

The Sacrifice of Melchizedek.

Resp. JOHANNE HORENBEEK, Haarlem-Batavian. May 14, 1636.

The Papists, in order to prop up that ruinous Mass sacrifice, seek supports from all sides. Sometimes they flee from the sacred writings to their non-entities, I say, chimerical traditions; sometimes they implore the consensus of the ancient Church and the Fathers, but in vain, as has been shown by the Lord of Noble Plessy in his book on the Eucharist, Chamier, in his *Panstratia*, Molina in his *Novelty of Papism*, and most recently by Aubertin, a minister of Paris, in place of a response to whom the Irreformable Clerics have contrived calumny and treachery. At last, when they have wandered through everything, they cast themselves with a desperate leap, as it were, into Scripture, which is so adverse and so horrifying to them. Among other testimonies of Scripture, they also bring forward Genesis 14, verses 18 and 19, which we will vindicate in the present, according to the custom of the theses, briefly from inept corruptions and senile fables, so that the Christian reader may recognize from this one desperate prop of their cause the rest also of that ilk.

§.1. The opinion of the PAPISTS is: In the Mass or in the Sacrament of the altar (as they say), the Son of God, Jesus Christ, in body and blood transubstantiated from bread and wine, under the species of bread and wine, is truly, really, and corporally offered to God by the priest as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead, and also as an impetratory sacrifice for obtaining benefits of all kinds from God. They want this opinion of theirs to be of faith; and accordingly they devote all those who think otherwise to eternal and temporal flames. Compare the Canon of the Mass and the Council of Trent, session 22, the Oath of the Profession of Faith in the bull of Pius IV, 1564, the Profession of Faith to be made by the Greeks by order of Gregory XIII, Bellarmine book 1 on the Mass chapters 6 and 7, Azor moral institutes part 1 book 10 chapters 9, 18, 20, Thomas part 3 question 83 article 1 and there Cajetan and other commentators, particularly Vasquez on the 3rd part of Thomas disputation 218, Suarez on the 3rd part of Thomas question 83 volume 3 disputations 74-75, Coccius' Catholic Treasury volume 2 book 6, Becan's Manual book 1 chapter 10, and innumerable other skirmishers. We reject this whole system of mythological theology with the same ease with which it is asserted without Scripture and the consent of antiquity; indeed, with the Reformed Churches, martyrs, Confessors, Doctors, we detest it from the heart as a denial of the unique sacrifice of Christ on the cross, and execrable idolatry, as our Catechism says in question 80. Moreover, we add that Christian Magistrates most gravely wound their conscience when they knowingly and willingly allow the miserable people to be imposed on by those abominable rites; which, however, we do not want to apply to those who can protest before God in conscience that they only tolerate an evil which they cannot remove without subversion of the Republic, or great concussion, or formidable and inevitable danger; which brings more evil than tolerating the Mass.

Corollary 1. The decrees of the supreme powers in the federated Netherlands promulgated against the celebration of Masses, particularly in 1612, 1630, 1635, likewise the legitimate executions of those decrees (among which we number that famous one trumpeted by the Papists at Amisfort, if I am not mistaken in 1610, when the apparatus of the Mass was publicly

burned with fire), cannot be accused by the Papists of any color of injustice, iniquity, or tyranny against consciences: unless at the same time they want to blacken with the same calumny the command of God in Deuteronomy 7:5 and 12:2-3, the Examples of Asa, Hezekiah, Josiah, etc., and of the Christian Emperors who extirpated idolatry.

2. With Roman-Papistic faith, the Author of the book which is widely circulated among the Papists under the name of the Gallic Mars under the name of Alexander Patricius Armachanus the Theologian, thunders against the Federated Dutch the crimes of tyranny, heresy, rebellion, perfidy, Libertinism, Atheism, on account of the prohibited use of the Papistic Religion, and the restoration of the ancient and Catholic Christianity, book 2 chapters 3, 4, 5, 10, 24, 26, 28. The Author of it is said to be Cornelius Jansenius of Leerdam, recently Professor of Theology at Louvain, now Bishop of Ypres.

They seek the chief proof of that sacrifice from the example of Melchizedek, whom they imagine to have offered bread and wine as a figure of Christ in a type of the Missal sacrifice to be performed in the N.T. Thus Bellarmine, Coccius, Vasquez, Suarez in the cited places, Becanus in his Manual, Malderus in his Catholic Institutes in Dutch chapter 28, Joh. Jansonius formerly Professor of Louvain in a special treatise published in Dutch, entitled The Process of Melchizedek. Cottonus in his Genevan Plagiarism, where he also imputes to our people the crime of a corrupted text of Scripture, Genesis 14:18. We on the contrary assert:

I. Nothing is contained in the cited text about any sacrifice of Melchizedek.

II. Granted but not conceded, if such a thing were held, yet the Missal sacrifice could in no way be demonstrated from here.

§.3. Our prior assertion is most clearly proved from the cited text verses 18-19, which Pagnini's Version and that of Arias Montanus, so solemnly approved with the Royal Bibles in the Papacy, translate word for word thus: "And Melchizedek king of Salem brought out bread and wine, and he was priest to God most high. And he blessed him." The Tigurine Version, which is also called Vatablus' (the Royal Professor of Paris) because Vatablus' notes are added to it, which was also twice published by the Papists at Lyons by the Spanish Theologians (about which see Thuanus' Histories book 23) then at Salamanca in 1584, which version along with Pagnini's the Jesuit Serrarius also says is commended above all other versions (prolegomena to the Bible chapter 18 question 3), who there also mentions both of those editions by the Spanish Theologians. This version reads thus: "And Melchizedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine, and he was priest of God most high. And he blessed him." The Greek interpreters (who are as if authentic to the Papists) translate: "And Melchizedek king of Salem brought out bread and wine, and he was priest to God most high, and he blessed Abram." It is noted on the Greek Bible of Wechelus' edition in folio that other copies read "he brought to him", that is, to Abraham. And thus the Latin translation of the Septuagint published at Basel in 1562 in 4to: "he brought to him bread and wine." The Targum of Onkelos: "he brought out bread and wine, and he was a minister before God most high. And he blessed him." The Arabic Translation published by Erpenius: "he brought out (or produced, drew out) food and drink or boiled fruit." Schindler in his lexicon this word "mead or boiled fruit, which the Arabs use for wine and honey." Who now would elicit from that text a sacrifice of bread and wine, and indeed a propitiatory one? Even if

the Vulgate Version were to prevail? "But Melchizedek king of Salem, bringing forth bread and wine, for he was priest of God most high, blessed him." Which the Papists seeing, now seek the force of the argument not in the text or phrase of the text "he brought forth" or "he brought out bread and wine", but in what they want to be understood, that is, in what is not in the text, in their assumptions, of course, and comments. He brought forth, they say, but for sacrificing. For to what end would he have brought it forth? A fine consequence indeed. As if no priest could ever bring forth or draw out food or bread and wine except for sacrificing.

§.4. II. Because the analogy and circumstances of the text not only admit this simple sense and interpretation of ours, which is enough for us against the Papists affirming and failing in proof; but also (to add this out of abundance) not obscurely prove it. "Bread" signifies by a synecdoche familiar to the Hebrews "food", "victual", Genesis 3:19, Numbers 28:2, even "feast", Daniel 5:1. "He brought out", by force of the word, nowhere denotes "to sacrifice", not even "to bring out for sacrificing". Otherwise strange significations of this word could be fabricated by this new and ungrammatical grammar of the Jesuits, as Exodus 8:18, Leviticus 24:22. Next, he is not said to have brought it forth to God, which is required in sacrifices. To whom then, you will say, did he bring it forth? To Abraham (thus Tertullian against the Jews chapter 3), whom he congratulates on his victory, in order to refresh him, or at least to receive him honorably, and to exhibit this sign of honor and of his own and the public joy; for thus munificence is wont to be exercised in the ancient manner for the sake of honor, benevolence, and congratulation, see Deuteronomy 23:4, Judges 8:6. The Papists admit that Abraham was received with a feast, Genebrardus in his chronology page 43, Pererius, and Cornelius à Lapide in their commentaries (although this is denied by Bellarmine, Vasquez, Valencia), and the tired soldiers refreshed with bread and wine. But the priest brought it forth. Rightly indeed, but not as priest. As a Musician builds a house, which Aristotle calls "per accidens"; for he does not build as a Musician. As they themselves will not say that the Popes who were Magicians, Heretics, Apostates, were such as Popes. Why can it not be said that he exhibited those gifts as a king and friend, and blessed Abraham as a greater priest? Compare Hebrews 7:6-7. The Papists except, Bellarmine book 1 on the Mass chapter 6, that the title of priest must necessarily be joined with the act of bringing forth bread, and not with the act of blessing, because the causal particle "for" and the accent *soph-pasuk* terminating a full period with verse 17 prove this; and accordingly verse 18 begins a new period.

Response 1: First, the "for" does not appear in the Hebrew text; besides, the Septuagint join it with the blessing, when they translate "and he was". Which the Jesuit Pererius acknowledges (in his commentary on Genesis 14), "The Greek translation here does not have a causal particle but a copulative one."

Second, in Hebrews 7:6-7, the dignity and excellence of the Priesthood of Melchizedek is placed in this, that he blessed Abraham; why then would the blessing here not be joined as effect with the priesthood as its cause? Whatever some more shameless ones may struggle against, yet the Jesuits Ribera, Justinianus, Cornelius à Lapide concede and confirm in their commentaries on Hebrews 7 that he blessed Abraham as priest. As for the particle "for", which Bellarmine says compels the pretended interpretation, thus Oleaster in his commentary: "Note

that although the Septuagint and the Vulgate translate 'For he was etc.', as if the following sentence gave the reason for the former, yet in Hebrew it is as we have translated, 'And he was priest'."

Third, Those who elsewhere ascribe the accents and points to the Masoretic Critics of the Jews, and detract all authenticity from them, now seek the foundation of their whole cause in it.

Fourth, They clamor that the period must necessarily be closed by that accent (Bellarmine on the Word of God book 1 chapter 1), who elsewhere with their Vulgate interpreter do not end the period on account of the *soph-pasuk*, as in this same chapter 14 verses 1 with 2, and 5 with 6, in this very text, which is thus punctuated: "bringing forth bread and wine (for he was priest of God most high) he blessed him, and said etc." See also 1 Chronicles 21:11, Genesis 23:17, 2 Samuel 11:19, Jeremiah 33:10.

As for their addition about the conjunction, that it signifies "for" as the Vulgate translated "for he was Priest", certainly it is too diluted; for if it be conceded that sometimes this particle can be so explained, yet they will not conclude that it must necessarily be so explained here; unless by a puerile paralogism, which is called "from a particular", as if one were to conclude "One or another Jesuit was a Cardinal, as for example Bellarmine, Tolet; therefore all Jesuits are or will be Cardinals." Pope Urban VIII would deny this consequence. But what if we concede that a reason is given why he brought forth bread and wine to Abraham, because of course he was not only king but also priest, how will they sculpt out a sacrifice from there? Why could not Moses give the reason that Abraham was honored with food and wine, because Melchizedek was not only a powerful king, but also a pious and benevolent priest of God, whom it befitted especially as a pious priest to do good to Abraham; no less than it befits a Bishop in the N.T. to be hospitable, 1 Timothy 3:2.

§.5. III. Our opinion is confirmed by Josephus, Antiquities book 1 chapter 12, where he says that Melchizedek offered Abraham gifts and an abundance of all necessary things. And Philo on Abraham: that he slaughtered victims and entertained all his comrades of the battle with a feast. Peter Comestor praises and follows this opinion, Scholastic History on Genesis chapter 46. Indeed, Bellarmine himself on the Mass book 1 chapter 6, compelled by the force of truth, thus far yields: "We do not deny that those things were given for food to Abraham and his companions." But above all the most learned Cardinal Cajetan ingeniously deserts his companions here, commentary on Genesis 14: "Nothing is written here about a sacrifice or oblation, but about a bringing forth or drawing out, which Josephus says was done to refresh the victors. But what is added in the Vulgate edition as the cause of the oblation, 'For he was priest to God most high', is not held in Hebrew as the cause, but as a separate clause, 'And he was priest to God most high'." Of the Fathers, whom the adversaries summon here, Chrysostom on Genesis 14 expressly says: "he brought forth bread and wine to him" (for he says "he was priest of God most high"), "from him he receives what was brought etc.", where note that the oblation was made to Abraham, and indeed that they were breads, in the plural number. All the other Fathers who allegorically and by accommodation seek a figure here of the sacrament of bread and wine, by which Christ feeds his own in the Church, make for us, Epiphanius heresies 55, Clement of Alexandria Stromata book 4 chapter 8, Basil on Psalm 109, Chrysostom homily 35

on Genesis, Theodore on Genesis question 63, Cyprian epistle 63, nor do the rest who further name sacrifice oppose; for they understand nothing other than a metaphorical and Eucharistic sacrifice in the Eucharist. As among others the most Noble Plessis has solidly proved, book 3 on the Eucharist chapter 2. If it was permitted to Bellarmine, Coccius, Cottonus to lead the Rabbis into battle from Galatinus and Genebrardus, it will be permitted to us also to refer to the Rabbis; particularly R. S. Jarchi, who expounds this history in the same way as we do. Whatever also they may adduce from others, yet nothing for the Mass, but rather against it. For this the Rabbis say, who will be produced, that in the time of the Messiah all sacrifices will cease, except the toda, that is, Eucharistic, which was to be performed with bread and wine. And this is what we want. Therefore the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass is excluded.

The prior assertion having been established, we briefly prove the latter thus.

§.6. First, because nowhere either in Genesis, or in the epistle to the Hebrews, or in Psalm 110, where mention is made of the priesthood of Melchizedek, is it indicated by even a single apex that his sacrifice, if indeed there was any, is a type of the Missal sacrifice; but it is not permitted to establish any type destined somewhere without the word of God. But if it is said that the mere similarity which exists between bread and wine in the sacrifice of Melchizedek and in the Eucharist suffices to found such a type, we retort that then by equal reason every minchah or oblation of the priests the posterity of Aaron which was made in bread and wine will be a type of the Mass, and every sprinkling of water will be a destined type of Baptism; which the Papists themselves do not admit as most absurd. Bellarmine, Cottonus and others object that on account of the difficulty the Apostle did not dare then to explain those mysteries of the Eucharist.

Response 1: But he had already before explained it to the Corinthians, by nature Gentiles, 1 Corinthians 11.

Response 2: He did not conceal from the Hebrews the higher mysteries about the person of Christ, his offices, sacrifice, intercession, likewise about Melchizedek exhorting them to perfection, chapter 6:1.

Second, if indeed there had been any sacrifice in Genesis 14:18, why would it not equally or rather be said to have been a type of the sacrifice itself on the cross?

Third, because that which is imagined, the sacrifice of Melchizedek, could not have been a type of the sacrifice in the Eucharist. For it would not have been propitiatory (since propitiation or expiation of sins was not made by bread and wine), but the Mass is said to be propitiatory.

Then there bread and wine were offered, as they want; but here in the Mass Christ himself; there would therefore be no similarity between the type and the antitype.

Finally, the signs of the Old Testament are not types of the signs of the New Testament, but of Christ himself, who is the body adumbrated by them, Colossians 2:17.

Fourth, if the priest, as priest, according to the Papists, both distributes the Eucharist and sacrifices, and exercises communion and sacrifice in one and the same Eucharist, whence will they prove that the bread and wine of Melchizedek were a type of the sacrifice, and not of the communion; or of the priest consecrating and not communicating?

Fifth, because the whole comparison of Melchizedek and Christ most exactly set forth by the Apostle does not have a typical sacrifice or a non-typical one, nor an antitype, of course the sacrifice of the Mass, not even the communion or sacrament of the Eucharist. For it consists in the origin and duration of the person; then in the adjuncts of sacerdotal dignity, absolute ones indeed - kingdom, royal virtues of justice and peace, duration of priesthood and kingship to eternity; comparative adjuncts, that it excels the Levitical priesthood:

1. In person.
2. In kingship, or royal priesthood.
3. In duration.
4. In the offices and effects of priesthood.

So that Bellarmine disputes too impudently, not so much against us as against the Apostle, Hebrews 7, that in the priesthood of Melchizedek there is nothing proper or peculiar why it alone is a type of the priesthood of Christ, unless the sacrifice of bread and wine - whose opinion, although with name suppressed, Vasquez refutes, on the 3rd part volume 1 disputation 26.

§.7. We conclude that nothing is contained in the cited place Genesis 14:18 about a sacrifice; nor also in Psalm 110, nor in Hebrews 7, where especially it should have been explained in the comparison of the priesthood of Melchizedek and Christ. If mention of a sacrifice were granted in Genesis 14, it would not yet have been proved that it was propitiatory. Finally, if we were to concede that it was propitiatory, whence will it be proved that it was a type, and indeed a destined one, of the Missal sacrifice?

COROLLARIES:

I. The Targum of Jerusalem and Midrash Agada in R. S. Jarchi, and other Rabbis, and with them Broughton, in the Consent of Scripture, do not rightly assert that Melchizedek is Shem.

II. Nor is it better said that he was an angel, or the Son of God, or the Holy Spirit, or a power of God superior to Christ himself. See Epiphanius heresies 55 and 67, Augustine on heresies chapter 34, and there Danaeus.

III. It is no slight vertigo, when with the alleged examples of Melchizedek and Numa Pompilius, the Remonstrants once asserted (when things so required) to the Magistrate the pretended Ecclesiastical power.

IV. King Anius in Virgil, Mercury (whom they call) Trismegistus, Numa Pompilius with their royal priesthood do not hinder Christ alone from being King and Priest, and Melchizedek his peculiar type - no more than the Devil, God's ape, can hinder God alone from being God; and Apollonius of Tyana and Simon Magus with their tricks, that Christ alone is not that thaumaturgist promised to the fathers, Matthew 11:4-5.

V. There are no priests of the New Testament properly so called, besides Christ. For if such were imagined, they would be according to the order either of Melchizedek or of Aaron. But they are neither. Therefore.

VI. That phrase by which pastors and ministers of churches in the N.T. are called priests seems incorrect and abusive in some way. Why do they not call the churches synagogues by the same right? Why do they not revive the rest of the technologisms of Judaism (from which the Apostles abstain in the N.T.)?

VII. To bring back altars into the churches, whence they were ejected, is to forsake the former love, and to relapse from perfection to imperfection.