

The Historical Development of Luther's Concept of Authority

Attributed to Siegbert W. Becker

INTRODUCTION

Luther's concept of authority in religion is today a matter of lively debate. The champions of neo-orthodoxy have sought to claim Luther as one of their own. It is possible to find in Luther's writings statements concerning the Word of God, which, standing by themselves, might be given a neo-orthodox interpretation. He speaks sometimes of an inner Word. He says that a Christian is free from all outward authority. But if Luther is read and his statements concerning the truth and validity of Scripture, which remains true even if no one believes it,¹ are taken seriously, it must become crystal clear that to Luther the Bible is the Word of God, objectively true and authoritative.

Nothing aroused the ire of Luther more than those who set themselves up as teachers in the Church without the "outward Word." To him the "inner Word" meant nothing if it did not have the "outward Word" to substantiate it.

Luther would have called the present-day followers of neo-orthodoxy "*Schwaermer*", or enthusiasts." He says that those who say that the Spirit comes without the "writings and spoken Word of the apostles," "without the preaching of the scripture"² should stop writing themselves. He says that "whatsoever is extolled as Spirit without the Word and Sacraments is the devil himself."³ Neo-orthodoxy will find aid and comfort in Luther only if one whole aspect of Luther's thought on authority in religious is completely ignored.

It is the purpose of this paper to set forth Luther's views of religious authority as much as possible on the basis of the writings of Luther himself.

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF LUTHER'S CONCEPT OF AUTHORITY.

Two hundred years before Luther's time, William of Occam had asserted the supreme authority of Scripture,¹ but at the same time he made the principle inoperative by designating the Church as the final arbiter of what was of really taught in Scripture. Theoretically, "Scripture was the source and norm of Christian doctrine for Occam, but for all practical purposes the Church and the Church alone spoke the final Word in matters of faith and life. For him the doctrines of the Bible are the doctrines of the Church,² and he said, "Whatever the Roman Church believes that alone and nothing else I believe explicitly or implicitly."³

Luther's teachers at Erfurt were Occamists in theology. Among the theological works he studied were the writings of Gabriel Biel, Peter D'Ailly, and John Gerson all of whom were devoted followers of the Invincible Doctor. Biel and D'Ailly he knew almost by heart.⁴ From them Luther learned at least formally that Scripture is the final authority in matters of Christian doctrine, although neither he nor any of his teachers knew what this really meant, and if they had they would very likely have been most unwilling to draw the natural conclusions which should have followed from this proposition.

When Luther, on the eighth of May in 1518, came to Erfurt on his way back from the General Chapter meeting of the Augustinian order, he made an attempt to see his old teacher, Jodocus Trutvetter, who had some time before written to Luther, expressing his disapproval of the theses against indulgences.⁵ He was told that Trutvetter was too ill to see him, and on the next day he wrote a letter reminding his former instructor that it was from his lips that he had first learned that one should believe only the canonical books, and that all other books are to be read with a critical eye.⁶

While Luther's teachers, therefore, had taught him that Scripture alone was the source and norm of doctrine, they did not understand this in the same sense in which Luther later understood it. They saw no inconsistencies between the teachings of the Bible and the doctrines of the Church; in fact, such a suggestion would have seemed to them to be the foulest blasphemy. To Occam the Bible was an unclear book. The Church,

and the Church alone, had the authority and the ability to interpret the Scripture correctly. Boehmer is certainly correct when he says that Occam was “in reality not a Biblicist, and consequently could never have made one of Luther.”⁷

When it is said that the church is the final authority for Occam that does not mean that the Roman hierarchy was to be obeyed implicitly. Occam did not consider the hierarchy to be infallible. On the contrary, he definitely held that both popes and councils can err.⁸ He taught that the head of the state had the right and the duty to depose pope, if the pope should become guilty of manifest sin. Whether Luther had become acquainted with these views of Occam before 1517 has not yet been established. But, in any case, it is unlikely that these ideas were without some influence on the Reformer through his teachers.

If we keep this Occamistic training that Luther received at the university in mind, it is not difficult to see how Luther could attack the councils of the Church and call the Pope the Antichrist without too much hesitation. What really troubled him was that the Church as a whole seemed to stand against him. It was easy for many good Romanists of that time to hold the church to be infallible, and to shift the blame for all abuses to the shoulders of an occasional immoral pope and individual incompetent and ignorant priests. But this way out of the dilemma of a corrupt church was closed to Luther. His studies had convinced him that the best teachers of the church were ranged against him.⁹ And the more clearly he saw that, the more inescapable became the conclusion that the church as the voice of authority would have to be cast aside as the popes and the councils had been cast aside.

And this step Luther could not take lightly. At the Leipzig Disputation he spoke of the “common consent of all believers in Christ, which one may not contradict.”¹⁰ At the same time he made use of the old argument that one should not find fault with the church because there were a few bad men in it.¹¹ There is a long hard road between saying that your church, the church in which you had received your childhood training and in which you had learned your childhood prayers, the church which you had learned to love, – there is a long way between saying that this church *can* be wrong and saying that this church *is* wrong.

This was the road that Occam and Trutvetter could not travel. And this was the step that Luther dreaded to take. In the stormy days before Worms, Luther was assailed again and again by the most harrowing temptations, or *Anfechtungen*, as he called them. Again and again, he would ask himself: “*Meinest du, dasz alle vorigen Lehrer nichts gewusst haben? Muessen dir alle Vaeter Narren sein? Bistu allein des heiligen Geistes Nestei blieben auf diese letzte Zeit? Sollt Gott so viele Jahre lang sein Volk haben irren lassen!*”¹² At another time he wrote

How often did my heart pound and punish me by confronting me with the very powerful argument: Are you alone wise? Are you certain that all the rest are in error and that they have been in error for so long a time? What if you should be in error and through this lead so many people astray who would then all be eternally damned? This lasted until Christ with his only certain Word reassured and supported me so that my heart no longer continued to pound, but like a cliff on a shore that laughs at the waves of papal argument that dash against it, threatening and storming its existence.¹³

All through the controversy on indulgences, in his meetings with Cajetan and Miltitz, Luther had insisted that he was the loyal son of the Church, and that his doctrine was the doctrine of the Catholic Church. He did not realize at the time that almost every step he took was leading him farther and farther from Rome.

It was the Leipzig debate that opened his eyes. John Eck saw more clearly than Luther where Luther’s theology had to lead. It was here as Boehmer says, that Luther “formally declared war on the Papacy.”¹⁴ Relentlessly Eck probed into Luther’s mind and heart to bring to the surface thoughts and attitudes which were not quite clear and definite to Luther himself, until he finally forced Luther to say not only that councils *can* err but that the Council of Constance *had* erred. If Eck wanted to stand on the acts of the Council of Constance, he would take his position with the Council of Nicaea, which had spoken quite differently. But in any case, no

matter how often the decisions of the councils are quoted, one cannot by such a course establish anything as having divine force and authority.¹⁵ Here at Leipzig Luther only took the position that the opinion of a private citizen counts for more than pope, council, and church, if he stands upon better evidence and better proof.¹⁶

On the afternoon of the fifth of July, 1519, in the course of the debate with Eck, Luther said that many of the articles of Hus and the Bohemians were thoroughly Christian and evangelical, and that the church catholic could not condemn them.¹⁷ And shortly thereafter he said, "No believing Christian may be compelled to go beyond the holy Scriptures, which is the pure divine law, unless a new and accredited revelation is received."¹⁸

At Leipzig, the controversy that had begun on Oct. 31, 1517, had come to an end. It is noteworthy that while Eck and Luther were debating at the university, Tetzl lay dying in disgrace in the Dominican cloister in the same city. But in defending the theses on indulgences, Luther had discovered that there were far more serious differences between his theology and that of Rome. These conflicts were brought to a head at Leipzig. In less than a year after the debate, he wrote to a friend, "We are all Hussites without knowing it,"¹⁹ and a short time later he openly identified the pope with the Antichrist. The break with Rome was complete long before Worms. It was at Leipzig that Luther learned to speak the words that were to shake the world less than two years later at the diet.

To follow this line of development further would involve us in a long discussion regarding Luther's concept of the church. Those who would study this aspect of Luther's theology will find an excellent treatment of the subject in the fourth of Karl Holl's *Gesammelte Aufsätze*.²⁰ It is sufficient for our present purposes to note that it was in connection with the debate with Eck that Luther came to see clearly that the doctrines of the Church and the doctrines of Scripture are not necessarily synonymous. Schwiebert summarizes the results of Leipzig in these words:

As an aftermath of the debate, Luther's convictions were all the clearer on the following points: (1) the Word of God must be the Christians' sole guide in matters of faith and doctrine; (2) the Church which Jesus Christ had founded was not founded upon St. Peter, nor was it an outward, corporate body, as Eck had claimed; it was the invisible body of Jesus Christ, the communion of saints in existence since Jesus' day in spite of all the errors and corruption which had crept into the outward Roman Church; (3) that the Papacy, in fact the whole Roman hierarchy, was a human governing body that had slowly risen to power throughout the centuries; and that it was to be obeyed, not in the sense of being the divinely instituted authority by Christ, (sic) but as any human ruler is obeyed for the sake of unity and peace; (4) that it was his divine mission to point out the human weaknesses and errors in the Roman Church by the preaching of the Gospel and by once more restoring the Scriptures to their rightful place.²¹

II. Luther's Concept of Authority in Religion.

1. Luther and the Pope.

As we have seen, Luther was never a believer in papal infallibility. When Cajetan insisted that the pope exercised authority over the councils, the Scriptures, and the whole Church, Luther denied this emphatically and said that he had never heard of such a thing.²² As Boehmer says, "He grew up amidst the views of a theological school whose founders and most influential spokesmen were pronounced enemies of the Papal system. He certainly never was a 'Papist' in the strict sense of the word not even while he still held very high notions of the sanctity of the Roman Church."²³ In holding this position, he had respectable companions, even in Roman circles of the time. In discussing this whole question of papal authority with Cajetan, he could cite the University of Paris in support of his position.²⁴ It is no accident that the University of Paris took almost two

years to render a decision on the Leipzig debate, and when the decision came it completely ignored Eck's arguments for the primacy of the pope.

And yet, in the early years of his ministry, Luther set great stock by the decrees of the pope. On his return from the Chapter Meeting in Heidelberg in May of 1518, he sent a copy of his defense of the ninety-five theses²⁵ to Leo X, and with it he dispatched a letter which closed with the words, "Therefore, most holy father, I cast myself at the feet of your holiness and yield myself to you, with all that I am and have. Quicken, kill, call, recall, approve, disapprove, as it may please you. Your voice I will recognize as the voice of Christ, who governs and speaks through you."²⁶

But in the same year, when Prierias identified the voice of the pope with the voice of the Church, Luther wrote to him and said, "You say that the Church consists virtually in the pope. What abominations will you not have to regard as the deeds of the Church? Look at the outrageous tyranny of Boniface VIII who, as the proverb declares, 'came in as a wolf, reigned as a lion, and died as a dog.' ... You make the pope into an emperor in power and violence."²⁷

When Cajetan, in October of 1518, tried to convince Luther of his error by citing the bull *Unigenitus* of Clement VI, and insisted that the decrees of the pope are the voice of St. Peter, Luther answered that this could be said only of those papal decrees which did not contradict Scripture or the decrees of previous popes.²⁸ He clearly asserted that the pope is not superior to but subject to the Word of God.²⁹ And yet, just a few lines later he states that it is possible to bring this papal decree and his own theses into agreement with each other,³⁰ and during the negotiations with Cajetan he drew up a notarized statement in which he said that he was not conscious of having said anything which was contrary to the Scripture, the dogmas of the church, the decrees and laws of the popes, or against right reason.³¹

Luther explains this deference to the pope in his account of the meeting with Cajetan, and he says that one must preserve an attitude of respect toward the man who holds the papal office, and even when one speaks the truth one must do so with respect and with humility.³²

After the meeting with Cajetan, Luther saw a copy of the instructions in which Leo had told the cardinal how he was to proceed in Luther's case.³³ He could not believe that Leo would write in such a way,³⁴ and when his appeal from Leo ill-informed to Leo-better informed fell on deaf ears, Luther became convinced that he had made a mistake in putting any confidence in the pope. And by December of that same year, when he published his account of the meeting with the cardinal at Augsburg, he wrote that the correct understanding of scripture was not found in all the decrees of the popes, and that if one permits the abominable doctrine, that the pope cannot err and that he is superior to the Scriptures, to be taught, then nothing will be left in the Church but a man's word.³⁵

In his first letter to the pope in 1518, he had offered complete obedience. In his second letter, after the meeting with Cajetan, he had still spoken with great respect and humility.³⁶ But in his third letter to Leo, toward the end of 1520, he presumes to give Leo some sound advice and to tell him that he should not listen to those who would make him more than a mere man. Unmistakably he wrote, "They err who exalt thee above a council and above the Church universal. They err who ascribe to thee alone the right of interpreting Scripture."³⁷

Shortly before Worms Luther wrote to a friend, "This shall be my recantation at Worms: 'Previously I said the pope is the vicar of Christ. I recant. Now I say the pope is the adversary of Christ and the apostle of the Devil.'"³⁸ The break with the pope was complete.

2. Luther and the Councils.

We have seen that after the meetings with Cajetan, Luther's confidence in the pope was severely shaken, but still he was willing to give the holy father the benefit of the doubt, and he appealed from Leo ill informed to Leo better informed. When that appeal was rejected, Luther on Nov. 18, 1518 prepared an appeal from Leo

better informed to a general council of the church, but he made it plain that he wanted the council to show him on the basis of Scripture that he was wrong.³⁹

At Leipzig, in the next summer, he made it clear that he was not willing to accept any decision of a council as authoritative in itself.⁴⁰ It is very evident that Luther looked upon a church council as nothing more than an open forum where he would have an opportunity to defend his theology. With this hope, he renewed his appeal to a general council on November 17, 1520, only this time he insisted that it was to be a *free* council, not under the domination of Rome.⁴¹

When Luther in 1537 prepared the Smalcald Articles for presentation to such a free, general council, he wrote,

I verily desire to see a truly Christian Council, in order that many matters and persons might be helped. Not that we need it, for our churches are now, through God's grace, so enlightened and equipped with the pure Word and right use of the Sacraments ... that we on our part ask for no Council, and on such points have nothing better to hope or expect from a Council.⁴²

And as far as the Roman Church was concerned he was sure that "ten councils and twenty diets" could not correct what was wrong.⁴³

In 1539, Luther published a long article *Concerning Councils and Churches*, which one of his editors called one of the "most learned and carefully composed writings" of the great reformer.⁴⁴ In this work he stated his views concerning the authority of councils in detail. He says that

- (1) a council has no power to establish new articles of faith.
- (2) a council has the power and the duty to combat and condemn new articles of faith.
- (3) a council has no power to command new good works.
- (4) a council has the power on the basis of Scripture to condemn evil works, which are contrary to love.
- (5) a council has no power to establish new ceremonies and require them of Christians under penalty of mortal sin.
- (6) a council has the power and the duty to condemn such ceremonies.
- (7) a council has no power to meddle in the affairs of the state.
- (8) a council has the power and the duty to condemn such attempts.
- (9) a council has no power to set up regulations that foster tyranny.
- (10) a council has power to establish ceremonies, provided that the tyranny of the bishops is not confirmed thereby and the welfare of the people demands them.⁴⁵

To the question about what power a council has after he had circumscribed it in this way, he answers that a council has the power to condemn, but that it may not do this according to its own opinions but only according to "the law of the kingdom, that is, according to Holy Scripture."⁴⁶ A church council, then, according to Luther has no authority except the authority of Holy Scripture.

3. Luther and Scripture.

"*Sola Scriptura*," "Scripture alone," has always been one of the watchwords of the Lutheran Church, and this watchword she learned from Luther. As has been noticed, Luther had learned from Trutvetter and D'Ailly and Biel that the Bible is the sole source of doctrine. When he was elevated to the priesthood, Hans Luther came to the monastery to attend the ordination banquet, and when Martin tried to make his father see that God had called him to the priesthood and therefore he had been right to act contrary to his father's wishes,

he received the answer that the Scriptures say, "Honor thy father and mother." Grimm says that Luther "never forgot his father's appeal to the Bible in opposition to the authority of the Church."⁴⁷

The key-note of "*sola Scriptura*" is never entirely absent from Luther's writings. Schwiebert says that Luther very likely adopted this principle during his first year at Wittenberg, 1508 to 1509.⁴⁸ While he was preparing to take the degree of *Doctor Biblicus*, one of the professors at Wittenberg said of him,

This monk will confuse all the Doctors. He will start a new religion and reform the whole Roman Church, for he bases his theology on the writings of the Prophets and the Apostles. He stands on the words of Christ, which no philosophy or sophistry can upset or oppose.⁴⁹

In his answer to Prierias he had asserted that only Scripture is without error. When Cajetan held up to him the decree of Clement VI, Luther answered with Scripture. At Leipzig he told Eck that he revered the fathers but would bow only to the authority of Scripture. At Worms, he asked to be shown from Scripture that he had erred. When he agreed at Worms to submit his case to a general council, he added the provision that the council would have to be guided by the Bible. In a sermon preached in 1524, he says that only Scripture can decide what is right and what is wrong in matters of doctrine.⁵⁰ Hundreds of citations could be adduced from every period of Luther's life to show that this was a guiding principle in his theology.⁵¹

For him, the Bible was the Word of God. Even Watson, steeped as he is in Bartheanism and in the Lundensian misinterpretation of Luther must admit that "at times ... he appears to identify the Word with the written word of Scripture."⁵² That "at times" is certainly the understatement of the year. Luther said that if one finds people who deny or doubt that the Scriptures are the Word of God, then one should be quiet and not speak a word to them. "Say to them," he says, "I will give you evidence enough out of Scripture. If you will believe it, good! If you do not want to believe it, I will give you nothing more."⁵³

For Luther the Scriptures were verbally inspired. The Holy Scriptures have been spoken by the Holy Ghost.⁵⁴ God speaks to us through the Scriptures.⁵⁵ He calls Scripture the book of the Holy Ghost.⁵⁶ The Holy Scriptures did not grow on earth.⁵⁷ In the Scriptures we do not read man's word but God's Word.⁵⁸ God Himself speaks to us in the Scriptures.⁵⁹ He says that the words which the Scriptures employ are from God.⁶⁰ One verse of Scripture is worth more than all the books in the world.⁶¹ And in his colloquy with Zwingli at Marburg, he insisted on one word of Scripture as being determinative in the whole argument.

It would take us too far afield to discuss passages from Luther which are adduced to show that Luther had a liberal attitude toward Scripture. A few passages are quoted over and over. It cannot be denied that quoted out of context they often seem to indicate that Luther's view of Scripture is not that it is inerrant and verbally inspired. And yet Luther says again and again that the Bible is inerrant, that it does not, and cannot contradict itself.⁶² And always, when the quotations are examined in context it becomes evident that Luther has either not been read or he has been deliberately misquoted.

When Luther said "Scripture alone," he meant exactly that. He emphatically denied that human reason had any voice in determining how Scripture is to be interpreted. The Humanists had a tendency to rationalize Scripture.⁶³ In the Marburg colloquy, he insisted that no argument from reason could ever destroy the clear statement, "This is my body." He did not attempt to explain how the body of Christ could be present. God had spoken these words, he said, and not a mere man, and faith demanded that they be allowed to stand.⁶⁴ When Zwingli asked whether Christ was present locally or illocalily, Luther answered that God had not revealed the answer to that question and it could not be proved one way or another.⁶⁵ Luther hated reason when it set itself up as a Judge of Scripture and called it the devil's whore. Again and again he warns against letting reason interpret Scripture.⁶⁶

Luther also warned against placing any reliance on personal religious experience. Muentzer claimed special enlightenment, but Luther said that he would not believe him even if he "Had swallowed the Holy Ghost, feathers and all."⁶⁷ The object of the believer's faith must never be what God has done in him but what Christ has done for him, as that work is revealed in the Word of Scripture.⁶⁸ For him the assurance of salvation

is not founded on religious experience, but religious experience is a fruit of faith. In his lectures on Galatians he says, “We must not judge according to the feeling of our own heart, but according to the Word of God⁶⁹ ... This is the reason why our theology is certain, for it brings us to this point that we no longer look to ourselves but take our stand on that which is outside of ourselves, and do not build on our own powers, conscience, feelings, person, or works, but depend upon that which is outside of us, that is on the promises and truth of God, which cannot fail⁷⁰ ... We must measure this treasure not according to human reason or feeling, but ... according to the promise of God.”⁷¹

It must be clear from this that Watson is correct when he says, “There could hardly be a more perverse caricature of Luther’s whole intention than to say that the main plank in his reforming platform was the assertion of the ‘right of private judgment.’”⁷² No man has a right to interpret Scripture.

He insisted that Scripture is a clear book,⁷³ that it provides its own light.⁷⁴ Scripture therefore must interpret Scripture. The context of Scripture must decide what the words mean, and the words must be allowed to stand even if experience and reason protest. It is the Word of God and even if it appears to us at times that the Holy Ghost is drunk, we must remember that these words are the words of God and we are ignorant. The Scriptures must be allowed to have their say. They must bear undisputed rule in the Church.

Conclusion:

There can be no doubt, that Luther, then, accepted the Bible as the verbally inspired Word of God. Much of the modern literature on Luther’s theology, especially that which has its roots in neo-orthodoxy has ignored or attempted to explain away the plainest and clearest statements of Luther. That Luther held to a rigid view of Scripture as an objective authority is ‘plain by his statements that the object of our faith ‘is something outside of ourselves, the words and promises of God, and by his comparison of Scripture with the law of the land according to which all decisions are to be made.

Much of the confusion has arisen from a failure to understand Luther’s concept of conversion. To Luther conversion was a complete reversal of the human will. The person who has been converted, according to the new man wants what God wants. When a man has come to faith the Scripture no longer confronts him as authority which compels assent, but it is for him the word of his heavenly Father which he wants to believe. Also here the Christian is a free man, but his very freedom consists in complete subjection to the will of God.

¹ Martin Luther: *Saemmtliche Schriften*, Concordia, St. Louis, 1899-1910, VII, 992. (Hereafter referred to as St. L. ed.).

² Luther: *Smalcald Articles*, III, viii, 5.

³ Ibid.

¹ R. Seeberg: *History of Doctrine*, II, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1952, p. 192.

² Ibid., p. 193.

³ A.C. McGriffert: *History of Christian Thought*, II, Scribner’s, New York, 1953, p. 308.

⁴ H. Boehmer: *Luther in the Light of Recent Research*, The Christian Herald, New York, 1918, p. 180.

⁵ Luther’s *Saemmtliche Schriften*, St. L. ed., XV, 410.

⁶ Ibid, 413.

⁷ Boehmer, op. cit., p. 94.

⁸ Boehmer, op. cit., p. 92.

⁹ Karl Holl: *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Vorlag von J.C.B. Mohr. Tuebingen, 1923, p. 382.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 316f.: “*consensu fidelium Christi, cui non licet resistere.*” Holl: “*uebereinstimmende Wille der Christenheit.*”

¹¹ St. L. ed. XV, 970.

¹² Holl, op. cit., p. 382.

¹³ E. G. Schwiebert: *Luther and His Times*, Concordia, St. Louis, 1950, p. 455.

¹⁴ E. G. Schwiebert: *Luther and His Times*, Concordia, St. Louis, 1950, p. 455.

¹⁵ St. L. ed. XV, 993.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 942.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 941f.

- ¹⁸ Ibid., p. 942.
- ¹⁹ R. Bainton, *Here I Stand*, The New American Library, New York, 1955, p. 92 (End of chapter 6).
- ²⁰ Op. Cit. p. 288 ff. “*Die Entstehung von Luthers Kirchenbegriff.*” Cp. also the next chapter, “*Luther und das landesherrliche Kirchenregiment.*”
- ²¹ Op. cit., p. 417.
- ²² St. L. ed. XV, 616 “*Dies was in meinen Ohren etwas neues.*”
- ²³ Op. cit., p. 93.
- ²⁴ Schwiebert, op. cit., p. 351.
- ²⁵ “*Resolutiones disputationum de indulgentiarum virtute.*” St. L. ed. XVIII, 102f.
- ²⁶ St. L. ed. XV, 404.
- ²⁷ Bainton, op. cit., p. 68 (Chapter V).
- ²⁸ St. L. ed. XV, 573.
- ²⁹ Ibid., 574
- ³⁰ Ibid., 575.
- ³¹ Ibid., 568.
- ³² Ibid., 617.
- ³³ For a copy see St. L. ed. XV, 539ff.
- ³⁴ Schwiebert, op. cit., p. 355.
- ³⁵ St. L. ed., 623-624.
- ³⁶ Ibid., 705-708.
- ³⁷ *Works of Martin Luther*, Holman, Philadelphia, 1915, II, 310.
- ³⁸ Bainton, op. cit., p. 139.
- ³⁹ St. L. ed., XV, 656-665.
- ⁴⁰ H. J. Grimm: *The Reformation Era*, Macmillan, New York, 1954, p. 124.
- ⁴¹ St. L. ed., XV, 1602-1607.
- ⁴² *Concordia Triglotta*, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1921, p. 457.
- ⁴³ Ibid., p. 459.
- ⁴⁴ St. L. ed., XVI, 2144.
- ⁴⁵ St. L. ed., XVI, 2145-2303.
- ⁴⁶ Ibid., 2259.
- ⁴⁷ Grim, op. cit., p. 98.
- ⁴⁸ Op. cit., p. 158.
- ⁴⁹ Schwiebert, op. cit., p. 194.
- ⁵⁰ St. L. ed., III, 503.
- ⁵¹ St. L. ed., I, 1290, XIX, 582.
- ⁵² Philip S. Watson: *Let God be God*, Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia, 1949, p. 149.
- ⁵³ St. L. ed., IX, 1072.
- ⁵⁴ Ibid., III, 1895.
- ⁵⁵ Ibid., VI, 80.
- ⁵⁶ Ibid., IX, 1775.
- ⁵⁷ Ibid., VIII, 2095.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid., IX, 1808.
- ⁵⁹ Ibid., IX, 1821.
- ⁶⁰ Ibid., IV, 1960.
- ⁶¹ St. L. ed., XIX, 1734.
- ⁶² Ibid., XIX, 1073; XV, 1481; XX, 798; IX, 356.
- ⁶³ Schwiebert, op. cit., p. 695.
- ⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 707.
- ⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 709.
- ⁶⁶ St. L. ed., XXII, 577; XIV, 434f; XIII, 1899.
- ⁶⁷ Bainton, p. 203.
- ⁶⁸ Saarnivaara: *Luther Discovers the Gospel*, Concordia, St. Louis, 1951, pp. 123f.
- ⁶⁹ St. L. ed., IX, 504.
- ⁷⁰ Ibid., 509.
- ⁷¹ Ibid., 514.
- ⁷² Watson, op. cit., p. 13.
- ⁷³ St. L. ed., XVIII, 1745f.

⁷⁴ Ibid., XI, 2335.