Concordia Theological Monthly

Volume 24 Article 53

9-1-1953

The Incarnation and the Lord's Supper in Luther

Norman Nagel
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Concordia Theological Monthly

VOL. XXIV SEPTEMBER, 1953 NO. 9

The Incarnation and the Lord's Supper in Luther

By NORMAN NAGEL

The author received his collegiate and early theological training at Concordia College, Parksdale, South Australia, and completed his theological studies at Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., 1953, with the B. D. degree. He served his internship in London, England, and has accepted a call to the London parish. — ED.

THE ways of God to men are one. Despite the paradox of Law and Gospel, despite His myriad providence, despite our wondering and paltry understanding, we may yet discern a unity in the way in which the holy God deals with us. It is the way of His grace, of which Christ is the archetype and the Lord's Supper the consequent and continuing form.

It will be the attempt of this paper to set forth some of the aspects of the parallel between God's dealing with us in Christ and Christ's dealing with us in His Supper as grasped and expressed by Luther, especially in the controversies concerning the Lord's Supper in the 1520's.

With Luther we must begin with God. This, however, is exactly what we as natural men are anxious not to do. Yet God cannot be escaped. We are haunted and hounded by the dread of Him to whom we are responsible, before whom we are guilty, and who yet remains the hidden, the holy God. What knowledge we have of Him can only make us fear. Of God in and for Himself we can know nothing.[1] Reason with natural knowledge can know that there are God, right, wrong, and retribution. This helps nothing; nor does man's aspiration to understand.

> The philosophers dispute and make speculative inquiry concerning God, and they arrive at some sort of notion just as Plato had an intuition and recognition of a divine government. How-

> ever, all this is objectively such that there is none of that knowledge . . . which heals, which rejoices and which succors in afflictions. This Plato cannot manage. He remains in his metaphysical knowledge like a cow boggling at a new door.[2]

God does not suffer Himself to be seized and pressed into a pattern of man's making. All static conditions and human categories are shattered by the living God.[3] This God, as Luther knew Him, is set forth in *De Servo Arbitrio,* a writing Luther never wished to alter. Here God is characterized as Will and Action, and these are one.[4] God as such is subject to neither circumscription nor prescription.

> God is He whose will is without cause or logic which prescribe to Him rule or measure, for nothing is equal or superior to Him, but He Himself is the Rule of all things. If there were any rule or measure or cause or logic for Him, then a will of God would be impossible. It is not that God is or was bound to will in such a way and in this way willed what is right. On the contrary, that which He does is right because He wills it.[5]

This baffling will of the *deus absconditus* is *occulta et metuenda voluntas.*[6] This is more than frightening. God is a consuming fire,[7] *nihil ad nos,* and also requiring fear and adoration.[8]

This reduces man to the *punctum mathematicum* and its despair. Νυνὶ δέ, as St. Paul would say, there is not only the *deus absconditus,* but also the *deus revelatus,* and this is the *deus incarnatus.* Here is Luther's *Alpha* and *Omega.* This is the fountainhead of his entire theology. All derives from this, all is consequent with this, that God was made man.

> It is this article and no other that makes a Christian. When this one is lost, all the others are no help; and by this we are also set apart from all false Christians and saints.[9]

Only when we take the Incarnation just as seriously as Luther will we be able to move toward a proper understanding and evaluation of his theology in general and of his treatment of the Lord's Supper in particular.

Luther distinguishes between "Gott inwendig in der Gottheit, auszer und über der Kreatur, und Gott, auswendig der Gottheit, in der Kreatur." [10] Yet the transcendent and immanent Creator is still the *deus absconditus,* and in His creation we see only His honor

and majesty.[11] Man cannot know God,[12] and it is arrogant rebellion to attempt to know God in Himself.[13] Man cannot move or climb toward God. The only hope is that God come to man, that the *deus absconditus* become the *deus revelatus.* This God did in the Incarnation. In Christ alone can God be known.

> If you want to hit and grasp everything that God is and does and has in mind, then look nowhere else but where He Himself has put and placed it. Hence a Christian is to know no other seeking and finding of God than is in the bosom of the Virgin and on the cross, or as Christ reveals Himself in the Word.[14]
>
> You must not forget . . . that we do not go beyond this man, and we know that God speaks, does, and gives everything through Him. Hence we seek both God's Word and work in Christ. As Christ confronts you, deals with you, promises, draws, comforts, bears, and gives, even so does the Father. In short, you cannot see nor hear aught of Christ, but you see and hear the Father Himself.[15]

Luther's Christology was traditional and catholic.[16] However, delineation of his Christology is not here our task. Because of subsequent relevance we shall here try only to emphasize with what entire seriousness Luther took the Incarnation.

Of vital importance for our purpose, for Luther, and altogether for that matter, is the way in which God comes to man, that is, the Incarnation way. He came so close He could not come closer, for He became a man.[17] God became a creature.[18] He became a part of time and place. God was born of a Jewish maid and slept on straw in a stable in Bethlehem in the days of Herod the King. *Deus revelatus et incarnatus* is seen and touched and heard. God came to us as and where we are and made Himself knowable to us. This is the only way. Any attempt to rise above our creatureliness, of which God has made Himself a part, is to remove oneself from the only place and way of knowing God. "Ausser Christo, kein Gott."[19] "Ausser diesem Menschen kein Gott ist."[20]

> You are not to ascend to God, but begin where He began: in His mother's womb, *factus homo et factus,* and forbid every inclination to speculate.[21]
>
> The divine nature is too high and incomprehensible for us; therefore for our good He betook Himself into that nature which is best of all known to us, into our own. There it is His wish to await us, there He would be found and nowhere else. Whoever

> calls to Him there is immediately heard. Here is the Throne of Grace, where no one who comes is excluded. Those who would have Him dwell elsewhere, and nevertheless wish to serve and call upon Him who made heaven and earth, already have their answer in Ps. 17 (18), where it says of them: They call, and no one will help them; they cry to God, and He does not hear them.[22]

"Averte ergo oculos a maiestate dei et converte ad humanitatem eius in gremio matris iacentem."[23] Luther rejoiced to emphasize the utter humanity of Christ. It is impossible to make Christ too human; the more human, the more sure hope.[24] Luther's Christmas sermons and hymns depict most apprehendably the complete humanity of Christ and also the wonder that in this Baby we confront God.

> Des ew'gen Vaters einig Kind jetzt man in der Krippen findt;
> In unser armes Fleisch und Blut verkleidet sich das ewig Gut.
> Kyrieleis.
>
> Den aller Welt Kreis nie beschlosz, der liegt in Marien Schosz;
> Er ist ein Kindlein worden klein, der alle Ding' erhält allein.
> Kyrieleis.[25]

When God comes as a Baby to Luther, he worships with humble simplicity as a man. He does not impudently strive to leave the place to which God has come to meet him. We see his vivid, personal, and creaturely apprehension when he declares that when he hears God's Word,

> It is impossible for me not to make pictures of it in my heart. Whether I want to or not, when I hear Christ, there is in my heart the picture of a man who hangs on the cross, just as naturally as my face is reflected in water when I look into it.[26]

However offended we may be by a God who so humbles Himself for us, we may not say that the Incarnation is unworthy of God.

> Whether it is to God's shame or honor that God became a man we should not make great disputation. Indeed, we should with an eager heart take hold of this, that it has happened for me, for my good and comfort, and from our hearts give God thanks.[27]

God has His honor in the opposite of what men call honor. Men gauge their honor by the number of men that they have serving them; God has His honor in that He became the humble, suffering Servant of all men. The deeper the humiliation, the higher the honor.

> Our God has His honor in this, that for our sakes He gave Himself to the utmost depth, into flesh and blood, in our mouth, heart, and bosom, and for this reason for our sakes He suffers and is contemptuously handled both on cross and altar.[28]

It follows from this that whoever would diminish the descent of God to man and things robs God of His honor. Hence Luther does not minimize the condescension, and with glad and grateful heart he glorifies the inexpressible grace.

> How could the High Majesty be more deeply humbled that our poor flesh and blood be honored and be elevated by His divine honor and power than in His lowering Himself into this our nature and becoming one of the human race. Such an honor has not even been given an angel (Heb. 2:16)![29]

We tell ourselves that it does not make sense. Of course it does not make sense.

> Oh, it is a laughable thing that the One God, the High Majesty, should become a man! Here they both come together, Creator and creature, in one Person. Here reason with all its powers objects that this Person should at the same time be a man, born of woman by a true and natural birth, truly flesh and blood with all members and everything that makes up a man (yet without sin); that He is born on earth of woman, nursed, clothed, tended as by an ordinary mother, is rocked, carried, given food and drink, and so on — everything just as any other baby. Here we are to become such fools and so blind as to take captive our reason and say that this same Man is in very truth God, and apart from Him there is no God. Where this Baby lies, whether in the cradle, in its mother's arms, or at her breast, there is God essentially and personally. . . . Hence here one must, contrary to all reason and sense, simply cling to the words revealed from heaven: "This is My beloved Son," etc.[30]

If God says it is so, it is so, and there is no further doubt.

Nor may we ask what is the use of Christ's humanity. The question is rather to be reversed, for

> God without flesh is useless. Upon the flesh of Christ, upon that Infant clinging to the bosom of the Virgin, you are to set your eyes and simply with steadfast heart say: "I have neither in heaven nor earth a God, nor do I know one, outside this flesh, which is gently enfolded in the bosom of the Virgin Mary." When

> you say this, there is no danger that you will fall away from God or your mind be distressed with terror or desperate fear. By every other way God is incomprehensible; only in the flesh of Christ is He comprehensible.[31]

The personal union is such as to make it unthinkable for Christ to be operative apart from His humanity.

> You are to know nothing of God or the Son of God except as "born of the Virgin Mary" and become a man, as the Christian creed tells. If any would separate Him from the Son of God and put a wall between God's Son and the Son of Mary the Virgin, do not accept such a preacher, do not listen to him, but say: "I know of no God or Son of God but the One of whom the Christian creed tells. If He is not the Man born of Mary, I will have none of Him." If you but humble yourself and cling with your heart to the words and stay by the humanity of Christ, you will surely find the Godhead, and the Father and the Holy Ghost and the whole Godhead will take hold of you. This article will not let you go wrong.[32]

Despite his emphasis on the humanity and his rejection of any transmutation of the human into the divine, Luther abhors the suggestion that Christ is merely man. "Die Menschheit allein wäre kein nütze."[33] He gave bold and unequivocal emphasis to both poles of the paradox of the Incarnation. He did not care to attempt to range them into adjusted harmony or neat formulation. That was left to his successors, and it is surely significant that the men both of Wittenberg and Württemberg claimed full loyalty to him. For Luther the humanity meant first and last the way of God to man.

God Incarnate was seen, touched, and heard by men. Now, however, we cannot see, touch, or hear Him. God came to us as Man, but of what use is that fact to us if the Man has gone? The necessary consequence of the Incarnation and the Ascension is that the λόγος ἔνσαρκὸς be also the λόγος ἐγγραφός. The steps are these: Scripture confronts us with Mary's Son; in Mary's Son we are confronted by God. Remove one of these, and we are lost, for then God is lost to us.

We begin with the spoken or written words, but these have their significance in leading us to the Man born in Bethlehem, in whom we are confronted by God.

> "The Word was made flesh," i.e., God became a man. This wonderful and more than wonderful thing is the entire and sole teaching of this Book, the Bible. No other book knows anything of this. Now, if in this Book you do not seek the Word made flesh, you may just as well read fairy stories. Everything has to do with this Word that was made flesh and that was written. It is the Lord who lies in the manger and in Mary's arms. Whoever does not believe this truth, to him this Book is utterly useless.[34]

"Gott mag nit funden werden denn durch und ynn diszer menschheyt." [35] "Wo Gottes Wort ist, da ist Christus." [36] This is the way God comes to us, and no less really when it is spoken today than He came centuries ago in Palestine.

Luther had no care for the delineation of the "how" of all these things; he built all on fact: God is dealing with us in Jesus of Nazareth, who meets us in Scripture. Reason may not intrude with impudent inquiry. Any diminution of the wonder of what was begun in the stable of Bethlehem is a threat to our salvation. Certainty of salvation is a matter of life and death for Luther. Therefore with all the vehement energy of his faith he contended against every attempt to remove Christ. In the defense of his faith, his salvation, Luther's Christology became more explicit; but it did not change. We have therefore quoted him quite unchronologically. If there was anything constant in Luther it was this conviction. Already 1514 shows clear adumbration and 1519 certain statement.[37]

To Luther the Incarnation says:

> He has brought Himself down into our flesh and blood, and for this alone, that He might pour out the measureless wealth of His goodness and rescue us from sin, death, Satan, hell, and every evil.[38]
>
> Everyone that believes has this consolation and declares: "God is my God, He puts on my flesh, becomes as I am, bears my calamity, yet without sin." Yet faith must go on further. When God is fashioned into this bawling boy, it declares: "He could not come closer. This goes beyond all brotherhood or family tie. This is nearer than my brother or family have ever been. He that is so far from me and great puts Himself inside this tiny body. This is far nearer than mother, brother, or any other. Therefore He is called our brother, and also our bone and flesh, even closer than

> man and wife. For all this faith declares His flesh is ours, for He counts it to be of one body, blood, and so on. Whoever perceives this truth has what he can call comfort." For whoever believes that this boy is born God must laugh with his heart and say: "This is for me. He Himself came to me; I did not ascend to Him. He becomes a boy, not an angel or a lion, but puts on these fingers, hands, and body. If you believe this article, you have comfort." If in Scripture there were no more than these two articles of the conception and birth of Christ, we should have to be forever glad.[39]

Christ says this also elsewhere, for He is laid into our grasp not only in flesh and Scripture, but also in wine and bread. There God is present dealing with us also, and His coming is the same *in re*.[40] "Gott kann nicht unser Gott sein, er gebe uns denn etwas äuszerliches, daran wir jn finden, als das mündlich Wort und die zwey Sacrament. Wenn ich Gott nicht ergreife durch äuszerliches Ding, wie kann ich jn denn antreffen?" [41] "Quanta consolatio sit habere Deum non nudum in spiritu sed incarnatum et Baptismo ac Eucharistia indutum." [42] Only via creatureliness does He reach us, His creatures; and in that very creatureliness it is the living God Himself that reaches us.

Luther does not derive his doctrine of the Lord's Supper by deduction; it is not simply an *ex hypothesi* of his Christology. Should it even be conceded that his Christology was to Luther a regulative doctrine — and a cogent and revealing case, it would seem, can be made for this — there would be little need for apology. This would certainly be much more likely than that his Christology is the product of his doctrine of the Sacrament. To Luther each Scripture text spoke, and he was bound by the words of God. This loyalty to Scripture and the refusal to harmonize by deduction from a regulative doctrine gives us those logical paradoxes which are the glory of the Lutheran statement of doctrine, e. g., grace universal and serious and yet the damnation of many, salvation by grace alone and damnation by human fault. In the matter before us, however, there are no such seeming contradictions, though indeed no dearth of matter for awed worship and wonder, but a quite marvelous unity. God reveals Himself and deals with men only through the concrete realities of His Son's humanity and the things designated by Him.[43] In these palpable and ordinary things the fullness of

the Godhead is come to men. This oneness of God's ways to men is basic for Luther in both the Incarnation and the Lord's Supper. Yet he does not move merely deductively from the Incarnation to the Lord's Supper. Ernst Sommerlath would seem to be pressing farther than Luther when in expounding Luther he bluntly declares: "Das Ursakrament ist Christus selbst, das Leibwerden des ewigen Logos."[44] This conclusion is certainly not in disharmony with Luther, and he does almost say it; but that he does not surely shows even more clearly his lack of instrinsic interest in pursuing deductions.[45] The connection that he discerns between the Incarnation and the Sacrament is nothing so superficial, so rational, so unreal. It is rather the deep and thoroughgoing harmony of a faith that lays hold of Christ and in that grasp gets everything. The explications drawn from Luther when the apprehensions of his faith were attacked were nothing novel, but the organic consequences of that same faith. "Im Kampfe erst wird das Letzte offenbar, and je mehr von verschiedenen Seiten her ein Angriff erfolgt, desto mehr kommt es zum inneren Ausgleich und zu letzten Entscheidungen."[46] Christ is central, and therefore in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper Luther feels compelled to reject every statement that deprives him of his Incarnate Lord. He has no patience with or intrinsic interest in explanations or formulas inserted between him and his Lord; he has only faith for the revealed facts.

The central fact is God comes all the way to me in my humanity and things. This is accomplished by the Word of God ἔνσαρκος and ἐγγραφός. Its power is none the less for being framed in human creaturely terms. It is this Word, in which God is operative, that brought to pass the Incarnation and the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar.

> The angel Gabriel comes with the words: "Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb and bear a son. . . ." With these words Christ comes not only into her heart, but also into her womb as she hears, grasps, and believes them. Hence no one can tell her anything else but that the power comes through the words.[47]
>
> As soon as Christ says: "This is My body," His body is there through the words and by the power of the Holy Ghost. If there is no word, then there is merely bread; but when the words come to it, they bring with them that of which they speak.[48]

It is difficult to overemphasize the decisive importance of Scripture for Luther. Whatever his conjugation of doctrine, the verb was of Scripture. Not by any theory, philosophical or otherwise, did he decline. The insertion of a principle or formula was the interposing of an impediment between man and the truth.[49] The principle, via creatureliness alone, which this paper seeks to elucidate in its dual embodiment in Luther's doctrine of the Incarnation and the Lord's Supper, does not come under this condemnation, for Luther grasped this as Scripture's description of the way of God to men. If it were shown to be unscriptural, he would be the first to reject it.

Some would object that one cannot equate the Word of God with Scripture. While the discussion of this matter is not here our business, it might be mentioned in passing that the notion of another Word differing from the written Word was foreign to Luther. He had no such facile artifice for evading the blunt meaning of the text, some canonical misgivings as to James notwithstanding. Wherever he opened his Bible, he knew that he was being addressed by God. His statement, "Wo Gottes Wort ist, da ist Christus,"[50] is not a mere "one equals one"; Christ is mediated by Scripture.[51]

With Scripture as *Ausgangspunkt*, the parallel of the Incarnation with the Eucharist is not hard to discern. The man born of Mary is man for me until the word comes to His humanity and declares Him God. One might say *accedit verbum ad carnem et fit Christus.*

> If it had not been according to the revealed word, who would ever have believed that this Baby, lying in the cradle and not even owning the diapers in which it lies, is the Savior. Reason calls this a lie.[52]

> All who regard and know Christ in a fleshly fashion must be offended at Him, as it happened with the Jews, for flesh and blood thinks no farther than it sees and feels. When it sees that Christ as a mortal man is crucified, it must say: "There is the end. There is neither life nor salvation here. He is done for and can help nobody; He Himself is lost." Whoever, on the other hand, is not to be offended at Him, must pass beyond the fleshly and be supported by the word, that he spiritually discern how Christ even through His suffering and death attains life and glory. Whoever does this truly and can do it, he is a new creature in Christ, gifted with a new spiritual discernment.[53]

"The humanity of Christ if it be without a word is an empty thing."[54] The humanity remains the humanity, but through the word it is the medium of God. By the words the humanity of Christ is for me no longer merely *res externa*, but now *res spiritualis*. This *spiritualis* means in no way a spiritualizing away of the reality of the humanity in a Docetic direction. *Spiritualis* for Luther means of the Holy Spirit and indicates no withdrawing from crass things.

> Everything is and is called spirit, spiritual, and the thing of the Spirit, which comes from the Holy Spirit, be it ever so physical, external, and visible. Again, flesh and fleshly is everything which without the Spirit comes of the natural power of the flesh, however inward and invisible it may be.[55]

Luther is at pains to show that there is to be no diffidence about a thoroughly earthly medium. "Si deus verbum suum hat gesteckt in ein strohalm, dicerem in culmo esse salutem non propter ipsum, sed verbum quod ubi adest, adest deus ipse cum omni sapientia," etc.[56] The word spoken of the concrete reality makes it the conveyor of God to me. Apart from that word it is *res vana*. This implies no disdain of the thing. It and the word together are God's instrument. "Gott gibt uns kein wort noch gebot fur, da er nicht ein leiblich äuszerlich ding einfasse und uns furhalte."[57] Yet it is the word that is primary, for even without the thing the word's power would be none the less. There is no worthiness in the thing, whether the thing be human flesh, words, wine, or bread; but ambivalently Luther declares, if bread is unworthy, so is our flesh, and there can have been no Incarnation.

> I hold that God does not ask about the worthiness of a thing. If this were so, we should also have to say God did not become man, for the thing that is a man is not worthy of God. Similarly bread is not worthy of the body of Christ, but from this it does not follow that it is not there.[58]

Word and thing must not be wrested apart; and when the Real Presence goes, with it goes the Incarnation. "Sicut in Christo res se habet, ita et in sacramento."[59]

For the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, Scripture is equally decisive. "Ich las mir den Leib Christi vom Wort nicht scheiden."[60] Of the words of Scripture it is the Words of Institution that are the center of Luther's attention.[61] "Es ligt alles an den worten

disses sacraments." [62] It is impossible to follow Luther in his discussion of the Lord's Supper without an appreciation of the dread earnestness with which he takes these words, an earnestness equal to that with which he takes the words which make the Babe of Bethlehem his Lord. He who said, "This is My body" is the same as He who by His words created the sun and the moon. His words are "schöpferische Tatworte"; [63] they bring and achieve what they declare. *Hoc est corpus Meum* "ist nicht von Menschen, sondern von Gott selbst aus seinem eigenen Munde mit solchen Buchstaben und Worten gesprochen und gesetzt." [64] His almighty power, presence, and operation via these things of words. "Even if it is only a few 'poor miserable words,' one must have greater regard for a dot and a letter than for the whole world and tremble and fear before them as before God Himself." [65] Only in creaturely forms can God come to man; apart from these God is a nameless horror.[66] "Wenn ich Gott nicht ergreife durch äuszerliche ding, wie kan ich jn deen antreffen?" [67]

Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum.[68] Luther was not much occupied in defending the integrity of the thing. His battle was fought more on the other front. To these enemies he even declared in exasperation that he would rather surrender the integrity of the thing than the Real Presence.

> Before I would want to have mere wine with the *Schwärmer*, I would rather have mere blood with the Pope. As I have often confessed, it is no matter of contention with me whether wine remains or not. It is enough for me that Christ's blood be there, and the wine may fare however God wills.[69]

This was, however, not his considered judgment over against transubstantiation, which he explicitly rejected. In his "Sermon on the Lord's Supper" in 1519 he still clearly taught transubstantiation.[70] In 1524 he wrote how sorely tempted he was in 1519 to accept the purely symbolical interpretation in order to make a more thoroughgoing break with Rome, but he was bound by the Words of Institution. However, from 1520 he explicitly rejected transubstantiation,[71] though without vehemence, for his energies were directed chiefly against the more dangerous error of the *Schwärmer*. Luther's chief repudiations of Rome here were the *opus operatum* and the Mass as enacted propitiatory sacrifice.

In rejecting transubstantiation, Luther was removing that which called the Incarnation in question. That he had precisely this fact in mind, I have found no evidence to demonstrate.[72] He was quite simply listening to Scripture, and it is not surprising therefore that he achieved a harmony between the Incarnation and the Eucharist, a harmony lost to both camps of his opponents by the rejection, on the one hand, of the thing and, on the other, of the divine.

Behind transubstantiation there is a balking at the conjunction of God and thing. The thing must surely be absorbed, transmuted, if there is to be an operation of God. Such thinking is of a piece with Docetism and its kindred heresies.[73] It is a condemnation of the creation in harmony with Neoplatonic *contemptus mundi* and anthithetical to that Lutheran *Weltfreudigkeit* which is begotten of the faith that takes the Incarnation quite seriously. If God was born into creation as Mary's baby, we cannot say that it was no true baby, that it merely had the accidents of a baby. Similarly it cannot be said that the bread and wine must lose their essence if God is to impart Himself to us in them.

While recognizing other presuppositions of the Roman Mass, we surely see that the thinking which rejects the essence of the bread calls for a consequent rejection of the essence of baby. If transubstantiation thinking were consistently pursued, it would arrive at a Docetic denial of the Incarnation. While logical difficulties are no ultimate compulsion in the formulation of doctrine where Scripture has spoken, logical difficulties when Scripture has not spoken or spoken to the contrary should give pause, especially to a communion that prides itself on its logic.

Luther stuck quite simply to Scripture and so evinces a quite remarkable harmony between Eucharist and Incarnation. Implicit in his stand is the disavowal of the rejection of the conjunction of God and thing. If God puts Himself into a thing that we may apprehend Him, that does not require the repudiation of the thing which is yet a creature of God. Herein the thing comes into its own, as it were, exalted to its Maker's gracious purpose, even if that thing were only a wisp of straw, a donkey, or dung.[74] Luther's biggest battles were fought, however, on the other front, in defense not of the thing, but of God's putting Himself into the thing within our grasp.

In passing to the other front we may note in the position defended by Luther a striking parallel to the great Christological controversies. The questions "Is Mary's Baby God?" "Is Christ man?" and "How are the two natures related?" are parallel to: "Is the consecrated host Christ's body?" "Is the Sacrament still bread?" and "What is the relationship of the bread and the body of Christ?" Luther's answers to the latter questions are parallel to the answers of the Catholic Church to the Christological questions. By this we see the heterodoxy of the opponents, who on the one hand reject the bread and on the other the Real Presence, and Luther's own catholic orthodoxy.

The first wave of assault was by the *Schwärmer.* With their vaulting spiritualizing they scorned the lowly word and the wine and bread. To them God spoke directly. That God should bind Himself to things was an insult to their spiritualizing. It also cramped their style. With breath-taking vehemence Luther attacked these people, for they would wrest salvation from our grasp.[75] Luther knew that only as God comes to us in things can we know Him. If God scorned the things of His creation, then He scorns us also, for we are irrevocably involved in the creation, being creatures, too. Only via creatureliness, only by placing Himself into things, can God come to us.[76] We have grasp and certainty of God only as He has put Himself into flesh, words, water, wine and bread. The denial of this fact casts us out into the empty darkness, where there is only the dread fear of the *deus absconditus,* and few men have known the meaning of that more keenly than Luther.[77] Therefore with all the enraged fire of his embattled faith he cries out against the *Schwärmer* that they

> with stubborn obstinacy declare that an external thing is to be rejected. Beware of the madness of these because when an external thing is appropriated by the word of God, it is for salvation. The humanity of Christ, if it were without a word, would be an empty thing. But now by His body and blood we are saved because a word is adjoined.[78]

The consequences for Christology are not hard to find. Luther saw that the "enthusiasts'" view of the Lord's Supper would replace Christ with a concocted Christ, a Christ who does not come all the

way to us where we are, a Christ who is not truly incarnate, and then there is an end of hope.[79]

> They concoct a Christ other than He who exists. The Jews: God is He who created all things. That is fine, but they do not have the Son. The *Schwärmer* thus: Christ is He who redeems us, who gives us the Holy Spirit, but is not He who has body and blood in bread and wine. This sort of Christ concocted by them does not exist, and His flesh is useless.[80]

And to complete the circle, the deprivation of Christ calls consequently for a derogation of the Sacrament. "The Christ whom the *Schwärmer* have I want nothing of. They have such a Christ that one must write off the Gospel and Sacraments as symbols." [81] The problems here raised will be discussed in connection with the Swiss, but already we can see the Incarnation and the Eucharist in unmistakable contiguity.

The second wave of attack was from the Swiss, though Luther lumped them all together with the *Schwärmer,* and not without justification, for basic to both was the rejection of things as the way of God to men.[82] Luther saw this was the only way, and in humble creaturely faith laid hold of God where God has placed Himself in things. Where He has placed Himself, we must seek Him; to search elsewhere is to be lost.[83] In all this Luther's concern was soteriological. "Quanta consolatio sit habere Deum non nudum in spiritu sed incarnatum et Baptismo ac Eucharistia indutum." [84] The above was quite offensive to the Swiss. In many ways their position is only a refinement of that of the *Schwärmer* and Schwenkfeld; [85] so it will not be amiss to use the occasion of the Swiss to draw together those items illustrative of our parallel.

As seen already in the *Schwärmer,* the basic error was the rejection of the thing as a medium of God. Zwingli's point of departure in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper was John 6:63, "The flesh profiteth nothing." [86] He was prompted to a positive formulation of the Eucharist, he wrote Melanchthon, by Erasmus. His static, Scholastic Christology had no place for a powerful, personal, dynamic understanding of the personal union. This is exemplified in his localization of the body of Christ at a local right hand. Such presuppositions led naturally to the rejection of God in things and so also of the body of Christ in the bread. Hence the *est* means

significat, and the Sacrament is purely symbolical. Christ is in the Sacrament only *contemplatione fidei* and not *per essentiam et realiter*. "Tunc editur corpus Christi, cum pro nobis creditur caesum."[87] Here was a spirit of static, rational detachment quite other than Luther's dynamic involvement with the living God, who deals with men in things, in words, humanity, water, wine and bread.[88]

In his spiritualizing away from crass things, a basic harmony with the Roman aberration is discernible in Zwingli. It is the same old antipathy to things[89] and misunderstanding of God's gracious way to man.

When at Marburg Scripture and the Fathers failed to establish agreement, Oecolampadius attempted to correct Luther's Christology and so demonstrate his error in the Sacrament, but here he was running against Luther's central bastion. The concession that Christ was present according to His deity meant nothing, for they refused to acknowledge it *in re*. We have seen Luther's insistence on the total Christ and emphasis on the humanity. Therefore when Oecolampadius suggested that Luther raise his thoughts above the human to the divine Christ, Luther with unwavering consistency and conviction declared that "He knows nor honors no other God than Him who became man. He would have no other apart from this one, for there is no other who can save. Hence he could not bear that the humanity was treated as so little worth and cast aside." Elert calls these the most important of all the words that Luther spoke at Marburg. They lead to the center of his theology. They give the key to his doctrine of the Lord's Supper.[90] Christ cannot be divided.[91] To remove the humanity is to remove God, for only via humanity does God come to us. "Leib und Blut sind der Inbegriff der vollendeten Menschlichkeit des Gekreuzigten."[92]

But humanity is a spatially circumscribed thing. The Swiss placed the humanity of Christ at a local and circumscribed right hand and declared that it obviously could not be over the place in many Eucharists. "Wirsts ouch nimmermeer erhalten, dass die menschheit Jesu Christi meer deen an einem ort sye."[93] This was a consequence of Zwingli's Christology, for he did not take the Incarnation with entire seriousness.[94] God "hat die menschliche Natur an sich genommen," and the Incarnation for Zwingli amounted to no more.

Hence he does violence to the personal union and unashamedly divides the natures with his *alloeosis*,[95] and by all this denies the *communicatio idiomatum* and the ἐγένετο of John 1:14.

To Luther this *alloeosis* was "des Teufels Larven,"[96] for he took the ἐγένετο with entire seriousness. "Aus einem unendlichen gott ist ein endlicher und beschlisslicher mensch geworden."[97]

When the Swiss maintained that a body not limited in space was no body, Luther called this mathematics and inadmissable. To this judgment he was compelled by the personal union and his understanding of faith.

> Christ according to His divinity, wherever He is, is there an essentially divine Person, and He is this essentially and personally as His conception in the womb well shows. For if He is to be God's Son, He must essentially and personally be in the womb and become man. If He is essentially and personally wherever He is, then He must be this same also as man, for there are not two separated persons, but one single Person. Where this is, there is the one unseparated Person. Where you can say, "Here is Christ," there you must also say, "Hence is Christ the Man also . . . everything through and through is full of Christ also according to His humanity."[98]

It is significant that it is the Incarnation that means all this to Luther, and the post-resurrection body of our Lord here plays no large part in his thinking.[99] In the state of humiliation Christ was omnipresent according to His human nature.[100] The session at the right hand can bring no increase of omnipresence. The "right hand" was for Luther God's almighty power and therefore without limit or circumscription. "Sol er macht haben und regieren, mus er freilich auch da sein gegenwertig und wesentlich durch die rechte hand Gotts, die allenthalben ist."[101] This is a little more than mathematics can comprehend. We may not prescribe categories to God. "Was wollen wir den Gotts gewalt spannen und messen?"[102] "Wiltu yhm weise und mas setzen und welen?"[103] "Weil Gotts gewalt kein mas noch zal hat, und solche ding thut, die keine vernunfft begreyffen kan."[104] Mathematics grasps only the tangible; faith grasps the spiritual. Mathematics which man projects upon things grasps nothing more than the things. The faith of a man also cannot but operate with things, but in ap-

prehending the things, to which the word is joined, it apprehends what God has placed into the things. Only faith apprehends God in Mary's Baby, only faith knows that it receives the body and blood of Christ, for faith believes the vital words of God.[105] This is no passing from the possible to the impossible, but simply taking God at His words. It is not that the finite is capable of containing the infinite, but that the infinite is capable of placing itself in the finite.

Luther saw the problem in relation to the omnipresence of God. In the controversy Luther does not tire to emphasize that God is everywhere in His creatures.[106] If He were not, they would not exist.[107] Yet man does not have God merely in having the thing.[108] It all depends on God. God acts. God comes. He comes all the way and appoints the place.

> It is one thing for God to be in a place, and quite another for Him to be in a place for you. He is in a place for you when He puts His word to it and so binds Himself saying, "Here you are to find Me." However, He is now become beyond our grasp, and you will not take hold of Him even if He is in your bread, except He bind Himself to you, and appoint you to a special table by His word, and He Himself designate the bread with His word.[109]

This is the hallowing of things as the Incarnation hallows the Creation. It is the gracious God Himself who comes to us in things, and it is faith believing the words which apprehends. That which faith apprehends is not calculable, for it is the apprehension of God. In the Eucharist God is *dir da,* mediated by the humanity of Christ, which is His body and blood. Therefore to ask Luther to rise above the humanity, to conceive of it as circumscribed at the right hand, was to ask him to surrender God.

The omnipresence of the humanity of Christ, or ubiquity, as the Reformed with insulting intent called the Lutheran position, was no deduction forced on Luther by his stand against the Swiss, but rather an emphatic statement of his implicit Christology drawn forth by controversy.[110] The denial of the omnipresence of the humanity, Luther feared, would lead consequently to the denial of the deity. "Ich sorge, es werde noch die zeit komen, das unser Rottengeister mit yhrer vernunfft Christum noch gar werden austilgen wollen und yhn kein ewigen waren Gott lassen seyn."[111] If the

humanity is not there and cannot mediate the deity, then the deity is lost to me. Conversely, if the deity is mediated by the humanity, the humanity is present with the deity. However, "gegen Zwingli beruft er sich nicht auf die Logik, sondern auf die Grammatik."[112] The humanity, i. e., the body and blood, are given to us with the bread and the wine. Our Lord said so.[113]

Since the humanity of Christ is in so many places in the Eucharist, we may not confine it to a local right hand as to some celestial swallow's nest.[114] It is omnipresent, and if omnipresent, then there is no reason why not in bread and wine.[115] Thus Luther sought to demonstrate the possibility of the Real Presence; for the doctrine his foundation were the Words of Institution.

The same conclusion is arrived at by a consideration of the personal union.[116] The Ascension did not, as Zwingli maintained, nullify the Incarnation. Christ did not become less a man thereby, for in Him God and man are utterly and indissolubly united.

Parallel with the question of the relationship of the two natures in Christ is the relationship of the bread and the body. As God was truly in Jesus of Nazareth, so the body of Christ is truly in the bread. Yet both are blessedly apprehendable only to faith, and not to sight and touch. Not that any human action puts them there. They are there irrespective of man's belief or disbelief. Of the certain comfort of this fact we shall speak later. The point here is that what the shepherds saw was an ordinary Baby. Their eyes did not behold any divine attribute in the Infant. It was just a common Baby, but with their faith's embrace of that Baby they grasped God. The only attributes they saw were most human creaturely.[117] Only thus can God come to men, via creatureliness.

Now, Luther thought it necessary to distinguish modes of the presence of the humanity of Christ, and we can be sure that Luther will not make distinctions which virtually remove the humanity of Christ, for he knew that if the humanity is gone, God is lost to us.

He distinguishes three modes, and for these he is indebted to Occam and Biel.[118] There are "dreyerley weise an eim ort zu sein: localiter odder circumscriptive, diffinitive, repletive."[119] *Localiter* is as wine is in a barrel, or straw in a sack, or Jesus of Nazareth in a boat, "da er raum nam und gab nach seiner grösse." A physical body displaces air by its mass. This is measurable, *begreiflich. Dif-*

finitive is when something is in a place, but where there is no perceptible congruence between it and the limits of space, e. g., an angel in a room. An angel displaces no air. This cannot be measured; it is *unbegreiflich.* In this manner Christ rose through the stone and passed through a door.[120] He did not displace any door, and yet He did not cease to be fully Man. *Repletive* is as only God is in all. As we have seen, Luther also ascribes this last mode of presence to the humanity of Christ. However, as R. Seeberg points out, Luther's intention in these distinctions was to show Zwingli that there are other possible modes of presence than his crass physical conception.

Luther's interest lay with the *diffinitive,* for this is the mode of the presence of the humanity of Christ in the Eucharist. He gives the similes of a man's face being present at a distance from its local presence, because it is apprehendable, and that even if a mirror be smashed into pieces, yet in each piece the image reflected is complete and present. However, he admits that in these he is speaking not from Scripture but only for illustration. To the reproach of Zwingli that the body of Christ is not graspable in the bread Luther agrees, but the grasping here is that of Zwingli, i. e., of the measuring reason, whereas the grasping of which Luther is wont to speak is that of faith. "Wir künnen yhn nicht ynns brod fassen, odder beschweren, wie sie felschlich von uns deuten."[121] "Das er aber sich wil finden lassen eygendlich ym brod und wein, macht sein almechtig wort."[122] It is, then, the *diffinitive, unbegreiflich* mode of presence which faith, trusting in the words, apprehends.

> Er ist nu auch unbegreifflich worden und wirst yhn nicht ertappen ob er gleich in deinem brod ist, es sey denn, das er sich dir anbinde und bescheide dich zu eim sonderlichen tissch durch sein wort.[123]

There is only hope, then, for man when God binds Himself by His words to a thing.

Logically transubstantiation rejects the thing; the symbolical interpreters reject Christ. Luther, loyal to catholic Christology and the Words of Institution, rejects neither, for Scripture speaks of the presence of both.

That he would not allow himself to go beyond Scripture, no matter how striking the parallel, we see in his clear distinction

between the personal union of God and man in Christ and what he called the sacramental union of the bread and the body of Christ.

> Why should not one much more in the Lord's Supper say, "This is My body" even if bread and body are two distinctly different things, and refer the "this" to the bread? For here also there is come a union of two different things, which I would call a sacramental union because Christ's body and blood are by this given us for a sacrament and because it is not the union of nature and person as in God and Christ.[124]

He contrasts also the coming of the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove with the Incarnation and likens it to the sacramental union.[125] He does not blithely identify or theorize, and yet he draws the parallel of the Incarnation and the sacramental union as Scripturally close as possible, and that is very close. The flesh of Christ is "ein Gottesfleisch, ein Geistfleisch," and of the sacramental union he can say:

> Both bread and body remain, and because of the sacramental union it is truly said, "This is My body," with the little word "this" referring to the bread, for it is no more mere bread; it is a bread which is become with the body of Christ a sacramental thing, a single thing.[126]

Most illustrative of the foregoing is Luther's distinction between sign and symbol, which makes abundantly clear the profound harmony of Incarnation and Eucharist. He rejects every symbolical interpretation, for they would remove Christ from the place to which He has come to us, i. e., in things.[127]

To say that Christ is symbolized by humanity or bread and wine not only denies His actual, apprehendable presence and the clear words of Scripture; it is patently foolish. For anything to symbolize something it must have a likeness in itself to the thing symbolized.

> This is absolute foolishness that he says: "The bread signifies or is a likeness of the body given for us, and the cup, or wine, is a likeness of the blood shed for us." My dear fellow, where is this likeness in the bread and cup of wine? For where there is to be a figure, symbol, or likeness, by which the other thing is to be signified, there must in the two be some likeness shown on which the likeness rests.[128]

What thing, then, can possibly symbolize the living God? Here we see the honor given God by Luther, who, his opponents declared, had God act unworthy of Himself. They prescribed to God and sought to press Him into "mathematical" categories. They refused to permit the Almighty to come in a thing, and by this they thought to have a more exalted conception of God. It is, however, Luther who magnifies the grace and honor of God by recognizing that no thing can contain or symbolize Him, and yet, and this is the incredible, the *unbegreiflich,* that only faith can grasp, the holy and living God, whom worlds cannot contain, is pleased to be born of a woman and impart Himself to us in bread and wine. To lessen the full extent of God's coming down to us is to rob Him of His honor.[129]

If God had wanted symbols, He needed not to be born as Mary's Baby; a Docetic body would have done just as well; and there would have been no need to change the Passover.

> If Christ had wished to institute a Supper in which were not His body and blood, but the likeness of His body and blood, He could have quite simply left the Passover, which, by and large and taken as a whole, quite magnificently signifies His body, given for us, and His blood, shed for the forgiveness of sins, and which really is a figure and likeness, as the whole world well knows. What piece of foolishness is this, then, that He does away with the Supper of the Old Testament and institutes a Supper which has nothing to compare with that one, either in words or in itself? [130]

Therefore not symbols but signs, and such signs that he who grasps the *signum* grasps the *res signata,* for the vital words of God have spoken it there.

In a sense the Eucharist is a symbol, but this rather to the heathen, for they see only the externals. "Sacramenta, quibus segregamur ab omnibus populis, qui non sunt Christiani ut per *zeichen.*" [131] To the believer, who grasps the words of God, there is infinitely more. "Verbum dei est nobis veritas. Si est verbum in Sacramento, lasz mir auch leben und warheit drin bleiben." [132] Of the words, in turn, the thing is the guarantee and seal.

> He has dealt in this way from the beginning. When He gives the Gospel, He does not leave it at the words, but adds a sign. Thus in the New Testament we have the words "Whoever be-

lieves. . . ." To this He adds the sign "Whoever is baptized." Similarly we have Christ's body and blood in bread and wine added to the words. Thus He deals like an honest and true man who, when he writes a letter, affixes his seal to it.[133]

That these are all objectively there, and in no way derive their validity from me, is the basis of assurance and comfort.

It is this way with Jesus: I see a man, but faith shows me that which is invisible. We have no article of faith which does not have an external thing as its expression. Distinguished, however, between the external things that have been designated by God and those by man. The Lord puts that behind the bread that I must grasp by the word and faith. This is where we take issue with the *Schwärmer.* Faith lays bare whatever is invisibly concealed within the visible thing. Whatever command of God it is, it is contained in an external thing. Thus faith clings to the hidden, while the eyes see only the exterior. Thus indeed Elizabeth does not look at His mother as upon another mother, but with other eyes, because she acknowledges herself a servant. Thus she judges the external body according to faith. "The mother of my Lord," this is not the utterance of reason, but of faith. Faith has no single article, but there must be a physical thing put with it that we may get hold of that which is invisible. For this reason Christ was sent, for God cannot be comprehended; therefore He sent His Son, in whom, as it were, we have the sign and are drawn to that which is invisible.[134]

Both the Incarnation and the Eucharist are a sign. Here is the closest convergence of the two in Luther.[135] Yet nothing is farther from him than theorizing. Here is a sinner who has trembled to despair before the *deus absconditus* and then has been raised to vital faith by God, who reached out and took hold of him in things, humanity, words, water, wine and bread. Burning through all his theology is a life-and-death concern for the certainty of salvation, a salvation that is ours only in the actuality of God's coming to man in things. Therefore not symbols, but signs. As surely as the fullness of the Godhead was in Jesus of Nazareth bodily, so surely is the body and blood of Christ in the bread and wine. We see the movement of his faith in his words:

The words, as the first step, bring with them the bread and the cup for the Sacrament; the bread and the cup bring with them

> the body and the blood of Christ; the body and blood of Christ bring with them the New Testament; the New Testament brings with it the forgiveness of sins; the forgiveness of sins brings with it eternal life and salvation.[136]

Through anguished struggle his faith had laid hold of the gracious God, and he would not let Him go, nor suffer his grip to be emptied by those who would deny that God has come all the way to him in humanity, words, water, wine and bread. It was his salvation that was at stake, his hold on Christ, true man, born of the Virgin Mary, and true God, begotten of the Father from eternity.[137]

Because of the *solus Christus* of his faith he grasped the glorious parallel of the Incarnation and the Lord's Supper. He gives glory to God, whose honor is the depth to which He comes down, that worthless men may have hold on Him and live. To save His creatures, the Son of God became a creature and took for His gracious purpose the most common things of the creature world. Men could not move toward God. God came all the way to man. "Ipse mihi venit. Ego non ad eum ascendi." [138] He exposed Himself to the contempt of men. His body was flogged by soldiers and is given into the mouths of unbelievers. Of all imaginable gods, such a God is the most obnoxious to men who would have a part in earning their salvation, who would take some steps at least toward God. Yet if God be gracious, if we are saved by grace alone, then His "No" to every effort of man is categorical. The same *iugulum* was attacked by the Sacramentarians and by Erasmus. *Sola gratia* was at stake, and Luther could concede not an inch, or his salvation was imperiled. No supposed movement of man to God could be a part of salvation. Salvation is alone in God coming all the way to man, all the way into creatureliness, all the way into things. Such is His coming in the Incarnation and the Lord's Supper. Thus alone He comes, and thus the gracious ways of God to man are one.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Cf. Theodosius Harnack, *Luthers Theologie* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1927), I, 84 f.
2. *Weimarer Ausgabe*, XLIV, 591. Hereafter referred to as *W. A.* — All translations from German or Latin into English were made by the author.

3. Cf. Werner Elert, *Morphologie des Lutbertums* (München: C. Beck, 1931), I, 18.
4. *W. A.*, XVIII, 719.
5. *W. A.*, XVIII, 712.
6. *W. A.*, XVIII, 184.
7. *W. A.*, XL, 761.
8. *W. A.*, XVIII, 685
9. *W. A.*, XXXIII, 160
10. *Erlanger Ausgabe*, XXXVII, 43. Hereafter referred to as *E. A.*
11. *W. A.*, XL, No. 1, 76.
12. *W. A.*, XXV, 237.
13. *W. A.*, V, 172.
14. *W. A.*, XXVIII, 136.
15. *W. A.*, XXVIII, 135
16. Erich Seeberg, *Christus Wirklichkeit und Urbild* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1937), pp. 67 f. and 241 ff.
17. *W. A.*, XXIX, 643.
18. *W. A.*, IX, 41.
19. *W. A.*, XXIII, 131.
20. *W. A.*, XXVI, 332.
21. *W. A.*, XL, No. 1, 76.
22. *W. A.*, X, No. 1, 356.
23. *W. A.*, IV, 649.
24. *W. A.*, X, No. 1, 67.
25. *Kirchengesangbuch*, Hymn 21.
26. *W. A.*, XVIII, 83.
27. *W. A.*, XLVI, 634.
28. *W. A.*, XXIII, 156. See also *W. A.*, XIX, 486.
29. *E. A.*, XL, 59.
30. *W. A.*, XXXVII, 42.
31. *W. A.*, XXV, 107.
32. *W. A.*, XXX, 154.
33. *W. A.*, XL, 558. Cf. Wilhelm Link, *Das Ringen Luthers um die Freiheit der Theologie von der Philosophie* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1940), p. 374.
34. *E. A.*, LII, 348.
35. *W. A.*, X, No. 1, 208.
36. *W. A.*, XVII, No. 2, 132.
37. Cf. Theodosius Harnack, *op. cit.*, II, 103.
38. *W. A.*, XVII, No. 2, 327.
39. *W. A.*, XXXIV, No. 2, 492.
40. *W. A.*, IV, 258.
41. *W. A.*, XXVIII, 576.
42. *W. A.*, XXV, 128.
43. *W. A.*, XXV, 128.

44. Ernst Sommerlath, "Das Abendmahl bei Luther," *Vom Sacrament des Altars*, ed. Hermann Sasse (Leipzig: Dörffling and Franke, 1941), p. 109.
45. This is recognized by Sommerlath, *ibid.*, p. 116, but he is perhaps a little overanxious to formulate too neat a case.
46. Ernst Sommerlath, "Luthers Lehre von der Realpräsenz im Abendmahl im Zusammenhang mit seiner Gottesanschauung nach den Abendsmahlsschriften von 1527—1528," *Das Erbe Martin Luthers und die gegenwärtige theologische Forschung*, ed. Robert Jelke (Leipzig: Dörffling and Franke, 1928), p. 324.
47. *W. A.*, XIX, 490.
48. *W. A.*, XIX, 491.
49. Cf. Werner Elert, *Die Morphologie des Luthertums* (München: C. Beck, 1931), I, 268.
50. *W. A.*, XVII, No. 2, 132.
51. Marburg is given as the great example of Luther's being bound by a single word of Scripture. W. Elert, "Luther in Marburg," *Zeitwende* (October, 1929), p. 315. Cf. Paul Althaus, *Die Lutherische Abendmahlslehre in der Gegenwart* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1931), p. 11.
52. *W. A.*, XXIII, 734.
53. *W. A.*, XXVI, 312.
54. *W. A.*, X, No. 2, 246.
55. *W. A.*, XXIII, 203.
56. *W. A.*, XX, 387.
57. *W. A.*, XXIII, 261.
58. *W. A.*, X, No. 2, 249.
59. *W. A.*, VI, 511.
60. *W. A.*, XXIII, 257.
61. Cf. Paul Althaus, *op. cit.*, p. 10. "Er selber beruft sich am entscheidenden Punkt immer wieder auf die Einsetzungsworte in ihrem klaren Wortlaute." See also R. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1917), Vol. IV, No. 1, p. 326.
62. *W. A.*, VI, 360.
63. Cf. Erich Sommerlath, *op. cit.*, p. 326. *W. A.*, XXVI, 282. "Er spricht, so stehet's da."
64. *W. A.*, XXVI, 446.
65. *W. A.*, XXVI, 450.
66. *Supra*, p. 625 f.
67. *W. A.*, XXVIII, 576.
68. The force of St. Augustine's dictum for Luther was that it recognized the formative role of the word, but yet did not exhaust the dynamic wealth of his creaturely understanding of the Sacrament. *Verbum visibile* was more sufficient for Melanchthon than for Luther, as Erich Sommerlath points out, "Das Abendmahl bei Luther," *Vom Sakrament des Altars*, p. 107.
69. *W. A.*, XXVI, 462.
70. *W. A.*, II, 749.
71. Cf. R. Seeberg, *op. cit.*, p. 325.
72. Of the parallel he was most certainly aware. "Denn ich kan wol sagen: 'das brod ist meyn leyb,' gleych wie ich sage von Christo: 'Der Mensch

ist Got,' das dennoch nicht nott sey die menscheyt tzu verschwynden und eytel Got da bleyben, alszo hie auch 'das ist mein leyb' kan wol der leyb da seyn, das dennoch brot bleybe." *W. A.*, X, No. 2, 246.

73. *W. A.*, VII, 14; XX, 1053.
74. *W. A.*, II, 132; XXIV, 254; XXVIII, 202, 262; XXX, 116.
75. Cf. Karl Jäger, *Luthers religiöses Interesse an seiner Lehre von der Realpräsenz* (Giessen: J. Ricker, 1900), p. 1. "Theologische Streitigkeiten von solcher Heftigkeit werden niemals um blosse dogmatische Formeln geführt."
76. *W. A.*, XXV, 128.
77. Cf. Erich Sommerlath, "Das Abendmahl usw.," p. 120.
78. *W. A.*, XXV, 64.
79. Cf. Erich Sommerlath, *op. cit.*, p. 120; *W. A.*, XVIII, 143.
80. W. A., XX, 682.
81. *W. A.*, XXVI, 65.
82. Cf. Paul Wilhelm Gennrich, *Die Christologie Luthers im Abendmahls-Streit 1524—1529* (Königsberg: Otto Kümmel, 1929), p. 59.
83. *Supra*, p. 627.
84. *W. A.*, XXV, 128.
85. Cf. R. Seeberg, *op. cit.*, p. 380.
86. For Luther's radically different understanding of flesh see footnote 51.
87. Cf. R. Seeberg, *op. cit.*, p. 378.
88. *Supra*, p. 627.
89. P. Althaus, *op. cit.*, p. 26.
90. Werner Elert, *op. cit.*, p. 317.
91. *W. A.*, XX, 541. "Ubi video Christum, video integrum, wo ich yhn ergreife, ist er gantz in baptismo, sacramento."
92. Werner Elert, *op. cit.*, p. 320.
93. R. Seeberg, *op. cit.*, p. 379.
94. Cf. Werner Elert, *Der christliche Glaube* (Berlin: Furche, 1941), p. 402.
95. *Ibid.* "Es ist eine rhetorische permutatio, qua de altera in Christo natura loquentes alterius vocibus utimur."
96. *W. A.*, XXVI, 321.
97. *W. A.*, XLVII, 263.
98. *W. A.*, XXVI, 332.
99. *W. A.*, XXIII, 199.
100. *W. A.*, XXIII, 147.
101. *W. A.*, XXIII, 145.
102. *W. A.*, XXVI, 417.
103. *W. A.*, XXIII, 268.
104. *W. A.*, XXIII, 117.
105. *W. A.*, XX, 520. "Das er aber sich wil finden lassen ym brod und wein, macht sein almechtig wort."
106. *W. A.*, XXVI, 339. "Nichts ist so klein, Gott ist noch kleiner; nichts ist so gros, Gott ist noch gröszer; nichts ist so kurz, Gott ist noch kürzer; nichts ist so lang, Gott ist noch lenger; nichts ist so breit, Gott ist noch breiter; nichts is so schmal, Gott ist noch schmeler; und so fort an ist's ein unaussprechlich wesen uber und auszer allem, das man nennen odder dencken kan."

107. *W. A.*, XIX, 492.
108. *W. A.*, XXIII, 151.
109. *Ibid.*
110. It was already held by him in 1525. Cf. *W. A.*, XVIII, 206.
111. *W. A.*, XX, 522.
112. E. Seeberg, *op. cit.*, p. 362.
113. *W. A.*, XXVI, 446.
114. *W. A.*, XXVIII, 141.
115. *W. A.*, XX, 384. "Si est ubique et super omnes creaturas, ergo est in vino et pane."
116. *Supra*, p. 640 f.
117. *Supra*, p. 627.
118. Cf. R. Seeberg, *op. cit.*, p. 386 f.
119. *W. A.*, XXVI, 327.
120. *W. A.*, XIX, 490.
121. *W. A.*, XX, 520.
122. *W. A.*, XX, 521.
123. *W. A.*, XIII, 151. See footnote 109.
124. *W. A.*, XXVI, 442.
125. *Ibid.*
126. *W. A.*, XXVI, 445.
127. Though Luther later used different terms, the distinction remained intact. "Symbol" becomes "philosophical sign." *W. A.*, IV, 666. "Duplicia sunt signa: Philosophica et theologica. Signum philosophicum est nota absentis rei, signum theologicum est nota praesentis rei."
128. *W. A.*, XXVI, 391.
129. See footnotes 27, 28.
130. *W. A.*, XXVI, 395.
131. *W. A.*, XXVII, 2.
132. *W. A.*, XX, 387.
133. *W. A.*, XXIV, 204.
134. *W. A.*, XXVII, 234.
135. *W. A.*, XXIII, 23. "Er will uns ja so nahe sein leiblich als er ihnen gewest ist." See also p. 256.
136. Althaus, *op. cit.*, p. 31.
137. "Sieht man den Kampf Luthers um das Abendmahl im Zusammenhang mit seiner gesamten Theologie und ihrem Kernstück der Christologie, so versteht man die Leidenschaft und die Erbitterung, mit der er sich für seine Auffassung einsetzte. Es ging hier eben nicht um theologische Meinungsverschiedenheiten, sondern um in ihrem tiefsten Grund verschieden gerichtete Weltanschauungen und um auf ganz verschiedenem Boden entwachsene Glaubensüberzeugungen." P. Gennrich, quoted in *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, LIV, 58 f.
138. *W. A.*, XXXIV, No. 2, 492.