# WSEVENTEENTH CENTURY EXEGETICAL BRIEFS

I Timothy 1:9
John 20:19

from George König's

CENTURIA

VINDICIARUM

SACRARUM

Paul Brug Senior Dogmatics Submtted to Prof. Brug May 1, 1998 The following selections are taken from George König's *Centuria Vindiciarum Sacrarum* of 1628. This work, which is bound together with Balduin's *Casus Confessionis*, is a collection of articles similar to the exegetical briefs published in the Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly. It might be a little bit of a stretch to call all of them *exegetical* in nature, because not all of them are what we would consider exegetical – questions of syntax or vocabulary are not always addressed in detail. From a brief scanning of the other selections, though, it appears to be more of an exception than the rule not to have any points going back to the original language.

There are many similarities to the exegetical briefs, though. They are of a similar length—usually from 1-6 pages, and share a similar purpose—to take a more in-depth look at a specific passage of the Bible and explain it. Many directly address false arguments made by the opponents of the Lutherans. The following example is a response to an argument made by Robert Bellarmine. Some other responses are directed at theological writers such as Jacob Arminius.

The first selection repudiates the antinomian use of 1 Timothy 1:9. After giving several quotations regarding the use of the law, a response is made on the basis of the context of the passage and on the grammar of the passage. After his careful explanation of the passage, the author makes a distinction between the way that an unbeliever is *under* the law and the way that a believer (*justus*) is *in* the Law (cf. 1 Corinthians 9:21).

The second selection has to do with the resurrected body of Christ. In commenting on Jesus' coming into the closed upper room on Easter Sunday evening, many had tried to get around explaining the event as a miracle. Several quotations expressing this opinion are given, and then the response is given. The main argument is based on the grammar. The tense of the verb (perfect) and the construction (use of the conjunction with the modifying phrases) both support a miraculous entry by Jesus. Several other arguments are given as well, based on the manner in which the event is described. The author is also very careful to note that the words don't necessarily have to mean that Jesus came directly through the closed doors, since  $\delta\iota\acute{a}$  is not used. Latin paragraph 10 also includes an interesting discussion of what it means that Christ "broke through" the heavens in Hebrews 4:14 and Micah 2:13. He seems to have the idea that the heavens, or at least the firmament of Genesis 1:6, are made of solid material. Though this argument is not supported by Scripture or science, it provides an interesting look at how some have perceived the "firmament."

There are a total of 100 passages addressed in König's *Centuria*. It seems a worthwhile work to consult, especially if you wanted to see how they might have addressed a certain passage or topic. There is an index of passages at the end, as well as a subject index and an index of Hebrew and Greek words addressed.

### LOCUS III

Timoth. Cap. 1. v.9

# Justo non est lex posita. $E \Xi E \Gamma H \Sigma H \Sigma$ .

Antinomi & Libertini hoc dicto abutuntur, contendentes in Ecclesià Christiana, in qua multi sunt justi, legis usum esse nullam.

Sed Respondetur I. ex sententia Veterum; simpilciter concedendo, Justo, quà justus est, legem non esse positam, ideò quia antea faciat, quæ Legis sint. Sic Epiphanius: Quandoquidem justo lex non ait posita, iniquus ergò est justus ? absit: Sed quoniam anticipavit justus perficere ea, quæ sunt legis, non est Lex contra justum, qui fecit legem; verùm posita est contra eos, qui deliquererunt, judicans iniquos. Tomo.2. in Catalo. dogmatum Manich: pag.334. Et Isidorus Pelusiota: Lex optimum est integritatis documentum, non eos qui rectum iter tenent corrigens: Verùm eorum qui petulanter se gerunt impetus reprimens, ob idq; Paulus etiam dixit : Justo non est Lex posita, lib. 2. Epist. 288. p.274.

Deinde ex sententia Neotericorum, qui dicunt, Justo non esse positam legem, secundum, quid, nempe respectu usus primi. Nam dicunt quod Legis usus sit triplex. Unus, ut coerceat scelera externa: Alter, ut peccata monstret: Tertius, ut sit norma bonorum operum. Quorum primus ad non renatos : tertius ad renatos : Secundus ad utrosq; pertinet. De primo usu Apostolicum Aphorismum intelligendum esse constat : Siquidem Lex apud Justos, sive illi originaliter, sive regeneratione tales sint effecti, officium illud suum proprium exercere nequit, ut accusare, terrêre, damnare eos posset. Ad Rom. 8. v.1.&33. Jam verò ab unius usus negatione ad negationem omnium usuum vitiosa instituitur collectio, quia à specie ad genus, affirmando argumentari non possumus, nisi plena fiat specierum enumeratio. Leonhardus Hutterus in L.C. tit. De statu integrit. Ante lapsum, p.277.

Nos attendemus partim ad scopum, partim ad verba, è quibus duobus verus manabit sensus. Scopus Apostoli est à se amoliri, & in Judæos

### LOCUS III

1 Timothy 1:9

# The law is not established for a righteous person.

#### **EXEGESIS:**

Antinomians and Libertines use this passage incorrectly, contending that in the Christian Church, in which there are many righteous people, there is no use for the law.

Response: From the opinion of the ancients. It must be honestly granted that the law is not established for a righteous person, insofar as far as he is righteous, because it established beforehand which Law they might be of. Epiphanius says the same thing: "Just because the law is not indeed established for a righteous person, is a transgressor therefore righteous? Far be it. But seeing that the righteous person received beforehand [through Christ] the status of having completed2 those things which are of the law, the Law is not against the righteous person, who does the law. Truly it is established against those who fail, judging [them to be] transgressors" (Volume 2 in Catalog dogmatum Manich., p. 334). And Isidorus Pelusiota says, "The best law is a pattern of purity for those who do not have a right path, setting it Truly of those who conduct themselves impudently, impulse restrains [them] because of this as well. Paul also says, 'The law is not established for a righteous person" (Book 2, Letter 288, p. 274).

We can also see this from the opinion of the Neotericians, who say that the law is not established for a righteous person. They follow this by saying that this is, of course, with respect to the first use. For they say that there are three uses of the Law: one, to restrain external evil actions; another, to point out sins; the third, to be a guide for good works. Of these, the first applies to the unregenerate, the third to the regenerate, the second to both. Concerning the first use, it stands that the Apostolic Aphorism must be understood: "If indeed the Law among the righteous (whether they are [righteous] originally, or have been made such by regeneration) is unable to exercise its own duty - that it can accuse, terrify and damn them" (Romans 8:1,33). Now surely the faulty<sup>3</sup> summary is established [by arguing] from the negation of the one use to the negation of all uses. [But] by arguing from the species to the genus, we cannot produce an argument to be proven, unless a full enumeration of species is given (Leonard Hutter, L.C.Tit. De statu integrit, Ante lapsum, 277).

We give our attention partly to the context, partly to the words. The true sense [of the passage]

transferre invidiosam calumniam, quâ onerabatur ac si Legem hostiliter impugnare, ac prorsus è medio tollere voluisset. Negat se id facere, quia legem bonam esse statuat v.8. à Judæis autem fieri probat, quia justos legis jugo premant, & illius minis terreant, allegantes subinde illud : Maledictus ex *Deut.27*. Quod perinde faciunt ac illi, qui juveni abundè instructo, pædagogum insuper plagiosum obtrudere: aut servum spontè imperata facientem, flagellis vexare vellent. In verbis respicimus 1. Subjectum, quod est LEX. Intelligitur autem lex moralis. agit enim de correctione injustorum, impiorum, peccatorum, in ver.9. quod pertinet ad Legem Moralem. Prædicatum, posita est. In Græco est κεἶται, κείσθαι autem jacere significat, mann einem etmas auff und über dem Hals ligt das ihn drücket. Hinc & Syrus utitur Sim quod significat Ἐπιτίθημι', super impono, Matth. 21. v.7. 3. Objectum, quod est, Justis, quales hic sunt veri Christiani ad Evangelium vocati & per Christum justificati v.11. Hisce legem esse superim positam, negat Apostolus contra Judæos, lege tum abutentes, & Tales namq; justi pressura legis non indigent, sed ab eà per Christum liberati, sunt supra omnem legem, ait Chrysostomus. ad hunc locum; non amplius sub lege. Qui enim sub lege est, secundum legem agitur & servus est. In lege tamen sunt, quia in lege qui est, secundum legem. agit & liber est, ait Augustin. in Psal.1.

will proceed from these two things. The context of the apostle is to remove from himself and put off among the Jews the hateful trick with which they were burdened, if in fact he had wanted to attack the Law like an enemy and to abolish it altogether. He says that he does not do this, because he establishes that the law is good (v. 8). Moreover, he finds it good to be one of the Jews, because they are close to the righteous demands of the law as a yoke, and in that way [the righteous demands of the law] may frighten less, repeatedly choosing it (cf. the curse from Deut. 27). They do this just as those who want to impose a whip-happy pedagogue upon a fully trained young man or to whip a slave who willingly does his orders.

We look back upon the words.

- 1. The subject, which is "the Law." But the moral law is understood. For it follows from the correction of the unjust, impious, sinner (v. 9) that it pertains to the Moral Law.
- [2.] The predicate is "it is established." In Greek it is  $\kappa \in \hat{l} \tau \alpha \iota$ .  $\kappa \in \hat{l} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ , however, means "to lie," when a certain one lies on and over the neck and presses it down. Hence Syrus also uses "Sim," which means  $E\pi \iota \tau \iota \theta \eta \mu \iota$ , "I place upon (Matt. 21:7).
- 3. The object is righteous people, the kind of people who are true Christians, called by the Gospel and justified through Christ (v. 11). The apostle says, against the Jews, who were abusing the law at that time, that for these the law is not established, and rightly so. For such righteous ones are not in need of the pressure of the law, but have been freed from it through Christ, beyond every law. Chrysostum speaks to this point, "No longer under the law." Indeed, whoever is under the law is led after the law and is [its] slave. Yet they are in the law, because whoever is in the law is led after the law and is free, says Augustine in *Psalm 1*.

### LOCUSLVI

Dohann. 20. Vers. 19.

Cum serò esset, & fores essent clausæ, venit Jesus, & stetit in medio!

I

rthodoxi ut demonstrent, non, Christum lesse ubiq'; uti Sadeel illis affingit de Veritate humanæ Naturæ, *locoto. pag. 199*: Sed eum, quà hominem, non esse alligatum communibus naturæ legibus, quo minus præter & supra eas esse possit præsens, ubi velit: ex hoc loco sic argumentantur: Quicunq'; suo corpore, clausis januis, alicubi se sistit, is non est alligatus naturæ legibus. At Christus suo corpore clausis januis stetit in medio doscipulorum. Ergò &c. Major patet, quia corpus penetrare corpus, naturæ repugnat. Cujus effati rationes, à posteriori potius, quàm à priori desumtas, vide apud Bonamicum de Motu, pag. 427. & autoritatem apud Aristotelem 1.2. de anima, c.7. fol.1398. dicentem: Possibile non est, ut duo corpora in eodem sint simul! Minor est Iohan. 20. v.19.&26. Quare stat conclusio, Christi corpus naturælegibus non esse alligatum!

- 2. Heterodoxi variè excipiunt. Sic Valent. Schmaltzius: Nihil ibi nec miraculosum, nedum impossibile: Quod enim Christus apparuit Januis clausis, & stetit in medio discipulorum, id non modum, quo intravit: sed tempus, quando id factum sit, tantummodò declarare dici potest: Aut si quis modum etiam his verbis indicari velit, potuit tunc, cum clausæessent januæ, Christus intrare, vel aliquo aperiente, vel porta seipsa aperiente, quod Petro etiam Apostolo accidisse legitur, Actor. 12 v. 10. In Refut. Thes. Frantz. Pag. 74.
- 3. Sic Petrus Martyr serm. *In cap. 20. Ioh. Pag. 106.* & in dialogo de πανταχωσία *pag. 97.* inquit : Fortè cesserunt Januæ fortè Christus per fenestras aut tectum ingressus est ?
- 4. Respondeo I. Temporis descriptionem non contineri his verbis θυρὧν κεκλεισμένων, sed modi notationem fieri, sic probamus. I. Quia temporis notatio jam præcessit ibi : ἄσης 'οψίαs. 2. Si esset tantum modò temporis descriptio,

### LOCUSLVI

John 20:19

When it was late, and the doors were closed, Jesus came and stood among them!

From the Truth of human Nature, Sadeel invents in addition that the orthodox point out that Christ is not everywhere (Locus 10, p. 199). But he, as a man, is not bound to the universal laws of nature. From this, [we can see that] he is less able to be present wherever he wants above and beyond them [the laws of nature]. From this point they draw this argument: Whoever appears somewhere in his own body, with the doors closed, that one is not bound by the laws of nature. And Christ stood among his disciples in his own body, with the doors closed. Therefore . . .

The greater [premise] lies open, because it is contrary to nature for a body to pass through a body. The reasons for this are proposed, chosen a posteriori [from the latter] rather than a priori [from the former]. See the writings of Bonamicus de Motu (p. 427) and the support in the writings of Aristotle (Book 2, De Anima, ch. 7, fol. 1398), which says, "It is not possible for two bodies to be in the same place at the same time!" The lesser [premise] is John 20:19,26. By this means, the conclusion stands: Christ's body is not bound by the laws of nature!

The heterodox make exceptions in various ways. This is what Valentine Schmaltzius says: "Nothing then miraculous [can happen], much less the impossible. For just because Christ appeared when the doors were closed and stood in the middle of the disciples, this is not the way Christ entered. But it can be said that the time when it was done only explains it in [this] way: If someone would also want the way to be indicated by these words, then Christ, while the doors were closed, would have been able to enter, either by some opening, or by the very same opening gate [in the way] that it is said that it happened to the Apostle Peter in Acts 12:10" (Refut. Thes. Frantz 74).

Peter Martyr asks this in his sermon on John chapter 20, page 106 and in his dialogue on πανταχωσὶα, page 99: "Did the doors perhaps give way? Did Christ perhaps come in through the windows or roof?"

#### Response.

I. We demonstrate in this way that the description of the time is not contained in these words,  $\theta \nu \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda \epsilon \iota \sigma \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \omega \nu$ , but the way is noted: 1. Because the notation of the time already occurred beforehand in the words  $\mathring{\omega} \sigma \eta s$  'οψίαs. 2. If only the

dixisset Evangelista, μτ' τ θυρών κεκλεισμένων, vel 'εν τῷ κλείθς τὰς θύρας. 3. dixisset, τ θύρῶν κλεισμένων, cum clauderentur Januæ; non in præterito κεκλεισμένων. 4. Usitatum non est. quando denominatio temporis præcedit, & duo genitivi apud Græcos, vel duo Ablativi apud Latinos, consequentiam designantes, seguntur, iiq'; temporis observationi inserviunt, ut per copulativam, etiam temporis denominationi adjungantur, ut hîc sit: ὤσης 'οψίας κὰι θυρὧν; Sed absolutè, sine copula, ponatur. e.g. usitatè non dico: Anno urbis conditæ 710. & Triumviratu Antonii Augusti, & Lepidi durante, Cicero proscriptus est : Sed absolutè, Anno urbis conditæ, durante Triumviratu &c. 5. Si temporis esset notatio, sequeretur, Apostolos tunc demum clausisse januas, postquam Christus apparuit! quæ apparitio quia facta est nocte sera, (siquidem 'οψία noctem seram aliàs significat, *Iudith. 13. V.1* collato cum v.2) & verò verisimile sit, ingruente statim crepusculo Apostolos præmetu januas clausisse, manet, non tàm temporis descriptionem, quàm modi notationem innui!

- 5. Cum Christus 2. appareret, fores erant clausæ! Ergò nemo aperuit, nec ipsæ patuerunt hoc enim non esset venire clausis foribus.
- 6. Miraculosum 3. fuisse ingressum, colligitur ex *v.30* & Sadeel ipse fatetur loco dicto, ingressum esse præter ordinarium rationem. & ibidem, hunc ingressum per miraculum esse factum. imò *Luc. 24. v.37.* dicitur, quod discipuli putarint, se Spiritum sivè spectrum videre. Ex quo inferimus: Qualis est ingressum spectri in clausum conclave, talis fuit & Christi. Ratio patet, quia si alio & consueto modo venisset Christus, non aborta esset suspicio de spectro, nec consternatio consecuta. At apparitio spectri est sine clausarum forium apertione, videatur *Bodin. lib. 3.* Dæmoni maniæ *c.6.* Ergò &c.
- 7. Christus 4. Subitò stetit in medio discipulorum. Ergò neq'; per aperta claustra ingressus, neq'; pedentim de loco in locum progressus est. Sic enim apparitio in medio, non posset dici subitanea aut momentanea.
  - 8. Patro Martyri 5. Opponimus partim

description of the time were in this way, the Evangelist would have written, "μετὰ των θυρών κεκλεισμένων, οτ 'εν τῷ κλεἶθς τὰς θύρας." 3. He would have said, "τὧν θύρὧν κλεισμένων, after the doors had been closed" not in the perfect κεκλεισμένων. 4. It is not customary when the designation of the time comes first, and two genitives (in Greek) or two ablatives (in Latin) indicating a succession follow, and they serve as an observation of time, that they are also joined with the denotation of time by a conjunction, as it would be here: ἄσης 'οψίας κὰι θυρὧν. But it is placed as an absolute, without a conjunction. For example, I don't normally say, "In the year 710 after the founding of the city, and while the Triumvirate of Anthony, Augustus and Lepidus endured, Cicero was published." Instead [I would say it] absolutely: "In the year after the founding of the city, while the Triumvirate endured. . ." 5. If it were a notation of time, it follows then that the Apostles actually closed the doors after Christ appeared! His appearance happened late at night (since indeed 'οψία otherwise [always] means late at night [Judith. 13:1, compared with verse 2), and indeed it probably was as soon as twilight was falling that the apostles closed the doors out of fear. Because of this, it remains not as much a designation of the time as I have indicated a notation of the way!

- **II.** When Christ appeared, the door were closed! Therefore no one opened them, nor did they stand open, for that would not be to come in with the doors closed.
- III. That it was a miraculous entrance is gathered from verse 30, and Sadeel himself admits in the place cited that the entrance was beyond ordinary reckoning, and [he admits] in the same place that this entrance was made through a miracle. At the end of Luke 24:37, it is said that the disciples thought that they saw a spirit or ghost. From this we infer that Christ's entrance was just like a ghost's entrance into a closed room. The reasoning is because if Christ came by a different and usual way, their suspicion about a ghost would not have disappeared, nor would their dismay have followed. But the appearance of a ghost is without the opening of closed doors. (See Bodin. book 3, *Demoni maniae*, chapter 6: "Therefore...")
- IV. Christ suddenly stood in the middle of the disciples. Therefore he neither came in through opened barriers, nor did he go from place to place gradually. For in this way an appearance in the middle [of a group] cannot be called sudden or momentary.<sup>4</sup>
- V. We place before you⁵ part of *Vidam* by Peter

Vidam, qui sic canit

Improvisus adest, & inobservabilis heros, Cum clausa mansêre fores, mansêre fenestra:

partim ipsum Calvinum, cujus verba hoc modo recitat Marloratus: Quod putant quidam, reseratas illi fuisse fores per aliquem, & humano more ingressum, prorsus à mente Evangilistæ discrepat. sic igitur habendum est, Christum non sine miraculo ingressum esse: Exposit. *Ecclesiast. In cap. 20. Iohan. pag. 601. f.a.* 

- 9. Subjungamus tamen. 6. Nos hinc nolle colligere, Christum peripsas januas pertransiisse, quia non dicitur Διά¹ θυρὧν κεκλεισμένων; sed in genere, quod facta fuerit penetratio. Quia conclavi undiq'; manente clauso, Christus steterit in medio; licet ignoremus, per quam conclavis partem præcisè contigerit.
- 10. Neq'; est, ut obtendas impossibilitatem penetrationis! Meminerimus enim ex Hilario, Eum non subjacere naturæ legibus, à quo legem omnis natura sortitur. Lib.9. de Trinit. Pag.196. Et annon Christus suo corpore ipsos Cœlos penetravit? Heb. 4. v.14. perrupit? Mich. 2. v.13. qui tamen sunt  $\sigma \in \rho \in \omega \mu \alpha$ , quovis ferro solidius. Genes. 1. V.6. imó fusi quasi solidissimo æra. Hiob. 37. v.14.
- 11. Ergò crede, sic etiam penetrasse claustra, ut sui nulla relinqueret vestigia, cum venerabili Beda in *Ps. 52*.
  - 1. Greek typesetting is unclear.
  - 2. Literally: "to complete."
  - 3.Literally: "wicked."
  - 4. No meaning was listed for these two words.
  - 5. Or "oppose" or "contrast."
  - 6. A "making one's way in" or a "passing into."
  - 7. No meaning was listed for  $\sigma \in \rho \in \omega \mu \alpha$ . The reference to Genesis 1:6 seems to suggest a meaning of "firmament."

Martyr, who sings:

Suddenly he is here, an imperceptible hero, With doors and windows staying closed.

For the most part Calvin [says] the same thing. Marloratus repeats his words in this way: "It is simply inconsistent with the mind of the Evangelist that they suppose that the doors were unlocked in some way and that he entered in a human manner. Then it must be held that Christ did not enter without a miracle." (Exposition of Ecclesiastes, John 20, p. 601, f.a.)

VI. Nevertheless we add that from this we are not willing to conclude that Christ went directly through the doors themselves, because it doesn't say  $\Delta\iota\alpha^{'1}$   $\theta\upsilon\rho\tilde{\omega}\nu$   $\kappa\varepsilon\kappa\lambda\varepsilon\iota\sigma\mu\acute{e}\nu\omega\nu$ , but in general, that a penetration had been made. Because Christ would have stood in a room with [everything] staying closed on all sides, we may not know decidedly through which part of the room it happened.

Nor is it that you should allege the impossibility of the penetration!<sup>6</sup> For we should have mentioned out of Hilary, "He from whom all nature receives the law is not [himself] subject to the laws of nature" (Book 9, *On the Trinity*, p. 196). Or has not Christ penetrated [gone through?] the Heavens themselves with his body? (Hebrews 4:14). Has he broken through [them]? (Micah 2:13). Yet they are the  $\sigma \in \rho \in \omega \mu \alpha^7$  [firmament?], more solid than iron to anyone at all (Genesis 1:6), indeed poured out as if most solid air (Job 37:14 [18?]).

Therefore, like the venerable Bede in *Psalm* 52, believe that the closed [doors] were penetrated in this way that no traces remained for him.