

# Concordia Theological Monthly



J A N U A R Y

•

1 9 5 3



ARCHIVES

# Luther on Creation

## A Study in Theocentric Theology

By HENRY W. REIMANN \*

ALTHOUGH he was bred in a Church and society in which men tried with their works to appease the God whom theologians and philosophers had carefully thought out, Martin Luther returned to the Gospel. Here God took the initiative to rescue and redeem His sinful creatures through His Son. This has rightly been called a Copernican revolution in the realm of religion.

Just as Copernicus started with a geocentric, but reached a heliocentric conception of the physical world, Luther began with an anthropocentric or egocentric conception of religion, but came to a theocentric conception. In this sense, Luther is a Copernicus in the realm of religion.<sup>1</sup>

But this theocentric emphasis is restricted by no means to the doctrine of justification by faith. For all of Luther's theology there is only one proper subject: Man as guilty on account of sin and God as the Justifier and Savior of sinful man. That this is eminently true of Luther's doctrine of Creation will be the subject of this study.

The Creator God for Luther was the Lord, the Holy One, the Almighty. Those words of the First Commandment: "the Lord, thy God," had made a deep impression on Luther. This Lord is the Creator, "who has given and constantly preserves to me my body, soul and life, members great and small, all my senses, reason, and understanding, and so on."<sup>2</sup> Holl is doubtless correct in affirming that Luther's reformation did not lie in changing any single doctrine.<sup>3</sup> The Reformer built up anew from the very conception of God, the Creator Lord. The personal God, who is Creator, Redeemer, and Vivifier, is Luther's Lord. Whatever had no relation to this God had no place in his Christian thinking.

---

\* The author was graduated from Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., in June, 1950, with the B. D. degree. During the previous school year he served as instructor at California Concordia College, Oakland, Calif. Receiving a fellowship, he pursued graduate studies at Concordia Seminary from 1950 to 1951. He received the degree of Master of Sacred Theology in June, 1951, when he received a call to Calvary Lutheran Church, Charleston, S. C. — ED.

This Creator Lord is the Holy One, the Almighty. After expounding the First Article of the Apostles' Creed, Luther adds: "Therefore this article ought to humble and terrify us all if we believed it. For we sin daily. . . ." <sup>4</sup> In Luther's theology the life of the holy Creator is no ideal toward which men strive. God's life is absolutely different from the sinful life of His creatures. <sup>5</sup> Here is determined opposition to medieval theology, which had never known a radical break between the life of God and the life of men. <sup>6</sup> The holy Creator is "wholly other."

Luther's understanding of God as almighty also forced him to part company with the Middle Ages. The world was no quiet order as it was for the Greeks and the Scholastics. The entire world is an unbroken witness to God's restless creative activity as Almighty Lord. <sup>7</sup> The trouble with people, Luther complained in *De Servo Arbitrio*, was that they do not consider what a restless sort of Mover God is in all His creatures. <sup>8</sup>

This holy, almighty Creator Lord is the sovereign Source of all. He is the Source not only of man's repentance but of man's every action. He is Sovereign also over Satan and evil men. <sup>9</sup> This was Luther's position against Erasmus, who could not bring himself to see God in evil disturbances. Luther did, for God could not relinquish His sovereignty over the wicked without ceasing to be God. <sup>10</sup> There are no Neoplatonic aversions in Luther that prevent the living God from being what He is. <sup>11</sup>

It is evident, then, that this living Creator God is not the God of the Philosophers. God is not in the first place Thought, but Will and Action. Luther will have none of a God like Aristotle's, who in His self-sufficiency leaves so much to men. Some of the passages in *De Servo Arbitrio* appear to be definitely slanted against the Homeric view of a far-off God, who has left men and gone off to a banquet. <sup>12</sup> But it was primarily because this philosophic view of God had obscured the Gospel that Luther rejected it so vehemently. <sup>13</sup> He wanted no far-off phantom for a God. His God was living, active, powerful — the Creator Lord who had come nigh to men through His Son in the promise of the Gospel.

Nevertheless the Creator is no familiar neighbor with whom man can talk on equal terms. That was why Luther was so stern with the "enthusiasts" who spoke with the high majesty of God as if

they were talking to a cobbler.<sup>14</sup> He is the Creator; man is His creature. In answer to what the First Article of the Creed means, Luther replies: "This is what I mean and believe: that I am a creature of God. . . ." <sup>15</sup> For this reason God cannot be measured by human standards.<sup>16</sup> Even though Luther knew that man cannot live without God, he would not say that man "needs" God. He is the Lord, whose commandments are to be obeyed unconditionally and without thought of reward.<sup>17</sup> Even after the creation of the world God is within, beyond, and above all creatures. That means that He is still incomprehensible.<sup>18</sup>

This sovereign Creator Lord had created man and the world in the beginning. Here it is important to note that Luther was not first and foremost a systematician.<sup>19</sup> His works from which references will be cited are exegetical treatises. And as an exegetical theologian Luther uses what Koeberle has called "a magnificent carelessness of expression."<sup>20</sup> Although such expressions may be painful for the critical theologian, they serve to emphasize the essentially religious view of Creation that Luther wished to set forth. What he wants to portray is the relationship between God and the world. God is the Creator, and man and the world are His creation.

Luther's religious view of Creation is plainly apparent in what he says about the Word of God. That Word was God's medium and instrument in performing the works of creation. Christ, the Second Person of the Trinity, had a definite part in Creation.<sup>21</sup> Even in such physical phenomena as keeping the sea in its place, God used His Word,<sup>22</sup> and the cause for the continuous propagation of the race is the same Word.<sup>23</sup> But Luther rejects any Logos speculation apart from the Logos *ensarkos*. He would not accept the idea that God's Word is a light that enlightens the reason of the heathen. That was a human, Platonic, philosophic thought that led away from Christ instead of to Him.<sup>24</sup> Nevertheless the Word who in the fullness of time was made flesh was the power of God through whom God had created the world.

The purpose of Creation was all important for Luther. Man was created to serve God. Even before the Fall man was to know why he had been created, namely, to acknowledge God and to glorify Him.<sup>25</sup> This was the purpose Luther found in the Sabbath observance. And this purpose of Creation is beautifully incorporated in

the *Small Catechism*: "I believe that God has made me . . . for all which it is my duty to thank and praise, to serve and obey Him." The creature has been created to live unto the Creator, and by very right of that creation God requires such service.<sup>26</sup>

But in no point is Luther's religious emphasis brought out more strongly than when he lauds God's *present* creative work. The germination of seed in the botanical world is still the work of Creation,<sup>27</sup> and the same applies to the propagation of the human race. The creative Word is still efficacious today when mothers conceive and children are born.<sup>28</sup> Although people do not wonder at the ever-recurring story of human birth, it is still God's miracle.<sup>29</sup> On the one hand, Luther speaks as if God's creation in human birth were unconnected with the historical beginning of Creation, but on the other he holds that in God's sight he was born already at the beginning of the world.<sup>30</sup> At any rate, God is still Lord of His creation. The Creator is still at work.

Luther relates this natural birth to the spiritual rebirth of the Christian. Johann Haar has studied this side of Luther's theology in a short monograph entitled *Initium Creaturae Dei*, in which he analyzes particularly Luther's exegesis of James 1:18.<sup>31</sup> It is Haar's conclusion that Luther does not speak of the natural birth of man without also speaking of the rebirth of the new man in Christ.<sup>32</sup> God, the Creator of heaven and earth, is also the Creator of the new creature. As God began physical life in man and has preserved that life, so in the new creation the same Creator bestows the new life and sustains it. In both creative acts God's Word is active.<sup>33</sup>

It would seem, then, that the Reformer understood two creations of God. Haar maintains that this is not true. There is only one Creation of God, but this unity becomes evident only to faith.<sup>34</sup> By faith in Christ God appears as One before whom all days are as one moment.<sup>35</sup> By that faith, from the understanding of the new life, the proper understanding of one's natural birth also is clear. Only the Christian can actually see God's Creation in the right perspective.<sup>36</sup> In all facets of the doctrine of Creation, Luther exhibited his religious interest.

That is not to say, however, that the Reformer was not bound by the historical account of the Creation in the beginning found in Genesis, or that he is in the company of some modern theologians

who emphasize the religious at the expense of the historical. Where Scripture had spoken, Luther was bound. Even on moot points like the problem of the waters of the firmament, Luther's advice was: "Remain in the words of the Holy Spirit."<sup>37</sup> Although he freely admitted that there was a lack of clarity on particulars,<sup>38</sup> that did not mean for him that the doctrine of Creation was unclear. Holy Scripture and the Word of God contained true wisdom for the all-important questions: Who has created all things and for what has He created them?<sup>39</sup>

Creatureliness was basic to Luther's view of man. This meant first of all that man stood in a creaturely, dependent relationship to his Creator. It is noteworthy how Luther stresses again and again in the opening chapters of the Genesis commentary that even the holy Adam was a creature. The purpose of God's command not to eat of the fruit of the tree was that Adam and Eve might have an external worship and work of obedience toward God.<sup>40</sup> Even if there had been no sin, Adam would have set this commandment before his posterity.<sup>41</sup> Even if man had not fallen, he would have continued to stand in a creaturely relation toward God, observing the Sabbath day and worshiping God.<sup>42</sup>

Neither was it only a part of man, his "lower" self, which was in such a relation to the Creator. The whole man was God's creature. He is not the God of temporal possessions only but of all things. The Creator wanted man to worship Him with all his strength, with all his heart, with his whole self.<sup>43</sup> Recapturing the existentialism of the Scriptures, Luther regarded the total man as a creature of God.

But sin had entered the world, and sin affected the total man.<sup>44</sup> Although God had created a world which was to serve Him and which stood rooted in His Law, man had turned about and had become an idolater. The disposition of his mind has become ungodly "... seeking in all things, even in God Himself, the things that are its own."<sup>45</sup> Contrary to the Neoplatonic mysticism of the Middle Ages, Luther rejected the idea that the spirit of man had escaped this sin. The whole man was under God's judgment as an idolatrous sinner.<sup>46</sup>

For this reason it seems as if Luther saw nothing good in man. All was mud; all was untilled ground.<sup>47</sup> As far as the creature's relationship to his God, there was nothing good in him. He could

not and would not let God be God.<sup>48</sup> Even man's reason, which Luther regarded as one of the Creator's best gifts, had become "the devil's whore," since it served the egocentricity of natural man.<sup>49</sup> The entire sex relation, God's *bona creatio*, was polluted by sin.<sup>50</sup> After the Fall, also the world which was corrupted through man's sin had become harmful. Sun and moon were clothed in sackcloth, and all creatures were deformed by sin.<sup>51</sup>

But God had made all things good, and He is still almighty Lord. Is He, then, responsible for this perversion of His good creation? While Luther's philosophic reasoning, especially in his controversy with Erasmus on freedom of the will, tended toward determinism, his basic argument was religious. Whatever judgment of *De Servo Arbitrio* one adopts,<sup>52</sup> this much must be said. Even in the kingdom of evil where Satan rules, God the Lord is still omnipotent.<sup>53</sup> Moreover, Luther does not teach that God is the author of sin, either now or at the beginning of the world.<sup>54</sup> The sin that occurs in men's lives is not the fault of God but of men themselves. Men are always responsible.<sup>55</sup> However, in the last analysis Luther left the philosophic problem of sin and evil unsolved. God is the Lord. Man is a sinner.<sup>56</sup>

But man's complete sinfulness never made him any less a creature of God.<sup>57</sup> Even after the Fall, Satan and man are not *nihil*. It is true that the sinner is turned toward his own desires. Nevertheless he remains God's creature, subject to God's omnipotent will.<sup>58</sup> Although man's apprehension of the divine will was distorted by the Fall, man's position as a creature of God, who is utterly dependent on God, remains even in his sinfulness. Because of sin, however, this creaturely relationship is not fully realized nor its goal actualized until the sinner is made a new creature through faith in the Son of God.

In this assertion that sinful man is still God's creature, Luther broke with the Neoplatonic and ascetic dualism of the Middle Ages, which had always negated man's physical being. Luther affirmed both mind and body as creaturely endowments of God. He even praises reason as one of God's best gifts to man.<sup>59</sup> Watson points out that the rough language Luther uses concerning reason "... is the measure of his indignation at the abuse and perversion of what he regards as one of the Creator's best gifts to His creatures."<sup>60</sup> The body, too, was a part of God's good creation.<sup>61</sup> Luther has no con-

tempt for the natural, but rather a disciplinary culture that springs from reverence of the body as God's gift.<sup>62</sup> For Luther both statements are true. The total man, including mind and body and physical gifts, is a good creature of God.<sup>63</sup> But man has perverted his entire being and turned his whole self into evil.<sup>64</sup>

Similarly Luther also affirmed the world as God's creation. In rejecting the medieval division of life into spiritual and earthly duties, Luther praised the lowliest of earthly callings.<sup>65</sup> And when he extols earthly government and worldly offices, Carlson holds that "he is extolling creation as such."<sup>66</sup> Holl<sup>67</sup> believes that this extended to the natural sciences despite Luther's purported derision of Copernicus.<sup>68</sup> Rejoicing in God's goodness in Christ, Luther found joy in the world, in the splendor of the heavens, in the happy singing of the birds, in the majesty of the elements, in the riches of nature.<sup>69</sup> It is from man's use of the world, not from God's good creation, that ills and sorrows arise. Nevertheless, just as the Reformer never made man autonomous, so he never made the world autonomous.<sup>70</sup> God is the Creator and the world's Lord.

Luther has much to say about the relationship between Creator and creature, about the way in which and by which the one reaches the other. It is plain that Luther taught that sin had separated the creature from his Maker. But does Luther then teach a natural knowledge of God? The Reformer taught a twofold knowledge of God — a general and a particular knowledge.

All men have the general knowledge, namely, that there is a God, that He created heaven and earth, that He is just, that He punisheth the wicked. But what God thinketh of us, what His will is toward us, what He will give or what He will do to the end that we may be delivered from sin and death, and be saved (which is the true knowledge of God indeed), this they know not.<sup>71</sup>

It is this general knowledge of God which was called the Natural Knowledge of God in later Lutheran theology.

But, according to Luther, from this general, or natural, knowledge of God has sprung all idolatry.

For upon this proposition which all men do naturally hold, namely, that there is a God, hath sprung all idolatry, which without the knowledge of the Divinity, could never have come into the world.<sup>72</sup>



The religion of the natural man is built on his natural knowledge of God, but it is a false religion, for it brings a false conception of God. It brings a false conception because of what man does with this knowledge. Men know that God is powerful, invisible, just, and good, but they do not worship Him as God.<sup>73</sup> Indeed, they cannot, since as sinners they are not in the right relationship with God.<sup>74</sup> Hence Luther's views on natural knowledge brought no continuity between man and God, but rather emphasized still more the distance between the holy Lord and His sinful creation.

The particular knowledge of God is the knowledge of the Creator in His Son. Without this knowledge man could never avoid idolatry. But this is not to assert an essential disharmony between the general and the particular knowledge of God. Luther explains himself in this way. We can be distantly acquainted with a man and even have much to do with him and still be ignorant of his personal attitude toward us. So also with the natural knowledge of God. It has given man a false picture of God because he stood in the wrong relationship to Him.<sup>75</sup>

It is important neither to overemphasize nor to underemphasize what Luther says about this general knowledge of God. Protestant Orthodoxy had an imposing *theologia naturalis*. And as far as that was based on Luther's general knowledge of God, that there was an awareness of some *numen* in all men,<sup>76</sup> Orthodoxy was correct. But later Lutheran theology all too often carried on the scholastic tradition of positing a continuity between Creator and creature and of seeking the Creator through the works of creation.<sup>77</sup>

What sets Luther off from the natural theology of the Scholastics and of the later dogmaticians is his view of the *larvae dei*. It is God Himself who actively confronts His creatures in the works of creation and in His Word.<sup>78</sup> The various orders in society, such as prince, magistrate, teacher, father, as well as the created world itself, are God's masks or veils through which He confronts men in their environment.<sup>79</sup> It is not as though men should use the created world to rise up to God. No ". . . God is One who comes down veiled in the *larvae* of His creatures and meets man precisely in the 'material substantial Sphere' of the external world."<sup>80</sup> Thus God's own revelation of Himself in Creation is the foundation of the general knowledge of God.

However, Luther is emphatic that only the Christian who has learned to know God properly can see God's face in the creation works. The natural man who has not seen God in Christ does not recognize Him, does not distinguish between the veils and God Himself.<sup>81</sup> God actually confronts such a man in His masks, but that man turns this general knowledge of God into a lie. Koeberle summarizes Luther's position this way: Whoever looks into the heart of God in His Son can look on His face in Creation.<sup>82</sup> The soul that trusts in the *revelatio specialis* will be led to the *revelatio generalis*.

It is the God who has revealed Himself in Christ with whom His creatures are to deal. Here man can see God's heart, His love for men in Christ, His very life which is so different from the life of men. It is true that God is the *Deus revelatus* also in Creation, but His *life* cannot be known through the Creation but only in Christ.<sup>83</sup> But knowing God in Christ the revelation in Creation is not excluded. In the works of Creation the Christian learns to see the same face of God that has been revealed to him in the person of Jesus Christ. Hence the Christian learns about Creation through God, his Creator Lord, and not the other way around.<sup>84</sup>

But even the new relationship of faith does not obscure creatureliness. Although the Christian is God's child and heir by faith in Christ, he is still a creature. Luther certainly could write that the believers live in God and that the Christian becomes "ein Kuchen" with Christ.<sup>85</sup> But at the same time he extolled prayer as a wonderful way to acknowledge utter dependency on God,<sup>86</sup> and he stressed the fact that God wanted to form, and not to be formed.<sup>87</sup> Without any sense of conflict Luther asserted both the nearness of God in Christ and the creaturely distance from Him that still exists.<sup>88</sup> The Creator is always the Potter, and we are His clay.<sup>89</sup>

The things that Luther wrote, preached, taught, and believed about Creation were no isolated fragments about a certain doctrine of the Christian faith. For him doctrine was not in the first place information about God, but the very witness of the activity of the living God reaching out to men. This activity centered in the love of Christ. If Luther's theology can be called Christocentric<sup>90</sup> (and surely it is), then his doctrine of Creation is equally Christocentric. Also in this area of theology all questions and problems center in

the God-Man and His saving work. Who the Creator is, how He performed His work of Creation, what He did for His sinful creatures, how He revealed Himself to them — the answers all revolved around Jesus Christ. Answering the question, What should the creature do in thinking about God? Luther replied: Let him occupy himself with the Incarnate God, namely, the crucified Jesus.<sup>91</sup>

Is, then, Luther's doctrine of Creation theocentric? Watson has the following quotation:

Only Christocentric theology is theocentric, because it takes seriously the revelation of God in Christ, and renounces the theoretical construction of God.<sup>92</sup>

This is what Luther did. For him the religious relationship did not center in man but in God, who had made man, who justified him in Christ, who sent the Holy Spirit through Word and Sacrament to lead him to God's own heart. To all questions with which the creature would like to challenge the Creator Luther replied: "Deus est."<sup>93</sup>

Charleston, S. C.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. Philip S. Watson, *Let God Be God* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1950), p. 34.
2. Martin Luther, "The Large Catechism," *Concordia Triglotta*, edited by F. Bente (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921), p. 681.
3. Karl Holl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte* (seventh edition; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1948), I, 2.
4. Luther, *op. cit.*, p. 683.
5. Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 58, note 1. Holl thanks Soederblom and Otto for working through the concept of the "Holy," but he holds that the distinctiveness of this concept in Luther is more apparent than either of these men will admit.
6. Carl Stange, "Die Gottesanschauung Luthers," *Zeitschrift fuer systematische Theologie*, VIII (1931), 68.
7. "Den das wortlin 'Mchtig' sol hie nit heysen ein still ruhende macht. . . . Sondern ein wirkende macht und stettige tetickeit, die on unterlass geht ym schwanck und wirkt." *Weimar Edition*, VII, 574, 12. Quoted in Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 45, note 3.
8. "Non satis cogitantes, quam inquietus sit actor Deus in omnibus creaturis suis nullamque sinat feriari." Martin Luther, *De Servo Arbitrio*, D. Martin Luthers Werke (Weimar: Hermann Boehlaus Nachfolger, 1908), XVIII, 710. Hereafter this edition of Luther's works will be referred to as *WA*.
9. "Quando ergo Deus omnia movet et agit, necessario movet etiam et agit in Satana et impio." *Ibid.*, p. 709.
10. "Deus suam omnipotentiam non potest omittere propter illius aversionem." *Ibid.*, p. 710.

11. "Igitur Pius animus non exhorret audire, Deum esse in morte vel in inferno . . . imo cum scriptura testetur Deum esse ubique et replere omnia." *Ibid.*, p. 623.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 706. In a footnote the editor suggests that Luther may have been referring to the *Odyssey*, I, 22 ff.
13. Cf. Jaroslav Pelikan, *From Luther to Kierkegaard* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, c. 1950), p. 11f.
14. "Wir haben Propheten ym landt hyn und her, die leeren die leut allzu freydig trotzen, und reden mit der hohen Majestet als mit einem schuster-knecht." *WA*, XII, 499, 15. Quoted in Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 58.
15. Luther, *Large Catechism*, *op. cit.*, p. 681.
16. "Die Vernunft will allezeit Gott hofmeistern, ob er Fug und Recht habe, will Gott messen nach ihrem Gesetze und Gedanken. . . . Aber das musst du aus deinem Kopfe lassen, wenn du von Gott reden wilt, dass du kein Gesetz oder Mass auf Gott gibest; denn er ist nicht eine Creatur, er ist unermesslich." *Erlangen Edition*, 35, 165. Quoted by Stange, *op. cit.*, p. 56.
17. Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 62.
18. ". . . sentiamus Deum ante conditionem mundi fuisse incomprehensibilem in sua essentiali quiete, Nunc autem post creationem esse intra, extra et supra omnes creaturas, hoc est, etiam esse incomprehensibilem." Martin Luther, *Enarratio in Genesim*, *D. Martin Luthers Werke* (Weimar: Hermann Boehlaus Nachfolger, 1911), XLII, 9.
19. Pelikan, *op. cit.*, p. 14f.
20. Adolf Koeberle, *The Quest for Holiness*, translated from the third German edition by John C. Mattes (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, c. 1936), p. 79.
21. Luther, *Enarratio in Genesim*, *op. cit.*, p. 13.
22. "Sed Deus mare verbo suo repellit et facit planiciem illam extare." *Ibid.*, p. 26.
23. The cause for generation is ". . . nempe verbum Dei iubentis, quod dicit ad hunc maritum: Iam sanguis tuus fiat masculus, fiat foemella. Hoc verbum ratio nescit." *Ibid.*, p. 95.
24. Such thoughts are ". . . alliss noch menschlich, platonische und philosophische dancken . . . denn er (der Euangelist) will das gottliche, almechtige, ewige wortt gottis nicht handeln, noch von yhm reden, denn alss ynn dem fleysch und blut, das auff erden gangen ist." *WA*, X, I, 1, p. 202. 7ff. Quoted in Johann Haar, *Initium Creaturae Dei* (Guetersloh: Verlag C. Bertelsmann, 1939), p. 41.
25. "Deinde ostenditur hic (sanctificatio Sabbati) quoque hominem praecipue esse conditum ad noticiam et cultum Dei." Luther, *Enarratio in Genesim*, *op. cit.*, p. 140.
26. "He may by right of creation require as due service, all things of us His creatures, created to live unto Him." *Sermons on the most interesting Doctrines of the Gospel* (London, 1830), p. 130. Quoted by Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 100, note 80.
27. "Quod autem nunc semina proveniunt, Id quoque est creationis opus plenum admiratione." Luther, *Enarratio in Genesim*, *op. cit.*, p. 27.
28. "Aber wenn Gott ein Wort spricht, so geschieht alsbald das, was gesagt wird. So sagt er zu meiner Mutter: Empfange, und sie empfaengt; zu mir sagt er: Werde geboren, und ich werde geboren." Luther, "Auslegung des 90. Psalms," *Dr. Martin Luthers Saemmtliche Schriften*, edited by Georg Walch (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1896), V, 757.

29. Cf. Luther, *Enarratio in Genesim*, *op. cit.*, p. 94f.
30. ". . . coram Deo sum generatus et multiplicatus statim in principio mundi, quia hic verbum, 'Et dixit Deus: Faciamus hominem' me quoque creavit." *Ibid.*, p. 57. According to Luther, it is the creative Word that links the creation in the beginning to his own creation. "Ita Deus per verbum suum currit ab initio usque ad finem mundi." *Ibid.*
31. Haar, *op. cit.*, p. 28f., where he makes the point that a particular discussion of the "new creature" is lacking in Luther's works but that he discusses this under James 1:18. Haar refers to *WA* XVIII, 754, 12ff. and XLIV, 767, 29ff.
32. Haar, *op. cit.*, p. 52.
33. *Ibid.*, pp. 37—44, *passim*.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 55.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 19. Cf. *WA* IV, 149, 29.
36. Cf. *WA* XLVI, 616, 36ff. Haar, *op. cit.*, p. 53f., says that it is only to the Christian to whom Luther appeals not to despise God's creation.
37. "Oportet enim nos servare phrasim scripturae sanctae, et manere in verbis Spiritus sancti." Luther, *Enarratio in Genesim*, *op. cit.*, p. 23.
38. ". . . relicta ista generali notitia nobis, quod scimus, mundum cepisse et conditum esse per Deum ex nihilo. . . . In particularibus autem sunt plurima, de quibus aliquid." *Ibid.*, p. 3.
39. "Ergo discamus veram sapientiam esse in scriptura sancta et in verbo Dei. Id enim non solum de materia, non solum de forma totius creaturae sed etiam de efficienti et finali causa, de principio et de fine omnium rerum docet: Quis creaverit, et ad quid creaverit." *Ibid.*, p. 94.
40. "Discamus itaque, necesse fuisse homini sic condito, ut omnes reliquas creaturas viventes in manu haberet, ut agnosceret creatorem suum, ut ageret creatori suo gratias, ut etiam externum aliquem cultum et certum opus obedientiae haberet." *Ibid.*, p. 72.
41. "Haec igitur arbor scientiae boni et mali, seu locus, in quo magno numero huiusmodi arbores fuerunt consitae, fuisset Ecclesia, ad quam Adam cum posteritate sua die Sabbato convenisset, et post refectionem ex arbore vitae praedicasset Deum et laudasset eum pro tradito dominio omnium creaturarum super terram." *Ibid.*, p. 80.
42. "Si Adam in innocentia stetisset, tamen habuisset septimum diem sacrum, hoc est, eo die docuisset posteros de voluntate et cultu Dei, laudasset Deum, gratias egisset, obtulisset, etc." *Ibid.*, p. 60.
43. "Neque enim Deus noster tantum temporalium Deus est sed omnium. Necque tibi Deus esse aut coli volet dimidio humero aut claudicante pede, sed totis viribus totoque corde." Luther, *De Servo Arbitrio*, *op. cit.*, p. 726.
44. Pelikan, *op. cit.*, p. 16. Cf. *WA*, II, 585—7 and XXXVI, 478—696.
45. *WA* V, 38, 11ff. Quoted in Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 139.
46. Holl, *op. cit.*, pp. 61—3.
47. "Sed de uno in omnibus hominibus aequaliter impotente loquimur, quod non nisi limus, non nisi terra inculta est, ut quod non possit velle bonum." Luther, *De Servo Arbitrio*, *op. cit.*, p. 706.
48. ". . . non potest homo naturaliter velle deum esse deum, immo vellet se esse deum et deum non esse deum." *WA* I, 225. Quoted in Pelikan, *op. cit.*, p. 147, note 127.
49. Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

50. "Bona quidem est creatio, bona benedictio, sed per peccatum sic sunt haec corrupta, ut sine pudore coniuges non possint iis uti." Luther, *Enarratio in Genesim*, *op. cit.*, p. 75.
51. "Haec omnia post peccatum deformata sunt, ita ut creaturae omnes, etiam Sol et Luna quasi saccum induisse videantur, et quae prius bonae fuerunt, postea sint factae noxiae propter peccatum." *Ibid.*, p. 68.
52. Swedes like Runestam and Bohlin say that Luther's doctrine of God's omnipotence is metaphysical determinism, where Luther leaves the personal field. But another Swedish Luther scholar, Ragnar Bring, does not agree. In *Dualismen hos Luther* he sets forth the opinion that the solution lies in Luther's conception of the Law: that God's Law produces in man the devil's work. Cf. Edgar M. Carlson, *The Reinterpretation of Luther* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, c. 1948), p. 58 ff. For a full discussion of the Swedish Luther research that points to the dualistic pattern in Luther cf. *ibid.*, pp. 48—57.
53. "Gott bedient sich zwar des Teufels, um uns zu plagen und zu toedten, aber der Teufel vermag dies nicht, wenn Gott nicht wollte, dass die Suende auf diese Weise bestraft wuerde." Luther, *Auslegung des 90. Psalms*, *op. cit.*, p. 754.
54. In Paradise: "Nondum enim erat peccatum: Quia Deus peccatum non creavit." Luther, *Enarratio in Genesim*, *op. cit.*, p. 83. At the present time: "Licet enim Deus peccatum non faciat, tamen naturam peccato, subtracto spiritu, vitiatam non cessat formare et multiplicare." *De Servo Arbitrio*, *op. cit.*, p. 708.
55. "In nobis, id est, per nos Deum operari mala, non culpa Dei, sed vitio nostro, qui cum sinus natura mali, Deus vero bonus." *Ibid.*, p. 711.
56. Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 48.
57. "Haec rata et certa sunt, si credimus omnipotentem esse Deum, deinde impium esse creaturam Dei." Luther, *De Servo Arbitrio*, *op. cit.*, p. 710.
58. *Ibid.*, p. 709.
59. Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 86 where the author refers to *WA* X, 1, p. 207.
60. Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 87.
61. At least in the state of innocence. "Nulla enim pars corporis fuit sordida in statu innocentiae; non fuit foetor in excrementis, non aliae foeditates, sed omnia fuerunt pulcherrima, sine ulla offensione organorum sensuum, et tamen fuit animalis vita." Luther, *Enarratio in Genesim*, *op. cit.*, p. 84.
62. Koeberle, *op. cit.*, p. 191.
63. Concerning Eccl. 7:2, which calls the day of death better than the day of life, Luther wrote: "Si coram deo [sic] loqui vellem: qui facit nos homines et vult nos vivere, tam impiissime dicerem." *WA* XX, 125, 13 f. Quoted in Haar, *op. cit.*, p. 58.
64. Carlson mentions that the phrase "omnia bona, sed sunt in abusu" occurs frequently in Luther. Cf. Edgar M. Carlson's, "Luther's Conception of Government," *Church History*, XV (December, 1946), 270, note 52. He refers to *WA* XL, 2, p. 203, 7 and to I, 174.
65. Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 102.
66. Carlson, "Luther's Conception of Government," *op. cit.*, p. 261.
67. Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 108. Holl quotes as follows from Luther: "Vehementer enim et toto coelo errare censeo, qui philosophiam et naturae cognitionem inutilem putant theologia." *Enders* III, 245, 36.

68. Pelikan's view is that Luther's cosmology was well developed for its day and represented the best thought of the period. For additional material on this subject cf. Pelikan, *op. cit.*, p. 5 f. and p. 122, note 16. Werner Elert discusses in detail the oft-quoted passage from the *Tischreden* in which Luther condemns Copernicus. Elert points out that Luther's influence was great enough to persuade the Lutheran princes to suppress Copernicus' teachings had he wanted to. The passage so often quoted is not only the only one in which Luther refers to Copernicus, but it is highly suspect, since it first was reported twenty-seven years after it was supposed to have been spoken. Cf. Werner Elert, *Morphologie des Luthertums* (Muenchen: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1931), I, 372.
69. Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 89.
70. Cf. *St. Louis Edition* III, 1675, where Luther emphatically states that the world has no being in itself.
71. *Galatians Commentary*, 4, 8 ff. Quoted in Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 73.
72. *Ibid.*, p. 74.
73. Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 54, note 1, brings this quotation from Luther's Roemerbrief II, 19, 3 ff. ". . . in hoc ergo erraverunt, quod hanc divinitatem non nudam reliquerunt et coluerunt, sed eam mutaverunt et applicuerunt pro votis et desyderiis suis. et unusquisque divinitatem in eo esse voluit, qui sibi placeret, et sic dei veritatem mutaverunt in mendacium. cognoverunt ergo, quod divinitatis sive eius, qui est deus sit esse potentem, invisibilem, iustum, immortalem, bonum; ergo cognoverunt invisibilia dei sempiternamque virtutem eius et divinitatem. hec maior syllogismi practici, hec syntheresis theologica est inobscurabilis in omnibus. sed in minore errabant."
74. Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 74 f.
75. *Ibid.*
76. "Even the heathen have this awareness (sensus) by a natural instinct, that there is some supreme deity (numen) . . . as Paul says in Romans 1, that the Gentiles knew God by nature." *WA XLII*, 631, 36 ff. Quoted in Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 80.
77. *Ibid.*, p. 77 and p. 135.
78. "Ideo Deus quoque se non manifestat nisi in operibus et verbo, quia haec aliquo modo capiuntur. . . ." Luther, *Enarratio in Genesim*, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
79. Watson, *op. cit.*, pp. 112—4.
80. *Ibid.*, p. 115. J. Baille, in *Our Knowledge of God*, p. 178 ff., tries to do justice to both aspects of Luther's thought by calling this revelation a "mediated immediacy." Cf. Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 80.
81. "This the natural man cannot see; but the spiritual man only discerneth . . . the veil of God from God Himself. . . . But here wisdom is required, which can discern the veil from God Himself; and this wisdom the world hath not. The covetous man, hearing 'that man liveth not by bread alone' . . . eateth the bread, but he seeth not God in the bread. . . . And thus he honoreth not the Creator, but the creatures, not God, but his own belly." *Galatians Commentary*, 2, 6. Quoted in Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 80.
82. Koeberle, *op. cit.*, p. 132.
83. Stange, *op. cit.*, p. 53 f.
84. "Wer Gott erkennet, der erkennet auch die Kreatur, versteht dieselbige und hat sie auch lieb." *Erlangen Edition*, 5, 304. Quoted in Stange, *op. cit.*, p. 62.
85. Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 81. But Werner Elert, in a careful scrutiny of the relevant passages, challenges this phrase as a cardinal proof for Luther's Christmysticism. Cf. Elert, *op. cit.*, p. 152, footnote.

86. Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 40f.
87. "Deus vult formare, non formari." *WA* XIII, 39, 5. Quoted in Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 55, note 3.
88. So Gustav Aulen in *Den kristna guds bilden*, p. 244. "In a sense, the distance increases with the nearness. . . . The closer God approaches man, the more intimately He binds the bonds of fellowship, the more clearly and inescapably the distance between man and God becomes simultaneously apparent." Quoted in Carlson, *The Reinterpretation of Luther*, *op. cit.*, p. 149.
89. "Quoniam autem haec cum brutis communis generatio est, non tollit tamen illam gloriam originis nostrae primae, quod sumus vascula Dei ab ipso Deo facta, quod ipse est figulus noster, nos autem lutum eius, sicut Iesaias 64. loquitur. Idque non solum ad originem nostram attinet, sed per omnem vitam et usque ad mortem et in sepulchram manemus lutum huius Figuli." Luther, *Enarratio in Genesin*, *op. cit.*, p. 64.
90. That is Watson's conclusion, *op. cit.*, p. 96.
91. "Occupet vero sese cum Deo incarnato seu (ut Paulus loquitur) cum Ihesu crucifixo." Luther, *De Servo Arbitrio*, *op. cit.*, p. 689.
92. Obendieck, *Der Teufel bei Martin Luther*, p. 30. Quoted in Watson, *op. cit.*, p. 101, note 113.
93. "Deus est, cuius voluntatis nulla est causa nec ratio, quae illi ceu regula et mensura praescribatur, cum nihil sit illi aequale aut superius, sed ipsa est regula omnium. . . . Creaturae voluntati causa et ratio praescribitur sed non Creatoris voluntati, nisi alium illi praefereris creatorem." Luther, *De Servo Arbitrio*, *op. cit.*, p. 712.