basel (1536)³, and Wenzeslaus Linck at Wittenberg (1543)⁴. Johannes Oecolampadius had commented on Genesis 1-16 (1536)⁵ and there were partial commentaries by Philip Melancthon (1523)⁶, Augustinus Steuchus Eugubinus (1535)⁷, Wolfgang Capito (1539)⁸, and Paul Fagius (1542)⁹, none of whom interpreted Genesis 38. The great burst of commentary writing on Genesis took place after 1545 when new commentaries were composed by such figures as Peter Becker (Artopoeus), Martin Borrhaus, Antonio Brucioli, John Calvin, Andreas Hyperius, Luigi Lipomani, Wolfgang Musculus, Jerome Oleaster, Peder Palladius, Ambrosius Catherinus Politus, Nicholas Selnecker, Peter Martyr Vermigli, and Jerome Zanchi.

Luther relied more on older commentaries than on the writings of his contemporaries for exegetical insight and stimulus. His favorite medieval commentator was the fourteenth-century Franciscan interpreter, Nicholas of Lyra, whom he repeatedly cited throughout his lectures¹⁰. Lyra wrote *Postilla* on both the literal and moral senses of the Bible. More than most of his predecessors, Lyra attempted to utilize the rabbinic traditions of exegesis in his exposition of the Old Testament. While he was primarily concerned with the literal sense of the text, he did not consider it in isolation from Christian theology. By appealing to a double-literal sense, a literal-historical sense concerned with the story line and a literal-prophetic sense concerned with the story's theological significance, he broadened the meaning of letter to include matters that had earlier been relegated to the spiritual sense of the text.

Lyra was only one of several medieval exegetes who wrote on Genesis 38. The thirteenth-century French Dominican, Hugh of St. Cher¹¹, and the fifteenth-century monastic reformer, Denis the Carthusian¹², also wrote standard commentaries on Genesis. All three commented extensively on the literal sense of the text, which they recognized as primary. For them, as

for the medieval tradition generally, the literal sense was the only sense of the text from which theological arguments could be drawn.

Printed editions of their commentaries were easily accessible in the early sixteenth century. Lyra's *Postilla super Genesim* went through several printings at Nuremberg and Basel in the 1480's and 90's, while Hugh's *Repertorium* on Genesis was printed in Nuremberg in 1502 and Basel in 1503. Denis's *Enarrationes* were released in a new edition in Cologne in 1534. In order to provide a context for Luther's interpretation of Genesis 38, I want to recreate a composite late medieval Christian reading of the Tamar story, using these three standard commentators.

Medieval Exegesis

The first question that preoccupied medieval commentators is what Er, Tamar's first husband, did to merit death. The text, of course, is silent. All three commentators speculate that Er must have done what his brother did, though for different reasons.¹³ Er must have had sexual relations with Tamar, but in such a way as to prevent pregnancy. Nicholas of Lyra suggests that Er practiced a primitive form of birth control because he was so libidinally attached to Tamar that he did not want to spoil her beauty by impregnating her.

In medieval Christian ethics it was never enough to restrict sexual activity within the boundaries of marriage. Married couples were also obligated to observe certain rules of sexual conduct. By refusing to impregnate his wife, Er treated Tamar like a prostitute and defrauded her of the children that were rightfully hers and which gave her status in ancient Jewish society.

The case of Onan, Er's brother and Tamar's second husband, is simple enough. Onan was willing to sleep with Er's widow, but unwilling to impregnate her. Unlike Er, Onan was not concerned with preserving Tamar's beauty. He simply did not want the firstborn child of his marriage to Tamar attributed to his dead brother.¹⁴

When Onan died, Judah, fearing these multiple deaths were the fault of Tamar, sent her back to her father's house. Tamar, who knew (as Denis asserts) that Christ would descend from

the line of Judah, waited for him to keep his promise.¹⁵ When she realized that Judah had denied his third son to her as a bridegroom, she decided to have sexual intercourse with her father-in-law. She was driven, not by her libido, but by a desire for the posterity that had been promised her. Hugh of St. Cher, who seems a little embarrassed by the ease with which Tamar seduced the recently widowed Judah, observes that while Judah was wrong to cohabit with Tamar, he at least had the decency to attempt to redeem his pledge and pay her the price agreed upon.¹⁶

When Judah learns that Tamar had behaved like a common prostitute and was pregnant through her wanton conduct, he orders her to be burned. The order to subject her to death by fire prompts a lively debate among the medieval commentators. What sexual transgression did Tamar commit to merit such a harsh punishment? Since both Judah and Tamar were widowed, they appear to have committed fornication, i.e., illicit heterosexual activity between unmarried consenting adults. While not to be encouraged and certainly a mortal sin, fornication was by no means the most serious fault in the medieval catalog of sexual sins. Far more serious was simple adultery, i.e., illicit heterosexual activity between two consenting adults, one of whom was married. If Shelah was betrothed to Tamar, then, perhaps, she should be regarded as already married at the time of her encounter with Judah. Hugh and Lyra agree and opt for adultery, while Denis merely reports both possibilities without choosing between them.¹⁷ Paul of Burgos, who comments on Lyra's exegesis, rejects out of hand the notion that Tamar was married.¹⁸

Complicating the situation still further is the fact that Judah and Tamar violated the forbidden degrees. They are related as father and daughter by affinity rather than consanguinity, since Judah is Tamar's father-in-law rather than her biological father. But that is a distinction without a difference, since no sharp division was made in the later middle ages between consanguinity and affinity and since all sexual activity within the forbidden degrees was regarded as incestuous. According to medieval sexual ethics Judah and Tamar committed adultery and incest, he unwittingly, she knowingly.¹⁹ For his part Judah was only dimly aware of a casual act of fornication

with an anonymous prostitute, who made off with his seal, staff, and cord.

Even if it is granted that Tamar committed adultery and incest, it is puzzling why Judah ordered her to be burnt. According to the later law of Moses, foreshadowed in the Levirate marriage of Onan with Tamar, she should have been executed by stoning for her crimes. The commentators surmise that she was subject to severer penalties because she was the daughter of a Canaanite priest. Lyra and Denis are concerned, however, to scotch the notion that Tamar was the daughter of Melchizedek, the mysterious priestly figure who receives tithes from Abraham, as some earlier commentators had argued.²⁰ When Tamar was born, Melchizedek was long dead.

The story builds to the confrontation between Judah and Tamar. When she is brought out, she sends Judah's seal, staff, and cord to him with the words, "The father of my child is the man to whom these things belong." Judah immediately recognizes the pledge he gave to an unknown prostitute on the road to Timnath and confesses that Tamar is more righteous than he is. The Latin word he uses is *iustior*.

Judah's confession that Tamar is "more righteous" than he troubles the medieval commentators. While they recognized that Judah had failed to live up to his obligation to guarantee his line through Er and had committed a casual act of fornication with a prostitute, they also acknowledged that Tamar had knowingly deceived her father-in-law and committed adultery and incest.²¹ Although they admitted that Tamar's deceit kept the family line intact, they found no morally untainted characters in this story. All four principal actors—Er, Onan, Judah, and Tamar—committed mortal sin. Perhaps, Hugh suggests, it would be better to concede that Tamar was not more just than Judah but only less unjust.²²

Luther's Interpretation

Luther was concerned with many of the questions that troubled medieval commentators. Like them he worried about the moral responsibility of the principal figures in the story—Er, Onan, Judah, and Tamar—though he broadened the cast of characters to include a chorus of Tamar's relatives, who were dismissed as mere bystanders in medieval exegesis. Like them

he professed astonishment at the severity of Judah's sentence and explored the relationship of Tamar to a priestly line. Like them he was puzzled by the unqualified confession of Judah that Tamar was more righteous than he.

Yet, for all the similarities, there are important differences as well. The first dissimilarity is Luther's preoccupation with matters of chronology. Luther had worked out a chart derived from the ages of the patriarchs at their death. On the basis of this chronology Luther advanced the astonishing claim that Judah was only 12 years old when he married Bathshua and 27 when he defiled his daughter-in-law.²³ More importantly, Luther's reconstructed chronology enabled him to support the hypothesis of Lyra (sharpened by Paul of Burgos) that Melchizedek had been dead for fifty years when Tamar deceived Judah.²⁴ It was therefore highly improbable that Melchizedek could have been her father. Luther was himself of the opinion that Tamar belonged to a priestly line only by marriage to the family of Jacob.²⁵

A second difference between Luther's exegesis and the exegesis of his predecessors lies in what appears to us as Luther's psychologizing of the biblical text. Luther was not alone among medieval theologians in his expansion of the spare narrative offered in the Bible or in his attempt to offer credible human motivations for the actions of biblical characters. Medieval theologians and preachers were quite willing to provide the additional links that tie the narrative of the biblical stories more tightly together. The fact that Hugh, Lyra, and Denis did not do it in their commentaries on Genesis 38 does not mean that they had any principled objections against it when it was done by someone else.

Luther could discuss the motivations of the biblical characters with considerable self-confidence because he drew no overly sharp lines between then and now, yesterday and today, the world of the Bible and the world of sixteenth-century Germany. The men and women in Genesis looked forward to a Redeemer who was yet to come, while sixteenth-century Christians looked back to a Redeemer who lived, taught, died, and was raised from the dead. Having conceded that important difference, Luther was hard-pressed to find any other. What makes a human being human was not changed very much over the centuries. Judah, Er, Onan, and Tamar share a common

humanity with Luther and his contemporaries. Therefore the inner life of Luther and his contemporaries provides a key to unlock the innermost secrets of Judah, Er, Onan, and Tamar.

Four examples of Luther's approach will suffice. The first example concerns Onan.²⁶ Luther suggested an additional reason for Onan's disobedience to his father's command (though the command was not merely Judah's but God's). Onan was motivated not only by jealousy of his elder brother, but by a hatred for the commandment itself. It is a burdensome thing to be forced to take a woman as a wife whom one does not desire. Onan therefore mistreated his unwanted and undesired wife by exciting her sexually only to deny her the children she wished. By doing so, he violated an order of nature and received the punishment he deserved.

Example two concerns Judah.²⁷ Luther was puzzled by Judah's failure to recognize Tamar. Although she was veiled, Judah could see her eyes and hear her voice. Luther's explanation rests on the proposition that "imagination takes away perception and reflection."²⁸ The sexual appetite of the recently-widowed Judah had so focused his mind and imagination that he took Tamar at face value and accepted her for what she pretended to be. To Judah the eyes and voice of Tamar were the eyes and voice of an anonymous prostitute.

The third example concerns the anonymous bystanders who deny they have seen a prostitute at the fork in the road to Timnath and who later denounce Tamar for having played the harlot. Luther is convinced they are not anonymous at all but are actually Tamar's relatives.²⁹ They were in on Tamar's deception from the first and may even have put her up to it. They covered her escape by denying all knowledge of a prostitute. Only when they were absolutely certain that Tamar was pregnant with Judah's child did they triumphantly denounce her to Judah. They could hardly wait to see the expression on Judah's face when he was handed his seal, cord, and staff and discovered with horror that he was the father of his own grandchildren.

The final example concerns Tamar herself.³⁰ Luther believes Tamar was driven to deceive Judah by her longing for children and not by her sexual passion. Tamar knew full well that Shehlah was obligated by divine command to become her husband.

She also knew that she had done nothing to merit the contemptuous treatment she had received from Judah. Judah had rejected her without cause.

Tamar was driven to take desperate measures by Judah's unjustified behavior. Perhaps she knew that Judah had had sexual relations with prostitutes before and so would be highly susceptible to seduction.³¹ Perhaps she regarded Judah as a good man and only tried to deceive him because she could think of no other way to gain her rights. At any event, Luther regarded Tamar as an extraordinary woman (*mirabilis mulier*), who forced Judah against his will to obey God's command, even if not in the way God commanded.³² She was prepared to try something even more desperate if this ruse failed.

Luther nurtured no romantic illusions about biblical families. He rejected any approach to Genesis which treated its stories of often dysfunctional families like an ancient Jewish collection of the *Lives of the Saints*.³³ Unlike Ignatius Loyola whose conversion to a more authentic Christianity was profoundly shaped by his reading of the biographies of saints, Luther confessed that he found more comfort in the failings of the saints than in their virtues.³⁴ Such a confession ought not to be confused with a kind of *Schadenfreude* that takes delight in the misdoings or misfortunes of others. Luther wanted only to underscore the importance of a grace that overcomes human weakness and unreliability. If God could save the very great sinners who inhabit the pages of Genesis, then he can certainly save half-hearted and unimaginative sinners like you and me.

Unlike Hugh, Lyra, or Denis, Luther focused on the christological framework within which the story of Judah and Tamar should be read. Luther observed that Tamar was a Gentile and that the ancestry of Jesus of Nazareth includes both Jews and Gentiles. If the story of Tamar and Judah teaches its readers nothing else, it teaches them that a Canaanite woman was the mother of the whole tribe of Judah and therefore the remote mother of Christ.³⁵ This genealogical fact established for Luther the important theological point that the inclusion of Jews and Gentiles in the redeemed people of God was intended by God from the very beginning.³⁶

The story of Judah and Tamar also demonstrated to Luther that fallen human sexuality provides the context within which

the incarnation should be understood. Jesus Christ was not born from a line of ancestors who were beyond reproach in their sexual morality. "God allows [Christ] to be conceived in most disgraceful incest," says Luther, "in order that he may assume the truest flesh..."³⁷ Just as all human beings are given life through fallen human sexuality, so Jesus Christ was born from a flesh truly "polluted by Judah and Tamar."³⁸

Of course, the flesh which Jesus assumed in the womb of the Virgin Mary was sanctified by the Holy Spirit.³⁹ But it was sanctified because it was sinful. Otherwise Christ would not be flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone. "Judah, the very eminent patriarch, a father of Christ, committed this unspeakable act of incest," concludes Luther, "in order that Christ may be born from a flesh outstandingly sinful and contaminated by a most disgraceful sin."⁴⁰ The context for Bethlehem is the road to Timnath.

Finally, Luther dealt with the confrontation between Tamar and Judah and Judah's puzzling confession that Tamar was more righteous than he. Luther was well aware that Judah's remark must be understood within the context of the covenant line. God had commanded Judah to give Tamar to Shelah and Judah had refused. By deceiving Judah, Tamar had redeemed her dead husband Er and had preserved the line of Judah that leads to Christ.

On the other hand, Luther was concerned with the violation of Christian sexual morality embodied in this story. On the face of it, it seemed to Luther and his predecessors that Judah was guilty of nothing more serious than an absent-minded act of fornication, while Tamar, who knew exactly what she was doing, involved Judah in incest.⁴¹ But Luther was convinced that such a reading of the text is superficial. By disobeying God's command and so preventing the birth of children to his dead son by Shelah, Judah was guilty of sacrilege and homicide.⁴² Furthermore, his sin was greater than Tamar's because, unlike her, he was a teacher and ruler of the Church. And so on both levels, the covenant-lineal and the ethical-moral, Tamar was more righteous than Judah.

Conclusion

Luther concluded his exposition of Genesis 38 with the words: "I have preferred a simple explanation to the invention of allegories."⁴³ On one level, of course, that statement is

self-evidently true. Unlike Hugh of St. Cher, Luther does not suggest that Judah is a type of Christ, Tamar a type of the Church, Shelah a representative of the chorus of the apostles, or Er an enduring example of a bad prelate.⁴⁴ Luther takes the ancient narrative at face value and tries to explain the gaps in the biblical story by drawing on his own experience of human nature.

On the other hand, one could object that Luther and his medieval predecessors created problems for themselves by reading Genesis 38 within the framework provided by Christian sexual morality. In its original setting the story does not appear to be about incest (though Tamar was condemned by Judah for sexual misconduct) but about the redemption of a dead brother's line. What Tamar wanted was not a forbidden sexual experience (as Denis and Luther admitted) but the children that were owed her by her kinsmen within the family of Judah.

However, for Luther and his generation the question of a Levirate marriage was not moot. It had been pushed into the center of theological discussion by the appeal of Henry VIII to European universities for support of his petition to annul his marriage to Catherine of Aragon.⁴⁵ Henry supported his claim for an annulment by citing the prohibition in Leviticus of marriage between a brother and his sister-in-law. In answering Henry's argument sixteenth-century theologians found themselves caught between two conflicting sets of texts from Leviticus and Deuteronomy. On the one hand, Leviticus 18:16 and 20:21 forbade a brother to marry his sister-in-law. On the other hand, Deuteronomy 25 advocated exactly such a policy. Neither set of texts authorized a father-in-law to redeem the line of a dead son, though that was not the question posed by Henry.

William Tyndale attempted to reconcile the conflicting texts by arguing that Leviticus forbade a marriage between a brother and his brother's wife only when the first brother was still living. The Catholic theologian, Felix de Prato, elaborated Tyndale's thesis by insisting that a Levirate marriage was allowed, if the first brother were dead and had left no offspring. If there were living children, then the prohibition in Leviticus took precedence over the permission in Deuteronomy. Zwingli argued on the basis of Leviticus 18:16 that marriage with a sister-in-law was condemned by natural and divine law under

all circumstances, while Thomas Cardinal Cajetan argued that on the basis of Mosaic law Henry VIII was obligated to marry Catherine of Aragon. Melanchthon suggested that, under certain circumstances, bigamy was preferable to a divorce, while Luther concluded that neither text had any lingering power to bind Christian consciences. In short, when Christian theologians limited themselves to the Old Testament, they found that the ambiguity of the evidence forced them to look elsewhere for a resolution.

The Tamar story resolved itself for Luther into the question of the relation of the two testaments. If there is one people of God throughout time, then the question of Tamar's significance cannot be answered on the basis of Genesis alone. Tamar, the Gentile, is the mother of Christ, who conceived him by way-laying an unsuspecting Judah on the road to Timnath. While Luther disapproved of her sexual morality, he nevertheless admired her force of character and initiative. Desperate times call for desperate measures.

Although Luther accepted the traditional view that Tamar achieved her objective by knowingly committing incest, he placed her act in a larger theological context. Tamar the Canaanite was a witness for Luther to the universality of God's saving purpose, a sign that there is neither Jew nor Gentile, male nor female, in the redemptive plan of God.

She was also a sign of the reality of the incarnation. Luther insisted that the incarnation did not take place in a world of unfallen human sexuality. Christ was conceived in what Judah regarded as an insignificant encounter with a nameless prostitute and in what Tamar realized was a desperate deception of a man who held the power of life and death over her. There is a direct line for Luther from the tiny hut on the road to Timnath in which Perez and Zerah were conceived to the stable in Bethlehem in which Christ was born. Redemption embraces human sexuality as it is and not as it should be. The flesh Christ assumed and purified was fallen human flesh. Christ came from the incest of Judah and Tamar to redeem the world from sin, including its sexual sins.⁴⁶ That is the gospel message Luther found embedded in the Tamar story.

Notes

¹ Thomas de Vio Cardinal Cajetan, *In Omnes Authenticos Veteris Testamenti Historiales Libros et Iob, Commentarii* (Rome, 1531).

- 2 Huldrych Zwingli, *Farrago Annotationum in Genesim* (Zurich: Christophor Froschouer, 1527).
- 3 Conrad Pellikan, *Commentaria Bibliorum, Tomus Primus in quo continentur V. libri Mosis* (Zurich: Christophor Froschouer, 1536).
- 4 Wenzeslaus Linck, *Annotationum in die fünf Bücher Mose. Eyn schöne Vorred Doctoris Martini Lutheri* (Strasbourg: Balthasar Beck, 1543).
- 5 Johannes Oecolampadius, *D. Io. Oecolampadius in Genesim Enarratio* (Basel: Johann Bebel, 1536).
- 6 Philip Melanchthon, *In obscuriora aliquot capita Geneseos Annotationes* (Hagenau: Johann Secerius, 1523).
- 7 Augustinus Steuchus Eugubinus, *Cosmopoiea, vel de mundano opificio, expositio trium capitum Genesis, in quibus de creatione tractat Mosis* (Lyon, 1535). Eugubinus, Bishop of Kisami, Canon Regular of St. Saviour, was Vatican librarian.
- 8 Wolfgang Capito, *Hexaameron Dei Opus Explicatum* (Strasbourg: Wendelin Rihel, 1539).
- 9 Paul Fagius, *Exegesis sive Expositio Dictionum Hebraicorum literalis et simplex, in quatuor capita Geneseos, pro studiosis linguae Hebraicae* (Isen, 1542).
- 10 Nicholas of Lyra, *Postilla super Genesim, Exodum, Leviticum, Numeri, Deuteronomum, Iosue, Iudicum, Regum et Paralippomenon, cum additionibus Pauli Episcopi Burgensis replicisque Mathie Dorinck cumque textu plano incluso* (Nuremberg: Anton Koburger, 1498). For the history of the printings of Lyra in this period, see Karlfried Froehlich, "The Printed Gloss," in the *Biblia Latina cum Glossa Ordinaria* (Brepols-Turnhout, 1992), pp. xii-xxvi.. This book is the facsimile reprint of the editio princeps by Adolph Rusch of Strasbourg (1480/81).
- 11 Hugh of St. Cher, *Repertorium apostillarum utriusque testamenti* (Basel: Johann Amerbach, Johann Petri, and Johann Froben for Anton Koburger, 1503-1504).
- 12 Denis the Carthusian, *Enarrationes piae et eruditae, in quinque Moisaicae legis libros* (Cologne: Peter Quentel, 1534).
- 13 Denis, *Enarrationes*, 115v; Hugh, *Repertorium*, 55v; Lyra, *Postilla*, cap. 38.
- 14 Denis, *Enarrationes*, 115v; Hugh, *Repertorium*, 55v; Lyra, *Postilla*, cap. 38.
- 15 Denis, *Enarrationes*, 115v.
- 16 Hugh, *Repertorium*, 56.
- 17 Denis, *Enarrationes*, 116; Hugh, *Repertorium*, 56v; Lyra, *Postilla*, cap. 38.
- 18 Lyra, *Postilla*, cap. 38.
- 19 Denis, *Enarrationes*, 116.
- 20 Denis, *Enarrationes*, 116; Lyra, *Postilla*, cap. 38.
- 21 Denis, *Enarrationes*, 116; Hugh, *Repertorium*, 56v; Lyra, *Postilla*, cap. 38.

- 22 Hugh, *Repertorium*, 56v.
- 23 Martin Luther, *Luthers Werke*, WA 44 (Weimar: Hermann Böhlau's Nachfolger, 1915), p. 309. [Remaining references abbreviated according to the pattern WA 44.309.] See also Vol. 7 of *Luther's Works*. American edition (ed. Jaroslav Pelikan, Philadelphia: Fortress, St. Louis: Concordia, 1965, 3-50.
- 24 WA 44.332.
- 25 WA 44.332.
- 26 WA 44.315-317.
- 27 WA 44.323.
- 28 WA 44.323: "Respondeo: Imaginatio alienat sensus et cogitationem."
- 29 WA 44.329-332.
- 30 WA 44.321-322.
- 31 WA 44.323-324.
- 32 WA 44.325; "Fuit mirabilis mulier, ac videtur amplius tentatura fuisse, si spe sua frustrata esset."
- 33 WA 44.309.
- 34 WA 44.322.
- 35 WA 44.312.
- 36 WA 44.314-315.
- 37 WA 44.324: "Deus sinit eum concipi in incoestu foedissimo, ut asumeret verissimam carnem...."
- 38 WA 44.324: "et tamen revera erat caro polluta ex Iuda et Tamar."
- 39 WA 44.324.
- 40 WA 44.311: "Summus Patriarcha Iuda, pater Christi hunc infandum incoestum commisit, ut nasceretur Christus de carne excellenter peccante et turpissimo peccato contaminata."
- 41 WA 44.314: "Ex hac Thamar ortus est Messias, licet per stuprum et incoestum."
- 42 WA 44.332.
- 43 WA 44.337: "Hactenus vero historia Iudae et Thamar, quam simpliciter potius explicare, quam allegorias fingere libuit."
- 44 Hugh, *Repertorium*, 55v.
- 45 For a fascinating discussion of the issues involved see Guy Bedouelle, "The Consultations of the Universities and Scholars Concerning the 'Great Matter' of King Henry VIII," in *The Bible in the Sixteenth Century*, ed. David C. Steinmetz (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1990), pp. 21-36.
- 46 WA 44.311: "Caro Christi oritur ex incestuoso concubitu, similiter et caro Virginis, matris eius, et totius posteritate Iudae, ideo, ut significaretur ineffabile illud consilium misericordiae Dei, quod assumpsit carnem sive naturam humanam ex carne contaminata et horribiliter polluta."