

Marquette University

e-Publications@Marquette

Theology Faculty Research and Publications

Theology, Department of

7-2015

Eve in Early Reformation Exegesis: the Case of Iohannes Oecolampadius

Mickey L. Mattox

Marquette University, mickey.mattox@marquette.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://epublications.marquette.edu/theo_fac



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mattox, Mickey L., "Eve in Early Reformation Exegesis: the Case of Iohannes Oecolampadius" (2015).

Theology Faculty Research and Publications. 547.

https://epublications.marquette.edu/theo_fac/547

Marquette University

e-Publications@Marquette

Theology Faculty Research and Publications/College of Arts and Sciences

This paper is NOT THE PUBLISHED VERSION.

Access the published version at the link in the citation below.

Reformation and Renaissance Review, Vol. 17, No. 1 (July 2015): 196-205. [DOI](#). This article is © Taylor & Francis and permission has been granted for this version to appear in [e-Publications@Marquette](#). Taylor & Francis does not grant permission for this article to be further copied/distributed or hosted elsewhere without the express permission from Taylor & Francis.

Eve in Early Reformation Exegesis: The Case of Iohannes Oecolampadius

Mickey L. Mattox

Theology, Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI

Abstract

Iohannes Oecolampadius stood at the forefront of the Reformation in Basel. He not only worked tirelessly for the reform of the city's churches, but also authored pioneering evangelical works of theology and exegesis. The interpretation of Eve found in his late lectures on Genesis showcases both a new emphasis on Eve's goodness and original equality with Adam, as well as a parallel insistence on her subordination to her husband after the Fall. His conception of husband and wife as partners of equal dignity on the path toward salvation moves in the direction of companionate marriage, but it stops short of calling for women's equality in the public sphere.

Keywords

Oecolampadius, Genesis, Eve, Adam, the Fall, exegesis

In the late summer of 1531, Iohannes Oecolampadius (1482–1531) and his fellow reformers in Basel began a much-anticipated series of public lectures on the Bible, alternating weekly between Genesis and Matthew as required by the city's Reformation Ordinance of 1529.[2] After years of struggle to bring reform to Basel's churches, things at last seemed to be on track. Not long after the lectures began, however, their bright promise fell under lengthening shadows. In late October, the Baslers received the disheartening news of Ulrich Zwingli's death at the second battle of Kappel. Just a few weeks later, Oecolampadius himself fell ill, and in late November, surrounded by admirers and loved ones, including his wife and children[3], Basel's tireless reformer died, his work cut short.

In part because of his untimely death, Oecolampadius has traditionally been considered a less important reformer than, say, Martin Luther, Zwingli, or John Calvin. More recent studies, however, underscore his seminal contributions to early Reformed theology and exegesis.[4] Researchers have drawn attention, for example, to his extensive work with the Greek Church Fathers and the role these studies played in his preaching, his theology of the Lord's Supper, and his exegesis of the Bible, particularly the Old Testament.[5] The lectures on Genesis of 1531 reflect the piety and industry of a reformer who skilfully deployed the new learning of his day: reading Scripture in the original languages, and applying the insights gained through his intensive studies of the Fathers. Revered as a 'man of three languages' — Latin, Greek, and Hebrew — Oecolampadius was well positioned to reread the Bible with reform in mind.

Churchmen like him were bringing reform, moreover, not only to such prominent doctrines and practices as justification and the Lord's Supper, but also to the Church's ethic of sexual renunciation, most notably clerical celibacy,[6] and these particular reforms had significant implications for women. Scholars have debated for a generation now the question whether the social changes brought by the Reformation were good for women, with mixed results.[7] Some see Protestantism imposing new limits on women through a reinvigorated patriarchal ideology of the household, the closing of women's religious houses, and even the proscription of the public brothel. Others note the Reformation conviction that women and men are equal before God in their capacity for faith, and the narrowing of the gap between clerics and lay Christians expressed in the doctrine of the 'priesthood of believers.' Scholars have examined the extent to which reform in sexual ethics was reflected in the reformers' readings of the Bible, particularly the story of Eve. Studies have addressed such questions in the cases of Luther and Calvin, but relatively little attention has been paid to Oecolampadius.[8] Listening in on his interpretation of Eve's story we hear echoes of developments in early Reformation theology that simultaneously put forward a companionate understanding of marriage and support the subordination of women in public life.

Oecolampadius on Genesis

The published version of Oecolampadius's exposition of Genesis derives from the lectures on the Bible prescribed in Basel's Reformation Ordinance. A team of three men offered three distinct lectures. It was an impressive public display. First, Sebastian Münster (1488–1552) would read and comment on the text in the original Hebrew. Next, Oecolampadius would dictate a learned exposition of the text in Latin. Finally, Paul Phrygio (c.1483–1543) would preach a sermon on the text in the vernacular German.[9] This rather ambitious program imitated the *Prophezei* that had been instituted in Zurich and Strasbourg, and it was seen as a crucial step in establishing the new faith in Basel.

Before he fell ill Oecolampadius delivered thirty-two lectures on Genesis, up to chapter 16. Verbatim student notes on these lectures[10] came into the possession of Wolfgang Capito (1478–1541) when he married Oecolampadius's widow, Wibrandis. They were edited and published in 1536.[11] The lectures epitomize both the preaching for piety to which Oecolampadius had been committed even as a young Catholic priest, as well as the distinctive approach to Scripture he had developed as a reformer, one informed by his study of the Greek Church fathers, particularly John Chrysostom.[12]

An epitaph on the first published page of the Genesis lectures praised Oecolampadius for giving Basel a gift as great as Solon (d.558 BC) and Lycurgus (d.730 BC) had given to Athens and Sparta. Thus the publisher announced both the greatness of Oecolampadius and the lofty aspirations of Basel itself, namely, to achieve the stature of the Greek city-states through the establishment of a right godly order based on Scripture. In his preface Capito underscored Oecolampadius's capacity for inculcating both sound faith and a biblical social order, including a godly wife at the Reformed minister's side.

Oecolampadius began with a lengthy *paraclesis* or 'exhortation' to the study of the Bible in words that suggested a venture every bit as auspicious as the epitaph had proclaimed. He invited his students to accompany him into the 'divine inner sanctum',[13] sacred Scripture itself. But he also cautioned them that one should not enter unprepared. Reminding his auditors of the consequences that had befallen biblical men and women who failed to show proper respect for holy things, he inculcated a reverence for the text itself as holy, and its diligent study as transformative. As the high priest entered the holy of holies on the Day of Atonement covered in an ephod of gold, fine linen, and precious jewels, so those who enter into holy Scripture should be 'adorned in the mystical garments of righteousness.'[14] He was teaching for piety.

Eve in the *Exposition*

In his treatment of Genesis 1–3, Oecolampadius applied his vast biblical learning to establish the created goodness of the female sex. Some of his comments on Eve reflected a concern to provide solid biblical moorings for the practice of clerical marriage. At the same time, he also made use of his skill as a preacher and confessor to extract from Eve's story examples of faith and morals applicable to both sexes, combining biblical science with evangelical conviction and pious Christian humanism to produce a reading of Genesis supportive of the reformers' goal of the proper Christianization of public life.

In his comments on Genesis 1:26, which spoke of God's creation of humankind in the divine image and likeness, Oecolampadius readily affirmed their created equality:

we read here that God also created the female with the male. Granted that he was her superior after they had sinned, nevertheless she was created in equal dignity with the man. Just as even now man and wife are one in Christ, neither is this woman inferior to that man.[15]

Appealing to Galatians 3:28, Oecolampadius insisted that the woman was subordinated to the man only on account of sin. Interestingly, this reading of Eve's original positional relationship to her husband bears little of the imprint of Augustine's notion that the woman was created for 'submission' but punished after the Fall with 'servitude.'[16] It lines up well, however, with the sometimes equivocating affirmations of Eve's created equality found in Chrysostom's sermons on Genesis, which, as noted above, Oecolampadius knew well.[17]

In his comments on Genesis 1:27, Oecolampadius continued to lean on Galatians 3:28 as a crucial intertext. He noted that Genesis, too, explicitly mentions both male and female. Thus, readers may be certain that women have not been excluded from the dignity of creation in the divine image:

But so that you should know that the female was not excluded from this dignity, [the text] adds: 'male and female.' So also in Christ there is neither male nor female. Therefore until Eve had sinned the dignity of Adam and Eve was equal, because she too had received the Spirit of God.[18]

Eve's original equality meant that she was possessed of the same spiritual dignity, not subordinated to Adam's rule, and given the gift of the Holy Spirit. The latter suggests a pneumatological equality between the original human pair, which underscores both their equal dignity before God and their equal social standing.

He also emphasized not only Eve's utility for procreation,[19] but also for companionship with Adam. Reflecting upon Adam's naming of the animals Oecolampadius spoke forcefully:

God also wished that Adam from the beginning, and even before the woman had been formed, would know that she was made for him, and that he would know his own need for the woman, whom he ought to receive with greater gratitude if she should come to be. ... Thus God wished to form the woman, Eve, to be the man's companion, so that there should be the most intimate closeness and friendship between the man and the woman. So he took her out of Adam's side ... By that miracle God wanted to commend to us the highest love and friendship, which the married ought to preserve between them, and finally to teach each one to acknowledge one's spouse as one's own flesh.[20]

Not surprisingly, Oecolampadius interpreted the unity of man and woman in marriage as a figure for the unity of Christ and the Church. Somewhat less predictably, he connected their union of love (*charitas*) to the good of friendship (*amicitia*). This insistence surely reflected not only his theological conviction about the figurative meaning of marriage, but also his own experience of married life. To that extent, his reading of Eve contributed something new to the history of biblical interpretation.

Oecolampadius also insisted that the Scriptures present 'reliable history', which made Genesis 2 a blueprint for marriage. Considering the story of Eve's creation out of Adam's side, he expertly refuted any ascetic readings of the text that might try to turn it against marriage and procreation. His defence of the woman's goodness and created equality became the foundation for a vision of a sexually active married life in the garden of delights. Indeed, paradise as Oecolampadius imagined it would have rung with the sounds of children happily at play. The original human beatitude is imagined poignantly in his comments on Genesis 2:25: 'There are only a few words, but surely they are pregnant. Why does he [Moses] turn and say that Adam was nude, except that nakedness encloses an extraordinary glory? Innocence is happy without clothes.'[21]

Humankind was thus created not only with the gift of perfect justice, but with marital concord as well. This interpretation cannot be coincidental for a reforming movement in which clerics like Oecolampadius had embraced the holiness of married life.

Oecolampadius knew well that some had impugned the dignity of womankind on grounds of Eve's alleged responsibility for the Fall. Commenting on Genesis 2:18 he refuted that claim:

God [...] set forth at just the right time how the woman was made, lest anyone should object that God should not have created the woman because she made way for such destruction in humankind. He anticipates this and shows that she was formed by the divine counsel, and how she was useful to Adam for the preservation of the human race, and for other reasons, etc.[22]

To be sure, this insistence was evident early and often among Oecolampadius's Christian predecessors, including Augustine. But it reflects here the broader scope of his argument for the equal dignity of womankind. Consequently, he also defended the goodness of the married estate against its detractors:

Some defame marriage, clearly blaspheming against the Holy Spirit, daring to pronounce and call evil what God has testified is good. Behold, Eve was created in the beginning and was not in any way inferior to Adam, for she too had been given the divine Spirit and also made in the image of God.[23]

Looking to bolster his case by appeal to both the literal and figurative meanings one might discern in the story of Eve's creation, Oecolampadius noted somewhat impatiently four facts that support Eve's created goodness: 'God is the author of marriage. Eve was made in paradise, Adam outside. God brought Eve to Adam, and in the beginning Adam by the prophetic Spirit recognized a future mystery, as the text says.'[24] In mentioning a 'future mystery' Oecolampadius alludes to the relationship between Christ and the Church.[25] The union of husband and wife, he says, establishes bonds of charity and friendship, which, not coincidentally, are the traditional terms for the Christian in a state of grace, or for the Church in unity with Jesus Christ.[26] What marriage is in fact and history, then, it is theologically and eschatologically as well, for an allegorical 'secret meaning' lies hidden under the history; literal and allegorical meaning thus coinhere in one and the same text.[27]

Similarly, Oecolampadius reads the '*one flesh*' (Gen. 2:24) as an allegory of Christ's assumption of human flesh.[28] Christ's true humanity, then, is brought to the defence of the goodness of the woman qua woman, and her fitness for even greater things:

[Adam and Eve] [...] know that they are of the same nature and dignity. [...] By nature we are not able to be one with the Father, but because Christ is of one nature with us, except for sin, so also he somehow communicated to us his own dignity when he assumed our nature. [...] For he wishes to be our head and to have us for his members. If the spirit of Christ lives in us, then we will be true temples of God. And whoever clings to his Spirit, is made to be one spirit with him.

The dignity of human flesh shared equally by Eve with her husband thus reflects not only her original, created goodness but also her proleptic participation in the humanity of Christ. This participation bears a trinitarian stamp, moreover, because the Spirit communicates to Christians the dignity of Christ, which in turn qualifies them for union with the Father.[29]

Oecolampadius was also well aware that I Corinthians 7 appears to privilege celibacy over marriage. In response he allowed (based surely in part on experience) that the married estate does bring with it

certain compromises. He insisted, nevertheless, that Genesis confirms that an upright woman would be no 'trouble' at all, certainly not for a righteous man like Adam. Oecolampadius explained:

This is therefore the meaning: It would be extremely useful for a man if he could be without the trouble of women, if he were not even thinking about a woman at all. But when Eve was created in paradise, from the very beginning of her creation she was made upright so that she should be the least trouble to the man. [...] We also see other saintly men who were not deprived of the divine office and the prophetic spirit on account of marriage. Who was granted greater closeness to God than Moses himself? Who was more enlightened than David?[30]

The sanctity of the married patriarchs, and their prophetic possession of the Holy Spirit, demonstrates that marriage is consistent with ministerial service. Thus, the 'sleep' of Adam coincident with God drawing the woman out of his side can in no way be read as an allegory of the soul's decline from perfect devotion to God. There was as yet no concupiscence, Oecolampadius notes; the description of Adam and Eve in their original union therefore bears no negative symbolic meaning.

Moving to Genesis 3, Oecolampadius developed a figurative interpretation of the text. With what did the guilty human pair clothe themselves when they heard God walking in the garden in the '*cool of the day*' (Gen. 3:12)? Echoing an ancient tradition, he explained that the fig leaves they wore when confronted by God were nothing other than the 'frivolous excuses' they offered their divine inquisitor. Exemplifying the work of a good confessor, God through careful interrogation brought Adam and Eve to confession, announced the serpent's punishment, and at last lifted the human pair to hope with the promise that Eve's seed would one day crush the serpent's head. The point, then, is that divine mercy awaits every sinner who sincerely confesses, and Eve's experience is paradigmatic. Eve, in short, is everyone.

Indeed, Oecolampadius worked hard to defuse the limiting potential of Paul's assertion that Eve, not Adam, was deceived:

In I Timothy 2[:14] Paul writes that Adam was not deceived, but Eve. Satan with remarkable cleverness diverted her from the simplicity of her senses. Moreover, this is Satan's way, so that he can ambush as many of the faithful as possible. First he wants to create in us the suspicion that God does not want the best for us. He suggests that God is somehow jealous of us, or [he tries] at least to make us less certain of those things that have been said by him.

Accordingly, Oecolampadius's reading of Eve universalized her liability to sin. Moreover, he interpreted her weakness in a manner characteristic of Reformation interpreters. Much as the younger Martin Luther had said in his sermons on Genesis of 1523–24,[31] so here Oecolampadius made the movement from faith to unbelief the crucial element in Eve's Fall:

For the snake focused on this one thing. If he could direct Eve to it he would be able to lead her astray and place the word of God into doubt. Almost all of us sin like this. ... Had Eve not hesitated, Satan would not have become so bold in speaking with her. Likewise whenever we hand ourselves over to Satan to be defeated, he conquers easily and exults greatly in our destruction.[32]

Every person's sin thus recapitulates Eve's story; the Fall into sin is in the first place a Fall from faith to unbelief.

Finally, there is the matter of the woman's name. In a move that immediately rendered moot any socially progressive implications that might be drawn from Eve's prelapsarian equality, Oecolampadius read Adam's naming of the woman as an expression of his postlapsarian dominion over her. He could have read that story otherwise. In 1523, in the first commentary on Genesis to emerge from the evangelical movement,[33] Philip Melanchthon (1497–1560) had argued that Adam had given the name 'mother of the living' to the woman as a 'keepsake of the grace of God', that is, as a spontaneous expression of his firm faith in the promise of the 'seed of the woman' who would one day crush Satan's head.[34] It is unclear whether Oecolampadius was familiar with Melanchthon's opinion. If so, he chose not to repeat it, but argued instead that Adam's naming of the woman was an expression not of his faith but of his recognition that in a fallen world he would rule over her. As he had earlier imposed names upon the animals, so after sin he also named the woman:

You may be sure that Adam gave the name to the woman after sin and in this way showed himself to be the lord and head of the woman, she who before sin was a partner with equal worth. To impose a name on someone is a sign of dominion. Above, he imposed names on the animals but not on his wife.[35]

As shown above, Oecolampadius could at least imagine a world in which the original human pair had shared equally in the human dominion over the creation. In the 'not yet' of this fallen world, however, he read Genesis as a mandate that godly wives should remain under their husbands' rule.

Epilogue

Oecolampadius's public lectures on Genesis were the work of a devout and learned man, one who dedicated his life to the reform of the Church. At the same time, they were every bit a political act through which reform was promoted in both Church and society. In these lectures Oecolampadius vigorously defended woman's goodness and equality with her husband before the Fall. His exegetical arguments provided a strong affirmation of the goodness of marriage, even for Church ministers. As a married *Hausvater* [head of the household], moreover, Oecolampadius himself was clearly committed to the sanctity of the married estate. Nevertheless, his scriptural arguments for the goodness of womankind and the holiness of marriage stood alongside a clear insistence that Scripture places husbands in authority over wives after the Fall. The Reformation's potential for elevating the social status of women was thus limited by a refusal to reach back to the created order and pit it against patriarchy. On the contrary, for Oecolampadius Scripture itself establishes a patriarchal order within which woman's place in society includes both the godly companionship of marriage and subordination to husbands on account of the Fall.

Notes on contributor

Mickey Mattox is Professor of Historical Theology at Marquette University, Milwaukee, USA.
Correspondence to: Dr Mickey L. Mattox. Email: mickey.mattox@marquette.edu

Footnotes

- 1 The author wishes to thank Marquette University Press for permission to use here in revised form selections from the introduction to *Johannes Oecolampadius: An Exposition of Genesis*, trans. M. L. Mattox (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2013). This work gives Latin and English on facing pages. Citations below are given with page numbers for the Latin / English divided by a forward slash, e.g., *Exposition*, 95/6.
- 2 For the life and work of Oecolampadius, see Ernst Staehelin, *Das theologische Lebenswerk Johannes Oekolampads* (Leipzig: M. Heinsius Nachfolger, 1939); *Briefe und Akten zum Leben Oekolampads*, ed. E. Staehelin, 2 vols (Leipzig: M. Heinsius Nachfolger, 1927–34); T. Fudge, 'Icarus of Basel? Oecolampadius and the Early Swiss Reformation', *The Journal of Religious History* 21, no. 3 (1997): 268–84; E. L. Miller, 'Oecolampadius: Unsung Hero of the Basel Reformation', *Iliff Review* 39, no. 3 (1982): 5–25; G. Rupp, 'Johannes Oecolampadius: The Reformer as Scholar', in *Patterns of Reformation, Part I*, ed. Gordon Rupp (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), 3–46. For the course of the early Reformation in Basel, see Amy Nelson Burnett, *Teaching the Reformation: Ministers and Their Message in Basel, 1529–1629* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).
- 3 In 1528, Oecolampadius married Wibrandis Rosenblatt (1504–1564) the widow of the Basel humanist, Ludwig Keller [Cellarius]. For this woman's eventful life, see the portrayal in R. Bainton, *Women of the Reformation in Germany in Italy* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 79–95; cf. L. Haase, *Wibrandis Rosenblatt: ein Leben an der Seite der Reformatoren* (Stuttgart: Edition Anker, 2000).
- 4 The call for wider recognition of Oecolampadius's foundational role in early Protestant tradition is not entirely new. Already in 1854, for example, K. R. Hagenbach had claimed Oecolampadius as a 'Hauptreformer' alongside Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin. On this, see K. Hammer, 'Der Reformator Oekolampad (1482–1531)', *Zwingliana* 19, no. 2 (1992): 157. For an introduction to Oecolampadius as exegete, see Peter Opitz, 'The Exegetical and Hermeneutical Work of John Oecolampadius, Huldrych Zwingli and John Calvin', in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, vol. 2, *From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*, ed. M. Sæbø (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 407–13. A wide-reaching analysis of the shape of Oecolampadius's exegesis may be found in J. Fisher, 'A Christoscopic Reading of the New Testament Use of the Old: The Early Reformed Exegesis of Johannes Oecolampadius on the Book of Hebrews', doctoral thesis, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL, 2013. See also A. Demura, 'Two Commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans: Calvin and Oecolampadius', in *Calvinus Sincerioris Religionis Vindex: Calvin as Protector of the Purer Religion*, ed. W. Neuser and B. Armstrong (Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies, 1997), 165–88.
- 5 See H. O. Old, 'The Homiletics of John Oecolampadius and the Sermons of the Greek Fathers', in *Communio Sanctorum: Mélanges offerts à Jean-Jacques von Allmen*, ed. B. Bobrinskoy et al. (Geneva: Editions Labor et Fides, 1982), 239–50; E. W. Northway, 'The Reception of the Fathers and Eucharistic Theology in Johannes Oecolampadius (1482–1531), with Special Reference to the *Adversus Haereses* of Irenaeus of Lyons', doctoral dissertation, University of Durham, UK, 2008; and for a helpful study of Oecolampadius's exegesis, see D. Poythress, *Reformer of Basel: The Life, Thought, and Influence of Johannes Oecolampadius* (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011).

- 6 Describing the impact of the Reformation, Steven Ozment observes that by the 1540s the 'new clergy [...] have married rapidly and in large numbers. Clerical marriage has become as much the mark of the Protestant cleric as belief in the sole authority of Scripture. An unmarried cleric is deemed strange; the reformers play cupid for one another in a rush to share the newly discovered bliss of married life and to make another public statement against Rome.' *Protestants: the Birth of a Revolution* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 27.
- 7 For a brief introduction to these issues, see L. Roper, 'Gender and the Reformation', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 92 (2001): 290–302.
- 8 See, inter alia, M. L. Mattox 'Luther on Eve, Women and the Church', *Lutheran Quarterly*, ns 17, no. 4 (2003): 456–74; J. L. Thompson, *John Calvin and the Daughters of Sarah: Women in Regular and Exceptional Roles in the Exegesis of Calvin, his Predecessors, and his Contemporaries* (Genève: Librairie Droz, 1992), esp. 65–160. For a broad sampling in early Reformation exegesis of Eve, see J. L. Thompson, *Genesis 1–11*, vol. 1, *Reformation Commentary on Scripture* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2012).
- 9 *Briefe und Akten*, vol. 2, no. 904. Cf. Staehelin's account in *Lebenswerk*, 580 ff.
- 10 Staehelin, *Lebenswerk*, 580.
- 11 See J. Kittelson, *Wolfgang Capito: From Humanist to Reformer* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 193.
- 12 Oecolampadius had translated the Chrysostom's Genesis sermons. See *Divi Ioannis Chrysostomi, archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani, in totum Geneseos librum homiliae sexagintasex, à Ioanne Oecolampadio hoc anno versae* (Basel: Cratander, 1523).
- 13 Exposition, 34/5.
- 14 Exposition, 36/7.
- 15 Exposition, 95/6.
- 16 For Augustine's influential reading of Eve see Thompson, *Calvin and the Daughters of Sarah*, ch. 2.
- 17 For Chrysostom on Eve see Thompson, *Calvin and the Daughters of Sarah*, 75–79; cf. M. L. Mattox, 'Defender of the Most Holy Matriarchs': Martin Luther's Interpretation of the Women of Genesis in the *Enarrationes in Genesin 1535–1545*, *Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions*, 92 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 43–48.
- 18 Exposition, 104/5.
- 19 See, for example, Exposition, 142/3.
- 20 Exposition, 144/5–146/7.
- 21 Exposition, 154/5.
- 22 Exposition, 140/1.
- 23 Exposition, 140/1.
- 24 Exposition, 144/3.
- 25 Ephesians 5:32.
- 26 Exposition, 146/7.
- 27 Exposition, 148/9–150/1.
- 28 Exposition, 152/3.
- 29 Exposition, 152/3–154/5.
- 30 Exposition, 140/1–142/3; 148/9.
- 31 See Mattox, 'Defender', ch. 1.
- 32 Exposition, 160/1.

- 33 In *obscuriora aliquot capita geneseos annotationes* (Hagenau: Iohannes Secerius, 1523). These comments cover only Genesis 1–6. Barton suggests that this slim volume was based on lectures delivered in Melanchthon's home. See P. Barton, 'Die Exegetischen Arbeit des jungen Melanchthon 1518/19 bis 1528/29: Probleme und Ansätze', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 54 (1963): esp. 77–78. For more on these issues, see Mattox, 'Defender', 64–65 and 273–75.
- 34 Here is Melanchthon's felicitous description of Adam naming his wife 'Eve': 'haec adpellatio mulieris [est] testimonium fidei Adam, & mnemosynon gratiae Dei promissae per semen mulieris, et breviter, signum fidei credentis mortem iam non esse mortem, sed vitam.' In *obscuriora*, Giiii.^v Obviously Melanchthon thought Eve had been subordinated to her husband, but he saw that as intended already for the unfallen creation, not as a consequence of the Fall. Still, Oecolampadius could have combined his insistence on Eve's created equality with Melanchthon's interpretation of Eve's naming to arrive at an exegesis that denied woman's subordination, even in a fallen world. Further to this question, see M. L. Mattox, 'Order in the House? The Reception of Luther's Orders Teaching in Early Lutheran Genesis Commentaries', in *Reformation & Renaissance Review* 14, no. 2 (2012): 110–26.
- 35 Exposition, 194/5.

Primary sources

- Chrysotom, John. Divi Ioannis Chrysostomi, Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani, in totum Geneseos librum Homiliae sexagintasex, à Ioanne Oecolampadio hoc anno versae. Basel: Cratander, 1523.*
- Melanchthon, Philip. In obscuriora aliquot capita geneseos annotationes. Hagenau: Iohannes Secerius, 1523.*
- Oecolampadius, Iohannes D. Io. Oecolampadii in Genesim enarratio. Basel: Bebel, 1536.*
- Oecolampadius, Iohannes D. An Exposition of Genesis [1–3]. Trans. Mickey L. Mattox. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2013.*
- Staehelin, Ernst, ed. Briefe und Akten zum Leben Oekolampads. 2 vols. Leipzig: M. Heinsius Nachfolger, 1927–34.*

Secondary sources

- Bainton, Roland. Women of the Reformation in Germany in Italy. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.*
- Barton, Peter C. 'Die Exegetischen Arbeit des jungen Melanchthon 1518/19 bis 1528/29: Probleme und Ansätze.' *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 54 (1963): 52–89.*
- Burnett, Amy Nelson. Teaching the Reformation: Ministers and their Message in Basel, 1529–1629. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.*
- Demura, Akira. 'Two Commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans: Calvin and Oecolampadius.' In *Calvinus Sincerioris Religionis Vindex: Calvin as Protector of the Purer Religion*, edited by Wilhelm H. Neuser and Brian G. Armstrong, 165–88. Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies, 1997.*
- Fisher, Jeff. 'A Christoscopic Reading of the New Testament Use of the Old: The Early Reformed Exegesis of Johannes Oecolampadius on the Book of Hebrews.' Doctoral dissertation, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, ILL, 2013.*

- Fudge, Thomas A. 'Icarus of Basel? Oecolampadius and the Early Swiss Reformation.' *The Journal of Religious History* 21, no. 3 (1997): 268–84.
- Haase, Lisbeth. *Wibrandis Rosenblatt: ein Leben an der Seite der Reformatoren*. Stuttgart: Anker, 2000.
- Hammer, Karl. 'Der Reformator Oekolampad.' *Zwingliana* 19, no. 1 (1992): 157–69.
- Kittelson, James. *Wolfgang Capito: From Humanist to Reformer*. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Mattox, Mickey Leland. "Defender of the Most Holy Matriarchs": Martin Luther's Interpretation of the Women of Genesis in the Enarrationes in Genesin 1535–1545. *Studies in Medieval and Reformation Traditions*, 92. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Mattox, Mickey Leland. 'Luther on Eve, Women and the Church.' *Lutheran Quarterly*, NS 17, no. 4 (2003): 456–74.
- Mattox, Mickey Leland. 'Order in the House? The Reception of Luther's Orders Teaching in Early Lutheran Genesis Commentaries.' In *Reformation & Renaissance Review* 14, no. 2 (2012): 110–26.
- Miller, Ed L. 'Oecolampadius: The Unsung Hero of the Basel Reformation.' *Ilfiff Review* 39, no. 3 (1982): 5–25.
- Northway, Eric W. 'The Reception of the Fathers and Eucharistic Theology in Johannes Oecolampadius (1482–1531), with Special Reference to the Adversus Haereses of Irenaeus of Lyons.' *Doctoral dissertation, University of Durham, UK, 2008*.
- Old, Hughes Oliphant. 'The Homiletics of John Oecolampadius and the Sermons of the Greek Fathers.' In *Communio Sanctorum: Mélanges offerts à Jean-Jacques von Allmen*, edited by B. Bobrinsky et al., 239–50. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1982.
- Opitz, Peter. 'The Exegetical and Hermeneutical Work of John Oecolampadius, Huldrych Zwingli and John Calvin.' In *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*. Vol. 2, edited by Magne Sæbø, 407–13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- Ozment, Steven. *Protestants: the Birth of a Revolution*. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Poythress, Diane. *Reformer of Basel: The Life, Thought, and Influence of Johannes Oecolampadius*. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2011.
- Roper, Lyndal. 'Gender and the Reformation.' *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 92 (2001): 290–302.
- Rupp, Gordon. 'Johannes Oecolampadius: The Reformer as Scholar.' In *Patterns of Reformation*, edited by Gordon Rupp, 3–46. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.
- Stahelin, Ernst. *Das theologische Lebenswerk Johannes Oekolampads*. Leipzig: M. Heinsius Nachfolger, 1939.
- Thompson, John Lee. *Genesis 1–11*. Vol. 1, *Reformation Commentary on Scripture*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2012.
- Thompson, John Lee. *John Calvin and the Daughters of Sarah: Women in Regular and Exceptional Roles in the Exegesis of Calvin, his Predecessors, and his Contemporaries*. Genève: Librairie Droz, 1992.