

SOLA SCRIPTURA OR THE SOLE »MAJESTY OF THE DIVINE WORD«¹ AS FOUNDATION FOR THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY

With this striking phrase Martin Luther engraved the Protestant principle of *sola scriptura* on his students in his second lecture on the letter of Galatians,² which he commenced in July 1531. And even now, in 2017, on the 500th anniversary of the reformation, *sola scriptura* is still on everyone's tongue, although in historical-critical relativization.³

But when surveying recent publications for the actual contents of *sola scriptura*, one only finds philosophical, hermeneutic or dogmatic reflections on the prolonged crisis of the Protestant principle of scripture rather than a source-oriented account of the position of Luther based on actual quotations from his writings.⁴

In contrast to these present discussions it therefore is necessary to freshly voice Luther's own understanding of *sola scriptura* at least for the 500th anniversary of the reformation, since today it is possible to easily search the digital Weimar edition of his writings.⁵ Hence, the goal of this paper is to outline the development of the Protestant principle of *sola scriptura* based on actual quotations from Luther, which crystallized 500 years ago as one of the paramount pillars of the reformation. The starting point of our investigation is Luther's second lecture on Galatians in 1531, which is, as it were, an exegetical underpinning of the *Confessio Augustana* authored by MELANCTON in 1530.⁶ The corresponding historical framework is then to be unfolded starting from the beginning of the indulgence

controversy on the 31st of October, 1517 until the conclusion of the Leipzig Disputation in August 1519. Special attention is to be given to Luther's argumentation with scripture in contrast to his most significant opponents.

First of all, as a result of this road to *sola scriptura*, we want to give word to the second lecture on Galatians from 1531, in which Luther says the following about the rank and relevance of scripture:⁷

- *Exegesis of Gal 1:9*: »[...] Here Paul subordinates himself, an angel from heaven, teachers on earth, and any other masters at all to sacred scripture (*sacrae scripturae*). This queen must rule (*Haec Regina debet dominari*), and everyone must obey, and be subject to, her. [...] Nor should any doctrine be taught or heard in the church except the pure word of God (*purum verbum Dei*). Otherwise, let the teachers and the hearers be accursed along with their doctrine.«⁸
- *Exegesis of Gal 1:11f*: »[...] if the church teaches anything in addition or contrary to the word of God (*extra scripturam et verbum dei*), one must say that it is in error.«⁹
- *Exegesis of Gal 5:9*: »[...] Therefore let us leave the praise of harmony and of Christian love to them. We, on the other hand, praise faith and the majesty of the word (*maiestatem verbi et fidem*).«¹⁰
- *Exegesis of Gal 5:12*: »[...] Therefore let us learn to praise and magnify the majesty and authority of the word (*maiestatem et*

autoritatem verbi). For it is no trifle, as the fanatics of our day suppose; but one dot (Matt 5:18) is greater than heaven and earth. Therefore we have no reason here to exercise love or Christian concord, but we simply employ the tribunal; that is, we condemn and curse all those who insult or injure the majesty of the divine word (*maiestatem divini verbi*) in the slightest, because (5:9) a little yeast leavens the whole lump.«¹¹

1. The Beginning of the Dispute During the Indulgence Controversy (1517–1518)

If we take a closer look at the first and the last of Luther's 95 theses, whose pinning on the door of the church in Wittenberg on the 31st of October, 1517 mark the beginning of the indulgence controversy,¹² we find two citations from scripture as an exegetical frame for Luther's protest against the common practice of indulgence and penitence of his time, namely in his 1st thesis: *Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand* (Matt 4:17) and in his 95th thesis: *We must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God* (Acts 14:22).¹³ Starting from Matt 4:17 (and many other passages from scripture)¹⁴ Luther unfolds his opposing view of penitence as a life-long process of »changing one's senses« (gr. *metanoia*) from the earthly to the heavenly, which results in the hatred of sin and the abandonment and crucifixion of the flesh. In a more general sense Luther speaks about the word of God in his 53rd and 54th theses where he says:

*Luther's Theses (Latin/English)*¹⁵

53. *Hostes Christi et Papae sunt, qui propter venias praedicandas verbum dei in aliis ecclesiis penitus silere iubent.* (WA 1, 604)
53. »They are enemies of Christ and of the pope, who bid the word of God be altogether silent in some Churches, in order that pardons may be preached in others.«

54. *Iniuria fit verbo dei, dura in eodem sermone aequale vel longius tempus impenditur veniis quam illi.* (WA 1, 604)

54. »Injury is done to the word of God when, in the same sermon, an equal or a longer time is spent on pardons than on this word.«

Hence, the preaching of the word of God was partially abandoned, or at least pushed to the background. However, since Luther had intended his 95 theses for the republic of letters, although they found wider circulation against his will, he issued a *Sermon on Penitence and Grace* in February/March 1518 which was aimed at the general public.¹⁶ In this sermon he labeled the common practice of indulgence and penitence as »hardly or not at all founded [...] in Holy Scripture«¹⁷, and as »not attestable by any scripture«¹⁸. In conclusion, he affirmed once more, that he does not doubt his arguments, since they are »sufficiently founded in scripture«¹⁹. In contrast, Luther designated his opponents as »gloomy brains, which never have smelled the Bible.«²⁰ Here Luther's central principle of basing himself on scripture becomes apparent more clearly and memorably than in his 95 theses, which he had authored before.

Quite different was the approach of Luther's opponents, most notably of JOHANN TETZEL, who, according to Luther's own testimony, was selling indulgence near Wittenberg with the words »that the red indulgence-cross on the coat of arms of the pope [...] would be as strong as the cross of Christ.«²¹ In these words the central position of the authority of the pope becomes apparent, which is also reflected in Tetzel's following first disputation against Luther's theses.²² In contrast to Luther, Tetzel does not frame or base his theses on Holy Scripture, but rather begins with the words »to the honor of the holy apostolic chair«²³, and ends with »to the holy apostolic chair, the highest judge in matters of faith.«²⁴ In full

compliance with this spirit Tetzel's theses contain no explicit quotations from scripture.

2. The Escalation of the Controversy with the Pope (1518–1519)

The indulgence controversy reached a further step of escalation in June 1518 through the opening of a heresy process against Luther due to a file charged by the Dominican fraternity, of whom Tetzel was also a part. Thereby, the likewise Dominican papal theologian and head-inquisitor SILVESTER PRIERIAS became Luther's weightiest accuser on the part of the Roman church. He accorded Luther with an expertise *On the Potency of the Pope (De potestate papae dialogus)* including a citation to Rome by the papal legate CAJETAN.²⁵ In his first three fundamental theses he points Luther (1) to »the pope [as] the head of the Roman church«, (2) that »neither the Roman church nor the pope are mistaken« and (3) that »even holy scripture has its force and importance [from the teaching of the Roman church and the Roman pope]«. ²⁶ Luther only learned of this process against him with some delay,²⁷ but still replied to Prierias at length in August 1518, most notably with Gal 1:8: »But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed«²⁸, and with the inquiry: »Dear, where in this does one hear scripture, fathers or canon law?«²⁹ From an outward point of view Luther still integrated scripture with the church fathers and canon law as authorities. Yet, both by the fronted position in the enumeration, as well as examined from the historical and argumentative context, Luther already gave explicit priority to Holy Scripture.³⁰

Prierias replied to Luther by the end of 1519 with two further writings of which Luther only responded to the latter (*Epitoma responsionis ad Martinum Luther*), which he issued in June 1520 furnished with a foreword and

comments.³¹ One important conclusion that Luther draws in this foreword (based on two quotations from scripture: Matt 16:18 and Joh 21:17) is that »scripture does not come from the authority of the pope (*non scripturas ex Papae auctoritate*), but that the authority of the pope comes from scripture (*sed auctoritatem Papae ex scripturis*).«³²

3. The Road to the Disputation of Leipzig (1518–1519)

In March of 1518, long before the opening of the heresy process against Luther, a quick-witted and also crafty opponent of Luther's theses on indulgence arose in the person of the professor and theologian JOHANN ECK from Ingolstadt. He would pique Luther to voice the utmost consequence of his principle of *sola scriptura* during the Disputation of Leipzig in July 1519, namely that Holy Scripture does not only stand above the pope as the supreme bishop, but also above an entire council of the church.³³ Already in his first polemic writing *Obelisci* (spears) Eck stigmatized Luther as a dispraiser of the pope.³⁴ Luther replied with his *Asterisci* (stars) and rated Eck's spears as »[...] nothing from Holy Scripture (*sacrarum literarum*), nothing from the church fathers, nothing from canon law, but only scholastic arbitrary makings and mere dreams [...]«³⁵

The further debate with Eck was taken over by Luther's colleague ANDREAS KARLSTADT from Wittenberg until shortly before the Disputation of Leipzig. At first Luther was busy with preparing for the disputation in Heidelberg, which was held in April 1518. Then, from June onwards, the heresy process was initiated against him. In October 1518 Luther was cited to Augsburg for an interrogation by the papal legate Cajetan during which he, however, did not revoke his theses.³⁶ There, in Augsburg, he also met with Eck, who visited Luther in his inn. Both came to the agreement to hold a disputation between Eck and Karlstadt in the

following year.³⁷ Luther tried to keep out of the further debate with Eck due to an agreement to keep still in the question of indulgence with the papal chamberlain KARL VON MILTITZ.³⁸ However, he only succeeded to keep this agreement shortly, since Eck was actually aiming for Luther in his theses against Karlstadt, which he published towards the end of 1518 for the upcoming disputation in Leipzig.³⁹

Luther responded in February 1519 with 12 antitheses,⁴⁰ but then focused on working exegetically with scripture until Mai 1519. Together with Melancton he revised his first lecture on Galatians from 1516/17 between February and April and then submitted it to the printing press.⁴¹ In parallel, towards the end of March 1519, the first part of his revised exposition of the Psalms *Operationes in Psalmos* appeared in print, in which he completely overcame the prevailing scheme of scholastic exegesis.⁴²

In this relation we want to take a closer look at Luther's first lecture on Galatians from 1519. A computer-search for the Latin keywords *verbum* and *scriptura* supplemented by the treatment of Preuß⁴³ yielded the following evidence for our topic of *sola scriptura*:

- *Foreword*: »For I have judged [...] according to the measure of the divine commandments and the holy gospel of Christ (*mandatis divinis et sacrosancto euangelio Christi*). But those [...] have [...] no other measure than the force of the pope and the privileges of the Roman church (*potestate Papae et Privilegiis Rhomanae Ecclesiae*).«⁴⁴
- *Exegesis of Gal 1:1f*: »[...] For as the first and foremost asset of the church is the word of God (*verbum dei*), likewise no other mischief ruins the church more than human words and statues (*verbo hominis et traditionibus*) of this world. *Let God be true, but every man a liar* (Rom 3:4). With this same caring intention with which

David once left behind everything that Salomon [...] would need for the construction of the temple, so also Christ has left behind the gospel and the other holy scriptures (*scripturas alias*), so that through them, not through human statues (*humanis decretis*), the church would be built up.«⁴⁵

- *Exegesis of Gal 1:8f*: »O that also in our time such proclaimers for Christ would stand up in the battle against the unrelenting and violent executors of the papal decrees and ordinances (*decretorum et decretalium pontificalium*)! [...] A heretic is, however, only he, who sins against the word of faith (*verbum fidei*).«⁴⁶
- *Exegesis of Gal 1:11f*: »Thus it now happens everywhere: one defiles scripture (*scripturas [...] contaminant*) either with human doctrines (*humanis opinionibus*), which one has received, or with interpretations (*inventis glossis*), who's inventor oneself has been in own mastery.«⁴⁷
- *Exegesis of Gal 3:3*: »Therefore, it is »a word of power« (1 Cor 1:18) and »a word of grace« (Acts 14:3) (*verbum virtutis et gratiae*): as it appeals to the ears, at the same time it pours the Spirit inside. [...] If you want to attain grace then take heed that you either listen to the word of God (*verbum dei*) attentively or that you examine it carefully. The word, I say, and only the word (*solum verbum*) is the vehicle in which the grace of God moves (*vehiculum gratiae dei*).«⁴⁸
- *Exegesis of Gal 5:12*: »Christ is the husband of the church, which he makes fertile through the seed of the word of God (*semine verbi dei*) [...] But the members of the godless shall be cut off, for they spread alien seed and an adulterous word (*alienum semen et adulterinum verbum*).«⁴⁹
- *Exegesis of Gal 5:26*: »For if one treats divine writings (*litterae divinae*) in a way, that one explains them only with regard to past events and does not apply them to the events and nature of our time, - what use

can they have then? Then they are cold, dead, yes, not even divine anymore.«⁵⁰

- *Exegesis of Gal 6:6*: »The first and primary work (*primum sane et maximum opus*) of the church is certainly to carry on the word (*verbi tractatio*). This the Lord has assigned to Peter three times (John 21:15ff) and he demanded it from everyone most decidedly. In present-day time, however, there is nothing which is held back and despised to a greater extent.«⁵¹

In middle of May 1519 Luther came back to the dispute with Eck and supplemented his 12 theses from February with a 13th thesis against Eck, after the latter had added a 13th thesis to his own. Both of these 13th theses, which dealt with the pros and cons of the supremacy of the Roman church, Luther issued with annotations and a foreword just before the disputation in Leipzig (*Resolutio Lutheriana super propositione sua decima tertia de potestate papae*).⁵² In the above-mentioned foreword Luther makes the following two statements concerning *sola scriptura*:

- (1) »[...] Holy Scripture [has been] neglected completely at all universities (*sacras literas passim in universalibus studiis fuisse neglectas penitus*), although they pride themselves to understand scripture (*scripturas*) more precisely through human understanding, which is brought in by others rather than through [Scripture's] own [understanding].«⁵³
- (2) »[...] I do not want to understand scripture according to the judgement of one humane day (*non iudice humano die scripturam*), but according to the judgement of scripture the writings, sayings and deeds of all men (*sed scriptura iudice omnium hominum scripta, dicta, facta intelligere*).«⁵⁴

Almost simultaneously to the publication of this *Resolutio*, and after a longer time of uncertainty, Luther was finally admitted on June 24th

to take part in the Leipzig Disputation.⁵⁵ After reaching Leipzig, Karlstadt and Eck began to debate over free will on the 27th of June. In the following dispute between Luther and Eck the first topic was the supremacy of the Roman church in which Luther, as previously in his *Resolutio* (esp. with reference to Gal 1:17f and 2:1), was pointing to the church of Jerusalem (*ecclesia Hierosolymitana*).⁵⁶ Eck countered this argument primarily with the church fathers, whereupon Luther argued with the inferior authority of the church fathers compared to Paul and the superior authority of the word of God as against all words of men (*Verbum enim dei super omnia verba hominum est*).⁵⁷

Since Luther did not respond to Eck's argument of the supremacy of the Roman church, the latter tried to lure him into identifying with the errors of Wykliff, Huss and the Bohemians in the further course of the dispute. Luther answered to this cunning assault that many of the articles of Huss and the Bohemians were certainly Christian and Protestant, whereupon Eck led the discussion into the direction of the council of Constance, during which Huss was condemned as a heretic.⁵⁸ Upset by Eck's intended and hasty branding as a heretic Luther realized the last consequence of his principle of holding up scripture, namely that the inerrant word of God stands above any council, which in fact is a true creation of the same word (*verbum dei infallibile, concilium vero creatura istius verbi*) but still lower, since it can be mistaken.⁵⁹

Just after the Disputation of Leipzig, in August 1519, Luther issued a written explanation of his 13 theses for which he argued during the disputation (*Resolutiones Lutherianae super propositionibus suis Lipsiae disputatis*). There he confirmed the new insight which he had gained during the disputation by specifying and securing it with Holy Scripture: »For the church is a creation of the gospel, unequally lower than it (*Ecclesia enim creatura est Euangelii*,

incomparabiliter minor ipso) as James says (James 1:18): *Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth*, and Paul (1 Cor 4:15): *For in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel.*«⁶⁰ As a further consequence of this new insight of the creator's rank of the gospel Luther also now realized clearly that the pope, as far as he is placed above the gospel as a mere human, agrees with the Antichrist as Paul says (2 Thess 2:4): *[He] exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped.*⁶¹

4. Summary and Outlook

Tracing the historical development of the Protestant principle of *sola scriptura* in actual quotations from Luther's works from 1517–1519 makes it clear how little we are orienting ourselves in today's debates in church and theology towards this criterion. The historical criticism of the Bible in the past 150 years has contributed decisively to the fact that, Protestant theology today hardly subjects itself anymore to the revealed word of scripture and does not know it's conscience to be bound by scripture as Luther confessed it in 1521 on the Reichstag in Worms (*victus sum scripturis a me adductis et capta conscientia in verbis dei*).⁶² Today's critical exegesis, rather, emphasizes the human character of scripture, places itself above scripture and consequently acts without being bound to scripture as it can be observed in many of the current debates.

A way out of this current crisis of the Protestant principle of scripture, which is starting to take on threatening dimensions is, in my opinion, Luther's quest for the original church of Jerusalem, for the *ecclesia Hierosolymitana*, on which the New Testament reports explicitly in Galatians 1–2 and Acts 1–12 but implicitly also in the Gospel of John.⁶³ Only in the context of this oldest church of Christianity can

a reasonable and appropriate »human« picture of the formation and transmission of Holy Scripture be traced, which reaches beyond our occidental and philosophical tradition of interpreting scripture.

However, in all our »human« theological struggle over scripture it has to be kept in mind, that any theology is deducted from scripture and not vice versa, that scripture is deducted from theology. We should therefore turn back to a personal, intensive study of Holy Scripture, so that Luther's judgement of his former opponent Eck may not apply to us. To him he said at the end of the disputation in Leipzig: »It makes me feel sorry in my soul, that Mr. Doctor only penetrates as far into scripture as a water spider into water. Yes, it appears to me, as if he is fleeing from her sight as the devil from the cross.«⁶⁴

Yet, true theology can never be mere academic discipline from a human point of view. Luther pointed this out very clearly in his writing *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation* (August 1520),⁶⁵ in which he wrote: »I know here no other advice than a humble prayer to God, that he may give us doctors of theology. Doctors of philosophy, medicine, law, sentences - the pope, emperor and the universities can make. But be assured, a doctor of Holy Scripture nobody will make you except the Holy Spirit from heaven, as Christ says (John 6:45): *And they shall be all taught of God.*«⁶⁶

LITERATURE

- Bornkamm, H. »Luther, Martin.« *RGG*³ 4: 480–495.
- Bornkamm, K. *Luthers Auslegungen des Galaterbriefs von 1519 und 1531*. AKG 35. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1963.
- Bornkamm, K. and G. Ebeling (ed.), *Martin Luther Ausgewählte Schriften*, vol.

- I, *Martin Luther Aufbruch zur Reformation*. Frankfurt a.M.: Insel Verlag, 1990.
- D. *Martin Luthers Werke – Kritische Gesamtausgabe*. Weimar: Böhlau, 1883–1929. Electronic edition accessed on 24.01.2020. <http://luther.chadwyck.com/> [= WA].
- Dalferth, I. U. *Wirkendes Wort: Bibel, Schrift und Evangelium im Leben der Kirche und im Denken der Theologie*. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2018.
- Dr. *Martin Luthers sämtliche Schriften*, ed. by J. G. Walch. 2. überarbeitete Auflage. St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1880–1910 (Reprint: Groß-Oesingen: Verlag der Lutherischen Buchhandlung Harms, 1987). [= Walch]
- Jedin, H. (ed.) *Reformation, Katholische Reform und Gegenreformation*. HKG IV. Darmstadt: WBG, 2017.
- Kaufmann, T. *Geschichte der Reformation in Deutschland*. Berlin: Suhrkamp, 2016.
- Kleinknecht, H. *Luthers Galaterbrief-Auslegung von 1531*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.
- Metzger, W. (ed.) *Martin Luther: Kommentar zum Galaterbrief – 1519*. Calwer Luther-Ausgabe Bd. 10. Stuttgart: Calwer, ²1979.
- Pannenberg, W. »Die Krise des Schriftprinzips.« In *Grundfragen systematischer Theologie*, 11–21. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.
- Preuß, H. *Die Entwicklung des Schriftprinzips bei Luther bis zur Leipziger Disputation: im Zusammenhang mit der Stellung Luthers zu den andern theologischen Autoritäten seiner Zeit*. Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1901.
- Rechtfertigung und Freiheit: 500 Jahre Reformation 2017; Ein Grundlagentext des Rates der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland (EKD)*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, ⁴2015.
- Stengel, F. *Sola scriptura im Kontext: Behauptung und Bestreitung des reformatorischen Schriftprinzips*. ThLZ.F 2016. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2016.
- Van Dülmen, A. *Luther-Chronik: Daten zu Leben und Werk*. München: dtv, 1983.
- Wallmann, J. *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands seit der Reformation*. UTB 1355. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, ⁷2012.
- Wassermann, C. *Das vierte Evangelium aus Sicht der semitischen Sprachen: Ein linguistischer Beitrag zur Klärung der johanneischen Frage*. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2020.
- Wick, P. and M. Cramer (ed.) *Allein die Schrift? Neue Perspektiven auf eine Hermeneutik für Kirche und Gesellschaft*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2019.

ENDNOTES

- 1 WA 40 II, 57: *maiestatem divini verbi*. All translations of quotations from Luther without reference in the footnotes are own translations, often based on the German translations of Walch.
- 2 Luther held his first lecture on Galatians from October 1516 to March 1517. He published this lecture in revised form in collaboration with Melancthon in 1519, cf. A. van Dülmen, *Luther-Chronik: Daten zu Leben und Werk* (München: dtv, 1983), 27, 45, 52.
- 3 Cf. *Rechtfertigung und Freiheit: 500 Jahre Reformation 2017; Ein Grundlagentext des Rates der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland (EKD)* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, ⁴2015), 76–86.
- 4 Cf. W. Pannenberg, »Die Krise des Schriftprinzips,« in *Grundfragen sy-*

- stematischer Theologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), 11–21, I. U. Dalferth, *Wirkendes Wort: Bibel, Schrift und Evangelium im Leben der Kirche und im Denken der Theologie* (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2018) or P. Wick and Malte Cramer (ed.), *Allein die Schrift? Neue Perspektiven auf eine Hermeneutik für Kirche und Gesellschaft* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2019). A more historical but summarizing inquiry is found in F. Stengel, *Sola scriptura im Kontext: Behauptung und Bestreitung des reformatorischen Schriftprinzips*, ThLZ.F (2016) (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2016). Still, a truly source-oriented approach with many quotations from Luther is found in the dissertation of H. Preuß, *Die Entwicklung des Schriftprinzips bei Luther bis zur Leipziger Disputation: im Zusammenhang mit der Stellung Luthers zu den andern theologischen Autoritäten seiner Zeit* (Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1901).
- 5 Cf. <http://luther.chadwyck.com/deutsch/frames/werke/search> (accessed on 24.01.2020).
 - 6 The aftermath of the Augsburg Reichstag still occupied Luther (in form of the Reichsabschied) until spring 1531, cf. van Dülmen, *Luther-Chronik*, 188–190.
 - 7 Compilation based on K. Bornkamm, *Luthers Auslegungen des Galaterbriefs von 1519 und 1531*, AKG 35 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1963), 369–391.
 - 8 WA 40 I, 120; Transl. J. Pelikan et al. (ed.), *Luther's Works*, vol. 26, *Lectures on Galatians, 1535, Chapters 1–4* (Saint Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1999), 58.
 - 9 WA 40 I, 132; Transl. Pelikan et al., *Luther's Works*, vol. 26, 66f.
 - 10 WA 40 II, 48; Transl. J. Pelikan et al. (ed.), *Luther's Works*, vol. 27, *Lectures on Galatians, 1535, Chapters 5–6* (Saint Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1999), 38.
 - 11 WA 40 II, 57; Transl. Pelikan et al., *Luther's Works*, vol. 27, 46. Cf. here-with also Luther's negative summary on Gal 3:6 with the very similar wording: *In summa: nihil maiestatis et divinitas habet Deus, ubi fides non est* (WA 40 I, 360) = »All in all, God has no majesty or divinity where there is no faith« (own translation).
 - 12 On the fact of Luther's pinning of the 95 theses in Wittenberg cf. T. Kaufmann, *Geschichte der Reformation in Deutschland* (Berlin: Suhrkamp, 2016), 182f, 207f.
 - 13 WA 1, 233–238; Cf. also Kaufmann, *Geschichte*, 192f.
 - 14 Cf. Luther's subsequent explanation of his theses for Pope Leo X. (from May 1518), here of his first thesis, in which he quotes the following passages: Rom 12,2; Jn 12,25; Matt 10,34.38; 5,4; Rom 6; 8; Gal 5,24; 2 Cor 6,4.5; Matt 6,16 (WA 1, 530f).
 - 15 Transl. acc. to J. Pelikan et al. (ed.), *Luther's Works*.
 - 16 On this cf. WA 1, 239–246, Kaufmann, *Geschichte*, 210–215, van Dülmen, *Luther-Chronik*, 32f.
 - 17 WA 1, 243.
 - 18 WA 1, 243.
 - 19 WA 1, 246.
 - 20 WA 1, 246.
 - 21 Cf. WA 51, 539 in connection with Kaufmann, *Geschichte*, 203.
 - 22 Cf. Walch 18, 82–95 in connection with van Dülmen, *Luther-Chronik*, 32f. Yet, these theses were probably not written by Tetzel's own hand, but rather by Konrad Wimpina from the University of Frankfurt/Oder, cf. Kaufmann, *Geschichte*, 209.
 - 23 Translated from Walch 18, 82.
 - 24 Translated from Walch 18, 95.

- 25 On this cf. J. Wallmann, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands seit der Reformation*, UTB 1355 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 21f, Kaufmann, *Geschichte*, 223–225, van Dülmen, *Luther-Chronik*, 37 and H. Jedin (ed.), *Reformation, Katholische Reform und Gegenreformation*, HKG IV (Darmstadt: WBG, 2017), 53–65.
- 26 Cf. Walch 18, 314.
- 27 Cf. van Dülmen, *Luther-Chronik*, 37.
- 28 WA 1, 647.
- 29 WA 1, 647.
- 30 For a more extensive analysis with references (esp. from Luther's writing *Freiheit des Sermons* from June 1518, which also cites Gal 1:8) cf. Preuß, *Schriftprinzip*, 41–43, 47.
- 31 Cf. van Dülmen, *Luther-Chronik*, 59.
- 32 WA 6, 328.
- 33 Cf. Preuß, *Schriftprinzip*, 75–96, hier 82.
- 34 Cf. Eck's 28th Obelisc on Luthers 77th thesis (WA 1, 312) in connection with van Dülmen, *Luther-Chronik*, 32.
- 35 WA 1, 281.
- 36 Cf. Wallmann, *Kirchengeschichte*, 23f, van Dülmen, *Luther-Chronik*, 34, 39f.
- 37 Cf. WA 2, 154, Kaufmann, *Geschichte*, 233.
- 38 Cf. Wallmann, *Kirchengeschichte*, 25f, van Dülmen, *Luther-Chronik*, 42f.
- 39 Cf. Kaufmann, *Geschichte*, 234, van Dülmen, *Luther-Chronik*, 42f.
- 40 Cf. Kaufmann, *Geschichte*, 234, van Dülmen, *Luther-Chronik*, 43f.
- 41 Cf. WA 2, 436f, van Dülmen, *Luther-Chronik*, 45.
- 42 Cf. WA 5, 1–7, van Dülmen, *Luther-Chronik*, 45 in connection with H. Bornkamm, »Luther, Martin,« *RGG*³ 4: 480–495, here 485.
- 43 Cf. Preuß, *Schriftprinzip*, 67–69.
- 44 WA 2, 445.
- 45 WA 2, 453.
- 46 WA 2, 462.
- 47 WA 2, 465.
- 48 WA 2, 509.
- 49 WA 2, 574.
- 50 WA 2, 601.
- 51 WA 2, 608.
- 52 Cf. WA 2, 180f, van Dülmen, *Luther-Chronik*, 47f.
- 53 WA 2, 183.
- 54 WA 2, 184.
- 55 Cf. Kaufmann, *Geschichte*, 234, van Dülmen, *Luther-Chronik*, 47f.
- 56 Cf. WA 2, 190, 203, 206 (*Resolutio*) with WA 2, 258 (Leipzig Disputation). This argumentation of Luther with the more original church of Jerusalem is already prepared in his *Operationes in Psalmos* (exegesis of Ps 2:6), cf. WA 5, 56.
- 57 Cf. WA 2, in connection with Preuß, *Schriftprinzip*, 77f.
- 58 On this cf. Preuß, *Schriftprinzip*, 79–81.
- 59 Cf. WA 2, 288 in connection with Preuß, *Schriftprinzip*, 82.
- 60 WA 2, 430.
- 61 Cf. WA 2, 430 in connection with Preuß, *Schriftprinzip*, 93.
- 62 WA 7, 838.
- 63 On this cf. the results of my dissertation *Das vierte Evangelium aus Sicht der semitischen Sprachen: Ein linguistischer Beitrag zur Klärung der johanneischen Frage* (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2020), 285–293.
- 64 WA 2, 382.
- 65 Cf. van Dülmen, *Luther-Chronik*, 61f.
- 66 WA 6, 460.

Clemens Wassermann (Dr. theol.) is lecturer in New Testament at EUSEBIA School of Theology (ESTh) and teaches the languages of the Old Testament (Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic). Co-author of STUTTGART THEOLOGICAL TOPICS.

