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Scripture quotations, except quotations from others, are from

the New Revised Standard Version, unless indicated otherwise.

## Luther on the Severe Wounding

## of Human Nature after the Fall

1. **exaggerated view of man**’**s sinfulness**
   1. “. . . a too pessimistic view of man’s sin . . . comes from St. Augustine . . .” (Moeller and Philips 53)
   2. It also comes from a desire to glorify God by increasing the distance between God and man. “. . . Protes­tants accord a privileged position to . . . the primacy of God [John 15:5, “apart from me you can do nothing”] [10] . . . [But all Christians] have always affirmed that only God can for­give sins and that everything without exception in the super­natural life comes from God . . .” (Moeller and Philips 10-11)
   3. The Refor­ma­tion “brings into prominence all the wickedness of our nature, and ar­rives at a theology of imputation and of a grace which is extrinsic and whose realization is deferred until the last days.” (Moeller and Philips 9)
   4. “Protestant teaching has always laid great stress on the for­mula ‘simul justus et pecca­tor’ [simultaneously justified and a sinner]; it . . . has certainly the virtue of emphasizing the sinful condition of man . . .” (Moeller and Philips 53)
2. **1512-1513**: ***Lectures on Genesis***
   1. Luther substituted “the image of the devil” for the “image of God” referred to in Gen 1:26-27 (*Lectures on Genesis* 1.26). He wrote: “the divine image was no longer . . . present, for “it was lost through sin in Paradise”” (*Lectures on Genesis* 1.26). He directed this doctrine “against the peril that the doctrine of the image of God and of the freedom of the will as part of the content of that image would glorify human powers at the expense of grace and thus jeopardize the doctrine that the role of the human will in conversion was “purely passive” . . .” (Pelikan 4.142)
3. **1517**: ***Lectures on Romans***
   1. Luther (*Luther’s Works* 25.345; *Luthers Werke* 56.355): “It is said that human nature has a general notion of knowing and willing what is good, but that it goes wrong in particulars. It would be better to say that it knows what is good in particular things but that in general it neither knows nor wills the good.” (Qtd. in Kittelson 92)
   2. “For Luther, therefore, whenever people hated or behaved badly toward their neighbors, they were not just committing a single sin for which they could seek forgiveness. They were acting in perfect accord with their basically selfish nature.” (Kittelson 92)
4. **September 1517**: ***Disputation against Scholastic Theology***
   1. Luther had “opened his *Disputation against Scholastic Theology* with a spirited defense of Augustine, arguing (against the Manicheans) that the human will was not “evil by nature, that is, essentially evil,” but then going on immediately to insist (against Scotus and Gabriel Biel) that it was “nevertheless innately and inevitably evil and corrupt” and therefore “not free to strive toward whatever is declared good.”” (Pelikan 4.141)
5. **April 25**, **1518**: **Heidelberg Theses**
   1. Thesis 11: “genuine hope [cannot] exist, unless it is feared that every work brings with it the judgment of condemnation.” (Kittelson 111)
   2. Thesis 16: “Anyone who thinks he would attain righteousness by doing what is in him is adding sin to sin, so that he becomes doubly guilty.” (Kittelson 112)
   3. Thesis 13: ““Free will” after the fall is nothing but a word, and so long as it does what is within it, it is committing deadly sin.” (Kittelson 111)
6. **November 1520**: ***On the Freedom of a Christian***
   1. Luther: “the moment you begin to have faith you learn that all things in you are altogether blameworthy, sinful, and damnable.” “A Christian was therefore to be constantly penitent.” (Kittelson 156)
   2. Luther: “if someone were not first a believer and a Christian, then all his works would amount to nothing and would be truly wicked and damnable sins.” (Qtd. in Kittelson 156)
7. **1521**: ***Defense and Explanation of All the Articles***
   1. Luther (“Defense and Explanation of All the Articles.” *Luther*’*s Works* 32.91): “all our good works are mortal sins . . .”
8. **December 1521-February 1522**: **Luther’s translation of the New Testament**
   1. “As he commented in the *Preface to Romans*, [176] “. . . all it [the law] does is remind us of our sins, uses them to kill us, and makes us guilty, subject to everlasting wrath.”” (*Luthers Werke* 35.377, *Luthers Werke Deutsche Bibel* 7.20) (Kittelson 176-77)
9. **December 1525**: ***On the Bondage of the Will*** (***Servium arbitrium***)
   1. “. . . we do everything by necessity and nothing by our free will, since the power of the free will is nothing and neither does the good nor is capable of it in the absence of grace . . .” (*Servium arbitrium*, in *Luthers Werke* 1.636) (Pelikan 4.141)
   2. Luther “confined free will to “natural matters, such as eating, drinking, procreating, governing” and the like.” (*Servium arbitrium*, in *Luthers Werke* 1.752) (Pelikan 4.141) “He granted that “free choice is allowed to man, [but] only with respect to what is beneath him, and not to what is above him.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 33.170; *Luthers Werke* 18.636) (Kittelson 205)
   3. “The human will could not “move toward the righteousness of God.” True freedom of the will was a divine attribute “that can no more justly be attributed to human beings than can divinity itself.” [*Luther*’*s Works* 33.68; *Luthers Werke* 18.636] He borrowed from Augustine to illustrate his meaning: “The human will is like a beast between [God and Satan]. If God sits on it, it wills and goes where [205] God wills to go. . . . If Satan sits on it, it wills and goes where Satan wills. Nor does it have the power to choose which rider it will go to or seek, but the riders struggle over which of them will have it or rule it.” [*Luther*’*s Works* 33.65-66; *Luthers Werke* 18.635] Not even the most faithful people had any choice in the matter.” (Kittelson 205-6)
   4. In the debate on free will, “Luther accused Erasmus of reviving the Pelagian heresy, in fact of going even beyond it, in his willingness to ascribe freedom to the fallen will of man . . .” (Pelikan 4.140)
   5. Luther held “the doctrine that the role of the human will in conversion was “purely passive” . . .” (Pelikan 4.142)
   6. For Luther there could be no Christianity without “staunchly holding your ground, stating your position, confessing it, defending it, and persevering in it unvanquished.” [*Luther*’*s Works* 33.20; *Luthers Werke* 18.603] . . . He fully intended the implication that Erasmus was not a Christian.” (Kittelson 206)
10. **1538**: “**Psalm 51**: **The Psalm *Miserere***”
    1. Luther (*Luther*’*s Works* 12.307): “the whole nature [is] corrupted by sin . . .”
       1. Luther (*Luther*’*s Works* 12.307, Althaus trans.): “there is simply nothing in us that is not sinful.” (Qtd. in Althaus, Paul. *The Theology of Martin Luther*. Trans. Robert C. Schultz. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966. 153.)
    2. Luther (“Psalm 51” 12.337): “neither the tree nor the fruit of human nature is good . . . everything has been so deformed and destroyed by sin that there is nothing sound left in all of human nature.”

## Luther on “Faith Alone”

1. “***sola fide***” **before Luther**
   1. “In a gloss to 1 Timothy 1,8 [“the law is good, if one uses it legitimately”], Thomas Aquinas had explained that justification is not the result of fulfilling the law, but is received through faith alone.” (Schmaus 29)
   2. “. . . the trans­lation of the Bible that appeared in 1483 had rendered Galatians 2,16: “justified only by faith.”” (Schmaus 29) Gal 2:16, “a person is justified not by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ. And we have come to believe in Christ Jesus, so that we might be justified by faith in Christ . . .”
   3. “Three Italian editions of Scripture (Genoa, 1476; Venice, 1583 and 1546) offered a similar trans­lation.” (Schmaus 29)
   4. “In his work “On Justification” [*De Justificatione* 1.25, in *De* *Controversus* vol. 4], Cardinal Bellarmine [29] cited a series of Fathers and Church documents as witnesses for the formula “by faith alone.”” (Schmaus 29-30)
2. **justification by faith in scripture**
   1. Rom 1:17, “For in it [the gospel] the righteousness of God is revealed through faith for faith; as it is written, “The one who is righteous will live by faith.””
   2. Rom 3:21-31, “But now, apart from law, the righteousness of God has been disclosed, and is at­tes­ted by the law and the prophets, 22the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all who believe. For there is no dis­tinc­tion, 23since all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God; 24they are now justified by his grace as a gift, through the re­demption that is in Christ Jesus, 25whom God put forward as a sacrifice of atonement by his blood, effective through faith. He did this to show his righteousness, be­cause in his divine forbearance he had passed over the sins previously com­mitted; 26it was to prove at the present time that he him­self is right­eous and that he justifies the one who has faith in Jesus. 27Then what becomes of boasting? It is excluded. By what law? By that of works? No, but by the law of faith. 28For we hold that a person is justified by faith apart from works prescribed by the law. 29Or is God the God of Jews only? Is he not the God of Gentiles also? Yes, of Gentiles also, 30since God is one; and he will justify the circumcised on the ground of faith and the uncircumcised through that same faith. 31Do we then overthrow the law by this faith? By no means! On the contrary, we uphold the law.”
   3. Gal 2:16, “a person is justified not by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ. And we have come to believe in Christ Jesus, so that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by doing the works of the law, because no one will be justified by the works of the law.”
   4. Eph 2:8-10, “For by grace you have been saved through faith, and this is not your own doing; it is the gift of God—9not the result of works, so that no one may boast. 10For we are what he has made us, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand to be our way of life.
3. **October 12-14**, **1518**: **Luther’s written response when meeting with Cardinal Cajetan**
   1. Luther met with Cajetan at Augsburg. Cajetan “declared Luther’s insistence that faith (rather than the sacraments) justified sinners to be “a false innovation.” Luther replied that he could not withdraw this point.” (Kittelson 123)
4. **c**. **February 1519**: **Luther**’**s tower experience** (from his 1545 *Reflectiones*)
   1. introduction
      1. Luther “made a very important discovery [134] . . . during the relative calm that followed . . . the death of the emperor [Maximilian, January 1519]. But Luther was well aware that it had been building for years.” (Kittelson 134-35)
      2. “In a moment, perhaps in the twinkling of an eye, Luther suddenly realized that what he had been teaching for four years all fit together. . . . His conscious realization of it came in a rush . . .” (Kittelson 135)
      3. This discovery is known as “the celebrated “tower experience” . . .” (Lapple 5)
      4. Our knowledge of this insight comes from a work of ??reflections written many years later, in 1545??.
   2. text from the 1545 *Reflections*??
      1. (The reminiscence was written in 1544, when Luther was 61 years old; he was remembering an experience from when he was 35. Dillenberger and Welch 17)
      2. (The following is Kittelson’s translation. For a different translation, see: “Preface to the Complete Edition of Luther’s Latin Writings, 1545.” *Luther*’*s Works*. Vol. 34. Philadelphia: 1960. 336-37.])
      3. “I was seized with the conviction that I must understand his [Paul’s] letter to the Romans. I did not have a heart of stone, but to that moment one phrase in chapter 1 [:17] stood in my way. I hated the idea, “in it the righteousness of God is revealed,” for I had been taught to understand the term, “the righteousness of God,” in the formal or active sense, as the philosophers called it, according to which God is righteous and punishes the unrighteous sinner.
      4. “I lived without reproach as a monk, but my conscience was disturbed to its very depths and all I knew about myself was that I was a sinner. I could not believe that anything that I thought or did or prayed satisfied God. I did not love, nay, I hated the righteous God who punishes sinners. Certainly, and with intense grumbling (perhaps even blasphemy), I was angry with God and said, “As if it were indeed not enough that miserable sinners who are eternally lost through original sin and are crushed again by every kind of calamity through the Ten Commandments, God himself adds pain to pain in the gospel by threatening us with his righteousness and wrath!”
      5. “At last, meditating day and night and by the mercy of God, I gave heed to the context of the words, “In it the righteousness of God is revealed, as it is written, ‘He who through faith is righteous shall live.’ Then I began to understand that the righteousness of God is that through which the righteous live by a gift of God, namely by faith. . . . Here I felt as if I were entirely born again and had entered paradise itself through gates that had been flung open. An entirely new side of the Scriptures opened itself to me . . . and I extolled my sweetest word with a love as great as the loathing with which before I had hated the term, “the righteousness of God.” Thus, that verse in Paul was for me truly the gate of paradise. [134] . . .
      6. “This is the meaning: the righteousness of God is revealed by the gospel, namely, the passive righteousness with which the merciful God justifies us by faith, as it is written, ‘He who through faith is righteous shall live.’” (*Luther*’*s Works* 34.336-38; *Luthers Werke* 54.185-86) (Kittelson 134-35)
5. **Dillenberger and Welch on the** “**tower experience**”
   1. “. . . he experienced God’s righteousness as also God’s mercy . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 29)
   2. God indicated his mercy “toward those who knew that they were not righteous. . . . with­out rescinding a demand, [yet without] asking a sign of worth, God extended mercy to those who trusted, [17] not themselves and their activities, but God.” (Dillenberger and Welch 17-18)
   3. “. . . the accent shifted from the one who was actually righteous to the one “who through faith is righteous.” The release was tremendous. Now one might be accepted as one was, since God justified those who came, not on their own merit or righteousness, but on their trust in God . . . God, without easing the demand upon us, had revealed righteousness as mercy . . . one need no longer be preoccupied with self; one is set free from oneself. But this is only possible if one abandons all calcula­tion . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 18)
6. **after the tower experience**
   1. “At the time of the Reformation the major debate centred on the question whether faith alone [sufficed] to establish an enduring dialogue with God. The affirmative answer to this question cited Romans 3,28, where it is said that we are justified by faith. Luther added the qualifier “alone.”” (Schmaus 29) Rom 3:28, “For we hold that a person is justified by faith apart from works prescribed by the law.”
   2. “. . . by early 1519 he was consistently teaching that the sinner is justified (accepted, acquited, forgiven) before God by faith *alone* . . .” (Walker 425)
   3. “However, this was [not] a complete innovation . . .” See the examples above. (Schmaus 29)
   4. “In the light of this usage [of *sola* in relation to *fide* by Luther’s predecessors] it is clear that the formula [in Luther’s writings] should not be taken literally, without adverting to its full sense. What it is intended to stress is that man is justified by grace alone, and not by his own efforts.” (Schmaus 30)
      1. But Luther did say, “faith justifies *without* and *before* love.” (*In Gal*. 2.16) (Newman 21)
   5. April 25, 1518: Heidelberg Disputation: “Near the end of the disputation he declared, “The law says, ‘Do this!’ and it is never done. Grace says, ‘Believe in this man!’ and immediately everything is done. . . . The theologian of glory calls the bad good and the good bad. The theologian of the cross says what a thing is.”” (Kittelson 112)
   6. Oct. 12-14, 1518: Luther’s written response when meeting with Cardinal Cajetan at Augsburg: Cajetan “declared Luther’s insistence that faith (rather than the sacraments) justified sinners to be “a false innovation.” Luther replied that he could not withdraw this point.” (Kittelson 123)
7. **mid-December**: **letter to Spalatin**
   1. “Luther was once again reducing everything in the life of a Christian to the promises of God that called forth trust in his goodwill. In this way he denied the church any power over the life of the individual Christian.” (Kittelson 149)
8. **early October 1520**: ***On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church***
   1. the sacraments and faith alone
      1. ““All the sacraments were instituted to feed our faith,” Luther wrote.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 36.39-40; *Luthers Werke* 6.512) (Kittelson 153)
      2. “In both Baptism and the Lord’s Supper Luther found Christ alone, the fulfilled promise of God.” (Kittelson 153)
      3. baptism: see “baptism” below.
      4. Eucharist: Luther: “Faith believes Christ to be truthful in these words and does not doubt that these immense blessings have been bestowed on it.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 36.39-40; *Luthers Werke* 6.514-15) (Kittelson 154)
   2. Luther: God “does not first accept our works and then save us. The Word of God comes before everything else. Faith follows, and then after faith comes love, and love finally yields every good work.” “Once again Luther placed the emphasis exclusively on God’s work and God’s promise.” (Kittelson 154)
9. **November 1520**: ***On the Freedom of a Christian***
   1. antinomianism
      1. “Luther began with “the following two propositions concerning the freedom and the bondage of the spirit: “A Christian is a perfectly free lord of all, subject to none. A Christian is a perfectly dutiful servant of all, subject to all.””” (*Luther*’*s Works* 31.344-47; *Luthers Werke* 7.49-52) (Kittelson 155)
   2. “. . . “contemplation, meditation, and all that the soul can do, does not help” in making someone righteous before God and therefore free. The other side of the coin was that living within the world and partaking fully of its joys and sorrows could do the soul no harm. “One thing and only one thing is necessary for Christian life, righteousness, and freedom. That one thing is the most holy Word of God, the gospel of Christ.” This gospel created faith. “To preach Christ means to feed the soul, make it righteous, set it free, and save it, provided it believes the preaching.”” (Kittelson 156)
   3. “. . . “only ungodliness and unbelief of the heart, and no outer work, make him guilty and a damnable servant of sin,” no matter what else the person did or did not do.” (Kittelson 156)
   4. “Works of love for the neighbor followed naturally. “So the Christian who is consecrated by his faith does good works, but the works do not make him holier or more Christian, for that is the work of faith alone. And if someone were not first a believer and a Christian, then all his works would amount to nothing and would be truly wicked and damnable sins.” He concluded that therefore “we are not freed from works through faith in Christ but from false opinions concerning works, that is, from the foolish presumption that justification comes by works.”” (Kittelson 156)
   5. “A Christian was both free from the obligation to do good works in order to please God and still bound to do them.” (Kittelson 156)
10. ***Against Latomus*** (June 20, 1521 [Kittelson 23])
    1. “In his response to Latomus, which he completed within a month, Luther came as close as he ever did to a full treatment of his doctrine of justification.” (Kittelson 167)
    2. “There was no part of the human being that stood above or beyond sin. The whole person was condemned and therefore the whole person was saved. “Whoever is subject to wrath is entirely subject to the entirety of wrath, and whoever is subject to grace is entirely under the entirety of grace, for wrath and grace concern the person” as a whole. [*Luther*’*s Works* 32.228; *Luthers Werke* 8.106-07] There was for Luther therefore no room to speak of a spark of goodness that might incline a Christian to do partially good works . . . There was no way to attain salvation through doing works of any kind.” (Kittelson 167)
11. **December 1521-February 1522**: **Luther’s translation of the New Testament**
    1. While staying at the Wartburg castle (May 1521-March 1522), “Luther translated the entire New Testament into German within 11 weeks.” The translation was from December 1521 to February 1522. (Kittelson 23, 175)
    2. “Translating the Scriptures [was] a theological act . . . In the *Preface to the New* [175] *Testament* he insisted that the reader “must be shown what to expect in this volume, that he might not search through it for commandments and laws, when he should be looking for the gospel and promises of God.”” (*Luther*’*s Works* 35.357; *Luthers Werke deutsche Bibel* 6.2) (Kittelson 175-76)
    3. “He admonished his readers to “beware lest you make Christ into a Moses and the gospel into a book of law or doctrine, as has been done before now. . . . the gospel demands no works of us to become holy and redeemed. Indeed, it damns such works and requires of us only that we trust in Christ, because he has overcome sin, death, and hell for us.”” (*Luther*’*s Works* 35.360; *Luthers Werke deutsche Bibel* 6.8) (Kittelson 176)
    4. “Indeed, Luther held, “it is not yet knowledge of the gospel when you know the doctrines and commandments, but only when the voice comes that says, ‘Christ is your own, with his life, teaching, works, death, resurrection, all that he is, has, does, and can do.’” The gospel [177] was not a distant abstraction but an intensely personal matter.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 35.361; *Luthers Werke deutsche Bibel* 6.8) (Kittelson 177-78)
12. **March 1522**: **the Invocavit sermons**
    1. Luther: “a faith without love is not enough. Indeed, it is no faith at all; in fact it is a false faith, just as a face seen in a mirror is not a face but merely the image of one.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 51.70-71; *Luthers Werke* 103.1.4) (Kittelson 182)
    2. So the local church authorities at Wittenberg should not coerce changes, since (Kittelson’s words) “Love did not coerce others.” (Kittelson 183)

## The Reformers on Justification

## as Mere Non-Imputation of Sins

1. **introduction**: “forgiveness is seen as having great value. As to this, the council [of Trent] and the Reformers are of one mind.” (Schmaus 62)
2. **the Reformers**
   1. The Protestant heresy concerning grace is that Christ’s passion, without any other gift, makes us pleasing to God by remitting our sins, because by his passion we obtain a juridical title which causes God to treat us as just, though we aren’t. (Daujat 67) (Daujat seems wrong here: Luther required faith also as a necessary gift. Luther required subjective redemption in addition to objective redemption.—Hahn)
   2. “Contemporary investigation of Reforma­tion theology has given rise to a lively debate as to whether the teaching condemned by the council was actually that of the Reformers. It is not to be denied that these theses are to be found in the wording of the Reformers’ writings. So far as the wording is concerned, a clarification was attempted by the council, especially of such teachings as might have disastrous consequences. But it still remains to be shown whether the Reformers, and Luther in particular, understood the doctrine of non-imputation in the sense condemned by the council.” (Schmaus 58)
   3. “In this doctrine [of nonimputation of sin] the Reformers were probably influenced by late scholasticism. Peter Aureolus, Durandus of St. Pourçain, William of Occam, and, to a certain extent, Gabriel Biel (but not John Duns Scotus), in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, had emphasized the extrinsic nonimputation of sin. In stressing the freedom of God, they reached the point of speaking about the “free will” of God.” (Schmaus 58)
   4. The Reformers “understood the word whereby God declared the sinner justified not as a mere analytical statement, but as a creative word. When the sinner is held by God to be a just man, then he does not simply pass for one, he *is* a just man. The judgment of God effects the reality. According to Luther, justification includes two [58] elements: the declaration that a man is justified and the changing of an unjust into a just man. The transformation must be understood as coming out of the declaration. Man is transformed into a just man through the judgment of God. The declaration of God and the trans­formation of man cannot be separated from each other, but they must be clearly distinguished. This is the teaching of the Reformers if one looks at it as a whole, notwithstanding the condemnation by the Council of Trent of one-sided theses which actually are not in essential opposition to the council’s doctrine.” (Schmaus 58-59)
      1. “Justification” in scripture “is used chiefly in a juridical sense,” but it is true also in scripture that “God’s word is not a mere statement, it is a creative word. When God declares a man just, he makes him just . . .” (Schmaus 54)
      2. “The council’s definition implies that the man justified by God is declared just (DS 1528), but that this declaration at the same time creates the state of justification. God’s declaration is not a result of the preceding justification, but rather its foundation.” (Schmaus 64)
   5. “When God speaks the word of forgiveness, man becomes other than he was. According to Luther, the word of forgiveness is directed to regeneration, to sanctification, to rebirth. In place of his enslaved will man achieves, through God in the Holy Spirit, a will freed from enslavement and docile to God. The change wrought by God in the declaration of justification to the sinner appears on the ethical-psychological, on the existential, level. It shows itself in fruits of love, of faith and hope. These are the work of God also; the justification and rebirth are one unified action of divine grace. The sanctification is a consequence of the forgiveness of sin, not an element of, much less the basis for, the forgiveness.” (Schmaus 59)
   6. “Luther points out that although forgiveness of sin and rebirth are [59] indivisibly united, the signs of rebirth appearing to the reborn individual cannot be the basis either of faith in his justification or of his consola­tion. The consolation of the Christian is the work of Christ alone. On the other hand, the defects and imperfections of the regenerated man should not lead to doubt about his justification. In the face of the daily sins which the Christian commits, the identification of forgiveness and rebirth would destroy the solace of forgiveness and the faith that he is beloved and possessed by God.” [59-60] “See E. Schunk, *Theologie* *der* *lutherischen* *Bekenntnisschriften* (Munich, 1940).” (Schmaus 59-60, 60 n. 3)
   7. “By defining justification as the forgiveness of sins, Luther emphasized even more sharply its gratuitous character.” (Pelikan 4.148)
   8. “. . . the text, “God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself, not imputing [*non reputans*] their trespasses to them” [2 Cor 5:19 Vg.], had given to justification and forgive­ness a definition as the non-imputation of sin, a definition that was accepted as valid [by, e.g., Aquinas].” (Pelikan 4.149)

## Imputed Righteousness

1. **Luther**
   1. no habitual grace
      1. “. . . the *habitus* conceived of according to the ideas of Biel [Gabriel Biel] or Ockham [William of Ockham, 1285?-1349?] could not but be something separate from God, shut off inside the closed system of humanity, with God removed to an arbitrary and inaccessible transcendence. Because nominalism could conceive of no real contact between the creature and the Creator . . .” (Moeller and Philips 29)
      2. “It is understandable, therefore, that Luther, finding in St. Augustine the doc­trine of the persistence of concupiscence (in the Augustinian sense), should conclude that man was not transformed ontologically, and deny that grace produced a *habitual* transformation in us. [However,] he recov­ered from else­where, and in another context, the idea of a real transformation of man by grace.” (Moeller and Philips 30)
   2. Christ as shield
      1. “Reformation theology was especially concerned to emphasize the remission of sin by God. The question is what is to be understood by this forgiveness of sin; very often the Reformation doctrine concerning it is presented in the sense of a simple nonimputation. In this view the process of forgiveness is to be interpreted as follows: the Father in heaven looks upon Jesus Christ and sees his love and obedience. Christ stands in front of sinful man as a shield so that God the Father no longer sees their sinfulness. In gazing on his beloved Son, he declares the sinner guiltless and justified for the sake of his Son. Justification is a [57] nonimputation of sin for the sake of Christ.” (Schmaus 57-58)
2. **imputed righteousness**; **alien righteousness**
   1. Luther had defined justification as forgive­ness, the non-imputation of sin. “But now, by extension this became the positive imputation of faith in Christ as righteousness: As Melanchthon said at the beginning of the Reformation, “all our righteousness is the gratuitous imputation of God.” [*Thes*. *bacc*. 10 (Plitt-Kolde 251)] Luther developed this positive definition in extenso [*sic*]. In the doctrine of justification “these three things are joined together: faith, Christ, and acceptance or imputation.” [*Gal*. (1535) 2:16] Christian righteousness was “a trust of the heart in God through Christ,” on account of which “God overlooks sins.” This is accomplished by imputation, when for the sake of Christ “God reckons imperfect righteousness as perfect righteousness and sin as not sin, even though it really is sin.” [*Gal*. (1535) 3:6] [149] . . . Imputation meant that “God averts his eyes from our sins, yes, even from our righteousness and virtues, and reckons us as righteous because of faith, which lays hold of his Son.” [*Gen*. 15:6] . . .” (Pelikan 4.149-50)
   2. “. . . it was necessary to specify just what was being imputed. Having asserted that “no one will be justified by any works whatever . . ., but by faith alone,” Luther went on to explain that “we must live by alien righteousness,” [*Jes*. 11:4] and that “those who know Christ . . . rely . . . on the life and righteousness of Christ alone.” [*Jes*. 11:9] The concept of an alien righteousness, the righteousness of Christ, as imputed to the believer in the divine act of justification, meant that, to be quite precise, one would describe justification as taking place “on account of Christ” but only “through faith,” with Christ as the ground and faith as the instrument. . . . [As Melanchthon, in the later Lutheran statement, *Apology for the Augsburg Confession*, said (4.305), in] Romans “‘justify’ is used in a forensic fashion to mean ‘to absolve a guilty man and pronounce him righteous,’ and to do so on account of an alien righteousness, namely that of Christ, which is communi­cated to us through faith.” And Luther himself . . . did use the concept of the alien righteousness of Christ, a righteousness “outside ourselves,” to prove that justification must be through faith alone [*Disp*. *just*. 27-29] . . .” (Pelikan 4.150)
   3. “Thus Luther’s “forensic” doctrine of imputation, as made precise by Melanchthon, gained dominance in the confessional interpretations of justification (whether Lutheran, Calvinist, or Arminian) . . .” (Pelikan 4.152)
   4. “Generally, . . . Luther had declared that the righteousness of God is imputed to us, that is, ascribed to us though we do not actually possess it.” (Dillenberger and Welch 78)
   5. “As a believer, one may be more righteous than as an unbeliever. But in Luther’s understanding, one is not yet righteous and needs to be covered by God’s cloak of righteousness. He did not deny that the Christian was actually righteous *in contrast* to a former status. His main point, however, was that the unrighteousness which still characterized the believer made it impossible to think of righteousness or consider even degrees of righteousness. In the last analysis, we need God’s righteousness ascribed to us if we are to stand before God.” (Dillenberger and Welch 78)
3. **later Lutheranism**
   1. “Andreas Osiander insisted that we were genuinely made righteous in faith. In asserting that faith made a difference and that one entered into a new reality, Osian­der was correct. But the insistence that even believers were unrighteous was so much a part of the Reformation that Osiander’s view had no chance of success.” (Dillenberger and Welch 78)
4. **Calvin**
   1. *Institutes* 3.22.1: “When Paul teaches that we were chosen in Christ ‘before the creation of the world’ [Eph. 1:4a], he takes away all consideration of the real worth on our part, for it is just as if he said: since among all the offspring of Adam, the Heavenly Father found nothing worthy of his election, he turned his eyes upon his Anointed, to choose from that body as members those whom he was to take into the fellowship of life.” (Klooster 41)
   2. *Institutes* 3.24.5: “those whom God has adopted as his sons are said to have been chosen not in themselves but in his Christ [Eph. 1:4]; for unless he could love them in him, he could not honor them with the inheritance of his Kingdom if they had not previously become partakers of him.” (Klooster 41)

## Simul Justus et Peccator

## (No Increasing Holiness)

1. **August 1520: *Address to the Christian Nobility***
   1. monasticism
      1. “In his *Address to the Christian Nobility*, he had declared that celibacy should not be mandatory for secular priests who worked daily with the laity in the world. But monks and nuns were different, because they had taken their vows freely and had not had them imposed on them from without.” (Kittelson 171)
2. **May 1521-April 1522** (works written at the Wartburg): ***Commentary on the Magnificat***
   1. saints (Mary)
      1. ““We ought to call on her,” he wrote, “so for her sake God may grant and do what we ask.” But, he added, “she does nothing; God does everything.” Mary stood as a lesson to all Christians not because she was so pure but because she was so impoverished, a woman who was pregnant but not married. The lesson was obvious: “You must not only think and speak in a lowly manner,” he concluded, “but actually become impoverished and be completely wrapped up in poverty so that, without any human help, God alone may do the work.” [*Luther*’*s Works* 21.347-48; *Luthers Werke* 7.593-94] Mary was far from a saint whose great worthiness Christians should copy. She was an example of utter worthlessness, blessed by God.” (Kittelson 166)
3. **November 1521**: ***On Monastic Vows***
   1. monasticism
      1. May 1521: Luther “heard that one of his Augustinian friends had left the order and had married. Luther neither condemned nor blessed the act.” (Kittelson 169)
      2. August 1521: “he had confessed to Melanchthon, “If Christ were here, I do not doubt he would dissolve these chains and would annul all vows.”” (*Luther*’*s Works* 48.286; *Luthers Werke* *Briefe* 2.374) (Kittelson 171)
      3. August 1521: “he received yet another of Carlstadt’s essays. This time the restless spirit was arguing that vows of celibacy were themselves sinful and had to be broken. Luther declared that his friends “will never force a wife on me!”” (*Luther*’*s Works* 48.290; *Luthers Werke* *Briefe* 2.377. See *Luther*’*s Works* 48.303; *Luthers Werke* *Briefe* 2.385.) (Kittelson 169)
      4. “If the vow had been taken in order to make the taker more righteous, and if it still served this purpose, then it was idolatrous. But if a Christian was able to serve freely within monastic vows, then there was no compulsion to reject them. He therefore insisted that “According to Paul, the law is not law when you keep it of your own accord; so too the vow is not a vow when you keep it freely.” [*Luthers Werke* 8.331] Luther sent these considerations to Wittenberg in two separate documents that totaled 280 theses.” (Kittelson 171)
      5. November 11, 1521: letter to Spalatin: ““I have decided to attack monastic vows and to free the young people from that hell of celibacy, totally unclean and condemned as it is through its burning and pollutions.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 48.328; *Luthers Werke* *Briefe* 2.403) (Kittelson 171)
      6. November 12, 1521: “. . . 13 of his fellow monks left the Augustinian cloister in Wittenberg.” (Kittelson 171)
      7. *On Monastic Vows* was “120 pages long and written in only 10 days . . . [Luther] admitted that [his father] Hans [171] had been right when he had asked if perhaps Luther had not been hearing the devil in the thunderstorm.” (Kittelson 171-72)
      8. Monastic vows “could be freely taken, but were not to be legally binding. Above all, such vows went against the law of love, and in particular love for one’s parents. By being in a monastery and withdrawing from the world, he could do nothing to help others. “Therefore,” he concluded, “we may keep our vows, but we are not obligated to do so, because love is our only obligation.” He closed with the advice that those who were thinking of leaving a monastery or convent should first examine their consciences. If they had taken those vows because they then thought they would be pleasing God but now thought they could serve God’s creatures better in the outside world, they should freely leave.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 44.393; *Luthers Werke* 8.664) (Kittelson 172)

## Against Good Works

1. **August 1518**: ***Resolutions Concerning the 95 Theses***
   1. penitence vs. penance
      1. “. . . God demanded not outward deeds but a changed heart and mind. “Doing” had literally nothing to do with salvation, particularly with regard to indulgences.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 48.65-68; *Luthers Werke* 1.525-26) (Kittelson 113)
   2. on merit
      1. “. . . he assaulted the idea that the church possessed a treasury of merits from which, under the proper conditions, Christians could make withdrawals. He insisted that no saint had been saintly enough to make any deposits in this treasury. Only Christ had left behind a positive legacy. He offered it freely, directly, and to all. If the pope had any authority in this area, it extended only to penalties that he himself had established for violations of church law.” (Kittelson 114)
2. **December 1521-February 1522**: **Luther’s translation of the New Testament**
   1. “The law, commandments, and regulations had their place. Their chief task was to condemn everyone at all times. “How,” he asked, “can anyone prepare himself to be good with works when he never does a good work without some reluctance or reticence inside him? How can it be possible for God to delight in works that grow out of reluctant and resisting hearts?” For Luther the Scriptures, and in particular Paul in his letter to the Romans, were absolutely clear about the law and right living. “To fulfill the law is to do its works happily and in love, and freely without the compulsion of the law to live godly and virtuous lives as if there were no law or punishment.” [*Luther*’*s Works* 35.368; *Luthers Werke deutsche Bibel* 7.6] No one, not even the most pious Christian, could fulfill this requirement—ever.” (Kittelson 176)
   2. “Therefore the law was also a hammer that smashed down human pride and prepared Christians to hear the gospel once again, because “to know [Christ’s] works and the story of his life is not the same thing as to know the gospel, because it does not mean that you trust that he has vanquished sin, death, and the devil.”” (*Luther*’*s Works* 35.361; *Luthers Werke deutsche Bibel* 6.8) (Kittelson 176)
   3. Moses, Luther declared, “urges, drives, threatens, strikes out, and punishes severely.” By contrast, the gospel, even in the Beatitudes, “does not constrain us but invites us in a friendly way.”” (*Luther*’*s Works* 35.361; *Luthers Werke deutsche Bibel* 6.8) (Kittelson 176)
   4. ““With the law God was working in a hidden way, as if behind a mask. For under the horrible face of the law and God’s demands there lay his gracious work of preparing sinners (and all Christians were sinners) to receive grace. Hearing the law had to lead to one conclusion, that “a person must have something other than the law, more than the law, to make him righteous and save him.” Consequently Paul moved from his treatment of the law to the gospel, where he “assures us that we are still God’s children, however hard sin may be raging within us, so long as we follow the Spirit and resist sin in order to slay it.” The law started and restarted Christians on their pilgrimage, while the gospel “comforts us in our sufferings by assuring us of the support of the Spirit, of love, and of all created things, namely that the Spirit sighs within us and the creatures long with us that we may be without the flesh and sin.”” (*Luther*’*s Works* 35.377; *Luthers Werke deutsche Bibel* 7.20, 22) (Kittelson 177)
   5. “For him the Bible was not first and foremost a book of doctrines or collection of laws with respect to what one must believe in order to be saved. Rather, it proclaimed Christ and him crucified, that is, the back-and-forth of law and gospel which repeatedly condemned and saved sinners.” (Kittelson 177)
3. **1537**: **Antinomian controversy**
   1. John Agricola, a former student and rector of the school in Eisleben, “began to argue that good works had so little place in the life of Christians that parishioners should not even be exhorted to perform them. In particular, the law should not be preached to believers as law.” (Kittelson 269)
   2. “Luther repeatedly reminded him that the law was to be preached to Christians (just as good works were to be expected of them), even if fulfilling the law could not affect their standing in the presence of God.” (Kittelson 270)
4. **year unknown**: **common morality**
   1. “Faced with an attack on faith, Luther even had little regard for common morality, at least if it was used to make believers feel guilty. He was frequently very explicit on this subject. “Sometimes it is necessary to drink a little more, play, joke, or even commit some sin in defiance and contempt of the devil in order not to give him an opportunity to make us scrupulous about small things. We will be overcome if we worry too much about falling into some sin. . . . What do you think is my reason for drinking wine undiluted, talking freely, and eating more often if it is not to torment and vex the devil who has made up his mind to torment and vex me? Would that I could commit some token sin simply for the sake of mocking the devil, so that he might understand that I acknowledge no sin and am conscious of no [287] sin. When the devil attacks and torments us, we must completely set aside the entire Ten Commandments.” [*Luthers Werke* *Briefe* 5.519 (*Letters of Spiritual Counsel* 86)] Nothing, absolutely nothing was more important to Luther than faith and, with it, a free conscience.” (Kittelson 287-88)
5. **1539**: **bigamy**
   1. In late 1539, Philip of Hesse’s “marriage was a terribly unhappy one and Philip was having an affair with one of the ladies at court. There was nothing unusual about this situation for politicians and rulers of the time, whose marriages were rarely made with more than the tacit consent of the couple. But Philip alleged that his sin caused him so much distress that he was unable to partake of the Lord’s Supper. Bucer informed Luther of the situation. After discussing the matter with Philip, Luther and Melanchthon deliberated and recommended that the landgrave marry the other woman. As the Scriptures freely attested, bigamy was not contrary to the law of God. It was far preferable to a courtly liaison, because it would protect both Philip’s conscience and the woman’s status. “Bigamy did, however, violate both imperial law and common morality. Partly for these reasons, Luther urged Philip to keep the matter secret. He also regarded his advice as having been given within the confessional. For this reason, too, it was to remain secret. Very soon, however, both Philip of Hesse’s bigamy and Luther’s cooperation with it were well-known. The landgrave could not keep quiet on either matter.” (Kittelson 288)
   2. In the 1540s, “. . . Katie [Luther’s wife] was not at all amused when her husband proved from the Scriptures, and in the presence of others, that a man might take more than one wife without violating the law of God. If Luther acted on this truth, she replied, she would return to the convent and leave him to manage the children. No one present, including the learned doctor, had any doubt that she was serious.” (Kittelson 284)

## Luther and the Indulgences Controversy

1. **the 1517 indulgence**
   1. In 1500, “the papacy was in severe financial straits. Pope Leo X’s predecessors had figured prominently in the politics of both Italy and Europe as a whole. It was an expensive game, and now Leo was determined to compete directly with the crowned heads of Europe by having Rome outdo all other courts in its magnificence. His contribution would be to complete St. Peter’s . . .” (Kittelson 104)
   2. “To the north, in the patchwork of competing principalities, cities, and bishoprics that made up Germany, there was another man who desperately needed money. His name was Albert, and he was a member of the ambitious House of Hohenzollern . . . Albert—a soft-skinned, pudgy youngster with scarcely a beard—was doing his part for the family’s future. Not legally of age even to hold a bishopric, by 1517 he had already secured both Magdeburg and Halberstadt. Now Mainz was open, and he wanted it as well. To get it would require a substantial dispensation from Leo X, payable in cash. [104] . . . Leo authorized the preaching of this indulgence in Albert’s territories, . . . to help build the Sistine Chapel.” (Kittelson 104-5)
2. **Johann Tetzel**
   1. “Johann Tetzel was a short, dumpy, stump-preacher . . .” In the fall of 1517 he went from town to town in Germany. “Several horsemen, drummers, and trumpeters announced the imminent arrival of something important. With Tetzel himself and his armed guard came the symbols of the papacy and Pope Leo X’s family coat of arms. A copy of the prized indulgence was attached to a makeshift cross and raised high above onlookers for all to see. Then came Tetzel, who strode to the prepared platform and began to preach.” (Kittelson 103)
   2. Tetzel (qtd. in: Köhler, Walther, ed. *Dokumente zum Ablassenstreit von 1517*. 2nd rev. ed. Tübingen: 1934. 125): “Do you not hear the voices of your dead relatives and others, crying out to you and saying, ‘Pity us, pity us, for we are in dire punishment and torment from which you can redeem us for a pittance’? And you will not? . . . Will you not then for a quarter of a florin receive these letters of indulgence through which you are able to lead a divine and immortal soul safely and securely into the homeland of paradise?” (Kittelson 103)
   3. “A money chest, a supply of blank indulgences, a scale to make certain that people’s coins were good, and the scribes were all ready and in their places. Then came Tetzel’s last exhortation: “Once the coin into the coffer clings, a soul from purgatory heavenward [103] springs!”” (Kittelson 103-104)
3. **opposition to indulgences**
   1. Luther had “sought them [indulgences] for his own relatives by saying special masses when he was in Rome in 1510.” [105] (Luther’s journey to Rome was November 1510-April 1511. Kittelson 79) In Rome was “the *scala sancta*, the very steps Christ climbed to the palace of Pontius Pilate. . . . Just by crawling up the *scala sancta* on his knees, Luther could free one of his loved ones from purgatory.” [59] (Kittelson 59, 79, 105)
   2. Elector Frederick the Wise of Saxony “was an assiduous buyer of relics for the Castle Church [in Wittenberg]. His collection was [very] extensive . . .” (Kittelson 105)
   3. Erasmus strongly disapproved of the selling of indulgences. (Kittelson 104)
   4. ““Roman bloodsucking” was what many German princes called this and other money-raising schemes that came from south of the Alps. It was indeed common for someone such as Tetzel to encounter at least mild opposition as he rode into a territory, stayed a few days, and then rode out with its gold and silver in his saddlebags. In fact Frederick the Wise warned Tetzel against even entering Electoral Saxony.” (Kittelson 104)
4. **October 31, 1517**: **the *95 Theses***
   1. October 31, 1517: Luther sent his 95 theses to the bishops of Mainz and Brandenburg.
   2. “When Luther issued his ninety-five theses . . ., he was merely following the accepted custom of preparing propositions one was ready to debate.” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
   3. It is not known whether he posted them “on the door of the castle church in Wittenberg, which served as the university bulletin board, . . . though it seems most likely that he did.” (Walker 426)
   4. Luther “did not reject indulgences outright.” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
   5. But “The Pope could change or cancel only those penalties imposed by his own authority or by the canons of the church. Indulgences were valid only when confined to such . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
   6. He denied “the extension of indulgences to purgatory.” (Walker 426)
   7. Indulgences “had no necessary relation to the final destiny of any individual believer.” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
   8. In fact, “The papacy, he declared, did not have the power to remit *guilt* in respect to the least of venial sins . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
5. **aftermath of the *95 Theses***
   1. Luther “had no idea that anything momentous would happen.” (Kittelson 108)
   2. Albert, Archbishop of Mainz, was one of Luther’s ecclesiastical superiors, and Luther sent him a copy of the theses, along with a cover letter. “God on high!” he said. “Is this how souls entrusted to your care are taught?” (*Luthers Werke* *Briefe* 1.111?) (Kittelson 107)
   3. “The theses themselves, composed in Latin for a learned audience of clergy and professors, were quickly translated into German, and soon popular cartoons showing the love of Christ vastly outweighing an indulgence in the balance of salvation were circulating all over Germany. Luther’s protest was so effective that even today the very word *indulgence* has a slightly unsavory smell about it. Tetzel’s enthusiastic crowds soon contained substantial numbers of hecklers. His mission was ruined.” (Kittelson 106)
   4. “Within months it was arranged for Tetzel to receive his own doctor’s degree so he could publish against Luther as a professional equal. At the same time, Archbishop Albert sent Leo X a copy of Luther’s theses. Leo appointed a new general of the Augustinians and gave him explicit instructions to silence [Luther].” (Kittelson 108)
   5. “In mid-January [1519], . . . he had been asked to comment on the new papal decree regarding indulgences. There he said that it “does not allege a single word from the Scriptures, neither of the teachers [of the church] nor of [church] law nor of reason” as support; therefore it was “just empty words” that “I am unable to acknowledge as proper and sufficient teaching of the holy church. I must hold to the commands of God.”” (*Luthers Werke* *Briefe* 1.307-8; Smith and Jacobs 1.155) (Kittelson 137)
6. **October 12-14**, **1518**: **Luther’s written response when meeting with Cardinal Cajetan**
   1. Luther met with Cajetan at Augsburg. Cajetan “pointed to the decree *Unigenitus*, which did not have the standing of official doctrine but which did employ the doctrine of the treasury of merits as the grounds for indulgences.” (Kittelson 123)
   2. “. . . the discussion finally came to the fundamental issue: the authority of the pope versus the authority of the Scriptures or a council of the church. . . . Cajetan insisted that Luther bow to *Unigenitus* and therefore to the right of the pope to authorize indulgences, even in principle those Tetzel preached.” (Kittelson 123)
   3. On the third day Luther presented “a document that was several pages long. [123] . . . Luther would not agree that indulgences had solid doctrinal standing.” (Kittelson 123-24)
   4. Then “Cajetan insisted that papal authority required Luther to submit to *Unigenitus* and therefore to indulgences. Luther replied that the decree was contrary to the Scriptures, that indulgences were no more than a scheme to raise money, and that in any event they were not the same thing as the merits of Christ. This was too much. Cajetan threatened to shackle Luther and take him to Rome . . .” But Cajetan honored Luther’s safe conduct and allowed him to leave. (Kittelson 124)
7. **November or December, 1521**: ***Against the Idol at Halle***
   1. “With Luther out of sight, the archbishop of Mainz thought he could get away with opening a new collection of relics at his residence in Halle. . . . [Luther] responded with a little essay, *Against the Idol at Halle*, whose very title suggested that the idol was not just the relic collection but the good archbishop himself! . . . [Spalatin] held up publication of the book. But the mere threat of a blast from the Wartburg was enough to put an end to the new reliquary.” (Kittelson 172)

## Luther on Church Authority

1. **October 31, 1517**: **the *95 Theses***
   1. “The Pope could change or cancel only those penalties imposed by his own authority or by the canons of the church. Indulgences were valid only when confined to such . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
   2. “The papacy, he declared, did not have the power to remit *guilt* in respect to the least of venial sins . . .” (Dillenberger and Welch 15)
2. **August 1518**: ***Resolutions Concerning the 95 Theses***
   1. Luther (*Luthers Werke* *Tischreden* 5.34-35): “The church needs a reformation, [but it] is not an affair of one man, namely the pope, or of many men, namely the cardinals, both of which have been demonstrated by the most recent council. On the contrary, it is the business of the entire Christian world, yes, the business of God alone.” (Kittelson 114)
   2. Luther “dedicated the [*Resolutions Concerning the 95 Theses*] to Pope Leo X . . . in the dedication he declared to Leo, “I put myself at the feet of Your Holiness . . . I will regard your voice as the voice of Christ, who speaks through you.”” (*Luther*’*s Works* 31.83; *Luthers Werke* 1.529) (Kittelson 114)
3. **August 31**, **1518**: **Luther’s reply to Prierias’s *Dialogus***
   1. The *Dialogus* of Sylvester Prierias, overseer of doctrine for the Dominicans, said the *95 Theses* were in error because the pope is as infallible as the church as a whole. (Kittelson 117)
   2. Luther replied that popes and councils can err (but never have). “. . . he had not yet come to the point of saying that the church of Rome and the pope *were* in error. He argued only that in principle both pope and councils *could* err, as judged by the standard of the Scriptures. In fact, Luther still declared that the church of Rome “has never contradicted the true faith by any of its decrees.” Rather, it retained “the authority of the Bible and of the ancient church Fathers . . .”” (Kittelson 119)
   3. Luther: “the church is virtually present in Christ alone, and it is represented only in a general council.” (*Luthers Werke* *Briefe* 1.192; *Luthers Werke* 1.656-57) (Kittelson 119)
   4. “Perhaps Luther had been listening to his colleagues and friends such as Carlstadt [who asserted *sola scriptura*]. . . . No longer did he pledge allegiance to the Fathers, the canons, and the decretals of the church.” (Kittelson 119)
4. **October 12-14**, **1518**: **Luther’s written response when meeting with Cardinal Cajetan**
   1. Luther met at Augsburg with Cardinal Cajetan, “papal legate [and] learn­ed commentator on Aquinas.” (Walker 427)
   2. Cajetan “pointed to the decree *Unigenitus*, which did not have the standing of official doctrine but which did employ the doctrine of the treasury of merits as the grounds for indulgences.” (Kittelson 123)
   3. “. . . the discussion finally came to the fundamental issue: the authority of the pope versus the authority of the Scriptures or a council of the church. . . . Cajetan insisted that Luther bow to *Unigenitus* and therefore to the right of the pope to authorize indulgences . . .” (Kittelson 123) “Cajetan ordered Luther to retract, especially his criticisms of the complete­ness of papal power of indulgence.” (Walker 427)
   4. On the third day Luther presented “a document that was several pages long. In it he insisted that a council was above the pope on [123] matters of doctrine . . . and that the Scriptures were finally authoritative in matters of doctrine because all human beings could err.” (Kittelson 123-24)
   5. Then “Cajetan insisted that papal authority required Luther to submit to *Unigenitus* and therefore to indulgences. Luther replied that the decree was contrary to the Scriptures . . .” (Kittelson 124)
5. **June 1519**: ***Resolution Concerning the Authority of the Pope***
   1. “The preeminence of the pope was a human creation and the pope was neither infallible nor the sole and final authority in the interpretation of the Scriptures.” (Kittelson 138)
6. **June 27-July 6, 1519**: **Leipzig debate with Johann Eck**
   1. John (Johannes) Eck, professor of theology at the University of Ingolstadt [111], became friends with Luther in 1517. But in 1518 Eck “insisted on the absolute authority of the pope and declared that anyone (like Luther) who questioned papal pronouncements was a heretic.” [115] (Kittelson 111, 115)
   2. prior to the Leipzig debate
      1. December 1518: “. . . Eck published 12 theses of his own that he proposed as the agenda. He defended confession, the treasury of merits, purgatory, and indulgences on the grounds that they had been established by the church. From the very beginning of Christianity, he argued, the church of Rome, headed by the pope, had the divine right to make authoritative pronouncements on the life of faith.” (Kittelson 137)
      2. January 1519: “To Eck’s theses he [Luther] replied two weeks later: “Against them stand the recognized history of the past 1100 years, the text of the Scriptures, and the decrees of the Council of Nicea.”” (*Luther*’*s Works* 31.318; *Luthers Werke* 2.160-61) (Kittelson 137)
      3. end of February 1519: “To Spalatin he remarked at the end of February, “I count papal authority among those things that are neutral, such as health, wealth, and other temporal things.” Then he declared that the pope and his representatives were putting forth “an utterly perverse interpretation of the Word of God and conclusions that are contrary to it.” (*Luthers Werke* *Briefe* 1.354) (Kittelson 138)
      4. late February 1519: “By late February Luther’s old loyalties were rapidly disappearing. He had concluded that the papacy was not a divinely-created institution. About two weeks later he wrote Spalatin again: “I am studying the decrees of the popes in preparation for my disputation. And (I whisper this in your ear) I do not know whether the pope is the Antichrist himself or his apostle, so wretchedly in his decrees does he corrupt and crucify Christ, that is, the truth.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 48.114; *Luthers Werke* *Briefe* 1.359) (Kittelson 138)
   3. Church authority at the Leipzig debate
      1. “Eck immediately confronted him with the traditional argument for papal authority, the passage from Matthew 16:18 according to which Christ said, “You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church.” Eck was outlining the common understanding that the pope, as Peter’s successor, held the power of the keys and with it divine authority over the church on earth.” (Kittelson 140)
      2. “. . . Luther replied that the Greek church . . . continued to exist without acknowledging the authority of Rome.” (Kittelson 140)
      3. Luther wrote Spalatin afterward that at the debate, “I openly confessed that [councils] have faithlessly damned some articles that have been taught by Paul, Augustine, and even Christ himself in so many words. . . . I proved from the very words of the Council [of Constance] itself that not all the condemned articles were heretical and in error.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 31.325; *Luthers Werke* *Briefe* l.424) (Kittelson 140)
      4. “. . . Luther had denied not only the authority of the pope but also that of councils of the church. He insisted that only Christ was the head of the church, even here on earth.” (Kittelson 141)
      5. “Luther’s understanding of the church did in fact have a distinctly Hussite smell, though he did not realize it. He soon received a letter from two Czech theologians who were still avowed followers of Hus. [141] They applauded him and included a gift of several quality knives, plus a copy of a little book, *Concerning the Church*, which spelled out Hus’s views on the subject. In their letter they freely called Luther “the Saxon Hus.” Luther was cautious. He replied by sending copies of his own works, but he had Melanchthon dictate a cover letter to the courier so it could not be positively traced back to him. It would do no good to have real Hussites publicly calling him a Hussite. But later he read the little book. “We are all Hussites without knowing it!” he exclaimed. His astonished realization had nothing to do with Hus’s understanding of faith, grace, works, and righteousness before God, subjects about which Hus had little to say. . . . Rather, his amazement came from the [fact that Huss] also taught that only Christ was the head of the church . . .” (*Luther*’*s Works* 48.153; *Luthers Werke* *Briefe* 2.42) (Kittelson 141-42)
      6. “Anyone who did not acknowledge Christ and him alone was the Antichrist, that is, someone who put himself in the place of Christ. This was what Luther now meant when he called the pope the Antichrist. The papacy had put itself in the place of Christ.” (Kittelson 142)
      7. During the debate, Luther “declared that even councils might and did err—as in the case of Hus at Constance a century earlier.” (Kittelson 263)
   4. During the Leipzig debate, Luther proposed “that the supremacy of the Roman church is unsupported by his­tory or Scripture.” (Walker 428)
   5. He admitted “that his positions were in some respects those of Jan Hus and that in con­demning Hus the revered Council of Constance had erred. [This denied] the infallibility of a general council . . .” (Walker 428)
7. **June 1519**: ***Resolution Concerning the Authority of the Pope***
   1. “The preeminence of the pope was a human creation and the pope was neither infallible nor the sole and final authority in the interpretation of the Scriptures.” (Kittelson 138)
   2. June 1519: “By June his study of church law and history led him to publish a *Resolution Concerning the Authority of the Pope*. There he sought to be as clear and evenhanded as possible. The institution of the papacy, he declared, existed by the will of God. But the Scriptures granted it no specifically sacred status, not even in the pastoral office of the keys as given to Peter. The preeminence of the pope was a human creation and the pope was neither infallible nor the sole and final authority in the interpretation of the Scriptures.” (Kittelson 138)
8. **May 1520**: ***On the Papacy at Rome***
   1. “. . . he declared that there were two [149] churches in the world. One was external and visible and had the hierarchy and the pope at its head. The other “we call a spiritual, inner Christendom” that acknowledged only Christ.” (Kittelson 149-50)
9. **early October 1520**: ***On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church***
   1. Luther: if “the pope and all the Romanists . . . do not abrogate all their laws and traditions [and] restore proper liberty to the churches of Christ, [then] the papacy is identical with the kingdom of Babylon and the Antichrist itself.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 36.72; *Luthers Werke* 6.537) (Kittelson 152)
10. **November 1520**: ***On The Freedom of a Christian***
    1. “Luther began with “the following two propositions concerning the freedom and the bondage of the spirit: “A Christian is a perfectly free lord of all, subject to none. A Christian is a perfectly dutiful servant of all, subject to all.””” (Kittelson 155)
11. **early October 1520**: ***On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church***
    1. The “Babylonian captivity” is “the priests’ hold on the sacraments and the insistence that Christians must perform good works in order to gain salvation.” (Kittelson 152)
    2. antinomianism: Luther wrote that, if “the pope and all the Romanists . . . do not abrogate all their laws and traditions [and] restore proper liberty to the churches of Christ, . . . then . . . the papacy is identical with the kingdom of Babylon and the Antichrist itself.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 36.72; *Luthers Werke* 6.537) (Kittelson 152)
12. **October 1520**: **cover letter to *On the Freedom of a Christian***
    1. On October 12, Luther “agreed to write the pope a defense of his actions in which he would say that he had never attacked Leo X personally and that the entire uproar was the fault of Eck.” (Kittelson 154)
    2. Luther: “[I] with all my heart wish you and your see every blessing, for which I have begged God with earnest prayers to the best of my ability.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 31.334-341; *Luthers Werke* 7.42-48) (Kittelson 155)
    3. “But finally he could not contain himself. “I have truly despised your see, the Roman curia,” he confessed; “neither you nor anyone else can deny that it is more corrupt than any Babylon or Sodom ever was. As far as I can see, it is marked by a completely depraved, hopeless, and notorious godlessness.”” (*Luther*’*s Works* 31, 334-41; *Luthers Werke* 7.42-48) (Kittelson 155)
    4. “Eck in his vainglory was responsible for the way things had gone. “I detest contentions.”” (*Luther*’*s Works* 31.334-41; *Luthers Werke* 7.42-48) (Kittelson 155)
13. **January 1521**: **the Diet of Worms**
    1. Luther: “This will be my recantation at Worms: ‘Before I said the pope is the vicar of Christ. Now I declare that the pope is the opponent of Christ and the apostle of the devil.’” (*Luthers Werke* *Briefe* 2.389) (Kittelson 160)
    2. Luther: “I will enter Worms under the banner of Christ against the gates of hell. . . . I have had my Palm Sunday. Is all this pomp merely a temptation or is it also a sign of the passion to come?” (*Luthers Werke* *Briefe* 2.395-96) (Kittelson 160)
14. **April 16-18**, **1521**: **Luther before the Diet of Worms**
    1. Luther distinguished three categories among his works. “There were some “in which I have taught about the Christian faith and good works in such a proper, clear, and Christian manner” that even his opponents thought well of them. He certainly could not retract these. There were others in which he had “attacked the papacy and papist teaching.” To retract them would be to encourage tyranny. Finally, there were some in which he had attacked individuals. Perhaps he had done so too harshly, but he still could not retract them, because these people defended papal tyranny. . . . “Unless I can be instructed and convinced with evidence from the Holy Scriptures or with open, clear, and distinct grounds and reasoning—and my conscience is captive to the Word of God—then I cannot and will not recant, because it is neither safe nor wise to act against conscience.” He then added: “Here I stand. I can do no other. God help me! Amen.”” (*Buch der Reformation* 243-46) (Kittelson 161)
15. **July 1521**: **reply to Jerome Emser**, **canon at Meissen**
    1. Church authority: priesthood of all believers
       1. “. . . he pressed the idea that all Christians were priests to one another.” (Kittelson 167)
16. **May 1530**: ***To the Clergy Assembled at Augsburg***
    1. “. . . one of his most potent assaults ever on the Church of Rome.” (Kittelson 232)
17. **1531-1532**: ***Commentary on the Alleged Imperial Edict***
    1. Luther says the papacy is so corrupt “that those who are with me cannot any longer even pray for it.” [*Luther*’*s Works* 34.103; *Luthers Werke* 303.386-87] [237] . . . The Diet of Augsburg . . . proved that Rome and its defenders were utterly and hopelessly reprobate. True Christians were no longer even to pray for the pope.” (Kittelson 237, 239)
    2. “He hoped that people would “say of me from this moment forward how full I am of evil words, abuse, and cursing for the papists. [258] . . . [since] there is no hope” for them. Because the “papal asses” were utterly reprobate, he planned “from this day forward until I am in the grave to busy myself with cursing and rebuking these miscreants.” [*Luthers Werke* 303.470] . . . Earlier, he had declared that he and his supporters could no longer pray for them. Now he added that true prayer carried with it curses on the papacy: “For I cannot pray without therefore being forced to curse. If I say, “Holy be thy name,” then I must add, “Cursed, damned, and disgraced must be the papists’ name . . .”” (Kittelson 258-59)
18. **early January, 1532**: ***On Infiltrating and Clandestine Preachers***
    1. church order; Anabaptists
       1. Anabaptists “were for the most part lay men and women who earnestly desired to create a church of true believers. In order to guarantee the church’s purity, they practiced believers’ baptism, which they limited to adults on the grounds that children could not knowingly confess their faith. Standing opposed to infant baptism in a world in which everyone had been baptized as an infant, they often urged true believers to be rebaptized as a sign of their membership in the true church. Moreover, they insisted that this true church knew no territorial or political boundaries. It consisted purely, simply, and finally of the faithful.” (Kittelson 242)
       2. “Luther’s letter [warned] those in authority [that the Anabaptists] had taken the idea of the priesthood of all believers and turned it into license for people to preach whatever they wished. Now everyone claimed the office of preacher, but, Luther insisted, no one could have the office without authorization and a calling, and the infiltrating preachers had neither. Their preaching, he declared, was properly the work of Satan. He added that these people could be recognized by their works. . . . they claimed private revelations, while the Holy Spirit “flew down from heaven publicly” so people could see it . . . Whoever listened to one of these preachers needed to recognize that they were listening “to a man possessed.” The gospel and the sacraments, on the other hand, were preached and administered by regularly called and ordained pastors.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 40.384; *Luthers Werke* 303.518. *Luther*’*s Works* 40.394; *Luthers Werke* 303.527) (Kittelson 242)
       3. Luther “and his colleagues consciously began to train new pastors and systematically to examine, ordain, and place them.” [248] “By and large Luther left the business of actually composing the new church orders and seeing them established to younger colleagues such as Melanchthon and Bugenhagen . . .” [247] (Kittelson 247-48)
    2. anti-intellectualism
       1. “. . . education in general had suffered during the stormy 1520s. In this sense, Erasmus had been perfectly justified in his fear that Luther’s movement would harm the revival of learning. Wittenberg’s own enrollment plummeted after the Diet of Worms, and people such as Müntzer and the Zwickau Prophets bluntly rejected study as a qualification for preaching the Word of God. Carlstadt’s decision in 1524 to give up his academic position in order to become “the new layman” symbolized what was happening all over Gennany. To the Anabaptists, someone like Luther was learned “according to the letter” but not “according to the Spirit.” By contrast, Luther was convinced that proper education was essential.” (Kittelson 248)

## *Sola Scriptura*

1. **April 1518**: After the Heidelberg disputation (April 25), “In the wagon on the way back . . . he wrote to one of his former professors, “. . . it will be impossible to reform the church unless the canon law, the decretals, scholastic theology, philosophy, and logic, as they now exist, are absolutely eradicated and other studies instituted.” (*Luthers Werke* *Briefe* 1.170) (Kittelson 112)
   1. 1518: Luther reordered “the course of study at his own university. Aristotle’s logic was virtually banished from the theological curriculum, and direct study of the Bible, the church Fathers, and the ancient languages was put in its place.” (Kittelson 248)
   2. 1518: Luther “worked to bring an able scholar of Greek and Hebrew to Wittenberg so that he and others could readily learn the biblical languages.” Philip Melanchthon (1497-1560), skinny and young (21 years old), was chosen. He was nephew of Johannes Reuchlin, Europe’s greatest Hebraist. [110] In November 1518, Luther wrote Spalatin that “Greek studies were flourishing under Melanchthon, but the new instructor in Hebrew was trying to teach his students to speak the language rather than just to read it.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 48.90; *Luthers Werke* *Briefe* l.224) [125] (Kittelson 110, 125)
   3. December 1518: At the University of Wittenberg, “He [Luther] and the rector agreed to put an end to all lectures that followed the teachings of Thomas Aquinas, whose disciples included Cajetan and most Dominicans. Now, Luther declared, students would be able to [learn] without the pollution of [Aquinas].” (*Luthers Werke* *Briefe* 1.262) (Kittelson 131)
2. **August 1518**: ***Resolutions Concerning the 95 Theses***
   1. “Luther insisted that he would “set forth nothing except what is found and can be found in the Holy Scriptures in the first place but also in the church Fathers as received by the Church of Rome and in the papal canons and decretals” of church law. He would even heed earlier theologians to the extent that their views were in harmony with these sources. [114] . . . in the *Resolutions* Luther pictured himself as the very model of loyalty to the genuine traditions of the church.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 31.83; *Luthers Werke* 1.529) (Kittelson 114-15)
3. **August 1518**: **Andreas Carlstadt and *sola scriptura***
   1. “One of his colleagues at Wittenberg, Andreas Carlstadt, also had a work published in August 1518. It was a collection of theses in which he insisted that only the Scriptures—not the church Fathers, not the papal canons, and not the decretals—were authoritative in matters of faith.” (Kittelson 115)
4. **October 12-14**, **1518**: **Luther’s written response when meeting with Cardinal Cajetan**
   1. Luther met with Cajetan at Augsburg. Cajetan “pointed to the decree *Unigenitus*, which [used] the doctrine of the treasury of merits as the grounds for indulgences. . . . Cajetan insisted that Luther bow to *Unigenitus* and therefore to the right of the pope to authorize indulgences . . .” (Kittelson 123)
   2. “. . . the discussion finally came to the fundamental issue: the authority of the pope versus the authority of the Scriptures or a council of the church.” (Kittelson 123)
   3. On the third day Luther presented “a document that was several pages long. In it he insisted that a council was above the pope on [123] matters of doctrine . . . and that the Scriptures were finally authoritative in matters of doctrine because all human beings could err. . . . Luther replied that the decree was contrary to the Scriptures . . .” (Kittelson 123-24)
   4. “Cajetan insisted that papal authority required Luther to submit to *Unigenitus* and therefore to indulgences. Luther replied that the decree was contrary to the Scriptures . . .” (Kittelson 124)
5. **January or February 1519**: **letter to Pirckheimer**
   1. To Pirckheimer in Nuremberg he wrote, “I will serve and acknowledge the authority and majesty of the pope, but I will not become a corrupter of the Scriptures.” [*Luthers Werke* *Briefe* 1.351, 348] . . . The authority of the papacy and the history of the institutional church and its laws still had a powerful hold on his loyalties.” (Kittelson 137)
6. **June 27, 1519**: **the Leipzig debate**
   1. “Luther had still not come to his revolutionary insistence that only the Scriptures were authoritative in matters of faith.” (Kittelson 137)
7. **May 1521-April 1522**: **unidentified work** (written at the Wartburg)
   1. “. . . his teachings had by now been condemned by the theological faculties of the universities of Paris, Louvain, and Cologne. . . . Luther scarcely replied to these condemnations. “Who,” he asked, “can imagine that the Scriptures still carry any weight when one is obligated to assent to professors who concoct their arguments without reference to the Scriptures?”” (*Luther*’*s Works* 32.135; *Luthers Werke* 6.181-82) (Kittelson 167)
8. **December 1521-February 1522**: **Luther’s translation of the New Testament**
   1. Luther “stayed at the Wartburg and took up the translation of the New Testament. If he could put the Scriptures and a guide to reading and understanding them in the hands of every Christian, then they could all become *theodidacti*, people taught by God. . . . he took great care to use the language of the people. . . . In this last of his works at the Wartburg, Luther was once again the theologian and pastor . . .” (Kittelson 175)
   2. “Luther obviously did not think that Bible reading by itself would necessarily lead anyone to a saving knowledge of God.” (Kittelson 176)
   3. “For him the Bible was not first and foremost a book of doctrines or collection of laws with respect to what one must believe in order to be saved. Rather, it proclaimed Christ and him crucified, that is, the back-and-forth of law and gospel which repeatedly condemned and saved sinners.” (Kittelson 177)
   4. “This understanding allowed Luther even to declare that not all books of the Bible had equal authority in the Christian life.” (Kittelson 177)
      1. [?? Kümmel on books left out.]
      2. ““You,” he addressed his readers, “are now in a position to differentiate properly among all the books [of the Bible] and decide which are the best.” Among these he included the gospel of John, the letters of Paul, and the first letter of Peter. “You will not find much said in these books about the works and the miracles of Christ,” he admitted, “but you will find a masterly treatment of how faith in Christ conquers sin, death, and hell, and gives life, righteousness, and salvation.”” (*Luthers Werke deutsche Bibel* 6.10; *Luthers Werke* 35.361-62) (Kittelson 177)
      3. “Of the books he recommended he declared, “They teach everything you need to know for your salvation, even if you were never to see or hear any other book or hear any other teaching. In comparison with these, the letter of St. James is full of straw, because it contains nothing about the gospel.” Set beside John, Luther thought even Matthew, Mark, and Luke were inferior because “they record many of [Christ’s] works but few of his words.” [*Luther*’*s Works* 35.362; *Luthers Werke deutsche Bibel* 6.10] For Luther, the gospel was the one authority for Christian life and the one message he wished to convey.” (Kittelson 178)

## Luther on the Sacraments in General

### the sacraments and faith alone

1. **October 12-14**, **1518**: **Luther’s written response when meeting with Cardinal Cajetan**
   1. Luther met with Cajetan at Augsburg. On the third day Luther presented a document. “In it he insisted [123] . . . that faith was necessary before the sacraments could be effective . . .” (Kittelson 123-24)
2. **November 1519**: “**series of published sermons**” **on the sacraments** (Kittelson 147)
   1. The Mass “was a sign that pointed to Christ and that strengthened faith.” (Kittelson 147)
3. **early October 1520**: ***On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church***
   1. Luther: “All the sacraments were instituted to feed our faith.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 36.39-40; *Luthers Werke* 6.512) (Kittelson 153)
   2. “In both Baptism and the Lord’s Supper Luther found Christ alone, the fulfilled promise of God.” (Kittelson 153)
   3. “By remembering their baptisms, Christians found their faith “constantly aroused and cultivated.” . . . The whole purpose of Baptism was to strengthen faith. “[The Christian] has a solace . . . when he [the Christian] says, ‘God is faithful in his promises, and I received his sign when I was baptized.’” . . . [Baptism] was always there, ever reminding them of God’s graciousness in Christ. No spiritual exercises could add anything to it.” (Kittelson 153)

### the number of the sacraments

1. **mid-December 1519**: **letter to Spalatin**
   1. “Luther [said] that in his view there were only three sacraments rather than seven. These three—Baptism, confession, and the Lord’s Supper—carried a promise with them. “For me,” he continued, “the others are not sacraments, because a sacrament does not exist unless there is given with it an explicit divine promise [147] that promotes faith, because without the Word of promise and without trusting that something has been received, there is no work with God that benefits us.”” (*Luthers Werke* *Briefe* 1.595) (Kittelson 147-48)
2. **early October 1520**: ***On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church***
   1. Luther repeated his “rejection of confirmation, marriage, holy orders, and extreme unction on the grounds that they had no basis in the Scriptures.” (Kittelson 153)
   2. By the end of *Babylonian Captivity* he had rejected confession as well. (Kittelson 153)
   3. “. . . where there had been seven sacraments there were now only two.” (Kittelson 153)

## Luther on the Sacrament of Reconciliation

1. **August 1518**: ***Resolutions Concerning the 95 Theses***
   1. In the prefatory letter to Staupitz, Luther “recalled that in confession Staupitz had always emphasized the inclination of the heart rather than particular sins or particular good works as a determinant of the status of the soul.” (Kittelson 113)
   2. “Luther pointed out . . . that common confessional practices had no basis in the Scriptures. The Latin translation of Jesus’ command at Matthew 4:17 read, “Do penance, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” But the Greek said, “Be penitent . . .” [The usual English translation is, “Repent.”] Therefore God demanded not outward deeds but a changed heart and mind. “Doing” had literally nothing to do with salvation . . . “To repent” and “to do penance” were two different things.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 48.65-68; *Luthers Werke* 1.525-26) (Kittelson 113)
   3. Luther “focused on the absolution that came from a priest after confession. He concluded that a priest could declare forgiveness in Christ, but had no authority to absolve. “Christ did not intend [by the power of the keys] to put [113] the salvation of people into the hands or at the discretion of an individual.” *Instead*, *everything depended on* “*believing only in the truth of Christ*’*s promise*.” [*Luthers Werke* 1.631] In these words [was] an end not only to indulgences, but also to pilgrimages, special masses for the dead, shrines, images, relics, special spiritual exercises . . ., much that was central to the practice of late medieval religion.” (Kittelson 113-14)
2. **late August or early September 1519**: ***Fourteen Consolations for Those Who Suffer***
   1. Luther: there “is no work of the church so much in need of reforming as confession and penance. For it is here that rage [146] all the laws, profits, power, tyranny, error, danger, and innumerable evils for all souls and the entire church.” (*Luthers Werke* 2.646) “Thereby, he charged, people were led to depend on the power of their confession and its validation by the church rather than on Christ.” (Kittelson 146-47)
3. **early October 1520**: ***On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church***
   1. In a letter to Spalatin (mid-December 1519), Luther reduced the number of the sacraments to three: baptism, the Lord’s Supper, and confession. “. . . but by now Luther had doubts about confession as well.” (Kittelson 153)
   2. “By the end of [*Babylonian Captivity*] he had reduced confession to a useful practice but no longer a sacrament.” (Kittelson 153)
   3. “Personally, Luther continued daily to confess his own sins . . .” (Kittelson 153)
4. **June 1, 1521**: ***On Confession***: ***Whether the Pope Has the Power to Require It***
   1. “It was not necessary, he insisted, to confess one’s sins to a priest, because Christ himself ordered only that Christians confess to one another.” (Kittelson 168)
5. **1540s**
   1. “As a pastor, Luther sought above all to console troubled consciences. His medieval predecessors had debated whether a thorough confession [284] was worth the tortured spirit that might result from it, and they had agreed that it was. In both theory and practice, however, Luther insisted that consolation came first.” (Kittelson 284-85)
   2. “There was good reason to protect the conscience first and foremost. It was here that Luther found Satan at work most powerfully. Faith or the absence of faith was all that counted in the end, and it was faith that Satan sought to destroy. “Paul’s ‘thorn in the flesh,’” he said, “refers to the tempting of our faith. He regarded it as a big skewer that would impale our soul and flesh.” In spite of all his own labors, Luther confessed that “nothing has so exhausted me as sorrow, especially at night.” [*Luther*’*s Works* 54.207; *Luthers Werke* *Tischreden* 3.439, 341] From his own experience and that of others, he declared, “To raise one conscience up out of despair is worth more than a hundred kingdoms.”” (*Luthers Werke* *Tischreden* 2.263) (Kittelson 285)
   3. “For Luther, nothing was more important than this struggle for faith. The first thing a Christian had to do was always to look at Christ, who was both Savior and cosufferer [*sic*]. Luther told one dying man, “God will not forsake you. He is not a tyrant who holds a good, crude blunder against you either, not even blasphemy when you are in distress, or denial of God, such as Peter committed and Paul too.”” (*Luthers Werke* *Tischreden* 3.507) (Kittelson 285)

## Luther on Baptism

1. **November 1519**: “**series of published sermons**” **on the sacraments** (Kittelson 147)
   1. Baptism is “the beginning of the Christian life, the first step of justification before a righteous God, and the source of all true repentance.” (Kittelson 147)
   2. “There was no need to add to Baptism through indulgences; what was needful was remembering the graciousness of a God who through Christ accepted even helpless children.” (Kittelson 147)
2. **early October 1520**: ***On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church***
   1. The purpose of baptism was primarily as a reminder, as “evidence of God’s grace. By remembering their baptisms, Christians found their faith “constantly aroused and cultivated. Once the divine promise has been accepted by us, its truth lasts until death.” The whole purpose of Baptism was to strengthen faith. “[The Christian] has a solace . . . when he [the Christian] says, ‘God is faithful in his promises, and I received his sign when I was baptized.” . . . [Baptism] was always there, ever reminding them of God’s graciousness in Christ. No spiritual exercises could add anything to it.” (Kittelson 153)

## Luther on Holy Orders

1. **August 1520**: ***Address to the Christian Nobility***
   1. Luther’s *Address to the Christian Nobility* “put forth his famous doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. With it he destroyed the idea of a special class of priests who, because they held in their hands the means of grace, also held special authority . . . [Priests] had no authority over anyone other than that of the gospel.” (Kittelson 151)
2. **early October 1520**: ***On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church***
   1. The “Babylonian captivity” is “the priests’ hold on the sacraments and the insistence that Christians must perform good works in order to gain salvation. . . .” (Kittelson 152)

## Luther on the Eucharist

1. **Catholic understanding**: “when the priest uttered the Words of Institution, he suddenly and substantially changed the bread and the wine into the body and blood of Christ. This transubstantiation, as it was called, was the basis for the idea that the Mass was a sacrifice, and therefore a good work that was meritorious for salvation. In this act also lay the distinctive authority of the priest, for only he could perform it.” (Kittelson 195)
2. **1519**: ***Sermon on the Body of Christ***
   1. Luther “simply assumed . . . that Jesus’ words meant precisely what they said, that the bread became the body of Christ and the wine his blood.” (Kittelson 196)
3. **November 1519**: “**series of published sermons**” **on the sacraments** (Kittelson 147)
   1. The Mass “was a sign that pointed to Christ and that strengthened faith.” (Kittelson 147)
   2. “Luther even threw a bouquet to some of Hus’s followers. He added that the common practice of withholding the cup from the laity lest they spill it was misleading, because simple people might conclude that priests were somehow closer to God. This comment caused an uproar. Duke George of Saxony called it “full of heresy and scandal.” . . . he *had* openly identified himself with the hated Hussites.” (Kittelson 147)
4. **1520**: ***Explanation of Certain Articles on the Holy Sacrament***
   1. “the Lord is saying nothing about the sacrament in this passage [John 6]. On the contrary, he is talking about faith in . . . Christ.” (*Luthers Werke* 6.80; see also *Luthers Werke* *Briefe* 2.531 ff.]) (Kittelson 200)
5. **early October 1520**: ***On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church***
   1. real presence
      1. Luther: “Faith believes Christ to be truthful in these words and does not doubt that these immense blessings have been bestowed on it [the Eucharist].” (*Luther*’*s Works* 36.39-40; *Luthers Werke* 6.514-15) (Kittelson 154)
   2. the Mass
      1. “The doctrine of transubstantiation (the idea that in the Mass the priest turned bread and wine into Christ’s body and blood) made the priest, rather than Christ, the actor.” (Kittelson 153)
      2. “Describing the sacrament as effective *ex* [153] *opere operato*, a completed work that the priest performed by making sacrifice, denied that grace was a free gift directly from God. Rather, Luther suggested, the Mass should more properly be called an opus *operans*, a work that God was doing and by which he was feeding his people. As practiced, the Mass was therefore blasphemy and idolatry in the most basic sense, because it stood in the place of Christ. “This abuse,” he wrote, “has then brought with it countless other abuses to the point that the faith of this sacrament is entirely obliterated and people turn the divine sacraments over to market days, shopkeepers, and tax collectors.”” (*Luther*’*s Works* 36.39-40; *Luthers Werke* 6.512) (Kittelson 153-54)
   3. the Eucharist and faith alone
      1. ““All the sacraments were instituted to feed our faith,” Luther wrote.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 36.39-40; *Luthers Werke* 6.512) (Kittelson 153)
      2. “In both Baptism and the Lord’s Supper Luther found Christ alone, the fulfilled promise of God.” (Kittelson 153)
6. **November 1521**: ***On the Abolition of Private Masses***
   1. the Mass
      1. October 20, 1521: The Wittenberg faculty “declared that the Mass, when conceived as a sacrifice, was idolatry. Therefore it could not be celebrated in private, as in the case of masses for the dead. Moreover, withholding the cup from the [169] laity suggested that the priest was somehow closer to God than they were. . . . [Luther] had more than implied the need for such changes in his three treatises of 1520.” (Kittelson 169-70)
      2. “Luther’s reply to these developments was *On the Abolition of Private Masses* . . . the New Testament did not speak of a special priesthood that was empowered to handle the mysteries of God in a magical way. Nonetheless, for the present at least, nothing should be said against a brother who wished to celebrate the Mass in the old way for the nourishment of his own soul. Luther refused to require anyone to commune in both kinds. Just because it was preferable for all to be offered both the body and the blood of Christ did not require anyone to take them both.” (Kittelson 170)
7. **1522**: **letters to Paul Speratus and Margrave George of Brandenburg-Ansbach**
   1. 1522: Paul Speratus, a friend, asked Luther about venerating the consecrated species.
   2. 1523: the Margrave George of Brandenburg-Ansbach asked about the same thing.
   3. Luther answered that “In their sacramental use, the bread and wine were Christ’s body and blood, but whether one venerated them was an indifferent matter. No one was to be compelled either [way].” (Kittelson 197)

### The Sacramentarian Controversy

### (August 1524-May 1536)

1. **symbolic interpretations**
   1. *Wyclif*: “. . . the Englishman John Wycliffe [d. 1384] had argued that the bread and wine were symbols of the body and blood rather than the things themselves. Therefore priests had no special power over the laity.” (Kittelson 196)
   2. *Hus*: “Jan Hus, the Bohemian, concurred, and his followers declared that the laity could indeed handle the sacred elements and should receive both the bread and the wine.” (Kittelson 196)
   3. *Carlstadt* espoused these ideas before March 1522. (Kittelson 196)
   4. *Zwingli*
      1. Before November 1524, Zwingli was “teaching that references to eating Christ’s body in the Lord’s Supper meant only that Christians were “to believe that his body was given over to death for us.”” (Kittelson 200)
      2. Before November 1524, Zwingli wrote in a letter “that he admired Carlstadt’s boldness on the subject of the Eucharist.” (Kittelson 200)
   5. “The position that Luther’s opponents took in the Sacramentarian Controversy was therefore largely developed before the conflict began.” (Kittelson 199)
2. **the Sacramentarian Controversy**
   1. August 1524: Luther could not dissuade Carlstadt from his symbolic interpretation of the Eucharist. Carlstadt was therefore expelled from his parish. (Kittelson 196-97)
   2. November 1524: Capito and Bucer wrote in a letter to Luther: “The bread and the cup are external things (whatever they may be) and by themselves they accomplish nothing for salvation; but the memory of the Lord’s death is both beneficial and necessary.” They appealed to John 6:63 (“It is the spirit that gives life; the flesh is useless. The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life”). (Kittelson 199)
   3. November 1524: *Letter to the Christians in Strasbourg against the Enthusiasts* (reply to Capito and Bucer’s letter of November 1524). Luther wrote: “For me, the text [“This is my body”] is too powerful. I cannot get away from it.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 40.68; *Luthers Werke* 15.394) He felt that “Anyone who sought to turn the bread and the wine into symbols of Christ’s body and blood was an instrument of Satan.” (Kittelson 199)
   4. March 1525: Zwingli’s *Commentary on True and False Religion* says “that Christ was not physically present in the bread and the wine.” (Kittelson 200)
   5. mid-July 1525: “Luther’s colleague, Bugenhagen, countered . . .” (Kittelson 200)
   6. Oecolampadius
      1. Oecolampadius replied to Bugenhagen’s reply (of July 1525) to Zwingli. (Kittelson 200)
      2. Oecolampadius “joined Zwingli in depending on John 6:63 for his understanding of the Words of Institution.” (Kittelson 207)
      3. “But he added [the further argument] that because Christ was resurrected and seated at the right hand of the Father, he could not be physically present in the elements of the Lord’s Supper.” (Kittelson 207)
   7. Luther replied: “the Word says first of all that Christ has a body, and this I believe. Secondly, that this same body rose to heaven and sits at the right hand of God; this too I believe. It says further that this same body is in the Lord’s Supper and is given to us to eat. Likewise I believe this, for my Lord Jesus Christ can easily do what he wishes, and that he wishes to do this is attested by his own words.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 38.44; *Luthers Werke* 303.130) (Kittelson 207)
   8. spring 1527: “For Luther, . . . the great error came in the argument that according to John 6:63, physical things could not, by their nature, carry spiritual benefits. In a work prepared for the Frankfurt book fair in the spring of 1527, he [said,] . . . “Our fanatics . . . think nothing spiritual can be present where there is anything material and physical, and they assert that the flesh is of no profit [citing John 6:63].”” (*Luther*’*s Works* 37.95; *Luthers Werke* 23.193) (Kittelson 208)
   9. “To Luther’s mind, the claims of his opponents in the Sacramentarian Controversy . . . allowed human reason to intrude on the plain words of the Scriptures. [They] required Christians to bring something of their own to their salvation.” (Kittelson 208)
   10. Luther: “I write not against flesh and blood, as St. Paul teaches, but against Satan and his followers . . .” (*Luther*’*s Works* 3.270; *Luthers Werke* 26.402) This “is the way Luther finally directed his attack against Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Bucer, and [206] Capito. [207] . . . Luther found no reason to be more charitable with the “false brethren” than he was with his opponents from Rome.” (Kittelson 206-7)
3. **October 1-4, 1529**: **Marburg Colloquy**
   1. Luther said to his opponents (Zwingli, Bucer, Capito, and Oecolampadius): “You seek to prove that a body cannot be in two places at the same time. I will not listen to proofs . . . based on arguments derived from geometry.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 38.16; *Luthers Werke* 303.112) (Kittelson 223)
   2. “Oecolampadius [argued that] The Scriptures were full of metaphors . . . There was no reason to deny metaphor in this place if Luther accepted it in other passages, such as “I am the vine.” . . . [Luther replied:] “I do not deny figurative speech [in the Scriptures], but you must prove that this is what we have here. It is not enough to say that these words . . . could be interpreted in this way. You must prove that they *must* be interpreted in this figurative sense.” [See *Luther*’*s Works* 38.17; *Luthers Werke* 303.114. Also *Luther*’*s Works* 38.37.] This neither Oecolampadius nor Zwingli could do.” (Kittelson 224)

## Luther on Church-State Relations

1. **August 1520**: ***Address to the Christian Nobility***
   1. “The 4000 copies in the first press run (an enormous number for that time) sold out in two weeks.” (Kittelson 151)
   2. “. . . he called on the secular authorities to legislate the reforms that popes, cardinals, bishops, and the like refused to undertake. Taken together, his 27 proposals struck at each of the ways the church maintained its power in civil affairs.” (Kittelson 151)
   3. Luther: “Here and now, the German nation, its bishops and princes, . . . should protect them [the German people] from these ravening wolves who come dressed in sheep’s clothing as if they were shepherds and rulers.”” (*Luther*’*s Works* 44.145; *Luthers Werke* 6.419) (Kittelson 151)
   4. “. . . papal officials were a “crawling mass of reptiles” who told everyone, “We are Christ’s agents and the shepherds of Christ’s sheep, and the senseless, drunken Germans must put up with it.”” (Kittelson 152)
   5. In the *Address* Luther argued “that a Christian who held secular office was still a Christian and as such was equally obliged to serve the well-being of the church as was any priest, bishop, cardinal, or pope.” (Kittelson 215)
      1. “On the other hand, in the midst of the Peasants’ War [1524-25] he had also declared that people must be allowed to believe and teach as they wished, even if it were utter nonsense.” (Kittelson 215)
      2. But in 1527, Luther approved Elector John of Saxony’s decision to visit every parish in his realm to ensure that only Evangelical doctrine was taught. (Kittelson 214-15)
2. **December 15, 1521**: ***An Admonition to All True Christians to Guard Themselves against Sedition***
   1. “He declared that any public uproar was “a precise and certain sign of Satan’s intervention.” Above all, he insisted, “There are no grounds for insurrection, [173] because it almost always harms the innocent more than the guilty. . . .” (*Luther*’*s Works* 45.63-64; *Luthers Werke* 8.681) [175] (Kittelson 173, 175)
3. **March 1523**: ***On Temporal Authority*, *the Extent to which It Should Be Obeyed***
   1. Luther “rejected stirring up the populace . . .” (Kittelson 188)
   2. “. . . no one had the right to rebel against those whose task it was to govern. God, he said, had created two kingdoms in this world. In one belonged the righteous, and over them God ruled with the love of the gospel. To the other belonged sinners. Over them God ruled through the might and terror of the secular sword. Without the sword, he declared, “men become beasts.”” (Kittelson 188)
   3. Christians “owed allegiance to the secular authorities . . . “so that good order may not perish” and people live in fear for their lives. Emperor, king, prince, city council—all held authority directly from God . . . Christians themselves remained sinners and required the constraints of judge, jailer, and executioner. . . . Christians could resist only if the authorities acted with manifest injustice and against the gospel. Even then, resistance ought to take the form of passive disobedience, grow out of love for one’s neighbor, and stand in full readiness to suffer the consequences of imprisonment and death. Never were private citizens to seize the sword of rebellion or act against the authorities simply in defense of what they took to be their own rights.” (Kittelson 188)
   4. “But when it came to condemning Carlstadt, the Zwickau Prophets, and those he generally called *Schwärmgeister* (or “spirits who swarm about” in the manner of a beehive gone mad), Luther’s own actions presented him with a problem. He himself had defied the [188] authorities on a matter of principle. How could he consistently condemn those who appeared to follow his example?” (Kittelson 188-89)
4. **January 1525**: ***Against the Heavenly Prophets***
   1. “. . . iconoclasm and rapid, compulsory changes in the forms of worship . . . were acts of sedition of the same type as the Peasants’ War.” (Kittelson 195)
5. **April 19, 1525**: ***An Admonition to Peace***
   1. “. . . he condemned as blasphemy their [the peasants’] appeal to Christian liberty and the gospel as justification for self-serving violence.” (Kittelson 191)
6. **May 1525**: ***Against the Murderous and Thieving Hordes of Peasants***
   1. “. . . the princes were to “smite, strangle, and stab [them], secretly or openly, remembering that nothing can be more poisonous, hurtful, or devilish than a rebel.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 46.50; *Luthers Werke* 18.358]) (Kittelson 191)
   2. Luther’s *An Open Letter on the Harsh Book against the Peasants* (June 1525) was intended to deflect criticism of the earlier work. “But he took back scarcely a word.” (Kittelson 192)
7. **mid-April, 1529**: **on war against the Turks**
   1. “Contrary to all tradition, Luther then declared that the emperor “is not the head of Christendom, neither is he the defender of the gospel or of the faith.” Whatever the emperor did with his sword was “a bodily, worldly affair.”” (*Luther*’*s Works* 46.185-86; *Luthers Werke* 302.130-31) (Kittelson 221)
8. **October-November 1530**: **meeting with lawyers**
   1. civil disobedience
      1. After meeting with the lawyers of Elector John and Landgrave Philip, Luther agreed that “resistance—even armed resistance—was legitimate for a Christian prince, but only because the German constitution allowed princes to take up arms against an emperor who disregarded the law of the land.” [236] His friends were “disturbed by Luther’s apparent sanctioning of disobedience, and they well remembered the harsh position he had taken against the peasants only five years earlier. Luther simply replied that “we have left such matters to the competence of the lawyers. When they find that in such a case imperial law allows resistance . . . then we cannot suspend temporal law” in favor of the gospel. [*Luthers Werke* *Briefe* 6.56] All authority was divinely established, including the peculiarities of the German constitution.” (Kittelson 236-37)
      2. Luther (a statement from a later date): “Office in itself is divinely instituted and it is good, be it the office of the prince or that of his ministers. But those who occupy these offices are usually put there by the devil.” (*Luther*’*s Works* 13.212; *Luthers Werke* 51.254]) (Kittelson 289)
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