



THE SPRINGFIELDER

October 1974
Volume 38, Number 4

A Study in Luther's Anti-Sacramentarian Writings

ARMAND JOHN BOEHME

The writer is pastor of St. Peter's Church, Muscoda, Wisconsin

THIS PAPER REPRESENTS AN ATTEMPT to show the relationship of the Word of God to the Sacrament of Holy Communion in what we have chosen to call Luther's anti-Sacramentarian writings. "Sacramentarian" is here used to signify anyone denying the real presence in the Lord's Supper.

SOME OF LUTHER'S WRITINGS REGARDING THE SACRAMENTARIANS

There are five of Luther's writings in this category, excluding his Confessional writings.

1. *The Adoration of the Sacrament*, April, 1523.¹ This work is specifically addressed to the Bohemian Brethren. They had published a catechism in 1520 which contained some statements which disturbed Luther. Yet Luther had heard many good things about the Brethren.²

Luther desired an official statement from the Brethren. In December 1522 Senior Lucas and a special delegation of the Brethren visited Wittenberg with official documents which were meant to clarify the position of the Brethren on the Sacrament of Holy Communion. Even though Luther was pleased to find that the Brethren were not in the same boat with Karlstadt and the Swiss theologians, he was still unsure as to how the Brethren interpreted the Words of Institution and their feelings on the real presence.³ Luther published this work to answer the questions of the Brethren more fully.⁴

2. *Against the Heavenly Prophets In the Matter of Images and Sacraments*, 1525.⁵ This writing is a refutation of the fanatical ideas of Luther's former colleague, Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt. Karlstadt became a leader in Wittenberg while Luther was in seclusion at the Wartburg.⁶ Karlstadt, along with Zwilling, undertook the removal of all images, pictures, statues, crucifixes, and even music from the church.⁷ These were to be abolished because they were too closely connected with the Roman Mass. Luther returned from exile to calm the ensuing riots. This he did by preaching what are now known as the Eight Wittenberg Sermons.⁸ Zwilling repented and was given another church. Karlstadt was sent to Orlamünde.⁹ Here he continued his attack on the Romanist influences in the Sacrament of Holy Communion and began even to attack the real presence and infant baptism.¹⁰ Karlstadt was expelled from Saxony in 1524 because of his incendiary views. He then became a professor at Basel. Luther challenged Karlstadt to state his views publicly in writing.¹¹ In response, Karlstadt wrote eight tracts: five on the Lord's Supper, one on weak consciences, one on the nature of faith and unbelief, and one opposing infant baptism. Zwingli had already disseminated his views on the sacrament when Karlstadt pub-

lished his treatises. Luther, realizing how akin Karlstadt was to Zwingli, felt compelled to refute the former's treatises.¹²

3. *The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ—Against the Fanatics*, in 1526.¹³ This writing is actually a recording of three sermons¹¹ given by Luther in preparation for Easter Sunday Mass in 1526.¹⁵ That these sermons were published is due to numerous events. Zwingli's ideas on the sacraments first appeared publicly in 1524. John Bugenhagen undertook a refutation of Zwingli's ideas. Though Luther wrote several letters to congregations in refutation of Zwingli's views, he undertook no public refutation of Zwingli at this time.

In January, 1526, Luther wrote a preface to the Swabian *Syngramma*, a writing composed by Brenz in refutation of the position of Oecolampadius. Luther also wrote a more emphatic preface to the German edition of the Swabian *Syngramma* in September 1526, because the Swiss had claimed Luther's assent to their ideas.

Also in September 1526, Luther was having published by John Herwagen the German edition of his *Exposition of the Epistles and Gospels*. During the process of publication, the translator, Martin Bucer, seems to have been converted to Zwingli's view of the sacraments. Therefore, in the fourth volume of the translation, Bucer presented the Swiss view in refutation of Luther. Luther protested vehemently and demanded that any future editions also include his letter of protest against this procedure.

Almost simultaneously, Luther's attention was called to a writing from Leo Jud, a friend of Zwingli and Oecolampadius, which tried to place Luther in agreement with the Swiss view of the sacraments.

The Lutherans recognized the need for immediate and swift reply. Luther, however, was occupied with many other heavy burdens and could not find the time to write a detailed refutation of the Swiss. Luther's followers, therefore, published these sermons to show how Luther had warned his congregation against the fanatics. This writing touched off the battle on the sacraments between Luther and the Swiss.¹⁶

4. *That These Words of Christ, "This Is My Body," etc., Still Stand Firm Against the Fanatics*, in 1527.¹⁷ This treatise was a reply to the more than thirty writings attacking the Lutheran position on the Lord's Supper between 1524 and 1527. Luther treated all of these writers as being in the same camp—the devil's. Luther, therefore, did not refute each of the writings against the Lutheran position individually. Yet though he lumps them all together, he still alludes to eleven of these writings.¹⁸ For Luther, the very heart of the Gospel was at stake. Of the five, this treatise is the clearest definition of Luther's doctrine of the Word of God and its relationship to the Sacrament.

5. *Confession Concerning Christ's Supper*, in 1528.¹⁹ This was a refutation of four writings attacking the Lutheran position on the Lord's Supper, three by Zwingli and one by Oecolampadius. Among the Swiss points was the assertion that faith is the only way to receive Christ; bodily eating and drinking add nothing. In fact,

the Swiss claimed that the bodily eating and drinking corrupt the purity of faith. Christ could only be allowed a mental or spiritual presence in the Lord's Supper. Lutherans were faulted for stating:

- 1) that Christ's body, naturally eaten in the sacrament, strengthens faith;
- 2) that it also forgives sins;
- 3) that Christ's body is naturally brought into the sacrament by the reciting of the words of institution;
- 4) that the gospel is appropriated by the recipient and the body and blood of Christ bestowed on him;²⁰
- 5) that Christ's body is everywhere, like his divinity.²¹

Here in this work, Luther defined and explained the ubiquity of Christ's body.

However, to say that this controversy was a result of disregard for God and the Bible by one party and high regard by the other would be entirely false.

Both insisted that the Scriptures are the only sure tangible seat of authority in the church. Both insisted that Scripture must be interpreted by Scripture, not by external norms. Both Luther and the Swiss were profoundly devoted to the study of the Scriptures. When Zwingli attacked some views of Luther as "absurd," he tried to make it clear that he meant not absurd to human reason primarily, but incompatible with Scripture and the Creed; each of them insisted that the other was mis-using reason and importing it into Scripture.²²

Where then did the differences arise? To understand the difference fully, we must understand the reasons behind the ideas of the Sacramentarians.

ZWINGLI AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SACRAMENTARIANS

Ulrich Zwingli came to be Luther's main opponent in this controversy. This section will be an explanation of Zwingli's understanding of the Sacrament, which basically was the position of most of the rest of the Sacramentarians: Karlstadt, Oecolampadius, Hoen, and many others.

Zwingli held to the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation until 1523, but being of the humanistic persuasion, it seems he did not take it very seriously.²³ Even though he did not take this doctrine seriously—and may even have spiritualized it—he seemed, as he first became a reformer, to have no desire to give up the Real Presence. He also excluded a figurative understanding of the Eucharist.

Zwingli first criticized the Roman Mass in January of 1523. By June, he began to attack transubstantiation, but still maintained the real presence. However,

. . . it is not that Presence which Luther taught. Zwingli's view at that time was: The believer eats Christ, who otherwise is in heaven, seated at the right hand of the Father, but who

miraculously descends in this sacrament. How this is possible, no one knows. By an inscrutable miracle Christ enters the soul of the believer.²⁴

Zwingli was unable to conceptualize any actual relationship between the elements and Christ's body and blood. He was also vague about what the unbelievers receive, since the believer receives Christ in the sacrament only by faith.

Zwingli, then, in his early stages held the widespread view of most of the humanist clergy of his day. But this early stage was soon supplanted. The Dutch humanist Cornelius Hoen, or Honius, had written and circulated a letter in which he explained his view on the Lord's Supper. Luther received this document in 1521. Zwingli, however, did not receive it until 1524.²⁵ Hoen took up an older position which had been extant in the church since the twelfth century and can be seen in the writings of Berengan,²⁶ Gansfort,²⁷ and John Wycliffe.²⁸ Hoen's ideas were the following:

(1) Contrary to the idolatrous Roman Catholic opinion, the Lord's Supper is in essence a visible reminder to trust Christ's promise (just as a ring is a pledge from a bridegroom to his bride). (2) The key to the words of institution, "This is my body," is John 6, where our Lord made it plain that *faith* is the spiritual eating and drinking of his body and blood; no material *body* of Christ is present in the sacrament. (3) Matt. 24:23 and 1 Cor. 10:16 also show that the Roman Catholic notion of a bodily presence is absurd. (4) The words therefore must be understood *figuratively*: "This *signifies* (or *represents*) my body." (5) The verb "is" in Scripture is often meant figuratively, e.g. Matt. 11:14, I Cor. 10:4, the "I am" passages in John, and Gen. 41:26, etc. (6) A bodily presence in the Lord's Supper contradicts the Apostles' Creed, in the article of Christ's ascension; he removed his bodily presence for our good, John 16:7. (7) No recourse to "miracle" is justifiable, for the miracles Christ performed were not contrary to sense experience.²⁹

Zwingli wholeheartedly accepted all of Hoen's ideas. But he combined them with one which he borrowed from Karlstadt in 1524, an idea popular in Augustinian circles, that "Christ's body is in heaven and cannot, therefore, at the same time be in the bread."³⁰

Zwingli came to regard three passages of Scripture as his greatest tools in the controversy:

John 6:63 ("the flesh profiteth nothing"), Exodus 12:11, ("This is the Lord's Passover"), the passage that occurred to him in a dream as a sort of revelation, and Matthew 26:11 ("Me ye have not always").³¹

Zwingli readily accepted his ideas, because they were simple and clear. For to Zwingli "clarity was always a mark of the Word of God . . ."³² Zwingli further held that

. . . faith is spiritual in that it is drawn away from created things

to the Creator and Savior. It must have no earthly thing for its object. Body and spirit are mutually exclusive. Hence our faith ought not be drawn even to Christ's body, for this too is creaturely and space-bound; it is Christ's divinity alone which saves us. We cannot speak of a "spiritual body," for such an idea is as absurd as "watery fire" or "wooden iron." Nor can the sacrament have been instituted to provide a bodily eating of Christ's body. Such a notion is absurd even to Scripture and the Creed, and even if it were not, it would be useless. The purpose of the sacrament, therefore, is to lift our faith, by remembrance of the breaking of Christ's body for us on the cross, to heaven, where he sits bodily at the right hand of God—or, to express the thought otherwise, as Zwingli did especially in his later writings, to offer us Christ's spiritual presence. Zwingli denies that this conception separates the two natures of Christ in a Nestorian way. It only recognizes, interpreting Scripture by Scripture, that much of the language of the Bible is figurative. Through John 6 we discern the simple and natural sense of Christ's words: offering his disciples bread, a symbol, he says, "This is my body"; by a figure of speech, in which Christ speaks of his human nature but really has in mind the divine, he summons them to partake of his saving divinity by faith. According to this approach, moreover, "nothing about faith is absurd, if only you rightly believe." Faith is not forced credulity, negating our God, who leads us into light, not darkness, "does not set before us many incomprehensible things" to believe.

At every point Luther vigorously disagreed.³³

BACKGROUND OF LUTHER'S POSITION

To understand Luther's position, it seems absolutely necessary to speak of his *theologia crucis*.³⁴ "Man must learn to find God in the masks He has chosen to clothe himself." God's revelations were masks that were ". . . appeals neither to reason nor to common sense."³⁵ These masks of God's revelations seems to hide the true meaning of what was really happening. God's revelation at times contradicted man's reason. Christ is the greatest revelation of God.³⁷ God hides in events like Communion, the Incarnation, Baptism, the Crucifixion and in this way reveals himself to us.

This is a great basic difference between Zwingli and Luther. Zwingli equates God's revelation with what is reasonable to man. Luther states that God reveals himself through actions that seem unreasonable. The results of their biblical exegesis can then be expected to be miles apart.

In 1520, Luther already had rejected John 6 as referring to the Lord's Supper.³⁸ And in the same work (*The Babylonian Captivity of the Church*), he stated that ". . . there remain two records which deal, and that very clearly with this subject, viz.: the gospel passages on the Lord's Supper, and St. Paul in I Corinthians 11."³⁹ Luther, as early as 1520, stood on the clear texts of Scripture which show the real presence in the Lord's Supper. Zwingli and the rest

of the Sacramentarians, however, saw the texts of the words of Institution as figurative and unclear, because they conflicted with reason and so tried to interpret them with John 6 or other parts of Scripture, which they considered reasonable and clear.

THE PLACE OF THE WORD IN LUTHER'S ARGUMENTATION

This element of Luther's thought is summed up in this passage from *The Adoration of the Sacrament*:

. . . the chief and foremost thing in the sacrament is the word of Christ, when he says: "*Take and eat, this is my body which is given for you.*" Likewise also, when he took the cup, he said: "*Take and drink of it, all of you, this is the cup of the new testament in my blood which is shed for you for the forgiveness of sins. As often as you do this, do it in remembrance of me.*"

Everything depends on these words. Every Christian should and must know them and hold them fast. He must never let anyone take them away from him by any other kind of teaching, even though it were an angel from heaven [Gal. 1:8].⁴⁰

Luther went on to mention two ways of honoring the Word. The one is external—the ostentatious kind of honor. But ". . . the proper honor for the Word is nothing else than a genuine faith from the bottom of one's heart, a faith that holds the Word to be true, that trusts it and stakes its life on it for eternity."⁴¹ Luther began every one of the five works mentioned with a discussion of the texts of the Words of Institution—how they must be trusted, how they are clear, how the devil attempts to twist God's clear Word with false ideas!

In his first work, Luther already warned the Brethren against a figurative interpretation of the text:

Now beware of such a view. Let go of reason and intellect; for they strive in vain to understand how flesh and blood can be present, and because they do not grasp it they refuse to believe it. Lay hold on the word which Christ speaks: "Take, this is my body, this is my blood." One must not do such violence to the words of God as to give to any word a meaning other than its natural one, unless there is clear and definite Scripture to do that. This is what is done by those who without any basis in Scripture take the word "is" and forcibly twist it to mean the same as the word "signifies." They sneer at Christ's statement: "This is my body," and say it is equivalent to: "This signifies my body," and so forth. But we should and will simply stick to the words of Christ—he will not deceive us—and repel this error with no other sword than the fact that Christ does not say: "This signifies my body," but "This is my body."

For if we permit such violence to be done in one passage, that without any basis in Scripture a person can say the word "is" means the same as the word "signifies," then it would be impossible to stop it in any other passage. The entire Scripture would be nullified, since there would be no good rea-

son why such violence should be valid in one passage but not in all passages . . . See what a horrible mess this would lead to. Therefore, since such violence cannot be allowed in other passages of Scripture, it cannot be allowed here either . . .⁴²

Luther rather cautions all that every word in the Bible should be understood according to its natural meaning unless Scripture or the analogy of faith compels one to proceed another way.⁴³

Man's reason cannot force Scripture to an interpretation contrary to the clear meaning of the words. Luther went on to say:

. . . this is not Christian teaching, when I introduce my own ideas into the Scripture and compel Scripture to accord with them. On the contrary, the Christian way is to make clear first what the Scriptures teach and then compel my own ideas to accord with them.⁴⁴

Luther continued by stating that believing Christians are not "commanded to know how God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, or how the soul of Christ is in the sacrament."⁴⁵ Rather Christians are to believe God's Word when it states that the Lord's body and blood are there.⁴⁶

Even though Luther was not able to explain fully everything about the Lord's Supper, and there are things that clearly violate and conflict with reason, he does not surrender what the Words of Institution clearly say. For Luther knew ". . . full well that the Word of God cannot lie, and it says that the body and blood of Christ are in the sacrament."⁴⁷ Luther tied the Words of Institution so very closely with the Sacrament that if the words are not there—neither is there a sacrament.⁴⁸ Since the Word makes the Sacrament effective, to doubt God's Word would make it ineffective. This is true not only of the Words of Institution, but of *any* Word of God. Doubt of God's Word causes one to lose the Gospel.

Neither does it help them to assert that at all other points they have a high and noble regard for God's words and the entire gospel, except in this matter. My friend, God's Word is God's Word; this point does not require much haggling! When one blasphemously gives the lie to God in a single word, or says it is a minor matter if God is blasphemed or called a liar, one blasphemes the entire God and makes light of all blasphemy. There is only one God who does not permit himself to be divided, praised at one place and chided at another, glorified in one word and scorned in another. The Jews believe the Old Testament, but because they do not believe Christ, it does them no good. You see, the circumcision of Abraham [Gen. 12:10ff.] is now an old dead thing and no longer necessary or useful. But if I were to say that God did not command it in its time, it would do me no good even if I believed the gospel.⁴⁹

For Luther then, more than the sacrament was at stake. God's Word also was threatened. And Luther believed that God's Word was

the *only* way of knowing God. Man cannot have the Spirit work in him without the outward Word being present.⁵⁰

I should like to know, however, where they get the idea that there is a God, that God's Son is man, that one must believe, and all the other articles of our faith, which of course have never occurred to reason. Did they get these ideas from the Spirit before they physically and outwardly heard or read them? Here they must say No, I know full well, for they got them through the material outward Word and Scripture. Then how can this outward Word, through which the Holy Spirit is given with all his gifts, be of no avail? Oh, in their blind arrogance they think they have Christ at the right hand of God, locked up in a closet, and do not believe that he is present in his Word and in the outward things of which his Word speaks.⁵¹

To disbelieve the Word (whether the Words of Institution or any other words of God), then, is to disbelieve Christ, the Father, or the Holy Spirit.

Our adversary says that mere bread and wine are present, not the body and blood of the Lord. If they believe and teach wrongly here, then they blaspheme God and are giving the lie to the Holy Spirit, betray Christ, and seduce the world. One side must be of the devil, and God's enemy . . . Now let every faithful Christian see whether . . . God's Word is to be trifled with . . . But a faithful Christian knows clearly that God's Word concerns God's glory, the Spirit, Christ, grace, everlasting life, death, sin, and all things.⁵²

Since Christ is so intimately connected with God's Word, to say God's Word is false says that Christ is false.

Nor does it help them to boast that they rightly teach and praise Christ in other subjects. For he who deliberately denies, blasphemes, and desecrates Christ in one subject or article cannot correctly teach or honor him at any other point; it is sheer hypocrisy and deception, however impressive its appearance. For this is the way it is: one either loses Christ completely, or has him completely.⁵³

To say that God's Word could be false would cast a dark shadow over God's glory.

God is truthful; what he says he can do and does, Ps. 33:4. Since he says here, "This is my body," and refers with the word "this" to the bread, as the fanatics admit, his body must necessarily be present. The need for God to maintain his glory is an important matter, for he boasts that he is truthful and faithful . . . Faith in God's Word is necessary for us, because it has been spoken in order that we should believe it, and God wills and demands of us to have faith where his Word is.⁵⁴

The fanatic Sacramentarians tried to prove their interpreta-

tion of the Lord's Supper by stating that God's Word was contradictory.⁵⁵ Luther stated that though man's reason might think God's Word contradictory, in reality it is not, for Scripture cannot be at variance with itself.

Even Luther's argumentation for the ubiquity of Christ's body—though very philosophical in flavor in his *Confession Concerning Christ's Supper*—is still totally based on Scripture.⁵⁶ Without clear irrefutable proof in Holy Scripture, Luther could not have argued as he did.

The fanatics not only tried figurative interpretations of the Words of Institution, but arbitrarily changed words in the biblical text—the most notable example is Oecolampadius' treatment of John 6:63, "Flesh is of no avail. . ." ⁵⁷ Oecolampadius said "flesh" here meant Christ's flesh. Luther replied:

Now, however, since he does not say here, "my flesh is of no avail," but simply, "Flesh is of no avail," you really find yourself in trouble and distress, because you must prove it means Christ's flesh here. There is a very great difference between Christ's flesh and ordinary flesh. When we ask you point blank and challenge you, "who commanded you to alter and amend the text, and make 'my flesh' out of 'flesh'?" you must become speechless.⁵⁸

Luther not only held the Words of Institution as biblical texts that could not be tampered with, figuratively interpreted, or changed at will, but he also felt that the rest of the Bible could not be tampered with either. To tamper with the text in any way elevates the creature above the Creator and leads to grave sin and error.

. . . Well then, even if we could not show how it is useful and necessary for Christ's body to be in the bread, should God's Word for that reason be false, or be twisted around according to our notion? A faithful, God-fearing heart does this: it asks first whether it is God's Word. When it hears that it is, it smothers with hands and feet the question why it is useful or necessary. For it says with fear and humility, "My dear God, I am blind; truly I know not what is useful or necessary for me, nor do I wish to know, but I believe and trust that Thou dost know best and dost intend the best in thy divine goodness and wisdom. I am satisfied and happy to hear thy simple Word and perceive thy will."

But those who are possessed with devilish arrogance invert this procedure and, by asking why it is useful and necessary, try to smother God's Word. They boldly set themselves on the judgment seat, summon God to the bar to give an account of his Word, and ask the poor defendant why he chooses and uses such words, and why it is useful and necessary to do and say these things. If he does not show their use and necessity, they immediately take him away and crucify him as a malefactor, and then boast with the Jews that they have the sure truth and have rendered service to God. Isn't it horrible

to hear this? This is where one comes out when one tries to treat God's Word according to men's fancy.⁵⁹

The other argument which they bring up is that it is not necessary. So Christ has to let himself be taken to school and taught by them. The Holy Spirit hasn't hit it right . . . Do you wish to instruct God as to what is necessary and unnecessary, and have him decide according to your notions? It is better for us to reverse this and say: God wishes it thus, therefore your notions are false. Who are you, that you dare to speak against that which God regards as necessary? You are a liar, and therefore God is true. Rom. 3:4.⁶⁰

Luther believed that the Holy Spirit, through the written Word of God, brought light into a dark world through clear passages of Holy Scripture.

The holy doctors follow the practice, in expounding the Scriptures, of using diverse and clear passages to clarify the obscure and ambiguous passages. It is also the Holy Spirit's practice to illumine the darkness with light. But our fanatics proceed the other way around: they tear out of a text an obscure, ambiguous word which pleases their fancy, ignore the context, and then run around trying to use it to make a lucid, clear text obscure and ambiguous, and then claim that it is the pure truth. This is the method of the devil, who is a lord of darkness and tries with darkness to extinguish the light.⁶¹

Luther took the Sacramentarians to task many times for their diverse unity.⁶² The Sacramentarians united because they all denied the real presence. However, they could not agree among themselves how the Words of Institution and other texts should be interpreted. But they claimed that the Holy Spirit had led them to all their diverse conclusions. Luther replied:

If I attack their disunity and uncertainty, he replies in terms of diversity, just as if diversity and disunity were the same thing. I ask: How is it that their interpretations and meanings are not only diverse but also discordant and contradictory? and he answers: It is not wrong for them to be diverse. We are supposed to be satisfied with that, and confess our error, and acknowledge their faith as correct! When will we be given an explanation, how the disunity in such diversity can come from the Holy Spirit? . . . Images would not hinder us. But disunity in interpretation and expression—that is the very devil.⁶³

The Holy Spirit cannot create such disunity and diversity, since for Luther, "the Holy Spirit neither lies nor errs nor doubts."⁶⁴

It is evident that Luther tied the Word and sacraments together so tightly that, without God's Word, there could be no sacrament. To ensure the efficacy of what was promised in the sacrament, God's Word must be trustworthy and trusted. Luther saw that doubt of any part of the Bible could very easily lead to doubting all

of it. Thus, the individual Christian could be led to doubt the forgiveness of sins given in the sacrament of Holy Communion. For if God's Word were false in any other place, it could also be false here. We conclude, therefore, that, in reality, the Sacramentarian controversy was also a controversy over God's Word. For the Sacrament can only be lost when the Word is lost through faulty interpretation or doubt.

FOOTNOTES

1. Helmut Lehman, ed., *Luther's Works* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press), XXXVI, pp. 269-305.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 271.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 272.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 273.
5. *LW*, XL, pp. 73-223.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 75.
7. Roland Bainton, *Here I Stand* (New York: Abingdon, 1950), pp. 207-208.
8. *LW*, XL, p. 75.
9. Bainton, p. 214.
10. *Ibid.*, pp. 258-259.
11. *LW*, XL, p. 75.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 76.
13. *LW*, XXXVI, pp. 329-361.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 333.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 331.
16. *LW*, XXXVI, pp. 332-333.
17. *LW*, XXXVII, pp. 3-150.
18. *LW*, XXXVII, pp. 5-11.
19. *LW*, XXXVII, pp. 151-372.
20. *LW*, XXXVII, p. 183.
21. *LW*, XXXVII, p. 155.
22. *LW*, XXXVII, p. xvii.
23. Herman Sasse, *This is My Body* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1959), p. 120.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 121.
25. *LW*, XXXVII, p. xii.
26. Sasse, pp. 31ff.
27. *Ibid.*, pp. 122ff.
28. *Ibid.*, pp. 56ff.
29. *LW*, XXXVII, p. xii; see also Sasse, pp. 123-125.
30. Sasse, p. 126.
31. *Ibid.*
32. *Ibid.*, p. 127.
33. *LW*, XXXVII, p. xviii.
34. Heino O. Kadai, ed., *Accents in Luther's Theology* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1967), p. 231.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 240.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 244.
37. Paul Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), p. 26.
38. John Dillenberger, *Martin Luther, Selections From His Writings* (New York: Anchor Books, 1961), p. 256.

Ibid., p. 257.

LW, XXXVI, p. 277.

LW, XXXVI, pp. 278-279.

LW, XXXVI, pp. 279-280.

LW, XXXVI, p. 281; XXXVII, p. 32; XL, pp. 157, 170.

LW, XXXVI, p. 283; see also XXXVI, pp. 343ff; XL, pp. 153-154.

LW, XXXVI, p. 297.

LW, XXXVI, p. 337.

LW, XL, p. 176.

LW, XXXVI, p. 295; XL, pp. 212-214.

. LW, XXXVII, p. 26.

. LW, XL, pp. 146-149.

. LW, XXXVII, p. 137.

. LW, XXXVII, p. 26.

. LW, XXXVII, p. 131.

. LW, XXXVII, pp. 139-140.

. LW, XXXVII, pp. 46-51.

. LW, XXXVII, pp. 55-78; 203-235.

. LW, XXXVII, p. 78.

. LW, XXXVII, p. 79; see also, p. 176.

. LW, XXXVII, pp. 128-129.

. LW, XXXVI, pp. 343-344.

.. LW, XXXVII, p. 112.

. LW, XXXVII, pp. 164ff.

. LW, XXXVII, pp. 167-168; see also, pp. 194, 287ff.

f. LW, XXXVII, p. 279.