

## Scripture and Theological Method

Though perhaps not a systematic theologian, Luther had a high regard for theology. In remarks written for a graduating student he called theology “the queen of all wisdom and knowledge.”<sup>1</sup> The Reformer’s approach is not properly understood unless we realize that he did not understand himself to be elevating his own agenda, but was merely articulating what the best theologians of the Church always knew.<sup>2</sup> Or as he put it in a 1532 sermon, “For I must place the Word of God above everything else ... I must be willing to risk my body and life, the popularity of the work, my goods, my reputation, and all my happiness.”<sup>3</sup>

We have already noted Luther’s troubled relationship with Scholastic Theology and how this entails a critique of Aristotle on whom the followers of Thomas Aquinas depended.<sup>4</sup> As a result, and as we shall observe further in this chapter, Luther had suspicions about the use of Philosophy in Theology.<sup>5</sup> If used, philosophical concepts and reason first need to be bathed in faith, he contended while articulating the logic of Christian faith or offering comments with an apologetic intent.<sup>6</sup> In one such context he notes that such an apostolic philosophy will be more eschatologically oriented, focusing not on the essence of what things are but on what they might become or how they relate to life.<sup>7</sup>

The Reformer speaks of the weakness of human knowledge when he is engaged in polemics.<sup>8</sup> The problem with the prevailing philosophy in his day, rooted in Greek Philosophy, was that reality was defined in terms of essence. Luther changes the focus to *existentia*, the external relations one

has. For him, one's essence is determined by what one does or is done to them.<sup>9</sup>

From such a perspective, Luther could deem the study of history as nothing else than viewing God's work—grace and wrath.<sup>10</sup> When we rest in God's good pleasure with God's Word, he claims, then all we do becomes glorious and remains forever, while histories of the world are eternally wretched. Such a view of the tensions between ordinary history and history from God's perspective is most suggestive of Luther's endorsement of something like the modern notion of "salvation-history" as distinct from ordinary history.<sup>11</sup>

### REASON AND THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD

Philosophy, like reason, always has its place in earthly matters, including law and medicine, the Reformer contended.<sup>12</sup> At times, when explaining the logic of Christian faith, he was even willing to affirm that through reason we can know God.<sup>13</sup> For apologetic purposes, the Reformer posits the natural knowledge of God (while conceding it is imperfect).<sup>14</sup> He even embraces a cosmological argument.<sup>15</sup>

Reason even tells us what God is like. In his Catechism the Reformer defines Him as "that to which we look for good and in which we find refuge in very time of need."<sup>16</sup> To have a god, he says, is to trust and believe in that with your whole heart.<sup>17</sup> But Luther warns in other contexts, when teaching the Commandments of God, that the natural knowledge of God can lead to idolatry.<sup>18</sup> Yet he seems to engage in precisely this exercise, not naming it idolatry, when his focus shifts to comforting despair or exhorting Christian life. Then he claims that we all shape a God for ourselves.<sup>19</sup> He goes so far in one polemical setting as to contend that we have a general knowledge (accessible to all) of God as omnipotent.<sup>20</sup> (Could this be a way of his contending that such a vision of a wrathful God is a human construction?) And when addressing the logic of a text he was exegeting, with some polemical agendas in view, he even claims that we know God generally as merciful.<sup>21</sup> Perhaps he is contending here that a baptized reason already saturated with faith, does see God in this loving way. But in polemical contexts he claims that "It is the nature of reason that it seeks to understand and to measure God according to the Law."<sup>22</sup>

The contextuality of Luther's thought is obviously evident in these instances. It reflects further in polemical contexts or when criticizing

philosophy when he insists that God is incomprehensible (presumably denying access to God through reason).<sup>23</sup> Also in such contexts or when explaining the logic of faith or offering comfort Luther insisted that God is only known in the Word.<sup>24</sup> We will observe this even more clearly later in the chapter when we consider his Theology of the Cross. And in similar contexts he posits a distinction between the general knowledge of God (accessible to all) and the particular knowledge of God (regarding what the Lord thinks of us and how we are saved).<sup>25</sup> This distinction made in contexts when he was not totally rejecting some role for reason in knowing God, clearly connects with the Reformer's commitment to biblical authority, with what many contend to be a commitment on his part to the authority of Scripture alone (*sola scriptura*).<sup>26</sup> But in fact, there is more to this story.

### SCRIPTURE ALONE (SOMETIMES)

True enough, on some occasions, like when critiquing newer Catholic practices of the day, the Reformer claimed that no work not found in Scripture should be undertaken.<sup>27</sup> The assent of faith is due only to what is in Scripture, he contends.<sup>28</sup> When defending his position in Catholic polemics Luther affirmed the authority of Scripture, the most reliable of all testimonies, he claimed.<sup>29</sup> It is said to be our first principle.<sup>30</sup> He asserts that it is the true lord and master of all writings and doctrine.<sup>31</sup> And as he refers to Scripture in another work:

The queen must rule and everyone must obey and be subject to her. The Pope, Luther, Augustine, Paul, or even an angel from heaven ... these should not be masters or arbiters, but only witnesses, disciples, and confessors of Scripture.<sup>32</sup>

In this connection Luther speaks of the Christian's freedom to judge doctrine.<sup>33</sup> He also insisted in this connection on the clarity of Scripture, that it is its own interpreter, which is said to be the easiest and clearest interpretation.<sup>34</sup> These commitments entail that we do not need Tradition as an interpretive guide, for Scripture's literal sense is clear. This in turn undermines the validity of the use of allegorical interpretation.

These commitments reflect elsewhere in Luther's writings. When addressing polemical concerns, critiquing episcopal authority, Tradition

is said not to be authoritative, even if it lasted for a thousand years.<sup>35</sup> He even asserted on at least two occasions that Councils can err.<sup>36</sup> In his view a Council has no more authority to establish new articles of faith (a position more compatible with the Eastern view of the *consensus fidelium*) than the Catholic position on the authority of Councils.<sup>37</sup> But he did take a Conciliarist position in other polemical circumstances, contending that Councils have more authority than the Pope.<sup>38</sup>

In the same spirit, in face of temptation, the Reformer claims that one must cling to the Word and cast aside discussion contrary to it.<sup>39</sup> While dealing with papal abuses, he claims that the Church can only discern the books of the Bible, the canon.<sup>40</sup> Yet when in a similar context concerned with the Gospel, he claims that “the Gospel is not believed because the Church confirms it but rather because people sense that it is the Word of God.”<sup>41</sup> (Regarding the canon, it is interesting to note that Luther included the Apocrypha in his first German translation of the Bible, referring to it as “Those Books Are Not Held Equal to the Scriptures, but Are Useful as Good to Read.”<sup>42</sup>) But there are times when the Reformer appeals to Tradition, while explaining the logic of faith or when making arguments especially to authorize infant baptism, Christ’s Presence in the Eucharist, or the Immaculate Conception, as well as to authorize The Creed and the Trinity.<sup>43</sup>

Councils never err, Luther claimed, while considering essential things of faith.<sup>44</sup> They have no intrinsic authority, but can represent the universal Church if in accord with Scripture.<sup>45</sup>

### LUTHER AS DIALECTICAL THEOLOGIAN: PHILOSOPHICAL ROOTS

Endorsement of the paradoxical character of Luther’s thought is widespread in the academy.<sup>46</sup> That is true, but not all the time. We have already noted that the Reformer was very critical of Aristotle, and so of systematizing his own theological convictions. His roots in Nominalist philosophy explain this point of view. The Reformer claimed that Occam was his master.<sup>47</sup> He embraces the Nominalist realism and its claim that things are defined by their essence, not just their impact on the observer.<sup>48</sup> Luther also speaks of the influence of Johann von Staupitz on him.<sup>49</sup> Mysticism was another influence he acknowledged, even prior to the Reformation when he either sought

to depict the Christian life or offered a response to despair.<sup>50</sup> All of these influences entailed critique of the rationalist approach to the theology of his day. Of course once again Luther was not systematically consistent in endorsing these convictions, as in polemics he repudiated Mysticism.<sup>51</sup>

We have already observed that Luther understood himself as a contextual theologian. He is overtly critical of a systematic approach:

45. To state that a theologian who is not a logician is a monstrous heretic – this is a monstrous and heretical statement. This is in opposition to common opinion.

46. In vain does one fashion a logic of faith, a substation brought about with regard for limit and measure. This is in opposition to the new dialecticians.<sup>52</sup>

47. To say that Augustine exaggerates in speaking against heretics is to say that Augustine tells lies almost everywhere. This is contrary to common knowledge.<sup>53</sup>

Luther's critique of reason, already observed in connection with the knowledge of God, relates to faith as a whole. When exhorting faith in a sermon he proclaimed, "The natural light of man and the light of grace cannot be friends. Human nature wants perception and certitude as a condition of faith. Grace wants faith prior to perception."<sup>54</sup>

Even when just explicating faith or critiquing works-righteousness he claimed that human reason does not understand faith; it remains hidden.<sup>55</sup> Reason is the devil's whore, he claims when critiquing Erasmus's defense of free will.<sup>56</sup>

In Scripture, he claims, one finds nothing but "contrast and antithesis."<sup>57</sup> He even makes this claim when merely explaining the faith.<sup>58</sup> In the same spirit he contends that every assertion is said to be hidden under its denial.<sup>59</sup>

Yes, Luther was a dialectical theologian, but not all the time, only in polemics and a lesser extent when expositing the faith. And yet for all of his use of dialectical paradoxical thinking, when addressing death and sin he claimed that "faith reconciles opposites."<sup>60</sup> When dialoguing with philosophy he was even open to its use as long as it was clearly subordinated to Christ and the Word, that we had become fools in Christ.<sup>61</sup>

## LUTHER THE LITERALIST: THE RESULT OF THEOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT?

Luther was very aware how easily Scripture could be or has been distorted, claiming it was a “wax nose.”<sup>62</sup> Most of the time Luther’s hermeneutical method involved denial of allegorical interpretation in favor of concentrating on the literal sense.<sup>63</sup> Allegory, he claims, is too hard to understand.<sup>64</sup>

In one early context Luther claimed that the spiritual meaning of the Bible is not merely its allegorical, but its mystical meaning.<sup>65</sup> For him, even early in his career prior to the Reformation, the literal sense referred to the plain meaning of Scripture interpreted christologically, that is in light of the message of God’s unconditional love and justification by grace through faith revealed in Christ.<sup>66</sup> He made a similar point nearly two decades later in 1535 claiming that “The chief point of all Scripture is that ... God is merciful, kind, and patient.” Scripture is about the God Who promises he once contended while offering comfort.<sup>67</sup> Explaining the faith in earlier lectures Luther said much the same, claiming that

Scripture always proclaims the mercy of God and our sin. The Majesty of God is supreme; we are completely worthless ... If only our faith were strong, this gracious disposition of God would make us fearless in all things.<sup>68</sup>

These comments are not prescriptive for reading Scripture critically, which, as we shall observe, Luther endorsed in some contexts. But at this point Luther is merely offering descriptions of his conclusions about the main themes of the Bible’s literal sense.

When the context changed to defending faith, there is some change in the Reformer’s characterization of Scripture’s main point. He claims that Scripture’s purpose is to reveal sin.<sup>69</sup> Its every word finds meaning in Christ, or He is said to be the King of Scripture when Luther was exhorting faith or was engaged in polemics.<sup>70</sup> Concerned with pointing out our sin he says that “If you would interpret well and confidently, set Christ before you ...”<sup>71</sup> This entails for the Reformer that one thing Scripture taught was that life was possible only under the forgiveness of sin.<sup>72</sup> But when dealing with Christian ethics, his sense of Scripture’s main point changes again. He claims that Scripture is “written for our instruction, that is our moral upbuilding, to be understood as an example.”<sup>73</sup>

Luther prioritizes the literal sense (understood Christologically), even prior to 1517, when he still employed allegorical modes of interpreting Scripture.<sup>74</sup> Or as he put it in his *First Lectures on the Psalms*, the literal sense, attributed to Christ, is fundamental.<sup>75</sup> In a polemical context the Reformer claims that generally Scripture has just one meaning.<sup>76</sup> The four senses of Scripture all point to Christ, he claimed.<sup>77</sup> He added that whenever a text is difficult, it should be dashed against Christ the Rock.<sup>78</sup>

Luther later became critical of reading the Old Testament allegorically.<sup>79</sup> But he never totally rejected the use of allegory. He spoke of an openness to it if the literal meaning is absurd.<sup>80</sup> Even after the Reformation had begun, while dealing with the Psalms, the budding Reformer's affinity with allegory remained to the extent that he was open to a variety of valid given interpretations as long as they are pious. (His concern here was with the Christian life.)<sup>81</sup> There are suggestions here that like in the First Psalm Lectures Luther is open to various construals of Scripture insofar as there are different paths to holiness.<sup>82</sup>

#### ALLEGORY AND A LIBERAL/CRITICAL APPROACH TO BIBLICAL HERMENEUTICS

Once over table in 1531, speaking against pride of learning, sounding like a very postmodern scholar, Luther claimed that "experience alone makes the theologian."<sup>83</sup> He includes experience and agonizing struggle [*tentatio*] as a necessary ingredient of a theologian in 1536.<sup>84</sup> Dealing with charges not to give into sin, Luther notes in a sermon that "The Holy Spirit is only given to the anxious and distressed heart."<sup>85</sup> Again it is evident that experience is deemed an essential element for understanding the faith and Scripture for the Reformer when he addressed how to live the Christian life (Sanctification issues). He also claims, when dealing with Christian life, that *Anfechtung* (despair) leads to an appreciation of how sweet God's Word is.<sup>86</sup>

Luther knew a great deal about this trouble, terror, and despair which he called *Anfechtung*.<sup>87</sup> He writes,

If I would live long enough, I would like to write a book on *Anfechtung*, for without this nobody can understand Holy Scriptures, not faith, or know the fear and love of God, indeed he or she cannot know what hope is.<sup>88</sup>

But it is evident, especially in the 1539 comment cited above that experience is not so much normative or constitutive of the Bible's meaning for Luther in this or most contexts. In these comments he was merely suggesting that experience gives credibility to one's teachings. It refers to experience living in the world of the biblical text.<sup>89</sup>

Defending the faith from legalistic abuse, Luther claims that what God says must be taken at face value.<sup>90</sup> When exegeting he claimed that the literal sense "alone holds its ground in trouble and trial."<sup>91</sup> Luther affirms the objectivity of God's Word as he offers comfort, claiming that rejection of the Word does not detract from its efficacy.<sup>92</sup>

The Reformer's commitment to Scripture's literal sense made him uncomfortable in polemical contexts with any effort to separate Scripture's spiritual meaning from its literal sense, as is done in allegory.<sup>93</sup> In line with these commitments he taught, as we have previously noted, that Scripture interprets itself.<sup>94</sup> It is also of interest to note that this point that in non-polemical contexts when reading the Bible literally, Luther envisaged a compatibility of reason and faith.<sup>95</sup> It is evident that Luther relied on the literal sense of Scripture for his theology, but not unilaterally and in a patterned diversity.

### AN INERRANT SCRIPTURE

Some branches of Luther's heirs have contended that his literalism leads to the affirmation of biblical inerrancy. True enough, in contexts concerned to undercut the authority of the ecclesiastical hierarchy and Tradition, Luther claims that Scripture is inerrant.<sup>96</sup> When trying to make clear our own inadequacies in interpreting Scripture, when critiquing the authority of Tradition or addressing our own lack of understanding, he referred to the Bible in language implying that the words and phrases of Scripture are divine.<sup>97</sup> He spoke of the Bible in some contexts as written by God.<sup>98</sup> When engaged in polemics in one lecture, the Reformer claims that every word of Scripture is revealed.<sup>99</sup>

Concerned to exhort praise (Christian living), Luther notes that Scriptures are a different book from any other ever written.<sup>100</sup> Or when defending the Trinity as sublime he speaks of something like the verbal inspiration of Scripture.<sup>101</sup> He refers to the biblical authors as "infallible teachers" (in the context of where he had opted for a Christocentric critical principle).<sup>102</sup> Luther also affirmed divine inspiration of Scripture when engaged in polemics with alternative worldviews.<sup>103</sup> The Holy



Spirit is said to be the author of Scripture.<sup>104</sup> Even small details are deemed inspired, a point made while addressing Christian life with polemics in the background.<sup>105</sup> In a softer way he claims with dialoguing with reason that faith holds that Scripture does not deceive or lie.<sup>106</sup>

When critiquing Catholic hierarchy, Luther claimed that many contradictions in Scripture can be resolved by analyzing the texts' motivations.<sup>107</sup> In the same spirit, while defending himself from his critics, Luther insisted that all teaching of Scripture must be accepted, not endorsing one article and rejecting others.<sup>108</sup>

### TOWARDS A NARRATIVE THEOLOGY?

Of course such insistence on divine inerrant inspiration was not monolithic. Other times, without polemics in view, such as while telling the Christmas story, he employed a narrative style of preaching most reminiscent of modern Narrative Theology and the homiletics of the African-American church.<sup>109</sup> This narrative predisposition was related to Luther's stress on orality, evidenced in a work appended to a collection of his sermons. He claimed that strictly speaking Scripture is not God's Word, for the Gospel is a spoken Word or narrative.<sup>110</sup>

Frequently Luther refers to the "historical sense" of Scripture in such contexts or those in which he stressed the literal sense of Scripture.<sup>111</sup> But the significance of the biblical writings is not exhausted by the facts reported, he insisted.<sup>112</sup> The proper use of the accounts consists in making their reality efficacious for the present.<sup>113</sup> This is a responsible use of these texts, he contends, for in his view godliness and ungodliness remain the same through all the ages."<sup>114</sup> Like modern Narrative Theology, Luther teaches in preaching contexts that the Bible is true, even if not historically verifiable or if we discern some inconsistencies.<sup>115</sup> The Reformer speaks of truth in theology in terms of God's truth saturating our hearts (acting on us).<sup>116</sup> In the same spirit Luther also offers an interesting insight about why miracles no longer seem to happen: "God will perform no miracles so long as problems can be solved by means of other gifts He has bestowed on us."<sup>117</sup>

Of course he claimed that apparently natural events like grain growing out of the earth are miracles.<sup>118</sup> And to critics of Lutheranism he claimed in a sermon that mighty miracles continue among Lutherans.<sup>119</sup> Luther makes this point in his 1532 sermons on 1 Corinthians. Much like Narrative theologians he makes no effort there to defend the historical

credibility of the Resurrection.<sup>120</sup> The argument for the Resurrection is based solely on the Word and its logical outcome, that Christians cannot be Christians if they deny the Resurrection.<sup>121</sup> Reason, he claims, makes nonsense of the Resurrection.<sup>122</sup> We need to ignore experience and sense perception.<sup>123</sup> (Luther himself handles the Resurrection differently when exhorting Christian living against Antinomians. Then sounding like the Theology of Hope he speaks of Jesus' Resurrection as something begun in us, but not completed.<sup>124</sup>)

At other points the Reformer, when outlining the logic of faith, makes comments suggesting that truth differs depending on one's discipline or set of assumptions.<sup>125</sup> Truth in theology and philosophy differ, he argued.<sup>126</sup> Faith must follow the grammar of faith in using philosophy, he insisted.<sup>127</sup> Every word in Christ takes on a new meaning, a commitment which resembles the view of twentieth-century philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein, who taught that words have different meanings in different contexts (language games).<sup>128</sup> In this light, much like many modern narrative theologians (influenced by the philosophy of Ludwig Wittgenstein) Luther claims while exegeting Biblical texts or criticizing alternative worldviews that sacred subjects cannot be made to fit grammatical rules, that the language of faith is not subject to rules imposed from outside the subject.<sup>129</sup> The language of faith transcends reason in this case; it is its own language game, as Wittgenstein would contend.<sup>130</sup>

Another example of this propensity to regard truth as different in different language games is found in the Reformer's 1535 Lecture on Galatians, as he claims that righteousness is different in theology from how it comes about in philosophy.<sup>131</sup> Elsewhere Luther claims that people of faith must learn a new language in faith.<sup>132</sup>

The Reformer also contended that Christ is present in faith.<sup>133</sup> This has implications for the doctrine of Justification, that in faith and salvation we actually encounter Christ.

Likewise it follows that God is Present in the Word.<sup>134</sup> When we heed God's Word we are taught by God Himself, Luther asserted. This happens even if we hear an ass speaking, like Balaam did.<sup>135</sup> He is also said to be present in the Word.<sup>136</sup>

This is why Luther claims that while according to reason and the senses what the Christian has is small and finite when in fact what he has is large and infinite. The infinite is enclosed in the finite.<sup>137</sup> As a result he can saw,

Today I beheld God's Word and Work. Yes, I saw and heard God Himself preaching and baptizing. To be sure, the tongue, the voice, the hands, etc., are those of a human being; but the Word and the ministry are really those of the Divine Majesty Himself.<sup>138</sup>

Luther says the Word is living, while offering comfort or when responding to Enthusiasts.<sup>139</sup>

The Reformer adds to this that God's Word is said to accomplish something; He works through words.<sup>140</sup> The Word is construed as the womb which conceives the believer.<sup>141</sup> God's Word takes us captive, Luther proclaims.<sup>142</sup> Scripture changes us into it; we do not change it into us.<sup>143</sup> The words fit our case in whatever situation we are, he insists.<sup>144</sup>

It is important to note that when Luther talks this way Scripture is not transformed into the one who studies it, but transforms us into it.<sup>145</sup> The Biblical characters tell us who we are, as the text leads us to identify with them.<sup>146</sup> We are to crawl into the Word.<sup>147</sup> In that sense the Word is Sacramental.<sup>148</sup> It is Sacramental, for, as Luther claims while expositing faith or comforting, in theology the sign marked by its language is already present in the Word. As we already observed, the Reformer believes that the Word brings what is actually bestowed.<sup>149</sup> Of course this does not mean that we can trust our experience. As he once put it:

We must not judge by what we feel or what we see before us. The Word must be followed, and we must firmly hold that these truths are to be believed, not experienced; for to believe is not to experience. Nor indeed that what we believe is never to be experienced, but that faith is to precede experience, and the Word must be believed even when we feel and experience what differs from the Word.<sup>150</sup>

In the same way the Reformer writes, "We should adapt and adjust our minds and feelings so that they are in accord with the sense of the Psalms."<sup>151</sup>

While expositing the faith he claims that we become the Word of God as the intellect becomes what it knows.<sup>152</sup> We experience the Word.<sup>153</sup> In a similar manner he states that this happens because we only know God and His extraordinary actions like the Resurrection and The Virgin Birth because Christ reveals them to us. We could never get to such knowledge on our own.<sup>154</sup>

## OTHER ALTERNATIVE HERMENEUTICAL APPROACHES

In other contexts, when offering comfort, Luther speaks of the Biblical characters as offering examples of our moral upbuilding.<sup>155</sup> When offering comfort we are not so much to identify with the biblical characters as we are to imitate them.

The commitments to biblical literalism that we have noted are problematic to some interpreters of Luther, those who regard him as the first modern man. They are likely to dismiss texts noted as examples of Luther's medievalism, but to highlight instead his appeal to freedom of conscience exhibited in his heroic defiance of the Roman Empire at the Diet of Worms.<sup>156</sup>

Contrary to those who regard Luther as a forerunner of modern freedom of conscience, our bondage to the Word of God seems consistent with Luther's famed claim at the Diet of Worms that his conscience is bound by the Word of God.<sup>157</sup> Nevertheless, we can begin to note Luther's tendency to inject more of himself in the interpretation in polemical circumstances or when dealing with despair than the more passive role for the interpreter that we have observed when he opts while just preaching or teaching for a hermeneutic which deems Scripture as narrative or as inerrant.

We see this in tendency in a sermon on the Epiphany while Luther seeks to comfort despair. He says there that Scripture bears Christ in its arms.<sup>158</sup> In line with this Christocentrism already observed (but now in justifying a critical interpretation), the Reformer wrote, when dealing with those who would compromise grace,

I refuse to look at anything except this Christ. He should be such a treasure to me that in comparison with Him everything else is filthy. He should be such a light to me that when I have taken hold of Him by faith I do not know whether there is such a thing as Law, sin, or unrighteousness in the world. For what is everything there is in heaven and on earth in comparison with the Son of God?<sup>159</sup>

Against his critics Luther also says, in citing the opinion of Staupitz, that his theology is about glorifying God, that it is safer to ascribe too much to God than to man.<sup>160</sup> Dealing with works-righteousness he contends that every statement in Scripture and act of God, has the purpose of getting us to see that we are sinners.<sup>161</sup> All Scripture speaks of faith and that works are useless, Luther declares in a similar pastoral context.<sup>162</sup>

Even in these cases, Luther did not want to be the lone interpreter, cutting new ground with his interpretations. Thus he makes clear that Scripture was not alone for him when he addressed charges of heresy, as he claimed that he was not just offering his own private concerns by the teachings of the Church.<sup>163</sup> For him the Church's Rule of Faith was his hermeneutical canon. In fact, even when just interpreting Scripture he insisted that we cannot manipulate it, relying on our own understanding, read it in dialogue with the Rule of Faith.<sup>164</sup>

For example, we have already noted that Luther would rely on Tradition (traditional practice), not just Scripture, when dialoguing with Anabaptists.<sup>165</sup> In the context of reminding us of our sinfulness he spoke of the Apostles as infallible teachers.<sup>166</sup> Luther is not the solitary individual, the creative forger of new meanings that today's Postmodern Deconstructionist claims him to be.<sup>167</sup> But some of the language of his use of the letter-spirit distinction gives some modern interpreters a sense that he may be an ally.

### LETTER-SPIRIT DISTINCTION

Especially when concerned with Christian feelings, with how we live or in polemical circumstances, Luther sometimes posits a letter-spirit distinction:

By the term "written code" in the writings of the Apostle, Paul refers not only to the symbolic portions of Scripture or the doctrine of the Law but to every teaching which prescribes those things which belong to the good life, whether Gospel or Mosaic Law. For if these things are known and remembered and the spirit of grace is not present, it is merely an empty code and death of the soul. Hence blessed Augustine, *De Spiritu et littera*, ch.4: "That teaching by which we receive the command to live continently and uprightly is the written code that kills, unless the life-giving Spirit is present."<sup>168</sup>

Luther's use of the letter-spirit distinction entails that if grace is not given, if Christ is not made present, Scripture is merely a dead letter.<sup>169</sup> The letter kills, Luther and Paul teach; both seem to equate spirit with the Gospel.<sup>170</sup> Only by the Spirit can we suppose that one who is visibly exalted is inwardly slain, despised, rejected be exalted.<sup>171</sup>

In a manner most suggestive of modern, Kantian epistemology and its commitment to the autonomy of the interpreter, Luther seems to claim

that the interpreter judges Scripture on the basis of the experience it gives. But this also provides him with a critical perspective on Scripture. In the midst of polemics he writes,

Even if you were to provide six hundred passages ... I have the Author and Lord of Scripture, and I want to stand on His side rather than believe you. Nevertheless it is impossible for Scripture to contradict itself ... If you are not able to reconcile Scripture and yet stress Scripture ... I shall stress the Lord.<sup>172</sup>

Another way of saying this is that the Bible is only spiritually understood when its meaning comes to us and is experienced as a present reality.

The Reformer makes a related claim while engaging in apologetics or when offering comfort in preaching in contending that Scripture often speaks of God as we feel him to be, expressing the feelings of the biblical authors.<sup>173</sup> Elsewhere he even goes so far as to claim when dealing with the Christian life that faith creates the deity.<sup>174</sup> But this very modern-sounding phrase is balanced by an awareness that God exists and is greater than our experience of him in faith.<sup>175</sup>

Even when functioning as a narrative theologian Luther claimed, as we have noted, that Christ is present in faith, in its form.<sup>176</sup> But when deploying the letter-spirit distinction, it entails for Luther that if the Bible is read merely as a report of the past, it is functioning as a dead letter.<sup>177</sup> The biblical text is merely said to be the womb of Christ.<sup>178</sup> The Gospel is said to be hidden in Scriptures.<sup>179</sup> This entails for Luther, when addressing opponents who compromise grace, that we must use Christ against the Scripture sometimes. In fact he claims that if Christ is not in Scripture it is not Scripture.<sup>180</sup>

These commitments likewise entail that for Luther the Bible is said to “contain” God’s Word; preachers extract from it the living Word. Scripture is said to hold God’s Word.<sup>181</sup> It is also contains some wood, straw, and hay mixed with the gold, the swaddling clothes and manger in which Christ lies.<sup>182</sup> It is good to be reminded that Luther sounds much like a modern biblical scholar when he describes how the early Christian witness was originally oral and only later put in writing.<sup>183</sup>

The letter-spirit distinction provided Luther with a way of responding to those who say they read the Bible and it cannot be understood. He argued that only the Spirit understands Scripture correctly.<sup>184</sup>

Of course the letter–spirit distinction we have been discussing entails a critical approach to Scripture. Introducing his translation of the Bible, explaining the Gospel’s real nature, how we are saved, the Reformer lists the best books of the Bible—John’s Gospel, Paul’s letters (esp. Romans), and 1 Peter. They are said to be “the true kernel and marrow of all the Books.”<sup>185</sup> In a polemical context, Paul’s theology is said to open up all of Scripture.<sup>186</sup> He calls James by contrast “an epistle of straw,” would throw Jimmy in the fire. Yet with his conservative hermeneutic he is led to praise when not engaged in polemics.<sup>187</sup> He was also critical of the Book of Hebrews and found no trace of the Spirit in Revelation.<sup>188</sup>

In softer, less polemical moments Luther refers to Galatians as his Katherine von Bora.<sup>189</sup> When explicating faith or exhorting works, Luther claims that Paul and John do the best job in the Bible of emphasizing Christ, while the other Gospel writers are better emphasizing good works. Both seem to have a valid place (though Luther himself would emphasize faith and Christ).<sup>190</sup>

We need to be sure in closing this section that we not forget that this critical approach to Scripture was not Luther’s only methodological approach. For example when just expositing the Word Luther moves away from a functional letter–spirit view of Scripture.<sup>191</sup> In such contexts Luther advises that if vexed by sin and fear of judgment, we should simply search Scriptures for what comforts and avoid all that testifies to wrath.<sup>192</sup> With regard to Theological Method and Hermeneutics it is evident that Luther was a Pastoral Theologian, sensitive to his context.

## LAW AND GOSPEL

No discussion of Luther’s Theological Method can avoid his views on the relationship between Law and Gospel. He says that the knowledge of theology depends on the right knowledge of Law and Gospel: “Next to knowledge of the whole of Scripture, the knowledge of the whole of theology depends on the right knowledge of Law and Gospel.”<sup>193</sup> He claims that knowing the difference between Law and Gospel was his breakthrough.<sup>194</sup>

He adds at one point that “whoever knows well how to distinguish the Gospel and the Law ... is a real theologian.”<sup>195</sup> Distinguishing them is “the greatest skill in Christendom.”<sup>196</sup> In line with this observation is a 1532 lecture on Psalm 51, expositing the text, Luther writes, “The proper subject of theology is man guilty of sin and condemned and God

the Justifier and Savior of man the sinner.” Luther adds that what is discussed in theology outside this subject is in error.<sup>197</sup>

As the Reformer put it while polemicizing,

The knowledge of this topic, the distinction between the Law and the Gospel, is necessary to the highest degree; for it contains a summary of all Christian doctrine.<sup>198</sup>

Let no one, therefore, ponder the Divine Majesty, what God has done and how mighty He is; or think of man as the master of his property, and the way the lawyer does; or his health the way the physician does, But let him think of man as sinner. The proper subject of theology is man guilty of sin and condemned, and God the Justifier and Savior of man the sinner. Whatever is asked or discussed in theology outside this subject is error and poison.<sup>199</sup>

These commitments are in line with his claim already observed that one finds nothing in Scripture, Luther adds at one point, but “contrast and antitheses.”<sup>200</sup> He said much the same in his Lectures on Hebrews in 1517–1518, which he claimed as the basis of his Theology of the Cross (see below):

Frequently in the Scriptures there are two opposite ideas side by side. For example, judgement and righteousness, wrath and grace, death and life, evil and good. This is what is referred to in the phrase ... “And alien work is done by Him so that He might affect His proper work” [Is.28:21] ... Here we find the Theology of the Cross, or, as the Apostle expresses it: “The Word of the cross is a stumbling block to the Jews and foolishness to the Gentiles” [1 Cor.1:18, 23], because it is utterly hidden from their eyes.<sup>201</sup>

In polemics Luther teaches that every concept of Scripture must be understood to imply its opposite.<sup>202</sup> One cannot keep the true meaning of justification without it, he adds.<sup>203</sup> We cannot confuse them.<sup>204</sup> Law and Gospel, the finite and the infinite, must remain in tension.<sup>205</sup> In a 1537 sermon he claimed that we need to learn well the “grand distinction” between Law and grace, that it had befuddled him for more than the first thirty years of his life.<sup>206</sup>

The Reformer distinguishes Law and Gospel most sharply when defending faith from abuse. He softens the distinction more when exhorting faith and still more when exhorting Christian life. Perhaps most famously he remarks while defending faith from papal abuse:



The way to distinguish the one from the other is to locate the Gospel in heaven and the Law on earth, ... to distinguish as sharply the righteousness of the Gospel and that of the Law as God distinguishes day and night. Let the one be like the light and the day, and the other like the darkness and the night. If we could only put an even greater distance between them!<sup>207</sup>

But, Luther adds against the Antinomians, just as repentance and forgiveness of sin should not be separated, neither should Law and Gospel be separated.<sup>208</sup>

Often Luther distinguishes Law and Gospel in terms of content, especially in polemical contexts or expositing faith:

26 ...The Law says “do this,” and it is never done. Grace says “believe in this,” and everything is already done.<sup>209</sup>

On this subject the Reformer also writes,

By “Law” we should understand nothing but God’s Word and command in which He commands us what we are to do and not to do ... The Gospel is such a doctrine or Word of God as does not demand our works or command us to do anything but bids us simply to receive the offered grace of forgiveness ...<sup>210</sup>

The Law is a commandment, Luther claims, and the Gospel teaches what God has given us.<sup>211</sup> The Gospel is defined as good tidings.<sup>212</sup> It is defined as “this divine promise of grace and forgiveness of sin.”<sup>213</sup> It is preaching Christ, not dependent on works.<sup>214</sup> It is discourse about Christ.<sup>215</sup> It is the truth that “our righteousness comes by faith alone, without works of the Law.”<sup>216</sup>

The Gospel is also defined as or identified with the “promises” of God or the works of God understood as the creation of righteousness, peace, mercy, patience, kindness, joy, and health.<sup>217</sup> It is nothing else but Christ coming to us.<sup>218</sup> It is salvation, a pure free gift:

The Gospel or faith is something that does not demand our works or tell us what to do, but tells us to receive, to accept the gift, so that we are passive, that is, that God promises and says to you: “this and that I import to you. You can do nothing for it.”<sup>219</sup>

Luther also defines the Gospel as God's Promise, while the Law is said to deal with our things and works.<sup>220</sup> The Gospel is also said to be the preaching of forgiveness.<sup>221</sup>

More often when dealing with exhortation to faith or Christian life issues the Reformer distinguishes Law and Gospel in terms of their impact on people, not their content. Thus he identifies the Gospel as what gives life.<sup>222</sup> But the Law cannot justify.<sup>223</sup> It is a Word that only condemns.<sup>224</sup> It makes us sinners or is anything that makes us realize our sin.<sup>225</sup> It kills and terrifies.<sup>226</sup> The objective of the Law is desperation.<sup>227</sup> It produces hatred of God and despair.<sup>228</sup> As Luther put it in the midst of polemics, God commands the impossible.<sup>229</sup>

Luther, as we have noted, knew a great deal about this terror and despair, which he called *Anfechtung*. Thus in his view the Law lays guilt on us.<sup>230</sup> It teaches us our impotence.<sup>231</sup> It crushes us.<sup>232</sup> It frightens and annoys.<sup>233</sup> When taken in the fleshly sense, the Law produces brilliant hypocrites who imagine themselves the first of all to whom everything is due. Christ kills their righteousness.<sup>234</sup>

Luther adds that the Law also shows not the grace of God, but His wrath.<sup>235</sup> It reveals the wrath and judgment of God in such a way as to make it impossible not to hate God, to wish He did not exist.<sup>236</sup> About the Law Luther writes,

If our nature had not been corrupted by sin to such an extent, there would be no need for the preaching of the Law. But now, because of our hardness and extreme smugness, God cannot accomplish anything through His grace unless He has first broken and crushed our adamant hearts.<sup>237</sup>

He contends that the more sinful we perceive ourselves to be the more passionately will we call on God.<sup>238</sup> The Reformer adds,

The Law constrains us ... teaches us that we must be changed before we can accomplish its works; it makes us conscious of our inability as we are.<sup>239</sup> The Commandments of God are but a mirror, wherein we behold our filth and wickedness ...<sup>240</sup>

It teaches us our sin.<sup>241</sup>

Without the Law we are ignorant of our sin. In fact, Luther adds, we are likely to remain secure and proud of our moral capacity.<sup>242</sup> But he also insists that the Law cannot get us to righteousness.<sup>243</sup>

As the Word of Moses, the Law in Luther's view is only able to instruct and sanctify the flesh, while the Gospel is directed to the inner life of man and so about to sanctify the spirit.<sup>244</sup> It shows us our inability.<sup>245</sup> Nothing goes as the Law demands.<sup>246</sup> It is beyond the power of humans to fulfill.<sup>247</sup> It demands the impossible.<sup>248</sup> In this sense the Law is a tyrant.<sup>249</sup> It makes sin abound, because it irritates and repels the will. Every work of the Law is sin.<sup>250</sup>

Luther maintains that the Law makes us see how desperately wicked his heart is, how great his sins are, even what was considered good works.<sup>251</sup> It is like a jail that fences us in. By contrast, the Gospel is a free wilderness, unrestrained.<sup>252</sup> The Law only reveals what already exists in human nature.<sup>253</sup> We need to be careful, then, in how we use the Law, Luther warns. For when good works are taught, Luther notes, it leads to pride and works-righteousness.<sup>254</sup>

Making a point too often overlooked in modern Reformation theology, Luther notes that the Law is not properly understood apart from the Gospel:

Thus we see that the Law and Prophets, too, cannot be preached or recognized properly, unless we see Christ wrapped up in the Scriptures ... For Christ must be heard in the Gospel and then one sees how beautifully the entire Old Testament is attuned to Him.<sup>255</sup>

The Law is found in the New Testament as well as in the Old Testament, Luther notes.<sup>256</sup> Yet the Old Testament also contains grace, he adds.<sup>257</sup> But the Law can also be known from reason (natural law), Luther insists.<sup>258</sup>

The Reformer says about our freedom from the Law that the Law is a bit like the child's tutor:

The tutor's release of the pupil does not mean the death or departure of the tutor, but spiritually, that the child has been changed, and can do what the father wished the tutor to teach him. Likewise the Law releases us, not by its passing, not by being abrogated, but spiritually; and because a change has been effected in us and we have the experience God designed us to have through the Law.<sup>259</sup>

The Gospel is greater than the Law, Luther insists, for the latter was ordained through servants.<sup>260</sup> He compares the Gospel to the sun and the Law to the moon. The moon beams with the sun's light. As long as both shine, you can distinguish day and night. But when the two lights

disappear you just have an absolute blackout.<sup>261</sup> The Gospel has the Law in its power.<sup>262</sup> In explaining the faith, the Law is said to be destroyed by the Gospel.<sup>263</sup> But despite the Gospel's freeing Word, Luther nicely asserts why we still need the Law:

Therefore the grumbling, "If the Law does not justify, it is nothing," is a fallacious conclusion. For just as the conclusion is valid if one says: "Money does not justify; therefore it is nothing. The eyes do not justify; therefore I shall pluck them out" ... When we deny that the Law justifies, we are not destroying or condemning it.<sup>264</sup>

But we still need the Law, he says, in order to work repentance.<sup>265</sup>

God first gives the cross and affliction, then honor and blessedness ... But God first of all terrifies the conscience, set on miserable wine ... then, however, He consoles us with the promises of the Gospel which endure forever.<sup>266</sup>

Regarding the Law's role in working repentance and its importance, Luther writes,

there is no person on earth in His [Jesus'] mind who is to be excused or excepted, but must confess and acknowledge they are sinners ... For the cornerstone of this building, of how to become a Christian, must in every case be to confess our sins, for otherwise you can neither rejoice in your forgiveness nor be comforted.<sup>267</sup>

The Law introduces us to sin and overwhelms us with the knowledge of it. It does this so that we may see to be freed and sigh after grace.<sup>268</sup> ... [T]hen the whole world becomes too small for us there is no help anywhere except in Christ."<sup>269</sup>

Luther nicely elaborates on this point:

I must first take you down to hell before taking you up to heaven, you must despair in the first place ... In view of this lay hold of His Word and Promise that He will change you; this only will help you ... This is true comfort that does not rest on our ability but on the fact that we have a gracious God Who forgives our sins.<sup>270</sup>

We can identify the seeds of Luther's thinking about a distinction between Law and Gospel in his efforts to deal with the need for repentance over-against the sale of Indulgences. Addressing in 1516 the combination of proclaiming the logic of faith and also critiquing

self-righteousness, Luther introduced the idea (suggestive of his Theology of the Cross) that a distinction must be made between God's proper work (making us righteous or saving us) and his alien work (to make us sinners).<sup>271</sup> The strange work correlates with the Law and the proper work with the Gospel in the Law–Gospel distinction.<sup>272</sup> We must despair of our own ability in order to be prepared to receive the grace of God, Luther notes when engaging the legalism of Catholic Scholasticism or articulating the logic of faith.<sup>273</sup>

In polemical circumstances the Law precedes the Gospel for Luther (just as one must first experience *Anfechtung*). The Law drives us to Christ, Luther says, and the Gospel says that God is present with those who are contrite, when the Reformer exhorts faith while responding to Antinomian polemics.<sup>274</sup> But here we must remember Luther's previously noted caution that the Law and the Gospel are to be preached according to circumstances, and his claim outside of polemics that the Law is only properly known in relation to the Gospel.<sup>275</sup> In this connection Luther also advises against the Antinomians that the Law should be preached first, but not at all to the faint-hearted, those already in despair.<sup>276</sup>

## HOW AND HOW FAR SHOULD LAW AND GOSPEL BE DISTINGUISHED?

Luther does concede that at least until 1513 or longer he did not understand the Law–Gospel distinction and so he did not know God's mercy.<sup>277</sup> When defending faith Luther stressed the opposition of Law and Gospel:

The way to distinguish the one from the other is to locate the Gospel in heaven and the Law on earth, to call the righteousness of the Gospel heavenly and divine and the righteousness of the Law earthly and human, and to distinguish the righteousness of the Gospel and that of the Law as God distinguishes between heaven and earth or between day and night. Let the one be like the light and the day, and the other like the darkness and the night. If we could only put an even greater distance between them.<sup>278</sup>

Luther seems contextual in the emphasis he places on the distinction between Law and Gospel.<sup>279</sup> We have already noted that when addressing despair the Reformer posits their distinction solely on the basis of our response to the Word:

The corollary is that the Word of the new and of the old Law is the same, but only according to our understanding or lack of understanding it is described as perfect or imperfect, short or lengthened.<sup>280</sup>

Law and Gospel are said to be distinct in these pastoral contexts only in respect to attitudes and function, not regarding their differences in content.<sup>281</sup> In this spirit Luther writes (when addressing Antinomian distortions), “The time and proper function of the Law is to kill; but the function of the Gospel is to make alive.”<sup>282</sup>

Luther concedes the contextuality of his approach to the Law–Gospel dialectic even later in his career in dialogue with the Antinomians. He even concedes that early in his career in order to preach the Gospel powerfully against papal abuse he had preached like the Antinomians, but now the situation is different, he contends.<sup>283</sup>

When dealing with Christian life issues the Reformer refers to the unity of Law and Gospel in experience.<sup>284</sup> In one good example he writes,

The Law and the Gospel neither can nor should be separated; just as repentance and forgiveness of sins should not be separated. For they are so closely bound up together and involved in each other.<sup>285</sup>

In these contexts, later in his career he even spoke of faith working through love.<sup>286</sup> Or when focusing just on our relationship to God or when addressing despair, Luther counsels no attention be paid to the Law.<sup>287</sup> The Reformer himself speaks of his contextual approach to preaching the Law differently to the faint-hearted.<sup>288</sup> How and the extent to which Law and Gospel should be distinguished is clearly a matter of context.

## ON DIFFERENT USES OF THE LAW

It is standard to say that Luther posits Two Uses of the Law (the Political Use, which is the Law functioning to nurture good citizens and as a norm for just laws, and the Theological Use, the Commandments functioning to condemn sin). He most clearly articulates this in his articulation of the faith in The Smalcald Articles.<sup>289</sup> He claims that the Second (Theological) Use to condemn sin is the principal Use.<sup>290</sup>

However, when dealing with Antinomians, those not taking seriously our Christian responsibility, he is recorded as teaching much like

Catholics, the Eastern church, and virtually all Protestant denominations, a Third Use of the Law (the Commandments functioning as a guide to and exhorter for Christian living).<sup>291</sup> Granted, the authenticity of this text has been disputed. But there are other texts which imply a Third Use. One is to be found in a 1522 New Year's Sermon concerned with the Law. He speaks there of preaching even to those who observe the Law (i.e., Christians).<sup>292</sup>

We see something like a Third Use of the Law when the Reformer addressed matters related to Sanctification or comfort.<sup>293</sup> Even in the Catechisms the positive use of the Commandments appears in texts concerned to address changes in Christian behavior.<sup>294</sup> Luther also claims that the Law is a disciplinarian that makes us do good, rather like a custodian prepared the child for adulthood.<sup>295</sup> Late in his career when addressing issues related to living the Christian life, the Reformer even spoke of Christ as an example.<sup>296</sup> He also spoke of the law of love in these contexts (equating it sometimes with the natural law).<sup>297</sup>

Luther even goes so far as to indicate the proper contexts for a Third Use of the Law. As late as 1535 he claims that the Law should be made a god and be dealt with reverently apart from the matter of Justification.<sup>298</sup> But he also claims that the final cause of obedience to the Law is the good example it can portray for evangelism and our gratitude towards God reflected in our actions.<sup>299</sup> Elsewhere the Reformer insists that good works must also be urged on account of the weakness of the flesh.<sup>300</sup> In that sense the Third Use functions in comforting despair occasioned by this weakness.<sup>301</sup> That the Third Use of the Law appears in these contexts is not surprising in view of his tendency to construe Scripture this way (as providing examples) in such contexts.

## THEOLOGY OF THE CROSS

A crucial aspect of Luther's critique of Scholastic Theology emerges from his Theology of the Cross. It should already be obvious that this set of commitments stressing the paradoxical character of God's actions is a significant part of Luther's thinking, but when not engaged in polemics or exhorting faith, the Reformer is not a consistent adherent of these themes.<sup>302</sup>

It was while polemicalizing in The Heidelberg Disputation that the Reformer claimed that "true theology and recognition of God are in the

crucified Christ.”<sup>303</sup> Such a theologian knows only the crucified and hidden God.<sup>304</sup> Luther notes,

20. He deserves to be called a theologian, however, who comprehends the visible and manifest things of God seen through suffering and the Cross.<sup>305</sup>

We must begin at the bottom to rise up, not at the top as Philosophy does.<sup>306</sup> The Reformer even claims that God is found in the weakness of an infant, in the suffering of a cross.<sup>307</sup>

Luther’s commitment to the literal sense of Scripture led him to claim while extolling faith from the pride of works that Scripture is “filled with antitheses.”<sup>308</sup> We have already noted Luther’s critical perspective on reason. He claims, when responding to critiques of faith by reason, that we should follow the Word and regard our own thoughts as vain.<sup>309</sup> Reason cannot endure God’s Word unless it is first blinded and disagrees, a point Luther makes against proponents of believer’s baptism.<sup>310</sup> Reason is the devil’s whore, he asserts.<sup>311</sup> Faith must kill reason, Luther says in polemical circumstances.<sup>312</sup>

Luther also contends that reason cannot understand the Word (stated when trying to comfort or engaged in polemics).<sup>313</sup> Reason is said to amount to nothing compared to the Word.<sup>314</sup> When explicating faith with specialized concern to avoid doctrines of men, Luther proclaims,

The natural light of man and grace cannot be friends. Human nature wants perception and certitude as a condition of faith prior to perception; that is why human nature will not proceed beyond its own light. Grace happily steps out into the darkness and follows nothing but the Word ...<sup>315</sup>

The light of man and grace cannot be friends (a comment made while dealing with sin).<sup>316</sup>

The lowly appearance of the Gospel offends (a claim Luther makes while condemning reason).<sup>317</sup> God’s Word must be a stumbling block, Luther remarks in a sermon proclaiming faith and responding to his critics.<sup>318</sup> Elsewhere the Reformer adds, “It is the lot of God’s Word in the world to find that the learned and the works-righteous always knows better.”<sup>319</sup>

The Theology of the Cross entails believing that God turns everything upside down, Luther proclaims in a sermon. What we call jolly and beautiful He calls poor, sick, and weak.<sup>320</sup> “In the eyes of the world the



Word of Christ is always foolishness,” Luther notes.<sup>321</sup> “This seems to the world contrary to reason because God seems to be lying, forsaking us, not choosing us by rejecting us. To the godly man, however, it is believable.”<sup>322</sup>

This critique of reason has implications for the focus of Theology:

The person who wants to know God, free from unsubstantial speculation about Him, must begin at the bottom and learn first to know the Virgin Mary’s son born in Bethlehem. Thereafter he will learn, as the text itself states, precisely Who the Virgin’s Son is, namely the everlasting Lord and King.<sup>323</sup>

Luther claims there is a reason to be on guard against wisdom:

But the meaning of the saying is this: The wise and understanding ... are always exerting themselves; they do things in the Christian Church the way they want to themselves. Everything that God does they must improve, so that there is no poorer, more insignificant and despised disciple on earth than God; He must be everybody’s pupil.<sup>324</sup>

The Reformer was critical of Philosophy and the concept of substance. It is a foothold or settled ground on which man can stand.<sup>325</sup> Addressing temptations, he claims that faith attaches itself to nothing.<sup>326</sup> When exhorting comfort in a sermon Luther observed, “Faith is against feeling and feeling against faith.”<sup>327</sup> Faith is said to be in contradiction to the senses.<sup>328</sup> In one sermon he proclaims, “That is why we should refuse to listen when our heart speaks to us in terror and unbelief. We should instead listen to what God says, for He is greater than your heart or mine.”<sup>329</sup>

In polemical circumstances doctrine is even distinguished from life.<sup>330</sup> Luther writes,

There as I often warn you, doctrine must be carefully distinguished from life. Doctrine is heaven; life is earth. In life there is sin, error, uncleanness, and misery, mixed, as the saying goes, “with vinegar.” Here love should condone, tolerate, be deceived, trust, hope, and endure all things (I Cor.13:7); here the forgiveness of sins should have complete sway, provided that sin and error are not defended. But just as there is no error in doctrine, so there is no need for any forgiveness of sins. Therefore there is no comparison at all between doctrine and life.<sup>331</sup>

The distinction between doctrine and life or faith and feeling in contexts when faith is being defended or even exhorted led the Reformer to some apparently flippant attitudes towards suffering, as he claims that it does not matter who believes or that “the person must be completely rejected.”<sup>332</sup> Such attitudes reflect in the abusive language he could use towards opponents, calling them liars and goats in print.<sup>333</sup>

Distinguishing faith from life (its feelings and trends) entails that for the Reformer God is greater than our hearts.<sup>334</sup> The heart may deceive, but not Christ, he asserts when engaged in polemics with the Catholic establishment.<sup>335</sup> Dialoguing with uncertainty and Catholic teaching he writes,

And this is the reason why our theology is certain: it snatches us away from ourselves and places us outside ourselves, so that we do not depend on our own strength, conscience, experience, person, or works but depend on that which is outside ourselves, that is not the promise and truth of God, which cannot deceive.<sup>336</sup>

In one of his lectures he claimed,

This is not a mean art but the art of the Holy Spirit. Reason cannot sing about the Lord’s blessings. It is the work of the Spirit alone to understand the mercies of God. It is the wise man who begins to praise and give thanks. Reason of itself cannot do this. It only observes the threats and terrors of God and the ungodliness in the world, and then it begins to murmur and blaspheme.<sup>337</sup>

Even when concerned with the logic of faith Luther observes that God proposes things that are impossible and absurd. There is a tension with reason.<sup>338</sup>

Writing in a context while aiming to undermine legalism the Reformer observes,

And universally our every assertion of anything good is hidden under the denial of it, so that faith may have its place in God, Who is a negative essence of goodness and wisdom and righteousness, Who cannot be possessed or touched except by the negation of all our affirmatives.<sup>339</sup>

And while seeking to undercut pride in a 1532 Advent sermon, he writes,

It [the Gospel] is and remains a teaching which causes offense but not to the unimportant people. Experience has shown that it remains a teaching which causes offense ... They [the self-righteous] consider the Gospel an annoying, rebellious teaching.<sup>340</sup>

In the same spirit in Lectures on Galatians he claims that Scripture is “filled with antitheses.”<sup>341</sup>

All of these themes suggest the Theology of the Cross of his Heidelberg Disputation, where Luther wrote,

20. He deserves to be called a theologian, however, who comprehends the visible and manifest things of God through suffering and the cross.<sup>342</sup>

Thus God destroys the wisdom of the wise ... It is impossible for a person not to be puffed by his good works unless he has first been deflated and destroyed by suffering and evil until he knows that he is worthless and that his works are not his but God's.<sup>343</sup>

In line with these early appearances of the Theology of the Cross when Luther addressed despair or aimed to undercut legalism, in a 1516 sermon he makes a distinction between God's proper work and His alien work (making men sinners) in order to create righteousness.<sup>344</sup> God is said to reveal by concealing.<sup>345</sup> The Reformer writes elsewhere,

Although the works of God are always unattractive and appear evil, they are nevertheless really eternal merits.<sup>346</sup>

God is hidden, but recognized in suffering.<sup>347</sup>

Addressing legalism, Luther notes in a 1520 commentary on a psalm that God's Word is like a lamp shining in a dark place. It becomes a lie before it becomes truth. We cannot go to heaven unless we first go to hell and God becomes first a devil. But the last word is that God's faithfulness endures.<sup>348</sup> In an early sermon he observes that God performs an alien work making the faithful sinners before performing His Work of Justification. He kills and makes alive.<sup>349</sup> God works like a surgeon, making dangerous and disfiguring incisions, but nevertheless does good work.<sup>350</sup>

Of course God's hiddenness is related to the Theology of the Cross.<sup>351</sup> While addressing legalism (the usual context for invoking The Theology of the Cross) along with seeking comfort for the faithful's despair, Luther notes God's hidden ways:

He has hidden His power under nothing but weakness, His wisdom under foolishness, His goodness under severity, His righteousness under sin, His mercy under wrath.<sup>352</sup>

Prior to the Reformation the Reformer claimed that “God conceals what is His in order to reveal it.”<sup>353</sup>

Responding to legalism, Luther notes that the righteousness of God is hidden under sin.<sup>354</sup> In similar contexts he frequently notes that the ways of God are said to be hidden, far above our patterns of thought.<sup>355</sup> The Gospel is said to be hidden.<sup>356</sup> So is the heritage of Christ.<sup>357</sup> As the Reformer put it in a polemical context, If faith is essentially concerned with concealed reality then “it is necessary that everything which is to be believed be hidden so that there may be room for faith.” He adds,

It cannot be hidden any more deeply than when it appears to be the exact opposite of what we see, sense, and experience.<sup>358</sup>

Faith must believe against reason Luther claims for reason says faith is impossible.<sup>359</sup>

Hiddenness (esp. of the Christian) is a theme used to comfort from despair, Luther adds.<sup>360</sup> It is also used in polemical circumstances.<sup>361</sup> In a comment with rich implications for Ministry and Social Ethics (God working through the lowly), Luther writes,

But God follows this method and shows poor sinners, such as Saint Paul and we were, to fend off the arrogance and conceit of such wiseacres. For He does not wish to use such self-assured and presumptuous spirits for this work by people who have been through the mill, have been tested and crushed ... No, God must always retain the honor.<sup>362</sup>

Engaging in polemics, God is even said to be recognized in suffering.<sup>363</sup> Indeed while offering comfort prior to the Reformation Luther writes,

For we ought to have the greatest courage at the very time when evil befalls us, for that is where God shows His good will; we should be most pleased at the time when the most unpleasant things happen, for then it is certain that the acceptable Will of God is at work ...<sup>364</sup>

Against the spiritual pride of the Anabaptists he even claimed that faith is paradoxical, often greatest when we doubt or are in despair.<sup>365</sup>

Not just the ways of God, but the Christian life is hidden, according to the Theology of the Cross.<sup>366</sup> Most of the time Luther's Theology of the Cross emerges when defending faith. But he seems to develop the theme of Christian life being hidden at least when dealing with the Christian life and comfort in language suggesting modern liberation theology the Reformer speaks of he faithful experiencing poverty, that you must become of low estate.<sup>367</sup>

A focus on The Cross seems evident in Luther's Christocentric claim that the Cross of Christ alone is his theology.<sup>368</sup> But in another context he claims that God might not have spoken His final Word in Christ.<sup>369</sup> He even claims in *The Bondage of the Will* in polemics with legalism that God wills things not disclosed in His Word.<sup>370</sup> This is another sense of hiddenness (the Hidden Will of God) posited by Luther in addition to His revealed Will.<sup>371</sup>

The Reformer advises that we focus on the revealed God, believe against the hidden God.<sup>372</sup> We should seek to know no other God than the God clothed with His Promises.<sup>373</sup> In these contexts the Reformer urges that we leave God in His Majesty [*deus absconditus*] to Himself, but only contrite on Him as set forth in His Word.<sup>374</sup> Better to do that than speculate (a claim made in polemics with Erasmus).<sup>375</sup>

Something like the Theology of the Cross appears early in Luther's career, in the *First Lectures on Psalms*. God, it seems, defies reason, cannot be known empirically, Luther claims while seeking to humble us. This makes place for faith.<sup>376</sup> While exhorting Christian living, Luther notes that we cannot contemplate the divine majesty, the hidden God. This awareness leads to humility.<sup>377</sup> While reflecting on our sinful nature or polemicizing against legalistic distortions of the faith, Luther notes that to contemplate God in His hiddenness will lead to our being crushed.<sup>378</sup>

Of course in another context, concerned merely to interpret Romans, Luther is willing as we have noted to claim that there is a natural knowledge of God (though theology cannot be constructed on it).<sup>379</sup> Seeking to undercut reason and to exhort faith, Luther contends that only by faith can the invisible things be discerned.<sup>380</sup>

Dealing with Christian life or comfort he states that faith is concerned with what is hidden.<sup>381</sup> Faith creates hope, he states.<sup>382</sup> While addressing Pelagian abuses, Luther claims that this hiddenness is in part related to the fact that faith is grounded in the knowledge of God in the sense of His means, not His essence.<sup>383</sup> As we shall observe in later chapters, The

Theology of the Cross and its theme of the *deus absconditus* also pertains to Predestination and Providence. It clearly permeates his thinking in polemics, exhortation to faith, and exhortation to comfort, but we have noted that its paradoxical themes fade in contexts when the Reformer exhorts Christian living.

### BLACK PRESENCE IN THE BIBLE

Another topic of hermeneutics most relevant to our present situation is Luther's awareness of the African contributions to the Bible. A few examples follow. Luther identifies one of The Wise Men as Ethiopian.<sup>384</sup> Writing late in his life he claimed that "Many Ethiopians, Ammonites, and Edomites attached themselves to the confession and worship of the God of Israel in accordance with God's call." He also claimed that Nimrod and Cush were Ethiopian.<sup>385</sup> Luther's reflections at this point are most pertinent to our subsequent analysis of the contributions his Social Ethic might make to Reformation theology today.

### SUMMARY REFLECTIONS

Certainly we find in Luther evidence that he employed at times (esp. when doing apologetics or comforting despair) which takes seriously the role of the interpreters and what they bring to the text, models much like what dominates in the academy today.<sup>386</sup> But we also more typically find in Luther a hermeneutic that is pre-modern, positing a theology not rooted in reason or experience, entailing an objectivity to theology. This fits his focus on God (Who is outside us) saving us, and not we ourselves. Addressing God in thankfulness in comforting us, Luther writes,

And this is the reason why our theology is certain: it snatches us away from ourselves and places us outside ourselves ...<sup>387</sup>

Christ helps the world by confounding the world's wisdom ...<sup>388</sup>

Sometimes these commitments led to complete, unconditional fidelity to the biblical texts. Other times we see in him a critical approach to Scripture, its originator. Just as sometimes we find him totally committed to the authority of Scripture (in polemics) and other times (esp. when dealing with the logic of the Christian faith) an appreciation of

the catholic tradition and even of a legitimate role for philosophy when subordinated to the Word. And so Luther is a man who provides gives us glimpses of how to hold these different methodological options together, encouraging us to use them in appropriate ways as long as they serve the Word of God's unconditional love. Luther nicely summarizes his theology in the spirit of the Theology of the Cross over dinner, reminding us not to get sidetracked in our theological/methodological meanderings:

If at death I could leave behind me the reputation that I teach with the greatest diligence that one should be on guard against speculations and should in all simplicity apprehend Christ, I would have done much.<sup>389</sup>

## NOTES

1. Thes.Wel., WA39<sup>I</sup>:59, 20/ LW34:128.
2. Latom., WA8:45, 17/ LW32:140–141; Pr. Op. lat., WA54:180, 8/ LW34:329; Disp.Schol. Theo., WA1:228, 34/ LW31:16.
3. Matt.5–7, WA32:399f., 35ff./ LW21:121: "... So segne ich Gottes wort verfluche sie mit allem was sie haben, Denn ich must Gottes wort uber alle ding setzen und leib und leben, der welt ganst, gut, her un alles heil daran zusetzen."
4. Disp.Verb., WA39<sup>II</sup>:3, 5/ LW38:239; Latom., WA8:127, 7/ LW32:258. See p.15, n.27. For Luther on Aristotle, see Disp.Schol.Theo., WA1:226, 16/ LW31:12. Also see p. 16, n. 35.
5. Latom., WA8:127, 7/ LW32:258; Promodisp.Pall., WA39<sup>I</sup>:228f., 14.
6. TR (1533), WATR3:105f., 11ff./ LW54:183ff.; Disp.Verb., WA39<sup>II</sup>:26ff., 29ff./ LW38: 259. Cf. TR (1533), WATR1:191, 15/ LW54:71; TR (1530–1535), WATR1:191, 23/ LW54:71; Disp.hom., WA39<sup>I</sup>:180, 11ff./ LW34:144; Serv.arb., WA18:L718, 13/ LW33:189: Unlike the preceding texts, Luther merely claims there while polemicizing with Erasmus that with faith as a supposition reason can be used to develop the logic of faith.
7. Rom., WA56:371, 1ff./LW25:360f.; Dict.Ps., WA3:419, 25/ LW10:355–356; *Ibid.*, WA55<sup>I</sup>:388, 273ff.
8. Serv.arb., WA18:659, 28/ LW33:99–100.
9. Dict.Ps., WA3:419f., 25ff./ LW10:355–356.
10. Vor.Hist., WA50:383f., 17ff./ LW34:277–278.

11. Gen., WA43:672f., 40ff./ LW5:354. For the modern concept of salvation-history, see J. C. K. von Hofmann, *Interpreting the Bible*, trans. Christian Preus (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1959), pp. 28, 72, 205; Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, eds. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance (4 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1935–1969), Vol.I/1, pp. 373–378; *Ibid.*, Vol.I/2, pp. 470, 521.
12. Disp. hom., WA39<sup>I</sup>:175, 11/ LW34:137; Disp. Verb., WA39<sup>II</sup>:14, 1/ LW38:248; *Ibid.*, WA39<sup>II</sup>:24f., 32ff./ LW38:272; Ex., WA16:262, 29; cf. Wein., WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:191, 14/ LW52:149; Gen., WA42:469f., 32ff./ LW2:290–291; *Ibid.*, WA43:104, 37/ LW3:320; *Ibid.*, WA44:17, 32/ LW6:24–25.
13. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:607, 19/LW26:399; Gen., WA42:631, 36/ LW3:117; Reih. Gen., WA24:9, 20; Jon., WA19:205f., 27ff./ LW19:53; Promodisp. Heg., WA39<sup>II</sup>:346, 4; TR (n.d.), WATR6:20, 19.
14. Rom., WA56:176, 16/ LW25:156; Jon., WA19:206, 30/ LW19:54.
15. Pred. (1537), WA45:90, 2.
16. Dtsch. Kat., WA30<sup>I</sup>:133, 1/ BC:386.2: “Antwort: Ein Gott heisset das dazu man sich versehen sol alles guten und zuflucht haben ynn allen noten.”
17. *Ibid.*, WA30<sup>I</sup>:133, 2/ BC:386.2.
18. Pred. Deut., WA28:609f., 29ff.; Deut., WA14:587f., 16ff./ LW9:53–54; cf. Ps. 51, WA40<sup>II</sup>:329f., 17ff./ LW12:312ff.
19. Kl. Proph., WA13:246, 6/ LW19:11; Pred. (1525), WA17<sup>I</sup>:412, 19.
20. Serv. arb., WA18:709, 10/ LW33:175; *Ibid.*, WA18:719, 22/ LW33:191.
21. Rom., WA56:177, 11/ LW25:157; Jon., WA19:206, 7/ LW19:54.
22. Ex., WA16:140, 16: “Nu die vernunft wil allezeit Gott hofemeistern, ob er fuge und recht habe, wil Gott messen nach irem Gesetze und gedanken.” Cf. Serv. arb., WA18:729, 15/ LW33:206.
23. Serv. arb., WA18:784, 11/ LW33:290; Wein., WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:527, 11; Desp. hom., WA39<sup>I</sup>: 175, 28/ LW34:138; Disp. Verb., WA39<sup>II</sup>:8.10/ LW38:244; *Ibid.*, WA39<sup>II</sup>:5, 9/ LW38:241; Gen., WA 42:293, 29ff./ LW2:45.
24. Serm. Sak., WA19:492, 33/ LW36:343; Pred. Deut., WA28:608, 8–9; Jes. (1527–1529), WA25:106, 43; Jes. (1527–1531), WA31<sup>II</sup>:37, 17ff./ LW16:53–54; Disp. Verb., WA39<sup>II</sup>:5, 9/ LW38:241; Wort., WA23:151, 14/ LW37:68; Ev. Joh. 6–8, WA33:267, 22/ LW23:169.
25. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:607, 27/ LW26:399; Jon., WA19:207, 7/ LW19:55–56 (specialized exhortation to faith); Wein., WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:532, 1.
26. This popular perception of Luther, all over the Internet, has been espoused by Lewis Spitz, Sr., “Luther’s Sola Scriptura,” *Concordia Theological Monthly* XXXI, No.12 (December, 1960): 740–745; Peter



- Kreseft, "The Authority of the Bible," *Fundamentals of the Faith* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1988), p. 272.
27. Wein., WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:431f., 17/ LW52:136–137; Miss.Mess., WA8:527, 20/ LW36:186.
  28. BR (1518), WABR1:171, 70; Capt. Bab., WA6:508, 14/ LW36:29; Rat. Lat., WA8:97, 17/ LW32:215; Grund., WA7:453, 1ff.; Schmal. Art., WA50:206, 26/ BC:304.
  29. Grnd., WA7:317, 1/ LW32:11–12; Asert.art., WA7:96f., 35ff.
  30. Assert.art., WA7:97f., 16ff.
  31. Grnd., WA7:317, 8/ LW32:11–12.
  32. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:120, 20/ LW26:58: "Haec Regina debet dominari, huic omnes obedire et subiungere debent. Non eius Magistri, Iudices seu Arbitri, sed simplices testes, discipuli et confessores esse debent, sive sit Papa, sive Lutherus, sive Augustinus, sive Paulus, sive Angelus e coelo."
  33. Christ.Adel., WA6:412, 20/ LW44:135
  34. Assert.art., WA7:97, 23; Pred. (1522), WA10<sup>III</sup>:238, 10; Serv.arb., WA18:609, 4/ LW33:28; *Ibid.*, WA18:653ff., 13ff./ LW33:90ff.; Latom., WA8:99, 14/ LW32:217. Scripture is said to be not clear only for those held captive by Satan; see Serv.arb., WA18:659, 18/ LW33:99.
  35. Christ.ver., WA11:408f., 29ff./ LW39:306.
  36. Dial.Pri., WA1:656, 30; Disp.Ec., WA59:480, 1469.
  37. Konz., WA50:607, 7/ LW41:123. On the *consensus fidelium*, see John Meyendorff, "Doing Theology in an Eastern Orthodox Perspective," *Eastern Orthodox Theology: A Contemporary Reader*, ed. Daniel B. Clendenin (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1995), p. 88.
  38. App.Conc., WA2:36, 23.
  39. Gen, WA43:517, 30/ LW5:129.
  40. Capt.Bab., WA6:561, 3/ LW36:107–108
  41. Pot.leg., WA30<sup>II</sup>:687, 32: "Non enim dico creditor, quia Ecclesia approbat, Sed quia verbum Dei esse sentitur, ut Thessalonicenses fecerunt." Cf. Prop.Sat., WA30<sup>II</sup>:420, 6ff.
  42. Bib.D.B., WADB2:547: Das sind Bucher: so nicht der heiligen Schrifft gleich gehalten: und doch nutzlich und gut ze lesen sind."
  43. Ab.Chr., WA26:500, 14/ LW37:361; see Notes on Infant Baptism and the Creeds or Trinity in Chs.12 or 3. Cf. Dr.Sym., WA50:262ff., 1ff./ LW34:201ff.
  44. Disp.ed., WA59:547, 3575; 118.Ps., WA8:149f., 34ff.
  45. Disp.potest., WA39<sup>I</sup>:186, 24; Capt.Bab., WA6:508, 18/ LW36:29.
  46. Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther*, trans. Robert Schultz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970), pp. 26, 32, 33; Werner Elert, *The Structure of Lutheranism*, trans. Walter Hansen (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1962), pp. 59ff.; Gerhard Forde, *On Being a*

*Theologian of the Cross: Reflection on Luther's Heidelberg Disputation 1518* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997).

47. Kl.Ant., WA38:160, 3; Antinom. (2), WA39<sup>1</sup>:420, 27; Geist.Aug., WA30<sup>II</sup>:300, 22/ LW34:27–28; TR(1532), WATR2:516, 6; TR (1532), WATR2:517, 22; Adv.bull., WA6:600, 11; TR(1540), WATR5:63, 1. For Luther's critique of Aristotle and systematic theological convictions, see INT nn.27–30; Disp. Schol.Theol., 41, 43, 50, WA1:226, 10ff./ LW31:12; TR (1532), WATR1:79, 6; Hndb., 9:27, 22; Kirchpost.G, W<sup>2</sup>11:48, 7/ CS1/1:63. Luther was also critical of Plato. See Kirchpost.G., W<sup>2</sup>11:171, 44/ CS1/1:190.
48. Magn., WA7:577, 26/ LW21:331; Capt.Bab., WA6:508, 7/ LW36:28–29; Verm. Zu Aug., WA30<sup>II</sup>:300, 22 Rom., WA56:371, 2/ LW25:360–361. Cf. William Ockham, *Summa Logicae*, I. C.XIV–XV (St. Bonaventure, N.Y.: The Franciscan Institute, 1957), Vol. I, pp. 43–49; William of Ockham, *Super 4 Libros Sententiarum*, I, Dist.43.

Related to such realism is Luther's propensity to define a substance (like God's Being) in terms of how it acts. (See Magn., WA7:577, 26/ LW21:331 and Chap. 3 for other references.) Commitment to ontology that presupposes essence entails a rejection of subjective construal of reality. These commitments are also suggested by the Reformer's claim, while exegeting, that words must be adopted to the subject matter (Gen., WA42:195, 3ff./ LW1:263). Also see the discussion of Narrative Theology below.

49. TR (1533), WATR1:245, 11/ LW54:97; *Ibid.* (1531), WATR1:59, 10/ LW54:19–20; BR (1518), WABR1:525, 4/ LW48:65–66; BR(1516), WABR1:79, 58/ LW48:35–36; Vor.D.T., WA1:378–379/ LW31:75–76.
50. Vor.D.T., WA1:379, 5/ LW31:75; Rom., WA56:413, 18/ LW24:404ff.; *Ibid.*, WA56:377f., 24ff./ LW25:367–368; *Ibid.*, WA56:423, 19/ LW25:415; Dict.Ps., WA3: 124, 29ff./ LW19:119ff. Also see the discussion of Justification As Conformity To Christ in Chap. 9.

The influence of Mysticism on the young Luther was a dominating interest among many Luther scholars. For examples, see John Dillenberger, *God: Hidden and Revealed* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1953), who conducts a thorough survey of the attitude of scholarship on this issue prior to the middle of the twentieth century. See Rudolf Otto, *West-Östliche Mystik* (Gotha: Leopold Klotz Verlag, 1926), pp. 277f.; Hermann Hering, *Die Mystik Luthers in Zusammenhang seiner Theologie und in ihrem Verhältnis zur älteren Mystik* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1879); Wilhem Braun, *Die Bedeutung der Concupiscentia in Luthers Leben und Lehre* (Berlin: Trowitsch, 1908), p. 295; Siegfried Lommatzsch, *Luthers Lehre vom ethisch-religiösen Standpunkt aus und mit besonderer Berücksichtigung seiner Theorie vom Gesetz* (Berlin, 1879), p. 141; Karl Holl, "Die Rechtfertigungslehre in Luthers Vorlesung

über Römerbrief mit Rücksicht auf die Frage der Heilsgewissheit," *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, Vol. 1 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1932), pp. 148–149.

With the notable exceptions of Bengt Hoffman, *Luther and the Mystics* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1977); Louis Saint-Blanc, "La theologie de Luther et un nouveau Plagiat de Pierre d'Ailly," *Positions Lutheriennes* 4 (1956):61–77; and Volker Leppin, "Luther's Transformation of Medieval Thought: Continuity and Discontinuity," in *The Oxford Handbook of Martin Luther's Theology*, eds. Robert Kolb, Irene Dingel, and L'Ubomir Batka (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), esp. p. 121 (affirming Mysticism's impact on Luther's dialectical thinking), more recent Luther research has tended to stress the Reformer's discontinuity with Mysticism. See Walther von Loewenich, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, trans. Herbert Bouman (4th ed.; Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1976), p. 166; Roland Bainton, *Here I Stand* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1950), pp. 42–43; Scott Hendrix, "Martin Luther's Reformation of Spirituality," in *Harvesting Martin Luther's Reflections*, ed. Timothy Wengert (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), p. 255. Of course, in an addendum to the fourth edition of his work, von Loewenich, p. 222, in a manner not unlike Hoffmann in his "On the Relationship between Mystical Faith and Moral Life in Luther's Thought," *Bulletin*, Vol.55, No.1 (Feb.1975): 21–33, suggests that there was an appropriate place for the imagery of Mysticism in Luther's thought, at the level of his piety.

51. Rom., WA56:299f., 25ff./ LW25:287; TR (1533), WATR1:302f., 30ff./ LW54:112; Capt.Bab., WA6:561f., 34ff./ LW36:109.
52. Disp. Schol. Theol., WA1:226, 17ff./ LW31:12: "45. Theolus non logicus est monstrosus haereticus, Est monstrosa et haeretica oratio. Contra dictum commune."  
46. Frusta fingitur logica fidei, Suppositio mediate extra terminum et numerum. Contra recen. Dialect."
53. *Ibid.*, WA 1:224, 7/ LW31:9: "1. Dicere, quod Augustinus contra haereticos excessive loquatur, Est dicere Augustam fere ubique mentium esse. Contradictum commune."
54. Wein., WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:611, 18/LW52:196: "Es mag nitt natur-liecht unnd gnaden-liecht freund sein. Natur will fulen und gewisz seyn, ehe sie glewbt. Gnad will glewben, ehe sie fulet, darumb gehet die natur nit weytter den ynn yhr liecht."
55. Haus., W<sup>2</sup>13<sup>II</sup>:2390, 2/ CS7:210; *Ibid.*, W<sup>2</sup>13<sup>II</sup>:2438ff., 1/ CS7:237; Jes. (1527–1530), WA31<sup>II</sup>:71, 3/ LW16:100–101.
56. Himm.Proph., WA18:164, 24/ LW40:174–175. Also see other relevant footnotes in the subsequent discussion of the Theology of the Cross.

57. *Serv.arb.*, WA18:782, 21/ LW33:287: "Summa cum scriptura ubique Christum per contentionem et antithesin praedicet (ut dixi), ut quicquid sine Christi spiritu fuerit, hoc Satanae, impietati, errori, tenebris peccato, morti et irae Dei subiiciat, contra liberum arbitrium pugnabunt tentimonia, quotquot de Christo loquuntur. At ea sunt innumerabilia, imo tota scriptura."
- Other instances of such a dialectical vision of Scripture when defending faith from critique include *Rom.*, WA56:233, 5/ LW25:217–218; *Lib.christ.*, WA7:50, 23/ LW31:345–346; *Gal.* (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:391, 17/ LW26:248.
58. *Gal.* (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:391, 18/ LW26:248: "Est enim Scriptura plena Antithesibus. Et ingeniosi hominis est cernere Antitheses in Scripturis ac per eas posse interpretari Scripturas."
59. *Rom.*, WA56:392f., 32ff./ LW25:383.
60. *Gen.*, WA43:219, 28/ LW4:117: "Fides igitur conciliat contraria."
61. *Disp.Heid.*, 29–30, WA1:355, 2ff./ LW31:41. Also see n. 6.
62. *Prae.Witt.*, WA1:507, 34.
63. For the rejection of allegory, see *Gen.*, WA42:67, 21/ LW1:89; *Ibid.*, WA42:68, 26/ LW1:90; *Ibid.* WA42:69, 16/ LW1:91; *Ibid.*, WA42:74, 5, 33/ LW1:97, 98; *Ibid.*, WA 42:76, 1/ LW1:99; *Ibid.*, WA42:91f., 4ff./ LW1:122; *Ibid.*, WA42:173, 4, 35/ LW1:232, 233; *Ibid.*, WA42:368, 14ff./ LW2:151–152; *Ibid.*, WA372, 21ff./ LW2:158; *Ibid.*, WA42:377, 1/ LW2:164; *Ibid.*, WA43:490, 14/ LW5:88; *Ibid.*, WA43:667f., 4ff./ LW5:345; *Ibid.*, WA44:93, 15/ LW6:125; *Ibid.*, WA44:114:29/ LW6:153; *Capt.Bab.*, WA6:509, 8/ LW36:30; *TR* (n.d.), WATR6:178, 1; *Deut.*, WA14:500, 10/ LW9:7; *Ibid.*, WA14:560, 20/ LW9:25; *Ps.*, WA31<sup>I</sup>:254, 13/ LW14:36; *Jes.* (1527–1530), WA31<sup>II</sup>:242, 30/ LW16:326; *Zach.*, WA23:485, 10/ LW20:155; *Ibid.*, WA23:608f., 32/ LW20:282; *Gal.* (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:653, 14/ LW26:433; *Gal.* (1519), WA2:515, 28/ LW 27:259; *Ibid.*, WA2:551, 16/ LW27:312; *Serv.arb.*, WA18:701, 4/ LW33:163; *Ibid.*, WA18:703, 26/ LW33:167; *Ibid.*, WA18:734f., 25/ LW33:213; *Uber.*, WA7:647, 21/ LW39:175; *Ibid.*, WA7:650, 12/ LW39:178; *Ibid.*, WA7:653, 1/ LW39:181; *BR* (1518), WABR1:34, 1/ LW48:54.
64. *Gal.* (1519), WA2:574, 16/ LW27:346.
65. *Prae.Witt.*, WA1:461, 27.
66. *Dict.Ps.*, WA3:13, 14/ LW10:7; *Ibid.*, WA4:153, 27/ LW11:304; *Men.*, WA10<sup>II</sup>:73, 15/ LW35:132. For numerous other references, see p. 246, nn. 1–5.
67. *Gal.* (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:588, 12/ LW26:386): "Deinde tota scripura hoc praecipue agit, ne dubitemus, sed certo speremus, confidamus et creadamus Deus esse misericordiam, benignum, patientem, non mentientem

- et fallentem, sed fidelem et verace, qui servet promissa, Imo qui nunc praestiterit, quod promisit, tradendo unigenitum filium suum in mortem propter peccata nostra, ut omnis, qui credit in filium, non pereat, sed habeat aeternam.” Cf. *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>I</sup>:129, 19/ LW26:64. On Scripture as concerned with the Who promises, see Gen., WA44:724, 41/ LW8:201.
68. Jes. (1527–1529), WA31<sup>II</sup>: 11, 19 / LW16:16–17: “Scriptura semper praedicat misericordiam dei et nostrum peccatum. Maiestas dei summa est, nos vilissimi, attamen nobis persuadere debemus deum nobis misericordem esse, quia promisit. Hic favor dei, si modo firma esset fides, faceret nos impavidos in omnibus.”
  69. Rom., WA56:233, 5/ LW25:217–218.
  70. Rom., WA56:414, 13/ LW25:405; Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:459, 16/ LW26:295. Cf. Vor.N.T., WADB7:384, 26/ LW35:396; Dict.Ps., WA4:439, 20f; Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:458, 30/ LW26:295.
  71. Vor.OT., WADB8:29, 32/ LW35:247: “Wenn du wilt wol und sicher deuten, So nim Christum fur dich, Denn das ist der Man, dem es alles und gantz und gar gilt.” A similar point when exhorting faith against false teaching is evident in Ev.Joh.3–4, WA47:66, 17/ LW22:339.
  72. Stuf., WA40<sup>III</sup>:348, 18.
  73. Rom., WA56:137, 1/ LW25:119–120: “*Quaecumque* [Qu] e [cumque enim etiam de Christo et do quocunque alio *Scriptura sunt/ ad nostrum doctrinam* i.e. morale institutionem exemplariter intelligendo *scripta* Grec[us] ‘prescripta’ *sunt*: i.i. quasi ante oculos posita sunt *tut per patentiam* in rebus *ut consolationem scripturarum* in Verbis *spem habeamus* in Deum.” Cf. Mos., WA16:391, 1/ LW35:173.
  74. Dict.Ps., WA3:11, 26ff./ LW10:3f., is an example of his use of allegorical interpretation.
  75. *Ibid.*, WA3:11, 33/ LW10:11. For other examples of this stress on the literal sense, see Dict.Ps., Glosses, WA55<sup>I</sup>:4, 20: “In Scriptura ... nulla valet allegoria, tropologia, anagoge, nisi albi hystorice idem exresse dicatur. Alioquin ludibrium fieret Scriptura.” Dict.Ps., WA4:305, 6: “Quod inde puto venire, quia propheticum, id est literalem, primo non quesierunt: qui est fundmentum ceterorum, magister et lux et author et fons atque origo.”

This emphasis was in line with medieval thinking; see Thomas Aquinas, *In I Sent* prol. Q.1aa. 5, 7; A. Haufnagel, “Wort Gottes: Sinn und Bedeutung nach Thomas von Aquin,” in Helmut Feld and J. Nolte, eds., *Wort Gottes in der Zeit* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1973), pp. 236–256; Helmut Feld, *Die Anfänge der modernen biblischen Hermeneutik in der spätmittelalterlichen Theologie* (Weisbaden: Fran Steiner Verlag, 1977), pp. 70–83.

76. Serv.arb., WA18:606, 29/ LW33:26.
77. Dict.Ps., WA3:458., 5ff./ LW10:402; *Ibid.*, WA4:439, 20f.
78. *Ibid.*, WA3:12, 32/ LW10:6.
79. Vor.O.T., WADB8:11, 1/ LW35:235; Jes. (1527–1530), WA31<sup>II</sup>:243, 20/ LW16:327; *Ibid.*, WA31<sup>II</sup>:97, 23/ LW16:136–137; Deut., WA14:560, 12/ LW9:24–25; Gen., WA42:568, 3ff./ LW3:27.
80. Gen., WA44:93, 13/ LW6:125; *Ibid.*, WA42:173f., 30ff./ LW1:233; *Ibid.*, WA43:490, 15/ LW5:88; Latom., WA8:64, 17/ LW32:168; 2.Ps., WA5:541, 12. For further discussions of Luther's use of allegory, see Heinrich Bornkamm, *Luther und das alte Testament* (Tübingen: JCB Mohr, 1948), pp. 74ff.; Gerhard Ebeling, *Evangelische Evangelienauslegung: Eine Untersuchung zu Luthers Hermeneutik* (München: Kaiser, 1942); Karl Holl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, Vol.1 (Tübingen: JCB Mohr, 1932), pp. 553ff.; Robert Kolb, *Martin Luther and the Enduring Word of God* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2016), pp. 158–161.
81. 2.Ps., WA5:23, 1/ LW14:285.
82. Dict.Ps., WA3:512, 21/ LW10:455.
83. TR (1531), WATR1:16, 13/ LW54:7: "Sola autem experientia facit theologum." Cf. *Ibid.* (1532), WATR1:146, 12/ LW54:50.
84. *Ibid.* (1536), WATR3:312, 11; cf. *ibid.* (1532), WATR1:146, 12/ LW54:50.
85. Kirchpost.E., W<sup>2</sup>12:625, 6/ CS4/1:335: "Darumb wird der heilige Geist niemand gegeben, den even dennen, die da stehen in Betrübniß und Angst."
86. Vor.Deut.Schr., WA50:659, 3/ LW34:285; 2.Ps., WA5:163, 28; Taul. Sermon., WA9:98, 21.
87. Disp.indulg., WA1:234, 5/ LW31:27; Res., WA1:557, 23/ LW31:129.
88. TR (1539), WATR4:490, 24ff.: "Ego si diutius vivere libenter vellem librum conscribere de tentationibus, nam sine illis homo neque sacram scripturam neque fidem, timorem et dilectionem Dei agnoscere potest immo non potest scire, qui nunquam fuit in tentationibus."
89. Another text indicating that Luther refers to experience not in terms of experience which shapes a Biblical text's meaning, but the interpreter's experience with the biblical text is Vor.Lat., WA54:186, 27/ LW34:338. Cf. Latom., WA8:127, 21/ LW32:258. For a similar interpretation what Luther means by experience is offered by Oswald Bayer, *Martin Luther's Theology: A Contemporary Interpretation*, trans. Thomas Trapp (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007), p. 22.
90. Serv.arb., WA18: 702f., 29ff./ LW33:166.
91. Deut., WA14:560, 13/ LW9:24: "... ut Christianus lector primam operam navet quaerendo sensui illi, ut vocant, literali, qui solus tota est fidei et theologiae Christianae substantia, qui in tribulation et tentatione solus

- subsistit et portas inferi cum peccato et morte vincit atque triumphat in laudem et glorium dei.”
92. Ev.Joh.1–2, WA46:582f., 40ff./ LW22:55.
  93. Latom., WA8:63, 27/ LW32:167; Uber., WA7:655, 27/ LW39:184; *Ibid.*, WA7:650, 16ff./ LW39:178.
  94. Pred. (1522), WA10<sup>III</sup>:238, 10. Also see Note 34, above for other references.
  95. Som.Post. (Cruc.), WA22:108,12; Disp.hom., WA39<sup>I</sup>:180, 27/ LW34:144; TR (1533), WATR1:191, 15/ LW54:71; *Ibid.* (1532), WATR3:105, 11/ LW54:183.
  96. Pred. (1531), WA34<sup>I</sup>:347f., 26ff.: “Es ist vil spruch ... Ita in conscione videamus, ut sincerum verbum praedicatur. Das ist, das er sagt. Quod ipse sit moriturus dei, non sunt recht.”
  97. Stuf., WA40<sup>III</sup>:254, 7: “Sunt vocabula et locutio divina.” The Spirit is said to be the author of Scripture, in *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>III</sup>:16, 24.
  98. Gen., WA43:618, 31/ LW5:275; Men., WA10<sup>II</sup>:92, 6/ LW35:153; Letz.Wort., WA54:55, 21/ LW15:299; Hspost. (1545), WA52:811, 34. These points are made while offering comforting or defending Christian readings of the Bible. And when combatting Enthusiasts in 1.Joh, WA20:789, 35/ LW20:321, Luther claims that all Scripture is inspired.
  99. Ps.51, WA40<sup>III</sup>:386, 11.
  100. Pred. (1542), WA49:256f.35ff./ CS2/1:98: “Denn Gottes Wort ist ein andere Rede, und die Heilige Schrift ein ander Buch den menschen rede und Schriftt, das wol S. Gregorius gesagt (wie er auch zu dem guten spruch komen ist, die Schriftt sey ein solch wasser, darin ligunt et sapientibus, ut non possint erlangen.”
  101. Letz.Wort., WA54:35, 2/ LW15:275.
  102. Thes.Wel., WA39<sup>I</sup>:48, 1 / LW34:113.
  103. Men., WA10<sup>II</sup>:92, 4.
  104. Stuf., WA40<sup>III</sup>:16, 24; TR (1532), WATR2:151, 11; Gen., WA42:23, 23/ LW1:30; 1 Pet., WA14:31, 25/ LW30:167.
  105. Haus., WA52:811, 28; Gen., WA44:91f.38ff. / LW6:123.
  106. Wein., WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:191, 13/ LW52:49.
  107. Konz., WA50:548, 14/ LW41:54; cf. Haus., WA52:564, 16.
  108. BR (1523), WABR3:345, 4.
  109. Wein., WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:58ff./ LW52:7ff. What follows should be carefully noted by critics like Robert Kolb, who in his *Luther and the Stories of God* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2012), pp. 34–35, incorrectly accused me of contending that Luther imposed his own agenda on the biblical narrative. What follows makes clear he did that, but most times he did not. See my “Luther as Narrative Exegete,” *Journal of Religion* 63 (Oct. 1983): 394–413.

110. Kl.unt., WA10<sup>1/1</sup>:17, 7/ LW35:123; *Ibid.*, WA10<sup>1/1</sup>:84, 14ff./ LW35:117–118; Leip. Disp., WA2:424, 16; Ab.Chr., WA26:444, 37; 1 Pet., WA12:259, 8/ LW30:3.
111. Uber., WA7:652, 23/ LW39:181; Gen., WA42:108, 17/ LW1:144; *Ibid.*, WA42: 141, 4/ LW 1:188; *Ibid.*, WA42:356, 19/ LW2:134.
112. 2.Ps., WA5:543, 13.
113. Pred. (1519–1521), WA9:630, 14ff.
114. 2.Ps., WA5:29, 28/ LW14:290f.: “Nam etsi variant per tempora mores, personae, loca, ritus, eadem tamen vel pietas vel impietas transit per omnia saecula.” Cf. Latom., WA8:69, 24/ LW32:176.
115. Ev.Joh., 1–2, WA46:726, 1ff./ LW22:218f.; Pred. (1532/1533), WA36:492, 6/ LW28:68.
116. Fid.in., WA6:94, 9.
117. Rath., WA15:35, 18/ LW45:356: “... so wird Gott nicht wunder thun, so lang man der saschen durch ander seyne dargethane gutter greaten kan.”
118. Som.Post. (Cruc.), WA22:121, 5/ LW78:258; Kirchpost.G., W<sup>2</sup>11:1379f., 15/ CS2/2:219.
119. Jes. (1527–1529), WA25:233f., 37.
120. Pred. (1532/1533), WA36:5501f., 17ff./ LW28:77–78; *Ibid.*, WA36:525ff., 16ff./ LW28:94–95, 97; cf. Hans Frei, *The Identity of Jesus Christ*, pp. 7–9.
121. Pred. (1532/1533), WA36:492f., 31ff./ LW28:68–72; *Ibid.*, WA WA36:524f., 31ff./ LW28:94–95; *Ibid.*, WA36:530, 25/ LW28:98; *Ibid.*, WA36:540, 20/ LW28:105.
122. Pred. (1532/1533), WA36:632, 11/ LW28:170; *Ibid.*, WA36:478, 5ff./ LW28:59.
123. *Ibid.*, WA36:530, 13/ LW28:98.
124. Thes. Antinom., WA39<sup>1</sup>:356, 15. Such a position is affirmed by Jürgen Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, trans. James W. Leitch (5th ed.; London: SCM Press, 1967), p. 87.
125. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>1</sup>:410f., 13ff. / LW26:260–262; Gen., WA42:35, 22/ LW1:47.
126. Disp.Verb., WA39<sup>II</sup>:5, 9ff./ LW38:241–242.
127. *Ibid.*, WA39<sup>II</sup>:24, 36/ LW38:276.
128. Disp.Christ., WA39<sup>II</sup>:94, 16ff.; Gen., WA42:35f., 40ff./ LW1:47–48; cf. Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, trans. G. E. M. Anscombe (New York: Macmillan Co., 1958), p. 216.
129. Gen., WA42:599, 6/ LW3:70–71; *Ibid.*, WA42:272, 16/ LW2:14–15; cf. *Ibid.*, WA43:144f., 35ff./ LW4:13; *Ibid.*, WA42:35, 22ff./ LW1:47; Disp.Verb., WA39<sup>II</sup>:5, 13ff./ LW 38:241; Disp.Christ., WA39<sup>II</sup>:94, 16; Promodisp.Pall., WA39<sup>I</sup>:229, 16; 2Ps., WA5:27, 8; Disp.hom., WA39<sup>I</sup>:180, 27/ LW34:144; Gal.



- (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:418, 12/ LW26:267; Disp.Verb., WA39<sup>II</sup>:3, 1/ LW38:239; TR (1540), WATR5:26, 11.
- Cf. Disp.hom., WA39<sup>I</sup>:175, 24/ LW34:137ff.; George Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1984), p. 20; Hans Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), p. viii.
130. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:596, 16/ LW26: 391; Ps.2, WA40<sup>II</sup>:231, 20/ LW12:32–33; cf. Wittgenstein, esp. 2–5, 20–21. See Hannes Ilge, *Gewissheit durch das Wort: Eine sprachphilosophische Untersuchung von Luthers fundamentaltheologischer Einsicht* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2008).
  131. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:407f., 32ff./ LW26:260; cf. Disp.Christ., WA39<sup>II</sup>:94, 17.
  132. Pred. (1532/1533), WA36:646, 11/ LW28:180; *Ibid.*, WA36:687, 35/ LW28:208;  
cf. 2.Ps., WA5:27, 7/ LW14:286.
  133. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:228f., 31ff./ LW26:129
  134. Wein., WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:186, 15.
  135. Ev.Joh.6–8, WA33:148, 24/ LW23:97.
  136. 1.Pet., WA12:369, 10/ LW30:114; Ps., WA31<sup>I</sup>:456, 1/ LW14:134; Latom., WA8:50, 20/ LW32:147.
  137. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:596, 21/ LW26:391; Disp.Christ., WA39<sup>II</sup>:112, 15.
  138. Ev.Joh.14–15, WA45:521f., 36/ LW24:67: “jeut hab ich Gottes wort und werck gesehen ja Gott selbs gehört und gesehen, predigen und Teuffen ... Die zunge stimme, faust k. sind wol des menschen, aber das wort und ampt ist eigentlich der Gottlichen maiestet selbs...”
  139. Haus., W<sup>2</sup>13<sup>I</sup>:560, 23/ CS6:76; 1.Joh., WA20:790, 24/ LW20:321.
  140. Dict.Ps., WA3:152, 7/ LW10:128.
  141. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:597, 15 / LW26:392; Wein.,WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:232, 13/ LW52:78–79.
  142. Wein, WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:130, 14/ CS1/1:163.
  143. Dict. Ps., WA3:397, 11/ LW10:333.
  144. Vor.O.T., WADB10<sup>I</sup>:102, 23/ LW35:256.
  145. Dict. Ps., WA3:397, 9ff./ LW10:332. Cf. Gen., WA44:262, 11/ LW6:350–351; *Ibid.*, WA44:265, 33/ LW6:355; Wein., WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:87f., 4ff./ CS1/1:155f.; Pred.(1519–1521), WA9:630, 14.
  146. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup> :195f., 28ff/ LW26:108–109; Ev.Joh.16–20, WA28:371, 15ff./ LW24:242–243; Wein., WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:63f., 14ff./ LW52:9–10; Wein., WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:72, 11/ LW52:15; Hspost., W<sup>2</sup>13<sup>II</sup>:2639.7/ CS7:258.
  147. Pred. (1530), WA32:98, 17.
  148. Pred. (1519–1521), WA9:440, 2.
  149. TR (1540), WATR4:666, 8f.; Gen., WA43:535, 3/ LW5:140.

150. Stuf., WA40<sup>III</sup>:370f., 23: "Ideo autem opus habemus hoc testimonio, quod, cum sensum sequimur, contrarium experimur. Sed non ex sensu nee ex re praesenti iudicui, facienum est, verbum est sequendum et statuendum, quod haec credenda, no experienda sint. Credere enim non est experiri; non, quod nunquam expereinda sint, quae credimus, sed quod experientiam debet praecedere fides et est credendum verbo etiam tum, cum diversa a verbo senimus et experimur..."
151. Oper.Ps. (1519–1521), WA5:46, 13/ LW14:310: "In fine hoc movendum, quod illustrissimi patres, presertim Athanasius et Augustinius tradiderunt, hoc est, ut affectibus psalmodum affectus nostros accomodemus et attempremus."
152. Serm. (1514–1517), WA1:29,15: "Nec id mirum, quod nos verbum fieri oportere dixi, cum Philosophi dicant, quod intellectus sit intelligibile per actualem intellectionem et sensus sensible per actualem sensationem, quanto magis id in spiritu et verbo verum est! ... et ita obiecta sunt eorum esse et actus, sine quibus nihil essent, sicut materia sine forma nihil esset."
153. Stuf., WA40<sup>III</sup>:370, 5; Ev.Joh.14–15, WA45:599, 5/ LW24:151; Jon., 19:220, 5/ LW19:68–69.
154. Hspost., W<sup>2</sup>13<sup>II</sup>:2585.2/ CS7:210; *Ibid.*, W<sup>2</sup>13<sup>II</sup>:2614.1/ CS7:237.
155. Rom., WA56:137, 1/ LW25:119–120
156. See p. 12, n. 3.
157. Worm., WA7:838, 2/ LW32:112–113. Cf. Hans Schwarz, *True Faith in the True God: An Introduction to Luther's Life and Thought* (expanded ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress press, 2015), esp. p. 31.
158. Wein., WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:576, 18/ CS1/1:337.
159. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:304, 9 /LW26:182: "Ego plane nihil videre volo prae illo Christo. Is tantus mihi thesaurus esse debet, ut reliqua omnia prae ipso mihi sordeant. Is denique tanta lux mihi esse debet, ut eo apprehenso fide nesciam, an sit lex, peccatum vel ulla iniustitia in mundo. Quid enim onmia quae in coelo et terra sunt, ad filium Dei?" Cf. *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>I</sup>:458, 19/ LW26:295; Wein., WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:81f., 21ff./ LW52:22 (where Luther also makes this point when preaching).
160. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:132., 10/ LW26:66.
161. Rom., WA56:233, 8/ LW25:218.
162. Wein., WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:379, 9/ CS1/1:270
163. Lat., WA8:45, 19/ LW32:140–141.
164. Oper.Ps., WA3:517, 33/LW10:460.
165. Dtsch.Kat, 4, WA30<sup>I</sup>:218, 6ff./ BC462.49ff.; Widdertauf., WA26:155, 7ff./ LW40:241.
166. Thes. Wel., WA39<sup>I</sup>:48, 1/ LW34:113.
167. See Jacques Derrida, *Limited Inc.* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1977); Edward Said. *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage, 1944), esp. p. 10.

168. Rom., WA56:336, 25/ LW25:324–325: “‘Littera’ apud Apostolum Paulum Est non tantum figuralis Scriptura aut doctrina legis, Sed prorsus omnis doctrina, que precipit ea, quae sunt bone, vite, siue sit euangelica siue Mosica. Haec enim si cognoscantur et memoria teneantur et non assit spiritus gratiae, sunt tantum litera vacua et mors animae. Unde B. Augustinus de spi. et lit. c.4: ‘Doctrina illa, quippe qua mandatum accipimus continenter recteque vivendi. Litera est occidens, nisi assit spiritus viuificans ...’”  
Cf. Dict.Ps., WA3:255ff., 23ff./ LW10:211–213; *Ibid.*, WA3:12, 2/ LW10:4–5.
169. Dict. Ps., WA3:620, 2/ LW11:110: “Quia habere intellectum spiritualium non nisi ex scientia seu notitia Christi habetur. Nescito enim Christo impossibile est habere intellectuam in Scriptura, cum ipse sit sol et veritas in Scriptura.” Cf. Vor.N.T., WADB7:384, 25/ LW35:396.
170. Dict.Ps., WA4:365, 5/ LW11:497; *Ibid.*, WA3:258, 8f./LW10:215.
171. *Ibid.*, WA4:82, 19/ LW11:231.
172. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>1</sup>:458, 32/ LW26:295f.: “... nihil moror Scripturae locos, si etiam sexcentos producas pro iustitia operam contra fidei iustitiam et clamites Scripturam pugnare; Ego Autorem et Dominum Scripturae habeo, a cuius parte volo potius stare quam tibi credere – Quanquam impossibile sit Scripturam pugnare nisi ... Ego cum Autore Scripturae maneo.” Cf. Thes.Wel., WA39<sup>1</sup>:47, 19/ LW34:112.
173. Pred.l.Mose. (1523/1524), WA24:169, 24; Gen., WA42:293, 6/ LW2:44.
174. Dtsch.Kat., WA30<sup>1</sup>:133, 3/ BC386.2.
175. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>1</sup>:360, 24/ LW26:227. This phrase which was used by Ludwig Feuerbach to coopt Luther and also by Karl Barth to condemn the Reformer for fostering Humanism (*Protestant Theology from Rousseau to Ritschl*, trans. Brian Cozens [New York: Harper, 1959], p. 359) overlooks Luther’s safeguarding of the trans-subjective character of God’s existence. For Feuerbach’s critique of Luther, see his *The Essence of Christianity*, trans. Georg Eliot (New York: Harper& Row, 1957), pp. 44–46.
176. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>1</sup>:228, 27/ LW26:129.
177. Dict. Ps., WA4:365, 6/ LW11:497: “Nam quod illis tunc suffecit ad intellectum, nobis nunc est litera. Quia ut supra dixi, subtilior est nunc litera nobiscum quam olim fuit. Et hoc propter profectum. Nam, ut dixi, onmis qui proficit, hoc quod post se obliviscitur, est ei litera, et in quod se ante extendit, est ei spiritus. Quia semper illud quod habetur, est litera ad illud, quod acquirendum est: ut de motu diximus. Ita articulus trinitatis expressus tempore Arrii fuit spiritus et paucis datus, nunc autem est litera, quia revelatus, nisi et nos addamus aliud, scilicet vivam fidem ipsius. Quare orandum semper est pro intellectu, ut non in

occidente litera torpescamus. Si enim filii dei sumus, semper oportet esse in generatione.”

178. *Ibid.*, WA3:454, 22/ LW10:397.
179. Adv., WA10<sup>1/2</sup>:35, 1/ CS1/1:31.
180. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>1</sup>:458, 13ff. / LW26:295f.: “Deinde esto etiam quod Sophistae sint arguitoires me et ita obruant et illaqueent me argumentis pro operibus contra fidem, ut prorsus me explicare nonpossim, quamvis hoc nullo modo possint, tamen potius honorem habere et credere velim uni Christo quam permoveri omnibus locis, quos contra me pro iustitia operum statuenda producerent.
- Quare si ipse est pretium redemptionis meae, si Ipse factus est Peccatum et Maledictum, ut me iustificaret et benediceret, nihil moror Scripturae locos, si etiam sexcentos producas pro iustitia operum contra fidei iustitiam et clamites Scripturam pugnare; Ego Autorem et Dominum Scripturae habeo, a cuius parte volo potius stare quam tibi credere...” Cf. Vor.N.T., WADB7:384, 29/ LW35:396; Thes.Wel., WA39<sup>1</sup>:47, 19/ LW34:112.
181. Adv., WA10<sup>1/2</sup>:75, 1/ CS3/2:42: “Wo ist aber gottis wortt ynn allen buchernn ausser der heiligen schriff?” Cf. Wein., WA10<sup>1/1</sup>:628f., 12ff./ LW52:205–206.
182. Vor.N.T., WADB7:344, 27/ LW35:395; Vor.O.T., WADB8:12, 5/ LW35:236; Wein., WA10<sup>1/1</sup>:576, 10/ LW52:171; *Ibid.*, WA10<sup>1/1</sup>:139, 13/ CS1/1:169. Luther’s remarks obviously suggest that he is a forerunner of historical criticism, points made by K. A. Meissenger, *Luthers Exegese in der Frubzeit* (Leipzig: M. Heinsius Nachfolger, 1911); Karl Holl, “Luthers Bedeutung fur den Fortschritt der Auslegungskunst (1921),” *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, Vol.1 (Tubingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1932), pp. 544–582; Fritz Hahn, “Luthers Auslegungsgrundsätze und ihre theologischen Voraussetzungen” *Zeitschrift fur systematische Theologie* 12 (1934): 165–218; Gerhard Ebeling, *Evangelische Evangelienauslegung: Eine Untersuchung zu Luthers Hermeneutik* (Munich: Kaiser, 1942).
183. Wein., WA10<sup>1/1</sup>:625ff., 18ff./ LW52:205–206; 1 Pet., WA12:259, 81/ LW30:3.
184. Rom., WA56:336, 10/ LW25:324.
185. Vor.N.T., WADB6:10, 9/ LW35:361–362; 1.Pet., WA12:260, 8/ LW30:3–4. Cf. Vor.N.T., WADB7:2f., 1ff./ LW35:365f.
186. Latom., WA8:107f., 37ff./ LW32:229f.
187. Promodisp.Schmed., WA39<sup>II</sup>:194, 24/ LW34:317; Vor.N.T., WADB6:20, 33/ LW35:362; cf. *Ibid.*, WADB7:384ff., 1ff./ LW35:395.
188. Vor.N.T., WADB7:344, 27/ LW35:395; *Ibid.*, WADB7:404, 12/ LW35:398.
189. TR (1531–1532), WATR1:69, 18/ LW54:20.

190. Matt.5–7, WA32:352f., 35/ LW21:65.
191. See pp. 14–15, n. 19; Ev.Joh.14–15, WA45:473, 14ff./ LW24:14.
192. 1 Tim., WA26:24, 31/ LW38:245–246.
193. En.ep., WA7:502, 34f.: “Quando autem pene universa scriptura totiusque Theologiae cognitio pendet in recta cognitione legis et Euangelii ...” Cf. Gen., WA42:637, 29/ LW3:125; Lib. Christ., WA7:52, 24/ LW31:348; Serv.arb., WA18:694f., 39ff./ LW33:153–154; TR (1542–1543), WATR5:210, 12/ LW54:442f.; Pred. (1532), WA36:369, 19/ LW51:281; *Ibid.*, WA36:27, 17; TR (1531–1546), WATR6:142, 26; *Ibid.* (1531), WATR2:4, 7/ LW54:127.
194. TR (1542–1543), WATR5:210, 12/ LW54:442–443.
195. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:207, 17/ LW26:115: “Qui igitur bene novit discernere Evangelium a lege, is gratias agat Deo et sciat se esse Theologum.” Cf. *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>I</sup>:526, 15/ LW26:342; TR (1531–1536), WATR6:127ff., 33ff. (esp. 146, 17); Antinom.(1), WA39<sup>I</sup>:361f., 19ff.; Antinom.(3), WA39<sup>I</sup>:552, 10.
196. Pred. (1532), WA36:9, 28: “Denn dis [zwischen dem Gebot und Euangelion] ist die höchste kunft ynn der Christenheit, die wir wissen sollen...”
197. Ps.57, WA40<sup>II</sup>:328, 1. LW12:311: “... ut proprie si subiectum Theologiae homo reus et perditus et deus iustificans vel salvator.”
198. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:209., 16/ LW26:117: “Is locus de discrimine legis et Evangelii scitu maxime necessarius est, quia continent summam totius Christianae doctrinae.” Cf. Pred. (1532), WA36:25, 29; En.ep., WA7:502, 34.
199. Ps.51, WA40<sup>II</sup>:327f., 37ff./ LW12:311: “... Ne quis de Maiestate cogitet, quid fecerit Deus et quam potens sit, Item ne quis cogitet de homine suarum rerum domino, sicut Iureconsultus, aut de homine aegro, sicut Medicus, sed de homine peccante. Nam Theologiae proprium subiectum est homo peccati reus ac perditus et Deus iustificans ac salvator hominis peccatoris. Quicquid extra hoc subiectum in Theologia quaeritur aut disputatur, est error et venenum.” Cf. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:526, 26/ LW26:342.
200. Serv.arb., WA18:782, 21/ LW33:287: “Summa, cum scriptura ubique Christum per contentionem et antithesis praedicat (ut dixi), ut quicquid sine Christi spritu fuerit, hoc Satanae, impietati, errori, tenebris, peccato, morti et irae Dei subiiciat, contra liberum arbitrium pugnabunt testimonia, quotquot de Christo loquuntur. At ea sunt innumerabilia, imo tota scriptura.” Luther uses this dialectical vision of Scripture in similar contexts in Rom., WA56:233, 5/ LW25:217–218; Lib. Christ., WA7:50, 23/ LW31:345–346; Gal (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:391, 18/ LW26:248.
201. Heb., WA57<sup>III</sup>:79f., 12ff.: “Hae sunt duo contraria in Scripturis frequentata: iudicium et iusticia, ira et gratia, mors et vita, malum et

- bonum ... Alienum opus eius ab eo, ut operator opus suum ... Haec theologia crucis est, seu ut Apostolu dicit: 'Verbum crucis scandalum Iudeis et stulticia Gentibus,' quia penitus abscondita ab oculis eorum."
202. Gal.(1535), WA40<sup>1</sup>:391, 18/ LW26:248.
  203. *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>1</sup>:486, 25/ LW26:313.
  204. Pred. (1532), WA36:9, 6.
  205. Gal.(1535), WA40<sup>1</sup>:40, 28/ LW26:4–5; Disp.Schol.Theol., WA1:228, 1/ LW31:14; Gal.(1535), WA40<sup>1</sup>:207, 19/ LW26:115; Disp.Schol.Theol., WA1:227, 6ff./ LW31:13, 14; *Ibid.*, WA1:228, 229./ LW31:15; Serv. arb., WA18:680, 23ff./ LW33:132; *Ibid.*, WA18: 677f.7ff./ LW33:127–128; *Ibid.*, WA18:694f.39ff./ LW33:153–154; *Ibid.*, WA18:766ff.8ff./ LW33:261–264.
  206. Ev.Joh.1–2, WA46:658, 24 / LW22:145.
  207. Gal (1535), WA40<sup>1</sup>:207, 19/ LW26:115: "Sic autem discernenda sunt, ut Evangelium ponas in coelo, legem in terra, ut Evangelii iustitiam appelles coelestem et divinam, legis terrenam et humanam, Utque tam diligenter distinguas iustitiam Evangelii a legis iustitia, quam diligenter distinxit Deus coelum a terra, lucem a tenebris, diem a nocte, Ut haec sit lux et dies, illa tenebrae et nox. Atque utinam adhuc longius eas discernere possemus." Cf. *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>1</sup>:558f., 33ff./ LW26:115; *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>1</sup>:469, 19/ LW26:301.
  208. Disp.miss.priv., WA39<sup>1</sup>:146, 8.
  209. Disp.Heid., WA1:354, 31/ LW31:41: "26. Lex dicit 'fac hoc,' et nunquam fit: gratia dicit 'Crede in hunc,' et iam facta sunt omnia."
  210. Pred. (1532), WA36:30f., 3ff.: "Das Gesetz sol das heissen, das Gottes Wort und gebot ist, das Gott uns gebeut, was wir thun sollen, und foddert werck von uns ... Dagegen das Euangelium oder der Glaube ist solche Lere oder wort Gottes, Das nicht unsere Wercke foddert noch gebeut Uns etwas zu thun, Sondern heisst uns die angebotene Gnad von vergebung der Sünden..."
  211. Mos., WA16:366f., 15ff./ LW35:162; Ev.Joh.1–2, WA46:661, 11f./ LW22:143; *ibid.*, WA46:667, 7/ LW22:150; Kl.unt., WA10<sup>1/1</sup>:9, 11ff./ LW35:117; *ibid.*, WA10<sup>1/1</sup>:13, 3/ LW35. 120.
  212. Vor.N.T., WADB6:2, 23/ LW35:358.
  213. Kirchpost.G., W<sup>2</sup>11:83, 25/ CS1/1:99.
  214. Vor.N.T., WADB6:6, 22/ LW35:360.
  215. Rom., WA56:168f., 33/ LW25:148; Kl.unt., WA10<sup>1/1</sup>:9, 11/ LW35:117.
  216. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>1</sup>:163, 28/ LW26:88: Est autem veritas Evangelii, quod iustitia nostra est ex sola fide, sine operibus legis."
  217. Gen., WA44:711f., 10ff./ LW8:181ff.; Serm.S.Thom., WA1:118., 20ff./ LW51:18; cf. Capt.Bab., WA6:513f., 34ff./ LW36:38ff.
  218. Kl.unt., WA10<sup>1/1</sup>:13, 19/ LW35:121.

219. Pred. (1532), WA36:14, 22: "Das Euangelium oder der glaube ist, welcher nicht unsere werck foddert, heist uns nicht thuen, sondern heist uns nemen und uns lassen geben, das wir etwas leiden, das ist, dast Gott verheist und lesst dir sagen: dis and das schencke ich dir, du kanst oder hast nichts dazu gethan..."
220. BR (1531), WABR6:96, 28/ LW50:16; Gal. (1519), WA2:466, n.27/ LW27:184.
221. Gal. (1519), WA2:466,12/ LW27:184; Antinom. (1), WA39<sup>I</sup>:370, 4.
222. Latom., WA8:108, 12/ LW32:230; Ev.Joh.1–2, WA46:663, 3/ LW22:145.
223. Gal.(1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:218, 15/ LW26:122; TR (1531–1546), WATR6:144, 30; Promodisp.Pall., WA39<sup>I</sup>: 213, 17; Thes.Antinom., WA39<sup>I</sup>:347, 27.
224. Res., WA1:616, 26/ LW31:231; Schmal.Art., III.2, WA50:223f., 33ff/ BC311f.; Disp.Heid., WA1:354, 25/ LW31:41 (#23); Thes.Antinom., WA39<sup>I</sup>: 356, 19ff.; Kirchpost.G., W<sup>2</sup>11:1119, 9/ CS2/1:377; Rom., WA56:293f., 31/ LW25:281; Haus.,W<sup>2</sup>13<sup>II</sup>:1951, 13/ CS6:65; Deut., WA14:676, 36ff./ LW9:178; Kirchpost.E., W<sup>2</sup>12:373, 22/ CS4/1:67; Krichpost.G., W<sup>2</sup>11:1338, 7/ CS2/2:170; *Ibid.*, W<sup>2</sup>11:1342, 18/ CS2/2:174; Serv. arb.,WA18:678, 15/ LW33:128; Pref.N.T., WADB 7:21, 31/ LW35:377; Kirchpost.E., W<sup>2</sup>12:216, 29/ CS3/2:237; Gen., WA42:567, 15/ LW3:26; Wein, WA10<sup>I</sup>:455, 5; Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:556, 20/ LW26:364; *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>I</sup>:509, 12/ LW26:329; Lib. christ., WA7:52f., 37ff./ LW31:348; Bet., WA10<sup>II</sup> :377, 4/ LW43:14; Latom., WA8:105, 37/ LW32:226f.; Letz. Wort., WA54:79,1/ LW15:327; Serv.arb., WA18:67, 9/ LW33:127.
225. Rom., WA56:293f., 33/ LW25:281; Thes.Antinom., WA39<sup>I</sup>:348, 29; Antinom. (3), WA39<sup>I</sup>:535, 1.
226. Deut., WA14:680, 4/ LW9:182; Antinom.(2), WA39<sup>I</sup>:456, 7.
227. Thes. Wel., WA39<sup>I</sup>:50, 36/ LW34:116–117; Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:368, 12.
228. Antinom.(3), WA39<sup>I</sup>:559, 11; *Ibid.*, WA39<sup>I</sup>:556f., 15ff.; *Ibid.*, WA39<sup>I</sup>:580., 7.
229. Latom., WA8:97f., 38ff./ LW32:215; *Ibid.*, WA8:75, 15/ LW32:180; Rom., WA56: 182, 29/ LW25:163.
230. Pred. (1532), WA36:17, 23.
231. Serv.arb., WA18:673f., 34ff./ LW33:121.
232. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:517f., 10ff./ LW26:335.
233. *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>I</sup>:532, 17/ LW26:346; *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>I</sup>:486, 13 / LW26:313.
234. Deut., WA14:577f., 28ff./ LW9:41.
235. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:485f., 28ff./ LW26:313; Rom., WA56:292, 1/ LW25: 279.

236. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:487., 17/ LW26:313–314.
237. Gen., WA43:172, 17/ LW4:51–52: “Si natura peccato non sic corrupta esset, legis praedictione non esset opus. Nunc autem Deus per gratium suam nihil apud nos propter nostram duritem, et altissimam securitatem efficere potest, nisi prius adamantia corde lege fregerit et contuderit.” Cf. Serv.arb., A18:684, 27/ LW33:138.
238. Hauspost., W<sup>2</sup>13<sup>II</sup>:256f., 7/ CS5:323.
239. Kirchpost.E., W<sup>2</sup>12:372f., 22/ CS4/1:67: “Wiewohl es sie damit dringet und zu merken gibt, die Person müsses anders werden, sole sie solche Werke reichen, weil sie fuhlt, dass sie nicht kann solche Werke reichen.”
240. *Ibid.*, W<sup>2</sup>11:1338, 7/ CS2/2:170: “Darum sind die Gesetze Gottes allein ein Spiegel, darin wir sehen unsern Schlamm und Bosheit; den sie beschliessen uns alle unter die Sunde.”
241. *Ibid.*, W<sup>2</sup>11:1697, 29ff./ CS3/1:181: Promodisp.Pall., WA39<sup>I</sup>:213, 4.
242. Serv.arb., WA18:673f., 40/ LW33:121; *Ibid.*, WA18:769, 9/ LW33:262; Latom., WA8: 105, 13/ LW32:226; Gal (1519), WA2:522, 26/ LW27:269; Thes. Antinom., WA39<sup>I</sup>: 348, 3ff.
243. Vor.O.T., WADB5:7, 2ff.; Kirchpost.G., W<sup>2</sup>11:1694, 21/ CS3/1:177.
244. Dict.Ps., WA4:9, 28/ LW11:160.
245. Vor.O.T., WADB8:24, 6/ LW35:244.
246. *Ibid.*, WADB8:14, 18/ LW35:238.
247. Dtsch.Kat., WA30<sup>I</sup>:179, 24/ BC: 429.
248. Vor.O.T., WADB8:26, 14/ LW35:245.
249. Jes. (1527–1530), WA31<sup>II</sup>:69, 17/ LW16:98.
250. Disp. Schol. Theol., WA1:228 /LW31:14.
251. Kirchpost.G., W<sup>2</sup>11:83, 23/ CS1/1:98.
252. Jes. (1527–1530), WA31<sup>II</sup>:265, 11/ LW17:8.
253. Antinom.(1), WA39<sup>I</sup>:361, 30.
254. Rom., WA56:276, 6/ LW25:263.
255. Wein., WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:81, 8/ LW52:22: “Szo sehen myr, das auch gesetz und propheten nitt recht geprediget noch erkennet werdenn, wyr sehenn denn Christum drynnen gewicklet ... Denn Christus muss tzuuor ym Euangelio gehortt werden, alss den sihet man, wie seyn das gantz allt testament auff yhn alleynn stymmet und reymet sich szo lieblich...”
256. Vor.O.T., WADB8:13, 11/ LW35:236.
257. *Ibid.*, WADB8:13, 16/ LW35:237.
258. Ev.Joh.1–2, WA46:667, 10/ LW22:150; Widder him., WA18:80, 17/ LW40: 96–97; Mos., WA16:379f., 32ff./ LW35:168; Wellt. Über., WA11:279, 19/ LW45:128.
259. Wein., WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:467, 15/ CS3/2:282: “Wie nu der tzuuchmeyster nit also von dem knaben lessit, das er sterke odder andersswo hyntzihe,



- szondern geystlich, das der knabe ist anders worden unnd kan, was der vatter haben willt durch den zuchtmeyster, Alsoz lessit das gesetz auch nit von uns, das es auffhore tzu seyn odder abethan werde, szondern geystlich lest es abe, das wyr anders worden sind und haben, das gott wollt durch seyn gesetz gehabt haben.”
260. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>: 494, 14ff./ LW26:318–319.
261. Haus., W<sup>2</sup>13<sup>II</sup>:2423, 22/ CS7:68–69.
262. Vor.O.T., WADB8:19, 16/ LW35:240.
263. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>: 467, 14/ LW26:300; cf. *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>I</sup>: 517f., 31ff./ LW26: 335–336.
264. *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>I</sup>:475f., 32ff./ LW26:306: “Est itaque haec murmuratio: Si lex iustificat, Ergo nihil est. *Nein, das tang nicht.* Pecunia non iustificat, ergo est nihil. Nasus meus non iustificat, ergo abscondo; caput meum etc. Oportet unicuique rei officium suum et usum tribuere. legem non damnamus, sed aliter respondemus ad rem, quando dicitur neminem peream iustificari etc.”
265. Wider Antinom., WA50:474, 13/ LW47:114; Thes. Antinom., WA39<sup>I</sup>:352, 1; *Ibid.*, WA39<sup>I</sup>:355, 17.
266. Kirchpost.G., W<sup>2</sup>11:477, 39/ CS1/2:69: “Gott zuerst da Kreuz und Leiben, darnach Ehre und Seligkeit ... Aber Gott macht zuvor böse Gewissen und gibt bösen Wein, ja, eitel wasser; aber hernach tröstet er mit seinen Verheisungen des Euangelii, die da ewig währen.”
267. Haus., W<sup>2</sup>13<sup>II</sup>:1917, 13, 15/ CS6:36: “ ... so will er keinen Menschen auf Erden entschuldigt noch ausgenommen haben, sondern will, dass sie sichalle für Sunder beschuldigen dargeben ... Denn zu diesen Bau, wo man einen Christen will machen, muss da allewege der erste Stein, dass man die Sünde erkenne. Denn sonst wird man sich Vergebebug nicht können freuen noch trosten.”
268. Latom., WA8:105, 37/ LW32:226–227: “Lex enim introduxit et nos obruit peccato per cognitionem eius, quo fecit, ut ab illo peteremus et gratiam suspiraremus.”
269. Antinom. (2), WA39<sup>I</sup>:456, 7: “Talis enim est doctrinal egis, ut, si vere tangat cor, so wirt einen die weite welt zu enge, neque hic erit auxilium ullum, reliquum praeter quam Christus.”
270. Kirchpost.G., W<sup>2</sup>11:1350f., 10ff./ CS2/2:183–184: “Ja, mein Freund, ich muss dich zuvor Hölle führen und darnach erst gen Himmel; du müsst vorhin verzeiseln ... Darnach ulym sein Wort und Verheissung, dass er dich verwandeln woll, das wird dir erst helfen ... Das ist ein rechter Trost, der nicht in unserm Vermögen steht, sondern darauf, dass wir einer gnädigen Gott haben de runs vergibt.”
- Cf. Antinom. (2), WA39<sup>I</sup>:445, 20.
271. Serm. S. Thom, WA1:112, 24/ LW51:19; cf. Dict.Ps., WA3:249, 19/ :W10:232; *ibid.*, WA4:87, 22.

272. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:88f., 26ff./ LW26:36; Rom., WA56:375, 6/ LW25:365; *Ibid.*, WA56:426, 6/ LW25:418; Ps.2, WA40<sup>II</sup>:237f., 36ff./ LW12:311–312; Disp. Heid., WA1:354, 31/ LW31:41 (#26).
273. Disp.Heid., 18, WA1:354, 15/ LW31:40; Kurz Form., WA7:204, 13.
274. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:489f., 29ff./ LW26:315.
275. See p. 14, n. 15 and p. 66, n. 255, above.
276. Kirchpost.G., W<sup>2</sup>11:1330, 46/ CS2/2:160–161.
277. Ev.Joh.1–2, WA46:663, /LW22:145–146.
278. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:207, 19/ LW26:115: “Sic autem discernenda sunt, ut Evangelium ponas in coelo, legem in terra, ut Evangelii iustitiam appelles coelestem et divinam, legis terrenam et humanam, Utque tam diligenter distinguas iustitiam Evangelii a legis iustitia, quam diligenter distinxit Deus coelum a terra, lucem a tenebris, diem a nocte, Ut haec sit lux et dies, illa tenebrae et nox. Atque utinam adhuc longius eas discernere possemus.”  
     Cf. Rom., WA56:248ff., 5ff./ LW25:234–236; Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:336f., 32ff./ LW26:208–209.
279. This insight has been noted by Gerhard Heitze, *Luthers Predigt von Gesetz und Evangelium* (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1958), pp. 261, 264, 274.
280. Rom., WA56:408, 18/ LW25:398: “Corollarium. Quia Idem est verbum Noue et veteris Legis, solum secundum nostrum Intelligentiam Vel non-Intelligentiam dicitur perfectum Vel non perfectum, Breue Vel longum.”  
     Cf. *Ibid.*, WA56:404ff., 21ff./LW25:393–394; Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:469, 19/ LW26:301–302.
281. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:469, 19/ LW26:301–302; Disp.just., WA39<sup>I</sup>:89, 19/ LW34:159
282. Antinom. (1), WA39<sup>I</sup>:363, 19: “Sic verum et proprium officium legis est accusare et occidere, Evangelii vivificare.”
283. Antinom. (3), WA39<sup>I</sup>:571ff., 8ff.
284. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:520, 25/ LW26:337–338; cf. *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>I</sup>:522f., 32ff./ LW26:339–340; *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>I</sup>:527., 21./ LW26:343; *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>I</sup>:529., 16./ LW26:345.
285. Antinom. (1), WA39<sup>I</sup>:416, 7: “Lex et Evangelium non possunt nec debent separari, sicut nec poenitentia et remissio peccatorum. Ita enim sunt inter se colligate et implicita.”
286. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:37f., 25ff./ LW27:30–31; cf. *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>I</sup>:240, 17/ LW26:137; *ibid.*, WA40<sup>I</sup>:427f., 25ff./ LW26:273.
287. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:317, 19./ LW27:64; *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>I</sup>:239f., 15ff./ LW27:136–137; *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>I</sup>:251f., 26ff./ LW27:144–145; Gen., WA43:47f., 37ff./ LW3:241.
288. Gen., WA43:34., 5ff./ LW3:222.

289. Schmal.Art., III.II, WA50:223f., 33ff./ BC: 311f.; cf. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:479f., 17ff./ LW26:308ff.; I Tim., WA26:15, 39/ LW28:233; *Ibid.*, WA26:16, 24/ LW28:234; Antinom. (2), WA39<sup>I</sup>:441, 2f.; *Ibid.*, WA39<sup>I</sup>:460, 12.
290. Antinom. (2), WA39<sup>I</sup>:460, 16.
291. *Ibid.*, WA39<sup>I</sup>:485, 15.
292. Wein. (1522), WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:456f., 8ff./ CS3/2:272–274. For a critique of this reading, see Bernhard Lohse, *Martin Luther's Theology: Its Historical and Systematic Development*, trans. and ed. Roy A. Harrisville (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), p. 183.
293. Gen., WA42:670, 3ff./ LW3:170 (see 160 for context); Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:577, 20/ LW26:378–379; Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>II</sup>:162, 20/ LW27:127; Wein., WA10<sup>I/2</sup>:187, 31/ CS3/2:112.
294. Kl.Kat., Pref.11, in *Bekennnisschriften der evangelisch-luthersche Kirche* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956), 503.11/ BC348.11; Dtsch.Kat, I.Con.319, WA30<sup>I</sup>: 179.30/ BC429.319; references in Chap. 9.
295. Gal. (1519), WA2:528, 17/ LW27:278.
296. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:389f., 27ff./ LW26:246–247.
297. *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>II</sup>:144f., 14ff./ LW27:113–114; Himm.Proph., WA18:80, 28/ LW40:97.
298. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:588., 24/ LW26:365–366.
299. Ev.Joh.1–2, WA46:662, 9ff./ LW22:144; Promodisp. Fab., WA39<sup>II</sup>:274, 8ff.
300. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:67f., 22ff./ LW27:53–54., *Ibid.* WA40<sup>II</sup>:78, 22ff./ LW27:63; *ibid.* WA40<sup>II</sup>:90f., 26ff./ LW27:72; Thes. Wel., WA39<sup>I</sup>:47, 37/ LW34:113.
301. 1 Pet., WA12:386, 4/ LW30:130–131.
302. Walther von Loewenich, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, trnas. Herbert J. A. Bouman (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing, 1976), p. 167, contended that the Theology of the Cross is “something that impinges on Luther’s total theology.” As long as “impinges” is taken loosely to entail always in the background and not consistently deployed, I can agree. For the history of scholarship on the various views of the Theology of the Cross in Luther, see Alister E. McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross* (Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1985), pp. 179–180 (noted especially by scholars after the shattering of the optimism of liberal Protestantism).
303. Disp. Heid., WA1:362, 18/ LW31:53: “Ergo in Christo, crucifixion est vera Theologia et cognitio Dei.” Cf. 2 Ps., WA5:176, 32.
304. Sermon. (1514–1517), WA1:64, 35/ LW51:17; Ps., WA31<sup>I</sup>:436, 7.

305. Disp.Heid., WA1:354, 19/ LW31:40: "20. Sed qui visibilia et posteriora Dei per passions eet crucem conspecta intelligit."
306. Som.Post. (1526), WA10<sup>I/2</sup>:297, 5; cf. Ess.9, WA40<sup>III</sup>:656, 21.
307. Disp.Heid., WA1:362, 1/ LW31:52.
308. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:391, 18/ LW26:248: "Est enim Scriptura plena Antithesibus. Et ingeniosi hominis est cernere Antitheses in Scripturis ac per eas posse interpretari Scripturas..."
309. Pred. (1533), WA37:39, 15ff.
310. Kirchpost.G., W<sup>2</sup>11:493, 36/ CS1/2:87; Stut., WA40<sup>III</sup>:51, 8; cf. Kirchpost.G., W<sup>2</sup>11: 494, 37/ CS1/2:88; *Ibid.*, W<sup>2</sup>11:505, 17/ CS1/2:99.
311. Pred. (1545/1546), WA51:126, 19/ LW51:374; Serv.arb., WA18:729, 7/ LW33:206; Wider him., WA18:164, 24/ LW40:174–175; *Ibid.*, WA18:182, 11/ LW40:192; Eel.Leb., WA10<sup>II</sup>:295, 16/ LW45:39; Wein, WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:326f., 16ff./ CS3/2:225–226; cf. TR (1533). WATR4:105, 35/ LW54:183.
312. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:363, 3/ LW26:228; cf. Gen., WA42:53, 22/ LW1:70.
313. Haus., W<sup>2</sup>13<sup>II</sup>:2125, 14/ CS6:221; Gen., WA44:587, 5/ LW8:10; Disp. Verb., WA39<sup>II</sup>: 8, 10ff./ LW38:244; *Ibid.*, WA39<sup>II</sup>: 14, 8/ LW38:248.
314. Serv.arb., WA18:784, 17/ LW33:290.
315. Wein., WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:611, 18/ LW52:196: "Es mag nitt natur-liecht unnd gnaden-liecht freund seyn. Natur will fulen und gewiss seyn, ehe sie glewbt. Gnade will glewben, ehe sie fulet, darumb gehet die natur nit weytter den ynn yhr liecht. Gnade trit erauss frolich ynn finsternis, folgert den blossen wort und schrifft."
316. *Ibid.*, WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:232f., 16ff./ LW52:79.
317. Jes. (1527–1530), WA31<sup>I</sup>:500, 12/ LW17:311.
318. Wein, WA10<sup>I/1</sup>:402, 11/ LW52:117.
319. Ev.Joh.6–8, WA33:39f/.41ff./ LW23:30: "dis gluck hat das Gottliche Wort in der Welt, das die Lerer und Werck heiligen alles bessser wissen, darumb sagen sie acuh."
320. Fast. (1518), WA1:268, 3/ LW51:36–37.
321. Jes. (1527–1531), WA31<sup>II</sup>: 393, 13/ LW17:169: "Nam Christi verbum semper coram mundo est plane stulticia sicut hodie contingit nobis."
322. Jes. (1527–1531), WA31<sup>II</sup>:400, 4/ LW17:177: "Contraria rationi coram mundo apparent, quia videtur mendax deus, nos relinquens, non eligens nos, sed repudians. Pio autem credibile est."
323. Hspost., W<sup>2</sup>13<sup>II</sup>:1570.14/ CS5:212–213: "Also habe ich oft gesagt und sage es hoch: Wer Gott erkennen und ohne Gefahr von Gott speculiren will, der schaue in die Krippe, hebe unten an und lerne erstlich erkennen der Jungfrauen Maria Sohn, geboren zu Bethlehem; danach wird er sein

- an diesem Kindlein lernen, wie es der Text an sich selbst gibt, wer der Jungfrauen Sohn sei, nämlich ein König und Herr in Ewigkeit.”
324. Pred. (1546), WA51:188, 7/ LW51:384: “Aber res hat deise meinung: Die weisen und Klugen in der Welt machens also, das ynen Gott nicht gunstig oder gut sein kan, Denn sie haben das hertze leid, machens in der Christlicher Kirchen, wie sie es slbs wollen, Alles, was Gott thut und macht, das müssen sie bessern. Das also kein ermer geringer, verechtiger Discipel nicht ist auff Erden als Gott. Er mus aller Jünger sein, jederman wil sein Schulmeister und Preceptor sein.”
325. Oper.Ps., WA3:419, 25ff./ LW10:355–356. See Lib.christ., WA7:61, 18ff./ LW31:361.
326. Gen., WA43:517, 25/ LW5:129.
327. Som.Post. (1526), WA10<sup>1/2</sup>:222:20/ CS1/2:244; cf. Stuf., WA40<sup>III</sup>:370f., 26ff.
328. Pred.Gen., WA3:474, 14; Rom., WA56:48, 18/ LW25:41; Kirchpost.G., W<sup>2</sup>11:628, 13/ CS1/2:244.
329. Haus., W<sup>2</sup>13<sup>II</sup>:2501, 25/ CS7:140: “Darum soll man nicht hören, was unser Herz dazu sagt aus Zagen und Unglauben; sondern horen, was Gott sagt, der grosser ist den mein und dein Herz.”
330. TR (1533), WATR1:294f., 19/ LW54:110 – noting this is why he did not critique the life-style of his opponents
331. Gal.(1535), WA40<sup>II</sup>:51, 8; 52, 13/ LW27:41): “Ista distinctio valde necessaria doctrinae et vitae: doctrina coelum, vita terra. In vita est peccatum, error, immundities et miseria, ut dici solet, cum aceto; ibi charitas convineat, toleret, ludatur, credat, speret, sustineat omni, ibi maxime valeat remissio peccatorum, modo peccatum et error non defendantur. Sed in doctrina ut non est error, ita non opus habet ulla remissione peccatorum. Nulla igitur penitus est comparatio doctrinae et vitae.” Cf. Gl.Ed., WAWA30<sup>III</sup>:343, 23/ LW34:77.
332. Rom., WA56:224, 25/ LW25: 209; *Ibid.*, WA56:210, 11/ LW25:195; Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:234, 24/ LW26:133; *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>I</sup>:282, 18/ LW26:166: “Itaque cum disputandum est de iustia Christiana, prorsus abiicienda est persona.”
- Cf. TR (1533), WATR1:294ff., 19ff./ LW54:110; Wider Bau., WA18:361, 24/ LW46:54; for his reaction to the Jews, see the last chapter.
333. Auff.Leip., WA7:274, 17/ LW39:125; *Ibid.*, WA7:271, 6/ LW39:121.
334. Ep. 1.Joh., WA20:717, 10/ LW30:280.
335. Res., WA1:596, 8/ LW31:195.
336. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:589, 25/ LW26:387: “Atque haec est ratio, cur nostra Theologia certa est: Quia rapit nos a nobis et point nos extra nos, ut non nitamur viribus, conscientia, sensu, persona, operibus nostris, sed eo nitamur, quod est extra nos, Hoc est, promissione et veritate Dei, quae fallere non potest.”

337. Jes. (1527–1530), WA31<sup>II</sup>:536, 20/ LW17:356: Non est ars exigua, sed est spiritussancti ars. Racio non potest de beneficiis domini canere. Nam solius spiritus opus intelligere misericordias domini, ille sapiens incipit laudare, gracias agere. Racio per se hoc non potest, sed solum speculatur minas et terrores dei et mundi impretatem, tunc incipit murmurare, blasphemare.”
338. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:361, 19/ LW 26:227–228; Jes. (1528–1531), WA31<sup>II</sup>:129, 3/ LW16:183.
339. Rom., WA56:392f., 32ff. /LW25:383: “Et universaliter omnis nostra affirmatio boni cuiuscunque sub negatione eiusdem, Vt [*sic* “Ut”] fides locum habeat in Deo, Qui Est Negatiua Essentia et bonitas et Sapientia et Iustitia Nec potest possideri aut attingi nisi negatis omnibus affirmatiuis nostras.”
340. Haus., WA52:29, 15/ CS:5:67: “... Es ist ein predigt, da man sich anstosset, unnd nicht geringe leut, Sonder die heyligsten, frombsten, weysten, gewaltigsten auff erden ... Die es aber nicht wissen, die blasen sich auff umb irer güten werck willen fallen von disem wort auff eygne gerechtigkeit unnd halten es für ein ergerliche oder auffrührische lehr.”
341. Gal (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:391, 18/ LW26:248: “Est enim Scriptura plean Antithesibus. Et ingeniosi hominis est cernere Anththeses in Scripturis acper eas posse interptetari Scripturas.”
342. Disp.Heid., WA1:354, 19 /LW31:40: 20. Sed quia visibilia et posteriora Dei per passions et erucem conspecta intelligit.” Cf. *Ibid.*, WA1:362, 1/ LW31:52
343. *Ibid.*, WA1:362, 31/ LW31:53: “Impossible est enim, ut non infletur operibus suis bonis, qui non prius exinanitus et destructus est passionibus et malis, donec sciat seipsum esse nihil et opera non usa sed Dei esse.”
344. Serm.(1514–1517), WA1:112, 10ff./ LW51:18–19; cf. Dict.Ps., WA3:246, 19–20; *Ibid.*, WA4:87, 22/ LW11:236.
345. Serm. (1514–1517), WA1:138, 15/ LW51:26.
346. Disp.Heid., WA1:353, 21/ LW31:39: “Opera Dei ut semper sint deformia malaque videantur, vere tamen sunt merita immortalia.”
347. Disp.Heid., WA1:362, 1/ LW31:52; cf. Gen., WA44:587, 11/ LW8:11.
348. Ps.117, WA31<sup>I</sup>:249, 15ff./ LW14:31f.
349. Serm. (1514–1517), WA1:112, 24/ LW51:19; Antinom. (2), WA39<sup>I</sup>:470, 26.
350. Disp.Heid, WA1:357, 36/ LW31:45.
351. *Ibid.*, WA1:357, 3/ LW31:44; *Ibid.*, WA1:362, 14/ LW31:53; Dict.Ps.,WA3:246, 19; *Ibid.*,WA4:87, 22/ LW11:236; *Ibid.*, WA4:111, 21/ LW11:263.
352. Rom., WA56:380, 33/ LW25:370: “Quia methaphysice intelligimus, i.e. fecundum quod nos eos comprehenimus fall. Apparentes et non absconditas, Cum suam potentiam non nisi sub infirmitate, Sapientiam sub stilitia,

- Bonitatem sub austeritate, Iustitiam sub peccatis, misericordiam sub ira absconderit.”
353. Serm.S.Thom., WA1:138, 13/ LW51:26: “Homo abscondit sua neget, Deus absconite sua ut revelet.”
  354. Rom., WA56:380, 33/ LW25:370; *Ibid.*, WA56:392, 28/ LW25:382–383.
  355. Rom., WA56:167f., 13ff./ LW25:146–147; *Ibid.*, WA56:237, 20/ LW25:223; *Ibid.*, WA56:375, 21/ LW25:365; *Ibid.*, WA56:171, 8ff./ LW25:150–151; *Ibid.*, WA56:186, 10/ LW25:167–168; *Ibid.*, WA56:375f., 6ff./ LW25:365–366; *Ibid.*, WA56:380, 33/ LW25:370; *Ibid.*, WA56:446, 11/ LW25:438; Serm. (1514–1517), WA1:108, 13ff./ LW51:26; Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>l</sup>:366, 16/ LW26:231; Disp.Heid., WA1:354, 19/ LW31:40; *Ibid.*, WA1:353, 8/ LW31:39.
  356. Rom., WA56:446., 31/ LW25:438–439.
  357. Dict.Ps., WA3:106, 29/ LW10:107.
  358. Serv.arb., WA18:633, 8/ LW33:62: “Non autem remotius absconduntur, quam sub contrario obiectu, sensu, experientia.”
  359. Matt.18–24, WA47:330, 36.
  360. Rom., WA56:392, 29ff./ LW25:382–383; *Ibid.*, WA56:246, 12ff./ LW25:232–233; Oper. Ps., WA3:183, 32/ LW10:155–156.
  361. Serv.arb., WA18:651, 21/ LW 33:156. For more on hiddenness, see Jaroslav Pelikan, *Luther the Expositor* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1959), pp. 94–102; Alfred Adam, “Der Begriff ‘Deus absconditus’ bei Luther nach herkunft und Bedeutung,” *Luther-Jahrbuch* (1963): 101.
  362. Pred. (1532), WA36:514, 16/ LW28:86–87: “So thut es Gott auch darumb, das er solche arme sündler dazu erwelet, wie S. Paulus und wir gewest sind, das er solcher Klügler vermessenheit und dunckel wehre, Denn er will nicht solche sichere vermessene geister dazu haben, sondern solche leute, die zuvor wol durch die rolle gezogen ... das sie Gott erwelet habe.”
  363. Disp.Heid., WA1:362, 1ff./ LW31:52.
  364. Rom., 56:450, 13/ LW25:442–443: “Et sunt hec Verba consolationis plenissima. Quia tunc maxime bonum debemus habere animum, quando mala veniunt, quia ibi est bona voluntas Dei; tunc maxime beneplacere, quando displicentissima veniunt, quia ibi est certissime voluntas Dei beneplacens i.e. placibilissima.”
  365. Widdertauß., WA26:155, 18/ LW40:241.
  366. Disp.Heid., WA1:357, 1/ LW31:44; *Ibid.*, WA1:353, 21/ LW31:39 (#4); 2.Ps., WA5:36, 15 / LW14:298; Rom., 56:392, 25/ LW25:382; Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>l</sup>:573, 25/ LW26:376.
  367. Magn., WA7:593f., 30ff./ LW21:347f.

368. 2.Ps., WA5:176, 32.
369. TR (1543), WATR 5:293ff.
370. Serv.arb., WA18:685, 27/ LW33:140.
371. See *Ibid.*, WA18:684ff., 5ff./ LW33:138ff.
372. *Ibid.*, WA18:689, 22/ LW33:145–146.
373. Ps.51, WA40<sup>II</sup>:329f., 10ff./ LW12:312f.; cf. *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>II</sup>:386, 31/ LW12:352.
374. Serv.arb., WA18:285, 14ff./ LW33:139–140.
375. *Ibid.*, WA18:685, 1ff./ LW33:139–140; *Ibid.*, WA18:784, 1ff./ LW33:289–290; *Ibid.*, WA18:689, 18ff./ LW33:145–146.
376. Dict.Ps., WA3:124, 33/ LW10:119–120; *Ibid.*, WA4:83, 3/ LW11:231–232.
377. *Ibid.*, WA3:190, 24/ LW10:161–162.
378. Ps.51, WA40<sup>II</sup>:330, 1; *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>II</sup>:327f., 37ff./ LW12:311; *Ibid.*, WA40<sup>II</sup>:329, 32/ LW12:312; Serv.arb., WA18:684, 14/ LW33:139–140.
379. Rom., WA56:176f.15ff./ LW25:156–157. See notes 13–25, above.
380. Dict.Ps., WA3:230, 25/ LW 10:190; *Ibid.*, WA3:508, 1/ LW10:45; Jes. (1527–1530), WA31<sup>II</sup>:364, 21ff./ LW17:131–132.
381. Dict.Ps., WA4:272, 22/ LW11:407.
382. Rom., WA56:295, 14ff./ LW25:283.
383. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:608, 6/ LW26:399–340.
384. Dict.Ps., WA3:470, 5/ LW10:412–413.
385. Gen., WA44:211,1/ LW6:283–284:”Multi Aethiopes, Ammonitae, Edomitae adiunxerunt se confessioni et culti Dei Israel secundum vocationem Dei.”  
Cf. *Ibid.*, WA42:401, 7ff./ LW2:197.
386. Paul Tillich, *A History of Christian Thought*, ed. Carl Braaten (New York and Evanston, IL: Harper & Row, 1968), esp. p. 243, well represents this model and an interpretation of Luther in harmony with it.
387. Gal. (1535), WA40<sup>I</sup>:589, 25/ LW26:387: “Atque haec est ratio, cur nostra Theologia certa sit: Quia rapit nos a nobis et point nos extra nos, ut non nitamur viribus, conscientia, sensu, persona, operibus nostris, sed eo nitamur, quod est extra nos, Hoc est promissione et veritate Dei, quae fallere non potest.”
388. Ev.Joh.3–4, WA47<sup>I</sup>:68, 41/ LW22:342: “er hulfft also der welt, des her der welt weisheit zu schanden machete.”
389. TR (1532), WATR2:106, 19: “Wann ich mocht hinder mir lassen, das ich mit hochstem vleis lerne man soll sich hutten vor speculirn und allein Christum *quam simplicissime* ergreifen, multum effecissem.”



Martin Luther's Legacy

Reforming Reformation Theology for the 21st Century

Ellingsen, M.

2017, XXVIII, 348 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-1-137-58757-2