

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY
EXEGETICAL BRIEFS

An Overview
and an Example
from George König's
CENTURIA
VINDICIARUM
SACRARUM

Paul Brug
Senior Dogmatics
Submitted to Prof. Brug
February 15, 1998

The following selection is 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. The example that follows really addresses more of a hermeneutical question. 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.

In the following example, the question revolves around the interpretation of a type. If Moses' establishment of the covenant between God and the Israelites by the sprinkling of blood was a type of Jesus' institution of the Lord's Supper, which both sides grant, what degree of comparison can be made, and to what detail does the type prefigure the antitype? Bellarmine's contention is that this account validates the Roman theology of the sacrifice of the mass. Since Moses had to make a sacrifice before he sprinkled the blood on the people, he contends, Christ must be sacrificed (again) before we may partake in his blood.

The response really has two main arguments. The first, which is stated briefly, is that it is bad hermeneutics to draw a conclusion from a type unless the interpretation is drawn from Scripture itself. The second argument is really a basic lesson in Logic 101. Bellarmine's argument cannot work because it just does not follow from the facts. He misses the fact that the key to every kind of comparison or type is to know what the *tertium* is -- the one aspect that is similar between both sides of the comparison.

There are a total of 100 passages addressed in this work. 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 VI

Exod. 24:8

Moses sumptum sanguinem respersit in populum. Et ait; hic est sanguis foederis.

ROBERTUS BELLARMINUS probaturus, Missam esse Sacrificium proprie sic dictum allegat hunc textum, & ex eo sic argumentatur:

Sanguis V.T. apud Mosen erat sanguis victimæ jam immolatæ & verè ac propriè sacrificatæ, ut patet *Exod. 24*. Ergo Sanguis N.T. ap. Christum est sanguis victimæ immolatæ & verè ac propriè sacrificatæ. Est autem sanguis ille, sanguis Christi, ut ipse dicit: Hic est sanguis meus; E. Fuit ipse victima in coena immolata & sacrificata. Ratio connexi est: quia dedicatio & celebratio hæc V.T. fuis figura impleta in ultima coena. Aeq; responderi potest (ita præoccupat Jesuita) sanguinem Christi in coenâ fuisse sanguinem victimæ futuræ in cruce. Nam in Exodo prius immolata est victima, deinde sanguis aspersus in populum, illis verbis: Hic est sanguis &c. Ergo & Christus debuit se ipsum victimam facere & immolare: Deinde de sanguine dicere, hic est sanguis &c.

Præterea nulla ratio patitur, ut prius sanguis victimæ hauriatur, deinde victima immoletur, cum econtrariò, ex immolatione sanguis sequatur. Deniq; cum in figura V.T. *Exod. 24*. tria inveniantur. 1. Promulgatio legis coram populo. *v.5*. 2. Immolatio victimæ foederalis seu pacificæ *vers.5*. 3. Aspersio sanguinis & manducatio victimæ; *vers.8*. & Christus implevit primum cum ait: hoc est præceptum meum: Et tertium cum ait: comedite, hoc est corpus meum: Bibite, hic est sanguis meus: Quis credat prætermissum fuisse secundum, videlicet victimæ immolationem? Ad hoc argumentum nullam legi vel CHEMNITII vel aliorum confutationem, *Tom. 8. controversiarum lib. 1. de Missa c. 8. col. 745*.

LOCUS VI

Exodus 24:8

Moses took blood and sprinkled it on the people. And he said, "This is the blood of the covenant."

Robert Bellarmine, about to be approved,¹ claims that the sacrifice of the mass is properly spoken of in this text, and from that point makes this argument:

The blood of the Old Testament in connection with Moses was the blood of a victim² already offered and truly and properly sacrificed, as it is revealed in Exodus 24. Therefore the blood of the New Testament in connection with Christ is the blood of a victim of a victim offered and truly and properly sacrificed. But it is the very blood of Christ, as he himself says, "This is my blood." He himself was the victim offered and sacrificed in the Supper. This is the reason of connection: because this O.T. dedication and celebration was a type fulfilled in the Last Supper. In the same way, one could respond (this is what the Jesuit anticipates) that the blood of Christ in the Supper was the blood of a victim yet to be [offered] on the cross. For in Exodus, the victim is first offered, then the blood is sprinkled on the people in accordance with these words: "This is the blood...". Therefore, Christ himself also ought to be a victim and be offered; after that, to say about the blood, "This is the blood..."

Further, it doesn't make sense that first the blood of the victim is shed, then the victim is offered, when, on the contrary, the blood follows after the sacrifice. Finally, [this is evident] when in the Old Testament type in Exodus 24, three things are discovered: 1. The revelation of the law in the presence of the people (*v.5*). 2. The sacrifice of a covenantal or peacemaking victim (*v.5*). 3. The sprinkling of the blood and the eating of the victim (*v.8*). And Christ fulfilled the first thing when he asserts, "Eat, this is my body. Drink, this is my blood." Who would believe that the second thing was omitted, namely, the sacrifice of the victim? To this argument I found no confutation, either in Chemnitz or anyone else. (Book 3, *controversiarum*, Book 1, *Concerning the Mass*, c. 8, column 743)

I Respond: As this locus is rightly treated, there should be an order to be observed, in this way, so that at the start, a completed syllogism might be

Respondeo. Ut hic locus ritè pertractetur, ordo erit observandus, ita, ut initiò perfectus syllogismus formetur : Deinde ad utramq; præmissarum respondeatur : diniqu' ; quantum præoccupatio valeat, dispiciatur.

I. Itaq; perfectus Syllogismus erit hic:

Quodcumq; præcessit in dedicatione & celebratione V.T. idem debet sequi in institutione N.T. Ratio est, quia ista dedicatio fuit figura institutionis N.T. At in ista dedicatione facta est immolatio victimæ & sanguinis aspersio. Ergo idem debet sequi in hac institutione.

II. Respondemus ad Majorem I. In genere. Ex figuris & typis non ducuntur firma argumenta, nisi explicatio inveniatur, & addatur ex scriptura. AUGUST. *Epistola 48. 2.* In specie. Propositio ista, sic absolutè posita, falsa est. Nam si idem debuit sequi in institutione N.T. quod præcessit in dedicatione veteris, sequetur, discipulos sanguine Christi fuisse aspersos, quia Moses populum sanguine aspersisse legitur. *Vers.8.* Cum tamen scriptura in *ευ'χαριστίας* institutione, non aspersiois : sed bibitionis tantùm sanguinis mentionem faciat, tam apud Paulum, quàm apud tres reliquos Evangelistas. Imò, an non sequitur ; aut sanguinem illum foederalem effusum fuisse in remissionem peccatorum quoq', quemadmodum de Christi sanguine enunciatur, quod effundatur in remissionem peccatorum, *Matth. 26.28* aut plus, non idem secutum esse in antitypo, quàm in typo fuerit præfiguratum?

3. Isthæc propositio erit verissima, si sic limitata fuerit; quod in dedicatione V.T. præcessit, quantum ipsam sanctionem attinet, istud secutum est etiam in institutione N.T. Sanè non negamus, hunc locum continere typum & figuram rei implendæ in N.T.: seu implendum esse in veritate, quod per Mosen fuerat ostensum in imagine, quemadmodum PELARGUS loquitur in *explicatione hujus capituli*

formed. Then from both angles, the argument sent before is answered. Finally, how strong his anticipatory argument might be is considered.

1. And so this [is] the completed syllogism:

Whatever went before in the Old Testament consecration and celebration, the same ought to be followed in the New Testament institution. The reason is because this consecration was a figure of the New Testament institution. But in that consecration, the sacrifice of the victim and the sprinkling of blood was made. Therefore the same ought to be followed in this institution.

2. Let me respond to the greater

1) In general. Sound arguments are not derived from figures and types, unless an interpretation is found and produced from Scripture. (*Augustine, Letter 48*).

2) Specifically. This proposition, stated completely in this way, is false. For if in the New Testament institution, the same thing ought to follow that went before in the old consecration, it follows that the disciples sprinkled the blood of Christ, because it says that Moses sprinkled the people with blood (verse 8). Nevertheless, when Scripture, in the institution of the Eucharist, doesn't mention sprinkling, but only the drinking of blood, as in the writings of Paul, as well as in the three remaining Evangelists. On the contrary, does it *not* really follow that either the former blood of the covenant was also poured out for the forgiveness of sins - just as it is declared about the blood of Christ, which was poured out for the forgiveness of sins (*Matthew 26:28*) - or the same thing did not follow in the antitype, which was prefigured in the type?

3) This proposition would be most true if it was limited in this way: what went before in the Old Testament consecration, as much as it is in keeping with the same aspect, the same thing also followed in the New Testament institution. Of course, we do not deny that this passage contains a type and figure of a thing to be fulfilled in the New Testament, and that it would be fulfilled in truth, which was shown through Moses in a picture, just as Pelargus says in *Explicatione hujus Capituli*, P. 231. Now we should surely pay attention to which mode of comparison³ that of the type stands in. For in every comparison, which is the category to which types

pag. 231. Jam vero attendendum, in quo ratio istius typi consistat. Nam in omni comparatione, quorsum etiam typi pertinent, ad tria est attendendum. I. ad terminum à quo, quidam vocant argutum. 2. ad terminum ad quem, quem iidem arguens indignant. 3. ad rationem similitudinis, seu tertium comparationis, in quo duo isti termini conferuntur. Vide CONRAD. DIETERICUM *in Instit. logic. l. 1. c. 20. pag. 151.* Quod tertium comparationis seu ratio typi erit, testamenti sanctio per sanguinem, sine respectu ad victimam, sive pecuniam, sive humanam, sive mactatam, sive mactandam: sine consideratione oblationis seu cruentæ seu incruentæ: sine modo applicationis seu per aspersionem, seu per bibitionem. Aliàs n. si ratio typi in his consideraretur, concludendum foret, in antitypo etiam I. vitulos mactandos. 2. Christum prius occidendum. 3. Oblationem cruentè peragendam. 4. Non bibendum, sed spargendum sanguinem. Rectissimè enim GRAWERUS: Qualis conditio typi, talis est antitypi. *In examine Sophisticationum Photinianorum p. 41.* Et CORNELIUS à Lapide: Qualis est res in se, talis est & typus ejus in repræsentatione, *in caput 9. Ad Hebræ. pag. 964. num. 181.* Stante igitur ista ratione typi sola & genuina, nempe testamenti sanctione per sanguinem, Substituenda erit.

III. Hæc Minor: Atqui V.T. sancitum est per sanguinem, Ergo N.T. quoq; per sanguinem sanciri oportuit. Quem etiam adhibitum fuisse, nulla tenus dubitamus, permoti autoritate istorum verborum: hic est sanguinis N.T.

IV. Ad membra præoccupationis Bellarminianæ, quæ recitantur diversa, cum tamen diversitas solùm appareat in verbis, in re consensus sit unus & quidem hic: Quia ibi prius immolata sit victima, & deinde demum haustus atq; sparsus sanguis, idèd Christum quoq; se ipsum prius victimam facere. deinde sanguinem

belong, three things must be paid attention to: 1. to the *terminus a quo* [end from which], [which] certain people call clear, 2. to the *terminus ad quem* [end to which], which the same people need in their arguing. 3. To the mode of similarity¹, also [called] the *tertium* [third part] of the comparison, in which those two *termini* [ends] are put together. (See Conrad Dietericum in *Institutes of Logic*, Book 1, Chapter 20, p. 151.) But the *tertium* of the comparison and the mode [of similarity] of the type is the establishment of a covenant through blood - without respect to the victim, whether property or one of the human race, whether killed or yet to be killed - without considering the [type of] offering, whether bloody or unbloody - apart from the means of application, whether sprinkling or drinking. If the mode [of similarity] of the type is not considered among these other things, it will have to be concluded, in the antitype as well, 1. A bull-calf had to be killed, 2. Christ had to be killed first, 3. The offering had to be carried out in a bloody manner, and 4. The blood should not have been drunk, but sprinkled. Indeed, Grawerus very rightly [says], "The antitype is the same kind of arrangement as the type" (*Examination of the Sophistries of the Photinians*, p. 41). Also Cornelius [in] *A Lapide*: "Just as the thing is in itself, so also is its type in representation" (*Hebrews Chapter 9*, p. 964, num. 181). Therefore, since the mode [of similarity] of the type stands alone and naturally - to be sure, the establishment of a covenant through blood - it should be substituted.

3. This is the lesser argument: At any rate, the Old Covenant was consecrated through blood, therefore the New Covenant also should have been consecrated through blood. We in no way doubt that this was meant to be applied, persuaded by the authority of these words: "This is the blood of the New Covenant⁶."

4. Concerning Bellarmine's anticipatory argument - in which contradictory things are read, yet when the contradiction appears in words, in the matter there should be one consensus, namely, this: Because on that first occasion, a victim was offered, and at that time and not before, the blood was poured out as well as sprinkled, therefore Christ also had to first make himself a victim, then should

porrigere oportuisse ; forte responderi posset. I. per *Distinct. Inter Sanctionem seu ordinationem Testamenti & ejus obsignationem.* Moses quia condidit, ordinavit & simul obsignavit T.V. debuit utiq; prius mactare victimam: pòst de ejus sanguine populum aspergere: Christus verò quia in Cæna testamentum saltem ordinavit, per mortem autem subsequenter obsignavit *in caput 9. Ad Heb. p. 965. num. 186.*

Nos tamen respondemus: Christum in coena I. non debuisse se victimam facere, quia victimalis ejus oblatio semel erat finienda. Si a. in coena se obtulisset, & in cruce iterum, multiplicata fuisset oblatio contra PAULUM *Heb. 9. 12. 26. cap. 10. 10.* Neq; elabentur sua distinctione inter sacrificium *cruentum & incruentum*, quasi Christus sacrificasset se semel, sed cruentè in cruce: Incruentè a. in coena. *Primum* n. ubicunq; in scriptura Christus dicitur oblatus, seu tanquam victima sacrificatus, semper intelligitur illius mors & sacrificium cruentum, nec ullus est locus in contrarium. *Deinde* sacrificium cruentum aut fuit idem cum sacrificio incruento, aut diversum. Si idem, aliquid fuit simul cruentum & incruentum: Si diversum, & istud in cruce, hoc verò in coena est peractum, *denuò* sequeretur, diversis sacrificiis, & bis, non unica oblatione & semel nos per Christum esse consummatos. II. Non potuisse tùm se victimam facere, quia Christus, & Testator. N. T. & victima Deo oblata dicitur. *Heb 9. 14.* Non potest autem prius esse victima, quam testator, salvo naturæ ordine. Nam ut nullus testator prius moritur, postea demum Testamentum condit, esset n. impossibile ; nisi statuere velis, hominem mortuum, sensus & rationis expertem, tamen suam voluntatem posse declarare : Sic ne Christus prius potuit victima fieri (utpote quod sine intercedente morte erat impossibile : sed necessum fuit, testamentum

have offered his blood — this anticipatory argument can be answered powerfully. 1) Through the *distinction between the consecration or putting in place of the Covenant and its sealing.* Moses, because he established, put in place and at the same time sealed the Old Covenant⁵, should at any rate have killed the victim first and afterwards sprinkled the people with some of its blood. Indeed, Christ, because he at least put the covenant in place in the Supper, he nevertheless sealed it through his death, which followed after (In Chapter 9, *Hebrews*, p. 965, num. 186).

Nevertheless, we respond: In the Supper, Christ 1) did not have to make himself a victim, because the offering of his victimhood was to be accomplished once. If he offered himself both in the Supper and again on the cross, there was a multiple offering, contrary to Paul (Hebrews 9:12, 26; 10:10). Nor do they escape by their distinction between a *bloody* and an *unbloody* sacrifice, as if Christ sacrificed himself once, but bloodily on the cross, and unbloodily in the Supper. *First*, Christ is neither spoken of everywhere in Scripture as offered or sacrificed as a victim, nor there is any passage on the other side. *Then*, the bloody sacrifice was either the same thing as the unbloody sacrifice, or something different. If the same thing, it was something bloody and unbloody at the same time. If something different, and that on the cross, this truly was accomplished in the Supper, *again* it would follow that we are consummated through Christ by different sacrifices, and twice — and not by a single offering, and once.

2) Then he cannot make himself a victim, because Christ is spoken of both as the testator of the New Covenant and as the victim offered by God (Hebrews 9:14). Moreover, he cannot be a victim before being a testator without breaking the order of nature. For just as no testator dies first, then writes a will, for it would be impossible for a dead man, without sense or reason, unless he established a will⁶, to still declare his wishes. For it was not possible for Christ to be made a victim, inasmuch as that it was impossible, as long as his end, death, came between. But it was necessary for him to form his testament⁵, afterwards to pour out his blood upon the altar, like the sacrificed victim upon the sins of the many which would be removed.

suum conderet, postea sanguinem ad altare effunderet, quasi hostiam ad multorum exhaurienda peccata. AMBROS. *Tom. 5. Epistola 3. Ad Simplicianum pag. 65.*

Ut autem tota collatio, hujus typi & antitypi accuratius intelligatur, sequens Schema erit observandum: Testamentum V. & N. conditur á Deo, inter se, tanquam testatorem, & homines, ceu heredes, & expeditur mediante sanguine. Vetus, sanguine pecuino : Novum sanguine Filii Dei. Ut ratum sit, tam testator, quam hæredes utrobique de sanguine participant, olim DEUS & Israelitæ: DEUS, dum super altare suum pars sanguinis funditur *Exod. 14. 16.* Israelitæ, dum sanguine eodem asperguntur *Exod. 24. 8.* Nunc seu in N. T. Deus, & Christiani: Deus, dum in ara crucis, in signum plenæ satisfactionis sanguis ei á filio funditur. *Ephes. 5. 2.* Christiani dum in usu cænæ exhibetur illis, & mediante vino bibitur idem sanguis, & eo ipso dignè utentibus, spiritualia legata applicantur, sic uti argui potest ex *I. Corinth. 11. 29.*

(Ambrose, Vol. 3, Letter 3, *Ad Simplicianum*, p. 63).

Moreover, as an entire collection, it is accurately understood of this type and antitype, the following figure should be observed: the Old and New Testaments are established by God, between himself, as the testator, and men, as heirs, and it is effective because the blood is mediating. In the Old, the blood of an animal, in the New, the blood of the Son of God. As a result it has been judged, as the testator [takes part in the blood], so also the heirs in both cases take part in the blood. In former times, it was God and the Israelites: God, as long as part of the blood was poured out above his altar (*Exodus 14:16*); the Israelites, as long as they were sprinkled with the same blood (*Exodus 24:8*). And now in the New Testament, it is God and Christians: God, as long as on the altar of the cross, as a mark of full satisfaction, the blood of [his] Son is poured out to him. (*Ephesians 5:2*); and Christians, as long as in the use of the Supper it is displayed to them, and with the wine acting as the medium, the same blood is drunk, and by that same [blood] the spiritual things appointed are applied to the ones making use of it rightly, as it can be argued in this way from *1 Corinthians 11:29*.

1. Probaturus might indicate that he is a candidate for beatification/sainthood.
2. Victima denotes an animal offered in a sacrifice. It is translated *victim* throughout.
3. In the following section, ratio seems best translated by *mode of comparison* or *mode of thinking*. It indicates the way of thinking that makes the comparison work – the *tertium* which connects the two *termini* (see the next paragraph).
4. Rationem similitudinis.
5. Testamentum in Latin covers the English concepts of covenant, testament, and will. *Testament* is usually used when referring to the Old and New Testament portions of the Bible. *Covenant* is usually used to indicate the covenants established through Moses and through Jesus. The terminology becomes a bit mixed and confusing in English when, later on, he uses the illustration of a will-writer (testator), which is also used in Hebrews.
6. Latin *velis* – I couldn't find any definition; *will* seemed to fit the context best.